

Pay Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 18th October 2022 at 6pm at the Sherwood Hill Campus and via Google Meet



Sherwood Park School
Sherwood Hill Campus 5
Leeds LS14 4JG

Eileen Bone (EB)	Foundation Governor	Absent
Gemma Davies (GD)	Co-opted Governor	Present
Brian Ikin (BI)	Co-opted Governor	Present
Matthew Grew (MG)	Co-opted Governor (Chair)	Present
David Murden (DM)	Ex-Officio Governor / Headteacher	Present
Rosemary Viggiani (RV)	Clerk	Present

	Item		Action
1.	<p>Welcome; Apologies for absence and quorum (3)</p> <p>MG opened the meeting at 6pm and welcomed all to the Sherwood Hill Campus. Apologies were received and accepted from Eileen Bone.</p> <p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest regarding items on the agenda.</p>		
2.	<p>Minutes of the previous meeting held on 8th November 2021</p> <p>DECISION: Governors approved the minutes of the meetings held on 8th November 2021 as a true and complete record of the meetings.</p> <p>Matters arising (see action list below)</p>		
3.	<p>QA of PRP Process / PRP Outcomes for all staff and leadership</p> <p>The Committee reviewed the Pay Policy applicable to the pay process for this year.</p> <p><u>To review and moderate the PRP process and outcomes for all staff and leaders.</u></p> <p><i>Governors asked whether all teachers have had a pay appraisal and mid-year review this year?</i></p> <p>DM confirmed that they have.</p> <p>A paper outlining the recommendations was shared with the Committee. DM noted that the cost of the pay rises as recommended will be c£8,000 over what was budgeted.</p> <p><i>Governors asked why so many people have not been recommended an increment?</i></p> <p>DM confirmed that most people have not moved because they are at the top of their pay scale. He has indicated in the paper where there are concerns around performance. The recommendations made are backed up by appraisals and targets; there are some difficult situations but, on the whole people are progressing as their performance is assessed to be good or satisfactory.</p> <p>Following a discussion it was agreed that the criteria for a pay rise needs to be reviewed; performance should be good for people to progress, not just satisfactory. The aim is to encourage and reward good performance, moving away from the expectation that the one step is automatic.</p> <p>It was noted that people have not yet been informed of their pay recommendations; this will follow the Committee's recommendations. Staff can appeal if they believe that the decision is incorrect.</p> <p>To allow governors to moderate the process, three anonymised case studies were provided in addition to the table of recommendations for all staff and the summary of recommendations analysed by gender and ethnicity. DM talked through the case studies which provided examples of recommendations for one step, two steps and no progression.</p>		

Item**Action**

Governors reviewed the three case studies and asked questions around:

- Who carries out the appraisals and makes the recommendations?
- How is the process moderated to ensure fairness across all teachers?
- Where progression is not recommended, what steps are being taken to help the individual improve their performance in future?
- Whether appropriate steps are considered during the year to support people and help them to improve at an earlier stage?
- How and when is the capability process invoked?
- Whether any teachers had objectives that were unmet?
- Whether the met / partially met / no met criteria are correct or whether teachers should be recognised for exceeding their objectives?

DM confirmed that the process is carried out by their line managers and that DM meets with the Deputy Head's weekly to look through examples and moderate across the school to ensure consistency.

Governors noted that the evidence provided reflected the individuals' assessments against their objectives in each case. They were also pleased to note that, where the individual had not been recommended for progression, that the review was still led with respect for the individual and that an amicable relationship had been retained with personal development needs agreed to help them to further develop their skills.

The discussion was wide-ranging covering the process for reviewing and supporting mid-year.

It was noted that the capability process can be invoked at any point; the early stages of the capability policy ensure that all reasonable support and guidance are provided and that the next stage of the capability policy will only be invoked if the individual is still struggling.

DM provided examples of support given, for example where experienced teaching assistants are swapped around to better support a struggling teacher to have an immediate positive impact on the students in the class room. Team Teaching may also be invoked where a senior leader will work alongside a teacher to provide support; this also allows the senior leaders to get to know the teachers better. There are also drop-ins for all teachers.

Governors noted the thorough approach and were pleased to hear how the SLT are coaching and encouraging people through.

DM confirmed that this is a central part of the school's culture which creates a climate where teachers feel that they can make mistakes and be supported. Further examples were provided where the appropriate support enabled teachers to improve their performance and also increased their enthusiasm for the job.

It was noted that some of the teachers did have objectives that were graded as 'not met' but it is very seldom that teachers are not improving.

It was agreed that a system that is fact-based and objective and recognises the full range of performance, including where teachers are exceeding expectations, is preferable and better for both well-being and progress.

Governors stated that they were reassured by the moderation process.

It was further noted that there were no appeals last year but all teachers progressed; this year there are a few teachers who have not progressed so there may be the potential for appeals.

DECISION: The Committee approved the Headteacher's recommendations.

To review and moderate other pay-related matters e.g. TLRs, Retention Awards

There were no other pay-related matters to review.

To have oversight of the application and effectiveness of the Capability Policy

See discussions above.

Item	Action
<p>4. Draft salary statement letters for approval To review and approve template letters to be sent to staff The letters were delegated to the Headteacher.</p>	
<p>5. Trends in pay progression and review of equality matters A report was circulated prior to the meeting providing an analysis of pay progression across specific groups of staff and relevant demographics. The Committee thanked the Head for his report. <i>Governors noted that ethnicity data was not available for half of the staff.</i> DM confirmed that this data is provided voluntarily by staff – it is not a requirement. The data is gathered at the point of employment although it was noted that people could be invited to update it annually where it has not previously been provided. The school has requested updates in the past but could do more to encourage people to provide the data. Governors noted that it is important to respect people’s right not to provide that data and that it is also important for people to understand how the data might be used. It was noted that there are different uses for the data between the school and the DfE. In terms of the analysis by ethnicity, it was agreed that the data is so limited that few meaningful conclusions can be drawn. However, DM noted that it reinforces the difference in the diversity of staff in terms of their level in the school. There is an increasing preponderance of people of White British ethnicity higher up in the organisation. This is something that DM has previously raised and this has previously been discussed by the Board where there have also been efforts to address this within the Board itself. Approaches to encourage greater diversity in the teaching staff were discussed including encouraging TA’s within the school to progress through the teacher training route. The data on gender is more available; it was noted that no-one had classed themselves as ‘other’ although it was noted that this is a relatively small community. It was also questioned as to whether the correct question is asked with regards to sex and gender noting that these may be different. Whilst no monitoring data was evidenced beyond that for race and gender, DM reflected upon the number of neurodivergent teachers and the positive benefits neurodivergence brings to the school’s educational context. Neurodivergent candidates are being actively encouraged in job advertisements and it was noted that people are feeling more comfortable with disclosing this. It was further noted that it would be interesting to look at similar data for the whole staff body. Governors agreed that, from the available data, there were no equality concerns arising with regards to pay progression.</p>	
<p>6. To consider any matters relating to the budget for referral to the Finance Committee The additional £8,000 relating to the progression was noted. DM confirmed that he will be seeking to fit this into the budget but was not yet able to say how this could be afforded against the DRP but this will have to be done if the school is to retain staff. The governors discussed the importance of the pay process being objective. However, it is also important that it is affordable. There is a mention in the policy of it being subject to the school’s financial position which, in theory gives the school the ability to withhold pay rises. In reviewing the pay policy this should be borne in mind; the budget process needs to align with the policy to ensure affordability. This is particularly important where more staff may become eligible for progression.</p>	
<p>7. Policies for review / approval To review progress re approval of the Pay Policy for 2022-23</p>	

Item**Action**

The policy is currently being reviewed and should be available for approval at FGB in December.

The following points were agreed:

- The appraisal and pay policies need to be reviewed together;
- DM will consider whether the Optimus / Browne Jacobsen approved templates can be adapted to the school's needs;
- The criteria for a pay rise needs to be reviewed; performance should be good for people to progress, not just satisfactory. The policy needs to provide clear definitions of terms such as satisfactory, good and exceptional.
- The aim is to encourage and reward good performance - moving away from the expectation that the one step is automatic.
- There is a need to ensure that the pay policy will be affordable in future. This could include the review of the use of options for rewarding exceptional performance including the award of two steps or the sharing of a bonus pot to be set within the budget process.

It was noted that the Finance Committee is on the 23rd November and, ideally, the financial implications of any future policy need to be understood and agreed at that meeting. The appraisal policy could potentially go straight to FGB.

ACTION: DM to prepare the Pay Policy for scrutiny at the Finance Committee on Nov 23rd – to be circulated by Wednesday 16th November (a week beforehand). The Appraisal Policy can go directly to FGB with the final Pay Policy for approval. The points discussed in the Pay Committee should be taken into account.

1

8. **Update re the HTPM Committee**

It was noted that a date has yet to be set for the Head's review.

ACTION: RV to follow up re a date for the HTPM.

2

9. **Any other business**

There was no other business

Confidential items

To agree whether any items should be recorded in Part B Minutes as confidential.

It was noted that the paper circulated with the pay recommendations is confidential.

Any other business / dates of future meetings / close

Forthcoming Meetings: FGB: 14th December 2022
 Finance: 19th October 2022 and 23rd November 2022
 Curriculum & Staffing: 16th November 2022

The meeting closed at 8:06pm

Signed:



Print Name:



Chair

Date:



Action list

Item	Action point	Who	By when	Update
Actions arising from the meeting of 8 th November 2021				
2021/1	Review the Pay Policy and to utilise the maximum flexibility possible within the terms of the STPCD to ensure that we are rewarding those people who are performing best and are free to make investment in the school in way that best helps us to meet our overall objectives. To bring it for discussion to the FGB at the earliest opportunity.			Action superseded by Action 1 below; action closed.
Actions arising from the Meeting of the 18 th October 2022				
1	DM to prepare the Pay Policy for scrutiny at the Finance Committee on Nov 23 rd – to be circulated by Wednesday 16 th November (a week beforehand). The Appraisal Policy can go directly to FGB with the final Pay Policy for approval. The points discussed in the Pay Committee should be taken into account.	DM	Dec 22	
2	RV to follow up re a date for the HTPM.	RV	Oct 22	