

**MEADOW VIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL  
MEETING OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING  
COMMITTEE  
8th SEPTEMBER 2020 AT 4.45PM**



**MINUTES**

Present – T White (chair), J Logan, J West  
In Attendance – A Blench (clerk)

**SP1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 To accept apologies for absence – none received as all present.

TW welcomed governors back for the start of a new academic year. All present had attended the virtual governance forum last week run by RoSiS. It was acknowledged that this would be a challenging year due to the departure of several experienced governors and also because of COVID. There are also challenges to the school financial position due to falling student numbers. TW said that we can rise to these challenges but need to be mindful of governor and school staff levels of wellbeing. A balance needs to be struck.

**SP2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL AND BUSINESS INTEREST**

2.1 Individual governors to declare any personal or business interests on any item on the agenda. No declarations were made.

**SP3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

3.1 To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020 – KT took notes in ABL absence from the 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020 meeting. These have been made available by KT today.

3.2 To discuss matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting:

- Arrangements for external review of governance – update KS
- AB to send a list of documents he would expect KS and BV to have to review and sign before academy conversion
- KS to forward to all governors the school meetings plan for 2019 20
- TW to seek nominations from governing body for the role of head teacher's appraiser

- AB to check when last GDPR update was brought to governors
- KS/JL to review policy document and bring to next meeting
- AB to circulate 2018/19 attendance record to governors and then to arrange for publication on the school website
- KT to locate a suitable governor application form
- AB to amend the governor plan document

It was agreed that given the length of time since the committee had met that SP3.2 would not now need to be discussed as most of these items have now moved on or been addressed.

#### **SP4. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**

4.1 To review terms of reference for the strategic planning committee

It was agreed that after names were changed to reflect changes in membership these could be approved.

4.2 To table at next Full Governing Body Meeting for ratification

It was agreed that these would be taken to the meeting of the full governing body on 16<sup>th</sup> September for approval.

Action – ABL to ensure the approval of the SPC TOR is on the agenda at the FGB meeting for approval.

#### **SP5. AGENDAS FOR FORTHCOMING MEETINGS**

5.1 To review the agenda plan for the coming year

JL and TW had met with Jackie Oliver from JMAT yesterday. We have had sight of the JMAT governance planner and liked the way that governing body meetings were planned within it.

ABL explained that whilst school is an LA school it will have much more work to complete than when an academy as all of the compliance issues fall to the local governing body. In a MAT a lot of this work is handled by the trust board which then allows the local academy committee to focus more upon raising standards in their schools.

J Oliver had shared the view that she would be keen for MVP Governors to meet less often (perhaps 5 times per year) and discharge a lot of its responsibilities in between meetings by completing work in school in between governors' meetings.

It was agreed that for the autumn term at least the MVP governing body would continue to meet monthly to enable to discharge its responsibilities as an LA school. This is because we had several new governors to find/induct and also quite a volume of policies to review and/or approve.

TW had asked J Oliver if she could attend a JMAT Local Academy Committee meeting to get a feel for how JMAT did governance. TW expressed the view that she liked the approach which JMAT took to planning governor visits into school. It would

need to be determined if these could be face to face or would need to be virtual visits.

**Governor question – are there elements in the JMAT governance planner which aren't covered in ours?**

ABL agreed to review the JMAT model with the MVP model and report back.

Action – ABL to report back after making this comparison

5.2 To review policies for approval/review and allocate to specific meetings.

**Governor question – does the COVID risk assessment include external visitors?**

Yes, it does, and the control measure is that we minimise external visitors calling into school, but won't be stopping this completely as some visitors are critical to school working effectively. It was suggested that a governor section was added to the risk assessment to reflect current advice and practice.

JL did a lot of work to update the policy tracker document 6 months ago. We discussed at the last FGB Meeting the idea of a lead governor/s doing a deep read of any policy linked to their area of specialism. The lead governor would then report back to all governors with a recommendation to approve or otherwise. It was thought that only significant changes would need full discussion with all governors. It was noted that quite a few policies fall due for review in September 2020. It was also noted that a few policies would fall to the safeguarding governor for review. Currently JW is temporary safeguarding governor. It was agreed that TW and JW will look at policies with a safeguarding element together to spread the load. It was noted that from this September JL is school's Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL). It was agreed that JL will send the policies for review by the safeguarding governor to JW and TW. Generally, these are generic JMAT policies and where any amendments have been made to reflect local arrangements these will be highlighted in yellow.

It was agreed that governors would be reminded of the system for approval and review of policies which we had discussed at the last meeting.

Actions – JL to add governor visits section to the risk assessment. JL to send safeguarding policies for review to TW and JW. TW to remind governors at the next meeting of the new arrangements for review and approval of policies.

**SP6. REVIEW OF GOVERNOR PARTICIPATION**

6.1 Review of participation in 2019 20

It was agreed that DT name would be removed from the record of attendance for 2019 20 as she had not as yet received a DBS clearance. It was agreed that ABL will circulate the document to governors for them to check that the data is accurate prior to publishing on the MVP website.

Actions – ABL to remove DT from the record and circulate to governors for checking.

- 6.2 Publication of attendance on school website site  
It was agreed that this would be published on the school website after checking with governors.

### **SP7. GOVERNORS' TERMS OF OFFICE**

- 7.1 To review governors' terms of office.

There are not any governors with terms of office expiring this year.

- 7.2 Review current vacancies.

It was noted that DT had attended the FGB meeting in March 2020 but that there had not been any communication from her since, despite TW sending texts and emails. Her daughter has now left school and JL does not see her dropping off her grandchildren as only 1 parent is allowed to drop off children now and this is usually their parents. TW had sent a read-receipt with her last email to DT and it was agreed that we would wait to see if this was opened and if there was any response. To be able to confirm DT place as a Parent Governor satisfactory DBS checks would need to be completed. At the date of the meeting DT had not as yet brought her ID documents into school to facilitate the processing of the DBS.

Maaria Khan will be attending the FGB Meeting next week as an observer with a view to her becoming a co-opted governor.

TW had also spoken to someone called Nazia Sidique who had expressed an interest in becoming a co-opted governor at MVP, via Inspiring Governance website. As we will soon have filled all of our vacancies TW will offer to put her on reserve and/or link her with other schools which are seeking governors.

This leaves 1 parent governor vacancy (possibly 2 if DT doesn't respond). It was noted that in the JMAT model of governance schools can only have 4 foundation governors and they don't have an LA governor. It was proposed that KB be asked if he would like to stand as a Parent Governor when we advertise the role. He could then transfer from co-opted to parent governor which would secure all governor places as an academy.

It was agreed that if we have had no response from DT by the time of the FGB Meeting in October we would formally minute that here place is not confirmed.

It was agreed that JL and TW will discuss outside of this meeting the best way to advertise the parent governor role.

Actions – TW and JL to discuss and put into place arrangements to nominate/elect a parent governor.

### **SP8. REVIEW OF GOVERNORS' SKILLS AND TRAINING**

- 8.1 To review governors' skills and plan for 2020 21 – TW

No comments were made regarding the plan for 2020 21, which was accepted by governors. There will not be any face to face governor training provided by RoSiS this term. TW recommended the Learning Links online training and hoped that more

governors would complete these. TW said that she would like to encourage governors to take personal responsibility for their training this year.

It was agreed that ABL will send out the skills audit questionnaire to governors after mentioning this at the FGM Meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020.

TW mentioned that she has started the Leading Governance Chairs programme this year. It is a requirement of the course that chairs seek 360-degree feedback on their performance as chair from governors using an online questionnaire. This would be repeated at the end of the programme to mark progress made. Governor agreed to support TW by completing the online questionnaire.

Actions – ABL to issue skills audit questionnaire and compile responses from governors.

## **SP9. THE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (DEP) 2020 21**

### 9.1 Strategic overview of the development plan (DEP). – JL

This year DEP had been based upon the Ofsted Action Plan and would be tabled for discussion at the FGB Meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020. Governors are encouraged to put forward items for inclusion. Due to COVID certain things outstanding from last years DEP have not made into this year. For example, the development of Subject Leaders subject knowledge. This isn't because it's not important but is about being realistic in what we can achieve in an exceptional situation. It was agreed that it will be 3 -4 years before Ofsted will revisit and that everything doesn't need to be achieved in 1 year. The fact that we have to keep staff in their bubbles and that they can't move from bubble to bubble restrict how much CPD we can do.

### 9.2 Review of the Governor Development Plan – TW

It is 1 year since we conducted a self-review of our effectiveness as a governing body. There are still some areas outstanding from that review. TW agreed to look at these and build them into the DEP where needed.

### 9.3 Updating of the School Self Evaluation Form (S.E.F.) – JL

The SEF is in the process of being written. This has not been amended since the Ofsted visit in December 2019. KS intended to do this but then left MVP, then COVID hit us.

#### **Governor question – is this a mandatory requirement to have a SEF?**

No, it isn't mandatory at this point of the year and other JMAT schools haven't got this updated yet. The priority has been the risk assessment and arrangements to get everyone back to school safely.

#### **Governor question – can Ofsted request to see the SEF at any time?**

No and can only be requested when visiting. If this happens JL would upload to the Ofsted portal. Governors agreed that they are not pressing JL to get this completed at the moment.

9.4 Academy update – JL/TW

TW and JL had met with Jackie Oliver yesterday. School had received its academy order in July 2019, so this has been ongoing for a long time now. The hold ups have been due to the legal processes around the PFI contract and also COVID. There is not anything which school can do to move this along. For the moment we can plan for how the GB will operate once we are an academy.

The second part of this discussion is recorded in the confidential minutes.

Actions – TW to review GB self-evaluation and build any objectives into the DEP as appropriate.

**SP10 CONFIDENTIALITY**

10.1 To determine any confidential items. It was agreed that the discussion at SPC 9.4 regarding the caretaker's house would form part of the confidential minutes.

**SP11. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

11.1 To review the dates and format of meetings for the academic year. These will continue as previously agreed.

**SP12. OTHER BUSINESS**

12.1 D Sylvester (CEO JMAT) has agreed to attend an FGB Meeting to explain how becoming a JMAT school will affect governance and school generally. It was noted that a lot of our current governors were not here when we deliberated around the decision to become an academy and won't know the background to this. It was suggested that DS could be invited to the October 13<sup>th</sup> FGB Meeting.

12.2 Engie have offered to attend a FGB Meeting to talk to governors about compliance. It was agreed that we invite Elliot to present at the 17<sup>th</sup> November FGB Meeting.

Actions – JL to approach DS regarding the October FGB Meeting. TW to approach Engie regarding attendance at the 17<sup>th</sup> November meeting.

**MEADOW VIEW PRIMARY SCHOOL – CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES FROM THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE OF 8<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2020**

It was noted that ENGIE who currently own and are responsible for the house onsite, had asked school if we would like to take the house from them at the point of conversion. The current occupant is leaving soon. KT will be investigating the options for use of the house. Could this be a source of income? A structural survey would need to be completed and clarity sought on responsibilities for maintenance. The access to the school drive has forced the issue, as there is no other way of accessing the property than over school grounds.

**Governor question – who would be responsible for the property maintenance?**

This needs to be clarified. If it falls under the PFI contract that would be ideal. If it didn't then maintenance would be a school responsibility. If it happens then we could have nursery provision operating from there which would link nicely into MVP.