

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

Minutes of the meeting held in school on Thursday 26 January 2023 at 6.30pm

PRESENT Amy Sanderson (Chair) Nicholas Sykes (Headteacher)
Bobbie Gresser Amy Wilson

IN ATTENDANCE: Sophie Sian (Clerk – Governor Support Service)
David Harris (School Business Manager)

1.00 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.01 Apologies had been received and accepted from Emma Healey and Mohammed Rafique.

2.00 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS AND REGISTER OF GOVERNORS' INTERESTS

2.01 There were no new declarations of interest.

3.00 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

3.01 The Headteacher noted that most additional matters would be covered elsewhere in the meeting but wanted to discuss the upcoming teacher strikes. The following was discussed.

1. The Headteacher had sent a communication to parents 48 hours ago in regards to the strikes.
2. He had received replies from most teachers in response to asking if they were part of a union and if they were planning to strike. There would be 3 teachers available to work and all would have PPA hours.
3. There had been consideration of whether it was worthwhile and feasible for the school to open, as there would be enough staff for those teacher's classes.
4. The decision had been made to close school for several reasons – there would be absences of children whose siblings were not able to be in, for example.
5. 18-24 vulnerable students had been identified to be able to attend and the process of speaking with those parents had been started. This would be optional.
6. The Head had met with the NEU representative and considered the DfE guidance which suggested that headteachers looked at supply teachers, theatre groups, sports coaches etc. However, the Headteacher had felt that would undermine the process but also needed to consider how to remain impartial and try to function as normal.
7. One option was to ask certain members of staff to take on different roles e.g. teaching assistants taking on teacher responsibilities but this would be personal choice.
8. There would be a second strike towards the end of February and the Headteacher predicted that there would be around half

ACTION

the staff available as most teachers could only afford one day. This would mean having those classes as normal and finding a way to manage the others.

9. This would create various issues e.g. teachers' PPA time is around 10% of the timetable and this would normally be covered by a PE coach or TA etc. PPA can't be provided another day for those teachers – it would be the individual's choice to lose this. The Headteacher felt that strikes should not cost the school, if possible, though this decision would disappoint teachers.
10. A dynamic risk assessment had been completed and the school would have enough staff to cover the limited number of pupils as well as training and jobs that there would not normally be time to do. For the teachers in, there would be subject leadership time.

3.02

The Chair stated that, from a parent perspective, the strike had been handled well and communicated well, in time for parents to make alternative plans.

3.03

Q: Bobbie Gresser asked if there had been any complaints or issues from parents.

A: The Headteacher said no and that there had been some discussion with staff who have children at other schools that are also striking. Alternative arrangements for these individuals had been arranged.

3.04

Q: The Chair asked if there had been harmony between the striking and non-striking teachers.

A: The Headteacher said that he had not heard anything about this and that, unless staff say so, it would not be obvious. It had been a considerable decision for some, supporting the agenda but also considering the financial impact, the impact on children, moral question etc. There had been talk of a picket line which may be some staff or members of the community etc. but this would be planned in such a way to avoid confrontation.

3.05

Q: Bobbie Gresser asked if, administratively, staff have to share their decision.

A: The SBM explained that staff would have a form to complete for payroll and it would be evident from the signing in system. He had made those who were close to pension age aware of the impact on their pension, as well as those that work part-time. The SBM added that it felt positive from both sides, every one seemed to feel supported and that the Head had tried to be supportive of individual views.

4.00

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

4.01

Resolved:

- That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

5.00	REVIEW ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING	
5.01	Potential associate member (minute 3.01 refers): <u>Ongoing</u> - Bobbie Gresser had spoken to the potential member via email and was waiting to confirm a new date to speak in detail.	BG
5.02	On the subject of the full governing body, the Chair noted that Ofsted had started asking how governors were chosen and so a skills audit could be a good idea, to demonstrate that choices are based on an audit. The Headteacher stated that the board generally did well in this respect, in terms of having a wide range of skills in the local area and it would be a surprise if an audit revealed any particular gaps. The Chair then added that an audit would also be helpful for succession planning as if certain members were to leave, this would mean a considerable loss of knowledge.	
5.03	Staff surveys (minute 5.04 refers): <u>Ongoing</u> - The SBM confirmed that there would be a further communication survey for staff, likely in March.	SBM
5.04	School Fund Audit (minute 8.03 refers): <u>Ongoing</u> - The SBM had not yet sent this out as it had not long been ready. agreed to send the report from the school fund audit to governors when he received it.	SBM
5.05	Amendments to policies to reflect ECT (minute 10.01 refers): Not yet completed.	Head
5.06	Letter from staff member to governors (minute 12.10.02 refers): Resolved – to be discussed elsewhere in the meeting.	
5.07	Health and Safety training slides (minute 15.04 refers): Ongoing – Chair to complete this action.	Chair
5.08	Evolve system for trips (minute 16.04 refers): The Head confirmed that the Evolve system was now being used and working well.	
6.00	BUDGET MONITORING INCLUDING PUPIL NUMBERS (TOR 2.01)	
6.01	The School Business Manager noted that the budget was much as in the previous meeting but discussed the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current budget modelling may not be accurate but the main point to highlight was the increase in funding/income. 2. Items such as the cost of utilities may change from the estimations. 	
6.02	Bobbie Gresser noted the massive variance in cost of teaching assistants. The SBM explained that this was due to the initial budget being set before the increase in pay of 9% which was unforeseen and had to be backdated to April. Since setting the initial budget, the cost of teaching had decreased but the cost of teaching assistants had increased. There was an overspend on the supply budget and so that	

would be increased the following year.

6.03 The Headteacher stated that the school had done well given there had been a lot more short-term absences which required cover. The TAs were felt to be of a high standard and so had been used for cover however when an existing member of staff is used, that came with additional costs. A lot more had been spent on external supply cover but the Headteacher hoped that next year curriculum costs would be lower. It had been good to look at training for the curriculum in detail but this entailed supply costs.

6.04 The SBM also noted that there would inevitably be other staff sickness in the rest of the year and so other pots of funding would be looked at.

6.05 Q: Bobbie Gresser asked if there was an issue with workload or morale that had caused an increase in sickness.

A: The Headteacher did not feel that this was the case but noted that staff had worked very hard during the first term. The SBM added that the majority of the absences were coughs and colds etc. so only short-term. There have been some unavoidable personal issues for staff and that absences overall were not related to a particular issue.

6.06 It was discussed that a lot of staff in Foundation were tied to being one to one with particular children and this was better served with existing staff. There was a high number of children in Foundation with special needs and the aim was for their needs to be targeted now for better outcomes later and to ensure that the whole class was able to learn. However, some of these children did not yet have funding. The person who did interventions had also been off.

6.07 Q: The Chair asked if, when return to work interviews were done, if work related stress was considered.

A: The Headteacher confirmed that this was the case and was working well. The SBM added that it was at that point that any work-related stress would be picked up and staff offered the necessary support.

6.08 The Chair summarised that, overall, the budget forecast had changed but that message about the years to come was the same. The SBM confirmed that it would be necessary to start discussing teaching structures in the future. The Headteacher added that there would be discussions with teachers soon about their plans for the next year. There were some temporary contracts in some places which may impact these discussions.

6.09 Q: The Chair asked when the funding for 2024/25 would be available.

A: The SBM stated that the Finance Officer thinks it would be the same as the previous year.

6.10 Q: Bobbie Gresser asked if the school had to follow the advice of the Local Authority?

A: The Headteacher stated that they may have some say about certain costs and certain costs had to be covered by the school.

6.11 There was then discussion of a request from a teacher to go from full to part time, from a budgetary point of view. The request might have to be delayed until more was known about the budget. The Headteacher explained that the school had, in the past, had to limit the number of part-time staff to ensure that staff continuity and communication was effective. For bulge classes, if there were to be 4 different teachers, this would be very difficult to manage and would be more costly for training etc. if courses needed to be delivered twice. For these reasons, the school had adopted a policy of 'one in, one out' but it was not possible to decide on this yet. There was another member of staff on a temporary part-time contract which would impact a decision for the request. The Headteacher added that he would be sorry to lose this teacher as a full-time member of staff.

6.12 Pupil numbers were felt to be steady although it was disappointing that some children started after the funding cut-off date in October.

6.13 The SBM discussed the Lettings update (appendix F in the provided documents) and that the school were able to facilitate Lettings without compromising the teaching space.

6.14 Q: The Chair asked why Elevations get a reduced rate?
A: The SBM explained that this was a long-standing rate to reflect the income they bring in. It was last increased in April from £16 to £18. The school wanted to support them after the challenges of Covid given they had been with the school for 16 years. One option to be considered in the future could be asking Elevations to fund places for CAP pupils.

6.15 The Headteacher thanked the SBM for the massive increase in Lettings within the last 5 years, adding that using the classrooms for any Lettings did not work for teachers so this had reduced the possible Lettings. All the current bookings were working well and the markets were a nice community connection.

6.16 The Chair asked about a governor sitting on budget meetings with the finance officer. The Headteacher said that the next one would be after the Easter holidays and this would be an observing role. The Chair would ask during the next full governing board meeting if any members would be interested and available for this.

Chair

7.00 SCHOOLS FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD (SFVS) (TOR 2.02)

7.01 In regards to the SFVS, the Headteacher clarified that it was still too early to complete this. The Chair had seen last year's SFVS.

7.02 In regards to an inventory of non-capital assets, this had not yet been completed but the Headteacher would want to set a sensible limit on

what was counted.

7.03 In regards to controls for the 'fraudulent or improper use of public funds', the School Business Manager noted that the school followed the council's guidance and there was an electronic system in place. The school use a purchase card and there was very little petty cash in place. Two members of staff have access to purchase cards and all use is fed back to the SBM.

8.00 HEADTEACHERS MID-YEAR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

8.01 The Headteacher confirmed that a date had been arranged to meet with the Performance management governors to conduct a mid-year review of objectives – this had been arranged for 6th March 2023.

9.00 STAFFING UPDATE, INCLUDING WELLBEING

9.01 The request from Mr Cunningham to reduce to part-time hours had been discussed at item 6.

9.02 One of the teaching assistants had left at Christmas due to her own need for more flexibility and because she had started to do more one-to-one work than she preferred which involved a lot of challenging behaviours.

9.03 Q: The Chair asked if it had become harder for the school to recruit?
A: The Headteacher confirmed this was correct, particularly for SEN roles. The school needed the right skills and personality. Though the roles were better paid and fit well with the school day/holidays, it remained difficult due to losing long standing staff and because mid-year recruitment was usually harder. The expectations of the role had also increased.

9.04 The Headteacher explained that it had been necessary to redeploy some of the SALT teaching assistants and they were not doing as much SALT intervention which was having an impact on certain children who were not able to have one-to-one support. Attempts were being made to ensure these TAs could still target the pupils with the highest need.

9.05 Q: Amy Wilson asked what the contingency plan for this would be.
A: The Headteacher stated that recruitment would continue and it sometimes took time to find the right quality of people.

9.06 The SBM added that the supply agencies were able to recruit for these roles but it was very expensive and were not always providing good enough options. There were a lot of people within the local area that had the right skills and availability.

9.07 Q: Bobbie Gresser asked about the knock-on effect on the SALT TAs not being able to provide interventions.
A: The Headteacher said that it was likely they would see the impact in

progress rates for those that should have had SALT intervention and these would not be as up to date.

9.08 Bobbie Gresser asked that the board's gratitude for this hard work was given to these staff members.

Head

9.09 In terms of staff absences when caring for ill children, this had added to costs and was recorded as special leave, not as absence for illness.

9.10 There was discussion of the long-term absence of Mrs Raw who had written to the board in regards to reduced hours and pay. This included the context of her absence, the input of the union representative, communication between parties and next steps, including input from Occupational Health.

9.11 The Headteacher then explained the Training and Development Time Log that had been provided to members and detailed the necessary training for improving the curriculum. This training had been spread across various subjects and some specialised qualifications. A lot of training came with costs for covering lessons, non-working days etc. When a TA covered something, there was then a loss in quality e.g. interventions that were not able to be delivered.

9.12 Q: The Chair asked if the Head had tried to do too much development at the expense of learning?
A: The Headteacher had considered this and felt that some groups and individuals were more affected than others but some of this had been necessary for the changes to subject areas. The alternative would have been prioritising certain subjects but there was an interconnectedness between them all so if one was changed, it would have a knock-on effect. Some of it had been slimming down of curriculum. Some year groups had taken longer than others, some staff members had taken on more because of their experience etc. The Headteacher hoped to have a more settled term now – the job of changing the curriculum was bigger than expected which was not foreseeable. There had been more thinking and changing than thought. If it had been done more gradually, it would have taken much longer. It was possible that the consistency of teaching had been affected in the autumn term which now needed picking up. The short-term impact could be recovered and there would be less cost for cover. The changes could be naturally refined within PPA by individual teachers. The Headteacher was glad that this had been asked for, to get an oversight of the changes.

9.13 Bobbie Gresser and the Chair both suggested that this could be threaded through with other committees to assess what the impact had been on outcomes. The Headteacher shared that there had been two staff meetings in January for which he had created a feedback form for staff which had been positive about training and provided helpful feedback. The Chair felt that this was good evidence building of impact.

Agenda

9.14 Q: When there was CPD, was there a way to clarify with a follow up how staff had implemented learning?

A: This would be seen when looking at work/books. Subject leads would also get feedback on engagement and delivery.

10.00 POLICIES FOR APPROVAL (TOR 3.05)

10.01 The SBM discussed the GDPR audit as support services are due to stop this year, within the current set-up. The plan is to stay with the new system for a year and then consider putting this out to tender. The GDPR policy would be due for approval in March-May this year although very little change is expected.

10.02 The Chair noted that she had recently completed some governor training and wanted to suggest changing how policies are considered. Currently, as they could be very long to read, it could make more sense for individual governors to have individual policies to read in depth throughout the year. This would be better than every governor reading every policy but not in detail. The SBM would send around a list of all policies for this purpose.

SBM

11.00 HEALTH AND SAFETY AND PREMISES

11.01 The SDM went through the relevant documentation provided for the meeting. The following was discussed.

1. The Headteacher noted that, last year, the school had changed two of the playground surfaces and there had been a decrease in injuries in these areas. In the Foundation area, the playground surfaces encouraged more fun and adventurous play but on a safer surface.
2. There had been an increase in teacher injuries due to biting from children that require one to one support. The class teacher had been supporting with this and it was acknowledged that these children were not able to communicate and so predicting these incidents was difficult. It was hoped that this would decrease as these children settled in.
3. The Headteacher had asbestos training and felt confident that the school did not have any asbestos as the process was to check when any work was completed which happened when all the fire alarms were changed last year.
4. There was one advisory issue from the GDPR audit in regards to holding onto data on the schools' online systems. It was confirmed that the school were still on a waiting list for a GDPR inspection from LCC. The Chair would be conducting a visit with a GDPR focus in the next half-term.

11.02 Bobbie Gresser noted that there were a few updates in the audit but no dates which would be helpful. The SBM agreed to add these.

SBM

11.03 Following a question from the Chair about how risk assessments were completed, the SBM confirmed that likelihood x severity was how

school's own risk assessment works.

11.04 In terms of Premises, the SBM noted that most of the information on the documentation was straightforward and that the main works was the roof repairs. The quotes for this work were from Leeds City Council Building Services with MPS managing and an approved contractor had been chosen. It was in the budget for this work to be completed during the summer however there may be higher priority work nearer the time. The SBM gave an update on this and provided a detailed map of the site and the different parts of the roof. It was discussed that it was possible to accommodate the work in May after SATS exams which would be preferable to September when there are new pupils to consider. There was not yet a risk assessment of roof work during school time. The work would last a minimum of 6 weeks. This would be a good improvement for the school, rather than patching smaller parts up over longer. It would not be possible to repair all the necessary sections at once.

11.05 There would be no holiday clubs etc. during the school holidays although it could be possible to use the dining hall for that instead. The Head and SDM did not want to lose the Lettings income. Some PE partners would use other venues but still offer funded places for CAP children.

11.06 The Chair noted that she was pleased to see the lighting work had been completed.

12.00 RISK MANAGEMENT

12.01 The School Business Manager confirmed that it was a statutory requirement for academies to have a risk register but this was not the case for Local Authority schools.

13.00 EDUCATIONAL VISITS (if required)

13.01 This had been discussed elsewhere in the meeting.

14.00 DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the committee would be held on Thursday 27 April 2023 at 6.30pm, in school.

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.45pm.

The Headteacher introduced a final point of discussion after items 1-14 had been discussed.

CAP had benefitted from Carr Manor expanding and offering other services such as HR and IT however a letter was sent before Christmas about the IT service that the school have from Carr Manor. They would no longer be able to offer an IT technician to do outreach support – the Headteacher was disappointed to hear this but it was still possible to

continue this for more local schools which had not been confirmed. There was not a private equivalent of this service that was felt to be good enough for the school's needs.

The same letter for the HR offer was then received which stated that some of the staff from CM were starting their own independent business offering the same service but not via Carr Manor school. The Headteacher said CAP would use this new service for a year and then review to see if the service should be put out to tender.

The SBM then discussed the upcoming changes from Chartwells that provide the school's meals. They had contacted the school to increase the prices because of rising costs. The SBM then had a meeting with them to discuss the approximately 40p increase which was significant. The agreement eventually was a reduced increase, a delayed start date to the increase and an agreement that the school would get a full terms notice for any changes. School meals would cost £2.55 from 01/03 and would not change until September at the earliest. Leeds City Council's meals services could be an alternative but it was not considered to be as good quality although this could change depending on the council's offer next term.

If the school were to leave the Chartwells contract earlier, there would be money to pay back. However, the SBM hoped that the new agreement was positive and there was a good number of pupils choosing school meals. There would be communication with parents about this decision making i.e. lower costs vs quality.