

ST FRANCIS CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL

Date of meeting 19.11.14	Reference 02.11.14
Venue Classroom 5	ST FRANCIS' SCHOOL at 7.30pm

Copies to those present and absent plus

- Diocesan Schools Commission
- Department of Education, RBWM
- School Website

Meeting to begin promptly at 7.30pm

Minutes remain in draft format until approved and/or corrected at the next meeting

Present: Sarah Chidede (SC), Jane Gow (JG), Karen Inglis (KI), , Daire Leonard (DL), Clare Lewis (CL), Stephen Poulston (SP), Catherine Shooter (C Sh), Mary Surlis (MS)

Apologies: Rob Jones (RJ), Kevin Clifford (KC) Fr. Tom Taaffe (Fr T), Richard Evans (RE)

Absent: Kevan Jeffrey

Clerk: Franchesca O'Shea

Guests: Kath Palmer - Pre-School
Lynne Ringshaw

The Governing Body meeting opened at 19.30pm

1	Reflection & Opening Prayers SP opened the meeting with prayers.
2.	Apologies – Acceptance & Non Acceptance
3.	SP and JG on behalf of the school and the Governing Body, thanked both Angela Sheehan who was no longer a member of staff and Rob Jones who had come to the end of his term of office for their commitment and dedication to the school.
4.	Register of Business Interests – any changes? ACTION: No changes were recorded.
5.	Approval of Governor Meeting Minutes dated 17.09.14 There were no changes and the Minutes were approved unanimously. ACTION: The Minutes dated 17/09/14 were proposed by SP and seconded by SC
6.	Any Matters Arising from the Minutes of the last meeting
a)	(5) Parish Advert – Associate Member Finance update - JG confirmed that a couple of people had approached her after the request for help in the School Newsletter, therefore a Parish Advert was not deemed necessary. One of the candidates had agreed to become an Associate Member with Finance as her speciality. The candidate was currently a parent and an Accountant. She had met with Jan Turney and the plan would be for the school to request help when required. ACTION: JG to determine what information from the Induction Pack would be necessary to give to the new Associate Member/inform the Governing Body who the new Associate Member is.

b)	<p>(6) TOR Pay & Performance update & ratification clarification SP proposed that these be sent to the Governors for approval by email.</p>
	<p>ACTION: CV apologised this had not been done and committed to send out asap to the GB.</p>
c)	<p>(9) Safeguarding Governor Report <i>To be covered later during the Standards Committee Summary Report</i></p>
7.	<p>St Francis Governing Body Objectives – The Year Ahead Academy planning including its effect on pre-school, governor self assessment and impact of teaching school on St Francis in particular effect on staff leadership development). SP explained that the GB had been working hard on self evaluation already by using the GSET tools the Termly Tracker and the Skills Audit for governor self-assessment. The outcomes of the skills audit would be determined from the information submitted and submitted to the CES shortly. GSET initial population of data to be completed later in the meeting (see below). Already an Associate Member had been found with finance skills which fulfilled one of the objectives that had been identified in the skills audit..</p>
	<p>ACTIONS: SP/ALL Skills Audit & Termly Tracker to assist the governing body set their objectives for the year. The Teaching School Status would also have an impact on the objectives set. Once set the objectives to be given in writing to the GB and monitored with the help of the teaching school governor (KJ).</p>
8.	<p>GSET Governor Self-Evaluation The governing body split into groups to work on the three remaining GSET assessment criteria. The other two had been completed at the recent training facilitated by CH. CH would be returning to school on the 10th December to assist LR with the input of the data onto the computerised system.</p>
9.	<p>St Francis Pre-School</p> <p>SP introduced Kathy Palmer Headteacher of the St Francis Pre School and thanked her for attending this evening. SP briefly summarised the reason why Kathy was here tonight as the formation of the Academy and MAT would affect the existing contract with the Pre-School. SP informed the GB that he had spoken to the Pre-School Committee earlier in the term. The Options that SP and JG could see for the way forward were</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Pre-School to stay as it is administratively. 2. Maintain an independent Pre-School – with the Pre-School paying rent for use of school facilities/land. Or as an alternative to rent could be agreement for the use of pre-school premises to enable extension of after school provision at St Francis. 3. Fully integrated Pre-School which is governor controlled within the multi academy trust (MAT) being discussed <p>JG explained to the GB that after her meeting with the Diocese and Solicitors they would be able to determine who owned the land and the Pre-school building, at the moment it was unclear and was a historical issue.</p> <p>KP thanked the GB for giving her the opportunity to speak this evening. She explained that the Pre-school Committee had reviewed the three options. The Pre School Committee felt that the practical reality for Option one was probably not financially feasible, though difficult to determine in the absence of a clear charging structure, explaining to the GB that the Pre school was a charity therefore their</p>

	<p>financial margins were currently very small to non-existent. At the moment the Pre-School gave a peppercorn rent to the School which had historically been set. DO they pay anything?</p> <p>KP explained that the Pre-School Committee felt strongly that they should keep their Pre School Identity as they and their predecessors had worked hard over a 24 year period to build the excellent local reputation that the Pre-School continued to have. Therefore the Pre-school's preference would be to maintain the pre-schools identity and also the input from their committee.</p> <p>Pre-school concerns</p> <p><i>Pre-School Admissions Policy</i> Kathy asked about the existing Pre-School Admissions Policy and whether the School felt this was likely to change. JG answered that as far as she understood pre-school children were not of school age therefore it was not statutory for the Admissions Policy to determine Catholic Children as a priority. This would have to be checked and confirmed legally.</p> <p><i>Staffing and Job security</i> Resources – would the pre-school remain in control? SP explained that the changes being made were very much being determined by the formation of the MAT and St Francis academy conversion therefore some of the questions being raised could not be answered until the legal team submitted their report Kathy recognised that the Pre-school may need to consider taking legal advice on the above.</p> <p><i>Who would be the employer of the Pre-School Staff/Manage the Pre-School Staff</i> Kathy asked the above question JG responded that this at present was unanswerable and would be dependent on how the school moves forward but at the moment they are still waiting for answers to these questions. Once the legal team have submitted their report the Pre-School and St Francis can continue discussions and review the legalities. SP offered to forward any information received to K Palmer.</p> <p><i>Wrap Around Care and Improvements</i> JG explained that at present the school building is used for the Breakfast club which is very successful as well as after school activities which currently finish at 4.15pm. When JG visited a local after school facility, Village End, she noted that the majority of the children present were from St Francis, indicating a clear need for such care. JG explained that she would like St Francis to provide after school care until 6pm as well as possibly providing Summer Holiday school wrap around care in the future</p> <p>. SP/JG emphasised that they would like to proceed by working collaboratively with the pre-school in the interests of all concerned. Thanks was given to Kathy Palmer for attending the meeting. <i>Kathy Palmer left the meeting at 8.05pm</i></p>
	<p>ACTION: ALL - Working Group for the Pre-school to be set up. Feedback for pre-school once more information received from MAT solicitors</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Website Demonstration LR demonstrated the new school website on the whiteboard. LR explained that this was currently being populated. The Governors were very enthusiastic about what they were shown. Thanks was given to LR. Action: Governors to give feedback to LR on content for 'Governor' part of the website.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Teaching School Progress Report</p>

	<p>Encompass Learning Alliance – the website is currently being built and will be signposted from our school website CH will be coming into school to work with LR to finalise and complete.</p> <p>Initial Teacher Training JG informed the GB that Initial Teacher Training successfully applied for trainees to work in the alliance. There were 7 primary places, 7 secondary places and 1 Marist placement. The application process is through UCAS. 40 days to get the applications in and appoint. Shortlist is in January. These are non-salaried trainees, meaning there is no cost to the school.</p> <p>Succession planning – Charters are taking the lead for this, not just secondary places but across the board.</p> <p>The Forest, The Foundations Early School Alliance and Windsor Girls School are also Teaching Schools in this area and they are working collaboratively to provide training for future school leaders. Funding has been awarded to the Berkshire Teaching Schools to set up and run 2 leadership courses next year. Encompass will need to find potential headship candidates and we hope to target Catholic Deputy Heads to support the Diocese as much as possible.</p> <p>School to school support – JG explained that in her Heads Report she briefly mentioned what support she has currently been involved with. JG carried out a Pupil Premium review recently completed at Our Lady of Peace Catholic School in Burnham, Slough. Four other schools have been identified by the Diocese as they are currently judged as requiring improvement . St Francis will be facilitating the support although staff from this school may not be involved directly. Encompass will retain 5% retention fee.</p> <p>JG informed the GB that Hilary Prendergast has been supporting St Peter’s School which has been very successful and the experiences HP identified have also benefitted St Francis. St Peter’s, a Church of England School’s Governing Body have requested to visit St Francis as they wanted to see how St Francis manages its religious ethos visually and otherwise.</p> <p>One of JG’s objectives was to evaluate the impact of being a teaching school on St Francis School and to the St Francis pupils, this will be ongoing and will be monitored closely.</p> <p>A question was raised on who will be managing the teaching school, the quality assurance and budget etc. JG responded that there is a Teaching School Governor (KJ) and they will be joined by Carol Pearce from RBWM and one other independent person. The plan is that they will quality assure the work of Encompass annually. Another Teaching School will also be asked to review the work that is completed.</p> <p>Training Programme –JG was currently looking into having an accredited course in Business Management. Once achieved this will enable Encompass to run courses with a nationally recognised accreditation.</p> <p>The Diocese have been very encouraging and supportive of the work of Encompass LA. The Leadership Development, initial teacher training and talent management is currently a particular focus for the Diocese.</p> <p>Positive feedback has also been received from C Pearce and the National College of Teaching and Learning.</p>
	<p>ACTION: Teaching School to be a regular item on the FGB Agenda. Assessment of impact of teaching school on St Francis to be item on agenda for standards /finance committee KJ</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p><i>Academy Status Information/Progress Report</i></p> <p>SP explained that he had attended a meeting with the other Chair of Governors and U Topp from the Diocese about moving forward with the MAT and Academy planning.</p> <p>SP explained that the structure St Francis adopts has to be flexible for the future in case the MAT expands.</p> <p>A brief discussion was had about the legal requirements and who would be represented on the Board of Directors. JG explained that it would not be a Board of Directors but rather a Board of Trustees but still with levels of delegation.</p> <p>Articles of Association have been drawn up which would define what would be managed at Board level or local level. JG explained one of the difficulties is that Trustees cannot keep being added to the Board</p>

	<p>if for example the MAT grows. For example very large MATs do not have a representative from every school and this wasn't something that JG thought would be desirable.</p> <p>Clarification would need to be made for example hiring and firing. Who would be responsible for this – would the local Board of Governors appoint the Head teacher and the Board of Trustees ratify or was this not the case? JG explained that the Solicitor had asked what JG wanted to happen as she could have this drawn into the Article of Association meaning that JG could insist on safeguards being built in. Once the Articles are decided the Dept of Education have to agree, however once agreement has been reached and the School has become an Academy the School can make changes anyway however this could prove quite expensive if legal fees are incurred..</p> <p>JG explained that government legislation for Academies keeps changing however Blake Morgan lawyers have suggested that we could keep the original Academy Order that St Mary's have already got and then further down the line this could be updated as other schools join the MAT.</p> <p>With regard to Safeguarding and Admissions – each school would continue to have their own Admissions Policy, levels of delegation for each area etc. would be made clear in the Articles of Association.</p> <p>Staff conditions of employment would remain the same however new staff would have on their contract that their main place of work is St Francis <i>however</i> that they may be required to work at a different work place if required. Existing staff would <i>not</i> have to change their contract to accommodate this but if they wished to go to another school for their own career development this could be mutually agreed. CV explained that most “business contracts” stipulate that you may be required to work at another site if needed so this was not unusual.</p> <p>A discussion ensued briefly about the former consultation with staff and that there may have been confusion with staff thinking that this was a formal consultation. JG confirmed that this was not the case and that verbally this had been mentioned at the meeting however looking forward the GB asked MS how best this could be resolved.</p> <p>The GB agreed that Staff may be concerned that there questions had not been answered timely and therefore should be informed that there was reason for this and that it was not the GB being tardy but that the answers to questions were not yet forthcoming as the legal team had not yet submitted their report. The ongoing difficulty/frustration was that even when the legal team had submitted their report not all the questions could be answered. The GB agreed that the Staff needed to have reassurance and to be brought up to date with the current position of the academy planning and given an explanation into why their questions had not been answered to date.</p> <p>A letter to Staff explaining the reason for the delay in answering their questions and confirmation to staff that the former discussion had been informal and not a formal consultation would be drafted and sent to staff/non-teaching staff asap by JG and SP on behalf of the Governing Body.</p> <p>The next deadline for the Academy planning is in January 2015.</p> <p>JG informed the GB that as they had guessed the Academy Planning was taking up a lot of time, for example this week there were four meetings she had to attend.</p> <p>The GB had raised concern at the impact this may have on the school however this was being closely monitored and one of the reasons behind ensuring that staff succession and support was a priority for St Francis.</p>
	<p>ACTION: : SP and JG A letter to be written to all teaching and non-teaching staff ACTION: JG - A copy of the letter to be sent to the Governing Body and a copy of the letter to be submitted in the FGB Minutes Folder.</p>
12a	<p>Academy Working Party Members Currently SP, JG, RE – to be reviewed next term</p>
13	<p>Heads Report/SEF and SDP JG confirmed that the GB had the opportunity to read and if there were any questions.</p>

	<p>The GB expressed their positivity about the format and context of the report. In particular opportunity for school subject leaders to input into report and input of pupil feedback into Early Years section. M Surlis role to be added to the report – MS was currently working two days a week in Year 5 which she was enjoying and finding a pleasant challenge. Some discussion of how governors can get feedback from staff on these changes – opportunity for this in the questions of the survey that was planned for later in the school year.</p> <p>Positive impact of teaching school could be seen in staffing changes made since last year. This had enabled leadership development, through more flexible staffing structure – one of the objectives set from last Ofsted inspection.</p> <p>One child newly admitted to school was not mentioned in the report?</p> <p>There was discussion of pupil performance targets outlined in report. Some may require minor review/amendment as new pupils admitted and have not yet been properly assessed.</p> <p>A question was raised about Maths as a specialist subject within the School. JG responded that even though Mrs Edgar had retired she had agreed to return to the school to run specific maths sessions. Mrs Johnson whose speciality was RE would also continue to support the Maths provision. JG would actively try to recruit a Teacher with maths as the specialism however three other local schools would also be recruiting locally in January 2015 so the school would be competing with other local schools for the best teaching candidates.</p> <p>Action: ensure survey this year seeks feedback from staff on new structure and impact of teaching school on them. JG/SP</p>
	<p>Review/improve the SEF/SDP</p> <p>Darren Ellsum’s report gave an overview and evidence of an external view.</p> <p>The school would continue with Ascot schools cluster sessions and also individual sessions for St Francis</p> <p>Mastering the Curriculum and Deep Learning are the focus of the new curriculum. Work is being done the term with Darren and the Ascot Cluster to develop assessment without levels. The Year 1 class are trialling an approach and if successful this will be introduced to all teachers in the Spring term.</p> <p>Action: investigate possibility of having Darren meet/give direct feedback to governors at some point. JG/SP</p>
	Pupil Targets for 2015
	Pupil Premium <i>included within the Heads Report</i>
14.	<p>Chairs Report</p> <p>SP confirmed that the GB had received and read his report and whether there were any questions. Short discussion of the questions that had been sent to school from Vicar general for Education at Portsmouth Diocese.</p>
	ACTION: SP to email out questions from Diocese to seek feedback of governors which could then be reported to Diocese
15.	Chairs Correspondence (see 14 above on letter from vicar general for Education) -
	Committee Summary Reports Summaries/Actions
16.	<p>Committee One</p> <p>CS confirmed the GB had received the draft minutes.</p> <p>Budget tight with little contingency.</p> <p>Roles within the committee.</p> <p>Support Fund – CS explained that they were changing way to communicate with parents slightly. A letter would be placed on the new school website thanking and encouraging parents about the monies given to the Support Fund. To back this up photographic evidence would be submitted showing the families what had been done with their monies. The plan was that from hereon this would be actioned every Summer. CS continued that the Welcome meetings to new families would continue and the</p>

	<p>information pack relating to the Support Fund would be explained to all new families as well as families joining the school mid term. This would be monitored by surveys to the parents.</p> <p>CS explained that a Survey just gone out to the parents and the responses from this may help to keep the committee better informed for future planning.</p> <p>Capital Projects were agreed re the development of the staff administration wing. CS explained the need for space for meetings, separate space for J Turney the Business Manager/Bursar, the staff room to be moved and the front of house to be separate to the Business Manager/Bursar.</p> <p>All Chairs were sent the Budget Overview so the finance of the project is very transparent.</p> <p>Action:1. ensure annual communication goes to parents describing impact of SFSSF 2. Consider feedback from funding survey and consider if this requires changes to the way we feedback to parents on impact of alternative funding streams e.g. SFSSF, FoStF, Pupil premium etc</p>
17.	<p>Standards Committee</p> <p>Raise on Line would be reviewed before Christmas</p> <p>SC explained to the GB that she had submitted a Safeguarding Report. After visiting the school. She had reviewed the relevant business folders with LR. SC agreed to email the report to the governing body but explained that this was a “rolling” report and that recommendations had already been implemented by JG.</p> <p>The Safeguarding report needs to be submitted to the Borough but the schools plan would be to review annually and perhaps look at different approaches for example SC suggested that next time the safeguarding school visit be done with another governor.</p>
	<p>ACTIONS: SC will review safeguarding annually.</p> <p>ACTIONS: SC would submit the Safeguarding Report to the Governing Body.</p> <p>ACTIONS: SC to submit a copy of the safeguarding report to be filed in the FGB Folder held in the School Office.</p> <p>Action: KI to meet with JG to discuss Raise on Line data</p>
18.	<p>Pay & Performance</p> <p>HT Performance Management</p> <p><i>This would be discussed in Part II</i></p>
19.	<p>Admissions</p> <p>DL explained that JG had covered most of the Admissions items in her Head’s Report. To summarise 3 new children were starting next week. All Catholic families.</p> <p>DL recommended another governor join the Admissions Committee. At present there are no parents or staff members.</p> <p>Discussion of the possibility of changing admissions policy to give preferential admission to children of staff to aid staff retention and recruitment. Some schools already do this though there seem to have been objections to this at Charters. Legal position unclear.</p>
	<p>ACTION: GB member to join the Admissions Committee SP</p> <p>Action: clarify legal position on changing admissions policy to give preference to children of staff</p> <p>JG</p>
20.	<p>Policies</p> <p>CL showed the GB two folders. She explained that the Blue folder was for statutory policies and the orange folder was for the recommended policies. There were fewer statutory policies and not all the recommended policies needed to be ratified by the FGB. Recommended policies would be periodically reviewed by JG</p> <p>LR would now be able to notify committees when new policies were due to be reviewed.</p> <p>CL and RL confirmed all the Policies had been reviewed and the Data Protection Policy and the Access to Medical Needs would need to be updated and reviewed.</p> <p>Charging Policy Ratification – no changes required.</p>

	<p>Curriculum Plans for 2014-15 Covered in JG's Heads Report Community/Parish Link Governor Role? -</p>
	<p>ACTION: CL will circulate the Policy document but explained that it is an evolving document. ACTION: SP to check all the statutory policies are signed and up to date</p>
21.	<p>Governor Training CL thanked CS for her recent training report. CL confirmed that now GSET has been introduced this would change how we log training. As soon as GSET was implemented RL would log training.</p> <p>Modern Governor information CH had not yet imparted the information CL would chase. <i>JG LR and MS left the meeting at 10pm as the meeting closed and the GB began the Part II matters.</i> <i>9.50pm</i></p>
	<p>Any Other Business – Clerk to be notified 24hrs before meeting There was no items brought to the Clerk's attention.</p>

The meeting closed at 9.50pm