

**MINUTES OF THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF OAKFIELD LODGE  
SCHOOL, HELD VIRTUALLY ON 17<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2020**

**PART ONE – NON-CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS**

**Apologies:** Ian Southern IS Chair  
 Gemma Bailey GB Headteacher  
 John Edmonstone JE  
 Lloyd Willday LW  
 Emma Thompson ET

**Also Present:** Sue Lambeth Clerk Clerk to the Governors

**PART ONE – NON-CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS**

*The meeting was quorate and commenced at 15:19.*

<b>Item</b>	
1.	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies</b>            The Chair welcomed Governors to the meeting.</p> <p>Pat Smith was unable to attend due to technical issues and her apologies were accepted.</p>
2.	<p><b>Declarations of Interest and Any Other Business</b>            No conflicts of interest with the business to be discussed at this meeting were declared.</p> <p>The clerk confirmed that all information on GovernorHub was now up-to-date.</p> <p>Items of AOB requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointment of the School Improvement Partner (SIP)</li> <li>• Alternative provision catch up fund for Year 11</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>Membership</b>            There remained a vacancy for a Local Authority Governor which would be pursued by GB.</p> <p><b>ACTION: To investigate a suitable candidate to join the Management Committee as a Local Authority Governor with Mike Harris. (GB)</b></p>
4.	<p><b>Chair's Action</b>            DfE guidance had stated that only 25% of Year 10 pupils could be on site. This caused an issue as vulnerable and key worker students took up the whole number and no further Year 10s would be able to be in school. After discussion, the Chair had decided that all Year 10 students would now be on rotational face to face, with no full time places for Year 10. Due to the availability of Google Classrooms and the imminent arrival of laptops for students, the safest course of action would be to see all pupils each week.</p>

	<p>GB had clarified the situation with the DfE and Cheshire East (CE) had been made aware. The DfE were clear that the guidance could not be disregarded and the school would not break the rule.</p> <p>Next week three pupils would attend each day and the number would grow as more pupils return. <b>All Year 10s would now be seen once a week, a decision which was endorsed by the Governors.</b></p>
5.	<p><b>Approval of the Minutes of 29<sup>th</sup> April 2020</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> April 2020 were <b>agreed</b> to be a true and accurate account, would be signed by the Chair at the earliest possible opportunity and passed to GB for safe storage.</p> <p>Governors requested clarification around the amount of £54k shortfall in Year 3 as discussed in the previous meeting. GB advised that the budget had changed since that time and a screen shot of the 3 year plan had been uploaded to Governor Hub to show bottom line figures.</p> <p>The carry forward figures were now correct for the next 3 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2019/20 outturn £49,919</li> <li>• 2020/21 (Year 1) outturn £191,535</li> <li>• 2021/22 (Year 2) outturn £138,390</li> <li>• 2022/23 (Year 3) outturn £22620</li> </ul> <p>Budget shortfalls were shown in Years 2 and 3, to be negated by the carry forward. In Year 3 no amount had yet been factored in from the Local Authority (LA) for pension contributions or for any additional funding e.g. for teacher and support staff pay increases. Essentially there are significant incomes, details of which were not yet available. The projected carry forward indicated the school finances were in a healthy condition for three years.</p> <p>GB pointed out that the Year 1 carry forward was significantly above the 5% clawback operated by the LA, and in order to avoid this situation a further earmarked reserve for £80k would be put in to protect the money. This would allow the funds to be used across Years 2 and 3 to offset the increase for non-business rates in the new building, which had risen from £10k to £52k. In Years 4 and 5 the charge would have a significant impact on the budget. Cheshire East had agreed this was a viable move. It would not be an additional spend and would not change the outturn position.</p> <p><b>Q: Is the budget prediction always so fluid?</b> A: Yes. There can be issues with local authority finance support.</p> <p>GB confirmed that the budget was now balanced.</p> <p><b>Governors approved the budget 3-year plan.</b></p>
6.	<p><b>Finance overview / update</b></p> <p>See discussions in Item 5 above.</p>

	<p><b>Q: What are the reasons for the large positive variances on the spreadsheet?</b>  A: The variances relate to reductions in transport costs, travel expenses and resources. One long term supply member of staff is still paid as the school feels this is morally correct and the member of staff continues to work in the same way as other staff. Due to the shut down at the end of March it was not possible to receipt some purchases before the end of the financial year. The budget versus actual figures have now been amended and are correct.</p> <p><b>Q: Is this the reason for the large carry forward?</b>  A: There is an earmarked reserve of £82k for outdoor work.</p>
7.	<p><b>Business Critical Decisions</b>  No pods had been required to isolate and staff absence had been low. Two staff had been tested and DfE guidance was being followed. Morning routines including sanitising and PPE were in place and cleaning was undertaken constantly.</p> <p>Governors had commented on the risk assessment prior to reopening for Year 10 students. The risk assessment had been submitted to the satisfaction of the Local Authority.</p>
8.	<p><b>Care for students not attending</b>  The situation was as reported at the last meeting and the phone calls three times a week to students rag rated red and one to others continued. Emergency doorstep visits had taken place in Macclesfield. There were currently no school vehicles and no necessity for other home visits. Staff would deliver the Cheshire East (CE) laptops week commencing 22<sup>nd</sup> June.</p>
9.	<p><b>Building and remote working issues</b>  There were no issues with the building or remote working. Laptops for students were scheduled to arrive shortly and Paul Lomax had been tasked to work with JTRS, the school IT Provider, on any issues.</p> <p>OAK National Academy resources are being used with additional materials added by staff, who have been trained in the use of Google Classroom.</p> <p><b>Q: What training has been available?</b>  A: Training has been provided by school staff and by JTRS who have delivered helpful and informative sessions online. Reopening the school on 15<sup>th</sup> allowed the purple pod chance to have a trial run before the Year 10 students arrived.</p> <p><b>Q: Why was Google Classroom chosen?</b>  A: JTRS were an early IT adopter and the school received a £2k bursary from the DfE to use it.</p>
10.	<p><b>Support to carers and parents</b>  GB reported that school now had closer contact with parents than prior to the pandemic, details of which were available in the Headteacher report</p>

	<p>uploaded to GovernorHub. The Free School Meals system was working well and vouchers were distributed. Form Tutors continued to make contact with pupils and parents on a regular basis.</p> <p>Contacts were monitored by GB as Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) and issues escalated if necessary. The system in place was extremely effective.</p>
11.	<p><b>Wellbeing of students, staff and stakeholders</b></p> <p>Pupils were well, with Green pod students attending each day. Staff would be mindful of student wellbeing as more students return. Many links and offers of support were available on the school website.</p> <p>Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural (SMSC) wellbeing resources were being added to Google Classroom and an assembly on mental health was scheduled for green pod.</p> <p>Twitter had been used effectively to show pictures of the outdoor gym and other interesting images. Social media had proved very effective in maintaining staff morale. Various WhatsApp groups were in place and the importance of communication had become clearly evident over the pandemic.</p> <p>The Child Protection Online Management System (CPOMS) had been used to good effect for communication around pupils during the crisis. Governors agreed this was a very powerful tool which was now used extensively each day e.g. to record student temperatures, phone calls home and any issues.</p>
12.	<p><b>Exceptional Policy and Risk Assessment Updates</b></p> <p>The following exceptional documents had been <b>ratified by Governors</b> via GovernorHub:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Revised Behaviour Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Safeguarding Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Google Acceptable Use Policy for staff, parents and students.</b></li> <li>• <b>Reopening Risk Assessment.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION: To send a list of policies to the Chair for signing and delivering to school. (Clerk)</b></p>
13.	<p><b>Meetings for 2020/21</b></p> <p>The next meeting of the Oakfield Lodge Management Committee was confirmed as 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020 at 15.30.</p> <p>Management Committee meeting dates for 2020/21 were advised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020</li> <li>• 11<sup>th</sup> November 2020</li> <li>• 13<sup>th</sup> January 2021</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021</li> <li>• 21<sup>st</sup> April 2021</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> June 2021</li> </ul> <p>Governors had no questions on the Headteacher's report.</p>
14.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b>  <u>Appointment of the School Improvement Partner (SIP)</u></p> <p>The appointment of the current SIP, Dave Smith, had been agreed by the Management Committee last year. However, due to the current situation he had not been able to complete the full cycles of visits. In view of the possible change in school status in the new academic year, GB proposed that DS be requested to visit in the autumn term and the situation would be reviewed in light of developments. <b>Governors agreed.</b></p> <p><u>Alternative provision catch up fund for Year 11 students</u>  GB had been made aware of funding targeted at avoiding Year 11 students falling into the category of Not In Education, Employment or Training (NEET) in 2020/21. This would amount to £750 per Year 11 student for provision over the summer break and the autumn term. Costs would be borne by the school and then reclaimed.</p> <p>GB advised that most Year 11 students had destinations arranged for September, and only two were giving cause for concern. The Youth Support Service had contacted and a proposal and costing for a programme requested. However, issues in terms of capacity had been identified and the focus of avoiding NEET had to be paramount.</p> <p>School would be unable to organise anything using Oakfield Lodge staff over the summer holiday as staff were reaching the point of exhaustion and additional provision over the autumn term would not be possible due to the lack of staff and the lack of eligibility for transport costs.</p> <p>Other pupil referral units and alternative provision settings had expressed concerns that the funding could be reclaimed if the school was in surplus, regardless of the outlay already incurred by the school.</p> <p><b>Q: What are the practical implications in terms of staff demand and capacity?</b>  A: It would be additional work and even commissioning outside work could involve the need for OL staff to be site and the cost of student transport, which would alone use 60% of the funding.</p> <p>Governors felt that in the interests of the health and wellbeing of the staff and previous difficulties in reclaiming funding, this was not a viable option.</p> <p>GB proposed that OL staff could carry out home visits over the summer to check that Year 11 students were on track for going to college in September. Some staff were also offering face to face meetings with Year 11 students before the end of term.</p>

	<p>Contact with students would be maintained and provision could be put in place in the first week in September after the publication of examination results if required with transport for pupils provided.</p> <p>Any costs incurred to South Cheshire College for additional support in the first three weeks of September could be submitted for reclaim.</p> <p>GB confirmed that the school would do everything possible to support the students.</p> <p><u>GCSE Grading</u> All grades had been approved and submitted, although the task of ranking the students had proved difficult. The vast majority of teacher grades were submitted with one alteration in English after spot checks were carried out by GB. Grades appeared to be similar to last year but were felt to be realistic for students.</p> <p>As there may be an element of teacher assessment in the next year, it was important to note that lessons had been learnt e.g. in the availability of assessment evidence.</p>
15.	<p><b>Impact Statement</b> <u>What is the impact of this meeting on the pupils of Oakfield Lodge School?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governors received reassurance of the sound financial position of the school.</li> <li>• The quality of the information provided by the Headteacher as evidenced in the documentation available on GovernorHub assured the committee that the highest level of safeguarding and wellbeing monitoring possible was in place.</li> <li>• The risk assessment relating to the reopening of the school evidenced that all steps possible were being taken to ensure the safety of both staff and students.</li> <li>• Discussion around the proposals for ensuring the future of the Year 11 students would ensure that their future education/employment prospects would not be adversely affected by the pandemic.</li> </ul> <p>Emma Thompson left the meeting at 16.05.</p>

*The Part One meeting closed at 16.05.*

Signed.....

Date .....