

**MINUTES OF MOORCROFT SCHOOL LOCAL GOVERNING BODY (LGB)
BUSINESS MEETING**

Non Confidential Minutes for the Business Meeting
Held in the Staff Room at Moorcroft School
on Thursday 10th March 2016 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Present:

Margaret Bird	MB	Governor	Chair
Andrew Sanders	AS	Governor	Head of School (HoS)
Collette Stone	CS	Governor	Moorcroft Representative on Board of Directors
Andrew Irving	AI	Governor	Teacher
Debbie Wiseman	DW	Governor	Moorcroft Representative on Finance Committee and Vice-Chair
Mike Wisgard	MW	Governor	
Phil Haigh	PH	Governor	Director
Jane Essex	JE	Observer	Potential Governor (from 8:10 p.m.)
Carey Philpott	CP	Clerk	

The meeting was declared quorate.

Item	Discussions and Decisions	Action
46/2015-16	Welcome MB welcomed everyone to the Moorcroft Business meeting.	
47/2015-16	Apologies of Absence Toni Moore (TM) and Kam Parmar (KP) had sent their apologies, which the governors accepted. Lisa Hatcher (LH) did not attend.	Apologies Accepted for TM & KP. Non attendance by LH.
48/2015-16	Declaration of Interests No new declaration of interests were declared.	

Item	Discussions and Decisions	Action
49/2015-16	<p>Approval of minutes of the last meeting 26th November 2015</p> <p>Item 25b/2015-16 should read: 'A cardboard tree with the old Moorcroft logo will be removed, as the logo has changed.'</p> <p>Otherwise both the non-confidential and confidential minutes of the last GB Business meeting were AGREED as an accurate record and duly signed, each page initialled by MB.</p>	Minutes AGREED
50/2015-16	<p>Matters arising from the previous meeting</p> <p><i>Item 24/2015-16:</i> The school is still waiting to hear about the outcome of the capital bids for the leaking roof and perimeter fence. MB has written to Sudhi Pathak (SP) to say that a new perimeter fence is needed to reduce the risk of a particular pupil escaping. Governors were very concerned about the risk of the outcome if the pupil escapes and questioned whether it is on the risk register. AS replied that the student is on the pupil risk assessment register, and he will speak to SP in case the bid is unsuccessful.</p> <p><i>Item 25/2015-16:</i> MW asked why Health and Safety (H&S) is not an agenda item for this meeting. AS said that H&S had been included in his HoS report sent to governors and that governors were asked to table questions by email. MW asked why the minutes of the H&S management group had not been circulated. AS pointed out that they were in fact distributed with the agenda. MW would like the governors to have greater involvement in H&S decisions. AS explained that a governor representative was still needed on the H&S group. MW or any other governor would be welcome to join.</p> <p><i>Item 27 b /2015-16:</i> MW asked if AS would be reporting back on his Absence Management review. AS explained that the report was now complete and had been shared with directors and Heads of School. JA and AS had agreed to meet and discuss how the report would be rolled out across the academy. The report was a detailed one and there was not space in the present meeting to do justice to it, due to a full agenda.</p>	AS to speak to SP about health and safety risk of one pupil escaping and need for perimeter fence.
51/2015-16	<p>Items for Any Other Business</p> <p>None.</p>	
52/2015-16	<p>Finance</p> <p>1. Mid year budget update:</p> <p>a) The written report had been sent to governors the afternoon of the meeting. MW asked if the report could be provided to the governing body in advance so governors could be prepared to</p>	

Item	Discussions and Decisions	Action
	<p>raise questions about it at the meeting. AS will feed this back to SP.</p> <p>b) Governors noted that there was an £89k variance between the cost and the capital funding of the boiler replacement. They were told that the Asset Management Committee will prioritise where there is the most need for capital funding across the academy, and will decide where to spend any surplus. MB told governors that she had not been to an Asset Management Committee meeting for some time, as she missed a meeting in 2015 and apologies were sent on her behalf. Therefore AS will stress to SP that the perimeter fence should be a priority as there is a high risk.</p> <p>c) MW asked why expenditure on building repairs was so low. He felt that the budget for capital repairs should be doubled. CS is of the view that there is little room to adjust the budget due to staffing costs. PH supported this view.</p> <p>d) MW asked about the impact on the reduction in pupils which will affect revenue. AS replied that if Moorcroft has a surplus of TAs, they may be able to move to the Grangewood class at Moorcroft. Another pupil was taken on today, now there are 65. In September, 67 are expected, possibly more. Hillingdon is introducing a banding system and it is important to ensure children will be placed in the right bands. He will be meeting with SP before the budget is finalised to ensure that the LA are made aware of the staff allocation needed for all pupils.</p> <p>e) From the budget monitor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. AS highlighted that Education Support Staff has an underspend of £17k due to vacancies, but Non-Teaching Supply has an overspend of £29k because agency staff are used to cover the vacancies. PH asked about the quality of the agency staff. AS said that a number of TAs were of very high quality and the school always tried to keep them as long as possible. One TA has already joined the school having being employed through a teaching agency. Another high quality TA had not applied for a permanent job and would be replaced once the position has been filled. ii. MW wanted to know more about the £8k underspend on IT. AS replied it is earmarked for the new ICT support tender which was now complete. 	<p>AS to stress to SP that perimeter fence is a priority.</p>

Item	Discussions and Decisions	Action
	<p>iii. PH asked about the Educational Psychologist expenditure. Why is there any spend when support from the LA would be free of charge? AS responded that Moorcroft takes the free support from the LA in addition to the Educational Psychologist employed across the academy. She understands the needs of Moorcroft pupils and knows them well. Her role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. tracks pupils falling behind (some pupil premium funds are used for this) and b. works with pupils who have particularly challenging behaviour. <p>AS explained that the school was overspend on the Educational Psychologist budget. This was due to the increased needs of the pupils this year. However, the Educational Psychologist work has a very high impact and structures were in place to successfully support pupils whose placements were in danger of breaking down.</p> <p>2. Finance Committee Update</p> <p>DW said the last time the Finance Committee had met was in February. Ideally Moorcroft want around 70 pupils. Risks are linked to numbers of pupils being too low and levels of top up fees.</p>	
53/2015-16	<p>Focus: Recruitment and Retention</p> <p>(i) What is already happening</p> <p>AS gave a Powerpoint presentation (attached) on where the school is now and what it is doing in terms of recruitment and retention. He invited governors to discuss.</p> <p>Jane Essex (JE) arrived 8:10 p.m.</p> <p>(ii) Formulating an action plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Governors questioned why Moorcroft is not lobbying or attracting NQTs? How can the school attract teachers into SEN? MW stated that Moorcroft's flyer, advertisements and job specification are not attractive in terms of language used. What do potential teachers want? This should come out with strong Unique Selling Points. The website should highlight what potential teachers want to see and funds should be spent so that the website can be found by those searching the web, so that Moorcroft's adverts appear on page one. The key is what to include in the advertisement and where the link goes when searching 	

Item	Discussions and Decisions	Action
	<p>for a job. AS agreed that the materials should focus more on what candidates would like to see and requested MW's help. MW said that he felt that this was the schools role, but would be prepared to assist once final documents were produced^[AS1]. MW said that now it is necessary to consider locations to advertise.</p> <p>ii. PH said the other issue is that candidates are being headhunted before the advertisements have gone out. Some schools talk to teaching students before they qualify. All good NQTs are picked up whilst training or by people visiting colleges. JE, as a PGC tutor at Brunel, was asked for her advice. JE stated that it is difficult for potential students to obtain school experience in the London area, prior to starting a PGCE course. A condition for pre course registration is 10 days work experience in schools. JE proposed that serious student applicants are offered 3 days voluntary work at Moorcroft. The school would then know the students and could remain in touch. JE would welcome this and Brunel would be willing to endorse candidates.</p> <p>iii. JE suggested that the literature could offer candidates opportunities to be creative, to work with students in a personalised way, be part of a 'family' with few pupils and get to know the children well. It would appeal to some candidates, especially those who do not want to work in a large Comprehensive school. Some literature should include information about complex needs and difficulties. In addition, the job at Moorcroft would have prospects, with opportunities across the academy. It is important to find the unique match between candidate and job.</p> <p>iv. CS asked whether strategically Moorcroft should become a headhunting school to attract staff. If that is the aim, then ideas should be harvested like attending fairs and inviting potential teaching students for 3 days. Does Moorcroft have the resources to do this and does it have the expertise on site? AS responded that this has been discussed by the Head of School group. John Ayres and Nick White have started talks with universities. Moorcroft does not have the resources, but the academy does, and it would be possible to have a joint recruitment drive. AS believes the best way forward is to discuss the LGBs suggestions with JA and Heads of School. They could then take a cross academy approach to teacher</p>	<p>AS to redraft job ads and share with governors to comment.</p>

Item	Discussions and Decisions	Action
	<p>recruitment. MW disagreed and felt that AS should focus on recruitment for Moorcroft. AS pointed out that a more successful recruitment drive could take place if we used the resources available across the academy. For example, Denise Coles has already begun talks with teacher training providers.</p> <p>v. DW proposed that recruitment is raised at a team meeting at Moorcroft because staff may have a lot to offer. Until teachers know what it is like to work in a SEND school, they may not wish to work there. AS considered asking at a teachers meeting, what attracted the teachers to the job?</p> <p>vi. MW suggested that parents are told that the school is looking for people, as they may have useful contacts.</p> <p>vii. PH asked if the school is fully staffed with teachers directly employed. AS replied not, there is a teaching vacancy and maternity cover, which are both covered by supply. No teachers have left in the last year, but it has not been possible to fill the teacher vacancy with a full time member of staff. PH noted that there is no budget heading for recruitment at Moorcroft.</p> <p>viii. AS thanked governors for their ideas and suggestions. The first step will be to write an action plan.</p>	<p>AS to write action plan, taking discussion into account.</p>
54/2015-16	<p>Ratification of Health and Safety Policies</p> <p>Governors had been asked to send comments to AS before the meeting. AS had not received any, so the policies were RATIFIED.</p>	<p>Health and Safety Policies RATIFIED.</p>
55/2015-16	<p>Urgent Items from Full GB Meeting, Board of Directors</p> <p>CS highlighted that the LGB has the ability to influence upwards. AS had presented to the board his research on absence management. Directors had taken his recommendations on board, and requested regular data in the future. AS will feed back to the LGB at a later date. CS requested that when he does he focuses on what his research reveals about Moorcroft.</p>	
56/2015-16	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>Moorcroft Meetings: PH and MW were unhappy with the limit of 1.5 hours time limit. They stated that this had not been agreed at a board meeting. AS stated that this was a decision made at a meeting convened by the CEO with all the LGB chairs across the academy. He had discussed this at a recent meeting with the both</p>	

Item	Discussions and Decisions	Action
	<p>Moorcroft Chair and the Moorcroft director and they were in agreement that the time limit was adhered to. PH stated that they give up their time freely and it is reasonable to allow time to answer his questions. AS stated that he is happy to discuss the length of the meetings privately, but this evenings meeting was not the appropriate forum.</p> <p>CS commented that culturally important questions are raised by governors, but they often are not picked up as the meeting moves on before they can be addressed. CS requested a standing item on the agenda of questions to raise with the board.</p> <p>MW wanted to know who decided on this meeting's agenda and to spend 45 minutes discussing teacher recruitment. AS explained that this had been a joint decision between him, MB and CS. MW felt other governors had not been consulted on this. MW feels that shorter presentations are needed as they take up a large part of the meeting and there is less time for discussion and decision making about issues such as finance.</p>	<p>Standing item on agenda of questions to raise with BoD.</p>
57/2015-16	<p>Dates of meetings next academic year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Thursday 21st April 2016 FGB</i> • <i>Thursday 16th June 2016 Business</i> 	

Meeting closed at 9:00 p.m.

There are no confidential minutes for this meeting.