

AUTUMN TERM 2025

MINUTES of the meeting of the Governors of Chalfont St Giles Village School held at the school on 2 October 2025 at 7 pm

PRESENT:	Sri Akunuri Ann Alderson Laura Bell Kym Connolly Alastair Haywood (Headteacher) Lisa Higgin Elaine Hoare	Nigel Hobbs Clive Jones Katherine Mannion Hemal Pandya Penny Thomson Russell Turner Donna Westall (Chair)
IN ATTENDANCE:	Gill Brown Javita Malhotra Ann Baines (by phone)	Associate Member Associate Member Clerk
ABSENT:	Olivier Eymery Patricia English Barbara O'Farrell Becky Spencer	(apologies received and accepted) (apologies received and accepted) (apologies received and accepted) (apologies received and accepted)

		ACTION
1	NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
	The following item was raised as other business: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Facilities for staff	
2	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
	There were no declarations of interest in items covered at this meeting.	
3	MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING	
3.1	MINUTES	
	The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 October 2025, having been circulated, were confirmed as an accurate record. The minutes were signed by the Chair and would be available in the school.	
3.2	MATTERS ARISING	
3.2.1	Declarations of Interest (Minute 3)	
	Governors had been asked to complete the annual declaration of business interests on Governor Hub. Nearly all Governors had done so and the others had been reminded.	
3.2.2	Collaboration with Iver Village Juniors (Minute 5.1)	
	Iver Village Junior School GB had yet to meet.	

		ACTION
3.2.3	Terms of Reference (Minute 5.2) All Committees except Infrastructure had met and recommended the terms of reference which were adopted by the FGB.	Infrastructure Cttee
3.2.4	Governor Charter (Minute 5.4) Governors thanked Clive Jones for reworking the Charter and Code of Conduct to remove duplication. The Charter and Code of Conduct were adopted.	
3.2.5	Parental school finance working group (Minute 6.1) The Headteacher reported on his meeting with this group where he gave an update of the financial situation and the projects, such as refurbishment, which could not be afforded. The parents were keen to assist and had other suggestions to help as well. <i>Russell Turner joined the meeting</i> The focus was on three areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing parental contributions to the Trust Fund. £4,000 had been donated since September but two of the donations had been significant. Other schools suggested amounts to donate, sometimes between £50 and £100. Options would be discussed with the group. • Explore the possibility of advertising, perhaps for local businesses in a termly brochure. Strict selection guidelines would be needed as the school would be perceived as endorsing those businesses. • Take advantage of the school’s social media presence in a time effective way. The Group were setting up to follow through on these good suggestions. How many were involved? <i>Seventeen parents were on the original list. There were eight in person and two or three joined on line.</i>	
3.2.6	Safeguarding report, KCSiE and training (Minutes 8.2/8.2.1/8.2.2) The Safeguarding report had been posted in GovernorHub. Reminders had been sent to Governors who had not done safeguarding training or where there was no record of it.	
3.2.7	Staff wellbeing survey (Minute 8.2.5) This was covered in the questions on the Headteacher’s report. Less than half members of staff had responded (33 of 75). On the questions about workload and feeling valued, a little fewer than last year had given positive responses and the response to ‘being noticed or appreciated’ was low. If the group could be identified, it could be addressed. The only split possible was between teachers and support staff. Responses on the whole were mainly positive. Some people wanted to say something but, as responses were anonymous, they could not be addressed directly. Wellbeing would be discussed further at the next Personnel committee meeting.	
3.2.8	RSHE new guidance for 2026 (Minute 9.3) The new guidance would be active from September 2026 and the Christopher Winter Project materials used by the school would be reviewed. RSHE was covered in the Summer term so parents would have the information and	

explanation ahead of time.

3.2.9 New EYFS guidance on qualifications (Minute 9.4)

The elements of the new EYFS Statutory Framework, which was brought in from September, were safeguarding, First Aid and safer eating, which covered allergens and prevention of choking. For safer eating, the organisational challenge was the requirement to have a member of staff with a Pediatric First Aid (PFA) qualification able to watch the children whilst eating, on table duty in the Memorial Hall and main hall and for Reception children's snack. Whilst the majority of staff had First Aid training, not all were qualified in PFA. The situation was covered but more would be trained to increase flexibility.

Hemal Pandya joined the meeting.

The PFA training took two days. The training would cost over £500 and the cover a further £800.

The school already complied with the safeguarding requirements.

3.2.10 New DfE procurement guidance (Minute 9.5)

The School Business Manager would take this on board.

3.2.11 New school website audit (Minute 9.10)

The new website would be ready before Christmas and the plan was to let parents have access over the holiday and come back with questions and comments. Any issues, such as access from different devices, could then be fixed. An audit check has been done but Laura will conduct a further check before it goes live.

4 STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

4.1 Headteacher's report

Governors noted the report of the Headteacher and related documents which had been circulated in advance. Answers to questions sent by the Chair had been circulated ahead of the meeting and led to further questions and discussion. They were incorporated here in the minutes.

Q1 ***Attendance: It's good to see the unauthorised absence figure reducing when compared to the same period as last year. How confident are you that the actions taken will result in a permanent lower level?***

(The charts were in the report so Governors could see the spikes in absence.)

I think there has been more consideration of holidays, but in the last week a few more have crept in. I will do a email thanking people for the reduction and reminding them they should not be taking it. It looks like I will be referring for the first fine in mid-January when a family return from a three-week break (you have to do it on their return). That might also be a reminder for some!

The LA requires referrals to be made and parents would be warned if they were close to the limit. The count of days was over a rolling ten week period. The penalty increased for repeated offences. The number of offences was taken over a twelve month period.

Q2 ***What is the level of authorised absence?***

At the Infants, for example, there was 94% attendance and 0.3% unauthorised absence so 5.7% absence was authorised due to medical reasons or illness.

Q3 What is the level of persistent absence, below 90%?

The figures alone would show 20% of pupils at below 90% attendance but, the pattern of attendance shows the extent of illness in a two week period in early October. The number of pupils who were below 10% attendance, allowing for illness, was low.

Q4 ABIE: They mention failure to meet targets results in a "link with attendance and behaviour hub schools", but what does this mean in reality? Are there any direct negative consequences if the targets are not met. Is there anything else we could be doing on the SDP Attendance objective, as a result of this initiative?

At the moment there isn't any further detail what this will look like. This year is 'test and learn' so it may all change. The targets have already been suspended and reset once after a DFE data error. I imagine it will be an advisor coming to school and setting action plans on how to improve attendance. The expectation is achievable.

Q5 Staff absence: I'm a bit confused by the data presented Eg, is year to date the academic year or calendar year? The "to september" data, is this just one month of september? I don't want to draw conclusions in case I've mis-interpreted the timescales involved.

Infants

Year to date (1 st September 2025 – present)			1 st September to 2 nd Oct (data from last FGB meeting)			1 st Sept 24 – 23 Nov 24 (data presented at equivalent FGB meeting last year)		
Sickness	Paid Leave	Unpaid Leave	Sickness	Paid Leave	Unpaid Leave	Sickness	Paid Leave	Unpaid Leave
55	11	6	4	2	0	102	11	12

Juniors

Year to date (1 st September 2025 – present)			1 st September to 2 nd Oct (data from last FGB meeting)			1 st Sept 24 – 23 Nov 24 (data presented at equivalent FGB meeting last year)		
Sickness	Paid Leave	Unpaid Leave	Sickness	Paid Leave	Unpaid Leave	Sickness	Paid Leave	Unpaid Leave
102	17.5	1	8	3	0	36	22.5	9

Governors noted that a small number of staff had required a lengthy absence for medical reasons. Most of the increase over the equivalent period last year were accounted for by these situations.

