

**Bassingbourn Village College
Academy**



Minutes of the Full Governing Body meeting held on 8th December 2016

Present: Ken Murphy (KM) (in the Chair) Stephen Morris (SM)
Duncan Cooper (DC) Peter Nussey (PN)
Alison Butterworth (AB) Vicky Poulter (VP)
Rachel Dix-Pincott (RD-P) Chris Roope (CR)
James Dow (JD) Simon Saggars (SSag)
Kate French (KF) Sue Speller (SSp)
George Lynn (GL)

In attendance: Louise Carter (LC)
Tom Meeks (Price Bailey)(TM)
Sue Smith (SS)

Minutes: Hilary Forrester (Clerk)

Business	ACTION
<p>1. Apologies: Dushy Chetty. Apologies were accepted.</p>	
<p>2. Minutes of last meeting/matters arising</p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting on 21 September 2016 were approved and signed.</p> <p><u>Appraisal of Chair:</u> KM thanked everyone for completing the questionnaires. These were collated by SS into a spreadsheet with the overall mean scores and comments. DC and KM met with John Colpin, Principal at Sawston, who acted as an independent reviewer. KM found the exercise very useful and the Trust Board acknowledged that this should be done across the Trust in the form of a review, rather than an appraisal. The Trust Board plan to develop a MAT-wide review programme. Leading on from the appraisal, succession planning was discussed. Alison and KM would put together a succession plan for all the posts for submission to the Trust Board. The role of the Chair would change and there would be a new committee structure.</p> <p><u>Lockdown Policy:</u> This was being finalised and would be circulated to staff in January.</p> <p><u>Child Protection Policy:</u> All actions had been done and the policy was in place.</p> <p><u>Site update:</u> KM had met with the developer who had put in an offer which was initially too low. KM agreed to contact him again following valuations from estate agents. The property was valued in three ways (i) 'as is'; (ii) if BVC did the work to update it; and (iii) as a development plot. The average value was £300,000 'as is', £340,000 if it was updated, however the property would need approximately £40,000 spent on it. Only two estate agents valued the property as a development plot, one at £475,000 and the other at £500,000. However, selling the development plot would entail giving up a large part of the car park and could compromise school security.</p> <p>KM had met with the developer again and he had put forward a revised figure of £300,000 which was close to the valuation to sell the property 'as is'.</p> <p>Q: Will the developer redevelop the plot? A: Yes, the access would be from the other side of the site with a fence where the front of the house is.</p> <p>Q: How far does the site extend? A: It does not encroach onto the land that we use.</p> <p>The next step was for KM to complete the procedures for the EFA to show full due diligence, with an explanation justifying the preferred option. If the EFA approve the proposal, the developer can put a formal offer in. The school would apply for planning permission with the developer paying the cost. Discussions would then take place with the EFA about the use of the funds.</p>	

<p>Q: Should we put the money into capital A: The EFA may require us to use it, but we want to have as much flexibility as possible. Q: It would be better not to have to spend it on running costs. A: Yes, but we may need to spend some of it on that.</p> <p>Q: How does the valuation in £ per sq m, compare to prices of land in the village? A: The developer has gone to the maximum he will pay. The market price for the land is £500,000 but that would mean giving up an access channel across the school grounds. Q: Could we wait until the developer has built the other houses and then negotiate access? A: That would not be possible.</p> <p>Governors agreed to proceed on the basis of the developer's £300,000 offer.</p> <p>SSag reported that he had met with Tom Sims and Sarah Anderson from Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) who manage the land bank. CCC had given a directive to retain assess to provide a revenue stream and they had set up a Special Purchase Vehicle (SPV) for this. They were looking at the site on the other side of the playing field, behind the bowls club and sports centre. This is a large field that BVC half own with CCC. That development plot offers a number of options: to join a joint venture with CCC to create a revenue stream, eg build houses to give long term income; or sell the land directly to CCC; or part of each option. The permission would have Section 106 funding attached, which could be transfer into an asset, eg an Astro-turf pitch. Tom was preparing a broad analysis of the options and Sarah would carry out mapping work. BVC could then consider the options.</p> <p>Q: What is the land currently used for? A: Nothing. Q: How many houses are they proposing? A: In the order of 20-30. Q: Are they likely to get permission? A: That is unclear at this stage.</p> <p>SSag noted that there were two issues that needed addressing:</p> <p>(i) the scrub bushes along the potential access need to be removed.</p> <p>ACTION: Site staff and governors may be able to help clear bushes.</p> <p>(ii) CCC need to find out what the telegraph poles are being used for and why they are in that location. Sarah spoke to the electricity board but they could not identify what they were for.</p> <p>ACTION: DC to talk to Barbara about the telegraph poles.</p>	<p>KM</p> <p>SSag/KM</p> <p>DC</p>
<p>3. Pecuniary Interests</p> <p>None were recorded. All Pecuniary/Declaration of interest forms had been returned.</p>	
<p>4. Accounts 2015/16: Sign off and Management letter</p> <p>Tom Meeks from Price Bailey presented the Management letter and accounts, previously circulated. It was noted that although this was the last year that BVC was a stand-alone entity the accounts had been prepared on the basis of an 'ongoing concern'.</p> <p>The report noted that all assets were transferred to Anglia Learning at original cost (note 24). Pages 14-17 shows two clean audit reports confirming that the accounts present a true and fair picture, and that the work undertaken has not given any cause for concern.</p> <p>The Accounts begin with the Trustees report written in collaboration with DC, KM and LC. This is compliant and a fair representation of the school.</p> <p>There were no questions. The Accounts would be place on the Trust and school website and lodged at Companies House.</p> <p>TM reported that the Management letter set out the results of the audit of statutory accounts together with the systems, processes and procedures. The five key risk areas set out on p3-4 presented no major concerns.</p> <p>Q: The report states that assets and liabilities were transferred to the Trust at the closing of the accounts. What is the liability in respect of the governing body? A: It is just a timing difference. The transfer document states that all assets and liabilities were transferred to the Trust, but this has not yet been accounted for as funding carried over.</p>	

<p>TM noted that page 8 reports on the findings, and identifies two points to be addressed: (i) The EFA is concerned about gifts and hospitality, including consultancy work between schools.</p> <p>Q: Are there model policies? A: There are some available but they would need to be tailored to the individual school. (ii) The deferring of income is a departure from generally accepted UK practice. This has been discussed and is included as a recommendation.</p> <p>It was noted that the three to five year budgeting had been done well. An apprentice levy would need to be paid as the payroll exceeds £3million.</p> <p>TM invited comments from governors before the accounts were signed. There were no further comments.</p> <p>Governors thanked TM and Price Bailey for their work.</p>	
<p>5. 3 Year forecast and October variance report</p> <p>LC presented the variance report.</p> <p>Q: Is one months' worth of reserves acceptable for unrestricted funds? In other charities, there is the process of allocating funding between restricted and unrestricted funds. Currently you are treating it as deferred income which would not be allowed. What do the two terms mean in this context?</p> <p>ACTION: KM to ask Sarah and speak to the EFA about the use of the restricted funds as unrestricted, and feedback to GL.</p> <p>LC reported on the 2016/17 budget. SEN funding was currently running under budget, but was expected to end the year with a £9,000 shortfall. Pupil premium was over budget by £2,000. The college was £4,300 over budget on other income, which was boosted by additional funding for a student who was attending a Pupil Referral Unit. The net surplus was £4,755 over budget for the first two months of the year.</p> <p>The Balance sheet showed analysis of the energy project. Credits had been slow to come in and the next payment was due in January.</p> <p>Expenditure on teacher salaries and admin staff was under budget, although the backdated salary payments had now gone in which would bring this into line. The cover budget was overspent because a member of teaching staff had not started in September and had since resigned.</p> <p>Utilities were under budget for 2 months, but the Biomass was over budget and this would be monitored over the coming year. Rates for the caretaker's house were over budget.</p> <p>The college had planned to save £4,000 by combining professional personnel services across the MAT, however it had been decided to continue with EPM for the time being.</p> <p>Q: Are we paying less to the MAT because of this? A: We were going to look for a different service, but were not able to find a new provider to cover the whole MAT and go through the procurement process in time for this academic year. There will be additional money coming back to us and we are also benefiting from the support of the MAT HR Director.</p> <p>The Sports Centre income is in line with budget.</p> <p>There were no further questions and governors thanked LC for her work especially in relation to the conversion.</p> <p>DC reported on the three year forecast. The Cambridgeshire Secondary Heads had written to Nick Gibb, Education Secretary about Fairer Funding. His response stated that the Government was still committed to Fairer Funding for the 2018-19 academic year. KM informed governors that he had met with four army officers and two people from the County Council about reopening the barracks and the schooling required for the families. This involved places for 26 students from next September across all year groups.</p> <p>Q: Is this long term? A: It would be for a minimum of two years, possibly three. A third of the personnel on site would be permanent staff. The occupancy of the barracks is planned to</p>	<p>KM</p>

<p>increase until 2021, with the majority in place by 2017. BVC should receive 6 month notice of new families coming in to facilitate planning.</p> <p>Q: Can we accommodate them without increasing the PAN? A: County have advised that there is an exclusion from going over the PAN for military families. The children would come with two additional amounts of funding.</p> <p>Q: Would we have to take on more staff? A: Yes and development of the building, although this could be accommodated in portacabins initially. The next stage was for DC and Sue from the Primary School to discuss the requirements in more detail.</p> <p>KM noted that the three to five year forecast was now looking stronger than it did a few months ago.</p>	
<p>6. Matters arising from Link Governor visits</p> <p>KM expressed concern that three link governor visit reports had not yet been received. It was important for all reports to be submitted in view of the proposed changes for link governors to lead on related FGB agenda items.</p>	
<p>7. Safeguarding update</p> <p>It was noted that SSp had done the previous safeguarding visit.</p> <p>ACTION: GL and SM to do the next safeguarding visit.</p>	<p>GL and SM</p>
<p>8. Training Governor</p> <p>KM reported that, as best practice, Governance services recommended having a Training Governor responsible for coordinating, and promoting governor training. The Training Governor would receive the programme of courses and recommend training, taking into account the skills audit and the needs of new governors.</p> <p>Q: Is there a training budget? A: Yes.</p> <p>ACTION: SSp to be training governor.</p>	<p>SSp</p>
<p>9. Governance arrangements January 2017 onwards</p> <p>The following documents had been circulated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference • Code of Conduct • Scheme of delegation • Governance planner • Governance audit • Meeting schedule – to agree dates <p>DC reported that the Code of Conduct was based on a national model that could vary for each MAT. These documents would be worked through over the next few terms and refined according to the needs of the local governing body. The Terms of Reference for the committees were also being revised. All the schools in the MAT would be using a similar template.</p> <p>Q: What would happen if there were no committees. A: Business would be handled by the FGB.</p> <p>ACTION: KM to talk to Kerry (Clerk to the MAT) for guidance based on how we propose to run local governance from January.</p> <p>Concern was expressed about the length of meetings. Even if the governing body or committee were no longer required to approve items, they would still be expected to monitor and make recommendations and this was the part that takes time. DC noted that there may be some time saved in drafting policies, but in other areas the process would be developed over the next few terms. The responsibility ultimately sits with the Board but governors need to be</p>	<p>KM</p>

<p>clear about the rules as set out in the Scheme of Delegation. The plan was for each meeting to have a specific focus with CIP governors leading discussions on areas following their reviews.</p> <p>There was discussion about the procedure for Chairing the meetings and preparing the agendas. It was noted that Personnel, Finance and Premises were not specifically covered on the CIP. DC advised that these areas would come under leadership and management and there would be strands within the link governor remit.</p> <p>ACTION: DC and KM to consider who would Chair and/or lead various sections of the meetings.</p> <p>KM reported that he planned to step down as Chair at the end of the academic year, although he would still be available to give support.</p>	DC/KM
<p>10. Raise online initial analysis to include a maths update</p> <p><u>Raise online:</u> Governors noted that the Raise online analysis would be discussed in detail at the forthcoming ASC. The data was currently unvalidated and JBr had prepared notes. The four top performing Pupil Premium (PP) pupils had not been included in the data and this had been queried with Raise.</p> <p>DC noted that the structure of the report had changed a lot and he would be doing some training on 14th December. Training would be provided for the governing body early next term.</p> <p><u>Maths update:</u> Information was circulated for governors to take away and feedback.</p> <p>Q: Do you think we now have a stronger maths department than last year A: Yes.</p> <p>Q: What is the ability of the children going through the exam next year? A: They are less able and the exam is harder. We will not be able to compare with last year, except for the Y10 statistics.</p>	All
<p>11. Any other Business</p> <p><u>Governing Body Term of Office</u> – KM informed governors that the term of office for the Community Governors restarted on 1st September for a four year term. Governors could leave before the end of their term if they wished. The Staff Governor and Parent period of office was unchanged.</p> <p>Governors approved AB moving from Parent Governor to Community Governor with a four year term starting with immediate effect.</p> <p>There was one parent governor position, and a staff governor position was also vacant following Simon’s resignation.</p> <p><u>Boundary issue</u> – There was discussion about the proposed changes to the Hertfordshire boundary. KM noted that although the constituencies would change, the counties would stay the same as at present.</p>	

Chair

Date of next scheduled FGB meetings are as follows:

- 25.01.17 – 6pm
- 01.03.17 – 7pm
- 30.03.17 – 6pm
- 10.05.17 – 7pm
- 18.05.17 – 6pm
- 12.07.17 – 7pm