

**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 21 March 2022 at 5.00 p.m. held virtually via Teams.**

MINUTES

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

Apologies: None.

In attendance:

Mathew Atkinson (MA) – Acting Executive Headteacher
 Holly Whyte (HW)- Acting Headteacher
 James Routh (JR) –Curriculum Leader
 Amanda Newbold (AN) - Assistant Director Education and Skills, NYCC
 Karen Butler (KB) – Senior Education Advisor
 Penny Fenton – Clerk
 Rachel Richardson (RR) - Bursar

Actions from this meeting

Item	Action	Lead	Deadline
4.1	Rol forms to be completed and returned to Chris.	IEB Members	
4.2	Disqualification Certificates to be signed and returned to Chris.	IE Members	
5.1	Change time of meeting on minutes 14/2/22	Clerk	
5.2	Change time of meeting on confidential minutes 14/2/22	Clerk	
9.1	AN to pick up with finance colleagues how to address the 'lag' in addressing the banking issues.	AN	
9.1	RR to follow up on the £24k School Improvement funds with NYCC.	RR	
9.3	RR to obtain attendance data for wraparound care and prepare some financial modelling.	RR	Next meeting
9.3	Parents survey and consistent wraparound care offer to be in place by September.	IEB/HT	
9.3	Meeting to be arranged to finalise the above.		
9.3	RR to provide the figures and IEB to decide whether pp funding can be used for wraparound care.	RR/IEB	
9.3	MA to confirm the fsm pupils at Kettleasing before ASC debt can be written off.	MA	
10.4	MA to email NYCC re caretaking time and issues across the federation and cc RL.	MA/RL	
10.5	MA to check pupil numbers in the HT Report.	MA	

10.5	RL to thank interim leadership team for their work and support, in writing.	RL	
11.2	Statement of Action to be a standing agenda item.	Clerk/ Agenda	Ongoing.
11.2	HS/DD to discuss merging three school newsletters.	HS/DD	
11.5	RL to confirm when completed reading KCSiE	RL.	
11.6	AV/DD/HS - (RL Deputy) to form Staff Appeals Panel for Kettlesing.	AV/DD/HS (RS)	
14	RL to check with MA regarding venue for parents evening.	RL	
14	KB to check capacity of school hall and village hall.	KB	
15	KB to request Julie send a colleague for the HT recruitment planning meeting.	KB	
15	KB to discuss HT applications with Joy at Beckwithshaw	KB.	

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.

MINUTES

No.	Item	Actions
PART 'A' - PROCEDURAL		
1	Welcome and Introductions: RL opened the meeting, welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending. A round of introductions were made.	
2	Apologies: There were no apologies for absence as all members of the IEB were present at the meeting.	
3	Confidentiality: The importance of confidentiality was emphasised. Members to notify any confidential matters as the meeting progressed.	
4	Declarations of Interest: 4.1 <u>Register of Business Interest forms</u> Register of Interest forms had been circulated prior to the meeting. To be completed and returned to Chris.	IEB

	<p>4.2 <u>Disqualification Certificate</u></p> <p>To be signed and returned to Chris.</p> <p>4.3 <u>Declaration of Interest</u></p> <p>AV advised that Upper Wharfedale were advertising for a Head Teacher also and will be interviewing two days after the interviews for the federation Head Teacher post.</p>	IEB
5	<p>To approve the minutes and confidential minutes of the meetings of 14th February 2022 and 28th February 2022:</p> <p>Three sets of minutes had been circulated.</p> <p>5.1 <u>Minutes 14th February 2022</u></p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> that the minutes be approve as an accurate record and signed by the IEB chair, subject to change of the time of the meeting to 1.00 pm.</p> <p>5.2 <u>Confidential Minute 14th February 2022</u></p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> that the confidential minutes be approved as an accurate record and signed by the IEB chair, subject to change of the time of the meeting to 1.00 pm.</p> <p>5.3 <u>Confidential Minutes 28th February 2022</u></p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> that the confidential minutes be approved as an accurate record and signed by the IEB chair.</p>	<p>Chair Clerk</p> <p>Chair Clerk</p> <p>Chair</p>
6	<p>Matters Arising:</p> <p>There were no matters arising from any of the minutes.</p>	
7	<p>Code of Conduct:</p> <p>This had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> to adopt the NGA code of Conduct.</p>	
8	<p>Standing Orders:</p> <p>These had been circulated in advance of the meeting.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u> to adopt the Standing Orders, as submitted.</p>	

PART 'B' – SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

9

Finance:

RR guided the IEB through the documents and some slides that she had been asked to produce. The slides were shared to screen.

