



**Full Governing Body Virtual Meeting  
Held on Monday 17 May 2021 at 6pm**

**PRESENT:**

W Cooper	- Chair/Parent Governor (WC)
R Alden	- Parent Governor (RA) <i>(from 6.14pm)</i>
Y Birnie	- Co-opted Governor (YB)
C Hunt	- Associate Member (CH)
J Joiner	- Local Authority Governor (JJ)
M Jones	- Associate Governor (MJ)
N Prockter	- Headteacher (NP)
N Seward	- Co-opted Governor (NS)
C Wheeler	- Co-opted Governor (CW)
L Woskett	- Staff Governor (LW) <i>(from 6.14pm)</i>

**APOLOGIES:**

D Salter	- Co-opted Governor (DS)
----------	--------------------------

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

S Pritchett	- Clerk to Governors (SP)
H Hare	- School Business Manager (HH)

Item		Action
<b>1</b>	<p>1.1 WELCOME WC welcomed Governors to the meeting which had been convened to consider responses to the staff consultation before interviews for the DHT post took place later in the week.</p> <p>LW and RA had sent apologies for lateness.</p> <p>1.2 APOLOGIES AND ABSENCES DS had given his apologies for absence which were received and accepted.</p> <p>1.3 QUORUM The meeting was quorate with quorum being 5 of the 9 Governors in post.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<p>DECLARATION OF BUSINESS/PECUNIARY/OTHER INTERESTS None</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p>RESPONSES TO STAFF CONSULTATION The Staffing Structure Consultation came to an end at 3.00pm on Friday 14 May. Responses to the consultation had been received at the deadline on Friday from the National Education Union (NEU representing teachers and support staff), NASUWT (representing teachers) and from one member of administrative staff. Responses had been circulated to Governors and discussed in detail with the Chair of Governors and the Human Resources representatives of Oxfordshire County Council. While Governors were not required to reply to all or any of the issues raised, the Full Governing Board was to give them due consideration and to decide whether or not to change any aspects of the proposed staffing structure as a result.</p>	

<p>Governors considered each of the consultation responses and the points raised at length. It was explained that Kingham had sought dispensation from OCC to overlap the consultation process with the interview process because of the timeline imposed by the external teaching diary. In the interests of fairness, the consultation period had been extended and had run in full during term time rather than holidays. The recruitment timetable was tight as a result. School had ensured that no appointment to the DHT role had been made while the consultation process was ongoing. The timeline had been informally discussed with Assistant Heads before going ahead with the advertisement. Advertising early gave AHTs an opportunity to apply for the DHT role at Kingham, as well as to consider options at other schools (the national deadline for teacher resignations is the end of May).</p> <p>Since the start of the staff consultation there had been some material changes to future staffing. One teacher had resigned with effect from the end of this academic year and two teaching assistants had also resigned. Whilst not technically part of the restructuring, NP explained that historically there was one Teacher who had been paid as a TA. He proposed that this opportunity be taken to redesignate the post as a teaching post to correct a historic anomaly. Together, these changes meant that there was no longer a requirement to reduce the number of teaching staff, although some roles might change. The remaining number of teaching assistants would only exceed the proposed structure by 0.5 full time equivalent staff.</p> <p>One of the responses had commented on the requirement to write a statement of suitability for the role in no more than 2,000 words. This was considered to be a legitimate approach and the fairest way to determine suitability. Other systems, such as the panel's consideration of past performance, had been discussed but deemed to be not as fair. However, given the recent resignations the restructure could be implemented without any member of staff needing to complete a statement of suitability and reapply for a post.</p> <p>Feedback had highlighted the impact of the restructuring on staff morale. Staff Governors agreed that the process has been very unsettling but suggested that most staff understood the rationale behind the proposals and the intention to secure a structure that was in the best interests of the school. Governors were mindful of the impact of the restructuring process on staff and wished to minimise concern and anxiety as far as possible. With Governors agreement, the requirement to complete a statement of suitability and reapply for a post was waived for both teaching and support staff.</p> <p>Responding to comments raised during the consultation, NP confirmed that the Deputy Head role would be manageable as the staff member would be given dedicated time to carry out their responsibilities. Kingham did not have a significant number of children with SEND and the SENDCo role was currently carried out 1.5 days per week. The meeting recognised that the SENDCo role was the post most affected by the proposals. The incumbent had indicated that she did not wish to be redesignated as a teacher. Redundancy or termination by agreement options would be explored with the postholder and OCC HR.</p> <p>HR had advised that budgets were never provided to unions when requested during restructures. Kingham had already reduced expenses to a minimum operating level. The school did not have substantial reserves and with spending on staff at current level, reserves would be depleted within 3 years and the school will be in debt. Expenditure was being made to improve teaching and learning. More would be spent on qualified teachers as a result of the restructure and less on support staff. Teachers would not be asked to do any more than they do already, or to increase their hours. Subject budgets had not been cut and Teachers would definitely continue to receive their planning, preparation and assessment cover each week.</p> <p>Governors revisited the estimates of potential savings and possible costs envisaged when support for proposed staff structure 2 had been expressed at the previous FGB meeting. The changes to future staffing as referenced above, together with appointment of a DHT would result in a more modest annual saving and significantly reduced costs than originally envisaged. Nonetheless, Governors were</p>	NP
--	----

	<p>content that efficiencies would be secured, a better structure would be in place as well as appropriate contracts for the entire staff.</p> <p>Governors discussed Teaching and Learning Responsibility (TLRs) which were awarded in larger schools for subject leadership. Smaller schools, including Kingham, did not have the budget for TLRs and Upper Pay Scale teachers could be asked to take on additional responsibilities as long as they were not held accountable. It was noted that this was not a change being introduced but a continuation of the status quo. It should also be recognised that taking on subject leadership helped teachers to progress in their careers. Improving the staff structure and reducing Kingham’s deficit might open a way of introducing Teaching and Learning responsibilities in the future. This would cost around £30,000 per year.</p> <p>Discussion turned to the proposed reduction in administration assistant hours and relevant comments from the consultation. Governors reviewed changes to administrative processes and improved information technology, channel shifting opportunities and the possible impact of proposed changes on SLT. Governors recognised that a significant cut in hours did raise the risk of redundancy and every effort would be made to avoid this. The increase in hours for the Business Manager was not a reallocation. There had been a plan for some time to increase the BM hours as this was deemed necessary for that role to be effective and efficient. On balance, Governors decided to proceed with the changes to administrative assistant hours as originally proposed. Managing the impact was an operational matter.</p> <p>Having considered all the feedback received as part of the consultation process, it was proposed that that the restructuring be implemented with the compromise that had evolved as result of recent resignations. The motion was carried, and NP given a clear mandate to proceed. Neither teaching staff nor support staff would need to complete a statement of suitability and reapply for a post. A letter would be sent to all staff confirming that the new structure was coming into effect. NP would have further discussions with SENDCo and OCC HR as well as follow-up conversations with administrative staff. DHT interviews would proceed the following two days. WC and MJ would support NP as appropriate.</p>	<p>NP WC, MJ</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING 5 July 2021</p>	