



The Blue Tangerine Federation

Governing Body Meeting

Held on Thursday 22 May 2025 at 7pm at The Collett School

MINUTES

Meeting Attendance 2024/25							
Name	Governor Category	23 Sept	25 Nov	20 Jan	17 Mar	22 May	30 Jun
Chris Constant	Co-opted governor	P	P	N	A	P	
Ian Dignum	Partnership governor	P	P	A	A	P	
Julie Foster	Co-opted governor	P	P	P	P	P	
Nick Griffith	Co-opted governor	P	P	P	P	P	
Helen Harrison	Co-opted governor	P	P	A	P	P	
Stephen Hoult-Allen	Executive head	P	P	P	P	P	
Joshua Jayson	Associate member	A	A	A	A	A	
Gemma Luke	Parent governor	P	P	P	P	A	
Ola Molade	Co-opted governor			P	P	A	
Edward O'Loughlin	Co-opted governor		P	P	A	P	
Chris Parsons	Partnership governor	A	P	N	A	N	
Christina Self	Staff governor	P	A	P	A	P	
Kirsty Turner	Parent governor		P	P	P	P	
In attendance							
Jamie Caple	Head of school: St Luke's	P	P	P	P	P	
Jenny Witter	Head of school: Collett	P	P	P	P	P	
Manda Sides	Head of Operations	P	P	P	P	P	
Philip McBeth	DSL	P		P		P	
Tracey Norris	Clerk, HLF Education	P	P	P	P	P	

P	Present
A	Apologies provided
N	Not present

	Item	Action
1.	Welcome and apologies Ian Dignum welcomed all to the meeting, he apologised for his prolonged absence and thanked those governors who had been covering his role and responsibilities during this time. Apologies for absence had been received in advance of the meeting from Gemma Luke and Ola Molade. Chris Parsons was not present. Joshua Jayson was not required to attend FGB meetings in his capacity as associate member. The meeting was quorate with 9 governors present.	
2.	Declarations of conflicts of interest for this agenda None raised. Longstanding declarations were noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SHA's partner was currently the chair of trustees of the Blue Tangerine charity. JF was a non-executive director at Frays Academy Trust. 	
3.	Minutes and actions arising The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2025 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.	

	<p>Actions arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. ID/SHA to meet with CS and discuss role of EDI link governor: c/f to next meeting. b. NG to chase training team for response to complaint re in-house training on risk management: email sent, no response. NG to chase. c. JC to upload St Luke’s staff survey results data: completed. d. Governors to complete financial skills matrix and return to CP/NG: completed. e. EOL to complete St Luke’s H&S visit: completed, see visit report. f. ID to complete Collett H&S visit until such time as a link governor for The Collett had been appointed: c/f to June. g. Donna to advertise co-opted governor vacancy (to fill LA post) on all platforms: completed, no response to date. DA to advertise governor vacancy on Federation website. h. School to check fire insurance policy prior to using straw bales for fundraising event in January 2026: completed. Straw bales would not be used. i. NG to complete SFSV submission – sharing on GH in advance: completed. 	<p>ID/SHA</p> <p>NG</p> <p>ID</p> <p>Donna Able</p>
4.	<p>Any other business</p> <p>St Luke’s staff survey results.</p>	
5.	<p>Safeguarding, attendance and behaviour</p> <p>The following documents had been circulated in advance of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safeguarding report for governors - Spring 2 ▪ Safeguarding link governor visit report: 13 May 2025 <p>Questions and comments were invited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The safeguarding link governor was unable to attend the meeting but had met with the DSL on 13 May – see visit report, the focus of this meeting had been on the schools’ contextual safeguarding concerns (NB online safety) and the actions being taken to address those concerns. ▪ Q What did IFST refer to? Ans: Intensive Family Support Team. ▪ Q What did Operation Encompass refer to? Ans: Domestic abuse notification from the police were shared with schools and other organisations via Operation Encompass notifications. ▪ Q How timely were these notifications? Ans: Not as quick as required. For example, there had been an incident at a pupils’ family home on a Saturday and school had not been informed until the Tuesday. ▪ Q How could school escalate these concerns? Ans: PMB was in contact with DASU (Domestic abuse specialist unit). Governors were aware that in other borough’s domestic abuse notifications were sent through to schools via text message within a matter of hours. ▪ Q: Wellbeing of DSL? Ans: The DSL role was emotionally draining but there was good support within DSL team. ▪ Q What was the hierarchy of support from social services? Ans: Pupils were placed on a tiered level support depending on need, this was always meant to be temporary and movement between levels was quite fluid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TAF (team around the family): low level intervention from Families First Team. ○ CIN (Child in Need) assessment by social worker, parental consent required. ○ CP: Child protection plan): multi-disciplinary input from professionals. Category of need could be sexual harm, physical harm. emotional harm or neglect. ▪ Staff survey results said 100% of staff agreed that pupils were safe at school but there were comments about pupils “going missing” Q What did this refer to? Ans: PMB reassured governors that at no point has a pupil “gone missing”. ▪ Action: PMB/JC to review the comments in the staff survey. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q What protocols were in place for staff to make home visits, was this always done in twos? <p>Ans: Clear processes were in place for this. Notification was always given, staff always informed others where they were going, some visits were made by a single member of staff some visits were undertaken by two members of staff; it depended on the risk assessment. JW noted the many occasions where solo visits to family homes were made eg by social workers, nursery transition visits/Y6-Y7 transition visits.</p> <p>(PMB left the meeting)</p>	PMB/JC
6.	<p>Chair's Update</p> <p>ID shared the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> He thanked NG for covering the chair's role at recent meetings. As previously notified, ID would be stepping down at the end of the summer term as chair and as a governor. The appointment of the new chair would be made at the next meeting. ID was available to discuss the chair's role and what it entailed; he would ensure the new chair had a well-planned handover. A staff governor could not take on the chair's role. A future chair did not need to have experience or a background in finance; the school was well led by the operations director and the F&R committee. ID recommended the effective chair's training offered by HFL and noted that in addition to support from the clerk, the HFL governance team were always available to support chairs on any matter. 	
7.	<p>Federation-wide strategic matters</p> <p>The following documents had been circulated in advance of the meeting and were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EHT report to governors Risk register Collett School: expansion plans <p>a. <u>Executive headteacher's report:</u> questions and comments were invited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governors noted the great success of TA recruitment at St Luke's; there were now only 7 vacancies. Q What had been done differently to improve this situation? Ans: There had been an increase in applications to TA vacancies at St Luke's and there had been a good conversion rate of agency staff to permanent staff. Q What was the rationale behind a 50-year strategy for the federation, when would this be shared with governors? Ans: The long-term approach to strategy was intentional; the first iteration had been shared with the school's effectiveness adviser. Action: Agenda item at next FGB meeting: review of draft 50-year strategy. