

Oswald Road School

Governing Body Meeting Minutes

| | |
|---|--|
| Quorum: 6 (met at this meeting) | Approved as a true and accurate record. |
| Chair: Peter Martin | Name..... |
| Date of meeting: 21 March 2022 | Date..... |
| Venue: via Zoom Video Conference | Chair of Committee / Governing Body |

Attendees

| Name | Governor Designation | Term of Office End Date | Present – P Apologies – Ap Absent - A |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Peter Martin | Co-Opted (Chair) | 27/06/25 | P |
| Ali Ayub (AA) | Co-Opted | 04/01/24 | P |
| Deborah Howard | Staff (HT) | N/A | P |
| Ellen Martinez (EM) | Parent | 18/12/24 | P |
| Yogita Patel (YP) | Co-Opted | 21/09/24 | P |
| Tom Sumner (TS) | Co-Opted | 22/09/23 | P |
| Zainab Suleman (ZS) | Parent | 18/12/24 | P |
| | | | |
| Scott Davenport | Co-Opted | 17/06/22 | Ap |
| Joanna Dennis | Co-Opted | 31/08/25 | Ap |
| Eve Holt | Local Authority | 25/03/23 | Ap |
| Ellie Linton | Staff | 21/09/24 | Ap |
| Carole Wigzell | Co-Opted | 27/06/25 | |

| Also Present | Role |
|---------------------|---|
| Helen Woolf | Deputy Headteacher (DHT) & Special Educational Needs and Disability Coordinator (SENDSCO) |
| Gerard McCoy | Clerk - AGM Clerking and Administration Service |

Agenda Items

| Item | Apologies, Introductions and Welcome |
|--|---|
| 1 | |
| The Governing Body noted that apologies for non-attendance were submitted by Scott Davenport, Joanna Dennis, Eve Holt and Ellie Linton – who was currently on maternity leave. | |

| | | |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| There were no further issues raised and the Governing Body agreed to accept the submitted apologies. | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept submitted apologies. | Governing Body | |

| | | |
|--|---|-------------|
| Item 2 | Declaration of Pecuniary Interests | |
| There were no declarations of pecuniary interests in relation to any of the items on the current agenda. | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| Item 3 | Minutes of the Previous Meeting and Matters Arising (30.11.21) | |
| <p>The Chair presented the minutes in relation to the previous meeting which had been circulated in advance. In the process of reviewing the document there were no amendments / corrections identified.</p> <p>Governors approved the document as a true record of the meeting and a signed copy of the document was retained on record.</p> <p>Matters Arising. Page 3: Item 3 – DBS Checks (AA). AA confirmed that he had completed this action.</p> <p>Page 3: Item 3 – Complete SFVS skills matrices. The Clerk confirmed that the individual skills matrices had been completed and collated.</p> <p>Page 3: Item 3 – Complete Governor Documents. The Clerk confirmed that all Governors had completed the required documents.</p> | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – minutes of previous meeting (30.11.21) as true record. | Governing Body | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Item 4 | Headteacher's Update | |
| <p>The Headteacher presented her report which had been circulated prior to the meeting. In addition, Helen Woolf the DHT and SENDCO was introduced to Governors. It was appreciated that the SENDCO would also present a report related to SEND provision. During these presentations, the following points were noted in discussion by Governors.</p> <p>School Context. Governors noted the school context as per the Headteacher's report and recognised that there were 653 pupils on the school roll currently. The gender split for the school was almost 50:50 and the school was close to the national average for pupils designated as English as an additional language (EAL), pupils designated as special educational needs and disability (SEND) and those pupils with an educational health care plan (EHCP).</p> <p>The Headteacher highlighted the breakdown of the contextual data in relation to the different year groups. It was appreciated that this provided additional information</p> | | |

that was cohort specific – including where there was a predominance of summer born children, such as Reception, Year 2, and Year 4.

Q. There was an increase in pupils on the school roll?

A. Yes, and the school monitored pupil numbers especially those leaving to join other schools. There was no significant area of concern as the main rationale for those leaving was the families had moved out of the area.

The Headteacher advised that the main area for concern had been Nursery numbers for the new academic year (2022-2023). There was a trend in the area with a dip in Nursery numbers and the school had provided an 'open-afternoon' (in addition to an already extensive programme of school visits for prospective nursery and reception children) for prospective families. The promotional exercise worked well as the number of applicants had increased – the Nursery was now 'full' and there were a further six children on the current waiting list.

Staffing.

The Headteacher provided a summary of the current staffing across the school and the allocation of staffing for the different year groups. This included the staff to support interventions for the children.

Governors noted the long-term absence related to a member of the Nursery staff team – although the remaining teachers were experienced and the Nursery provision worked well. In addition, the school had secured staff to cover absence and any leave. The school used cover supervisors (supported by the recent re-model) and had also secured another teacher during that recruitment cycle who would be taking a Year 1 class when the member of staff leaves. A current part time Reception teacher was extending hours to full time to take an upcoming maternity leave in reception and school had secured a part time EYFS teacher to cover a member of staff who left at Christmas due to relocating. One member of the Year 2 team was due to start maternity leave at Easter. The school had already secured supply staff cover, utilising an individual who had previously worked with the school and was very experienced. The Headteacher noted she was clear on recruitment needed for the next academic year.

Q. There was a long-term sickness absence in Year 6?

A. Yes – this individual had returned to work recently.

The Headteacher confirmed there was still ongoing pressure on the wider staff team due to sickness absences – these were still linked to positive Covid-19 tests. This had also impacted on the allocation of staffing.

Q. Were there many instances of long-Covid-19?

A. There was one individual from the teaching staff with long-Covid-19- and one member of the lunchtime organisers (LO).

Q. How did the school manage this situation with the individuals returning?

A. The school followed the protocols in the policies and documents. The school offered a phased return to work option, occupational health referrals and reasonable adjustments.

The Headteacher confirmed that once an individual had completed the required period of isolation then the traditional absence management protocols applied. The school always attempted to apply a supportive approach to attendance – this

included one individual who had requested a part-time contract going forward on a short-term basis as requested.

The Headteacher highlighted teaching assistant (TA) staff allocated to the different year groups. It was appreciated that a designated TA was allocated to provide 1:1 support for a high-needs child in Year 6. In addition, there were extra TA staff allocated across the school to support the delivery of the target learning model (TLM). The Headteacher noted that school had stayed true to its promise that TLM1 classes remain staffed by a teacher and a TA and this has remained in place – even when cover situations have been very difficult.

The SENDCO confirmed that the school had been faced with a serious recruitment challenge for TA staff, but especially SEND TA staff. The most recent advertisements had resulted in a low number of applicants and these were without any previous SEND support experience. It was appreciated that where the school had recruited TA staff for SEND roles there was a need to raise their skill sets with a considerable amount of training.

Q. The situation was getting worse?

A. Yes – the school predicted that by the end of the current academic year there would be 20 pupils with an education health care plan (EHCP) who would also require designated 1:1 support. These would be children with complex needs and who required a high level of support.

Q. Was this an issue only for the school or was it a wider issue?

A. It was certainly an issue across the Manchester City Council (MCC) area. It was not clear if this was a post-pandemic issue, however it has notably become a more worrying picture.

Q. Was supply staff an option?

A. Yes – although the lack of experienced SEND TA staff would also involve agency supply staff and there were additional costs associated with supply staff in general. In addition, one of the main challenges for SEND children was consistency – supply staffing was not as consistent as a permanent member of staff.

Q. How feasible was it to train the current potential candidates?

A. There was a basic requirement for maths and English as a minimal, but this was not always available.

The SENDCO confirmed the school could provide training, but some of the interventions were quite complex and experience in the role was a prerequisite. The school did provide a good level of continuous professional development (CPD).

Governors considered the recruitment process and the advertisements used by the school. It was recognised that following the pandemic people were more conscious of flexibility in their working environment – the advertisements might not attract the right candidates. It was highlighted that the school was flexible and did monitor supply staff who might then be amenable to convert to a permanent contract. However, it was noted that the agency expected to levy a 'finders-fee' in these circumstances.

The SENDCO explained that the SEND TA role was very demanding on any individual and this may also be a significant aspect in peoples' consideration before applying for such a role. In addition, the school was investigating where the advertisements were

placed – the school may need to advertise differently to secure more / better candidates.

Q. Was there an issue with job-sharing?

A. The school would explore that as an option, but it would be considered in relation to the context of the individual class and the pupils involved. The school also considered the individual staff involved.

