



Kingsbury Episcopi Primary School Full Governing Body Meeting

MINUTES of the meeting held on Monday 7th July 2025, 6.30pm

Present:

Simon Faull (SF) – Chair of Governors
Fiona Guest (FG) - Co-opted Governor
David Harris (DH) - Parent Governor
Elodie Carson (EC) - Staff Governor
Mike Gulliver (MG) - Co-opted Governor
Barbara Teale (BT) - Co-opted Governor
Neil Burn (NB) - Parent Governor

Apologies:

Melanie Lawson (ML) - Headteacher
Jon Loxston (JL) – Vice Chair
Charlotte England (CE) - Co-opted Governor
Neil Thompson (NT) – Headteacher elect

Documents for this meeting can be found on SharePoint [here](#)

1.	Welcome & introductions
	Those present were welcomed to the meeting. It was confirmed that the meeting was quorate.
2.	Apologies
	Apologies had been received from Melanie Lawson, Jon Loxston and Charlotte England. These were accepted.
3.	Declarations of Interest in items on this meeting's agenda
	There were none.
4.	Minutes of previous meeting <i>Previously circulated</i>
	The minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2025 were agreed and will be electronically signed and dated. Correction: <u>Item 11, Business Support Staffing</u> It was noted that the school is <u>not</u> being chased by PGL for non-payment of a bill; the solicitors who have contacted the school are acting on behalf of a group of schools who are trying to get a refund from PGL. The party at fault was recorded incorrectly at the previous meeting; it should be the other way around.
5.	Matters Arising
	There were none.
6.	Matters of Urgency
	There were none.
New Items	
7.	Budget
	SFVS – it was confirmed that this has now been sent to the Local Authority (LA).

	- Quotes for pool fencing – only one quote has been received. Quotes were sought because a child managed to climb over the fence, so it was deemed necessary to make it higher. Governors agreed that the fence should be heightened. They raised concern that it was erected by the LA very recently and has been shown already not to be fit for purpose. It was felt that the LA should be approached to see if they would be willing to pay for this alteration. The quote provided is dated towards the end of May and is only valid for 28 days. Governors were asked if they were happy to proceed with one quote? It was confirmed that the child who climbed the fence is in Year 6 and so will be leaving the school soon. On balance, governors felt that there is no urgency to have this work done. More quotes should be sought, and the LA should be contacted. Governors agreed to defer the matter to the NT in the next academic year. - Teacher pay award confirmed – budget implications. In the absence of the Headteacher, governors were unable to understand any budget implications around this. - PE and Sports Premium report – governors were told that the school will not meet the deadline for submitting this report to the LA; SF has already spoken to NT so that the deadline can be met next year. - Expansion of Universal Infant Free School Meals to all pupils in families in receipt of universal credit – it was noted that this was for governor information only. There may be budget and other implications. - Month 2 financial report – shows a deficit of £62.5k. Question: why is there an in-year positive balance but the school year is ending with a deficit balance? The deficit is a cumulative deficit, accumulated over a few years. The deficit will have increased by the next report due to additional costs such as paying for supply cover in one class to the end of term and employing a new member of office staff, as agreed at the last governor meeting. Comment: the format of the financial report has changed, making it more difficult to read. It was noted that this report is quarterly and provided by the school. The usual reports, provided by the LA, will continue to be provided alongside.
--	--

8.	School Improvement Partner (SIP) Note of Visit
	Governors felt that the report raised some questions: - At the top of the report is a list of activities undertaken that should be deleted or amended as required. This was not done. It was thought that the SIP met with ML, completed a learning walk and undertook a book scrutiny. She did not meet with governors or other staff, and it is unclear if she undertook any pupil voice. - The report states that “staff and parents are positive about the changes the Headteacher has made and are proud to be working in such a good school” and that “the school has regained its popularity within the local community.” Where is the evidence for these statements? The SIP has visited the school before; is this a cumulative report based on previous visits?

	- Governors felt there was much use of the word “now”, which implies a “then”. What period does “then” relate to? It was felt that the report exaggerated the level and impact of the LA’s support. - One of the agreed actions was to “review handwriting/presentation policy with all staff and insist this is addressed before the end of the school year.” How can the SIP “insist”? Governors felt that the criticisms about the pre-school were hard-hitting, although they acknowledged that there were also many positive comments in the report. The final point about the pre-school is reasonable because the SIP is saying the same as other people who have visited pre-school. There is a sense that there has been a shift from the concern being an issue with the pre-school to an issue with leadership. Question: has the Headteacher acted on the contractual hours point? No. It was felt that the deadlines for achieving some of these actions is very short. Governors were unclear if the reports and actions have been shared with staff. Overall, governors did not feel that the report offered a way forward for the school although it was noted that a specialist SEY has visited school since this report was written. Question: what is the purpose of the report? It allows the LA to monitor the performance of its schools and report back both to the LA and to the governors. The school doesn’t pay for this; it is the LA discharging its monitoring role. KEPS has a visit once a year because it is a “good” school.
--	--

NB arrived at 7.05pm.

