**Bristol Hospital Education Service**

Meeting of the Management Committee

Held in person at Falkland Road

**Term 5, Wednesday 17th May 2023, 5.00pm**

**Final MINUTES OF MEETING**

*Overall Objective of the Meeting:* *Transition and succession*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Governors Present**  Jude Bramton  Vicki Franklin (except within Item 3 – 1745 until 1750)  Sean Lancastle  Sarah Prouse  James Ralston  Xavier Ribeiro  Philippa Scholar, Headteacher  Jacqueline Ward-Warren | **In Attendance** (non-voting)  Keira Stobie, Clerk  Sue Stokes (until 1750 – Item 4)  Patricia Varano, Burser (until 1750 – Item 4)  Quorum = 5 | **Apologies**  Dan White |

**ACTIONS GRID from this meeting**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA NUMBER** | **AGENDA ITEM** | **ACTION** | **RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| 1 | Welcome | KS to update Pecuniary Interests recorded on Governor Hub. | KS |
| 1 | Welcome | GB to update Pecuniary Interests recorded on the school website. | GB |
| 1 | Welcome | Governors to considered incorporating finance training into the Management Committee Development Plan for 2023 – 2024. | All Governors |
| 2 | Elections | KS to change the date of the T6 meeting on Governor Hub and highlight this to Governors. | KS |
| 4 | SDP and Management Committee Development Plan | PS to arrange with SLT for predictive success criteria to be included as an additional column on the SDP. | PS |
| 4 | SDP and Management Committee Development Plan | All Governors to note their area(s) of responsibility and links to the SDP and feedback any comments prior to the T6 MC meeting. | All Governors |
| 4 | SDP and Management Committee Development Plan | VF/PS to add reporting expectations for each Link Governor to relevant SDP documentation. | VF/PS |
| 4 | SDP and Management Committee Development Plan | KS to set up a Governor Hub folder for Link Governor reports. | KS |
| 4 | SDP and Management Committee Development Plan | KS to include an update on Link Governor reports available as a standing item on the agenda for each MC meeting. | KS |
| 6 | Safeguarding Report | VF to contact LA Safeguarding team regarding Safeguarding audit. | VF |
| 7 | Policies | JB to liaise with GB regarding updates required to the Governor Visits Policy. | JB |
| 7 | Policies | PS to liaise with staff member supporting Teams to provide Governors with access to all policies and the live tracker spreadsheet via this platform. | PS |
| 7 | Policies | GB to advise KS of the relevant policies to which the Governor Code of Conduct should link to under section 11. | GB |
| 8 | Succession Planning | Any Governor potentially interested in the role of Chair to discuss the role with VF if appropriate. | All Governors |
| 8 | Succession Planning | KS to include succession planning as an item on the T6 MC meeting agenda. | KS |
| 8 | Succession Planning | KS to contact GDS and Inspiring Governance regarding seeking a new Chair externally. | KS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | VF/PS to complete self-certification process on Governor Hub. | VF/PS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | All Governors to update KS regarding progress on actions arising from T4 MC meeting. | All Governors |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | VF to sign final minutes of both parts of the T4 meeting on Governor Hub. | VF |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | VF to contact MK regarding future options. | VF |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | KS to contact GDS regarding the appointment process for an alternative LA Governor. | KS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | KS to arrange e mail accounts for new Governors where required. | KS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | KS to notify all Governors of all relevant e mail addresses when finalised. | KS |

