



# Sir Simon Milton Westminster

University Technical College

## Governing Body Meeting

### Minutes

#### Draft for Circulation

Meeting 4, 2018/19 Cycle

Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> May 2019, 8.30am

Sutherland Street, London, SW1V 4LD

<b>MEMBERSHIP:</b>			<b>ATTENDANCE:</b>
Elizabeth Phillips	EP	Chair	
Bill Templeton	BT	Vice Chair	***
Evelyne Rugg	ER	Vice Chair	
Anna Kennedy	AK		
Andrew Christie	AC		
Duncan Whitfield	DW		
Richard Lane	RL		
Marc Cadwaladr	MC		
Jeremy Lucas	JL		
Peter Jordan	PJ		***
John Farodoye	JF		***
Chris Williams	CW		***
Antonia Evans	AE	Principal	
Olufemi Awosile	OA	Staff Governor	

<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>		
Penny Venters	PV	Clerk

ITEM	BUSINESS ITEM	ACTION
1	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
	Apologies were received and accepted from Bill Templeton, Peter Jordan, John Farodoye and Chris Williams.	
2	<b>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</b>	
	There were no declarations.	
3	<b>CONSTITUTION AND APPOINTMENTS</b>	
	Due to time constraints, Chris Williams has tendered his resignation as Parent Governor with immediate effect. An election for a new parent Governor will take place in the 2019 Autumn term.	
4	<b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	
	<b>Resolution: The minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2019 were agreed and signed as an accurate record.</b>	
5	<b>MATTERS ARISING NOT ON THE AGENDA</b>	
	The Risk Register has been revised and with one further amendment will be complete. Members of the Resources Committee will approve it by e-mail and the final document will be presented to the Board for approval at the July meeting.	<b>PV</b>
6	<b>MAT UPDATE and TRUST MEMBERS MEETING</b>	
	<p>The <b>Chair explained</b> that Trust Members had been brought up to speed on predicted pupil numbers, exam expectations and the finance position and confirmed they had expressed great concern.</p> <p><b>AC reiterated</b> that at the EGM, he had highlighted that if the UTC failed Ofsted, the RSC would stand down the current Governing Body and dictate which MAT it should join. He did not stipulate which MAT he thought this would be. A Governor expressed the opinion that this was very likely to be Future Academies Trust (FAT).</p> <p>ER <b>brought to attention</b> of the Governors her paper on the timeline of previous negotiations with FAT.</p> <p>ER also <b>presented a paper</b> on a proposed strategic development for the college to become a specialist university engineering facility for 16+ and young adults. The curriculum would include the new 'Technical' T- Level qualifications. Students would also include young adults who needed upskilling.</p> <p>It <b>was confirmed</b> that a business case built on demand would be essential and that as funding would derive from a different pool, a new application process would be required.</p>	

	<p>A <b>Governor questioned</b> if an FBS collaboration could successfully bridge the gap until such an institution was successfully up and running. A <b>Governor enquired</b> if the initiative had been discussed with FBS and as it had not, it was agreed that this possible development strategy would not be brought into discussions at this point.</p> <p>In reply to a <b>Governor question</b>, it was explained that the DfE had yet to confirm the transitional funding grant for 2019/20. However, they had given the go-ahead for FBS to create a MAT and Caroline Finch suggested in an e-mail to EP that the UTC discuss MAT membership with FBS. In addition, through its dealings with FAT, the UTC had met all the criteria set out by the DfE for transitional funding. As such, it was expected that the grant would be paid.</p> <p>In reply to <b>other governor questions</b> it was confirmed that whilst a complicated process, the DfE did close schools and that the DfE had suggested a replacement Principal to the UTC but this individual was very expensive.</p>	
	<p><b>PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION, FULHAM BOYS SCHOOL</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ALUN EBENEZER – HEADMASTER</li> <li>• MARK HARRIS – HEAD of FINANCE &amp; OPERATIONS</li> </ul>	
	<p>The Chair welcomed Alun Ebenezer (AEb) and Mark Harris (MH)</p> <p>AEb began by setting out some of the general principles which will drive the FBS MAT. It is intended that partnerships works as a critical friend. Each MAT member will be an individual establishment with a voice at the table. FBS is academically rigorous and business focussed and these elements would be common to all. Small class sizes were the basis of this. The geography between the UTC and the FBS sites would work well at ½ hour travel time. In overall terms, the role of the MAT was to ‘remove the noise’, allowing establishments to concentrate on Teaching and Learning.</p> <p>AEb outlines that there were two outstanding Deputy Heads at FBS who have complementary strengths and are keen to develop their management skills. Working with the UTC SLT, the intention would be to work at both sites. A collaborative approach is imagined with the development of each school being done in tandem.</p> <p>Five years ago, FBS had nothing and through effective marketing they have created a strong community and an oversubscribed school, taking its students from a wide range of backgrounds. Staff retention is excellent with FBS committed to their professional development. Parental involvement is high and a key part to the success of the school. Feedback is actively sought and acted upon.</p> <p>Standards across the board are high which includes small details such as a strict uniform policy. Through very hard work and focus, attendance is above 96%. FBS is a place the students want to be.</p> <p>The approach to Teaching and Learning is robust with an open focus on Enterprise and Careers. Departments review their own performance ahead of the SLT. Difficult decisions are not shied away from; if staff continue to underperform, they are moved on.</p> <p>MH reiterated that his role was to ‘remove noise’ so that the those who need to can spend time with students. His function is to manage the school efficiently in order to deliver cost savings and raise revenue. Governors needed to be a strategic force with others managing processes to secure financial probity.</p>	

MH suggested that the UTC's biggest asset was the building and this must be used to generate funds which can then be ploughed back into the college to provide the non-standard and extra elements that constitute a broad education.

**The Chair invited Governor questions:**

*What is FBS's financial position:*

To date FBS has spent more funds than it raised as there are slightly less boys in the upper years than there could be. This year will see a surplus of c£10k and the out years take the school into the black.

*How many students are expected into the new Sixth Form and how many of those progress from Year 11?*

Due to the LA changing things just prior to opening, FBS nearly did not open and as a result, Year 11 is smaller than it should be. There will be c 75 Year 12 pupils, but the focus is much more on the quality of the students than numbers of. The FBS Sixth Form will be academically rigorous with many students expected to go on to Russell Group universities.

*What assumptions are you making about the destination of Year 10 students?*

The FBS capacity is 120 boys per year in KS3 and KS4 and 100 per year in the Sixth Form. Those who demonstrate suitability to an engineering curriculum will be able to move over to the UTC.

*What other institutions are you looking at to be MAT partners?*

There are three or four currently in discussion including a Primary School. They are geographically spread.

*How will the Governance of each MAT partner be managed?*

Each will have a local Board with a Member from each sitting on the FBS Board.

*How do you see the working relationship playing out?*

Whilst each institution is autonomous, we must think of all students as 'our' students. Joint curriculum planning would allow different disciplines to be centred at each site. If Engineering is better at the UTC, then that is where students should be taught. If it is preferable to teach Geography at FBS, then they will be taught there. The sport offer at FBS is very strong and this is something the UTC students could benefit from.

*What do you see as the timeline of a partnership with the UTC?*

The DfE have approved FBS as a MAT, but we cannot be a MAT until we join with our first partner. It is anticipated that our application will be put through in Wave 14 in September 2019.

*What if the DfE does not approve the UTC as a MAT partner?*

FBS and the UTC can still work in partnership with shared services.

*The problem that UTCs have in recruiting pupils into Year 10 is well documented. Do you have any thoughts on how the model may be adapted?*

The FBS commitment is to make the college the most successful it can be and we would be prepared to consider all options but do not know the specifics at this point.

The Governors thanked Alun Ebenezer and Mark Harris for their presentation and they left the meeting.

**The Chair asked for comments from Governors.**

A Governor thought that FBS did not seem a good strategic fit. They are very focussed on academic success and it is hard to imagine that many of their students would be suitable candidates for the UTC offer as it stands. In addition, ½ hour travel in a school day is a considerable amount of time and planning a timetable around this would prove challenging.

A Governor liked the FBS standards and ethos and another admired the fact that after a relatively short time they were oversubscribed.

A Governor expressed concern that FBS did not have large reserves and as such they would find it challenging to take on the UTC in its current financial position. The model they described of sharing teachers and support staff would not be enough to balance the deficit. Another Governor felt that these matters had to be put to FBS at the before negotiation went any further.

A Governor stated that in addition, an FBS partnership would not secure the pupil numbers that the UTC needs to progress.

A Governor reminded members that the UTC was in need of a partner and an SLA within a short period of time. FBS were the first prospective MAT partner to offer to work with the UTC in a way in which fitted Governor criteria.

Another Governor felt that the high FBS standards would be beneficial to the UTC, reminding members that it was not long ago that FBS had been in exactly the same position that the UTC was in now. Two other Governor concurred, citing their energy and ability to get things done as very positive.

The Governors discussed the difference between a SLA and a MAT partnership. Given the immediate nature of the UTC requirements, members concluded that the college should negotiate with the candid intention to join the FBS MAT. In so doing, an SLA may be an initial step.

Due diligence with regard to full MAT member ship should thus begin immediately. A Governor pointed out that strategy would be preferred by the DfE with regard to the transitional funding grant.

In response to Governor question, the Chair explained that the RSC and the DfE had not explicitly given approval for the UTC to join the FBS MAT but had suggested the UTC investigate the possibility. Another Governor confirmed that a business case would be required for submission to the DfE. FBS would receive £150k to employ a project manager to oversee the process.

On learning that the DfE had also recommended the UTC explore other potential partners, a Governor suggested that these should be also be followed up.

The Chair agreed to draft a Resolution for circulation later in the day to which all members would send their replies to the clerk. The Resolution would state that due diligence be immediately progressed in regard to joining the FBS MAT and that in addition, the Fulham College Academy Trust and the Dunraven Educational Trust should be profiled as suitable partners.

**EP**

7	<b>DfE VISIT</b>	
	<p>With the final report still due, <b>EP reported</b> that overall the initial report was good.</p> <p>Observed Teaching and Learning was not as good as hoped. Whilst there is some outstanding and good teaching at the UTC, there is also some which remains inadequate.</p> <p>When presented with predicted grade data, Carolyn Unsted (CU) was of the opinion that it was overly confident. <b>EP confirmed</b> that the predictions represented the best a candidate could achieve but that on exam day a student would have any number of reasons for falling short.</p>	
8	<b>2018/19 BUDGET</b>	
8.1	<p><i>Management Accounts to April 2019:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Income from pupil numbers is reduced by £32,255: This incorporates the Pupil Number Adjustment (PNA) from the October Census, based on a new funding statement from the DfE.</li> <li>• With the effect of the PNA, an accrual adjustment and reduced Lettings income, the April Management accounts for 2018/19 predict an <b>in-year deficit of £51,272.</b></li> </ul>	
8.2	<p><i>2019/20 Budget:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recently received Annual Funding letter for 2019/20 allocates a total of £1,780,252 to the UTC. This constitutes a <b>reduction in funding of £238,023</b> from 2018/19.</li> <li>• The Recourses Committee asked the Business Manager to re-work the 2019/20 Budget with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Build in a 2% teacher pay award</li> <li>* Build in the full cost of the Head of Engineering</li> <li>* Reduce Lettings Income to a more pragmatic £30k</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As a result, the <b>in-year balance is a deficit of £227,286</b></li> </ul> <p>A <b>Governor suggested</b> that this necessitated urgent talks with the DfE to secure a delay on the funding clawback of the transitional grant. <b>Another Governor agreed</b>, expressing the opinion that such talks kept being delayed and that in fact the DfE and the ESFA were more than aware of the UTC's funding difficulties. Another <b>Governor cautioned</b> against alerting the ESFA to the financial situation at this sensitive time. Whilst discussion on delaying VAT payments was appropriate, it was not the time to alert them to a deficit budget position.</p> <p><b>Governors expressed concern</b> at the FBS reaction to these figures. It was clear from earlier questioning that they do not have significant reserves. A <b>Governor suggested</b> the UTC must be completely honest and upfront with FBS before negotiations proceeded any further.</p> <p><b>Governors discussed</b> reducing staff to decrease the deficit. The Principal suggested that a reduction in teacher numbers would not leave enough staff to cover the curriculum. <b>The Chair suggested</b> that sharing some subject and support staff with FBS would help reduce the budget for next year.</p>	

<b>9</b>	<b>UPDATE FROM COMMITTEES</b>	
	Relevant items had been covered within the meeting.	
<b>10</b>	<b>GOVERNOR SKILLS AUDIT</b>	
	The Clerk will circulate the Skills Audit proforma to those who have not yet responded.	<b>PV</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>DATES OF THE NEXT MEETING</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> June 2019</li> </ul>	
<b>12</b>	<b>ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA</b>	
	No specific items were identified.	
<b>13</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
	There were no items.	
<b>14</b>	<b>CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS</b>	
	<b>Resolution: The Confidential minutes of the meeting on February 26<sup>th</sup> 2019 were agreed and signed as an accurate record.</b>	

The meeting closed at 10.15am

Signed ..... Date:  
Chair

## Actions

<b>MINUTE REF:</b>	<b>ACTION:</b>	<b>At or by next meeting, unless stated</b>
5	Circulate the Risk Register	PV
FBS Presentation	Prepare a Resolution regarding due diligence on MAT membership with FBS and circulate to members for sign-off by e-mail.	EP / PV
10	Circulate the Skills Audit proforma to those who are yet to complete it.	PV