



# MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FULL GOVERNING BOARD OF ALDERLEY EDGE COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL ON THURSDAY 6<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2025

GOVERNORS IN ATTENDANCE:	Wendy Davies	(WD)	Chair of Governors
	Nick Hughes	(NH)	Vice Chair of Governors
	Martin Smith	(MS)	Co-opted Governor
	Anne Turner	(AT)	Co-opted Governor
	Lindsey Walsh	(LW)	Headteacher
	Mark Ross	(MR)	Parent Governor
	Helen Handley	(HH)	Co-opted Governor
	Mike Lamb	(ML)	Parent Governor
	Sheila Keegan	(SK)	Local Authority Governor
OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:	Lyndsey Platt	(LP)	Deputy Headteacher
	Sarah Lomas	(SL)	Clerk
APOLOGIES:	Hannah Lomas	(HL)	Co-opted Governor
	Sam Cooper	(SC)	Co-opted Governor
	Alex Shaw	(AS)	Co-opted Governor
	Lesley Sym	(LS)	Staff Governor
	Ian Roberts	(IR)	Co-opted Governor

## MINUTES – PART ONE: NON-CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

The meeting commenced at 5:05pm.

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<b>APOLOGIES AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AOB) ITEMS</b> Apologies were received and accepted from the following governors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HL</li> <li>• SC</li> <li>• AS</li> <li>• LS</li> <li>• IR</li> </ul>	
2.	<b>CONFLICT OF INTEREST</b> a) The following declarations were made by governors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NH is a governor at Rushton Spencer Primary School.</li> <li>• ML is an IT director at Quest EPM Limited.</li> </ul> <p>There were no anticipated conflicts of interest with the business of the meeting raised by governors.</p>	
3.	<b>MEMBERSHIP</b> a) There were no changes to the membership of the board of governors to receive at this meeting. b) Governors noted that there are no terms of office that are due to expire before the next meeting.	
4.	<b>PART ONE MINUTES &amp; MATTERS ARISING</b> a) The minutes from the previous meeting on 28.11.24 were confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings. One typo was noted. Governors <b>approved</b> the	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>minutes subject to amendment of the typo noted.  <b>ACTION:</b> Amend item 2 NL to NH.  <b>ACTION:</b> Upload an electronically signed copy of the minutes to GVO.</p> <p>b) The action log from the previous meeting was reviewed and the following items were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft catering contract was received yesterday and has been issued to MR and IR for review. The school had identified three minor issues upon which clarity will be sought.</li> <li>• The school confirmed that Johnathon Christian-Hare has been approached and has agreed to be appointed as the unofficial school fund auditor for 2024-25.</li> <li>• A discussion has not yet taken place with the PTA regarding potential contributions to subsidise transport costs for residential trips due to other discussions regarding the best use of PTA funds.</li> <li>• Link governor reports were considered, and it was agreed that follow up with AS would be undertaken post meeting regarding the PE and Geography link visit reports.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Follow up with AS regarding the link visit reports for PE and Geography.</p>	<p><b>Clerk Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p>
5.	<p><b>CHAIR'S ACTION</b>  There had been no Chair's actions taken outside of the meeting and therefore no report to receive at this meeting.</p>	
6.	<p><b>PART ONE REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES AND REPORTS FROM GOVERNORS WITH SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES</b>  To receive:</p> <p>a) Governors received a summary of the spring term committee meetings as follows:  <b>Strategic Review Committee 14.01.25</b>  The membership of the Board was reviewed along with committee link roles. The Governor Action Plan was reviewed in terms of progress along with the Ofsted report. Governors also received an update on the academisation process including the parent consultation event.</p> <p><b>Teaching and Learning Committee 28.01.25</b>  Attendance was discussed and it was highlighted that authorised absences are no longer permitted. The school continue to follow the processes and procedures in place to monitor attendance. There was a drop in attendance in the autumn term due to illness. Governors also discussed safeguarding and no concerns were raised.</p> <p>b) The following reports from link governors were received:  <b>Safeguarding and Single Central Record (SCR)</b>  The safeguarding visit had a focus on bullying with a review of policies and school procedures in place. Robust procedures are in place. The vulnerable children's list was reviewed, and it was evidenced that school manages the case load effectively including following up on vulnerable pupils who are no longer in school. The SCR was reviewed, and a discussion took place regarding potential changes, including improvements in the encryption of data, following academisation. There were no issues to report with regard to the SCR.</p> <p><b>Modern Foreign Languages</b>  A visit has been scheduled for next week by HH.</p>	
7.	<p><b>FINANCIAL MATTERS</b>  a) Governors considered the draft annual budget for 2025-26. It was noted that the school had included a second 3-year plan within the meeting papers following confirmation of the source of funds for 2025-26. Errors in the high needs funding remain and the school is still in the process of reviewing the source of funds to ensure accuracy.</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>Governors noted that the information provided in the 3-year plan from the Local Authority (LA) shows a surplus position in Year 3 and the school have never been in this position. There remains a deficit (c.£30,000) for this academic year which was not predicted and was caused following LA errors in the figures applied for staff pay increases. Further work has been undertaken by the school to reduce this deficit which now stands at approximately £9,000. However, in order to achieve this reduction in the deficit, there are difficult decisions to be taken. Governors noted that the budget assumes that all the temporary contracts in school will end. Changes to staffing have been made where there has been natural turnover including the change from site manager to site maintenance officer. Two midday staff have left and only one new member of staff will be recruited. These changes have provided savings.</p> <p>The three-year plan has also assumed a significant increase in pupil numbers following the departure of the current Year 6 who are the smallest cohort in school and an estimated full Reception class for 2025-26.</p> <p><b><i>Additional items relating to financial matters were considered under Part 2 of this meeting (Item 5).</i></b></p> <p>Governors considered the additional information required and agreed to delegate the approval of the budget to the Assets Committee. Governors emphasised that any decisions taken should not adversely impact education or staff wellbeing.</p> <p><b>Q: Following academisation, will sports grant funding still be received?</b>  <b>A:</b> Yes, this funding is provided for all maintained schools and academies.  <b>ACTION:</b> Add approval of the 2025-26 budget to the summer term Assets Committee meeting agenda.</p> <p>b) The review of Budget vs Actuals for the current year 2024/25 and progress against the 3-year budget plan was considered under item 7a) above.</p> <p>c) It was confirmed that the draft SFVS was not yet ready for approval and that the budget papers are key to completion of this document. Governors were informed that the draft SFVS would be issued on 11.03.25 and an EFGB would be scheduled to approve prior to submission in line with the 31.03.25 deadline.  <b>ACTION:</b> Schedule and online EFGB for Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> March at 5pm.  Governors discussed benchmarking and the new comparator tool available.</p> <p>d) The staffing costs were discussed under item 7a) above. The current structure is 7 teachers for 7 classes. Any changes to the structure will be communicated once the budget is finalised.</p> <p>e) The Board confirmed the authority to approve the budget is delegated to the Assets and Finance Committee.  <b>ACTION:</b> Add budget approval to the summer term FGB agenda for ratification.</p> <p>f) Governors considered the Manual of Internal Financial Procedures (MIFP), specifically the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Continuity Plan – It was confirmed that there were no changes at this stage but there may be some amendments once new staff commence employment. Governors <b>approved</b> the Business Continuity Plan.</li> <li>• Cyber Response Plan – Governors <b>approved</b> the cyber response plan.</li> </ul> <p>g) The school confirmed that the Pupil Premium strategy statement detailing the expenditure of funds was published on the school website and had been discussed in detail at the spring term Teaching and Learning Committee meeting.</p>	<p><b>Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p>
8.	<p><b>PART ONE HEADTEACHER'S REPORT AND MATTERS ARISING</b></p> <p>Governors confirmed receipt of the Headteacher's report circulated prior to the meeting</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>and thanked LW for the detail included.</p> <p>It was noted that the report had been structured to include the Ofsted outcomes and the work ongoing within school. It was clarified that the main focus for governors is to ensure progress against the Ofsted action point. The school confirmed that work on this action point had begun prior to the inspection but was continuing apace, having commenced the spring term with twilight training sessions for staff. Additional monitoring is also in place and the school have organised training to be delivered by the SIP in addition to the school improvement visits, the cost of which has been covered by the training budget.</p> <p>Governors <b>commented</b> on the strength of the school and the challenges in finding areas to improve. The school countered that one of the main challenges can be to maintain high levels of performance in times of changing attitudes, research and pedagogy.</p> <p><b>Q: Is the school beginning to see the results from the Oracy project?</b>  <b>A:</b> LP is the oracy lead and is undertaking the training. The change can be seen within Reception class in which LP teaches, however the challenge is disseminating the information amongst staff and monitoring implementation which is a slow process. Ideally, the school would like staff to visit other schools to see the implementation first hand and the benefits. The extended time for change to be seen with this project is countered by the small steps which securely embed the skills which over time, it is anticipated, will demonstrate significant impact.</p>	
9.	<p><b>SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN / OFSTED</b></p> <p>The school confirmed that the SDP is now essentially the Ofsted action plan. The school has met with the SIP to review the document following the inspection and implementation of the plan is now the focus.</p> <p>Governors <b>queried</b> the position of the SDP prior to the inspection and whether this was no longer in operation. The school confirmed that the content from the previous SDP is still in place, but additional detail has been included within the plan to provide further structure for staff to monitor implementation.</p>	
10.	<p><b>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PARTNER (SIP)</b></p> <p>a) Governors noted that there was no formal report to receive at this meeting as the most recent SIP visit had been utilised to assist in the construction of the Ofsted action plan.</p> <p>b) Consideration was given to the appointment of the SIP. It was confirmed that the school would not be converting to an academy prior to January 2026. During this timeframe support was required for the Headteacher's performance management panel, input on the Ofsted work and general school improvement visits. The school proposed that Clive Davies (CD), current SIP, be reappointed for a further 12 months to ensure continuity prior to academisation. Governors <b>approved</b> the reappointment of CD as SIP for 2025-26.</p>	
11.	<p><b>ACCESSIBILITY PLAN</b></p> <p>The draft accessibility plan had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting for review. There were no questions about the document. It was confirmed that a review is undertaken every two years. Governors <b>approved</b> the accessibility plan.</p>	
12.	<p><b>STRATEGIC GOVERNANCE – ORGANISATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND CLERKING ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2025/26</b></p> <p>Governors considered the clerking arrangements required given the current position with academisation not taking place prior to January 2026.</p> <p>Governors were briefed on the structure of charges for clerking. A clerk is required for FGB meetings and there is a set cost for this package with the LA with any additional clerking for committees and additional meetings purchased separately. The Board discussed the cost</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>vs benefit of purchasing more than the minimum FGB clerking package and the cost implications.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the service level agreement (SLA) for 2025-26 was not yet published and enquiries would be made following the meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Review the cost of clerking for 2025-26 following publication of the SLA and communicate information to the Board.</p> <p>Governors <b>approved</b> the purchase of clerking services for the FGB meetings with further purchases to be considered following a review of costs.</p> <p><b>Q: Are there any other contracts that may overlap the financial year?</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> All contracts have been considered as part of the budget work and the ChESS package from the Local Authority contains a range of items including HR services, legal support etc.</p> <p>Governors considered the timeframe for academisation and the uncertainty around this. It was queried if clerking services could be purchased termly.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Ascertain if clerking can be purchased termly.</p>	<p><b>LW</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p>
13.	<p><b>GOVERNOR TRAINING &amp; DEVELOPMENT</b></p> <p>a) It was confirmed that governors remain active in their training with new governors working through the available induction courses. Exclusions training was highlighted with governors recommended to undertake this where possible.</p> <p>b) There was no feedback to receive from recent training at this meeting.</p> <p>c) Consideration was given to the Board self-review for 2024-25 and it was agreed that this would be actioned following the meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Send the link for the Board self-review to governors.</p> <p>d) <b>ACTION:</b> Issue the link for the skills audit following the meeting.</p>	<p><b>HH Clerk</b></p>
14.	<p><b>SCHOOL POLICIES</b></p> <p>The following policies had been circulated to governors prior to the meeting for review.</p> <p>a) 5. Admissions</p> <p>b) 55. Intimate Care</p> <p>Governors <b>approved</b> the above-listed policies.</p>	
15.	<p><b>PLANNED RESIDENTIAL VISITS</b></p> <p>The following residential trips for 2024-25 were confirmed:</p> <p>a) Delamere – Year 2, 28<sup>th</sup>-29<sup>th</sup> April 2025</p> <p>b) Whitehall – Year 4, 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> May 2025</p> <p>c) Pensarn – Year 6, 19<sup>th</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> May 2025</p> <p>The school confirmed that all risk assessments were currently underway and would be submitted to the LA in line with the required deadlines.</p> <p>Governors discussed transport costs and the previous suggestion to engage with the PTA on potential funding to subsidise costs. The school confirmed that this suggestion was not being pursued at present due to other items requiring PTA support. It was noted that the cost of residential trips is increasing significantly but the benefits to the children are substantial. The school provide as much notice to parents as possible for payment for trips.</p> <p><b>Q: Has the school received any negative feedback from parents regarding residential trips?</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Not directly but comments have been fed back to the school.</p> <p><b>Q: What is the provision for pupils who cannot go on the trips?</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> If the reason for non-attendance is financial, the school would work to support families and negate this issue. There are some instances where children do not attend but this is</p>	

ITEM		ACTION
	<p>rare and they would be encouraged to attend for the day to gain some of the benefits.</p> <p><b>Q: Does provision have to be made for any pupils who do not attend?</b>  <b>A:</b> Yes, the children would be expected to attend school.</p> <p>Governors considered the pros and cons of alternative methods of transport such as the train. The school confirmed that this has been done in the past but limits the venues and locations of trips and is dependent on the age of the pupils.</p>	
16.	<p><b>TO NOTE ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRODUCTION OF MEETING PRECIS</b>  <b>ACTION:</b> Complete the meeting precis.</p>	WD
17.	<p><b>MEETINGS</b>  Governors noted the date of the next FGB meeting scheduled on Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2025 at 5:00pm at the school.</p>	
18.	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>  There were no items of other business tabled for discussion at the meeting.</p>	
19.	<p><b>IMPACT STATEMENT</b>  The Board of Governors helped to move the school forward in the following ways during this meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governors reviewed the financial position of the school in detail with approval of the draft budget deferred due to the requirement for additional information.</li> <li>• An action was taken for the Assets Committee to review the 2025-26 proposed budget for approval in the summer term.</li> <li>• Governors reviewed the progress of the Ofsted action plan and were satisfied with the ongoing school improvement works underway.</li> <li>• The SIP for 2025-26 was considered and approved to ensure consistency for the school prior to academisation.</li> <li>• Residential trips were reviewed with consideration given to the impact of rising costs.</li> </ul>	

The meeting moved to Part 2.

.....*WGD Davies*.....Chair  
.....03.07.25.....Date