

MANOR

CHURCH OF ENGLAND ACADEMY, YORK

LOCAL GOVERNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23rd June 2021 at 6.00pm

Present: Simon Barber (Principal) Charlotte Day
Andy Richardson (Chair) Steve King
Debbie Cooper Sally Smith
Rvd Andrew Gready

In Attendance: Andrew Hill (Vice Principal: Attainment & Progress)
Sam Vince (Governance Advisor - Clerk)

		Action
1.	<p><u>Opening Prayer, Welcome, Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, which opened with a prayer. No apologies were received. Richard Nihill was absent.</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Minutes of the meeting held on 14th April 2021, Action Plan and Matters Arising</u></p> <p>Previously distributed. The minutes were agreed to be a true and accurate record.</p> <p>With reference to the Action Plan:</p> <p>1. <i>Governors agreed that from a scrutiny perspective, it would be helpful to see more detail about how the school had responded to negative comments, and whether these were random or a pattern of connected issues. The Principal agreed to request further detail on this for governors' information from the Vice Principal.</i> Closed. The Principal noted a Vice Principal had produced a helpful summary for the school newsletter which had not been included in the papers for this meeting. He agreed to distribute this to governors after the meeting. The Principal provided a verbal overview of the way the analysis had been conducted and provided some examples of issues raised. He confirmed that everyone who had raised an issue (and had put their name to it) had been contacted by a head of year to discuss the issue in more detail.</p> <p>2. <i>The Principal agreed to check with the Vice Principal (Welfare) whether exclusion data comparisons with schools of a similar demographic was possible, and report back.</i> Completed. The Principal confirmed the school received data comparing their school with other York schools each month and had requested this be included in reports to governors moving forwards.</p> <p>3. <i>Governors to contact Chair to advise which link governor roles they were able to take on.</i> Carried forward – governors were reminded by the Chair to submit their preferences to him.</p> <p>4. <i>The Governance Advisor agreed to re-circulate information on remote link governor monitoring.</i> Completed.</p> <p>5. <i>It was agreed that the Chair should request a meeting with the CEO to raise governors' concerns about the pooling of funding and changes to Local Governing Committee responsibilities and discuss these in more detail.</i> Completed.</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>All gobs</p>

	<p>6. It was agreed that the Principal, Chair, Debbie Cooper (Standards) and Steve King (Resources) should meet to discuss potential changes to the way that the Local Governing Committee operated from September. Closed – on this agenda for discussion in item 7.4.</p> <p>7. Andrew Greedy to contact Katherine Humpleby to volunteer as Manor representative on the Church School Network. Completed.</p> <p>There were no other matters arising.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p><u>Resources – Receipt of Start Budget (recommendation to the Board for approval)</u> <u>Resources Working Group</u></p> <p>The chair of the Resources Working Group was invited to highlight items of interest from the minutes. It was confirmed the surplus had only dropped by £29,000 to £87,000, which was seen as remarkable given the amount of lost lettings during Covid. The rendering on the main building had now been completed, but it was confirmed rendering still needed to be undertaken on the Hive. Questions were invited from governors.</p> <p>A governor queried what the current situation was regarding lettings. The Principal confirmed the outdoor lettings were beginning to re-start, but it was not clear how lettings would progress throughout the rest of the year.</p> <p><u>Start Budget</u></p> <p>The Principal confirmed the school had not seen a final version of the Start Budget and was concerned their budget was falling between roles in the finance team. He also confirmed he had been requested to attend the Trust Resources committee the following week to answer questions on the budget. The LGC were due to formally recommend approval of the start budget to the board, but given they had not had sight of it, they agreed they could not do this.</p> <p>There was no representation from Finance at this meeting, so the clerk was asked to take an action to confirm the position with the Start Budget and whether the LGC was still expected to review and provide a recommendation for approval, given the changes to governance structures and they would no longer be responsible for setting it.</p> <p>A governor queried why the Principal had to answer questions on the budget when he had not set it. The Principal explained the Trust wished to get a sense of the Principal’s understanding of his budgets and the parameters the school was working within.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><u>Principal’s Report</u> <u>4.1 Data update</u></p> <p>Mr Hill, the Vice Principal, was asked to highlight key areas of the data. He noted an issue with lockdown had been the January to March data collection points had been suspended, as standardised assessments could not be run from home. Exam boards released GCSE requirements in March and so the school planned for those as best as they could, with all staff directed at gathering evidence for the GCSEs. No data was collected in April as the school was solely focused on year 11. It was confirmed the GCSE results had been submitted to the exam boards the week before along with the samples of work requested and rationales behind the decisions made. Grades had to be awarded by the exam board before the school could discuss them with anyone and finalised grades were expected on 12th August. Mr Hill confirmed a number of students had been supported by extra tutoring which had had a significant impact on forecast grades.</p> <p>In terms of KS3, the data demonstrated the students who had arrived at the school were performing slightly better than the national average, but the school would be in a position to confirm which students needed support once the online GL assessments, which were currently being undertaken, had been completed. Generally the school’s average national average had dropped by up to five points across English, Maths and Science. The impact of lockdown had been seen in the year 7 CAT scores which were approximately 102 upon entry, but following progress checks after ten weeks,</p>	

this had risen to 106 for English and Maths and 103 for Science.

Year 10 students were undertaking end of year exams in classrooms with another data collection point in July to enable the school to understand which students would benefit from extra tutoring from the Autumn term.

A governor asked whether the exam boards chose what to moderate at random or whether it was based on suspicions grades had been inflated. Mr Hill confirmed English or Maths had to be moderated but the school had also had French selected, which he considered was because the school historically had been just below the national average and this year it had risen slightly above that. However, the school were confident that could be explained by the fact there had been a reduction from about 85% to 50% of students choosing foreign languages, with those in the cohort who had chosen it having higher ability.

4.2 Behaviour & Attendance

Behaviour

The Principal confirmed the PA figure was over 13% which looked quite high in comparison to previous years, but was low in comparison to other schools. Exclusions were 6.3% with Covid adaptations having been recognised as significantly reducing a number of behaviour issues. An example was provided where most issues occurred at lunchtime, so having half an hour for lunch and half an hour free time (which was reduced from pre-Covid) reduced the amount of time students had to get into trouble. He confirmed the school would like to retain this arrangement and the same level of supervision even when restrictions had ended. Split breaks would also be retained to limit the number of students in the same place at the same time. The Principal confirmed 46 students had had one exclusion, with 14 having multiple exclusions.

Attendance

The Principal confirmed attendance was 94.46% and whilst school would prefer it to be above 95%, he felt this was an amazing achievement in the pandemic. It was noted since the school had removed the need for face masks in May, this had adversely affected the number of Covid cases and consequently attendance, but cases had stabilised with none at all in the past few weeks. Some local schools were experiencing higher numbers of cases.

Items discussed which were not included on the agenda:

4.3 Standards Working Group Update

The group chair was asked to provide a verbal overview of the items discussed at the Standards Working Group meeting. It was noted the outcome of the Ofsted review had been discussed which had been very positive on the whole, with a slight shift in emphasis suggested to the QA process. The new complaints procedure for students and parents for TAGs was also reviewed and a weakness highlighted where the Principal was involved in both confirming internal grade decisions and also with appeals. The committee had recommended he did not sit on both and so he would now only be involved with appeals.

The resources from the Education Endowment Foundation had been reviewed and found to be the most effective way of ensuring students caught up, so the committee had been pleased the school had followed that research when deciding how best to utilise their catch-up funding. Behaviour had also been reviewed in detail. The committee chair confirmed they had also requested more information on bullying as they had not reviewed the data in detail for a while.

4.4 Exam Fees

Mr Hill explained there was a dispute between the unions and exam boards regarding exam fees rebates. The school had spent £95,000 that year and it was noted exam boards had increased their fees. The first exam board had declared a rebate of 42% but a union survey suggested rebates should be nearer 50-75% as schools had done most of the work. Last year rebates were approximately 22%. Mr Hill noted the exam boards were still employing staff to undertake the QA of grades but they were not marking any papers and were also making significant savings on postage and printing.

