



names be added to the training file.

#### **4.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

4.01 There were no declarations of interest made. The Chair agreed to check the school's register of interests received.

**Chair**

#### **5.0 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

##### **5.01 Resolved:**

- that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2016 were agreed as a correct record and that the Chair be authorised to sign them.

#### **6.00 MATTERS ARISING**

##### **6.01 Training - (Minute 5.01 refers)**

C Burgess advised governors that they would need to re-register on Gel Online as the application had been refreshed.

**All Govs.**

##### **6.02 Safer Recruitment Training - (Minute 8.04 refers)**

James Annetts and Kevin Birkin had not yet completed the Safer Recruitment Training.

**J Annetts /  
K Birkin**

The Chair highlighted the need for another governor to complete the training and Claire Burgess volunteered. The Headteacher confirmed the school would pay for the training and agreed to forward the link to Claire.

**Head**

##### **6.03 Nomination of a governing Body from Another School to Enable Complaints to be Dealt with Should Impartiality Issues Arise with the Current Governing Body - (Minute 8.07 refers)**

The Headteacher reported that Sharp Lane had agreed to be nominated on a reciprocal basis with Hunslet Carr. Governors agreed the proposal.

##### **6.04 Staffing - (Minute 9.02 refers)**

The Headteacher confirmed that no problems had been experienced following the alteration of the TA's hours and that the changes had made a positive impact on children.

##### **6.05 Performance Management (Minute 9.08 refers)**

The Headteacher's review had taken place and new targets had been agreed and set.

##### **6.06 Resources Committee - (Minute 10.01 refers)**

Yvonne McMullen pointed out that although she was not a member of the resources committee her apologies had been recorded for the meeting held on Tuesday 15 March 2016.

#### **7.0 THE FUTURE OF COG'S AND THE STATUS OF THE SCHOOL**

7.01 The Headteacher provided feedback from the meeting with the Co-op Learning Partnership on 28 April 2016. A copy of the Co-op's presentation had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting and the following points were discussed.

7.01.1 Hunslet Carr, New Bewerley and Sharp Lane schools were already working collaboratively and were considering formalising the arrangements. The Headteacher and the Chair had looked at several models but had found the values of the Co-op to be closest to those of the school.

7.01.2 The Headteacher illustrated how the structure of the proposed learning partnership would work and explained that moving to a learning partnership would formalise the current arrangements but that each school would retain their own budget, values and curriculum etc and would also continue to have their own governing bodies. As a learning partnership, there would be a trust board and two members from each school would sit on the board and other partners, who had an interest in the community and the school, could also be asked to join the board.

7.01.3 Governors noted the alternative would be to become a multi academy trust under which the schools would have one governing body. Under this arrangement, schools could continue to have their own governing body but it would only have delegated powers and staff could also be moved around to different schools as required.

7.01.4 The school's preferred option was to move to become a learning partnership. Hunslet Moor had expressed an interest in working with the school if it became a learning partnership and may want to join the partnership fully in future.

7.01.5 The Headteacher informed governors there were two routes the school could follow school to become a learning partnership, one through the Co-op and one through Leeds Governor Services.

**Q.** Where is the local authority in this arrangement?

**A.** The school would continue to obtain their polices etc from the local authority through the SLA.

**Q.** Would there be SLA's with an academy?

**A.** Yes, but at a cost.

**Q.** Is there a danger that the school would become a maintained trust?

**A.** The move to become a learning partnership would be a stepping stone towards the new direction.

The Headteacher highlighted that, by 2022, the present government required schools to move to either a learning partnership or a multi academy trust and the Chair added that it was important to guide the school in the right direction and to chose the best option for the school.

7.01.6 **Q.** At the meeting it was said that the school building would be handed over so would the Co-op be given the building?

**A.** No. If the school moved to a Trust the local authority would

give the building to the school / Trust.

**Q.** Would that mean increased maintenance costs for the school?

**A.** No, the building would only be transferred in law.

**Q.** Would the school lose any financial benefits?

**A.** No, the school would receive the same budget.

**Q.** Would there be an increased workload for the school in attending Trust meetings?

**A.** No, there would be no subcommittees and meetings would be held once per term where the school would report on key issues.

**Q.** How would the school make sure it was not outvoted at meetings? Will schools work together?

**A.** The Trust board would only be given powers over the areas schools wanted the board to have control over.

7.01.7 The Chair advised governors that exploring the options available to the school would be seen as a positive move, should Ofsted come into school.

**Q.** When Ofsted visited, would the school be deemed as being Requiring Improvement as it was not already an academy?

**A.** No.

**Q.** What if other schools in the learning partnership became Requiring Improvement; how would it affect the school?

**A.** The action plan put in by Ofsted would draw on the resources in other schools to help improve the school and provide support.

7.01.8 The Headteacher drew discussions to a close and informed governors a meeting would be arranged with Leeds Governor Services to look at their option. The two options and what they offered would then be compared. The Headteacher informed governors they were welcome to attend the meeting agreed to circulate the date to governors.

**Head**

## **8.0 HEADTEACHER'S REPORT**

8.01 The Headteacher's report had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting and the Headteacher invited questions on the report.

### **8.02 EYFS Trip to Finland and Sweden**

The Chair asked whether the trip had been worthwhile. The Headteacher confirmed that it had as staff had returned from the trip motivated, inspired and excited. Following their visit, the three teachers had compiled a document detailing what they would like to change in school and the impact this would have on the children and themselves, which would be presented at the next Teaching & Learning Committee meeting.

**Q.** Did staff establish why children in Finland and Sweden don't

start primary school until they are six or seven?

**A.** Yes. They have childcare which is play based and children are allowed to play and use their imagination which is nurtured by schools who then look at how their imagination can be moved forward.

8.03 Attendance

Attendance to date was 95.5%, slightly below the national average of 95.8%. Claire Burgess asked which governor was responsible for attendance and the Headteacher confirmed it was Pam Reed.

8.03.1 Claire pointed out that, as attendance was below the national average, it needed to be looked at as Ofsted would look for evidence of work being done by governors to monitor and improve attendance. Pam Reed reported that persistent absenteeism was lowering attendance figures and was being monitored by the pupil support committee. The Headteacher highlighted that Carol Mitchell's attendance report, presented to the Pupil Support committee, would detail the work governors had contributed towards improving attendance.

**C Mitchell**

8.04 Pupil Premium

The budget review had revealed that the number of pupil premium children in school who attracted pupil premium funding had fallen from 239 to 202. Numbers in nursery and reception had also fallen from 40 to 28.

8.04.1 The Headteacher explained that children in Years 1 and 2 did not need to apply for a school meal as they automatically received them but families with children in Year 6 needed to apply, through claiming benefits.

8.04.2 In an attempt to resolve this, letters were being sent to parents requesting basic information which would allow the school to check parent's eligibility for benefits in Reception and Years 1 and 2. To encourage parents to provide all the information required, names would be put into a draw for a uniform voucher.

**Q.** Why are letters only being sent to parents in Year 1 and 2?

**A.** Parents of children in Years 3, 4 and 5 had to apply to receive school meals but those in Years 1 and 2 did not so the letters would help the school identify how many children would be eligible. In future, the letter would be included in the new starter packs given to parents and would be a reminder for parents that, when their child entered Year 3, they would need to apply for free school meals.

**9.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS**

9.01 Copies of the minutes from the Resources, Pupil Support and Teaching & Learning committees had been circulated prior to the meeting.

9.02 Claire Burgess pointed out that the minutes from the most recent

committee meetings had not been circulated and agreed to follow this up with Governor Support.

- 9.03 Kevin Birkin reported that he had attended the budget setting meeting which had provided a good insight into how the school's budget was set. He advised governors the budget was healthy and confirmed that plans made by the school could be covered by the budget and left a good carry forward figure for any future projects.
- 9.04 **Q.** Did the school budget plans utilise the budget for staffing and then pupil premium funding for 'good stuff'?
- A.** There was an assumption that pupil premium funding was used for school trips and residentials but the school had more TA's than it would have without pupil premium funding to ensure it had a good team of staff and assumed the school would receive some pupil premium funding each year.
- Q.** Was this a good approach?
- A.** Demographics were likely to change so pupil premium funding would fluctuate but the school would not lose a large amount of its funding overnight, unless there was a change in government policy that resulted in the school not receiving the funding.
- 9.05 The Headteacher advised that, if the funding was lost, the school would need to reconsider school outings and the amount of TA's and other additional staff. He added that a reduction in pupil premium funding was not a cause for concern as the school had a good carry forward figure and would be able to continue as it was for one or maybe two years before any changes would need to be made.
- 10.0 APPROVAL OF FORMAL BUDGET FOR THE YEAR**
- 10.01 Copies of the budget report for 2016/17 had been circulated prior to the meeting. The following points were highlighted by the Headteacher and discussed.
- 10.02 A reduction in the number of pupil premium children was a concern along with the loss of funding for SEN children. The implementation of the increase in the living wage would also have a large impact on the budget. Staffing costs had also been increased to reflect staff pay awards.
- 10.03 Although a large number of projects had been carried out this year, there was only one planned for 2016/17 and savings had been made on other teaching costs and premises costs. Curriculum costs had risen but included the cost of new furniture.
- 10.04 The budget showed an in year deficit which was due to RCCO of £130,000 for the new staff room. The Headteacher explained the new staff room was required as there were now over 100 members of staff in school and that the present room was no longer fit for purpose.

**Q.** Would staff use the new room? Staff need to stop eating in their own class room.

**A.** Staff could not be told not to eat in class rooms until the school had a larger staff room.

**Q.** Where would the new staff room be situated?

**A.** There were two options. The first was to demolish the conservatory near reception and build on to the school at a cost of £120,000. The second was to build a two storey extension onto the house to create a SEN 'centre'. The library would be moved into the inclusion room and the wall in the inclusion room would be knocked through to create the new staff room. The cost of this work was £130,000.

The Chair agreed that the current staff room was not fit for purpose and that it was important to consider the needs of staff. Governors agreed to proceed with the second proposal.

**Resolved:**

- The budget for the financial year 2016/2017, indicating an in year deficit of £58,560 and a projected balance brought forward from 2015/16 of £258,750 leaving a contingency for 2016/17 of £200,190, was approved by the governing body.

**11.0**

**CLUSTER UPDATE**

11.01

The Jess Cluster report for March 2016 had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting.

11.02

The Headteacher reminded governors that, from 2017, funding for the cluster would no longer be taken direct from the school budget and schools would be required to make a contribution to funding for the cluster. As a result of the changes to funding, the cluster had improved the offer to schools to secure their continued support.

11.03

The Headteacher informed governors that the cluster's Targeted Services Lead had left which created an opportunity to look at what schools wanted from the cluster. He pointed out that there were several senior rolls within the JESS cluster but that in other clusters there was only one meaning there was the potential to make savings.

11.04

Governors noted that the school received value for money for their contribution and the Headteacher confirmed that schools had to contribute to the JESS to receive support from the cluster. The Headteacher added that if the school did not contribute to the cluster the school would need to pay for support when it was needed, the cost of which would be more expensive than the school's contribution.

11.05

Governors agreed the school needed to remain in the cluster as it was beneficial to the school. The Headteacher confirmed he

would continue to update governors on progress and changes in the cluster.

**12.0 EVALUATION OF GOVERNING BODY EFFECTIVENESS - GOVERNORS' ANNUAL STATEMENT TO BE PUBLISHED ON THE WEBSITE**

12.01 Academies were required to publish an annual statement but maintained schools were not although it was good practice for them to do so.

12.02 Claire Burgess explained the type of information that should be included in the annual statement and that statements were usually published at the end of the academic year. Claire added that the statement should include a report from each committee Chair on the work carried out during the year and agreed to forward a report template to all governors for completion / information.

**C Burgess**

12.03 Claire Burgess agreed to prepare the statement on behalf of the governing body and governors were asked to return their completed forms to Claire who would collate the information.

**All Govs.**

**13.0 SET FULL GOVERNING BODY MEETING DATES FOR THE YEAR**

13.01 The meeting schedule for the 2016 / 2017 governing body and committee meetings had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting but had not been received by all governors.

13.02 The Headteacher explained all meetings had been arranged for the same week of the month and approximately the same dates as this year. The Headteacher agreed to recirculate the dates to governors.

**Head**

**14.0 SAFEGUARDING**

14.01 The recent changes to the DBS regulations were explained to governors and the Chair asked governors to ensure they had a DBS in place. The Headteacher explained that governors only needed to apply if they did not already have a DBS check in place and Claire Burgess highlighted that new governors were required to apply for a DBS check within three weeks of joining a governing body.

**15.0 CHAIR'S BUSINESS**

15.01 The Chair had no further business to report.

**16.0 CLERK'S BUSINESS**

16.01 The Clerk highlighted the dates of the forthcoming governor briefing meetings.

**17.0 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

17.01 No other items were raised.

**18.0 DATE AND TIME FO NEXT MEETING**

18.01

- Tuesday 12 July 2016 at 6.00 p.m..

*The meeting was closed by the Chair at 7.50 p.m.*