

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Strategic Governing Body of
Breakwater Academy and High Cliff Academy
Thursday 8th November 2018 @ 5pm at Breakwater Academy**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
Helen Hewitt (HH)	Co-opted STEP Governor (Chair)	Present
Cliff Robinson (CR)	Co-opted STEP Governor	Present
Helen Day (HD)	Co-opted STEP Governor	Present
David Laird (DL)	Co-opted STEP Governor	Absent
Zoe Griffiths (ZG)	Head Teacher, Breakwater Academy	Present
Becky Viner-Waite (BVW)	Staff Governor, Breakwater Academy	Present until 7.05pm
Ian Davey (ID)	Parent Governor, Breakwater Academy	Present
Abby Kilgarriff (AK)	Head Teacher, High Cliff Academy	Present
Becky Packham (BP)	Staff Governor, High Cliff Academy	Present until 7.05pm
Brendan Clemens (BC)	Parent Governor, High Cliff Academy	Present
Other Attendees		
Tim Mills (TM)	STEP Executive Head	Present
Mark Ducker (MD)	STEP CEO	Present until 7.05pm
James Hooper (JM)	STEP Director of Operational Services	Present until 7.05pm
Sally Franceschi (SF)	Deputy Head Teacher, Breakwater Academy	Present until 7.05pm
Chloe Parks (CP)	Assistant Head Teacher, High Cliff Academy	Present until 7.05pm
Aldona Kanadys (AKa)	Prospective Governor	Present until 7.05pm
Jackie Wales (JW)	Business Manager, BWA and HCA	Present until 7.05pm
Sarah Morgan (SM)	Clerk to the SGB	Present

<u>No.</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Action</u>
STEP First – We are all one Team		
1	<p><u>Welcome, Apologies and Housekeeping</u></p> <p>SM welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the new attendees; AKa, MD, JH, CP and ZG. No apologies had been received and it was noted that DL was absent.</p> <p>JW confirmed the evacuation procedures. SM highlighted the requirement to have a trained first aider and fire warden on the premises for all meetings. The Premises Manager was the fire warden and BP was a first aider.</p>	
2	<p><u>Quorum</u></p> <p>SM established that the meeting was quorate.</p>	
3	<p><u>Election of Chair and Vice-Chair 2018/19</u></p> <p>SM invited nominations / self-nominations for the position of Chair. CR proposed the re-election of HH, who was happy to stand. There were no other nominations put forward and HH was duly re-elected as Chair on a show of hands.</p> <p>HH invited nominations / self-nominations for the position of Vice-Chair. She proposed the re-election of CR, who was happy to stand if there were no other interested parties. There were not and so CR was duly re-elected as Vice-Chair.</p>	
4	<p><u>Declaration of Pecuniary Interests and/or Conflict of Interests</u></p> <p>There were no interests declared by those present regarding agenda items.</p>	

5 **STEP Governance / SGB Membership**

Purpose and remit of SGBs

MD thanked those governors who had attended the recent STEP Ahead training sessions. Good feedback had been received and a briefing paper produced which summarised the feedback (circulated). The sessions had focused on the need for clarity for roles and responsibilities within the broader governance structure at STEP. The organisation had evolved and there was a need to avoid the replication of duties. There had been some concerns voiced by governors however, that their role no longer held any value. But all agreed that standards was the key role to focus on for local governance and that safeguarding must also sit locally. Governors also recognised issues with communication and stakeholder engagement.

Changes needed to be captured accurately in the Scheme of Delegation with transition taking place over the next two terms for full implementation in September. Finally, MD stated that he would plan to attend each SGB meeting once a year.

HH invited comments from governors and the following points were made:

- HD - The SGB was not effective anymore as responsibilities had changed. Knowing the role was so important and this had not been clear. As standards was the key area, perhaps monitoring responsibilities could be divided amongst governors?
- CR - Although finances were managed centrally, resourcing was still an important issue for governors, who had had no input into the budget setting last year. MD acknowledged that the central team had grown and good quality information was needed by governors. But how much? The decisions were taken elsewhere. JH did add that governors could focus on, how is the budget being delivered?
- HH - Responsibilities needed re-defining. HH felt that there was still some value in having a finance nominated governor; they would be a communication link between the locality and the central team. There could also be, for instance, a group of safeguarding governors set up, to meet, network and train together
- ID - Role descriptions would lay the foundations to being effective. Although finance decisions were made at executive level, local level must have an input
- MD – Forums / networks could be created but there may need to be academy specific roles
- HH – The Chairs and Vice-Chairs in East Sussex were planning on meeting to network
- AK – Standards and the curriculum really needed to be understood and analysed by governors
- HH – It was more important for Ofsted, to reference things you've seen in school rather than a paper you've read. HH urged governors to get to know their schools well to have impact
- AK – Ensure that meetings were dove-tailed to governor visits. This had not happened yet
- BVW – Staff were so used to different visitors coming in and out of their classrooms. This was embedded and so governors would be welcome too
- BP – Some staff didn't know the governors so it was important to be in school if possible. ZG added that the pupils needed to know who governors were also

Finally, HH concluded that the structure of STEP had changed. Different challenges and questions needed to be raised by governors now but they would be better focused overall.

SGB membership

AKa was welcomed as a prospective governor and she introduced herself; she had a son at HCA and was a Trustee and Treasurer for a local voluntary Saturday pre-school. She had local business links and was interested in becoming a governor and seeing the schools evolving. HH noted that it was a good reflection on the schools that people were interested in becoming governors and it would be good to forge links with the local community.

Skills Audit

A Skills Gap Analysis Report had been circulated and SM asked all those who had not yet completed

	<p>their skills audit on The Trust Governor, to do so – it was a simple process. HH added that she was currently undertaking a Chair’s Development course and may need some input from governors at some stage.</p> <p><u>Lead Governor roles</u></p> <p>Whilst the Scheme of Delegation was under review, the following appointments were approved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding / CLA Governor – Helen Day • Finance Governor – Cliff Robinson • Standards Governor – Brendan Clemens • SEND / Inclusion Governor – Ian Davey • Pupil Premium Governor – Becky Packham • Academy Website Monitoring Governor – Becky Viner-Waite 	ALL
6	<p><u>STEP Board of Trustees Update</u></p> <p>Governors had received the termly update and noted the recent STEP Policies approved by Trustees. MD stated that this report may just be circulated in future rather than an agenda item. There were no questions.</p>	
7	<p><u>Community Engagement</u></p> <p>Governors had received a briefing paper and JH explained the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When STEP arrived in East Sussex, work was needed on branding as STEP were unknown, in an area not heavily academised • Stakeholders may not understand the STEP set-up so this needed development • A parent survey had been carried out and there had been strong PUPAC responses • Two key risks were pupil numbers and Ofsted Parent View • If parents felt engaged with the Trust, it was easier to take them on the journey • HCA had received great results in the summer. BWA had received good results but there was still work to do. SGBs needed to be focused on standards and outcomes, holding Head Teachers to account, being a critical friend • Noted that the Hailsham Academies were undertaking a joint pupil recruitment drive, working collaboratively • Governors could be key in talking to the community, to get the message out there <p>The following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was very important to challenge misconceptions by parents. Breakwater still had a bad reputation from its days as Meeching Valley • We need to know what STEP’s branding is and how we engage? Was there a Communication Policy? JH showed HH this on the websites • Governors should promote the STEP Standard to get the message across • Many pre-school parents did not even know about Breakwater • Could the survey results be shared? JH agreed to circulate these 	JH
STEP Way – We agree to do things like this		
8	<p><u>Safeguarding</u></p> <p>Safeguarding was covered in the Head Teacher Reports. But HD had checked the SCRs and both were compliant apart from a few tweaking errors. HD had met with AK that day to discuss specific families and she was due to meet with ZG the following week. AK confirmed that all PTA members were DBS checked. SM sent round a list for governors to sign to say that they had read and understood the updated KCSIE September 2018 document. She also confirmed that all governors were up-to-date with safeguarding training.</p>	

9	<p><u>Admissions 2020/21</u> Trustees were currently considering bringing in year admissions for the year 2020/21, in house, instead of using ESCC. AK explained that this would make the process easier for schools and also save money. A central computer system would be used.</p>	
STEP Up – We all succeed together		
10	<p><u>Breakwater Educational Standards</u> Copies of the Head Teacher Report and a Standards Visit Report had been previously circulated and ZG invited questions.</p> <p>Q – Were the targets safe or aspirational? A – They were aspirational but needed to be high. They were based on Year 5 data and teacher assessment and would be reviewed in January. Noted that four new pupils had joined in Year 6. Additionally, there were a large number of home school children in the area, which ESCC were not grasping</p> <p>Q – The Standards Adviser had not agreed with the school’s assessment of ‘2’? A – TM explained that the Adviser had visited again that day and her current evaluation was now a ‘2’. TM pointed out that Breakwater had been graded 4 in the summer, 3 at the last visit in October and now 2 (High Cliff was graded 1). This was a rapid and significant improvement. ZG invited governors to come in and see the school in action</p> <p><u>Summer results</u> The results had now been validated and the tables would be published in the first week of December.</p> <p><u>Academy Improvement Plan</u> ZG to forward the AIP to SM for circulation, noting and any comments.</p>	ZG/SM
11	<p><u>Breakwater Financial Management</u> A confidential minute was taken for this item.</p>	
12	<p><u>High Cliff Educational Standards</u> Copies of the Head Teacher Report had been previously circulated and AK highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last half-term, one member of staff had left and one had been recruited. This had very little impact on the pupils • HCA were currently carrying one family ‘missing in education’. This had an impact on the attendance figures <p>AK invited questions.</p> <p>Q – Was there any news on the roof works? A – JH reported that a temporary solution used at High Cliff and Burfield (same roof, same problem) had not worked. Burfield’s had then been repaired over the summer and High Cliff’s would be completed next summer. JH was in the process of agreeing an SLA for remedial work in the meantime (patch as and when required). The work would be carried out by the actual company who designed it, not sub-contracted out. They have re-designed it themselves and completed at Burfield. JH had made it very clear the impact it was having and how dissatisfied they were.</p> <p><u>Academy Improvement Plan</u> AK to forward the AIP to SM for circulation, noting and any comments.</p>	AK/SM
13	<p><u>High Cliff Financial Management</u> A confidential minute was taken for this item.</p>	

	ZG stated that ESCC could not force her to accept the child as Breakwater was an Academy. However, HH felt it may be better to accept this one. BC added that, although he understood the reasons for refusal, we should be providing education for pupils. BP also pointed out that we wanted positive comments made about the school.	
18	<p><u>Meeting Impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful discussions on the way forward for SGBs • Useful discussions on community engagement • HD completing a safeguarding audit • Agreeing visits to get to know the schools better 	
19	<p><u>Meeting Dates</u> The SGB would next meet on Thursday 7th February @ 5pm at High Cliff. The meeting dates for 2018/19 had been circulated.</p>	
20	<p><u>Publication of Minutes</u> The financial items would be recorded as confidential (Part B).</p>	
21	<p><u>Confidential Matters</u> MD, JH, JW, CP, SF, BP, BVW and AKa left the meeting at this point (7.05pm) and a confidential minute was taken for this item.</p>	

The meeting closed at 7.15pm.
SM 131118

Summary of Action Points

<i>Agenda Item</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Owner</i>
5	<i>Governors to complete skills audit on TTG</i>	ALL
7	<i>JH to circulate parent survey results</i>	JH
10	<i>ZG to send AIP to SM for circulation</i>	ZG/SM
12	<i>AK to send AIP to SM for circulation</i>	AK/SM
14	<i>ZG to pass on ID's thanks for the Governor Day</i>	ZG
14	<i>SM to arrange Governor Day before Christmas</i>	SM
16	<i>AK to provide a report at the next meeting on the impact of investment on the learning environment</i>	AK

Signed as a true and accurate record of the meeting	
Chair's Signature	
Chair's Name	
Date	