

The Boston Grammar Schools Federation
Record of a Meeting of the Governing Body,
27th April 2010

Meeting commenced at 7.07pm

Present: Mr. P. Bosworth, Mr. M. Worrall, Mr. C. Champion, Mrs. J. Wardell, Mr. Barrie Gosling, Mrs. Catherine Ellis, Mr. John McHenry, Mrs. O. Thomas. Mrs. C. Hamshaw, Mr. J. Tryner, Mr. Rex Piggins, Mrs. Louise Storry, Mr. T. Elmer, Mr. G. Cook. Mrs. J. Thornally, Mr. P. Marsh

1. **Absent/Apologies:** Mr. Brian Pycok, Mrs. K. Kelly, Mrs. H. McEvoy, Mrs. L. Hammond.

2. **Minutes of the Meeting:**

The minutes of the meetings: 16th & 23rd March were distributed.

- ❖ Mrs. Thomas pointed out that the information "dates for governors" diaries was incorrectly inserted as minutes. (to be corrected)
- ❖ Amendment to the appendix was made by Mrs. Hamshaw.
- ❖ Name spelling- Mrs. Storry was corrected. Apology offered accordingly.
COG signed and approved the minutes as an accurate record of both meetings.

3. **Correspondence:**

- ❖ Letter from a parent was discussed wrt a new course specification. Teachers had been offering extra help to enable pupils to meet course requirements. Mr. Piggins was delighted to hear the pupils are aware of course curricula.
- ❖ Letter from parent wrt re-sit costs. Mr. Marsh outlined the difficulty involved in this area. Costs may be up to as much as £200 if A Level exams are to be 're-sat'. The need for a clear policy was emphasised. COG suggested the F& GP committee examine "costings" position to be written out by both Deputy Heads. An all encompassing policy is to be sought as the there appeared to be a shift in the parents' perception of responsibility for re-sit costs.

4. **Update of Y6 and Y7 boys intake:**

Recent communications between the Deputy Head, COG and Mr. Pike was relayed. There followed an in-depth discussion with most members of the GB contributing.

The discussion largely centred on verbal information obtained from a meeting with Mr. Breckon and CoG and VCoG and a diagram, contributed an explained by the VCOG, representing current and future events and their possible outcomes . Several points were made here.

- ❖ Boys intake - no decision so far; continue to examine to find a solution for boys only entry to BGS after 11+. Discussions referring to the LA and the co-ed status / appeal withdrawal and submission of the BSF bid. Options open perceived to be (i) refer to the school adjudicator regarding the legality of withdrawing the school's co-ed appeal without GB consent; (ii) check whether the GB should make BGS a mixed school and GB, as own admissions authority, decide which school the boys attend.
- ❖ The LA stated that they were apparently unaware of the GB decision to make BGS the preferred site for the re-build. This was met with a mixture of great concern and surprise by

the governors as the Head and the previous Chair were to have ensured that the GB decision was transferred to the LA - not least during the July 2009 meeting that they attended with the LA.

(7.50)

- ❖ Mr. Worrall drew a visual layout profiling the options discussed with the LA which showed most clearly relevant points in time which required key decisions, the dependence on the success of the bid, ofsted, any LA interventions and the current phase of re-building the infra-structure of the schools whilst working to provide the best possible education for all pupils. Important dates were given as Nov 2012 being the finalised bid date for BSF and the point at which a contract could go out. According to the LA money had been invested in the bid to secure funding.
- ❖ There was a question, still to be ascertained as to when specifically, the decision to change to one mixed site school [two single schools brought together] would need to be made. Governors wished to keep to their current decision and plan, and therefore keep options open for the two schools to continue on two sites until such time as any funding becomes concrete – i.e Nov 2012 – or if not – to continue as two vibrant Boston Grammar Schools ensuring every child who meets the schools entrance criteria realises it's full capability through the delivery of high quality provision and high academic results.
- ❖ During BSF there is a requirement for competition (for the building contract) and therefore it is important for the BGSF to maintain full control of it's buildings. There is a requirement under BSF for Mr. Breckon to speak with staff and pupils and the need for staff unity was endorsed. Mr. Breckon's and the LA had made strenuous efforts for BGSF to be included in the 'Boston Schools bid'. These efforts were clearly recognised by the GB.

(8.12)

- ❖ Mr. Breckon has assured the COG and VCOG that the LA review inspection would be supportive of the school and the DH's as they are working so hard to help the school.
- ❖ Various aspects were mentioned for consideration by BGSF under the BSF, including the advantages of a link to a University(s) to raise our profile and attract academic ability.

(8.15)

The LA stated that an ofsted inspection could take place in the future (and would review both schools together – new policy for federated schools) - however it was thought that the LA's own review team report [led by the School's current School Improvement Partner Mrs Margaret Bainbridge, a retired grammar school head] would satisfy any current questions raised by Ofsted. Mrs Bainbridge has been assisting the two DH's and SLT with the school SEF's and revised SIP. This was recognised as being very beneficial and helpful for when a review takes place. Terms for the review will be sent in advance to the COG for discussion and approval. It was mentioned that the "readiness to deliver" criteria was important; to ensure the school met with and satisfied the application / bid by the LA.

(8.20)

- ❖ The PAN [relevant to the 'new' build] was discussed along with the impact of very high birth rates in Boston as a result, mainly, of immigration to the area. The GB are concerned that the local requirement in 2013/14 onwards for a new BGSF school (when the first BSF money could appear or would need to be paid to contractors) must reflect the population and cohorts and the GB have a duty to ensure that there are sufficient places for all Boston's children at that time who attain the relevant scores. The BSF money it was said,

