



**THE PINNACLE SCHOOLS FEDERATION**  
 Minutes of the Full Governing Body meeting  
 Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2021, 7pm. Via Microsoft Teams



NAME	Abrv	STATUS	Present	NAME	Abrv	STATUS	Present
Jill Bendeaux	JB	Foundation – Hawkesbury	✓	Deb Marriage	DM	Co-opted	✓
Ellie Blanch	EB	Co-opted(Chair)	✓	Charlotte Murphy	CM	Parent Elected	✓
Alec Bryant	AB	Co-opted	✓	Mike Riches	MR	Executive Headteacher	✓
Ben Clarke	BC	Co-opted	✓	Jo Strange	JS	Foundation Iron Acton	✓
Iona Cooper	IC	Parent Elected	✓	Rob Taylor	RT	Co-opted	✓
Adam Dinham	AD	Foundation – Iron Acton	✓	Tom Wilmers	TW	Associate	✓
Sarah Godsell	SG	Local Authority	✓	Christine Wilson	CW	Staff Elected	✓
Ken Hull	KH	Co-opted	✓	Vacancy		Hawkesbury Ex-officio	
Kathryn Kempster	KK	Co-opted	✓	Kate Bashford	KB	Clerk to Governors	✓

✓ = Attended, **A** = Absent with Apologies, **X** = absent no apology

**Meeting Opened: 19.00**

<b>1</b>	<p><b>Welcome</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EB welcomed everyone to the meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Apologies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No apologies received.</li> </ul> <p><b>Quorum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The meeting was quorate.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Declaration of Pecuniary and Business Interests</b></p> <p>None declared.</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Minutes from Previous Meeting</b></p> <p>Minutes from 1<sup>st</sup> February were reviewed and agreed.</p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p>Governors to feed monitoring evidence and informal feedback, including for the SEF, into log collated by KB – reminder that this ongoing and evidence can be submitted at any time. <b>Action ALL</b></p> <p>All actions have been completed or are discussed later in these minutes.</p>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Headteacher’s Report</b></p> <p>The HT report had been shared in advance of the meeting on Teams and questions submitted by Governors. Responses to questions were also shared on teams in advance of the meeting. The Governors acknowledged that the report was very thorough. MR asked if there were any additional questions. The format of the report had changed and MR asked for feedback on the revised format as well as on the content.</p> <p>It was asked if Governors would prefer less content in the Headteacher’s report as this could lead to more challenges and questions. But it was agreed that challenges were being raised where necessary: the practice of asking and answering questions in advance has come about as a result of online meetings and trying to reduce the duration of these. Completing this work in advance has not necessarily reduced the number of challenges.</p> <p>If questions are not asked until the meeting, there is a danger that MR may not have all of the answers to hand so it would be good to continue to have the questions in advance, and this practice was in place before online meetings.</p>

Signed by Chair:



	<p>There are challenges at Committee too and they will be minuted. Some governors feel that it works well to have questions and answers in advance - it is important to keep things as succinct as possible. Governors agreed it would be good to include the responses to questions in the minutes – <b>Action KB</b>. Governors understand that they can raise challenges to the responses, and from here they can highlight further information that they would like. We had some good challenges to this report.</p> <p>Are there any other questions on the report this evening:</p> <p><b>The Inclusion meetings sound brilliant. Has anything instigated this?</b> – CW and MR often had quite a lot of ad-hoc meetings so the Inclusion meetings have been scheduled in so that they know they have a formal meeting in the diary – it’s more systematic and can be recorded.</p> <p><b>Have we had a report from Dave Smith yet?</b> – No not yet but he has apologised for the delay in getting the report to us.</p> <p>The questions and answers to the HT report are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>As a result of departure of apprentice, the report states that currently her afternoon times will not be covered. Will this have adverse effect on particular children?</b>  <i>We have now made alternative arrangements. Our catch up TA was due to finish soon but has now agreed to extend her hours as a result of the apprentice finishing. Another of our experienced TAs has also agreed to take on additional hours. I feel this is now covered suitably.</i></li> <li>• <b>Mental Health week activities sounded great – will further plans be put in place to ensure children have regular activities outside to boost mental health in addition to the IA walk to school scheme which is fantastic?</b>  <i>This is certainly what we are aiming to do more of. We have been gradually putting the tools in place to encourage more of this. Our curriculum is designed to support more of this way of working and we have engaged in a range of training appropriate to this, including Forest Schools and outdoor learning. One of the restraints we often find is time which is why we have been so keen to build opportunities into the curriculum.</i></li> <li>• <b>Re support for HT through hub meetings – are these to continue indefinitely?</b>  <i>Hub meetings are definitely going to continue. As to the frequency of them, we are not currently sure. All HTs in the group are finding this invaluable at the moment but it may be that, as things return to normal and the stresses and strains caused by the pandemic reduce, the frequency may not be so critical.</i></li> <li>• <b>How are the two children that haven't returned to Iron Acton being supported? What is the framework for how long that continues?</b>  <i>Teachers are sending work home which matches that completed in class. The parents and grandparents are capable of supporting in this way. At the moment we are working towards Easter with a return at the start of T5 once shielding is removed and if rates in the area remain low.</i></li> <li>• <b>Could you elaborate more on the "new pupil premium profiles" that are mentioned?</b>  <i>The new pupil premium profiles have been updated to track progress and attainment throughout the child's primary school career. They also include a list of the child's strengths, their specific barriers to learning. They include a space to record provision in place to remove barriers and the impact of the provision.</i></li> </ul>
6	<p><b>Review and approval of SFVS Submission</b></p> <p>EB thanked all governors for the work that has been done on the SFVS, but also for work that has been done in a number of other areas – there has been a lot of work throughout the term and in the run up to this meeting and it is to be commended.</p>



	<p>IC discussed the SFVS documents which have been made available on teams. We have had to submit a separate form for the 2 schools, but there are many similarities.</p> <p>The SFVS has been presented to the Resources Committee, and is now coming to FGB to ask for approval (pending any other questions). Questions may particularly arise from the Dashboard for each school, which provides a rag rating for certain areas. Challenges were raised following the Resources Meeting. A thorough process has been undertaken to collate the data, including information from the School Business Manager.</p> <p>BC has seen the question on teams from CM regarding the ratio of Senior Leaders and would be interested to hear the feedback on this. The ratio is basically because in a small rural school, even though there are low numbers of Staff who are senior leaders, this represents a high percentage of overall staff. It was agreed the question and response would be shared.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note - The question and response are as follows: I was surprised to see the IA was rating highly on senior leaders as % of staff, given that we have a p/t head and p/t deputy head. I can't see that we can reduce this without fundamentally impacting the schools. Can we explain why so high? Is it impacted by Mrs Bagnall's maternity?</i></p> <p><i>I have looked and checked the data on Senior Leadership. We have 1.3 at IA, 21.7% leadership, and we have 1.5 at HA, 34.2% leadership. This is not impacted by any maternity cover.</i></p> <p>IC said she would like to highlight the response to the question about a balanced / sustainable budget – in the past at HA we have had to say no to that. We didn't have to do that this time. The measures that have been taken – including the federation, cost savings, changes over time – mean that the picture for that budget is looking much more robust and sustainable.</p> <p>TW highlighted that a question had been asked at Resources Committee regarding Insurance and asked that the response to this be shared on teams. <b>Action KB.</b></p> <p>Do we need any more time to ask questions or have discussion on this? Are we happy for it to be signed off? – Governors agreed with the submission.</p>
7	<p><b>Feedback from IA parents-governors meeting and parent questionnaire.</b></p> <p>CM gave a summary of the Questionnaires that have been completed by parent(s) / carer(s) of children at both schools (information is also available on teams):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Survey responses were overwhelmingly positive with some pockets where parents were critical.</li> <li>• Parents felt there was a much better provision in the second (Jan 2021) lockdown.</li> <li>• Responses make it clear that contact with teachers is paramount to parents – it is hard to know how we balance this without adding too much of a burden to teachers, particularly when there are some children in school. Parents clearly want to be engaged with the learning.</li> <li>• There was a noticeable difference in the feedback from the 2 schools - HA families tend to be more critical but also more engaged: this was also borne out by higher level of attendance at the Parent-Governor session for HA parents.</li> <li>• It is important to remember that criticisms arose from very small numbers, this can appear to distort when the data is reported as a percentage.</li> <li>• There was a lot of support and praise for the schools.</li> <li>• It has been a useful exercise that gives us some useful feedback, and we can follow up with future surveys to keep an eye on things.</li> <li>• The HA parents had some good ideas, however, we need to ensure there is adequate expectation management, and ensure that parents understand what is realistic.</li> </ul> <p>Governors thanked CM for the presentation of the data.</p> <p><b>Is the difference in the feedback a dynamic of the school – a different school demographic?</b> –it is good to have engaged parents, but it is also important they have a realistic view. The HA parents have high expectations which is good, but it is important to see the bigger picture and that we want to bring</p>



	<p>about benefits for all pupils. The demographic at IA has changed over recent years, and they have a less-engaged feel.</p> <p><b>It would be interesting to know the numbers of responses. Is this possible?</b> – Yes, we had 32 respondents from HA, 28 from IA. The responses from HA came much quicker, and with less prompting.</p> <p><b>Is it an alarm bell that IA parents are less responsive?</b> – From HA, we had responses as soon as the questionnaire was sent out.</p> <p>It was observed that it could have been interesting to carry out the survey earlier in the lockdown, as it would have been fresher in people’s mind how quickly the school turned around the switch to online learning and how positive this felt at the time.</p> <p>CM gave a summary of the Parent – Governor meeting at IA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 people joined the meeting. Broadly speaking they said they were there to listen to what other people said and didn’t bring to the meeting any particular issues or points for discussion.</li> <li>• We can take it as a positive that parent(s) / carer(s) didn’t join to voice concerns.</li> <li>• But on the negative side, it that because people are less engaged with the school?</li> </ul> <p>Informal feedback suggests that people are happy with the school and didn’t feel the need to join the meeting.</p> <p><b>How many people turned up to the HA parent-governor meeting?</b> – it was 25. The fact that the HA one was held during lockdown could have impacted on this, but it could also be attributed to the Ofsted rating and parents wanting to understand more about what is going on. The IA one also happened after the survey so parents may have felt they had already provided feedback. It could also be due to fatigue with online meetings. Perhaps it would have been different if we had been able to have a face to face meeting.</p> <p>One parent said that they was disappointed about the level of attendance, and the fact that this reflected dis-engagement.</p> <p>We need to be aware of the disengagement. Next year, we have a significant number of children joining us who live outside the village. We need to monitor it and we need to try and rectify it. It’s one of our USPs and contributes to our identity as a small community school.</p> <p>A quick count up suggests there are 60 families in the school and of those 28 families are within the parish and therefore we do also have significant numbers who live within the parish. Even if people live outside of the Parish, we need to help to make them feel that they are part of the community. Covid won’t have helped with that and things may improve if we are able to hold face to face meetings, PTA events etc.</p> <p>Maybe we need to do a school-gov-pta target on this?</p> <p><b>Were there differences between how the parent-governor session was promoted at HA and IA?</b> – It was very similar.</p> <p>We need to continue to monitor it and then decide if we need to do something strategic.</p> <p>Could the Ethos Community think about the link between the school, the parish and the community? – Yes, governors agreed this could be a good idea.</p> <p><b>Is Community engagement also a part of what the Futures committee can consider?</b> – Yes - whilst being aware of overlap, it could be considered by the Futures Committee as well and both Committees could report back to FGB.</p> <p>Governors agreed.</p> <p>Ethos and Futures to discuss and feedback to FGB. <b>Action KB / JB / RT.</b></p>
8	<p><b>Update from Futures Sub-Committee</b></p> <p>RT provided an update: The Preschool provision at HA is now on hold. The Preschool Committee held a meeting with parents, where future and existing parents said that they were reluctant for preschool to close in its current form so agreed to form a new Committee for September, and retain preschool in its current form. Governors acknowledged that this was disappointing.</p>



	<p>Subsequent to that, a ToR for the Futures Group has been drawn up. Governors need to agree if Futures is a committee or working group. Based on the minutes from Term 2 (7/12/20) and some other ideas, it has been possible to identify a number of areas that will be looked at by the group. However, it is a two-way street - any governor can suggest ideas to the futures group for them to look at. The Group will also propose ideas and best practice back to FGB.</p> <p><b>Has there been a decision if it is a Committee or a working group? Does this need to be ratified at FGB so that we can ensure there isn't overlap?</b> The Futures Group will be asking different questions to the existing groups. We need to ensure that there is full discussion at FGB to agree the structure and remit of the Committee and we need to ensure we have the backing of all Governors. It's great that people are enthused to be involved but we need to slow it down. Terms of Reference will be brought to next FGB. <b>Action RT / KB.</b></p> <p><b>So who is on the Committee?</b> – RT, JB, BC, KK and CM. MR also attends. It feels as if we are breaking new ground, ahead of the game but we need to design how it works. We can take on board everyone's feedback. This is absolutely not a replacement for the other Committees who can continue to innovate and govern within their current remit. It is very positive that we are in the position where we can look forward.</p>
9	<p><b>New Partnerships</b> <b>See Confidential Minutes.</b></p>
10	<p><b>Review of SEF judgements</b> SEF judgements had been shared on teams.</p> <p><b>Do we really consider both schools to be in exactly the same place in all areas?</b> – There is room within a judgement for some variation in the provision. Governors need to help make sure there is a range of evidence available that feeds into the SEF. Previously the process we took was to look at an area at FGB, but this wasn't always successful and doesn't feel applicable going forward. Perhaps we should ask what is the evidence that we have seen (e.g. monitoring) since the last meeting and what does this back up in the SEF? – If there isn't evidence, we can identify what evidence we need for the next meeting. There is a governor training session on 5<sup>th</sup> May on effective Self Evaluation. Are there any governors who like to attend? SG and BC will attend. <b>Action SG and BC.</b></p> <p>Governors need to be looking for the signs at all times. E.g. if feedback from data or pupil monitoring was of concern, we need to review this, piece it together and join it up with other information.</p> <p><b>Do we need some sort of evidence log?</b> – We do try and prompt this through the monitoring forms and through the opportunity to report informal feedback to the Clerk. MR needs to log his evidence too.</p> <p><b>Does anyone wish to challenge the good ratings?</b> <b>Behaviour – this year we have the Behaviour Project – how has that gone, is it going to improve the rating?</b> Ben Brown (IA) and Alec Bryant (HA) have been carefully introducing the new ideas without overwhelming staff. We also have to remember that behaviour at the schools haven't been a huge issue. Lock down has impacted on the implementation that was originally planned. Pupil and teacher conferencing has taken place. A full review was scheduled for term 5 but this is now more likely to take place in term 6. This would include monitoring of staff and their implementation of strategies. Returning to school has brought about a big push on the behaviour project. There are visual consistencies throughout the school – e.g. welcoming children, praising fantastic walking.</p> <p><b>So why would this not be considered to be outstanding?</b> – there are successes within in it but there are areas and individual children for whom the approach isn't working so we need to look at some individual strategies being introduced. The two Schools see different behaviour in the children, particularly since lockdown: there are some challenges particularly at IA for which we are looking to implement specific strategies</p>



	<p><b>So is that about the strategies or the actual behaviour of the children?</b> – we have to have effective strategies in place, but additionally they have to be successful and embedded in the children a little more than they are now. We need a little more time to ensure this.</p> <p><b>So why are we not outstanding – because they are not embedded?</b> – yes, and looking at the specific language that is used for outstanding – e.g. <u>exceptional</u> behaviour, <u>highly</u> positive, tangible contribution to community – it would be hard to say that those are fully in place at the moment.</p> <p>It comes back to what is in the SDP about better behaviours, and what are the stepped impact behaviours that you would like to see. Evidence should link back to those targets in the SDP. It’s about joining up the targets so that governors can monitor progress against those targets. This will be reviewed in Term 6 and added to the Term 6 FGB agenda – <b>Action KB</b>.</p>
11	<p><b>Vision for the Federation</b></p> <p>JB introduced that the Ethos Committee have prepared a Vision for the Federation. The Ethos Committee had prepared this on the basis that the Federation Vision would sit over the two individual school Visions and Values, and that it should be something that is quick and easy to remember.</p> <p>The Vision proposed is:      “Striving for the Pinnacle for our Communities”      Striving – chosen because it is an action word, something we are working towards.      Pinnacle – because it’s our federation name.      Communities – as a reference to our school, village, federation and church communities.</p> <p>JB asked for any comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I like it but some schools have this sort of thing as a strapline, with an explanation written underneath it – do we need something more like that?</li> <li>• Coming back to the Better Behaviours – some key words are “be ready be respectful be safe” – can this be linked to the Vision for the Federation?</li> <li>• I agree that because the schools do have distinctive personalities, we need this to sit alongside the schools V&amp;V.</li> <li>• We need to have something that is easy for everyone to remember.</li> <li>• The Branding statement and the Vision should be two separate things.</li> <li>• The Vision should be something we want to aspire to and how we are going to get there whereas the branding should be something that is easy to remember.</li> <li>• I think a key question is who is this vision for? – is it for people looking in or is it for us to know where we want to go? Governors felt it should be for all stakeholders.</li> <li>• Just going back to the different feedback we had from the different schools on the survey and Parent-Governor meeting. One school has a vision about flourishing, one has a vision about caring. Is that linking to the different levels of feedback and engagement? Is this something we want to link into?</li> <li>• The IA Vision has been very recently developed. Does the HA Vision need to be reconsidered? Do we ever want to have the same V&amp;V at both schools? – Governors agreed that we want the schools to keep their own.</li> <li>• We want to bring the 2 aspirations in the individual Schools’ visions together.</li> </ul> <p>Can we have more space at FGB to discuss this? – FGB needs to first agree the “structure” of the statement – i.e. regarding the strapline and explanation.</p> <p>Governors agreed that further discussion could start to take place on teams, where governors could all share ideas. As a starter, the Ethos Committee will share the ideas that contributed to the Vision that has been proposed – JB to co-ordinate - <b>Action JB</b>. Governors can then add to this progressively as they think of ideas. Governors will start by looking for a strapline, and then work on the wording that sits underneath it. <b>Action ALL</b>.</p>



12	<p><b>Approval of Spend</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Copier – spend approved with Photocopier Solutions.</li> <li>Amphitheatre and Canopy – MR explained that we will only proceed if we have a grant and a contribution from the PTA, and recommended the use of Playforce.  <b>Could we ask the PTA to fundraise more rather than using the sports funding?</b> – yes, that is the idea.            Spend approved.</li> <li>Integra contract – MR summarised the situation regarding Integra: prices for the Integra contracts that take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April have only recently be released and shared on teams. MR highlighted that many schools, not just ours, are very frustrated with how the information has been shared and that it has been made available much too late. The recommendation is that we sign up for another year, but look into alternative providers going forward.            The provider for Sickness absence insurance also needs to be decided: Education Mutual isn't the cheapest but we know it is reliable, and this is the recommendation to Governors.  <b>If we are signing up for another year, do we need to add to Resources Agenda that they will look into this in more detail?</b> – Yes, there is a six month notice period for all of these.            Members of the Resources Committee felt that there hadn't been adequate time to review the information provided, and that there were many questions to be asked. They do not feel comfortable authorising the spend without further review. It's very clear that we have ended up in this position because of the provider, not because of the school however, the information needs to be looked at in more detail.  <b>Can we delegate the decision to the Resources Committee?</b> - Yes.            MR flagged that MR and HP need to take action before next Wednesday, but Governors recognised that there is a need to challenge the numbers and understand why some have increased.            Governors agreed that the final review of the decision will be completed by the Resources Committee on teams. This will be completed by Friday 26<sup>th</sup> March. <b>Action RT.</b></li> </ul>
13	<p><b>Succession Planning</b>          To be discussed during Term 5 FGB. <b>Action KB.</b></p>
14	<p><b>Policies</b>          Assessment Policy          Positive Behaviour Policy – author needs to be change to read Executive Headteacher          Code of Conduct (Staff)          Disciplinary Procedure          Equalities Procedure – middle of page 2, only mentions HA, needs to be amended to refer to IA or the Federation.          Exclusions Policy          First Aid Policy – location of first aid box at IA needs adding, and AB is now a Paediatric First Aider.          Grievance Procedure          RE Policy – review frequency / dates need checking.          Risk Management Policy – review frequency / dates need checking.          Amendments to be made.          All Policies ratified on the basis that amendments are made.</p>
15	<p><b>Safeguarding</b>          A summary of the Safeguarding Audit and Action Plan has been shared on teams.</p>
16	<p><b>Committee Headlines</b>  <b>Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PSHE presentation from CW</li> <li>Five areas of teaching focus for the return to school</li> </ul>



**THE PINNACLE SCHOOLS FEDERATION**  
 Minutes of the Full Governing Body meeting  
 Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2021, 7pm. Via Microsoft Teams



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of impact of remote learning on PP children</li> </ul> <p><b>Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SFVS</li> <li>Challenge on TA hours</li> <li>Integra contract renewal</li> </ul> <p><b>Ethos</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federation Vision</li> <li>Embedding of V&amp;V at each school</li> <li>Challenge on Policies</li> </ul>
17	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>None</p>
18	<p><b>Headlines</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SFVS sign off</li> <li>Parental engagement</li> <li>Resources Committee regrouping on Integra Contract by the end of the week.</li> <li>Vision for the Federation.</li> </ul>
19	<p><b>Date of Next meeting</b> – 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021 7pm Via Microsoft teams.</p>

**Meeting Closed 9.08pm.**

**Action Checklist**

WHO	ACTION	WHEN
ALL	Reminder - Governors to feed monitoring evidence and feedback into log collated by KB	Ongoing
KB	HT report Questions and responses to be included in FGB minutes going forward.	24/05/21
KB	Information regarding Insurance to be shared on teams.	01/04/21
KB / JB / RT	Engagement – Ethos Committee to consider the link between the school, the parish and the community. Futures Committee to discuss Community Engagement. Both Committees to report to FGB.	24/05/21
RT / KB	Terms of Reference for Futures Committee to be discussed at next FGB.	24/05/21
BC / SG	Attend SEF training course provided by Governor Services and report back to FGB	24/05/21
KB	Follow up to SEF ratings to be included on Term 6 FGB agenda	12/07/21
JB	Collate information to share discussion from Ethos Committee about the background to setting up the Federation Vision	01/04/21
ALL	Governors to contribute to online discussion regarding the Vision for the Federation	24/05/21
RT	Co-ordinate Resources Committee review of information regarding Integra contract renewal.	26/03/21
KB	Succession Planning to appear on T5 FGB agenda.	24/05/21