

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
AUDIT COMMITTEE**

20th January 2012

Report of: Strategic Director (Corporate Services)

Title: Additional Funding to Bishop Road School

Ward: Bishopston

Officer Presenting Report: Richard Powell, Chief Internal Auditor

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 92 22448

RECOMMENDATION

The Audit Committee are recommended to note the investigation and findings and endorse the recommendations set out in the report.

Summary

This report sets out the findings of the Internal Audit investigation into the governance issues relating to the decision to take an extra entry form at Bishop Road School in 2009 and the associated funding issues.

The significant issues in the report are:

Section 1 Background to the investigation
Section 2 Context and Terms of Reference
Section 3 Findings in relation to the Council's and the School's Involvement
Section 4 Conclusions in relation to the Council and the School
Section 5 Recommendations for the Council and the School

Policy

Not applicable.

Consultation

Internal

Various officers in Children and Young Peoples Services (CYPS), Human Resources (HR) and Legal Services (LS)

External

Bishop Road School - Headteacher and Chair of Governors

Former staff

Various members of the public.

1. Background to the Investigation

- 1.1 The City Council approached the School re school places and in April 2009 the Full Governing Body (FGB) of Bishop Road Primary School agreed to take one extra class at Reception level beyond the normal 3 form entry for the year commencing 1 September 2009 only, and to support the class through to the end of its final year of primary education.
- 1.2 From the Council's perspective, Bishop Road School is one of its most popular and highest performing Primary Schools. It is also one of the largest Primary Schools and with the addition of the extra reception class in 2009, became its first 4 Form Entry School. Following an Ofsted Inspection in 2007 the School was graded as 'Good' and continued to build on this grading which resulted in a judgement of "Outstanding" in the May 2011 inspection, in relation to its overall effectiveness and its capacity for sustained improvement.
- 1.3 Ofsted identified that "very strong leadership at all levels underpins the School's success. Effective teamwork is embedded and staff and members and the governing body share a clear understanding of how well the School is doing, what it is aiming for and the part they play in striving to get there." Responses to a questionnaire for parents showed that "the very large majority are happy with their child's experience at the School". However, "a small minority of parents and carers felt that insufficient account is taken of their

suggestions and concerns.”

1.4 In support of the extra reception class, financial commitment was made available to the School, from the Council as set out in a letter dated 22 April 2009, from the former Service Director: Inclusive and Learning Communities (Service Director I&LC), to the School (Appendix 1). The financial commitment comprised:

- additional pupil number related funding totalling £39,122 for the period 1 September 2009 to 31 March 2010.
- a temporary classroom, possibly a double classroom, to be provided on site at a location to be agreed with the School, unless ground conditions made this impossible.
- £150,000 to be provided to make the necessary alterations to current accommodation and play space to allow for the additional numbers. The School will decide how this money is spent, but this is the maximum available.
- An honorarium will be added to the School budget for each of 2009/10 and 2010/11 of £30,000 (subsequently increased to £33,000 for 2009/10, see 3.13 below), to be distributed to key members of the leadership team who will take on the responsibility of maintaining standards at the School whilst expanding capacity to accommodate this one year group. This allocation is for the School to distribute.

1.5 The additional funding subsequently created some media and public interest, the most significant of which related to:

1.5.1 the equity of approach given that some aspects of the funding made available to the School were not replicated for other schools who also accepted additional pupils at the time.

1.5.2 the provision of an "honorarium" to provide additional payments to staff.

1.6 In November 2010 the Audit Committee called for a report on the matter in the light of the public interest and their duty to ensure everything that had happened had been both legal and ethical. The

Audit Committee's terms of reference relate to governance, internal control and the management of risk. It does not have responsibility for employment matters and therefore does not consider any behaviour of individuals within an employment context.

- 1.7 In view of their previous involvement in the issue, it was agreed that CYPS would provide the requested report, and accordingly the Service Director: Education Strategy and Targeted Support submitted a report to a special meeting of the Audit Committee held on 16 February 2011.

- 1.8 Inter alia, this report acknowledged that there had been significant failings on the part of the Council in that the use of the descriptor “honorarium” was inappropriate and was used merely to convey the availability of additional funding for the School to address staffing issues associated with expansion. As a consequence, the Strategic Director for CYPS, on behalf of the Council, has already acknowledged that the Council did not exercise its responsibilities correctly. The issuing of a sum of money termed as an “honorarium” to be distributed to key members of the leadership team created a chain of unfortunate events and damaged the credibility of the Council both with other schools and the wider public. Action in this respect has already been taken, and the Bristol Schools' Forum has now agreed a standard methodology for the revenue funding of any primary school accepting an additional class of pupils as a consequence of demographic growth. The adoption of the policy by the Schools' Forum now means that all schools are treated equitably and receive a minimum amount of funding to enable them to run a class structure.

2. Context and Terms of Reference for the Audit Investigation

2.1 At the meeting on 16 February, and notwithstanding the Council's acknowledgement of the failings identified at 1.8 above, it was apparent that the CYPS report was not sufficiently detailed to allay the concerns expressed by members of the Committee. Some members of the public had e-mailed members of the Committee on, or shortly before, the day of the meeting, and two attended the Committee in person. In order to ensure that all members of the Committee had the opportunity to see all the material submitted, copies of the e-mails from members of public were tabled at the meeting, and one member of the public was invited to briefly summarise the content of her e-mail.

2.2 During consideration of the CYPS report, these e-mails, and the verbal submission, it became apparent that there was a high level of interest/feeling from a section of the school community that had not been fully addressed by the report. As a result the Committee resolved:

2.2.1 that the City Council's Internal Audit Section be asked to carry out a more detailed investigation related to Additional Funding to Bishop Road School.

2.2.2 that the report encompass all public and Councillor queries in so far as they are within the ambit of the Audit Committee and includes a summary of any perceived barriers to information.

2.3 The areas that were investigated can be summarised as follows:

- Did the Council act inappropriately in offering an honorarium to the School with the intention of it being distributed to the Leadership Team (LT)?
- Did the Chair of Governors and the Headteacher knowingly accept the offer of a sum of money termed as an honorarium for key members of the LT, that cannot be paid under the School Teachers Pay Terms and Conditions Document (STP&CD)?
- Was the provision of the financial package on offer by the Council fully transparent in the decision making process?

- Did members of the School's LT, Headteacher and three senior school staff participate in a vote at a Governing body meeting to take an additional reception class knowing that they could personally benefit?
- Whether these actions resulted in an inappropriate payment of an "honorarium" to members of the School's LT?

Internal Audit Investigation

- 2.4 As Internal Audit had no prior involvement with this subject before the Committee's consideration of the report on 16 February, it was necessary for Audit staff to come up to speed on exactly what had taken place, acquaint themselves with all the related facts and familiarise themselves with all relevant documentation.
- 2.5 The Audit investigation has attempted to draw on all the relevant documentation that was available from the outset and concerns expressed by members of the Audit Committee.
- 2.6 After the February Audit Committee meeting, a number of individuals contacted Audit directly in respect of their concerns, either supplying documentation in support of those concerns and/or offering to meet with Audit staff. Some suggestions were also made as to other individuals whom it was believed may have had something to offer the investigation, should Audit meet with them.
- 2.7 Accordingly Audit have met with a number of individuals external to the Council, as well as seeking information from a number of Council and School officers and members of the Governing Body.
- 2.8 The results of these meetings and the findings from the Audit investigation are set out in the following paragraphs. Given the need for Audit to start their enquiries from scratch, and the number of people to be seen, the quantity of documents to be examined, together with the need for Audit to re-check occasions where versions of events differed, the investigation has taken a considerable amount of time. It was also found that as one avenue of enquiry was explored, it identified further avenues that needed to be examined, and in many cases the audit trail was incomplete and that it was not possible to establish a full evidential trail for everything that happened.

3. Findings

The City Council's Involvement

3.1 There is no doubt that the Council was in extreme difficulty in relation to having adequate numbers of primary school places in early 2009. Deficiencies in forward planning had left insufficient places to cope with demand, as the subsequent report the Council commissioned from Cambridge Education confirmed. This report also confirmed that this lack of forward planning brought with it additional costs, and identified that:

"Recognition of the scale of the problem and delays in organising solutions to the problem weakened the Council's position in negotiating a successful outcome with the schools concerned and led to higher costs being incurred than might otherwise have been the case."