Q6 Staff absence: Do we have any benchmark data Eg a Bucks average? similar to the ABIE data to use as a benchmark target. Also, it's quite common to

segregate planned/unplanned absence Eg an scheduled operation is planned, an absence due to flu is unplanned. Do we do this to understand the underlying absence context?

There is no Bucks figures published that I am aware of. I am working with Tina to find a way we can work this a percentage of FTE in a straightforward way for both schools. Currently we keep track of planned and preplanned as every absence has a reason for absence recorded with it. Staff are allowed to take five days paid absence for childcare reasons. Some are close to this amount and would take unpaid leave above the five days.

Q7 Staff absence: Has the staff absence resulted in any direct financial impact Eg external staff cover? or is it being covered through other means?

This year we have been working hard not to use external cover, and apart from one afternoon we have achieved this. Teachers are generally covered by LSAs (which has a small act up cost for the LSAs) and LSA and SSA absence is being covered by moving staff around. Longer term teacher absence (more than 3 days) is covered by insurance.

Support staff absence is not insured. When a member of staff had her hip operation we needed to employ cover, whilst not being able to claim for her absence. The cost of insuring all support staff is prohibitive and not value for money in most years. Mr Cato is the exception and his absences are insured.

Q8 Does the insurance pay for itself?

The cost of insuring teacher absence is £12,000 per site for the package. The cost takes into account the risk of maternity leave. For long term absence, the cost is covered. After three days' absence, supply is covered by insurance. The school receives £10,000 for maternity leave which does not cover the cost. The cost of insuring SSAs has been considered but their skills and experience can be specialist and cover hard to find.

Q9 SEN Support & EHCP: If I've understood correctly, we have 7 children with an EHCP and an additional 44 children receiving unfunded SEN support. You mention 9 pupils currently waiting and progressing (which is good news), what of the remaining 35? are they in any process stage to gain assessment and any funding support?

The children who are SEN but not EHCP are not unfunded. In our school budget from the DFE, 10% is unofficially set aside as your notional SEN budget which pays for the support and interventions those children get. Largely, this is spent on LSA salaries. Most SEN children will not get an EHCP, nor do they need one – their needs can be met with targeted support provided by the notional SEN budget. It is only when we can prove they need more than 13.5 hours of 1:1 support a week that we can apply for extra funding to support them. The school pays 6.5 hours for EHCP 1:1 support from the notional 10% as well. This results in an overspend on SEND for the school.

The LA expects schools to pay the 6.5 hours from the notional budget but it is possible to appeal for top up money if there is proof that the costs are greater than the notional 10% of the budget. The High Needs Block Funding (HNBF) which was used for this, has been withdrawn. A consultation by the LA to siphon 0.5% of schools' budgets to the HNBF in 2026-27 was rejected by 75%

of respondents. The LA has indicated that it will not ask for DfE approval to go ahead.

All the applications for EHCPs have been waiting for more than the statutory 20 week period. The LA insists on evidence over two terms through a plan, do, review process that the support is required even if the need is obvious, for example, a non verbal child in Reception. Some Nurseries do not start any process and the school has to provide 1:1 support from entry.

Bucks does have a plan for the backlog. Educational Psychologists' time has been bought for six months from January to clear the backlog, prioritising the highest needs. This will follow the current Ofsted Inspection of SEND. The current statutory disregard for LA spending on SEND lasts until March 2028. An announcement in the Budget indicated that SEND funding would fall centrally to the DfE from 2028.

- Q10** ***Ofsted Framework: In recognition of the change, how can we get ahead of the assessment and prepare the school, staff and stakeholders? Is a "mock assessment" an option? or asking one of our local schools who have been assessed to share their experience? or anything else?***

The Local Authority will provide training on this, and I have attended a session from Ofsted about the new framework. The link to the slides for the session I attended has been published today:

https://mcusercontent.com/e5667297f7bb28514a52d2323/files/071af3d2-c0b1-6b69-5c80-7510e1530e49/Ofsted_renewed_framework_engagement_events_1.pdf

Bucks will put on sessions for those who have been through inspections and get those HTs to come and talk to us all as well as sharing inspection timetables, feedback from the DFE, template SEFs etc. I am also not convinced there won't be further changes to the framework before too long as well as the reality of it settles in. I think we need to just see how things pan out as we have the luxury a bit of time before we come into window (our next inspection is due around Feb 2027). Briefings for Governors had begun and links to recordings would be shared.

The framework is significantly different and appears to be too much for a two day inspection. Experience so far indicates that there was more collaboration but one member of SLT had to be with an Inspector at all times so it was time consuming and far from the 'energising' intention. Inclusion ran throughout the process. In the original call, the Lead Inspector will ask for a list of all children with PP or other vulnerabilities and select six to follow during the Inspection to gain insight into their experience. Four would be from EY/KS1.

- Q11** ***Curriculum leader objectives: Have these now been reviewed and set? If so, can they be communicated to the relevant Curriculum Governors?***

I have added all the ones I have so far to a folder in the FGB meeting. I will chase the remaining ones.

- Q12** ***The responses were from 33 members of staff, what is the total number and are administrative staff included?***

Yes, all staff are included. At the moment there approximately 75 staff across both sites

		ACTION
Q13	<p>Did the staff who found it difficult to manage their workload also find difficulty in switching off? (9% find workload difficult and 18% hard to switch off, though only 3% strongly).</p> <p><i>Yes, the respondents who had difficulty managing their workload also said they found it hard to switch off.</i></p>	
4.2	<p>School Development Plan (SDP) / Self Evaluation Form (SEF)</p> <p>The Headteacher had circulated the updated SDP for 2025-26.</p> <p><i>Inclusion – is there scope to look at topics, for example, in history, to choose areas that might be more relevant to the school community?</i></p> <p><i>There was some scope to look into this. The National Curriculum asked for three of four topics and KAPOW offered various units.</i></p> <p><i>Where did the lead for the Governing Board objectives lie?</i></p> <p><i>The Chair and Headteacher would plan the actions.</i></p> <p><i>Under the EDI objective, is guidance awaited on gender identity?</i></p> <p><i>There would be more guidance. The focus for the school community would be on their understanding of process and children’s own family experiences. Care was always taken on language which was relevant to various family situations including single sex families.</i></p> <p>Updating the SEF in line with the new Ofsted Framework would be a significant task. The Headteacher would wait for new templates to be shared.</p>	<p>Headteacher</p> <p>Chair and Headteacher</p>
5	GOVERNING BOARD	
5.1	<p>LA governor confirmation</p> <p>Written confirmation of Donna Westall’s appointment had been received.</p>	
5.2	<p>Approval of minutes on GovernorHub</p> <p>Carried forward to the next meeting.</p>	
6	Legislation/regulations/policies	
6.1	<p>New Attendance Baseline Improvement Expectation (ABIE)</p> <p>This had been covered in the Headteacher’s report.</p>	
7	COMMITTEE MINUTES	
7.1	<p>COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE</p> <p>The Minutes of the Communications Committee meeting held on 20 October 2025 had been circulated and were noted. Following some difficulty with meeting dates, the Clerk would circulate information on aligning personal calendars with the GovernorHub calendar which had meeting details.</p> <p>An update on the Parents Evening survey was given. There had been 232</p>	<p>Clerk</p>

responses. The themes would be discussed at the next Committee meeting but overall the feedback was very positive.

There were questions and comments around:

- tools such as Google Classroom and the amount of screen time involved.
- support for children of varying abilities.
- increasing communications, particularly around children's progress.

The challenges in communication were to work out what parents were looking for and whether it could be supplied in a practical way. In the New Year, the reports from Insight could be considered and perhaps generated in a template to be sent to parents. Some parents might not consider that this would be sufficient. Some parents had high expectations of communication and others just wanted reassurance and to know if there was an issue. It was possible to contact the teacher by e mail if it was not possible to meet at the end of a day.

