

**Minutes of a meeting of the Full Governing Board (FGB) of
Richmond Methodist Primary School
held at the school on Monday 23rd September 2019 at 5.30pm**

Present:

Jan Linsley (JL) – Chair of Governors ,Sharon Stevenson (Headteacher),
Rev Les Nevin (LN),Kathleen Bradley (KB),Rebecca Simpson (RS), Stephen Rawson (SR),
Nicola Scrafton (NS), Lucinda Kirk (LK), Julie Swinbank (JS), Les Cutter (LC).

In attendance:

Susan Gardner– Deputy Headteacher.
Lucy Coates - SENDCo
Pat Gale (NYCC Clerk to Governors)

Minute No.		Action
PART A – PROCEDURAL		
GB 109/19	<p><u>Welcome and opening prayer:</u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited Rev Les Nevin to give an opening prayer setting the scene for the start of a new academic year ahead. The Chair then welcomed the newly appointed Foundation Governor, Les Cutter, and introductions were made.</p>	
GB 110/19	<p><u>Election of Co Vice Chair:</u></p> <p>The Clerk asked the Chair and Co-Vice Chair (SR) if they wished to continue in their roles for the remainder of their term of office, a further year.</p> <p>Resolved: a) That the Chair and Steve Rawson (Co-Vice Chair) would continue to serve the remaining year of their term of office.</p> <p>The Clerk then invited nominations for the vacant Co-Vice Chair, Nicola Scrafton offered to take on the role, and in the absence of any other nominations for the role, NS was asked to leave the room and a secret ballot took place.</p> <p>Resolved: b) That Nicola Scrafton was unanimously voted in as Co Vice Chair for a one year term of office.</p>	
GB 111/19	<p><u>Apologies for Absence :</u></p> <p>Apologies had been received and consented to from Nicola Hebb (NH).</p> <p>It was noted that Rebecca Simpson would arrive late 6.15pm due to work commitments, and Nicola Scrafton would need to leave early, 6.15pm due to a Parents Evening at another school.</p>	
GB 112/19	<p><u>Headteachers Report-SEND provision:</u></p> <p>This item was taken at the start of the meeting, and the Chair welcomed the school SENDCo, Lucy Coates, to give an update on the SEND provision in the school.</p>	
GB 95/19	<p><u>Declarations of business and personal interests, pecuniary or non-pecuniary:</u></p> <p>None declared.</p>	

Sign:

Date:

<p>GB 96/19</p>	<p><u>Confidentiality issues:</u></p> <p>Confidential Minutes GB 89/19, GB 90/19 and GB 91/19 were considered at the end of the meeting. A confidential staffing issue was covered by minute GB 108/19.</p>	
<p>GB 97/19</p>	<p><u>Notification of urgent other business:</u></p> <p>The Chair wished to include a summary report of the Nursery Consultation. (See GB 98/19) Items 7, 9 and 10 on the agenda were taken after the Financial Performance section.</p>	
<p>PART B- HOLDING THE HEADTEACHER TO ACCOUNT</p>		
<p>PART C- FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE</p>		
<p>GB 98/19</p>	<p><u>Results of the Nursery Consultation:</u></p> <p>The Chair circulated a summary of the responses to the consultation for the development of a 26 place nursery, which had run for four school weeks from Friday June 7th to Friday 4th July 2019. The consultation documentation had been sent to MAST, NYCC, 40 childcare providers including Trinity Academy and St Mary's, 47 staff and 348 parents, an estimated 400 plus individuals. By the close of the consultation period we had received 36 individual responses, of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27 said YES to opening nursery provision for 3 year olds, only two were not parents. 13 requested places for September 2019, 2 for September 2020 and 2 further requests for 2022. Important to note that at this stage we are unsure of days and hours required. • 9 said NO to opening nursery provision for 3 year olds, of which 3 were not parents, but other providers possibly due to commercial implications. <p>It was reported that a number of responses expressed concern and other responses asked for clarification around certain aspects of the proposal, regardless of whether the responses were YES or NO to the proposal, these included:</p> <p>1. The logistics and administration of opening in September 2019</p> <p><i>Q: What will need to be in place?</i> <i>A: Nothing on day 1 from an administrative perspective, we will need to carry out a Health and Safety and safeguarding audit, and let parents who have expressed an interest know about the offer. Monthly returns and quarterly audits need to be made but training can be given.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Have you got a project plan in place, as this would inform our decision making about whether September 2019 is achievable?</i> <i>A: No, not yet, as we have only just received the consultation responses.</i></p> <p>Concerns were raised about the shortness of planning time and staffing, and the fact that interviews for eight new staff members were also taking place over the coming week before the end of term.</p> <p><i>Q: How many potential children would we have if we opened in September?</i> <i>A: Eleven certain.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Would they go elsewhere if we delayed an opening?</i></p>	

