**Baguley Hall Primary School**

**Governing Body Meeting Minutes**

**School: Baguley Hall Primary School**

**Quorum: 6 (Met at this meeting)**

**Chair: Carol Steedman**

**Clerk: Colette Garner**

**Date of meeting: 14 February 2022**

**Venue: Remotely via Zoom**

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Designate****Governor type** | **‘End of Term of Office’ date**  | **Present (P)/apologies (Ap)/absent (A)** |
| Kate Bulman | Headteacher (HT) | N/A | P |
| Carol Steedman  | Partnership (Chair) | 23/03/23 | P |
| Peter Renshaw | Co-Opted | 26/03/22 | P |
| Mike Allison | Partnership | 15/07/23 | P |
| Laura Lodge | Co-opted | 01/09/22 | P |
| Clair Goulding | Associate | 22/03/23 | P |
| Yanghong Huang | Co-opted | 23/11/24 | P |
| Helen Stevens | Co-Opted | 22/11/25 | P |
| Kayleigh Spencer | Parent | 19/4/25 | P |
| Victoria Cook | Staff | 12/12/24 | P |
|  |  |  |  |
| Katie McDwyer | LA governor | 30/11/25 | Ap |
|  |  |  |  |

**Others present**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
| Colette Garner | Clerk (One Education) |
| Anne-Marie Dorsey | School Business Manager (SBM) |
| Jen Gibson | Observer |

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Welcome and apologies** |
| The Chair welcomed everybody and introduced Jen Gibson, a new Parent Governor attending the meeting as an observer until all the new governor administrative paper work has been completed.Katie McDwyer is on Maternity Leave following the recent birth of her baby son. Apologies have been received and accepted in advance for non-attendance at all meetings during Katie’s maternity leave. |
|  | **Action decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2** | **Declaration of Pecuniary Interests** |
| There were no declarations of pecuniary interest expressed in connection with any item on the agenda. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3** | **Presentations to Governors** |
| National Nurturing Schools ProgrammeStaff from the school delivered and talked through a presentation to inform governors about The National Nurturing Schools Programme which the school is participating in. The presentation was screen shared with governors.Maslow’s hierarchy of needs outlines the basic needs that must be met so that children can achieve their full potential. Where needs are not met or distorted, for example problems with early attachments, children tend to do less well than children who have had a good start in their early life.The Nurturing approach helps to counteract the early missing nurturing experiences by providing experiences and giving children skills to cope.The school aims to embed and develop a nurturing culture throughout the whole school.All staff are involved leading to the creation of a committed ethos and culture embraced by everyone. There are 6 principles of nurture and everything that the school is doing is based on those 6 principles.The programme is aimed at children who have missed experiences of early attachment, however the approach benefits all children.The aim is to embed the 6 principles of nurture. There is no given definition for each principle and schools works individually to decide how each principle will look in practice.Children and staff have gone through each principle and developed examples of how each looks in practice.For example, the principle ‘Children’s Learning is Understood Developmentally’ is about allowing children to learn in different ways and by stage not age, which ensures children feel confident in their learning.The principle ‘The classroom offers a Safe Space’, allows children to say how they feel. They can trust grown-ups in school.Nurture is important for the development of well-being. Children say that grown-ups look after them, try hard to understand them which makes them feel happy.The programme teaches that all behaviour is communication and it is important that staff teach children the language they need to communicate and express their feelings.The Boxall Profile is a key part of the programme. It is a tool used to assess children’s social, emotional and health needs. Staff use the profile when there is a particular concern about a child, allowing difficulties to be clearly identified as well as informing support.Staff have assessed about one third of each class to obtain a big picture of needs across the school.Nurture Intervention Groups have been set up for children identified with significant needs.The whole school assessment has identified 2 main areas for the whole school to work on and has led to whole school strategies.The school is working towards the Nurture UK Award and is developing an Evidence File to show how it is meeting each of the required standards. Following self-assessment, many of the standards are already being met. Action Plans have been created for standards that are developing.Next steps include:Continuing to embed the principles.Collect more evidence.Update the Boxall Profiles (twice a year).Develop the Behaviour Policy (include a more nurturing focus).Collect case studies.Share with parents/carers.The Chair thanked the staff for their presentation and commented that Nurturing is one of the main areas on the current School Development Plan.