

**CHAPEL ALLERTON PRIMARY SCHOOL GOVERNING BOARD
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 9 May 2022 at 6.30pm

PRESENT	Sarah Perrigo (Chair)	Nicholas Sykes (Headteacher)
	Bobbie Gresser	Eric Roussounis
	Amy Sanderson	Emma Wilson

IN ATTENDANCE: Sharon Burn (Clerk – Governor Support Service)
David HARRIS (School Business Manager)

		ACTION
1.00	APOLOGIES AND MEMBERSHIP MATTERS	
1.01	Apologies were received and accepted from Mohammed Rafique.	
1.02	The Chair noted that this would be the last time she would be attending the Leadership and Management Committee meeting and advised governors that they needed to think about succession.	
1.03	'Bobbie Gresser told governors that she would be doing the pay review with Amy Sanderson and Mohammed Rafique in July.	
2.00	DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS	
2.01	There were no new declarations of interests.	
3.00	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING	
3.01	Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 1 February 2022 were accepted as an accurate record and the Chair was authorised to sign the minutes.	
4.00	MATTERS ARISING	
4.01	Capacity in nursery (minute 4.02.02 refers): Q: Had a decision been made about provision for two year olds? A: There had not been a conclusive decision as yet. The Headteacher noted that he was not convinced that the school had the capacity for the provision or that there was a need for it in the area. He pointed out that there was already a children's centre in the locality and other nursery provision. School would only be able to offer the provision for the school day and would need higher staff ratios for two year olds. The two year old offer was for the most disadvantaged children, and they would be coming from outside the local area so school would not be able to offer them a place in Foundation Stage 2 (FS2). NS noted that although pupil numbers were falling generally, they were holding steady in Chapel Allerton and school expected early years admissions to be around 60 for the next three years.	
4.01.01	NS suggested that school would decide upon the best use for the additional space in school. He reminded governors that it had	

already been decided that it was not suitable for SEND (special educational needs and disabilities) provision.

- 4.02 Catch up funding (minute 4.04 refers): **Q:** Was the school still doing catch-up?
A: School was still doing catch up and was still rolling through pupils. Another group of children were due to start the tuition.
Q: How did school assess which children needed catch up?
A: The core groups were from Years 5 and 6. School was focusing catch up on these year groups because they were in their last stage of primary school and school wanted to get them back on track ready for high school. The Headteacher pointed out that the younger children had more time to catch up on the primary school curriculum.
- 4.03 **Early Career Teacher (ECT) framework (minute 4.06.01 refers):** **Q:** Had there been an opportunity to review the ECT framework?
A: The framework was time consuming. The school phonics lead was the main ECT mentor, and the framework required time out of class for the mentor and the ECT, but it was working well. School was learning to tailor the process to meet its own needs.
- 4.04 **Well being survey (minute 4.05 refers):** Action completed. Emma Wilson confirmed that she had been involved in looking at the input from the survey and had provided some feedback.
- 4.05 **School Improvement Priorities (minute 5.01 refers):** **Q** Had the staff training day gone ahead?
A: It had and had been a successful day. In the morning staff had looked at the ambitions and there had been an update from each ambition leader. In the afternoon staff had done orienteering outside and this had been great for team building. All teachers and teaching assistants (TAs) had been involved.
- 4.06 **Operoo (minute 5.03.01)** **Q:** Governors asked for an update on the implantation of Operoo. The School Business Manager (SBM) reported that it was ongoing.
- 4.07 **Year 4 (minute 9.04 refers)****Q:** A governor asked for an update on Year 4.
A: The Headteacher noted that there had been staffing issues in Year 4. School had appointed a teacher for Year 4 on a temporary two term contract and the teacher had needed time to settle and build relationships with children and staff. There had also been health issues with other members of Year 4 staff which had impacted on their attendance which in turn had made an impact on the children. A TA who worked in Year 4 had been needed to provide cover. NS assured governors that things had now settled down. He acknowledged that Year 4 had still not moved on enough.
Q: Was there anything in place as the children moved into Year 5?
A: School would seek to ensure there was a strong team of

experienced teachers and TAs in Year 5 next year. NS noted that currently the focus in school was on the Year 6 SATs but when the SATS were over school would be able to free up another TA to provide support where it was needed.

4.08 **Feedback on life coaching sessions (minute 9.08 refers):**
Action completed. One of the teachers had provided written feedback about the coaching and the Headteacher had sent that to governors. NS reported that the other teacher who had done the coaching had talked about how it had boosted his confidence. NS said that he was planning to offer the coaching to more teachers next year.

5.00 **MONITOR FUNDING ALLOCATED TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PRIORITIES**

5.01 Prior to the meeting the updated section of the School Development Plan (SDP) relevant to the Committee had been sent to governors. It had been RAG (red, amber, green) rated. The Headteacher noted that progress on actions were all rated green or amber. He highlighted key points.

- There had been a face to face meeting with the Family of Schools which the Headteacher felt was more productive than meeting via zoom.
- There had been too much staff absence in the first half of the spring term to enable monitoring to go ahead but school had caught up in the second half term
- There had been whole staff safeguarding training. TAs had received personalised feedback on their appraisal observations.

5.02 **Q:** A governor asked if school kept a record of every time a governor visited school. E.g. attended staff training or an assembly.

A: The SBM filed monitoring reports but did not keep a record of visits. There was a discussion. Eric Roussounis suggested that it would be a straightforward task to set up a spread sheet to log the date of each governor visit to school. He agreed to set that up on SharePoint and agreed to communicate with all governors to gain the retrospective information for all visits this year.

ER

5.03 Referring to the monitoring of teaching and learning the Headteacher reported that the school leadership team (SLT) had wanted to meet with each teacher after English and maths monitoring to provide more in depth feedback. That had worked well, and school needed to keep that going. NS explained that it provided opportunities for feedback and coaching.

5.03.01 **Q:** Were school leaders skilled in coaching?

A: There had not been formal training in coaching. NS said that he would do some research into that. He noted that some people would be more skilled than others.

Headteacher

5.04 **Q:** A governor noted that provision for more able children was not

currently a school focus. Would the more able come to the fore?

A: School did have ambition for more able children but currently there were less children working at greater depth. The Headteacher pointed out that current priorities were more about catching up than pushing on. Some children were making sound progress but there were fewer higher achievers. There were more children needing core work because they did not have a solid background from the preceding two years.

5.04.01 Governors noted that school would need to be mindful of what it was doing for high functioning children and expressed the hope that it would be something school would come to re-focus on. NS agreed and pointed out that Year 3 was a strong cohort and should include some children who would progress to Greater Depth (GD). He assured governors that the SLT was always reminding teachers to be aware of the needs of their children and tailor their approach according but pointed out that the children were currently at a different starting point and more children needed basic grounding.

5.08 **Q:** A governor suggested that the question was not where money was spent but how staff time was allocated and asked if there was a way to measure where resources were going.

A: The Headteacher said that school did put a lot of money into staffing. He noted that the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) was overstaffed and that was because school wanted to ensure that the children had a good start. The situation was similar in Year 1. He explained that staffing a class with a teacher and a TA gave the teacher more scope to think about how to use time with children. This year teachers had given more of their time to children with SEND. NS said that he would have a think about how to put funding in the SDP.

Headteacher

5.09 **Q:** Did school still have volunteer helpers?

A: A lot of volunteering had stopped because of the pandemic. There was only one volunteer currently back in school. The SBM noted that volunteering in school was made harder by safeguarding regulations and the need for disclosure and barring service (DBS) certificates.

6.00 AGREE THE PRICE OF PAID-FOR SCHOOL MEALS

6.01 The SBM had sent a report about school meal payments to governors prior to the meeting. He highlighted that school was in negotiation with Chartwells. The price of school meals needed to increase to £2.40 a day.

6.02 **Q:** Governors expressed concern about the impact of the rise in the context of the rise in the cost of living.

A: The SBM pointed out that children entitled to free school meals (FSM) would still get them. School had sent out the paperwork for that and some nursery children had signed up for FSM. Key Stage 1 (KS1) children all got universal FSM, but it was important to encourage families in need to access them.

- 6.03 The Headteacher and the SBM reported that they had researched catering providers. They had looked at the catering provided by Leeds City Council (LCC) at another school and compared it with Chartwells. LCC did not have a better offer than Chartwells.
- 6.04 Chartwells was investing £30,000 in the school as part of the contract and was asking school how it would like the money to be spent. School was looking to use the money to develop the dining room and toilets. It had asked Chartwells to offset the price of school meals and school would keep the price at £2.40 for September.
- 6.05 **Q:** How many years would the contract with Chartwells be for?
A: Three years. The company would push to get more children to have school meals.
Q: Was there scope not to do a three year contract?
A: The SBM was not sure but pointed out that Chartwells was the most competitive.
Q: How much money went towards food?
A: The SBM did not know but noted that Chartwells had to meet nutrition standards and that included standards on portion sizes.
- 6.06 **Resolved:**
Governors approved the price of school meals as discussed.

7.00 APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET

- 7.01 The SBM reported that the school had got a new Finance Officer (FO) and the service level agreement (SLA) with LCC had changed. The FO would not come to the Committee meeting but had said that she would respond by email to any questions governors had which the SBM could not answer.
- 7.02 The following documents had been sent to governors prior to the meeting:
 - 3 Year Budget report
 - Explanation of Variances
The SBM highlighted key points.
- 7.03
 - There had been big changes in staffing. Teacher costs had increased to cover for absence. Point six in the variances noted the cost of supply. There had been a pay rise for non-teaching staff. The cost of lunch time staff was slightly lower.
 - With references to services it was noted that there was a lot around funding the school did not know it would have when the budget was set last April. The school had overpaid for music provision but had got 50% of that back.
 - School had gained additional funding from SEND top up funding.
 - Numbers in nursery had increased so funding had gone up. There was a waiting list for the second and third term for next year, so numbers were looking good
 - There had been an increase in demand for school meals. It

had been hard to predict uptake after COVID but uptake had significantly increased.

- Price increases had been scheduled in the fee for lettings to meet increases in costs.

7.04 The Headteacher noted that the big change this year was the teacher pay rise. Currently the government was working on a 3% pay rise but this was subject to change as the unions were not yet involved.

7.05 The next big increase in spending for school would be on building repairs and maintenance. There would be the roof repairs and the cost of redecoration. School had already decorated some areas. The plan was for all classrooms to have an internal refresh over a three year period. The school had allocated £12.000 in each of the next three financial years for the roof.

7.06 .The SBM informed governors that clawback was reducing to 8%. Previously it had been 15% so school needed to avoid keeping too much money back and it was pulling projects forward.

7.07 By Year 3 school would be in significant deficit but there were variables such as SEND and Pupil Premium funding and school could not predict too much for 2024-2025. The Headteacher pointed out that Year 3 usually looked poor in terms of the budget but noted that school wanted to spend money to avoid clawback.

7.08 **Q:** What would be the impact of the rise in utility costs?

A: The impact would be big.

Q: Was it a fixed cost or based on usage?

A: Much had been based on previous usage. There would be a 100% rise this year in the cost of gas. Governors noted that if school usage dropped then costs should drop but agreed it was harder to reduce the usage of gas than electricity. The SBM pointed out that during COVID all the doors and windows had been open and hoped going forward usage of gas for heating would drop.

7.09 **Q:** Was there a risk that Pupil Premium would drop given the demographic of the local area?

A: There was a risk and school had factored that in. The SBM noted that he hoped the push to get parents of younger children to sign up for FSM which would support Pupil Premium funding. Before the pandemic parents had generally not needed to sign up for FSM until their children were in Year 3 but during COVID they had needed to register for FSM vouchers. He explained that school could use Operoo to log information about which benefits parents accessed.

7.10 **Q:** What would happen if the school budget did not balance?

A: School was not allowed to set a deficit budget.

Q: A governor noted that there must be a point where the funding was not enough.

A: That would be the point when school looked at staffing because that was the biggest cost. The Headteacher pointed out that more experienced teachers were more expensive to employ than newly qualified teachers. He explained that school had put ten TAs and one teacher on temporary contracts. This gave the school room for manoeuvre if there was a need to cut staffing costs.

7.11

Resolved:

The Resource Committee recommended the budget for approval by the full governing board.

FGB agenda

8.00

SCHOOLS FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD (SFVS)

8.01

The SBM confirmed that the SFVS had been completed and authorised by the Chair of governors and had been submitted at the end of March. There was nothing to report.

9.00

POLICIES TO APPROVE

9.01

It was confirmed that all staffing policies were up to date and not due for review.

9.02

The Whistleblowing policy had not been reviewed since the LA had updated the model policy in November. It would be tabled for review at the full governing board meeting.

FGB agenda

10.00

STAFFING AND RECRUITMENT UPDATE INCLUDING PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND WELLBEING

10.01

Prior to the meeting governors had received an HR update from the Headteacher and an overview of the results of the staff well-being survey. The overview provided a comparison of the survey results from 2022 and 2018.

10.02

The Headteacher highlighted that a lot of staff had completed the well-being survey, significantly more than in 2018. He was pleased with the results and pointed out that it was evidence that the staffing structure worked, and the ambitions had pulled people together. The Chair congratulated the Headteacher on the high level of staff morale in the context of the pandemic.

10.03

The Headteacher noted that some areas for development had emerged from the survey. Governors pointed out that the SLT could look at these, discuss them with staff and discuss where things could be improved. The Headteacher agreed and said that the SLT would be happy to look at these points with staff.

10.04

The Headteacher noted that one point emerging from the survey was a TA request for PPA (planning, preparation and administration) time. He said that he would advise teachers to ensure that their TAs were given appropriate time to complete tasks. E.g TAs could have some PPA time when teachers were reading the class story.

10.05

The Headteacher pointed out that school had changed the appraisal process so it was more pro-active. Staff now had an

opportunity for a third target for their personal development if they wanted one.

10.06 **Q:** Was there a need for another space for staff to go to ?
A: Most staff chose to have lunch in their classrooms as they worked but the staffroom was there for staff to use if they wanted to.

10.07 **Q:** A governor pointed out that the score for the question about the school's response to bullying had dropped from 2018 and asked why?
A: The Headteacher thought that the score reflected the fact that some staff new to school were unsure of how effectively the school dealt with bullying as they had not encountered it.

10.08 The Headteacher reported that he had sent a communication out to staff to clarify the expectations around emails. Staff were expected to check their emails once a day and were asked to read the staff board every morning. NS noted that there was a staff voice box which staff could use to share ideas and suggestions and to praise one another. There was a staff member star of the week. The SBM informed governors that he was working on a communication document for staff and parents.

DH

10.09 The Headteacher highlighted that staff absence rates were back to normal. School had done some internal teacher interviews. The standard of candidates had been high. The Outdoor Ambitions Leader had secured a permanent contract.

10.10 The Headteacher drew governor's attention to staffing matters. There was one teacher who had taken unpaid leave for family reasons. The teacher had asked to extend the leave for the whole of the next school year and planned to return in September 2023 or resign this time next year.

10.10.01 **Q:** What was the financial contribution from the school in terms of pension?
A: There would be no financial commitment from school. The Headteacher explained that he had taken advice from HR and they had said that it was a decision for the school. There was a policy that a school or organisation should offer 18 weeks of leave in these circumstances and school had already done this. He pointed out that granting the request would not incur any cost to school and the teacher in question was a particularly good teacher and subject leader.

10.10.02 The Headteacher advised governors that he believed that it would be in the school's interests to grant the teacher's request. School would recruit a temporary teacher for one year to cover the leave. NS pointed out that school needed to advertise for a teacher within the next six weeks because after that the field of candidates would decline.

