

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

Meeting of:	Full Governing Body of Homewood College and Full Management Committee of Brighton and Hove Pupil Referral Unit and The Connected Hub	
Date/Time:	25 th February 2020 4 pm	
Location:	Homewood College	
Status:	Open/Confidential until 2 nd April 2020 (FGB 23 rd March 2020 / MC 2 nd April 2020)	
Distribution:	Full Governing Body, Full Management Committee (items 1-7), Karen Prout	
Quorum:	<p>Homewood College Governing Body: for decisions to be binding at least half the governors in office required to be present. Decisions were postponed until after the meeting was quorate (17:29).</p> <p>Management Committee: for decisions to be binding at least half the management committee members in office required to be present. The meeting was quorate throughout.</p>	
Present:	<p>Governors (voting at HC items unless noted) Jo Adams (JA) Louise Cook (LC) Executive Headteacher Flora Jenkins (FJ) from 17:29 Jeff Matthews (JM) Bob Wall (BW) Chair of Governors, Chair of Meeting</p> <p>Members (voting at MC items unless noted) Louise Cook (LC) Executive Headteacher Jackie O'Toole Quinn (JQ) Tim Shelley (TS) Jerry Thomas (JT) Bob Wall (BW)</p> <p>Other (non-voting) Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors Michelle McCann (MM) Clerk to Management Committee Karen Prout (KP) School Business Manager, in attendance Kate Schofield (KS)– observer and in attendance Tim Self (TSF) – observer and in attendance</p>	
Apologies:	Considered by HC governing body: Rachel Carter (RC) – accepted Anna Gianfrancesco (AG) – accepted Luke Burstow (LB) – accepted	Considered by MC: Sam Garrett (SG) - accepted Dion Page-Hammond (DP)- accepted
Acronyms:	HC – Homewood College EHT – Executive Headteacher FTE – Full-time equivalent HR – Human Resources department at the local authority LA – local authority MC – Management Committee PRU – pupil referral unit PRUs – The Connected Hub and Brighton and Hove Pupil Referral Unit	

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

MINUTES

	DECISION AND DISCUSSIONS	Action
1	<p>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS BW opened the meeting and general introductions followed. It was noted the HC governing body was not yet quorate. Their decision discussion would be postponed until FJ arrived.</p> <p>A brief background to the meeting was given. Consultation on two staffing restructures were being proposed and they would have an impact on both HC and PRUs.</p>	
2	<p>CONSIDERATION OF INTERESTS AND CHAIRING Papers: Interest Register HC governing body; Briefing paper from BW. Note: the interest register of the MC had not been received.</p> <p>2.1 Chairing The briefing paper had been considered. Governors and Members agreed BW should be the Chair of this meeting.</p> <p>2.2 Interests No new interests were declared when invited. In discussion, and after consideration of each governor and member, it was agreed they could all contribute to the meeting and no withdrawals from voting were required. It was agreed withdrawal of either the MC or HC governing body to enable independent discussion leading to a decision required by either body would be made at the time.</p>	
3	<p>CONSIDERATION OF APOLOGIES</p> <p>3.1 Governing Body LB, RC and AG had sent apologies and these were accepted. [Clerk note: Claire Saunders' message re apologies was received just after the meeting had closed]. The absence of Sue Shanks was noted.</p> <p>3.2 Management Committee SG and DP had sent apologies and these were accepted. The absences of Julie Stewart, Tracey Williams and Sarah Walker were noted.</p>	
4	<p>PRESENTATION OF STAFFING RESTRUCTURE CONSULTATION DOCUMENT BY LC Papers: Confidential Restructure consultation documents PRU (tabled) and HC (circulated a few days prior, JA received copy 25.2.20); summary restructure document (tabled); restructure staffing diagram (tabled).</p> <p>4.1 LC distributed copies of the draft restructure consultation documents. The PRU document had not previously been seen by HC governing body. She also tabled a summary of the two restructure documents which she then talked through and took questions.</p> <p>4.2 HC restructure The rationale was to enable the best provision within a sustainable budget, ensuring equality for staff. A licensed budget deficit was not an option. The proposed changes had been the subject of debate within the school, at a governors meeting 4.2.20 and with HR, which included meetings attended by BW and FJ.</p>	

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

4.2.1 Further information was given:

- The 5.4 FTE teachers now included the unqualified teacher post.
- The level D teaching assistant posts were to be more focussed.
- The inclusion of the level B teaching assistant posts were awaiting confirmation from HR, as those currently in post had not been so for longer than 2 years.
- The new therapist would not be on the senior leadership team.
- Advice was to be sought from governors with regard to the inclusion of the safeguarding, attendance and welfare lead post and whether this should be for example, a grade change and/or hours change.

4.2.2 A governor noted that should staffing continue as at present there would be an in year deficit of £138k dr, in addition to the projected outturn deficit of £16k dr. **Disregarding the safeguarding, attendance and welfare lead post: what are the savings?** 2 teachers and 4 teaching assistants. We have budgeted for 5 teaching assistants. The other teaching assistants are employed separately by the LA. The roles we propose for the level D posts will be different.

4.2.2 **In terms of the expertise you will be losing, in therapy for example, how will you keep up the standard of provision?** As the therapist is leaving we have the opportunity to restructure. Some of the things currently being done will be moved to other roles.

Are you confident they will be covered well? LC and KS responded: yes.

4.2.3 Safeguarding, welfare and attendance post

Is it a valuable role? It is difficult to say as some of the role has already been absorbed elsewhere.

KS added that the senior leadership team part of the role was not needed but safeguarding and some other items were.

Would that be covered under this scheme [restructure]? Yes.

Could the changes in the role be taken in two stages? Possibly.

KS said that parity across the hub needed to be considered and gave an example of incongruity in the PRU.

Are the demands of the pupils and numbers similar? KS responded: yes and the numbers for the PRUs are 40 and HC 45. The management role is not needed here.

It was acknowledged the school had brought in attachment aware policies which allowed for support for the whole school community, which would include the post holder.

4.2.3 **What will happen with the SENCo role?** LC informed it would be split. TSF informed that administrative support was given and was not a set role. LC reminded that as we are a special school assessments were not needed and KS added that the role needed to be about leading interventions across the board.

The matter was deferred till later on in the meeting.

LC tabled the restructure diagram.

4.3 PRUs restructure

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

LC talked through this section of the summary document, gave further information and took questions.

- She was continuing to take advice from HR
- Some changes were likely to be made regarding the SEN points. Not so many were now needed but an incomparable position had developed over time that was to be addressed. It had seemed fair that everyone had 1 point across the Central Hub as to remove all would cause a lot of bad will. TSF said they would have 3 years to change as pay would be protected.
- The Head of School PRU was proposed to be the same pay grade as the Head of School HC.
- The leadership pay spine (5-9) proposal for the key stage 3, 4 and primary leads was for clarity. They would start at 5 and they would not have the usual pay progression. An option could be to retain the 2 SEN points or have 1 SEN point and increase the TLR.
- There had been no further movement on moving the primary school as they have not yet been approached yet.
- The TLRs were following the Ofsted report and for across the Hub working.

4.3.1 **What are the costs?** LC informed that initial calculations showed the budget would balance all bar pay protection and SEN points by £44k. The pay protection could be met over 5 years; however, when the budget was drafted again today, it showed a deficit of **~£160k dr**

KP informed that she had requested the LA check her figures as it was possible an error had been made.

Can you tell us what it might be? KP I cannot, I have looked at different scenarios – it could be income. I have not had a commissioning number. If you look at the PRU in 2012 we had the same per pupil funding as we do now. The funding has never increased.

LC considered that an increase would not be forthcoming and they were awaiting a response from the LA. The MC would need to consider whether it was sustainable. She added that they had been told we would not lose front line staff yet we are now in this position

Have you have support from the LA? KP I am getting some. I have been discussion regarding the budget.

What is the carry forward? KP it is £30k surplus.

In discussion it was calculated that the only change making a difference was the pay protection and it did not account for the difference. Members agreed that the matter needed further work and the restructure could not be approved with that predicted outcome.

This was acknowledged by LC as was the impossibility of changing HC without the PRUs changes. She suggested the leadership changes proposal could still be considered.

4.3.2 General discussion followed regarding the inclusion of additional information.

Re the impact of possibly having to do it again when the sites are merged, can we make the posts fixed term for a period? That proposal was considered initially but HR queried it.

Are their costs to leadership change? Not really.

Have we heard more about increased funding from the government? TSF

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

	<p>had heard today that the LA was getting £9.8m but this would include adult care. A member said some of the money will be going to mainstream for SEN assessments.</p> <p>Can we demand more from the LA, particularly for in year movements, we may not be getting all we should? In discussion it was agreed going ahead with it not knowing the budget would be dangerous.</p> <p>TSF leaves 16.59</p> <p>How are the numeracy and literacy cross Hub working TLRs funded? One from the PRUs one from HC.</p> <p>4.3.3 The MC members considered whether to consult only on the leadership items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They felt they had no proof the budget would work for the management section and that could not be extracted. • A structure was needed that would work across the Hub. • Other possibilities, suggested by LC would be more radical, such as moving the key stage 3 and shutting Dyke Road. • In view of the potential redundancies the HC proposal could not be delayed. • Their vision was for an equitable structure. <p>A governor's email comment on the proposal was read out.</p> <p>4.3.4 Management Committee decisions re PRU proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The MC agreed to make the decision without withdrawal of the HC governors. ❖ The MC agreed that the consultation should proceed for the following items as stated on page 3 of the Summary of Proposed Changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Head of School (PRU) ○ Head of School (TCH) ○ Two TLRs of £2880 each across the Hub ❖ The MC agreed the consultation should proceed for the other items on that list only if the PRUs budget could be adjusted to give an in-year balance and if the penultimate bullet point be amended by the deletion of the words 'until the proposed restructure of the PRUs is completed when this will be reviewed again'. <p>Discussion turned to item 6.</p>	LC
5	<p>DRAFT BUDGET 2020/1 + indicative 3 year</p> <p>There were no papers for this item, which was taken after item 6.</p> <p>5.1 PRUs KP informed she had sent in the draft budget to the LA and would continue discussions with their Finance department.</p> <p>5.2 Homewood College KP informed she had submitted the draft budget.</p> <p>5.3 FJ arrived 17.29. The Homewood College Governing Body was now quorate. The MC was thanked for attending and their contribution then left.</p>	BW

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

	KS left.	
6	<p>JOINT WORKING – THE CAMDEN APPROACH UPDATE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congratulations on the Ofsted report were passed to KP KS and all involved. • BW gave an update on the Camden schools. This group of schools consisted of two PRUs and a SEMH school. Each had a school number but there was a single budget. There were two instruments of governance, each governor was on both boards, they had one meeting but with two sets of minutes. It having a similar structure to the Central Hub LC and BW would plan a visit to see how it operated, including the governance arrangements. JJ suggested making contact with the clerk. <p>Discussion reverted to item 5</p>	
7	<p>DECISION DISCUSSIONS</p> <p>7.1 The MC decision discussion had been taken at item 4.3.4.</p> <p>7.2 Homewood College FJ was apprised of the previous discussions, including the MC budget. The governing body was now quorate.</p> <p>7.2.1 In discussion governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledged JA was in a difficult position and thanked her for attendance and contributions. <p>KS returns 17.35</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed no withdrawals were required for the discussions and decision. • Ascertained the current safeguarding and welfare post was not a teaching role. • Checked the MC had agreed to share in the costs of the change of the HC restructure. • Checked the pay scales involved and that the higher level teaching assistants would have designated areas of responsibility. • Sought clarification regarding the phrase ‘some roles can now be filled by support staff that are now fulfilled by teachers’. LC was awaiting HR to respond following a legal check. • Suggested the therapy that would be provided was included. LC informed it had been HR advice not to include it. • Clarified the application pool and procedure for the Head of School. <p>7.2.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Subject to the condition that the restructure document had a legal check before it proceeded, governors agreed the document with the following amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That the amount of therapy would not be reduced be included in the document. ○ That external analysis was held supporting the proposed staff structure be included. This was to address possible concerns that higher salary and more senior leaders were being created whilst teacher and teaching assistant numbers were reducing. ○ The safeguarding and welfare role should be included in the restructure with regard to changing to a term time only role in 	LC

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

	<p style="text-align: center;">line with other term time only contracts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Being 'attachment aware' was included in the introduction. <p>7.2.3 Governors also suggested it would be useful to be able to give an indication of the areas that would be covered by the higher level teaching assistants even if the job descriptions were not to be written too prescriptively. They then sought clarification as to the next steps and dates of required governor meetings.</p>	BW LC
8	<p>MC retire The MC had left after item 5.3 The Homewood Governing body now remained.</p>	
HOMEWOOD GOVERNING BODY		
9	<p>FINANCE Papers: Outturn and chart of accounts as at 19.2.2020; Scheme of Delegation 2020; Queensdown site IT list; Inventory HC</p> <p>9.1 Budget monitoring The outturn and chart of accounts were noted. Discussion was invited by email.</p> <p>9.2 Scheme of Delegation ❖ The Scheme of Delegation was agreed as presented and signed by BW accordingly.</p> <p>9.3 Asset register The IT list and inventory were noted. Discussion was invited by email.</p> <p>9.4 Write offs No write offs were requested.</p> <p>9.5 Audit This was scheduled for late February.</p> <p>9.6 Contracts <i>For approval</i> No contracts were presented.</p>	ALL JJ ALL
10	<p>LAST MEETING (s) Papers: 10.1 Minutes FGB 20.1.20 10.2 Extra resources meeting 4.2.20 (Confidential to HCGB)</p> <p>This item was deferred.</p>	BW JJ
11	<p>OFSTED REPORT Paper: Ofsted report Thanks were passed to all those involved in the school improvement and the Ofsted inspection. ❖ The Ofsted report was formally accepted.</p>	
12	<p>POLICIES Papers: Business Continuity Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LC exhibited the updated school schedule and JJ reminded that governors needed to address monitoring requirements. • The business continuity plan was noted 	BW/LB #
13	<p>HEALTH AND SAFETY Receive report , consider issues arising Papers: Joint Health and Safety Policy Dec2019 This item was not taken</p>	#
14	<p>MEMBERSHIP AND CHAIRING</p>	

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

	CS had now completed the required documentation. Chairing would be revisited	BW
15	Any other urgent business. There being no further business the meeting closed 18.08	

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE ACTION PLAN SUMMARY

Item	Owner	Resources Action	Update/Due Date
Resources 16 th October 2019			
3.2	BW	Arrange GT to attend an appropriate meeting regarding GDPR.	Now by March 2020
FGB (Resources) 20.1.20			
3	RC	Offsite review	
13	BW	Follow up re premises if nothing heard	1.2.20
13	LC	Circulate 'wish list'	31.1.20

Item	Owner	FGB Action	DUE DATE
21.3.19 (11) & 11.12.19(12)	LC	Provide final H&S policy and report to next meeting	
25.9.19 (3)	ALL	Consider VC role	Not resolved
21.10.19 (6)	LC	Update on communications/website	17.3.20
11.12.19			
3.1	RC	Report back on staffing working party	17.3.20?
10.1	LC	Draft statements etc for 'admissions' policy	17.3.20
10.3	FJ	Pupil premium/ year 7 catch up report Liaise BW re when able to present	5.1.20
13	LB BW??? LC	Progress policy reviews – needs governor discussion for what info needed and slotting into agenda plans (so chairs) + confirmation from LC re when info will be available LC – continue to send in statutory policies for approval or noting. Keep JJ updated	17.2.20
25.2.20			
5	BW	Follow up re draft budget, papers, and governor discussion	
4.3.4 and 7.2.2	LC	Amend document as agreed	
7.2.3	BW/LC	Revert to governors re meeting dates	
9.1 9.3	ALL	Raise any queries by Email	
10. 13. 14	BW	Take action re deferred items/items not covered	
#	JJ	Take admin action	8.3.20

Signature authorised at meeting 23.3.20

..... signed dated