



**Governing Body of the Winchcombe School
Minutes of the Governing Board
Tuesday 14th July 2026 at 5.00pm**

Present: Liam Anderson (LA) (Chair) co-opted governor; Harry James (vice chair) (HJ) remotely[part]; Dani Clay (DC) elected staff governor; Georgina Furr (GF) elected parent governor; Laurence Andrews (L Andrews) co-opted governor; Abi Preston-Rees (APR) co-opted governor;	
Apologies: Matt Percy (MP) (Head teacher), Andy Smithyman (AS) co-opted governor; Rob Clay (RC) elected parent governor; Gary Smith (GS) co-opted governor, Sarah Whatmore (SW) Local Authority appointed governor;	
In attendance: Christina Pummell (CP), Clerk; Elode Scarlett (ES) (Deputy Head teacher);	
Key: Strategic direction/Challenge or Question/Answer/Action/Extract	Who
1.Introductions and Apologies Introductions were made <i>The meeting was quorate</i>	
2.Declaration of any other business 2.1 Membership of complaints panel 2.2 Request for Spar form from Happy Kids re making changes – circulate to governors after the meeting and read properly.	
3.Declaration of interests L Andrews declared he works at the company that manages the school's staff absences. L Andrews to complete declaration on Governor Hub.	
4. Minutes of the meeting of 2nd March 2026, 28th April 2026 and EFGB Part II meeting of 17th June 2026 It was agreed that the minutes of the aforementioned meetings were all approved as a true record of the meeting. Clerk to upload 2/3/2026 and 28/4/2026 minutes to the school website: ASAP	Clerk
5. Matters arising (see actions log from minutes of meeting dated 16/1/26, 28/4/26 and 17/6/26) Actions were briefly discussed, to be fully updated at the next meeting. HJ joined the meeting at 5:15pm	
6. Report on review of governance HJ advised that an action plan should be developed following the governance review. It should be realistic, reflect current leadership capacity, and include efficient timescales. The review identified numerous examples of good practice for the board to consider. Key recommendations included developing a clear 3–5 year strategic vision, with the board identifying the school's current position, long-term ambitions and Year 1 milestones. The School Development Plan (SDP) will support delivery, outlining Year 1 priorities and being reviewed annually. The review also recommended establishing a Standards and Curriculum Committee, as the Full Governing Body (FGB) does not have sufficient time to scrutinise educational performance in depth. The committee would analyse attainment, progress, trends and key groups, reporting back to the FGB through minutes and Chair updates. A data matrix would identify what data is available, who produces it and when, enabling meetings to align with data release points. Other recommendations included strengthening governor monitoring through visits, protocols and role descriptors, aligning SDP priorities with budget spending, producing regular three-year financial forecasts, providing governors with guidance on policy reviews, developing a stakeholder communication plan, undertaking annual board self-evaluation, introducing a formal governor induction process and improving succession planning through skills development. HJ invited questions on the report. ES noted that introducing another committee would affect the governing body meeting schedule, which is currently aligned to leadership data points.	

HJ advised that any Standards Committee should meet after data points, with papers and minutes uploaded to GH to allow the FGB to focus on outcomes and actions rather than detailed data analysis.

ES raised concerns about governor workload and meeting times. HJ agreed capacity should be considered. LA suggested the committee meet three times a year, after each termly data point, rather than as frequently as the Finance Committee, enabling timely scrutiny and informing future actions. ES agreed. GF asked about the committee's membership. HJ suggested it should include the Chair or Vice Chair, governors with educational expertise, and governors from other backgrounds to provide challenge. A staff governor was not considered necessary, but an appropriate member of the Senior Leadership Team should attend to explain the data. LA clarified the committee would review attainment, progress, trends and performance of key pupil groups, although workload would need consideration.

ACTION: ES and HJ to review the annual meeting schedule and committee dates.

HJ noted the example report included a yearly planner and suggested this should be used to map meetings before finalising committee dates.

LA requested a **summary of the Standards Committee remit and Terms of Reference before the next meeting to gauge governor interest. HJ confirmed he would circulate both.**

GF welcomed the review but questioned whether implementation timelines were ambitious enough, stressing that progress should begin over the summer rather than waiting until the next FGB meeting. GF also asked whether a strategic risk register should be introduced. HJ agreed, proposing a RAG-rated risk register, overseen administratively by the Finance Committee but with risks owned by appropriate individuals, committees or the board, and reviewed two or three times a year.

ACTION: HJ to develop a strategic risk register/framework for consideration at the next Finance Committee meeting.

ES asked who would own and RAG-rate risks. HJ explained that while the Finance Committee would maintain the register, each risk would have an assigned owner responsible for assessing likelihood and impact using an agreed scoring matrix.

LA asked whether any specific governance themes had emerged from the review. HJ explained that the low response rate to the governor questionnaire limited school-specific findings, resulting in more general governance recommendations. GF reiterated that governor engagement needed to improve if the board was to achieve its ambitions.

