

**MINUTES OF THE VIRTUAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING OF
OAKFIELD LODGE SCHOOL
25th NOVEMBER 2021**

Members Present: Su Turner ST Chair
 Gemma Bailey GB Headteacher
 John Edmonstone JE
 Claire Howarth CH
 Pat Smith PS
 Mike Taylor MT
 Emma Thompson ET

Also Present: Sue Lambeth SL Clerk to the Governors
 Sian Nixon SN Bursar
 Andy Souter AS Pupil Premium (PP) Lead (part)

PART ONE – NON-CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

The meeting was quorate and commenced at 15:29.

| Item | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | <p>Welcome, Apologies and Any Other Business The Chair welcomed all to the meeting, especially Claire Howarth, a new governor.</p> <p>DP was not in attendance.</p> <p>No apologies had been received.</p> <p>No other items of business were requested.</p> <p>ACTION: To contact DP regarding attendance. (ST)</p> |
| 2. | <p>Declarations of Interest/Code of Conduct Most declarations of interest were up-to-date on GovernorHub.</p> <p>No conflicts of interest with the business to be discussed at this meeting were declared.</p> <p>ACTION: To complete declarations of interest on GovernorHub. (CH)</p> |
| 3. | <p>Approval of Part One minutes of 11th October 2021 The minutes from the meetings on 11th October were reviewed, agreed to be an accurate account and would be signed electronically by the Chair.</p> |
| 4. | <p>Matters arising from the minutes and Action Log Review There were no matters arising from the minutes.</p> <p>The action log from 11th October 2021 was reviewed and updated. The following points were highlighted:</p> |

| | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To date there had been no expression of interest for the LA or Parent Governor positions currently vacant. SN had investigated criteria for abuse allegations against staff without success. It was agreed that the scenarios found would be posted on GovernorHub and SN would pursue with Manor Hall Academy Trust. <p>ACTION: To upload scenarios relating to abuse allegations against staff to GovernorHub. (SN)</p> |
| 5. | <p>Chair's Action</p> <p>The Chair reported she had questioned aligning with the trust in terms of current contracts. Once established the matter will be resolved either by Chair's Action or approval via GovernorHub.</p> <p>SN agreed the position regarding the Sick Pay provider would be investigated nearer to expiry date of the current contract.</p> |
| 6. | <p>Membership</p> <p><i>The Instrument of Government (dated April 2018), which forms the constitution of the Management Committee, sets out the following categories of membership of the committee:</i></p> <p>1 Parent – currently vacant 2 Staff (including the HT- GB and ET) 2 LA (DP, one other) 6 Community (1 vacant): JE, PS, MT, ST, CH + one) Total: 11</p> <p>Claire Howarth had now joined the board as a Community Governor.</p> <p>Andy Souter arrived at 15.38.</p> |
| 7. | <p>Pupil Premium (PP)</p> <p>MT as Pupil Premium Link Governor had visited the school and met with AS, the PP lead.</p> <p>AS directed governors' attention to the document Pupil Premium Strategy 20-21 available in the meeting folder which was a working document available on the school website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for the current year was £22920 plus the Covid Recovery Premium of £6970 which had to be reported in the mandatory format provided by the DfE. Following the Education Endowment Foundation guidance the report contained the three strands: teaching, targeted academic support and wider strategies. All pupils at the school got equal benefit from the fund. Total school spending in 2020/21 was £63k and the funding received was £45k. Funding for the next year would be approximately £30k (see above) which was based on January roll numbers. |

| | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of pupils fluctuated due to the nature of the school and funding for 2021/22 was based on 22 pupils which represented £995 per student unless pupils were eligible for the Looked After Child (LAC) designation or parents were in the armed forces, in which case it was £2345. • MT confirmed that the school had considered Covid carefully and the impact and spending could be justified. • Governors suggested the inclusion of an explanation of the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) context plus a case study for an individual pupil as had been done for Ofsted visits to demonstrate the benefit of funding to PP pupils. • The document would be completed and on the website before the end of the autumn term. <p>ET joined the meeting at 15.47.</p> <p>ACTION: To meet before the next meeting to discuss PP further. (AS / MT)</p> <p>Q: How is the impact of the £29k of funding received evidenced when total spending is £63k? A: Funding is given to the three strands and topped up by the school. Social enrichment is covered in the wider strategy strand.</p> <p>AS was thanked and left the meeting at 15.56.</p> |
| 8. | <p>Financial Matters</p> <p><u>Budget update</u> A copy of the budget summary from the recent Cheshire East (CE) meeting had been attached to the meeting, including the 3-year plan.</p> <p>Q: What is the reason for the actual spend of £85k on administrative staff salaries compared to the budget of £58k? A: One member of staff was originally placed in the incorrect category and would be moved to support staff.</p> <p>Q: Why is expenditure on repairs and maintenance much higher than the budget? A: This is due to payment for the painting, and earmarked reserves drawdowns need to be made to cover. Otherwise there is a small overspend.</p> <p>Q: Why does the Year 2 and 3 spending on premises in the 3-year plan almost halve. A: Specific projects were agreed for the current year but will not be spent year on year e.g. the forest school, the construction and the Year 11 areas.</p> <p>Q: Why was no inflationary increase included in the transport budget in the 3-year plan? A: This may not be needed as previously the budget was not completely spent. The school once again has three vehicles and the budget was cautious, although it is not anticipated that the full amount will be spent. The</p> |

tuition team travel less as provision is on site more but this could revert. Rises should be built in for future years

Q: What is the reason for the teaching staff budget of £361k and a predicted figure of £599k?

A: This is an administrative error.

Monitoring of catch up and transition funding

ET reported that:

- All catch up funding had been spent on the National Tutoring Programme for a pupil, who ultimately did not engage. The programme was felt to be very good and staffed by tutors with great expertise.
- Mock examinations were scheduled for the week commencing 29th November and impact data would be made available after the December data drop.
- The school was making use of the purchased MyOn electronic reading resources, and the English department had purchased small laptops which would support other pupil learning. Science resources had also been purchased.
- Discussions had taken place around the purchase of a reading pen from PP funding.
- DfE laptops were now ready to use, and pupils would have access to electronic devices with appropriate programmes which were under further investigation with Manor Hall Academy Trust.

ACTION: To report on the use and impact of catch up and transition funding in the January Management Committee meeting. (ET)

9. **Headteacher's Part One Report and matters arising**

The report had been made available to governors prior to the meeting. However, there were still technical issues obtaining data from SIMS and the impact of the delay by CE in updating the Getting Information About Schools (GIAS) system.

Additional attendance and curriculum information was included in the report. Governors were referred to the work scrutiny evidenced by photographs from various subject areas showing impact of curriculum changes.

Q: What is the reason for the difference between the numbers of pupils on roll (31) as shown on the report and the school capacity of 60?

A: The school has been oversubscribed, but the closure of secondary schools over the last 2 years and the consequent fall in the number of exclusions has resulted in Oakfield Lodge being under Published Admission Number (PAN). A further 7 pupils will be admitted before the end of the autumn term resulting in a total of 40. By February half term the number of pupils will be close to 60 (the PAN). Pupil numbers for the previous two years have been unrealistically low.

Q: What is the reason for the attendance figure of 72% average,

| | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>compared to other similar schools at 94.9%. A: This is incorrect and due to the current data extraction process from the school data system.</p> <p>Q: How does the school compare with other similar schools? A: The national PRU attendance average is 68%, which had fallen during the pandemic to around 56%. Oakfield Lodge attendance is always above that.</p> <p>Governors felt that attendance comparison by percentage was difficult on small numbers, but the data presented was a compliment to the school.</p> <p>Q: What is the definition of persistent absence (PA)? A: This is attendance identified by the DfE as being below 95%. Most PRUs therefore showed persistent absence of 100% due to their context, as pupils were usually PA on arrival at the school. Demonstration of progress in attendance at the school has been accepted by Ofsted on visits.</p> <p>GB welcomed feedback on the book samples provided, and governors agreed to send further questions and comments to GB for transmission to the staff. For the future, book scrutiny by selected pupils could be carried out to verify consistency based on an Ofsted approach. Summaries of book scrutiny were included in the headteacher report and could be used for comparison. Staff had met to compare book layouts in terms of quality and consistency and took pride in pupil books. The quality of presentation and content compared to that of the same pupils in mainstream schools of pupils was felt to be very good.</p> <p>Q: How can an impression of progress be gleaned from books? A: Books identify the elements of the learning journey and dates can be verified. Marking and feedback should identify the gaps in pupil learning identified and knowledge checks. AS and ET could support governors to do this, thereby achieving triangulation.</p> <p>Governors requested assurance that such systems and innovations were in place rather than carrying it out themselves. A governor visit was proposed to verify the typical delivery and also to speak to teachers and pupils.</p> |
| 10. | <p>Curriculum Update A curriculum update was included in the HT report.</p> <p>Q: Is the curriculum as broad and balanced as it can be? A: Yes. Discussion of not offering MFL across the board has taken place, and the school is committed to ensure pupils have opportunities to undertake musical activities.</p> <p>GB reported that the school curriculum model could be considered more advanced those across the other Manor Hall Academy Trust (MHAT) schools.</p> <p>Q: What is the current position with humanities?</p> |

| | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>A: Humanities are taught in Key Stage 3 (KS3) and as a KS4 option, all of which was going well.</p> <p>Q: Why are extended activity providers used?</p> <p>A: They have been used previously e.g. Cre8 for music production, although not during the pandemic. Some are not Ofsted approved and further guidance from CE on their use is awaited.</p> <p>Governors had no further questions.</p> |
| 11. | <p>Part 1 Reports from link Governors</p> <p>Governors were urged to make contact with their school links details of which were available via School contacts for link governors</p> |
| 12. | <p>School Development Plan (SDP) update and self-evaluation framework (SEF)</p> <p>The School Development Plan document was available on GovernorHub as was the SEF. The SEF had changed significantly in terms of grading following feedback from governors, the SIP and trust colleagues.</p> <p>The chair recommended that governors should build in consideration of aspects of the SDP in visits to inform evidence for the SEF.</p> <p>Governors would be welcome to come into the school provided the timing fitted with the calendar and with proof of a negative Lateral Flow Test. Staff and student testing was taking place twice per week.</p> <p>Governors had no further comments.</p> |
| 13. | <p>Performance of the Management Committee update</p> <p><u>Pupil and Parent Voice update</u> (Shaping Governance outcome)</p> <p><u>Parent Voice</u></p> <p>GB reported that a parent survey had been carried out (see Headteacher report) with another planned for early in the spring term with amended Covid-related questions. Comparison with previous surveys would be difficult in view of the changing nature of parent cohorts. Data reporting to parents had been reviewed following comments in the survey, and a comment box was included. Some parental surveys completed in February 2021 was due to direct contact by staff with parents who were guided through the questionnaire. The school had excellent relationships with parents and knew them well.</p> <p><u>Pupil Voice</u></p> <p>A bank of questions would be devised which staff would ask on behalf the governors.</p> <p>ACTION: To provide questions for staff to ask as part of Pupil Voice on behalf of governors. (All)</p> <p>ACTIONS: To share examples of questions for staff to ask as part of Pupil</p> |

| | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>Voice on behalf of governors. (ST)</p> <p>PS left the meeting at 16.43.</p> |
| 14. | <p>School Improvement Partner (SIP) Update <u>SIP Visit Report</u> The SIP visit had been postponed to 8th December 2021 due to illness.</p> |
| 15. | <p>Policy Review The following policies had been circulated prior to the meeting on GovernorHub:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anti-Bullying Policy • Careers Policy 2021 • Critical Incidents Plan 2021 • Exam Contingency Policy 2021 • Exams Policy 2021 • Freedom of Information Publication Scheme • Grievance Policy and Procedure 2021 • Health and Safety 2021 • Medicine 2021 • Non-exam assessment policy 2021 • Provider Access Policy 2021 • Support Staff Appraisal Process 2021 • Teacher Appraisal Policy 2021 <p>ACTION: To confirm approval of allocated policies (list on GovernorHub) by 6 p.m. Monday 29th November 2021. (All)</p> <p>Statutory policies are all available on the school website.</p> <p>ST reminded governors that their role was to ensure that the school had all the correct policies in place and that they were being consistently and correctly applied.</p> |
| 16. | <p>Meetings The next meeting of the Oakfield Lodge Management Committee was agreed as Wednesday 12th January 2022.</p> |
| 17. | <p>Any Other Business There was no other business to discuss.</p> |
| 18. | <p>Impact Statement <u>What is the impact of the discussions, decisions and actions of this meeting on the pupils of Oakfield Lodge School?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors considered Pupil Premium in depth, questioned the PP lead and were assured of the work and spending of the school. • Governors challenged the Headteacher on pupil attendance and were satisfied with the reasons given for the position. • Governors questioned the SBM on aspects of the budget and school |

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | spending and were assured that the funding received was being used to provide the best provision possible for the pupils. |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

ET and SN left and the Part One meeting closed at 16.57.

Signed.....

Date