**Bristol Hospital Education Service**

Meeting of the Management Committee

Held in person at Falkland Road

**Term 6, Wednesday 19th July 2023, 5.00pm**

**Final MINUTES OF MEETING**

*Overall Objective of the Meeting:* *Moving forward, building on success*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Governors Present**  Jude Bramton  Vicki Franklin  Sean Lancastle  Sarah Prouse (until 1905 – item 9)  James Ralston  Xavier Ribeiro  Philippa Scholar, Headteacher  Jacqueline Ward-Warren  Dan White | **In Attendance** (non-voting)  Sylvia Aldrich (until 1725 – item 3)  Gwen Bennion (until 1855 – item 9)  Andrew Langley (until 1725 – item 3)  Keira Stobie, Clerk  Patricia Varano, Burser (until 1740 – item 4)  Quorum = 5 | **Apologies**  Gareth Manson |

**ACTIONS GRID from this meeting**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA NUMBER** | **AGENDA ITEM** | **ACTION** | **RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| 3 | Finance Report | PS to ensure the LA is appropriately updated regarding progress towards implementing the additional charge to schools | PS |
| 3 | Finance Report | PS and PV to present the envisaged approach to implementing the proposed additional charge to schools at the T1 MC meeting | PS/PV |
| 3 | Finance Report | XR to investigate potential finance training provided by SS to ascertain suitability and cost | XR |
| 4 | Head’s Report | PS to update Governors on the backdated award of the SEN point to teaching staff at the T1 MC meeting | PS |
| 4 | Head’s Report | All Governors to examine the updated SDP available on Governor Hub | All Governors |
| 5 | SLT and Link Governor Updates | PS to investigate adding subscribing to the CPOMS service as a criterion of the Service Level Agreement | PS |
| 5 | SLT and Link Governor Updates | KS to recirculate details of each Link Governor’s role and SLT contact | KS |
| 6 | Succession Planning | VF to notify KS of her resignation when appropriate and KS to update records to reflect this | VF/KS |
| 6 | Succession Planning | KS to adapt current Inspiring Governance advert and circulate to Governors | KS |
| 6 | Succession Planning | Governors to use advert appropriately to attract potential new Governors | All Governors |
| 6 | Succession Planning | KS to liaise with PV to advertise for a potential Chair via Eteach, with an application deadline of 1st September 2023 | KS |
| 6 | Succession Planning | KS to liaise with GDS to facilitate JR being appointed as an LA Governor | KS |
| 6 | Succession Planning | GB to advertise Parent Governor vacancy on the new communication platform | GB |
| 6 | Succession Planning | GB to advertise Parent Governor vacancy termly via e mail and text until filled | GB |
| 6 | Succession Planning | KS to send GB Governor Code of Conduct | KS |
| 6 | Succession Planning | GB to post Governor Code of Conduct where necessary on the website | GB |
| 7 | Health and Safety Report | SP to include information on incidents/near misses in future Health and Safety reports | SP |
| 8 | Policies | KS to verify with GDS if the Pay and Teacher Appraisal Policies could be approved electronically | KS |
| 8 | Policies | KS to include consideration of the Child Protection Policy and Procedures and the First Aid Policy on the agenda for the T1 MC meeting | KS |
| 8 | Policies | JB/GB to bring the Governor Visits Policy to the T1 MC meeting | JB/GB |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | GB to send KS details of online Safeguarding and Prevent trainings | GB |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | KS to update Governor self-certification process for September 2023 | KS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | All Link Governors to meet with their SLT contacts during T1 | Link Governors |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | Link Governors to arrange for reporting expectations for their areas to be added to the SDP | Link Governors |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | PS to investigate providing access to the policy tracker spreadsheet for all Governors | PS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | PS to add Link Governor titles to relevant areas of the SDP | PS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | VF to sign final minutes of the T5 meeting on Governor Hub | VF |

**Feedback on actions from T5 2022 - 2023 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 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Final Minutes of Meeting** |
| **1** | **Welcome (VF)**  Apologies were received and accepted from GM and the meeting was quorate.  VF began her final meeting as Chair with thanks to all at BHES for such an enjoyable experience and for being an amazing team to work with. With the great news from Ofsted and a clearly defined path ahead, it felt a good time to move on, particularly with stability now established within the MC. This left her very confident for the future of BHES.  Pecuniary Interests  No updates or changes were reported.  Training  VF had attended a briefing from the new Director of Education.  SS had indicated that she would be willing to arrange finance training for Governors, but how specific to BHES this would be was uncertain.  *Governor Question: What was the risk assessment with respect to financial knowledge within the MC?*  At least three Governors had professional experience in this field and, in addition, PV could also be consulted when needed. It was felt that other Governors would gain sufficient awareness through discussions within meetings and reading documentation disseminated, but were encouraged to seek clarification or guidance from colleagues whenever necessary.  Governors’ attention was drawn to the new GDS training programme for the Autumn, published and bookable on Governor Hub. Unfortunately, the only financial training currently being offered via this route was specifically for academies and free schools and therefore would not be appropriate. |
| **2** | **Congratulations and Ofsted Feedback (VF/PS/SA/GB/AL/GM)**  The MC expressed their enormous thanks for what had been a very proud moment and asked for this to be conveyed to all within the BHES community.  *Governor Question: What is the timeline for the publication of the report?*  The draft document had been received and returned immediately as there were no points that BHES wished to raise and therefore the final version was expected by the end of this week.  Staff feedback was then invited, especially in light of the recent national debate regarding these inspections.  It was reported that this had been raised by the inspectors themselves, yet they had impressed staff by being unobtrusive, supportive and curious. Although they had suitable background knowledge, they stressed their eagerness to learn and their questions demonstrated a genuine interest. They had been honest throughout, cautioning that one possible outcome from their visit could be a full inspection, and indicating that the biggest development point would be how to share the good practice they had witnessed. It reminded staff that what they dealt with on a routine basis was at the extreme end of mainstream experience.  There had been so much structural change and reflection over the last 18 months that staff felt comfortable answering the questions posed, as they were very familiar with the material being discussed.  *Governor Question: What feedback had been expressed by other staff?*  Although the inspectors asked many questions, these never felt overly intense and staff particularly liked time being allocated for them to share any points that they wished to highlight.  The feedback meeting had taken the unusual format of staff witnessing the two inspectors reporting their thoughts to each other, and this included many amazing statements about BHES.  GM had also sent the following written feedback:  I was really pleased with how the whole BHES community responded to the inspection. I do not think that this happened by accident, I think all involved have invested heavily in developing a climate in which an excellent culture can develop. I think that this investment needs to be applauded.  During a virtual meeting with VF, JR and KS, the inspectors had enquired about the MAT options that BHES had explored. The process undertaken had been outlined and it had been explained that this had been halted when none of the options appeared to offer the chance for BHES to maintain its high standards. Furthermore, some options could have risked the service becoming an exclusive MAT only provision and, overall, it did not feel like a decision an acting Head should be expected to be take.  *Governor Question: What was felt to be the motivation behind such a question?*  It had been a considerable focus for the MC and therefore it was beneficial for the point to be addressed proactively.  Overall, it was felt a timely visit and that all involved had been thoroughly prepared.  SA and AL left the meeting at this point. |
| **3** | **Finance Report (PV/XR)**  Q1 Outturn forecast  This was favourable, with the actual in year deficit £38, 837 (thirty eight thousand eight hundred and thirty seven pounds) less than that predicted. This gave an overall surplus balance of £239, 909 (two hundred and thirty nine thousand nine hundred and nine pounds).  Main Material Changes from Budget Report  A teachers’ pay and pension grant of £113, 998 (one hundred and thirteen thousand nine hundred and ninety eight pounds) which had not been included in the budget was now expected and the latest DfE figures indicated there would now be 23 pupils in receipt of Pupil Premium funding, resulting in BHES receiving funds totalling £23, 805 (twenty three thousand eight hundred and five pounds). This was via a new system of direct funding, with the amount received calculated from census data. It would be highly dependent on the pupils on roll on census day and BHES would miss out on any pre-census funding, but it still represented a significant improvement.  *Governor Question: How had this funding been received previously?*  As this would have previously gone to the pupil’s school, BHES would have had to attempt to claim it back from them, which effectively was not possible due to the administration required.  Expenditure  Teacher SEN allowances would now be paid from September 2023, rather than September 2022, so the back pay originally included in the budget would no longer be required. However, the overall cost for teachers’ overtime had increased and the Governors were also asked to approve the writing off of historic unpaid invoices totalling £16, 500 (sixteen thousand five hundred pounds). These related to when BHES had been without the capacity to follow up these debts from schools.  *Governor Question: How would such debts be followed up in the future?*  There was now a system in place which would involve PV reporting unpaid invoices to BCC.  *Governor Question: Do the more recent invoices remain outstanding?*  These have now been paid.  *Governor Question: Will new contracts for staff reflecting the additional SEN allowance be necessary?*  Updated contracts are scheduled to be issued in September/October.  Five Year Budget Forecast 2023/2024  The LA had advised BHES that it would receive a 3.4% increase to its funding, corresponding to an additional £89, 203 (eighty nine thousand two hundred and three pounds). The fees that BHES charges other schools for provision will also increase from September 2023 as follows: £35 (thirty five pounds) per day for classes and inclusion work  £75 (seventy five pounds) per hour of teacher time  These figures had been incorporated into the budget from September.  The number of pupils with EHCPs is estimated at 48, with 78 pupils attending classes and 84 receiving one to one tuition.  BHES is still seeking agreement to implement a new charge per pupil per day for those on roll at Bristol schools. It was unfortunate that the presentation of this to Heads coincided with the Ofsted inspection and has therefore been postponed until T1, but BHES still envisages the agreement being in place from April 2024.  *Governor Question: What is the likelihood that this will not be agreed, as it would have a huge impact on the budget?*  It was thought that the decision ultimate rested with the Director of Education, however, it was considered highly probable that approval would be given as the fee proposed represented such good value for money when compared with sourcing an equivalent service from other providers.  *Governor Question: With the Director of Education being only recently appointed, were their thoughts on the matter known?*  BHES was focusing on obtaining the agreement of the Heads of other Bristol schools first, especially as the majority of these had control of their own budgets.  *Governor Question: Would the relevant schools need to sign some form of contract which bound them to paying this fee, if agreed?*  Although this was already stipulated within the Service Level Agreement between BHES and the relevant schools, it was felt that, in future, a more formal contract could potentially be advantageous.  *Governor Question: If a student already at BHES continues attending, how would their school know that there was now a charge to be paid?*  It was hoped that by bringing the matter to the Heads for agreement first, this would eliminate the need for any further action in this respect.  *Governor Question: As BHES is an LA maintained provision, would approval be needed from the LA to implement this?*  It was felt that it would be more the case that BHES would keep the LA informed of developments rather than approval being required.  **ACTION: PS to ensure the LA is appropriately updated regarding progress towards implementing the additional charge to schools.**  *Governor Question: Would the funds be paid to the LA and then transferred to BHES or could BHES charge in its own right?*  Historically, the LA had made this charge, however, the comparison to BHES charging out of county schools should also be considered.  *Governor Question: Would it be beneficial to present a comprehensive plan at discussions with the LA?*  It was agreed that this would be advantageous.  **ACTION: PS and PV to present the envisaged approach to implementing the proposed additional charge to schools at the T1 MC meeting.**  Employee costs had increased by £515, 339 (five hundred and fifteen thousand three hundred and thirty nine pounds), reflecting a greater number of pupils requiring a greater number of teachers. Similarly, the amount of supply work and overtime necessary had also increased and the overspend on exam fees reflected the additional entries made. These costs were partially mitigated by some instances of over budgeting in other areas.  No invoices for cleaning work have yet been received, but an invoice for caretaking was submitted which had not been expected to feature at this point in the financial cycle. In addition, there had been an overspend on energy due to a delayed invoice. However, funding to cover this had been put aside in advance.  Governors were made aware that an amended version of the budget had replaced the document originally published and was now available on Governor Hub.  *Governor Question: Was there any scope to recoup the additional exam fees from the relevant schools?*  They had been invoiced and so BHES hopes to receive these funds. However, it was impossible to invoice for those pupils from private schools.  *Governor Question: Could the families be invoiced directly in these cases?*  As only a few pupils fall into this category it could be considered as a strategy in the future.  Some questions relating to the budget forecast had been addressed to SS before the meeting and the explanation given for non-uniform increases was uncertainty surrounding so many of the estimates BHES was required to make when constructing this document.  In general, detailed prior scrutiny of the budget had concluded that if it was not possible to secure the additional charge proposed, this would be alarming, however, in all other respects the Governors concerned were satisfied.  BHES remains vulnerable because the buildings agreement is less rigorous than would be desired. Initial investigations aiming to address this had been undertaken, but there is no capacity to pursue the matter further at present.  The Governors voted on the outstanding invoices being written off:  Proposer: XR  Seconder: VF  Agreed unanimously.  The Governors voted on agreeing the budget outlined:  Proposer: XR  Seconder: DW  Agreed unanimously.  **ACTION: XR to investigate potential finance training provided by SS to ascertain suitability and cost.**  PV thanked VF for her outstanding work and passed on best wishes for the future.  PV was also thanked sincerely by the Governors before leaving the meeting at this point. |
| **4** | **Head’s Report (PS)**  Apologies were offered that this had not been published in advance due to being overtaken by recent events.  Staffing  As highlighted within the previous item, it had been necessary to make changes to staff contracts after BHES had been made aware that the existing ones were not legal. In order to ensure these were fit for the purpose of the service, discussions with all stakeholders involved had been held and all were now satisfied with the new versions produced. These included alterations such as travel being defined as starting and ending from the site and a standardisation of how PPA and other time was claimed. It had been impossible to issue these this term, and so staff would now receive them in September/October. However, they would be backdated to apply from 1st September 2023.  The SEN point for teaching staff did remain an issue following a request from the relevant unions for payment to be backdated, but without any specific point in time being defined. The LA HR team had been consulted and no response had been forthcoming from the Head’s Line Manager. Therefore, the HR team had been advised to escalate the matter to the next level. Unfortunately, BHES simply did not have the funds to support limitless backdating and PS had also asked the HR team to contact the LA to ascertain how and where the funding will be sourced should it prove necessary. It was felt that responsibility ultimately rested with the LA as it had a duty in law to provide education for the BHES pupils, but a lengthy wait for a conclusive resolution was predicted. While informal discussions with the NEU representative indicated that a token gesture could be welcomed and acceptable, BHES was leaving the LA to lead on further discussions with the relevant unions.  *Governor Question: Is this allowance being paid by any equivalent service?*  There was evidence that this was the case.  **ACTION: PS to update Governors on the backdated award of the SEN point to teaching staff at the T1 MC meeting.**  The teachers’ pay award had been agreed at Governmental level and this had removed the threat of further industrial action. The award was also to be fully funded, which was a great relief to all involved.  It was felt that the feedback from the Ofsted inspection covered all other areas and Governors were encouraged to examine the updated SDP available on Governor Hub as this provided a detailed picture of progress being made.  **ACTION: All Governors to examine the updated SDP available on Governor Hub.** |
| **5** | **SLT and Link Governor Updates**  Safeguarding (JB/GB)  The relevant report was available on Governor Hub and the feedback on this area received from the Ofsted inspection had been outstanding.  The CPOMS free trial which had allowed data sharing between BHES and schools with pupils attending had come to an end and CPOMS would now be charging secondary schools £200 (two hundred pounds) and primary schools £100 (one hundred pounds) per year to continue with the service. In spite of multiple messages from CPOMS, and the fact that 80% of Bristol schools subscribe to CPOMS independently, the schools were not responding, indicating that something was awry with communications. Concerns were heightened by the work that had been involved to ensure all schools subscribed when the additional service was provided free of charge as this will only be increased now a payment was necessary.  In response, GB was planning to address a document to Henry Chan (Safeguarding in Education Team Manager) outlining the consequences should schools not sign up to this, to be circulated in appropriate newsletters as well as to all relevant contacts within schools.  This was felt to be a widespread issue as all alternative providers were now using CPOMS in a similar manner.  Bristol Free School, who have indicated that they would not be paying to subscribe to the CPOMS service, have a large number of pupils attending BHES and this would create significant additional work for BHES, therefore issuing an equivalent charge in this case was being considered.  *Governor Question: Could the Service Level Agreement be updated to include a stipulation that schools subscribe to the CPOMS service?*  This was agreed to be worth pursuing.  **ACTION: PS to investigate adding subscribing to the CPOMS service as a criterion of the Service Level Agreement.**  *Governor Question: Were Service Level Agreements issued per pupil or per school?*  One Agreement is issued per pupil, however, the document itself was discussed annually at the schools’ forum.  Confirmation had been received that the LA Safeguarding Audit would be carried out during the next academic year and the Ofsted inspectors had fully appreciated that this delay was not the responsibility of BHES.  Finance (XR/PV/SS)  These discussions had been covered within an earlier item.  There was a general discussion regarding the nature, scope and expectations associated with Link Governor roles and Link Governors were referred to helpful background documentation available on The Knowledge (accessed via Governor Hub).  **ACTION: KS to recirculate details of each Link Governor’s role and SLT contact.**  *Governor Question: What are the expectations regarding submitting written reports?*  Safeguarding remains a standing item on the agenda each term and so a termly written report was appropriate. For other Link Governors, it was felt the SDP would indicate when would be suitable, and further guidance could be sought from the relevant SLT contact as well. The final step of establishing this new system would be to include the Link Governors on the SDP, indicating the areas each would cover. Governors were reminded that they were also welcome to visit the settings, however, they were asked to balance this with respectful regard of the workload of staff.  It was noted that staff wellbeing had arisen in both the Ofsted inspection and recent Safeguarding discussions. As such, it illustrated how Link Governors might cover multiple areas, for example, staff wellbeing could also be monitored during Learning Walks by the Teaching and Learning Link Governor. This was an area where BHES felt confident that all staff were aware of the resources available and how to access and use these so a suitable support plan could be put in place if and when needed. The LA had adopted guidance from Mind which encouraged self-responsibility and this reinforced the concept to staff effectively. |
| **6** | **Succession Planning (VF)**  Appointment of Chair  Since the T5 meeting contact had been made with a prospective new Governor who could be willing to take on the role of Chair. It was hoped that a meeting could be arranged with VF/JR/PS during August and, if all progressed favourably, this would be followed by an invite to attend the T1 MC meeting as an observer.  *Governor Question: Would VF be continuing as a Governor after stepping down as Chair?*  Unfortunately, the demands of external roles meant that this would be impossible.  **ACTION: VF to notify KS of her resignation, when appropriate, and KS to update records to reflect this.**  *Governor Question: Had any Governors expressed an interest in acting as co-Chairs?*  This had not been the case and those with previous experience of such an arrangement had found the liaising required to successfully manage this actually generated additional work.  In light of this, JR agreed to Chair the T1 MC meeting and wider avenues for Governor recruitment were suggested, including:   * The LA/GDS * Eteach * Inspiring Governance * Linked In   **ACTION: KS to adapt current Inspiring Governance advert and circulate to Governors.**  **ACTION: Governors to use advert appropriately to attract potential new Governors.**  **ACTION: KS to liaise with PV to advertise for a potential Chair via Eteach, with an application deadline of 1st September 2023.**  **ACTION: KS to liaise with GDS to facilitate JR being appointed as an LA Governor.**  Parent Governor Vacancy  As the recent contact regarding the Parent Governor vacancy had withdrawn, GB reported that the vacancy continued to be advertised on the BHES website and all its social media channels. Furthermore, BHES was now using a new, more precise and targeted, platform to communicate directly to families and so the advert would be placed on this as well.  **ACTION: GB to advertise Parent Governor vacancy on the new communication platform.**  *Governor Question: Could families of past pupils be approached to stand as Parent Governors?*  These individuals were not felt to fulfil the necessary criteria.  *Governor Question: Is there a BHES newsletter this could be promoted within?*  Social media channels were used instead, and so the vacancy would be highlighted termly by e mail and text until filled.  **ACTION: GB to advertise Parent Governor vacancy termly via e mail and text until filled.**  External Review of Governance  It was felt that given the recent Ofsted inspection, this was not currently appropriate, but would be revisited in the future.  *Governor Question: Who would carry this out?*  It would be performed by LA staff.  Governor Code of Conduct  As all outstanding issues had now been resolved, Governors were asked to approve this document.  Proposer: VF  Seconder: SL  Agreed unanimously that this would be adopted from September 2023.  **ACTION: KS to send GB Governor Code of Conduct.**  **ACTION: GB to post Governor Code of Conduct where necessary on the website.** |
| **7** | **Health and Safety Report (SP)**  Recent developments had been highlighted within the report submitted and a tour of the premises with the caretaker had also been undertaken. As a result of this, numerous issues had been identified, with all of those within the scope of BHES having now been resolved. However, the buildings were owned by the Venturers Trust and BHES was still waiting on a response regarding the issues that it had brought to their attention.  *Governor Question: Did any of the outstanding issues represent an immediate threat?*  This was not felt to be the case.  *Governor Question: Would it be useful to summarise incidents/near misses on this report?*  This was considered a valuable addition and the relevant information would be included in future.  **ACTION: SP to include information on incidents/near misses in future Health and Safety reports.** |
| **8** | **Policies (VF/GB/KS)**  A list of policies due for review had been included on the agenda. These fell into three categories:  Issued by BCC and adopted by BHES with no additions or amendments   * Staff Wellbeing * Staff Codes of Conduct * Staff Disciplinary Procedures * Staff grievance procedures * Statement of procedures for dealing with allegations of abuse against staff * Managing medicines in school policy * Health and Safety   Reviewed by BHES and no additions or amendments necessary   * Equality information and objectives statement * Careers guidance and provider access policy statement * RSE * Complaints   Substantially amended and/or added to   * Pay Policy * Teacher Appraisal Policy   The following policies were to be considered at the T1 meeting:   * Governor Visits Policy * Child protection policy and procedures – requires updates based on the September 2023 iteration of KCSIE * First Aid * Instrument of Governance – currently being updated by GDS   The Animals on Site Policy was no longer deemed relevant as the only animal brought on site remained in an external room throughout and all relevant certification had been fully checked.  *Governor Question: What was the situation if assurances had already been made to home a hamster for a pupil at the Childrens’ Hospital?*  This would need to be referred to staff at the hospital and a full risk assessment would be required.  Action such as replacing door locks was being undertaken over the summer holidays to enable necessary details to be added to the Lockdown procedures and staff training would be provided in September once the work had been completed.  *Governor Question: Did this link with any points highlighted by the Health and Safety report?*  The work to be undertaken would address issues raised within both the Health and Safety and Safeguarding reports.  The Governors voted to approve the continued use of the eleven policies listed above where no substantial amendments or additions were required.  Proposer: JB  Seconder: XR  Agreed unanimously.  *Governor Question: How would the changes made to the Pay and Teacher Appraisal Policies be noted?*  A review date would be added when the policies were agreed and this would also be recorded on the policy tracker spreadsheet. All changes made would be listed on the front page of each policy.  While it was acknowledged that a final version of these policies must be in place before the start of T1, the Governors decided additional time was required for scrutiny. It was hoped they could be approved electronically and it was to be verified that this would be possible without the need for a physical or virtual meeting.  **ACTION: KS to verify with GDS if the Pay and Teacher Appraisal Policies could be approved electronically.**  **ACTION: KS to include consideration of the Child Protection Policy and Procedures and the First Aid Policy on the agenda for the T1 MC meeting.**  **ACTION: JB/GB to bring the Governor Visits Policy to the T1 MC meeting.**  GB left the meeting at this point. |
| **9** | **Clerk’s Business (KS)**  Self-Certification  Governors agreed that the self-certification confirmations on Governor Hub could be updated with a new iteration of Safeguarding and Prevent trainings to reflect important and relevant changes in these areas. Governors would be required to complete this process in September 2023.  **ACTION: GB to send KS details of online Safeguarding and Prevent trainings.**  **ACTION: KS to update Governor self-certification process for September 2023.**  Approval of minutes from the previous meeting  Actions Arising from the T5 meeting were reviewed. See grid at start of document in addition to the following supplementary actions:  **ACTION: All Link Governors to meet with their SLT contacts during T1.**  **ACTION: Link Governors to arrange for reporting expectations for their areas to be added to the SDP.**  **ACTION: PS to investigate providing access to the policy tracker spreadsheet for all Governors.**  **ACTION: PS to add Link Governor titles to relevant areas of the SDP.**  The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the that meeting.  Proposer: VF  Seconder: JB  Agreed unanimously.  **ACTION: VF to sign final minutes of the T5 meeting on Governor Hub.** |
| **10** | **AOB and Close**  No AOB were raised. |
|  | Meeting closed at 7.10 pm. |

Signed as a true record: Date:

Chair of Governors

Vicki Franklin

**DECISIONS GRID**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA NUMBER** | **AGENDA ITEM** | **DECISION** |
| 1 | Welcome | Apologies were accepted |
| 1 | Welcome | It was agreed the financial expertise within the MC did not constitute a risk |
| 3 | Finance Report | Outstanding invoices to be written off |
| 3 | Finance Report | Budget agreed as presented |
| 6 | Succession Planning | JR to Chair the T1 MC meeting |
| 6 | Succession Planning | External review of Governance to be postponed |
| 6 | Succession Planning | Governor Code of Conduct agreed |
| 8 | Policies | Animal on Site Policy no longer relevant |
| 8 | Policies | Continued use of policies not requiring substantial amendments or additions agreed |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | Minutes from the previous meeting agreed without amendments |