

**Federation of Beckwithshaw and Kettleasing Felliscliffe Primary Schools and Ripley Endowed Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School**

**Meeting of the Interim Executive Board held on  
Monday, 9 January 2023 at 5.00 p.m. – held virtually.**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Robert Ling (RL) – Chair, Helen Smith (HS), Sarah Bassitt (SB), Anne Vetch (AV), Darren Dudman (DD)

**Apologies:** All present

**In attendance:**

Amanda Newbold (AN) – Assistant Director Education and Skills

Karen Taylor (KT) – FMS officer

Victoria Kirkman (VK) – Acting Executive Headteacher

Rebecca Foy (BF)– Co-exec HT and SENCO

Chris Walker – Clerk

Charlotte Holstein (CH) – Teacher

Governing Body functions:

Ensuring the vision, ethos and strategic direction of the school are clearly defined.

Ensuring that the Head Teacher performs her responsibilities for the educational performance of the school.

Ensuring the sound, proper and efficient use of the school’s financial resources.

		<b>Actions</b>
<b>PART ‘A’ - PROCEDURAL</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b> RL welcomed everyone to the meeting. AV had agreed to join the meeting to discuss item 16.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b> All present.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Confidentiality</b> Governors agreed to consider confidentiality as the meeting progressed.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest for any agenda item:</b> No declarations were made.	
<b>5</b>	<b>To approve the minutes and confidential minutes from the meetings on 12 December 2022.</b> The minutes were approved by the governors as a true record to be signed by the Chair.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Matters arising</b> None.	

## PART 'B' – SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT.

7

### Finance

KT provided a verbal update on any financial developments since the previous meeting. Key points raised included:

- The LA support to cover the costs of VK had ended from half term October 2023. These costs would now need to be met by the Federation and the monitoring reports would be adjusted accordingly.
- The Expenditure Concerns Panel had not approved the support from Killinghall.
- Governors understood that there had been a misinterpretation by the Panel and it was hoped that this support would be approved.
- AV/KT/VK had met to discuss staffing structures. The outcomes would be reflected in the draft Start Budget.
- Additional funding would be provided as part of nationally agreed support from the Government. Details were not yet known.

Governors agreed that it would be helpful to see the impact of the staffing changes on the budgets for each of the schools.

**Action:** KT to share updated reports once ready.

Governor question

Q: How accurate are the current reports?

A: They are accurate. The financial systems across the Federation have been streamlined and ensuring that the figures were accurate had been a priority.

### School Meals

Governors had been provided with a report setting out the costs of school meals at each of the schools within the Federation as well as two other local schools. The report also identified the reasons for the costs and how much each school was currently losing per meal. Governors were asked to consider raising the price of school meals across the Federation.

Governor questions.

Q: Who currently provides the meals?

A: North Yorkshire County Council Caterers.

Q: Are these meals for Key Stage 2 pupils?

A: Yes.

Governors noted that in addition to the figures set out in the table schools also incurred a loss for each Free School Meal (FSM) that they provided.

Governors agreed that whilst it was not sustainable for these losses to continue they had to be mindful that a significant increase could impact on families being able to afford a meal for their children. In some cases this might be the only hot meal that the child received each day. There was also the possibility that a significant rise could deter future parents from sending their children to the Federation.

AN joined the meeting at 5.23pm.

KT

	<p>VK proposed a rise of 10% in line with inflation which would take the price to £2.80.</p> <p>SB informed governors that a different provider had been used at her school with a cost neutral outcome. The meal cost was £2.70. If this route was to be chosen by the Federation there would be a number of actions to undertake including a consultation. Any staffing implications would also need consideration.</p> <p>Governors agreed that they needed a clearer understanding of how many meals would be affected and therefore the potential cost implications before making a final decision.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> VK/KT to provide this information for governors by the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Lease arrangements.</u> A note had been shared with governors, in advance of the meeting, which set out a number of issues with regard to the lease status at Ripley; some areas of the site had a lease, others did not. Governors were concerned as to whether the insurance cover would apply if the leases were not in place. HS had been working with the Trustees to resolve the situation and would keep the IEB updated.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS to liaise with VK and KT as required.</p> <p>KT informed governors that the cost of the current insurance was £1040 and had therefore gone to Panel who had refused to authorise the payment as they were concerned that there could end up being a double charge. HS confirmed that the Trustees had covered the payment and that this was therefore a re-charge. Insurance was therefore in place.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS to provide VK with a briefing note to share with the Panel at their next meeting in order to get this payment approved.</p> <p><u>Maintenance Programme</u> <b>Action:</b> VK agreed to provide governors with a list of proposed capital spends at the next IEB.</p> <p><u>Review contracts schedule, renewals/tender documents.</u> VK confirmed that this had been completed; savings had been identified and a more streamlined process put in place.</p> <p>Governors thanked KT who left the meeting at 17.43</p>	<p>VK/KT</p> <p>HS/VK/KT</p> <p>HS</p> <p>VK</p>
8	<p><b>Subject Lead Updates</b> CH provided a verbal update on the Maths curriculum. Key points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The curriculum had been reviewed last term. The process included a range of monitoring such as book scrutinies.</li> <li>- A key outcome had been to develop a set of non-negotiables that all teachers were required to implement. These included the format of lessons, what books should look like and how work was marked.</li> <li>- The focus had been on Y3 and Y4. Assessment trackers were being used to identify areas of improvement.</li> <li>- Next steps included ensuring staff were supported to deliver the required curriculum. CPD and lesson observations would form part of this support.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maths and English provision in Early Years was included as part of the curriculum development.</li> <li>- Leaders would assess impact, check on progress and identify gaps as part of the monitoring cycle.</li> <li>- Building confidence in the subject leaders was key and training sessions, including INSET days would focus on this.</li> </ul> <p>Governor question  Q: Is there consistency in the teaching of Maths across the Federation and is it at the right standard?  A: Standards of practice have risen significantly following the introduction of the non-negotiables. Consistency is improving and we are monitoring this closely. We regularly monitor impact, identify any gaps or areas for improvement and provide support where required.</p> <p>A governor reported that during a monitoring visit today she had observed more confidence amongst the middle leaders within the Federation. There had clearly been an impact of the work being undertaken by CH and VK which was welcomed.</p> <p>Q: How do we know, as an IEB, that what you are telling us is actually happening?  A: Evidence is provided through the Headteacher’s Report, the data, through link governor monitoring visits and through external reports from Karen Butler.</p> <p>Governors were mindful of the need to ensure all the positive developments, such as curriculum development and the development of middle leaders was communicated to parents.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Governors agreed that the developments outlined by CH should be included in the next IEB newsletter to parents. (AV)</p> <p>VK confirmed that a questionnaire would be sent to parents/carers, staff and pupils this term. Outcomes would be shared at the next IEB meeting.</p> <p>Governors thanked CH for her presentation.</p> <p>CH left the meeting at 6.04pm</p>	AV
9	<p><b>Headteacher’s Report</b>  Governors had been provided with a dashboard in advance of the meeting. VK talked through each section but highlighted that not much had changed since the last meeting and as the new term had just started.</p> <p>Governor question  Q: What period does the data cover?  A: From the start of the Spring Term.</p> <p>Q: Will you be including any SIAMS grades?  A: Yes, I will update after having a meeting with the Diocesan Education Advisor next week.</p> <p>VK confirmed that future reports would include data for ‘severe absence’ - where pupils attendance was 50% or lower.</p>	

	<p><b>Action:</b> VK agreed to ensure data in the HT report started from September and was then updated. This would enable governors to track progress over time.</p> <p>The Sports Premium Plans for 2022-23 for each school had been shared in advance of the meeting and were approved by governors. VK/BF reported that the CPD schedule was a working document which was updated on a regular basis. The training on the schedule aimed to align with the Federation Development Plan.</p> <p><u>Policy Schedule</u> The updated Policy Schedule had been shared with governors. The schedule set out when policies would require IEB approval and therefore at which meeting they would be tabled.</p> <p>The Risk Assessment Index had been shared with governors in advance of the meeting and detailed what assessments would be undertaken and when.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Governors asked for routine updates that these assessments had been undertaken. (VK)</p>	VK
10	<p><b>Federation Development Plan (FDP) 2022-23</b> The FDP had been shared with governors in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>VK reported that the FDP focused on 6 key priorities. This was an organic document and had full staff support.</p> <p>Governor question Q: How will monitoring be undertaken? A: There will be regular, ongoing monitoring of progress. This will be done by subject leaders, the SLT and by the IEB. Governors will be encouraged to monitor the priorities as part of their link governor monitoring visits.</p> <p>Governors agreed that it would be helpful to receive updates on the actions - ideally in the HT Report.</p> <p>AN thanked VK for all her work to develop the FDP and informed governors that the FDP would also be reviewed by Karen Butler before being signed off.</p> <p><u>Staffing</u> This discussion has been recorded in a separate confidential minute as it related to confidential staffing matters.</p>	
11	<p><b>Governor</b></p> <p><u>Monitoring visits</u> SB had undertaken a monitoring visit on 9 January and would provide a written report.</p>	
12	<p><b>Policies</b> Item 8 refers</p>	
13	<p><b>Health and Safety/ Safeguarding</b> There were no concerns to report.</p>	

<b>14</b>	<b>Correspondence</b> None	
<b>15</b>	<b>Any other urgent business</b> None	
<b>16</b>	<b>Future Leadership Arrangements/ Strategic Direction</b>	

The meeting closed at 6.45 pm

Signed: (Chair)

Date: