Minutes of a meeting of the Full Governing Board (FGB) of Richmond Methodist Primary School held at the school on Monday 20th June 2022 at 5.30 pm.

Present:

Jan Linsley (Chair), Sharon Stevenson (Headteacher), John Armitage (JA), Julie Swinbank (JS), Rev. Kathleen Wood and Kate Pepperrell (KP).

In attendance:

Pat Gale (NYCC Clerk to Governors)

Minute No.	PART 'A'-PROCEDURAL	Action
GB	Welcome:	
50/22		
	The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly the subject leaders who had given up their time to share their subject plans and priorities around curriculum leadership.	
	PART C-Educational Performance and Strategic Direction	
GB 51/22	'Round Robin' with subject leaders on Foundation Subjects:	
O II Z	Governors had been circulated with a list of questions to ask subject leaders and were also provided with curriculum leadership reports to inform the questioning process, which was structured on a five minute slot for each of the discussions. This part of the meeting closed at 18.05 and staff were thanked by the Chair and all governors for a very helpful and informative process.	
	The Chair asked governors for headlines from what they had learned from the monitoring process, which included:	
	 Learning about the 'reading spine' Learning much more about curriculum planning 	
	Understanding more about sequencing, noting that phonics was perhaps easier to sequence than other cross curricular areas.	
	 Good practice for subject leaders to talk to governors, mirroring the Ofsted experience in some ways. 	
	The quality of documents produced by staff was strong and reflected the examples set by the HT.	
	The Chair suggested that if a governor had any concerns that they should have a confidential conversation with the HT.	
	Appendix 1 provides a helpful record of the governor monitoring process of the quality of education experienced by governors.	
	PART A-PROCEDURAL	<u> </u>
GR	ODENING DRAVED	1
GB 52/22	OPENING PRAYER: The Chair invited the Rev Kathleen Wood to give her opening thoughts for the day	

Sign:

1

Date:26.9.22

which referred to Corinthians 1, about how the school flourished as a community

	and collectively all should function together, with all members dependent on each other in 'doing all the good we can'. This opening reflection was then followed by a prayer.	
GB 53/22	Apologies for Absence: Apologies had been received and consented to from NH, NS, SW and KB. No apologies had been received from Caroline Dawson.	
GB 54/22	Declarations of business and personal interests, pecuniary or non-pecuniary: None declared.	
GB 55/22	Confidentiality issues:	
GB 56/22	Notification of urgent other business: The Chair requested that the proposal for extending the pupil age range from the age of two should be taken before item 10.	
GB 57/22	To approve as a correct record the minutes of the FGB meeting held on the 11th May 2022: The Chair wished to apologise for not being able to attend the meeting due to transport issues beyond her control and to also thank NH for taking on the role of Acting Chair in her absence, which had been undertaken so willingly and effectively without any prior notice. The Chair reviewed the minutes and all governors agreed they were an accurate record and should be approved. Resolved: The minutes of the 11th May 2022 should be approved, signed and dated by the Chair.	All
GB 58/22	 To consider matters arising from the minutes of the meeting and for which there was no separate agenda item: Governors considered the summary of actions and agreed the following: GB 45/22 b)-Governor Allowances Policy-deferred to the September 2022 meeting. GB 45/22 f)-The Capability Policy-deferred to the September 2022 meeting. GB 45/22 j)-The Staff Discipline, conduct and grievance policy-deferred to the September 2022 meeting. GB 45/22 I)-the HT confirmed that CCTV signage does exist. 	
GB 59/22	Governance Update: Governors were reminded that there was still a LA governor vacancy, the LA was aware of this and understood the skillset that was preferred, that of a person with a business, finance and/or community focus. However, if any governor identified someone with the potential and commitment to become	

sign:

- an RMS governor, then they should let the Chair, HT and clerk know, as this could then be followed up with the LA.(Action)
- Governor training evidence to be sent to Zoe Pick and the Clerk for filing, no new training opportunities had been identified.
- It was reported that the Rev. KW had undertaken a RE governor monitoring visit, and the 'Round Robin' session gave a strong overview of Foundation Subjects. (See appendix 1).

GB 60/22

To agree the dates of future meetings in 2022/23 academic year:

Meetings to take place on Mondays at 5pm for networking and a 5.30pm business start:

- 26th September 2022
- 21st November 2022
- 23rd January 2023
- 6th March 2023
- 15th May 2023
- 26th June 2023

PART 'B'-FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

GB 61/22

To discuss the possible consultation to lower the age-range from 3 year olds to 2 year olds from September 2022.

Governors had been circulated with a paper outlining the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Feedback from the EYFS transition activities suggests that parents appreciate one transition for their children to attend one setting from two years onwards, avoiding disruption to their learning and building confidence. There is also positive impact on standards for our pupil premium children if they have accessed two year old provision backed by current educational research.
- There is demand from our own RMS parents and a constant request for two year old provision at the school.
- RMS could resource two year old provision in RMS without any further capital investment or need for additional classrooms until 2028-29.
 Q: Is there time to carry out a meaningful consultation in time for a September start?

A: The recommended consultation is four weeks and we will need to do this quite quickly, if governors are able to give their approval to this development this evening. We would then need an extraordinary TEAMS FGB meeting at the end of the consultation period to discuss the findings and actions.

Q: Why wouldn't we need more staff?

A: We already have existing staff with two year old provision expertise, who are enthusiastic about delivering this new service.

Q: Is the local authority supportive?

A: Yes they are supportive of lowering the age range of the governor-led provision both from a strategic and school improvement perspective.

Q: What funding is available from government?

A: Funding for two year olds is often referred to as the 'golden ticket' taken from our October census.

an:

	Q: Do you know that there is demand for this service? A: Yes, we already have 5 children on the EYFS waiting list for January who would be interested in starting the 2 year old provision in September and that is without any marketing. The Chair proposed that the school should move to immediate consultation, and this was supported by all governors. Resolved: That the consultation process to lower the age range of the school to two year olds should take place immediately for a four week period followed by an extraordinary FGB meeting to consider the outcomes of the consultation. Action: JA offered to send a copy of the consultation process his school had undertaken for information to the HT.	AII
GB	To discuss the WAC prices:	
62/22		
	Governors had been circulated with a WAC price comparator with other local schools for both breakfast and after school services. It was reported that the prices had not increased since May 2018, and like other WAC clubs breakfast and snacks were also provided. Q: How many staff are employed? A: We employ 9 WAC staff on a rota basis, and there are always two staff with each group of children, morning and afternoon.	
	Q: How do parents book and pay? A: We offer parents the flexibility to book and cancel their own sessions online via Parent Pay, and unlike most schools we charge in arrears rather than upfront. We used to offer sibling discount but not currently.	
	The Chair noted that the current pricing seemed to be in line with other schools in the area and proposed that charges should remain the same but be kept under review.	
	Resolved: That WAC prices should remain the same for 2022-23.	All
GB	To discuss the statutory guidance on Uniform Policy compliance:	
63/22	The HT explained that the new guidance aimed to ensure that the cost of school uniforms is reasonable and secures the best value for money, and assured governors that the school is already complying with the new guidelines, for instance: • We have one official supplier 'School Shop' for logo items, but we also allow parents to send their children in plain garments of the correct colour that can be purchased from a number of high street outlets. In comparison with other suppliers, 'School-Shop' does appear to provide value for money, as they have held their prices from 2019 to the end of 2022, and as they are a webbased service the delivery charges are affordable, they also supply adult sizes for our staff. Q: Do you offer a second hand market? A: We don't have a formal arrangement, but we do facilitate this through FORMS at the twice yearly school fairs. We also encourage parents to	
	donate used uniforms for needy families, and at the end of the school year we pass surplus donations to the local charity Store House uniform bank.	

J. 8101.

Q: Is there an option for a sewn on badge as well as the iron-on badge? A: I am sure we can consult with parents on whether they would prefer this flexibility.	
Q: Do any children choose not to wear the school logo? A: It is an option for parents' choice.	
It was noted that pupils choose more active rather than traditional clothing, especially on PE days, and this could help parents with affordability. The HT reported that pupils had worn active-wear clothing for the SATs and all looked smart and comfortable.	
	AII
Action: To consider consulting with parents on whether they wished to have sewn on or ironed on logos. Rev. KW offered to help with sewing on the school logos.	HT/KW
GB To approve the following policies and procedures:	
a) Reorganisation, redundancy and redeployment policy- in the absence of CD it was agreed to defer to a future meeting. (Action)	CD
b) Resolving Issues at Work Policy- Rev.KW had reviewed this NYCC recommended policy, which she felt had clear processes and procedures in managing issues objectively. She explained that there was a very helpful terms and conditions flowchart and timeline which summarised the different stages of the process. She recommended that the Policy should be approved subject to the removal of highlighted content which reflected the changes since the last policy was approved.	
Resolved: That the Resolving Issues at Work Policy be approved and adopted.	All
c) Early Retirement Policy- the Chair had reviewed the NYCC recommended policy and explained that it related to those staff over the age of 55 and covered voluntary early retirement, redundancy and flexible retirement options. It did not cover those members of staff in the Teachers' Pension Scheme. It was noted that the details of the hearing and appeals procedure was similar to the previous policy, and she was happy to recommend for approval.	
	All
That the Early Retirement Policy be approved and adopted.	
d) RSE Policy- JS had reviewed this school policy, explaining that as an 'Early Adopter' school, a good deal of experience had been gained and staff felt confident and comfortable in implementing the policy in ensuring children were safe in line with KCSiE and that sexual health education was age appropriate and morally complicit. JS recommended that the policy should be approved.	
Resolved: That the RSE Policy should be approved and adopted.	All
	sw

8161.

	e) Children with health needs who cannot attend school- in the absence of SW who had been asked to review the policy, it was agreed to defer to a future meeting. (Action)	
GB	Update on opportunities for sponsorship and fundraising:	
65/22	In the absence of SW and NH it was agreed to defer to a future meeting, subject to NH and SW having time to consider and discuss with the HT and DHT. (Action)	SW/NH HT/ DHT
	PART 'C' – EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE	
GB 66/22	Update on academisation:	
00/22	The Chair informed governors of the recent DfE White Paper guidance with the intention that all schools should become a member of a Multi Academy Trust (MAT) by 2030. The HT also informed governors that she and Rev. KW had received a communication from MAST that explained that there was a Methodist Academy Trust called The Epworth Trust that focused on the Manchester, Bolton and Birmingham areas. There was no legal obligation to join Epworth Trust but that MAST would like all Methodist Schools to join Methodist Trusts and that MAST would need to approve the decision of the Governing Body. The HT, Chair and Vice Chair (NH) had been invited to a conference on the 22 nd June to find out more.	
	The Chair said the school need to keep academisation on the agenda, to listen and learn and inform any decision making in the future.	
	Q: How long does it take to become an academy? A: The White Paper guidance suggests 6 to 12 months, but it will depend on many factors.	
	Q: Would a change in government lead to a change in policy? A: It would depend, in my advisory role with schools I have signed off two academies, there are lots of things to consider such as land transfer, staff TUPE, and funding transfer issues. A: As HT in other local schools locally it took 18 months to complete, it varies so much.	
	Q: Would the local authority be interested in taking on a MAT? A: They couldn't run one of their own, but they could engineer it. For example there are some schools that MATs would not want to take on, so a local authority might be asked to take on. The Regional Schools Commissioner would have to make a decision.	
	Q: What are the benefits of being part of a MAT? A: We will need to find out more from the MAST conference and be better informed.	
	Action: To continue to monitor and review MAT developments on an ongoing basis in the best interests of the school.	All

1:

GB 67/22

What can we learn from other governing bodies?

The Chair asked governors if they were able to share their experiences of working with other governing bodies in informing the future agendas and business of the RMS FGB.

- It would be helpful to produce a schedule of governor monitoring visits.
- Could we be more efficient with the approval of policies, such as only approving those that have changed and assume we adopt NYCC recommended policies?

Q: Do academies have committees?

A: They have local governing boards and most decisions are taken by the Board of Directors of the Trust, who also have oversight of budget and financial issues. The HT usually produces a termly report.

- More staff that present at FGBs the better, then we get to know much more about staff and the school.
- Should we have fewer meetings?

Q: Should we have updates and papers rather than just the HT report?

A: I am happy with the information we get, but it is good to hear from other staff, we can then get a richer contribution about the school from a different perspective. Also it would be helpful to get external reports but on reflection I think we get everything we need to see.

• The Clerk suggested that there should always be an agenda item on safeguarding, even if nothing to report or it was covered by the HT Report.

PART D-OTHER BUSINESS

GB 68/22

What impact have we had on the learning experience of pupils in the school?

- Consultation on the two year old offer agreed
- Consultation on the school uniform flexibility agreed
- Encouraged and been informed by subject leaders on the curriculum experienced by children in the school.
- Confirmed that WAC prices should remain the same.

There being no further business, the Chair thanked Governors, the HT and all staff for their hard work and commitment to the school, and closed the meeting at 19.38 pm.

The date of the next FGB meeting is the 26th September 2022 at 5pm for a 5.30 start of business.

Please send apologies to the Clerk Pat Gale:

Pat.gale@northyorks.gov.uk;

Or 07793 846 441

Sign:

Please note: The colour coding above links to the three key roles of governance questioning; RED for 'setting strategic direction'

RED for 'setting strategic direction', BLUE for 'holding Headteacher to account for educational performance'

GREEN for 'ensuring financial health, probity and value for money'.

Sign: