

Bassingbourn Village College

Local Governing Body

Meeting Minutes



06 May 2026 at 6pm at the college

PRESENT:

Ian Stoneham (IS)	Principal
Sarah Anderson (SA)	
Kim Caldwell (KC)	
Jo Lambert (JL)	
Elizabeth Lock (EL)	
Alison Maley (AM)	Chair
Simon Martin (SM)	
Lucy Navi (LN)	
Laura Sims (LS)	

APOLOGIES: Nicholas Cunliffe (NC)

IN ATTENDANCE: Stuart Hales (SH) Clerk

Action Log

Item	Action	Resp.
3.0	Accessibility Plan to be taken to LGB on 09.07.26 for approval	IS,SH
4.0	IS and LS to meet separately to discuss the most appropriate way of the college reporting behaviours for governor review	IS,LS
4.1	Governors to complete all training (if not already done so) by 13.05.26 and either forward a certificate or screenshot to SH for his records	All
4.2	AM to liaise with Rebecca and Tori to discuss wider experiences and trips	AM
4.3	AM forwarded the candidates email address to SH on 08.05.26, to allow him to liaise with the candidate ref. starting the application/ onboarding process	SH
4.4	All governors to liaise with AM if they know of candidates who may be interested in joining the LGB	All
4.5	Central team confirmed on 08.05.26 they were happy for LGBs to go over the 'rule' that parents of a child in the college could not ' <i>form the majority of the LGB</i> ', on a case by case basis.	AM
4.6	SEND link governor to complete visit	KC,LS
4.7	LS and EL to liaise on finalising dashboard	LS,EL
4.8	Governors to inform AM of suggestions of focusses for Governance Day 3	All
4.9	SM, AM and EL to forward certificates from suspension, PEX and complaints training to SH for his records	SM,AM,EL
4.10	IS and SM to liaise further ref. Inset Day on 04.06.26 being based at Bassingbourn Barracks	IS,SM
6.0	NC to liaise with IS ref. clarification of governor question raised prior to the LGB	NC,IS
8.0	IS to supply breakdown of 20-26-27 cohort	IS
10.0	Governors to review draft meeting dates for LGBs in 2026-27 by 13 May and inform AM if any can't attend – after which the dates could be taken as being approved	All

ITEM	ACTION
------	--------

1.	Welcome and Apologies	
	Apologies were received from NC which were accepted by Governors and the meeting was quorate.	
2.	Declarations of Interest	
	There were no declarations for any item on the agenda.	
3	Minutes of last meeting (12.03.2026)	
	<u>LGB Minutes</u> All Governors had read the previously circulated minutes, and the following points were raised;- <i>A governor noted IS's response to a question has not been clearly minuted. Following a lengthy discussion on streaming (particularly in mathematics), the agreed action was for IS to confirm the principles behind timetabling, including the trade-offs involved in introducing even limited streaming in Years 7 and 8. However, the minutes (top of p.7) simply state "IS advised he did," which is unclear and does not reflect the substance of the discussion. Could this section be reworked?</i> <i>The minutes from the LGB in March had since been updated to include ISs response from the Governors Questions document from that meeting.</i> <i>A governor noted no information has been provided in the papers for this meeting in response to "Action: 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"</i> Refer to Item 4.2 below. <i>A governor had checked the website this morning (3rd May) and the policies have still not been updated. Will this be done before our meeting on Wednesday?</i> <i>IS advised this should now be complete.</i> Having reviewed the website a governor noted the Curriculum Policy had not been included and the Accessibility Plan required updating. IS advised whilst it was a statutory requirement for schools to have the Curriculum Policy on their websites, due to it currently being reviewed he would not include it on the college's website. All other policies on the website were now up to date. Action: Accessibility Plan to be taken to LGB on 09.07.26 for approval <u>Confidential LGB Minutes</u> All Governors had read the previously circulated minutes, and these were accepted as a true record and agreed.	IS,SH
4.	Matters arising from minutes of 12.03.2026 not on this agenda	
	<u>LGB Minutes</u> Item 4.0 – IS apologised for only sharing Google folders, providing a link to the colleges policies, with governors earlier the same day. A governor noted the LGB did not have access to a Google log-in and IS suggested governors use their AL email.	

Item 4.1 – AM thanked those governors who had commented on the Admissions, Anti-Bullying and Behaviour Policies since the last LGB – the policies would now be taken as being approved. Item 4.2 – IS advised with regard to providing data on student results versus cover staff volume, there were more than one type of cover;- • External supply to cover short term staff absence, who would not be on the colleges system and would be recorded differently on Bromcom. • Long term supply cover which did not flag on Bromcom and would not be recorded as cover staff. • Existing staff to be redeployed in the college. IS then advised using the colleges systems, it would be time consuming to provide a summary data for governors to review. The college was tracking students annually but was not able to review data over a longer period of time. Item 4.3 – It was agreed to carry over the action for IS and LS to meet to discuss the most appropriate way of the college reporting behaviours for governor review. Action: IS and LS to meet separately to discuss the most appropriate way of the college reporting behaviours for governor review Item 4.4 – Governors were asked to complete all outstanding training and forward a certificate or screenshot to SH for his records (JL noted she had completed Cyber Security training). Action: Governors to complete all training (if not already done so) by 13.05.26 and either forward a certificate or screenshot to SH for his records Item 4.5 – Further to Governance Day 2, it was agreed to carry over the action for AM to liaise with Rebecca and Tori to discuss wider experiences and trips and feedback to an LGB. AM advised she had since attempted to contact them and asked if IS would chase them to respond? Action: AM to liaise with Rebecca and Tori to discuss wider experiences and trips Item 4.6 – LN had brought her DBS to the LGB which was passed to IS to have oversight of. Item 4.7 – AM advised she had since liaised with a candidate who had expressed an interest in joining the LGB as a trust appointed governor and asked SH to liaise with him to start the onboarding process. Post Meeting Note: AM forwarded the candidates email address to SH on 08.05.26, to allow him to liaise with the candidate ref. starting the application/ onboarding process	IS,LS All AM SH
--	---

Item 4.8 – AM asked should a governor know of a potential candidate who may be interested in joining the LGB, to please liaise with herself. Action: All governors to liaise with AM if they know of candidates who may be interested in joining the LGB A governor noted the LGB had previously advertised for governors via local parish councils. SM noted he had links with Whaddon Parish Council. SH noted he was still chasing a response from the central governance team as to whether there was any flexibility from guidance from the LGB Handbook that parents of a child in the college could not <i>‘form the majority of the LGB’</i>. Post Meeting Note: Central team confirmed on 08.05.26 they were happy for LGBs to go over the ‘rule’ that parents of a child in the college could not ‘form the majority of the LGB’, on a case by case basis Item 4.9 – A separate document titled ‘Link Governor Meeting (Safeguarding) ELSM 29.04.26’ was distributed prior to the meeting. Item 4.10 – It was agreed to carry-over the action for the SEND link governor to complete a visit. Action: SEND link governor to complete visit Item 4.11 – It was agreed to carry over the action for LS and EL to liaise on finalising a combined governor dashboard to discuss both updated SEND and safeguarding monitoring metrics. Action: LS and EL to liaise on finalising dashboard Item 4.12 – AM thanked governors for completing the evaluation form for Governance Day 2 - governors had found the day useful, interesting and worthwhile, with clear benefits for understanding the colleges strategic systems, which she would consider when planning future governance days (the summary had been uploaded to the Governance Day 2 folder). AM had emailed governors prior to the LGB, asking for suggestions which could form a focus for Governance Day 3 on Thursday June (she had suggested visions, community, leadership and core standards) Action: Governors to inform AM of suggestions of focusses for Governance Day 3 IS noted as students would be in the middle of exams, governors would be restricted as to available spaces they could use around the college during the Governance Day in June. A governor suggested the LGB consider the success of the next day and if necessary, be mindful of exams when agreeing governance days for 2026-27. AM mentioned that exams were held from April to the end of June which left very few days available, especially as Governance Days had to also be governed by the college calendar.	All - KC,LS LS,EL All
---	--

5.	Vision, Values and strategic objectives	
	A separate document titled 'RAG College Strategic Improvement Plan - with Comments' was distributed prior to the meeting. IS asked governors to focus on the summaries and success against strategic objectives. The overall priority in the autumn term had been to focus on behaviours and expectations - curriculum, teaching and learning would now be an increasing focus, including curriculum enrichment and student aspiration The personal development of students would become a priority in Yrs2 and 3 of the plan. The SLT had reflected on the number of priorities in 2025-26 and would look to have fewer moving forwards. Initial Strategy Planning for 2026-27 – A separate document titled 'Summary of this Year and Focus of 2026-7' was distributed prior to the meeting. IS advised there had been a significant reduction in support from the Trust central team due to illness. <i>A governor noted Summary: when Step Lab was introduced, we were told the acid test of the staff reaction would be when Step Lab feedback moved from exclusively positive to more developmental in nature? Has that transition occurred? And what challenges has it led to?</i> <i>IS advised yes - the transition has happened and has been a positive progression. We have found the challenge is that meaningful developmental feedback is much more time consuming. We have therefore simplified our process in terms of leaders approach to who we see and what we are asking staff to focus on. The two themes currently are pace and challenge in lessons.</i> IS advised whilst short lesson observations continued, longer observations allowed for more meaningful feedback. Each member of the SLT had a number of staff to provide developmental feedback to on a half termly basis, and the college had started to see the positive impact of this approach. <i>A governor queried Priorities for next year: what specific problems are you aiming to fix with the continued focus on behaviour/expectations? What can be measured in terms of the specific issues and what would constitute success?</i> <i>IS advised we have improved significantly the overall climate for learning in the College this year, but two challenges remain. The first is that the relationship between high quality teaching and learning and low levels of disruption mean that behaviour in the classroom that is slowing down learning is the biggest area to address. Alongside this there are a very small (reduced this year) number of students who are not accessing the curriculum consistently and this has noticeable impact on the atmosphere and climate across the school.</i> IS added there were effectively two types of behaviours;-	

	• Environmental – a calm and purposeful atmosphere in the college had been a priority in 2025-26. • In 2026-27, there would be a focus on behaviours and attitudes to learning. <i>A governor queried within Systems in priorities for next year. What does "parents and the wider community more actively involved" mean? Can it - particularly the latter - be quantified in a way which goes beyond anecdotal data?</i> <i>IS advised our data at parents evenings, information evenings, parent forums shows we have a significant portion of parents who are not regularly engaging with us. We need to go to them rather than expecting that they will come to us. This requires us to build strong relationships with certain families and not be constricted by traditional events. We can measure the involvement with the local community in terms of how many opportunities within the curriculum there are for students to engage and work within the local community. In addition, the amount of for example careers talks, work experience and other activities where members of the local community are in school working with students can be measured.</i> <i>A governor queried within Curriculum. How can we as a LGB know there are "improvements in teaching and learning"? Particularly within the next academic year (since we are told improvements will be "quick"). What are the success metrics for the new curriculum and over what timescale? What does "coaching at the heart" correspond to for staff, and are there risks here?</i> <i>IS advised this is a very broad question, hard to answer simply here. Improvements in teaching and learning need to be measured by leaders observations, student voice, trust monitoring visits and academic results but this may be in measures such as reading scores before it is evident in summative assessment. Coaching at the heart I will talk through in the meeting.</i> <i>IS added there will be metrics from trust reports, which would be reported to governors.</i> <i>AM asked if there were any further queries? There were none.</i>	
6.	Curriculum	
	Achievement Tracking (Spring Term Data) – A separate document titled 'Letter explaining approach to Year 7 data' was distributed prior to the meeting. <i>A governor noted while the GCSE flight path information is interesting, it is difficult to relate it to the sextile-based data parents receive. Students with different KS2 entry scores must be grouped together yet must also have different expected outcomes within the intra-sextile range, making the "on target" (green) indicator potentially misleading. How can the reported information be made more informative and personalised for individual students? What range of combined KS2 entry scores do each of the different sextiles cover?</i> <i>IS advised this is a very good question. I think the key here is that we do not think the new approach is perfect. It is an evolution to</i>	

	<i>ensure that data is more comparable across subject areas. How we report on individual students is something we continue to reflect on and will work with parents on. The feedback of this approach has so far been broadly positive from parents, but we need subject leaders to shape this approach and have greater input moving forward.</i> <i>IS added that he did not consider the college had landed upon the final assessment process for Yrs7 and 8.</i> IS noted on reflection, there been insufficient consultation with subject leaders before the system had changed, and there was a challenge with subjects requiring fundamentally different assessment models. A separate document titled 'Current Data Year 7-11' was distributed prior to the meeting. <i>A governor queried what are the bands here? Whatever they are, the bandings for music seem quite surprising?!</i> <i>IS advised bands are the movement of students between sextiles (up or down). Music is a concern and being is addressed through line management and curriculum and assessment work. Further context here as well which I will share in our meeting.</i> IS added for context the Yr7 assessment model would divide students into six banded groups and whether students would then continue within the same bands as they progressed through the college. There was an ongoing review of TLRs across the trust to ensure an equality of roles across Anglian Learning. The college did not currently have a lead for music and as a result had introduced leadership logs for Music and Drama as part of this process. A governor queried staff morale as a result of the TLR review? IS advised it could be better and although he understood the reasoning for the review, from the colleges perspective he would not have chosen to undertake it at this particular time due to the risk of staff resignations. There would not be a staff restructuring in the college in the present year. A governor queried if the college would consider recruitment and retention bonuses to encourage staff to remain? IS advised such bonuses would only have a short term benefit and could not for the colleges strategy alone. Currently opportunities for staff to benefit from secondments to other schools in the trust were not practically possible and the college would look for a greater benefit of being part of a wider organisation. <i>For Year 8 a governor noted a significantly increased rate of progress in science to Y8DP1 (to a level exceeding that achieved current Y9 at the *end* of Y8). What explains this rate of progress?</i> <i>IS advised this is something that we have also noticed and are following up through line management. There is some inconsistency in the science data which has not been helped by the non-specialist and supply teaching this year. Lead for Science is looking carefully at curriculum at KS3 for next year.</i>	
--	--	--

<i>For Year 9 a governor queried to what extent are the target grades for each individual subject driven by KS2 entry scores for the students who take it versus Y8 DP2 versus other things? IS advised KS2 entry scores are the prime driver given that is the benchmark we are ultimately judged on. Our internal data provides context and there are some moves but these need strong justification.</i> <i>For Year 10 a governor noted the APS for history (cell \$Y\$13) at Y10DP1 seems very high relative to the target (cell \$R\$13). What explains this? IS advised strong teaching in Year 10 but there is also some inconsistency in assessment approach across the two classes which we are looking to address.</i> <i>For Year 11 a governor noted Maths APS in Y11DP2 currently seems weak relative to target (particularly in comparison to English). Is this a problem? IS advised it may be. The maths data has typically been accurate if sometimes a little cautious. Focussed intervention has been ongoing to target specific students and their gaps.</i> <i>For Year 11 a governor noted APS and percentages at each grade in Y11DP2 Latin/health & fitness. Do you have any comments here? IS advised for context for Latin, a change in teacher and the subject now being open to all students would affect outcomes in 2025-26. For Health&Fitness the outcomes for 2024-25 were exceptionally strong, so the college would expect some drop of in data for the current year.</i> Core Standards Executive Summary for Outcomes – A separate document titled ‘CS2 Outcomes Executive Summary April 2026 BVC’ was distributed prior to the meeting. <i>A governor noted numbers reported for PP (top of page 2). Are these correct? It is surprising - and inconsistent with what is said on RHS - if PP are actually outperforming HPA in terms of A8?</i> Action: NC to liaise with IS ref. clarification of governor question raised prior to the LGB <i>A governor noted throughout the document, there is mention of attainment AND progress. But only attainment is ever reported. Why? IS advised this is focussed on KS4 outcomes for where there is not currently national progress benchmarks. We need to look at what we do about this internally.</i> The trust have a number of executive summaries, for schools to have in place. They were part a self-evaluation, a means to identify school strategic priorities and partly a pre-inspection tool. Different executive summaries would be taken to forthcoming LGBs for governor awareness and also as the college would expect an Ofsted inspection in 2026-27. AM asked if there were any further queries? There were none.	NC,IS
---	---------------------

7.	People & Leadership	
	Staff Survey Feedback – A separate document titled ‘Wellbeing Pulse Survey Results’ was distributed prior to the meeting. <i>A governor queried were the results around job satisfaction at BVC (Page 11/13) a surprise to the SLT? There is a worrying disconnect between "Staff generally more positive and feel they have a greater voice in school improvement" (in doc for Section 5.2) and the survey result. What are the drivers? What is being done in response?</i> <i>IS advised yes and no. I don't think there is a disconnect but it shows there is still much work to be done. We do not have a historic benchmark of this survey to compare to. We need to see this improve over time. The drivers are the national drivers but also some of the sticky problems we have here particularly in terms of behaviour, but these are being tackled and it takes time. We need to also probably better communicate and celebrate our successes when we have them.</i> Governors then discussed the level of response to the survey, staff morale and the connection to the wider trust in further detail. IS noted there would be a further staff survey in June with the same questions as used in 2024-25. Planned Staffing Structure 2026-27 – A separate document titled ‘Confidential - Proposed Staff Structure for 2026-7’ was distributed prior to the meeting, which IS briefly went through noting the SLT and middle leadership structure and responsibilities would not change. A governor queried if there had been any staff resignations? IS advised two members of staff would leave at the end of 2025-26 and one would reduce their responsibilities. The were vacancies for the Head of Computing and a TA. ICFP (Integrated Planning and Financial Planning) – A separate document titled 'ICFP Staff Allocation Overview' was distributed prior to the meeting. IS advised there had been a significant budgetary challenge in 2025-26. The college was still forecasting to end 2025-26 with a small surplus, even with re-payments to the central reserves. The college had set a budget for 2026-27 with a small surplus, which also included for further repayments to central reserves. The college would ask whether it could use the surplus from 2025-26 to make additional re-payments now, to allow for more funding to be used directly in the college in 2026-27. <i>A governor noted in maths, a large shortfall from the need of 111 hours, even with all possible subject specialist hours (94) already timetabled. Although there are competing demands, since maths is a core subject/taught in a mixed ability setting that even specialist teachers find it rather difficult to cater to, can a good case be made for recruitment of a PT Maths teacher for next year?</i> <i>IS advised yes - budget work is ongoing, but this will be the next position we look to recruit to.</i>	

	<i>A governor queried what is the current expected entry for next year's Y7? Is there any risk it could go beyond what would be reasonable for a 4 class model? Did the reduction in PAN that was mooted by IS last year go ahead?</i> <i>IS advised 125 but this is moving around a bit. Will explain more in meeting.</i> IS advised of the reasoning as to why the PAN would remain at 125. Currently 126 students had been offered places to start in Yr7 in September and from these 90 had accepted (there would be a Yr6 parents meeting next week). Regarding the risk of pupil numbers, IS considered it to be a medium/ long term risk. In the next couple of years large numbers of students would move from KS3 to 4 and from a financial perspective, the college could absorb a small reduction in Yr7 numbers over the next couple of years. The college had a number of 'out of catchment' students. A governor queried the optimum number of students for the college? IS advised the current PAN was financially the most effective way of running four classes. Whilst numbers reducing to 120 would still be manageable, any further would be financially inefficient as students moved through the college. <i>A governor queried why is the discussion around 4 classes in Year 11 rather than Year 10 (given the relative sizes of the year groups)?</i> <i>IS advised it is current Year 10 for when they move into Year 11.</i>	
8.	Risk	
	<i>A governor queried if it would it be possible to see a breakdown of next year's Y7, e.g., by primary, in comparison to last two (say) years. To judge trends, understand whether transport problems leading to changes?</i> Action: IS to supply breakdown of 2026-27 cohort IS noted the current ongoing risks;- • Long term risk around finances and pupil numbers • Recruitment and retention • Site Security	IS
9.	Governance and Shared Services Team Matters	
	Feedback from Academy Improvement work, Strategic Groups & Improvement Networks – Review Training – The following documents were distributed prior to the meeting;- • National College Training Courses and Webinars 2024-25 • Governance Training Opportunities 2025-26 Sep 2025 • Training schedule for new appointments Sep 2025 Governors were asked to continue to inform SH of any attended training to allow him to update governor records.	

	Reminder of Governance Training Opportunities – The remaining trust meetings were confirmed; - • Safeguarding/ Inclusion ‘drop-in’ on Wednesday 15 May • AGF on Thursday 09 July AM advised the AGF on 30 April had been deferred to allow the central team to continue to develop their proposals for the trusts new local governance model (it was hoped this could be shared at the AGF on 09 July).	
10.	AOB	
	LGB Meeting Dates for 2026-27 – AM had forwarded draft meeting dates to governors prior to the meeting for their approval. Action: Governors to review draft meeting dates for LGBs in 2026-27 by 13 May and inform AM if any can’t attend – after which the dates could be taken as being approved The meeting ended at 8.05pm.	All
11.	Date, time and venue of next LGB meeting	
	Governance Day 3 – Thursday 04 June – all day LGB5 – Thursday 09 July 6.00-8.00pm (NC gave his apologies) All held at Bassingbourn VC.	

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