LA advised that a governor skills audit would be completed over the summer using the GH self-assessment tool to inform succession planning and identify recruitment needs.

ACTION: Governors to complete the GovernorHub skills audit over the summer for review at the next meeting.

7. Headteacher report

ES responded to governors' questions.

On Pupil Premium (PPG), ES acknowledged the school's improvement journey but noted leadership capacity remains a challenge. PPG monitoring is being strengthened, with the PPG Lead overseeing provision, supported by Phase Leaders, while ES maintains strategic oversight of trends and outcomes. Roles and accountability are continuing to be refined.

GF offered to meet with the PPG Lead to provide support.

On adaptive teaching, ES confirmed this remains a key priority, with next year's focus on embedding existing practice, including gradual release, hinge questions and explicit instruction. Planned CPD includes dyslexia, subject to leadership capacity.

LA asked whether Phase Leader monitoring would specifically focus on adaptive teaching. ES replied that this will be mapped out alongside the school's improvement priorities.

EG said there was an individual safeguarding matter but advised she could not comment further due to confidentiality.

On persistent absence, ES described attendance as a significant concern but advised that limited leadership capacity has restricted progress. Ofsted recognised that the school had correctly identified pupils causing concern, and ES confirmed a dedicated Attendance Officer is being considered.

LA asked whether work with the DfE Attendance Hub would continue. ES confirmed a meeting with the new Education Welfare Officer (EWO) was taking place the following day to plan September arrangements.

LA asked whether data targets were sufficiently ambitious. ES confirmed Year 6 targets are above national expectations where possible, with specialist provision planned to maximise Greater Depth outcomes. LA also asked whether the current Year 5 cohort was in a stronger position than the previous year, which

ES confirmed.

Governors discussed monitoring for disadvantaged pupils. ES confirmed the PPG Lead and Phase Leaders will continue working collaboratively, with separate monitoring for PPG and PPG SEND pupils. Planned interventions, including Snap Maths, will continue.

ES confirmed the SEND Hub will expand from September following a successful trial.

When asked about the most significant developments in teaching, ES highlighted the embedding of explicit instruction, gradual release, active participation and checking for understanding. GF commented that these approaches had been evident during a Year 2 visit.

ES confirmed next year's priorities remain adaptive teaching, attendance, disadvantaged pupils, RIP and phonics.

GF asked what would have the greatest impact on improvement. ES said the school's greatest need is a stable leadership team, explaining that reduced senior leadership capacity means significant time is spent managing parental concerns and behaviour, reducing time available for teaching and learning.

GF asked whether technology could reduce investigation workloads. ES agreed it could but noted the financial cost and GDPR implications. GF suggested Microsoft Teams for recording and transcription.

LA asked whether complaints procedures were being followed appropriately and whether parents were directed to class teachers first. ES confirmed this was the case but noted reduced leadership capacity meant more issues were escalating to the Headteacher. LA suggested reminding parents of the agreed process.

HJ left the meeting at 6.16 pm.

DC confirmed the school's behaviour system remained robust.

GF asked whether increased behaviour incidents reflected greater consistency or reduced staffing capacity. ES believed leadership capacity was the main issue.

GF suggested reviewing workload or behaviour processes, including red card thresholds. ES advised this would require a wider review.

LA asked whether providing parents with brief explanations of behaviour incidents could reduce follow-up queries. ES agreed this may help, although some parents would still request further information.

GF asked whether increased parental concerns were linked to higher behaviour expectations. ES felt expectations had contributed but leadership capacity remained the greater issue. LA asked whether more parents were challenging decisions? ES said this was difficult to determine.

LA welcomed the revised Headteacher's report, commenting that it gave governors a clear overview alongside the Phase Leader reports. ES invited feedback on the new format, which GF described as clear and informative.

GS raised concerns about AI, data protection and Subject Access Requests, asking whether an AI Policy was needed. ES agreed these posed increasing workload and compliance risks, particularly following the loss of external GDPR support.

Governors discussed appointing or buying in external Data Protection Officer (DPO) support, including possible collaboration with local schools.

ACTION: Clerk to investigate AI policies used by other schools and identify potential external GDPR/DPO support providers for governors to consider.

8. Data on achievement and progress

ES highlighted the school's strong outcomes, particularly in phonics, where 84.5% of pupils met the expected standard, above the national figure of 82%.

ES thanked staff for their hard work and dedication. Governors congratulated the team on the achievement.

ES also reported that EYFS Good Level of Development (GLD) was 78%, compared with the national figure of 72%. LA commented that Ofsted would recognise the significant progress made.

ES explained that flexible pupil groupings based on need are already having a positive impact, with leadership expecting further measurable improvements in next year's data.

LA raised concerns about declining nursery intake numbers and whether this was linked to Ofsted and the school's reputation. ES suggested exploring a single September nursery intake, rather than multiple entry points, to improve financial sustainability, consistency and transition into Reception. Governors discussed the potential benefits and drawbacks, including funding, policy implications, parental demand and the impact on admissions. Dani noted there were currently children waiting for January places.

GF asked about the disadvantages of a single intake. ES acknowledged some children may have to wait until the following September but noted the financial and educational benefits. DC added that a September intake could strengthen continuity into Reception and reinforce the nursery's educational offer.

LA asked whether SLT had developed a proposal. ES advised this would be explored during the autumn term with a view to making a decision for

September 2027.

ACTION: ES to circulate the KS2 data to governors in advance and include it as an agenda item for the September meeting.

9. Rapid Improvement Plan – review meeting update

ES reported that the recent review meeting with James Stewart and Kate Parietti was very positive. Both were impressed with the progress made and agreed the school is moving in the right direction. Minor refinements to the Rapid Improvement Plan (RIP) were suggested, particularly around disadvantaged pupils and attendance, and the plan will continue into the next academic year. ES thanked governors for their support and confidence in the leadership team, noting that the improvements made are benefiting pupils and providing stronger foundations for future success. Planning for next year will focus on maintaining progress, including targeted phonics support.

LA congratulated the staff on the rapid progress made and expressed hope that the momentum would continue into the new academic year.

GF asked when the RIP would become part of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). LA advised that the RIP would continue for now, with the expectation that it may conclude by the end of the autumn term, subject to continued progress.

While EYFS and phonics outcomes were strong, further improvement is still required in KS2 outcomes.

10. Governor monitoring visit reports

LA thanked governors for completing a range of visits, including SEND, PPG, attendance, EYFS, SCR and Health & Safety.

GS reported that, during the Health & Safety visit, he had used the Natasha's Foundation checklist and identified updated DfE statutory guidance on allergen management that had not previously been implemented. Training has now been arranged for all relevant staff.

LA noted that a consistent theme across governor visits was the impact of leadership capacity, which governors should continue to monitor.

LA also advised that a short PII would be held at the end of the meeting.

GF encouraged governors to spend more time in school, for example by listening to children read or supporting at lunchtime, to become more visible and better understand the day-to-day life of the school. LA agreed that governor presence and engagement with staff and pupils is valuable.

11. Policy Review

Suspensions and exclusions Policy - LA advised that the policy had been updated to reflect the September DfE guidance. The key changes include managed moves now only being permitted on a permanent basis, clearer guidance on off-rolling, a new safeguarding section allowing pupils to be educated off-site or at home for safeguarding reasons without this being classed as a suspension, and increased expectations around governor scrutiny of suspension and exclusion data.

LA confirmed the policy is based on The Key model policy.

LA asked whether governors had any comments or whether SW's feedback had been received. ES stressed the importance of ensuring the policy fully reflects the latest guidance. LA suggested asking WB to review the policy to ensure all required changes had been incorporated. ES agreed.

ACTION: LA to make the final amendments and ask Ros Arthur at WB to review the policy before adoption.

At 6.53 pm, LA thanked DC for her valuable contribution to the governing board as she attended her final meeting as Staff Governor.

DC left the meeting at 6.54 pm.

12. New statutory allergy guidelines for schools

GS advised that new statutory allergy guidance comes into effect from September and that the school will need an updated Allergy Policy based on the model guidance, adapted for Winchcombe. ES acknowledged that limited staffing capacity meant the policy could not be completed over the summer.

GS confirmed he had a copy of the existing policy and will review it against the new guidance to identify the required updates. He also confirmed that spare adrenaline auto-injectors (EpiPens) are in place, training has been issued to staff and the new SBM would monitor completion of training.

GS explained that pupils with allergies should have an Individual Healthcare Plan completed by a healthcare professional, outlining required actions. The policy should also identify the member of SLT responsible for allergy management and name a link governor. GS volunteered to take on the governor role. ES advised that the appropriate SLT lead would be confirmed, subject to capacity.

GS also recommended ensuring allergy alerts are clearly displayed on pupils' SIMS records. ES agreed that, once the new SBM is in post, GS should meet with them to continue the work started with CB. **GS would provide the new SBM with his notes.**

Governors also noted that the school's catering provider may need to update its own allergy management procedures to align with the new statutory guidance.

13. Governor training Governors could complete training on GH. Clerk to see if governors could have access to NGA.	
14. Governor link role visits for next academic year Revisit in September after the skills audit, this could also be linked to risks too.	
15. AOB 15.1 Agree membership of complaints panel – GF, GS, APR.	
16. Date & time of next meeting Monday 28 th September 2026 at 5.00pm – FGB Proposed Monday 19 th October 2026 at 5.00pm – Finance Committee Meeting schedule dates would be circulated in September once ES and HJ had agreed dates. PII Minutes.	
<i>The meeting closed at 7:20pm</i>	

Minutes of the meeting of 14.07.2026

Signed Date