*Q. Are there any plans to include pupil feedback as part of the award process?*Yes. A number of feedback points have already been identified. Feedback will also be obtained through questionnaires via the School Council.A governor commented through Zoom Chat, saying that it was wonderful to see the excellent work and thanks to the staff for sharing.Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Annual Information Report 2020/21The Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (SENDCO) delivered a presentation to governors The Presentation is included in the meeting papers.The Presentation started with an overview of SEND across the school with numbers correct to the end of the Autumn term 2021. The overview enabled governors to see the range of different needs with Speech, Language and Communication (SLC) need accounting for 66%. The figures illustrate the primary need and do not show that some of the children have more than one need.SLC is delivered through the school’s universal offer and good practice because it is an area of such high need and importance. For example, language and delivery is a focus in every curriculum area.The Nurturing Programme gives all children the language needed to develop their social and emotional skills.Speech and Language Therapy (SALT) interventions are given to specific individuals / groups.The SENDCO referred governors to the SEND Attendance table in the presentation. There are 2 levels of support outlined on the table. SEN support and EHC (those with an Educational and Health Care Plan (EHCP).Children who have been SEN support for 2 cycles but are still not making sufficient progress are put forward for an EHCP. The table compares the attendance data with the Fischer Family Trust (FFT) attendance data for SEND and the school’s comparative attendance data for EHCP children is generally quite favourable.The school’s comparative attendance data for SEN support is less favourable.Some children find transition difficult and strategies such as the Nurture Breakfast are helpful, allowing those children to come straight into school for breakfast and taking away the barrier of coming straight into the school day along with other children.Some adults struggle bringing children to school, and support is given.*Q. Why do the EHCP attendance figures in Year 3 show a large negative difference compared to FFT? Is it just one child skewing the figures?*Yes. One child has medical issues and has a lot of out of school appointments. In addition, another child with an EHCP has been ill a few times this year.*Q. Can the figures be broken down to differentiate between acceptable (children absent because of medical reasons) and not acceptable non-attendance?*The reason for children’s non-attendance can be obtained from the system.*Q. Are FFT comparative figures for all non-attendance or just unexplained non-attendance?*FFT is not national data. It is data generated from schools who subscribe to FFT. FFT allows schools to drill further down into the data.The Report provides a table with the number of children with SEND in each year group. The numbers tend to increase as the children move through the school. Some children, but not all, are identified with SEND in the Nursery.Year 5 has quite a high number of SEND children.SEND Exclusions - 3 children were particularly challenging at the beginning of the year, finding transition after the long summer break difficult. Challenges presented by covid have added to children’s difficulties.The school is an Accessible School. Every part is fully accessible for wheelchairs.The Presentation contains a list of Interventions which the SENDCO read through.Working with parents is an integral part of the SENDCOs work. Children with an EHCP have at least one annual review where the child’s progress is discussed in detail and the plan updated.School gets additional funding for children with an EHCP. Numbers are updated termly as more children obtain EHCPs or when the school obtains emergency funding, for example when a child with significant needs moves to the school.The presentation contains a breakdown of the funding.A considerable amount (£21,360) is spent on Educational Psychology, reflecting the high level of need at the school. An anticipated £20,828 will be spent this financial year to support places at Newall Green POD, which is a provision for children who are not coping in mainstream and are likely to need special school provision.The Chair thanked the SENDCO for her detailed report and enthusiasm, commenting that she was conscious of time and asked if there was anything more that needed to be highlighted, as well as inviting questions from governors.Governors’ attention was drawn to the Progress Data (Reading and Maths) in the presentation with the percentages of expected and greater than expected progress, as well as the overall Age Related Attainment (ARA) percentages.*Q. How are targets set? How does the school decide whether children have or have not made Expected Progress?*Progress is measured based on data from the last assessment. If a child obtained 98 at their previous assessment and 98 in their current assessment, then progress would be expected. Anything lower than 98, less than expected progress and anything higher than 98, more than expected progress.*Q. Is it worth trying again to get additional Language and Communication referrals rather than the current two a term?*The school is looking again to see if there is a programme available that can be delivered in school. There are a lot of needs, so more referrals would be good, however there are many children who would benefit from extra support. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | **Minutes of last Meeting 22.11.21 and Matters Arising** |
| The minutes of the Full Governing Body meeting held on 22.11.21 were approved as an accurate record and a copy was retained on file to be signed when meetings resume in school.Matters Arising.Page 4 School Context*Q. The minutes refer to a Quality of Teaching Judgement which the HT intended to include in a future School On A Page (SOAP), however this has not been done. Why?*Governors were updated at the Standards Committee meeting (10.1.22). The Self Evaluation section contains the up-to-date statutory data from pre-covid with highlighted updates about the impact of covid. The section takes up more space so the previously included Quality of Teaching has been removed. Ofsted do not grade individual teachers but link pupil progress over time to the quality of teaching overall. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Minutes of the meeting held on 22.11.21 approved.
 | Gov. Body |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5** | **Headteacher’s Report** |
| The HT’s report was presented through several documents, circulated in advance and included in the meeting papers. The documents include School on a Page (SOAP), The School Development Plan (SDP), an Attendance Summary and Supporting Notes.The HT commented that she was mindful of time and unless governors wished otherwise, she would not go through each of the documents in detail, but instead talk through the document, Supporting Notes.A governor had emailed questions in advance of the meeting, and these would be included throughout the meeting.SDPThe plan is RAG (Red Amber Green) rated, with red signifying action/work that needs to happen; amber, actions/work underway and green, completed. The supporting notes explain why a particular action is amber, rather than green. For example, the Writing Deep Dive was postponed due to staff absence. from Wednesday 9th to Wednesday16th February.The first cohort of interventions are now coming to an end and positive impact can be seen with some clear gains in the Reading data and Writing Groups showing gaps have narrowed.The most successful interventions can be seen where the intervention has happened consistently and not been interrupted by attendance issues. Some children have only managed to attend 4 out of 13 sessions because of absenteeism.*Q. Has there been any progress in obtaining approval to retain the tutoring grant until the human resources become available to enable it to be spent?  If not, can governors help in any way to secure this?*A new School Led Tutor has been secured and is due to start next Monday, ensuring that all the grant will be spent by the end of the year.The other funding streams are not subject to claw back.The school is still trying to secure an Academic Mentor and will be interviewing shortly.The Read Write Inc (RWI) data trajectory shows the percentages making expected or better than expected progress increasing. Children who are not progressing well are receiving additional phonic input.The school has a very clear focus on data. Data outlined in the Supporting Notes is reflected in the SOAP.Children making the expected standard or above in Reading, Writing and Maths (RWM) at the end of Year 6 in 2019, was 49%. There is a real drive to improve that figure this year. The current projection is 54% in Reading and 62% in Maths, which are below FFT estimates however given all the challenges created by covid, would be a significant gain.*Q. Will an increase in the combined RWM be attainable given that Writing was the curriculum area most adversely affected by lockdown?*That is the aim. The school is working hard on Writing.Pupil progress meetings have recently been conducted. Every child is discussed and included in intervention groups where necessary.Year 6 will soon be sitting a Mock SATs test (2018 test), which will give staff a really good idea of areas to work on in preparation for the actual tests.Year 1 are doing Mock phonic screening checks.Year 2 will invite parents in after half term for a meeting about the end of Key Stage 1 assessments and an introduction to the practice work the children will undertake.Monitoring and Review ActivitiesEvery staff meeting is used to develop staff with weekly core subject coaching and development work.External Consultants support staff through, for example, learning walks, book looks and coaching.There is an ongoing programme of Curriculum Deep Dives, with Writing this week and RE after half term.AttendanceThe summary document shows attendance for the year.The HT attended a DfE webinar about good attendance. The session was very affirmative because it included many similar systems and strategies already in use. There were some new ideas including phoning the parents/carers of children with poor attendance, on days when their children are actually attending school. Parents are more likely to answer a phone call from school on those occasions and can hear how pleased the school is and how well their child is working that day and the amount of learning their child is doing that day. Persistent Absence (PA) remains a real challenge. The school is part of a pilot, however the pilot is not an avenue for referral to Child Services, which is what the school had originally believed. There still needs to be additional concerns for children to meet the threshold for referral.Continuous Professional development (CPD) Year to Date (YTD)Following a request from the Chair, a CPD YTD list has been included for governors in the Supporting Notes.EYFS Oral Hygiene has always been, and continues to be, a priority at the school. Prior to covid, teeth brushing was a daily event in Nursery and Early Years. Staff meetings are always used for CPD.Preparation for OfstedThe school is expecting a possible ofsted in the relatively near future and in addition to the ongoing work of continually seeking to improve, is trying to ensure that particular areas are as up to date as possible and information is readily to hand, so that the process of inspection can run smoothly. Consistency across curriculum provision/expectations.A website spring clean with fewer tabs, but drop down menus between.Case Studies to include more vulnerable children showing what the school does and how teams come together to support the children.Environment.Curriculum On A page (COAP) along with Action Plans and Displays.Personal Development (PD), with possibly PDOAP. PD gets an individual judgement from ofsted and the school believes it does PD very well. A PDOAP would ensure that PD measures would not be forgotten under the pressure of ofsted.An Ofsted File.HT Classroom Visits.SOAPThe report contains much of the information that governors need in an easily accessible format. Governors are not expected to retain all the important headlines about the school and given the short notice that schools receive from Ofsted, the SOAP will be particularly useful to governors.The report contains a section on each of the following: School Context; SDP; Self Evaluation and Overall Effectiveness of the school; School Data; SDP 2021-22; Pupil Premium; Sports Funding.School ContextNumber on roll 51553% Pupil Premium 52% Eligible for Frees School Meals (FSMs) More than 2 times the National Average.23% SEND 2 times the National Average.5% EHCPs. 2.5 times National Average. 1 Early Year (EY) funding. 1 Emergency Funding. 3 EY fundings pending. 3 EHCPs pending. 1 child alternative provision increasing high level needs to 6.5%14% English as an Additional Language (EAL) .6 times National Average. 91% Attendance Year to Date (YTD) (FFT Nat 94%) 1.2% Persistent Absence YTD. High but should diminish as the year progresses.3 pupils (7 sessions) fixed term exclusions.3 Looked After Children (LAC) 4 Special Guardianship Order (SGO) 11 Child Protection 5 Child in Need 3 NHS planning0 Team Around the Family (TAF)14 Education and Health Assessment (EHA)*Q. At the top of School On A Page (SOAP) the number of pupils on roll is said to be 515 but in the Pupil Premium insert lower down the number is 499 and on the separate Pupil Premium Strategy Statement the number is 503. Why are the numbers all different?* Numbers on roll fluctuate all the time. The numbers on the documents were correct at the time the particular document was completed. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6** | **2022/23 School Calendar** |
| Two versions of the School Calendar 2022/23 were presented to governors, Option 1 and Option 2 and are included in the meeting papers.*Q. The attachments to your email of 9 February include two slightly different versions of the School Calendar. Why?*Two versions for a decision. Option 1, the LA calendar and Option 2, following consultation with staff.Option 1 is the version from the Local Authority and Option 2 is an alternative version.Option 2 moves the start and finish date of the Christmas holiday so that school breaks up closer to Christmas and returns later in January than the dates proposed at Option 1.Staff have been consulted and 27 of the 32 responses asked for Option 2. *Q. Will changing the dates disadvantage families with children in different schools?*Possibly, however there is no guarantee that schools all have the same holiday dates.*Q. Has there been any feedback from parents in the past when school has changed the LA suggested holiday dates?*No.One parent governor commented that previous changes to the LA holidays had worked for her in the past.Another parent governor commented that the change of date in the past had not been ideal for her as she worked in a school with different holidays, however she understood the need for the school to make it work for the staff.A further governor, who also works in a school, expressed her opinion that time after Christmas was more valuable to teachers.*Q. How is staff well being and attendance at the moment?*Staff absence has improved with staff responding well to support. Staff morale seems generally positive.There were no further questions and governors approved the calendar, option 2. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * 2022-23 School Calendar Option 2 approved
 | Gov. Body |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7** | **Pupil Premium Strategy Statement** |
| The Pupil Premium Strategy Statement was circulated in advance of the meeting and is included in the meeting papers. A new template has been produced for schools to report on Pupil Premium and also include Recovery Grants / School Led Tutoring and the previous year’s outcomes. The numbers in the document differ slightly from the SOAP because numbers change all the time.The Pupil Premium Strategy Statement is a key accountability document which schools are required to publish on their websites. The document is very detailed in terms of planned expenditure and gives a very clear focus.The document includes information about what the school is doing to make a difference to disadvantaged learners.Research based interventions along with people able to deliver the interventions, have proved to be the most effective approach to raise standards and is the focus of the school’s approach.The document includes 2019 pupil premium data and the following targets for the end of KS2 in 2022:-45% of disadvantaged pupils to reach the expected standard. (50% for all other pupils)14% of disadvantaged pupils to reach the higher standard.The strategy contains 2 key priorities linked to Maths and English along with teaching priorities to achieve a positive progress score. Academic support and interventions, in addition to quality first teaching, are all costed and outlined in the document.A review of the previous year can be found at the end of the document.*Q. The Pupil Premium Strategy Statement includes figures for the pupil premium allocation for the current financial year.  Does this mean that the query regarding the amount of this allocation (£470 per pupil) has now been resolved?  if so, what was the outcome please?*At the Resources Committee Meeting 24.1.22, the SBM explained that £470 was a potential increase to the amount of Pupil Premium the school might receive as a result of Manchester City Council’s Local Formula Factor Values, however she was not confident that the money would actually be received.The figures provided are based on £1,345 per Pupil Premium (PP) child; £2,345 for a Looked After Child (LAC) including previously LAC and £310 for a Service Child (this can be in addition to PP)There were no further questions and governors approved the Pupil Premium Strategy Statement. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Pupil Premium Strategy statement approved.
 | Gov. Body |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8** | **PE and Sports Grant** |
| The Sports Premium Review 2020/21 and Sports Premium Action Plan 2021/22 were included in the meeting papers and circulated in advance.One of the governors had noticed a discrepancy with the figures and had sent the following question in advance of the meeting. *Q. Sports Premium Action plan 2021-2 - the figures suggest that:**We had a total of £35,939 available to spend for 2020-1 and are intending to carry over £34,009 to 2021-2 (so we spent only £1,930 in 2020-1) (This appears to contradict the information contained in the Sports Premium Review 2020-21); and**We are going to spend £54,042 by 31 July this year.  (The action plan only appears to indicate a total spend of just over £33,000).*The discrepancy was a result of financial year rather than academic year figures being includedGovernors approved the documents subject to the financial figures being changed to reflect the academic year. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Sports Premium Review 2020/21 approved
* Sports Premium Action Plan 2021/22 approved
 | Gov. BodyGov. Body |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9** | **Committee Meetings – Feedback and Updates** |
