|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **C:\Users\Tracey\Documents\CLERKING\CLERKING\BLUE TANGERINE\Logos\19.01.16 Federation logo.png** | **The Blue Tangerine Federation**7.00pm Monday 8 February 2021 via Zoom**Full Governing Body****MINUTES**  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present:** | Rachel Andrew (RA), Debbie Dorman (DD), Ruth Hammerson (RH), Claire Kelvin (CK), Stephen Hoult-Allen (SHA), Josh Pollard (JP),Andy Summerskill (AS), Parris Williams (PW), Ros Wood (RW, Chair)  |
| **Not Present:** | Poppy Choudhury (PC) |
| **In Attendance:** | Huw Bucknell – HB, Head of School, Forest House Education CentreJamie Caple – JC, Head of School, St Luke’sManda Sides – MS, Head of Operations, St Luke’sPam Stocks - PS, Head of School, CollettTracey Norris – HfL Clerk  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda item** | **Action** |
|  | **To receive apologies and approve absences** RW welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the staff for working so hard during this particularly difficult time. There were no apologies for absence., Poppy Choudhury was not present.  |  |
|  | **To declare any conflict of interest**None declared.  |  |
|  | **To approve the minutes of the previous meeting** The minutes of the previous meeting held on1 23 November 2020 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting and would be signed and filed in the school office at the earliest opportunity. |  |
|  | **To consider matters arising from the minutes** 1. AB (safeguarding governor) to speak to Helen Jones during safeguarding audit: completed (see reports at agenda item x)
2. Governors to make contact with link staff governors see agenda item 12.c
3. SHA to arrange Zom link for school assemblies: sent
4. Governor to take on role of safeguarding link (currently being performed by Chair: c/f no volunteers.
5. Redacted performance management appraisal form to be shared with governors: completed, see agenda item 8.
6. RW to approach governor recruitment organisations re vacancies: RW has made contact with Inspiring Governance and Governors for Schools. Nothing to report.
7. Clerk to arrange in-house training: booked for Monday 22 February at 7pm.
 |  |
|  | **To note any other business** There was one item of other business.  |  |
|  | **Heads of School Update**The following documents had been circulated in advance of the meeting:* Head of School report: Collett
* Head of School Report: St Luke’s
* Head of School report: Forest House Education Centre
* Covid catchup funding report: Collett
* Covid catchup funding report: St Luke’s
* Collett transport statement

Questions/comments were invited:**Collett: Pam Sock*** Questions had been submitted in advance by governors, answers provided on email, see appendix A to minutes.

**St Luke’s: Jamie Caple*** Q How were teaching staff been supported with the very different challenges of online teaching? Varied ways. Teachers needed time to deliver face to face teaching and online provision. The first week was spent getting prepared.
* A blended offering of live teaching on MS Teams and other work set via Class dojo was being provided.
* Teachers were comfortable with these platforms.
* Q Were staff working both online and in school? A staff rota was in place either on line or face to face, all staff were working full time. Some staff were choosing to come into school to deliver their remote support.
* The school’s Remote Learning Policy provided a degree of flexibility.
* Younger pupils also needed some paper-based activities.
* Reading and maths programmes were available online.
* Q Were school leaders satisfied that the most vulnerable pupils were attending school? Anyone who has requested a space in school had been welcomed.
* 45% attendance vs national average 33%.
* JC was aware of some vulnerable pupils who had refused the place (due to high anxiety). JP was coordinating a comprehensive keeping in touch programme for these pupils.
* Q What provision was there for social engagement of pupils? This was an area which had improved since the previous lockdown. The use of MS Teams provided all pupils with an opportunity for social interaction with their teacher and classmates.
* 45 laptops had been received from DfE. (which was more than was needed). School leaders would remind parents that laptops could be borrowed from the school.
* Q Fleet tutors? These were online tutors who worked with pupils who were unable to access education. Fleet Tutors were currently working with a pupil at St Luke’s but tutoring has been erratic. The pupil had complex needs and did not fit in easily at St Luke's. She was being supported by RA and SHA.

**Forest House Education Centre: Huw Bucknell** * Q What moderation (of GCSE assessment) was available to FHEC staff? At this stage, there had been no specific guidance as to how this year’s external exams would be assessed. Last year, FHEC staff were able to cross-moderate for core subjects. This was an area of concern for HB; pupils at FHEC had smaller portfolios of work than mainstream.
* One member of staff has been signed off sick since mid-December, HB was covering sciences subjects in his absence.
* Q Would it be possible to bring in agency supply staff to support team? This had been considered, HB was concerned that the day pupils would struggle to engage with unknown supply teachers. For the time being, existing staff would try to cover colleagues’ absences.
* FHEC staff have explored different ways to try and engage the unit pupils. Their existing mental health issues were exacerbated by covid. Covid restrictions meant that they were also having reduced family contact and large periods of self-isolation. Attendance had suffered as a result.
* One pupil had physically attended the Centre 7today from the unit, three had participated remotely.
* The Centre's refurbishment has been completed, and HB was delighted with the result.
 |  |
| 7. | **Forest House Education Centre: HCC position**SHA referred governors the following reports relating to FHEC which had been circulated in advance of the meeting (and which had previously been shared with governors):* HCC Commissioned report on St Luke’s/FHEC funding arrangements November 2019 (author Richard Hill).
* Addendum to HCC commission report (Audit of funding arrangements) author Declan McCarthy and Richard Hill
* Executive headteacher summary of the current position February 2021.

  In addition, SHA provided the following update:* Sally Glossup and Tania Rawle (HCC) had informed SHA in a recent Zoom meeting that they were considering “moving” FHEC to Roman Fields as part of HCC’s review of SEMH/SLD school provision.
* SG/TR were both be fully aware of the financial situation at St Luke’s and the lump sum funding provision for FHEC. These were regular agenda items at the St Luke’s Action Group which had been meeting since 2017.
* A financial audit was commission in December 2020 by HCC (the report has not yet published).
* Roman Fields is an existing HCC SEMH school in the process of forming a multi academy trust.
* SHA was aware that TR has approached the Headteacher at Roman Fields to see if he would be prepared to bring FHEC into the Trust.
* SHA was unclear as to the motivation to transfer FHEC to another school. This has not been requested by Blue Tangerine.
* A request for a meeting of the action group (made on 27 January 2021 by Richard Hill) has not been responded to.
* Q what can governors do to support staff during this unsettling time? HB shared his feelings on the matter. He was concerned that the main purpose of FHEC – educational provision for the patients in the residential unit - would be watered down from such a move.
* Claire Kelvin, FHEC link governor would support HB at any future meetings with ESMA/HCC as and when necessary.
* Next steps:
* Legal advice may be required re the “removal” of FHEC from St Luke’s School. Would this require the dissolution of the Federation, for example?
* Await HCC’s proposal.
* Await outcome of HCC commission financial audit conducted in December 2020.

SHA would keep governors informed of developments.  |  |
| 8. | **Federation Improvement and Development Plan/Fundraising**SHA had circulated the IDP (updated in January 2021) in advance of the meeting together with a fundraising update. He invited Rhea Dickman to outline the Federations plan’s to further develop pupils’ work experience opportunities: * The Federation has worked hard on creating a curriculum which was purposeful meaningful and relevant. SHA was confident that this was now established. A significant challenge facing the Federation was the accreditation process. 70% of pupils were autistic and work experience/accreditation was proving hard to arrange externally.
* The vision of the Fedration was to have the resources to provide work experience opportunities for pupils on site.
* Governors were aware of the recent developments in this area:
* Blue Tangerine mobile café: this taught communication and language skills, understanding the work, barista qualifications.
* Level 1 first aid and barista training.
* Gym development: this will shortly be open to pupils and families.
* Funding stream from lettings: hall, gym, outside space.
* Repair Shed relationship
* Community support for existing farm animals: adoptions scheme, food donations from Waitrose.
* Planning permission was being prepared for a MUGA (multi use games area) with floodlights. This would provide all weather hockey/football pitch and a good income stream from lettings.
* A benefactor has approached the Federation with a view to developing a community farm. This would provide further work experience opportunities for pupils and develop community relations, visits from other schools etc.
* Next steps:
* Legal advice to reclaim land at the top of the school site, currently being used by the Redbourn Recreation Centre (this was an informal arrangement in place since the 1990s, no rent was paid).
* Survey by Sports England re the provision of playing fields in the local area (this would be helped by the development of a MUGA).
* Creation of a separate Blue Tangerine Charity to receive and mange donations to fund the community farm.
* Application for National Lottery funding.
* Q would the running costs of the farm become a financial risk to St Lukes? Governors were aware of the difficult financial position at St Luke’s and would need assurances going forward that the costs could be managed.
* Compliance to the Charity Commission legislation would ensure procedures and financial assurances were in place.
* This idea was still in its early exploratory stages. RD was in contact with an urban farm creator in London for ideas.
* RW was aware of a special needs farm at Heathrow airport which looked after the animals that were illegally imported, it provided work experience for special needs schools. **Action: RW to share contact with RD**.
* It was possible that this sort of co-venture could be proposed to Luton Airport.
* **Next steps**: Prepare a more formal proposal for governors (after outcome of Sports England review).
 | **RW** |
| 9. | **Performance management process**SHA had shared anonymised examples of performance management appraisals forms in advance of the meeting. These showed clear and trackable targets. Governors suggested that under the “areas for further development” section, space could be made for reflection on the areas for further development from the previous year/reporting period.  |  |
| 10. | **Safeguarding Update**The following safeguarding update had been circulated in advance of the meeting: * Safeguarding report to governors January 2021
* Safeguarding audit: Collett by Helen Jones external consultant
* Safeguarding audit: St Lukes by Helen Jones, external consultant
* Covid contingency planning addendum to Safeguarding policy

Questions had been submitted in advance by RW/DD, see below for responses from Josh Pollard which had been shared will all governors on email:* Q 127 concerns across 48 days. Did you feel these were genuine concerns? What actions did you have to take to decide how to proceed? All of these were genuine concerns felt by staff, however, the vast majority do not meet threshold for referral. A message JP consistently reinforce to all staff is "*if in doubt, record it*" and as such we prefer 'over recording' to 'under recording'.
* With concerns around ‘Neglect’ and ‘Emotional Abuse’, a large amount of information is required over a period to evidence necessity behind a referral. Examples include concerns such as insufficient contents in a child’s lunchbox, a child’s presentation is unkempt/unclean more than once and over a longer time.
* JP always discuss courses of action with the Heads of School and other relevant staff members as appropriate. JP uses the Consultation Hub phone line which is in place for this exact purpose. We similarly need to evidence action we have done to support the child/family.
* Q Do Children’s Services ever refuse referrals? What happens then? There have been occasions where Children’s Services have refused referrals as they don’t feel the referral “meets threshold”.
* With each referral, the referrer is asked what outcome they think is needed/what they’re aiming for. In these instances, JP discuss further with the assessing social worker to put across the school’s views and the importance we feel in the referral being accepted and request the social worker to have a conversation with their manager about the referral. If the decision is still for the referral not to be accepted, I write to them referencing relevant legislation and guidance which supports justification for the referral and collaborative working.
* Q Who are the 6 staff training to be deputies?
* St Luke’s
	+ Paula Leonard – Head of Middle School
	+ Julianne Bensissi – Class teacher
	+ Clara McDermott – Class teacher
* The Collett
	+ Anu Gray – Head of Interventions
	+ Jennie Witter – Head of Upper School
	+ Christina Self – Class teacher
* Q Would the schools be penalised by Ofsted for the high number of unauthorised absences for the October lockdown? Hopefully not but JP anticipated that there would be a challenging conversation around attendance. This was a key priority for the school. All staff were aware of the individual circumstances around low attendance and JP maintained regular contact with all families who chose not to send their children to school. Rigorous protocols were in place to chase non-attendance.
* Q How do you know pupils are safe if they are not in school? Please refer to the Covid-19 Safeguarding addendum policy; staff initiate contact with all students every school day and keep a record of this. In some cases, there have been agreements between individual families and teachers around reducing the amount of contact due to existing pressures already on the family. Each of these agreements has been made in agreement with the Head of School or DSL, factoring in any existing concerns.
* Q Bullying figures; what is the breakdown per child? If pupil has more than one incident, what measures are taken? At St Luke’s there were 10 incidents involving 11 separate students there was only one instance of a student being involved more than once. Upon further exploration, this was due to a staff member recording the same incident multiples times in error; therefore, the total should actually be 6 incidents involving 11 students.
* At Collett there were 8 incidents involving 14 students. 3 students were involved more than once. These students had intervention work from class staff to work on more appropriate ways of engaging.
* Q The cause for concern figures recorded of 59 and 68 for St Luke's and The Collett respectively – was this higher than for a similar period of time from last year? Cause for concern figures for 26/10/19 - 30/01/20 are 88 and 76 for St Luke' and The Collett respectively. I have looked back through the concerns logged for the same period at St Luke's last year and can see that the higher figures for the same period last year are largely attributed to 3 particular individuals who have since had a lot of support both from the school and external agencies.
* Q what qualifies as an unauthorised absence at the moment (ie durig lockdown)? The DfE detail unauthorised absence to be used "*If the school is not satisfied with the reason given for absence*". Some reasons have been because the student 'didn't want to come in today' or 'was tired' or 'overslept'.
* Q The figure for unauthorised absences is higher at St Luke's - why do you think that is? There is a cohort of students at St Luke’s who are constantly on the line of becoming school refusers. St Luke's is putting a lot of additional support into encouraging these students to attend with some success. The unauthorised absence figures are higher at t Luke's during this lockdown as there have been more students who have not attended when we were expecting them to. Technically, we could class all non-attendance as an authorised absence as parents are currently able to request a 'leave of absence' from school. However, marking unexpected absences in this way enables us to better track when expected students have not attended.
* Q What does the 'discounted' form of recording absences refer to, is it correct that special schools can't do that and therefore their numbers are higher for unauthorised absence? During the original lockdown all schools were instructed to mark students as Code X, which is defined as "*Not required to be in school - This code is used to record sessions that non-compulsory school age children are not expected to attend.*" This mark discounts them from the school census absence figures. During the second national lockdown in November, schools remained open and were not to use Code X for absence unless due to self-isolation or individual school closure because of Covid-19. Whilst Code X marks are discounted from school census absences, Code C is still included in these figures.
* In this third national lockdown, mainstream schools have been directed to mark all absences as Code X as they are only supposed to be having children of critical workers or those deemed most vulnerable attending. Technically, they could retain almost perfect attendance through marking any absent students as X, thus discounting the absence. Contrastingly, the DfE and Local Authority have directed Special Schools to mark absences as Code C for "*Leave of absence authorised by the school*".
* There was a conversation with heads of Special Schools across the county about recording absent students under Code X instead. However, after internal discussion we have opted to adhere to the guidance.
* An example of the above codes in action:
* A student who attended every school day of the Autumn term would have 100% attendance. If this student did not attend in January during the third national lockdown and was marked X, they retain 100% attendance. However, the same student's January absence marked as C would have their attendance drop to76% which will continue to decrease as more time goes by.
 |  |
| 11. | **Pupil Premium Report**The following reports had been circulated in advance of the meeting and were noted:* Pupil premium strategy and report: Collett
* Pupil premium strategy report: St Luke’s

