

Minutes of Governing Body Meeting January 23rd, 1330, 2024

Present:	C Gilbey (Chair) S Moss (Vice Chair) R Campbell (Head teacher) A Holland B Calvert V Sadd M Welsh N Wiltshire (Staff Governor) K Davies (Staff Governor)
In Attendance:	A Clarkson Clerk to Governors
Apologies:	N Maycock

24/23	Receive Apologies for Absence –
<i>Summary of Discussion</i> (Including questions and responses)	<i>Lead – Chair</i> <i>Purpose - Decision</i> Apologies received in advance via email
Actions Arising / Resolutions	
Accepted	Chair

24/24	New Declarations of Interest and Interests Relevant to this Meeting
<i>Summary of Discussion</i> (Including questions and responses)	<i>Lead – Chair</i> <i>Purpose – Information</i> Nil received CofG called out of meeting at 1335, Vice chair took over meeting
Actions Arising Resolutions	
N/A	NA

24/25	Agree Minutes of Past Meeting and Consider Matters Arising and CPD (Continuing Professional Development) question	
Summary of Discussion (Including questions and responses)	Lead – Chair Purpose – Information All actions completed for 24/14 and 24/16	
Actions Arising / Resolutions		
Previous minutes a true reflection and accepted as such unanimously to be uploaded to school portal		Clerk

24/26	Consider Meeting Focus – Finance and Resources	
Summary of Discussion (Including questions and responses)	Lead – Bursar Purpose – Information Policy documents tabled in advance to all Governors via portal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Receive revised budget (half year update), scrutiny and forward plan, monitoring statements and revised budget. ▫ Discuss benchmarking report ▫ Draft SFVS (or delegate to working party) ▫ Oversight of staff performance management Points of note raised by bursar Significantly better off than last view in April 2023 of this current year budget plan with 78K increase of funds in due in part to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receipt of MOD grant for 2024 and still awaiting remainder of 2023 MOD grant once paperwork completed to justify spend appropriate to grant request. • Increase of top up funding due to significant increase in SEND/EHCP. This will however be swallowed up for TA deployment to cover all additional needs across school. • Teachers pay award received 4% of 6.5% increase and this was in budget plan, however additional 2.5% to cover shortfall from government added to plan. • Slight savings on maintenance from last fiscal year on reconciliation from what we paid in. Cautionary note however we do also use other maintenance providers other than NYC (North Yorkshire Council), which takes staff time to check insurance, DBS and risk assessments held, therefore all these spends are why there is a contingency built into the plan. • The 3-year plan summary shows how rapidly the funding changes with only 155 pupils submitted in October census 2023 there is a huge drop in income going forward for school. Staffing will need to be closely monitored. The next 2 years will have exceptionally large deficits particularly with the grant pot reducing. • SFVS, suggestion that all governors have CPD on SFVS and alternate who is in the working party for this coming submission is agreed with VS, MW, volunteering to complete this year (NM to be approached too). Head to arrange meeting time. 	

Questions

Can we continue to apply for MOD grants going forward?

Yes, we can if they continue to offer them, however the criteria becomes increasingly difficult to meet: must be service linked, and it is not a funding stream we can rely on as it may not be applicable to our situation. If it is, we will of course continue to apply for the grants. Noted that the HT has been successful for 7 of 7 years in securing these.

Does the forward plan include grants or money earned by SLT through wider development work (e.g. NPQH)?

No forward planning only includes confirmed funding streams.

What is the likelihood of an increase in pupil numbers? Are actions being taken to promote / monitor this?

Station keeps informing us not to be concerned – Leeming is secure as an airbase. However we cannot predict what primary school children will arrive on station, and the ability to live and purchase home outside of station is indeed impacting pupil numbers negatively.

Noted that children do not come to this school from elsewhere in the community due to security issues – getting onto base etc., so 'recruiting' pupils is not a viable growth strategy.

The FAM is likely to also have a negative impact on pupil numbers, with more and more military families relocating back to family homes around the country.

Regarding the schedule of traded services are you expecting continued increase in these costs and how are you managing this?

Yes, we are expecting to have the costs increase year on year, as they also have the staffing costs to cover due to changes to living wage and minimal pay, we believe there will be another re-banding of wages within the next 12 months, so this impacts provision. We have sourced different grounds maintenance for the coming year starting April 2024 as the service over the last 2 years has deteriorated to the point the school administrative team is continually having to call to ask them to come and complete the grounds maintenance as the grounds are overgrown and untended. This should be being managed through their management service. School has sourced an outside provider who completes all the station ground maintenance. This will bring a £1500 saving over the year.

How does our budget compare to schools our size? What are the variances and why?

If you consider document 8 our benchmarking reports our staff percentage spend is higher than all within the report, again this is to do with the class structure we have maintained to allow for entry into all year groups and minimise mid-year alterations to class formats. We currently go from a class of 20 to a class of 30.

Other percentages are not drastically higher in any comparison, with 3% higher spending on SEND, but we are 10% higher than national average and that is current where we have 8 EHCP (Education, Health, and Care Plans) but we will be at 12 within a month and this four times the national EHCP.

CONFIDENTIAL QUESTION – see separate record.

Actions Arising / Resolutions 24/26	
Resolutions: All tabled documents carried The above documents (revised budget) tabled in advance of the meeting have been adopted unanimously.	NA
Agreed (All) Abstain None	
To arrange SFVS meetings with bursar and SFVS working party to upskill new governors and ensure good financial oversight.	Head

24/27	Consider Meeting Focus – Resources and School Performance
	<p><i>Lead – CoG - Headteacher</i> <i>Purpose – Information</i> Documents tabled in advance to all Governors via portal. School Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ ASP and IDSR <p>The HT fed back on these documents and noted that the content bears out what was previously shared in the Summer 2 Statutory Data report. There are no new variances.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>It appears that the levels of DPP are climbing – how does this break down? <i>Historically as a school we have extremely low DPP; note that this has climbed a little recently with 4 LAC, 6 FSM and 2 Ever 6. We track and monitor support and progression of this group more closely in an effort to narrow any achievement gaps. Aggregated data is still based on very small samples however.</i></p> <p>Most of the IDSR are recorded as 'not significant' – why is this? Noted that the vast majority of areas in IDSR are listed as not statistically significant due to cohort numbers, minor variances etc. Where items are listed as worthy of note (suspensions 2021-22, HPA KS2 Writing progress and PA), these are based on very small numbers and separate case studies are available. PA is being carefully monitored (see HT report).</p>
	<p>Governors to note these documents and their place in information School Improvement priorities.</p>
	NA

24/28	Consider Meeting Focus – School Improvement
<p><i>Summary of Discussion</i> (Including questions and responses)</p>	<p>Lead – CoG - Headteacher Purpose – Information Policy documents tabled in advance to all Governors via portal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DPP Strategy Statement - SPP Strategy Statement <p>Headteacher's Report – to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Data Report ▫ Pupil Premium Progress

- SEND
- Safeguarding Updates
- SIP (School Improvement Plan) Progress Report, including related monitoring

Questions

How do you deal with new pupils who have possibly not been used to the 'transferrable vocabulary' approach? Presumably, they will need some sort of tier 2 catch up?

We are still in the process of developing this approach. We are considering trialling what we do in KS2 homework with the children having 8-10 words where we ask parents to talk to children about these words and to use them at home. We also have recently had staff pedagogy training re retrieval practice. Every lesson starts with retrieval from this last week and now also last term. This also includes retrieval from a subject that is not being taught in the current term to counter the potential pitfalls of 'blocking'.

Does the amended monitoring approach you are using give enough evidence?

We would say that it gives more evidence as we have more frequent, lower-stakes visits/monitoring including subject leaders, SLT and governors. Recording this numerically judgement is rapid and teachers say this is working well - not long written feedback etc. It also helps identify trends and building a wider picture of provision and is far more efficient.

Considering staff wellbeing are they ok with this level of monitoring?

Subject Development weeks are still relatively new this year, but staff are appearing happy with their colleagues monitoring and visits. This is to be addressed deliberately from a wellbeing point of view in next staff meeting. If more significant issues present, this is fed back by SLT in a proactive manner, not by their colleagues. Ownership is with the subject leads, the focus that is delivered by using development weeks allows the lead to see direct comparisons across classes and key stages in how their subject. They help to identify where input and further development is needed. The program of development weeks is scheduled and diarized, so staff have lots of notice which supports wellbeing. This new format has actually validated judgments and is more child centred, not about watching 'a teacher teach', but monitoring what children are learning.

Re: the SPP Strategy statement - Explain how do you intend to address the low level % of SPP funded allocated to SEND time?

Ultimately, the tracking of this spend is of a finite pot of money and we are allocating SPP funding to all, but targeting the most vulnerable. £300 per child is not representative of the SENCO time allocated to a SEND Service Pupil. However, provision is also a class teachers' responsibility.

Re: the DP Strategy statement – how have you selected interventions etc.?

We have sought interventions that are low cost but high impact and can be used widely, impacting multiple pupils and their needs. This thus targets DPP pupils but some areas – e.g. early start time for IDL benefits others too. This also relates to the school-based tutoring, which would have yielded a very small amount of funding just over £800. The staff we could have employed to provide this are already skilled in a range of interventions and support approaches and we have found this a more useful approach - therefore we do not receive that additional funding as what benefits our pupils most does not fit that narrow criteria.

The children that are attending extra-curricular activities within school time, are they missing the same subjects within the classroom every week affecting their core learning?

No, the extracurricular within school is managed by a team that change which pupils are in at which time weekly to prevent one subject being impacted by them learning in our current case music delivered by an external provider.

Is the higher than last year's SEND persistent absenteeism being managed and monitored, if so, how?

The excel enclosures re attendance data has evidence of both pupils without any special categories and those with. FSM persistent absenteeism is almost all register marks 'Late after the register has closed' and 2 unauthorised holidays for pupils within said category. There are layers of data within the background of this which is updated every term, and comments and evidence added by the admin team, which are responded to by SLT in whether phone call, letter or meeting is required to discuss attendance. Within those layers are complexities for these families - we are compassionate and observant of the health needs of said families and we always encourage attendance while delicately balancing the family dynamics we are aware of.

Considering child protection cases, is there a significant need for teachers and SLT regarding their own well-being whilst being aware and involved in cases?

It is a graduated response dependent on the level of awareness, SLT are first line of support for staff, we also buy in to health assured which offers all staff support and confidential counselling. We also have external support for the team DDSL. SLT have open dialogues with each other to support each other and the cases are shared - particularly if there is a SEND involvement as NW may well already be heavily involved with a family which she will then pick up the CP if appropriate.

103 days loss of teaching days surely this is a concern?

This is on break down primarily parental leave which is covered under our staff absence scheme of which we receive payments from, therefore this is not concerning. HT shared NY benchmarking document, absence fluctuates and dips, but we are below our comparatives.

Please explain the big disparity between Test Data in Maths Y3/4 vs. 5/6?

Year 3 and 4 take a different test to year 5 and 6 there is no standardization for year 3 and 4. Approximate calculations based on conversion of raw score based on Y5/6 norms would mean cohort average score of 64%, which is higher than UKS2 SATs (50% = 100).

Please add the description re how this can be compared to future HT reports, thanks.

Is progress usually lower in autumn?

However, where attainment or progress is lower, we do recognise that there can be some 'slippage', especially of vulnerable pupils, during Summer. The current picture is much more positive than the equivalent Autumn 2 data last year. However, we also recognise that this was a long term so we would expect that 'summer gap' to close, and this will be closely monitored in April data.

Explain why has persistent absenteeism increased from 22-23 year?

To have an accurate view of today in HT report to last academic year at this time would require comparison to HT report Autumn 22. This report shows our attendance for Autumn 2023, where the end summary is the full 22-23 academic year. Thus an absence of a week is proportionately a higher percentage of one term than of one year.

What about how you make calls re attendance when we have every bug going around - does illness absence still incur calls?

	<p>Yes, although it is authorised it is still absent as in previous response re absence, we do consider all the data. It is our legal duty to inform parents re absence for their children, especially when it drops below 90% - even for authorised reasons. We always endeavour to be proportionate in our response here however.</p> <p>We have higher levels of pupil mental health and anxiety and these impact numbers as well - it is a fine line, we balance to support parents and provide our commitment to education.</p> <p>Despite all our contextual issues (including authorised Leave due to parental deployments) our attendance is still above the national average.</p> <p>Governors noted that the Personal development area of the website has been updated and now represents more of what we do in this area.</p>
--	--

Actions Arising / Resolutions 24/28

DPP Strategy Statement 2022-25 SPP Strategy Statement 2022-25	Agreed (All) Abstain None Agreed (All) Abstain None
Add description to headteacher report as requested	Head
Continue to monitor vulnerable pupils and those who have struggled to progress	Head / SLT via Class Teachers
Monitor PA and ARPA	Head / Admin Team

24/29	Policy Update
Summary of Discussion (Including questions and responses)	Lead – Chair Purpose - Decision Policy documents all tabled in advance to all governors. Already reviewed digitally – to be noted. Policies to be reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Health and Safety b. Health and Safety Premises Management c. Budget Management and Scheme of Delegation d. Governors Allowances e. SEND f. Complaints Procedure g. Marking and feedback Assessment

Actions Arising / Resolutions 24/29

Resolutions: All tabled policies carried The above policies tabled in advance of the meeting have been adopted unanimously. Agreed (All) Abstain None Noted that NYC released a new SEND policy on date of governor meeting however the current carried policy is valid and will be reviewed appropriately	NA Head
--	--

24/30	Receive Monitoring Reports –	
<p><i>Summary of Discussion</i> (Including questions and responses)</p>	<p><i>Lead – Chair</i> <i>Purpose – Information</i> <i>Tabled</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEND • Safeguarding • Humanities • Music • PSHCE • EYFS <p>The above reports were received and noted by governors. Actions and follow-ups to be completed in next visits.</p> <p>Question What does BYOD mean? <i>Bring your own devices.</i></p>	
Actions Arising / Resolutions		
N/A	NA	

24/30	Discuss H&S and Capital Expenditure	
Summary of Discussion (Including questions and responses)	<p>Lead – Chair Purpose – Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Heating in school KS1 in particular, admin office monitoring this and taking readings since full annual service of convector heaters, there has been an improvement as they were not internally set at the correct temp. The engineer noted that it will be slower to heat up due to only having one boiler to work for the whole school being overloaded with work. □ NYC running behind with their management of air-conditioning servicing, should have had annual review by 13th January 2024 but this is booked in for the 1st of February 2024. □ Full paperwork audit 22/11/2023 – still awaiting report <p>Question Where are we at with the boiler being replaced and how does that impact our budget, having children in coats in lessons is not viable?</p> <p><i>Our building manager is aware of the need, and we are logging data to provide evidence that this is urgent to the productivity and health of staff and pupils in school. If there is a cost it would be to take the full annual capital funding we receive to our capital, which would be a £6000 contribution from ourselves. Our capital balance is currently healthy, but this is to replace archaic IT equipment that is in process currently. A rolling 'allocation' of £10k is nominally made to this each year which has not always been spent, hence the raised balance.</i></p> <p><i>The first day back after holidays is always colder as the boiler only comes on for frost protection. On the heating review the time the boiler comes on return from holidays has been increased.</i></p>	
Actions Arising / Resolutions		
NA		NA

24/31	Discuss AOB –	
Summary of Discussion (Including questions and responses)	<p>Lead – Chair/Clerk Purpose – Information NA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HT performance review in hand with CofG completing review prior to the assessor being available in March 2024. Delay unavoidable, no fiscal impact. 	
Actions Arising / Resolutions		
NA		Clerk

24/32	Confirm Date of Next Meeting –	
Summary of Discussion	March 5 th 2024, 1330, on site unless informed different.	
Actions Arising / Resolutions		
NA		NA