

Meeting of:	Full Management Committee – Additional Meeting
Date/Time:	23 rd November 2022, 4pm
Location:	Lynchet Close, Brighton
Distribution:	Full Management Committee and website once approved at the next meeting
Quorum:	At least half the number of current members required to be present for decisions to be binding. The meeting was quorate throughout.
Present:	<p>Members (voting) Jenny Barnard-Langston (JBL) Richard Barker (RB) Diana Boyd (DB) Rachel Carter (RC) Dion Page-Hammond (DPH) Karen Prout (KP)</p> <p>Other Tim Self (TS) – Co-Headteacher Amanda Meier (AM) - Co-Headteacher</p> <p>Craig Nicholson (Head of Primary PRU) Penny Langridge (Head of Key Stage 3 PRU) Rosie Reekie (Head of Key Stage 4 PRU) Viv Papier (Assistant Head at TCH) Guy Williams (Senior Teacher at TCH)</p> <p>Sammie Lea – Clerk</p>
Apologies:	Lorraine Myles (LM) and Jackie O’Quinn (JO)

MINUTES

DISCUSSION, DECISIONS and Actions	
1	<p>Welcome, Apologies and Absence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RB opened the meeting in place of JBL who was held up at an emergency meeting. The MC was thanked for their attendance at this additional meeting in lieu of Ofsted visiting. • Apologies were accepted from LM and JO.



DISCUSSION, DECISIONS and Actions	
2	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No declarations of interest in items on the agenda were made.
3	<p>Briefing from the Co-Heads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CN gave an overview of Primary PRU. There are 18 places and six extra commissioned with the move to the Connaught Building. A site visit took place on the previous day. Some logistical issues are expected but the increased space is welcome and the offer can be increased. The staff team is strong. Staff retention is high, including B-grade TAs. Staff enjoy working there as it is successful and they are good at what they do. CN believes the school is increasingly trauma informed, and CHB is evolving well together. The MC asked how the excess space in the Connaught building will be used. CN - only the ground floor will be used. Residents have been assured the capacity will not be going past 24 students. The MC asked about Primary PRUs current priorities/aspirations. CN – the restructure, creating two HLTA posts, being able to prioritise his time away from teaching and towards leadership, increased working with stakeholders such as speech and language and other therapists, occupational health. Good relationships have been developed, but they could be really good. The MC asked about the revolving door nature of the PRU. CN – 18 of 19 students have EHCPs. Primary PRU operates as a special school, not a PRU. Destination data from the last seven to eight years is robust. Out of 90 pupils who have left, 4 have left at the end of a 12-week placement, 7 within a 12-24 week placement, 3 within 24-36 weeks. 20 of the 90 have successfully managed a full term at their new school. It’s difficult to get accurate data, but 7 of the 20 are either no longer in mainstream or are struggling significantly in their mainstream placements. Both pupils and schools are not equipped well enough to ensure successful transitions to mainstream secondary. Transition is more successful into mainstream primary as they have more capacity at primary for a nurture-style approach. The MC asked how parents/carers feel about the school. CN – parents are comfortable and trust the school. Taxis do pick/ups drop offs. JBL joined the meeting. PL gave an overview of KS3 PRU. The majority of students go back out to mainstream schools. They are referred to the PRU through BAP. PRU gets data from the mainstream schools. PRU provides lots of targets and assessments to ready them for the next learning environment. Many have had two managed moves already and lost faith in themselves/the systems. The school is constantly in a transition phase with students coming and leaving. Some students are longer stayers. Schools refer them to PRU without knowing where they are going next. It’s hard to find places for them to go on to. The school uses Reach2Teach to show SEMH progress. It produces an excellent report at the end which can show mainstream how they can support the young person.



DISCUSSION, DECISIONS and Actions

'Onwards and Upwards' is being used to record academics. PL met this week with the ICT lead and program designer to see how it can be used more fully to map progress in all areas of CHB and likewise for EHCP outcomes in the future.

PL has taken on a SENCO qualification.

MC – do you share case studies of what works well?

PL – Yes, but could improve. Schools have a very different understanding of the remit of the PRU despite the SLA. There still needs to be a shift. It would be good to offer different intervention paths in the future. Once the students have EHCPs, there is nowhere for them to move on to. Specialist schools are full.

MC – is it difficult to assess their learning needs because of their SEMH needs preventing assessment?

PL – no. Assessments are done at induction when they begin. Investment in parent/carer support is really important. The PRU has a bad reputation, but once the student is in the PRU the parents are happy.

MC – Is there a simple one-side document that tells parents what the PRU is about? De-mystifies it, reduces stigma, raises profile.

TS – Pre-covid, yes. Now, no. We can do it again.

It was discussed that there needs to be clarification with a PRU place whether the student has left permanently or if it's a partnership with the school with re-integration. Lack of clarity does damage of rejection and disrupts other children. There needs to be more constructive planning, the SLA underpins that. Children think it is for 12 weeks and then it isn't.

Those attending the BAP aren't always the ultimate authority in the school. The change needs to be through Heads, a cultural change.

The MC asked if Co-Heads are attending Heads Partnership Meetings. It was confirmed yes, since September.

The MC asked about aspirations in KS3. PL – sharing staff so staff can work as subject specialists. Staff currently teach across the curriculum which is nurturing but not a good model for returning to mainstream secondary.

The MC asked about KS3 moving to Lynchet Close. PL – Dyke Road building is old and unsuitable but logistically it will be harder for students to get to Lynchet Close, especially Year 7. It is very likely to affect attendance negatively.

- RR provided an overview of KS4 PRU.

There are 18 places and 17 students. 7 staff in, sometimes 8 daily, but 10 in total as some are part-time. The remit is to get GCSEs and go on to college so they are back on an even playing field, to engage students in learning and for them to realise school is ok. To nurture, to provide support for their disadvantage.

In 3-4 years only a couple of students have been here for 12 weeks. Once they are in Year 11 it's important they stay because of their exams. One student is reintegrating at the moment, really slowly.

We would like to see more 14-16 day-release college places, but there is no funding. More work experience. More HLTAs. We lose staff as the pay is low. Only HLTAs can be left alone with a group, not B-grade TAs. Funding to go climbing fortnightly. Tuesday afternoon is table tennis club, and Thursday afternoon is a trip, recently it was Brighton



DISCUSSION, DECISIONS and Actions

Museum and the Downs. More money to increase that offer would benefit the students.

The MC highlighted the need to increase links with employers.

The MC asked why KS4 was not a revolving door.

RR – we are trying to revolve it more and bring cases to BAPs. More connections to secondary schools would be a benefit. Sometimes schools can't take the students, sometimes the students don't want that. It's very difficult one they get to Year 11. One student came for three weeks and then successfully returned to mainstream.

- VP and GW provided an overview of The Connected Hub.
There are similarities between the Hub and the PRUs, but a difference is that at the Hub the students are staying. They start in September and finish at the end of their exams. The aspiration is to repair the damage of the rejection felt from a system that can't support them. For them to understand that *they* are not the problem. To give them a sense of belonging to the school and then to look to the future and their aspirations - where do you want to be next year, and how do we get you there?
They carry a lot of shame and trauma which is difficult to penetrate. There are mixed responses to them coming. Some hate the idea, some can't wait. Some mainstream schools use TCH as a threat. When some students arrive they display no behavioural problems at all – in the new environment they are gone.
The needs of the cohort appears to increase every year. There is much more complex SEMH, and this is a trigger for those with anxiety. And that can result in an attendance issue. It is very hard to balance that in a small building where sound travels.
MC – how can it get to Year 11 and a students SEMH needs are so bad?
AM – From experience, mainstream schools can't manage the needs due to high pressures and a lack of support staff.
MC – what are your wishes/aspirations for TCH?
VP/GW - money. We champion a different kind of learning. Sometimes offering something close to 1-to-1 is the only way to do that. Money would open up experiences they have never had. Like trips, sports, extra-curricular. Staffing underpins this.
KP – we need a minibus. There is currently only one for all sites.
- CN, PL, RR, GW, and VP left the meeting.

Briefing from the Co-Heads

- This item was removed due to time constraints.
- The School Development Plan (SDP) was briefly discussed.

JBL – the school development plan needs to be tied in with the focuses of the monitoring visits. Good practice is a termly monitoring visit plan with a report coming to MCMs. Three visits per year. JBL will provide a report template.

There are no costings in place for the SDP. KP will update.

4



	DISCUSSION, DECISIONS and Actions
	<p>The MC commented that the actions from the Ofsted visit in 2018 need to be explicit in the SDP. TS and AM said that as it was five years ago, they have been addressed over time.</p>
5	<p>Discussion about MC responsibility areas</p> <p>The MC discussed who should lead on four key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality of education - Behaviour and attitudes - Personal development - Leadership and management <p>It was decided that responsibilities will be:</p> <p>DB – Personal Development and LAC governor JO – Behaviour and Attitudes RC – Personal Development and Behaviour and Attitudes LM – Quality of Education DPH – Leadership and Management RB – Quality of Education</p> <p>KP as staff governor will gather staff views and provide a perspective overview.</p>
6	<p>Confidential items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the previous items were considered to be confidential.
7	<p>Confirm date of next MCM meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan 25th 2023, 4pm at Lynchet Close.

