

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Board



Date: Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm
Venue: At Tweseldown Infant School and on Teams

Present:

Kim Tottem	Headteacher		
Phil Sanday	Co-opted Governor	Co-Chair	
Deborah Stephenson	Co-opted Governor	Co-Chair	Chair of the meeting
Katy Astles	Parent Governor		
Jeev Chhokar	Parent Governor		
Mark Fricker	Co-opted Governor		<i>Arrived in item 4</i>
Becky Hilton	Staff Governor		
Sarah Jewitt	Co-opted Governor		
Ben White	Co-opted Governor		

Apologies

Stuart Meadows Co-opted Governor

In Attendance

Louise Barnes	Associate Member/ Deputy Headteacher	
Helen Blyde	School Business Manager	
Nigel Davies		
Rebecca Willows	Clerk	
Twenty-five members of staff (thirteen in person and twelve online)		<i>for item 4</i>

The meeting was Quorate

The meeting commenced at 7.01pm.

Item		Actions
1	Welcome and apologies for absence The Chair welcomed all to the meeting including Nigel Davies and twenty-five members of staff. Apologies were received and accepted from Stuart Meadows.	
2	Declarations of Pecuniary and any other conflicts of interest in items on this agenda. Becky Hilton declared an interest in item 4 and would not take part in the vote. There were no other declarations of interest made that were not already recorded.	
3	LA Governor appointment Nigel Davies had applied to become a Governor. There was a vacancy for a Local Authority (LA) Governor. County Councillor Stephen Parker had recommended Nigel Davies, who had business and Governor experience, for the position. <i>ND left the meeting.</i> After discussion, the Governing Body unanimously approved the appointment of Nigel Davies as the Local Authority Governor. ACTION 62: Arrange for Induction of new LA Governor. <i>ND rejoined the meeting</i> Nigel Davies was welcomed as the new LA Governor.	Clerk, Co-chairs, SBM, HT.
4	Restructuring Proposal The headteacher requested from all to record this item on the agenda. This was agreed by all present. <i>MF joined the meeting.</i> The school had originally started as a three-form entry infant school, but it had increased to a four-form entry school due to an increased number of young children in the area. However, there were no longer as many young families living in the area and the number of infant school places needed had decreased. If the school continued with the current level of spending it would have £350,000 worth of debt in three years' time, this was not viable or sustainable. The small area forecast for pupil numbers	

Signed by Chair

Date

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

was decreasing. The school had reduced its Published Admission Number (PAN) in stages to 105 in the current YR and Y1 and would reduce further to 90 in YR for September 2026. It was proposed to restructure the staff in two phases which would affect the whole school. This was being done solely for financial reasons: - September 2026 it was proposed to restructure the Assistant Teachers (ATs), Learning Support Assistants (LSAs) and Special Needs Assistants (SNAs) - September 2027 it was proposed to restructure class teachers and leadership. Whilst ATs, LSAs and SNAs continued to play a vital role in teaching and learning in the school, the current financial situation meant that the school could not continue with current support levels, and this needed to be adjusted to the available Budget. It had been hoped that there would be more funds available from the Government in light of the White Paper, but this was not the case until September 2027. The school had tried to increase the school's revenue by increasing clubs, establishing wraparound care Starcare, increased lettings, subletting to the Preschool and applying for grants where possible, but the increased revenue generated was not sufficient to cover rising expenditure. The restructure needed to be addressed in two phases, as there were currently two teachers on maternity leave and it was not currently known whether they would want to return to the school and on what basis. Once the school was fully a three-form entry school, the status of the school would change and so salary levels for leadership would have to be adjusted. The school had been able to carry forward a surplus for several years, but this had been diminishing over the past five years and would be completely depleted by Summer 2027. The school had been able to save on building maintenance costs as the school had been a new build, but maintenance was now needed. Every school in the area was in a similar position and looking to restructure. It was important for the school to continue with high quality provision so that every child makes good progress from its starting points. Statutory Ratios between adults and children were 1:15 in Year R and 1: 30 in Key Stage 1. Two proposals were being put forward: <u>Proposal One for September 2026</u> Year R – a class teacher and AT in each of the three classes. Year 1 – three class teachers with an AT to support Y1 Year 2 – three class teachers with an AT to support Y2 One Year 1/Year 2 class with a class teacher. A Forest School Teacher A SEND team in the Den with 4 ATs A Higher-Level Teaching Assistant (HLTA) to work across the school. Lunch time team – 5 ATs with lunch time responsibilities in addition to their class responsibilities. 5 additional lunchtime supervisors would need to be recruited. This proposal would mean two less ATs in Y1 and two less ATs in Y2, on less HLTA, five less SEN team, two fixed term contracts and an additional 5-hour fixed term contract would also finish. This would lead to a saving of £31,000 in the 2026-2027 financial year (April to March) and a £93,000 saving in 2027-2028 financial year. In both proposals the AT working weeks would be reduced from forty to thirty-nine. The Starcare manager role would remain vacant, which might include an external provider with a reduction in income to the school.	
---	--

Commented [sf1]: Until September 2027

Commented [sf2]: Completely depleted by summer 2027

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

<u>Proposal Two:</u> This would involve the ATs in Years 1 and 2 becoming job shares and incorporating Starcare Breakfast or After School care and lunchtime assistant roles. It would secure more jobs and retain more staff. There could be potential for additional hours to cover for sickness. Y1 one position 7.20am -1pm including Starcare Breakfast Manager and lunchtime assistant. Y1 one position 12.30pm - 6.10pm including Starcare Breakfast Manager and lunchtime assistant. Y1 one position 7.20am -1pm including Starcare Breakfast assistant and lunchtime assistant. Y1 one position 12.30pm - 6.10pm including Starcare Breakfast assistant and lunchtime assistant. Four additional ATs would be kept. It would secure Starcare wraparound provision for the school and additional funds from Starcare would be available for the school. It would lead to a saving of £22,500 in financial year 2026-2027 and £70,000 in financial year 2027-2028. These steps would not be sufficient and so restructuring of class teachers would be necessary. The process would start in Spring 2027. Both proposals would have an impact on class teachers and ATs. Class teachers would have to manage without the same level of support in class. ATs may be deployed to support a lesson in each class, and the timetable would have to be adapted to cater for this. Alternatively, they could be timetabled to support teaching and learning across the year group including those in different groups and then supporting pupils with their individual learning plan targets. In addition, the SNAs would support pupils with Education and Health Care plans both within classes and in the Den. The HLTA would support PPA time. This may mean teachers having separate PPA times, or the Headteacher and Deputy Headteacher covering PPA time. In either case, there would have to be redundancies. There were two possible approaches for selection, either a skills matrix or a competitive interview. There were pros and cons for each approach. A skills matrix would have questions in line with the job description and staff would be asked to detail their experience to the job descriptions. A governor would support the headteacher in the process. The new LA governor would be the most impartial choice, and he was willing to take part. Anonymity was not possible due to the experience of the staff in completing the matrix. The other approach would be a competitive interview with a series of questions asking staff to respond with their experience. Decisions about which staff were successful would be made after either process. Once the Governing Body had voted on whether to agree to the restructure and which proposal, the headteacher would send out a staff poll the following day to determine which approach would be preferred with a closing time of 5pm in the event of a vote in favour of restructuring. The headteacher would consult with the Unions on 30th April 2025. The Unions could reject the proposal or suggest additional proposals. The headteacher would contact staff on 1st May 2026 to notify staff the Unions' decision and if they agreed to inform them of the process. The process would be completed by May half term. The headteacher reiterated the value placed on each staff member and that the decision had been reached for financial reasons.	
---	--

Commented [sf3]: For selection

Signed by Chair:

Date:

The floor was opened for questions: 1: My main concern is safety issues for the children. What safeguarding risk assessments have been completed in response to staffing reductions, can they be shared with staff? 2: There was a concern about the emotional wellbeing and mental health of children with fewer AT support. How is the school going to continue to provide early emotional support and interventions particularly for vulnerable children; there are currently waiting lists for this support and is not being met in many schools currently. 3: How would emotional and mental health needs for current and new pupils be met? 4. What contingency plans are in place if there was to be an increase in anxiety, dysregulation of emotion-based school avoidance (EBSA)? 5: How will teachers manage challenging behaviour safely with fewer staff; it can be challenging with the existing staffing levels? 6. What will be the impact on other learners in the classroom? 7. What would be the plan if multiple children needed support simultaneously to deescalate? 8. How will exclusions, suspensions and behaviour incidents be prevented from rising as a result of reduced staffing? 9. How would the school meet the needs of the children with EHCPs as well as those on SEND support? 10. How would the school ensure that the school remained compliant with duties under the SEND Code of Practice? 11. What would happen if needs increased mid-year? Staff expressed their concern for the children, for safeguarding and health and safety, for example if there was a skeleton staff at lunchtime and there were no additional staff to support. There was also a concern expressed about how lower retaining or less confident pupils would be able to keep up academically with reduced support. Staff workload and staff retention in future might be impacted. The school had very experienced staff and if they were replaced with new staff this would involve additional training e.g. First Aid. 12: How would Governors monitor the real impact once implemented? 13. What are the review points and is there a commitment to revisit staffing if concerns arise? 14. How can parents and staff raise concerns of the new structure is not working in the proposal you decide on? Thanks were given to the member of staff raising these questions which would be borne in mind. If action was not taken to reduce the deficit, the LA would come in and make ATs redundant. The school had operated on a similar plan previously and had learned some lessons such as ATs having a main base in one class in the year group; the year leader's classroom. The year leader would direct each AT and provide a timetable for the week and what to do. This would be based on assessment for learning. Since the model was previously deployed, planning and sharing planning with ATs had improved so ATs knew what was expected of them. It could be adapted as time went on. 15: How would situations such as unsettled children arriving at school, toilet accidents, illness and accidents be managed? A: Any situations would be triaged between the AT and class teachers. Staff could use the telephone in the room to request help from the headteacher or deputy headteacher. There would still be ATs in YR classrooms, as well as an AT in the corridor and an HLTA. The operational details would be discussed in due course.	
--	--

Commented [sf4]: ? base

Signed by Chair:

Date:

16: Would the ATs job descriptions have to be changed? A: It was thought the job descriptions would not need to be changed but they could be reissued to staff to ensure staff were clear on their terms. 17: How would the mixed Y1/Y2 class work? The AT in the YR/Y1 class and the class teacher often shared teaching would this continue? A: This should be more straightforward as Y1 and Y2 were in the same key stage. 18: Is the SNA role being restructured into an AT role? A: This was not the case; the term AT was being used to cover all support teacher roles. Four SNAs would remain in the Den and there would still be a hub especially to support pupils with complex needs. Concern had been expressed about support for those pupils and the importance of staff who had built up connections with those pupils supporting them. It was being proposed by the LA that the school have Resourced Provision (RP) in the school. The school had expressed its interest. Initially it was thought this would be for high functioning autistic spectrum disorder (ASD), but clarification was needed on this. However, if this were to proceed it would not be until September 2027 and so the plans for restructuring would not be affected. The SENDCo believed all new RPs were either ASD or social emotional and mental health (SEMH). Other schools who had already established RPs had included other pupils from mainstream who had needed additional support. Governors acknowledged the questions, many of which were operational. However, it was important to collate the questions and ensure they were answered. The Governors had the duty to make the best decision for the school within the limited options available and bearing everything in mind. Over the past couple of years, a lot of work had been done to try and avoid this situation, but the predicted numbers coming from the LA were valid. The lack of numbers of pupils in the area together with new schools being built would have an impact and the Governors need to manage that as best they could. The staff were thanked for their attendance, for their questions, and for their valuable contribution to the life of the school. 19: Were staff members fixed with role in the restructure and would have to stay in their current role, or could they change role? A: They could change to a different role if they could demonstrate those skills and/or experience. Governors wanted to ensure that staff were clear on the reason for restructuring. Governors were mindful of the impact on children and staff of the proposed changes and the cuts which needed to be made. Staff indicated that they had been surprised about the level of cuts proposed. They understood that the reason was financial, but staff were focused on the needs and support for the children. Governors acknowledged that they hadn't anticipated the local pupil numbers falling so dramatically as this was not evident when they started the plan to increase income two years ago. 20: Did the Governors have to decide between the two proposals? A: No, they could decide on another course of action. 21: What would happen to staff who were not successful in the process? A: The school would help these staff find another role elsewhere e.g. schools who were looking for ATs, SNAs or HLTAs by recommendation if possible. The staff who were not successful would be made redundant. 22: Was it true that if a role was made redundant, it could not be advertised again for three years? A: This was not correct; a role could be advertised straight away but the school would act with caution; if the school made staff redundant and then discovered additional	
--	--

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

pupils were joining the school with EHCPs they could offer those roles to staff who had been made redundant. There was discussion about whether there could be any flexibility and this was confirmed if the situation changed. There was discussion about the timing of these decisions, which would be in May, but information about the pupils coming into the school would not be discovered until July.

23: Can you provide the full selection process, including the scoring criteria, weighting, evidence used and how fairness and consistency would be ensured? It was important to ensure that staff were being treated objectively and fairly.

A: The school liaised with Education Personnel Services (EPS) who guided the steps the school had to take. The school was following the steps directed by EPS and would be advised on the scoring criteria. Clarification was needed about any weighting. Evidence would be dependent on responses to the skills matrix or in interview. Fairness and consistency would be ensured by using a governor to whom staff are unknown.

24: It has been said that five pupils with EHCPs were expected in September, was there more need in 2026-2027?

A: There was not expected to be more need, but if it was discovered that these pupils had more complex needs than previously anticipated, it would be possible to change the staffing plan.

25: Will an Equality Impact Assessment be completed?

A: EPS would guide the school to make sure the process was fair. It was a structured process so that it was fair across all Hampshire schools.

Governors assured staff that they were aware of the impact of any decision and would do their utmost to ensure that needs were being met operationally. Governors were aware of how invested the staff were in the school and they thanked staff who had attended the meeting in person or online.

25 members of staff left the meeting.

Q: Could the school use last in first out as a mechanism of selection for redundancy?

A: This was not possible. EPS advised on the process, and the school followed the Restructuring Policy. The consultation, publishing what needed to be done by the dates on the presentation. The staff had been informed of the information.

Q: Had the school gone through this process before?

A: There had been a restructuring of the Office staff in the previous year.

Q: What was the total reduction?

A: There were nineteen staff in the consultation. Three posts were on a fixed term contract which would not be renewed. In Phase One eight roles were at risk. Phase Two involved the class teachers.

There was discussion about whether the savings in both Proposals were accurate due to the position of Starcare in each model. It was thought that Proposal One would mean the school would still be in deficit. There was discussion about the StarCare model and the manager role. The Admin Office had taken over more of the administrative side of the role. It was proposed that one member of staff would act as the manager in the morning and another in the afternoon, with two other ATs being Starcare assistants.

Q: At what point would staff be told of their redundancy payout?

A: Staff had already been told about this.

Some teaching staff had expressed concerns about working without the same level of AT support in class. It was confirmed that the Budget position was accurate. The LA had a clear view of pupil numbers going forward. The school had to abide by the staff

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

to pupil ratio, but the school was not working on the minimum ratio. The ratio was less favourable, but it was higher than the statutory level. There was no Budget to keep up the current levels.

Governors considered whether there would be any flexibility to create a fixed term role to support pupils with more complex needs if it transpired that pupils with additional needs who needed more support were joining the school. There were currently 9 SNAs, but this would reduce to 4 in September. This could potentially be adjusted if there were additional children starting school with EHCPs.

Q: Did the staff have separate job descriptions?

A: This was confirmed but they could be treated as one cohort except the HLTAs. The school currently employed two HLTAs but they only needed one. The support staff had equivalent skills even though their job descriptions differed.

The Restructuring Policy was in the Policies folder on GovernorHub. Staff could not go for voluntary redundancy. A concern was raised about staff completing the Skills Matrix identically. If this was done, selection would be taken to another level.

There was discussion about the two Proposals, and which one was financially more viable. Governors considered that Proposal Two was financially more viable and there would be fewer staff made redundant. However, it would be good to have the ability to relook at the numbers and the needs of pupils coming in and whether there were any unmet needs as well as to enable wellbeing in staff, pupils, SEND Pupils and those with additional needs. The employment of staff on fixed term contracts if required was considered. If staff were made redundant and then employed on a fixed term contract their long service would count. The possibility of this might ease the operational concerns of the staff. Staff should feel listened to, but this could not be addressed through a fixed structure.

Q: Was there any risk in losing staff if Option Two was followed as it would mean bigger job changes including Starcare cover?

A: ATs in class who did lunchtime assistant roles already had the same job description and were paid at the AT pay grade. Job descriptions could combine different roles.

The options were Proposal One, Proposal Two and Proposal Two plus the possibility of additional staff on fixed term contracts which would be put in place if need was available.

The financial position of each proposal was considered:

Proposal One:

2026 - 2027 - £122,889 surplus – Phase one
2027- 2028 - £27,663 surplus – Phase two
2028 -2029 - £286,000 deficit

The surplus would diminish quicker if Starcare did not continue.

Proposal Two:

2026-7 £109,334 surplus
2027-8 £9,755 surplus
2028-2029 £350,527 deficit

Proposal One was debated by Governors and financial position with Starcare outsourced to a third party was shared verbally, showing a worse position than Proposal Two. It was agreed to amend Starcare profit to reflect it having to be run by an external body. This led to Proposal Two being the most financially viable option.

The drop in pupil numbers was the reason for the dramatic drop in income in 2028-2029.

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

	If there was no clear decision by the Governors, the September deadline would be missed. Roles could be added later if the proposal was agreed. A concern was raised about the fact that there would be two ATs supporting seven classes in Y1 and Y2. Other staff could be used to support if necessary. Governors had confidence in the headteacher to manage the school operationally to ensure the school would continue to provide high quality teaching and learning and for the welfare of staff and pupils. <i>The staff governor and headteacher declared an interest and did not take part in the vote.</i> After discussion Governors approve Restructuring Proposal Two with the possibility of considering other fixed term roles if required and financially viable.	
5	Minutes of the previous meeting The minutes of the FGB meeting held on 28th January 2026 had been circulated prior to the meeting. The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record subject to an amendment to item 15a) Governor Vacancy-LA the words 'They had experience as a company director' was changed to 'They had experience as a Director and Vice President', the Minutes were approved and they were signed by the Chair.	
6	Actions and matters arising from meeting of 28th January 2026 All actions had been completed or were included later in the agenda except the following: 59: Raise Family Support Worker post with local headteachers in next Cluster meeting. <i>The headteachers had decided not to proceed as it was not affordable.</i> 33: Include observations of ethos, vision and values in Governor monitoring Ongoing 34: Add section to record observations of ethos, vision and values on Governor monitoring form <i>This had not yet been completed.</i> 35: Add consideration of resourced provision and Academisation to Strategy meeting agenda. <i>This had been added.</i> 38: Attend end of term SDP analysis meetings if possible. <i>This had been done by email.</i> 39: Contact County Councillor and HCC regarding proposed parking restrictions by estate managing agents. <i>The estate managing agents were able to impose these restrictions. They would be started on 7th April. Vehicles were allowed to park for half an hour for free.</i> 42: Arrange another date for Governor Half Day after Easter <i>This was to be arranged.</i> 57: Redraft and upload Training and Visits Document onto GovernorHub. <i>The document had been done and would now be uploaded.</i>	
7	Any questions arising from Reports from Committees a) Finance and Personnel Committee (F&P) The draft minutes of the F&P committee held on 6th March were circulated prior to the meeting. The F&P chair summarised the main points of the meeting which included a reduction in the surplus due to sickness and the IT failure. The committee considered future Budget planning, Risk Budgeting, agreeing a long-term replacement Budget, linking expenditure to SDP priorities and contingency. A major IT investment which would involve capital spend and investment in the future were agreed. A five-year maintenance plan for the capital Budget including £11,000 expenditure in Year 1 was approved. The School Financial Values Standard had been circulated prior to the meeting. This had been considered by the F&P committee and included some actions which were being addressed.	

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

	Governors approved the SFVS which was signed by the Chair. ACTION 63: Submit SFVS to LA by 31st March. b) <u>Curriculum and Standard (C&S)</u> The draft minutes of the C&S committee held on 18th March were circulated prior to the meeting. The Governors had considered and challenged aspects of inclusivity, Fisher Family Trust (FFT) data, queried why the Greater Depth (GDS) data was not on target and approved Policies. There were no questions raised.	SBM
8.	Headteacher's update (verbal) The Lead Learning Partner (LLPR) had visited the school. The visit had been successful. The written report was awaited. There were some action points: • It would be even better if the presentation in books matched the handwriting practice and skills were transferred. It was suggested that pupils practised handwriting in the same books. • Children should be encouraged to be as independent as possible and scaffolding reduced over time to enable this. • Pupils should be encouraged to use the skills they had. • Staff should circulate to ensure that mistakes were not embedded. The proposed INSET days for 2026-2027 needed Governor approval. The dates matched Crookham Junior Schools dates and one of the dates was a SHARP cluster INSET. Governors approved the following INSET days for the 2026-2027 academic year: 1st September, 23rd October (SHARP), 4th January, 22nd February, 28th June (handover). The LLPR visit for 2026-2027 had been set for 8th October 2026. Governors were invited to attend the Feedback meeting 1.30pm -2.30pm. ACTION 64: Diarise to attend LLPR Feedback meeting at 1.30pm on 8th October. The school had not been successful in appointing a Starcare Manager. The Senior Leadership Team were taking turns to fulfill the role, but this was not sustainable in the long term. The site manager had been off sick but had now returned. Thanks were given to the School Business Manager who had fulfilled some of the site manager's duties while he was away. The feedback meeting with parents of the mixed class had been positive. The following activities and events had taken place: Chinese Dance, Pancake making and racing, Flower shop, Founders Day, Poetry World Book Day. The PINs project would finish at Easter. A complete evaluation would be brought to the C&S Committee. The situation with the Preschool was more positive as they were settling into the premises. The Spring Fair had been successful. Attendance was at 97.1%, which was encouraging. Persistent Absences (PA) were at 10.3%, the national average was 15.7%. The school continued to work with PA families. Governors were encouraged to attend the Whole School Safeguarding Training on 1st September and to attend Ofsted Training – GS304 as the school was due to have an Ofsted inspection in Spring Term 2027. Behaviour – there had been one suspension of 1.5 days for violence against a pupil.	Govs

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

	An emergency evacuation practice including the Preschool had been successful. Health and Safety including accidents – all non-sterile cleansing wipes had been removed from the school. Obstructions had been removed. A parent had tripped on a kerb in the playground. The site manager would be fixing hooks to doors to prevent them slamming shut when it was windy. The values had been added to the front page of the Home School Agreement. Strict protocols and ensuring the Phonics Screening documents were locked away when they were received by the school were followed. The oven in the school kitchen was broken. It required a new heat exchanger at a cost of £1,956, which was a lot cheaper than purchasing a new oven. Governors unanimously approved the purchase of a new heat exchanger for the oven in the sum of £1,956.	
9	Questions and Challenge These were dealt with in item 8.	
10	Health and Safety update The Health and Safety Governor had visited the school and the report circulated. Other matters had been reported in the headteacher's update.	
11	<u>Safeguarding update</u> This had been dealt with in the headteacher's update	
12	Policies and other statutory/ best practice documents to be reviewed /adopted (on GovernorHub): a. <u>Anti-bullying Policy</u> The Anti-bullying Policy had been circulated prior to the meeting. There were no questions raised. Governors unanimously approved the Anti-bullying Policy b. <u>School Emergency Management Plan</u> The School Emergency Plan had been circulated prior to the meeting. It had been updated. There were no questions raised. Governors unanimously approved the School Emergency Management Plan c. <u>ECT Induction Policy</u> The ECT Policy had been circulated prior to the meeting. There were no questions raised. Governors unanimously approved the ECT Induction Policy. d. <u>Privacy Notice for Pupils</u> The Privacy Notice for Pupils had been circulated prior to the meeting. This had been updated. There were no questions raised. Governors unanimously approved the Privacy Notice for Pupils e. <u>Accessibility Plan</u> The Accessibility Plan had not been circulated prior to the meeting and would be carried forward. f. <u>Admissions Policy</u> The Admissions Policy had been circulated prior to the meeting for information. There were no questions raised. Governors unanimously approved the Admissions Policy g. <u>Low Level Concerns – (MOPP Policy)</u> The Low-Level Concerns Policy had been circulated prior to the meeting. There were no questions raised. Governors unanimously approved the Low Level Concerns Policy h. <u>Guidance for Requests for Time off to train (MOPP)</u> The Guidance for Requests for Time off to train had been circulated prior to the meeting. There were no questions raised.	

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

	Governors unanimously approved the Guidance for Requests for Time off to train. i. <u>Confidentiality Policy</u> The Confidentiality Policy had been circulated prior to the meeting. There were no changes to the Policy and no questions raised. Governors unanimously approved the Confidentiality Policy j. <u>Home School Agreement</u> The Home School Agreement had been circulated prior to the meeting. A suggestion had been made to add the new values to the document and this was agreed. Governors unanimously approved the Home School Agreement k. <u>Late Fee Policy</u> This would be carried forward to the next meeting. l. <u>Children with Health Needs who cannot attend school</u> There was a query about whether this was still a statutory policy for Governors. It was the responsibility of the LA.	
13	Governor Matters a. <u>School Governance Team Service Level Agreements (SLA)</u> The School Governance Team SLAs had been circulated prior to the meeting. This was a rolling contract. It included Advice, Support and Training and Clerking Service. There was discussion about the benefits of the SLA including the cost of paying for each training session versus the overall cost. Governors approved continuing with the School Governance Team SLA b. <u>Strategy Meeting update</u> The preschool was settling in now. Starcare options were discussed. It was agreed that investigating the possibility of joining a Multi-Academy Trust should be explored for the future of the school. There was discussion about the possibility of Resourced Provision, what this might look like, potential benefits to the school and whether the process could be accelerated. This would depend on the LA. c. <u>Governor vacancies –Governor resignation</u> Debbie Moss had resigned with effect from 4th March. Debbie's contribution to the Governing Body was acknowledged. This left a vacancy for a Co-opted Governor. Jeev Chhokar resigned as a Parent Governor and had agreed to put himself forward as a Co-opted Governor. <i>JC withdrew from the meeting.</i> There was discussion about the experience and commitment JC contributed to the Governing Body. The Governing Body unanimously agreed to appoint Jeev Chhokar as a Co-opted Governor. <i>JC returned to the meeting.</i> This left a Parent Governor vacancy and an election would be held. ACTION 65: Organise Parent Governor election at start of Summer Term. d. <u>Governor Visit Planning for 2025/26- update</u> Greater Depth monitoring had been rescheduled for Summer Term. A visit to monitor the changes Continuous Provision in Y1, a SEND visit and a Safeguarding Report would be carried out and reported to the next FGB meeting. e. <u>Governor Visit Reports –PINs monitoring report.</u> The PINs monitoring report had been circulated prior to the meeting. No questions were raised. f. <u>Governor Training – update</u>	HT

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

	Governors were encouraged to book their training on Hampshire Service for Schools (HSS). The new Training brochure had been uploaded to GovernorHub. All Governors were encouraged to do Ofsted training - GS304A. The next available training on 5th May 18.30-20.00 online. ACTION 66: Governors to book Training including Ofsted Training on HSS.	Govs
14	Clerk's briefing update The following matters were raised at the update: <u>The new Ofsted Framework</u> Governors should monitor the school website and ensure that it was up to date. The website should be monitored termly. Governors were inspected under Leadership and Governance. Inspectors would look at six months' worth of Governor minutes. Safeguarding monitoring reports should be easily accessible and well organised. As many governors as possible should attend the Feedback meeting at the end of the inspection. Governors should attend Ofsted training to ensure they knew how to prepare for Ofsted. <u>The White Paper- Every child Achieving and Thriving</u> The key points were improvements to SEND provision which included a three-tier support model. There would be more training for professionals, changes to funding. There were also changes to the curriculum which was broader and richer, behaviour was also a focus and there would be strong accountability for schools especially in inclusion, SEND funding accountability. The implementation of the White Paper would be over ten years. A consultation was open and schools were encouraged to contribute to the consultation which closed in May.	
15	Impact of the Meeting - Monitoring SDP progress to support Teaching & Learning through governor visits. - Planning to monitor SDP progress to support Teaching & Learning through planned governor visits. - Ensuring effective financial management and a balanced budget by analysing and approving the Restructure Proposal. - Approving Policies and plans for how to deliver the aims. - Developing GB membership through planning for training - Ensuring the school is compliant with current regulation with Health and Safety report. - Maintaining an effective Governing Body with appointment of new LA governor and new Co-opted governor. - Auditing financial processes to ensure compliance with policy through approval of SFVS.	
16	Date of Next Meetings all at Tweseldown Infant School Strategy Meeting – Monday 20th April 2026 9.00am F&P Committee – Friday 8th May 2026 8.45am -10.45am FGB - Wednesday 19th May 2026 7pm C&S Committee –Wednesday 1st July 7.00pm	

There being no other business the Chair closed the meeting at 9.20pm.

Signed by Chair:

Date:

Tweseldown Infant School
Minutes of the Full Governing Body
Tuesday 24th March 2026 at 7.00pm

Summary of Outstanding Actions

Date set	Action	Who
28.01.26	33: Include observations of ethos, vision and values in Governor monitoring	Govs
28.01.26	34: Add section to record observations of ethos, vision and values on Governor monitoring form	DS
28.01.26	48: Check whether to include recommendations from PINS to Accessibility Plan and add to agenda of next FGB meeting.	HT/Clerk
28.01.26	57: Upload Training and Visits Document onto GovernorHub	JC
24.03.26	62: Arrange for Induction of new LA Governor.	Clerk, Co-chairs, SBM, HT.
24.03.26	63: Submit SFVS to LA by 31st March.	SBM
24.03.26	64: Diarise to attend LLPR Feedback meeting at 1.30pm on 8th October.	Govs
24.03.26	65: Organise Parent Governor election at start of Summer Term.	HT
24.03.26	66: Governors to book Training including Ofsted Training on HSS.	Govs

Signed by Chair:

Date: