



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Full Governing Body of Woodfield Community Primary School  
Held virtually, 19 May 2020, 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  
Jonathan Spruce (JS)  
Jan Tringham (JT)  
Victoria Lack (VL)  
Matthew Boyle (MB)

**In attendance:** Karen Butler (KB) – School Education Advisor (SEA)  
Chris Walker (CW) – Clerk  
Judy Sturley (JS) - Bursar

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		Action
-----	-------------	--	--------

		<b>Part 'A' – Procedural</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	<p>PH chaired the meeting and welcomed everyone. Governors had agreed to hold this extraordinary meeting in order to agree the start budget and class structures for September 2020.</p> <p>PH introduced Matt Boyle (MB), the new Staff Governor, and Judy Sturley (JS) the LA Bursar. All present introduced themselves.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	Louise Downend sent her apologies which were consented to.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Identification of confidential items</b>	A staff matter to be discussed at the end of the meeting.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Identification of urgent other business</b>	Item 3 refers.	
<b>5</b>	<b>To remind governors of the need to declare interests, pecuniary or non-pecuniary.</b>	Governors were reminded of the need to declare any interests. There were none to declare.	
<b>6</b>	<b>To approve the minutes of the meeting on 28 April 2020.</b>	Governors approved the minutes from 28 April 2020 which were signed as an accurate record by the Chair. The minutes to be filed once school re-opens.	
<b>7</b>	<b>Matters arising</b>	<p>KB confirmed that the LA was sourcing a new LA Governor.</p> <p>PH agreed to update the governor details on the school website as soon as possible.</p> <p>All other items had been completed or were covered elsewhere on the agenda.</p>	<b>PH</b>

		<b>Part 'C' – School Improvement</b>	
<b>8</b>	<b>LA School Action Plan</b>	<p>Governors had been provided with a copy of the LA School Action Plan in advance of the meeting and had been asked to provide any specific questions in advance to give KB sufficient time to provide detailed answers. KB talked through the key points in the report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the LA Statement of Action followed the most recent Ofsted judgement at the school which placed it in special measures.</li> <li>- The Plan detailed the support to be provided by the LA to help get the school out of special measures.</li> <li>- Regular meetings would be undertaken to assess progress against milestones.</li> <li>- KB thanked governors for their questions:</li> </ul> <p><u>Governor Questions</u></p> <p>Q: What progress has been made against the June milestones?  A: Progress against the milestones has been put on hold during the current emergency situation. In all likelihood progress will not be checked until all the children return to school which is looking like it won't be until September at the earliest.</p> <p>Having said that, MA and JM had been able to address a number of the milestones during the current period of lockdown, particularly around curriculum development and planning. A new SENCO had been appointed and the backlog of work was being addressed. Progress against these milestones would not be formally quality assured until September, along with all the other milestones.</p> <p>Q: Will SRE be covered in the PHSE curriculum?  A: Yes, and it will be made explicit in the documentation.</p> <p>Q: What is the relationship between the LA and school Plans?  A: There are and should be a number of similarities. The SIP is more focused on how the school improvement milestones will be achieved. The LA Plan is more concerned with how these milestones will be achieved and the QA process.</p>	

		<p>Q: Does the LA Plan reference any budgetary considerations?  A: No. The Statement of Action plan doesn't contain budgetary information; this is put on the LA Partnership Plan which outlines any agreed training and support and associated costs.</p> <p>KB agreed to make one amendment to the context section regarding the previous Governing Body. JT had not received the documentation in advance of the meeting and was invited to send any questions or concerns she might have to KB directly.</p>	
9	<b>School Action Plan</b>	<p>Governors had been provided with a copy of the Post Ofsted School Action Plan in advance of the meeting. Governors had been asked to consider the Plan and to direct any specific questions or concerns to MA in advance of the meeting. The questions and answers to these questions have been appended to these minutes.</p> <p>MA provided an overview of the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To sit alongside the LA Action Plan</li> <li>- It sets out the practical actions that will be delivered to take the school forward</li> <li>- The timescales will be updated in September when the overall situation should be clearer following the covid emergency.</li> </ul> <p>Governors thanked MA, JM and MB for all their hard work in producing such a comprehensive document. PH reminded governors of the need to focus on those areas where the governing body had key responsibilities.</p> <p>Governor question  Q: Will there be another governance review?  A: Yes – it will be along the same lines as the previous one as a re-evaluation will need to take place.  (KB)</p>	
10	<b>Google Classrooms</b>	<p>Governors had been provided with information setting out the benefits of using Google Classrooms in advance of the meeting. In the light of the current emergency situation governors asked MA/JM if the use of additional technologies, such as Google Classrooms, could add benefit to the classes.</p>	

		<p>JM informed governors that the use of technology was already a key part of the school's learning support to parents and children during the lockdown; the use of the school website was integral as well as packages such as See Saw. In view of all the other challenges currently facing the school the development of new technology was not a top priority. The computing curriculum would be re-evaluated in the autumn term and options such as Google Classrooms could be considered. The current systems were working well and had been well-received by parents.</p> <p>Governors were also mindful of the new guidance regarding the use of equipment in classrooms.</p>	
<b>11</b>	<b>Finance</b>	<p>Governors had been provided with the latest Start Budget reports in advance of the meeting. The Reports were based on a 3-classroom structure and all the known variances in expenditure had been explained in the documents.</p> <p>JS talked through the reports in detail explaining spend on each item and where there had been any variance from the expected outcome. Key points to note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Little overall variation from the last monitoring report</li> <li>- Figures based on a 3-class structure; an additional class would cost an extra £50k based on the average cost of a suitably experienced teacher</li> <li>- The financial monitoring return had been completed and sent to the LA</li> <li>- Governors approved the transfer of £15.5k at year end; JS would now be able to complete the Statement of Reconciliation.</li> <li>- JS would undertake a more robust assessment of the budget in the autumn term. It was hoped further savings might be identified at this time arising from the current lockdown.</li> <li>- The biggest impact on the start budget had been the reduction in pupil numbers. The previous plans had been based on 69 pupils at September 2020. The figure was now 56. This impact on the overall figures had been to increase the planned deficit from £30k to £70k.</li> <li>- All know variables and assumptions had been built into the figures e.g. pay awards and utility uplifts etc.</li> <li>- The position as it stood was not sustainable with in-year deficits predicted in all three years.</li> <li>- The Staff Absence Scheme was not quite covering the costs of the absence of the HT.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All staffing costs and numbers had been checked with MA for accuracy and represented all known costs. This had resulted in some anomalies as there was a mismatch between actual hours and budgeted hours. This has now been rectified.</li> <li>- The After-School Clubs were operating at a loss. The figures indicated income of £3.3k with costs of £5.4k. Governors agreed to explore whether any grants were available which might provide financial support to the school for its clubs.</li> <li>- No costs had yet been assigned against the capital budget but a number of projects were already known and would be included when the budgets were re-examined in the autumn term.</li> </ul> <p>Questions were invited.</p> <p>Q: What implications would there be for support staff/TAs if we move to a 3-class structure?  A: There would be a consideration but I can't say at this point exactly how it will look. We need a clearer picture of all the needs of all the children first. I have now been able to clarify the contracted hours with all support staff and this is reflected in the budget. (MA)</p> <p>In discussion Governors had a number of concerns with the proposal to reduce the number of classes from 3 to 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Governors were mindful that the school had undertaken a staff restructure within the last 12 months. A number of key staff left the school at that point and a lot of staff resilience was lost. Since that time a number of other key and experience staff have left the school. Would this also leave the school in a vulnerable position?</li> <li>- Could the school justify having a non-teaching HT when the budget was so tight? Would it not be more effective to have a teaching HT? KB explained that the current Executive HT (MA) was funded and that she strongly recommended the appointment of a non-teaching HT to address the significant strategic and operational issues currently facing the school; not least to address the shortcomings identified in the most recent Ofsted report and to bring the school out of Special Measures. In addition, a saving was currently being made through the appointment of JM as HT (in terms of cost against the current HT)</li> <li>- KB confirmed that there was no evidence to indicate that a reduction to 3 classes would have a negative impact on pupil learning. Indeed, many schools within the County were flourishing with</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>two and three classes. Governors agreed that it would be helpful to have evidence that smaller classes (with a vertical structure) were successful and would not impact on pupil learning. Discussions with schools that had undergone a similar process would be one way to source this information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Governors were concerned that the reduction to 3 classes would not be well-received by parents and clear communication of the reasons would be essential.</li> <li>- MA strongly supported the start budget as set out by JS. The key issue going forward would be to recruit new staff of the right calibre.</li> <li>- Governors were concerned at how the forecast deficit of £71k could be addressed. The key would be to attract at least 12 additional pupils to the school. There was some capital surplus in the budget and consideration could be given to utilising some of this to improve the attraction of the school. Reducing the deficit was identified as an urgent key task for the governing body.</li> <li>- Communication with staff and parents was key. It would be essential to clarify the reasons for any decisions and to back up with evidence where possible.</li> <li>- Governors noted the extremely tight financial position and the increasing forecast deficit year on year.</li> </ul> <p>Governors unanimously approved the start budget for 2020-2021.</p> <p>Governors thanked JS for all her hard work in producing the reports and making such a detailed presentation.</p>	
12	<b>Class Structure</b>	<p>Item 11 refers.</p> <p>The discussion at Item 11 examined the impact of the budget on class sizes. Governors noted the tight financial position and the significant forecast deficit. Whilst there were a number of significant concerns amongst governors there was a unanimous decision to reduce the number of classes from 4 to 3 from September 2020.</p> <p>Governors agreed to communicate this to staff and parents as soon as possible, once staffing was in place and to explain the reasons why this decision was taken.</p>	

13	<b>Safeguarding</b>	No issues to report. MA informed governors that work had now started to install the new fencing which aimed to be completed within 6 weeks.	
14	<b>Health and Safety</b>	Nothing to report	
15	<b>Correspondence</b>	MA, PH and BT took part in an online meeting with the DfE, following an email request. 4 sponsors had expressed an interest but names had not been provided. Once the Academisation Order had been issued the DfE would be in contact with these schools. This would happen in the next week. A final decision would be made in July on who the sponsor is likely to be, with due-diligence to follow.	
16	<b>AOB</b>	<p><u>Back to school plans</u></p> <p>JM informed governors that the plans to re-open the school from 1 June, in line with the national policy, were currently being finalised to be shared with staff.</p> <p>1 June would be a training day and the various safeguarding procedures and protocols would be run through with staff.</p> <p>The current plans would include staggered starts for the 3 designated year groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nursery/ Reception</li> <li>- Year 1</li> <li>- Year 6</li> </ul> <p>Different entrance gates would be used for each group.</p> <p>Parents had been contacted by phone to inform them of the arrangements and to assess numbers. The vast majority had indicated that they wanted their children to return to school.</p> <p>Four teams of staff would be used.</p> <p>The school would continue to support vulnerable children and the children of key workers.</p> <p>National and local guidance would be applied which included ensuring adequate social distancing and rigorous cleaning protocols.</p> <p>Staff would be allowed sufficient PPA time.</p> <p>Individualized support would be provided to pupils to support them in closing any learning gaps accrued during the lockdown.</p> <p>Every effort would be made to provide a safe learning environment and to re-assure parents and staff.</p>	<b>PH</b>

		<p>The systems would be reviewed on a daily basis and adjusted if required. It was a learning experience for all involved.</p> <p>Governors thanked JM for all the planning and preparation that had been undertaken. Governors were mindful that the current arrangements could impact on the school's ability to attract and support additional numbers of pupils from September 2020. This would need close scrutiny.</p> <p>Governors were also mindful that the school would need to ensure that the needs of those groups of pupils not included in this return were also met: i.e. those pupils in Years 2,3,4,5. Governors agreed to discuss this further at the next meeting in June.</p> <p>JM confirmed that the school was in regular contact with the families of the children to provide as much support as possible. Staff had continued to work hard and support the school. No issues had been brought to the notice of staff up to this point.</p> <p>Governors wanted to pass on their thanks not only to the senior team but to all members of staff who continued to work hard to support the children in very difficult circumstances.</p> <p>MB left the meeting at 7.55pm</p> <p>A separate confidential note has been prepared for a staff related discussion.</p>	
--	--	---	--

**Signed:**

**Position:**

**Date:**

## Annex 1

### I know you were looking at the PP money. What do you intend to fund with it?

This will be something we will look at when I conduct the pupil premium review of the school. I will be looking at how it was used in the past as well as working with the staff to identify the barriers of the children on an individual level. This will then help us to look at guidance such as EEF to see what solutions may be recommended for specific barriers. This will then produce a plan which is grounded in the needs of the pupils and academic research/best practice.

### Do we get funding for any of the SEND pupils individually? Is it spent on supporting them and what kind of support is given?

There is some funding for some individuals but there should be a significant amount more based on the needs of some pupils. We have been trying to catch up with the back log of SEND work that exists and ensure that EHCP applications are prioritised. We have found some historic support plans which show staffing was the main expenditure in the past. We are reviewing all support plans to ensure they are robust and accurate. We will firstly focus on Quality First Teaching developments and then look at interventions if these are required.

### Are the curriculum leaders in place?

A TLR for curriculum has been appointed. As staffing is not confirmed for September this cannot be confirmed. Once this has been finalised we will slot people into suitable roles.

### What are the staffing plans for September?

The school has one full time teacher and one teacher who teaches 0.6 for September. One teacher will be on maternity who teaches 0.4- this will need covering. There will then be either 1 or 2 teachers to recruit to based on governors decision. We are actively pursuing further secondments or appointments. Secondments are tricky as we are unsure of Priestley's term of involvement.

### I wasn't clear what the RESPECT strap line was.

RESPECT is an acronym that will underline Woodfield's core values and further enhance the PSHE curriculum. They are 7 character traits that will help prepare our children for the next stages of their lives and link into British Values.

R – Resilience

E – Empathy  
S – self awareness  
P – Positivity  
E – Excellence  
C – Communication  
T – Team work

**When you say reading sessions, are these guided reading sessions and if so, whole class or group?**

There will be some whole class shared reading sessions, particularly in KS2, which focus on a book that the whole class will read together. Reading skills will be taught through this text and it will also link in with the topic for the half term so pupils are building their knowledge of the topic.

There will also be some smaller group sessions with in lessons. These will occur where the teacher has identified a specific gap in learning, or a group of pupils require additional support in acquiring a particular skill.

In KS1/EYFS reading would take the form of small group sessions with some whole class shared reading.

**You say that each child will read with an adult 1x weekly. Is there capacity to increase this for the poorer readers?**

Every child reading aloud to an adult 1 x week is the minimum expectation. Teachers would be expected to identify pupils who require more than this and plan in time through the day for this to be achieved. Once staffing and numbers are finalised then this will be easier to plan for.

**Information from the Clerk on Governing Body that has been noted for change in the context section-**

*The Governing Body was strengthened in September 2018 with the addition of 2 experienced governors on the advice of the Local Authority. Two new Co-Chairs were elected in September 2019. There remain a number of key vacancies on the Governing Body.*