9.1 Budget Monitoring

Kettlesing:

Projected revenue surplus of £9.3k and capital of £4k. Admin absences were leading to capacity issues at school and details were provided. Nursery was behind on billing for non-funded nursery hours for the last two half terms and this would be quite a significant figure.

Lack of access to the school Barclaycard had led to a senior teacher using their personal card to make payments. £5k of reimbursements were to be made to the senior teacher and details of the purchases were provided. The issue was this was not tracked spend leading to overspends in some cost centres, the VAT guidance had been revised, so school should not be re-claiming VAT on those purchases. RR had asked for financial controls to be reinstated for any spend of more than £50.

Challenge: How long has that been going on?

Response: Since the suspension of the substantive Head Teacher in October. Nothing had been put in place and she was the signatory on the bank accounts and had the Barclaycard with her when she left.

Challenge: Are we sure that no purchases have been made on the school credit card since the previous HT left?

Response: I code by looking at the account online and I have not seen anything that seems out of place, also the delivery address is correct. I went through by code looking for VAT.

It was agreed that no staff should be using their own credit cards for school purchases even though it had been done in good faith and for the benefit of the school.

Challenge: Who is going to be the cardholder, moving forward?

Response: At this point MH and HW, and a new process is to be put in place after Easter.

Challenge: There is always a time lag and so, two or three weeks from Easter, we could find ourselves with three schools with no ability to spend given the time it takes to get a Barclaycard, change signatories for the bank account and get set up on Virgin on-line to ensure appropriate codes are being used.

	<p>Response: Point taken and we will look at how we address that risk.</p> <p>AN advised that she will pick that up with Finance colleagues.</p> <p>MA updated on the Barclaycard. New cards had been ordered in HW's name for Ripley and Beckwithshaw. Kettlesing had submitted an application the previous week but on the wrong form and they will need to reapply but school need to know whose name that will be in. Agreed that the card would be in Becky's name until more permanent arrangements were put in place.</p> <p>Ripley:</p> <p>Ripley were showing a revenue position of minus £18.7k and capital of £10.8k surplus. There were questions about the reliability of some income streams. School Admin had been off again and it was not clear whether the bank statements back to August had been caught up with. Childcare vouchers for ASC and Nursery may not have been added and Nursery non-funding hours had not been added in for the last two half terms. RR was unsure whether any staff absence insurance had been claimed for the last two half terms. All schools are with private insurers and can be timed out if claims are not made promptly; this must be a priority for school leaders.</p> <p>The £24,127 from School Improvement was still outstanding as well as Trustees funding of £9k.</p> <p>A meeting was arranged for the following week regarding financial controls for Ripley and Beckwithshaw and attendees would be notified and would include someone from the IEB. AN had discussed this earlier in the day. HW and MA could stand down in that regard as alternative invitees for the meeting had been identified.</p> <p>RR advised that she had some budget issues for Ripley in that it was difficult to prepare the new budgets while questions remained about whether they are moving to a two-class structure in September, based on pupil projections. If so, there would be staffing consequences and a process to be followed and RR needed to know who would be making those decisions.</p> <p>Following discussions, it was agreed that RR should prepare the budget based on the school as it is at present as the IEB could not answer those questions at the present time.</p> <p>The timing of academisation was a concern as RR cannot prepare a budget with a large loss in it, that NYCC would be responsible for. Governors agreed that they could only prepare as best they can and alter things as more information becomes available.</p> <p>Challenge: Where is the £24k from NYCC? Response: RR will follow up with NYCC.</p>	<p>AN</p> <p>RR</p>
--	--	---------------------

Beckwithshaw:

Revenue was showing a £28.6k surplus, with Capital of nil.

There had been no admin in place for the autumn half term, a new starter had promptly resigned and there was someone in place now with no school experience. The previous admin had promised to do some work, but had not and the income management system was not correct. Details were provided. School meals could be reconciled and the difference was around £2,000 of meals not put onto the management system. RR will have to go through the meal reports, week by week, since September and parents may receive late bills. School will need to explain to parents what has happened and apologise.

The IEB were aware and would be picking that up with a covering letter and an explanation. The Chair felt it would be worthwhile getting an external audit in, as he had concerns about some of the procurement processes and Veritau might provide some clarify and reassurance or a very clear action plan for moving forward. Governors agreed.

Governors agreed on the need for a federation business manager, moving forward, as mistakes or gaps were being replicated three times, across three schools. The IEB discussed whether it would be worth finding someone in another federation who was more knowledgeable and buy in some of that support.

Governors felt that the issues were bigger than had first been thought and that an audit would be useful. It was felt that they may be looking at the headship as the major issue but without the finance in place, the schools would close. It was emphasised that they should appoint someone who could come in a get to grips with finance as soon as possible. Head Teachers have quite long notice periods but for business managers it should be around 4 weeks. It was felt that the federation should advertise for a competent SBM to deal with the issues for which the IEB was now responsible.

Challenge: Can we do both in parallel?

Response: Yes, Veritau can come in quite quickly and we need consistency and the rotation in roles is not helping. Affordability is an issue but how can we afford not to? The IEB must put things in place for where the federation is now. The federation need a new HT and admin for three schools, as each have individual issues.

The ASC income needed checking back to September for invoicing parents. Details were provided of changes to the billing system.

Teachers had been absent but no contact made with the insurance absence scheme and this needed to be addressed urgently. MA advised that those claims were in process for all three schools.

Thanks were offered to RR for her report. There were no other questions around the financial information circulated.

9.2 Approval of SFVS

The Chair has the SFVS for all three schools and these were in hand and were to be submitted along with the Related Third-Party Transaction reports to Veritau.

9.3 Wraparound Care Data

The report had been written in November for the previous governing body. MA provided additional information.

Challenge: Breakfast Clubs; do all three make money?

Response: Yes.

Challenge: ASC; how have you arrived at the figures?

Response: It is slightly different at Beckwithshaw as they charge less for the first hour than for the second hour. We need a conversation around fsm children being offered free clubs since September 2021 and whether we can reclaim that.

Challenge: Is there any written evidence or is that just verbal?

Response: Verbal but several parents have said they were told that, not just one. We have sent out debt letters and people have started paying for the clubs we can charge for, but not that one. The best guess for the cost is around £548.50 for the breakfast club (£144 relating to fsm children) and ASC over £800 for fsm pupils.

Challenge: Like the school meals, are we sure that all the weeks are included?

Response: No, we don't really know how much the debt will be.

Challenge: Can we look at an online booking system so that parents pay up front?

Details were provided of how this system worked elsewhere. It would be financially secure.

Challenge: Could we provide the Federation ASC in one venue? It is possible that an external provider would pick that up as it may be a viable business opportunity.

<p>AN commented that this would be the right approach for 'normal' schools, in normal circumstances, but the IEB were an interim board and the outcome will be a sponsorship arrangement. In terms of the big decisions, Governors had highlighted a list of key issues e.g., administration, finance and leadership (short-term solution and long-term solutions).</p> <p>A governor confirmed that they were not comfortable about sitting on the budgets in their current state and the issues around wraparound care that needed addressing. It was felt that the IEB must make it clear as they move forward with any potential sponsors that there are matters than need to be clarified.</p> <p>It was reiterated that the IEB must priorities as a board, what they focus on and that they cannot address all the issues faced by the schools. The importance of the breakfast and ASC clubs for keeping pupils in school was acknowledged but it was less so than Finance and Staffing.</p> <p>Kettlesing currently runs 5 days and Ripley 4 days (not on Friday). RR outlined the staffing costs and confirmed that Ripley was making some money but Kettlesing appeared not to be doing so. It was difficult getting people to staff the ASC. Recruitment was challenging, and they had a TA at Beckwithshaw who would leave this week. None of the sports staff would cover so MA and HW were covering until Easter.</p> <p>The schools were in crisis around TAs and wraparound care since Covid, as parents were working in a different way than they were two years ago and realistic expectations around that were needed.</p> <p>Discussion took place regarding whether a DSL was required to be on-site during sessions just or available.</p> <p>Challenge: Are there any suggestions how we can correct some of these issues?</p> <p>Response: The offer needs to be consistent and we can then gauge from parents what they want to use, so can plan for appropriate staffing. It is all too variable at present.</p> <p>Honorary payments were being considered at other schools for teachers who were covering clubs without being paid.</p> <p>Agreed that a Survey to parents and a consistent offer for wraparound care to be in place by September.</p> <p>Question: RR, could you do some modelling for us if we brought in consistencies around those offers?</p> <p>Response: Yes, I will get the data from admin on current attendance.</p> <p>A meeting to be arranged outside of the current meeting.</p>	<p>RR</p>
---	-----------

