

Cowes Enterprise College

Extra-ordinary Local Governing Body Meeting

Date: Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021

Time: 3pm

Location: Teams plus Cowes Enterprise College, Crossfield Avenue, Cowes, Isle of Wight, PO31 8HB

**Governors**

Ken Lloyd	KL	Chair
Rachel Kitley	RK	Principal
Jonathan Burt	JB	Governor
Nigel Harley (from 1530)	NH	Governor
Emma Heathcote	EH	Governor
John Irvine	JI	Governor
Vicky Leonard	VL	Governor
Robin Price	RCP	Governor
Rachel Richards	RR	Governor

**Apologies**

Karen Jupe	KJ	Governor
Rob Pritchard	RP	Governor
Claire Wilks – no apols	CW	Governor

**Attendees**

Richard Marinelli	RM	Business Director
Jill Wareham	JW	Clerk

**Minutes**

Part	Key: <b>Decisions, Actions, Support, Q: Governor questions, AP: Action Point</b>	Actions
1	<b>Apologies for absence</b>	
1.1	KL welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
1.2	<b>Apologies were received and accepted from KJ and RP.</b>	
2	<b>Declarations of interest and confidential business</b>	
2.1	There were no interests declared.	
2.2	There were no items of confidential business.	
3	<b>Agree budget and staffing structure for next academic year.</b>	
3.1	<b>Proposal for SEND new structures and further investment into staffing</b>	
3.0.1	RM reported pressures on the 2021-22 budget were the ring fencing of 6.5% partnership fee which meant over £130k more than previous years and replacement of IT equipment which will now be spread over next 3 years.	
3.0.2	RM has worked on bottom-up exercise based on delivering the academy's strategic plan and has produced a balanced budget.	
3.0.3	Income had to be based on ESFA funding information, any assumptions around other income streams had to be realistic and evidenced. The only assumptions made are pupil numbers. RM has built in the Renewable Heating Initiative (RHI) grant based on the lowest figure we may get. Sixth form numbers are expected to be better than last year. Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) shows a small uplift for minimum guarantee.	
3.0.4	The Curriculum Led Finance Planning (CLFP) model was used which OAT has been accepted.	
3.0.5	Staffing is based on current staffing structure. There is a national pay freeze for anyone earning over £24k. All staff that have the opportunity to pay progress will do so and this has been included in the budget. Staffing in the budget includes RK's proposal for SEND structure. Where staff have left, they have not been replaced during the long lockdown but will have to replace in future.	
3.0.6	Non staffing costs are based on actual figures. A sizeable figure for IT replacement and contingency has been built in for buildings. The devolved capital fund of £74,525 is assumed will pay towards the IT replacements. The IT plan is to replace projectors and core switches which	

	<p>will be leased over 4 years. RM has reviewed all site expenditure, discussed with site manager and regional director and agreed to have a small contingency of £10k. Rates have come down significantly although this does not affect the budget as we get the money back. Electricity costs were based on the last two years prior to lockdown. The biomass plant will start soon which will mean using less gas. RM has split out photocopying usage between departments; normally this would come out of capitation, teachers will need a lot more resources after coming out of lockdown. Free School Meals (FSM) are based on 80% of total funding which is the benchmark that OAT produce. Currently it is about 40-50% take up. Catering is going out to tender shortly; RM would like better value and more meal deals offered. OAT partnership cost is £440k due to ESFA putting pressure on Trusts to have surpluses.</p> <p>3.0.7 KPI for staffing is slightly higher as expenditure is based on assumptions of pay progression. Full time teaching staff is up a bit, but one experienced teacher has left and has been replaced by a less experienced one. Support staff is lower as there are vacancies at the moment, but these will be filled. Pupil: teacher ratio is good. SLT spend is higher as the Middle Leaders are on leadership scales. Spend per pupil shows CEC is spending more on pupils.</p> <p>3.0.8 Overall, it is estimated a surplus of £519 at end of next year.</p> <p><b>Q: Are you allowed to hold a contingency?</b> A: Only a small amount, there is more in building areas and curriculum development. If there was a larger amount left at the end of the year, this would be taken by OAT to put towards their contingency.</p> <p>3.0.9 <b>Q: For 2002-21 the numbers show 98 in Year 12 which drops to 85 in Year 13 the following year, this seems a lot of children are going to leave?</b> A: RM advised that some students do leave after Year 12 for a variety of reasons, there is an element of conservatism in the figures.</p> <p><b>Q: What provision is there in the budget for extra children in Year 7?</b> A: RK advised she has had a written assurance from OAT they would support financially if this happened.</p> <p><b>Q: Is this a likelihood?</b> A: RK anticipates there will be zero allowed in through appeal as the case is so strong not to take over the PAN of 210 but sometimes the Appeals Panel does not make a decision that is expected. RM said it was difficult to put in a contingency for this, OAT was clear that any income or expenditure had to be based on actual figures. RK has told the Local Authority (LA) that CEC would grow if supported but the LA has said they will not support that growth, if they had CEC would not be having appeals.</p> <p><b>Q: Do other schools have vacancies?</b> A: Yes, there are some secondary schools that have spaces.</p> <p><b>Q: Is 2.7% against OAT benchmark of 9% good or bad for curriculum bonus?</b> A: RM said it means CEC is incredibly efficient because there is little surplus teaching or teachers. OAT have verified and checked the figures.</p> <p><b>Q: Is it good to have extra teachers?</b> A: RK said it should not be as this would produce overspending. NH arrived at 1530 and apologised as he could not get into Teams. NH raised his concerns about how tight the budget is.</p> <p><b>Q: Is the retendering of the Catering Contract something that governors should be involved in?</b> A: RM thinks governors should be. KL advised in his experience normally governors would be there to check everything was correct i.e. ensure tender documents were right and attend the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>opening of tenders. <b>RM will check to see if governors need to be involved with the catering tender process.</b></p> <p><b>Q: What pupil number is the budget based on?</b> A: The 2021-22 budget will be based on the census taken in October 2020 which was 210.</p> <p><b>Q: How are the figures for Years 12 and 13 calculated?</b> A: The numbers are slightly higher than last year because there have been more expressions of interest. RK reported that for Year 12 they had applied a formula which was supported by how many students across other schools retain externally to internally schools, RM is being slightly more conservative. NH advised that this had been discussed at the finance working group and was acknowledged this area could grow. RK confirmed this as the Sixth Form is good and included students getting places at Oxbridge and Russell Group universities.</p> <p><b>Q: Is there a cap on Sixth Form numbers?</b> A: RM has modelled up to 106 entering Year 12.</p> <p><b>Governors thanked RM for producing the budget so clearly and efficiently.</b></p> <p><b>3.1.1 Proposal for SEND new structures and further investment into staffing.</b> JW requested this part of the item was recorded in order to support RK in her gaining the NPQEL qualification, all agreed.</p> <p><b>3.1.2</b> RK reported that she had developed a strategy to grow Inclusion staffing and resources brought about by concerns of quality of provision. RK is aiming to have a fully inclusive ethos which will reduce exclusions. The structure has to change because there is little external support for these children and RK wants to give children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) a fantastic provision which will in turn take the academy forward to be outstanding. SEND progress is not consistently good in all areas in line with national averages and Behaviour and Attendance in SEND is not as strong as other groups. The Inclusion department is currently strong but could bring more specialism to the SEND structure to retain staff which would enable stability, maintain confidence amongst the community and be financially stable. The Pestle document which is a risk assessment of external factors highlights exterior reasons which may be barriers. The LA will be, from now, writing Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP) in a new way giving flexibility to ways to organise support for these children. Exclusions are higher in this group as there is no infrastructure around CEC, e.g. alternative provision, external support, so the last resort is to exclude. This initiative will need to be funded by ourselves otherwise it will not happen. The current picture shows that CEC has higher number of children with EHCPs than national average and support is higher. Year 7 have 20% of children with SEND and will go up again in September 2021. We need to act now to futureproof. 75% of exclusions in CEC are given to SEND children, compared to 45% across OAT academies, so there has to be a radical shift in ethos around inclusion to improve by having a dynamic staffing structure, offer training and Continuous Professional Development (CPD) for all teachers. The recent staff survey was positive in the majority of areas except for Teaching Assistants' (TA) low morale. The proposed staff structure will be the best model for improving attendance, behaviour, progress and outcomes. Funding allocated to SEND will see improved quality of Teaching &amp; Learning (T&amp;L) and give opportunities to support TAs. The risks include short term risk to budget, loss of 'Velcro' type support, disruption of teaching to CPD, increased workload. The zero-tolerance exclusion culture will be replaced by giving support with internal staffed rooms to keep students in school. Mitigations can be done against risks.</p> <p><b>3.1.3</b> The proposal is to have a primary EHCP specialist teacher for Year 7 (some children may be working at level 1) which gives an efficient alternative solution to each child having a TA. The teacher would work across a small group to support educationally. Three Higher Level Teaching</p>	RM
--	--	----

	<p>Assistants (HLTA) or level 3 TAs will bring specialist support to the English, Maths and Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH). Three TAs to become key workers for specific needs, for which they will have specific CPD. The support will broaden to children on support register as well. Some children will still need a 1:1 TA. An Inclusion Behaviour Manager will deliver interventions in the 'Inclusion Success Centre' (ISC) which will include restorative reconciliation and behaviour support and guidance. RK has had a great deal of support and advice through consultation with the SEND Director at OAT, other HTs and colleagues who have run provision. RK has balanced the budget and anticipates savings as less children will go to the Island Learning Centre (ILC). This is a huge area of change and there are clear and robust plans to manage change using Kotter's 8 step change model. RK feels it is the right time to progress now.</p> <p><b>Governors thanked RK for her clear vision and plan for the future of Inclusion at CEC.</b></p> <p><b>Q: Comparing to other schools and working with OAT and others in other counties, are there more barriers because we are on the island? How are we doing compared to other schools on the island?</b></p> <p>A: RK said CEC is already providing strong provision for SEND in spite of lack of funding, support, etc. but we can do better.</p> <p><b>Q: If CEC is leading the way on the island by providing facilities for our children, could we open up to other schools?</b></p> <p>A: RK said yes, once it is embedded, we could share and explore any financial benefits.</p> <p><b>Q: Could the ISC be offered to non-SEND students?</b></p> <p>A: Yes, if it is appropriate.</p> <p>The ISC will give ability to reasonably adjust for SEND students as CEC will have the structure in place to reduce/remove exclusions. RK cannot do anything about one off extreme behaviour events if there is a safety issue which is above mitigation and keeping a child in school would cause a danger to themselves and/or others but persistent disruptive behaviour could be dealt with in the new structure. Governors were very pleased to receive the proposals as it is harrowing for children to be permanently excluded.</p> <p><b>Q: How will parents be engaged with the changes to EHCPs?</b></p> <p>A: RK said it will be a challenge as they may not like changes. RK will be using SENCo to promote the cultural shift although it will not be for every child with an EHCP, it will be mostly for the newer students.</p> <p><b>Q: How do staff feel about the proposals?</b></p> <p>A: VL said that from the teaching staff perspective it will be excellent to have improved provision for SEND students.</p> <p><b>Q: Why are some children so far behind when they come to CEC?</b></p> <p>A: RK advised it is because there is a large deficit on the Island in the SEND budget and the LA are unable to fund growth in special schools. The deficit is growing every year and the problems in Primary School are being shunted to Secondary Schools. <b>Governors agreed to approve the main budget, the SEND budget, the main staffing structure and the SEND structure and proposals.</b></p>	
4	<b>Confirm date of next meeting</b>	
	Thursday 6 <sup>th</sup> May 2021 at 3pm	

**Chair:**

**Date:**