

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE  
GOVERNING BODY  
MINUTES**

<b>Meeting of:</b>	<b>Full Governing Body</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	9 <sup>th</sup> July 2020 - 4.00 pm
<b>Location:</b>	Virtual – MS teams
<b>Distribution:</b>	Governing Body, Website, K Schofield, K Prout
<b>Quorum:</b>	At least half the governors in office must be present for decisions to be binding. The meeting was quorate throughout
<b>Present:</b>	Governors (voting) Jo Adams (JA) Luke Burstow (LB) Rachel Carter (RC) Louise Cook (LC) Executive Headteacher Jeff Matthews (JM) Sue Shanks (SS) Bob Wall (BW) Chair of Governors and Chair of this meeting  Other (non-voting) Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors Karen Prout (KP) School Business Manager Kate Schofield (KS) Head of School
<b>Apologies</b>	Flora Jenkins - accepted

	<b>DISCUSSION AND DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<b>WELCOME APOLOGIES</b> BW opened the meeting and apologies were considered. The absence of Claire Saunders was noted. BW would follow up.	BW
2	<b>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</b> BW was Chair of the PRU management committee and was currently engaged by the local authority on a home to school transport project. His stepson was headteacher at Moulsecoomb Primary School (declared at item 8). LB's spouse was the headteacher of a local special school. No withdrawals from discussion or voting were proposed.	
3	<b>CHAIR'S REPORT</b> Papers: Chair's report; Chair's action log 3.1 Chairs Report  BW had continued to be in regular contact with LC to discuss school arrangements and provide support. He had been impressed by the school's work ensuring safety and well-being of pupils and provision of learning activities and materials. Thanks were passed to LC and KS for the strong and consistent leadership. Other meetings attended included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary School Chair of Governors Meetings.</li> <li>• Local authority Covid-19 briefings.</li> <li>• Risk assessment review with Homewood leadership team and GMB union representative.</li> </ul> The local authority strategic board meeting had been cancelled and not	

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE  
GOVERNING BODY  
MINUTES**

	<p>yet rescheduled. The report also provided explanation and discussion points for several other items on the agenda.</p> <p><b>Did anything come out of the virtual meeting with the local GMB representative?</b> LC informed some minor adjustments were made to the with revised risk assessment.</p> <p>3.2 Chairs Action There were no new Chair's actions to report.</p>	
4	<p><b>FINANCE REPORT</b> Papers: Management Committee 3 year budget and summary; Response to R Barker at the local authority.</p> <p>4.1 Update on budget 20/21 and budget monitoring.</p> <p>No papers had been provided. KP was requested to give an update on the Homewood budget. She informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget had been submitted based on the restructure taking effect from January 2021. This forecast a <b>£40k dr</b> deficit in year one, <b>£68k dr</b> in year 2 and returning to £3k surplus in year 3.</li> <li>• An application for a licensed deficit was not required as a licensed deficit was already in place.</li> <li>• The month 3 budget monitoring documents had not yet been completed; a new format from the local authority was awaited.</li> <li>• A claim for the whole Central Hub in the sum of £12k for Covid-19 expenditure had been submitted.</li> </ul> <p>LC added that the budget did not include some recent staff changes (minimal effect) or the wages of a member of staff on secondment that would need to be paid for one term.</p> <p>Governors did not wish to defer monitoring till September and KP agreed to circulate the outturn once the new local authority form had been received.</p> <p>4.2 SFVS <b>Are there any outstanding actions from the SFVS/audit?</b> KP informed there was not.</p> <p>4.3 PRU/TCH Finance position</p> <p>The papers were acknowledged and in discussion it was noted that the outcome of the meeting regarding the PRU finance had not been clear. LC provided further comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs had increased but base funding had not changed since 2012. It did not benchmark with other authorities and the PRUs could not continue to run as at present.</li> <li>• The Management Committee had put forward a £45k deficit budget that was not accepted by the local authority. Eventually, following comparisons with other local Councils, sufficient funding was provided for a balanced budget this year but the structural deficit was not addressed.</li> <li>• Across the Central Hub there were 4 different top up rates and a review of top up funding across the city had been proposed.</li> </ul> <p>It was recalled that at Camden PRU top ups were £32k per place, which,</p>	<p>LC/KP</p> <p>BW</p>

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE  
GOVERNING BODY  
MINUTES**

	<p>even allowing for London weighting, were much higher than the Central Hubs.</p> <p><b>Why have they not increased it for longer than one year?</b> BW informed there continued to be pressures on the budget and they would only do it for a year.</p> <p><b>Is the agency budget just teaching staff?</b> KP informed it was not a big budget and used if internal cover could not be found. It was usually just for teaching assistants.</p> <p>[Given the state of the premises and inaction regarding premised move]</p> <p><b>Will we have to just live with building maintenance costs?</b> KP advised this was an area of concern and she had emailed the local authority. She acknowledged they were doing what they could to make it look nice but there are safety concerns.</p> <p><b>Is the budget likely to be influenced by recent announcements of government spending?</b> KP it is ring-fenced. If we spend money on it and subsequently closes, it is wasted money.</p> <p>Governors concluded that answers were needed on the premises issue. See also item 8.</p>	
5	<p><b>COVID-19 UPDATE</b></p> <p>Papers: Previously circulated were the risk assessment 16.6.20 and links to the DfE guidance for September opening; late paper Head of School update</p> <p>5.1 Risk Assessment This had been discussed elsewhere and was accepted.</p> <p>5.2 September planning LC informed each site had a different plan and went on to give brief explanation. Special schools guidance allowed for a slower return and at Homewood there would be a 2-3 week integration program and one bubble. Staff risk assessments were being worked through and they were gradually coming back on site.</p> <p>5.3 Head of School The detailed update was received with thanks. KS and LC took questions.</p> <p><b>Do you have 46/47 on roll at the moment?</b> LC: 45 now, 47 in September.</p> <p><b>What is the turnover, it looks like about 25% of pupils will be new on-site?</b> All year 11 have gone, many were off-site and 1 year 8 left in-year.</p> <p><b>Recalling the significant disruption from year 7 intake last year, what is the plan for this year?</b> KS reassured that they have had more transition sessions this year and it was much better.</p> <p><b>What happens if you go over the numbers?</b> LC informed that she thought they had agreed to exceed by one but there may be an additional. It was dependent upon numbers actually on site.</p> <p><b>Have you had the agreement to funding in writing?</b> LC yes.</p> <p><b>You refer to the rising numbers of those diagnosed with ASC?</b> KS explained there were 20 pupils and staff had had some training. As a result they were really improving and totally re-planning how we do things. She went on to explain the arrangements.</p> <p><b>Ofsted referred to the need to bring offsite learners into the life of the school.</b> KS explained how this could be achieved.</p>	

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE  
GOVERNING BODY  
MINUTES**

	<p><b>Are the numbers of those with ASC increasing because of the closure of Patcham House?</b> LC considered it could be. The reputation of Homewood was also improving.</p> <p><b>Is it mainly boys?</b> LC confirmed it was but there were a couple of girls coming.</p> <p>Home/School learning</p> <p><b>What is the feedback on Home/School learning?</b> KS informed they had had some good parental feedback. The office were continuing with the communications programme and posting work home. One of the aims was for each pupil to come in to school at least once. Only 1 parent has indicated they are only reasonable happy with the reasonable endeavours re EHCP.</p> <p>Governors supported doing things differently as it had all been based on proper investigation. They suggested the detail relating to the curriculum went to the Curriculum Working Group.</p> <p>Staffing and Staff wellbeing</p> <p>KS informed the numbers still working from home, adding that two had come in. To reduce the feeling of concern before return and recognising they only had one inset day, the school was setting up an optional afternoon tea at the end of August. Staff that had already been back a few weeks were now in full swing. JJ lost connection 16.55. Discussion continued on this item and the next.</p>	
6	<p><b>Governance Structure</b></p> <p>Late Paper: Proposal for parallel governance arrangements for governing body and management committee.</p> <p>JJ regained connection 17.03 and enquired if there was anything to record from discussion in her absence. There being nothing, discussion on the proposals continued.</p> <p>It was noted further difficulties in having large numbers on the board included the potential for the dilution of discussion and the need to retain the involvement. At the moment some actions were not completed and meetings did not cover all the items. Everyone needed a voice.</p> <p>It was suggested the proposal be accepted.</p> <p>JJ apologised for being temporarily absent and so did not know the extent or detail of the previous discussion. She informed she had not had time to consider all the information in the proposal along with further information relating to the Camden SLA subsequently received. She suggested that governors had not yet had all the information needed to make the decision. Referring to a detailed email, in general these were surrounding respective accountabilities and interests and she had not been able to get the external advice needed. She continued to recommend exploiting opportunities for more effective working.</p> <p>It was proposed and agreed that there would be further investigation of the model with a view to resolving the difficulties JJ had identified. JJ confirmed the governing body could authorise a change to the instrument of government.</p>	JJ BW

**HOMEWOOD COLLEGE  
GOVERNING BODY  
MINUTES**

7	<p><b>STAFFING RESTRUCTURE UPDATE</b> LC provided a brief update and confirmed if it went ahead it would be settled before half-term.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">❖ <b>Governors approved the recommencement of the process on 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2020.</b></p>	
8	<p><b>PREMISES UPDATE</b> In discussion it was agreed Covid-19 should not prevent this moving forward and it would be helpful if the local authority could reassure us it was proceeding. Governors lamented the lack of response from the local authority which was going to put forward some plans in response to the information from the school as to the facilities required.</p> <p>It was agreed the governing body would send a letter to the local authority and a governor would raise a question at Committee.</p>	LC BW SS
9	<p><b>ADMISSIONS POLICY and SLA UPDATE</b> Paper: School contact log summary</p> <p>The paper was accepted. A governor would report back from attending admission meetings when they restarted face to face meetings. There was a need to follow up whether the local authority was gaining a better idea of the youngsters that are appropriate for Homewood and whether that sort of child is changing in terms of complexity. LC agreed it was good for the school and child if they were placed appropriately.</p>	
10	<p><b>Last Meeting – Minutes, Matters Arising and Working Groups</b> Papers: FGB 13.5.20 minutes; 13.5.20 Action list; SWG draft minutes 9.6.20 This item was deferred until September.</p>	# BW
11	<p><b>GOVERNOR PRIORITIES</b> This item was not taken</p>	
12	<p><b>ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR</b> JJ had not received any nominations. This item was not taken.</p>	
13	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b> <b>23<sup>rd</sup> September 4pm</b> This was agreed to be 23<sup>rd</sup> September at 4pm. Virtual meetings would continue until agreed otherwise. In discussion, 4pm meetings were still convenient for those present today but this would be revisited in line with membership needs.</p>	
14	<p><b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b> 14.1 LC requested the inset day not taken in the current year be carried forward to the next.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">❖ <b>The carry over inset day was agreed as requested.</b></p> <p>14.2 Staff movements Governors wished to record their thanks to Frederique Haddad, Marika Roberts, Clare Cheetham, Judy Sherringham and Debbie for their contribution to the school during their time employed.</p> <p>Have the replacements been arranged? LC explained these to governors' satisfaction.</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting ended 17.30.</p>	

Signature approval noted in minutes of meeting 23.9.20