

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

Extraordinary Meeting of:	Resources Committee
Date/Time:	4 th February 2020 at 2.30 pm
Location:	Homewood College
Status:	Confidential until October 2020 or earlier if full governing body agrees
Distribution:	Governors, Karen Prout
Quorum:	At least 3 governors in addition to the Executive Headteacher must be present for decisions to be binding. The meeting was quorate throughout
Present:	Governors (voting) Luke Burstow (LB) Louise Cook (LC) Executive Headteacher Jeff Matthews (JM) Bob Wall (BW) Chair Other (non-voting) Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors
Apologies:	Rachel Carter (RC) - accepted Anna Gianfrancesco (AG) - accepted Flora Jenkins (FJ) - accepted

	DISCUSSION AND DECISION	ACTION
1	<p>WELCOME INTRODUCTIONS APOLOGIES</p> <p>It was agreed BW would chair this extraordinary meeting. The meeting had been arranged in the last few days to enable some governors to review initial plans for a staffing restructure prior to consideration by the full governing body. A formal agenda had not been circulated but all non-staff and non-parent governors had been invited.</p> <p>It had not been expected that RC AG or FJ would attend (apologies had been provided) and JM was welcomed; his experience with governor work outside the remit of Resources Committee would strengthen debate.</p>	
2	<p>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</p> <p>BW was Chair of the PRUs' Management Committee.</p> <p>LB's spouse was Executive Head of a Special School in the local authority.</p> <p>LC was Executive Headteacher.</p>	
3	<p>REVIEW OF INITIAL RESTRUCTURE PLANS</p> <p>Papers: (distributed to those in attendance the day before)</p> <p>Confidential - 1. Business Case 2 Appendix re teaching hours 3 Revised Structure</p>	

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

<p>The restructure was to enable provision for 45 pupils, assuming continuation of the £65k per annum received from the local authority for 'preventing agency placements' (pupils being admitted to more costly settings outside the LA).</p> <p>Governors had already considered the documents and now raised queries. They wished to ensure the restructure was feasible.</p> <p>3.1 Their main concerns were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Check the rationale• Ensure delivery of high quality provision within budget• The ability of the senior leadership team to have time to attend to strategic matters was not compromised• Enable effective use of teaching staff• Ensure provision both of teaching and therapy at Homewood was not compromised by provision elsewhere• Review the preliminary papers and anticipate concerns of stakeholders• Provide support and advice to LC for this restructure, identifying possible risks and addressing other anticipated staffing changes. <p>3.2 Questions asked and the responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will the proposed structure deliver what the pupils need and does it give senior leadership enough support? Yes• Is the restructure needed because you cannot afford staff or because the existing posts are not what you need? The restructure was needed both to keep within budget and for staff to be in the right roles and position to enable delivery.• How will you get it done by September? We will follow the timeline given by HR. <p>3.3 Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What percentage of posts is leadership time and what is the full time equivalent of senior leaders? The Head of School will teach 0.1 full-time equivalent, the Assistant Headteacher will be 1/3 of the timetable and the senior teacher will teach 2/3 of the timetable. There will be 2 full-time equivalent posts so we will be gaining some for teaching time. We are gaining a whole person.• What about the Head of School role? It will be a higher pay spine – 15-19, to lead on Quality of Education across the Hub. It is substantially different so anyone who is ring-fenced can apply. The PRU person (Head of School) will be responsible for Behaviour and Attitudes. <p>3.4 Off-site provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Replacing an offsite teacher with a teaching assistant: is that delivering? Using a teaching assistant to deliver teaching appears a risk? Is co-ordination administrative work and delivering, teaching? LC: we have discussed this a lot. The off-site teaching assistants secure better attendance and better results. In principle pupils should have the right to have a teacher.	BW
---	----

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What percentage of off-site teacher's time should be pupil contact? 80% but it is currently 10%.• Will the new role be 80%? LC: yes. It may be a day or a day and a half for co-ordination and then 4 days for teaching. We were going to ask HR as well if it is ok for someone else to do the teaching. If we used UQT (unqualified teacher) it would help and we could assure each pupil has a teacher once a week. <p>3.5 Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How would you deal with the curriculum? They will have lesson plans. The level C teaching assistant is given work.• Can we separate what the teachers should be doing? Does it give you any contingency for on and off-site? LC: originally we had another level, level D (paid to <u>plan</u> and deliver) but we thought we could drop one level D and work smarter instead. Now, if a teaching assistant is off we take one from one of the other groups but teachers need to get used to having one teaching assistant. If the jobs are more specified you can work on fewer staff.• Will that leave you with enough staff? LC: yes, KS and I think so.• You are proposing to lose only .3 of a post overall, so it is a very small reduction. Staff are just to be organised in a different way? Yes, for example the Assistant Headteacher is currently doing bike rides, which would be suitable for a lower level post. We would like to have a music teacher again for that to be more effective. <p>3.6 Finance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The restructure has been planned using worst case financial scenarios.• Does it take into account the pay protection and are there any other ongoing higher costs? LC: no. Just one TLR that will reduce after 2 or 3 years.• How does the administration figure compare with other schools? LC: we do not know.• The Non-staffing expenses: are they realistic? They have been produced by the school business manager so I assume they are accurate.• The £65k 'agency prevention' money: is there a measure of effectiveness for the LA for this? Not that we know.• There is nothing to say we will not continue to get these funds and we cannot run the school on a surplus. Can we ask the LA to reassure us that we will continue to receive it? LC: Yes, or at least get an increase in the numbers on roll. They want us to do a 3 year budget plan.• In discussion it was ascertained that following a (possible) move of site numbers may increase to 60. LC added that they would receive just the top up funding for additional pupils at the moment. If they were in a position of having neither the money nor places we would have to refuse to have children.• Do the costs in the document include paying back any of the current deficit? LC: No. We are; however, expecting to have	
--	--	--

HOMEWOOD COLLEGE GOVERNING BODY

	delivery/protection of provision and the reasons for changing to a teaching assistant. The inclusion of an acronym glossary was also requested. There being no further business the meeting closed 13.30	
--	---	--

The minutes were approved and confirmed to no longer be confidential at the meeting 21.10.20