	<p><u>4.5 Principal's wider role in the Trust</u></p> <p>The Principal noted he had been asked by Helen Winn to take on wider responsibilities within in the Trust. One of these was to become the Trust Schools Church Lead which involved attending the Trust Distinctiveness committee and helping to set up structures for the church schools in the Trust.</p> <p>The other responsibility he had been asked to take on was the co-ordination of QA for the Trust. Following the whole school B11 review it had been identified that some of the schools' QA could be more developmental in its nature other than holding people to account. Instead of checking marking was being done, it should be checking how what was being done was impacting students. All schools would receive a whole school B11 review and an external subject review every year, which would produce a report for LGC and SEF. Strengths and key areas for development would feed into the subject networks across the trust who would use the information to work on common areas for development across all schools. School specific QA would also be undertaken where schools could decide for themselves how and what was reviewed. Schools would also gift days to other schools where one of the team would spend a day at another school and vice versa. The aim of a more co-ordinated approach was to provide more regular updates on the effectiveness of the school. Governors noted this would also be helpful for link governor roles.</p>	
5.	<p><u>Academy Development Plan / Self-Evaluation Framework</u></p> <p>Governors noted the latest version of the Academy Development Plan / Self-Evaluation Framework, which had been circulated with the agenda. The Principal noted they were planning the school's priorities for the coming year but the previous year had been positive with catch-up initiatives being effective.</p> <p>Mr Hill was asked to provide an update on the tutoring programme, and confirmed the school would like this to remain but with slightly fewer students as only one cohort was able to use it this year due to the numbers involved. It was confirmed they would continue to utilise small groups rather than one to one interventions.</p> <p>A significant change was noted in KS3 when the school moved to having a two year rather than a three year KS4, with students choosing GCSEs in year 9 rather than year 8. The Principal noted he was only aware of one school nationally who was rated as outstanding with a three year KS4, given Ofsted's focus on curriculum breadth.</p>	
6.	<p><u>SEND Annual Review report 2020-21</u></p> <p>Governors noted the report which would be added to the school website. The report articulated what the school provided for SEND students enabling parents to make an informed choice about the best provision for their child.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Governance Update</u></p> <p><u>7.1 Link Governor Reports</u></p> <p>Governors noted no visits had been undertaken recently.</p> <p><u>7.2 Update from Trust Chair's meeting (24th May 2021)</u></p> <p>The Chair noted this meeting now included chairs from SALT. Covid recovery was discussed but the focus had been on the progression of the Trust merger, with the name of the new Trust confirmed as the Hope Sentamu Learning Trust. The Principal noted this name change would affect all email addresses within the Trust.</p> <p><u>7.3 Governor Training</u></p> <p>Governors were encouraged to book onto training around the assurance model and scrutiny and challenge of the Academy Development Plan/SEF, particularly given the imminent governance changes.</p> <p>A governor noted a query had been raised from the safeguarding audit in regards that governors</p>	

should all undertake the Trust's safeguarding training. The Principal agreed to distribute the Trust's Safeguarding training link again to the governors and would check school records to confirm who had already completed the training.

Principal

7.4 Future Structure of the Local Governing Committee

It was noted that a paper had been separately circulated providing governance options for review. The Chair summarised the issues which currently faced the governors; the LGC did not have enough governors and their remit would soon be re-focused and reduced. The Principal confirmed the Trust had stated sub-committees were no longer required and all business should be undertaken at LGCs. He confirmed the remit of the LGC going forwards would not include finances but would be to focus on the QA of education, safeguarding and behaviour, which was basically the remit of the Standards committee with church scrutiny added in. Usually the Standards committee met prior to the LGC to scrutinise the data in detail but this scrutiny would now be at the LGC. He suggested that Link governors could perhaps go into school to scrutinise the detailed data and report back to the LGC.

Governors noted there was merit in the proposal, especially to reduce meetings and overlap of responsibilities but raised the following concerns with the proposal;

- *Governors currently challenged information provided to them by school, requested additional data as they thought necessary and reviewed the information in detail. There was a concern schools could only provide data which painted a picture they wanted governors to see rather than demonstrating transparent scrutiny (governors were at pains to confirm they did not think this happened at the school, rather it was a risk it could happen in future).*
- *Discussing data in detail would change the tone of the LGC meetings and with more governors involved, there would be less opportunity to scrutinise the data in as much detail.*
- *It was unclear how pre-meetings would be organised and how they would work.*
- *Governors had a wider remit in the LGC and there was a need to ensure time was available to give the data the focus it needed.*
- *Several governors currently had in-depth knowledge of certain areas and they were unsure whether this would continue in the new structure.*
- *Having only one Link governor providing scrutiny prior to the LGC would be dangerous, different viewpoints were needed.*
- *Governors did not wish to lose the opportunity to encourage the ethos of the school. Teachers involved in the Ethos committee don't sit on the LGC so governors would miss hearing from these other staff members.*

However governors conceded they needed to be open to trying new approaches and understood a different mind-set was needed. A reduction in meetings was also seen as a positive for governors and for staff.

The Principal suggested that the LGCs going forwards would include all of the Vice Principals plus additional relevant staff for the church related items on the agenda, so the governors would retain the ability to receive updates from the same staff as they were doing now. He added meetings would need to be more focused and that it would be useful to have meetings in between to review data to inform LGC meetings and asked governors' permission to try the new structure from the Autumn term.

Governors discussed the merits of a potential compromise of reducing to one Standards Working Group meeting per term like the Ethos Working Group. However the Principal re-iterated the Trust did not want to have separate working group meetings but wanted the LGC to be the place where formal discussions were held and minutes and actions were agreed, where the school was held to account. The Principal suggested a scrutiny group involving multiple governors could meet in school in between LGC meetings and report their findings to the next LGC.

Governors queried whether data would be issued to governors for review and also raised a concern that due to work, multiple governors may not be able to visit school during the day. They also challenged that this solution did not address their concern regarding school choosing which data to present to them. The Principal responded by confirming the Trust provided clear

	<p>guidance on what they should report as they wanted schools to be rigorously held to account.</p> <p><i>Governors noted they currently had reassurance and full transparency about issues at the school because they had access to any data they wished to see and without this there was a risk they would not be providing an adequate level of challenge to the school.</i> Options were discussed to allow more access to detailed data in between meetings but no resolution was reached.</p> <p>Governors agreed to take the governance structure issue off-line and continue discussions over email, with a view to having a resolution by the end of the school year.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Safeguarding (standing item)</u></p> <p>Governors noted the Safeguarding Audit report, which had been circulated with the agenda. The Safeguarding governor confirmed only a small number of recommendations had been made, with the most pertinent one being to undertake the Trust Safeguarding training which had already been discussed in item 4.3. The report asserted the school had good practice and was very thorough.</p>	
9.	<p><u>Ethos, Wellbeing & Church Distinctiveness</u></p> <p>Governors noted the minutes from the Ethos meeting held on 9th June had been circulated with the agenda. The Principal confirmed the school was having its first assemblies in a year and a half in year groups in the hall from the following week, which was an important vehicle for emphasising the church ethos of the school. Relationships were being built with the new vicar of Poppleton and the Holy Redeemer and he would be going into school to take Eucharist from September.</p>	
10.	<p><u>Policies to Note / Approve</u></p> <p><u>Lettings policy annual review</u></p> <p>The Principal noted this policy review had been done but there had been no changes to it, hence why it had not been circulated with the agenda.</p>	
11.	<p><u>Items and Questions to Raise with the Trust Board</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Governance structures going forwards – Clarification about responsibilities for the Start Budget in this interim period prior to the new governance structures being implemented. Governors saw it as a significant issue that they had not had the opportunity to review the final version. 	
12.	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>Governors passed on their thanks to all staff and students for their efforts, adaptability and calm in an extraordinary year. Governors asked the Principal to inform them if there were any appropriate opportunities whereby they could visit school in person (Covid safely) before the end of term. The Principal was hopeful the school could hold a normal sports day in the last week of term and had planned for year group assemblies on the last day which governors were welcome to attend.</p>	
13.	<p><u>Date and Time of next meeting</u></p> <p>Governors noted the 2021-22 meeting dates for Hope Sentamu Learning Trust which had been circulated with the agenda.</p>	

The meeting closed at 19.52pm.

These minutes were approved at the Manor LGC meeting held on 29th September 2021

MANOR CHURCH OF ENGLAND ACADEMY ACTION POINTS – 23RD JUNE 2021

	Action Point	Item	Responsibility	Timescale
1	<i>Issue the Vice Principal's summary of responses to negative comments to governors (from the school newsletter)</i>	2	<i>Principal (SB)</i>	<i>Following the meeting</i>
2	<i>Governors to contact Chair to advise which link governor roles they were able to take on.</i>	2	<i>All governors</i>	<i>By the next meeting</i>
3	<i>Distribute the Trust's Safeguarding training link again to the governors and would check school records to confirm who had already completed the training.</i>	7.3	<i>Principal (SB)</i>	<i>By the next meeting</i>

APPROVED