

| | | |
|---|---|---------------|
| Minutes of a meeting of the Governing Body of Colburn C.P. School held at the school on Monday 16th May 2016 at 4pm. | | |
| <p>Present: Mrs. A Dale (Chair) Ms. H Grant, Ms. R Leyburn, Mrs. A Pickersgill, D. Miller, Mrs. A Offord, G. Sutterby, Mrs. G Brown, Mrs. J Bromfield and M. Watt (Headteacher).</p> <p>In attendance: Mrs. J Pearson (The School Business Manager) Ms. P Gale (Clerk to the Governing Body)</p> | | |
| Minute No. | | Action |
| PART 'A' - PROCEDURAL | | |
| GB 61/16 | <p><u>Welcome:</u> The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> | |
| GB 62/16 | <p><u>To receive apologies for absence and to determine whether any absences should be consented to:</u> No apologies had been received from Mr. Stuart Newman.</p> | |
| GB 63/16 | <p><u>To remind Governors of the need to declare interests, pecuniary or non-pecuniary:</u> None declared.</p> | |
| GB 64/16 | <p><u>To determine whether any part of the proceedings should be treated as confidential:</u> See minute GB 78/16.</p> | |
| GB 65/16 | <p><u>Notification of urgent other business:</u> The Head requested an update on the Breakfast Club.</p> | |
| GB 66/16 | <p><u>To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on the 25th April 2016:</u> The Chair asked Governors to consider whether the minutes were an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Resolved: That the minutes of the 25th April 2016 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting, signed and dated by the Chair.</p> | Chair |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>GB 67/16</p> | <p><u>Matters arising:</u></p> <p>In addressing matters arising the Actions Summary was considered and updated. (See attachment 1.0.)</p> | |
| <p>GB 68/16</p> | <p><u>Confirmation of the date of the next meeting:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Monday 11th July 2016 at 4pm. (Annual Strategic overview)</p> <p>(To note: a schedule of proposed meetings for 2016/17 will be considered at this meeting.)</p> | |
| <p>PART B – RESOURCES</p> | | |
| <p>GB 69/16</p> | <p><u>Budget Update:</u></p> <p>Governors had been previously circulated with the following reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Outturn Report for 2015/16 (ending the 31st March 2016) • The Start Budget for 2016/17 to 2018/19 (three options) <p>The SBM reported that the outturn position at the end of the 2015/16 financial year showed a smaller underspend of £100,299 than the predicted £114,988 at the revised budget, a lesser spend variance of £14,689. As planned the uncommitted revenue balance from 2014/15 covered this amount resulting in a carryforward figure into 2016/2017 of £82,181. The main variances had been summarised in a very clear report and no questions were raised by Governors.</p> <p>The SBM explained that the Start Budget was slightly more complex, as a number of assumptions and unknowns needed to be factored in. The initial starting point was based on all costs calculated from the previous year's spend with inflation added in as forecast by NYCC. No additional pupil numbers had been built in but costs for furnishing three new classrooms and whiteboards were built in, together with anticipating some staffing requirements but without the funding generated by increased pupil numbers. This original start budget was not suitable for submission because of the negative outturn position across years 2 and 3, with no means of turning the position round.</p> <p>The Head and the SBM held a meeting with Mark Ashton, NYCC Strategic Planning and Helen Coulthard, NYCC Head of Finance to discuss the expansion proposals and difficulties arising around the knowledge of pupil numbers, future staffing implications, difficulties in recruiting staff and the criteria for Pupil Growth Funding.</p> <p><i>Q: What is Pupil Growth Funding?</i></p> <p><i>A: Schools facing exceptional growth in numbers, when pupils cannot be accommodated within the existing class structure can access Pupil Growth Funding to cover the period from September to March, recognising that for this period the school's funding will not be based on the higher pupil</i></p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p><i>numbers.</i></p> <p>Following the meeting a letter had been received by the school confirming that £50k Pupil Growth Funding would be made available in 2016/17 with the remaining £25k confirmed in April/May 2017, when progress on the three classroom extension could be more accurately assessed.</p> <p>It was reported that the school had then been asked to prepare financial forecasts to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipated increase in pupil numbers from September 2017, modelling the impact of different levels of increase.(45 and 90) • Employing additional teaching staff and associated options regarding start dates, terms of contract etc. • The additional £75k Pupil Growth Funding in 2017/18. <p>The second option based on 45 additional pupils from September 2017 showed a more positive position, but reflected some reductions in pupil support such as no subsidy for the East Barnby residential, no drumming and reduced virtual maths time. However the PPA post would increase to a full time post and the Learning mentor would continue on a fixed term contract to August 2018.</p> <p><i>Q: Not very happy about reduced support for children going to East Barnby.</i></p> <p><i>A: The support isn't statutory but if we can help we will, and the Friends of School have agreed to do fundraising to support subsidies. In certain cases the Pupil Premium funding can also be used to support those who meet the criteria.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Would the budget be lower than last year?</i></p> <p><i>A: About £15k less due to the predicted reduction in Pupil Premium funding.</i></p> <p>The SBM then referred Governors to option 3, based on an additional 90 pupils from September 2017.This showed negative in-year positions for 2016/17 and 2017/18 and a negative outturn for 2017/18.</p> <p><i>Q: Can we submit a negative budget?</i></p> <p><i>A: Yes if there is a good reason, but there could be additional costs that we haven't assumed or forecast.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Do we definitely know there are 90 pupils coming to this school and when?</i></p> <p><i>A: As a result of the consultation, to be ratified by Council leaders at the end of May, it is highly likely that 90 new pupils will join the school, but we don't know when and how gradual the intake will be, which makes option 3 an unpredictable risk.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Can we wait until after the consultation outcomes have been ratified?</i></p> <p><i>A: We have to submit the Start Budget by the end of May 2016.</i></p> <p>Governors considered the options in great detail, wishing to maximise pupil support, school stability and minimise risk to the budget, recognising that it was always difficult to profile accurate budgets for Year 3.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| | <p>Resolved: a) That Governors approved option 2 Start Budget, based on 45 new pupils from September 2017, to be submitted to NYCC by the end of May 2016.</p> <p>Resolved: b) That the SBM and Head be thanked for a very clear and comprehensive overview of the options for the 2016/17 Start Budget.</p> | <p>All</p> <p>All</p> |
| <p>GB 70/16</p> | <p><u>To discuss and approve the contract review schedule:</u> Governors had been previously circulated with a schedule of all the contracts provided to the school, detailing renewal rates, notice periods, value and other relevant information.</p> <p>The SBM updated Governors on the current washroom products contract with PHS, explaining that the contract would end on the 28th July 2016; a new contract with Initial has been purchased under the framework agreement with YPO commencing on the same day.</p> <p><i>Q: Have hand dryers been included?</i> <i>A: No as they were too noisy and distracting to children in classrooms, so we will continue to use paper towels.</i></p> <p>It was noted that most of the service contracts were with NYCC as they provided the best value for money. <i>Q: How much notice do we have to give for a NYCC contract?</i> <i>A: Six months.</i></p> <p>Resolved: That Governors approved the contract schedule for 2016 and thanked the SBM for the management of this aspect of school business.</p> | <p>All</p> |
| <p>GB 71/16</p> | <p>To consider for approval the NYCC HandS recommended policies: Governors had been circulated with two policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lockdown Partial and Full Lockdown Policy. • Business Continuity and Disaster Critical Incident Recovery Plan. <p>Governors felt they were both very comprehensive and recommended their approval.</p> <p>Resolved: That the policies be approved and adopted by the Governing Body.</p> | <p>All</p> |
| <p>GB 72/16</p> | <p><u>To receive a staffing update:</u></p> <p>This item was considered at the end of the meeting as some aspects of the discussion were confidential.</p> <p>(See confidential minute:GB 78/16)</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------|
| <p>GB 73/16</p> | <p><u>Health and Safety Update:</u></p> <p>The SBM had previously circulated an update on Health and Safety to Governors. It was reported that on the 2nd March 2016 a Health and Safety premises inspection had been undertaken by Terry Bland, the HandS Safety Risk Adviser and was also attended by Helen Grant, the Health and Safety Governor and the SBM. The report was very positive, praising the school for their commitment to Health and Safety and the proactive approach taken by all.</p> <p>Thirty recommendations were observed requiring action, with a risk rating of 3 (moderate) action required within 3-6 months or 4 (low) action required within 6-12 months. It was noted that 26 of the recommendations have been completed so far and quotes for the wooden panelling in the hall and a finger guard to the UPVC bungalow door are in progress. Two outstanding recommendations requiring electrical work will be actioned when finances permit.</p> <p>On the 20th April 2016 a Health and Safety inspection was carried out by HG and the Chair, and recommendations to repair the fascia board and signage are being progressed.</p> <p>Resolved: That the SBM and HG be thanked for their thorough oversight of Health and Safety in the school.</p> | <p>All</p> |
| <p>PART C- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT</p> | | |
| <p>GB 74/16</p> | <p><u>Update from the Headteacher:</u></p> <p>The Head reported that the school had received a KS2 SATs inspection visit to ensure that all administrative procedures were in place, he was pleased to inform Governors that everything was in order and a report would be sent to the Chair shortly.</p> <p>An Early Years moderation visit also took place the previous week and again everything went well, a report will be sent to the Chair shortly.</p> <p><i>Q: As EYFS Lead Governor please can I also receive a copy of the report?</i> <i>A: Of course.</i></p> <p>It was reported that the School Improvement Adviser will be visiting the school on the 24th May 2016 to review and evaluate the impact of support received by the school, the report can be shared at the next FGB meeting in July.</p> <p>The Head also informed Governors of the date of the next LA Review, which would take place on the 5th July 2016.</p> <p>Resolved: That the Head and staff be thanked for ensuring the external moderation and inspection visits went well.</p> | <p>All</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| <p>GB 75/16</p> | <p><u>Update from the Governor Development Group:</u></p> <p>Governors were reminded of the planned working group meeting to update the Governor Development Plan and also produce a SEF/aide memoire for Governors.(also see GB minute GB 51/16 for the rationale)</p> <p>Resolved: a)That Governors would attend the working group on the 13th June 2016 at 4pm.</p> <p>There was some discussion raised by more recently appointed Governors about the purpose and process of the subject monitoring visits, and concern about whether they GS and RL were best prepared for their planned SEND visit to the school. Governors and DM as Lead School Improvement Governor offered to support them and also suggested they contact the DHT for a briefing on the expectations of the visit. DM reminded all Governors that there was an expectation of a minimum of one Governor visit a term. It was noted that AO and the Head were planning a monitoring visit on ‘British Values’ later in the term and the Chair is planning a visit with the PE Coordinators.</p> <p>Resolved: b) That all Governors were thanked for their commitment to this monitoring role and reports would be circulated once approved.</p> <p>The Clerk had circulated a National Governors Association (NGA) recommended skills audit for Governors to complete, with the intention of analysing and identifying areas for development or skills gaps which would help inform recruitment to future Governor vacancies. The interim analysis based on 8 out of 11 Governors identified areas such as change management, financial planning and procurement. It was agreed that the three missing audits may well change the overall picture, so an analysis based on 11 Governors would be completed and circulated for information. Discussion took place on the value and purpose of carrying out the audit, as the Governing Body was composed of very experienced Governors who, in the main, knew each other’s strengths.</p> <p>Resolved: c) That the audit would be analysed in ensuring that future Governor nominations and elections were substantiated by the skill gaps and areas for development could be used to inform the Governor Development Plan and priorities for training.</p> | <p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>All/ Clerk</p> |
| <p>GB 76/16</p> | <p><u>Update on Academisation:</u></p> <p>The Head informed Governors that although the government had backed down on enforcing the move to academisation in law, but it was still on the political radar and it was still clear that schools like Colburn, ‘Requiring Improvement’, would still be required to join a Multi-Academy Trust (MAT).He therefore suggested that the Governing Body should gather</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------|
| | <p>information about the process and options, in order to take a measured and informed view of the way ahead, rather than be ‘pushed’ or unready to make decisions. The Head said he would keep Governors informed of intelligence he was gathering from conferences, briefings and the educational press, but that it would also be useful for Governors to attend events so they could make their own personal and professional judgements.</p> <p>The Head reported that he had recently attended a conference run by the Diocese, which clearly explained that non-Church schools could join with Church schools to form a MAT, and they actively welcomed the ethos and values of non-Church schools and the advantages the community primaries could bring to a partnership, without losing their identity and local focus. A further event, organised by the Swaledale Alliance, was being held on the 27th May 2016 09.30-12.30 at Solberge Hall, if any Governors wished to attend they would be welcome.</p> <p><i>Q: So what kinds of Academies are there?</i> <i>A: Private chains, the Church, groups of local schools could create their own MAT, local authorities could form their own MAT, and there are lots of potential models. There is a view that to be sustainable an academy would need 1200 pupils, and a lead school would need to be ‘outstanding’.</i></p> <p>There was considerable discussion by Governors on the advantages and disadvantages, and concerns raised about being led by commercially orientated sponsors who may not have the best interests of children and a local community at the forefront of their priorities.</p> <p>GB informed Governors that she had previously worked in an academy, and that there had been a clear two- step process; she suggested that the Head would probably be willing to talk with Governors about the process, if they felt it might be a useful part of their research and information gathering. Governors thanked Gemma for the suggestion and could consider after the Swaledale Alliance conference.</p> <p>Resolved: Governors thanked the Head for a useful overview and agreed they needed to be aware of the developments and gather as much information as possible in supporting their decision making.</p> | <p>All</p> |
| <p>PART D- OTHER BUSINESS</p> | | |
| <p>GB 77/16</p> | <p><u>An update on the Breakfast Club was raised by the Headteacher.</u></p> <p>The Head reported that a parent had requested that Governors re-consider the start date for the planned changes to the Breakfast Club, and to make the changes from the start of the next academic year instead. Governors considered the request, but felt that six weeks’ notice was quite adequate to make new arrangements.</p> <p>Resolved: Governors unanimously agreed to stay with the planned changes to come into effect from Tuesday the 7th June 2016.</p> | |

Colburn FGB – Minutes –16- 05 -2016

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>(GB the Staff Governor was asked to leave the meeting at this point- 5.20pm).</p> <p>There being no further business the Chair thanked Governors for their contributions to the meeting.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 5.45pm.</p> <p>Date of the next meeting confirmed as:</p> <p>Monday 11th July 2016 at 4pm.</p> | |
|--|--|--|