

**Bassingbourn Village College  
Local Governing Body  
Meeting Minutes**



12 March 2026 at 6pm at the college

**PRESENT:** Ian Stoneham (IS) Principal  
Sarah Anderson (SA)  
Nicholas Cunniffe (NC)  
Elizabeth Lock (EL)  
Alison Maley (AM) Chair  
Simon Martin (SM)  
Laura Sims (LS)

**APOLOGIES:** Kim Caldwell (KC)  
Jo Lambert (JL)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Jeremy Brock (JB) Executive Deputy Head  
Stuart Hales (SH) Clerk

**Action Log**

Item	Action	Resp.
4.0	IS to resend link to Google folders providing a link to college policies	IS
4.1	Governors to forward comments on the Admissions, Anti-Bullying and Behaviour Policies to IS and SH by 19 March – after which the documents could be taken as being approved	All,IS,SH
4.2	It was agreed to carry-over the action for the college to provide data on student results versus cover staff volume to LGB4 on 06.05.26	IS
4.3	IS and LS to meet separately to discuss the most appropriate way of the college reporting behaviours for governor review	IS,LS
4.4	Governors agreed to complete all outstanding training by 20.03.26	All
4.5	AM to liaise with Rebecca and Tory to discuss wider experiences and trips	AM
4.6	SH to check progress of DBS/ onboarding with HR and parent be invited to LGB4 on 06.05.26	SH
4.7	AM to liaise with parent ref joining the LGB as a trust appointed governor	AM
4.8	Due to the difficulties in recruiting governors, SH to ask governance team if there was any flexibility to the statement on page 13 of the LGB Guidance Handbook that ' <i>...parents can be appointed to the other categories where they will address an identified gap in skills on the LGB and / or where it will contribute to greater diversity and / or retain valuable knowledge and experience but cannot form the majority of the LGB</i> '	SH
4.9	Safeguarding link governor to meet with Mr Hughes	EL,SM
4.10	SEND link governor to complete visit	KC,LS
4.11	LS and EL to liaise on finalising dashboard	LS,EL
4.12	Governors to complete evaluation form for Governance Day 2 by 20.03.26, if not already done so	All
4.13	SM agreed to complete Suspension and PEX training and AM&EL Complaints training	SM,AM,EL
4.14	Other governors to also consider completing Complaints and Suspension and Exclusion training, if not already done so	All

5.0	IS to confirm details of principles when setting the timetabling	IS
6.0	Verbal update on responses from pupil surveys to be taken to LGB4 on 06.05.26	IS
6.1	Student attendance data of interventions to be taken to LGB4 on 06.05.26	IS
10.0	Report from Governance Day 2 to be distributed	LS

	ITEM	ACTION
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	
	Apologies were received from Kim Caldwell (KC) and Jo Lambert (JL) which were accepted by governors and the meeting was quorate.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
	There were no declarations for any item on the agenda.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting (27.11.2025)</b>	
	All Governors had read the previously circulated minutes, and these were accepted as a true record and agreed.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Matters arising from minutes of 02.10.2025 not on this agenda</b>	
	<p><b>Item 4</b> – IS advised that a separate document titled ‘Behaviour Policy Update 25-26’, would require governor approval before the document could be included on the colleges website.</p> <p><b>Item 4</b> – From the Behaviour Policy, IS advised the college was awaiting changes to statutory guidance, before considering staff training on the ‘Appropriate Use of Force’.</p> <p><b>Item 4</b> – IS had since liaised with headteachers from all primaries which fed into the college regarding governor recruitment there had been no positive response. He would next consider attending a parents meeting at each setting to discuss governor recruitment.</p> <p><b>Item 4</b> – IS advised the use of safeguarding exemplars would be discussed within the trusts DSL group as it was apparent safeguarding reports were currently being taken to LGBs in a variety of formats within the trust and the central team were progressing a consistent approach to this in response. A governor queried who Chaired the group? IS advised the Director of Inclusion.</p> <p><b>Item 4</b> – IS advised he had previously shared Google folders providing the link to the college policies with governors via email and asked if governors had been able to access it?  <b>Action: IS to resend link to Google folders providing a link to college policies</b></p> <p><b>Item 4</b> – A separate document titled ‘BVC – Secondary Admission Arrangements for 2025-2026’ will require LGB approval before it could be included on the colleges website and IS noted there would be no changes to admissions arrangements. A governor noted the Admissions Arrangements Policy currently on the website was dated as 2024-25?</p>	IS



Governor	Safeguarding Policy	KCSiE	Governors Code of Conduct	ICT Policy	Data Protection	Cyber Security
SA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
NC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x
AM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LL	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
KC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
SM	x	x	x	x	x	x
IS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
JL	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?

LS forwarded a confirmation to SH as to which training she had completed in 2025-26 during the meeting.  
SM added he could now access training and would plan to complete this by 18 March.

IS advised he read all stated documentation.

**Action: Governors agreed to complete all outstanding training by 20.03.26**

All

**Item 4** – A separate document titled ‘ADM Staff Photo Report Landscape 368’ was distributed prior to the meeting. and IS advised photos had not been included for some temporary staff and the document would be updated on a regular basis.

**Item 4** – A report of student's experiences and trips was going to be covered in Governance Day 2, but two members of staff were unavailable due to teaching commitments. AM would arrange a meeting with Tory and Becca to discuss trips curriculum days and feedback to an LGB.

**Action: AM to liaise with Rebecca and Tory to discuss wider experiences and trips**

AM

**Item 4** – From an election, one parent had agreed to join the LGB, and her onboarding process was ongoing.

**Action: SH to check progress of DBS/ onboarding with HR and parent be invited to LGB4 on 06.05.26**

SH

A further parent had expressed an interest in joining the LGB and AM would explore whether it would be possible they could join as a trust appointed governor?

**Action: AM to liaise with parent ref joining the LGB as a trust appointed governor**

AM

**Action: Due to the difficulties in recruiting governors, SH to ask governance team if there was any flexibility to the statement on page 13 of the LGB Guidance Handbook that ‘...parents can be appointed to the other categories where they will address an identified gap in skills on the LGB and / or where it will contribute to greater diversity and / or retain valuable knowledge and experience but cannot form the majority of the LGB’**

SH

**Post Meeting Note: There were currently five governors with a child in the college and five who did not.**

<p><b>Item 5</b> – A separate document titled ‘Teaching and Learning Framework Final’ was distributed prior to the meeting.</p> <p><b>Item 5</b> – It was agreed key information continued to be updated to the college website.</p> <p><b>Item 6</b> – IS advised since the last LGB a number of governors had liaised with Mr Hughes (TH) regarding providing additional data in future Safeguarding reports and suggested it would be beneficial for governors to also meet separately with him.  <b>Action: Safeguarding link governor to meet with Mr Hughes</b>  <b>Action: SEND link governor to complete visit</b></p> <p><b>Item 6</b> – Data covering the number of students per concern had been included in the tabled safeguarding reports (refer to Item 7).</p> <p><b>Item 6</b> – Data covering the suspensions to allow governors to review trends had been included in the tabled safeguarding reports (refer to Item 7).</p> <p><b>Item 6</b> – IS advised the college was currently updating the Pupil Strategy for 2026-27 and would reconsider the targets within the document as part of this process.</p> <p><b>Item 6</b> – A governor queried if the LGB should have one combined governor dashboard to discuss both updated SEND and safeguarding monitoring metrics, which could be updated on a termly basis – this could be considered further within link meetings? IS agreed with this suggestion.  <b>Action: LS and EL to liaise on finalising dashboard</b></p> <p><b>NC left the meeting</b></p> <p><b>Item 8</b> – AM asked governors to liaise with herself should they have any matters to be raised during the next AGF?</p> <p><b>Item 8</b> – AM asked governors to complete the evaluation form for Governance Day 2 by 20.03.26, if not already done so  <b>Action: Governors to complete evaluation form for Governance Day 2 by 20.03.26, if not already done so</b></p> <p><b>Item 8</b> – IS advised the college would continue to explain the role and importance of local governance with students. He would also consider a similar piece of work with staff.</p> <p><b>NC returned to the meeting</b></p> <p><b>Item 8</b> – LS advised she had completed Complaints and Suspension and Exclusion training. IS noted national guidance would change to increase the threshold as to when schools could consider the use of suspensions.  <b>Action: SM agreed to complete Suspension and PEX training and AM&amp;EL Complaints training</b></p>	<p><b>EL,SM</b> <b>KC,LS</b></p> <p><b>LS, EL</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>AM,EL,SM</b></p>
---	--

	<p><b>Action: Other governors to also consider completing Complaints and Suspension and Exclusion training, if not already done so</b></p> <p>It was agreed all other actions had either been completed or would be discussed in the meeting.</p>	<b>All</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Vision, Values and strategic objectives</b>	
	<p><b>Improvement Plan</b> – A separate document titled ‘RAG College Strategic Plan - with Comments’ was distributed prior to the meeting, which IS proceeded to go through, advising the document included four priorities to be considered over a four year period. <i>A governor noted in Curriculum &amp; Learning, the "Effective use of data" was RAG rated green. What evidence gives leaders confidence in that judgement, and how do governors gain independent assurance it is accurate? Can comments be provided on approaches used in Y7-Y10 which "ensure(s) intervention is in place to support those not making desired progress"?</i> IS advised this was probably an error in that the college was focussed on a new approach to Year 7 which has been implemented. The quality assurance and use of this data is something the college was working on closely with middle leaders who need to be upskilled to take greater responsibility for their curriculum areas.</p> <p>There would also be a reflection on assessment and marking as previously there had been a number of departments within the college with one member of staff, who had a detailed understanding of relevant data. The SLT would look for subject leads to take a greater ownership of data. IS advised there had been significant progress around behaviours and expectations in the autumn term and would now focus on improvements to improve teaching &amp; learning.</p> <p><b>IDSR</b> – A separate document titled ‘IDSR (Inspection Data Summary Report)’ was distributed prior to the meeting and IS advised it included for a series of data and metrics which would be reviewed by the lead inspector to then develop themes during an Ofsted inspection. There was no data within the document which the college was unaware of and IS suggested although Ofsted may no longer form a pre-judgment prior to an inspection, it was still an informative document. <i>A governor queried could the college provide some further context to the "FSM6 - Attendance" figures? Are any interventions specifically in place for this group (and if so how are they being monitored)?</i> IS advised not specifically for this cohort. This will be addressed through inclusion framework and individual meetings with students and families. It is likely caused by a variety of factors. During the meeting he added FSM6 included for students who were either currently eligible for FSM or had been so in the last six years. There was an overlap between attendance and SEND as well as other indicators and attendance would be monitored on a student by student basis.</p>	

	<p><i>A governor queried in light of discussions at the last LGB around mixed ability KS3 and loose streaming In early KS4 for mathematics) can you provide some further comment on Maths A8 for "High prior attainers"? How can we be sure the current approach to mathematics in particular is delivering strong outcomes for *all* groups of learners? What evidence is the SLT using to assess this?</i></p> <p><i>IS advised he did not consider the issue is just Maths. It is also A8 for English and Open and speaks to our priority around curriculum improvement and development and thinking hard and not getting enough top grades anywhere in the curriculum. With Maths specifically, as with other subjects, the structure of groups is under review and we look at end point as well as interim data, but we know this an area for improvement.</i></p> <p><b>SM left the meeting</b></p> <p>A governor noted the college had previously considered reducing its PAN? IS advised whilst previously the college had taken up to 150 in two year groups, the college would continue with a PAN of 125 and would not want to go above this level.</p> <p><b>Action: IS to confirm details of principles when setting the timetabling</b></p> <p><b>SM returned to the meeting</b></p> <p><i>A governor noted numbers taking GCSE Dance in 23,24 &amp; 25 were very low and queried what were the resource and curriculum considerations when running subjects with consistently small cohorts? Are there agreed thresholds or principles the school uses when deciding whether to continue offering a subject?</i></p> <p><b>LS left the meeting</b></p> <p><i>IS advised both yes and no - we want to encourage subjects which have not been traditionally offered and broaden the curriculum offer and need to allow time for this to build from Year 7. However, we will not run courses and reduce class offer and deploy resource elsewhere if required. The challenge is often you can move the staff profile in a very agile way to meet changing demand.</i></p> <p><b>LS returned to the meeting</b></p>	IS
<b>6.</b>	<b>Curriculum</b>	
	<p>The following documents were distributed prior to the meeting; -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention Tracker Example</li> <li>• Link Governor Report for Curriculum</li> <li>• Year 11 Data, Comparisons and Themes</li> <li>• Year 11 Plan</li> </ul> <p><i>From the Year 11 Plan, a governor queried further details to the "Formation of Grade 9 club" (not RAG rated on plan). Could the SLT outline the intended purpose and structure of this provision,</i></p>	

*as well as reporting on whether it has been introduced? In particular, how will pupils be selected, how many are likely to participate, and how will leaders ensure equitable access (e.g. gender and disadvantaged pupils)? How will middle leaders be supported to deliver this effectively?*

*From the Year 11 Data document a governor queried how the SLT would know/monitor the grades reported from the practice exams in each subject are well-calibrated against likely outcomes? (noting comment on Spanish grades post practice exam). What moderation or quality assurance processes are used across subjects? JB advised students would be tested upon starting in Yr7 with resultant data being forwarded to the FFT (Family Fisher Trust who would translate this to what expectant KS2 data. 2025-26 would be the final year which student's data would be affected by the pandemic.*

Targets for Yrs 9 and 10 would be set both based on KS2 data and flight groups and from these barometers, targets would be set based on the higher of the two sets of data.

A governor congratulated the college for the Spanish data, without there being a specialist teacher in place.

*From the Yr11 Data document a governor queried some seemingly significant drops when practice exams in Dec 2025 and Dec 2024 are compared (e.g., 4-9 in maths from 65% to 55%; in science 61.9% to 48.6%; maths 7-9 from 16.4 to 9.9; chemistry from 45.2 to 29.0). But how meaningful/worrying are such comparisons given the cohorts of pupils differ? If it does matter, what is being done in response? JB advised there would be a moderation process for all test data and the reasons for any difference in Maths was due to a change in national grade boundaries (there had also been changes for other subjects).*

Taking History as an example, JB advised final exams would include for four units, whereas mock tests would only consider part of the curriculum. For English, students could both sit mock tests based on recently completed units as well as others which had been taught previously and could therefore be considered more challenging.

### **SM left the meeting**

*A governor noted whilst the analysis tab was very helpful but focuses on changes between practice exams and the last data point, as well as against last year's practice exams (for last year's cohort). What, if anything, can be learnt by instead comparing the data from the practice exams against this cohort's targets? Are there particular subjects or pupil groups where leaders have concerns, and how are these being addressed? JB advised data from mock tests would be reviewed by line managers, especially for those departments with only one member of staff. Secondary schools would be judged both on Grade 4-9 and 5-9 data and he explained the use of v groups and of targeted support for specific students.*

	<p><b>SM returned to the meeting</b></p> <p><i>From the link governor report, a governor queried if the SLT could provide a future report to LGB summarising recent pupil survey findings, including emerging key themes and how leaders intend to respond to them?</i> IS advised whilst the SLT could consider this, it would increase workload and instead suggested a verbal update be provided. The timing of pupil surveys was set by the central team.</p> <p><b>Action: Verbal update on responses from pupil surveys to be taken to LGB4 on 06.05.26</b></p> <p><i>A governor queried the process should students not attend interventions?</i> JB advised of the use of student intervention logs for every subject, which included for current attainment and strategies in place, both in and out of class. Subject leads would maintain an attendance register, and he would liaise with parents should a student not attend interventions. Due to the number of students who accessed the college via public transport, interventions were changed to take place at mentor times and lunchtimes.</p> <p>A governor queried should students attend interventions in more than one subject; would they then miss their lunchtime? JB advised English, maths and science interventions were compulsory over two lunchtimes /week, other interventions would run during mentor time.</p> <p><b>Action: Student attendance data of interventions to be taken to LGB4 on 06.05.26</b></p> <p><b>JB then left the meeting</b></p>	<p>IS</p> <p>IS</p>
7.	<p><b>Safeguarding</b></p>	
	<p>The following documents were distributed prior to the meeting; -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance Data</li> <li>• Largest Area of Concern by Year Group</li> <li>• Student by Year Group and Number of Concerns Logged Last Academic Year</li> <li>• Student by Year Group and Number of Concerns Logged Last Academic Year</li> </ul> <p><i>A governor queried if a verbal report could be given in the meeting by the SLT about the apparent drop off in attendance from Y7 to Y8? Do you have information on what strategies are used in other schools across the MAT (e.g., Linton, Sawston, Soham) at which the drop off in attendance from Y7 to Y8 is less marked than at BVC?</i> IS advised he had attended a heads conference on 11 March and noted the benefit of the college being in the trust to allow for benchmarking of data with other settings. An attendance officer had been recently employed by the college, but other trust secondary schools had a similar but more developed position. Other settings would separate data into further categories, which allowed for an early identification of students at risk of lower</p>	

	<p>attendance. He then noted the main comparisons with other settings;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance had been a focus within other schools for a longer period of time</li> <li>• Attendance would be considered with a greater use of data</li> <li>• There was a more developed link between attendance and inclusion, and the position would have a greater voice within the schools safeguarding team</li> </ul> <p>It was noted the colleges had shared its best practice with exam officers from other schools.</p> <p><b>NC left the meeting</b></p> <p>A governor queried if the attendance officer could be further supported by the SLT? IS advised the officer would now attend weekly safeguarding meetings.</p> <p><b>NC returned to the meeting</b></p> <p>A governor queried if the attendance officer had been trained on the use of Bromcom? IS advised it to be a user-friendly system and would reflect on how to give her a greater confidence in the role.</p> <p><i>A governor noted Bromcom and digital systems were often down, and queried the reasoning why is this? Is this solely a BassVC issue or the type of systems being used? IS advised there have been recent service issues, but it is a software not a BVC issue which the trust are reviewing and working with these providers.</i></p> <p><i>A governor queried in the bar charts for students logs of concerns what do the colour spots represent? IS advised it is just tracking numbers in case they sit across multiple students or year groups.</i></p> <p>He then gave reasons for presenting the data in the form it was which may or may not be useful.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>People and Leadership</b>	
	<p><b>Staff Absence</b> – A separate document titled ‘Absence Report January – February 2026 BAS’ was distributed prior to the meeting.</p> <p><i>A governor noted the sickness figures for the period given seemed very high. Does every employee who is absent through sickness complete a RTW interview? Is there a procedure for managing sickness absence?</i> IS advised the reasoning for the limited period within the report was to allow for a review of similar data across the trust.</p> <p>A governor queried who would have responsibility for inputting absence data? IS advised central HR and there was a return-to-work form, to be completed after any absence with the relevant line manager.</p> <p>The trust had updated its Staff Sickness and Absence Policy including thresholds, which would trigger different layers of support (he noted the number of staff who were currently on informal</p>	

	<p>management support and those who were close to crossing the threshold). There had been an improvement in the tracking and monitoring of staff absence in the last year, although data was still too high. A number of staff were consistently absent and IS suggested possible reasons for this.</p> <p><b>ICFP (Integrated Curriculum and Financial Planning) –</b> A separate document titled ‘ICFP Alphabetical Staff Allocation Overview 26-27’ was distributed prior to the meeting and IS advised of the documents purpose, which the trust had requested be taken to LGBs as part of a discussion on finances. He then suggested governors focus on the data in the bottom right of each tab.</p> <p>Whilst the detail in the report was at an operational level, the headlines were relevant to governors and other trust schools had considered staff restructuring in 2025-26 (which would not be necessary for the college in the current year).</p> <p>A governor noted it had proven problematic to have an understanding of data within the document, without being provided with additional contextual data from other schools.</p> <p>AM asked if there were any further queries on the Item? There were none.</p>	
9.	<b>Risk</b>	
	<p><b><u>Refer to separate document titled ‘LGB3 CONFIDENTIAL Meeting Minutes for 12 Mar 2026’</u></b></p>	
10.	<b>Governance and Shared Services Team Matters</b>	
	<p><b>Feedback from Academy Improvement work, Strategic Groups &amp; Improvement Networks –</b> AM noted the next AGF would now be on 30 April to allow for an update on possible changes to ‘local governance’ within the trust.</p> <p><b>Feedback on Governance Day 2 held on 5 March –</b> AM thanked governors and staff for their attendance. LS had prepared a subsequent document which AM and LS would review with IS before uploading to the meeting folder.</p> <p><b>Action: Report from Governance Day 2 to be distributed</b></p> <p><b>Review Training –</b> Governors were asked to continue to inform SH of any attended training to allow him to update governor records.</p> <p><b>Reminder of Governance Training Opportunities –</b> The remaining trust meetings were confirmed; -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Governor Induction at 6.00pm Tuesday 21 April at Bottisham Village College</li> <li>• AGF on Thursday 30 April</li> </ul>	<p><b>LS</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding/ Inclusion 'drop-in' on Wednesday 15 May</li> <li>• AGF on Thursday 09 July</li> </ul>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	<p><b>Mental Health</b> – SM asked if the college would welcome additional mental health support from the Basingbourn Barracks? IS noted the final staff training day would be in July and was still to consider a focus, which could for such a visit.</p> <p><b>LGB Folders</b> – A governor asked SH to review the current format of folders on SharePoint, with a view of simplifying them?</p> <p>The meeting ended at 8.35pm.</p>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>Date, time and venue of next LGB meeting</b>	
	<p><b>LGB4</b> – Wednesday 06 May 6.00-8.00pm  <b>Governance Day 3</b> – Thursday 04 June – all day  <b>LGB5</b> – Thursday 09 July 6.00-8.00pm (NC gave his apologies)</p> <p>All held at Basingbourn VC.</p>	

<b>Items for Future Meetings</b>	
<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Item</b>
<b>2025/26 Academic Year</b>	There was none.