| Draft minutes and papers from committee meetings were circulated in advance of the meeting. A number of items were reviewed and approved by the committees and require Governing Body ratification.Resources Committee meeting 24.1.22Draft minutes, along with associated papers, were circulated in advance of the meeting. A number of items had been approved at committee level and need to be ratified by the Governing Body.Period 9 Budget Monitoring Revenue Income £ 3,223,430Revenue Expenditure £ 3,405,354Revenue In Year balance £ 181,925 deficit B/f from 2020/21 £ 392,720 surplusCumulative c/f £ 210,796 surplusCapital Income - £ 9735Capital Expenditure - £ 35,985Capital In Year balance £ 26,250 deficitB/f from 2020/21 £ 27,357 surplusCumulative c/f £ 1,107 surplusProjected year end cumulative balances – including brought forward amounts from 2020/21Revenue £ 210,796 surplusCapital £ 1,107 surplusTotal Cumulative Balance £ 211,903 surplusNo issues were raised, and governors ratified the Period 9 monitoring.Budget ChangesThe net changes amounted to a in-year deficit increase of £37,622.No issues were raised, and governors ratified the budget changes.Cashflow forecastA credit balance is forecast and the school is able to meet its liabilities throughout the year.No issues were raised and governors ratified the cashflow forecast.Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS)Amendments suggested by governors at the Resources Committee meeting are included in the SFVS. The amended SFVS was sent to governors in advance of today’s meeting.*Q. Why are 3 year projections included in the SFVS if the budget plan is now 5 years?* HCSS automatically generates a 5 year budget plan, however, 3 year projections are requested by the LA. The School Development Plan is 5 years.*Q. Should discussions with the LA regarding the financing of the total renewal of the roof be mentioned in the SFVS?*There is uncertainty about what will happen, however it is the schools responsibility to maintain the roof until either capital works are approved by the LA or if the school is selected to be part of the DFE school rebuilding programme.No further issues were raised, and governors ratified the SFVS. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Period 9 Monitoring ratified
* Budget changes ratified
* Cashflow forecast ratified
* SFVS ratified
 | Gov. BodyGov. BodyGov. BodyGov. Body |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **10** | **Governing Board Housekeeping** |
| Governor Vacancies There is one Co-opted Governor vacancy.Governor VisitsThe SEND Link Governor (Peter Renshaw) visited school 7.12.21 and met with the school SENDCOs. A written report from that meeting was circulated by email to governors 16.12.21.The SEND Link Governor (Peter Renshaw) visited the Reception 1 Class and Zebra Class 9.2.22. A Report from the visit was emailed to governors 10.2.22.The Pupil Premium Link Governor (Mike Allison) has arranged a visit date.The Maths Link Governor (Yanghong Huang) has arranged a visit date.The Safeguarding Governor (Kayleigh Spencer) has arranged to visit on 18.2.22.Governor TrainingA number of governors recently attended Preparation for Ofsted training. The Chair will email the training slides to governors. (Slides emailed to governors 15.2.22) Kayleigh Spencer has completed Safeguarding Training to support her role as Safeguarding Link Governor.Jen Gibson is undertaking Governor Induction Training. |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **11** | **POLICIES for Review and Approval** |
| School Uniform PolicyThe policy, circulated in advance and included in the meeting papers, had been proof read by a governor who had corrected a number of minor spelling / grammatical errors.*Q. With reference to affordable school uniform, are the words ‘School uniforms will be made more affordable for families under a new law passed by Parliament 29th April’ still appropriate for inclusion?   Is this document to be replaced by the School Uniform Policy?*The wording was to draw attention to the legislation and show the webpage.There were no further questions and governors approved the policy |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * School Uniform Policy approved
 | Gov. Body |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **12.** | **Any other business** |
| The School House*Q. Has there been any progress in arranging for clearing the School House garden so that the School House can be offered for letting?  Have estate agents been contacted?  (This doesn’t need to wait for the garden and if the school’s gardeners are unable to schedule this work the agents are likely to have people they can recommend.)*The building rubbish is being removed at half term and the Site Manager is liaising with the school gardeners to complete the works. The letting agents will be contacted after half term.  |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of next meeting:** | Monday 18.7.22 at 4.30pm |