**Bristol Hospital Education Service**

Meeting of the Management Committee

Held in person at Falkland Road

**Term 4, Wednesday 8th March 2023, 5.30pm**

**Draft MINUTES OF MEETING**

*Overall Objective of the Meeting:* *A new phase for BHES*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Governors Present**  Jude Bramton  Vicki Franklin (except from Item 5 – 1740 until item 7 – 1950)  Sarah Prouse  James Ralston, chairing meeting  Xavier Ribeiro  Philippa Scholar, Headteacher (from Item 2 – 1725)  Jacqueline Ward-Warren (from Item 2 – 1725)  Dan White | **In Attendance** (non-voting)  Sylvia Aldrich (from Item 2 – 1725 until Item 3 - 1815)  Gwen Bennion (from Item 2 – 1725 until Item 4 - 1750)  Andrew Langley (from Item 4 – 1800 until Item 6 - 1810)  Gareth Manson (from Item 2 – 1725 until Item 6 - 1810)  Keira Stobie, Clerk  Quorum = 5 | **Apologies** |

**ACTIONS GRID from this 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. | KJB/S |
| 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 |

**Feedback on actions from T3 2022 - 2023 Meeting**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA NUMBER** | **AGENDA ITEM** | **ACTION** | **RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| 2 | Welcome | VF to contact MK | VF |
| 3 | Elections | KS to begin induction process for DW | KS |
| 3 | Elections | KS to update records to reflect the appointment of DW | KS |
| 4 | Presentation by Dr. Sian Rees | SR to e mail Powerpoint presentation to KS | SR |
| 4 | Presentation by Dr. Sian Rees | KS to publish SR Powerpoint presentation on Governor Hub | KS |
| 5 | Financial Update | PV to produce analysis of financial impact and justification of increased fees | PV |
| 6 | Head’s Report | PS to ensure reports can be digitally displayed at future meetings | PS |
| 8 | SDP | Link Governors to discuss SDP with relevant SLT staff and communicate their input via reports for the T4 MC meeting | Link Governors |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | VF to contact VF/FL/MK/SP with reminders to complete Self-Certification process by T4 MC meeting | VF |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | KS to establish if any charge would be incurred to change the name of an existing Governor e mail account | KS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | KS to initiate creation of Governor e mail account for DW | KS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | KS to inform all Governors of e mail address for DW | KS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | DW to discuss with VF possible areas of interest as a Governor | DW |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | VF to sign final minutes of both parts of the T2 meeting on Governor Hub | VF |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | PS/GB to e mail KS completed Policy Review Spreadsheet | PS/GB |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | KS to request change from Teacher in Charge to Headteacher | KS |
| 9 | Clerk’s Business | PS to discuss with staff if an additional Staff Governor from a different setting would be beneficial | PS |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Draft Minutes of Meeting** |
| **1** | **Head’s Post – CONFIDENTIAL** |
| **2** | **Welcome (JR)**  Thanks were extended to all staff for their patience and assistance as it was recognised that the appointment process had put everyone under considerable strain.  PS was enthusiastically welcomed to her first meeting as the future full time, rather than acting, Head and she emphasised that it will be an honour and a privilege to lead the service.  No apologies had been received and the meeting was quorate.  FL had stepped down since the T3 meeting, however, JB had been contacted by a potential new Community Governor and a potential Parent Governor had also made contact.  **ACTION: JB/PS/VF to facilitate initial conversations with potential new Community Governor.**  **ACTION: KS to invite potential Parent Governor as an observer to T5 meeting.**  VF updated Governors regarding the lack of support from the LA Governor which was particularly disappointing given that the Management Committee had recently been asked to make decisions which would impact on the future of a key LA maintained setting.  **ACTION: VF to seek resolution to lack of support from LA Governor.**  JWW was introduced as a new Staff Governor, a teacher of English and History at the Children’s Hospital and Acting Lead for Secondary Provision.  VF left the meeting at this point. |
| **5** | **Safeguarding (GB/PS/JB)**  JB had shared her report on Governor Hub prior to the meeting and GB added that the expected Safeguarding Audit had still not taken place.  *Governor Question: What communications had been received regarding this?*  Although this had been followed up several times by BHES, no further information had been provided.  It was felt that everything in this area was moving forward positively, with GB/JB working well together under the leadership of PS. It had been possible to continue working from the previous Audit carried out two years ago and monitor internally to ensure everything was up to date.  The school had signed up to a new app which provided a holistic dashboard view of the LA data available for each student. This was an important issue given the vulnerable nature of the students and previous delays of up to six weeks before the school was notified of incidents involving the emergency services.  *Governor Question: Did the app send an alert when information was received or did a teacher need to log in to check?*  Although alerts were not sent, it was something the relevant staff could have open in the background and regularly check for updates. When these were received, no details were given but the flag would be followed up.  Staff had been pleased that this had not revealed any new historic information and reported that the system appeared reasonably accurate with only one known incident not appearing and, in that case, the family had personally alerted the school, which had been highly beneficial.  Several long running Safeguarding investigations had been concluded recently and these had brought enormous understanding of the processes involved as well as demonstrating that the Safeguarding systems were working as expected. In addition, the school now had a digital archive of resources which could be utilised in the future, if necessary.  *Governor Question: Was GB focused full time on Safeguarding?*  It was stressed that Safeguarding was viewed as the responsibility of everyone and for GB this was one of numerous roles undertaken. Safeguarding was more live at BHES than other provisions and her role was overall monitoring, with all staff involved putting this into action. GB is the DSL, a statutory position required within the SLT and acts as a point of contact for all staff regarding Safeguarding.  At this point GB left the meeting. |
| **4** | **SLT reports**  GM  Questions were invited on the report available on Governor Hub.  *Governor Question: What was the difference between student feedback and the student voice survey?*  Student feedback describes the comments staff traditionally write in books when marking, although a broader range of methods, such as video messages, were now being adopted. It consisted of comments for the students from staff or other students but the term student feedback was being used to signify the move away from the traditional style of marking.  Student voice surveys involved capturing student opinions.  *Governor Question: What format did the peer skill sharing take?*  The idea was to create a learning space where colleagues could share thoughts on their practice on an entirely voluntary basis and without the involvement of SLT. Initially, staff had been asked to write a report outlining what they had gained through the process, however, this request was not followed up in order to encourage more informal work to flourish.  *Governor Question: Were any prompts provided for debriefing sessions?* This was a self-reflective exercise, and highly personal to staff who may have approached GM with a particular learning aim. Therefore, sessions were tailored to individual needs.  *Governor Question: A neuroscience course focusing on metacognition had been mentioned. How would this connect to the student voice surveys?*  This was designed to raise awareness of the link between how a question is asked and the response received. It involved incorporating opposing questions into surveys, which was challenging as there was also a desire to uncover information in a way that would mirror the style employed by Ofsted.  AL joined the meeting at this point.  *Governor Question: What was the overall purpose of the surveys?*  These were primarily to reveal and act on students’ opinions and were one of the tools employed by Ofsted during their visits. It was very important that students felt listened to and therefore it was vital to use a tool which was robust and fit for purpose.  *Governor Question: Are the issues being experience with completing these surveys unique to BHES or generic?*  While it is a complex process, it was thought that in some cases the language used could present an additional obstacle, however, now two cycles had been completed the results could be examined more closely.  JB highlighted an online app which obtained feedback anonymously and remotely using QR codes scanned by mobile phone.  **ACTION: JB to send GM details of feedback survey app.**  AL  The number of students involved had been included in the report available on Governor Hub to reiterate the scale of the area. These were also consistent with those reported last year as well.  60 students have an EHCP and, of these, 19 are the sole responsibility of BHES. While many of these students receive 1 to 1 tuition, a significant number (25) are in classes. Many are approaching educational transitions, e.g. in years 9, 11 or about to move on to further education so bring an onerous amount of planning.  The nearest equivalent setting undertakes 15 EHCPs per year, whereas at the midpoint in this academic year BHES had completed 51. Often the students arrive at a point of crisis and a statutory plan is therefore required.  Shifting some of the documentary burden to the school and at point of referral has also been beneficial.  The increase in SEN funding since switching to a single AP hub was continuing to be hugely positive. Not only was this single source of commissioning and action advantageous for the school, but the traceability built into the system leads to a more efficient use of public money as well.  Natasha Spence continued to provide invaluable assistance and, although there was a greater administrative burden on the school as well, the rewards have made this a worthwhile investment.  Previously the school had received a minimal number of proactive reports from stakeholders prior to an annual review, however, by introducing a new tool that can create bespoke forms tailored to each participating partner, the number has risen from an average of zero to four per review and the staff view was that this tool had made the process much easier to manage.  *Governor Question: How far in advance are these forms generated?*  The statutory requirement is two weeks before the review and even if they are received the day before a review they can still be useful.  Further questions related to the considerable changes made at Riverside.  *Governor Question: As the current staffing arrangements are described as short term, what are the plans for the longer term?* At the moment, staff numbers have been inflated, however, once the required cultural shift has become established, this can be reduced so the setting will become self-sustaining. This transition is being assisted by the low admission rate of 10 rather than 16 students resulting from NHS restrictions.  *Governor Question: Had the staff involved previously worked at the setting or are they new?*  A mixture of new and existing staff are being deployed, so some inductions and robust training had been provided as an understanding of the risks involved was imperative. Part of the rationale behind AL being based at the setting during this transition has been to ensure a high level of support is available.  This is currently being presented as a pilot project but it is hoped that the changes can be made permanently.  AL and GM left the meeting at this point. |
| **6** | **Progress report (SA)**  As the report contained considerable numerical data, any questions regarding these details were invited to be posted on Governor Hub and a verbal summary was provided in the meeting.  The first long COVID case had been admitted and the school was surprised at the length of time this had taken to arise. Although there appeared to be some similarities to students with CFS, it was a distinct condition in its own right.  The students with CFS were all progressing above expectations through following a rigorous programme of pacing. Activities were RAG rated and only a certain number of hours each day could be devoted to each category. This meant there might only be 3 hrs per day for activities such as eating, walking, dressing, using a computer or learning. Therefore, their day at BHES began with 15 minute sessions and the students were asked to monitor if they noticed any payback two or three days later. If none was reported then the length of each session could be increased. This could occur rapidly, or extremely gradually.  It was noted that as all students were regarded as vulnerable it was impossible to report on these students as a discrete group.  **ACTION: SA to e mail KS a copy of the Progress report to post on Governor Hub.**  SA left the meeting at this point. |
| **3** | **Head’s Report (PS)**  Again, questions on Governor Hub after the meeting were also invited and the format of reports was briefly highlighted.  **ACTION: PS to investigate appropriate formats for SLT/Head’s report to eliminate overlap.**  *Governor Question: What update was available regarding the additional charge being proposed?*  The Acting Director of Education had specified that a process must be followed prior to implementation and details of this were yet to be forthcoming. Therefore, the school was waiting for an interim Director of Education to be appointed in order to take this forward. However, now PS had been made substantive, this could be actioned.  As this would not now be in place this financial year it was acknowledged that budgets and future projections would need to be adjusted accordingly, bearing in mind that the current shortfall that the school was operating at could only be maintained for one additional year.  It was hoped that the additional charge could be taken to the Schools’ Forum on 01/09/23 in order that it could be instigated in April 2024.  *Governor Question: Why had the changes at Riverside not been made before?*  The previous setting lead, who had been in post for about six years, had regarded the role as more “caretaking” than providing dynamic leadership. During this time, the clinical body also became unstable and so the opportunities provided at the setting minimised as a result. Although the current changes had come as a request from the Area Managers, there was still some opposition from the clinical team.  *Governor Question: What student feedback had been received since implementing these changes?*  There had been good engagement, however, the low numbers on the unit also had to be considered.  *Governor Question: Is there a risk that the changes will be reversed when members of staff currently on leave return?*  This will be managed should the situation arise.  *Governor Question: Why has this been introduced as a pilot scheme rather than a permanent change?*  It was felt that it would be wise to introduce weekly monitoring and assessment alongside these changes and so a Friday morning session had been incorporated for this with the conclusions then being discussed with the clinical managers.  *Governor Question: If the scheme is successful, will the programme be shared more widely?*  There are very few comparable settings and these other units already follow a similar programme.  *Governor Question: What is the time frame of the pilot?*  It is envisaged to last six weeks and then a decision will be made whether to make it permanent or not.  *Governor Question: Have any clinical reasons against the changes been raised?*  It was felt that the students could mix and therefore none were raised.  *Governor Question: Where does responsibility for the final decision lie?*  PS will take the final decision and this ensures there is minimal chances of a reversal. The clinical commissioning managers are in support and therefore the psychologists have less involvement.  *Governor Question: Could the clinical commissioning managers reverse the decision?*  This is a possibility, but it is not felt to be likely.  *Governor Question: Is education withdrawn for any particular conditions?*  The more significant factor is students themselves opting out and therefore the alternative option is being made as unattractive as possible.  *Governor Question: When would education be withdrawn?*  This term does not imply that this is a punishment, but, instead, it refers to when it is decided education is inappropriate for a student, e.g. if they had an eating disorder and were not eating they would be deemed unable to access education. However, this is now more of a cultural than a medical idea.  **ACTION: PS to report on outcome of changes at Riverside at the T5 MC meeting.**  *Governor Question: What update is available regarding the situation with teachers’ pensions?*  All individual meetings had been held but payments had not yet been received. There is a delay because one union has requested that an external body reviews the case, which is frustrating for those who had been expecting an imminent payment. |
| **7** | **Clerk’s business (KS)**  VF returned to the meeting at this point.  Declaration of Pecuniary Interests  None were made at the meeting.  Self-Certification process  Governors were thanked for undertaking this and SP and VF (Section 3 only) were reminded these remained outstanding. DW reported this had been done 08/03/23 and the process was explained for the benefit of JW.  *Governor Question: What constituted a conflict of interest?* Various examples were discussed and it was decided that it was better to err on the side of caution if uncertain.  **ACTION: VF, SP and JW to complete Self-Certification process by T5 MC meeting.**  Training  JB reported that statutory training for another role did not automatically appear on the BHES Governor Hub profile.  **ACTION: JB to send KS details of training undertaken for manual recording on Governor Hub.**  Approval of minutes from the previous meeting and matters arising  Actions Arising from the T3 meeting were reviewed (see grid at start of document) with the following points updated:  **ACTION: VF/PS to finalise how Link Governors will contribute to SDP.**  **ACTION: PS/GB to finalise policy review schedule.**  With the amendment that the apologies of MK were not accepted the minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the that meeting and Governors were reminded that sending apologies to the Clerk was greatly appreciated.  Proposer: XR  Seconder: DW  Agreed unanimously.  **ACTION: VF to sign final minutes of both parts of the T3 meeting on Governor Hub.**  Website  **ACTION: KS to e mail GB information required to update MC section of the BHES website.**  **ACTION: GB to update the MC section of the BHES website.**  Admissions Policy  It was noted that this was set by the LA and therefore BHES cannot instigate any changes.  Parent Governor Recruitment  Detailed under Item 2.  Future plans  The role of Link Governor for Curriculum was currently vacant and the MC was aware others could similarly become vacant as well. Therefore, the question of whether to restructure the Link Governor roles arose.  *Governor Question: What Link Governor roles did PS feel was needed for BHES?*  The ideal situation would be to relate these roles to the Head of Department and SLT. This would result in Link Governors for:   * Teaching and Learning * Safeguarding * SEN * Curriculum * Health and Safety * Finance   *Governor Question: Are Curriculum and Teaching and Learning two separate areas?*  This was the case due to the expertise of the staff involved.  It was proposed that JWW considered the role of Link Governor for Curriculum, while DW considered the role of Link Governor for SEN. This would be reviewed at the T5 MC meeting.  **ACTION: Link Governor roles to be finalised at T5 MC meeting.**  **ACTION: KS to circulate an updated Governor email address list after the T5 MC meeting.**  Governor Visits Policy  It was felt further work was required on this before the MC could agree to adopt it.  **ACTION: JB/GB to discuss Governor Visits Policy.**  **ACTION: GB to bring updated Governor Visits Policy to T5 MC meeting.**  *Governor Question: How can Governors work collaboratively on policy documents?*  It was believed that this should be possible using the shared drive capabilities of Microsoft Outlook, via Governor e mail accounts.  Governor Induction Procedure  No amendments were proposed and so this would be adopted by the MC.  **ACTION: KS to upload Governor Induction Procedure on to Governor Hub.** |
| **8** | **AOB and Close**  *Governor Question: What administrative tasks remained outstanding now the Head’s appointment had been ratified?*  VF had not yet been able to contact all applicants to provide feedback, however, the next step was to confirm the offer which had been made, which should be straightforward as references had already been received.  **ACTION: VF to provide verbal feedback to candidates.**  **ACTION: JR to write to BCC to confirm appointment of PS.**  **ACTION: JR to provide details informing BHES families of the appointment to be communicated via website and/or e mail.**  **ACTION: PS to inform staff of appointment.**  **ACTION: PS to provide a photo and accompanying quote for the BHES website.**  *Governor Question: Who was responsible for managing the resultant changes within BHES?*  All contracts were valid until September, at which point PS will be in post and the staffing structure will be one of her responsibilities. |
|  | Meeting closed at 7.00 pm. |

Signed as a true record: Date:

Vice - Chair of Governors (chairing meeting),

James Ralston

**DECISIONS GRID**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA NUMBER** | **AGENDA ITEM** | **DECISION** |
| 2 | Welcome | JWW welcomed as a Staff Governor |
| 3 | Head’s Report | Budgets and future projections to be adjusted to take into consideration the delayed implementation of the additional charge |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | Amended minutes were accepted as an accurate account of the previous meeting |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | No review of Admissions Policy required |
| 7 | Clerk’s Business | Governor Induction Procedure adopted |