



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Full Governing Body of Woodfield Community Primary School
Held virtually, 15 December, 6.00pm**

Present: Mathew Atkinson (MA) – Acting Executive Head Teacher
Jo Marwood (JM) – Acting Head of School
Bridget Tayan (BT) - Joint Chair
Paul Haslam (PH) – Joint Chair
Jan Tringham (JT)
Victoria Lack (VL)
Matthew Boyle (MB)
Martin Deacon (MD)
Saskia Boardman (SB)
Jonathan Spruce (JS)

In attendance: Karen Butler (KB) – Senior Education Advisor
Karen Taylor (KT) – Bursar (NYCC)
Chris Walker (CW) – Clerk (NYCC)

Governing Body functions:

Ensuring the vision, ethos and strategic direction of the school are clearly defined

Ensuring that the Headteacher performs their responsibilities for the educational performance of the school

Ensuring the sound and proper and efficient use of the school's financial resources

No.	Agenda Item	Part 'A' – Procedural	Action
1	Welcome and Introductions	PH welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced KT, the bursar, to the meeting. PH thanked MA, JM and all staff, on behalf of the Governing Body, for all their hard work over the term.	
2	Apologies & Declarations of Interest	All present. No interests to declare.	
3	Identification of confidential items	Item 10 and to consider other discussions as they arose.	
4	Identification of urgent other business	None	
5	To remind governors of the need to declare interests, pecuniary or non-pecuniary.	None.	
6	To approve the minutes of the meeting on 20 October 2020	Governors approved the minutes from 24 November 2020 as an accurate record. The approved minutes to be signed by the Chair and filed in school once able to do so.	
7	Matters arising	JM confirmed that of the 13 pupils on the SEN Register 3 were in receipt of Free School Meals. All other items had been completed or were covered elsewhere on the agenda.	

		Part 'B' – School Improvement	
8	Finance	<p>Governors had been provided with the latest (October) detailed and summary monitoring reports, the 3-year forecast and the benchmarking data in advance of the meeting. KT talked through the reports highlighting the key variances. The key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was an outturn c/f of £10,851 against a budget of £34,230 at the start of the year. - This was largely as a result of a fall in Pupil Premium income by nearly £15k and an increase in teaching staff costs. - Teaching staff costs included a one-off payment in lieu to a previous member of staff of c£14k. - The In-Year position showed a deficit of £82,677 against a budget of £59,299. With the balance carry forward this would result in the outturn c/f of £10,851. - KT reported that the in-year position indicated that the school was spending more than it was receiving. <p>In discussion, Governors agreed that whilst the figures did not show a healthy financial position there had been two significant impacts on the budget which could not have been planned for; namely the significant reduction in the PP income and the payment in lieu. If these payments were removed from the figures the budget would be more in line with the forecast. Difficult decisions had been made two years ago to improve the budgetary position.</p> <p><u>Governor questions</u> Q: What are other schools doing better, financially? A: Forecasting and benchmarking – both locally and nationally. The SFVS highlights where you differ from those schools who have been better at managing their finances.</p> <p>Governors were concerned that the benchmarking data for the school was not accurate as it had been based on out-of-date pupil numbers.</p> <p>Q: Who pays for the Executive Headteacher? A: The LA meet this cost.</p>	

		<p>Q: Does the Catch-Up funding cover the additional costs of addressing Covid? A: No – the Catch-Up funding to there to support pupils in catching up on their learning. Some support has been provided to cover the cost of the extra cleaning equipment needed.</p> <p>Q: What are our flexibilities with regard to the budget? A: You should still be looking to reduce costs where possible even though you are currently required to seek LA approval for significant spends.</p> <p>Q: At what point could governors taken actions to address the budget, as decisions could not be postponed until next September? A: If Academisation had not progressed significantly by the first half of next term then an application for an LA Recovery Plan should be considered. (KB)</p> <p>Q: Are the LA content for the school to carry a structural deficit? A: PH – the LA are content with the current leadership of the school and the work of the Governing Body. The trajectory of the school is to academisation.</p> <p>PH informed governors that he had already written to the LA to tell them a decision on Academisation would be needed by 26 February 2021 in order to give the Governing Body sufficient time to make any urgent budgetary decisions.</p> <p>KB informed governors that if Academisation did not proceed the school would require an LA Recovery Plan but that all parties were doing their best to ensure the process went ahead. Woodfield was an essential part of the community with a significant catchment area.</p> <p>In discussion, governors agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Increasing pupil numbers was critical- Finance would be the main agenda item at the March meeting. <p>Governors approved the Revised Budget as a true and accurate reflection of the school’s current financial position.</p>	
--	--	---	--

9	Headteacher's Report to include: Health and Safety Safeguarding	<p>Governors had been provided with the Leadership Report in advance of the meeting. JM/MA talked through the key points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attendance continued to be excellent - Support was being provided to families over the holiday period, this would include the provision of food vouchers and parcels. - The report provided detailed answers to a number of questions from governors as follows: <p>Pupil Premium How many children are eligible for PP? There are 15 children eligible for Pupil Premium and no service children. How is the PP money being spent to support these children? The school have combined Pupil Premium and catch-up premium funds in order to have the most impact. A proportion of the funding pays for Teaching Assistants to lead interventions in school and for the Parent Support Worker to target these families (as needed). The funds are also spent on various programmes e.g. NowPressPlay, Commando Jos. A proportion of the funding has been used to pay for the Curriculum TLR, a reading scheme for KS1 and the computer suite. What impact is it having? The Curriculum TLR has allowed for leadership capacity to be expanded and now a sequences and progressive curriculum is in place. Attendance has significantly improved. The computer suite is in constant use with pupils using the various catch-up programmes such as lexia, TTRS etc, this has increased amount of use at home as pupils are more confident in school. Teaching Assistants interventions have shown some green shoots of improvement however this will be fully evaluated at the start of next term.</p> <p>Assessment What assessment system are you using? Targets have been using FFT for every pupil in the core subjects. There have been pupil progress meetings following that. There are assessment trackers set up for RWM as previously mentioned. These are updated half termly. Is there any data available for this term? This will be available in the New Year following moderation. Predictions/Targets for this year-</p>	

	FFT 50	Target
EYFS	NA	66%
Phonics Y1	NA	78%
KS1 Reading	62%	40%
KS1 Writing	55%	40%
KS1 Maths	63%	40%
KS2 Reading	55%	78%
KS2 Writing	62%	56%
KS2 Maths	67%	56%
KS2 Grammar	61%	78%
Combined RWM	46%	56%
	Confirmed	
Phonics Y2 confirmed results	60%	

How has progression been affected by the COVID lockdown? In relation to Writing pupils have significant gaps in their learning and stamina for writing has reduced. In Maths and Reading pupils are simply behind. They have gaps in coverage. Teachers are working from where the pupils need to be taught from rather than the content/skills for this time of the year. Pre-assessments are being used to support teachers and pupils with this process.

Are all subjects being assessed or just maths and English? RWM are all being assessed. Foundation subjects are being assessed at the end of a unit of work based on the knowledge children have acquired.

How will Foundation subjects be assessed (eg knowledge or skills based or a mixture of the two)? School to identify outcome points for subjects in the spring term.

How do you identify the children who are falling behind or making above average progress? Book scrutinies, conversations with staff and pupil progress reviews.

What do you have in place to support these children? Every child is discussed in depth with leaders so that support can be targeted as appropriate.

What is your marking policy? Schools policy is outdated and does not reflect best practice. NSAT were going to pick this up so it will now be a focus for us on our strategic day on the 14th December.

Governor questions during the meeting.

Q: Do all PP parents claim?

A: Yes

Q: Do you use EEF as part of your intervention strategy?

A: Yes – we base our interventions on a range of research including that provided by EEF.

Q: Any CPD for staff re interventions?

A: Yes, there is a thorough programme of CPD for staff. This includes regular in-house training from the SENCO. All interventions are carefully planned, structured and woven into the curriculum.

Q: Are interventions long or short-term?

A: They are managed on a case-by-case basis relating to the progress and impact observed. Pupil progress meetings evaluate and review each case half termly.

Q: The rationale for closing school a day early is not clear and will have a significant impact on many parents; could you please clarify your reasoning?

A: This was a decision taken on the advice of government. The decision was made by the Joint-Chairs under emergency powers in consultation with the school's leadership team.

A number of governors were concerned that this decision, and a number of previous ones, had not been taken with the approval of the full governing body. The decision to close the school a day early was not approved by at least one member of the governing body.

KB reminded governors that the school had been put in a difficult position. Advice had been given, at short notice, by the DfE and a quick decision was required. The SLT had consulted with the joint-chairs before a decision had been taken. Whilst the decision would not be welcomed by all, the most important thing was to ensure none of the children were disadvantaged and to show unity as a governing body in supporting the school.

Q: How are you monitoring the impact of the Behaviour Policy?

		<p>A: All incidents are input into CPOMs. The data clearly shows a significantly reduced number of incidents. In addition, we can see, on a day to day, basis the improvement in the behaviour of the children in the classroom, the corridors and at playtime. The views of the children can also be gauged through Pupil Voice.</p> <p>Q: Do you have a breakfast club? A: Yes. The charge is £1 per child per session. We have also obtained a small grant of £500 from Asda. 5/6 children regularly attend.</p>	
10	Academisation Update	<p>KB updated governors on the academisation process. This discussion was confidential and a separate confidential minute has been prepared.</p> <p>MD left the meeting at 7.30pm</p>	
11	Governance Process	<p>BT had circulated the school priorities to governors in advance of the meeting and asked for volunteer link governors to monitor. The following were agreed:</p> <p>Quality of Teaching - BT to arrange a monitoring meeting in January 2021 SEN + Attendance – JT to arrange a monitoring meeting in February 2021 Behaviour / PHSE – VL/SB to arrange a monitoring meeting in March 2021</p> <p>Action: KB agreed to provide an update on the Statement of Action at the next meeting.</p> <p>KB informed governors that her next visit was on 20 January 2021 and there would be a whole-school review on 4 March 2021, which would include governance.</p> <p>MA left the meeting at 7.45pm</p> <p>Governors agreed that it was important to regularly review an updated Post-Ofsted Action Plan. Two specific actions were highlighted as the due date for action had already passed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - L3.1.1 Review of Governance completed. - L3.1.2 Timetable of Governor monitoring in place 	KB

		<p>It was noted that governors had previously agreed to be flexible over the delivery of milestones due to the impact of Covid.</p> <p>Action: MA/JM to update the actions in the Post-Ofsted Action Plan for review at the next meeting. The actions to be updated half-termly and RAG rated.</p>	MA/JM
12	Governor	<p>Governors were reminded of the range of training courses available and to contact the school to arrange.</p> <p>Governors agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to consider the parent governor vacancies further at the meeting in January 2021. - To complete and circulate monitoring reports once a visit/meeting had been undertaken. 	
13	Marketing Working Group	<p>PH informed governors that the MWG had now had two meetings and a range of actions were underway – including leafletting, the placing of banners and an active social media campaign – to attract new pupils to the school.</p>	
14	Correspondence	None	
15	AOB	<p>PH informed governors that the £20k grant + £8.5k from his Councillor budget had been placed in an NYCC Bank Account and would be used to support the implementation of a 20 mph speed limit outside the school. The Traffic Order had now been commenced which was the start of the process.</p> <p>BT confirmed that the Annual Safeguarding Audit had already been completed.</p> <p>Governors agreed to the new meeting structure. There would be two meetings in the Spring Term: 19 January 23 March</p>	

Signed:

Position:

Date: