

MONKLEIGH PRIMARY SCHOOL

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY: Monday 22nd Feb 2016 – 17:00hrs

MINUTES

date produced: 23/02/2016

Name	Initials	Category	Name	Initials	Category
Mrs Marci Baxter	MB	Parent	Mr David McRoberts	DMcR	* Co-opted
Miss Rosie Beer	RB	* Co-opted	Mrs Bethany *O'Donoghue	BO'D	* Staff
Mr David Butler	DB	* Co-opted	Mrs Leah Paiano (Chair)	LP	* LA
Mr Brian Evans	BE	* Parent	Mrs Hannah Pettifer	HP	* Co-opted
Mrs Jess Gierke	JG	* Parent	Mrs Karen Reeves	KR	* Head
Mrs Marie Jones	MJ	* Co-opted	Rev. Gwen Smith	GS	* Co-opted
*Denotes present			Mrs Di Beer (Clerk)	LDB	* Clerk

Agenda	
1	Welcome and Apologies
2	Declarations of Interest
3	Multi Academy Trust
4	B&T Club update
5	Time and Date of next FGB meeting

MINUTES

Action / Notes

1 Welcome and Apologies

Apologies were received from Mrs Baxter – unable to get to meeting as prior commitment – accepted.

2 Declarations of Interest

None declared at this point (see later in meeting)

3 Multi Academy Trust

Mrs Reeves informed the governors that she had received contact from another headteacher before half term who had urged her that all schools should be in a MAT, and that schools need to do it quickly or they will be 'put' into a MAT with no control over who else would be in that MAT.

It had been suggested to her by the other headteacher that Monkleigh should investigate being in a MAT with Great Torrington School, Beaford Primary and Abbotsham Primary. It was felt that if Monkleigh has to be in a MAT it should be done soon and on our own terms.

Mrs Reeves and Mrs Pettifer advised governors that they are both on the governing body of Great Torrington School, and therefore could be deemed as having a conflict of interest – however no decisions or voting would be carried out at this meeting – both remained in the meeting.

A very healthy discussion ensued, with lots of questions & points being raised by all categories of governor:

Mrs Reeves informed governors that she had emailed Andrew Riley (Babcock – Lead Primary Advisor) asking for advice & general information on the forming of MATs – she was awaiting his reply.

- a Why isn't the Local Authority telling schools this? Why did it come from another headteacher?
- b Is now the right time to do this?
- c What will stop the MAT being reorganised in the future by the 'powers that be'?
- d Why does there *have* to be an executive head? How do governors feel about an executive head? The executive head may be someone not linked to a school.
- e How are schools going to be forced into being part of a MAT? It has been said that it will happen by 2020. What will happen if Monkleigh is still stand-alone at that time?
- f Some schools have managed to fight off academisation to date.
- g Governors feel that we could work well with the school that they have already agreed to form a partnership with, but don't want to feel that we are being pushed into being part of a MAT.
- h One head had made it clear that they had not wanted to be head of more than one school.
- i There was concern that there may be a vested interest somewhere regarding the forming of a MAT.

Governing bodies' core functions:

- A. Ensuring clarity of vision, ethos and strategic direction;
- B. Holding the headteacher to account for the educational performance of the school and its pupils, and the performance management of staff; and
- C. Overseeing the financial performance of the school and making sure its money is well spent.

- j The discussions regarding formation of a MAT seem very similar to the discussions some years ago regarding federations. The school was not forced into a federation.
- k What happens if a MAT collapses?
- l It was pointed out that school staff were concerned and had raised several questions / concerns -
 - i – Once TUPEd over to the MAT, staff contracts could be re-written – would have to go to consultation?
 - ii – All categories of school staff are feeling vulnerable – why is this the way we have to go?
 - iii – Unions – it was decided that those members of staff (both teaching and support) would contact their unions for neutral advice.
 - iv – Clerk had been informed that, once employed by the MAT, any member of staff could be expected to work at any site within the MAT, and be moved around.
 - v – Staff concerned about the speed that this seems to be happening.
- m What will the effect be on the budget? It was explained that the school funding would still be the same, however a percentage of the budget share would have to be ring fenced for payment of MAT central staff.
- n It was pointed out that there is a significant grant available (up to April 2016) for the setting up of a MAT – could this be encouraging the apparent rush?
- o It was suggested that a meeting could be held for staff and governors of the other schools interested in joining this particular MAT, and that there should be union representation.
- p Governors need to think about both the positives and negatives of being in a MAT.
- q There should be an action plan in place in case Mrs Reeves is put into a position of having to say yes or no (Mrs Reeves reassured governors that no decision could be made unless it had gone to FGB)
- r ‘Hand-picking’ other schools to form a MAT seems to be elitism.
- s Do we need to react quickly? The feeling is that we are being forced or we will be ‘left out’.
- t ‘Good’ schools may not always be ‘good’ and ‘bad’ schools may not always be ‘bad’.
- u Once the school is part of a MAT there will be no opportunity to come out of it.
- v What is the school going to gain? Will be lose more than we gain?
- w Clarity is needed as at present it is currently just ‘hear-say’. Need to speak with Andrew Riley.
- x What would encourage Monkleigh to be part of the MAT? It was considered that it would give the school more power; however it was pointed out that more power comes with more responsibilities.
- y Had the partner school gained the centre of teaching excellence? Mrs Reeves confirmed that they had been unsuccessful due to not having enough capacity.
- z Mrs Reeves to forward any correspondence received to governors and, if necessary, call another meeting.

RB, MJ,
BO'D, KR

MATs – No decision was made and full, open and honest meetings to be held with staff.

KR

4 B&T Club Update

Mrs Reeves advised that a few parents are persistently turning up late to collect children, and do not appear to be deterred by the fine charged.

Governors discussed fees / fines and were unanimous that B&T Club should have some sort of contract.

Late collection – it was agreed that a fine of £10 be added to the session fee if a child is collected 10 minutes of more late from either afternoon session. To be implemented after 2 occasions.

After 6 pm – If a child has not been collected by 6pm, the school should have the right to contact social services if it is deemed necessary.

Early Drop Offs – Parents should stay with children until their booked session time – B&T Club to refuse to accept the child until that time.

Non-attendance charges – currently charged at 75% of session cost. This to be removed. Booked sessions to be paid in full unless 24 hours' notice given (with the exception of illness)

Increased 'B' pre-school children fees – to be removed – same charges as school children.

Contract / Registration form – clearly explained form / contract to be created and used for all families using B&T Club facilities – outlining times / charges / fines etc.

LDB/KR

5 Time and Date of next FGB meeting

Full Governing Body

20th April 2016 – 17:00

Governors wished to thank Mrs Nash (kitchen manager) for providing light refreshments for the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 18:18

Signed as true: _____

Date: _____

(Chair of Governing Body)

Governing bodies' core functions:

- A. Ensuring clarity of vision, ethos and strategic direction;
- B. Holding the headteacher to account for the educational performance of the school and its pupils, and the performance management of staff; and
- C. Overseeing the financial performance of the school and making sure its money is well spent.