**Beaver Road Primary School**

**Local Governing Board Meeting**

**Thursday 4th May 2023 at 5pm.**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Lynne Allan Co-opted Governor (Chair)

Anthony Boothman Parent Governor

Paris Brown-Gardner Staff Governor

Matthew Coupe Parent Governor

Emma Forrester Co-opted Governor (Deputy Chair of Governors)

Liz Hardy Executive Headteacher

Melissa Ulett Staff Governor

Pauline Black Co-opted Governor

**In attendance:**

Michael Burke Associate Governor

Shelly Leigh Governance Professional

Tina Smith Chief Finance and Operations Officer

**The meeting met its quorum.**

***Any text in bold red represents Governors’ question, challenge, and Clerk’s advice.*** *Black bold represents decisions and actions.*

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
	1. Governors were welcomed to the meeting.
	2. Introductions were given for the benefit of the new Governors: Paris Brown-Gardner (Staff Governor), Melissa Ulett (Staff Governor), and Michael Burke (Associate).
2. **Apologies for Absence**
	1. Apologies for absence from Sian Hanison (Co-opted Governor) were received and accepted.
	2. There had been no apologies received from Emma Foster (Co-opted Governor). Apologies were received after the meeting.
3. **Declarations of Non/Pecuniary Interest**
	1. There were no declarations of non/pecuniary interest in relation to any of the agenda items.
4. **Declaration of Other Business**
	1. There was one declaration of other business: the proposed SLA for the internet services contract.
5. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting (23rd January 2023) and Matters Arising**
	1. **The minutes of the meeting held on 23rd January 2023 were formally approved as a true and accurate record.**
	2. Matters Arising
		1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if confirmation of the link Governor roles had been made.**

Yes, the confirmed link Governor roles had been emailed to all Governors. However, this confirmation would be resent.

***Action:*** Liz Hardy to resend the confirmation of all link Governor roles to the LGB following the meeting.

* + 1. To complete the skills audit, all Governors were asked to download and complete the skills audit on Google Drive prior to the next meeting.

***Action:*** All Governors to complete the skills audit prior to the next LGB meeting and send to Shelly.

* + 1. Pauline Black had shared the social work standards with Liz Hardy.
		2. Liz Hardy had shared, with the LGB, an email from the QA regarding the Ofsted self-evaluation.
		3. The link for the cyber security training had been shared by Tina Smith with the LGB.
		4. The draft Teaching and Learning Policy had now been completed. The policy was to be approved at the curriculum and standards meeting in June 2023 and ratified at the July 2023 LGB meeting. There had been a staff consultation regarding the teaching and learning processes. Subsequently there had been an evaluation of the teaching and learning approaches which would feed into the policy.
1. **Executive Headteacher’s Report**
	1. Liz Hardy presented the Executive Headteacher’s Report. The report had been shared with the LGB prior to the meeting.
	2. The Quality Assurance (QA) visit had taken place in January 2023. The report had been shared with the LGB who had received a verbal update at the previous meeting. Overall, this had been a positive visit.
	3. **Governors’ Question: A Governor requested further information on who had completed the QA visit and what had taken place during the visit.**

This was an external evaluation. There were two QA professionals who completed the QA audit. There was a QA from the Local Authority (LA) and a QA through a school buy-in. This QA also supported with the Headteacher’s appraisal on behalf of both the school and the Trust and was an Ofsted Inspector. It was noted, that during the previous academic year there had also been a Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) audit and a Looked After Children (LAC) review. The LGB were advised that external audits supported the external validation and evaluation of the school, both strategically, and operationally.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired how long a QA visit took.** This was one full day.
	2. Previously the school had self-evaluated as Good but had been advised a self-evaluation of Outstanding could be made. The Self Evaluation Form (SEF) and other documents are shared with Ofsted prior to an Inspection.
	3. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired why link Governors were not included in the SEF.**

The SEF was currently under review in line with the QA report. Link Governors would be included on the SEF. There had been some changes made through the contributions of the Heads of Year. This was a live document.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if there had been any areas of the SEF which had moved from Good to Outstanding.**

Yes, the quality of education had progressed from Good to Outstanding. The LGB were advised that to be an Outstanding school, it was essential that the quality of education was Outstanding.

* 1. Previously, there had been a discussion regarding a training session for Governors in preparation for an Ofsted Inspection. The school was due an Inspection between summer 2023 and summer 2024. The school is currently rated Outstanding. However, there have been significant changes since the previous Ofsted Inspection which had taken place under the preceding Ofsted Framework. Governors were advised that the school was prepared for the Inspection, and the offer and provision at the school was meaningful and purposeful. Members of the teaching staff were supported including through the application of SMART assessments, and training for members of staff was of a good quality.
	2. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on the potential impact on the school if the school was judged Good rather than remaining Outstanding.**

This was unknown. The school had been Outstanding since 2011. However, 2011 had also been the last time the school was Inspected. Potentially, a change in judgement could impact on pupil numbers. However, the school did not experience low pupil numbers and in general, families would consider the school offer and provision when choosing the school. In addition, most families were aware there had been changes to the Ofsted Framework as Ofsted Inspections had been discussed in the media. It was noted that a judgement of Good was acceptable.

* 1. The report informed on the number of behavioural incidents since the start of the academic year. There had been four racist incidents involving four pupils. There had been no reported incidents of bullying.
	2. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired how a racist incident was identified/classified.**

This could be a comment, the purposeful use of racist language, or the non-intended racial incident. The school actively discussed and educated pupils on racism and bullying through the curriculum, and through the schools’ values and ethos.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the racist incidents had been perpetrated by pupils new to the school who had less understanding of the school’s values and ethos.**

Some incidents had involved younger pupils, and/or pupils who were SEND. It was reported that there had been a pupil who had received a total of 6.5 days of suspension this academic year. The pupil had now returned to school. This pupil had received four suspensions in the last two terms. There is a high level of concern for this child and there is significant support in place for the pupil.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired what types of incidents led to a suspension.**

There was a checklist used and the school complied with the behaviour policy. The incidents which could result in a pupil being suspended included a physical attack, a verbal attack, or damage to property.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if on the process if there was a permanent exclusion.**

There had been a change to the exclusion policy. An exclusion was permanent, and the previous fixed term exclusion was now known as a suspension.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if a behavioural incident occurred outside of school would this be reported.**

No. Although the school would support those involved. However, this would not be recorded as the incident did not take place in the school. Furthermore, a suspension could not be issued for a behavioural incident outside of school, as an investigation could not take place.

* 1. The report presented the Nursery and Reception 2023 September admissions to date. The Nursery was full and there was a waiting list in place. Regarding the 2023 September intake for Reception, 139 places had been offered with 134 places currently accepted. It was noted that any late applications were yet to be received. Additionally, it was noted that induction evenings would take place on 13th and 14th of June 2023.

1. **Revised Leadership Staffing Structure Proposal**
	1. Liz Hardy presented the proposed revised leadership staffing structure to the LGB for agreement and approval.
	2. The LGB were provided an overview of why a revised leadership staffing structure was needed. As the school had expanded to a five-form entry the leadership structure needed to increase its capacity to lead a school which will have more than one thousand pupils. This was impacting on the capacity of the current leadership structure: operationally, the school is below the leadership capacity needed now with consideration given to communication with families, including the families of pupils who had SEND or behavioural concerns, supporting members of staff including several Early Career Teachers (ECTs), and supporting staff wellbeing. There was also an issue of capacity for driving the strategic direction of both the school and Trust. Liz Hardy is both the Executive Headteacher and the CEO of the Trust. The Trust Board had stated their aim to grow the Trust. To support the role of CEO and Executive Headteacher, capacity is needed to delegate some of the operational leadership of the school to the Senior Leadership Team (SLT). Currently the two Deputy Heads were acting on behalf of the Executive Headteacher, but greater autonomy was needed. To achieve this Liz Hardy proposed a temporary uplift of the two Deputy Heads role and responsibilities to Head of School.
	3. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if families would understand the title of Head of School.**

Yes. The role of the Head of School had been in the initial staffing model. There had been plans to introduce a staffing model in 2024/25 with two Heads of School and two Deputy Heads. However, this was not currently financially viable, as such, the LGB were being presented with an alternative which was best for the school operationally, strategically, and financially.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the Head of School would change each term.**

The Heads of School would be based in both schools and would move between the First school and the Junior school each term. The First school was larger than the Junior school. Moving between schools would better support the Head of Schools professional development and would support the retainment of the current Deputy Heads. In addition, despite the two separate sites this was one school. This would be a temporary arrangement whilst a better picture of the expansion of the Trust was known.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on the impact on the school budget.**

The two Deputy Heads would be the Head of School for one academic year. The role of Deputy Head would not be back filled.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if there would be an increase in pay for the current Deputy Heads.**

Yes, this would be enhanced pay due to the Deputy Heads taking additional responsibilities.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the role of Head of School needed to go to advert.**

No, this was a role which was an assimilated 80% of the Deputy Heads current role.

* 1. In addition to the two Heads of School, it was proposed that the Assistant Head roles would be advertised and ringfenced for the current Heads of Year. The successful candidates would remain a Head of Year with additional responsibilities including, teaching for 2.5 days, Planning, Preparation and Assessment (PPA) time, and leadership for 2.5 days. The successful candidates would be the job share members of staff in their year group. This would be a temporary role for 12 months.
	2. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the leadership days would be staggered to ensure there was an Assistant Head in school each day.**

The details had not been discussed. However, one Assistant Head would be based in first school and one Assistant Head would be based in the junior school.

* 1. As Chief Finance Officer (CFO), Tina Smith would continue to line manage the Facilities Manager and the School Business Manager (SBM). However, operationally the day-to-day management of responsibilities would be the responsibility of the Heads of School. This was a common model in most Trust schools. Consequently, this would increase the capacity of both Liz Hardy and Tina Smith.
	2. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if there would be two Facility Managers and two SBMs.**

No, there would be one Facilities Manager and one SBM working across both sites.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired how the proposed staffing structure would support the two sites as being one school.**

Operationally a Head of School would be based at a school for a half term. However, there would be flexible working with the Heads of Schools to support being one school. Currently, the Deputy Heads were working across both schools, but this had the potential to create a lack of consistency. The Heads of School would work closely together.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor raised a concern if an issue could not be resolved in a term this would then be addressed by a different Head of School.**

This would be flexible especially if the concern was a safeguarding issue. This was a 12-month trial.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on the costings of the two enhanced roles for the Heads of School, the two Assistant Head posts, and the back filling needed.**

The approximate cost to back fill for four days teaching would amount to £34,000. There were no additional Head of Year posts. Two of the eight Heads of Year would take the role of Assistant Head but would also remain a Head of Year.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired how many hours of leadership capacity would be created through the proposed staffing structure.**

Four days. This additional capacity was needed to support the needs of the pupils at the school.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the SENDCo hours would be increased.**

No, the SENDCo would continue to work four days a week. Increasing the SENDCos hours had been discussed.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the school needed the SENDCo’s hours to increase.**

The role of the SENDCo role was not to address all SEND needs. The SENDCo would advise leaders and teachers on how to support pupils with SEND. There was a lack of capacity for SEND, however, support for autism assessments were in place and TAs were being trained to support pupils with SEND interventions. Furthermore, the Assistant Heads would have the initial discussions with families regarding the identification of SEND needs. Teachers needed to support pupils with SEND with direction from leaders. Teachers needed to lead plans with support from the Heads of Year, the SENDCo, and external agencies. Increasing leadership capacity was needed to provide this support to teachers. The SENDCo was non-teaching.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the Heads of Year would be more involved with pupils and if they would have the capacity to support SEND.**

Yes, the Head of Year would have time to support the teacher with SEND and other issues including strategic actions.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired how the change to the leadership structure would affect existing policies and procedures.**

Most policies did refer to the SLT, but some amendments would be needed to some policies.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired how many members of staff were currently in the SLT.**

Four.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on any changes to line management.**

The proposed Heads of School would line manage the Heads of Year who line manged the year group. The Heads of Year who were Assistant Heads would not line manage other Heads of Year. The uplift in the Heads of Year/Assistant Heads was related to increased responsibilities and would result in an increase in pay of one leadership point.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on the time management for the Heads of School.**

The Heads of School will have greater responsibilities regarding the operational decisions made day to day. Heads of School will also report to Governors. Regarding time management the Heads of Schools would be required to delegate some responsibilities/duties to the Assistant Heads.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if consideration had been given to other staffing models.**

Yes, subsequently this was the most cost-effective solution to best meet the school’s needs. In addition, the proposed model provided greater opportunities for professional development.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on the focus for the Executive Headteacher/CEO when there was greater capacity in the SLT.**

This would allow the capacity to grow the Trust and also give more time to the strategic leadership of the school. Currently the role of the Executive Headteacher/CEO was too operational and needed to be more strategic.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on the finances for the revised leadership structure.**

This was currently confidential. The overview of costings had been submitted to Trustees who had confirmed the proposal was financially viable. The Two Assistant Head role would be an L7 role, and the two Heads of School would be an L16 role. The greatest cost was the back fill of teaching for four days based on a scale of L6. This gave the total cost of £34,000.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on the overall impact on the budget regarding staffing costs.**

Currently 17.46% of the budget was allocated to leadership costs, this will increase slightly.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the school would revert to the current leadership structure following the 12-month period.**

This was a trail. The success of the trial would be reviewed.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor queried introducing an additional layer of management with potential increases in pay awards and other increased costs in the budget.**

This had been considered. A change to the current leadership structure was required when consideration was given to this being a growing five-form entry school within a growing Trust. This was not linked to pay awards. The issue was capacity.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if there was a risk to agreeing the proposed changes to the leadership structure prior to the pay awards being confirmed.**

There was a three-to-five-year budget plan in place. This considered a range of assumptions with projections for the pay awards included. This was an on-going consideration.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the cost of the proposed change to the SLT structure had been built into the budget.**

Yes, consideration and planning for additional/changes to staffing had been made. This showed what was affordable for what was needed. This was a pilot for a needs led approach.

* 1. This proposal was a request for support from Governors using a trial to gain four leadership days. In addition, capacity was key, and the current structure was not fit for purpose. If the proposal were approved the costings for the changes to the SLT would remain below 18% of the budget.
	2. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the internal recruitment to the SLT presented issues in supporting equality.**

No, these were not new posts, this was a temporary uplift to existing roles.

* 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the proposal were approved how the changes would be communicated to the wider staffing team, and families.**

Currently, the proposed changes to staffing had not been communicated to members of staff. However, this was not expected to be an issue. The changes to the SLT would allow members of staff greater capacity and support and created professional development for members of staff. Communications with families would be given sensitively and families would be kept well informed.

* 1. **Governors approved the proposed Revised Leadership Structure as document on Google Drive.**
	2. (Anthony Boothman left the meeting at 7.05pm)
1. **Committee Reports**
	1. Buildings and Resources (02.03.23)
		1. The minutes had been shared with the LGB.
	2. Standards and Curriculum (09.03.23)
		1. The minutes had been shared with the LGB.
		2. The committee had received a Power Point presentation on the writing curriculum.
		3. It was noted there were several link Governor reports which would be uploaded to Google Drive.

***Action:*** Liz Hardy to upload the link Governor reports to Google Drive following the meeting.

1. **Safeguarding Update**
	1. CPOMs Update
		1. It was noted that following a CPOMs update there had been an increase in categories. The log on CPOMs was under continual review as were the safeguarding procedures in place. Currently across the school there were 10 Designated Safeguarding Leads (DSLs) who met half termly to review any safeguarding updates. It was noted that the school now used CPOMs Staff Safe which supported the monitoring of the Single Central Record (SCR).
		2. The LGB were shown an overview of the CPOMs categories and the roles and responsibilities of the DSLs.
		3. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired on the latest changes.**

There were some additional DSLs. In addition, there had been changes made in the mapping of behavioural incidents and where they had occurred. It was noted there had also be a change to the peer-on-peer abuse policy which was now the child-on-child abuse policy.

* 1. Attendance Update
		1. There had been a change to the attendance policy at the start of academic year. An overview of the reporting of attendance had been shared with the LGB. The school target attendance levels were aspirational at 96%. This was above the local attendance levels of 94% and the national average of 92%. However, the school had achieved an attendance level which had placed the school in the top 20% of all schools for attendance in the autumn term.
		2. The school had sought to address issues with pupil attendance with statutory action taken for families taking extended leave in term time. The school continued to use incentives to improve pupil attendance. Additionally, families would now receive an attendance newsletter. Recognition was given for the work undertaken in developing the attendance newsletter.
		3. It was noted that pupil attendance had been impacted by the teacher strikes.

1. **Health and Safety Update**
	1. Update on CIF Bids
		1. The school had submitted two CIF bids. To date the school had not received confirmation if these had been successful bids. Governors would be updated at the buildings and resources committee.
	2. Update on Compliance
		1. An update on compliance would be presented to the buildings and resources committee. A cyber audit had been completed on 4th May 2023. The audit recommendations would be presented to the buildings and resources committee. It was noted that this would affect the business continuity and crisis management plan.
2. **Policies for Review/Approval**
	1. The Absence Management Policy, Disciplinary Policy, leave of Absence Policy, and Grievance Policy had been shared with the LGB for information and comment.
	2. There were three policies for approval.
	3. Admissions Policy
		1. **Governors approved the Admissions Policy as documented on Google Drive.**
	4. Anti-bullying Policy
		1. **Governors approved the Anti-bullying Policy as documented on Google Drive**.
	5. Child on Child Abuse Policy
		1. **Governors approved the Child-on-Child Abuse Policy as documented on Google Drive.**

1. **Governance**
	1. Governor Training including follow up on Diversity Training
		1. The diversity training for Governors had been delayed due to there being a delay to diversity training for members of staff. A date would be arranged.
		2. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if this could include anti-racism training.**

This training would take place in the future.

* 1. Link Governor Reports/Visits
		1. Governors would be able to access copies of link Governor visits under the 2023/24 link Governor visits folder on Google Drive. Thanks were given to the Governors for their contribution.
	2. Arrange Google Meet for Ofsted Training (Monday 22nd May 2023 at 5pm to 6pm)
		1. The LGB were advised that a Google Meet for Ofsted training would take place on Monday 22nd May 2023 at 5pm to 6pm. This would be a remote meeting. Governors would receive an overview of what Governors could expect during an Ofsted Inspection.
1. **Any Other Business**
	1. Internet Service Level Agreement (SLA)
		1. Currently the school provider for the internet was with One Education. This contract had been extended to September 2023. At present One Education was the internet provider including providing the firewall and AVA were contracted for the school ICT support. However, there had been issues with the internet between the two sites. As such, it was proposed that one provider would be contracted for the internet, firewall, and ICT support. Two quotes had been sourced: One Education and AVA. The preferred provider was AVA who had an established good working relationship with the school. In addition, there would be savings made of £3,000 over three years.
		2. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if AVA were providers for the internet at other schools.**

Yes, this was the preferred provider for Stockport LA and were in Stockport schools.

* + 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if recommendations could be sourced.**

Yes.

* + 1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if AVA would complete an audit.**

Yes, this was completed on a regular basis. AVA had been involved in the cyber essentials and the cyber audit. In addition, the school would receive a faster internet connection.

* + 1. **Governors approved AVA as the only internet provider as proposed during the meeting.**
	1. **Governors’ Question: A Governor enquired if the meetings could be hybrid in the future.**

Yes.

1. **Date and Time of Next Meeting**
	1. Monday 3rd July 2023 at 5pm – LGB Meeting
	2. Thursday 15th June 2023 – Governance Afternoon

**Meeting ended 7:35pm**