

GFM Board Meeting**4th July 2017 Bay House School**

Attendees: Cris Beswick (CB) Chair
 Jeff Callander (JC)
 Paul Lane (PL)
 Jean Morgan (JM)
 Kirsty Robertson (KR)
 Ian Potter (IP)
 Stuart Tyreman (ST)
 Georgina Mulhall (GM)
 Sue Carter (SC)
 Nigel Duncan (ND)
 Jenny Bonsor (JB)

Apologies: Georgina Mulhall – arriving late
 Nigel Duncan – arriving late

In Attendance: Angela Tew (Clerk)

1. Welcome and apologies IP welcomed everyone and apologies for running late were received by GM and ND	
2. Declarations of Interest JB informed the Board she was working for the GFM in a consultancy capacity and the Board needed to decide if the advantages of her doing this outweighed the disadvantages – all agreed it did. IP informed the Board he was the Hampshire Branch Secretary for ASCL, the school paying into the HCC facilities fund enables it to claim for IP's time attending meetings.	
JC reminded the Board that all conflicts of interest should be declared, not just financial, then the Board needs to make a decision on them.	
3. Confirm accuracy of minutes	



The minutes were looked at and confirmed as accurate. CB signed a copy as Chair

4. Matters arising from the last minutes

ST updated the Board on the Girls provision – HCC wanted help with 2 girls they were unable to place and would be on dual roles with a GFM school and a Southampton City school but the Executive have decided that we are unable to support at the moment due to capacity. Things may change in the future and this will likely to be revisited.

IP updated the Board on working with Unions – The Executive brought the statement to the Board because it believed it would support the GFM within the education landscape. It understands the question why sign up to something if it's not mandatory. The Executive believe that by working closely with the unions this will support how MAT's/Academies are perceived. The GFM has already had praise as a good example of a MAT. IP informed the Board that the Executive see the statement as a document in the same way one would see a School Prospectus. Thus, it is not a Board strategy decision but an operational one. The Board agreed.

IP thanked everyone for their input at the Away Day

ST explained that the communication strategy is ongoing

5. Follow up on the Away Day

JC asked if everyone had read his synopsis and asked for comments around the table.

PL thought it was an interesting point on the term 'local'. This is something that has been touched on before but needs to be worked towards defining.

JC asked the board if local means location v community and if it did mean community it needs to be decided who is included (stakeholders).

A discussion took place on benchmarking KPI's and the following points were raised:-

- Benchmarking may differ in each school but should the majority crossover?
- A suggestion of a survey of stakeholder groups to receive information on how a particular area of work is progressing – we need to decide what we need to find out
- A survey could be seen as useful or threatening if not seen before – perhaps use a template already being used and adapt to GFM
- Use guiding principles from JC to steer what sort of questions to ask
- Look at other schools – compare where finance is being spent – staffing/students/equipment. Also compare internally
- Start from scratch – tell unions that we will survey staff, use as a marketing tool, timing – can we get something out before the summer to discuss in the Autumn?
- Clear aspirations to be in top 50% by doing data exercise – getting the first mark on the bench
- The Executive needs to spend time on the 8 areas and report at the next meeting – what is going well and what will be better if

Exec

GM and ND arrived and JC informed them of the discussion

All agreed on the Guiding Principles

A further discussion took place on what is meant by 'local'. IP stated that the GFM is trying to achieve a situation where no learner or their family should be concerned about what school they attend in Gosport. The GFM is the largest employer in the town. JC suggested support from the community could propel us. JB agreed with JC stating that there are some differences of how students/parents feel about the schools driven by what people are saying – if the GFM has a wider interaction with local businesses and other services, opinions can be reassuring and provide a weight of influence to students/parents. KR agreed with JB.



<p>Regarding the Improvement Plans; should the GFM MAT Improvement Plan be a summary of the individual school's Improvement Plans or universal to the MAT? Each school needs to be clear on what its focus is to improve, and so; is the GFM Improvement plan a mix of site specific plans and strategic targets from the Board? It was agreed that schools need to write Improvement Plans according to their Ofsted report not the GFM Guiding Principles.</p> <p>JC asked what therefore makes the GFM different from other academy chains. He argued that we have to be superior and focus on one area of schools that others have not made any headway with.</p>	
<p>ND didn't disagree with JC's comments but suggested that looking from the Boards perspective, the focus should be on the vision, mission and strategy.</p>	Exec
<p>CB commented that the Board monitors the schools performance and the Improvement Plan will have targets to get to a level which could be a journey of several years. Once the foundations are there and the initial plan phased, other targets can be introduced to differentiate the GFM from other MAT's.</p>	JB
<p>JB felt the Board needs to be creative.</p>	
<p>IP summarised that the under 8 Guiding Principles the Executive will present to the Board what is going well in the GFM and what will be better if. The Executive will put together a strategy for a more creative way to benefit the local agenda.</p> <p>JB will look at the 8 headings to consider if they can be sub sectioned into a fewer number.</p>	

levels. JM reported on the provision for SEN and vulnerable students and the Safeguarding Audit and there is a basic draft action plan. They are also looking at Off Site visits standards as there are several changes in personnel and BP will now adopt this policy as their Evolve licence runs out in November. There is an agenda for the Headship team to report on at the next meeting.

Primary – PL reported at the meeting discussions were hoping to take place on the financial closure from HCC but this hadn't happened yet. They discussed the formation of the GFM and was pleased to report that the issues with The Globe had now been resolved. There has been no negativity to the Academisation from parents or staff. GM provided a comprehensive report which covers every aspect of school life which she will continue to do. There is continuing movement on STEM and links with Ben Ainslee. There was a report on SATs and a target tracker from the Deputy Head. All governor positions are appointed and named. They have decided to hold another meeting on 12th July to include the SATs results and close the academic year.

SEN/AP – KR reported 6 new members have joined the LGC and they discussed the history of the school and the governor roles ready for the new academic year. There is a meeting on 10th July at BP for the parent governors with reps from LWS, Gomer and BP.

JC asked about the formation of the secondary LGC incorporating 2 schools – JM stated they had 1 parent from each school left standing from the old GB's and have a teacher rep from each school, the challenge will be getting all governors to consider both schools. There will also be a student rep from both schools.

7. GFM Board Skills Audit

JC asked what was the purpose of completing it and felt some questions had multiple answers.

A discussion took place on the relevance of questions and the audit and it was decided for the Board to complete electronically and send to AT who will add the scores and see if there are any skills gaps. This process will also determine if the questions are fit for purpose.	All/AT
<p>8. Recording of GFM Board minutes</p> <p>JC suggested the Board meetings should be recorded with an audio device as well as minuted to maximise accuracy and help AT to refer back to. Once the minutes have been approved the audio will be deleted.</p> <p>Views were sought from the Board on this – most of the Board agreed they were happy with this – there was concern about being conscious of what is said due to a recording device being present.</p> <p>All agreed that if it was a supportive tool for AT then it could be used and then deleted once the minutes have been approved.</p>	
<p>9. 2017/18 meeting schedule</p> <p>AT explained that 4 meetings have been planned for LGC's, Audit and Finance and the GFM Board for the next academic year, there are sufficient gaps in between the meetings to allow for the minutes to be distributed before the next meeting in the term.</p> <p>JM would like 6 meetings a year and will organise the extra 2 herself and if any other LGC's need extra meetings it is up to them to organise.</p> <p>JC asked if 4 meetings were enough for the Board? CB stated that these were the formal meetings needed and it is up to the Board to decide how often they get together and may have Away Days and twilight meetings in between official Board meetings.</p> <p>IP suggested an Away Day in October which AT will organise.</p>	LGC's AT

ST wanted the Board to be mindful that the LGC's are being asked to attend many meetings in a volunteer capacity and suggested they may not need to attend the extra GFM meetings if not relevant.

ND

IP asked if ND could present on F.E perspective of workforce costs – income to staff ratios, and what else the GFM could learn from G.F.E

10. DPA

PL sent an email regarding the DFE guidance on information needed to send to the ICO and then complete a register. No guidance is available, JC suggested contacting another MAT for this.

ND also mentioned the GDPR which is statutory from May 2018 which he emailed to the Board.

IP informed the Board the GFM has employed someone to support the IT policy strategy – this would be something he could get his teeth into.

11. A.O.B

ST tabled the Ofsted inspection for LWS along with the summary of the inspection process and the action plan. The Board were given time to read this and ST invited questions. The report is to be published on Friday. Academic outcomes pulled all sections of the report down to R.I. which ST accepts but identifies contradictions in the report.

PL asked if the report could be challenged – a discussion had been had about this but it was decided that it would not change outcomes. ST had the opportunity to feedback to the Senior HMI about the pilot process and did express his views on the inspection.

ND thought there were some good comments in the report and ST should be proud of the destinations of students after LWS.

PL asked if LWS were measured against mainstream schools. ST confirmed this and that it had always been the case.

IP pointed out that the 'lens' through which Ofsted judge effectiveness of schools are the same whether they are Secondary, Primary or SEN. This means that our job is to get the youngsters to achieve outcomes in every situation and that it is not a case that the student is special, the school is in SEMH, more money given to support students to achieve outcomes, we need to evaluate how well we are doing that and deploying the resources.

ST explained that an action plan is in place and there are 12 youngsters in year 10 going to year 11, their starting points, their funding and what we need to do for these youngsters to achieve.

ALL

ST invited Board members to email him any further questions they may have on the report.

12. Date and Venue of next meeting

TBC

13. Evaluation

Board members to email AT (only one received so far)