A: It is hard to say, although they may already be attending an Early Years setting.

SR offered to work with the incoming Headteacher and JS on the development of a Project Plan if Governors agreed to the opening of a nursery.

2. Adequacy of existing accommodation and resources, including provision for changing nappies.

The HT designate explained that the NYCC Early Years Adviser had visited the school to help support any planning of space, proposing two classes, FS1 and their outdoor area and FS2 and an outdoor area. It was noted that the furniture and some play equipment was not suitable, and additional resources would be needed. Hygiene was also raised as an issue in the FS2 area.

3. Insufficient space and will 3 year olds be integrated or in a separate area?

It was felt that this view about space was not founded on fact especially as FS2 numbers are currently low. It was explained that it would be integrated initially, but as the provision grew, separate areas could be developed.

4. Staffing levels, skills of existing staff to work with younger children.

JS as leader for EYFS reassured Governors that the two key staff were qualified to deliver to 3 year olds, and they had visited other nurseries to gain operational knowledge. If our numbers increased to over 13, then we would need additional staff.

5. Increased traffic through school as parents bring/collect children. Review traffic provision, walking buses and drop off zones.

After some discussion it was agreed that parking and traffic on Darlington Road was the responsibility of the Highways Dept. and Police, not the school. However it was possible to make a representation, along with other schools, to make a complaint about the safety and safeguarding issues. It was agreed that as part of the project plan access routes should be included.(also see point 13)

6. WAC is already over-subscribed, and it would be too wide an age range if 3-11 year olds....is WAC the stretched provision?

It was noted that there would be two separate areas to reflect age range. However the WAC is the stretched provision and there is capacity it is not over subscribed.

7. Mixed Age groups and impact on current class structure.

Most schools have mixed age groups and 3 and 4 year olds are usually in the same class, the curriculum is the same, it just reflects different stages of development rather than age.

8. A distraction from the improvements in standards that are needed elsewhere.

Governors agreed with this perception, and noted that clear communications should be relayed to parents about changes and improvements, but that the nursery development would impact positively on child development and also support the budgetary needs of the school.

9. Higher ratios-children won't get the same attention as in PVI nurseries.

Q: What are the ratios required?

A: In the Private, Voluntary and Independent sector the ratio is 1:8 children, in schools it could be 1:13.

10. Will the SENCO be able to cope with the age range?

The HT designate explained that the school would be able to draw on specialist EYFS support from NYCC if required.

11. Impact on other local businesses?

Governors agreed that it could, but that they felt the demand probably outweighed supply, and a mixed economy would encourage parental choice.

12. Safeguarding-how would this be managed?

It was agreed that this would be part of the school safeguarding policy, and that an Intimate Care Policy existed for those pupils that required this support.

13. Increased traffic on Darlington Road?

This had been discussed under item 5 and different session times to the school day could help minimise congestion.

14. Will the children have to wear uniform?

Governors discussed the pros and cons, suggesting that their own casual comfortable clothing could be worn, possibly with green tabards to ensure that children were identifiable as part of the school, and also it would be helpful for staff to be similarly visible to parents/carers.

15. Age 3 is too soon, will they have free flow play, and will it be an overly structured environment?

It was noted that the learning environment would depend on the stage of child development rather than age alone.

16. Have we explored funding and impact fully?

Governors were not clear about what was meant about impact, but all statutory funding and entitlements had been considered and other opportunities could be considered in support of the nursery development.

17. What extra work will the office have to manage and what extra training will they need?

It was agreed that the logistics need to be included in the project plan, but that the key worker could also be involved in meeting and greeting the children and parents in reception area.

18. Is there a need for this and have we done an analysis?

Governors felt that the consultation exercise had demonstrated a demand, with requests for places already being asked for. 27 people had said YES and 9 people had said NO.

19. Older children will be exposed daily to behaviours they should not have to encounter at primary school, such as hitting, kicking, snatching or biting.

Governors felt that this perception was not accurate as some older children also exhibited the same behavioural issues. All children are different.

The Chair then asked Governors for a vote on:

A. Do we want a nursery to open in September 2019?

B. Do we want a nursery to open in January 2020?

C. Do we not go ahead with a Nursery at all?

	<p>After some deliberation Governors unanimously agreed that option B was the preferred solution, enabling more time to plan the service, to ensure staff were in post and a robust project plan to steer the development in the best interest of the school and children.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>a) That a public response to the consultation be produced confirming a nursery would be available for 3 year olds from January 2020.</p> <p>b) That SR and SS would meet on the 10th July to start to develop a Project Plan.</p> <p>c) That SS, SG and JS would take on the operational development of the nursery.</p> <p>The Chair thanked everyone for their support in making the decision as it also helped inform the discussion on the next item, the budget.</p>	<p>Chair/ EHT</p> <p>SR/SS</p> <p>SS/SG/ JS</p>
<p>GB 99/19</p>	<p><u>Budget Update:</u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed the SBM and Katrina Coxon the NYCC Bursar to present their update on the end of June 2019 monitoring report.</p> <p>It was reported that three quotes had been provided for the completion of the playground works and a preferred provider was selected on the basis of criteria set to complete the work during the school summer holidays.</p> <p>KC then talked through the June 2019 budget summary report which showed an improved situation since the last report, this was due to income increases as a result of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £23,972 additional income from DfE to offset teacher pension increase costs. • £757 SEN income for one pupil • £16,960 teacher insurance refund, £1,443 non-teaching insurance. <p><i>Q: What does the three year profile look like now?</i></p> <p><i>A: In Year 1 we have a £21k surplus, Year 2 £31k deficit and Year 3 a £99k deficit. We have not included an increase in WAC numbers and funding ,so that will need factoring in when we know more about the January 2020 proposal for the nursery.</i></p> <p><i>Q: If we have 11 pupils in nursery from January, how much income will that generate?</i></p> <p><i>A: If they take the 15 hour entitlement over 15 weeks at £4 an hour that will generate an income of about £9,900. At the moment we charge £9 for two hours of WAC.</i></p> <p>The Chair commented that this would all need to be considered as part of the Expansion Plan.</p> <p><i>Q: What will be the impact of no rental income for the caretakers bungalow?</i></p> <p><i>A: The rent has been taken out of this year's budget, if it was to be used for another purpose then NYCC would be asked to help with refurbishment costs.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Do we need to apply for a change of use?</i></p> <p><i>A: NYCC would do that.</i></p> <p>Action:</p> <p>KC and the SBM would produce a report on potential pupil numbers and income for the proposed nursery development to inform the Project/Business Plan.</p> <p>The Chair thanked KC for her support and KC left the meeting at 7.20pm.</p>	<p>KC/ SBM</p>

<p>GB 100/ 19</p>	<p><u>To receive the School Fund Financial Statement for 2018/19:</u></p> <p>The SBM had circulated the report prior to the meeting and asked if there were any queries. Action None were raised and the Trustees, the Chair and EHT signed and dated the report for submission to the Charities Commission.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the SBM for her support and the SBM left the meeting at 7.25pm.</p>	<p>SBM</p>
<p>GB 101/ 19</p>	<p><u>To receive a staffing update:</u></p> <p>The EHT gave an update explaining that the restructuring process had been completed and there had not been any Appeals. There had been a lot of change and movement and staff had been concerned about the length of time of the process, but overall had been very strong and tremendously loyal despite the inevitable but unavoidable disruption. Some of the discussion was treated as confidential.</p>	
<p>GB 102/ 19</p>	<p><u>To receive a premises update:</u></p> <p>The EHT reported that the playground improvements would be completed over the summer holidays and Governors would be kept informed about the caretaker's bungalow.</p>	
<p>PART A- PROCEDURAL (cont.)</p>		
<p>GB 103/ 19</p>	<p><u>To approve as a correct record the minutes of the FGB meeting held on the 17th June 2019:</u></p> <p>Governors had been circulated with the minutes and all agreed that they should be approved as a correct record.</p> <p>Resolved: The minutes of the FGB held on the 17th June 2019 be approved, signed and dated by the Chair.</p>	<p>All</p>
<p>GB 104/ 19</p>	<p><u>Matters Arising from the minutes:</u></p> <p>The Summary of Actions was considered and all actions were underway or had been completed. GB 81/19-It was confirmed that parent governor elections would take place in the autumn term, but already there were three expressions of interest prior to the formal process. Actions: GB 84/19-It was agreed that the draft 'Curriculum Intent' could be shared with parents.</p> <p>The EHT explained that the KS2 results were due the following day and she would forward to all Governors for their information and interest.</p>	<p>EHT</p> <p>EHT/ Clerk</p>

<p>GB 105/ 19</p>	<p><u>To formalise the closure of Joint Collaboration with Arkengarthdale CE School:</u></p> <p>The Chair informed Governors that she had, on behalf of the Governing Body, contacted the Head of School and Chair of Governors to thank them for the commitment to the Collaboration which had been a positive experience for staff and pupils.</p> <p>It was noted that the Governing Body of the Arkengarthdale School had also recorded their thanks for the support they had received from RMS over the years and wished the school well in the future.</p> <p>The Arkengarthdale School would be closing at the end of the summer term after 360 years of delivering education in the Dale, and the Collaboration would also formally end at that point.</p>	
<p>GB 106/ 19</p>	<p><u>To confirm the date of the next FGB meeting:</u></p> <p>The date of the next meeting is Monday the 23rd September 2019 at 5.30pm with refreshments from 5pm.</p>	
<p>PART D– OTHER BUSINESS</p>		
<p>GB 107/ 19</p>	<p><u>Confidential Minutes GB 89/19,GB 90/19 and GB91/19 were considered by Governors:</u></p> <p>They were circulated and approved as an accurate record, signed and dated by the Chair for retaining in a secure place.</p> <p>Actions: GB 88/19-Update on staff absence and movements were noted. GB 90/19-Update on progress of the Nursery Consultation. GB 91/19-Agree arrangements for an Appeals Committee should it be required.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Susan Gardner for her role as Executive Headteacher over the year and presented her with a bouquet in recognition of the esteem the Governing Body held for her hard work and commitment to the school, during a very difficult year of challenges and change.</p> <p>The Executive Headteacher responded with her thanks for having been given the opportunity to lead the school and for the support she had gained from Governors, in particular the support she had received from NS, BP and KB during the very challenging recent restructuring process. She felt that there was a great team for taking the school forward in the future.</p> <p>There being no further business the Chair wished all Governors a very good summer break and thanked them for their commitment and support. The meeting was closed at 19.45.</p>	
<p>The date of the next FGB meeting will be held on Monday the 23rd September 2019 at 5pm for a 5.30pm start.</p> <p>Please send apologies to the Clerk Pat Gale: Pat.gale@northyorks.gov.uk;</p> <p>Or 07793 846 441</p>		

Sign:

Date:

Please note: The colour coding above links to the three key roles of governance questioning;
RED for 'setting strategic direction',
BLUE for 'holding Headteacher to account for educational performance'
GREEN for 'ensuring financial health, probity and value for money'.