

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES**

Meeting of:	Full Governing Body
Date/Time:	21 st March 2019
Location:	Homewood College
Distribution:	Governors, Website
Quorum:	For decisions to be binding at least 6 governors are required to be present. The meeting was quorate throughout.
Present:	<p>Governors (voting) Rachel Carter (RC) Kerry Clarke (KC) from 17.48 Louise Cook (LC) Executive Headteacher Flora Jenkins (FJ) Peter Lyndsell (PL) Fiona Martin (FM) Jeff Matthews (JM) Sue Shanks (SS) Bob Wall (BW) Chair of Governors</p> <p>Other (non-voting) Anthony Carlo (AC) Head of School Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors Karen Prout (KP) School Business Manager</p>
Apologies:	Gary Alexander (GA) – accepted Anna Gianfrancesco (AG) – accepted

	DISCUSSION AND DECISION	ACTION
1.	<p>PRELIMINARIES</p> <p>1.1 Welcome. BW opened the meeting and FM was welcomed back following an agreed absence. JJ would follow up annual declarations. FM had stepped down from membership of the Brighton and Hove Pupil Referral Unit (PPRU) management committee and continued to have employment in the legal industry.</p> <p>1.2 Apologies and Interests. Apologies were considered and no new declarations of interest were made when invited: BW continued to be Chair of the PRU Management Committee; PL continued to be resident at the school site and his spouse worked at the school; SS was standing at the Council elections in May; FJ worked for a multi-academy trust. In discussion it was agreed no withdrawals were required from the outset; however, this would be reviewed as discussion progressed.</p> <p>1.3 Additional papers. BW informed two items were tabled: the School financial value standard, which due to workload had only just been</p>	JJ

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES**

	completed, and the minutes from the Resources committee meeting in February. These had been withheld pending release of information to staff.	
2	<p>MINUTES OF LAST MEETING and MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>2.1 The part 1 and part 2 minutes of the full governing body meeting on 12th December 2018 were agreed to be an accurate record and signed by BW accordingly. The part 2 minutes were deemed to continue to be confidential as they could cause concern to staff, pending issue of the consultation document.</p> <p>2.2 Matters arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The trip to the Cedar Centre had been postponed. The centre would be vacated in September. • Governors were to use only their school email addresses from now on. • BW was taking the risk register forward and would populate the template circulated to all governors and recommended from Resources committee. <p>See mins for matters arising</p>	JJ
3	<p>CHAIR'S REPORT</p> <p>Papers: Chair's report; SEMH Hub Draft Proposed Site Development (currently confidential).</p> <p>3.1 Premises. The draft premises paper had been circulated late and was the updated version of the draft discussed at the previous meeting. The next step was to embark upon consultation.</p> <p>Pinaki Ghoshal at the local authority had informed that the consultation should not start until the new administration was in place after the Council elections and the decision then taken regarding whether it needed to go back to Committee. There was concern that anything under consideration at the moment might be used for political purposes. It did not prevent the governing body from doing the preparation.</p> <p>Governors noted the full consultation was in 3 parts: moving Homewood College to the Cedar Centre; closing the Dyke Road premises and then the remaining moves, including regarding the primary provision.</p> <p>3.1.1 The issue under consideration now was: are we as governors happy with the paper going forward?</p> <p>Comments and considerations included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was an improvement from the previous draft • There was no specified option to the proposal. • It should be made clear there was no proposal to cut staff – in fact it was an expansion to accommodate an increase in roll to 60, but this was subject to clarification. • We can put the proposal and receiving responses would be useful. • There were some concerns regarding the change and transport to other parts of the city would be difficult in comparison. • If it was at the Homewood College site the work could start now and 	

HOMWOOD COLLEGE
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES

not be subject to indeterminate delays.

- The current building needs investment.
- The proposal was for change for the students in 2021. The works were starting on Downs View to move in in September 2020 and then there would be a year to work on the Cedar Centre.
- If we had £4m, what would get the best deal for the children? This was spelt out in the document that the redevelopment would get the most for them but more detailed plans were needed to be more confident in recommending it.
- If it were all at the Homewood site, allowing all the Hub's pupils access to all the key stage 3 and 4 curriculum would be hard to achieve.
- It would be easier to engage stakeholders once it was out in the open.

3.1.2 LC informed she was starting to find out with headteachers and pupils what was wanted and a meeting was needed with Gillian Churchill.

Have you spoken to the deputy heads about their needs? And about best actions from elsewhere. Yes, we are working with the deputy headteacher group and John McKee at Patcham High School.

A governor thought it likely capital funding was available from the local authority. **Where did the £4m come from, and why £4m?** This was not known.

What do they want to do with this site? The Department for Education could claw it back but it was not thought that was the motivation.

Is the development money for the Homewood College ring-fenced? We have been told it is. The £4m is ring-fenced to the SEMH hub.

A governor voiced the concern that as Homewood College was the last action on the plan there would be a knock on effect in the event of overspending and delays elsewhere.

KC arrives 17.48

Can you put the document to staff? Do you agree with the views? This will be a consultation across the Hub and following the initial, individual responses there would be a joint meeting to take forward joint views.

3.1.3 Further comments about whether to take the proposal forward:

- If it is beneficial for pupils then yes but if it is just to spend £4m, greater clarity about the positive things is needed, along with an alternative option.
- The proposal does set out the pros and cons and is the preferred option.
- It needs to be what is best for the pupils.
- Are we comfortable having the PRU and Homewood College so physically close?
- From a parent perspective there is little difference between the units.
- Away from Brighton and Hove the SEMH units are seen as places of specialism rather than having negative connotations.

3.1.4 It was agreed governors were comfortable with the proposal going

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES**

	<p>forward. BW would take the issues relating to whether there was an option or it was a <i>fait accompli</i> and also relating to the source of the funding to the meeting on Tuesday. He added that Pinaki Ghoshal also wanted to know whether or not the Committee needed the outcomes of the consultation.</p> <p>Is our role as governors clear going in to consultation? BW and LC will discuss how that would look like and ensure it was in place before it was launched.</p> <p>3.2 Chairs report. Governors had already considered the contents of the report which also included feedback from the 'governors' executive group'. It was stressed this group was not fixed in membership and had no powers of decision making but was to add pace and oversight to change whilst supporting management. Thanks were given to those who had attended. Work was continuing with streamlining some of the working parties.</p> <p>A governor and JJ related briefly their experience of such groups and JJ advised limiting the audience relating to any matters that may result in the requirement of a governor panel. It was agreed feedback was essential although this did not need to be by way of formal minutes. Transparency to enable scrutiny by the full governing body relating to all its statutory work was still required.</p> <p>In discussion, with the exception of the terms of reference, the report was accepted.</p> <p>3.3 Further information Management support. The local authority support for a new headteacher was to include a secondment for up to 3 days a week, for a year. They would be on the leadership team and supporting the school to increase the pace of improvements, particularly in teaching and learning, moderation and training.</p> <p>Police presence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LC had drawn up a job description for police presence at the school. They would support staff to get to know the student so if they got into difficulties the response would be right. Will they be employed by the police? It will be paid for by the local authority. • A governor suggested involvement with the police with regard to 'Be the change' and relating to employers. It was thought to be useful to have the police at the school for reasons other than emergencies. 9 youth workers were also being funded in the city. • Another governor had attended a police child friendly conference and suggested that if they were employed by the police you would have more influence on the wider system as that employee could feed back into the police. LC will send the job description as it had not yet been fixed. • A governor added that the rapid response team tried not to criminalize and the whole ethos was to be child friendly. 	<p style="text-align: center;">BW LC</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>STRATEGIC DISCUSSIONS 4.1 VISION LC was in discussion with the school Council about 4 key objectives and would report back.</p>	

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES**

	<p>4.2 PREMISES PAPER This was discussed at item 3.1 4.3 RISK MANAGEMENT This was discussed at item 2.2 4.4 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT LC informed there would be a coffee afternoon on Weds the 3rd April 2-4pm and governors were welcome.</p>	
5	<p>RESOURCES COMMITTEE Papers: Minutes 21.1.19 and 27.2.19, SFVS (tabled), Terms of reference, Code of Conduct, Capability policy.</p> <p>5.1 KP reported that since the meeting the deficit had reduced. A variance where £25k had been left off one of the central payments reports had been investigated. Funds had been received for staffing, reducing the deficit to nearer £100k dr; however, there were some caveats with this, for example re teacher pensions. Minutes accepted.</p> <p>5.2 Governors observed that insufficient time had been available to assess the SFVS and they wished to have a rigorous action plan. It was decided to request the local authority to extend the deadline until 1st May. Governors were requested to forward comment on the form to KP by email.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ 5.3 The updated LA model staff code of conduct was agreed to be adopted subject to the minor amendments required to tailor it to Homewood. ❖ 5.4 The renewal of the local authority model capability policy was agreed. FM would review the wording and report back. ❖ 5.5 The terms of reference for the Resources Committee were approved. <p>5.6 The minutes from the meetings 21.1.19 and 27.2.19 were approved. KP leaves.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p># LC</p> <p># FM</p> <p>#</p> <p>#</p>
6	<p>SAFEGUARDING WORKING GROUP The draft minutes from the meeting 12.2.19 were accepted. There were no recommendations for approval. The main focus had been on the Central record. Vigilance was needed with offsite providers. LC confirmed everyone had now got onto the training. A governor had outlined concerns following visits. These surrounded levels of absence and the induction process . Another governor had visited and a helpful case study was examined. Work was continuing on building a joint behavior policy. At present this was divergent. That and a joint Child Protection policy was expected soon. They would continue to monitor.</p>	
7	<p>PERFORMANCE WORKING GROUP (PWG) Subject to the removal of FJ as being absent (she was not on the committee) the draft minutes from the meeting were accepted. There were no recommendations for approval. BW reported there was a huge issue on workload re data provision, especially for this group and he had met with SLT and taken this forward. The suggestion is that the 3 Heads of School would write a report for the</p>	JJ/Clerk Pru

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES**

	<p>PWG on pupil progress and quality of teaching. The suggestion is that Karen produces a grid of data upon which the Heads write a commentary on. We have a local authority strategy group that is monitoring the work of the governing body.</p> <p>At the meeting there had been reports from all the Heads of Schools and they had looked at quality of teaching. Discussions on the new Ofsted framework had begun and Mike Newman would do a presentation on this at the next meeting.</p>	
8	<p>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT – on track? GOVERNORS – Visits. Papers: behaviour visit.</p> <p>8.1 LC informed the school development plan (SDP) would be updated for the next meeting and rewritten for September. She informed it was moving forward but slowly. The secondment would help. We know what we need to do so we need to consolidate and move forward.</p> <p>What are the main changes as a result of Ofsted? Adjusting the curriculum and how we use our teaching assistants more effectively. Have you made any progress on the music space? A governor had followed up re using s106 monies with the local authority and had been confident it could be used. If we invest in an outdoor space it needed to be transportable.</p> <p>A governor suggested tying in the work that we are trying to do on the health outcomes, by looking at needs and outcomes to the SDP. LC agreed it would, it was all connected.</p> <p>LC and AC were requested to report back to us in July with the headlines and where we need to be. KC and LC would meet to review how the impact of the plan would be assessed and shown and report back in July.</p>	<p>LC</p> <p>KC LC</p>
9	<p>HEADTEACHER’S REPORT (if any items not covered elsewhere) and policies for approval Papers: Head of School report (confidential); Joint appraisal policy; Draft equality policy.</p> <p>9.1 Head of School report. AC gave further information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been some changes in the last week. We are now down to 50 from 53 on role. We had 3 that weren’t really attending that have now gone to other schools. • As a school requiring improvement we cannot meet extreme needs; however we would be able to meet the needs once the school was classed as ‘good’. • Attendance had increased to 59%, there had already been an impact from the new home liaison role. They are working 3 days a week. <p>LC added that at a meeting with the local authority, with educational psychologist and SEN input, it had been recognised a lot of those students had not been appropriately placed. The meetings will now take place every half term. Governors expressed concern about where else the children would go and with meeting their needs and those of the other children here.</p>	

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES

2	JJ	Take action re minutes and confidentiality	
3	BW LC	Report back on governor role re consultation	
5.2	ALL	Review SFVS and report back to KP	
5.3	LC	Make amendments. Ensure Jj receives final document	
5.4	FM	Review capability policy wording and report back	
8	LC	Amend SDP	
8	KC LC	Liaise re 'smart' SDP	
9	ALL	Submit comments re equality duties	
11	LC	Amend HT reports	
11	LC	Provide final H&S policy and report to next meeting	