**Feedback on actions from T4 2022 - 2023 Meeting**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA NUMBER** | **AGENDA ITEM** | **ACTION** | **RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| 2 | Welcome | JB/PS/VF to facilitate initial conversations with potential new Community Governor. | JB/PS/VF |
| 2 | Welcome | KS to invite potential Parent Governor as an observer to T5 meeting. | KS |
| 2 | Welcome | VF to seek resolution to lack of support from LA Governor. | VF |
| 4 | SLT reports | JB to send GM details of feedback survey app. | JB |
| 6 | Progress report | SA to e mail KS a copy of the Progress report to post on Governor Hub. | SA/KS |
| 3 | Head’s report | PS to investigate appropriate formats for SLT/Head’s report to eliminate overlap. | PS |
| 3 | Head’s Report | PS to report on outcome of changes at Riverside at the T5 MC meeting. | PS |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | VF, SP and JW to complete Self-Certification process by T5 MC meeting. | VF/SP/JW |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | JB to send KS details of training undertaken for manual recording on Governor Hub. | JB/KS |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | VF/PS to finalise how Link Governors will contribute to SDP. | VF/PS |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | PS/GB to finalise policy review schedule. | PS/GB |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | VF to sign final minutes of both parts of the T3 meeting on Governor Hub. | VF |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | KS to e mail GB information required to update MC section of the BHES website. | KS |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | GB to update the MC section of the BHES website. | GB |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | Link Governor roles to be finalised at T5 MC meeting. | Link Governors |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | KS to circulate an updated Governor email address list after the T5 MC meeting. | KS |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | KS to upload Governor Induction Procedure on to Governor Hub. | KS |
| 8 | AOB and close | VF to provide verbal feedback to candidates. | VF |
| 8 | AOB and close | JR to write to BCC to confirm appointment of PS. | JR |
| 8 | AOB and close | JR to provide details informing BHES families of the appointment to be communicated via website and/or e mail. | JR |
| 8 | AOB and close | PS to inform staff of appointment. | PS |
| 8 | AOB and close | PS to provide a photo and accompanying quote for the BHES website. | PS |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Final Minutes of Meeting** |
| **1** | **Welcome (VF)**  Apologies were received and accepted from DW and the meeting was quorate.  SL was welcomed as a prospective Governor, however, there had been no further contact received from the prospective Parent Governor.  The provision of private administrative support by KS for VF was reported as an updated Pecuniary Interest although it applied only to VF’s external professional role.  **ACTION: KS to update Pecuniary Interests recorded on Governor Hub.**  **ACTION: GB to update Pecuniary Interests recorded on the school website.**  Training  VF had registered on the Better Governor website which offered attendance related resources and support.  Bespoke finance training for the MC was offered by SS and was considered alongside the free, but generic, courses offered through GDS.  **ACTION: Governors to considered incorporating finance training into the Management Committee Development Plan for 2023 – 2024.**  The forthcoming Principles of Good Governance course run by GDS was highlighted, particularly to new Governors. This was recommended by previous attendees, especially as the facilitators were able to tailor the material to suit the backgrounds and interests of those present.  Governors were reminded of the regular training updates sent by GDS and any received by the Chair or Clerk separately will continue to be forwarded on to all Governors. |
| **2** | **Elections (VF/KS)**  Introductions were made and then the Governors were asked if they had any questions for SL.  *Governor Question: How does your new employer, the Office for Students, fit within the university system?*  It is a regulator for English universities.  SL was then elected as a Community Governor with thanks and congratulations.  Proposed: XR  Seconded: JB  Elected unanimously.  VF was also seeking re-election as her current Term of Office would end before the date of the T6 meeting.  Proposed: XR  Seconded: JB  Re-elected unanimously.  Due to financial deadlines, the date of the T6 meeting had been moved to 1700 – 1900 on Wednesday 19th July 2023.  **ACTION: KS to change the date of the T6 meeting on Governor Hub and highlight this to Governors.** |
| **3** | **Finance Report (SS/PV)**  Q4 Year End Outturn  This had been completed and the relevant documentation had been circulated on Governor Hub prior to the meeting. This showed that the overall deficit had decreased, largely due to a significant increase in SEN top up funding. Invoices had also been sent to schools earlier, which meant funds were being received within the period to which the invoice applied.  Including cost tracking and improvements to invoicing as targets on the SDP had greatly assisted in facilitating these changes, resulting in the overall income received increasing by approximately £40, 000 (forty thousand pounds). Thanks were extended to all staff involved with this highly successful work.  Energy costs had risen dramatically, as well as fees for cleaning and exams also increasing. The latter overspend was due to entering more students to more exams, which, educationally, was a positive sign.  *Governor Question: If a student is dual registered with both BHES and a school, could any of these costs be recouped?*  Costs would be recouped either via the school or as part of the student’s EHCP.  As the maximum surplus that can be retained by the school as a buffer is only 8% of the school’s income, an explanation of how anything above this value is to be spent must be provided, or the funds will need to be returned. As expenditure of such funds is designed to only affect an in-year budget, as opposed to covering staffing costs, it was suggested that replacement of the telephone system might be one suitable project. However, caution was advised due to the unexpected changes to the financial picture experienced when an analogous situation arose previously.  *Governor Question: How much surplus does the school have available?*  Approximately £245, 000 (two hundred and forty five thousand pounds).  *Governor Question: Could the situation last academic year end be explained fully?*  The school set and implemented a deficit budget, which meant it was felt unwise to proceed with the planned expenditure.  *Governor Question: Will the same uncertainty arise this year?*  Although the current prediction was felt to be more accurate, income calculations could still be refined. Furthermore, while less agency supply staff had been required, teacher over time remained a considerable outgoing.  *Governor Question: Is there scope for submitting a case for an alternative arrangement, outlining of the anomalous position the school finds itself in due to the proposed mid-year implementation of the additional charges to schools?*  The advice received has been to submit the figures and see what transpires, however, due to the size of the surplus accumulated, a plan for expenditure will be required.  *Governor Question: Does the school have a wish list on which any surplus could be spent?*  As this is a novel situation, this is something that is being developed. The school has been extremely fortunate to recently receive resources and support from the Childrens’ Charity and so feels the most obvious items are in place, however, looking to further improve enrichment activities was a possibility.  *Governor Question: Would assisting the allotment charity through the purchase of tools be an option?*  Following a speech delivered by PS at a fundraising event and the establishment of links with BHES, donations had dramatically increased and all the required tools were now in place.  *Governor Question: Had the SDP highlighted any areas of need?*  There were limited targets linked to expenditure as this had not previously been an option and so a re-examination would seek to identify where benefits would be gained.  *Governor Question: With so many educational developments to keep abreast of, what access did staff have to training, and was this of a satisfactory quality? With potentially new leaders emerging, could this be an area of need?*  These were options that had never previously been possible and were felt worthwhile to research further, especially as the funds could be used to cover supply staff costs.  *Governor Question: Would it be prudent to delay expenditure until after the additional charges had been agreed, as this would otherwise leave the school in deficit? Was a plan for such a scenario required?*  If this situation arose, there would be a need to look at staffing and begin a management of change process if there was predicted to be a continuous deficit over the five following years. This is another reason why the relevant documentation was being submitted for agreement well in advance of the proposed date of implementation.  VF left the meeting at this point.  *Governor Question: What would be the impact of any delay in agreeing or implementing these measures?*  As teacher resignations are limited to certain dates during the year only, any management of change process would also take considerable time so this was thought to be minimal.  2023 – 2024 Budget  This did not appear favourable, with a £412, 343.54 (four hundred and twelve thousand, three hundred and forty three pounds and fifty four pence) deficit predicted. However, this included all increases to staffing costs, but potentially less additional income than will be received due to the uncertain number of new students. Therefore, this budget has been based on the number attending during the 2022 – 2023 academic year, and it was felt advantageous to develop a mechanism to attain more accurate estimates before the budget submittal.  *Governor Question: Can any charges be levied in advance if it is known that the services will be provided and the income eventually received?*  Costs for all provision will increase from September 2023, with the additional charge to schools expected to begin from 01/04/24. Based on an estimate of 200 students, this will add to the surplus, as it will not feature until the following year’s budget. Therefore, the situation from April 2024 onwards will be very different to that of September 2023 to March 2024 and separate estimates could possibly be required to reflect this.  PS will bring the Service Level agreement to the T6 meeting of Secondary Heads, alongside funding papers for consideration. It is hoped that by submitting these papers before the end of this academic year, it will be possible for more accurate financial forecasts based on actual figures to be made.  In addition to the £89, 000 (eighty nine thousand pounds) increase in funding received from the Government, a substantial surplus of £57, 500 (fifty seven thousand, five hundred pounds) will also be accrued. As it was expected that implementation of the proposed additional charges to schools would generate a considerable excess too, it was felt that any such funds should be directed towards the high needs block as this was where they would have originated from.  Three teachers will be leaving at the end of the academic year, to be replaced by two UPS3 and four M5 teachers. This will increase costs by £273, 446 (two hundred and seventy three thousand, four hundred and forty six pounds).  *Governor Question: What is the deadline for the submittal of the budget?*  It is 31/05/23 this year, so these discussions are more directed towards future planning.  As a result of these discussions, Governors indicated that they were happy for this budget to be signed off.  A teachers’ pay increase of 5% is expected and has been incorporated into the budget, although it could be higher when finally agreed. So far, all such pay offers have been funded by the Government, including the latest comparative one introduced in Wales. There is the assumption that a similar increase will be introduced for support staff as well, which has similarly been factored into the budget. Agency costs for inclusion workers unexpectedly required will appear but these are covered by SEN funding streams.  VF returned at this point.  SFVS  This has been signed off after being audited because the school fund was below the threshold requiring the involvement of an accountant. During the process, questions were answered to explain how financial obligations, including the management of the school fund, were taken care of and therefore the Governors indicated that they were in agreement with this.  SS and PV left the meeting at this point, following thanks for their invaluable work. |
| **4** | **SDP and Management Committee Development Plan (VF/PS)**  SDP  The current iteration of the SDP had been made available on Governor Hub prior to the meeting and the linking of Governor roles to this had been discussed by VF and PS.  While the SDP document had been constructed by GB based on a template from another school, the material within it had been generated during an SLT workshop. It was then opened up to all staff for a four-week consultation period to capture additional ideas and feedback. Where appropriate, targets within it had been linked to Ofsted criteria.  *Governor Question: As it would be helpful for Governors, was it possible to include predictive success criteria for each target?*  Some examples were discussed to clarify what was envisaged so Governors could interrogate evidence and measure progress. Descriptions of where the school would be or what the outcome would be by when for each target was agreed as the preferred model.  **ACTION: PS to arrange with SLT for predictive success criteria to be included as an additional column on the SDP.**  Staff were sincerely thanked for their work on this new document and Governors felt the additional information would further enhance their confidence in its functionality and benefits.  Link roles for Governors  Initial suggestions from VF and KS regarding how statutory and advisory Governor roles could be linked to relevant areas of the SDP had been refined by PS and the resulting document had been published on Governor Hub prior to the meeting. The caveat that much of the DfE guidance in this area is directed towards mainstream settings and adaptation may therefore be required was added, with careers highlighted as an example of this. Statutory careers guidance was provided by the school for dual registered students and therefore the Link Governor role would be to provide quality assurance of this delivery. Within BHES, GB retained overall responsibility, with delivery being provided by the inclusion team, all of whom were to benefit from an offer of free training to become career advisors.  Another such area was mental health and wellbeing, which most closely aligned with H & S on the SDP, for which PS and GB would be the link staff.  **ACTION: All Governors to note their area(s) of responsibility and links to the SDP and feedback any comments prior to the T6 MC meeting.**  *Governor Question: Would it be useful to include a column to show the expected number of meetings between SLT and Link Governors?*  It was felt that this could result in overload for some Governors, particularly as the requirement for meetings would be variable from role to role and at different times of the academic year. However, it was agreed that some clarification regarding reporting expectations would be helpful.  **ACTION: VF/PS to add reporting expectations for each Link Governor to relevant SDP documentation.**  **ACTION: KS to set up a Governor Hub folder for Link Governor reports.**  **ACTION: KS to include an update on Link Governor reports available as a standing item on the agenda for each MC meeting.**  Management Committee Development Plan  Although this had been in existence for a number of years and much had been achieved, some items remained outstanding and it was felt that with a new Chair to be appointed a thorough update would be timely, produced in conjunction with PS to ensure it remained supportive to the school. Further measures suggested for the MC to consider in the future were:   * Completion of the Governor Hub Healthcheck by each Governor * An external review of governance by GDS * Further training, particularly for Governors from a non-educational background and in preparation for an Ofsted visit   When this plan should be in place by was to be discussed further. |
| **5** | **Head’s Report (PS)**  This had been published on Governor Hub prior to the meeting and questions were invited.  *Governor Question: What does the appointment of a 0.2 per week teacher represent?*  This is the equivalent of being employed for one day per week.  *Governor Question: There are currently three students at Riverside. What is the capacity for this setting?*  The maximum is fourteen, so the current situation is unusual and due to extreme staffing shortages within the clinical team. Unfortunately, rumours regarding the future of the setting have proved unsettling to all involved so it is good that its future had now been categorically assured and thanks had been extended for successfully implementation of group learning.  *Governor Question: Was teaching proceeding for the three students there, or were staff being absorbed into other settings?*  Two of the three students were continuing to engage and so teaching was continuing within the setting.  *Governor Question: When recruiting new teachers, were only specialist teachers sought, or were mainstream teachers also considered?*  The school placed adverts on the national website, eteach, and invited applications from all teachers. At the most recent round of interviews, attended by SL, multiple excellent teachers capable of teaching across the settings could have been appointed.  *Governor Question: Did the school retain contact information for strong candidates that were not appointed?*  Due to the stability of the staff team it was unusual to have so many vacant posts, hence no details were retained.  *Governor Question: What impact did an SEN point make?*  This was an increment added to a teacher’s salary when employed to work with SEN students. As there were approximately sixty students with an EHCP at BHES, on average, a teacher would work with at least two and therefore this would be added to all teaching staff salaries from September 2023. This situation had been discovered during discussions with unions when seeking to resolve issues with staff pensions and had now been included in the budget.  *Governor Question: Was the financial value of such points predicted to increase by a similar percentage to overall salaries?*  It was envisaged that this would be the case.  *Governor Question: What had motivated the change from annualised hours contracts to standard hours per week contracts?*  The former reflected fluctuations in student numbers throughout the year, but the BCC legal department had stated these were actually not legal under employment law. The new format gave staff greater security and it was hoped this would also boost their wellbeing as a result. Full time teachers were employed to work 1265 hours per year, but these do not have to be undertaken evenly throughout the year. The move between the two types of contract would require staff to continue monitoring the hours they taught in the same way, but they would be paid in uniform amounts throughout the year without any change in total salary or number of hours worked.  *Governor Question: What was the situation during the recent days of industrial action?*  Only a tiny proportion of the workforce had decided to go on strike, with others disagreeing on principle or feeling the extreme vulnerability of the students made this an impossible option. PS had supported whatever decision staff had made and had worked with SLT to ensure provision remained available. VF had been kept informed throughout. |
| **6** | **Safeguarding Report (JB)**  JB was thanked for providing this in advance of the meeting via Governor Hub and it was agreed that while this should remain termly, it could be verbal if more appropriate.  The main issue remained the outstanding Safeguarding Audit, for which no further details had been forthcoming and was therefore now not expected before the next academic year, in spite of regular enquires being made.  *Governor Question: What was the reason for such a delay?*  It was assumed this must be due to a considerable backlog.  *Governor Question: Could Governors support the school by submitting a note of concern?*  The school welcomed this offer and was still proactively seeking to remain up to date, using the findings of the last audit as a base.  **ACTION: VF to contact LA Safeguarding team regarding Safeguarding audit.** |
| **7** | **Policies (VF/KS)**  Governor Visits Policy  **ACTION: JB to liaise with GB regarding updates required to the Governor Visits Policy.**  Pay Policy Statement  Nationally, this was reviewed annually and the aim was for BHES to provide unions with the most up to date documentation to assist with ongoing discussions regarding pension anomalies. It was clarified that this was a statement rather than a policy, required to sit alongside the existing Pay Policy and complemented the message given in the Head’s statements. The Management Committee indicated that they accepted it as written.  Policy Tracker  PS and GB were thanked for evenly distributing policy review dates throughout the academic year and it was agreed that it would be advantageous for this process if Governors could have access to these policies in and editable format via Teams.  **ACTION: PS to liaise with staff member supporting Teams to provide Governors with access to all policies and the live tracker spreadsheet via this platform.**  It was highlighted that becoming compliant was a long-term goal, evidenced by the Management Committee Development Plan and that this could be extended to linking policies to appropriate areas of the SDP and therefore divide the workload evenly among Governors, starting with the statutory policies, which were usually determined by the LA.  Governor Code of Conduct  A draft version had been circulated on Governor Hub prior to the meeting, and the number of incidents constituting “repeated” grounds for suspension had been decided as two. The final step required was clarification of the relevant policies to which it would link.  **ACTION: GB to advise KS of the relevant policies to which the Governor Code of Conduct should link to under section 11.** |
| **8** | **Succession Planning (VF)**  VF stated that she would not be seeking re-election as Chair in T1 and highlighted that it would be a good opportunity for a new Chair following the appointment of PS as the new Head. The support and training available to anyone considering the role were emphasised.  **ACTION: Any Governor potentially interested in the role of Chair to discuss the role with VF if appropriate.**  **ACTION: KS to include succession planning as an item on the T6 MC meeting agenda.**  **ACTION: KS to contact GDS and Inspiring Governance regarding seeking a new Chair externally.** |
| **9** | **Clerk’s Business (KS)**  Self-Certification  **ACTION: VF/PS to complete self-certification process on Governor Hub.**  Approval of minutes from the previous meeting  Actions Arising from the T4 meeting were reviewed by KS following the meeting (see grid at start of document).  **ACTION: All Governors to update KS regarding progress on actions arising from T4 MC meeting.**  The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the that meeting.  Proposer: XR  Seconder: SP  Agreed unanimously.  **ACTION: VF to sign final minutes of both parts of the T4 meeting on Governor Hub.**  Matters arising  Background was given regarding the LA Governor role, including the receipt of a request to meet and discuss the ongoing situation. It was considered wise to maintain a productive relationship but that where multiple roles were involved these should be kept distinctly separate and therefore the appointment of an alternative individual would be investigated.  **ACTION: VF to contact MK regarding future options.**  **ACTION: KS to contact GDS regarding the appointment process for an alternative LA Governor.**  **ACTION: KS to arrange e mail accounts for new Governors where required.**  **ACTION: KS to notify all Governors of all relevant e mail addresses when finalised.** |
| **10** | **AOB and Close**  No AOB were raised. |
|  | Meeting closed at 7.05 pm. |

Signed as a true record: Date:

Chair of Governors

Vicki Franklin

**DECISIONS GRID**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA NUMBER** | **AGENDA ITEM** | **DECISION** |
| 1 | Welcome | Apologies were accepted |
| 2 | Elections | SL elected as a Community Governor |
| 2 | Elections | VF re-elected as a Community Governor |
| 2 | Elections | New date for T6 MC meeting to be 19/07/23 |
| 3 | Financial Report | Governors indicated that they were happy for the budget presented to be signed off |
| 3 | Financial Report | Governors indicated that they were happy for the submittal of the SFVS |
| 4 | SDP and Management Committee Development Plan | Inclusion of predictive success criteria to be included on the SDP |
| 4 | SDP and Management Committee Development Plan | A new Management Committee Development plan was to be devised |
| 6 | Safeguarding report | To continue to be submitted termly, but in verbal or written format as most appropriate |
| 7 | Policies | Governors indicated that they accepted the Pay Policy Statement as written |
| 9 | Clerk’s business | Minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as an accurate record |