Q. Was there capacity to upskill the standard TA staff to provide SEND cover and recruit standard TA staff?

A. This was something that the school did already – the SEND aspect was not a contractual issue and the school allocated TA staff to the best use of the school to deliver provision for all pupils.

Q. The cleaning staff were highlighted in the report?

A. Yes – this was an issue addressed at the previous resources Committee meeting. The school was investigating terminating the agreement with the current cleaning contractor and bringing the service back in-house.

Governors noted the respective school leads for the different subject areas. These had remained constant in general; there were a few minor changes to roles / responsibilities. In addition, there were no changes to the SIP plans and areas of responsibility.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD).

The Headteacher provided Governors with a summary of the CPD accessed by staff across the school to support teaching and learning and especially focused on the areas of development to support the pupils. It was recognised that this budget area had increased from the previous financial year.

Governors noted the extensive nature of the CPD opportunities and the feedback from staff was positive.

Q. Had the trauma informed training started?

A. That was scheduled for the latter part of May 2022.

The Headteacher explained that this was targeted at all staff and not a restricted selection of staff.

Compliments.

Governors noted and responded positively to the number and range of compliments – it was appreciated that this was a selection of those received by the school.

Q. What was the position in relation to complaints / concerns received?

A. These were recorded and monitored by the school. School keeps a 'Stakeholder Management Plan' which keeps complaints, concerns, compliments and any FOIs or SARs centrally.

Q. Had the school maintained the gate procedures introduced during the pandemic?

A. Yes – this was a change that had worked well for the school staff, the pupils and the parents. It had played a part in further developing parent / staff relationships and interactions.

Q. When was the next parents' evening scheduled?

A. This was going to be the Autumn Term for the 2022-2023 academic year although there would be a Year 6 leavers event to schedule too, depending on the pandemic developments.

The Headteacher confirmed there were no formal complaints and no specific trend associated with any concerns raised. The school had continued to address any concerns raised in line with current policies and procedures.

Monitoring Activities.

The Headteacher highlighted the ongoing monitoring activities, these were carried out by members of the senior leadership team (SLT) and phase leaders. It was noted that the monitoring included lesson drop-ins, workbook scrutiny exercises and accessing pupil voice. It was appreciated that the monitoring followed a similar format expected in the event of an Ofsted inspection. The current focus was discussions with pupils to talk about what they remember from previous units – 'knowing more / remembering more' from previous lessons. This was a matter of retained knowledge.

School Improvement Plan (SIP).

The Headteacher confirmed that the updated draft of the SIP had been attached to the report and circulated for Governors' consideration.

Governors noted that all areas were progressing in line with action plans. The link Governor roles were in place with regular updates from the respective SIP leads and where possible opportunities for link Governors to meet with their designated SIP lead. The SIP leads maintained their focus as there were scheduled review points built into the action plans.

There were no issues raised in relation to the updated SIP report and it was approved by Governors.

Attendance.

The Headteacher confirmed that the current attendance data was the worst it had been for many years. It was highlighted that:

Overall attendance - 93.84%

Disadvantaged pupils / Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) eligible pupils - 91.7%

English as an additional language (EAL) - 93.16%

Children designated as in-care - 95.37%

SEND - 93.26%

The Headteacher emphasised that the data reflected the impact of positive Covid-19 cases during Spring Term I. The issue was exacerbated by the change in how attendance was now recorded – previously it was designated as an 'X' which did not impact on attendance data. Now it was recorded as an 'I' directly impacted on the attendance data for the individual pupil concerned and the school.

The Headteacher provided a summary of the rigorous process and procedures adopted by the school when addressing attendance concerns – this included a child-by-child understanding of cases. In addition, the school scheduled and completed parent / carer meetings with opportunities for support where appropriate.

Q. Was it specific families?

A. Yes – there were specific families with patterns of absence. The school continued to provide support where necessary and ensured there was a consistent and rigorous approach applied.

Behaviour and Safety.

The Headteacher advised that pupils' behaviour had been very good since the start of the academic year and had continued so through to the current term. The school generated the report on a termly basis – the next report was scheduled for the end of Spring term II.

Governors noted that the main group represented in the data was the boys' cohort. Although there were no major concerns as the incidents were all low-level issues and the most recent issue was the movement of pupils in the corridors which had been addressed with support through assemblies.

Q. Did the school consider that it understood the boys' needs?

A. The picture from previous reports was similar and it was something the school would analyse further to determine if there was something missing that the school could do to better support the boys' cohort.

The Headteacher confirmed that the school would consider the current provision and supervision of activities – especially during the lunchtime breaks. It was important to take on board pupil voice, improve engagement with the children and consider how the staff address conflict management.

Q. Did the 'reflections' approach continue to be effective?

A. Yes – there were some specific children where this was seen as not having the desired impact. The school then adopted a more personalised approach for these individual children.

Governors considered that the main issues had related to communications and relationships and that these were related to the disruption experienced by the pupils – especially the Year 5 and Year 6 cohorts. The friendship groups and class groups had not had the chance to grow and develop together as much as their peers had done in previous years. It was recognised that the Year 6 cohort was ready to transition to high school.

The Headteacher confirmed that there were some issues associated with the Year 1 cohort (behaviours that are felt to be directly an outcome of missed time in school during the pandemic) and one of the Reception classes. The latter issue would be addressed with a re-allocation of pupils across the three classes to provide an improved mix of children. In relation to the Year 6 there were some concerns with increased incidents of unkindness which was monitored.

Q. The behaviour data indicated a high proportion of incidents with SEND children?

A. Yes – 16% of the reflections related to the SEND cohort.

The SENDCO indicated that this reflected the increased use of agency supply staff by the school and this meant a degree of inconsistency in approach / people. Despite the best induction processes the SEND children reacted less well to changes in staffing.

Appraisal procedures Linked to School Improvement.

The Headteacher highlighted there was nothing new to report in this section. The mid-term reviews had been completed for all relevant staff.

Leadership and Management.

The Headteacher confirmed that Covid-19 guidance and issues still dominated the management time of the school. However, the school continued to develop the curriculum with the subject leads who were supported with CPD as discussed above. The school considered that the process was developing well and the depth of subject knowledge had improved.

Governors noted that the Early Years (EY) lead had worked with Adrian Guy to consider how to develop the EY curriculum planning from its current point. It was appreciated that this represented a considerable piece of work and was likely to dominate the remainder of the current academic year and some of the next academic year too. However, the respective subject leads had developed (or were in the process of developing) their understanding of EYFS reforms and were implementing appropriate changes for their individual subject areas.

The Headteacher confirmed that the current SLT model was working well and had proven to be effective.

Extra-Curricular Activities.

Governors noted the range of extra-curricular activities provided by the school. This included activities for all year groups and genders with activities such as a drama club, a French club, a Spanish club, a creative writing club and skateboarding.

Q. Was there scope for more clubs during lunchtime?

A. This was still a matter of discussion with the SLT and it was appreciated that there was a greater strain on staffing to maintain this especially with sickness absence challenges.

The Headteacher confirmed that the option to consider 'play-leader' roles would be part of the discussions with the SLT in relation to this issue.

Ofsted Questions.

Governors noted the Ofsted questions document that had been circulated prior to the meeting. The document was intended for information purposes. However, there was scope for a presentation / training session for Governors to better prepare individuals for the experience.

Governors noted that this issue would be addressed as a pre-meeting training session to be completed half an hour before the main meeting.

There were no further issues raised or noted in discussion and Governors agreed to accept the Headteacher's update into the record of the meeting.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|---|--------------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved – updated SIP report. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action – complete further analysis of behaviour related to boys' cohort. | HT | March 2022 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action – Ofsted questions to be pre-meeting training session half hour before main meeting. | HT / Chair / Clerk | June 2022 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept Headteacher's update into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |

| Item 5 | Covid-19 Update | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| <p>The Headteacher presented an oral report in relation to Covid-19 issues which were current. The updated Covid-19 plan and risk assessment had been circulated prior to the meeting – it was available in the Governors’ Google Drive folder.</p> <p>The Headteacher explained that the document had been updated inline with the changes issued by central government and supported by guidance from MCC. This included the Outbreak Plan.</p> <p>Q. Was the school aware of how many cases there were? A. Yes – the families were consistent in reporting cases and keeping their children off school if they had Covid-19 symptoms.</p> <p>The Headteacher explained the changes to the Outbreak Plan related to an increase in the number of cases – this was a recognition that the trigger was a ‘rapid rising number of cases’ rather than the specific 10% adopted previously. The school would address the increase with improved ventilation, hygiene practices, enhanced cleaning and face coverings.</p> <p>Q. What was the approach for a wider outbreak across the school? A. The school would follow any specific Public Health (PH) guidance that would be shared with the school at that time and the Outbreak Plan reflected the current generic or standard guidance.</p> <p>There were no issues raised in relation to the Outbreak Plan and this was approved by Governors.</p> <p>Governors noted that the other aspects of the Covid-19 report had been raised as per the Headteacher’s report above.</p> <p>There were no additional points raised or noted in discussion and Governors agreed to accept the Covid-19 report into the record of the meeting.</p> | | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | | Owner | Date |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved – Outbreak Plan. | | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – accept Covid-19 report into record of meeting. | | Governing Body | |

| Item 6 | Committee Reports | |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Governors noted the following minutes and supporting documents related to the various committee meetings. The supporting documents and minutes had been circulated prior to the meeting and the following points were noted in discussion.</p> <p>Resources Committee – 24.01.22 The Chair of the Resources Committee, Ali Ayub (AA), presented the minutes and associated report for consideration by Governors and the following points were noted in discussion.</p> <p>Period 9 Budget Monitoring. Governors noted the Committee had reviewed, considered and approved the Period 9 budget monitoring report. It was appreciated that the supporting documents to the Period 9 budget monitoring had been circulated to all Governors prior to the meeting.</p> | | |

In addition, the updated 3-5-year budget plan had been circulated – this too had been reviewed, considered and approved by the Committee.

There were no issues raised in relation to the Period 9 budget monitoring and this was ratified by Governors.

3-5-Year Budget Plan.

There were no issues raised in relation to the updated 3-5-year budget plan and this was ratified by Governors.

SFVS Self-Assessment Document.

Governors noted that the Committee had reviewed and approved the SFVS self-assessment document. In addition, the Committee had reviewed the dashboard and benchmarking report card.

There were no issues raised and Governors ratified the SFVS self-assessment document.

Field of Os.

Governors noted that there were ongoing discussions related to the Field of Os. The repairs to the fence would be completed when potential contractors had been sourced. Although there were some challenges related to this project. In addition, the Committee had noted the school would defer any decision on plans for future utilisation of the site.

Health and Safety (H&S).

Governors noted that the Committee had considered a H&S report and there were no significant areas of concern. It was appreciated that the roof remained a challenging project and the school had action plans to address the general repairs and maintenance issues identified. The school was subject to an MCC H&S audit – this had been deferred until April 2022.

Cleaning Contract.

Governors considered the discussions and decision to bring the cleaning contract in-house. It was recognised that the process would have some additional benefits for the school and this was supported by the Governing Body – the decision was ratified by Governors.

Q. Was there any additional budget challenge related to the potential increase in energy costs?

A. Yes – this was built into the revised / updated 3-5-year budget plan which had contingencies built-in.

There were no further points raised or noted in discussion and Governors agreed to accept the minutes and report into the record of the meeting.

Teaching and Learning (T&L) Committee – 31.01.22.

As Scott Davenport (SD), Chair of the T&L Committee, was not available the Headteacher presented the minutes and report associated with the previous meeting and the following points were noted in discussion by Governors.

Staffing Challenges.

Governors noted that the Committee had considered and reviewed the ongoing challenges associated with finding and securing agency supply staff to balance the sickness absences related to substantive staff. It was appreciated that as per the

discussions above this had a financial impact on the school, but also impacted on maintaining consistency which affected outcomes for pupils and in many instances pupils' behaviours.

Disadvantaged Pupils.

The Headteacher emphasised the Committee discussions associated with the disadvantaged pupils / PPG eligible pupils and their attainment. In addition, the Committee considered the wider attainment outcomes. This had led to a focus on the Year 4 cohort. It was determined that the Committee would have a standing agenda item to support the focus on this year group.

Targeted Learning Model (TLM).

Governors recognised that the presentation delivered by Richard Farrow (RF) in relation to the TLM. It was appreciated that the project had been successful and well received in general. The discussions considered how the project could be maintained going forward - it was agreed by the Committee that this should be adopted by the school whilst it was having the desired impact.

