

# BASSINGBOURN VILLAGE COLLEGE

## Minutes of the Local Governing Body meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2017

<b>Present:</b>	Alison Butterworth (AB) (Chair) Peter Bolton (PB) Duncan Cooper (DC) Rachel Dix-Pincott (RD-P) James Dow (JD) Kate French (KF)	Stephen Morris (SM) Ken Murphy (KM) Vicky Poulter (VP) Chris Roope (CR) (from item 3) Simon Sagers (SSag) (from item 3)
<b>In attendance:</b>	Kate Evans CEO (up to item 5)	
<b>Minutes:</b>	Hilary Forrester (Clerk)	

	ACTION
<p><b>1. Apologies and welcome.</b></p> <p>Apologies were received and accepted from Dushy Chetty, George Lynn, Peter Nussey and Sue Speller. Governors welcomed Kate Evans to the meeting and introductions were made.</p>	
<p><b>2. Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interests.</p>	
<p><b>3. Minutes of last meeting/matters arising</b></p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> March were approved and signed.</p> <p><u>Reserves</u>: Still awaiting advice from the EFA on the definition of free and fixed reserves. <b>Action</b>: KM to chase up.</p> <p><u>Governor finance training</u>: Some governors had already indicated that they would be attending the finance training. KM asked other governors to respond.</p> <p><u>Termly briefings</u>: SSp had prepared a rota for attendance at Termly Briefings which was circulated at the meeting.</p> <p><u>Link governor reports</u>: Most reports had been completed but there was one outstanding.</p> <p><u>Agenda format</u>: DC alerted governors to the revised agenda format. This now included governor activity and forthcoming agenda items. The meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> May would focus on governance and this would be an opportunity to review the new format. Governors felt that the new format was helpful and that the LGB meeting structure was working well, capturing the items previously discussed at the sub-committees.</p> <p><b>Action</b>: To add a column on the agenda indicating who was leading on each item.</p> <p><u>Pupil Premium</u>: SM and CR met with Phil Church at the end of February. Progress was on track and governors noted that there was a clear strategy around individual children. The provision at BVC is bespoke, but this is labour intensive to put in place and monitor.</p> <p><u>Governor visit reports</u>: Reports from GL and VP were circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p><u>Attendance</u>: As discussed at the last meeting, this had been impacted by children on medical need provision.</p>	<p>KM</p> <p>Sue Smith (SS)</p>

#### 4. Presentation and Questions – Kate Evans CEO

Kate Evans gave a presentation to governors about the latest MAT developments.

**Action:** Circulate the presentation to governors and staff after the meeting.

SS

Governors asked the following questions:

**Q:** In what way is Anglian Learning working differently from other Trusts? **A:** They have more hierarchical models, eg Chief Executives and then Principals within the schools, or a Hub model with an Executive Principal. Given our size, a CEO with deputies, is a stronger model and a more collaborative way of working.

**Q:** Are CEOs always Principals? **A:** Usually, but there is a picture emerging where this is not necessarily the case. The majority of CEOs come through the headship route, others via finance or from a business background.

**Q:** Why is it important to have the independent Director? **A:** When the three Trusts were being merged, discussions identified that it was crucial to have the right people with the necessary skills set on the Board and this necessitated schools giving up some autonomy. As a starting point, the connection to where people had come from gave security and close working with primary schools was important as was a cross-phase concept. If any of the directors were to leave, the most important aspect of a replacement would be to get the right skill set, rather than proportional representation.

Kate confirmed that the Local Governing Body structures were very important for the schemes of delegation to work effectively. The DfE also emphasise that effective communication between the tiers is key.

**Q:** Do you agree? **A:** Yes, you have responsibility for four thousand pupils, so the allegiances are important. The danger would be if the Board becomes divorced from what is happening at the local level. We have a working group at Trust Board level to make sure that we have good communication.

**Q:** Would you envisage there being a single representative from each school on the Board going forward? **A:** It becomes unsustainable. One of the schools no longer has a representative on the Board (Bottisham) and we are already at the stage where, if we had three or four primary schools joining, the Board would have to stretch, which would risk not having the right skills on there. DC noted that feedback from some Trusts that had been set up with a proportional representation model suggested that it quickly becomes unworkable.

AB noted that if communication between the Board and the LGBs was effective, this should demonstrably remove the anxiety, rather than having to see your school's representative on the Board. KM responded that all schools had the opportunity to put someone forward for a new Director position if they had the right skill set.

**Q:** In terms of the skill set on the Trust Board, how many are parent governors, and what skill set do they bring? **A:** None are parent governors. If the LGBs have proper local representation and good communication with the Trust Board, it is unclear what additional skill set parent governors would bring to the business of running the Trust. Representation is built into the LGBs, and communication must be effective so that their perspective can be passed up to the Board.

KM informed governors that the Trust was looking to expand the Board by two governors. The criteria specified the skills needed at Trust level in the future. SSag emphasised the importance of having a broad selection of skills and recommended making one of the positions specifically for a parent with a school-age child who could bring that perspective to the Board.

<p><b>Q:</b> What fraction of the Trust Board membership do you see coming from the LGBs. <b>A:</b> I do not believe that representation from LGBs should be a driver. The overarching priority is that everyone at Board level cares as much about children here as at the other schools.</p> <p>There was discussion about the proposed Grammar schools and the new North Cherry Hinton housing development.</p> <p>There were no further questions. Governors thanked Kate for her informative presentation.</p>	
<p><b>5. Budget planning (half year actual to budget), first draft 17/18 budget</b></p> <p>The Variance report and budget forecast were circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>DC outlined the Budget assumptions and governors asked questions.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> How do any new roles get funded, eg those just discussed at Board level? <b>A:</b> Board roles are funded centrally from the schools' contributions to the MAT. <b>Q:</b> Will we be getting some money back as founders of the MAT? <b>A:</b> That is still for discussion in relation to the central charge.</p> <p>DC reported that originally it had been thought that the Barracks pupils would start from September, but the most recent communication suggested that this might be staggered. Ideally, they need to be on role by October as this determines our level of funding. If they are not in place by then, there would be a financial risk which would necessitate a conversation about funding the children for a year before they were included in the figures on role. The Education Services Grant (ESG) had reduced and the projection for next year is £17,000.</p> <p>DC advised governors that the three year budget was not on target but a plan was being put together which he would bring to the next meeting to show what movement was possible to get closer to the target.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Three year budget plan to be considered at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Will there be changes to the management structure for discussion in the Personnel section of the next meeting? <b>A:</b> This is the budget as it stands now, but that might be part of a conversation going forward.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Will recruitment at Trust level affect our future costs? <b>A:</b> No, the positions have been costed on existing funds, but there is some external funding going into the MAT. Our costs to the MAT will stay the same.</p> <p>DC informed governors that after Easter he would have a conversation with staff about the forecast and the approach being taken with the pupils from the barracks. The decision was made that these children would be additional to PAN and would be absorbed within current structures. In addition, the college would be aiming to recruit more pupils from September over all the year (approx.. 5-7 per year group). This would be done through advertising and open mornings.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> If there were 20 more pupils in each year group, would that be manageable? <b>A:</b> Possibly, we have tried to keep teaching groups as small as possible, but that might have to change. Year 7 is about full and there are some children on the waiting list for other year groups.</p> <p>KM reported that the MAT finance officers (Sarah and Duncan) were very complementary of the financial reports provided to governors by Louise . They saw these as examples of best practice that could be rolled out across the rest of the Trust.</p>	<p>DC</p>
<p><b>6. Pupil premium review</b></p> <p>DC informed governors that a Pupil Premium review was being carried out. This focussed on the green card (circulated). The leadership team had carried out work scrutiny to look at how the areas on the card were being implemented. This included looking at effective feedback in</p>	

lessons for PP students and staff training (CPD session). Staff shared PP and non-PP books to illustrate the feedback given for both groups.

**Q:** Was there a difference? **A:** The full findings are being compiled at present, but there were no particular differences observed in the feedback given or the pupils' responses.

The SLT identified 10 pupils, and visited lessons to look at pupil involvement and how staff gave feedback. **Q:** Did you look at tutor time? **A:** No, the focus was on lessons, but the whole exercise was about raising the profile of the green card and reminding staff about best practice. **Q:** Do all staff know who the PP students are? **A:** Yes, they have access to the information and they know the ones they teach or have in their tutor group.

As part of the exercise, the PP coordinator from Sawston would be reviewing the Pupil Premium Strategy together with a PP data and progress across the whole cohort.

A full report would come back to a future LGB meeting.

### **7. Year 9 Options**

The *Options Blocks March 2017* document was circulated prior to the meeting. DC reported that 91 students had been given all of their options. Eleven students would need to have discussions about their choices, but of these, seven students could be accommodated from their reserves choices. Only four students would need to reconsider because their reserve option would not work. Options should be finalised before Easter.

Three students had opted for Music, however, Music Technology was over subscribed. As a result, the proposal was not to offer Music, and to run two Music technology classes.

DC reported that the options had been considered in the light of strengths and weaknesses over the few past years. The decision was made to strengthen the EBAC element and so the option blocks were selected to fit this objective. The PP student options were also carefully considered to make sure that what they had chosen would be good for them.

**Q:** Are you planning to do early entry again? **A:** Yes. The Statistics will not exist in its current format as this is being revised. English Literature will be reviewed as early entry options. Sixth Form preference at the moment is for English Language. The ECDL will only count for current Year 11s and will not be included in the performance data for the other years.

**Q:** Is it a concern that some students are not doing a language option? **A:** Nationally we have quite a high proportion that do the EBAC. RD-P responded that at a meeting with Heads of languages in Cambridgeshire it was reported that the KS4 uptake of languages varied between schools, but BVC were in the top third of schools who were doing more languages. Some schools had been disappointed with their language uptake numbers, and a couple of schools make it mandatory to study a language for all but a handful of students.

### **8. Staffing and safeguarding update**

**Staffing:** DC reported on staffing. The maths teacher post was advertised and an internal candidate had been appointed. There were no other vacancies. The appraisal mid-term reviews were taking place. For those on the upper pay spine, reviewers would be commenting additionally on 'wider professional teaching responsibilities'. The conclusions of the mid-year reviews would be reported to the LGB at a later date.

**Q:** Were staff aware last September that they would be appraised on 'wider professional teaching responsibilities'? **A:** Yes, it is part of the teaching standards, and they have been reminded. The deadline for the reviews is mid-May.

**Safeguarding:** SM reviewed the single central record on 27 February. Visitors' information about safeguarding procedures had been revised and different coloured lanyards were now being used to distinguish authorised visitors (DBS checked) and non-authorised (non-DBS

<p>checked). Changes had been made to the out of hours reporting procedure. VP was currently developing a safeguarding training module with voice-over for new staff induction training which could be delivered promptly to avoid new staff having to wait for training. The module takes about an hour to complete, with questions at the end to check understanding. The system sends an email reminder, and lets Sue Smith track who has completed the training.</p> <p>Prevent awareness information was sent to staff for them to read and sign. Sue Murphy is the Prevent Lead. Regular safeguarding reminders are published in the Heron and the Bulletin which include instructions on how to report a safeguarding concern.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Do governors need to do a SCR check in the summer term? <b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Will the induction module be shared across the Trust? <b>A:</b> It could be, but it is specific to our local procedures and key personnel, so it might need to be adapted.</p>	
<p><b>9. Admissions</b></p> <p>DC reported on admissions and the draft Admissions Policy was circulated prior to the meeting. There were 119 confirmed pupils for the Y7 intake, and a couple more were awaiting confirmation. More pupils may come from Round 2 which would take the college over the 125 PAN without the Barracks children.</p> <p>The biggest change to the Admissions Policy was the addition of a statement about the admission of UK service personnel. <b>Q:</b> The policy mentions a sub-committee of the governing body, but we no longer have that. <b>A:</b> It should refer to the Appeals Panel which we pay the Local Authority to run. Any decision about admissions sits with the Governing Body who can over-ride the advice of the LA.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> To delete the last sentence referring to the governing body sub-committee.</p> <p>Governors noted that it was difficult to quote specific admissions numbers as there needed to be flexibility for the Barracks students. The college could define the limit on the basis of how the curriculum had been set and the structures in place. The Admissions Policy would be reviewed again in the Autumn term.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Would we still have a maximum class size of 30 students? <b>A:</b> Not necessarily. The policy states that all group sizes are at the discretion of the governors.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> To consider class sizes at the next meeting and re-issue to governors for review.</p>	<p>DC/SS</p> <p>DC</p>
<p><b>10. Links between LGB and PFA (Parent and Friends Association)</b></p> <p>SSag informed governors that he planned to talk to Ann Lynn about links between the LGB and PFA and would report to a future meeting.</p>	
<p><b>11. AOB</b></p> <p><u>Development Plot:</u> SSag updated governors on the joint BVC/CC development of the plot behind the sports centre. Tom Sims from County had produced draft proposals which consisted of a mixed housing development opposite BVC in Clay Farm. This scheme for 30 houses, had not been well received by the Parish. The school is proposing to use derelict land, but the other housing will be on recreational land, which is likely to be less popular. County representatives are planning to meet with BVC to discuss the arrangements further. Governors thanked SSag for taking this matter forward.</p>	

Meeting closed at 20:00

**Next meeting:** 10<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at 7pm – Chair: George Lynn

Chair .....