



**GFM Board Meeting**

**18<sup>th</sup> May 2017 LWS Academy**

**Attendees:**                   **Jeff Callander (JC) Acting Chair**  
**Paul Lane (PL)**  
**Jean Morgan (JM)**  
**Kirsty Robertson (KR)**  
**Ian Potter (IP)**  
**Stuart Tyreman (ST)**  
**Georgina Mulhall (GM)**  
**Sue Carter (SC)**

**Apologies:**                   **Nigel Duncan**  
**Cris Beswick**  
**Jenny Bonsor**

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

<p><b>1. Welcome and introductions - IP</b>  IP welcomed everyone and apologies were received from Nigel Duncan, Cris Beswick, Jenny Bonsor</p>	<p>Action</p>
<p><b>2. Declaration of interests – IP/ALL</b>  Forms were handed out for completion and to be returned to AT by the next meeting</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p><b>3. Confirm accuracy of the last minutes – 5<sup>th</sup> April 2017</b>  All agreed that the minutes were a true reflection of the meeting and were signed by JC, proxy Chair in CB absence</p>	
<p><b>4. Matters arising from the last minutes, not on the agenda</b>  JC asked how the Gomer celebration went, it was agreed it was a wonderfully organised Primary event with media coverage in the Portsmouth News.  BP are also holding a week of events next week including trooping of the colours. AT will ask D Rooney to send an invite to JC as he did not receive the email.</p>	<p>AT</p>

<p><b>5. Verbal report from IP on the narrative of Brune Park joining the GFM and overcoming the deficit risk - IP</b></p> <p>IP was pleased to announce that BP joined the GFM on 1<sup>st</sup> May. At the last Board meeting, it was decided to leave the negotiations with HCC to the Executive team. The RSC were informed of the carry forward at BP and HCC took their 'loan' from this. The RSC also informed the GFM that any surplus from BP would transfer to the GFM subsequent to conversion. The Solicitors could not get this documented as legally binding but there is an email trail that states this that HCC were party to. After HCC have shut their account for BP, we will know how much is left, this could take a few months. SC informed the group that the projected forecast is between £500,000 - £750,000 carry forward for BP and Gomer.</p> <p>Staff from BP were Tupe'd over. Subsequently a member of staff has stepped down as Deputy Head to Assistant Head. Another member of staff Tupe'd on sick leave and a settlement has now been agreed so they will come off payroll at the end of May. Redundancies will be identified as roles which are not required are identified. This has gone to consultation period, with Board approval.</p> <p>Congratulations were given by KR and JC, commenting that it looked like things went smoothly!</p> <p>IP informed the Board that due to the Deputy Head at BP stepping down, the plan for Duty Heads in the secondary provision had to be re thought and are now no longer site centric. Assistant heads are being given the opportunity to shadow duty Heads once a week or fortnight and there has been interest from other schools wanting to take on the duty head position which will build capacity beyond the MAT. ST is also working at BP once a week as a Duty Head.</p>	
<p><b>6. Submission to the EFA re Finances – SC</b></p>	

Planning a five-month budget plan is a bit hit and miss with 2 schools converting to an academy as it is not clear what balance will come in. The forecast is to be uploaded and if it is wildly out the EFA will ask questions, presently there is a deficit of £300,000 but BH and LWS are halfway through their financial year and the biggest costs lay in exams and maintenance costs which always are at this time of year.

SC also went through the first draft of 2017/18 budget which all 4 schools were budgeted like for like, year on year. Until there is a full understanding of costs/spending there will be in year deficits, which will be the same locally and nationally due to drops in funding. SC will put forward a deficit budget and then as spending is looked at, it will be cut accordingly in order to minimise a deficit. There will be natural staffing wastage over the year as well as savings on the centralised functions. There being no Head Teacher at BP is another cost saving.

Staffing costs are 80%, and higher at LWS, Top-up funding, Pupil Premium funding and the EFA funding makes up for the majority of the staffing budget.

SC is still working on Key Performance indicators and will have these ready for the next meeting, along with a 5-year plan.

Estimated surplus carry forward for this academic year could be up to £500,000 depending on the monies received from BP, but as there are invoices still coming in it is difficult to predict. A reserves policy needs looking at to spend on school improvement. The restricted reserves policy is 1 months' salary plus on costs which equates to around £1.5 million reserves. As the GFM is non-profit there should be a plan to spend on improving school sites and repairs to community areas. The Finance and Audit Committee will take on the task to be put in place by September. Phil Bowden is also starting to pull together a site rolling programme which will take lots of planning.

**SC**

<p>IP explained to the Board about bids Acadamies can put in for builds and repairs, BH have been unsuccessful for the last two years and LWS were also unsuccessful this year. If the GFM had a 5<sup>th</sup> Academy, then they would be given capital monies as a grant but as it only has 4 academies then a CIF bid has to be submitted.</p> <p>JC asked if the Executive were unaware of the surplus at BP. SC explained that the Due Diligence reports didn't identify the surplus, it was not until February that it came to light.</p>	
<p><b>7. Update on Girls SEMH provision – ST</b></p> <p>As per the papers sent out with the agenda, ST informed the Board that he was advised by the RSC that he needed to complete a full business case to run the pilot and re designate to a co-ed provision. If the pilot was unsuccessful then he would have to re-apply with HCC consent to return to a single sex provision. ST stated that the Executive do not recommend we do this. ST has informed HCC that he needs to take this to the GFM Board in making a recommendation not to pursue the Girls provision as the RSC are in purdah due to the general election, therefore September 2017 is no longer viable to start the provision. ST has spoken to Brian Pope at HCC and he would like to still pursue the pilot, September 2018 is still achievable for a 2-year pilot if RSC change their approach. The Board supported the Executives.</p>	
<p><b>8. Delegated Powers to LGC's - IP</b></p> <p>A draft copy of the Schemes of Delegation has been forwarded to the Board. A standard template version has been sent by the solicitors when the GFM was formed and IP has amended it accordingly.</p> <p>A discussion was had on the need for the document due to very little delegation. IP clarified that it is a document that LGC's can use for appointing members, understanding their relationship with the Board and their responsibility regarding quality of their provision. KR stated that it was a useful</p>	<p>AT</p>

<p>document for LGC's as it clearly states what they are about and can be used if there are issues in the LGC's. PL thought it stated clearly what is required of LGC's.</p> <p>IP asked if the document can moved to approved status – all agreed and AT would change the document to approved.</p> <p>IP confirmed that the GFM would follow the delegation of powers set up under the BH model. This includes signing off high value sums of money, for example. These would be continued practice in delegating powers to the CE and Exec Board. There was a discussion on adopting the BH procedures, JC was concerned about where the accountability was, JC wondered if there had been Executive delegation at BH – IP confirmed there was, and as, in effect, GFM is the old BH company it would remain.</p> <p>SC will circulate the document regarding signing off appointment, salaries etc and the delegation of powers to executive document so the Board will be aware of and can change if necessary.</p> <p>IP asked the Board to formally agree Board representatives for Safeguarding, Finance and Personnel. JM was agreed to be the Safeguarding lead; it was also discussed that safeguarding leads were necessary in the LGC's – KR is the safeguarding lead for the SEN/AP LGC. Finance representatives from the LGC's are also needed for the Finance and Audit committee.</p> <p>Action – AT to ask the Board by email, for leads in Finance and Personnel.</p> <p>The Finance and Audit committee will meet mid to late June once all LGC's have had their first meeting.</p> <p>There was a discussion on a staff member from the Primary LGC sitting on the Finance and Audit committee due to conflict of interest, but the conclusion was that it would have more of an impact and benefit to use her expertise.</p>	<p>SC</p> <p>AT</p>
--	---------------------

<p>IP reported ND comments on item 6 :-          The 17/18 budget presentation details savings of 570,258 but still maintains/increases a staff to income ratio of 80%. Are there any plans to reduce the staff to income ratio?          SC replied that the national benchmarking is between 76%-82% and we are towards the upper limit of this, staff % in LWS exceed that due to the type of school they are. The Board noted ND comments and would be interested in knowing how Fareham College keep their staff % low.</p> <p>Clerk's job description:-          Discussion on feedback from the Board, also regarding the clerk chairing the meeting once a year for the election of the Chair of the Board. JM stated that NGA do suggest this, AT confirmed she used the template from the NGA to create the Job description. The Board took on Board NG comments and AT will amend the Job description including the suggested amendments from all. She will also reference working alongside the Clerking Competency Framework. A person spec is to be created and ND's comments will be included.</p> <p>Code of Conduct for Trustees:-          This was passed to the Board for consideration and IP asked if it could be read ready for adoption at the next meeting. IP thanked AT for her work on this.</p>	<p>ND</p> <p>AT</p> <p>ALL</p>
<p><b>9. Salary policies across the GFM</b></p> <p>IP would like the Board to understand the difference between the schools' salary policies; all teachers pay is related to performance – BP and Gomer use the HCC policy, whereas BH and LWS have their own policies due to already being Academies. There is no urgency to have one policy, SC met with HR legal who advised to start a plan for a year's time so all have a consultation together because if you start changing one department at a time, this can cause uncertainty. They advised to let the MAT bed-in first.</p>	

<p>JC agreed that you can only use the restructuring card once but it does complicate things with new staff members.</p> <p>GM mentioned about new starters having the mobility clause to work in other schools</p> <p>PL mentioned harmonisation.</p> <p>IP proposed to the Board that the Finance and Audit committee agree the BH salary policy – all agreed.</p> <p>There will be on going work for the Board to decide what a restructure will look like for alignment across the organisation. JC confirmed it is called restructuring when the academies will change to one pay policy.</p>	
<p><b>10. Statement of GFM relations with Unions - GM</b></p> <p>The GFM Executive want a statement of intent to work with unions. GM and IP are involved in union work in Hampshire. JC asked as a limited company why are we making obligations we don't have to. A discussion took place on the Executives recommendation to engage with unions. GM stated it is good practise for teachers and support staff to join unions. It was discussed that the GFM wanted to be different to other MAT's and give protection and support for colleagues and have a collaborative working relationships with unions.</p> <p>GM stated that meetings she attends for the union generates money for the school if the school pays into a centralised facilities pot. Academies don't have to pay into the pot but then do not get any revenue for union work. GM also stated that from a teacher's career point of view it is another career direction to go in if they do not want to climb the ladder the traditional way.</p> <p>A discussion was had on giving 'free' space and time for unions in schools. It was argued that the level of commitment we make is returned 10 fold, creating a new way of thinking. KR, PL and JM were happy and supportive of the document and wouldn't object to it.</p> <p>IP stated that the Exec group supported this document in order to position the GFM in a different way from other MAT's.</p>	

<p>JC asked if Bay House have this before? IP replied No ... that's a good point.</p> <p>He suggested a period of reflection and to make a decision on the document at a future meeting and on whether is it a GFM Board statement or document from the Exec?</p>	
<p><b>11. Proposed adoption of the Workload Charter - GM</b></p> <p>GM clarified that the document has been amended and the document with “points 1-7 be endorsed by the following” was the one to be adopted. It has been endorsed by DFE, Ofsted and the Unions.</p> <p>IP argued the worth of there being a GFM version and it would be good to be published on the website for recruitment purposes. It could also receive a charter mark from the Unions. All agreed the adoption of the Fair Workforce Charter.</p>	
<p><b>12. Proposed Away Day for the Board - IP</b></p> <p>The agreed date is 7<sup>th</sup> June at the Lysses Hotel in Fareham – AT will send out more information.</p> <p>CB is keen for the Board to get to know each other, have space for visioning and values. For part of the day the Board will also be introduced to the headship team at BH and BP, finishing with a meal.</p> <p>JC and CB agreed a need to discuss giving children in Gosport and Fareham greater opportunity and how the key to success is getting the right staff.</p>	<p>AT</p>
<p><b>13. Comms strategy – ST</b></p> <p>ST informed the Board that a debate took place in Executive regarding releasing information that was school centric or GFM centric. Newsletters/tweets are being led by the schools.</p>	

A discussion took place on how BP parents have received the academisation. ST spoke about Facebook chatter which was concerning due to the misinformation being spread. There is a Q & A section on the GFM website and IP is responding to them through the Exec team.

A discussion took place about the role of someone taking on communication within the MAT, ST explained that they were trying to get to grips with resources within the MAT to see if anyone was suitable. ST also told the Board that job vacancies within the 4 schools were being advertised on all 4 school's websites.

GM informed the Board that Gomer were in the press again the next day.

All agreed the Comms Strategy will evolve as the GFM progresses.

#### **14. DPA**

This item was deferred

#### **15. Date and venue of next meeting**

GFM Board Away day 7<sup>th</sup> June, Lysses hotel, Fareham

GM liked the idea of Board meetings being held on different days of the week each time

#### **16. Evaluation**

SC – covered a lot of topic in depth, lively discussions

KR – good discussions and looking forward to the away day

JM – Some documents have

members/governors/directors/members – clarity needed.

Now the GFM has happened – it is good where we are

GM – Pleased there has been agreement in key areas

JC – documents have no identification – footers to reference version, folder etc. Enjoyed the meeting

PL – Very pleased levels of descent have come up

ST – robustness of meeting at a good level, welcomed it