The following was discussed:* Pupil premium (PP) strategy documents explained in detail how the funding has been allocated and the impact on PP children in terms of progress and attainment.
* Q How large was the gap between PP and non-PP in terms of literacy and numeracy? There was not a significant gap and in some areas the PP cohort performed better than non-PP. See page 6 of the report.
* The barriers to learning have been identified and the report listed the measures put in place to address this and narrow the gap.
* Challenge:
* It was hard for staff to assess pupil’s work which had been completed remotely – how much help had they receive from siblings/parents at home?
* Reward system: to support attendance. This was on hold during the spring term lockdown but would be reintroduced as soon as possible. Pupils responded well to this system and were incentivised to attend school.
* Q What work went on in the 9 ¾ room at St Luke’s? The 9 ¾ team delivered all non-educational aspects of pupils’ EHCP provision. This included nurture, therapeutic provision, multi-disciplinary team approach, occupational therapy, speech and language support and pastoral support. There had been no support from the local authority to fulfil the provision in most EHCP statements so this room allowed the school to meet EHCP needs in house.
* Q large amount was spent on food at Collett? When broken down the amount allocated amounted to £3000 for 12 classes: £250 per class which is £6 per week.
* Aim: create healthy snacks option for pupils, plus sustenance for pupils who don’t have breakfast at home and subsidise poor quality packed lunch if necessary.
* 80% of pupils arrive by taxi, which meant Collett was not able to offer a breakfast club.
* Support of extreme behaviours: some pupils need a 2:1 support. The cost of a H3 level TA was c £22,000 pa.
* Impact of support: fewer restrictive interventions being recorded.
* PS reported that there were 9 children at Collett whose needs could not be met by the school. There were a number of pupils who were not in the right provision, unfortunately, it was a long process to identify a suitable provision and move these pupils on, whilst this was happening, the school needed to support these pupils to the best of their ability.
 |  |
| 12. | **Resources Update**MS had uploaded the following documents in advance of the meeting:* Budget summary: February 2021
* St Luke’s re-forecast period 9
* SFVS submission
* H&S update
* Premises update
* Toilet quotes
* Toilet procurement submission January 2021
* Roof condition survey report
* Risk register report
* Risk register information
* Asset management plan: St Luke’s
* Asset management plan: Collett
 |  |
| 12.a  | **Budget Monitoring**MS shared the following information and invited questions:* The Collett monitoring report had not yet been finalized by FSS staff.
* MS expected Collett to have maintained its healthy reserve (see budget summary).
* The major variances to note at St Luke’s were:
	+ Savings in staffing costs: £200,000 lower
* The revised in-year deficit at St Luke's was predicted to be £109,000 by April 2021 rising to £800,000 by year end 2021/22.
* Q Was St Luke’s staffing structure now at a safe level? The following vacancies were still unfilled:
	+ Eight x TA vacancies
	+ Head of curriculum
	+ Cover teacher
* MS reported that recruitment was continuing and it was hoped that these vacancies would be filled by Easter.
* Recruitment had been difficult during covid. Senior leaders had been realistic and sensible about staggering the induction/start times.
* There has been no response from HCC regarding the deficit budge submission from April 2020.
* The action group had regularly scrutinised the financial position of St Luke’s.
* All committed funds and capital funds would be spent by the end of the year.
* Q £40,000 redundancy costs reimbursement? HCC had part-funded this, the final cost to school was £11,000.
* **SFVS**: This document was prepared based on the termly monitor report P9. It had been updated for St Luke’s and this had been shared this with the finance link governor, PW.
* The submission date for the SFVS was now under consideration by DfE/HCC (it might be delayed or cancelled because of Covid) but MS and PW both agreed that the SFVS provided a good opportunity to review school practices, and the document would be completed as usual.
 |  |
| 12.b | **Premises****St Luke’s:** * Condition survey of all flat roofs had been undertaken.
* £18,250 of remedial work had been identified. Thereafter, annual maintenance should be in the region of £6,000.
* MS proposed to submit bid to HCC to get all the flat roofs replaced (c£400,000 total cost). Part of the application process was a condition survey report. The remedial work needed to be completed before the condition survey was conducted.
* **Governors approved the spend of £18,250 on remedial work for the flat roofs and noted that this amount had already been included in the revised budget.**
* Toilets: quotes shared.
* Aim to do a double block at Easter cost: £30,000. County Washrooms had been used at Collett and provided a good service: **This was approved.**
* Demolition of mobile classrooms: £7,500 (this was a far more reasonable quote than had previously been obtained).
* SHA confirmed that there had been no news from Sally Glossup re the planned redevelopment of the site. This project had been due to start in early 2020.
* The area, once cleared, would be grassed over and provide more outdoor space for the current pupils.
* Demolition survey had been completed and work would commence during half term. **The demolition of the mobile classrooms was approved.**
* Q Had these amounts been accrued in the capital budget? No but the cost would be offset from savings in the R&M budget.

**Forest House*** Classroom refurbishment had been completed.
* SLA: still unresolved.
* Bloor Homes has been developing the outside space in liaison with the NHS Trust. They were donating their time and money.

**Collett*** Fire system has been updated. The replacement of all fire doors was still ongoing. The upper school corridor would be completed in February half term.
* Tree survey had been completed; some remedial work was needed.
* Front gates/car park resurfacing: £75,000. This project could be financed by the monies accrued in the capital fund for the heating project (a capital bid to HCC has been successful). Proposal: divert this pot of money to develop the front gates and car park.
* Timeframe: Companies have been in school to measure up for tenders for new heating system. This was being project managed by HCC.
* It was agreed that the car park resurfacing should be put on hold until after the new heating system had been installed.
* Q Highway consultant's report? this had not been a particularly helpful report. It suggested that a parking lane was not required. MS would find out what the next steps were to progress this.
 |  |
| 12.c | **Risk Analysis**The risk registers were noted. * Q Restructure: could this now be closed as a risk? It was agreed that the risks from the restructuring had passed. Lack of leadership capacity was the new risk.
* Q Was fundraising a potential risk: if the full amount was not raised? The creation of a community farm would cost in the region of £1.2m this was still a potential reputational risk even if the financial risk was borne by the charity.
 |  |
| 13 | **Policy Review**The following policy had been circulated in advance of the meeting and was approved: * Governor terms of reference.
 |  |
| 14 | **Governor Matters**1. **Governor vacancies:** The following vacancies were noted (RW had made contact with governor recruitment agencies):
* 1 x co-opted governor
* 1 x local authority governor
* 2 x partnership governor
1. **Succession planning:**
* RW reminded governors that she would be standing down at the end of the year. There was support available for chairs from the HfL governance team and the NGA and she urged anyone interested in this role to speak to her separately.
1. **Head of school: Collett**
* Pam Stocks announced her plans to retire at the end of Summer term. The position of Head of School was being advertised.
1. **Governor Training**
* Preparing for OFSTED training had been booked for Monday 22 February at 7pm.
 |  |
|  | **Staff members left the meeting** |  |
| 15. | **Any other business*** See Part II minute: Executive Headteacher’s performance appraisal.
 |  |
| 16. | **Meeting dates for 2020/21** Governor training: Monday 22 February at 7pmMonday 22 March Monday 17 May Monday 28 June |  |

 Meeting closed at 9.15pm

**Appendix A: Q&A submitted in advance re Collett**

1**.  Please can we have a breakdown of how the Covid catch up fund is being used?**

The actual figures will be discussed by Manda. However, to date we have focussed on our online programmes such as Reading Eggs, Mathletics, Nessy, IXL and we are looking to purchase new reading schemes across the school as ours are becoming very dated.

2.  **Who is monitoring the curriculum coverage?**

Heads of school in collaboration with Heads of Departments oversee Long term, medium term and weekly planning as part of monitoring cycle. Excel sheets are completed to check this has been done and any issues are raised. Teachers are still following curriculum plans during lockdown; however it is much more difficult to formally monitor due to Zoom sessions, classroom sessions etc. There has needed to be a greater consolidation of learning in light of current practice.

3.  **How are you teaching about Black Lives Matter?**

This is often addressed through assemblies, school council, speaking and listening topics etc. We recognise it needs to be more specific and forms part of our new curriculum going forward.

4.  **Have you had to adapt your safeguarding policy?**

There has been a bigger focus on monitoring pupils not in school and home situations. Teachers complete daily spreadsheets that highlight when there has been little contact with pupils.

5.  **How are you monitoring staff well-being and workload?**

There have been many more conversations, emails, texts to staff not in school and an empathic recognition that teaching presently is very difficult maintaining Zooms, class teaching etc. We encourage staff to have early offs when they can as it is very difficult for staff to meet in a supportive way due to bubbles.

6.  **Is the website complete**? The website is an ongoing and fluid resource which to be honest is never complete. We are still uploading curriculum type information. In a couple of places links do not work but Mary is working on this. From a GB point of view, is there anything we are missing?

7.  **Who is the PREVENT lead?** This is part of Josh’s role. Staff are all very aware of the need to be vigilant.