The Headteacher was considering a Parents' Information Evening to describe the approach to assessment and what was involved in Greater Depth and how it developed through the Curriculum. This might address some of the questions including the concerns that pupils were not stretched sufficiently.

7.2 Curriculum & Standards Committee

The Minutes of the Curriculum and Standards Committee meeting held on 18 November 2025 had been circulated and were noted. The talk on Writing had been excellent. A number of policies had been reviewed and adopted.

7.3 Finance Committee & Charitable Trust Fund

The Minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held on 15 October 2025 had been circulated and were noted. The Committee would meet again on 3 December.

7.4 Infrastructure Committee including Sustainability, H&S and F&M

The Infrastructure Committee would meet on 3 December 2025. The site reviews had been circulated.

Governors welcomed the contribution made by Mr Gerry Kilbane from Trust in Blue who was working two to three days a week to keep up the maintenance side of things during the Site Manager's absence. LSAs and other staff are covering the restocking aspects of the role.

7.5 Personnel/Pay Review Committee

The Minutes of the Personnel Committee meeting held on 15 October 2025, including the list of policies reviewed and adopted, had been circulated and were noted.

Governors thanked Clive Jones for his work on the new format for school

policies.

7.6 Performance Management Governors

The Chair reported that the Headteacher's performance management was completed.

7.7 HR Related Panels/Complaints Panel/Pupil Discipline Committee

These Committees has not needed to meet.

8 REPORTS

8.1 REPORT OF THE CHAIR

The Chair had taken no actions under delegated powers.

8.2 REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT GOVERNOR

New Governors had booked onto induction and some recommendations had been made to others. Governors who found some training useful should mention it at the next GB meeting.

8.3 REPORT OF THE SAFEGUARDING GOVERNOR

The Safeguarding Governor met the Headteacher and circulated her report. Wellbeing had been covered in the meeting.

Prevent training was offered to staff after school on 2 February. Governors could attend.

8.4 REPORT OF THE EQUALITY GOVERNOR

The Equality Governor would be invited to the next Pupil Progress meeting where the reports that could be generated from Insight would be discussed.

8.5 REPORT OF THE SEND GOVERNOR

The report of the SEND Governor's visit had not yet been checked and would be posted on Governor Hub. The meeting had covered the LA proposal for the backlog of EHCP approvals, Parental Review meetings, staff training and the difficulty of finding cover given the budget constraints.

8.6 PUPIL PREMIUM GOVERNOR

The meeting had not yet happened.

8.5 CURRICULUM GOVERNOR REPORTS

Governors noted the reports on the following:

- Literacy

ACTION

- Science
- Geography
- Art & DT
- PE
- Maths
- GB monitoring visit reports
- Arts week attendance

A PSHE visit had been done and a report would follow. The Maths Monitoring Visit report would be discussed at the next FGB.

Visits to come were History, IT, Music, French and Outdoor Learning.

Clerk: agenda

Governors

8.6 SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN

There had been fewer complaints about traffic and parking. A plan had been drawn up for the School Disco.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Facilities for staff

The Budget was restricted but there was some concern that staff facilities could be upgraded to provide a better environment. This was a thoughtful request and a wish list could be drawn up.

10 DATES AND TIMES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The dates and times of meetings in 2025-26 were confirmed as:

- Thursday 22 January 2026 at 7 pm
- Thursday 19 March 2026 at 7 pm
- Thursday 7 May 2026 at 7 pm
- Thursday 2 July 2026 at 7 pm

11 CONDUCT OF MEETING

Governors confirmed that the meeting was conducted in an open manner and that all governors were invited to participate and contribute to discussions. It was confirmed that all members of the Governing Board would have access to these minutes

This section of the meeting closed at 8.45 pm. Katherine Mannion and Penny Thomson left the meeting.

Signed Date

CHAIR