

GFM Board Meeting

5th April 2017 LWS Academy

Attendees: **Cris Beswick (CB)**
 Paul Lane (PL)
 Jean Morgan (JM)
 Kirsty Robertson (KR)
 Jenny Bonsor (JB)
 Ian Potter (IP)
 Stuart Tyreman (ST)
 Georgina Mulhall (GM)
 Sue Carter (SC)

Apologies: **Nigel Duncan**
 Jeff Callander

In Attendance: **Angela Tew (Clerk)**

1. Welcome and introductions - IP IP welcomed everyone and apologies were received from Nigel Duncan and Jeff Callander	Action
2. . Pecuniary Interests KR – Service Manager for Gosport and Fareham Motiv8 working with Bay House, Brune Park and LWS JM – casual invigilator for Bay House JB – is a consultant for 2 of the GFM schools Clerk duties discussed (once appointed):- <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ensure everyone is registered at Companies House2. Pecuniary Interests forms to be signed once a year and filed3. DBS checks for Board and how they will be recorded on a single central register	
3. Update on the formation of MAT – Exec team The MAT formed on 1 st April comprising of 3 schools – Bay House, Gomer Juniors and LWS Academy.	

<p>The Globe is now in the Ownership of the GFM. GM has populated a calendar when the Juniors use it and need to come to an agreement with the infants over their use.</p> <p>Gomer are having a celebration on Friday with students from Bay House and LWS joining them. The media will be present.</p> <p>LWS – business as usual – staff are aware of the conversion and are all looking forward to the challenge.</p> <p>The head of Property Services has now agreed that LWS, Gomer and Brune Park can continue their SLA's through them as they did buy into it before academisation and have a share of the pot. As Bay House did not have an SLA previously, they would have to renegotiate.</p>	
<p>4. Interim arrangements for Brune Park - IP</p> <p>Unfortunately Brune Park was unable to convert on 1st April. The Executive Team ran out of time for negotiations with HCC. IP had discussed with the Chair of Governors at BP regarding an SLA with HCC to oversee BP in the interim until they officially academise. It ended up getting too complex with the legals with HCC so IP checked that the interim head could continue at BP until things were resolved.</p> <p>SLA's for BP for one month amount to £35,000. HCC staff are booked to review Safeguarding. BP are a source of income for HCC.</p> <p>Whilst trying to get BP over the line to convert, HCC wanted the GFM to pay £140,000 for IT equipment at BP. The Exec Board declined this, they then asked for £100,000. The negotiations went with a 50/50 split but couldn't go any further as time ran out. A solicitors letter has now been received confirming HCC want £140,000 to release the CTA. IP has informed the RSC who want to know why they have reverted back to the full amount. IP also informed the Board that they have now learnt that BP will have a surplus to carry forward of £700,000 going into the new financial year, but HCC want the GFM to settle the monies before conversion.</p>	<p>IP/SC</p>

The Board has now also learnt that as BP is a forced academisation HCC are possibly entitled to keep any carry forward and not passport it to the GFM. A discussion took place and it was decided that IP and SC would draft something to send to the RSC outlining the issues/negotiations. SC informed the Board that the GFM can charge BP for any works that have happened in preparations for the Centralised Functions based at BP

The Board confirmed not to take any money from the GFM to pay for the debt at BP, especially now it has come to light about the healthy surplus.

PL asked if the conversion could happen on 1st May? Realistically due to the Easter break it would be more likely to work towards 1st June. If this does not happen there may be a change in direction for the GFM.

5. Verbal presentation on budget forecasts for the MAT-SC

This is work in progress based on the 3 schools in the GFM. Due to the different year ends of LWS and BH the income/expenditure is not evenly weighted.

BH – year-end would have been at break even in year largely due to savings in staffing, there was a deficit at the end of March but will have an in year surplus of £200,000. They also have a carry forward of £1.2million so BH will take £1.4million carry forward to the GFM.

LWS year-end would have been August 31st and would have been at break-even but as it's cut short to 31st March they have a deficit of £70,000. They do have a surplus of £150,000 so will have a carry forward of £80,000 to the GFM.

Gomer – The final outcome won't been known for up to 4 months as HCC won't rush to transfer the monies but it's looking like there will be a £30,000 deficit due to building works completed. They have a surplus of £133,000 so will have a carry forward of £100,000 to the GFM. SC is trying to

identify any monies that need to come straight to the GFM and not have to wait the 4 months – e.g. MOD grant.

To evaluate there will be £1.55 -1.6million to transfer to the GFM account from 3 schools.

The 3 schools should break even without touching the surplus. The new budget for the 17/18 academic year includes huge funding challenges as the ESG is being withdrawn fully that year with a loss of £330,000. On the plus side if BP convert before 31st August some monies will come through for a protection period for this.

NOR for BH 6th form has reduced by 20 students resulting in £100,000 reduction in funding.

NOR for BP has reduced by 40 resulting in £150.000 reduction in funding.

In comparing the 4 schools, have, in total, a drop in funding of £400,000. NI and Pension contributions increase this year and the Apprenticeship levy comes into place at a cost of £70,000 which is half a per cent of the staffing bill.

On the plus side, as 4 schools, the first draft of 17/18 forecast, with IT, Finance, Insurance and staffing is forecasting an in year surplus between £400,000 - £500,000. Economies of scale have not really been looked at yet.

The staffing bill equates to 81.3% of the total income, with teachers being 70% of the 81.3%. The average cost of a teacher is £41,700. Comparing to the Academies' benchmarking this is comparable.

The GFM received £870,000 this month base funding.

BH applied for 2 CIF bids totalling £100,000 which were unsuccessful so monies may need to be spent on building works in the near future.

Statutory returns coming up include a 5-month budget plan by 19th May which will need to be signed off by this Board at the

ALL

<p>next meeting due to timings of subcommittee meetings. The 17/18 budget forecast needs to be submitted by 31st July which can be signed off by the Finance and Audit committee if they have the authority.</p> <p>CB asked about thoughts for the spend of the surplus, but SC explained that good practice is to have one month's spend as contingency which will equate to around 1 million for the GFM which in turn equates to the surplus.</p> <p>PL asked to re visit the £50,000 offer to HCC for BP's loan after hearing the above information – another discussion took place and the Board agreed to offering £50,000 to HCC and it would be up to the Exec group to decide if they are willing to take-up the offer.</p> <p>It was also agreed to highlight to the RSC the surplus of BP to make them aware of the whole situation.</p>	<p>Exec</p> <p>IP</p>
<p>6. Update on The Wave Free School and the Girl's Hub – ST</p> <p>ST re-capped that HCC had approached LWS to provide a girl's provision and what it would look like. It would generate an income of £150,000 for 5 girls which they are willing to pay up front. HCC recognised they would need to fund this with the permission from the RSC for a pilot of 2 years on a separate site, as LWS are not prepared to re-designate to a co-ed provision.</p> <p>HCC also want LWS to increase their APN to 55 from 49 at the LWS site for boys, which will increase funding but would need to employ a teacher to increase staffing/subject areas to cover the extra students.</p> <p>There was a discussion on risk which ST felt he had mitigated – they only risk seen was that HCC would walk away after the 2 year pilot and it would possibly look like the provision had failed. IP suggested that if it was run as a pilot we could not fully commit and would not invest fully in the provision. PL suggested that measurable outcomes were put into place with HCC so if they were met it could not been seen to have</p>	<p>ST</p>

<p>failed which all agreed was a good idea. ST asked the Board if they were happy for him to discuss the success criteria for the Girls provision with HCC – all agreed. He also asked if the Board agreed to increasing LWS APN to 55 – all agreed.</p>	
<p>7. Evolution of Leadership configuration across the MAT – IP</p> <p>Across the Secondary provision (BH/BP) IP has aligned SLT members with year groups and subject leaders which will be a new way for BP to work. The vision/mission/goal will be for BP to have a positive Progress 8 score which in turn would mean young people of Gosport would be in the positive half of the country.</p> <p>IP has given colleagues the task of completing the flow chart distributed to the Board and then he will collate and produce a final version for the Board.</p>	<p>IP</p>
<p>8. Chair of the GFM – discussion and decision</p> <p>As the GFM is now trading, its Chair needs to be one of the Trustees. A discussion was had on who it should be. CB was happy to stand but wanted to make the Board aware that he was not local, works away a lot but would try and attend all meetings.</p> <p>A discussion took place about the relationship between the Chair, the CE and the Clerk, if CB became Chair, IP would be involved more with the facilitating. It was decided to appoint CB as the Chair for one year and then re-evaluate to see if it is a working model. CB and IP to meet before the next Board meeting.</p> <p>ST suggested having a Vice Chair but it was decided that if CB is unable to attend he would say a person would be his proxy.</p> <p>A discussion took place on who would sign off IP’s expenses which historically was the Bay House Chair of Governors (JM). It</p>	<p>CB/IP</p>

<p>was decided that CB was able to sign them off as Chair of the Board if he had a digital copy, which was agreed.</p>	
<p>9. Terms of Reference for LGC's – PL, JM, KR</p> <p>PL had read IP's paper regarding the structure and has replicated to the Primary Model. The committee will be small and simple, had to be people who were available and detached enough from roles to cover the sub committees. GM explained that once the Primary provision increased in the GFM they didn't have to have a representative on the LGC from each school.</p> <p>SC and IP are looking at the Delegated Powers document which clarifies the Board of Trustees' power and that of the LGC's, which will be brought to the next meeting</p> <p>LWS have drafted the letters for SEN parents of Gomer and Bay House to join the LWS LGC.</p> <p>JM feels in limbo as BP did not convert so has lost part of her LGC! BH governors have been identified to move to new Secondary LGC and they hope to go to BP for a governor. IP and JM have had a meeting with a parent governor who is interested in joining, they need people who are committed to a joint governance for Secondary. The first meeting of the Secondary LGC will be on 25th May.</p> <p>LGC Chairs to confirm to the Board when their first meetings are.</p> <p>LWs confirmed the directors of LWS Academy Trust have now stepped down.</p>	<p>Item for next meeting</p> <p>LGC chairs</p>
<p>10. PR and Communication - ST</p> <p>ST and ND met with Karen Woods to discuss PR and FAQ's. He will circulate with other actions to the Board</p>	<p>ST</p>
<p>11. The Data Protection Act</p> <p>Due to the meeting over running this item was deferred to the next meeting.</p>	<p>SC/PL</p>

<p>A quick discussion took place on the data commission which SC will look into. PL will re send SC the email.</p> <p>A discussion also took place on Freedom of Information requests, clarification of this will be discussed at the Exec meeting.</p>	<p>Exec</p>
<p>12. Evaluation</p> <p>GM – A detailed meeting, relevant point CB – timings JM – moving forward KR – confident but would like BP to convert a.s.a.p. SC – fulfilled remit PL – key issues with BP, key points to manage in a timely manner. JB – Some straight forward hard working people around the table, BP – ball back in Exec court, dynamic and difficult situation. ST – Significant value and challenge, warts and all forum, open and confident, raring to go!</p> <p>CB asked if an email could be sent to JC regarding the decision about the Chair of the Board. IP is due to see him so will discuss with him.</p>	<p>IP</p>
<p>Future agenda items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Working with Unions – A protocol for the GFM ● Developing Manual of Practice ● Delegated Power document ● Data Protection Act <p>Next GFM Board meeting 18th May 2017, 4.30pm at Bay House School.</p>	