

	<p>(two sets) of the 5 December 2023 FGB meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 6.3: KA and ML had completed the code of conduct confirmation on GovernorHub. Item 6.3: KA had completed the Keeping Children Safe in Education 2024 confirmation on GovernorHub. Item 6.3: Action carried forward: JS and JB to monitor the leadership structure. Item 7: The HT had covered filtering and monitoring updates in the Leadership Report. Item 10.4: The HT and ML would continue to discuss benchmarking data, when available / appropriate, during finance monitoring meetings. Item 11: The HT had finalised the approved gifts and hospitality policy as agreed. Item 12: The HT and ML had discussed the proposal for an onsite community hub. 	JS & JB
5	<p>Leadership Report, School Development & Monitoring</p> <p>5.1 Reports – Governors had received the following via GovernorHub:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership Report February 2025 covering: school development plan; leadership and management; quality of education; behaviour and attitudes; personal development; Early Years; special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) monitoring visit (LB 29-5-2024); maths and English monitoring report (ML & JS, 10-12-2024); and finance analysis January 2025 (ML). Final Ofsted report of 14 and 15 January 2025 inspection. Confidential Ofsted feedback notes. <p>5.2 Nursery – In her role as Deputy Head Teacher / Head of Early Years, Steph Mack (SM) gave an update on the nursery. The nursery was close to full, with waiting lists for April and September. In the first instance, parents of current nursery children would be asked whether they wished to make any changes to their attendance. The new classroom had been decorated for the Year 1 Apple Trees class. Work was due to start the following week on Apple Trees’ old classroom ready for Year R to move into. Furniture and resources had been bought for the nursery. Interviews had been held earlier that week for a new Early Years teaching assistant and a strong candidate had been appointed. The school would go back out to advert for additional staff as needed. Interviews had been held earlier that day for a nursery room leader; there had been a very strong field of candidates from which an appointment had been made.</p> <p>SM said that the garden development project was currently taking lower priority pending confirmation of funding. SM was confident that the new nursery classroom for children attending 30 hours per week (five days per week) would be ready by term 5. The HT outlined plans for the new nursery class – Mango Class – to interact with Year R and to follow a similar daily routine with respect to playtimes etc, which would help prepare children for transition to Year R. He emphasised that it was not the intention to accelerate nursery children to Year R in terms of expectations and curriculum; rather, to enable them to explore and gain an understanding of foundational skills such as counting to 10 and understanding numbers. SM said that the budget setting process in term 4 would take account of forecasted nursery numbers. Work would be undertaken to advertise and raise the profile of the expanded nursery provision. The HT wanted every parent to be made aware of their child’s eligibility for the 30 hours provision. SM suggested organising a working group to assist eligible parents with funding applications.</p> <p>A governor asked about staffing arrangements for Mango Class. SM said that it would be run by a room leader rather than a teacher. A governor asked the reason for this distinction. SM said that, after careful consideration, it had been decided that a room leader role would provide appropriate oversight of the nursery, working closely alongside the Year R teacher. The HT identified scope for room leaders to potentially train as Early Years teachers further down the line. Governors were keen to receive further updates on the development of the nursery. A governor asked about the impacts of the expanded nursery provision for children entering Year R. KG said that, among children entering Year R, there was a marked difference between those who had attended the school’s nursery and those who had not in terms of interactions and independence. For example, children who had attended the nursery were able to get changed much more quickly for</p>	

	PE, thereby increasing the amount of learning time available for other activities. At 5.20pm governors thanked SM and SM left the meeting.	
5.3	Filtering and monitoring – A governor asked how the school's IT filtering and monitoring system worked. The HT explained that the school used the Smoothwall system which was operated by real people and worked by picking up keystrokes. The school received email notifications for incidents at level 3 or above; this enabled staff to log in, see what had happened and who was involved, take a screenshot and investigate. The Inclusion Manager also routinely checked level 1 and 2 incidents.	
5.4	Staff attendance – A governor asked about the apparently high level of staff absence. The HT said that a staff member had been signed off for a known medical reason. A governor asked whether there were any concerns relating to the overall level of staff absence. The HT acknowledged that there were some concerns; however, there had not been a significant year-on-year increase in absence. The absence data reflected the fact that the school employed a high number of support staff, who tended to take more absence than teaching staff within the profession. This was in part because support staff were more likely to be the parent within their respective households to take time off work when their own children were unwell.	
5.5	Improving teaching – A governor asked about arrangements for supporting teachers. The HT said that Early Career Teachers (ECTs) received intense, approximately weekly support in line with requirements. There were many mechanisms by which the school supported ECTs, including via class teaching colleagues, Senior Teachers and DHTs. Support mechanisms for other staff were individualised as needed. Teachers were granted a lot of freedom and independence and if children were making good progress, this was seen to speak for itself. KG said that staff were good at sharing resources and supporting colleagues, including between different levels of staff. The Chair commended the school's outcomes data which reflected the high quality of teaching at Greenfields. The HT said that staff knew the children well and ensured that support was tailored to meet individual children's needs.	
5.6	Ofsted – The HT said that the Ofsted report was very positive and highlighted the school's strengths. Areas that had previously been graded as good had been graded as good again; areas that had previously been graded as outstanding had been graded as outstanding again. Governors agreed that the issues identified in the report were minor compared to the school's overall strengths. On behalf of the Governing Body, the Chair congratulated everyone at Greenfields on the Ofsted report.	
6	Safeguarding The HT said that Ofsted had been impressed by how well the school knew its children and families with respect to safeguarding. JS and the Inclusion Manager were arranging a monitoring visit.	
7	Data Protection There had been no data protection issues in the reporting period.	
8	Health, Safety and Premises The HT would continue to keep governors updated regarding the roof.	
9	Finance	
9.1	Monitoring reports – Governors had received the following reports via GovernorHub: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CFR Codes Cost Centres Budget Profile Details Report dated 30 November and December 2024. ML's Finance Analysis for Year Ending March 2025 (standalone reports for November and December; January report included in Leadership Report). 	
9.2	Updates – The HT reported that, as of that day, the forecasted revenue balance carried forward was c£282k, which was within the school's balance control mechanism (BCM) of c£303k.	

10	<p>Policies</p> <p>Governors approved the following documents which had been shared via GovernorHub:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility plan. A governor asked whether the site was wheelchair accessible. The HT confirmed that it was. • Breakfast and after school club policy. The HT signposted changes with respect to on-the-day bookings and the timings and costs of clubs. • Finance policy. <p>Action: The Clerk to review / update the Governing Body Terms of Reference to ensure alignment of spending thresholds with the finance policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freedom of information policy. The HT confirmed that website links had been updated. • School discipline and conduct policy. This policy had been adapted from the Schools Personnel Service (SPS) model policy. 	Clerk
11	<p>AOB</p> <p>11.1 Bulletin – Governors had received The Education People’s January governance bulletin.</p> <p>11.2 Staff feedback – The HT reported that staff had given positive feedback on a range of areas including: feeling loved; the leadership’s open door policy; buy-in to Greenfields’ ethos; the feeling of the school; fulfilment of their purpose as teachers; job satisfaction; opportunities for development; Christmas events; and inclusivity and equality for all children. A governor asked how often staff feedback was sought. The HT said it was sought informally at least three times per year, most recently during INSET.</p>	
12	<p>Confidentiality</p> <p>The Leadership Report and the Ofsted feedback notes were filed as confidential. Part of item 4.3 was deemed to be confidential and was recorded in Part 2 confidential minutes.</p>	
13	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Governors confirmed the next FGB meeting would be held at 4.30pm on Thursday 27 March.</p>	

The meeting closed at 5.49pm.

These minutes will be signed electronically via GovernorHub.