- 10.10.03 **Resolved:**
Governors agreed to approve the request to extend unpaid leave for a member of the teaching staff for the academic year 2022-2023.
- 10.11 The Headteacher informed governors that there was a concern around another staff member. A discussion took place with the Head providing further information to governors. It was agreed that the Head should have a conversation with the member of staff to consider their options.
- 10.12 The Headteacher highlighted that school had done interviews for TAs. Two TAs new to school had been appointed. School was going to move TAs around next year to provide opportunities to develop skills and experience and ensure that children did not become too dependent on individual staff members. NS advised governors that school might need more TA support depending on the number of children with SEND.
- 10.13 The Headteacher reported that two temporary TLR's had been given to teachers who were focusing on curriculum development and outdoor learning. He confirmed that school was able to afford that and it would keep the Ambitions going forward.
- 10.14 The Headteacher reported that a Higher Level Teaching Assistant (HLTA) who worked with SEND children had requested to work four days instead of five. He thought that school could accept the request as the HLTA would still be able to provide strong provision.
Q: A governor asked where the money saved from the reduction in hours would be spent.
A: The school would save £7000 and this would be spent on pastoral support.
Resolved:
Governors approved the reduction in working days for the Higher Level Teaching Assistant.
- 10.15 The Headteacher reported that another member of staff who had started as a full time TA in January had also requested a reduction in hours. NS was not sure by how much the TA wanted to reduce their hours. He noted that the member of staff was a good TA but he was reluctant to have another part time TA. The school had a large number of part time teachers. All of the class TAs were full time and this counter-balanced the number of part time teachers.
- 10.15.01 There was a discussion.
Q: A governor asked if the school was justified in allowing part time teachers in classes but not TAs.
A: Another governor pointed out that school could justify its position if it could point to a detrimental impact on quality.
Governors agreed that there needed to be clarity about what the TA was asking for and the Headteacher would need to decide what was in the best interests of the school. The Headteacher

said that he would seek advice from HR and have a meeting with the TA.

Resolved:

Governors devolved the decision about the reduction in the Teaching Assistant's hours to the Headteacher and he would make that after consulting HR and meeting with the staff member in question.

11.00 HEALTH AND SAFETY AND PREMISES

11.01 Premises

Premises work had been discussed (see item 7.05 of these minutes). The SBM noted that an outline of work to be done on premises had been sent to governors prior to the meeting.

11.02 The SBM reported that LCC had agreed that the land outside Reception belonged to school. The school was going to do something with the land. It would cost around £15,000 to have the area landscaped. The Headteacher explained that It would be an additional resource for outdoor learning. School was currently researching ideas. The SBM noted that the RCCO revenue and capital included all of that work.

11.02.01 The Headteacher shared plans for the landscaping with governors and there was discussion.

Q:Do you think that it will get used?

A: It would feature in curriculum plans.

Q: What about maintenance of plants etc?

A: It would be designed to be self-sufficient but would be part of the site manager's role. The Green Team could also be involved in the maintenance.

Q: Would the area be secure?

A: there would be a fence and it would be secure.

11.03 It was reported that the PSA had committed £5000 towards the KS1 library. The money would be used for structural change. E.g. building bespoke book shelves. The school would also apply for funding for books.

11.04 Health and Safety

A report of incidents and accidents had been sent to governors prior to the meeting. The SBM noted that there had been a significant drop in first aid incidents over the past two terms. Staff had got better at recording incidents and using categories appropriately.

11.05 Amy Sanderson reported that she had recently completed the Health and Safety walk and had sent her report. She noted that she was doing Health and Safety training.

12.00 RISK MANAGEMENT AND DATA PROTECTION REGULATION (GDPR)

12.01 It was noted that a full report had been given to governors at the last meeting and there was nothing further to add.

13.00 EDUCATIONAL VISITS

13.01 The Headteacher informed governors that lots of visits were going ahead. These included a Year 6 visit to London and trips to Filey and Bridlington.

14.00 ANNUAL REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

14.01 The Clerk agreed to send some information about the content for the review of effectiveness.

15.00 SCHOOL SELF EVALUATION (SEF)

15.01 The Headteacher reported that there had been no change to the SEF and it remained as it was in the autumn.

16.00 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was no other business to report.

17.00 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

17.01 The next committee meeting would be in the autumn. The date and time had not yet been arranged.

17.02 The next full governing board meeting would be on Tuesday 24 May 2022 at 6.30pm.

17.03 Bobbie Gresser thanked Sarah Perrigo for her work as Chair of the Leadership and Management Committee.

The Chair closed the meeting at 9.05pm