**Beaver Road Primary School**

**Governing Body**

| **Quorum: 33% of membership (met at this meeting)**  **Chair: Lynne Allan**  **Date of meeting: 4 July 2022**  **Venue: Beaver Road Junior School** | **Approved as a true and accurate record.**  **Name……………………………**  **Date…………………………**  **Chair of Committee / Governing Body** |
| --- | --- |

**Attendees**

| **Name** | **Committee Members** | **Present – P**  **Apologies – Ap**  **Absent - A** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Lynne Allan (Chair) | Co-opted Governor | P |
| Anthony Boothman | Parent Governor | P |
| Matthew Coupe | Parent Governor | P |
| Michael Davenport | Staff Governor | P |
| Emma Forrester | Co-opted Governor | P |
| Emma Foster | Co-opted Governor | P |
| Sian Hanison | Co-opted Governor (Staff) | P |
| Liz Hardy | Headteacher | P |
| Rihula Mour | Staff Governor | P |
|  |  |  |
| Pauline Black | Co-opted Governor | Ap |
| Jane Carroll | Parent Governor | Ap |

| **Also present** | **Role** |
| --- | --- |
| Tina Smith | Chief Finance and Operations Officer |

**Agenda items**

| **Item 1** | **Apologies for Absence** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Committee noted and agreed to accept apologies submitted by Pauline Black and Jane Carroll.  The Headteacher confirmed that a member of the school staff had died recently and that the school staff and pupils were being supported in managing the situation. The Year 6 pupils had decided to raise funds to purchase a commemorative bench and a plaque. In addition, a book of condolences was available for individuals to sign – members of the Local Governing Body (LGB) were invited to add their signatures. | | | |
| **Resolutions / Agreed actions** | | **Owner** | **Date** |
| * Agreed – apologies as above accepted. | | LGB |  |

| **Item 2** | **Declaration of interests** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| There were no declarations of interest submitted in relation to any of the items on the agenda. | | | |
| **Resolutions / Agreed actions** | | **Owner** | **Date** |
| * Noted – Trustees noted the above declaration. | | LGB |  |

| **Item 3** | **Minutes of the Previous Meeting (16.05.22) and Matters Arising** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The LGB noted that the minutes of the previous meeting had been circulated prior to the meeting for the consideration of the LGB.  The LGB confirmed that there were no amendments or corrections required and that the document represented a true / correct record of the meeting. The minutes were approved and a signed copy of the document was retained on record by the school.  Matters Arising.  The LGB noted a series of matters arising in relation to the previous minutes.  Trustee Vacancy.  The Chief Finance and Operations Officer (CFOO) confirmed that the Trust had advertised the current vacancy for a trustee which had included additional support information which would attract potential candidates from diverse backgrounds.  Q. Would the trust also maintain the links with Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) to recruit a trustee? A. Yes.  Safeguarding Training.  The CFOO confirmed that the scheduling of the training would be confirmed after the meeting.  National Governance Association (NGA) Learning Link.  The CFOO confirmed that the individual members of the LGB had been issued with the  necessary link to the NGA training and each individual would complete the required training modules.  Website Review.  The LGB members confirmed that they had completed a review and assessment of the school’s website. The overall impression was positive, the website was considered good although there was no further feedback. It was appreciated that this would be an ongoing issue. In addition, the executive Headteacher (EHT) confirmed that the school had completed a separate review of all communications with an external contractor- the final report had only been received the previous evening. However, the feedback did include some good suggestions which could be actioned immediately.  Link Governor Visits.  The EHT shared a copy of the document recording the visits completed by the LGB members with link roles. This included the most recent visits. It was noted that the document would be uploaded to the into an electronic folder as evidence in the event of a future Ofsted inspection.  Governors’ Skills Audit.  The Chair confirmed that there were still three individuals who had not yet completed and returned their skills audits. It was requested that these individuals do so at the earliest opportunity.  The LGB noted that any remaining matters arising from the previous minutes would be addressed throughout the meeting. | | | |
| **Resolutions / Agreed actions** | | **Owner** | **Date** |
| * Approved – minutes of previous meeting (16.05.22) as true / correct record. * Action – confirm scheduling of safeguarding training for LGB. * Action – complete outstanding skills audits. | | LGB  CFOO  Individual Governor | July 2022  July 2022 |

| **Item 4** | **EHT Report** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The EHT presented an oral report based on the standard template utilised at previous meetings. It was appreciated that the report would address the issues of attendance, the looked after children (LAC) review, the staffing structure and the class overview.  The following matters were considered / discussed in the course of the presentation.  Staffing Structure.  The EHT confirmed that the staffing structure had been circulated previously for consideration by the LGB. It was noted that the teacher-element of the structure was aligned with the previous year, but did include an increase in teacher numbers to allow for the increased number of pupils and growth of the school. In addition, the teaching assistant (TA) element of the structure had also increased which was intended to meet the increased demand to provide extra support for children. It was noted that there was an increase in the number of children who were designated as part of the special educational needs and disability cohort and / or those children who had secured an educational health care plan (EHCP).  The EHT confirmed that the percentage of pupils in the SEND cohort was now above the national average. There were four children with an EHCP that entitled them to a place in specialist provision, but there were no places currently available across the Manchester City Council (MCC) area. One additional child on the school roll would transition to specialist provision at the start of the next academic year.  The EHT confirmed that the school context for the Summer Term demonstrated that 2.64% of the pupils on the school roll were allocated an EHCP. This was part of an increasing trend across the MCC area. The ensuing discussions recognised the raised threshold to attain an EHCP for a child – it was considered that some children did not currently secure an EHCP although would have met the threshold previously.  Q. What was the extent of support for those who had not met the requirements for an EHCP?  A. The school provided support through a range of measures including the sports coach as mentioned above. However, it was recognised that this was a challenge for the school.  The EHT explained that in managing these children within a mainstream school environment there was a negative impact on the other children in the respective classes. There was also an impact on the wider school, the teacher and TA teams, the school budget and especially an impact on the families involved.  Q. How did the children cope?  A. it was very difficult for all of the children especially when there was one teacher allocated to a class of 30 children.  Q. Did the decision to allocate staff take these challenges into account? A. Yes – especially the allocation of teaching assistants for the respective year groups involved.  Q. Was the expansion of the teacher and TA numbers built into the budget?  A. Yes.  The CFOO confirmed that the school still monitored the overall staffing budget closely – the school had allocated higher-level teaching assistant (HLTA) staff to support each year group in order to support teaching and learning including some support with teachers during the allocated planning, preparation and assessment (PPA) time. These individuals were recognised as having higher skill levels than the standard TA staff and the school had allocated one HLTA to each of the year groups. In addition, the school had costed an increase in the time allocated to the sports coach which was another means of supporting these children / PPA time.  The EHT advised that this was part of the rationale behind the increased size of the SEND support team. The school had to improve its capacity to better meet the increased demand in terms of the numbers of children involved and also the extent / complexity of needs now being demonstrated by these children. This included the family engagement officer role which enabled the school to provide tailored support for individual SEND pupils.  Q. How many children were on the school’s SEND register? A. 108  The CFOO highlighted the increase in the dedicated SEND budget / cost centre in comparison to the previous year in order to meet the associated increased expenses in this area.  Q. Was there a correlation with the numbers involved in the respective target groups and the overall increase in numbers as the junior school expanded? A. Yes – to some extent, although it was always accepted that this was not a ‘typical’ Didsbury school.  The EHT highlighted the higher percentages in other targeted groups – there were more pupils designated as English as an additional language (EAL) which reflected the increased number of pupils / families from Ukraine. There were even more on the current school waiting list. In addition, the current patterns were difficult to understand – there was the possibility that the data was still skewed as a result of the pandemic. It may take some time for the numbers to settle and allow the school to identify ‘real’ trends.  The LGB recognised that ‘churn’ was another issue associated with the Year 1 cohort – 15 pupils joined the school mid-year. In addition, to the increase in numbers many of these children did not speak English which would have a significant impact on the outcomes for this year group now and in future years.  The EHT explained that the school would need to access extra support training and resources to enable the staff to better support pupils in these instances.  Q. Did the Deputy Headteacher (DHT) line-manage the heads of years? A. Yes.  The LGB considered and recognised the extent to which demographics of the MCC area had changed in recent years – there was a significant increase in the diversity.    Administration / Office team.  The EHT advised that this was an area subject to extensive changes in the current year with an expansion of the team in response to the increased workloads associated with the expansion of the school. This was especially evident in terms of communications with parents and warranted the introduction of the Coms and Marketing Officer role. Although this was a part-time role and had been maintained by an external provider as part of a service level agreement (SLA) contract.  The LGB noted that as per the minutes of the previous meeting some ‘quick fixes’ had been achieved / actioned to support the changes in the staffing of the finance and administration teams. This included an additional administration assistant role.  The CFOO confirmed that the allocation of the administrative staff team would ensure there was sufficient support for each school. In addition, the newly appointed SBM would allocate time across both schools. However, it was appreciated that the size of the staff team to support the breakfast club based at the Junior School would be delayed until the school had the feedback from the parents / carers planned survey.  Q. Did the school also have access to casual staff? A. Yes – there were several individuals who were employed on casual contracts and the school could access these at short notice which allowed for greater flexibility.    Q. Was the walking bus working well?  A. Yes – there were about 10 children each day and this would also influence the decision to re-open the breakfast club based at the Junior School.  There were no further points raised or noted in relation to the revised / updated 2022-2023 staffing structure and this was approved by the LGB.  Safeguarding.  The EHT confirmed that the Department for Education (DfE) had published the proposed updated / revised guidance Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSIE). The document was not yet statutory, but the traditional process suggested that the current content of the document would become formal statutory guidance from 1 September 2022.  The LGB noted that the EHT and DHT had completed the most recent format of the designated safeguarding lead (DSL) training. In addition, the model Safeguarding Policy was in the process of being updated to align with the expected changes to the KCSIE guidance.  Q. Had all LGB members and Trustees completed their safeguarding training? A. No – one member of the LGB and all the Trustees needed to complete their training.  Vison And Values Statement.  The EHT confirmed that the vision and values statement had been completed and included consideration of the concept to ‘treat others in the way you would expect others to treat you’ although the actual wording would be adjusted and align with the UNICEF Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) agenda.  The LGB considered the wording and appreciated that it was well presented and included good quotes from the children.  LAC Review.  The EHT explained that the LAC review had been completed and the outcomes included in the updated school self-evaluation form (SEF). In addition, the recent visit by the Senior School Quality Assurance (SSQA) professional and the headteacher and DHT from the Virtual School had generated some feedback and actions – these had already been addressed by the school.  Q. Were there any concerns from the school’s perspective?  A. The school staff were concerned that referrals made by the school were closed by social services staff without any feedback to the school team or any other form of communication.  Q. Was the partnership with Parrs Wood progressing? A. Yes – the school would need to review the arrangements going forward, but currently it was valuable as it recognised that schools were ‘true advocates for the children.’  RRSA.  The EHT confirmed that the school had successfully secured the UNICEF RRSA gold award following the recent external audit by the UNICEF representative. The audit / review had progressed well and there were many positive comments from parents / carers and the children. The gold award represented the extent to which the RRSA ethos was embedded in the school’s overall approach.  The LGB recognised that MCC as a local authority was working towards rolling out the RRSA approach to all schools in the MCC area. The intention was to promote Manchester as a child-friendly city.  Attendance.  The EHT presented the current attendance data – it was recognised that overall attendance was ‘poor’ especially in comparison to pre-pandemic data. However, the data was in-line with the MCC average for primary school attendance and the school maintained a rigorous approach to pupil absences.  Q. Was the attendance challenge still related to Covid-19?  A. Covid-19 still had an impact on the data with some families being more cautious than others. There was also a challenge with other families where the issue was simply ‘poor behaviours’ or bad habits that had developed following the pandemic disruption.  The EHT explained that many of the absences related to extended holidays which had  Not been authorised by the school – either starting holidays before the end of the term or not returning from holidays after the start of the new term. This was associated with the cost of holidays in general and the timing was scheduled by families to benefit from lower holiday prices. The cost of any ensuing fixed penalty notice was far less than the cost of the equivalent holiday taken during term time.  Q. Was it possible to use the forthcoming parents’ evening as ana opportunity to raise the profile of good attendance? A. Yes – the school was already using a range of other approaches to communicate this message to families. The school explained the link between absences and reduced gradings as a result of lost learning.  Behaviour Challenges.  The LGB noted the increased number of behaviour incidents record by the school. It was appreciated that there had been five racist incidents recorded – this was an increase in comparison to previous years. There was also a similar pattern to the increase in bullying related incidents.  The EHT explained that some of the racist incidents involved the use of inappropriate words that were not understood fully by the children using them. In addition, one of the racist incidents related to two parents and not children from the school. There were no recurrences from any of the children involved in the racist incidents – these were one-off events.  Q. How many bullying incidents were recorded? A. Nine.  The EHT confirmed that the number of behavioural incidents overall had increased, but this was partially due to the improved recording of such issues by the school – the data was more accurate. However, the school recognised that some children did struggle with the return to school following the disruption linked to the pandemic. The issues displayed were mainly associated with children having difficulty socialising and their interaction with peers – the SEND cohort was represented in this data. The situation had reached the point at which the school was forced to issue a fixed-term exclusion for one child. The individual in this case was allocated an EHCP, received 1:1 support and the school was working with the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) to ensure that extra support was provided for this child.  The DHT provided an overview of the school’s use of the team teach technique as a means address some of the more significant behavioural challenges, but emphasised that team teach was only used as a last resort.  Q. Were the staff trained in the use of team teach techniques? A. Yes – a range of staff across the school had completed the training, but it was only applied when all other approaches had failed to have a positive impact. The main approach adopted by all staff was through the use of de-escalation techniques and all staff were trained in this approach.  The LGB discussed the use of separating some children from their peers to limit the disruption to learning and there were logistical challenges that differentiated the Junior School and the First School. It was appreciated that there was simply more space available at the Junior School to manage the separation of children when behavioural incidents occurred.  Q. Which school experienced the most behavioural issues? A. The split in the data was relatively even across the different school sites.  School Roll.  The LGB noted the ongoing expansion of the Junior School as one year group progressed and a new year group entered. It was appreciated that the number of pupils impacted directly on the budget at the start of each financial year, but there was a ‘lag’ in funding with mid-year entries. The LGB understood that this may result in an over-allocation of children to specific class groups.  Q. What was the tipping point at which a new class was established in a specific year group? A. Approximately 130 pupils, but there was also consideration given to the budget impact.  During the discussion, the LGB considered the potential impact on children to be split from friends when a new class was established. The EHT provided an outline of the procedure and explained how the process was communicated to parents / carers as their children joined the school.  Attendance Policy.  The EHT explained that the revised draft of the new Attendance Policy was unavailable currently – the document would be completed in time for the next scheduled meeting at the start of the new academic year. It was also explained that the document would include the updates adopted as part of the school’s approach to addressing absences.    There were no further points raised in discussion and the LGB agreed to accept the EHT report into the record of the meeting. | | | |
| **Resolutions / Agreed actions** | | **Owner** | **Date** |
| * Approved – revised / updated staffing structure 2022-2023. * Action – deferred Attendance Policy to be agenda item next scheduled meeting. * Agreed – accept EHT report into record of meeting. | | LGB  EHT / Chair / Clerk  LGB | Autumn Term |

| **Item 5** | **Feedback from the Trust Finance Committee** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The CFOO presented a summary of the Trust Management Accounts (Period 8) and the M20 Learning Trust Internal Audit Report which had been circulated for information purposes.  The Committee recognised that the information contained in the summary and associated reports aligned with the earlier discussions. It was appreciated that the challenges faced by the trust / school had been discussed. This included the issue related to the pensions liability and the need to introduce a cash register system for snack money.  There were no issues raised in relation to the above documents and it was agreed the Committee would accept them into the record of the meeting. | | | |
| **Resolutions / Agreed actions** | | **Owner** | **Date** |
| * Agreed – accept Trust Management Accounts (Period 8) into record of meeting. * Agreed – accept M20 Learning Trust Internal Audit Report into record of meeting. | | B&R Committee  B&R Committee |  |

| **Item 6** | **Policies.** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Committee noted and considered the following policies and documents which had been made available prior to the current meeting.  Health and Safety Policy.  There were no issues raised and the Committee approved the Health and Safety Policy.  Fire Safety Policy.  There were no issues raised and the Committee approved the Fire Safety Policy.  Asbestos Management Plan.  There were no issues raised and the Committee approved the Asbestos Management Plan.  Business Continuity Plan.  The Committee noted there were minor changes made to the document which better reflected actual practice.  There were no issues raised and the Committee approved the Business Continuity Plan.  Crisis Management Plan.  There were no issues raised and the Committee approved the Crisis Management Plan.  Lettings Policy – First and Junior School.  There were no issues raised and the Committee approved the Lettings Policy – First and Junior School.  Data Protection Policy.  There were no issues raised and the Committee approved the Data Protection Policy.  Educational Visits Policy.  There were no issues raised and the Committee approved the Educational Visits Policy.  2022-2023 Charges Policy.  The committee noted that the costs associated with the breakfast club, the holiday club, the multi-sports clubs and nursery provision aligned with the costs levied by other schools in the local area.  The CFOO confirmed that the intention was to maintain the cost for meals at as low a level as possible for the nursery. The actual costs associated with lettings had increased – this reflected the increased energy costs. The school did not want to make the availability of clubs a ‘cost’ issue and in future the school would consider determining the costs based on the percentage of pupils involved. In addition, the document would be redrafted and ready for consideration by the Committee at the end of the Spring Term rather than the end of the Summer Term.  Q. Was the nursery care based on a daily charge or weekly charge? A. The charge was based on 15 hours per week which was rarely used as the majority of families were eligible for 30 hours funding.  The Committee noted the increase in after school costs from £10 to £11 and the charge of £11 for the breakfast club.  Q. Was there a good uptake of the provision? A. Yes – it was very busy.  The Committee noted that the school planned to issue a survey to families using the provision to determine ‘wants’ and ‘expectations’ going forward.  Q. What was the cost for the holiday club provision and was it competitive with other providers? A. The holiday club charge was £27.50 with most other providers charging between £30 and £35.  There were no further issues raised and the Committee approved the 2022-2023 Charges Policy. | | | |
| **Resolutions / Agreed actions** | | **Owner** | **Date** |
| * Approved - Health and Safety Policy. * Approved - Fire Safety Policy.      * Approved - Asbestos Management Plan. * Approved - Business Continuity Plan. * Approved - Crisis Management Plan. * Approved - Lettings Policy – First and Junior School. * Approved - Data Protection Policy. * Approved - Educational Visits Policy. * Approved - 2022-2023 Charges Policy. | | B&R Committee  B&R Committee  B&R Committee  B&R Committee  B&R Committee  B&R Committee  B&R Committee  B&R Committee  B&R Committee |  |

| **Item 7** | **AOB** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Chair confirmed there were no further matters of business for consideration and the meeting was closed. | | | |
| **Resolutions / Agreed actions** | | **Owner** | **Date** |
|  | |  |  |