

ROGATE C.E. PRIMARY SCHOOL



Meeting of the Full Governing Body

Tuesday 28th February 2017

4.00pm

PRESENT	PRESENT	APOLOGIES
Mrs Verona Hall <i>Chair</i>	Mr Max Harwood <i>Co-opted Governor</i>	Father Edward Doyle <i>Ex Officio</i>
Mrs Stephanie Garwood <i>Staff Governor</i>	Mr Matthew Wright <i>Vice Chair</i>	Mrs Louise Stevenson <i>LA Governor</i>
Ms Amy O'Toole <i>Head Teacher</i>	Mr Max Harwood <i>Co-opted Governor</i>	Mrs Fiona Dix <i>Associate Governor</i>
Mr Neil Ryder <i>Co-opted Governor</i>	Mrs Rita Roach <i>Foundation Governor</i>	Mrs Hannah Pasfield <i>Parent Gov</i>
Mr Joe Bowman <i>Parent Governor</i>	Mr Chris Hawker <i>Associate Governor</i>	
		IN ATTENDANCE
		Sarah McCarthy <i>LA Clerk (Left the meeting at 4.45pm)</i>

ITEM	MINUTES	ACTION
1	The meeting opened at 4.10pm with a prayer by the Chair. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received and accepted from Father Edward Doyle, Mrs Hannah Pasfield, Mrs Louise Stevenson and Mrs Fiona Dix.	
2	There were no details of pecuniary interests declared. The Chair reminded everyone of their duty toward ensuring confidentiality.	
3	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND ACTIONS ARISING</p> <p>Sex and Relationship Policy continue to be updated COMPLETED Minutes from the meeting of 31.01.17 to be circulated COMPLETED Pupil Premium and SEND spend report for summer term ONGOING for Summer 1 Draft Budget to be finished COMPLETED Upload Health and Safety report to GVO COMPLETED Chase Diamond Windows for revised quote COMPLETED Policies for review to be on next agenda COMPLETED HT To review milestones on sport premium spend ONGOING for Summer 1 A governor to volunteer for responsibility for EYFS ONGOING</p> <p>All present agreed that the minutes were an accurate reflection of the previous meeting and were duly signed by the Chair.</p>	
4	<p>HT WRITTEN REPORT</p> <p>With the agreement of the chairman, the HT gave a summary of a new proposal that had arisen: the possibility of offering the outside classroom to the Stedham Squirrels (SS) nursery school. She circulated and summarised a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis of the plan. It was stressed that the major benefit of the proposal would not be the income from the classroom rental, but the long-term benefit of increasing and improving the pupil intake to the school.</p> <p>Governors had the following questions; Q How many children does the nursery have at the moment: A Approximately 20 Q Are you proposing to keep it separate or absorb it into the school? A Initially, it would be a rental agreement, although they seem willing to offer significant influence over policies and other management issues. Longer-term, the aim would be to take over the nursery and broaden our school's age range, to improve both the quantity and quality of</p>	

<p>our reception input. The SS management team seem to be wholly in favour of becoming part of our school after an initial settling-in period, although there would be a number of issues – such as their charity charter, etc. – we would need to work through, and we have not yet had a chance to look at these.</p> <p>Q The reputation of SS seems to be good with its parents but a bit more varied in Stedham village. There have been rumours that it had to move out of the village hall over inability to pay its rent and that, while the staff seem to be idealists in terms of the care of the children, they are very much less capable as managers of their business. Do we believe our own leadership team have the capacity to take that extra load right now?</p> <p>A They have promised us a business plan, which should enable us to judge their management better - I will load this onto GVO and let governors know when it is there. The danger for us is that this opportunity may not rise again and we could risk going into a downward spiral if we do not find a way to reverse the decline in pupil numbers. This proposal could be a part of the solution to that.</p> <p>Q Is this a strategic priority now, when we still have a long way to go to fix our own school?</p> <p>A Again, can we afford not to take the opportunity? St James' school in Coldwaltham is an example of a school that took a similar step and it has been very positive for them. The Head teacher at Stedham Primary also says that having SS onsite was one of the factors that has helped them build their pupil numbers back up – It appears they regret not having the space to build more capacity to keep them. It is also worth pointing out that Bury school turned down a similar opportunity and is still suffering from declining pupil numbers.</p> <p>Q Would it be better for us to build our own nursery from scratch, the way we want it?</p> <p>A Possibly but that would take a great deal more management time and resource – which we really could not afford in the short term.</p> <p>Q Have we tested local opinion in Rogate about having a nursery here?</p> <p>A Not yet.</p> <p>After some discussion it was agreed that Mr Harwood would discuss this with the parish council.</p> <p>Q Have we done any research to establish whether there is sufficient local need for a nursery.</p> <p>A No but our local governors believe there is.</p> <p>Q How confident is the leadership team that we can do without that class-room – we seem to be very short of intervention space and room for other activities?</p> <p>A Yes, but we believe we could make much better use of the school hall. It used to be sub-divided and to serve a much wider range of functions. We would need to look at using that space much more efficiently.</p> <p>Q If we were successful in increasing our own numbers again and needed the space back, what would happen?</p> <p>A We have plenty of space to build a temporary classroom and the LA were quite encouraging about that possibility, although we would need to find out more about planning constraints and other restrictions?</p> <p>Q Have you looked at costs of running temporary buildings – they can be very expensive?</p> <p>A No, but I am told they are much more efficient than they used to be. That is something we would obviously have to discuss with the LA when the need arose.</p> <p>Q How will we know whether £800 per term would even cover the cost of the energy, cleaning and other facilities they would need? Can we get the SBM to give us cost estimates before we make a decision?</p> <p>A We will do our best.</p> <p>Q How will we make sure we impose all the necessary terms and conditions?</p> <p>A We will ask the LA for other examples and start from there.</p> <p>Q Have you looked at whether there are different safeguarding issues for younger children – I believe Stedham primary have had to “beef up” their security and safeguarding facilities?</p>	<p>HT action</p> <p>Action MH</p> <p>Action HT / SBM</p> <p>Action HT / SBM</p> <p>Action HT / SBM</p>
---	---

	<p>A We will ask Mrs Garwood and Mrs Roach to look at this</p> <p>Q Would you ask SS to provide our wrap-around care, instead of Activ8?</p> <p>A No. Certainly for the moment, they are providing sports and other activities that we would not want to lose.</p> <p>Q How much supervision / management of the nursery would we be able / have to provide?</p> <p>A They are self-managing at the moment and I would not expect us to have to take responsibility for their management until and if we were ready to absorb them fully.</p> <p>Q Do we need to ask the Diocese if they approve before we go any further?</p> <p>A I don't believe there is any obligation to do so. After further discussion it was agreed that the chairman would discuss this with the Diocese.</p> <p>Q How long a contract are you suggesting we offer them?</p> <p>A This has not yet been agreed. After further discussion, governors felt strongly that SS should be offered only a one-year lease, in order to give both sides time to assess the arrangement, and that no offer should be made at all unless it was agreed that there was to be a long term relationship; it could be very damaging to both sides if SS were asked to leave after a short period. There was more discussion about the proposal and it was agreed that the HT should arrange a visit to SS, if possible on the morning of 7th March for AOT, SG, NR, MH and possibly RR. All to be informed as soon as the meeting is arranged. It was also agreed that it should be made clear to SS that the GB were favourably inclined to the proposal in principle but wanted to see a much more detailed proposal before making any decision. Governors agreed to discuss a full proposal from the HT at the next FGB meeting but stressed that it needed to address the following key questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In strategic terms: do we want a nursery? 2. If so, is now the right time and does our SLT have the capacity to deal with this distraction now? 3. What does the classroom cost us and is £800 per term enough to cover it? 4. Are SS the right people and do we believe their business plan is viable? 	<p>Action SG & RR</p> <p>Action VH</p> <p>Action HT</p> <p>Action HT</p>
5	<p>BUDGET CONFIDENTIAL MINUTE</p>	
6	<p>PREMISES UPDATE The SBM informed the Governors that the windows and doors had been ordered, the relevant forms had been accepted and the building work was scheduled to be carried out week commencing 27.03.17. An asbestos survey was also completed during the half term which was all clear. The draft premises development plan had been received and would be added to the GVO for Governors to read.</p>	
7	<p>POLICIES The following policies had been circulated prior to the meeting and there were no questions about them. They were all proposed and seconded for approval (as below) and approved unanimously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff handbook – proposed by MW and seconded by MH - Staff induction policy – proposed by SG and seconded by MH - Governor code of conduct – proposed by MW and seconded by AOT - Sex & relationship policy – proposed by MH and seconded by CH <p>It was agreed that Mrs Roach and Mrs Garwood would review the safeguarding policy in the light of recent changes in regulations.</p>	<p>Action RR / SG</p>
8	<p>AOB The chair asked all governors to read the latest safeguarding report (on GVO).</p>	<p>Action All gobs</p>

	<p>Due to lack of time it was agreed that the sports premium funding report would be addressed at a future meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed that those governors intending to attend the “fake Ofsted / HMI inspection” on 16th March should try to attend a preparatory meeting at 6pm on 7th March</p>	<p>Action All govs</p>
	<p>The Chair thanked everyone for attending and the meeting closed at 6.15pm</p> <p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Tuesday 14th March 2017, 4pm.</p>	

TABLE OF ACTIONS

ITEM/MEETING DATE	ACTION	BY WHOM	DUE DATE
4a 28.02.17	Check Stedham Squirrels charity charter and any other restrictions on merging with Rogate CofE school	HT	ASAP
4b 28.02.17	Obtain business plan from Squirrels and load onto GVO	HT	ASAP
4c 28.02.17	Ascertain views of parish council to nursery at Rogate	MH	ASAP
4d 28.02.17	Check likely planning restrictions on extra (possibly temporary) buildings on school land	HT / SBM	ASAP
4e 28.02.17	Estimates of running costs for outside classroom	HT / SBM	ASAP
4e 28.02.17	Ask LA for sample T&Cs for renting out classrooms	HT / SBM	ASAP
4g 28.02.17	Look into safeguarding issues for nursery children	SG / RR	ASAP
4h 28.02.17	Inform / ask diocese about Squirrels proposal	VH	ASAP
4i 28.02.17	Arrange visit to Squirrels for SLT & 2-3 governors (7 Mar?)	HT	ASAP
4j 28.02.17	Inform MH, NR & RR of time / date for Squirrels visit	HT	ASAP
4k 28.02.17	Circulate proposal for Squirrels to move to Rogate	HT	7 Mar 2017
4l 28.02.17	Review safeguarding policy	SG / RR	7 Mar 2017
4m 28.02.17	Read latest safeguarding report on GVO	All govs	15 Mar 2017
4m 28.02.17	If planning to attend “Fake HMI visit”, go to prep meeting	All govs	7 Mar 2017

Signed
Chair of Governors

Date