

Dove House School Board of Trustees

Minutes of Meeting Tuesday 13th of July 2021

Present:	Category:
Juliet Annesley-Gamester (JAG)	Parent Trustee
Kevin Barwick (KB) Item 1-	Community Trustee
Sian Butler (SB)	Community Trustee
Andrea Francis (AF)	Community Trustee
Lisa Goodall (LG) (Chair)	Parent Trustee
Ollie Killinger (OK) Items 1-9	Community Trustee
Chris Toner (CT)	Interim Headteacher
Apologies:	
Emma Layzell (EL)	Co-opted Trustee
Kate Need (KN)	Co-opted Trustee
In Attendance:	
Jenny Burns (JB) Items 1-7	Finance & Resources Director
Jayne Humphrey (JH)	Governance Lead
Brigid Ryan (MBR)	Interim Head of School

1. Welcome & Apologies.

The Chair welcomed trustees to the meeting. Apologies were received and accepted from Emma Layzell and Kate Need.

The meeting was quorate. It was noted that the agenda and papers had been provided in advance of the meeting.

2. Pecuniary Interests

No interests were declared in the agenda item. Trustees confirmed that they did not have any new declarations to make.

3. Approval of Minutes

Trustees **agreed** that the minutes of the meeting of the 11th of May 2021 were a true and accurate record and these will be signed by the Chair.

4. Matters Arising

No	Action & Owner	Update
Action 2 Item 5 30/3/21	The F&RD will make arrangements for the use of the SRMA service and will report back to the Board. 11/5/21: The F&RD outlined the discussion that had taken place at a meeting with Jo Holmes, Operational Delivery Lead South ESFA and that a short precis now needs to be submitted by the school, setting out the reasons for wishing to utilise the service. Trustees agreed that this would remain as a matter arising in order that they are updated. JB	The F&RD advised that she has had an initial conversation with the SRMA adviser and is now awaiting a date and details of the documentation the school must provide. No further action.
Action 1 Item 4 11/5/21	It was agreed that the discussed amendments would be made to the SEND Information report by KO and submitted for approval to the Trust Board, via the Governance Lead. KO	Completed. No further action.
Action 2 Item 6 11/5/21	The F&RD will provide a written update for the next Board meeting outlining the progress made to dispose of The Privett Centre. JB	See narrative below
Action 3 Item 7 11/5/21	KN will share Maria Miller's BAME report with the Board. KN	Completed. No further action.
Action 4 Item 7 11/5/21	The Governance Lead will arrange the Board Equalities training. JH	Completed. No further action.

Matters Arising: Action 2 Item 6 11/5/21 Privett Centre Update

A written update had been provided by the F&RD who advised that she had a meeting with Savills and Hampshire Legal since she had written her report. The F&RD reported:

- Hampshire Legal Department is agreeable to the removal of the covenant as part of the sales process and the school are awaiting written confirmation of this.

- Hampshire Legal Department would like DHSA to market the property with the education covenant in place, to see if there is any interest.
- Savills suggested there is not a market for the property with the educational covenant in place.
- Savills advised that it is difficult to offer a valuation for Privett, but at auction (without the covenant) it could yield between £700k - £900k.
- Savills have offered a valuation and report which could be provided to Hampshire Legal Department, at a cost of £2,500.
- The process for disposal will not be quick and there are advantages and disadvantages in following each of the different options outlined.

Kevin Barwick left the meeting at 5.10pm

Q: Would the school have to repay any profit made on the sale because of the covenant?

A: (JB) Hampshire Legal Department have suggested that 50% of any uplift (profit) would revert to Hampshire Local Authority. This would form part of the legal negotiations.

Kevin Barwick re-joined the meeting at 5.13pm

The Chair asked if any decisions were required and the F&RD suggested that direction from the trustees would be helpful as to whether to proceed with the valuation and report from Savills. The F&RD noted that she hadn't had sufficient time to prepare a report regarding this, but could do so.

Trustees asked for the report to include costs and timescales, advantages and disadvantages of each option so that a decision can be given to the F&RD.

The Chair noted that as Privett is an asset of the school that the Board should seek to obtain best value for it.

ACTION 1: The F&RD will prepare a report for the trustees to consider the next steps.

5. Staffing Structure & TLR Approval

The Chair advised the Board that the Personnel & Pay committee had reviewed the staffing structure in detail, and were recommending it to the Board, but further questions were welcome.

A trustee noted that previously it had been suggested that a staffing review was undertaken and the Interim Headteacher provided information about where changes could be considered in the next year.

Q: Can I confirm that you are suggesting this be a 'holding' structure so that the new Headteacher can consider future staffing requirements in conjunction with the SRMA report that is due.

A: (CT) Yes, the new Headteacher will want the opportunity to review the existing provision and modernise some areas, where working could be 'smarter'. A restructuring process can take two terms so it is important that this is considered in the autumn term. The review should be wide-ranging and consider the tasks that staff are doing to see if they can be undertaken in more cost-effective ways.

Kevin Barwick left the meeting at 5.19pm and re-joined at 5.20 pm.

Q: Whilst the school goes through the SRMA process can we be sure that we will not be creating new posts, increasing hours or offering upgrades, unless it is to replace a necessary staff member?

A: (CT) Yes it would be my advice that there is a 'recruitment freeze' and once the staffing structure is approved any changes would need to revert to the Trustees. The only caveat to this is the 1-1 learning support assistants (LSAs) that may be required for students and this is covered separately in the recruitment policy.

Q: Has the recruitment policy been adhered to consistently this year?

A: (CT) Yes, apart from one post where a mistake was made. This was noted and the post was re-advertised again so everybody had a fair opportunity to apply for the role.

Q: At the Personnel & Pay committee meeting you advised us that you wished to reconsider the Remote Learning Lead TLR – how will this post be covered?

A: (CT) The member of staff has advised that she no longer wishes to do the role. I have a concern about the autumn term and remote learning being needed swiftly, but in the form of a more blended offering. This is not set up at the moment and the new Headteacher will need to decide quickly how this should be moved forward.

Trustees raised concerns that:

- Dove House is behind other schools, in that it is not in a position to offer blended learning.
- At present, remote learning does not have a named member of staff taking responsibility for it.

The Interim Headteacher advised the Board that the school would use remote learning if necessary and that the new Headteacher could act quickly to ensure that a senior leader took responsibility for organising blended learning.

It was noted that a further agenda item for remote learning would offer the opportunity for a wider discussion.

Noting that the Personnel & Pay committee had reviewed and recommended the staffing structure and TLRs, the trustees **approved** both unanimously.

6. Budget Approval

The Chair advised the Board that the Finance, Resources & Audit committee had reviewed the budget in detail, and were recommending it to the Board, but further questions were welcome.

Q: Are monies set aside in the budget for a programme of works for school repair and maintenance?

A: (JB) The school has £12k of capital coming into the budget for this academic year and this increases to £15k for the next three years. The school has £45k sitting in the capital pot already and we can transfer the £12k to this and use this towards the £78k cost of the MUGA. We are discussing this with Wise & Co and by using capital rather than revenue we would reduce our expected deficit.

The £15k allocated over the next three years has not been allocated for anything yet.

For the current year end we are looking at a £42k spend this year which includes £10k for electrics and £6k for glazing, which were unexpected. Moving forward I have included a healthy budget for premises repairs and maintenance.

Q: I am unclear about how we are prioritising school maintenance, repairs and capital projects. Could this all be put in an estate plan?

A: (JB) This is a large task as there are a number of projects to consider:

- Health & safety issues, which must be prioritised
- The future use of the huts (survey commissioned)
- The refurbishment of the Resistant Materials room
- Provision of a staff room
- Provision of a therapies room/suite
- Provision of a pastoral space.

The school has large reserves and it is appropriate to produce a well-considered longer-term plan to utilise these, rather than 'patching up' areas which may not stay.

Trustees noted that it was appropriate that the new Headteacher had input to this so that an Estate plan could be drawn up for the latter part of the autumn term.

Q: In terms of the SCITT recharges, how were these calculated and does it include leadership charges?

A: (JB) The Finance Manager and I considered the most equitable way for the recharges to be calculated for the SCITT and Post 16 and decided to do this by the number of staff in each unit. Post 16 will be recharged £30k which includes: HR, data protection, governance, finance, leadership, occupational health, legal services and insurance. The SCITT will be recharged £15.5k and this also includes IT services and premises costs. Leadership costs will not be recharged for the SCITT because the Partnership Headteachers give their time for free.

The Chair noted that the DHSA Headteacher is the Accounting Officer for the SCITT and also takes part in their management meetings and questioned whether leadership costs should be recharged. The F&RD advised the Board that leadership charges could be reassessed if there are changes.

Q: Have the recharges been imposed on the SCITT?

A: Yes, they have been imposed although I have had discussions with them. I have set the recharges to ensure they have a balanced budget but again they can be reassessed.

The Chair noted that the main school cannot financially support the SCITT.

Noting that the Finance, Resources & Audit committee had reviewed and recommended the budget, the trustees **approved** it unanimously.

DHSA School

Income	£ 3,380,741 - Three million three hundred eighty thousand seven hundred forty-one pounds
Expenditure	£ 3,372,838 - Three million three hundred seventy-two thousand eight hundred thirty-eight pounds
In Year (Surplus)	£ 7,903 - Seven thousand nine hundred three pounds

Post 16

Income	£ 351,163 – Three hundred fifty-one thousand one hundred sixty-three pounds
Expenditure	£ 309,447- Three hundred nine thousand four hundred forty-seven pounds
In Year (Surplus)	£ 41,716 – Forty-one thousand seven hundred sixteen pounds

Privett Centre

Income	£ 0 - nil pounds
Expenditure	£ 35,918 - Thirty-five thousand nine hundred eighteen pounds
In Year (Deficit)	£ 35,918 - Thirty-five thousand nine hundred eighteen pounds

SCITT

Income	£ 392,758 - Three hundred ninety-two thousand seven hundred fifty-eight pounds
Expenditure	£ 391,841 - Three hundred ninety-one thousand eight hundred forty-one
In Year (Surplus)	£ 917 - Nine hundred and seventeen pounds
Surplus B/Fwd.	£ 46,009 - Forty-six thousand and nine pounds
Cumulative C/Fwd.	£ 46,926 - Forty-six thousand nine hundred twenty-six pounds

DHSA Group

Income	£ 4,124,662 - Four million one hundred twenty-four thousand six hundred sixty-two pounds
Expenditure	£ 4,110,056 - Four million one hundred ten thousand fifty-six pounds
In Year (Surplus)	£ 14,606 - Fourteen thousand six hundred six pounds
Surplus B/Fwd.	£ 985,566 - Nine hundred eighty-five thousand five hundred sixty-six pounds
Cumulative C/Fwd.	£ 1,000,172 - One million one hundred seventy-two pounds

7. BFRO Approval

The F&RD briefly explained the BFRO return to the ESFA, noting that:

- Usually the BFRO and BFR3Y are separate returns but because of Covid the information has been combined.
- The figures included within the return have been presented to trustees during the budget approval process that was just undertaken and also include the predicted out-turn as of March 2021
- There are validation queries within the return which the school have clarified having sought guidance from Wise & Co

The trustees **approved** the BFRO unanimously.

Jenny Burns left the meeting at 5.46 pm

8. Remote Learning Review

The Interim Head of School had provided a remote learning report with supplementary information regarding stakeholder surveys. Questions had been requested in advance of the meeting and were all answered by the Interim Head of School:

Q: There is no clear reporting on Post 16, and only reference to KS3 & 4 but not KS5? Why is this?

A: There was no specific request to separately canvas Post 16. The survey went out to all users via Scopay and it was designed to be anonymous. One respondent indicated that they were unhappy with the delivery in Post 16. I would recommend that DHSA consider separate canvassing going forward because of the difference in tuition delivery and face to face contact.

Q: Why was only one other school contacted, regarding the platform chosen? Considering more than one other school's experiences would have been useful to give a wider, more varied picture.

A: I agree that a broader spectrum of schools could have been contacted.

Original analysis by Mr Williams looked at several platforms such as Zoom, Teams, Edmodo and IXL and this information was provided to trustees last year (2019-2020) identifying Teams as the functional Remote Learning platform for the school.

Teachers consulted colleagues in other schools and fed into the discussion over the RLP in Faculty meetings. Minutes of the Faculty Leaders Meeting and Mr Williams report scoped several platforms which had issues relating to safeguarding (Zoom), costs (Edmodo) and IXL show that there were continuous discussions around the suitability of the remote learning for students as it directly affected their cognitive load.

Google Classroom was incompatible with the schools' network provider at the time. The minutes clearly show that discussions and actions were ongoing during an incredibly difficult time to ensure the remote education matched the needs of our students and parents/carers at that time and was closely monitored.

The school also staffed the care provision in school and had Year 10's in school on rotation to focus on subject accreditation.

Q: Only 12 pupils were surveyed, why was this such a small percentage of students?

A: The Remote Learning Lead made the decision to undertake this. When I picked up the responsibility for the analysis I was also surprised at the low number of surveys.

I believe that tutors could have supported a visual survey in tutor time. It would be my recommendation that in the event of a continued need to rely on a remote learning platform then any survey should involve the whole school.

Q: Could the students from Post 16 have completed a simple online survey?

A: Yes, there is no reason why this couldn't have happened.

Q: With regard to the staff survey, was this circulated to all classroom staff including teachers and classroom support staff? Why was the response rate so low?

A: Firstly, the response to the survey was voluntary not mandatory. The survey was not anonymous and I think that some staff did not respond because of this.

Q: For our remote learning offer our website says: 'Provision Offer will be 5 hours per day with these hours including both a blend of direct teaching and time for pupils to complete tasks or set assignments independently'. Do we have evidence that 5 hours of work/lessons a day was offered? Is there any data on the amount of live lessons offered?

A: Yes, we did have tutor times counted in, lessons scheduled and afternoon enrichment lessons plus extension tasks set. This is 5 hours of work / learning not 5 hours of lessons.

Q: The parent survey says 68% of pupils were actually doing 3 hours work or less. What plans are there to address that shortfall?

A: Perhaps a better question to parents/carers would have been 'what stopped students doing more than 3 hours a day'. The school is aware that many parents/carers said they were struggling to give the students the 1:1 support they needed when juggling other children and working from home themselves. We do not have an action plan for this at present but the new Headteacher should consider this to prepare us for a future lockdown.

Q: On page 31, why are there several different headings saying more live lessons and praise? Why aren't they counted together?

A: Live lessons were counted separately to determine their impact on engagement. Praise reflects parents/carers thanks to the school and lead teachers.

Q: On the monitoring and tracking spreadsheet why does it only do January and then the first week in February? Why is there no later analysis of a hopefully improving picture?

A: As the pandemic continued, students and parents/carers anxieties increased and they struggled to engage with resources but did engage with live lessons and live tutor calls. They wanted face to face interaction. Many engaged with the live aspects of the lesson but did not complete the work despite tutor support.

Q: Will parents/carers get a feedback letter following the survey so they feel heard and can see what will change going forward?

A: I believe that they should and I am happy to facilitate this response and can have it checked by the Trustees via email.

Q: You have provided some recommendations but what is the Action Plan from here?

A: The action plan should be created by the new Headteacher and Senior Leadership Team if the current national circumstances warrant it. It would be helpful for the school to look at 'blended' learning. It is important that we offer this type of learning, not just because of Covid but because it is useful for school refusers or students absent through other illnesses.

Q: Using the Teams platform, were learning support assistants able to work with students that needed greater assistance or differentiation of work?

A: No that didn't happen, and this is where Dove House were behind in the set up and operation of remote learning.

The Interim Headteacher relayed how impressive the live learning offered by QMC had been when she viewed it. In her view it was the 'gold standard' and she suggested that Dove House could learn from them.

There was a brief discussion which included:

- How to involve parents/carers so that the school can understand what is needed to be improve their offering.
- How remote learning could be used in school, in certain circumstances.
- How training and support needs to be offered to encourage staff to engage with the recording of live learning.
- How engagement was improved when the teacher 'pre-taught' and talked through the task they were going to teach. This allowed parents/carers the opportunity to assist their child leading to better engagement.
- How it is critical that staff do not lose the skills they have acquired, so staff need to continue to use Teams.
- That although remote learning has moved on, it can still be further improved to ensure the offering is high quality.

The trustees thanked the Interim Head of School for compiling the information into a meaningful report, in such a short timescale. They agreed that the new

Headteacher will need to review the report and documents to move remote learning forward as quickly as possible.

ACTION 2: The Headteacher is to review the remote learning report and documents and formulate an action plan to ensure remote learning moves forward.

On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked the Interim Head of School for her hard work during the last two terms and wished her well for her new role.

9. Interim Headteacher Report

The Interim Headteacher advised trustees that she has a further report to be issued to them, following a visit to review teaching and learning in the school by Naomi Carter from Hampshire Inspection and Advice Service (HIAS).

The Interim Headteacher invited questions:

Q: Matthew Rixson's report regarding data and assessment had some useful recommendations in it. Will these be included in the school improvement plan?

A: The school improvement plan will include all recommendations from HIAS as the actions must be put in place. The school has too much data but it isn't currently being used robustly to ensure pupil progress. Certain staff need to have training on the Primary 2018 framework as quickly as possible.

Q: What are the most important action the trustees can support the school with?

A: There are a number of important priorities to include in the school improvement plan:

- A focus on teaching and learning, which would include the use of LSA's in the classroom, expectations of what every classroom should have at DHSA, pace of lessons and extension work.
- Effective and efficient use of data as this needs to be more focussed and triangulated.
- Staff need to be made more accountable and held to expectations. This is noted in the internal audit and I agree that we need to better hold staff to account.
- Some areas of safeguarding could be tightened as although there are policies and procedures these are not always followed. The DSL needs to ensure that safeguarding processes are reiterated to staff and always followed through.

Q: In the report under behaviour the school notes that bullying has increased significantly, though is not necessarily accurate in the labelling. Is this being addressed?

A: There are a number of issues here to consider and address:

- Since the Covid pandemic students are experiencing more mental health issues and therefore their ability to be resilient is less.

- The Senior Leadership Team need to provide training in behaviour management to others, including LSAs.
- Staff aren't always recording incidents on CPOMs and if they do it is not always as quickly as they should. Staff should be held to account for this.
- Staff need further training on recording promptly and accurately on CPOMs.

Q: There is a comment under staff wellbeing which notes that 'There is an increased workload covering colleague absence' – how is this being addressed?

A: I think this comment comes from the pastoral team and senior leaders as they are probably most impacted because we don't use supply teachers at DHSA. Normally a school would utilise supply teachers. The absence policy is in place and absence is being tracked.

Ollie Killinger left the meeting at 6.26pm

A brief discussion was held regarding the standardisation of the Headteacher Reports to ensure appropriate information is supplied for trustees to discharge their responsibilities. The Chair advised the Board that the Governance Lead will work with the new Headteacher and Senior Leadership Team to ensure that this happens.

Trustees noted how positive it was that attendance for students has returned to a high level again and how pleasing it was to see school events now being held.

On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked the Interim Headteacher for her hard work since January, in such difficult circumstances too, and noted that the school has moved forward in this time. She wished her well for her future.

10. Grievance Report Update

Further to her written end of year report the Chair advised trustees that the new Headteacher had been made aware of the grievance and the 'Dignity and Respect' policy that has been introduced and the work that has been undertaken around this.

The Chair noted that progress has been made, but is incomplete, and that an external 'climate review' will be undertaken in September.

Trustees **agreed** that progress against the recommended actions be further reviewed in the Spring term, through a report from the Headteacher and F&RD.

ACTION 3: The Governance Lead will ensure this item is added to a Spring agenda.

11. Governance

a) Chair's Notes

The Chair's report was noted.

b) Finance, Resources & Audit Committee Annual Report (Q&A)

The Finance, Resources & Audit Committee annual report was noted.

Q: Are there any key things that you would want to flag to us?

A: (KB) I think going forward we must focus on a 3-year plan for our cash reserves so that we have plans in place and are ready for Condition Improvement Funding (CIF) bids or any other funding. There has been some positive progress as financially we are resilient, reporting is much improved, and the internal audit reporting is being actioned.

c) Personnel & Pay Committee Annual Report (Q&A)

Q: Are there any key things that you would want to flag to us?

A: (JAG) I have highlighted the actions in the report that will need to be taken forward. It is unfortunate that because of Covid and a trustee resignation we haven't had a trustee monitoring visit for performance management to offer assurance. It has been useful to monitor the school improvement plan at each committee meeting and there has been good progress in moving things forward.

12. Trustee Visit Reports

Reports were received and noted for:

- a) BASCITT
- b) EPIC
- c) Pupil Premium
- d) HR SIP Review

The Chair thanked trustees for taking part in visits over the last academic year, noting that they form part of the evidence base that trustees are monitoring progress in the school.

13. Policy Reviews

a) Support Staff Probationary Policy

The Governance Lead advised that the policy had been reviewed by the school's HR provider and been signed off by them.

Q: How will the school ensure that training is provided to line managers so there is consistency in the application of the probationary policy for all support staff?

A: (CT) There needs to be training for all line managers, which will include teachers so this will need to be completed during a twilight. The programme hasn't yet been finalised so this training can still be included.

Q: How will the school ensure that the objectives set are robust yet fair?

A: Objectives that are set need to match up with the expectations laid out in the Performance Management policy. The school could use the Teaching Assistant standards to help set appropriate objectives.

The Support Staff Probationary policy was **approved**.

ACTION 4: The Interim Headteacher will include a twilight session of training for staff who will be involved in the application of the Support Staff probationary policy.

b) Staff Pay Policy

The Staff Pay policy was **approved**.

c) Equality Information & Objectives Policy

Trustees had been provided with a review document of the existing objectives, so they could monitor progress and achievement.

Trustees asked that wording was amended for Objective 2 from:

- Look at the balance between genders in House Captain, Tutor and School Representative nominations

to include:

- Look at the balance between genders in House Captain, Tutor and School Representative and School Ambassador nominations

The Equality Information & Objectives policy was **approved**.

14. BASCITT

a) Review and Approval of the BASCITT Finance Agreement and Partnership Agreement

There was a brief discussion which covered:

- Whether cross-charging from the school to the SCITT should be shown in the finance agreement for transparency.
- Whether the level of cross-charging set for the next year has been set in such a way that costs will be covered.
- That the finance agreement includes the return of monies to placement school as detailed in section 1.5 of the finance agreement.
- How trustees ensure that funds are spent appropriately and within ESFA guidelines, by SCITT staff adhering to the Finance policy and following procurement procedures.
- That both documents must be reviewed and simplified by the BASCITT Director, Governance Lead and Finance & Resources Director for 2022/23.

- That the documents should be presented for review and approval at the first meeting of the summer term 2022, so there is time for discussion and amendment if necessary.

The BASCITT Finance Agreement and Partnership Agreement were **approved**

b) Consideration of a new Partnership Alliance School

The Chair noted that a written proposal had been provided and highlighted that the BASCITT Director recommends that The Bridge Education Centre joins the partnership.

Q: Does BASCITT have enough trainee demand to recruit another partnership school?

A: (CT) We don't currently have enough places for all our trainees, so recruiting more 'good' partnership schools is sensible. The Local Authority had recommended that the Bridge Education Centre contact us to join, because of the excellent work of BASCITT. The Bridge Education Centre are a different provider and therefore will be useful for BASCITT as trainees will have an increased choice. It could also be useful to upskill Dove House staff.

The application for The Bridge Education Centre to join the BASCITT was **approved**

The meeting closed at 7.12pm.

Signed.....

Dated.....

The next meeting date will be confirmed

**Summary of Actions from:
Meeting of Tuesday 13th July 2021**

No	Action	Owner
Action 1 Item 4	Matters Arising - Privett Centre: The F&RD will prepare a report for the trustees to consider the next steps.	JB
Action 2 Item 8	Remote Learning Review: The Headteacher is to review the remote learning report and documents and formulate an action plan to ensure remote learning moves forward.	OP
Action 3 Item 10	Confidential Grievance: The Governance Lead will ensure this item is added to a Spring agenda.	JH
Action 4 Item 13b	The Interim Headteacher agreed to include a twilight session of training for staff who will be involved in the application of the Support Staff probationary policy	CT