**Full Governing Body Meeting**

**6pm Wednesday 22nd January 2020**

**Governors Present**: Kieron Woodland (KW) Peter Newbold (PN) (Head teacher),

Mark Harding (MH), Helen Lewis (HL), Rhiannon Mudford (RM), Richard Harris (RH), Sharon Carter (SC), Nick Winder (NW)

**Associate Members:** Helen Denison (HD)

**Apologies for Absence:**

**In attendance**: Linda Tullett (Clerk)

The agenda and all supporting papers for the meeting were placed on the Southway VLE site for all Governors and Associate Members to view prior to the meeting. Hard copies of papers will no longer be printed out for the inspection file, apart from the minutes of each meeting - these signed minutes will be kept in the school office.

**Start 6.02pm**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda item |  | Action |
| **SPR20 FGB. 1** (Welcome) | KW opened the meeting welcoming governors |  |
| **SPR20 FGB. 2** (Apologies for absence) | No apologies were received. |  |
| **SPR20 FGB. 3** (Declaration of Pecuniary Interest) | None stated.  |  |
| **SPR20 FGB. 4**(Approval of the previous meetings Minutes and report on Matters Arising) | The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved and signed by the Chair.KW put forward a proposal to review minutes from the previous months’ meeting as opposed to the previous FGB Meeting. This was agreed. LT to check whether we would still be compliant if we changed our procedure.  | LT to check approval of Minutes is compliant. |
| **SPR20 FGB. 5**(Head teacher’s Update) | The Headteacher’s update was circulated to the members prior to the meeting. 1. Learning & Inclusion Mentor now 3 weeks in – currently getting to know the target children and finding feet.
2. Governor reported on a conversation outside of school commenting in a positive way about the amount of trips undertaken by the school.
3. Claire Morley has been appointed as admin support for teachers/YGL. At present she will be working 4 days a week. PN wanted to thank the governors who took part in the interview process.
4. Governor highlighted the attendance being fractionally below target and asked whether there were any concerns. PN added that national is at 95.6% and we are currently at 96%. Over 3 years, the average is 96.4%. Year 3 is currently showing as the lowest attendance and focus is on the parents to ensure good attendance.
 |  |
| **SPR20 FGB.6**(Aspiration Fund) | PN mentioned the subject of raising the aspirations of the children and suggested an Aspiration Fund for children who do not have access to cultural experiences. School is currently in a good position financially and a fund could be set up through Pioneer income, Christmas card sales and trainee teacher funds. Pupil premium money is already allocated. He suggested £10k in a pot and once a term the pupil premium children have an opportunity to experience something cultural.1. HL stated that she felt this was a brilliant idea and has contacts. There would also be use of the minibus to assist with transport.
2. Parental consent would be required to attend but permission not needed as experiences would mainly be during the school day.
3. A cultural experience would make a difference for those children. £10K annually would equal out to approx. £3k per term over 4 year groups. The figure would be shown in the budget and money goes directly into the pot.
4. This would have a big impact on those children.
5. PN to explore with groups of staff to research and Claire Morley could be involved in the organisation of the experiences.

All those present were in agreement to the fund being set up. |  |
| **SPR20 FGB.7**(Policies) | The WSCC Pay Policy was circulated to all members prior to the meeting for approval. It is a statutory policy. Only amendment is the date.Approved and agreed to adopt. |  |
| **SPR20 FGB.8**(Academisation) | The subject of Academisation was raised at the December meeting with a view to discussing it further at this meeting and asked whether this is the correct time to move or not. A subsequent document was sent to all governors prior to the meeting. WSCC are not in favour of schools changing status and there is a lack of support from WSCC. We are in a strong position and this should not be seen as a one-off discussion. An informed discussion is needed with time to think about possible options.1. The document was clear but there were some questions around it. The governors would become a local board and representatives would go to trustee meetings. There was no pressure on us taking up this status and we are currently in a comfortable position. It may be more challenging in multi school academy trust but we should be looking at it as a whole. There were concerns over losing independence.
2. Q: Would we be joining a Multi Academy Trust (MAT) or forming our own? There were concerns over financial control.
3. The geography and location were key to collaboration.
4. To set it up we would need to approach another school and the process would involve a substantial workload for the Business Manager. We are a prime school for starting MAT and we could have a significant impact on lots of children. University of Brighton would be a possible choice as we have several trainee teachers from them however we may lose our identity as a large MAT (currently 15 schools).
5. Q: Are there were any other schools that have moved to academy status? - some schools have seen a change.
6. Q; Would Gattons would be interested in forming a Federation? There would be 1 governing body and 1 budget. Two schools becoming 1 – we can both grow. They may be interested in a MAT but that would be a conversation once our position is clearer.
7. A new school is planned on the new development and all new schools would automatically be academies.
8. Q: Are there any other schools considering changing to which the reply was none.
9. The costs involved were highlighted for legal advisers/consultants and the huge undertaking. Governors would need to be in it for a long period of time.
10. It could draw in more high profile trustees.
11. Q: What are the benefits for the children? Could we do better under MAT? This could have a big impact on other children. If we form our own MAT, we would have autonomy.
12. What is the timeframe was for this if we went ahead and it was suggested around 2 years. There would be support throughout the process. There were concerns over disruption for staff and children but it would be business as usual with limited disruption.
13. It was suggested that the principal of a MAT who formed the MAT to come and speak to the governing body which we may find useful.
14. Q: Could we be a standalone academy – No.
15. There were pros and cons for the possible options and needed to be laid out - we need an analysis of the right model: a) form our own MAT, b) join another MAT, c) Federation or d) soft Federation. Whichever option is chosen, it will change the way we operate. If we form a MAT, there would be additional commitment to work and offer time/support to the school.
16. Q: Was additional governor recruitment needed and a sponsor was suggested - we cannot be a sponsor, we would need outside sponsor before starting.
17. It was suggested that the first step would be to speak to the Chair/Head of an academy and arrange a visit. An Agenda item for the next meeting was suggested and to approach a chair or trustees to come and visit for detailed explanation.
18. It could benefit all our teachers.
19. Suggestion of Warden Park Academy trust.
20. We need to allow conversations to direct us to one route to allow structure. Challenging members of the governing body who would report to trustees. This limits the number of staff trustees and more constrained as governors; only 2 parent governors and lots of unanswered questions.
21. The next step would be to approach an Academy to ask questions.
 |   |
| **SPR20 FGB. 9**(Governor Courses) | KW gave feedback to those present on his recent ‘Talking the Chair’ course.It was a 3 day course – leading effective governance, improving schools and building a successful governance team.3 keys areas – are we doing it?Continue with termly visits and giving feedback.Celebrate the success of the school and thanks given to the staff.Involvement in SDIP.It was clear that we needed more members on the governing body.KW ended by thanking all the governors for their time and commitment as we are all volunteers.PN added that there needs to be more visibility of governors for staff. Suggested a social during a Wednesday staff meeting where staff members can meet governors and governors can have a view from the staff working in the school (3.30pm – 4.30pm). Suggested during the summer term. LT to circulate dates to governors. | LT to circulate possible dates for staff social. |
| **SPR20 FGB. 14**(Any further matters) | 1. Q: Are we part of the National Governance Association? No.
2. LT raised concerns over the Instrument of Government and the lack of co-opted governors. We are currently required to have 3 more. If these were not found, we would need to change the Instrument of Government legally via WSCC. It was suggested that NW contact local businesses/people in order to recruit an additional 3 co-opted members.
 | NW – governor recruitment. |
| **SPR20 FGB. 15**(Future Business) | The next meeting will be F&P on Wednesday 26th February 2020.  |  |
| **SPR20 FGB.16** (meeting review to be judged against the Ofsted framework) | It was agreed that the following points of the meeting in particular showed good governance, in accordance with the three core strategic functions of the Governing Body, as detailed below;* Academisation/Federation status
* Expansion of Governing Body
* Pay Policy approval
* Aspiration Fund

A Ensuring clarity of vision, ethos and strategic direction.B Holding executive leaders to account for the educational performance of the school.C Ensuring sound, proper and effective use of the school’s financial resource, |  |

End 7.44pm