The planning deficiencies also meant that the Council had limited time to negotiate the compelling need to provide for the inclusion of additional school places for September 2009 within its existing schools, resulting in the whole process being undertaken in a very tight time frame to facilitate completion by the required date.

3.2 It was in this context that, having already achieved a certain number of additional places, dialogue was opened with Bishop Road Primary School in March 2009, about the School's ability to take an extra reception class. It was unclear whether the School could initially cope with such a class as the School is a very large school with no obvious expansion route and there is evidence that the School initially declined to do so. However at the meeting of the FGB on 2 April 2009 the minutes record that when asked about the shortage of school places across Bristol and the potential implication for Bishop Road, the Headteacher explained that she would be meeting the representatives from the Council that week.

3.3 It is evident that further meetings and dialogue took place between the School and the Council. These meetings were led by the Service Director I&LC. There are indications that this dialogue included reference to the academic success of the School and the potential impact of taking the additional pupils, and that any dip in the

performance of the School would be attributable to the additional intake. The dialogue questioned the ability of the Council to support remuneration to the LT, which was commensurate with the additional workload and pressure and in addition to the core budget already set for the School.

- 3.4 The above matter was considered by CYPs and advice was sought from the Council's Human Resources Team (HR), who advised that "The governing body are responsible for determining the pay of the head and deputy etc."
- 3.5 There is evidence of a further meeting between the Headteacher and the Service Director I&LC during which the latter was looking to see if she could agree most of the School's requirements. This meeting resulted in the confirmatory letter dated 22 April 2009 which set out the Council's financial commitment as identified earlier in paragraph 1.4. The letter is copied to the Chair of Governors and was e-mailed to both the Headteacher and the Chair of Governors on 24 April 2009.
- 3.6 There is no evidence that any other schools taking extra classes were given additional support over and above additional classrooms, capital funding and extra pupil number related finance, although it is fair to say that in the particular area of North West Bristol there was, at the time an unresolved shortage of pupil places, and time was even more of the essence.
- 3.7 It is considered appropriate for the School to maximise the benefits for itself in order to protect existing arrangements and for there to be some recognition for additional duties and responsibilities. However, the STP&CD makes no provision for such "honorarium" payments and the Council was clearly at fault for using the term in this letter.
- 3.8 There is the question as to whether officers with extensive experience in the education sector, both within the Council and the School, should have been aware that "honoraria" are not permitted under the STP&CD and the Locally Managed Schools Pay Policy adopted by Bishop Road. The Council should not have offered, and the School should have rejected, the basis of an "honorarium" offer. However it is understandable that the School accepted an offer of an "honorarium" without challenge when it came from a senior, Council officer.

- 3.9 Evidence suggests that it only became apparent to the Council that the provision of an “honorarium” was not permissible under the STP&CD in July 2009 as a result of subsequent HR advice in response to a query. However there is evidence that at this time a Council officer suggested “Regarding honorarium, as a Head I used it occasionally so I don't think there is an issue there.” This would suggest that the this officer, from her previous experience as a Head outside of the Council, considered the use of an “honorarium” as permissible.

The School's Involvement

Knowledge of the Financial Package

- 3.10 In the light of the dialogue with Council representatives, an Extraordinary Governors' Meeting (EGM) was called on 30 April 2009, to discuss whether the School should offer to take the additional reception class (Appendix 2). There are differing recollections as to whether a formal report was tabled or verbally presented. Although there is no reference to a report in the minutes of the meeting, Audit have sighted a paper entitled 'Governors' Paper - Proposed Additional Class in Reception for 2009/10', full details of the content can be found in (Appendix 3). This report, written by the former Deputy Head, on behalf of the Headteacher, details the benefits to the School, in relation to taking the additional reception class and records “A re-grading of the School in light of its increased size, which would support professional development and recruitment and retention of high calibre staff, further establishing Bishop Road School as a beacon of success both within the city and nationally.” The financial and non financial support mentioned in the report reflects all of the support as set out in the letter from the Service Director I&LC dated 22 April 2009, *with the exception of the offer of the “honorarium”*.
- 3.11 There is clear recollection on the part of the Chair of the Governing Body that the Council gave the impression that they wanted him to keep the offer confidential, this is supported by the statement made, to this effect, by the Chair in the FGB Minutes of the 21 May 2009 (see 3.14 below).

- 3.12 In the minutes of the EGM on 30 April 2009, published on the School's website (Appendix 3) and headed as 'Agreed', reference is made only to three elements of the Council's financial commitment being offered, items 1-3 of the Council's letter of 22 April 2009. No mention was made of the "honorarium" in these minutes or the report. It is unclear whether a verbal reference was made to the existence of an "honorarium" or that the Council's letter (See 1.4) was tabled at this meeting which could have been the result of the request (See 3.11) by the Council to maintain confidentiality (see also paragraphs 3.14-3.16). However, in the version of the minutes of the 30 April 2009 EGM headed as 'Amended at FGB Meeting of 21st May' (Appendix 4), provided to Audit during the Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS) Assessment process it is minuted that "An honorarium has been offered to some key staff to reflect the additional workload, likely to arise." All of the minutes for the FGB meetings provided for the FMSiS assessment match the versions held on the School's website, and are signed by the Chair of Governors, with the exception of the minutes of the EGM on the 30 April 2009, therefore it is unclear which set is considered to be the final version.
- 3.13 Following the EGM on 30 April, the Chair of Governors drew up a document (Appendix 5), to protect the School from any clawback in the future. This document set out the FGB's resolution "to take one extra class at reception level beyond the normal three form entry in September 2009 subject to the conditions as outlined in the letter from the Council of 22 April 2009. As a first item this document records an oral amendment to sub paragraph 4 of the letter of 22 April to £33,000, an increase of £3,000 against the sum originally promulgated.
- 3.14 With regard to the availability of the full financial package, there are references in the minutes of the FGB on 21 May 2009 (Appendix 6) that a parent governor asked for more details to be included in the minutes, with the Chair of Governors stating that he had been asked to maintain confidentiality about the details of the proposal and the implications, and that he would discuss with the Council what information could be made available to stakeholders. It is minuted that a vote was then taken on a motion requesting that full details of the financial package be made available to governors, this being approved 12 in favour, 1 against.

- 3.15 In the minutes of the FGB on 24 September 2009 (Appendix 8), it is recorded that a parent governor requested a copy of the financial package referred to in the minutes of 21 May (Appendix 6) and 9 July 2009 (Appendix 7). It is minuted that "these were handed out. Governors were reminded that this information was confidential."
- 3.16 In the confidential minutes of the Joint Finance and Staffing Committee Meeting that took place in December 2009 (Appendix 10 Exempt), one of the parent governors expressed concern that during the proposal to take an extra reception class, no reference was initially made in papers to Governors to the fact and amount of an "honorarium", or the move to become a Group 5 School. It is minuted that in response to this concern, the Chair of Governors indicated "that he had raised the fact of the "honorarium" at the relevant meeting at the discussion stage."

Paragraphs 3.10-3.16 reflect the fact that there was a lack of transparency in the decision making process.

Declarations of Pecuniary and Financial Interests in April 2009 during voting for acceptance of a further reception class from September 2009

- 3.17 Whilst there was no invitation to declare interests in the minutes of the EGM on 30 April 2009 (Appendix 2) contrary to the good practice demonstrated in other FGB meetings, one declaration of non-financial interest was made by the Chair of Governors in relation to a member of his family being affected by the outcome of the discussion and that he would therefore not participate in the vote at the conclusion of the meeting. No other declarations of financial or non financial interest were made. Some members of the LT attending the FGB would have been aware of the existence of the "honorarium" for key members of the LT. Therefore the decision not to table full information, and then not to disclose potential conflicts of interest, could be considered to be inappropriate and not in accordance with relevant codes of conduct which reflect the "Nolan Principles of Public Life", particularly in relation to "openness".
- 3.18 The recorded voting is not by name, but by numbers only. The decision to accept the extra class was recorded in both sets of minutes as being by 11 votes to 0 in favour, with 3 abstentions (one of which could be considered to be the Chair of Governors, given the

declaration noted in 3.17 above). Therefore, it would appear that of the four LT members present, at least two members voted for the acceptance of the class.

Decision on Disbursement of the funding termed as an “Honorarium” by the Council and Declarations of Financial Interests at the time of these decisions

- 3.19 No decisions on the disbursement of the "honorarium" were made until the FGB meeting in November 2009 (Appendix 9) where it was decided that the matter be discussed/decided by a joint meeting of Staffing and Finance Committees. The minutes state “The Declaration of Financial Interest Form was signed with 'NIL' returns by all Governors present”. The Headteacher, the former Deputy Head and the Business Manager were all present at this meeting.
- 3.20 The joint meeting referred to at 3.19 above took place on 14 December 2009. The minutes of this meeting are confidential, and not on the School website but Audit have sighted a copy (Appendix 10 Exempt). It is minuted that the 'Declaration of Financial Interest Form' was signed with 'Nil' returns by Governors, except for the Headteacher, the former Deputy Head and the School Business Manager. The minutes refer to the Chair of Governors outlining the regulation for withdrawing and indicate that the Headteacher, Deputy Head and the School Business Manager left the meeting whilst this item was discussed and the vote taken.
- 3.21 The Chair of Governors makes reference during the meeting to papers previously circulated which refer to "Distribution of additional LA Funds following expansion of reception group for September 2009." Audit have obtained a copy of a report written by the Headteacher headed "Strictly Confidential - Read Only - School Proposal Dec 09" (Appendix 11 Exempt) which sets out the three potential options for the use of the “honorarium” as outlined by the Chair of Governors' in the minutes of this meeting. The paper states that the LA negotiated a new building, a formula capital sum of £150,000 and an allowance of £30,000 for two years and £3,000 for year one, total £63,000 to recognise the revised workload of the LT resulting from the increased class numbers.
- 3.22 The paper sets out three options for the use of the other allowance (being the “honorarium”) and states “the Governors have options

round distribution of this sum but must not deploy the money for other purposes. It was clearly designed principally for the work of the Head, Deputy Headteacher and Business Manager, who took on the work and challenging responsibility and accountability, both initially and in the long term with elements for others where appropriate. It should be distributed therefore accordingly.”

- 3.23 The act of declaring a financial interest, and withdrawing from the meeting, has not been minuted as happening on previous occasions when the "honorary" was discussed, in particular the EGM of 30 April 2009.
- 3.24 At the end of the meeting of the 14 December 2009, a vote was taken by the governors on the options presented in the report which resulted in “the decision to adopt Option 3.” It is important to note that the Headteacher, Deputy Headteacher and School Business Manager were minuted as not present for the vote (Appendix 10 Exempt)
- 3.25 The Option 3 proposal resulted in the Governing Body re-banding the Headteacher Group from 4 to 5 with effect from 1 September 2009. As a consequence the Individual School Range (ISR) also increased. The decision was presented to the FGB meeting on 4 March 2010 and following discussion was accepted.

School Group Size for the Formula Allocation

- 3.26 The Schools Finance (England) Regulations 2008, updated in 2010 & 2011 state that schools must be funded for each financial year on the basis of the previous January's Census. The full time equivalent of the pupil numbers per the Census are applied to the Key Stage Funding Units to determine the school group size and the associated formula allocation.
- 3.27 Internal Audit have established that for the financial years 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12 the school was classified as a Group size 4 for the purpose of the formula allocation.

Determination of the School's Headteacher Group Size

- 3.28 An ordinary school must be assigned to a Headteacher group in accordance with its total unit score which is based on pupil numbers per the most recent return of DfE.
- 3.29 Audit have calculated that in 2009 and 2010 (using the pupil numbers per the respective January census) the School would have been classified as a Group 4 School, regardless of any Special Educational Needs (SEN) Provision.
- 3.30 On the basis of the January 2011 census the pupil numbers are such that the School would become a Group 5 School for 2011/12 assuming Governors allocated the additional units for statemented pupils. If Governors had not allocated the additional units the School would have remained a Group 4 School.
- 3.31 The School has the ability to re-band the Headteacher Group for the purposes of determining the ISR, by up to two group ranges, but only where certain criteria are met, as follows;
- The criteria for re-banding a school are as follows;
- (a) the school is a school causing concern;
 - (b) if the maximum of the individual school range did not exceed the maximum of the head teacher group range, the relevant body consider the school would have substantial difficulty filling the vacant head teacher post; or
 - (c) if the maximum of the individual school range did not exceed the maximum of the head teacher group range, the relevant body consider the school would have substantial difficulty retaining the existing head teacher.
- 3.32 The only applicable option for Bishop Road School is recruitment and retention which is suggested in the report tabled during the Finance and Staffing Committee on 14 December 2009 (Appendix 14a) and is carried through in letters sent by the Chair of Governors to members of LT.
- 3.34 Where there is an expected change in the number of registered

pupils, the Governing Body can change the Group Size of the School to the appropriate group that would result after the expected change in numbers.

Financial Implications

3.35 From the evidence sighted by Internal Audit, five members of the Senior Leadership Team initially benefited from the decision referred to in paragraph 3.25. The summary below sets out the salary changes for the two most senior officers:

- For the two years prior to 2009/10 the Headteacher was paid at the equivalent of L29, approximately £3,500 above the maximum of her substantive grade of L27. These payments were in accordance with nationally prescribed conditions and approved by the Governing Body.

The Headteacher anticipated that payment at this level would have continued in 2009/10, but following the increase in the ISR agreed by the FGB in March 2010, payment was made at L31 to reflect increased responsibilities, performance and retention, an increase of approximately £3,500 above L29.

- The Lead Deputy Headteacher's increased by £6,000 in both 2009/10 and 2010/11 up to the point in which he was seconded to another Bristol School. ISR L18 - L22.

However, there has been an overall reduction in the members of the LT, due to staff leaving, promotions and some posts being deleted. This has reduced the overall salary cost for the Leadership Team in 2011/12.

Capital Funding

3.36 Additional funding was allocated in accordance with the Council's letter of 22 April 2009, for the "necessary alterations to current accommodation and playspace to allow for the additional numbers" and was spent appropriately.

4. Conclusions

4.1 Conclusions for the Council and the School

- There was no financial impropriety by the Council or the School. Internal Audit found no evidence of fraud, dishonesty or improper financial benefit.
 - The Head or Members of her LT did not personally receive an “Honorary” in relation to the additional duties and responsibilities.
 - The Council offered and paid to the School budget £60,000 over 2 years and £3,000 for the 2009 Summer Term. The Council inappropriately termed this as an “honorary” for the Governing Body to distribute as they saw fit, despite the fact that an “honorary” is not permissible under the School Teachers Pay and Conditions Document (STP&CD). However, the Council took no steps to rectify the inappropriateness of its original offer of an “honorary”.
 - There was a valid case for the recognition of additional duties and responsibilities associated with the extra class.
 - The School was “re-banded” by the Governing Body in respect of the Headteacher Group, meaning it was re-categorised as a Group 5 School, from a Group 4, to recognise recruitment and retention issues and the increase in pupil numbers. This is within the powers of the Governing body and is not unusual. The School used the additional funding from the Council to meet the additional salary costs resulting from increased group size.
- There was a lack of transparency in decision making by the Council in the language it used i.e used the term “honorary”
- There was a lack of transparency in the decision making process. Best practice in decision-making requires transparency and the full disclosure of all relevant information. In the April 2009 FGB meeting, the FGB did not have all the relevant information when it took the decision. However, the decision of the Chair not to

disclose all of the available information was based on his impression that the Council wanted the information to be kept confidential.

5. Recommendations for the Council

The Council has already revised its policy on the support for schools taking additional classes but should revisit this policy to ensure it is comprehensive, and where necessary strengthen the requirements of the policy in relation to;

- (i) the availability, source of and criteria for allocation of additional funding; and
- (ii) clear definition of what is, and is not, permissible in relation to the recognition of additional duties and responsibilities by way of extra remuneration for teaching staff.

The Council should ensure that any correspondence issued is accurate and legal

CYPS should consider more guidance, support and training to all Governing Bodies to ensure that:

- the role of the FGB is clearly defined and understood and applies to all schools
- the management of its business is to a high standard with fully transparent and comprehensive reports being presented to enable Governors to challenge and evaluate proposals in an objective manner
- management of the agenda should require that full declarations of interest are sought and are fully recorded at each and every FGB and Committee Meeting

Other Options Considered

None necessary

Risk Assessment

None associated with this report, although failures in good governance

processes will mean that appropriate standards of transparency in decision-making are not achieved.

Equalities Impact Assessment

None required for this report.

Legal and Resource Implications

Legal - advice sought re Data Protection issues and other matters.

Resources - none arising from this report.

Appendices:

Appendix 1 - Council letter to School 22 April 2009

Appendix 2 - Minutes of School EGM 30 April 2009

Appendix 3 - Report to EGM 30 April 2009

Appendix 4 - FMSiS minutes of EGM 30 April 2009

Appendix 5 - Agreement between School and Council

Appendix 6 - FGB minutes of 21 May 2009

Appendix 7 - FGB minutes of 9 July 2009

Appendix 8 - FGB minutes of 24 September 2009

Appendix 9 - FGB minutes 26 November 2009

Appendix 10 (Exempt) - Minutes of School Finance with Staffing Committee
14 December 2009

Appendix 11 (Exempt) - Report to School Finance and Staffing Committee
14 December 2009

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Background Papers: Internal Audit Bishop Road School files



Gillian Powe
Headteacher
Bishop Road Primary School
Bishop Road
Bishopston
BRISTOL BS7 8LS

ask for: Kate Camplon
telephone: 0117 60 37900
Our ref: Bishop Road Primary 230400
e-mail: kate.camplon@bristol.cyp.gov.uk

22 April 2009

Dear Gillian,

Following our discussion yesterday evening regarding the extra class for reception children at Bishop Road Primary school in September 2009, can I confirm the following financial commitment of the Local Authority.

1. £39,122 will be added to the school budget for the period 1st September 2009 – 31st March 2010, to fund the extra children.
2. A temporary classroom, possibly a double classroom will be provided on the site at a location agreed with the school, unless ground conditions make this impossible.
3. £150,000 will be provided to make the necessary alterations to current accommodation and play space to allow for the additional numbers. The school will decide on how this money is spent, but this is the maximum available.
4. An honorarium will be added to the school budget for 2009/10 and 2010/11 of £30,000 per year to be distributed to key members of the leadership team who will take on the responsibility of maintaining standards at the school while expanding capacity to accommodate this one year group. This allocation is for the school to distribute.

I do hope this gives you enough confirmation to ensure the governing body can make an informed decision and I appreciate the time and effort you have put in to develop this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Camplon,
Service Director: Inclusive & Learning Communities

Cc: Mr Mark Worsley, Chair of Governors
Mr Michael Branaghan, Bristol City Council

~~CONFIDENTIAL - INFORMATION FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

P.O. Box 57
The Council House, College Green
Bristol BS99 7EB

Annie Hudson
Interim Strategic Director
- Children, Young
People & Skills



2004-2005
Housing Renewal
2005-2006
Promoting Fairness & Equality



AIMS



BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL

Website
www.bristol-cyps.org.uk

PO Box 57
The Council House, College
Green Bristol BS99 7EB

Craig Bolt
Service Director
Education Strategy and
Targeted Support

Website
www.bristol-cyps.gov.uk

Bishop Road Primary School - Agreed
FGB – 30th April 2009

**Bishop Road Primary School
Minutes of the Extraordinary Governors' Meeting
held on 30th April 2009**

Present:	
Mark Worsley (chair)	Julie Taylor
Richard Burbridge (left at 7.35)	Julie Chappell
Darren Jones	Khalid Khan
Franklin Morton (arrived at 7.15)	Gale Levingston
Simon Burch	Alex Kennard (left at 7.50)
Gillian Powe	Chris Shrimpton
Lucy Pow (LJP)	Lee Pajak (LP)
In attendance:	
Roger Paynter –clerk	
Apologies:	
Lee Pajak (LP)	

Item:	Action
<p>1. Introduction: MW thanked everyone for attending at short notice.</p> <p>He explained that there is a shortage of school places from September 2009 for children in the area, close to the school. He indicated that he wished to record a personal interest, as a member of his family was affected by the outcome of the discussion and that he would therefore not participate in the vote at the conclusion of the meeting. A meeting with council officers had been held last week, and the council needed an early response –hence the special meeting.</p> <p>The council is seeking additional places at Bishop Road and is willing to provide revenue for 30 children, two temporary classrooms (including toilets) and capital to make any other necessary alterations. The request was for this additional class to start in September, and to continue throughout the school life of this group. Extra classes are not anticipated in future years.</p> <p>As there is some urgency, there is no time to conduct a formal consultation, so it was agreed that it was particularly important that the Governors should identify and discuss any potential concerns likely to be raised by parents.</p>	
<p>2. GP explained that she had met with a group of parents affected, and recognised their concerns. 250 children were affected overall. She had discussed the issues with staff and considered the implications. She felt that it would be practical to accommodate the additional children, and that the financial support offered would mean that existing children would not be disadvantaged.</p> <p>MW read out two letters – one in support of taking additional children, one concerned about the impact of the additional children. He suggested that it</p>	

<p>would be a useful practical exercise to discuss all the concerns raised in the latter. He suggested that it was particularly important that the Governors considered detriment to other pupils when considering the proposal, on the basis that an extra class could not be justified if there was any educational detriment foreseen.</p>	
<p>3. CS asked if the impact could be tracked throughout the children's time in the school. It was felt that the impact could be managed, with additional classrooms and toilets provided in 'temporary' classrooms. A large proportion of the capital available would be used to improve play space. Additional staff would be brought in to manage the impact in the classroom, and on lunches and playtimes.</p>	
<p>4. There was concern that the additional children should be from within the school's local area. Assurances were given that this was the area of need.</p> <p>Questions were asked about whether the additional pupils would lead to overcrowding in classrooms or in KS1 generally. It was felt this could be managed. It was recognised that there would be a small impact on lunch arrangements, but this could also be easily managed. The kitchens would be able to cope with the additional numbers.</p> <p>It was suggested that the extra numbers could lead to congestion at the start and end of the day, but again it was felt this could be managed.</p>	
<p>5. Governors were assured that the capital funding was flexible over financial years, to ensure that there was time to plan and implement the changes. FM asked for an indication of the broad proportions of expenditure anticipated, so that he could envisage the potential benefits.</p>	
<p>6. The potential impact on extra-curricular activities was considered, as was the environmental impact of the additional classrooms. The governors were assured that the additional staff required could be recruited, and that it would be possible to link this with recruitment to other vacant posts, already underway.</p>	
<p>7. A vote was taken on the motion that 'the school should take a fourth class in reception from September 2009, subject to confirmation of the financial terms as currently indicated'. There were 11 votes in favour, with three abstentions.</p>	
<p>8. It was agreed that there was a need to manage the next steps, so that the interested parties were kept informed. MW would respond to the Bristol City Council. MW and GP would agree a joint letter to parents.</p>	<p>MW MW/ GP</p>

Date of next meeting: 21st May 2009 at 6.15pm

CONFIDENTIAL**Governors' Paper – Proposed Additional Class in Reception for 2009 / 10****Background:**

The LA has visited the school to request that BRS accept an additional intake of 30 reception children to support the local community with the problem of over-subscription of 300+ children in the Bristol area.

The SMT were keen to consider the LA's proposals to explore benefits to the school and in order to support the community.

The SMT commenced discussions focused on a basic premise: there should be no overall detriment to the existing children at BRS should any further children be accepted. For this to be ascertained, certain provisos required agreement:

- Building development is required: The addition of new structures and alteration to existing structures would be needed to cater for an additional 30 children both this year and for the duration of the 'bulge' year
- Additional funding for increased numbers must be provided enabling management to ensure educational standards are maintained and the new class can be resourced without drawing from existing school funds
- The character of the school should be maintained by drawing upon the existing catchment thereby maintaining a consistent demographic
- The local community should be the main beneficiary
- The LA would take a key role in publicising information sent to parents

The school will gain from supporting such a project by:

- Significant benefits to the existing school community enabled through an additional £150k capital spend. This funding, which is three times the entire annual building budget, will allow substantial and sought-after developments to be brought forward: the re-development of the Reception external garden and learning areas; refurbishment and enhancement of school halls affording greater learning space; and the purchase of much needed play equipment for N and R, which will support the delivery of the Foundation Stage curriculum for all children.
- A re-grading of the school in light of its increased size, which would support professional development and the recruitment and retention of high calibre staff, further establishing BRS as a beacon of success both within the city and nationally
- Improved facilities for the entire school: two additional classrooms placed on an underused site

To that end, the following has been proposed and is agreed in principle by the SMT/SLT:

- The LA will increase the intake number for 2009 / 10 to 120 pupils
- The children will be drawn from the existing locality
- The school will receive £39,122 to cover costs from September 2009 to 31st March 2010. From 1st April 2010, the school will receive funding on pupil numbers as usual.

- A temporary classroom, possibly a double classroom, will be provided on the site at a location agreed with the school, unless ground conditions make this impossible. *(The SMT would like assurance that they can decide upon the location and that a double classroom be guaranteed. Furthermore, all costs incurred in locating the double class would be absorbed by the LA and would be in addition to the £150k. School has found a suitable site that will further enhance playing and learning space and will not impact on the Silverthorne playground.)*
- £150,000 will be provided to make the necessary alterations to current accommodation and play space to allow for the additional numbers. The school will decide on how this money is spent. *(School also seeks assurance that the funding is paid in one lump sum, in addition to current financing and there be no time limit on its expenditure.)*

The following concerns have been raised:

- H&S of children leaving the school site – on a daily basis there can be a fluctuation of between 10 to 100 children out of school for sickness and holiday. Therefore the increase of 30 children would not make significant impact on departure.
- Management of the additional year group – this can be absorbed by the SLT through slight re-organisation. This happens on a yearly basis in any event.
- Pressure on school buildings – an additional classroom is already available. Additional funds would enable developments, which would be of benefit to all children and would not be possible without accepting new class
- Inclusion in school trips: school is required to organise trips for children on a class by class basis in most cases. So, the children would be invited over 4 rather than 3 days.
- Lunchtime pressure – the increase by one class would also allow the employment of additional lunchtime staff
- Playground pressure in the Boat playground. Flexibility of the use of the playgrounds would enable a greater flow and reduce pressure in key areas. Also, the development of the Reception garden area would also increase available space and off-set this pressure.

Conclusion:

The senior leaders of the school believe the benefits of this process significantly outweigh the deficits.

GA Powe
Tuesday, 28 April 2009

I Pajak

G Levingston

Bishop Road Primary School - Amended at FGB meeting of 21st May
FGB - 30th April 2009

**Bishop Road Primary School
Minutes of the Extraordinary Governors' Meeting
held on 30th April 2009**

Present:	
Mark Worsley (chair)	Julie Taylor
Richard Burbridge (left at 7.35)	Julie Chappell
Darren Jones	Khalid Khan
Franklin Morton (arrived at 7.15)	Gale Levingston
Simon Burch	Alex Kennard (left at 7.50)
Gillian Powe	Chris Shrimpton
Lucy Pow (LJP)	Lee Pajak (LP)
In attendance:	
Roger Paynter - clerk	
Apologies:	
Richard Holloway (RH)	

Item:	Action
<p>1. Introduction: MW thanked everyone for attending at short notice.</p> <p>He explained that there is a shortage of school places from September 2009 for children in the area, close to the school. He indicated that he wished to record a personal interest, as a member of his family was affected by the outcome of the discussion. A meeting with council officers had been held last week, and the council needed an early response - hence the special meeting.</p> <p>The council is seeking a additional places at Bishop Road and is willing to provide revenue for 30 children, two temporary classrooms (including toilets) and capital to make any other necessary alterations. The request was for this additional class to start in September, and to continue throughout the school life of this group. Extra classes are not anticipated in future years.</p> <p>As there is some urgency, there is no time to conduct a formal consultation, so it was agreed that it was particularly important that the Governor's should identify and discuss any potential concerns likely to be raised by parents.</p>	
<p>2. GP explained that she had met with a group of parents affected, and recognised their concerns. 250 children were affected overall. She had discussed the issues with staff and considered the implications. She felt that it would be practical to accommodate the additional children, and that the financial support offered would mean that existing children would not be disadvantaged. An honorarium has been offered to some key staff to reflect the additional workload, likely to arise. -</p> <p>MW read out two letters - one in support of taking additional children, one concerned about the impact of the additional children.</p>	

Bishop Road Primary School - Amended at FGB meeting of 21st May
 FGB – 30th April 2009

<p>3. CS asked if the impact could be tracked throughout the children's time in the school. It was felt that the impact could be managed, with additional classrooms and toilets provided in 'temporary' classrooms. Some of the capital available could be used to improve play space. Additional staff could be brought in to manage the impact in the classroom, and on lunches and playtimes.</p>	
<p>4. There was concern that the additional children should be from within the school's local area. Assurances were given that this was the area of need.</p> <p>Questions were asked about whether the additional pupils would lead to overcrowding in classrooms or in KS1 generally. It was felt this could be managed. It was recognised that there would be a small impact on lunch arrangements, but this could also be easily managed. The kitchens would be able to cope with the additional numbers.</p> <p>It was suggested that the extra numbers could lead to congestion at the start and end of the day, but again it was felt this could be managed.</p>	
<p>5. Governors were assured that the capital funding was flexible over financial years, to ensure that there was time to plan and implement the changes. FM asked for an indication of the broad proportions of expenditure anticipated, so that he could envisage the potential benefits.</p>	
<p>6. The potential impact on extra-curricula activities was considered, as was the environmental impact of the additional classrooms. The governor's were assured that the additional staff required could be recruited, and that it would be possible to link this with recruitment to other vacant posts, already underway.</p>	
<p>7. A vote was taken on the motion that 'the school should take a fourth class in reception from September 2009, subject to confirmation of the financial terms as currently indicated'. There were 11 votes in favour, with three abstentions.</p>	
<p>8. It was agreed that there was a need to manage the next steps, so that the interested parties were kept informed. MW would respond to the Bristol City Council. MW and GP would agree a joint letter to parents.</p>	<p>MW MW/ GP</p>

Date of next meeting: 21st May 2009 at 6.15pm

On 30th April 2009 the Governing Body of Bishop Road Primary School ("the school") resolved that the school would take one extra class at Reception level beyond the normal three form entry in September 2009 on the following conditions:

- (i) the adherence by the Local Authority to the financial commitment made on its behalf by Kate Campion (Service Director: Inclusive & Learning Communities) in her letter of 22nd April 2009 to Mrs. Gillian Powe (the "22nd April letter") (as amended orally thereafter at sub-paragraph 4 thereof to £33,000).
- (ii) The sum of £150,000 referred to at sub-paragraph 3 of the 22nd April letter (to be provided to make the necessary alterations to current accommodation and play space to allow for the additional numbers) will be paid by the Local Authority into the school's capital fund in such time as to make it possible for the school to make and fund all necessary alterations prior to the start of Term 1 in the 2009/2010 school calendar.
- (iii) There will be no "claw back" by the Local Authority of such amount of the £150,000 referred to in sub-paragraph (ii), above, as may remain unspent as at 1st September 2009 or at any time thereafter, nor any other time limit imposed on the school in relation to by when such sum is spent.
- (iv) The funding commitment set out in the 22nd April letter will not affect the formula funding received into the main school budget or the school's devolved capital funding either now or hereafter.
- (v) The Local Authority acknowledges that the decision by the school as set out above is a commitment to take a fourth Reception class in September 2009 only.

Signed: Anna Clark
(on behalf of Children and Young Persons Services,
Bristol City Council)

Bishop Road Primary School -
FGB - 21st May 2009

Bishop Road Primary School
Minutes of the Governors' Meeting held on Thursday
21st May 2009

Present:	
Mark Worsley (chair)	Julie Taylor
Richard Burbridge	Julie Chappell
Darren Jones	Khalid Khan
Franklin Morton	Gale Levingston
Richard Holloway	Alex Kennard
Gillian Powe	
Lucy Pow	
In attendance:	Lee Pajak (associate member)
	Roger Paynter - clerk
Apologies:	Chris Shrimpton

Item:	Action
1. Welcome / Apologies and declaration of pecuniary interest:	
2. Minutes of 2nd April 2009: The minutes of the last meeting were approved.	
3. Matters arising from the above: Progress on the proposed mission statement and the draft equality / diversity policy was discussed.	
4. Budget for 2009/10 : Copies of the draft budget had been circulated. The proposals were explained by the Bursar. The draft budget for 2009/10 is balanced. This would be achieved by making savings on non-pay budgets. The income for 2010/11 is a reasonably accurate prediction, but there may be significant pressures for 2011/12. Income for this year is not yet known and there may be an increase in pension costs for support staff. It was agreed that there was a need to maximize the carry forward to offset these anticipated future pressures. It was explained that the reduction in the budget for supply teachers was offset by an increase in the number of 'floating teachers' employed. It was noted that the budgets had been drawn up on the assumption that there would be no staff turnover (except for known leavers). The head explained that the impact was expected to be less than in some other schools, because of the limited middle management tier, and the steps taken to keep LSA costs down.	

<p>The draft budget was approved, with one abstention.</p>	
<p>5. Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 30th April 2009.</p> <p>The minutes were agreed, subject to amendments to the attendance – Richard Holloway had given apologies, and Lee Pajak was present. FM asked for more detail to be included in the minutes. MW stated that he had been asked to maintain confidentiality about the details of the proposals and the implications. He would discuss with the council what information could be made available to stakeholders. FM asked for this information to be made available with the minutes. The Head Teacher expressed her concerns about the implications of releasing too much detail – an element of trust was needed on this issue.</p> <p>A motion requesting publication of full details of the package on offer was rejected by 8 votes to 3. An alternative motion requesting that full details of the financial package should be made available to governors was approved (12 in favour, 1 against).</p> <p>MW referred to correspondence from parents, which indicated a strength of feeling, particularly from a group of parents identifying themselves as "the gardening group". was agreed that the Chair would send out a response on his return from holiday. It was suggested that the Buildings/Health and Safety Committee should be asked to review the siting of the temporary classrooms. Some governors felt that possible alternative locations for the temporary classrooms should be considered, in the light of the strength of concern expressed. Others felt that the objections had been anticipated when the original decision had been made, that the responses had come from a small minority of parents, and that the Governors should not revisit their decision. The Head explained the background to current use of the proposed site and the steps that could be taken to relocate or retain some of planting.</p> <p>There was a discussion about the possibility of arranging a meeting with parents to explain / discuss the proposals, and to review options for creating green space within the school. It was suggested that the Buildings Committee should be given delegated responsibility to find options for creating alternative 'green space'. MW felt there was already a commitment to re-create any green space lost, but others felt this had not been communicated sufficiently.</p> <p>Governors asked how to respond to questions from parents on this development. It was agreed that all communication should be through the Chair.</p>	
<p>6. Governor Self- Evaluation : A Presentation by Ian Caskie</p> <p>Mr. Caskie explained that governance is likely to have a higher priority in future OFSTED inspections. He said governors should be working with the Senior Leadership Team to drive improvement in the school. He suggested detailed actions could be considered by the Teaching and Learning Committee.</p> <p>Guidance is available at www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk. This identifies issues that school leaders have been asked to consider and questions to be considered by the governors.</p>	

Bishop Road Primary School -
FGB – 21st May 2009

He suggested that governors should seek information from many sources to get a variety of perspectives. He encouraged governors to see the school 'in action', not just attend meetings after school. GDS has a suggested questionnaire for governors. The next SEF visit is in June. The Chair will encourage other governors to attend.

There is an increasing expectation that governors will get involved in setting the direction for the school. Mutual trust and respect between governors and school leaders are essential. Governors are not judging the quality of teaching, but should decide what purpose each visit should focus on: e.g. how effective are classroom displays as prompts to learning? Findings from visits should be submitted to the SLT and made available for Ofsted visits.

Mr. Caskie suggested the governor visits should focus on school improvement priorities, rather than on subjects. He suggested 'Learning Walks' as a way of gathering evidence, and that governors should work with small groups from the school to develop their skills and knowledge. He suggested reports from sub-committees, rather than just minutes, to encourage debate on key issues in greater depth, and 'progress reports' from lead governors.

It was suggested that a 'Governor Effectiveness Group', perhaps consisting of the Chair and Chairs of the sub-committees, should be established to take forward the necessary improvements. Mr. Caskie indicated his willingness to attend.

Date of next meeting: 9th July 2009 at 6.15 pm

Bishop Road Primary School
FGB – 9th July 2009

**Bishop Road Primary School
Minutes of the Governors' Meeting held on Thursday
9th July 2009**

Present:	
Mark Worsley (chair)	Julie Taylor
Richard Burbridge	Julie Chappell
Darren Jones	Khalid Khan
Franklin Morton	Gale Levingston
Richard Holloway	Sally Brown (from item 4)
Gillian Powe	Chris Shrimpton
Lucy Pow (LJP)	
In attendance:	
Lee Pajak (LP) (associate member)	
Roger Paynter – clerk	
Apologies:	

Item:	Action
1. Election of Chair: As only one nomination for the post of Chair had been received, Mark Worsley was duly re-elected as Chair for one year.	
2. Welcome / Apologies and declaration of pecuniary interest: None	
3. Membership Changes : A letter of resignation had been received from Alex Kennard. Sally Brown was duly elected to the Governing Body as a Community Governor. The Chair reminded members that this was Simon Burch's last governors' meeting before his move to Stoke Bishop Primary as DHT and thanked him for his contributions over the last 6 years both to the school and the governing body.	
4. Minutes of 21st May 2009: It was agreed that approval of the minutes of 21 st May would be deferred to the next meeting.	RP
5. Matters arising from the above: Mission Statement : Khalid and Lee had met to discuss this. The views of the Senior Leadership Team would be sought, with a view to making a recommendation to the next FGB. Governor Effectiveness : The Chair indicated that he had discussed creating a programme of training with Ian Caskie based on the latter's recent	KK/LP

Bishop Road Primary School
FGB – 9th July 2009

attendance at an FGB meeting and that he planned to follow this up next term.

6. SATs results :

GP informed the governors that the SATs results, due to be published shortly, were excellent. The Governors wished to record their congratulations and thanks to the Senior Leadership Team and all involved.

7. Kate Campion / Mark Williams

The Chair welcomed Kate Campion, Programme Director, and Mark Williams, HR Specialist, from Bristol City Council to the Governors' meeting.

KC explained that the City Council will build a new school in Bishopston (near the County Cricket Ground), to open in September 2010. The site is only big enough for a one-form entry school. The school would have its own catchment area. The LA wished the governors of BRS to consider whether they would like to explore with the LA the proposition that the new school would be part of Bishop Road School. The Council needed a decision in principle by the end of this term. It was made clear that such a decision related at the moment purely to an exploration of the proposal and that it would not bind the Governors, who could in due course decide not to proceed with the idea. KC indicated that there were obvious benefits to the new school in being part of Bishop Road, given the very successful recent track record of Bishop Road in its management of a large number of pupils.

A number of questions were raised in discussion, including the financial allocations, the availability of more detailed information about the proposal (notes of the Cabinet discussion and copies of the planning application are available from the Council), the workload of the Senior leadership team and the budgetary arrangements. It was agreed that, if the Governors agreed to the link in principle, then more detailed plans would be worked up with the Leadership Team involved.

The Head said that the SLT supported the proposal, seeing it as an exciting professional opportunity, rather than an extra burden. Distributive leadership within the school would minimize the impact on work-life balance. The Governors were told that the local demographics would ensure that the additional places in the area would not reduce admissions to Bishop Road or affect the school's budget in the long term.

DJ and LP felt that the proposal was a valuable development opportunity and a considerable compliment to the current leadership team. LJP asked how communications with parents at Bishop Road should be managed. It was agreed that the proposal would be fully minuted in the usual way.

The Governors voted to accept the invitation of the LA to explore the proposition put forward by KC.

8. Head Teacher's Report

The Headteacher presented her report, which included the Annual Report to Governors and the SIP visit report. She was very pleased with the SATs results, which should maintain the school's position nationally at the high end of results for such testing. Maths results had improved substantially and the combined score of 95% was exceptionally high.

She highlighted the recent year group performances, which had been highly successful. However, she was disappointed that some parents did not send their children to participate in the Y 4/5 evening performances, which made her question whether it was appropriate to put on evening performances in future. Governors hoped it would be possible to continue them, as they benefited parents who could not attend during the day.

MW commented on the recent impressive presentations made to the SIP by phase leaders Pauline Pritchard, Darren Jones and Lee Pajak. He stressed how important it was not to lose sight of just how very good the school is and paid tribute to the level of expertise and professionalism in the SLT.

The induction visits for new pupils have been held this week – with very positive feedback from new parents.

There will be an INSET Day on Friday 11th September. Governors are encouraged to attend for the morning session.

9. Child Protection Report

This had been received.

10. Governor Committees

The minutes of the following governor committees were received without comment.

- Buildings Health and Safety - draft minutes of 15th June
- Teaching and Learning – draft minutes of 4th June 2009

FM drew attention to the draft minutes of the Staffing Committee held on 2nd March 2009. He reported that the committee was working with Bill Crocker (BCC) and the school's leadership team to take forward the issues arising from the last staff survey.

On Finance, (see draft minutes of 16th March 2009), GL presented the Outturn report (dated 25/06/09). She highlighted the changes arising from the additional reception class. Funds for additional places are expected to be received in September. These can only be spent as agreed with BCC.

11. Performance Management of HeadTeacher

Bishop Road Primary School

FGB – 9th July 2009

<p>It was agreed that MW, JC and RB would undertake this process on behalf of the Governors.</p>	
<p>12. Governor Training and Development</p> <p>LJP has prepared a list of training and development opportunities, which she will circulate.</p>	LJP
<p>Before the meeting ended, Simon Burch thanked the SLT for their support during his time at Bishop Road. He emphasised how very successful the current leadership of the school had been in improving the education of children at the school. The governors wished him success and happiness in his new post.</p>	RP

Date of next meeting: 24th September 2009 at 6.15pm

Bishop Road Primary School
FGB – 24th Sept 2009

Bishop Road Primary School
Minutes of the Governors' Meeting held on Thursday
24th September 2009

Present:	
Mark Worsley (chair) (MW)	Julie Taylor (JT)
Richard Burbridge (RB)	Julie Chappell (JC)
Darren Jones (DJ)	Khalid Khan (KK)
Franklin Morton (FM)	Gale Levingston (GL)
Richard Holloway (RH)	Lucy Pow (LJP)
Gillian Powe (GP)	
Carrie Stone (CS)	
In attendance:	
Lee Pajak (LP) (associate member)	Annie Hudson (Strategic Director – Children's Services)
Roger Paynter (Clerk)	Mick Brannigan (Service Manager – Capital Assets)
Apologies:	
	Chris Shrimpton

Item:	Action
<p>1. Welcome / Apologies and declaration of pecuniary interest:</p> <p>No pecuniary interests were declared.</p>	
<p>2. Minutes of 21st May and 9th July 2009:</p> <p>RP was asked to confirm that the correct version of the minutes of the meeting held on 30th April was on the website. The minutes of the meeting held on 21st May were approved, subject to an amendment to the item re. the gardening group.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 9th July were <i>not approved</i>. They will be presented again at the next meeting.</p>	RP
<p>3. Matters arising from the above:</p> <p>Mission Statement – Discussion on the mission statement was postponed to the next meeting.</p> <p>Governor Effectiveness – It was agreed that the February 2010 meeting would be set aside for governor development issues. LJP will arrange a pre-meet with chairs of sub-committees to agree issues and approach. The date to be agreed with Ian Caskie.</p> <p>Richard Holloway asked for a copy of the financial package referred to in the minutes. These were handed out. Governors were reminded that this information was confidential.</p>	LJP

Proposed 'Federated' School - A Briefing Note prepared by Bristol City Council was circulated. It was noted that this had not been circulated with the agenda, and that therefore an extra meeting might be required to consider it fully.

Annie Hudson explained the pressure to find school places in North Bristol, and the reasons for looking to Bishop Road School for help – in particular, their confidence in the team at Bishop Road to meet the Council's expectations. The proposal was for Bishop Road School to take on the new school at Brunel Field as an annex in the short to medium term, although the new school would be largely separate and self-contained. It was expected that the new school would be one-form entry from 2010, although two-form entry was possible in future years.

It was explained that there could be significant delays in completing the new school site, especially if planning approval was not agreed in October. In this case, the council would have to develop contingency plans. FM asked if the scheme remained financially viable in the light of current financial constraints. AH explained that annexing the new school to an existing school had a number of advantages, in particular the opportunity to work with existing and well-established management teams.

MW asked if the council required the approval of the Bishop Road Governors in order to proceed. AH stated that she had taken legal advice, and that it would be possible to proceed without the support of the Bishop Road Governors in certain circumstances.

In answer to a question from RH, Mr. Brannigan explained that there would not be time to establish the new school as a separate legal entity by September 2010, though this would be a possible option later. JC expressed concern about how publicity on this issue would be handled, and what effect the new school would have on the admissions process for Bishop Road. It was expected that children would be allocated according to distance from the school (taking into account the sibling rule), even though the annex was not a separate legal entity.

MW suggested that a special meeting to consider the issues be convened (it was agreed that this would take place on 8th October). The need to prepare questions/issues for consideration in advance of the meeting was agreed.

AH and MB then left the meeting. There then followed a discussion of the issues raised so far.

MW

It was noted that the Senior Leadership Team had had to dedicate an immense amount of time over the course of the Summer in dealing with the planning application for the temporary classroom block and the processes associated therewith. It had taken a great deal of time from their duties in running the day to day activities in running the school. Concern was voiced in contemplation of the further processes to be gone through should the

JC

<p>decision be taken to proceed with taking on the Brunel Field site as an annex.</p> <p>After due consideration the governors decided that a vote on the proposal should be taken immediately without waiting for the 8th October meeting. The governors resolved that the school should not continue any further with the proposal to take responsibility for the annex at Brunel Field.</p> <p>MW agreed to notify the council of the outcome of the governors' discussion.</p>	
<p>4. Appointment / re-appointment of Associate Governors</p> <p>Peter Waylett and Lee Pajak were re-elected as Associate Governors without objection.</p>	<p>RP</p>
<p>5. Membership of Sub-Committees and Appointment of named Governors.</p> <p>It was agreed that the committee structure would remain unchanged for 2009/10. It was agreed that LP would prepare guidance for governors who might be invited to attend hearings, and that RB would look at the appropriate roles for 'named governors'.</p> <p>The following appointments were agreed : Governor representative on the PTFA – Franklin Morton (Khalid Khan to deputise).</p> <p>Extended Schools – no change.</p> <p>Pay Committee – FM, LJP and CS.</p> <p>Named Governors and Year Group Reps – to be reviewed at the next meeting.</p>	
<p>6. Headteacher's Report</p> <p>GP reported that she is a member of a review group looking at possible changes in nursery education. The potential impact is not yet clear.</p> <p>The budget situation is likely to become more difficult, and the impact will be closely reviewed.</p> <p>She reported on schemes being developed in the school :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equipment in Nursery Playground – good progress Music Room – complete Library – complete Food technology – in use. Every class will use the room in Key Stage 2. The new classrooms are being used for science and dance. <p>LP reported some concern about the allocation of places in after-school clubs. It is proposed to review the process by January.</p> <p>It was agreed that the agenda item re. the Principle of Financing Trips should be adjourned to the next FGB.</p>	

Bishop Road Primary School
FGB – 24th Sept 2009

<p>Governors were pleased to hear that the SLT had agreed to continue camps for this year as they are hugely valued by the children and by the majority of parents. However, it was recognized that staff could not and should not be expected to risk their future livelihood if there were complaints about the conduct of school camps. It was recognized that staff attendance at school camps was voluntary.</p> <p>MW suggested that, in the light of a very lengthy complaint recently received which was made an extremely long time after the event, there should be a review of the complaints procedure, in particular as to whether complaints should be subjected to a reasonable time bar.</p> <p>Governors were encouraged to attend the special Christmas events. The Christmas market is to be held on 26th November (the same date as the next FGB)</p>	
<p>8) Programme of Future Meetings</p> <p>The programme of meetings for 2009/10 was circulated.</p>	

Date of next meeting: 26th November 2009 at 6.15 pm

Bishop Primary School

"Excellence enjoyed by all"

Full Governing Body Minutes

Thursday 26th November 2009

Name	Governor Status	Initials	Attended	Apologies	Absent
Mark Worsley	Chair - LEA	MW	X		
Carrie Stone	LEA	CSt			X
Richard Burbidge	Community	RB	X		
Chris Shrimpton	Community	CSh	X		
Sally Brown	Community	SB	X		
Julie Chappell	Parent	JC	X		
Julie Taylor	Parent	JT		X	
Ric Holloway	Parent	RH	X		
Khalid Khan	Parent	KK	X		
Frank Morton	Parent	FM	X		
Lucy Pow	Parent	LJP		X	
Darren Jones	Staff	DJ	X		
Gale Levingston	Staff	GL	X		
Gillian Powe	Head Teacher	GP	X		
Nick Kieboom	Staff	SP	X		
Lee Pajak	Associate	LP	X		
Stephen O'Shea	Clerk	SO	X		

1	Welcome	Action
1.1	MW welcomed Stephen O'Shea as guest Clerk Introduced and welcomed new Staff Governor Nick Kieboom (NK) NK agreed to join Buildings and Health & Safety Committee MW recorded thanks to Shelley – the Head teacher's PA for her hard work in helping with the production and distribution of the FGB documents.	
1.2	The Declaration of Financial Interest form was signed with NIL returns by all governors present.	
2	Chairs Items	
2.1	Target Setting for KS2 absence. Statutory requirement for all schools to set a target for absence. Target has to be higher than previous absence levels. Leadership Team propose that target for Bishop Road be set at 4%. Proposal discussed by Governors. Issues raised :- why not higher or lower figure; does 4% cover authorised and unauthorised absence (it does); will target be publicised to parents. (Yes - as part of school's commitment to work with parents to minimise absence) LP and GP explained rationale for 4% target. 4% target ratified by Governors GP to notify Local Authority	GP

Signed.....

Date.....

3 Previous Minutes		
3.1	Minutes of the 9 th July 2009 full governing body meeting were accepted by Governors and signed by MW as a true record.	
3.2	Minutes of the 24 th September 2009 full governing body meeting were accepted by Governors and signed by MW as a true record. Signed copy of minutes to be kept in School Office Signed copy of minutes to be sent to Governor Development Service	GL SO
4 Matters Arising		
4.1	<u>Mission Statement</u> – LP has looked at mission statements of other schools, read out examples – motto / vision / aims. The follow proposals for motto were made a. 'Enjoying excellence for all' b. 'Everyone enjoying excellence' c. 'Excellence enjoyed by all' C - 'Excellence enjoyed by all' was adopted by Governors.	
4.2	<u>Governor Effectiveness</u> – meeting needed in January or February 2010, will be attended by Ian Caskie (LA). MW will e-mail available dates to governors.	MW
4.3	<u>Principle of financing trips</u> – Governors agreed policy a while ago. Explained background Circumstances when parents not expected to pay (remissions). This year a small amount paid to parents on basis of 'hardship'. As a result of new legislation schools can no longer include staff costs in the cost of trips. Although the School recognised the importance of the Y5 and Y6 residential trips and fully supported them, a note of caution was sounded to the effect that given the inability of the School to attach the costs of replacement teaching staff to the cost of the trip, this might in the future affect their viability. Cost of covering absent staff needs to be met from school budget, approximately £6,000 has been covered for this school year. To be noted by governors. <u>Named Governors</u> Finance - Carrie Stone Literacy - Julie Chappell MW to ask Julie Taylor to be named Numeracy Governor.	All Governors MW
5 Head Teachers Report		
5.1	Previously circulated Gp added information about recent changes to OFSTED inspections called "Raising the bar". As well as focusing on school's achievement there is an increased focus on 'vulnerable' groups and data on individual children's progress. The initial results seem to show that schools being "downgraded". The 2 day inspections include ½ day examining safeguarding. Any gaps in CRB data will automatically reduce school's standing. This is part of the Government's 'Closing the gap' agenda where the focus is on underperforming groups. The increased work needed will impact on Management Team. Need to revisit the SEF (Self Evaluation From)	

	<p>Julie Chappell reported back to governors on meeting she attended with GP with SIP (School Improvement Partner)</p> <p>LP – difficult for school as <u>everyone</u> on premises during school hours needs to have CRB accreditation – there is a risk of alienating willing volunteers.</p> <p>GP asked for questions.</p> <p>FM asked if report could be in more accessible language or summary provided.</p> <p>RH raised lack of comparative data, the format assumes high level of knowledge in the reader.</p> <p>GP – ‘Raise on Line’ gives background information</p> <p>LP – will investigate who can access Raise on Line.</p> <p>Governors thanked GP for a detailed and comprehensive report.</p> <p>GP to consider if future reports could be in a different format, perhaps with a Key Point Summary supported by detailed appendices.</p> <p>Governors are welcome to meet Head teacher to be guided through the report. This report includes Analysis of last year’s performance data. Majority of time reports will be much shorter.</p> <p>RH offered services to access / analysis data.</p>	<p>LP</p> <p>GP</p>
6	Whether FGB meetings to be open or closed	
	<p>MW explained issues– asked governors for opinions.</p> <p>The Governors voted to have closed meetings.</p>	
7	Proposed arrangements in re. the Honorarium	
7.1	<p>Question of whether paying honorarium to teachers is legal.</p> <p>‘Honorarium’ is term used by the Local Authority, it is a sum of money provided by Local Authority in recognition of additional reception class.</p> <p>MW proposed that the matter be discussed/decided by joint meeting of Staffing & Finance committees.</p> <p>Finance committee will co-opt staffing members for the meeting which will be under Finance Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Agreed by Governors</p>	
8	Governor Committees	
8.1	Staffing – minutes and documents previously circulated.	
8.1.1	DJ emphasised the all embracing meaning of Equalities, Diversity and Community Cohesion Scheme. Linked to SDP (School Development Plan)	
8.1.2	Governors discussed – asked how this would monitored and how will we know it’s effective and being followed?	
8.1.3	MW referred to section on monitoring in the action plan.	
8.1.4	Governors thanked Lucy, Darren and staff for work on this project.	
8.2	Teaching & Learning – minutes and documents previously circulated.	
8.3	Finance – minutes and documents previously circulated.	

Signed-----

Date-----

8.4	<u>B H & S</u> – minutes and documents previously circulated. Committee minutes and recommendations accepted by Governors	
9	Budget Out Turn	
9.1	Should be provided by 4 December 2009. Local Authority(LA) agreed to defer return until after the December Finance Committee meeting. The out turn monitors expenditure against the annual budget. GL requested governors delegate the return of budget out turn to the LA to the Finance committee. Agreed by Governors.	
10	Christmas Events	
10.1	List circulated GP asked if governors could attend some events - if possible let school know so they can 'save you a seat'.	All Governors
11	Correspondence / DCFS / LA Items	
11.1	Thank you to Management and governors from parent who appreciated work done over the Summer.	
11.2	Complaint to DCFS (anonymous) about the school's decision to expand reception numbers. MW has replied to DCFS DCFS have replied that will not be taking any further action.	
12	Date of next meetings	
	7 December 2009 - Finance Committee 14 December - Finance/Staffing (5pm – item 7.1) 14 January 2010 - Full Governing Body	
13	Agenda items for next meeting	

Summary of Policies/Documents Recommended/Agreed at Meeting
(delete as appropriate)

Agenda Item	Policy/Document	Action
8.1	Capability Procedure	Adopted
8.1	Pay Policy	Adopted
8.1	Managing Change Policy	Adopted
8.1	Disciplinary policy	Adopted
8.1	Employee Grievance Policy	Adopted
8.1	Managing Attendance policy	Adopted
8.1	Appointment of Deputy Head	Agreed
8.2	Modern Foreign Language Policy	Adopted

Signed _____

Date _____