

**OHC&AT SURREY & SUSSEX HUB [SASHUB]  
Brantridge (BrS), Grafham Grange (GrG) & St Dominic's (StD) Schools**

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BODY (PART 1)  
4.15pm Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> December 2018  
at St Dominic's School**

<b>1.</b>	<b>OPENING</b>																																														
<b>.1</b>	<b>Attendees/Apologies</b>																																														
.1	<p>Attendees were:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Governors:</u></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>GB Designation</u></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Portfolio</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ken Cowdery (Meeting Chair)</td> <td>(KC) Academy Governor, Chair</td> <td>[PF1/5]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Angela Drayton</td> <td>(AD) Principal (StD and Regional Lead)</td> <td>(PF1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andrew Falk</td> <td>(AF) Academy Governor</td> <td>[PF4-StD]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sherie Harris</td> <td>(SH) Staff Governor (GrG)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Martin Hartwell</td> <td>(MH) Academy Governor</td> <td>[PF6/3]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Philip Knights</td> <td>(PK) Academy Governor, Vice-Chair</td> <td>[PF5/1]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alison Livesley</td> <td>(AL) Academy Governor</td> <td>[PF4-BrS]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Martin Lowthian</td> <td>(ML) Parent Governor (GrG)</td> <td>(PF5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diane Puica</td> <td>(DP) Staff Governor (BrS)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dafydd Roberts</td> <td>(DR) Principal (BrS)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Julian Short</td> <td>(JS) Parent Governor (StD)</td> <td>(PF5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Liz Simmons</td> <td>(LS) Academy Governor</td> <td>[PF3/6]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Janet Tremble</td> <td>(JT) Principal (GrG)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joanne Yarlett</td> <td>(JY) Academy Governor</td> <td>(PF4-BrS)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>In attendance:</u> Karma Hardin (SM) OHC&amp;AT, Finance Assistant for SASHUB Diane Brazier (DB) School Business Manager (StD/BrS)</p> <p><u>Officers:</u> Frank Curry (FC) Minute-taking Secretary</p>	<u>Governors:</u>	<u>GB Designation</u>	<u>Portfolio</u>	Ken Cowdery (Meeting Chair)	(KC) Academy Governor, Chair	[PF1/5]	Angela Drayton	(AD) Principal (StD and Regional Lead)	(PF1)	Andrew Falk	(AF) Academy Governor	[PF4-StD]	Sherie Harris	(SH) Staff Governor (GrG)		Martin Hartwell	(MH) Academy Governor	[PF6/3]	Philip Knights	(PK) Academy Governor, Vice-Chair	[PF5/1]	Alison Livesley	(AL) Academy Governor	[PF4-BrS]	Martin Lowthian	(ML) Parent Governor (GrG)	(PF5)	Diane Puica	(DP) Staff Governor (BrS)		Dafydd Roberts	(DR) Principal (BrS)		Julian Short	(JS) Parent Governor (StD)	(PF5)	Liz Simmons	(LS) Academy Governor	[PF3/6]	Janet Tremble	(JT) Principal (GrG)		Joanne Yarlett	(JY) Academy Governor	(PF4-BrS)	
<u>Governors:</u>	<u>GB Designation</u>	<u>Portfolio</u>																																													
Ken Cowdery (Meeting Chair)	(KC) Academy Governor, Chair	[PF1/5]																																													
Angela Drayton	(AD) Principal (StD and Regional Lead)	(PF1)																																													
Andrew Falk	(AF) Academy Governor	[PF4-StD]																																													
Sherie Harris	(SH) Staff Governor (GrG)																																														
Martin Hartwell	(MH) Academy Governor	[PF6/3]																																													
Philip Knights	(PK) Academy Governor, Vice-Chair	[PF5/1]																																													
Alison Livesley	(AL) Academy Governor	[PF4-BrS]																																													
Martin Lowthian	(ML) Parent Governor (GrG)	(PF5)																																													
Diane Puica	(DP) Staff Governor (BrS)																																														
Dafydd Roberts	(DR) Principal (BrS)																																														
Julian Short	(JS) Parent Governor (StD)	(PF5)																																													
Liz Simmons	(LS) Academy Governor	[PF3/6]																																													
Janet Tremble	(JT) Principal (GrG)																																														
Joanne Yarlett	(JY) Academy Governor	(PF4-BrS)																																													
<b>.2</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence.</b>																																														
.1	Apologies were received from Catherine Drummond (Parent Governor (BrS), PF2), Sam Marshall (Academy Governor, PF2) John Prior (Deputy CEO, OHC&AT), Brenda Scott (OHC&AT Finance Team), and Vicky Perry (Deputy Principal, StD).																																														
<b>.3</b>	<b>Chair's Remarks.</b>																																														
.1	KC welcomed all to the meeting and thanked them for their ongoing contributions to GB.																																														
.2	KC noted that Corinne Morgan had decided to stand down as staff Governor for St Dominic's. KC wished to be put on record the thanks and appreciation of the Chair and the whole Governing Body to Corinne for her valuable voluntary contribution over several years. The process of recruitment of a new staff governor for St Dominic's was now underway.																																														
.3	KC emphasised that there would not be sufficient time to cover all the items/papers in and that he would like Governing Body to spend sufficient time considering the key strategic issues on the agenda. KC suggested that, if Governors feel they have further questions that are not covered sufficiently in the meeting, they should follow up directly with the relevant parties following the meeting or perhaps at their next portfolio meeting.																																														
<b>.4</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest.</b>																																														
.1	There were no declarations of interest (s) in agenda items.																																														
.2	KC thanked Governors who had submitted their annual declaration of interests forms to OHC&AT and invited those who had not so far responded to do so as soon as possible. <b>Action: AD, SH, SM, DR, LS, JT, JY to share their updated declarations of interest with OHC&amp;AT before end of term.</b>	<b>AD, SH, SM, DR, LS, JT, JY</b>																																													
<b>.5</b>	<b>Review of Minutes of Previous Meeting</b>																																														
.1	The Part 1 minutes of the previous Governing Body Meeting, held on 19 <sup>th</sup> July 2018, having been circulated, were taken as read and signed by KC as an accurate record of the meeting.																																														

.6	<b>Matters Arising (see Paper SAS.18.3.01)</b>	
.1	KC drew attention to Paper SAS.18.3.01 which had been previously circulated with the Agenda. The paper set out Matters Arising from Governing Board Meeting SAS.18.2.M (Pt 1) together with an update on the resolution or continuing action pertaining to specific action items. He asked if there were any questions or queries arising from the paper. There were none.	
2.	<b>GOVERNANCE</b>	
.1	<b>Nomination and Election of Chair</b>	
.1	KC invited FC to oversee the nomination and election of a Chair for 2018/19.	
.2	FC explained that KC's current period of office as Chair of the Governing Body had come to an end and it was necessary to elect a Chair for the educational year 2018/19. He invited nominations.	
.3	PK nominated KC, seconded by AL. There were no other nominations and KC was elected unanimously.	
.2	<b>Nomination and election of Vice Chair and Assistant Chairs</b>	
.1	KC invited nominations for the position of Vice Chair. LS nominated PK, seconded by JT. There were no other nominations and PK was elected unanimously as Vice Chair and Assistant Chair at Grafham Grange.	
.2	KC also invited nominations for the post of Assistant Chair, based at Brantridge. PK nominated AL, seconded by JT. There were no other nominations and AL was elected unanimously.	
.3	KC also expressed his particular thanks to the Vice Chair and Assistant Chairs for their support and help during 2017/18 which had been a busy year for them all.	
.3	<b>Chair's Report (see Paper SAS.18.3.02)</b>	
.1	KC referred to his paper (SAS.18.3.02) which had been circulated with the agenda and invited any questions. There were none.	
.4	<b>Constitution</b>	
.1	KC noted that, to the best of his knowledge, there had been no changes since the last GB meeting to the local Governing Body standing orders or terms of reference as set out in OHCAT's scheme of delegation. No discussion was initiated but, for the record, Governing Body confirmed that it will continue to operate in line with the scheme.	
.5	<b>Skills Audit Review</b>	
.1	KC thanked Governors who had submitted their skills details and invited those who had not so far responded, to do so as soon as possible. <b>Action: AF, MH, JY, SM, AD, DR to share their updated Skills Matrix self-assessments to KC before end of term.</b>	AF, MH, JY, SM, AD, DR
3.	<b>PORTFOLIO GOVERNORS' REPORTS</b>	
.1	<b>PF1-Ethos, Vision and Strategy - see Paper SAS.18.3.PF1</b>	
.1	KC referred to his report, noted that there would be a discussion on Strategic Matters at Agenda Item 7 and stated that he would defer comments for that session. There were no other comments or queries raised.	
.2	<b>PF2-Teaching and Learning</b>	
.1	KC noted that he had not received a PF2 report to share with GB. Neither PF2 governors were present to provide a verbal report. KC stated that he would follow up with SM to enquire whether a report would be forthcoming. There were no other comments or queries raised. <b>Action: KC to contact SM regarding her PF2 report.</b>	KC/SM
.3	<b>PF3-Finance, Premises and Resources - see Paper SAS.18.3.PF3</b>	
.1	LS referred to her report and highlighted that indicated that each school were facing significant financial challenges. The issues were different for each school and would be addressed in more detail later in the agenda. It was noted that PF2 had made a number of recommendations to the schools – as set out in her report. There were no other comments or queries raised at this stage.	
.4	<b>PF4-Child Protection and Safeguarding (Brantridge) - see Paper SAS.18.3.PF4(BrS)</b>	
.1	AL referred to the Paper and had nothing further to add. There were no further questions or comments raised.	
.4	<b>PF4-Child Protection and Safeguarding (St Dominic's) - see Paper SAS.18.3.PF4(StD)</b>	

.2	<b>AF</b> referred to the Paper and <b>AF</b> referred to the uncertainty regarding the Head of Care role given the retirement of the current Head of Care at Christmas. <b>AD</b> explained that the newly appointed Nurse at the school would soon be taking up the role. There were no other comments or queries raised.	
.4 .3	<b>PF4-Child Protection and Safeguarding (Grafham Grange) - see Paper SAS.18.3.PF4(GrG)</b> <b>JY</b> referred to her report and highlighted that at Grafham Grange risk assessments for all pupils had not been fully updated and suggested that the school attend to this as soon as possible. There were no other comments or queries raised.	
.5 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5	<b>PF5-Marketing and Admissions - see Paper SAS.18.3.PF5</b> <b>JS</b> referred to his report and commented that he felt that the admissions process was positive and liaison with Local Authorities good. <b>JS</b> noted that the newly formed Friends of St Dominic's committee was already making a significant impact on fundraising initiatives and parental/school communications. <b>JS</b> particularly cited Charlotte Ling as being very influential in setting up the Friends of St Dominic's. <b>KC</b> wished to put on record the thanks of GB for Charlotte Ling's and all Friends initiative and contribution. <b>JS</b> noted the website content review at St Dominic's had been completed. <b>AL</b> asked who was responsible for website content assurance – local GB or OHC&AT. <b>KC</b> confirmed that OHC&AT had now delegated the responsibility to local GBs. <b>AL</b> expressed appreciation to PF5 governors for the website content reviews to date, which was a big job. <b>JS</b> noted that, going forward, the use of a checklist updated from time to time by the schools, subject to random assurance checks by governors would be a reasonable approach. There were no other comments or queries raised.	
.6 .1	<b>PF6-Human Resources - see Paper SAS.18.3.PF6</b> <b>MH</b> referred to his report and highlighted the next agenda item- report on Pay Committee. There were no other comments or queries.	
.7 .1 .2 .3 .4 .5	<b>Report on Pay Committee</b> <b>MH</b> noted he had chaired a recent annual SAS-Hub Schools Pay Committee. The committee also comprised <b>KC</b> , <b>LS</b> and the three Principal's. <b>MH</b> clarified that the purpose of the committee was to assure OHC&AT and the local GB that pay award recommendations made by the Principals were being made fairly and with due regard to OHC&AT pay policies and procedures. <b>MH</b> noted that the list of staff members tabled by the Principals had been appropriately anonymised. <b>MH</b> assured GB that the governors in attendees had raised a number of challenges but were satisfied and assured by the responses provided by the Principals. GB attendees agreed that there was clarity and fairness and all pay recommendations were rightly made. <b>MH</b> observed, however, that it would have been helpful had there been more commentary provided by the Principal in advance of the meeting to avoid the need for some of the questioning. This observation was noted by the Principals who would try to improve the format for next year's committee. There were no further comments or queries and <b>KC</b> thanked <b>MH</b> for chairing the committee effectively.	
.4	<b>PROCEDURE APPROVALS</b>	
.1	<b>School Procedures requiring approval</b>	
.1	There were no School Procedures requiring approval at this meeting	
.2 .1 .2 .3	<b>Progress update on reconciling procedures with new policies</b> <b>KC</b> expressed concern that there had been no procedures submitted to governors for review approval since the last GB meeting and that was fearful of procedures becoming out of date and/or there being a backlog of work for staff and governors. <b>AD</b> explained that, in the transition from the Radius Trust to OHC&AT, there had been insufficient time to overhaul local policies and procedures in the three schools. While OHC&AT carried the principal statutory policies on its website, local policies and procedures needed to be reviewed and new schedules set up for scrutiny by the Governing Board. This would take time. <b>KC</b> stated he understood the challenge of this task but asked the schools to prepare a plan and perhaps to gain some central support from OHC&AT or even an external consultant, so	

	that work can be accelerated. <b>Action: School Principals to prepare a plan for accelerating school procedure updates to align with OHC&amp;AT policies.</b>	School Principals
<b>5.</b>	<b>SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' REPORTS</b>	
	<i>KC prefaced this part of the meeting by remarking again that, as governors had had the opportunity to raise pre-meeting queries on the Principals' reports and to consider the Principals' written responses, he would ask governors to raise only significant or urgent further queries at the meeting. This would allow more time for discussions on key financial and strategic matters later on the agenda. KC reminded governors that they can take up any further queries with the Principals following the meeting, if necessary.</i>	
.1	<b>Brantridge Report/Dashboard/Q&amp;As – see papers SAS.18.3.03, 3a and 3b</b> Governors noted the Principal's report, Dashboard and written responses to governors' queries. Governors had no further significant/urgent comments of queries.	
.2	<b>Grafham Grange Report/Dashboard/Q&amp;As– see papers SAS.18.3.04, 4a and 4b</b> Governors noted the Principal's report, Dashboard and written responses to governors' queries. Governors had no further significant/urgent comments of queries.	
.3	<b>St Dominic's Report/Dashboard/Q&amp;As – see papers SAS.18.3.05, 5a and 5b</b> Governors noted the Principal's report, Dashboard and written responses to governors' queries. Governors had no further significant/urgent comments of queries.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>SCHOOL FINANCE AND FUNDING</b>	
.1	<b>Brantridge 2017/18 Final Accounts and Latest Management Accounts – see Paper SAS.18.3.06 and 06a.</b>	
.1	<b>KH</b> referred to the 2017/18 Final Accounts and reported that Brantridge had sustained a £184k deficit, after depreciation, on its income and expenditure account in 2017/18. However, taking into account reserves carried forward, the school had balanced its income and expenditure account, with a surplus of £31k. KH noted that the reserves had come from funds of c.£408k that Radius Trust had transferred on transfer to OHC&AT on behalf of the three schools. Some £283k of that sum had been allocated to finance redundancies and other liabilities. Therefore £125k remained as reserves for the three schools that OHC&AT had not yet decided how to allocate amongst the three schools. <b>LS</b> requested a breakdown of the usage of the transferred funds to date, which <b>KM</b> agreed to provide. <b>Action: KH to provide breakdown of usage of funds transferred by Radius Trust to OHC&amp;AT to date.</b>	<b>KH</b>
.2	<b>KH</b> then referred to the latest management accounts for the current financial year up to and including Period 2. It was noted that the forecast year-end out-turn was currently standing at a deficit of £306k after depreciation. However, these figures did not take into account three students admitted in November. When these were taken into account, the forecast deficit would fall to £222k.	
.3	<b>DR</b> commented, at this point, that the school was now receiving more admissions enquiries and its target was to reach 54 students by year end. <b>SH</b> asked, however, whether extra staff would be needed to support this increase in pupil numbers and, if so, whether the extra income would in fact be used-up by extra costs. <b>DR</b> stated that the existing staffing structure could accommodate increased pupils with significant additional resource and therefore the financial benefits should accrue.	
.4	<b>KC</b> reminded Governors that OHC&AT had a statutory duty to ensure that there was no deficit across the whole Trust by year end. There were no central funds and deficits in one Trust school would have to be met by borrowing from reserves of another OHC&AT school. <b>KC</b> stated that, whilst borrowing may become a necessity, it should be avoided if possible as it may prevent lending schools from utilising reserves for the good of their own cohort.	
.5	<b>KH</b> noted that there is now a financial control plan in place and that the Principal has been informed of a 'soft-freeze' on expenditure whereby non-essential purchases are postponed until there is further clarity over the anticipated financial outcome.	
.5	<b>Governors</b> agreed that, in view of the forecasts, a deficit-reducing plan was necessary. However, governors were concerned and sought assurances that such a strategy would not be of material detriment to the best interests of the pupils and safety/well-being of staff. <b>DR</b> stated that, whilst it was a challenging situation, the school would endeavour not to put quality of provision or health/safety at risk. Governors remained concerned and would	

	continue to monitor the situation through their respective portfolios	
.6	<b>LS</b> enquired whether OHC&AT could apply to the Educational & Skills Funding Agency for financial assistance. <b>KH</b> did not know the answer to this question and would find out. <b>Action: KH to enquire whether OHCA&amp;AT can apply to ESFA for financial assistance for Brantridge.</b>	<b>KH</b>
<b>.2</b>	<b>Grafham Grange 2017/18 Final Accounts and Latest Management Accounts</b>	
.1	<b>KH</b> referred to the 2017/18 Final Accounts and reported that the school had accrued a deficit of £106k in 2017/18 after depreciation, which was covered by the Radius Trust transferred reserves, leaving £76k surplus carried forward.	
.2	<b>KH</b> then referred to the latest management accounts for the current financial year up to and including Period 2. <b>KH</b> stated that, the school was currently forecast to accrue a deficit of £274k by the end of the year. This was based on an intake of 32 students. It was noted that four students were starting in January and then ten further students would be assessed in January for admission, of which <b>JT</b> felt six were potential students.	
.3	<b>KH</b> noted that, as a consequence and like BrS, there is now a financial control plan in place and that the Principal has been informed of a 'soft-freeze' on expenditure. Governors expressed similar concerns to those raised for BrS regarding pupil and staff interests.	
.4	<b>JT</b> referred to the "soft freeze" on recruitment which precluded recruitment of permanent staff with the resultant use of agency staff. <b>JT</b> emphasized that all resources were being channelled to front-line teaching and that an Assistant Head had been postponed and other remedial measures were being considered, including possible sale of empty properties. <b>SH</b> commented that staffing was being stretched and given the commitment to 1 to 1 teaching in some cases, more staff were really needed.	
.5	<b>LS</b> expressed the view that employment of agency staff was much more expensive and a false economy. <b>SH</b> added that staff turnover was, in any case, disruptive to pupils. <b>MH</b> agreed and expressed his own similar concerns. <b>LS</b> asked where final responsibility lay. <b>KM</b> stated that the Budget Panel had not concluded its business.	
.6	Some governors looked to OHC&AT to address the financial/recruitment issue. <b>KC</b> highlighted to governors that, whilst OHC&AT may be able to assist in overcoming the financial challenges, the school's income fundamentally comes from LA fees for pupil placements and not centrally from OHC&AT. The challenges faced are largely as a result of low pupil numbers at the school, which has been an ongoing problem over recent years.	
.7	<b>JT</b> emphasized that the school was trying hard to manage its financial difficulties and that there should be a healthier pipeline of pupils in the future.	
.8	Governors asked <b>JT</b> whether the introduction of the co-educational offer in 2019/20 was likely to be helpful in meeting financial targets in 2019/20. <b>JT</b> felt that, unless there was a significant intake of girls, the costs of adaptations, curriculum development, staffing and training, etc. could outweigh income. Governors shared this concern and suggested that the financial impact be considered carefully before any placements are made. <b>Action: JT to consider with OHC&amp;AT the financial implications of admitting a small cohort of girls before placement offers are made to girls.</b>	<b>JT</b>
<b>.3</b>	<b>St Dominic's 2017/18 Final Accounts and Latest Management Accounts</b>	
.1	<b>KH</b> referred to the 2017/18 Final Accounts and reported that the school had incurred a deficit of £80k in 2017/18 after depreciation, which was covered by reserves brought forward, leaving a surplus of £87k.	
.2	<b>KH</b> then referred to the latest management accounts for the current financial year up to and including Period 2. The forecast outturn at year end after depreciation stood at a surplus of £83k, based on 102 students.	
.3	<b>KC</b> asked why there had been an operating deficit in 2017/18 given the healthy pupil numbers on roll. <b>DB</b> and <b>KH</b> responded that this appeared to be due to some unpaid invoices from Local Authorities which was being investigated. If so, StD should be reporting a surplus for 2017/18. <b>KC</b> asked that <b>KH</b> report back on the matter. <b>Action: KH to report on updated financial out-turn for 2017/18 following investigation into possible unpaid invoices.</b>	<b>KH</b>
<b>.4</b>	<b>Generally</b>	
.1	<b>SH</b> raised the general matter of the value of properties on the schools' balance sheets and whether these assets could be unlocked. <b>KC</b> noted that OHC&AT has been considering ways in which the schools' assets might be utilised to enable improvement in schools' facilities. This was likely to be a matter for discussion at GB in the future.	

.2	<b>KC</b> concluded discussions on finance by emphasising the need to develop ambitious 3- to 5-year strategies, supported by realistic financial models that included building up reserves.	
<b>7.</b>	<b>STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR REVIEW/DISCUSSION</b>	
.1	<b>.1 SASHUB Schools' 3 Year strategic review, aims and options– see paper SAS.3.09</b>	
.1	<b>KC</b> prefaced this section of the meeting by explaining that the schools were starting the process of refreshing their medium-term strategies. The Principals had started by considering what they envisage the differences to be between their respective schools today and in 3 to 5 years' time. Principals would consider comments raised at this GB and aim to present a further update at the next GB. <b>KC</b> invited comments and discussion on the Paper.	
.2	<b>St Dominic's</b> <b>a) LS</b> felt that the central challenge lay in student numbers and turnover, controlling costs and maintaining quality of education for students. <b>b) AF</b> thought that a part of the way forward lay in how to exploit the considerable assets which the schools possessed. Staff student ratios were also critically important. The increase in 1 to 1 pupils was challenging and difficult to manage efficiently. <b>c) JS</b> suggested that the 47 acres of woodlands at St Dominic's was an asset which could definitely be exploited. <b>d) SH</b> cautioned that a drive to increase numbers sharply could impact negatively on existing students. Commenting on this <b>KC</b> posed the question of whether a target at St Dominic's of 150 students, for example, offered the best balance? Others thought that the curriculum for such numbers must be right but recognized that change was necessary. <b>e) AD</b> commented that the cost of attracting larger numbers and economies of operation had led to a 9-year build up of maintenance work requiring funding. <b>f) AD</b> added that there were physical constraints too. Citing the example of site vehicular accessibility via the long driveway, she made the point that, say, introducing a bus in order to reduce taxi pick-ups/drop-offs ignored the fact that the driveway itself was unsuitable for buses. <b>f) JY</b> raised the issue of the residual £120k resulting from the Radius/OHC&AT transfer and suggested that this could be put to good use for maintenance/adaptations. <b>g) MH</b> suggested that a feasibility study should look at increasing revenue through other opportunities e.g. hire of facilities for non-school use during summer <b>KC</b> agreed and suggested that a bid to fund a study into such option could be included in the 2019/20 budget. <b>KH</b> thought that the OHC&AT could help with such a study. <b>f) DB</b> drew Governors' attention to Condition Improvement bids which could be used to improve the assets and increase efficiency.	
.3	<b>Brantridge</b> <b>a) AL</b> confirmed that the school had looked closely at the likely numbers and was nervous about both the quantum and ratios. <b>b) DR</b> thought that the Local Authority projected numbers increase to 70 was a big challenge but in view of the financial pressures must take priority. The challenges would lie in sustaining quality of teaching and learning but greater opportunities could lie with greater student numbers. <b>c) DP</b> thought that much depended on the staff being able to cope with and adapt to the challenges.	
.4	<b>Grafham Grange</b> <b>a) JT</b> introduced her thoughts by identifying safety as an important issue when considering growth in pupil numbers required to be financially sustainable. For example, the right teachers must be in place by the time pupils arrive and not afterwards. The school had to build up numbers but in a careful way. JT felt that the curriculum was in need of and was currently undergoing modification to include more practical learning activities. JT added that she felt bringing on the co-educational so soon in the schools improvement programme posed introduced many additional challenges. <b>b) PF</b> agreed on the last point and felt it was important to signal that the co-educational issue should be shelved. <b>AD</b> agreed. It was agreed that advice was needed on whether the introduction of co-educational provision was mandatory. <b>Action: AD/JT to liaise with OHC&amp;AT to establish whether the introduction of the co-educational offer was mandatory for 2019/20.</b>	<b>AD/JT</b>

.5	<p>KC concluded by asking the Principals, with the help of KH, to progress their strategic plans and provide outline resource/financial models for the coming 3 to 4 years to demonstrate the sustainability or otherwise of their medium-term strategies.</p> <p><b>Action: Principals, with help from KH, to prepare financial/resource models for each of the next 3 to 4 years in line with their medium-term strategic aims.</b></p>	AD/DR/JT/KH
.2	<p><b>Brantridge Co-educational Proposal– see paper SAS.3.10 (n.b. numbered .11 on the paper itself)</b></p> <p>.1 <b>DR</b> introduced his Paper in which, subject to further consultation and business planning , he asked governors to endorse his recommendation to introduce a co-educational provision and increase the capacity of the school to 70 pupils by September 2020.</p> <p>.2 <b>Governors</b> enquired whether the proposal was driven by Local Authority demand for placements for girls of primary school age. <b>DR</b> stated that the West Sussex commissioners had indicated that there was a demand but that he would learn more from the consultation responses.</p> <p>.3 <b>LS</b> asked whether the costs of introducing a co-educational provision had been estimated carefully. <b>DR</b> stated that further business planning would be required, depending on the likely demand.</p> <p>.4 <b>LS</b> asked whether primary co-educational provision for BrS’s needs cohort is considered was a good thing in itself. <b>JS</b> stated that, in his view, co-educational arrangement provides a more normal environment for pupils – provide there is a sufficient cohort of girls. <b>DP</b> stated that she thought that co-ed could be accommodated in the school as long as there were separate activities for boys and girls.</p> <p>.5 <b>SH</b> noted that parental choice was a key factor. <b>SH</b> expected that some parents would be in favour and others would not.</p> <p>.6 <b>KC</b> enquired whether there are other successful co-ed primary schools for SEMH/ASC pupils. <b>AD</b> pointed to examples of successful co-educational special schools.</p> <p>.7 <b>Governing Body</b> concluded by endorsing DR’s proposal, subject to the outcome of further consultation and business planning.</p> <p><b>Action: DR to progress with consultation and business planning and to report back on findings at the next GB.</b></p>	DR
.3	<p><b>St Dominic’s Residential Proposal – see paper SAS.3.11</b></p> <p>.1 <b>AD</b> introduced her Paper in which, subject to further consultation and business planning, she asked governors to endorse her recommendations to phase out the residential provision with full closure by July 2020, to redeploy the residential care team staff and to increase the school’s capacity to 150 pupils /students by September 2020.</p> <p>.2 <b>AD</b> stated, that whilst she was sad to see close what has been for many years an outstanding residential provision, she felt strongly that there was no choice but to phase out the provision. The number of pupils was reducing every year and there were virtually no new enquiries. This was a reflection of the reductions in funding available to Local Authorities. The school was already losing money on the residential offer, which was not fair on other day pupils/students. Also, moreover, very low number of boarders, in her view, fostered an over-reliance on adults which was not the purpose of the residential offer and did not prepare students well for the outside world. However, <b>AD</b> felt that there was a moral imperative for current residential students to conclude their education at the school, despite the costs involved.</p> <p>.3 <b>Governors</b> discussed the proposal but acknowledged the realities of the lack of enquires.</p> <p>.4 <b>Governors</b> were pleased to hear that residential staff members could potentially be re-deployed in the school.</p> <p>.5 <b>Governors</b> concurred with AD’s view that the school should aim to sustain a residential offer for existing boarders until the end of 2019/20, if viable to do so.</p> <p>.6 <b>Governing Body</b>, concluded by endorsing AD’s proposal, subject to the outcome of further consultation and business planning.</p> <p><b>Action: AD to progress with consultation and business planning and to report back on findings at the next GB.</b></p>	AD
8.	<b>CALENDAR</b>	
.1	<b>School Events</b>	
.1	<b>JT</b> drew attention to an open afternoon for parents on the following Wednesday at	

.2	Grafham. Governors were welcome to attend. <b>AD</b> also invited Governors to attend the next Parents Forum at St Dominic's	
.2	<b>2018/19 Portfolio Meeting Dates</b>	
.1	<b>KC</b> asked some Portfolio Lead governors to confirm their Portfolio Meeting dates for next two terms – ideally by the end of term.	<b>SM, LS, JS, MH</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
.1	There was no Part 1 or Part 2 business and the meeting concluded at 1845.	