9.	School Development Plan 2025-26
	Question: has ML written this in collaboration with NT? No. Question: on that basis, to what extent is NT bound to this SDP? Not at all but the priorities draw heavily on the priorities established by the last Ofsted report. Governors agreed the SDP as an initial document hat NT can draw on, but felt that one of his first tasks for the new term should be for him to identify where it’s useful, and discard it where it’s not. It was noted that Carly Cleasby will continue to teach full-time. This is a permanent change. Parents have been informed about the class structure for next year and transition has taken place. Governors were pleased that a SENDCo is supporting the school.
10.	DfE Attendance monitoring report
	This is a new government innovation because attendance is a national concern. Governors felt it was helpful and easy to read and offers an appropriate benchmark with similar schools. Clear messages have come out of the document, which might need to be reflected in next year’s SDP. It was noted that KEPS attendance is a concern amongst vulnerable groups, who are not attending in line with their peers in other schools and are bringing KEPS’ overall attendance down as a result. It was also recognised that this is at odds with

	the SIP visit, which stated that “provision for those with SEND is good and the curriculum is now well adapted to meet their needs.” It was noted that the school has, in response to meeting the needs of certain children, put these children on repeated part-time timetables. This negatively affects both their attendance and the overall school’s attendance figure. Question: what is the definition of persistent absence [PA]? It equates to one day per fortnight or the same child missing school for half a day per week. Governors noted that KEPS is rated 21st out of 21 schools in the benchmarking report. It was agreed that there are very clear messages in this report, albeit unsurprising. What is surprising is the unfavourable comparison with other schools; however, if KEPS wishes to pride itself on being an inclusive school and including children on roll who are either unable or unwilling to attend school, then this will inevitably have a detrimental effect on the overall attendance figures. Question: where can KEPS go for help with improving attendance? The Local Authority does have an attendance officer, but there may first need to be further research at school level into the reasons behind non-attendance. The Richard Huish Trust has access to PFSA’s, which may be helpful, particularly as the waiting list for maintained schools for PFSA support is very long.
--	---

11.	Staffing
	- SEND – the school has secured a consultant SENDCo to support with a number of tasks. This will work out at 0.5 day per week, although there may be some front loading. This has been negotiated with Helen Berriman, the SEND consultant concerned, who has met with ML and NT to discuss the school’s needs. Helen will take on the role of SENDCo initially, and provide advice and guidance to the school on how to meet the needs of children with SEND. She will provide training where it is deemed necessary and appropriate with a view to working to any of the teaching staff who might be interested in working on gaining the SENDCo qualification. That will give NT a sound base to work from for at least the next two terms. This could be extended, but clearly there is a financial implication and the cost will increase the deficit. Some of this cost can be discounted in the sense that if the SENDCo isn’t the Headteacher, then the school is not having to pay the SENDCo allowance, and also if there was a SENDCo in school, they would have to be paid release time, which would also have a financial implication. Question: are all these tasks coming out of this 0.5 days a week? Yes. For the first half-term, Helen will be working with parents, children and class teachers to get a sense of SEND within the school. - recruitment to the part-time teacher post. This was covered in Item 9 above.

12.	Swimming Pool
	ML would like to transfer operation of the swimming pool to school [from the PTA]. The rationale is that the school has ultimate responsibility for the pool, so it makes sense to have day to day responsibility for it too. Question: is this an issue around insurance / liability? The school already has liability for the pool; this is more an issue of having control: if you have control, you can assure yourself of risk and liability.

	Question: do the PTA want this to happen? It was unclear if any conversation has taken place with the PTA. Governors felt that this discussion should be deferred until NT is in post.
--	---

Standing Items	
13.	Headteacher Update <i>Based on report previously circulated</i> To include questions asked at May meeting. <i>In the absence of the Headteacher, this was not covered.</i> - Planning for 4-class school – it was confirmed that all of this information has gone out and is known. - Academy conversion update – SF is in the process of completing the application. It is felt that the earliest the conversion will take place is the end of the next academic year. This is because academisation is a long process that involves a number of stakeholders. - Pre-school update – FG, SF and RHT (Richard Huish Trust) staff met with pre-school staff to update them on proposals. The plan is that the RHT will undertake some market research over the summer, to be completed in a two-week period. Proposals will then be brought back to the FGB and pre-school staff in September. FG felt that the proposal wasn't a complete surprise to staff. They were happy to do the market research but gave little other feedback. There was no resistance in the room, but this could be because they are possibly not going to be the people to take it forward. They did ask questions about timescales, contracts etc and were generally saying that they felt reassured by the answers that they got. They felt reassured by the network of Huish nurseries and staff and felt this would fill a need that is not currently being met. There was much anxiety around contracts, although this seemed less to do with the RHT and more to do with the LA.
14.	Policies for review There were none.
15.	Safeguarding <i>This item was not discussed.</i>
16.	Health & Safety <i>This item was not discussed.</i>
17.	Complaints There were none.
18.	Governor training/roles/visits FG has visited Beech class and provided a report.
19.	Any Other Business Thank you notes will be sent to each school group: classes, office, PTA, Headteacher, caretaker. They will be signed from KEPS governors. Governors were signposted to SharePoint to a letter of thanks to governors from Catherine McKinnell MP, Minister for School Standards.

	A vote of thanks was extended to Barbara Teale for her support and challenge during her time as a governor at KEPS. It was noted that although much discussion had been had by governors around the proposal to join the RHT, no formal agreement to do so had previously been minuted. Therefore: governors unanimously agreed to seek academy status and to join the Richard Huish Trust. It was noted that the school can withdraw at any point prior to signing the academy agreement, should governors feel that this is the best course of action for the school.
--	--

20.	Proposed meeting dates for 2025-26 academic year.
	The dates for next academic year's full Governing Body meetings were confirmed as: 7 October, 2 December, 27 January 2026, 24 March, 19 May and 7 July.

The meeting ended at 7.50 pm.