

**THE GOVERNING BODY OF SLAITHWAITE CE (VC) JUNIOR AND INFANT SCHOOL**

Minutes of the meeting of the Governing Body held at 6.30pm at the School on Tuesday, 12 July 2016.

**PRESENT**

Mrs A Parkinson (Chair), Ms N Bailey, Mrs S Bamforth (arrived 7.00pm), Dr CP Beith, Mrs E Bradley, Mrs P Cherrington, Mrs D Gledhill, Mrs D Kaye (arrived 6.50pm), Mrs CL Simpson, Mrs BCA Swift, Mr T Szoradi, Mr C West, Ms P Wood.

**In Attendance**

Ms C Stephen (Minute Clerk, arrived 6.55 pm), Miss C Wadsworth and Miss L Connolly (Left after discussion of Minute 1817)

The Governing Body Health-check and discussion of the PREVENT audit were deferred until September when a sub-committee would be set up to meet prior to the AGM.

**1811. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE, CONSENT AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs L Hayes (Consent)

Declarations of interest remained as published on the school website.

**1812. NOTIFICATION OF ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT UNDER ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The following items were notified to be brought under Any Other Business:

- Leaflet drops
- Front door

**1813. REPRESENTATION**

The following matter of representation was noted:

**Appointment**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>With Effect From</u>
Mr Christopher West	LA	03.05.2016

**1814. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 MAY 2016**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 May 2016 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**1815. MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

**1816. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES**

Mrs Bradley reported on the recent Fire Inspection which had not highlighted any major concerns.

A report regarding work scrutiny was discussed; its findings were positive.

#### 1817. FACEBOOK PAGE

Responsibility for this was to be taken by Miss Connolly and Miss Wadsworth as part of their role as IT co-ordinators which they had taken over from Miss Millward.

The Online Safety Policy was due to be reviewed in the coming months. A new Acceptable Use Policy was due out in September which would provide more stringent guidelines.

Governors discussed the setting up of a school controlled Twitter feed.

RESOLVED: That a school controlled Twitter feed be set up.

Safeguarding training regarding the dangers of social media was due to take place for staff on 20 and 27 September 2016; governors were invited to attend.

#### 1818. HEAD TEACHER'S REPORT AND GOVERNORS' QUESTIONS

The following points were highlighted:

##### (a) Staffing

New staff had been appointed to cover the lunchtime supervisors and the ETA who were leaving this year.

The documentation regarding teacher appraisals was explained to governors. The common target for all staff was to focus on Personal and Social Education, an objective which was also referred to in the School Development Plan. To facilitate this, a full day's training session would be held on 21 October 2016, focusing on the school's vision and values.

##### (b) Fair Trade

The diocese had requested that the school become a Fair Trade School.

RESOLVED: That the school would become a Fair Trade School.

#### **Mrs Kaye arrived at this point.**

##### (c) Parental Questionnaire

Responses to the recent parents' questionnaire had been very positive.

##### (d) Diocesan Roadshow

Six governors had attended this. The subject of church schools becoming academies had been discussed.

Whilst the church would prefer its Voluntary Controlled schools to be part of a church-school led Multi Academy Trust, it was not compulsory. One such church school led MAT had already been established in Kirklees, with Scissett CE (A) School as the lead, under the name Learning Accord.

Mrs Bradley questioned whether school should wait longer before making active enquiries and decisions about becoming an academy. She informed governors that Mrs Barker from MFG MAT was happy to come to speak to them regarding joining MFG, Colne Valley and Marsden Juniors. Governors suggested that a lead needed to be given by the diocese before any decision was taken.

**Q. What was the time scale for conversion?**

A. The deadline had been moved to 2022 but this had now been scrapped; however, LA resources were already being undermined and it was felt that this would only continue.

**Q. Was the school limited to looking for MAT partners in Kirklees?**

A. No.

It was felt that the school was in a position of strength as it was officially “Good”. Existing MATs would be keen to welcome it into their trust, although the school would have to put forward its case to the diocese should it want to join with an existing non-church led MAT. The diocese, however, was not in a position to veto such a move.

**Q. Was it necessary to have a secondary school in the MAT?**

A. No, though there were advantages in doing so to do with economy of scale.

**Q. What did being the lead school in a MAT actually entail? Did it confer any additional power as the management board seemed to be made up of trustees?**

A. As lead school with Aided status, the curriculum could be influenced.

It was felt that it would be good to “shop around” different academy models to find one which suited the school. The training day on 21 October 2016 discussing the school’s ethos and values could be used to decide what the school wanted from a MAT.

Ian Wildey was due to visit and would be able to make useful suggestions about where to look for suitable models of MATs. Mrs Simpson volunteered to look at local models with an emphasis on ethos.

RESOLVED: That Governors supported Mrs Bradley talking to the other two church school head teachers within the Pyramid about the subject of MATs.

Mrs Bradley invited governors to do their own research and bring their ideas to the table.

#### 1819. SCHOOL’S FUNDING FORMULA (Minute 1805 refers)

The clerk gave a summary of her understanding of this as gleaned from another meeting:

The National Funding Formula was designed to take away local differences in funding. Some area cost adjustments would be made but otherwise funding would be per pupil with higher rates of funding for those with additional needs, low prior attainment (based on the baseline assessments) and ESL. There would be a lump sum allocated for building costs.

Under the new formula, school was likely to receive less money. Kirklees would also lose the discretion to move funding around to help even out differences between schools.

Some guarantee that schools would have time to adjust to the new formula had been given but the NFF would be in force in the 2019-20 academic year.

Pupil Premium allowances were expected to continue and so it was especially important to encourage potentially eligible parents to apply. Additional funding for SEN pupils was likely to be part of the general budget.

## 1820. SATS RESULTS

### (a) EYFS

68.5% had a Good Level of Development which was judged against five criteria, all of which had to be met. This was just above the national and Kirklees average.

#### **Q. Were any of the “emerging” group classified as having SEN?**

A. Yes, especially in the area of Personal, Social and Emotional Development. Several of the children failed to achieve “Good” in only one of the five areas.

### (b) YEAR 1

88% passed their Phonics test. Only three children, one of whom had language development needs, did not succeed.

### (c) YEAR 2

Of the four who resat Phonics, two passed. The other two children had SEN.

The following percentages referred to those achieving the “Expected Level of Development” or above.

- Reading – 74%
- Writing – 62%
- Maths- 70%
- Science – 78%

Many were working at greater depth. The results had been moderated by the LA and were in line with similar schools within the authority.

### (d) YEAR 6

- Reading – 95%
- Writing – 85%
- SPaG – 95%
- Maths – 100%

These results far exceeded the national and Kirklees averages and were exceptionally pleasing.

Governors recorded their thanks and congratulations to the staff and children for their hard work and positive attitude. The benefit had been seen of investing in a

second teacher to teach Year 5 (who were in a mixed age class with Year 6) for the eleven weeks prior to the SATs.

Page 618

The combined score for Reading, Maths and Writing was 85%.

#### 1821. HEAD TEACHER'S LEADER IN EDUCATION WORK

Mrs Bradley had supplied Mrs Parkinson with a breakdown of her five days' work in this area.

She had spent two days devising a toolkit for schools with looked after children who were using the Virtual School. This would be going live initially in Kirklees, then nationally.

Three days had been spent supporting another school in the Holme Valley; she had been asked to do more next year.

This work brought money into school at the rate of £450 per day, some of which had been spent on cover. However, much of the work had been done out of school hours with no cost implications for the school.

Mrs Bradley left the meeting at this point whilst governors discussed whether any of the remaining money should be paid to her in recognition of the benefits her professional development brought to the school. When a decision had been reached, Mrs Bradley re-joined the meeting.

#### 1822. GOVERNORS' ACTION PLAN

This item was deferred until September.

#### 1823. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING

Deferred until the next meeting.

#### 1824. SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Copies of this had been circulated to governors for their perusal.

#### 1825. GOVERNOR TRAINING AND GOVERNOR VISITS

Mrs Bailey had attended an "Are we ready for Ofsted?" course. She had summarised her notes and passed them to Mrs Bradley who would bring them to the AGM in September.

Mrs Parkinson had completed the Safer Recruitment training.

Mrs Simpson and Mrs Parkinson had worked on the Parental Questionnaires.

Mrs Bailey and Dr Beith had been involved with Work Scrutiny.

#### 1826. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

##### (a) Leaflet Drops

Mrs Bradley asked governors to clarify the school's position regarding people who wanted school to distribute leaflets on their behalf. It was felt that doing so without a disclaimer implied that school endorsed the business or event being promoted which could lead to problems.

RESOLVED: That community activities or those run by companies already vetted and used by school (such as Project Sport) were the only ones that could be advertised by leaflet drops via the school.

(b) Front Door

Three quotes were needed before work could begin. One had been obtained; Mrs Bradley had been shocked at the price quoted to replace the door and install a new intercom system.

**Action: Mr West to obtain further quotes for this work.**

1827. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

RESOLVED: (i) That the next meeting of the Governing Body be held at 6.00 pm at the School on Tuesday, 27 September 2016.

(ii) That other meetings be held at the School as follows:

Staffing Committee: - Wednesday, 14 September at 2.30 pm

Self-Review and Governors' Action Plan: - Tuesday, 20 September at 2.00 pm

Safeguarding training: - Tuesday, 20 September and Tuesday, 27 September 3.45 pm - 5.30 pm - Governors welcome

Two Gates Supporters Cheese and Wine: - Thursday, 22 September at 7.00 pm – Governors welcome to attend.

1828. AGENDA, MINUTES AND RELATED PAPERS – SCHOOL COPY

RESOLVED: That no part of these minutes, agenda or related papers be excluded from the copy to be made available at the School, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

## **THE GOVERNING BODY OF SLAITHWAITE CE (VC) JUNIOR AND INFANT SCHOOL**

Minutes of the meeting of the Governing Body held at 7.00 pm at the School on Tuesday, 3 May 2016.

### PRESENT

Mrs A Parkinson (Chair), Ms N Bailey, Mrs S Bamforth (arrived at 7.00pm, as per the normal start time of the meeting), Dr CP Beith, Mrs E Bradley, Mrs P Cherrington, Mrs D Gledhill, Mrs D Kaye, Mrs CL Simpson, Mrs BCA Swift, Mr T Szoradi, Mr C West, Ms P Wood.

### In Attendance

Ms C Stephen (Minute Clerk)

The published agenda had been changed and this section of the meeting had taken place earlier in order to accommodate a talk from Collaboratives about the Government's proposals to force all schools to become academies by 2022 at the latest.

### 1798. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE, CONSENT AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs L Hayes (Consent).

The declarations of interest remained as published on the School website.

### 1799. NOTIFICATION OF ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT UNDER ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The following items were notified to be brought under Any Other Business:

- Diocesan Roadshow about academies.
- Parental Questionnaires.
- Informative talk from Collaboratives regarding the proposal to ensure all schools were converted to academy status by 2022.

### 1800. REPRESENTATION

The following matter of representation was noted:

#### Appointment

<u>Name</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>With Effect From</u>
Mr C West	LA Governor	03.05.2016

### 1801. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2016 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### 1802. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

1803. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Staffing Committee

The caretaker had resigned and would be leaving the post on 20 May 2016. A temporary replacement had been organised.

Two posts had been advertised, one for a one-year contract for an Educational Teaching Assistant and one for a Senior Lunchtime Supervisor.

1804. HEAD TEACHER'S REPORT AND GOVERNORS' QUESTIONS.

This item was deferred until the next meeting.

1805. SCHOOL'S FUNDING FORMULA

This item was deferred.

1806. SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Governors had examined the SEF in a meeting held immediately before the meeting of the full Governing Body.

1807. GOVERNOR TRAINING AND GOVERNOR VISITS

This item was deferred until the next meeting.

1808. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Diocesan Roadshow

Booking forms were available for the Diocesan Roadshow about church schools obtaining academy status.

(b) Parental Questionnaires

The parents' questionnaires had been completed and returned. Mrs Parkinson, Mrs Simpson and Mrs Bradley would review them and collate the findings on 18 May 2016 at 9.00 am.

(c) Talk by Collaboratives

School staff were in attendance for this section of the meeting. Mrs Bamforth arrived at this point.

Julie Bowdidge and Helen Butler (Collaboratives) introduced themselves and invited questions both throughout their presentation and at its end. They distributed hand-outs of the PowerPoint presentation they were about to make. The main points were as follows:

- The government's education strategy was explained. Regional School Commissioners would be appointed in lieu of the LA and would have powers to deal with "coasting" and underperforming schools in their area.
- Finances would be tight. The "key words" for the next few years were Autonomy, Austerity and Accountability. The aim was to facilitate

“Educational excellence everywhere” by forcing schools to have begun to convert to academy status by 2020.

Page 611

- The latest Education and Adoption Act (2016) gave the Secretary of State more power to intervene to force both “coasting” and underperforming schools to become academies.
- Free Schools were academies under another name and could be run by businesses, parents or charities.
- The majority of schools would become part of Multi Academy Trusts (MATs) made up of 10-15 separate schools. Smaller MATs could be set up but eventually would need to join with others to provide services with greater economy of scale.

**Q. Would one Head Teacher be responsible for all the schools?**

A. No, each school would have its own head.

- The responsibility for facilitating school improvement would be removed from Local Authority control; this would include CPD, NQT Induction etc. which would be bought in by the Trust. Mrs Bradley commented that this was already possible (and indeed happening), despite still being an LA school. The school was part of the Teaching Schools Alliance based at Moor End Academy.

**Q. Would the Local Authority have any role in the overall planning of future education as it would have knowledge of the Local Plan and be aware of potential demand for school places?**

A. Collaboratives were unsure.

- Underperforming schools within an Academy Trust could be moved to a different MAT. There would be an obligation that a MAT should be led by a “high performance” school and be obliged to include an under-performing one in order to bring about an improvement. The DfE would publish performance tables of MATs for the first time.
- Governance would change with governors being responsible for the MAT, not just their own school. There would be two levels of governance: a Board of Trustees would ultimately be responsible for all the schools in the trust while each school would maintain a board of governors with reduced responsibilities. Some governors would become trustees of the MAT Governing Body whilst others would continue to be governors of the individual school with powers delegated to them by the trustees of the MAT. The possibility of payment for the Chair of the MAT Board of Trustees had been raised.
- The focus of Ofsted inspections would shift from the quality of teaching and learning (as seen on their visit) to the overall outcomes for the pupils.
- Regional Schools’ Commissioners would be appointed – Vicky Beer would be responsible for Lancashire and West Yorkshire. Her responsibilities were outlined.
- The possible problems of not being part of a MAT in the current political climate included becoming isolated, competing rather than collaborating with other schools, coasting and the possibility of the gap between the best and worst schools growing ever wider.
- Collaboration was felt to be the way forward but it was pointed out that this already happened in many areas without the need for a formal framework.
- Collaboratives next outlined what an academy was and the opportunities and risks that converting to one would bring, including the possibility of increased funding and greater freedom to make a difference as well as the reduction of responsibility for the Governing Body of an individual school;

there would be fewer responsibilities delegated to schools that were under-performing from the Board of Trustees that would govern the MAT as a

Page 612

whole.

- Collaboratives explained that Multi Academy Chains were groups of schools supported by the same sponsor or trust. The opportunities and risks associated with this were detailed.
- A MAT was a single legal entity, governed by a Board. Governors would represent the MAT rather than an individual school. Funding would be by agreement with the DfE and would be the responsibility of the main Board with perhaps a percentage being devolved to an individual school. There was no fixed model for setting up a MAT Board but often it was made up of representatives from each school's Governing Body with a Chief Executive at its head.

**Q. Was the Regional Schools' Commissioner not responsible for how Boards were set up?**

A. No. There was a framework available but it was open to interpretation.

Governors expressed concern that what was essentially a business model was being imposed on schools without the legal framework that went with it that companies had to comply with. Amongst the risks was the possibility that there would be a lack of synergy between the schools in the trust.

**Q. Could schools be closed?**

A. There would be an obligation to provide places within education so this would be unlikely.

- Church schools were in a different position as the Church of England had agreed with the DfE that it would become the sponsor for its schools within a MAT. The Christian foundation of the schools would be maintained and could possibly be so by becoming the lead school in a MAT; any secular school which joined such a MAT would have to accept the same principles even though it did not need to become a church school. It was advisable that a church school should join a MAT led by another church school or by itself.

**Q. What would happen if a school became an academy but did not join a trust?**

A. It could choose to move from the LA to church control.

**Q. Would Free Schools be able to remain as single entities or would they be encouraged to join with others?**

A. This was not known. The government had said that they would not push existing single academies to join a Multi-Academy Trust (MAT) *if* their standards were good.

- The process of becoming an academy would be supported by a key worker. The Financial Academies Handbook was a key document that needed to be understood and followed. A grant of £25k was available to assist schools in meeting additional costs associated with the transition. Some schools had appointed a project Manager to deal with the transition process as it was unrealistic to expect people in already demanding jobs to manage this as well.
- Collaboratives' advice to schools was listed, including the benefits of setting up a new MAT where the ethos and philosophy of the Trust could be defined by the schools involved. They emphasised that ultimately, the best

- Q. Whilst a U-turn from the government about forcing all schools to become academies was not expected, was there any area where Collaboratives thought there might be some leeway given?**
- A. Timescales could be a logistical nightmare with so many schools having to pursue the same goals at the same time. In the long run, having bigger MATs (the government was recommending 10- 15 schools as the average size) would make it easier and cheaper for the government to run as there would be fewer institutions to deal with.

Governors and staff thanked Collaboratives for their informative talk.

1809. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED: That the next meeting of the Governing Body be held at 7.00 pm at the School on Tuesday, 12 July 2016, preceded by a Governing Body Health Check and Action Plan meeting at 6.00 pm.

1810. AGENDA, MINUTES AND RELATED PAPERS – SCHOOL COPY

RESOLVED: That no part of these minutes, agenda or related papers be excluded from the copy to be made available at the School, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.