

## **Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Governing Body of Blatchington Mill School and Sixth Form College held on 16 June 2016**

**Those Present:** Peter Sowrey (PS) (Chair), Gareth Chan (GC), Addy Balogun (AB), John Barker (JB), Ashley Harrold (AH), Richard Mills (RM) and Andrew Wallace (AW).

**In attendance:** David Harvey (DH – clerk), Sarah Hextall (SH), Ruth King (RK) and Lyndsey Thompson (LT)

**Quorum:** 7 out of 12 governors present with 3 vacancies – meeting was quorate throughout.

### **0. Welcome.**

### **1. Apologies for Absence.**

- 1.1. Kevin Fry (KF), Peter Gerry (PG), Richard Goodsell (RG), Sally Hunt (SH) and Fiona Bauermeister (FB) had sent their apologies for absence which were accepted.

### **2. Urgent Business**

- 2.1. None.

### **3. Declaration of interest**

- 3.1. None.

### **4. Minutes**

- 4.1. With the agreement of the FBG, the Chair stated that approval of the minutes of its' meeting held on 26 May 2016 would be deferred to 14 July.

### **5. Matters Arising**

- 5.1. None.

### **6. Discussion and approval of a new staffing structure**

- 6.1. AH set out the background to this exercise, explaining that it was for the governors to consider and approve a proposal to restructure the school business staff. AH pointed to three key reasons behind the proposal:-
- Financial – the budget needed to be balanced.
  - Part of the School Development Plan (SDP) was to include the creation of an administration hub; e.g. finance and information technology had changed significantly in recent years and now needed to be run differently.
  - Staff movements – in the last three weeks, a number of staff had submitted

resignations creating vacancies which had not been filled successfully.

- 6.2. AH informed governors that the three documents (consultation, Appendix 3 and Appendix 4) circulated earlier had had a number of amendments suggested by the local authority (LA) human resources department. SH specified that these were to do with earlier references to the methodology of posts allocation, timeline and competitive interviews.
- 6.3. AH began by addressing the rationale. AH explained that, for the present, this exercise was being confined to the business staff. In terms of the teaching staff, there would be a need to tackle this aspect as well, i.e. reduce the spend but with the hope that a reduction of two could be achieved without redundancies.
- 6.4. AH stated that the teaching assistant staffing was another area not yet addressed for restructuring. At present, the school had exactly the right amount of support, but TA staffing was regularly subject to a high turnover. In addition, AH pointed to the Teaching & Learning Responsibility (TLR) restructuring proposal, of spending £28K less.
- 6.5. AH believed that the proposed methodology was fair, highlighting the fact that if the post existed in the old structure and again in the new, this would be ring-fenced. If it was the case that a new role was created, then efforts would be made to move existing personnel of the same grade. However, for new roles, there would be competitive interviews conducted and a thirty day consultation to explain where staff would fit in the new structure. All members of staff at risk of redundancy would have a one to one interview.
- 6.6. Governors asked about the downgrading of posts, from 'B' to 'A'. AH explained that senior staff would be delegated basic levels of work as appropriate.
- 6.7. AH turned to the proposal and provided information in detail on the changes, stating that there would be an overall spend of £936K, a saving of £167K. AH expressed the hope that these changes would improve performance and emphasised the view that the cuts were fair and applied equally across all areas. AH provided details of the various sections affected setting out which roles would remain and where new ones were envisaged and at what grade, i.e. school finance; data; information technology; facilities; and administration.
- 6.8. Governors asked whether the budget had assumed that vacant roles were full. SH confirmed that this was the case.
- 6.9. Governors asked whether, in cases where staff were redeployed into lower graded jobs, their salaries would be cut. AH confirmed this would be the case, noting that unions were likely to raise the issue.
- 6.10. Governors asked about the school taking on apprentices for certain roles. AH acknowledged that this was a good idea and a route for the future, but the school had not been successful so far in this regard. SH noted that some staff already employed had progressed through the apprentice route. In addition, the school was in contact with the LA, in terms of notifying them when a role suitable for an apprenticeship became available.
- 6.11. The Chair noted the FBG's formal approval of the school's staffing restructuring proposal and informed AH that the management team should now take it forward. The Chair stated that the next meeting of the FBG (14 July) should review progress to date.

- 6.12. SH informed the FBG that a consultation meeting with staff was planned by the school to take place on 20 June at 15.15 hours. GC agreed to attend, on behalf of governors.
- 6.13. The Chair expressed thanks to AH and SH on behalf of the FBG for their hard work on this issue, which was very thorough and comprehensive. AH stated that thinking behind the rationale had been developed over the year. However, even with the reduction in expenditure envisaged, the budget was still outside the authorised deficit. AH commented that, even then the LA might still license this figure, but the school did not want to go down this route.
- **Action – Governor to attend staff consultation meeting on 20 June – GC**
  - **Action – Staffing proposal to be put on the agenda for the next meeting of the FBG - Clerk.**

These minutes are an accurate reflection of the meeting.

Signed ...

Position ...

Date ...