

**Colston's Primary School Full Governing Body Meeting**  
**Monday 10 July 2017, 6.00pm**

<b>Present:</b>			
Alex Bell (AB), Head Teacher	Katy Dunscombe (KD)	Nick Woodroffe (NW)	Sally Reardon (SR)
Emma Gledhill (EG)	Kate Swainson Price (KSP) , Chair	Pauline Allen (PA)	Steve Purdie (SP)
Emily Young (EY)			
<b>In attendance:</b>		<b>Apologies:</b>	
Leanne Sowersby (LS) – Clerk		Niklas Serning (NS)	
Kate Patience (KP), Business Manager		Emily Warren-Ballard (EWB)	

Subject	Discussion	Action Needed	Responsibility
<b>1 Welcomes, apologies and declarations of interest.</b>	No declarations of interest.		
<b>2 Vacancies Update</b>	We now have 1 Community Governor and 2 Staff Governor vacancies. To run Community elections next year. Discussion around Staff vacancies. There may be more interest in the new academic year. Alex Jarman is in touch with the Schools Cooperative Society regarding the SCS Governor	Run community gov election in September advertise to staff follow up with AJ	LS  EY, AB, KSP KSP
<b>3 Headteacher's Report</b>	Circulated before the meeting. There might be a number of other state schools celebrating their 70 <sup>th</sup> birthday next year – NW to look into. <b>Query re rationale for placing teachers where they have been placed</b> this is based on a number of things, requests made by staff, who will work well together, where particular skills will be best used etc. The decisions are made by SLT. As far as AB is aware staff are	Investigate whether other schools are celebrating 70 <sup>th</sup> birthdays	NW

Initial:



	<p><b>Suggestion to change the financial stability objective to, ‘increase the reserve’</b></p> <p><b>Q – Will there be an objective around community engagement and cooperative working? Might be useful to clarify what working groups are, what roles and responsibilities are, how decisions are made etc.</b> Discussion around where this might sit and some of the issues that have arisen. It is important that neither staff nor Governors commit to groups before they have been approved by Governors / staff with TORs in place.</p> <p>Discussion around whether there is a need to specifically identify literacy, numeracy etc. These are a specific focus for this year and need to be identified as such.</p>	<p>Draft guidelines around setting up a cooperative working group</p>	<p>AB/AJ</p>
<p><b>4 Committee Updates &amp; Monitoring Reports</b></p>	<p><b>Outcomes</b> – Data was reported – there has been an improvement in phonics. Also looked at the SEND report and information report, as well as discussing some of the funding issues around SEN</p> <p><b>Resources</b> – Looked at Absence policy, current year budget and the 17-18 budget and fed back questions. EG and KP have worked on the questions and this is now ready for approval and shows an increase in reserves over 16-17.</p> <p>The Coop Forum has asked for some money for some banners to raise awareness. The PTAF is not willing to support this at this point. There is a small amount available for printing costs etc. Forum members can come and use photocopiers in school etc. Discussion around other ways of funding this.</p> <p><b>MAT</b> – SP talked through the key points in his report. Discussion around the political pressures and external drivers for forming of joining a MAT. The next meeting is Friday 14 July. SP will post a report on GovernorHub. Plan to have a proposed direction.</p> <p><b>School Name</b> – KSP talked through the timeline. SP and NS have agreed to analyse survey and consultation event data for presentation to the school name sub-committee after survey closes on 21st October. It will be ready for presentation on 3rd November when Learners Forum reps (school council) will present summary findings of the pupils.</p> <p>Discussion around consultation process so far. KSP reports that the consultation meetings are going well, if low in terms of attendance. The survey was launched on 3rd July and</p>	<p>Feed back to AJ to work with the forum to identify if a budget is needed, what for and how much</p> <p>Collate and analyse consultation data</p>	<p>AB</p> <p>SP and NS</p>

Initial:

	<p>responses have been coming in. Three consultation meetings had guest speakers, Dr Madge Dresser, historian, attended one and Sarah Robertson from the Colston Hall attended two. There are currently no further guest speakers arranged.</p> <p><b>Q – Are there any speakers to put the opposing point of view?</b> KSP is in contact with the Merchant Venturers. The communications director there has expressed thanks for keeping them updated and reports that the treasurer and team are following our consultation with interest and thinking about how they might be involved. There is nothing to suggest they would express an ‘opposing view’. None of the speakers have expressed a specific view relating to what Colston’s Primary should do with its name. They have shown respect for the consultation process and the school’s ownership over its eventual decision. They shared things that may be relevant to our conversation and debate. Madge Dresser spoke about history rather than espousing a particular point of view. Sarah Robertson shared the journey that Colston Hall took and the rationale behind the decision, as well as the resultant impact.</p> <p>Feeling that there has been external lobbying.</p> <p>KSP emphasised that the consultation is a fair process and will result in a fair decision having taken into account all stakeholder views. None of guest speakers so far have expressed a view over what our school should do with regard to its name. They have shared their knowledge or experience which has relevance to the process we are undertaking and the decision we are due to make. The idea of having guest speakers is to help to engage stakeholders in the consultation process and inform the debate. The fact that some passionate people attend and express their views is part of the process - everybody has a right to be heard. The final decision will take into account <i>all</i> views that have been expressed and Governors will have a proper opportunity to digest these views in order to make a final, well thought through and considered decision taking all stakeholder views into account. Only pupils, staff, parents and carers, alumni and local community views will be taken into account as clearly outlined on the survey which is protected by a terms and conditions agreement at the beginning.</p> <p>Governors with ideas and / or connections with other potential speakers for consultation</p>	<p>Further potential consultation speakers to be sought</p>	<p>All govts</p>
--	--	---	------------------

Initial:

	<p>events in September to share with the school name committee for follow up.</p> <p><b>Q – There was a request for a separate meeting for BME community – what is happening with this?</b> This is being explored for future activities. Co-op forum reps are going to the international coffee morning regularly to raise awareness of and help talk through the consultation and survey. Further ways and opportunities to ensure all stakeholders are provided with the opportunity to engage in as safe and protective environment as possible depending on any specific sensitivities or access issues is being explored further. The process so far has provided ample opportunity for all stakeholder groups in this respect and will make sure the second phase in September builds on this.</p> <p>A timetable of consultation events is being drawn up by the Governors’ school name committee and the co-op forum reps.</p> <p><b>Dates proposed, voted and agreed for the decision making process:</b></p> <p><b>Friday 3rd November at 1.45pm: School Name Sub-committee meet for presentation of data analysis</b></p> <p><b>Sub-committee to come to recommended decision and draw up paper to present to Extra-ordinary Full Governing Body (EGB) meeting</b></p> <p><b>Thursday 9th November at 6pm: EGB meeting to decide whether to change the school is to change its name or not</b></p> <p>Discussion around the plan of action if we decide to change the name. This will need to be carefully thought through as an option before the final decision so that it is ready to be actioned soon after the decision is made if need be.</p> <p><b>Attendance Report</b> – This was discussed at Outcomes</p> <p><b>Safeguarding Report – Q – How do Governors know that all the actions in Keeping Children Safe in Education are taking place?</b> School do an annual audit of safeguarding that can easily be shared with Governors</p>	<p>Finalise September consultation programme of events with Co-op Forum</p> <p>Write paper / presentation</p> <p>Draw up proposed action plan for the four different outcomes of consultation.</p> <p>Summary of safeguarding audit to be shared with Governors</p>	<p>KSP, PA, NW, EWB</p> <p>KSP, NW, PA, EWB</p> <p>KSP, NW, PA, EWB</p> <p>AB</p>
--	---	---	---

<p>5</p> <p><b>GB Self-Evaluation</b></p>	<p>KSP shared a presentation about the new Governors Competency Framework. <i>EY left the meeting</i></p> <p><b>Chairs Report</b> - Concern expressed over the Twitter account. KSP set this up and has made a few tweets. It is locked and cannot be re-tweeted. AB intends to start a Twitter for the school. Discussion around whether it is appropriate that an individual sends tweets on behalf of Governors. Need some guidelines / agreement around what is tweeted etc. Replies need to be monitored. Tweets could be posted on GovernorHub so that Governors know what has been tweeted. Need to consider the sustainability of this.</p> <p>Suggestion that a general communications audit by Governors may be a good idea 2017/18.</p> <p>Objective setting to be carried over to the first meeting of next year. Proposed school and Governor objectives need to be discussed.</p>	<p>Everyone to complete the Governor Healthcheck and return to LS and to have a look at the healthcheck on GovernorHub to see if they are in agreement with assessments made by KSP</p> <p>Draw up proposed rationale and guidelines around governor twitter use - to feed into a potential gov overview audit of school communication, internal and external, as a whole</p> <p>Discussion and in principle agreement of school and governor objectives for 2017/18</p>	<p>All</p> <p>KSP</p> <p>AB, KSP, SP, NW</p>
<p>6</p> <p><b>2017-2018 Budget</b></p>	<p>KP talked through the key points of the budget.</p> <p>The final carry forward figure for 2016-2017 is £22,000</p> <p>The forecast final carry forward figure for 2017-2018 is £31,111</p> <p>The growth funding for 16-17 has been more than expected – KP has requested a</p>		

Initial:

	<p>breakdown of this.</p> <p>KP has had a response regarding the split sites today from BCC. They sent old information to the EFA which they do not think can be corrected in-year; therefore will correct for 18-19. KP has asked the EFA if they will look into it for this year. Have assumed £0 income for this year (may get double in 18-19).</p> <p><b>Q – How is Pupil Premium spent?</b> KP shared the support staff funding allocation. Pupil premium money is not ring-fenced in the same way that SEND top-up funding is, although we do have to justify how it is spent. Subsidy is spent on supporting music lessons and trips for PP children and providing LSAs. Ofsted are interested in the impact of the money – if PP children are doing as well as their peers, an assumption is made that the money is being spent appropriately.</p> <p>Interviews and appointment for Assistant Accountant position have been made today. Thank you to EG for support with this process.</p> <p>EG recommended that FGB approve the budget.</p> <p><b>Governors approved the budget unanimously</b></p> <p>Governors thanked KP for her work on the budget</p>		
<p><b>7 Catering Contract</b></p>	<p>The 5 schools have chosen Alliance in Partnership a new company to the Bristol area who only work with small groups. One of the appeals was that they offered a dedicated area manager for our cluster.</p> <p>The schools are currently discussing ways to split the proposed capital spend between them equitably. AiP will be visiting schools over the next few weeks.</p> <p>Existing staff will be TUPE'd over. AiP will be talking to Eden and staff over the next few weeks. Thus the cluster has agreed not to make the decision public until September, when there will be a formal launch.</p> <p><b>Q – How will we measure success?</b> By increase in meal numbers. They have guaranteed a surplus regardless of numbers within the first year, which will form a contribution to the school's costs of administering payments and gradually upgrading of equipment. They have clear KPIs against which success can be measured.</p>		

<b>8</b>	<b>School Vision Statement</b>	<b>Approved</b>		
<b>9</b>	<b>Absence Policy</b>	SP and KP have been through this taking into account earlier comments. <b>Policy Approved</b>		
<b>10</b>	<b>2017-2018 Meeting dates</b>	Discussion around committee reports and whether Chairs should do reports. Agreed to move forward and 'pilot' the suggested plan and adjust if needed		
<b>11</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting</b>	Agreed as correct		
<b>12</b>	<b>Matters arising &amp; actions</b>	Regional schools Commissioner has agreed that pupil numbers can go up to 630. A formal agreement now needs to be signed.	Contact solicitors	KP

Meeting closed 21:00

**Signed**

**Date**

Initial: