

## Hove Learning Federation Full Governing Body Meeting

Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> April 2023, Holland Road

### MINUTES

<b>GOVERNORS</b>	Anne-Marie Williamson, David Karp, Ben Massey (HoS – SR), Jo Corbett, Lisa Marshall (Co-Chair), Lorna Cummings (Head of School – HR), Louise Wilkinson (Co-Chair), Maddie Southern (HT - HJS),
<b>OTHER PARTICIPANTS</b>	Sam Ledger (Associate Member), Niamh O’Shea, Judith Harland (SBM), Sarah Shaw (SBM)
<b>CLERK</b>	Chelle McCann
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	Nick Jefferson, Ella Livingstone-Greer, Marie Benton

#	AGENDA ITEM
1.	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome – the meeting opened at 18:04pm</li> <li>• Apologies were noted and accepted from NJ, EL, MB</li> <li>• Notification of Any Urgent Business – none noted</li> <li>• Declarations of Interest – none noted</li> </ul>
2.	<p><b>Summary of WHIS/HJS Budget Mitigations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MS talked governors through the presentation submitted and the changes to the WHIS draft budget plan</li> <li>• There have been finance discussions with the LA which have included corroborating the school’s budget modelling. A further meeting with Deb Austin will be arranged once these are completed.</li> <li>• SS explained the splits of staffing costs and payroll changes which will enable more coherent monitoring and reporting</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>Federation Contracts for all staff</b></p> <p>MS covered the discussions raised at the FGB held on 21.3.23</p> <p><b>Governor Questions:</b></p> <p><i>Do you think there will be any trade union comment on this?</i> Yes, due to the movement across school’s sites. We are looking at a wider picture of supporting staff and operational flexibility across the sites.</p> <p><i>Can you outline the process?</i> There will be a consultation paper which is submitted to cover the changes including key information to give staff context for the reasons behind the change in contract. The school will only ask staff to move sites as a last resort and there would be ample opportunity to discuss before there is any movement between sites.</p> <p><i>Will the unions take the lead from staff?</i> The staff will speak to the unions but the unions will also want to consider the consultation to ensure fairness for staff.</p> <p><i>Will there be big difference for staff?</i> Benchmarking has taken place across sites and with the incoming reception there is the potential for less need on one site however there will be increase need on another site. The school do not want to reduce staff or make staff redundant and there will be due thought before moving any staff across sites. There will still be an opportunity for staff to express their site preference and reasoning for this preference, this would be considered before any</p>

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<p>changes are made. These changes are to mitigate the need for redundancy. This will also bring fairness across staffing as all staff would be on the same federated contract.</p> <p>Governors approved the recommendation to move towards a consultation on changing staff to federated contracts.</p>
4.	<p><b>Vertical Grouping of Years 1 and 2, Years 3 and 4 at Holland Road for September 2023</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MS talked through the reasoning previously presented at FGB on 21.3.23</li> <li>• Governors were made aware that class sizes under 27 are not financially viable</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Questions:</b></p> <p><i>Can the LA ask us to ensure space for more children?</i> We cannot cap numbers in Year 1 and 3 but the school could consider limiting the numbers of children coming in, this would need further discussion with the LA. The LA cannot force the school to accept more children. Any new admissions would be discussed with the school before being confirmed there would have to be an agreement with the LA in place.</p> <p><i>Has there been evidence from other schools that use this method in terms of a drop-in pupil numbers?</i> There is a meeting with Coldean this week (who currently vertical group) to discuss this further but there is no evidence that children have been removed by parents/carers due to vertical groupings.</p> <p><i>Are there any other schools considering this option?</i> There hasn't been any communication of this.</p> <p><i>How many pupils left Connaught Road when it was open?</i> These children often left due to significant family changes. There was a leavers survey and the results were often positive. There was evidence of some leaving to attend an all through primary and was not down to the quality of teaching. There are pupil spaces at the majority of schools across the city giving parents more choice. Numbers will not be increasing due to the city-wide PAN issues.</p> <p>Governors discussed that any changes to this would need to be carefully managed and promoted.</p> <p>Governors voiced concerns around this method of grouping in terms of PAN and financial income. There is also the concern that parental choice would result in a loss of PAN.</p> <p><i>Is there an option of making the school a 1 form entry for the following year rather than vertical grouping?</i> The modelling suggests that reducing PAN size would not help either site or the financial implications.</p> <p>Governors reflected on the catchment areas of the local primary schools. 99 First Choices for School Road with total PAN 119. Governors requested information on how many put either school as first and second choice.</p> <p>Governors felt that there was no evidence of the longer-term impact in order to negate any risks for the future security of the Holland Road site.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that there would need to be a huge amount of work to position this model as an option. SL is meeting with Coldean to look at how this model works and what roles, expectations and impact could be.</p>

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<p><i>Is there a decision to be made about a consultation period?</i> No, there does not need to be a consultation on this. If staff roles were to change this would need consultation.</p> <p>There would need to be a foundation for progression ladders as these would be invaluable tools.</p> <p>Governors discussed the potential for the model creating a disconnect across the school sites in terms of staffing teams.</p> <p>Governors considered staff wellbeing in their decision. It was acknowledged that teachers are at the forefront of any negativity felt within the school community around this.</p> <p>Governors acknowledged that there is also a huge financial risk if the school were to move forward with this model.</p> <p>Governors discussed that smaller classes could mean that there could be a possibility of a reduction in TA or teacher support. MS confirmed that this is a possible option with smaller classes. There is some flexibility with smaller classes compared to a full class. Moving to phase leaders may be another option to review.</p> <p><i>Do we have consult moving year leaders to phase leaders?</i> Yes, however this would not need to happen if any natural attrition occurs.</p> <p><i>Would it be viable to have Year Group lead for all classes across all sites?</i> This has been tried and did not work on an operational <b>day to day</b> basis.</p> <p>MS shared that this model would need plenty of time to ensure that it was managed appropriately. This would take time to reorganise the curriculum and governors acknowledged the effect it would have across staff working collaboratively across sites.</p> <p>Governors felt that this option is not viable for the next academic year due to the potential risks and the changing PAN situation across the city at this time.</p> <p>MS shared that the governors will have to share mitigations to the LA.</p> <p><b>Action: SL will produce a report for governors following discussions with Coldean for the next academic year which can be then compared to the city-wide picture. Action: Add to agenda of Autumn 2023.</b></p> <p>Governors agreed to look at an alternative of reducing the number of TA's for the smaller classes.</p> <p>Governors did not have the confidence that this option would have a financial impact against risk of parents not to manage choosing the school.</p> <p>Governors discussed transparency with staff on how the school will need PAN and financial responsibilities</p> <p><b>Action: MS/LC/SL to look at a modelling with a reduction of TA's to present to governors at the next FGB.</b></p> <p>Governors agreed that a decision could not be made at this time.</p>
5.	<b>Removal of [REDACTED] role</b>

#	AGENDA ITEM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 1 removal of role</li> <li>Option 2 1-day contract</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Questions:</b> <i>In terms of reducing the role is the current lead a viable option for the member of staff? This is not a discussion that we can have with the member of staff?</i></p> <p><i>Would this person be entitled to redundancy in option 2? This would have to be further discussed with the LA HR advisor.</i></p> <p>Governors agreed that there would be a risk with Option 2.</p> <p>Governors acknowledged that this is not a decision they would like to make but balanced the decision against the financial implications. It was acknowledged that this is a very difficult decision to make.</p> <p><i>Would the [REDACTED] role be designated elsewhere? This would be designated to a SLT which is in line with other schools.</i></p> <p>Governors reflected on the financial impacts and the ongoing cost savings to the school. Governors also took time to discuss the impact on both the children and staff if there were to be a removal or reduction of this role.</p> <p><i>If this role was not filled how would this role be covered in the school? This would usually be covered by a member of SLT.</i></p> <p>Governors agreed that although having this role is an asset to the school, it was a difficult decision that had been forced by the current financial situation. It was therefore considered and approved to reduce this role to 1 day a week. <b>Action: MS to update governors once conversations have taken place with the person currently in role.</b></p>
6.	<p><b>Removal of AHT role</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 1 [REDACTED] back in class F/T (1-day leadership role)</li> <li>Option 2 Restructuring of SLT and removal of [REDACTED] role</li> <li>The LA have said to proceed with caution on any restructure however the school have reviewed the needs of the school when considering this option.</li> <li>The savings would be made from the job share and were presented to FGB on 21.3.23</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Questions:</b></p> <p><i>How would this work? The capacity of the role would change and 1-day Leadership would be distributed among SLT. There would not be any redundancy in this option. From September they would be in class for 4 days (from 2.5) and 1-day Leadership time.</i></p> <p><i>What would be the implications of the changes? There would have to be redistribution of tasks and streamlining of the SLT. This is the best way to move forward with these roles, this would create an efficient and streamlined model.</i></p> <p>Governors approved the recommendation to move [REDACTED] role to 4 days a week in class from September 2023 with 1-day a week as Leadership time with a long-term review to look at removal of the role from September 2024. <b>Action: To add to the agenda for Autumn FGB.</b></p>

#	AGENDA ITEM
7.	<p><b>Change of PAN at SR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school have been asked to reduce School Road to a 3-form entry school</li> <li>• Reducing to a 3-form entry would not be financially viable</li> <li>• Any reduction would need governor agreement</li> <li>• The LA modelling will be distributed in May</li> <li>• The current forecast is modelled on the September 2023 PAN, however there are a potential 18 spaces in Reception that could be filled.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Questions:</b></p> <p><i>What causes the difference between 2023-24 to 24-25?</i> This is the lag in the funding due to the budget being based on the previous year census.</p> <p>Governors did not agree to a reduction in PAN for School Road.</p>
8.	<p><b>Modelling with LA and next steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MS/SS/JH HAVE met with LA.</li> <li>• There has been some benchmarking with WHIS against Cottesmore, this included support staff, EHCP.</li> <li>• MS/SS/JH were given opportunity to give specific context around expenditure</li> <li>• Apart from Support Staff this was in the upper benchmark</li> <li>• Presented the modelling and staffing structure to the LA team and they are corroborating the modelling. The LA Finance team will meet with Deb Austin before another meeting with the school.</li> <li>• It was felt that the meeting with Finance was very positive. Mitigations have been fair.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Questions:</b></p> <p><i>What is the end result of these meetings?</i> The LA will want to understand the budget and school context before speaking with decision makers, they will also need to look at this from a city-wide perspective. If the school carry on as is both budgets become increasingly worse with over £250k deficit predicted. There is a legal point of approval to authorise a deficit budget. The school have to show that they are mitigating costs, the LA will need to discuss if any additional support could be offered to the schools.</p> <p>The school have been clear and transparent with the modelling shared with governors and the LA.</p>
9.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The next Finance and Leadership Committee is in May and then a License Deficit approval will be applied for.</li> <li>• Governors reflected that further pay awards – Teachers Pay and the 2022-23 Pay Award for support staff will have a further impact on the budget.</li> <li>• Governors thanked JH/SS for their time ensuring forecasting</li> </ul> <p><b>The meeting closed at 19:48pm</b></p>