

<b>Minutes of a meeting of the Governing Body of Colburn C.P. School held at the school on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016 at 4pm.</b>		
<p><b>Present:</b> Mrs. A Dale (Chair) Mrs. J Bromfield, Ms. H Grant, Ms. R Leyburn, Mrs. A Pickersgill, D. Miller, Mrs. A Offord, G. Sutterby, S Newman and M. Watt (Headteacher).</p> <p><b>In attendance:</b> Mrs. J Pearson (The School Business Manager) Ms. P Gale (Clerk to the Governing Body)</p>		
<b>Minute No.</b>		<b>Action</b>
<b>PART 'A' - PROCEDURAL</b>		
<b>GB 21/16</b>	<p><b><u>Welcome:</u></b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and Governors introduced themselves to Stuart Newman the newly appointed Parent Governor. <b>The Chair noted that there were still vacancies for both a staff and co-opted Governor; nominations and elections would be actively sought after the Easter break.</b></p>	<b>All</b>
<b>GB 22/16</b>	<p><b><u>To receive apologies for absence and to determine whether any absences should be consented to:</u></b></p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>	
<b>GB 23/16</b>	<p><b><u>To remind Governors of the need to declare interests, pecuniary or non-pecuniary:</u></b></p> <p>None declared.</p>	<b>All</b>
<b>GB 24/16</b>	<p><b><u>To determine whether any part of the proceedings should be treated as confidential:</u></b></p> <p>The Head requested that an 'Other Business' item on LA plans for the Catterick area should be regarded as Confidential.</p>	<b>Chair</b>
<b>GB 25/16</b>	<p><b><u>Notification of urgent other business:</u></b></p> <p>As above.</p>	<b>Head</b>

<p><b>GB 26/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on the 9<sup>th</sup> February 2016:</u></b></p> <p>The Chair asked Governors to consider whether the minutes were an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b> <b>That the minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> February 2016 be approved, signed and dated by the Chair.</b></p>	<p><b>Chair</b></p>
<p><b>GB 27/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>Matters arising and consideration of the actions summary from the meeting:</u></b></p> <p>In addressing matters arising the <b>Actions Summary</b> was considered and updated. (See attachment 1.0).</p>	
<p><b>GB 28/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>Confirmation of the dates of the next meetings:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monday 25<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at 4pm.(School Improvement)</li> <li>• Monday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2016 at 4pm. (Resources)</li> <li>• Monday 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016 at 4pm. (Annual Strategic overview)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>PART B – RESOURCES</b></p>		
<p><b>GB 29/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>Budget Update:</u></b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed the SBM to the meeting and thanked her for the helpful supporting papers that had been circulated to Governors prior to the meeting; and requested any queries or points of clarification.</p> <p>The SBM explained that it was still too early to have exact financial forecasts, but she did go through the February monitoring report highlighting key variances in expenditure and income.</p> <p>It was noted that the current in-year planned deficit is currently at £109k largely due to classroom refurbishments and the MUGA, but this will largely be offset by a predicted carryforward of £73k and a more positive accurate picture will be available at the May FGB meeting.</p> <p><i>Q: Do we still buy into a staff insurance scheme?</i> <i>A: Yes, for teaching staff it is from Day 1 and for non-teaching staff from day six.</i></p> <p><i>Q: How do the supply teacher costs compare with previous years?</i> <i>A: Probably heavier than usual, but can't give an exact figure at this point, we still need more information before we plan and finalise the future budget for the next three years.</i></p>	

<p><b>GB 30/16</b></p>	<p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>That Governors thanked the SBM for a useful update and looked forward to the draft final budget and forecasts at the FGB in May 2016.</b></p> <p><b><u>Comparative statistics:</u></b></p> <p>The SBM explained that ‘benchmarking’ was the process of making a comparison between this school and others, both locally and nationally, in comparing and contrasting patterns of expenditure and income in helping the school understand their financial performance and support future resource planning.</p> <p>The Schools Financial Value Standard, (which had been approved at the last meeting), requires schools to undertake financial benchmarking to ensure available resources are used in the most efficient and effective ways. The NYCC benchmarking data report for 2015/16 is specific to the County and is helpful in comparing our school with other similar schools; in our case we chose to compare with schools with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numbers between 180 and 230 pupils</li> <li>• An attached nursery</li> <li>• Similar numbers for FSM and SEN</li> <li>• With /without an EMS unit/sparsity</li> </ul> <p><i>Q: Which schools did we compare with?</i>  <i>A: East Whitby CP school, Alverton Infant and Nursery School and Saltergate Infant School. A comparison was also made using just school numbers with a larger selection of schools-16 in total, but broadly speaking the two comparisons showed similar results.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Why are the school admin and non-teaching staff hours greater than other schools in the sample?</i>  <i>A: Because we only buy a minimum of hours of FMS time. ATA hours are more than double the average of other schools in the sample, but we have no GTA hours. If GTA and ATA hours are added together, we have less TA hours than two of the schools and more than one other school.</i></p> <p><i>Q: What do we include under education support staff?</i>  <i>A: Breakfast Club staff, Learning mentors and ATAs, we used to include these under admin staff, but this obviously skewed the reporting.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Why do we spend more on teaching staff costs per pupil?</i>  <i>A: We, as a Governing Body, made the decision that we wanted to prioritise high quality teaching in raising standards and achievement.</i></p> <p>The SBM also explained that the ‘other occupation costs’ were higher than other schools in the sample, and that this was due to costs for CCTV, which other schools might not have.</p>	<p><b>All</b></p>
----------------------------	---	-------------------

<p><b>GB 31/16</b></p>	<p><i>Q: How much a month do we pay for CCTV?</i>  <i>A: About £200, but on a positive note, it has reduced staff time and energy in combating many security issues.</i></p> <p>Some discussion took place over whether the school still benefited from the security system, but overall it was felt that there were more positives than negatives.</p> <p>The Chair asked Governors if they had undertaken training on the interpretation of comparative benchmarking data, and most had, although new Governors had not. The SBM offered to provide in house training on the data reporting and this was welcomed.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>That the SBM be thanked for a very helpful overview of the benchmarking report, and that training for new and other Governors on analysing and interpreting the data would be arranged by the SBM when she was preparing the report next year.</b></p> <p><b><u>Review of the Breakfast Club:</u></b></p> <p>Governors had requested a review of the Breakfast Club in the light of who benefited and whether the school was subsidising the service. It was noted that the service had originally been established to improve pupil attendance and achievement.</p> <p>The SBM had distributed a 'Breakfast Club research report for spring term 1'. It showed the number of sessions attended by pupils with or without food at FS1, KS1 and Reception and KS2.  <i>Q: How many Pupil Premium children?</i>  <i>A: About 20% but their attendance at nearly 50% of the Breakfast Club sessions was consistently high.</i></p> <p>Governors discussed the statistical report and it was established that the school had subsidised the service by £370.11 for this half term. The SBM had produced a detailed summary of essential staff qualification requirements and staffing ratios in order to deliver a high quality service that met statutory requirements.  <i>Q: What do other local schools charge?</i>  <i>A: It varies, but most charge above our rate. We probably need to increase the rate, even if only to break even.</i></p> <p>There was considerable discussion around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need to have additional staff on a 'call off' flexible contract to meet demand, for example Fridays always had higher numbers.</li> <li>• The need to have a policy which stated whether FS children should be included or not, bearing in mind the higher staff ratio requirements and issues of affordability.</li> </ul>	<p><b>All</b></p>
----------------------------	---	-------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The safeguarding issues if staffing levels were not appropriate, and agreement that the school should support good practice rather than just meeting statutory requirements.</li> <li>• The continuation of the catering service to provide breakfasts.</li> <li>• The level of notice that parents should be given about increases in fees, from the start of the second summer half term for September 2016.</li> <li>• The start time-whether 7am or 7.30/7.45 am, and to factor in the start time of staff.</li> <li>• The development of a 'booking in system' with non-refundable payment for the following week, in order to ensure sustainability.</li> <li>• Cases of hardship, the Head would be given the authority as to whether Pupil Premium or other funds could be used to support specific children.</li> <li>• A proposed fixed price of £2.50 a session, to be announced by the Head after the Spring Holiday and to be reviewed at the July FGB meeting.</li> <li>• A policy to outline the breakfast club service, including the new non-refundable payments and option for support from the school in cases of hardship.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>That the Head would produce a policy to explain what the Breakfast Club would offer in order to maintain a much-valued service, but with changes in the context of safeguarding and sustainability.</b></p>	<p>Head</p>
<p><b>GB</b>  <b>32/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>Update on the Access audit:</u></b></p> <p>The SBM reported that an access audit was a statutory requirement for schools to undertake every three years.</p> <p><i>Q: What is meant by an accessible school?</i>  <i>A: It is a school in which disabled pupils are able to participate fully in the school curriculum; and where the physical environment does not limit a pupil's ability to take advantage of education and other opportunities on offer. The school's key objective is therefore to reduce and eliminate, wherever possible, any barriers to access and to allow full participation in the school community for all children, and prospective pupils, with a disability.</i></p> <p>The SBM reminded Governors that the school had commissioned an external agency to carry out the audit and produce an accessibility plan with recommendations for improvement. The SBM had circulated a summary of how the recommendations on making 'reasonable adjustments' were progressing.</p> <p>It was noted that a lot of the actions were to do with signage both internally and externally.</p>	

	<p><i>Q: The planned improvements look quite costly.</i>  <i>A: Yes, but once the cost has been met the improvements will be in place for a long time, so an investment for the future as well as now.</i></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>That the SBM be thanked for a very useful update on the access audit and reassurance that the school was doing all it could to ensure accessibility for all pupils.</b></p>	<p><b>All</b></p>
<p><b>GB 33/16</b></p>	<p><b>Review and approval of policies:</b></p> <p>Governors had been previously circulated with the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Information Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Publication Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Charging and Remissions Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Maternity, Adoption and Paternity Leave Policy</b></li> </ul> <p>It was noted that NYCC guidance had been followed and Governors agreed to adopt for the 2015/16 academic year.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>That the policies be approved and adopted by the Governing Body.</b></p>	<p><b>All</b></p>
<p><b>GB 34/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>Health and Safety Update:</u></b></p> <p>The SBM reported that the HandS adviser had produced a very clear and thorough report of his visit on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2016, which identified very few actions and he had been complimentary of the school’s approach to health and safety management.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>That the SBM be thanked for her helpful update.</b></p> <p>(The SBM left the meeting at 5.40pm)</p>	<p><b>All</b></p>



<p><b>GB 36/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>An update on 'Achievement Unlocked':</u></b></p> <p>The Head circulated the Achievement Unlocked Action Plan submitted by the Head to the LA; in return NYCC has committed £3k for supply staff cover, CPD and training in order to deliver the priorities in the action plan. The milestones, and outcomes will be monitored by the LA, but there are clear objectives and evaluation questions for Governors to consider. Because the action plan had only just been approved by the LA, the Head agreed to circulate to Governors for their consideration in more depth and potential inclusion in the Governor Development Plan. HG/AO/RL/AP/GS/SN confirmed they will attend the 'Achievement Unlocked' event on the 19<sup>th</sup> April 2016.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>That the 'Achievement Unlocked' Action Plan be distributed to Governors for consideration before the 19<sup>th</sup> April event and the next FGB meeting.</b></p>	<p><b>Head/ Clerk</b></p>
<p><b>GB 37/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>Update on the Governor Development Plan:</u></b></p> <p>AO reported that the Plan would include reference to the 'School Partnership Plan' and the 'Achievement Unlocked' action plan and it was agreed that consideration of the Ofsted judgements on leadership and management should be discussed at the next FGB meeting.</p> <p>Some discussion took place on new Governor induction, and it was agreed that AO would lead a session on this after Easter. However, it would be helpful if new Governors could let AO know what they were unsure of and felt they needed to know, to make the meeting more relevant to their perceived needs. Governors were reminded to ensure that their monitoring visit forms were located in a new file in the office. DM was thanked for circulating his recent Maths monitoring visit report.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>a) That AO would provide a session on Ofsted judgements on leadership and management together with a short video at the next FGB meeting.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b>  <b>b) That AO would lead an induction session for new Governors RL,GS and SN on the 13<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at 09.30 am.</b></p>	<p><b>AO</b></p> <p><b>AO/RL/ GS/SN</b></p>

<p><b>GB 38/16</b></p>	<p><b><u>To consider and approve the following policies:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Pupil Premium Policy</li> <li>• The Equality Action Plan</li> <li>• The Equalities Scheme</li> </ul> <p>Governors had been previously circulated with the policies and after consideration they were approved and adopted. Some discussion took place on whether there should be a named linked Governor for Equalities, JB volunteered to take on that role for the Governing Body.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b> <b>a) That the policies be adopted by the Governing Body.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b> <b>b) That JB be thanked for taking on the role of linked Governor for Equalities.</b></p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p>
<p><b>PART D-OTHER BUSINESS</b></p>		
<p><b>GB 39/16</b></p>	<p>The Head wished to update Governors on the public consultation on plans for increased pupil numbers in the Garrison area. See confidential minute: GB 40/16</p>	
	<p><b>There being no further business the meeting closed at 18.30pm.</b></p> <p><b><u>The date of the next meeting is Monday April 25<sup>th</sup> 2016 at 4pm.</u></b></p> <p><b>Please send any apologies to the Clerk Pat Gale - (Copied to the Chair and Headteacher) at least 5 days before the meeting.</b></p> <p><b>Thank You.</b></p> <p><b><a href="mailto:pat.gale@northyorks.gov.uk">pat.gale@northyorks.gov.uk</a>;</b></p> <p><b>01748 825582</b> <b>07793 846 441</b></p>	