



FEDERATION of BOROUGHBRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL & KING JAMES'S SCHOOL

Minutes of Meeting of the Federation Governing Body 20 March 2025 at 5.30pm at King James's School

Present: Malcolm Dawson (MD) (Chair); Kathryn Stephenson (KS) (Head, BHS); Paul McIntosh (PMc) (Acting Head, KJS); Pat Dunnill (PD); Brian Horner (BH); Antoinette Stewart (AS); Andrew Howard (AH); Kelly Ashley (KA)

In Attendance: Justin Waters (JW) (Director Business Services); Robert Grierson (RG) (DHT - BHS); Stuart Giles (SG) (AHT, KJS); Sarah Bloomfield (SB) (Associate AHT- BHS), Tammy Godsell-Wright (TG-W) (AHT and SENCO- BHS)

Chris Walker (Clerk)

Apologies: Sarah Tabor, Ian Yapp, Cerys Townend

Governing Body functions:

Ensuring clarity of vision, ethos and strategic direction of the school

Holding the Headteachers to account for the educational performance of the schools and their pupils

Ensuring the sound, proper and efficient use of the school's financial resources

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
1.	Welcome and Introductions	<p>The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and introduced KA to her first meeting as the new parent governor. All present introduced themselves.</p> <p>A reminder was issued of the importance of confidentiality and code of conduct.</p> <p>PMc reported that Alison Knight, SENCo at KJS, was unable to attend the meeting as initially planned.</p>	
2.	Receive apologies and consider giving consent to absences	<p>Apologies had been received from Ian Yapp and Cerys Townend and were consented to. Sarah Tabor did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>Action: MD agreed to contact Sarah Tabor.</p>	MD
3.	Declaration of interests, pecuniary or non-pecuniary, for any agenda item	None.	
4.	To consider any confidential items to be excluded from the publicly available minutes.	Item 5 – would be discussed at the end of the meeting.	
5.	Notification of any other business	There was no other business raised to be discussed in the meeting.	
6.	Approval of the minutes of the FGB meeting held on 30.1.2025.	<p>The minutes from the meeting on 30 January 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.</p> <p>A review of the actions took place which were updated as follows:</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>Item 4: AS would undertake the safeguarding training as soon as possible and then feedback.</p> <p>Item 4: JW confirmed that GDPR training was not a statutory requirement for governors. A training matrix had been shared with governors in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>Item 6: Careers to be added as an agenda item to the June meeting.</p> <p>Item 7: Decision on whether to proceed with Edurio deferred.</p> <p>Item 10: Governors noted that the website was compliant with regards to equalities and agreed that a separate diversity statement was not required.</p> <p>Item 10: ST and CT need to provide a detailed bio for the website</p> <p>Item 11: Skills audits to be completed and sent to Sam Edwards as soon as possible.</p> <p>Item 11: MD to arrange intro meeting for new governors re Federation.</p>	<p>AS</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>ST/CT ALL MD</p>
7.	Safeguarding	<p>The monthly safeguarding reports and biennial safeguarding audits were circulated in advance for both schools and considered by governors.</p> <p><u>Monthly Reports</u></p> <p>TG-W reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the categorizations had been changed and an additional category added. • Close working between the two schools ensured that safeguarding was aligned. • All requirements were being met. <p><u>Biennial Reports</u></p> <p><u>BHS</u></p> <p>TG-W reported that no items had been categorised below a 4 which meant that all statutory requirements were being met. However, a number of areas which required further strengthening had been identified. An action plan had drawn out all the required actions and would be monitored closely. Most actions were straightforward but a number related to premises improvements for which there would be a cost. None presented a high risk.</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>Governor questions Q: You talked about the issue of adults collecting students for appointments and how do you identify whether they are a parent/carer. Is this an issue at both schools? A: I did discuss with the SENCo at KJS. I have sought additional advice from the LA on how to address this issue as we did have a recent case at BHS. We have reviewed our procedure and taken advice from the LA on our procedure.</p> <p>Q: How did you find out about the recent case? A: We contacted the father to check.</p> <p>Q: Were you suspicious at the time? A: Yes.</p> <p>KS confirmed that there was a balance between ensuring appropriate safeguarding actions were applied and not being too intrusive. All adults picking up students already had to fill in a form in advance.</p> <p>Governors agreed that there needed to be a clear and reasonable procedure to identify any adult picking up a student at both sites.</p> <p>TG-W confirmed that this was in the action plan.</p> <p><u>Lockdown Procedure</u> KS informed governors that BHS would not be undertaking a lockdown drill, which was included within the policy. SLT had agreed that any benefits of doing the drill would be outweighed by the negative impact on those pupils with SEN. All staff had been fully trained and briefed on the required processes and KS was confident that there would be no issues should a lockdown be required in reality.</p> <p>Governor questions Q: Are you confident that staff know what to do? A: Yes, a lot of time has been spent on training and briefing and all the various scenarios have been discussed in detail. There are also staff members who would be vulnerable to the procedure.</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>Governors suggested that a risk assessment should be undertaken and an exercise with staff arranged as part of their safety induction. KS confirmed that both recommendations would be actioned.</p> <p>JW confirmed that lockdown drills were undertaken annually at KJS.</p> <p>Q: Are risk assessments undertaken for those staff who might be affected by the drill? A: No.</p> <p>Q: With regards to those items categorised as a '4' – do you have any concerns about bridging the gap? A: Yes – we need to provide more support for staff around how to manage safeguarding disclosures.</p> <p>Q: What kind of support do you mean? A: Staff are all fully trained. This is more about addressing any issues arising after a disclosure and managing the impact that they might have.</p> <p>Q: Is support provided outside the line management structure? A: Yes – for example staff have access to Health Assured and a school counsellor.</p> <p>Governors approved the BHS Safeguarding Audit.</p> <p><u>KJS</u> PMc highlighted those areas which scored a 4 within the safeguarding audit which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure that issues relating to sexual harassment were included within the PSHSE curriculum. A new Head of PSHSE had recently been appointed and this had been identified as a key priority. • A risk assessment for Prevent had been introduced for staff and governors. • Inclusion: lots of examples of actions to improve staff health and well-being were detailed at the meeting. • The current SENCo was updating her training to support progress to becoming a full DSL. 	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new SENCO had been appointed and would start after Easter to help manage workload – which had been identified in the recent report from the SEA. <p>Governor question Q: When is the SCR audit taking place? A: Next week.</p> <p>Q: Do you have any concerns about being able to address all the required actions? A: No.</p> <p>Governors suggested that it would be helpful if there was greater clarity in the way the actions were set out in the document.</p> <p>Action: PMc to liaise with the SENCo to revise the wording of the actions to provide greater clarity.</p> <p>Governors thanked both SENCos for all their hard work in completing such substantial documents.</p> <p>Governors approved the safeguarding audit for KJS.</p> <p>JW confirmed that a number of external reviews had recently been undertaken at KJS including on inclusion and safeguarding.</p> <p>Action: Update on actions to be provided in the autumn term.</p> <p><u>Annual Safeguarding Report – Progress</u> Good progress had been made on the actions although a few ambers still remained which included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to complete the work on the perimeter fence. <p>A new filtering and monitoring system had been introduced at both schools. Training had been put in place and the impact of the new system would be tracked.</p> <p>All documentation would be updated and shared with governors.</p>	<p>PMc</p> <p>TG-W</p>

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>TG-W left the meeting at 6.25pm</p> <p>The agenda was revised to enable staff members to leave after presenting.</p>	
8.	Learning Cycle Data	<p>The Learning Cycle 2 reports were shared in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>KJS</p> <p>SG highlighted the key points from the report which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steady progress across Year 7 • A key focus was on the higher performers in Year 8 who had not done as well as expected. • Some dips in performance in Year 9, including in English. Work was ongoing to identify the reasons. • No real concerns in Year 10 and overall better data at the same point as last year. • More confident in the current Year 11 than for the previous year. Some concerns around the resilience of some students when taking the exams. (particularly the pupil premium cohort) • Year 12 /13 – the new Value-Added formula had been applied and had a significant impact on the forecast outcomes. Year 12 had improved by half a grade for example. SG reported that this level of performance was unlikely to be sustainable but it showed that the tracking had been accurate. <p>Governor questions</p> <p>Q: Should we be worried about the performance of the higher prior attainers?</p> <p>A: The issue had been identified at both schools and actions put in place to improve performance for these students. To be noted that statistically this was a very small group of students.</p> <p>Q: Have there been any big changes in science?</p> <p>A: There have been quite a few staffing changes and re-organisation. We have analysed all the data and the figures hold their own. The forecasts have been on the cautious side. We are expecting better results than last year and that the students should achieve what is expected.</p> <p>PMc reported that he was concerned that some of the data included within the SEA Report was not accurate and had been challenged directly with the SEA.</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>Q: Have you looked at the combined scaled score over 105? A: Yes. (Normally around 109)</p> <p>Q: Are you in line with national (with regards to the higher prior attainers)? A: Yes</p> <p>Q: How do you compare nationally? A: We compare favourably.</p> <p>Q: Is there the same trend at BHS? A: They are slightly below as detailed in the report.</p> <p>Q: Are you expecting a narrowing of the gap for the PP students? A: Yes – for example there was a 2% reduction in the gap in Y11 from last year.</p> <p>Q: Will you be implementing targeted interventions until the end of term? A: Yes – as detailed in my report.</p> <p>Q: How are you evaluating their impact? A: Through the range of assessments including teacher assessment. The biggest factor in terms of impact is attendance. External validation is also provided through the SEA reports.</p> <p>SG left the meeting at 7pm</p> <p><u>BHS</u> SB provided a verbal summary of the key points from the report which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slight decline in the number of pupils performing at expected levels overall. • Good progress in Y8 since LC1 • Y9 – tracking was done much later this year, after the exams – which has showed a marked improvement in performance. • Y10 – overall the basics have improved. 	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Y11 – after the first set of mocks, the high prior attainers were below the rest of the cohort. Attendance continues to be an issue. • Targeted interventions in place in Y10 & Y11 and a clear revision program. To note there is no progress data this year. <p>Governor questions Q: How do Y11 compare to the same point last year (for Y11)? A: The basics are higher. 5-9 slightly lower. Attainment 8 slightly higher.</p> <p>Q: Are they a stronger or weaker cohort? A: Very similar but smaller.</p> <p>Q: What evaluation is undertaken on the impact of the interventions? A: We use a range of assessments and will use the outcomes from the mocks to help inform how well the interventions have worked.</p> <p>Q: Has attendance at the intervention sessions been good? A: Yes</p> <p>Q: Any worries about specific subjects? A: KS explained that last year action plans had been put in place to address any concerns in subjects. A key concern this year was that the overall data would include all students – including those with significant attendance issues and a number who had not attended at all.</p> <p>This presents wider issue in terms of the message it sends to the community about the performance of the school.</p> <p>Governors were mindful of this context and were assured that there was a narrative about the data that could be shared with external organisations such as Ofsted if need be.</p> <p>Governor questions Q: How soon would you take action to support performance in Y7?</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>A: We analyse every pupil individually at each tracking point. We put in place any required interventions and provide whatever support is needed.</p> <p>Q: Is this individualized? A: Yes</p>	
9.	<p>SDP Committee Feedback</p> <p>a) Report from School Dev Cttee</p> <p>b) Proposed changes to BHS curriculum</p>	<p><u>Curriculum Changes</u> A report had been shared in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>KS reported that the KS3 curriculum at BHS had been identified by both Ofsted and in the most recent SEA Report. A key concern was that not enough time was included to cover the arts subjects in the national curriculum. A review of the curriculum was undertaken and governors were asked to consider the proposal to remove the mini options. This would require a number of further changes, as detailed in the report.</p> <p>KS confirmed that whilst there would be a reduction in French, the overall curriculum would remain balanced.</p> <p>Governor questions Q: Will you need to inform parents? A: Yes – and also staff and pupils.</p> <p>Governors approved the proposal.</p> <p><u>Report from School Development Committee</u> MD provided a verbal summary of the meeting which had focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three priorities at BHS – teaching, aspirations and raising attainment. • Feedback on the SEA Report <p>SB left the meeting at 7.10pm</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>KS and the SLT reported that the SEA (Tim Johnson) had had a significant impact on the development and progress of the school (BHS). TJ had secured another position. Governors agreed that it would be helpful to explore options to secure external professional advice to provide a similar level of support and challenge. One option was currently being explored.</p> <p>Action: To examine options to secure consultancy support.</p>	KS/PMc
10.	Headteacher Report	<p>The report had been shared in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>Governor questions for BHS Q: What is the current position with regards to attendance? A: Overall just below national. If you take out the small number of pupils with significant attendance issues, many of whom had been placed with the school by NYC, we would be above national. RG reported that he would share the outcomes from the recent attendance conference with governors.</p> <p>Q: Are you using the outcomes from the conference to help inform your approach to managing attendance ? A: Yes, for example we are using a more robust data analysis process through Power BI which enables us to identify students more easily on an individual basis.</p> <p>RG informed governors that he was liaising with the DfE to correct the published attendance data for the school which was completely inaccurate – and most likely related to another school.</p>	
11.	Finance	<p>All reports had been shared in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>JW highlighted the key points, which included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both BHS and KJS were on track against budget at P11. • A number of significant pressures were impacting both budgets – and detailed in the report. <p>Governor question Q: What are these pressures?</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>A: The National Funding Formula for next year is a cash flat offer – essentially costs will go up but income will be flat. It's worth being mindful that 83% of our income is spent on staffing which is high. Other pressures include the unfunded cost of living pay adjustments, the impact of the TA review and a decline in Sixth Form numbers. A rise in utility costs is another factor.</p> <p>A big unknown risk will be the impact of the employers NI contribution. We hope that support will be provided for this.</p> <p>Pupil numbers at BHS is a significant pressure with a projected student intake of 57 for September 2025.</p> <p>There is no flex in the budget at all as we have already made as many efficiency savings as possible.</p> <p>JW reported that governors would need to develop a robust plan to address the financial position at BHS by December 2025.</p> <p><u>KJS</u> JW explained that the £115k deficit forecast for 2025-26 could not be addressed without staffing efficiencies. A review would need to be undertaken and used to inform the Financial Plan. JW recommended governors approve the in-year deficit and notify the LA, who would then require a recovery plan. This would provide around 12 months to address the financial challenges.</p> <p>Q: Do we need to think about planning for the budget in 3 years' time? A: My advice would be to develop a robust and tight plan now which would impact on the future years. Essentially, to make some difficult decisions now but with a longer term impact; rather than look to make decisions now which might only have a short term impact.</p> <p>Q: If we managed to set a balanced budget just for this year would the LA require a plan for Years 2 and 3 ? A: Yes.</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>Governors agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to present the balanced budget for BHS and the deficit budget for KJS. • To develop a robust financial action plan, which would need to take into account a full staff review. 	
12.	Business services update incl. HR, H&S & training.	<p>The Federation HR report was circulated to governors in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>Governor questions Q: Are you confident that the NI costs will be covered? A: I've included an assumption based on all the information that I have at the current time.</p> <p>Q: Is any more support likely? A: There is no detail currently – which is why this remains an area of risk.</p>	
13.	Confidential Item	<p>This item has been recorded in a separate confidential note.</p> <p>Governors welcomed the positive news about the Rugby Team and asked that their congratulations be passed on. PMc reported that he had nominated the team for the Yorkshire Sports Awards.</p>	
14.	Governance	<p>New Governors' Update Governors had been sent the details of Greg Stewart in advance of the meeting. AH and MD had met with GS and recommended governors approve the appointment of GS as a Co-opted Governor.</p> <p>Governors approved the nomination of Greg Stewart as a new Co-opted Governor with immediate effect.</p> <p>MD and AH had also met Richard Playford. MD would circulate his CV and, if they were satisfied with his background, recommended governors approve his appointment as a Co-opted Governor.</p> <p>Governors approved the nomination of RP as a Co-opted Governor in principle, subject to seeing his CV.</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		<p>Action: MD to circulate RP's CV after the meeting.</p> <p>Link governor visits Two reports had been received from IY. This was self-explanatory and no questions were raised.</p> <p>AR had met with RG to discuss attendance at BHS – and would share her report after the meeting. PD had visited both schools as part of a familiarization process.</p> <p>Link roles KA agreed to become the link governor for SEND (taking over from PD)</p>	MD
15.	Policies for approval	<p>The following policies were adopted subject to a number of small amendments:</p> <p>Federation Budget Management Statement Charging and Remissions Educational Visits, Outdoor Learning and Adventurous Activities - to amend in line with the latest advice from LA. GDPR Policy: Acceptable Use Agreement.</p> <p>HR policies Whistle Blowing Staff Development Developing Performance Policy and Procedure. Policy Statement on Recruitment of Ex-offenders</p> <p>BHS Relationship & Sex Education Policy SEND Policy SEN Information Report</p>	

No.	Agenda Item		ACTION
		Behaviour for Learning Policy Managing Serial & Unreasonable Complaints Policy KJS Admissions 6 th Form Transfer from Year 11 Remote Learning Accessibility Policy Equalities Policy Equalities Objectives Action	
16.	Correspondence/ AOB	None	
<u>Date of next meeting:</u> 5th June 2025			

The meeting ended at: **8.15pm**

Malcolm Dawson (Chair) :

Date:

ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING

Item 2	Contact Sarah Tabor re meeting attendance.	MD
Item 6	Careers to be added as an agenda item to the June meeting.	Sam Edwards

Item 6	Decision on whether to proceed with Edurio deferred	MD
Item 6	Skills audits to be completed and sent to Sam Edwards as soon as possible.	ALL
Item 6	MD to arrange intro meeting for new governors re Federation.	MD
Item 6	ST and CT need to provide a detailed bio for the website	CT/ST
Item 7	Actions from Safeguarding Audit (KJS) to be given greater clarity.	PMc
Item 7	Update on progress against safeguarding audit actions to be added to autumn term agenda	Sam Edwards
Item 9	To explore options to secure expert educational consultancy support.	KS/PMc
Item 14	Richard Playford C.V. to be circulated.	MD