

Barley Lane School Full Governing Board Meeting 4 (Part 1 Minutes)

Date / Time:	17 th February 2022 at 17.00	Location:	Microsoft Teams
--------------	---	-----------	-----------------

Attendees:	Initials:	Governor Type:	Arrival time
Raz Miah	RM	Staff	
Liz Shinn	LS	Local Authority (Vice-Chair of Governors) - Chairing the meeting	
James Martin	JMa	Co-Opted	
Jenni Palmer	JP	Parent	

Attendees:	Initials:	Governor Type:	Arrival time
Dave Jones	DJ	Staff –Interim Headteacher	
Damian Furniss	DF	Foundation (Chair of Governors)	17:06
Pippa Ansell	PA	Parent	
Helen Crossfield	HC	Co-opted	

Sanctioned Apologies:	Initials:	Governor Type:
Katrina Campbell-Crocker	KC	Foundation

Unsanctioned Apologies:	Initials:	Governor Type:

In Attendance:	Initials:	
Helen Rimmer	HR	Clerk to Governors
Vicki Sessions	VS	Invited-BL Deputy Headteacher
Judith Ford	JF	Invited – BL Bursar
Jason McCarthy	JMcC	Invited – BL site manager

Minutes To:
Full Governing Board

BL= Barley Lane

DCC=Devon County Council

PPA= planning preparation and assessment time

GDPR=General Data Protection Regulation

FGB=Full Governing Board

SLT=Senior Leadership Team

LG=Lead Governor

DfE=Department of Education

This was a virtual meeting using the Teams online platform.

[Full Governing Board meeting 4 Teams Chat 17 February 2022](#)

DF, had been requested to attend an Emergency Planning Meeting, for storm Eunice, as part of his day job. This was also an online meeting. He therefore requested that LS Chair the meeting as he had to split his attention between the two meetings.

All reports had been distributed to the Governing Board via the GovernorHub (secure online portal) prior to the meeting.

All present, gave permission for the meeting to be recorded for the accuracy of minute keeping on the understanding that the recording will be destroyed when the minutes are approved.

Meeting started: 17:00

4/1.1	<p>Apologies & Business Interests KC's apologies were sanctioned by the Board. HR invited governors to declare any business interests, which may not be on their form but relate to the items on today's agenda. There were none.</p>		
	<p>DF arrived 17:06 Governors moved to the items on the agenda which required JMcC's input.</p>		
4/5.1	<p>Accident book 21.12.02 H&S Visit re Quinquennial report 22.02.14.H&S report HC reported that she reviewed the accident book last term and will review again later this term.</p>		
4/5.2	<p>Quinquennial report 21.12.02 H&S Visit re Quinquennial report 22.02.14.H&S report (HC had provided a report to the previous meeting in December (minute 3/4.1), which included recommendations to modify the Action (minute 2/4.1) which had been given to JMcC at the November meeting. However, it had been decided not to discuss the report as HC had been unable to attend the meeting.)</p> <p>HC reported that she had met with JMcC last term and could confirm that the only thing on the report which was essential was the fire-seal around the doors.</p> <p>HC recommended that in terms of the Quinquennial report, it was noted that the fire-seals are being dealt with and nothing else in report is an Health & Safety essential, but JMcC is continuing to monitor to ensure they do not become Health & Safety issues.</p> <p>HC recommended the Governing Board asks JMcC to continue to monitor the issues raised on the survey and raise it if an item becomes an issue. HC said it would not be good use of JMcC's time to get quotes for non-urgent work (as was originally requested in minute 3/4.1)</p> <p>The Governing Board agreed to follow HC's recommendations and withdrew action</p>		

	<p>3/4.1, with JMcc to continue to monitor the issues raised in the quinquennial report.</p> <p>HC noted that JMcc has raised the issue of the hall lighting (see item 4/5.3)</p> <p>JMcc wished to bring one additional Health & Safety item to the governors' attention. He said there is <u>a tree at the top of the playground, which is attracting birds, leading to a guano problem on the playground and the adjoining property.</u> It is a Health & Safety risk because it is getting on the pupils' hands from their footballs and it makes the playground slippery.</p> <p>JMcc reported that he has spoken to Health & Safety at DCC. Most of the trees on the school site have a tree preservation order (TPO). In which case nothing can be done unless the tree is in danger of falling. On Monday, 21st February, DCC will be inspecting the tree and will confirm whether it has a TPO.</p> <p>JMcc said that even if it is not possible to remove the tree, as it is a Health & Safety risk he will either have to block the area underneath, or put a protective roof over the play area. JC is seeking quotes but the process is lengthy so may need a short-term fix in the meantime. The area was hosed down today but that is not possible everyday.</p> <p>JMcc said regarding the <u>Quinquennial report</u>, in the holidays he will clean out the gutters and make repairs. Although they are not a Health & Safety risk, the work is needed as the gutters have lots of moss and if left it could lead to roof leaks.</p> <p>LS asked when fire door seals are being done. JMcc said he is aiming for them to be done by September 2022, with the work to be done when the pupils are not in school, he hoped work could be completed in the summer holidays. He said they do not pose an immediate safety risk, the doors still act as a fire-break for 30 minutes when closed.</p> <p>JMa understood the Quinquennial report goes to DCC, he asked if anyone had spoken to them about the larger works required as to whether funding could be available. JMcc confirmed that DCC request NPS to carry out the inspection and produce the report for them, but they will only give money if the report finds work which needs completing 'now or yesterday'. They will use report if there is money 'left in the pot'. School is expected to use it's budget. JF stated that she will be looking at using some of the carry forward.</p>		
4/5.3	<p>Hall lighting quote 22.02.14.H&S report</p> <p>JMcc reported that replacing the school hall lighting is urgent work. He informed the governors that 3 weeks ago a bulb broke which led to broken glass on the floor. The electrician has checked all 12 lights. They found the bulbs are held in with plastic clips which have become brittle. JMcc recommended the current bulbs are replaced with LED lights which are 99.9% damage proof and require hardly any maintenance. Currently to change a bulb a tower is required. JMcc said the same firm (IT electrical) provided a quote for this work in 2019 of between £7/8k, they have just submitted a new quote of £5,580.</p> <p>JMcc reported that he asked Mercury and JJ Cannings for a quote at the very start of February 2022, which he chased today but he still has received no response. JMcc felt the current lighting in the hall is dangerous and replacing it is urgent. The electricians who have quoted for the work have been used by school for 2 years and JMcc felt the quote was good value for money.</p> <p>HR said the Governance Consultancy at Babcock have confirmed that if BL can show an attempt has been made to get quotes and the work is too urgent to wait, the Governing Board can agree the spend with just one quote The Governing Board agreed to the £5580 spend on changing the 12 hall lights to LEDs.</p> <p>LS thanked JMcc on behalf of the Governing Board JMcc left 17:17</p>		
4/2.1	Clerk's Housekeeping		

	<p><u>Minute 3/2.5</u> - HR said that before the meeting, she emailed the 2 governors who were yet to complete their online declaration of business interests and sign the code of conduct using the GovernorHub. There was now only DJ who needed to complete these.</p> <p>ACTION – DJ to complete the online declaration of business interests and sign the code of conduct on GovernorHub.</p> <p>The clerk updated the governors on progress being made to catch-up with the outstanding meeting minutes. She informed the governors that DJ has allocated her a workspace in school in the same office as JF. HR said having a space to work in school would give her the space to concentrate she required.</p>	DJ	26 March 22
4/2.2	<p>Term Dates 2022-23 Term Dates 22-23 <u>Minute 8/8.3 2020/21</u> -VS reported that she has aligned inset days with Marland and BL have moved 'PRICE' training to July each year from now on (previously held every September). Therefore, BL will be able to arrange moderation with Marland. (Also, some staff with young children would have struggled with the previous dates set for training.) The Governing Board agreed with the proposed term dates for 2022-23 ACTION – JF to ensure the term dates are shared with the schools stake-holders.</p>	JF	ASAP
4/2.3	<p>Succession planning – Chair of Governors Due to time-pressures it was decided to have a reduced discussion at this time, with governors asked to go away and think about succession planning with the aim of returning to the discussion at a future meeting.</p> <p>LS said she would like to co-chair the Governing Board in the future. The Governing Board felt they would need to look closer at how co-chairing could work. They expressed concerns over being able to ensure all of the role of chair is covered without duplicating parts of the roles.</p>		
4/2.6	<p>Consider adding an additional FGB meeting in April LS recommended pencilling in an additional FGB meeting in April 2022, to ensure there is time to gather all the information needed to sign off the budget for next year. JF confirmed the deadline for submitting the budget is 1st May 2022. JF noted that after Easter, the budget could be updated to reflect future governance and BL will have hopefully just made the new substantive Headteacher appointment and be looking at transitions.</p> <p>The Governing Board agreed to add an additional FGB meeting in April this year, date to be confirmed. ACTION – HR to send out a doodle poll to decide date of additional April meeting.</p> <p>ACTION - HR to ensure 'Succession planning – Chair of Governors' is on the agenda for the additional meeting in April 2022 .</p>	HR HR	ASAP April 22
4/2.4	<p>Considering reconstituting to increase number of Governors on the Board</p> <p>HC lost WiFi and lost connection 17:26</p> <p>LS began a discussion, the Board has found that there is often not enough governors available to arrange quorate meetings. Also, especially the non-staff governors have lots of Lead Governor and Committee roles . (3 of the current 9 governors on the Governing Board, including the Headteacher, are members of staff.)</p> <p>The Governing Board discussed methods of recruitment. DJ said at the [Head, Chair and Clerk] training HR and he attended, he learned that some organisations, such as the met office and South-West Water support staff to be governors with paid days to allow staff to carry out governance duties.</p>		

	<p>HR said if the Governing Board did decide to reconstitute, governors need to consider the ideal number of governors and what roles to add. Best practice is around 11-13 governors. The most straight forward roles to add are co-opted governors as co-opted governors can be voted onto the Board by the Board itself, based on the skills they bring.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the pros and cons of returning to a Resources and teaching & learning committee structure, which may be possible with more governors to ensure committees were quorate. However, in the past BL found duplication took place between committee meetings and FGB and some governors could feel left 'out of the loop'.</p> <p>It was noted that more governors would mean the Lead Governor roles could be shared out more.</p> <p>DF suggested number of LG roles could drive the number of governors required. DF said he would want to continue and expand the Board's foundation of seeking diversity on the board with different ages, backgrounds etc.</p> <p>HR noted that the governors also need to consider ease of recruitment, to fill any additional roles.</p> <p>The Governing Board was in favour of seeking new governors from within local businesses, maybe those who already support BL by providing work experience places. They also were in favour of seeking an ex-pupil to join the Governing Board.</p> <p>HC returned 17:33 The Governing Board designated HC, JP and JMa to form a Working Party to discuss the pros and cons of reconstituting with an increased number of governors on the Governing Board and to bring back recommendations to the April meeting.</p> <p>ACTION – HR to add 'Considering reconstituting to increase number of Governors on the Board' to the April agenda for further discussion.</p>	HR	ASAP
4/2.5	<p>Consider when to return to in-person meetings (The Governing Board had been meeting virtually, via Microsoft Teams, since the start of the Covid-19 pandemic in March 2020.)</p> <p>The Governing Board discussed returning to in-person FGB meetings. It was noted that there had been very good attendance with virtual meetings, as it is easier for some governors whose day jobs still require working remotely from their home. The Governing Board agreed there are benefits from being in a room together, such as picking up on body language and the discussions flowing better without having to raise electronic 'hands' and waiting to be invited to speak. Everyone agreed that it would be nice if the 2 governors who have joined in the last 2 years could actually <u>meet</u> the other governors.</p> <p>Blended meetings (with some governors present in person and others joining virtually) were suggested. DF said that technology in the meeting room is essential to allow it to work successfully and he has found a blending meeting hard to chair. HC agreed with DF, adding you need someone who can operate the equipment. LS said screens are available in classrooms.</p> <p>LS said she values being able to have a learning walk in school before the meeting, looking at displays and the 'working walls'. PA said her experience of blended meetings has been successful. It was felt that remote meetings would be useful when meeting face-to-face was not possible.</p>		

	<p>Alternating virtual and in-person suggested.</p> <p>DF said that If the Board agreed to return to face-to-face meetings it may be necessary to have a later start at 5.30, to allow for travel time.</p> <p>The Governing Board agreed to return to holding a face-to-face meeting for the next meeting on 24th March 2022, with the revised start time of 5.30pm to allow for travel time.</p>		
4/2.7	<p>Ofsted OFSTED visit November 2021 training inspection example shared with DSL chat More Ofsted Prep Jan 22 HT notes Ofsted Info Ofsted Info for Teachers OFSTED Info Overview</p> <p>ACTION – All governors to read the information that has been shared ready for a discussion at the next meeting ACTION – HR to ensure ‘Ofsted’ is on the agenda for the March 2022 meeting</p>	<p>All HR</p>	<p>March 2022 “</p>
4/2.8	<p>Minutes of the last meeting Minutes see minute 4/2.1</p>		
4/2.9	<p>Action Points Table of Actions FGB 3 16 December21 Minute 3/2.5 - HR reported that she was still finding it difficult to know whether actions were completed or not, as no-one was updating her on their actions. ACTION – All to update the clerk on progress on all actions they have been allocated this academic year.</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>10 March 2022</p>
4/2.10	<p>Pay Committee The Governing Board was informed that the committee met on 9th February 2022.</p>		
4/2.11	<p>Chair’s Action DF reported that he has been busy with the Headteacher Recruitment process – with details to be discussed in Part 2 (minute 4/15.1). DF confirmed the job advert for recruiting the substantive headteacher was due to go live the following day, both in TES (Times Educational Supplement) and with Devon Jobs.</p> <p>DF also reported taking a Chair’s Action earlier during the day of the meeting, to allow the school to prepare to close the next day due to the Amber and Red weather warnings accompanying Storm Eunice.</p> <p>DF added that he has been dealing with a couple of staffing issues – and would be briefing HC on one confidential issue.</p>		
4/3.1	<p>Budget monitor G150 report 080222 JMa reported an improved carry forward of over £500k, due to receiving £31k of funding backdate plus 2.5 Teaching Assistant (TA) vacancies remaining unfilled, also receipt of insurance payments for absent staff. JMa noted an overspend on supply of £18k. He also noted that the carry forward drops significantly in Year 3.</p> <p>JMa added that DCC will ask what BL plans to do with the carry forward, BL will need to look at around £80k being earmarked for development of the school</p> <p>LS asked if budgeting costs have been benchmarked against other schools. JF replied that she will be looking at benchmarking with JMa (Finance LG). She has looked locally but found it tricky to find a benchmark school to compare to. LS suggested asking Diana Denman (Babcock LDP, Special Schools Advisor) to recommend suitable schools to benchmark against. Last year outsourced expenses were quite high and TAs was low but this year should look better as BL has brought in more staff and reduced intervention costs.</p>		

	<p>HC asked about Pupil Premium (PP) spend, she said it. looks like BL is not spending any PP and the information on the school website is not clear. She pointed out that Ofsted will be looking at this. HC also asked why nothing is allocated to the PP spending stream. JF replied that the PP money goes into the pot [for spending on all pupils], she said the DfE confirmed that PP money does not have to only be spend on PP pupils. LS said DD has provided a template for reporting how PP is spent, school needs to state what it is spending the money on specifically. LS said governors need to know where the PP is going and the impact it is having. In response DJ shared his screen, showing a working document he has created for staff. He said this shows that PP goes for example towards maths intervention, English intervention and Speech and Language, the effectiveness of which can be measured by outcomes. Measure by key school measures, attendance, behaviour etc. HC said the document DJ shared was a working document for staff and stressed that the budget must show the overall spending and the website information needs to be clearer and more precise.</p> <p>In response to a question from LS, DJ replied that 48% of pupils were eligible for PP. DF said PP is very important and it is one of Ofsted’s key lines of enquiry. He said quite a few other pupils are close to being entitled to PP. He said BL uses the PP funding to enrich the curriculum and give pupils wider opportunities. Opportunities which they do not get from their home lives but would be normal for pupils who didn’t have their disadvantaged background. He added that pupils eligible for PP are more likely to benefit from services the school funds such as 1to 1 mentoring, counselling, enrichment activities etc</p> <p>ACTION – DJ to work with Diana Denman (Babcock LDP, Special Schools Advisor) to produce information on how Pupil Premium is being spent. With an update to go to the website by the start of half-term</p> <p>DF asked about predicted expenditure in the budget forecast, highlighting current concerns over fuel inflation for example, making it hard to predict expenditure lines. He asked whether, as they are hard to predict, it may be necessary monitor the spend more closely. JF reported that she attended the recent Bursar briefing, where they looked at budget planning including forecasting staffing, fuel costs etc and were recommended to put at least inflation on everything school buys in. JF informed the governors that BL has not had it’s confirmed income confirmed yet. And she is looking at every expenditure individually. For example, gas may potentially increase 40%.</p>	DJ	w/b 28 Feb 2022
4/3.2	<p>Finance Policy Recommendations</p> <p>JMa recommended waiting until a permanent Headteacher has been recruited and waiting for the outcome of the discussions on amending the Governing Board structure before making recommendations for amendments on the Finance Policy.</p> <p>The Governing Board agreed to follow JMa’s recommendations and not make any amendments to the Finance Policy until a new substantive Headteacher is appointed.</p>		
3.3	<p>Service Contracts (Service Level Agreements – SLAs)</p> <p>SLAs Babcock SLA Staff Insurance Comparison Education Mutual Staff Absence Brochure Education Mutual Quote-4733-11158 EM Health and Wellness Services Info</p> <p>As Finance LG, JMa had met with JF and run through the list of all SLAs, which had been provide to the Governing Board for information.</p> <p>JMa said he had recommendations for 2 SLAs, for which the Governing Board needed to approve the spend;</p> <p>1st, Staff insurance. JF has sought 3 quotes. JMa recommend that the Governing Board</p>		

approve continuing the existing contract with SAS. He said although it is not the cheapest it provides better assurance and a wellbeing service which is comprehensive and being used by staff. At £12,338.16, it is £886 more expensive Education Mutual, but it is cheaper than DCC mutual fund. JF said SAS provide good cover and this year the company has been really good and paying out quickly. She said Education Mutual's cover is very similar but not covered by the FCA (Financial Conduct Authority) and school doesn't get paid if the mutual fund runs out of funds and with DCC cover there is a 5 day wait rather than the 3 days with SAS.

HC asked if SAS pay out for pre-existing conditions, JF replied that to receive this cover there is a premium to pay.

The Governing Board approved continuing the contract with SAS for staff insurance.

2nd, the contract with L&F multi-sport (who have been providing PE provision within the school).

(Post meeting note: JMa had reviewed the updated contract L&F had supplied but had requested a revised proposal before he brought a recommendation to the Board)

DJ reminded governors of the background to the contract with L&F, When BL moved to delivering lessons following the primary model across the school, the PE staff member had been moved from delivering PE curriculum. He said L&F have been delivering PE across the school for a couple of years, providing a good service. DJ reported that he has been meeting with L&F, negotiating a new contract. He said that L&F have raised their rates considerably, above what BL was expecting to pay, which had led him to reconsider what is best for the school and whether BL should employ a PE teacher again. DJ said that although he must consider the cost, he must also consider the impact when looking at value for money. He said L&F's impact has been all positive not just in regards PE provision, but they are a fit for the school's culture, they have received positive peer feedback and embraced the school culture. They have led to positive outcomes in both theoretical and practical PE. He said L&F carry out extra work in school, for example, they recently delivered a PHSE county-lines presentation to Key Stage 4, saving the higher cost quoted by another company. DJ said that L&F cover classes, if asked. They go above and beyond what they offer in PE. DJ said it would be possible to employ a PE teacher for around £35k but with on-costs it would be similar to the L&F contract. But L&F provide 2 people and there would be no guarantee that a new teacher would perform to the standard required. DJ concluded that he is not as convinced financially, but the [positive] impact of the provision supplied by L&F and contribution to school is not in question.

VS, who is the school's teaching and learning lead, expressed concerns about how much money it is costing school for 2 people, who are not qualified teachers and who [are delivering part of the school's curriculum but] sit outside school's performance management. She asked if Ofsted would be happy about non-qualified teachers, teaching Key Stage 4 students qualifications. DJ stated that he had consulted Diana Denman (Babcock LDP, Special Schools Advisor) on this situation adding that L&F were delivering 4 accreditations. He said that although BL can't performance manage L&F [the quality of their teaching] can be assessed by learning walks. DJ said that there have been less 'serious incidents' during PE lessons, with more children participating and more smiling. JP reported that she had viewed a PE session which the pupils clearly loved. VS said she appreciated the value L&F bring, but expressed concerned that teachers are not getting a pay rise but L&F are asking for more money. JF said L&F are receiving £30k more than BL pays a teacher and L&F leave school by 2.30pm, so they are not available to run after school interventions. JF also noted that L&F are charging school from 8.30 each morning but do not start teaching until 10.30am on Mondays and 9.30am the rest of the week. VS also expressed concern that they are paid for PPA time and paid for their lunchtimes, which school staff are not.

DJ said L&F are given PPA time, as initially they only were required to coach practical lessons but they are now required to deliver accreditations. VS pointed out that supply staff are only paid for the hours they are actively teaching. DJ said during [the time they are not teaching] L&F are absorbing the school culture and values which is essential to their success. He said he could say don't come in until 10.30am on Mondays but they would miss the discussions during the staff meeting which helps them embed into school.

LS asked about whether the PE curriculum being delivered by an outside provider was leading to the deskilling of school staff who are trained to deliver PE at primary level but not currently delivering PE teaching. She asked what was being done to help up-skill existing staff. DJ replied that the PE L&F are able to provide is better quality.

HC asked how much the contract for L&F cost for 2021/2022 and how much is proposed this year. She also asked whether, if one of the L&F employees is off sick do the company provide cover. Because if they do, this is better than having an employed staff who are not covered when off sick. HC added that in her opinion they should only be paid to be working with children or in a meeting that benefits the school and not have paid PPA time. JF replied that the proposed cost for 2021/2022 had been £63k, but they had had a member of staff off for part of the year, who had not been replaced for the whole time, so the cost will have been reduced. The contract with the company last year had worked out at £50 per hour. L&F are proposing a new contract which works out at £57 per hour which is an increase of 14%. DJ confirmed this year the proposed contract was £65k. LS asked if this is affordable.

HC asked for clarification on what hours BL is paying for. JF said the current SLA states 8.30 to 3pm but school now pays for 2 people every day from 8.30am – 2.30pm. There was a discussion about working hours and provision throughout the school year. VS reported that there was a week at the end of the summer term when there was no PE cover.

LS asked if this spend is affordable. DJ replied that he felt it was a choice between preserving the current [high] quality provision from L&F or taking a risk on a new provider of unknown quality. He expressed concern about taking this risk in a year when an Ofsted inspection was likely. HC agreed it was important not to destabilise provision when approaching a likely Ofsted inspection, but the Governing Board must make sure it is getting value for money. This includes only paying providers for hours they are with the children. DJ suggested that [if the governors approve a contract for 2022/2023] next year BL needs to return to employing a PE teacher/s and allow L&F to apply for the job.

In response to a question from LS, JF replied that the current contract with L&F runs until the end of this academic year. LS said, in that case, should [whoever is appointed to the permanent Headteacher post] make the decision.

The Governing Board discussed the choice between buying-in PE provision and PE being provided by in-house qualified PE teachers. LS asked if L&F deliver PE across the whole school. DJ confirmed that they do. He confirmed that there is a qualified PE teacher on staff (who stopped teaching PE when BL moved to the primary model). LS suggested that the skilled in-house PE teacher could teach Key Stage 2 and L& F could teach secondary PE. During a discussion it was suggested this could be achieved if someone covered their class whilst the qualified PE teacher was teaching PE.

DF said historically the Governing Board had deferred to the operational lead on such operational matters. As a core subject, in the longer term he would like to see PE delivered in-house by a qualified teacher. He said there was a need to consider the time and process required to transition back to this from buying-in PE, in this he would

	<p>defer to DJ.</p> <p>The Governing Board agreed that when they have seen L&F work with the pupils, they have seen that they do a good job.</p> <p>JP asked whether BL could go back to the company and request an improved quote. DJ replied that he has already been through a negation process with them.</p> <p>JMa said a 14% increase in cost, for less provision does not sit well within the wider spending on pay within the school and if the contract continued it would be necessary to ensure there is not a negative impact on the staff group or children. But he felt the direction of PE provision should be a choice for the new substantive Headteacher.</p> <p>DJ noted a new substantive Headteacher can give 6-weeks' notice to L&F, if they decide to employ a PE teacher.</p> <p>The Governing Board discussed whether DJ should go back to L& F and request a lower price. In conclusion the governors agreed to having concerns over the cost of the contract with L&F but agreed to follow DJ's recommendations.</p> <p>LS said that, if it is agreed to continue with PE provision from L&F, she wanted the impact they are having clearly recorded. DJ said the impact of L&F is shown in good behaviour, high performance, good attendance, low serious incidents and 3 accreditations.</p> <p>The Governing Board agreed to give L& F a contract to provide PE for a further year and to leave how it is (operationally) implemented to the Headteacher, with the aim to employ an in-house PE teacher in the future. The Governing Board requested evidence of the impact to show that the company are value for money. The Governing Board expected the SLT to work together to plan for the transition to in-house PE after the end of the next academic year.</p> <p>The Governing Board felt to ensure stability in the short term it was important to keep L&F for now.</p> <p>JF requested Governing Board approval for the <u>Babcock</u> SLA costing £16736. She said the hours for the Education Psychologist, GDPR, plus standard audit, Headteacher performance management remains the same, there is reduced finance support and an additional audit added to safeguarding. As well as GovernorHub and the Governance Consultancy.</p> <p>The Governing Board approved the spend on the proposed Babcock SLA .</p> <p>HC asked that all documents are provided more promptly in the future.</p>		
	<p>It was agreed to move all remaining items to the March meeting to allow enough time to discuss Headteacher recruitment (item 15.1)</p> <p>ACTION – HR to move all remaining items on the agenda to the new March meeting .</p>	HR	10 March 2022
4/15.1	<p>Staff members including those governors who are also member of staff were asked to leave</p> <p>RM, DJ, VS left 18:54</p>		

	Moved to Part 2 18:54		
	Meeting end 19:28		

Next Meeting:			
Date / Time:	24 th March 2022 at 5.30pm	Location:	Barley Lane School Hall

Agreed as a true record	Date
--------------------------------	-------------

KEY

Challenges and queries from Governors

Decisions made

Recommendations

(name of documents referred to)