The Headteacher confirmed that she was scheduled to meet with Liam Trippier, a former Governor and Quality Assurance (QA) lead after easter to discuss the project further. The decision would take into consideration parental voice.

Q. The impact of the TLM had been important for the children in the SEND cohort?
A. Yes.

The SENDCO confirmed that the impact was significant for the SEND cohort – initial thoughts were that there was an error. However, reassessment confirmed the data – the progress was better than any previous data in the past decade. In addition, the pupil voice was very positive – the children were more confident in relation to their learning, they had a better understanding of what they did / did not know and they were very happy. These pupils experienced smaller group lessons which were more attuned to their specific needs - where extra staff were available to provide support. The children in this environment were more confident to raise their hands and ask questions, they felt they would not be 'judged.'

The SENDCO highlighted the interest in the TLM model expressed by the school's educational psychologist (EP) – the success was seen as something that should be shared more widely. However, there were time constraints currently. The EP had helped to verify the successful progress of these children.

Q. Had the school identified any pitfalls with the TLM project?

A. The main danger would be 'burnout' of the teachers involved in delivering TLM1. The work loads and work rate required was substantial for the staff. The school planned further discussions with these teachers in readiness for the next academic year. The school had instigated welfare measures to support these individuals now, but if the school intended to carry the project forward these may need to be adjusted.

The Headteacher confirmed that the approach to parents would be based on a parent forum and letter and supported by the teachers involved in TLM1 and TLM2 with specific data and feedback. The school would be open to questions and the pre-meeting with Liam Trippier would be designed to prepare the school in advance for this process, allowing further rigorous review of the system in place.

There were no further points raised or noted in discussion and Governors agreed to accept the T&L Committee minutes and report into the record of the meeting.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified – Period 9 budget monitoring report. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified – updated 3–5-year budget plan. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified – SFVS self-assessment document. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified – decision to take cleaning contract in-house. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – accept Resources Committee and report and minutes (24.01.22) into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – accept T&L Committee minutes (31.01.22) and report into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |

| Item 7 | 2022-2023 Budget Preparation | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| <p>Governors noted that this matter was planned as a follow-up to the budget preparation meeting scheduled before the Governing body meeting. However, it was appreciated that this had been deferred due to the paternity leave of the School Business Manager (SBM). It was appreciated that the issue would initially be addressed at the next scheduled meeting of the Resources Committee and then submitted to the next Governing body meeting for ratification.</p> | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action – 2022-2023 budget and preparation to be agenda item next Resources Committee meeting. | HT / Chair / Clerk | May 2022 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action ratification of 2022-2023 budget to be agenda item next Governing Body meeting. | HT / Chair / Clerk | June 2022 |

| Item 8 | Behaviour and Safety of Pupils / Safeguarding | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Governor Safeguarding Visit 14.02.22. Yogita Patel (YP) the Governor linked to safeguarding presented a summary of her most recent safeguarding link meeting held via Zoom in February 2022. The report was supported by a briefing note circulated prior to the meeting and the following points were considered by Governors.</p> <p>YP confirmed that the meeting was positive and productive – the report highlighted the excellent work of the safeguarding team as a whole and the leadership provided by Donna Wealleans (DW). The main area of concern going forward for the school and Governing Body was succession planning to allow for sickness absence issues and in the event that DW would eventually seek to further her career – perhaps at another school. In addition, YP highlighted the potential need for external supervision support. It was appreciated that the school provided a good internal / peer network for support, but not having impartial support was a concern. It was also highlighted that there was no external support for the Headteacher – there may be a need for an ‘outlet.’ Governors were pleased to hear this was now in place for both the Safeguarding / Pastoral team and the SEND team.</p> | | |

Governors noted the increased and increasing demands on the safeguarding team as numbers increase. There was a waiting list which DW was managing by securing extra time from the school counsellor, but it was unlikely that the school could reduce the waiting list effectively. Although the support provided was excellent there was simply not the capacity available. It did raise the question as to whether there was scope to increase capacity – within current budget restrictions. Governors recognised the potential further increase in demands for a range of provision.

The Headteacher and SENDCO highlighted that this had also been an ongoing discussion around the SENDCo role between themselves and with the teaching staff – there was a general reluctance from other teachers to take-on the role. It was confirmed that the role could only be adopted by a qualified teacher. The Headteacher confirmed that the school could review the current offer and build into the process the succession planning process – this would be a longer-term project and included in role advertisements going forward.

Governors noted that the role was constant and demanding of a teacher and that to take on the additional responsibility was a significant step. The role also involved a huge amount of administrative paperwork which was not an attractive proposition considering the current workloads for teachers.

Q. Were the early careers teacher (ECT) exposed to this area of the role?

A. No – the training was more focused on core teaching activities / skills. It was only after initial qualification that teachers could really be exposed to the SENDCO role. The Headteacher confirmed the role would be best placed with a teacher with more experience.

Governors noted that it could be that incoming teachers had a fear of the unknown in relation to the SENDCO role with the extensive paperwork commitment. This was potentially a huge 'step' for a teacher recently qualified – the school had more than 100 pupils in the SEND register and links with a wide range of multi-agencies.

Governors noted the elements of the Headteacher's report which also addressed matters for consideration under this item.

There were no further points raised and Governors agreed to accept the safeguarding visits report into the record of the meeting.

There were no further points raised and Governors agreed to accept the behaviour and safety of pupils / safeguarding report into the record of the meeting.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept safeguarding visits report into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept behaviour, safety of pupils and safeguarding report into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |

| Item 9 | Policies / Documents for Review and Approval |
|---------------|---|
| | The Headteacher presented a series of policies and documents which had been circulated prior to the meeting. In addition, the policies were supported by a briefing note provided by the Headteacher, this highlighted the main changes to the individual policies. |

Attendance Management Policy.

Governors noted that the Attendance Management Policy was a model document provided by One Education. The document would have been presented to union representatives prior to publication by One Education and would have been subject to minor amendments as it was tailored to align with the school's specific needs.

There were no issues raised with the document and it was approved by Governors.

Bereavement Policy.

Governors noted there were no changes to this document it had simply been reviewed. There were no issues raised with the document and it was approved by Governors.

Disciplinary / Dismissal Policy.

Governors noted that the Disciplinary / Dismissal Policy was a model document provided by One Education. The document would have been presented to union representatives prior to publication by One Education and would have been subject to minor amendments as it was tailored to align with the school's specific needs.

The Headteacher highlighted the sections 3.21,3.22 and 3.23 which represented school specific additions to the document and reflected feedback that had previously been approved by governors.

There were no issues raised with the document and it was approved by Governors.

Outbreak Management Plan.

Governors noted that this document had been addressed above – see Item 5.

Safer Recruitment Policy.

The Headteacher confirmed that this document was currently for information purposes. The Policy had been approved previously with the proviso that minor amendments would be made – these were completed.

In addition, Governors noted and ratified the following documents which had been approved by the committees:

- SEND Policy
- Nursery Admissions Policy
- Equality Policy

The Headteacher reiterated that the current document had been approved by the Resources Committee, but there was some additional work to complete to finalise the document. This would be completed during the Easter break and re-presented at the next schooled meeting of the Resources Committee – May 2022.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| • Approved - Attendance Management Policy. | Governing Body | |
| • Approved - Bereavement Policy. | Governing Body | |
| • Approved - Disciplinary / Dismissal Policy. | Governing Body | |
| • Ratified - SEND Policy. | Governing Body | |

| | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - Nursery Admissions Policy. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - Equality Policy. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action – revised Equality Policy to be agenda item next scheduled Resources Committee meeting. | HT / Chair / Clerk | May 2022 |

| | | |
|---|--------------------|-------------|
| Item 10 | GDPR Report | |
| <p>Governors noted that the GDPR report had been reviewed and considered as per the minutes of the previous Resources Committee as above – see Item 6.</p> <p>Governors appreciated that the SBM presented an updated GDPR report to the resources Committee which had been circulated prior to the meeting. The supporting document was also accessible to all Governors. Governors noted that there had been no data breaches to report and the most recent subject access request (SAR) had been submitted prior to the Christmas break. The SAR was completed prior to the required deadline and there were no further issues raised.</p> <p>There were no further issues raised and Governors agreed to accept the GDPR report into the record of the meeting.</p> | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – accept GDPR report into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |

| | | |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Item 11 | Governor Visits | |
| <p>Governors noted the visits completed which included the safeguarding Zoom meeting convened with YP and DW as discussed above.</p> <p>Governors noted the TLM focused meeting, which was attended by YP, the Chair and the Headteacher in February 2022. It was appreciated that a briefing note related to this visit had been circulated to Governors prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The Headteacher confirmed that she and Kat Rowe, Assistant Headteacher (AHT), had met with Zainab Suleman (ZS) termly to discuss the SIP progress (Achieving Success) and updates.</p> <p>Governor Attendance SATS Week. The Headteacher proposed that as a matter of best practice a Governor was required to visit the school and view the protocols applied at a point during the forthcoming national tests (SATS). During the discussions it was agreed that the Chair would attend on Monday 9 May 2022 at 9.00am In addition, Carole Wigzell (CW) had previously suggested she may be available to provide the same support for Tuesday 10 May at 9.00am.</p> <p>Ellen Martinez (EM) confirmed that she had scheduled a visit to the school with the specific focus of meeting some of the children in the SEND cohort – 29 April 2022.</p> <p>There were no further points raised and Governors agreed to accept the Governor visits reports into the record of the meeting.</p> | | |

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – Chair and CW to attend SATS examinations as per dates above. | Chair / CW | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – accept Governor visits reports into record of meeting. | Governing body | |

| Item 12 | AOB |
|----------------|---|
| | <p>School Calendar 2022-2023. Governors noted that the school calendar for the 2022-2023 academic year had been circulated off-meeting and received approval via e-mail. There were no further issues raised and Governors provided their formal approval for the dates as previously agreed.</p> <p>Nut-Free School. The Headteacher provided a summary of the previous position adopted by the school in relation to a 'nut-free school' and the practicalities of this stance. However, the school had recently drafted a new Anaphylaxis Policy which had raised the importance of the issue again. In addition, the school had sourced an updated Nut-Free Policy which was more nuanced in addressing the issue.</p> <p>Governors recognised that it was not possible to be entirely nut-free as it was a complicated issue. It was noted that there was a mixed message communicated to families. However, there was an understanding that the issue represented a significant concern and was a matter of mitigating risks for the children.</p> <p>Q. Were staff trained for this issue? A. Yes.</p> <p>Governors confirmed their support for the school in managing this issue with the new policies which would be presented at a future meeting when completed.</p> <p>Ban on Sweets. The Headteacher confirmed that the previous Food and Drink Policy did not allow sweets/chocolate/crisps as snacks, but this was eased to limit issues with eating disorder when talking in terms of unhealthy foods. However, when the Food and Drink Policy was updated, the school maintained a ban on birthday cakes and / or sweets provided by families. The school accepted that this had created an incongruity in its approach.</p> <p>Governor discussions indicated that the 'ban' was appropriate and that if families wanted to provide cake or sweets outside of the school environment that was a personal matter. It was also appreciated that the approach was more aligned to managing the nut-free approach and public policy to limit refined sugar intake. It was considered that the current Food and Drink Policy may need to be reworded slightly to reduce the emphasis on refined sugar, but maintain the ban on cakes and sweets for birthdays.</p> <p>Inspection Questions. Governors noted that the above document had been circulated prior to the meeting and discussed above – see Item 4.</p> <p>Equality Training.</p> |

The Headteacher confirmed that this was an issue that had arisen from the Equality Policy which had been approved by the Resources Committee and ratified as above – see Item 9. It was appreciated that the Headteacher had reviewed the model Equality Policy in fine detail and had highlighted the need for staff and Governor equality training.

Q. Was this an online module?

A. The feedback from previous discussions with the providers of the training was that it was preferable on a face-to-face basis.

Q. Was there an option to have a live online version?

A. This would be investigated.

The Headteacher confirmed that she would investigate the above option and schedule the training for September 2022.

The Chair confirmed there was no further business for discussion and the meeting was closed.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved – school calendar 2022-2023. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – support development of Nut-Free School approach. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – support maintenance of ban on birthday cakes / sweets. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action – investigate equality training options and schedule for September 2022. | HT | April 2022 |

| Item | Date of Next Meeting |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 13 | |
| Governors noted the next meeting was scheduled for Monday 27 June 2022 at 6.15pm. | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted – time and date of next scheduled meeting. | Governing Body |