



SUTTON BENDER C of E PRIMARY SCHOOL

40 Chestnut Road, Sutton Benger, Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 4RP

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FULL GOVERNING BODY (“FGB”) MEETING TERM 4

Held on: Thursday 22 March 2018
Between: 7.00pm – 10.00pm
At: Sutton Benger C of E Primary School

Attendees:	
James Passmore : JP	Governor (Parent): Co-Chair of Governors
Daisy Broomfield : DB	Governor (LA): Vice Chair of Governors
Ursula Scott : US	Governor (Ex-Officio): Executive Head
Louise Pitman-Jones : LPJ	Governor (Ex-Officio): Associate Head
Katie Brown : KB	Governor (Foundation): Chair of Staffing
James Hirst : JH	Governor (Parent)
Melanie Knight : MK	Governor (Parent)
Alison Love : AL	Governor (Ex-Officio)
James Richardson : JR	Governor (Foundation)
Vicki Wilson : VW	Governor (Staff)
Apologies:	
Tom Whittingham : TW	Governor (Foundation): Co-Chair of Governors
Joan Cocker : JC	Governor (Foundation): Chair of Ethos
In Attendance (non-voting)	
Helen Flinn : HF	Clerk of Governors
Visitors/Observers	
Jez Piper : JPP	DBAT
John Swainston : JS	DBAT

Distribution of minutes to:

Governing Body, Governors' Admin Folder FOUR (Vol II);
Confidential Minute Folder; Governors “Minutes” Page on School Website;
Clerk Online Archive

Key:

Key Decisions agreed at this meeting in **bold**
Actions agreed at this meeting in **red font**.
Governors questions are highlighted in **blue font**.

The meeting was quorate.

FBG Chair – James Passmore (deciding vote)

SECTION ONE (CLASSIFIED NON-CONFIDENTIAL)

PART A: STANDARD ITEMS

Item		Action
1.0	Opening Prayer	
1.1	The meeting opened with Alison Love leading with an article about imagination, inspired by the recent passing of Sir Stephen Hawking, and a prayer.	
2.0	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence	
2.1	James Passmore introduced Helen Flinn, who has been appointed as the new Clerk of Governors.	
2.2	JP then welcomed Jez Piper and John Swainston from DBAT who joined the meeting to discuss academisation.	
2.3	Apologies were received from Tom Whittingham and Joan Cocker.	
3.0	Register of Business Interests, Code of Conduct, Disqualification Declarations and Declaration of Conflict of Interests	
3.1	Governors present confirmed that there were no new interests or conflicts to report.	
4.0	Governing Body Membership	
4.0	No membership changes were reported.	
4.1	James Richardson informed HF that he is in the process of becoming a governor via the Foundation route.	
4.2	JP confirmed that there had been no new approaches regarding the other vacant governors' positions, but he was exploring with Tash Carter joining via the Foundation route.	
4.2	JP explained that he and TW were considering succession planning, moving forward in future and how the FGB is structured going forward.	
4.3	James Hirst confirmed that he has joined the Value For Money (VFM) Committee.	
4.4	Governors have all been asked to complete the National Governors Association (NGA) Skills Matrix, and a blank template was sent out by JP prior to the meeting. A number provided completed copies to HF, who will compile a profile of skills held by committee members, which will help identify strengths and determine potential gaps.	
	ACTION: Outstanding matrices should be sent to HF via the Clerk@suttonbenger.wilts.sch.uk email address.	ALL
	ACTION: HF to send the completed matrix to Co-Chairs for review.	PJ/TW

Item		Action
<p>5.0</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.2i</p> <p>5.2ia</p> <p>5.2ii</p> <p>5.2iii</p> <p>5.2iv</p> <p>5.2v</p>	<p>Ratification of the Minutes of Previous FGB Meeting (25.01.2018)</p> <p>The minutes were agreed to be a true reflection of the previous meeting. JP signed a hard copy for the file and countersigned for Tom Whittingham in his absence.</p> <p><u>Actions Update</u></p> <p>Louise Pitman-Jones reported that the Safeguarding PowerPoint presentation had been sent out and staff had been updated.</p> <p>LPJ informed the committee that she and Ursula Scott had attended a safeguarding update briefing at the council, who had a useful leaflet for Governors. LPJ distributed copies to those present.</p> <p>ACTION: US advised that she would display a copy on the Governors notice board.</p> <p>JH and LPJ met to discuss the website and the communications strategy; a draft feedback survey for parents has been drawn up.</p> <p>ACTION: Once agreed the survey to be sent out to parents.</p> <p>US confirmed that the Pupil Premium information on the website had been updated.</p> <p>LPJ advised that the end of year pupil targets had been sent out.</p> <p>LPJ contacted finance regarding the impact of the Year 6 staffing changes, and reported that the school is in a slightly better position than expected.</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>US</p> <p></p> <p>LPJ</p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p>
<p>6.0</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.4i</p>	<p>Governing Body Committee Structure & Governance</p> <p>JP advised that the VFM meeting has been delayed until the 24th April to accommodate the fiscal year end.</p> <p>Daisy Broomfield confirmed that the Teaching & Learning Committee (T&L) have met. The minutes were agreed. Nothing required forwarding to the FGB.</p> <p>It was reported that JC attended Oaksey's Ethos Committee meeting. Nothing was raised that required escalation to the FGB.</p> <p>Katie Brown informed the group that the Staffing Committee met on the 22nd February. Nothing at the meeting required feeding back to the FGB. Subsequently, since the meeting, the Finance Officer position has now been filled.</p> <p>It has been suggested that in future the Staffing and T&L Committee meetings are dovetailed as there is a significant crossover. This will allow the committee members to be more time efficient.</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p>

Item		Action
7.0	Policies	
7.1	The Admissions Policy was circulated prior to the meeting. No feedback was received. US reported that no criteria changes had been made, just standard minor updates.	
7.1i	JS queried if the Diocese had been included, as there is a requirement to inform the Diocese before everyone else. US confirmed that it had been. US explained that consultation needs to take place every 7 years and advised that it would be required next year.	
7.1ii	JP proposed that the policy be accepted. KB seconded. All committee members present were happy to support the motion.	

PART B: GOVERNOR BODY TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

Item		Action
8.0	Academisation	
8.1	JPP thanked the Governors for the invitation to the meeting and explained that he and JS would do their best to give the FGB members a brief overview of the stages, time line and actions within the academisation process.	
8.2	JPP informed the committee that he had visited the school last week and had met with the teaching staff. The staff had the opportunity to ask questions regarding the process.	
8.2i	DBAT are conscious that the academisation process can seem impersonal so they are keen to talk through what happens and answer questions such as what it looks like, how does it affect staff etc.	
8.2ii	DBAT are keen to really get to know the school, to understand where children are, what their needs are, where pressures lie and how they can help school with their development plan. Ultimately DBAT feel that the children are the most important factor. They are not just numbers. He reassured the FGB members that the children, staff and governors are all important.	
8.3	JPP explained that once they have joined each school has a DBAT director and Central Team Officer assigned to them. The aim is to work with school to develop standards, outcomes and policies in order to help us steer school in the direction we want to go. Looking to add capacity to school where possible.	
8.3i	Melanie Knight queried what they meant by “capacity”. JPP answered that it meant working alongside the school’s senior leadership, and where required or appropriate, bringing in additional support or introducing different ways of working. DBAT are keen for school to use alliances and partners. He imparted that continuing current relations, and building further relationships and partnerships are encouraged. DBAT are always looking to expand, extend and develop collaborations.	

Item		Action
8.3ii	JPP then explained that the DBAT Business Team undertake a similar role, looking at the management of school, finance and health and safety to make the best use of resources and operate in the most effective way.	
8.3iii	MK asked if we identify areas where we need help or support can we ask DBAT for assistance or does DBAT determine what assistance they give? JPP answered that yes, school can request. School continue to be the ones that drive development. Their main aim is to walk alongside school to help us go in the direction we would like to.	
8.3iv	JS added that DBAT will also identify areas where we might not have things in place or could improve. DBAT will work with school to ensure process flow. They can provide templates and guidance where required.	
8.4	LPJ queried typically how often are DBAT officers present at school over the course of a term? JR wondered what drives the decision? JPP replied that it varies, depending of the level of need or support. It can take the form of supporting the leadership, undertaking training or providing resources.	
8.4i	JS commented that DBAT are privileged to have a healthy amount of people who can be present if required. The trust has 11 schools on its books at present, and these schools vary very differently. DBAT is committed to ensuring staff availability across them all. They have, so far, never turned down a school that has requested additional support.	
8.5	US queried if SIDP is driven by DBAT or school? JPP answered that it is driven by school, DBAT will advise and add to at times. DBAT have a format which has been developed by head teachers around development priorities. Subject Actions Plans sit underneath this underneath. The aim is to try to tie as much in to one place as possible. Synchronised forms are available to reduce replication and duplication. Can be reactive to school's needs.	
8.6	US asked what DBAT do in the case of an OSTED visit. JPP explained they will attend school straight away and support the leadership and staff with the preparation of documentation. They will also run through the school's narrative around where pressures lie, and work undertaken so staff feel confident and reassured. JS proffered that like the LA in previous visits, DBAT have to answer questions regarding what value and support the Trust has given the school.	
8.7	<p>JPP then moved on to the next steps of the academisation process. There are eight steps to the process:</p> <p>Stage 1 – school is invited by DBAT to join the Trust. School then make an expression of interest, to the Department for Education (DfE), about becoming an academy.</p> <p>Stage 2 – Informal consultation and mutual due diligence. If school feels that becoming an academy within the Trust is the right thing, they then make a formal application to the DfE to become an academy.</p> <p>Stage 3 – A DBAT Project Manager is appointed to start legal aspects around land and property transfers.</p>	

Item		Action
8.7 continued	<p>Stage 4 – Formal consultation begins. Transfer of properties and staff discussed and agreed.</p> <p>Stage 5 – Full formal application is submitted to the DfE. Solicitors are appointed for higher level legal aspects. Formal TUPE takes place and all monies and land transfers are organised.</p> <p>Stage 6 – Academy status is established. Paperwork is in place and signed off.</p> <p>Stage 7 – Funding agreements are transferred to DBAT, not school. Notification is given to all parties.</p> <p>Stage 8 – Day one of being an academy!</p>	
8.7i	<p>JPP explained that Sutton Benger Primary School (SBPS) are currently at the end of stage two, the informal consultation and mutual due diligence.</p>	
8.7ii	<p>JPP continued to say that stage three is a more formal process. The Governing Body make the decision to accept DBAT's invitation to join the Trust. This then triggers the formal consultation, in order for us to complete the full application.</p>	
8.7iii	<p>JS explained that in anticipation, DBAT have already done some groundwork, as agreement from various bodies (The DBAT Board, The Board of Education (that all 70 church schools are part of) and the Diocese Board of Finance (the Trust's Incorporated company)) is required before they can accept the school officially. At present two of the three have consented. DBAT have also identified a Project Manager, Colin McKay, to work on our application, should we decide to move forward.</p>	
8.8	<p>JS advised that one potential hurdle is that money at SBPS is very tight, and that the reserve budget projection over the next 5 years is reducing. He explained that the Trust as a whole can't have a negative budget forecast and cannot take schools on that are not actively seeking to increase their reserve funds. Schools ideally need to have 8% in reserve. The 11 current schools in the Trust are all working towards this.</p>	
8.8i	<p>JP expressed that SBPS would actively look to do this if it was decided to join but felt that DBAT would need to work with us to help us achieve it. JS agreed that DBAT would do this, as they are with the other schools in the Trust.</p>	
8.8ii	<p>JP queried if reserve percentages are decided by the Trust or the Government? JS confirmed they were set by the Trust and all schools need to work towards 8%.</p>	
8.8iii	<p>JP asked is it the 8% a Trust reserve or school reserve? JS explained that reserve still belongs to the school, so can be used for emergencies.</p>	
8.8iv	<p>JS imparted that the Central Services Team were expected to do the same, they are required to have 8% in reserve also. The Trust strategically use their reserves if particular schools encounter issues, and once these are resolved work then takes place to rebuild the</p>	

Item		Action
8.8iv <small>continued</small>	reserve.	
8.8v	JR asked if SBPS is expected to come into the trust with 8% in reserve? JS answered that we would be accepted as we currently stand, but we would need to demonstrate that we will be working towards a positive reserve going forward.	
8.8vi	JS explained how the 8% figure is calculated for each school looking at budgets minus any Pupil Premium and PE money. For reference, he also clarified that academies financial years are the same as the school year, they run from the 1 st September until the 31 st August.	
8.8vii	MK queried if, after doing due diligence on the school's financials, could DBAT say that they would not take us yet due to our negative projections? JS responded that DBAT will take us in our current position, however, they would need have to have the undertaking from us that we will be working towards a positive reserve.	
8.8viii	KB asked What will the consequences to school be if we can't get into a positive reserve position? JS answered that DBAT will help support school where possible. He explained that MAT schools are supposed to balance each other out, but if the issue became a serious long-term issue, redundancies may need to be made. It would however, remain the school's decision. JP added that local government is looking at same things, and that DBAT's model is not a surprise	
8.8ix	JH commented on bad publicity around academies and debt. He asked if the 8% figure unique to DBAT? JS answered that the Education and Schools Funding Agency have an expectation that Trusts will have at least 5% in reserve. JP added that he was aware that all MATs had been told to work towards a figure of 8%. JPP then expanded on the matter explaining that there always has to be a balance between standards and financial issues. DBAT are acutely aware of standards and capacity and would not compromise on essential capacity.	
8.8x	JS added that DBAT do have a positive element should scale downs be required. They have a kind of voluntary "dating service" available for staff where people can consider opportunities within the Trust and potentially move between schools if possible. He stressed that with DBAT people come first and they are keen not to lose resource from the Trust.	
8.9	US queried what regular accountancy checks take place? Do DBAT come in to school or do we send over? JPP explained that DBAT use PS Financials and Erovia packages which would be introduced if we join. It is a centrally aligned system, so information can be shared easily. Monthly returns are set up by DBAT duty Finance Officers, and the school Finance Officer shares information via those. Typically, submissions are made remotely once a month and then a member from the Business Team will visit the school once every two months.	
8.9i	US asked what do the Finance Team do while they are at school? JPP answered that they sit with the Finance Officer, Business Manager and	

Item		Action
8.9i continued	senior leaders going through the accounts line by line, looking at projection for the rest of the year, percentage spent, future projections etc.	
8.9ii	US went on to ask if this practice was in place now at other schools? And if it was how long has it been happening? JPP responded that it is in place and has been for around two years.	
8.9iii	JS commented that all schools are now asked for 3-year projections as this is a new requirement of MATs by the Education and Skills Funding Agency.	
8.10	JS wanted to reassure the Governors that although the monetary side of things can be uncomfortable to discuss, DBAT have never failed to work things through with schools. Money is an important issue as it is tight everywhere in education. DBAT's aim is to look all the time at getting schools to collaborate and share resources. There are potential opportunities to refresh the business models, so schools are not repeating or duplicating work.	
8.10i	US flagged that that aspect of joining is a concern of staff regarding their roles. JPP added that he is attending meetings where concerns are discussed and all the different perspectives (education, staff and finance) are looked at. The whole process is considered, and it is decided what can give, and what can't.	
8.10ii	US felt that it comes down to a perception of choice. Staff are concerned that they will be told to lose something rather than finding a way to work around an issue. JPP reiterated that schools that join DBAT still make the decisions. DBAT are there to support the school. They can assist by proffering an external view or bring information about what is happening elsewhere that could be useful in that situation.	
8.11	US asked regarding economy of scale, how can DBAT compare to the LA with regard to trade services? JS replied that to be honest, they can't in all cases. They are trying to work towards different ones. DBAT do have access to some government contracts such as energy so they do not have to start from scratch. However, compared to the LA, DBAT have a higher staff interface with the schools in the Trust, which adds value.	
8.11i	JPP expanded on the point adding that because of the changing picture, companies are beginning to appreciate that MATs are a growing field, so discounts are more forthcoming than in previous years. Not quite the same scale as the LAs get, but the bigger Trusts are the larger the discount becomes.	
8.12	KB asked how many schools are in the same position as SBPS at the moment? And, if lots of schools enter the Trust at the same time as SBPS, how will the level of support potentially differ? JS answered by saying there were another three schools at a similar point as SBPS. With regards to level of support available, he explained that it really depended on the rate of flow that schools join the Trust. It is somewhat	

Item		Action
8.12 <small>continued</small>	of a moveable feast, but they have budget & staffing models in readiness for when schools could come in and then when they do. JPP added that they look to never lose the capacity to cope.	
8.13	KB then asked, how big is DBAT looking to get? JS stated that potentially the maximum limit would be 30 schools. If SBPS did join they would be the 15 th school to join the Trust.	
8.13i	JP queried what 30 schools looked like in pupil numbers. JS answered that it would be around 5500.	
8.14	JS went on to explain that DBAT's aim is to always be looking at better ways of doing things. They have various projects underway including a procurement programme. They are expecting schools within the Trust to use deals arranged rather than it being optional, as ultimately, they will not be able to keep them going if schools do not use them.	
8.15	JS explained that schools within DBAT tend to work in hubs. Three schools in Bristol make up one hub and the eight schools in Wiltshire make up the other. The school hubs lead the development of the MAT.	
8.15i	JPP used the provision of a school system, SIMS, as an example. The hubs helped identify that there were 6 different providers of the same system, and there was no way to link them up. With DBAT's assistance they were able to appoint one provider of the system, which allowed them to enable central reporting and the system to be set up the way the schools wanted it to be, simplifying the process. They were able to reduce the overall costs from £22,500 to just over £17,000 and reduce the workload for the schools	
8.16	JH queried if schools are consulted for their opinion and involved when projects are identified. JPP responded that yes schools are involved in the tender process, and drive and own the projects.	
8.16i	JH then asked if DBAT would take suggestions from schools if particular suppliers had been identified. JPP answered that yes consideration would be made and best practice shared.	
8.16ii	JR queried if SBPS have done any analysis on areas like this? US replied that we have in some areas and added that local cluster schools share best practice. JPP explained that DBAT are trying to pre-empt changes.	
8.17	JH asked about the collaboration between DBAT schools. Will DBAT inform us if a school has done something particularly well or has a particular speciality we could make use of and arrange visits across schools? JS answered that they would. Staff can be asked to work at other schools for short periods at times if there is a requirement, although it is not compulsory. There is an inter-academy charging policy so that resource can be provided at cost.	
8.17i	He added that the Trust often have board meetings at DBAT schools which are invariably preceded by walk arounds, so they become aware	

Item		Action
Item		Action
8.17 <small>continued</small>	of what is happening at all the schools.	
8.18	JH flagged a concern that was raised by some parents about losing the school identity and enforced policies and principles. JPP explained that ideally children, staff and parents shouldn't notice any change. The transition should be seamless for them.	
8.19	JH then asked JPP and JS, as part of the two-way information consultation, what does DBAT feel SBPS will bring to them? JS answered that SBPS is an outstanding school and that we have a number of features of school life that are sharable across the Trust. JPP answered that SBPS has really good examples of integrated curriculum working, and that the school has creative drive to learning incorporating art and music. Staff are passionate about providing a rounded broad education to the children.	
8.20	US commented that DBAT seem to be good at getting new schools going. She queried why older or more established schools are not coming forward to the Trust? JS responded that it is fairly early days for DBAT. He explained that historically, academies were failing secondary schools, then Outstanding secondary schools started to become academies, and then Good schools. After that, Primary schools followed the same pattern. The Government originally incentivized schools to persuade them to change, which prompted quite a big uptake, however the Government no longer do that. Organisations like DBAT have to convince schools that the quality of the service offered is significantly superior to anything else out there, including the LA. Surges of interest ebb and flow depending on what the Government says, and offers.	
8.20i	JPP added that the Trust has dramatically changed over the past 2 years which has made a big difference and explained that they also have a much stronger marketing strategy, however they are aware there is still a perception issue around academies.	
8.21	JP asked for some further information on the next stages. JPP responded. At stage four the LA is notified, and the formal consultation process starts. DBAT will come and talk to parents and staff about the process and what it means for them. A mixture of people lead the academisation process including Governors, senior leaders and DBAT. The transfer of staff under TUPE is started and this is run by the LA.	
8.21i	Stage 5 is where the whole process goes towards the Academy Order being granted, following the application. Solicitors are appointed. Formal TUPE and Pension consultation happens. All money and land transfers are organised. DBAT will assist us with all of these aspects.	
8.21ii	Stage 6 is where Sutton Benger Academy is established. Paperwork is in place and signed off.	
8.21iii	At Stage 7, the school's funding agreement is transferred to DBAT, not to school. Any surplus items are dealt with. The LA issue us with a	

Item		Action
8.21iii <small>continued</small>	projected “go live” date and once this happens, notification of the change to academy status is made.	
8.21iv	Stage 8 Day one! DBAT come to school to welcome everyone, although it shouldn't really be any different!	
8.22	JP then queried what DBAT need from us next? JPP answered that DBAT require formal acceptance from the FGB that they would like to begin the secondary consultation process. This can be in the form of a letter, which would be sent to JS. Once that is received CK will be engaged to start stage 3.	
8.23	JH clarified that up until stage 7 either party can still pull out of the process if required? JS responded that yes this was the case, however both parties would be required to give a detailed explanation as to why the process had stopped to the DfE.	
8.24	JP enquired if the FGB should engage SBPS stakeholders prior to the letter being sent or does this tend to happen afterwards? JPP answered that this tends to be afterwards. They can then be included in the formal consultation process.	
8.25	JP asked who was responsible for completing the application form that is sent? JPP replied that CK would undertake this, with collaboration with SBPS.	
8.26	JH queried the structure of the Governing Body under DBAT and asked if it would stay the same if we became an academy? JS answered that in the scheme of delegation, governing bodies usually stay the same. He explained that the composition of the governing body depends on the status of school; Voluntarily Aided, Voluntarily Controlled or Community. Schools convert as they are.	
8.26i	JS went on to explain that under DBAT FGBs tend to be made up of 12 people. Of the 12, seven are Ex-Officio or Foundation Governors, of the other five, two are elected parents, one is the Principal/Headteacher, one is an elected staff member and one is a community member. This reflects the structure of SBPSs FGB.	
8.26ii	JS added that both he and JPP are happy to answer questions from staff, governors and parents on email or they can revisit school to meet with people. JP extended the same offer from himself and TW, they are happy to have one to one consultation with parents and staff members, and stressed that this was open ended. JP and TW do not feel an additional large scale parental consultation is required at this point as parental consultation has already taken place, and would also be achieved through the formal consultation process.	
8.27	JP formally thanked JPP and JS for attending the meeting.	

Item		Action
8.28	JJP expressed an interest in staying for the end of the meeting once discussions have taken place regarding the academisation decision. It was agreed this was acceptable.	
8.29	JS and JPP were excused at 20.55.	
8.30	Discussion took place between the Governors about the presentation and answers to the questions raised. Generally, the majority of Governors felt reassured about the process, however all agreed that further clarification and detailed analysis is needed in areas such as finance and the provision of certain services such as SEN. It is understood these areas would be looked at carefully as part of the formal consultation process.	
8.30i	Discussion then turned to making the decision about starting the formal consultation. It was agreed that a caveat, stating that we are not 100% committed until everyone has been consulted and we are convinced it will be the best course of action for SBPS, should be included if the motion is passed.	
8.30ii	JR asked if the FGB members had shared all the major concerns? US and LPJ felt that staff need to be involved a lot more as there is concern about a number of issues. Further discussion took place around what was driving the concerns and how they could be allayed. The consensus is that SBPS needs to do what is best to secure the future of the school for the children and the formal consultation will identify whether joining DBAT will enable us do this.	
8.30iii	JP stated that he wants to be robust with DBAT to ensure that it is understood that beginning the formal consultation does not mean that SBPS is 100% decided on joining the Trust. The rest of the Governors agreed this was the right decision.	
8.30iv	JP proposed that SBPS begin the formal consultation process, in order to get clarity and answers for the questions we still have, with the understanding that we are not committed to join DBAT. If we are not satisfied, then we will not continue with academisation. JH seconded.	
8.30v	A vote was taken. 9 voters were present. Votes cast: Yes – 7 No – 0 Abstentions – 2	
8.30vi	Therefore the vote by the FGB was in favour of starting the formal consultation. ACTION: JP agreed to draft a letter to JS requesting to start the formal consultation process.	JP
8.31	JPP re-joined the meeting at 9.37pm	
8.32	JP advised JPP that the Governors present had voted in favour of starting the formal consultation process with the discussed caveat.	

Item		Action
	JPP accepted the verbal vote and reiterated that this does not tie SBPS into committing to join the Trust.	
9.0	Link Governors Visits	
9.1	JP briefly explained for HF and JPPs behalf that the school has an established link governor programme.	
9.1i	JP had planned for DB to talk through highlights from the reports submitted, however due to length of academy discussions it was not possible at this session.	
9.1ii	JP summarised that during a recent inspection US identified how powerful both the visits and reports were. It was agreed that a review of these reports would become a standing item to ensure all Governors are aware of all visits taken place and are kept up to date. This will also help to ensure the whole process is more robust.	
9.1iii	US reiterated that the visits are not just a meeting with the joint subject lead, Governors will be meeting and conversing with the children. US also reminded everyone that the children's comments must be recorded.	
10.0	NAG 20 Questions & Rating of Governing Body	
10.1	<p>JP advised that back in March 2017, the FGB undertook a RAG rating of the Governing Body. He would like to review 2017's documents so that we can comment on the success and strengths and identify areas for improvement.</p> <p>ACTION: JP will add a review of the NGA's 20 Questions to the next meeting's agenda.</p> <p>ACTION: HF to send out copies prior to the meeting.</p>	<p>JP</p> <p>HF</p>

PART C – SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT AND ACTION PLANNING

Item		Action
11.0	Headteachers Report	
11.1	<p><u>External Reviews</u></p> <p>US updated the committee on the recent visit by Steve Riley from CASP. He reviewed the Progress Action Plan and met with subject leads and Governors for Literacy & Numeracy & governors. US was delighted to announce that SBPS has maintained its green risk rating. He admitted he was expecting to have to give an amber rating, based on the amount of actions identified during the October visit, so was pleasantly surprised.</p>	
11.1i	JP extended huge thanks to all staff involved and recognised that the capacity for improvement was huge and they have all made a massive effort to address actions. He acknowledged that the period has been a trying one especially as they have also had to contend with a NACE pre-	

Item		Action
	assessment and a visit from an external National School Improvement Officer.	
11.1ii	JP added that although there was not time to go through them at this session, Governors have been issued with progress reports prior to the meeting. The process will ensure there is new emphasis on tracking progress going forward.	
11.2	<u>Staffing Update</u> US reported that Sue Randall has joined Year 6 seamlessly and the Finance Officer position had been filled that morning. US extended a big thanks to LPJ for her support during a trying term.	
11.2i	US highlighted the Tea Birds vacancy. She explained that they were struggling to fill the vacancy and there was a risk of having to cut numbers. The position will continue to be advertised.	
11.3	<u>SEF & School Action Plan</u> US instructed that she will be sending out a new pack shortly. ACTION: US to ensure that this is completed prior to the next meeting.	US

PART D - OTHER

Item		Action
12.0	Urgent Items Not Covered Elsewhere	
12.1	No items were raised at this session.	
13.0	Dates and Times of Future Meetings	
13.1	The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday 24 th May 2018. 6.00pm for a 6.30pm start.	
13.2	JP queried if the Maths and English leads, and the School Council come to the next FGB meeting. US suggested that they would be better attending in Term 6, as the Term 5 meeting is scheduled as the Governors planning evening. LPJ added that the Eco Council also needed to be invited. ACTION: Vicki Wilson offered to action invites to all parties.	VW
14.0	Any Other Business	
14.1	JP highlighted the SVFS sent out prior to the meeting and asked if there were any questions? No responses were received. JP signed off the document.	
14.2	JP reported that DB had agreed to give a short presentation to the Parish Council about school progress on Wednesday 25 th April 2018.	

Item		Action
14.3	<p>JH informed the FGB that the crossing application has been declined by Wiltshire Council. JH plans to query the report and challenge the decision.</p> <p>ACTION: JH to update the FGB with information regarding the application once it is received.</p>	
14.3 continued		JH
15.0	<p>School's Confidential Section</p> <p>No items were raised at this meeting.</p>	

The meeting adjourned at 10.00pm

Signed for and behalf of
THE GOVERNING BODY OF SUTTON BENDER C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL

Signature: _____

James Passmore, Co-Chair of Governors

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Tom Whittingham, Co-Chair of Governors

Date: _____