



ALFRED SUTTON PRIMARY SCHOOL
Minutes of the Virtual Meeting of the Community Engagement Committee
Wednesday 6th March 2024. 7pm

Present: Dave Dymond (Chair); Andrew Burrell; Kate Gordon; Hajar Alami; Vincent Onuchi; David Colwill; Sze-Hang Wong.

In attendance: Rachel Lawson (DHT); Alice de Croos (SBM).

Apologies: Zoe Watling.

Absent: Adedayo Benson; Yota Dimitriadi.

Clerk: Deborah Savage

Agenda Item	
1	Welcome & Apologies. The chair welcomed all to this CEC meeting. Apologies had been received from Zoe which were accepted. Two governors on this committee did not attend. Robert Howell (EHT) did not attend the meeting as he is suffering from a chest infection and is not in school at present. The DHT attended the meeting in his place. The committee sent their best wishes to Robert for a speedy recovery.
2	Declarations of Interest. There were no declarations of interest.
3	Minutes of the meeting held 15th November 2023. The minutes from this meeting had been circulated in advance and the chair reviewed the actions from this meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The chair has signed the minutes from 22/6/22 in GovHub.• The TOR had been edited in the light of the discussion at the last meeting and the TOR is on this agenda for approval.• The committee chair informed the meeting that an impact statement is a summary of the work of a committee during an academic year to be submitted as a report to the FGB. It was noted that there is a mistake in the title of the committee within the November minutes. ACTION: This will be corrected. The minutes were approved subject to this correction and ACTION: Chair to sign these in GovernorHub.
4	Matters Arising.

	<p>Referring to section 6 of the November 23 minutes – <u>Federation: Communication with stakeholders</u>, the chair informed the meeting that there is no change from the November position. Planned meetings had not yet taken place although it is intended to send a letter to all staff and parents of both schools along with the LA to update them and inform them of the next steps that are planned. This is to update stakeholders and also to allay any concerns that information about Federation had not been sent for some time. ACTION: This letter will be sent out before the Easter break.</p> <p>The chair also had an update about Safer Streets – Maiden Erlegh school has become re-engaged with the scheme and is involving some pupils. UTC has also re-engaged after the marshals asked for additional support from these two schools. The current marshals are all local residents with no marshals being supplied by the UTC or Maiden Erlegh.</p> <p>Governor Question: What is the history of the other schools’ involvement with this scheme – have they always been disengaged or were they more involved in the past? All three schools agreed to set up the scheme – it needed the agreement of all three to work. Maiden Erlegh were heavily involved in getting the legalities of the scheme established. After a successful pilot scheme, it has now been running for 2 years. Maiden Erlegh and the UTC struggle with getting parent marshals as their age group of students often travel to school independently and also from a long distance. It is important that we establish a system that ensures the long-term successful operation of the scheme.</p> <p>The Committee chair said that he would keep the committee informed of any developments.</p>
5	<p>CEC Term of Reference – changes to review and approve.</p> <p>Following the discussion that took place in the November 2023 CEC meeting, the Clerk had made the requested changes to the TOR, which had then been circulated in advance of this meeting. The Clerk explained that the Educational Visits Policy had been removed from this TOR and added to the policies that the PEC is responsible for. Items 38 and 66 have also been removed from the decision planner as the school profile has been superseded by the DfE website school profile and the need for a “discipline policy” has been superseded by the new therapeutic behaviour policy.</p> <p>Also added to the TOR was an explanation of the word “community”; a target to work towards Federation with Redlands and the requirement to produce an annual committee review statement to be reported to the FGB.</p> <p>It was noted that all TORs would be reviewed again the light of the proposed Federation with Redlands Primary School.</p> <p>DECISION: changes to the TOR were approved. They would be reviewed by the FGB in the September 24 meeting ahead of the new academic year.</p>

<p>6</p>	<p>School's Vision Pre-Federation.</p> <p>The committee was informed that the CEC has the remit (stated on the TOR) for establishing the school vision and reviewing it. The school vision should be reflected in the school's development plans and other working documents. The school vision was last reviewed in 2018 and details of this were circulated before the meeting. Since then, education had been disrupted by the Covid pandemic and the vision has not been reviewed since then. It was noted that once Federation takes place, the vision will need to be reviewed again to reflect the changes brought by Federating the two schools.</p> <p>It was noted that the school had a successful Ofsted inspection and in the light of the fact that the school vision will have to change post Federation, the Chair expressed the opinion that the current vision should be retained and it did not need review currently.</p> <p>It was noted that the Memorandum of Understanding that was created for the initial stages of the Federation talks also expressed a vision for the two primary schools planning to Federate. ACTION: the MOU would be added to the CEC meeting folder for Governors to look at.</p> <p>It was also noted that, as part of the Federation process, a new vision would be created over the next 6-12 months.</p> <p>DECISION: The school vision will not be reviewed at the moment – as this is a major consultation process and the vision will change as part of the Federation process.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Survey Results for discussion.</p> <p>a) Children.</p> <p>The children were surveyed and two documents were circulated to governors in advance of the meeting containing an analysis of the results – which were very positive overall. Highlights were that children felt listened too, safe and respected. It is planned to carry out the same survey again later in the academic year, to see if anything changes. The order of the questions will be changed however, as it was felt that maybe the change from more positive answers to the first questions to slightly more negative responses towards the end of the 20 questions may be a reflection of children's weariness with the questionnaire.</p> <p>Governor Question: Has this been discussed in SLT? Yes – results have been shared with SLT and also with phase leads so that some areas that were picked up can be worked on at phase level.</p> <p>Governor Question: How was the questionnaire differentiated or changed to accommodate children with a SEND need? Provision was made where appropriate to allow all children to access the questionnaire. For example, some children had the questions read out to them.</p>

	<p>Governor Question: Were there any surprises? There were some slight inconsistencies at year group level, which phase leads are unpicking and acting on.</p> <p>Governor Question: Is it possible to see the survey the children completed please? It would help us understand the context and how it was presented. Yes. ACTION: The survey would be uploaded to the CEC meeting folder.</p> <p>b) Verbal update re staff survey: There was a staff survey circulated but only 2 responses were received. Staff were surveyed by Ofsted too as part of the recent inspection.</p> <p>Governor Question: Is it a worry that only 2 responses were received? We think the opposite actually – the EHT has an “open door” policy and staff do go to him and other senior leaders so any issues are addressed quickly. Staff do feel that they have a voice and that it is heard, so we think the low response is indicative of the fact that there are no pressing issues for staff. The Ofsted staff survey results were very positive.</p> <p>Governor Question: Did the staff survey have a deadline to respond by? Yes.</p> <p>The meeting was informed that the staff room has a pigeon hole that staff can leave comments in (anonymously if they prefer) so this is another way staff can raise issues if they wish to.</p> <p>c) Verbal update re Parents survey. Since parents and carers were also surveyed by Ofsted, it is felt that it is best to delay another survey of parents for a future date. It was also noted that parents would be surveyed as part of the Federation process.</p>
8	<p>Policies for approval. There were a number of policies for approval, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>a) Behaviour Principles Statement. It was noted that there was a typo that need correcting. The meeting was informed that the EHT and AHT responsible for Behaviour write this document together. DECISION: Approved.</p> <p>b) Complaints Policy. The meeting was informed that this is based on the most current model policy from the Department of Education, as issued by RBC to maintained schools. DECISION: Policy Approved for adoption.</p> <p>c) Equality Policy. It was noted that, as a public body, the school is obliged to abide by and be proactive in pursuing equality of opportunity for all. DECISION: Policy Approved for adoption.</p>

	<p>d) Pro-Social behaviour Policy.</p> <p>Governor Question: Should the Therapeutic Approach to behaviour management be more prominent in this Policy? This suggestion was noted for consideration in further reviews of the policy.</p> <p>Governor Question: The policy refers to “staff training where necessary.” Who policies this? Sarah Tweddle is our lead on this, and is highly trained in Therapeutic Behaviour Management to the point where she can deliver the training to staff. This has been done recently with new staff and also those who would benefit from a refresher. Phase leads and AHTs monitor behaviour management and how staff handle particular situations. Alice Boon from the LA has also delivered training to our staff and we have her training videos on the staff resources system for review at any time staff want to do this.</p> <p>DECISION: Policy Approved.</p> <p>e) RHE Policy (& long-term plan document)</p> <p>The meeting was informed that this area teaches children relationship and health education and it is a statutory requirement. Sometimes, parents have concerns over the content of these lessons, and meetings are held to reassure parents and discuss any concerns.</p> <p>DECISION: Policy Approved for adoption (by majority).</p> <p>f) Whistleblowing policy.</p> <p>This is a standard policy based on an RBC model policy.</p> <p>DECISION: Policy Approved for adoption (by majority).</p>
9	<p>Governors into school morning on 8th March 2024.</p> <p>Unfortunately, due to the EHT’s absence due to illness, this has been postponed. A new date will be circulated to governors as soon as possible.</p> <p>Governor Question: Is it still the plan to talk to the school council during this morning? Yes – but it would help to decide on a topic and 4 or 5 questions to give to the children in advance. ACTION: Governors to communicate via emails in GovHub forum to decide this ready for a new date for this event.</p>
10	<p>Wellbeing & Equality.</p> <p>The link governor for Wellbeing and Equality was at the meeting and she reported that there were no issues to raise.</p> <p>It was noted that the Director of Education had briefed governors that work was underway to improve staff wellbeing, particularly in the run up to and during Ofsted inspections when staff were under additional pressure. HTs and DHTs are also being encouraged by the LA to undertake coaching to help them cope with stress.</p>
11	<p>Issues for Parents/FGB/Confidentiality.</p> <p>There were no issues for the FGB nor confidential issues. Parents in both schools would be sent a letter giving an update on the Federation process before Easter.</p>

12	<p>Any Other Business.</p> <p>It was proposed that a Vice-chair for this committee be appointed, as a legacy planning measure. A Governor has been approached to discuss this. It was agreed that this is a sensible measure.</p> <p>There was some discussion over the format of meetings – whether to continue with online meetings, or to hold some meetings face to face. The view was expressed that it would be good to hold some face to face, but that it would be good to hold a survey of governors to discuss the timing of these. It was noted that governors could claim child care expenses if this was required.</p> <p>ACTION: CoG to survey the GB about format and timing of future meetings. ACTION: Committee chairs to discuss with their committees’ format and timing of committee meetings.</p> <p>The meeting was informed that the school values and appreciates the work that the GB do and would do what they can to accommodate the GB’s meeting preferences.</p> <p>The meeting was also informed that this year the school would have an artist in residence as part of the White Knights Studio Trail with a school art fair on Friday after school and the Artist in Residence on Saturday 8th June. Governors were invited to offer their support. The PTA would be selling light refreshments.</p>
13	Date of next meeting: Wednesday 19th June 2024

Meeting closed: 8.00pm

Actions:

Action:	Owner:
Correction to be made to minutes 15th November 2023	Clerk
Chair to sign minutes from 15/11/23 in GovHub asap	DD
CoG to draft letter to stakeholders re Federation with CoG at Redlands and circulate for approval via email. Letter to be sent before Easter break.	DD/CR then ALL
Add the MOU to the CEC meeting folder.	Clerk
Upload the pupil survey to the CEC meeting folder.	RL
Plan meeting with the school council via email thread in GovHub	ALL
Survey GB about meeting times / format	DD
Committee chairs to discuss with committees meeting times/formats.	DD/KG/AB/AB

Attendance at CEC meetings 2023/24 (2 meetings to date)

Dave Dymond	2 of 2 meetings
Robert Howell	1 of 2 meetings
Adedayo Benson	1 of 2 meetings
Yota Dimitriadi	0 of 2 meetings
Kate Gordon	2 of 2 meetings
Andrew Burrell	2 of 2 meetings
Hajar Alami	2 of 2 meetings
Sze-Hang Wong	1 of 1 possible meeting
David Colwill	1 of 2 meetings
Vincent Onuchi	1 of 2 meetings