	<p>A decision was required on the children at Beckwithshaw whose parents claimed they had been offered free places, as to whether the school try to obtain the funds. Some schools do offer free places to fsm children and the federation could have a legal case to deal with. It was recommended that the debt be written off (approx. £850).</p> <p>AN suggested that the IEB send out the survey and communicate with parents that they are reviewing the terms of the ASC and that may include prices. For those families that have been told they have a free place, the IEB will have to write that off but it was important to advise that a review will be undertaken before taking in any more children.</p> <p>The websites were out of date and needed to be addressed by whoever had ownership as, currently, it only offers 2-hour booking and not the 1-hour booking.</p> <p>The IEB need to be clear that the debt is being written off because it is too expensive to argue and reclaim and must also clarify that there will be no discount for fsm pupils from the start of the summer term. Discussion took place regarding the correct way to word that. In considering how to draw a line under the matter and how the situation can be re-couped, the IEB would need to look at the model and establish how many parents with fsm children use the ASC at all three schools.</p> <p>RR to review the figures and the IEB to make a decision at that point about whether to use pp funding for wraparound care.</p> <p>Clarity was required around the different types of pupil premium children e.g., service families, and what the right offer would be around pre and post schooling from September onwards. With regard to the outstanding issue of parents at Beckwithshaw, only that income would be written off. The IEB need to know how many will not pay because they get fsm; a list of names and confirmation that they are fsm to be provided. The debt cannot be written off until evidence is seen that those families are, in fact, fsm.</p> <p>RR thanked for her report and left the meeting at 6.10 pm.</p>	<p>RR/IEB</p> <p>MA</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Head Teacher's Report:</p> <p>10.1 <u>Head Teacher's Report</u></p> <p>MA highlighted key items in terms including the context of the schools in terms of numbers on roll, key characteristics and data. A SEN review had been carried out the previous week and a clear picture of the provision for each pupil would be shared with the SENCO the next day. A plan was in place for all children.</p> <p>Attendance was strong across the federation; persistent absence is slightly higher where families had taken a holiday.</p>	

Leadership and staff activities linked to SIPs had been federation wide and focussing on behaviour, Little Wandle and reading training.

Challenge: How do the staff get along working as federation staff?

Response: They enjoy working together and being able to share good practice. The schools are different so it does not always work out but we are trying to ensure they are all working together and not doing their own version of things.

Challenge: How is staff attendance?

Response: That is not in the report but we can talk generally. It does vary, and there is usually at least one person off every other week. There is currently one person off with Covid but other bugs are going around the schools. One member is on a phased return at Beckwithshaw. Systems and procedures were not in place and we have started return to work interviews, triggers and putting plans in place for those who hit them and keeping records for the next set of school leaders.

10.2 Action Plans

Challenge: The table relating to SEND pupils with plans. What is the level of confidence that each child has a plan in place to set out their entitlement to address those needs and your view on the quality of that delivery and whether it can be delivered in school?

Response: There are 32 children on the SEN register across the federation. All have a support plan although the quality varies and we reviewed each the previous week. We tracked the children and undertook a book scrutiny. There is an itemised list on where each child is and we provided feedback to staff. 80% of support plans are accurate, 10% need honing and 10% are not accurate and bespoke work is required with those staff. In terms of provision in school, we can determine that further now that we are clear about their needs. We can now monitor those support plans and that will determine needs moving forward for those children not meeting targets.

We carried out a staff survey regarding past training and what they would see useful. Staff were not able to identify their own training requirements so support will be required there.

Challenge: Was there anything in their PM or appraisal?

Response: That was not in place when we came in. We put that in place in mid-October to hit the end of October deadline.

In terms of staffing, there is a vacancy at Beckwithshaw for a TA and some applications had been received and the post was temporarily filled with supply to Easter. However, it would be an IEB decision on whether to recruit given that financial controls were being implemented. Permission was requested and the post included in the budget.

RESOLVED to proceed with recruitment to the TA post.

10.3 Wrap Around Care Assessment

This had been discussed, in depth, earlier in the meeting.

10.4 Health and Safety

A long list of actions had been provided and the leadership team were commended for having recorded such a long list. Governors were not surprised by the list as the federation have the same H&S advisor as other schools and similar issues had been found.

The issue of cleanliness at Kettlesing was raised. There is a night-time cleaner there and the quality of the work is poor. NYCC cleaning services had become involved and the cleaner had gone off sick and school had got supply in. This also needs to be monitored as it is still poor. There was a lack of caretaking time across the federation which limits many aspects in the H&S report. NYCC had been asked to look at that and had been very slow in responding. MA to email NYCC again and copy in RL.

HS arrived at 6.17 pm.

10.5 Safeguarding

Challenge: What progress against having a deputy DSL in each school? Will that be continuing when leadership changes?

Response: Yes, in each school. At Ripley there will not be one in on Thursday and Friday and that is a risk. It will be the interim leaders in the summer.

Challenge: Can someone be nominated on the staff who would respond well to that sort of training and role?

Response: There is temporary maternity cover in one class and a potential one other who might be suitable?

Challenge: Could there be someone at the closest school who could do that?

Response: Yes.

Challenge: Would staff be confident enough to do that?

Response: Yes.

Challenge: Are the Deputy DSLs confident enough?

Response: No. They will need supervision in the summer term from senior colleagues.

IEB member visits, action plans and structure of executive summaries would be shown at the end of the HT report.

MA/RL

<p>Challenge: On the Executive Summaries; the area for identifying pupils under-achieving is blank. Is it that we don't know or is that just an anomaly?</p> <p>Response: We had pupil progress meetings in January and targets have been set and discussions held about those. We do know who those are.</p> <p>In terms of Kettlesing, we need to swap two classrooms around. Details were provided of how the classes should be split. There would be some cost implications in terms of IT screens and toilet basins. AV had discussed this with SLT and they had approved the suggestion for a variety of reasons and these were outlined. Governors agreed, in principle. There was £4,000 in capital at Kettlesing. The costings to be sent through and school were keen to progress the works during the summer term.</p> <p>Challenge: Do we have any other members of staff on temporary contracts?</p> <p>Response: No, just one teacher at Ripley</p> <p>Challenge: Do we need to make a decision about extending her contract? Her contract ends in July/August.</p> <p>Response: That person would naturally leave if you decide to move to two classes from September. It depends on the IEB decision.</p> <p>Challenge: In terms of numbers of starters and leavers; there is one at Ripley that has not been included who has left. Are you confident in the numbers?</p> <p>Response: I will check; admin produced the figures.</p> <p>Challenge: This is the last meeting for MA and your team; what are you doing around the handover process? How are you working for a smooth transition to the new interim leadership?</p> <p>Response: You have had our views today and we will continue to share those with Karen. We will update all action plans by the end of term and send to Karen and the interim leaders. We can come back in the summer term to do a handover for a couple of days. Curriculum documents are being pulled together to go out by email to all IEB members. We are contactable during the summer term and will support transition.</p> <p>A crib sheet to be provided to IEB members e.g., caretaker and other items that are outstanding so that the IEB can keep an overview on those MA advised that there was a Federation Action List with all those on.</p> <p>The IEB formally thanked MA and his team for the work they had done, acknowledging that it had been very difficult for all of them. RL will put that in writing. The IEB were very grateful for the hard work and support provided by the team.</p> <p>SLT left the meeting at 6.35 pm.</p>	<p>MA</p> <p>RL</p>
---	---------------------

PART 'C' – OTHER

11

Governor Training:

11.1 Training

No training had been undertaken since last reporting.

11.2 Monitoring Visits

One visit report had been circulated earlier in the day. Discussions took place regarding a template for governor visit reports. KB requested a standing item to update on the Statement of Action each meeting.

KB had undertaken monitoring activities alone and with SB e.g., the curriculum in January with James and plans were to be sent through. They were working on foundation subjects, but not the core subjects yet. A Phonics programme was in place and all staff trained; long-term plans were in place and James had worked with all teachers to support them in writing the long-term plans.

KB would have further meetings with James as he was working with teachers planning medium-term plans and some quality assurance of Phonics at Beckwithshaw and foundation the subjects there. Where the planning is in place and planned in detailed, it is delivered and implemented quite well. When the plans are not detailed, it was not sequenced or coherent so there was still work to do around the curriculum, particularly Science. Maths was inconsistent and details were provided. There was still work to do on the foundation curriculum.

Also, some phonics were not being implemented well at Beckwithshaw. KB had provided feedback to the teacher and there were some performance issues with staff there and some particularly weak teaching. The scheme is very prescriptive but is not being well delivered there and children were not learning their phonics effectively.

For Early Years, some quality assurance is being planned on 28th March and 4th April at all three schools.

Additional support to be put in place and suggestions were outlined. James had planned with the teachers and those were being delivered quite well. Core subjects were not coherent or effective. Staff need to be capable and knowledgeable enough to plan core subjects themselves.

Comment: Thanks to Karen for the summary.

KB was asked to bring forward a plan for the core curriculum; leaders were needed in school to be able to do that. KB has ideas and needs someone

Clerk/
Agenda

to work with on that. AN updated on two options being worked through at NYCC in order the address the issue.

AN advised that movement towards sponsorship was positive. Elevate were planning to visit all three schools during the week regarding the buildings and continuing with their due diligence and they had plans for full leadership to come in.

A separate discussion around the advert put out and the potential leadership arrangements for the longer term would be required. Things were not certain at this stage that Elevate could provide anything for after Easter, but they do want to be involved. It was possible that there may be some more local HT who may be approachable in relation to a summer term leadership arrangement. AN could not say more about those yet but was working on them.

Information had been shared with parents at Beckwithshaw but no communications had been shared at the other schools. Priestley have told the staff they were not coming back. Staff to be careful in parents' meetings to say there could be some changes but not to commit any details. It was noted that communication should go to all three schools at the same time from the IEB about the forthcoming changes.

AV will circulate a report she had written. A small win was the weekly newsletter would now have an update from the Governors and AV will take ownership of that.

A good starting point could be the federation identity. At present, they appear to be three schools just sharing a leadership team. The current arrangements were creating work rather than saving work. The IEB need to work on that and linked to that was whether Ripley was in the right federation. It is the only church school; the smallest school and other factors were outlined that might impact on that. Governors discussed and agreed they need to look at that.

A governor pointed out that, as far as Ripley were concerned, the Diocese had never been happy with the federation model but that Elevate will be looking at taking on all three schools as one federation. The time to have that conversation would be if due diligence fell apart.

In relation to the vision, the previous governing body had recognised that lack of identity and details were provided. HS had been working on that and it could be resurrected. HS updated on the work that had been carried out already in that regard. Some things could be done quickly e.g., the schools currently have 3 separate newsletters going out. HS and DD to discuss outside the meeting.

Challenge: Regarding SB's monitoring visit; where do we draw the line between our role as governors? Is it our role to feedback to the teacher?

HS/ DD

	<p>Response: I did not feedback, Karen fed back. My governor role is Teaching & Learning and I fed back to the IEB on what I saw using my skills and talents. I did not make a judgement on that person's teaching, only factual comments on what I saw. It would have read very differently if that was a teacher in my school delivering that lesson.</p> <p>KB confirmed that SB did not stay for the whole of her visit. SB came in to look at Phonics while KB did a variety of activities during that day. KB fed back to the teacher and HW. SB was in the room but did not feedback.</p> <p>11.3 <u>Appoint SIAMS Link Governor</u></p> <p>This was not required by the Diocese. The IEB must ensure that they are cognisant of the fact that Ripley is a Church School. They must keep that on the agenda and insist it is included in the HT report for the new HT.</p> <p>11.4 <u>Distinctiveness Committee</u></p> <p>A Christian Distinctiveness Committee was not a requirement.</p> <p>The need for a Safeguarding Governor was highlighted and it was noted that AV/SB were sharing the safeguarding governor role.</p> <p>11.5 <u>KCSiE</u></p> <p>Most governors were able to confirm they had read the latest version of KCSiE. RL to confirm when this had been completed.</p> <p>11.6 <u>Staff Grievance Panel</u></p> <p>A staff grievance panel was needed for an issue at Kettlesing. AN had received additional information from HR. This was for a process that had begun before the IEB came in. HR will provide a management report to the panel. They will need 3 governors to form the panel to hear the appeal. AV/DD/HS volunteered although HS may be excluded as she was aware of some of the aspects of the case although had not direct prior involvement. Conversation to take place with HR to confirm eligibility. If HS was not eligible, RL will stand in.</p>	<p>RL</p> <p>AV/DD/HS (RL)</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>Health and Safety/Safeguarding:</p> <p>MA had circulated his report.</p> <p>Concerns regarding not having a DDSL in on Thursday and Fridays were outlined. Hopefully the new interim HT will be a DSL. There is currently cover every day of the week. A Deputy who works at the beginning of the week and another who works Thursday/Friday.</p> <p>MA had been highlighting that there could be a gap from Easter but that will be addressed to ensure cover will be in place from Easter, at Ripley.</p>	

13	<p>Correspondence:</p> <p>After a meeting at Beckwithshaw, a teacher had put their hand up for the interim arrangements, to lead on that. The Chair had gently pushed back whilst further information was sought. The HT of AV's federation knew of someone with availability and interest in the role.</p>	
14	<p>Any other Urgent Business:</p> <p>KB reminded that the Kettlesing parent evening was coming up on 28th March at 6.30 pm, and plans were needed. Staff would need to go through changes in leadership/curriculum etc. A consistent message was required across the Trust. The venue to be notified, possibly the school Hall. RL to check with MA. KB to check capacity of the hall and arrangements and whether any replies had been received from parents. There is a Village Hall across the road from the school with a car park and it may be possible to hire that, if needed. KB to check both.</p> <p>Parents need to be sure of transparency across all three schools. A brief response outlining some of the things that were happening across all three schools, e.g., the IEB, curriculum, training etc should be provided. A decision would need to be made around what is said about the future of Kettlesing in relation to DAOs for the other schools and the requirement for some sort of consultation. The IEB were not ready to do that yet but acknowledged that it will need to happen at some point.</p> <p>Challenge: Has there been any further correspondence from the parent at Kettlesing? Response: No.</p> <p>Information to go out to all three schools on the same day.</p> <p>An issue with the management of data at Beckwithshaw was raised and an example cited. Veritau were being brought in for a data check.</p>	<p>RL</p> <p>KB</p>
15	<p>Update on Head Teacher Recruitment:</p> <p>KB had met with the Diocesan adviser to look at assessment tasks and a fishbowl task had been requested and must be agreed. The IEB were due to meet with Julie on Wednesday but she had advised that she cannot make that time and was suggesting Thursday to run through the logistics and agree the assessment tasks. Concerns with the fishbowl activity were outlined. A schedule had been circulated and needed to be finalised.</p> <p>Governors discussed.</p> <p>It was clarified that the fishbowl exercise would be carried out with the candidates and not the SLT. Governors discussed including safeguarding as part of the process.</p>	

	<p>Governors could not accommodate on the Thursday and Julie to be requested to send a colleague to go through the process with the IEB. DD had submitted apologies for the Wednesday but had emailed suggestions through.</p> <p>DD submitted apologies for 6th April, (shortlisting meeting) but would send through scores.</p> <p>Only one application had been received to date. Additional information was provided. RL to address with Joy at Beckwithshaw.</p>	<p>KB</p> <p>RL</p>
16	<p>Date of Next Meetings:</p> <p>23rd March 2022, 5.00 pm – HT Recruitment tasks and logistics 28th March 2022, 6.30 pm – Kettlesing Parent Event 6th April 2022, 5.30 pm – HT Recruitment, shortlisting 25th April 2022, 5.00 pm – IEB Meeting, virtual 27th April t.b.c. – IEB Meeting – HT Ratification</p>	

The meeting closed at 7.25 pm.

Signed: (Chair)

Date: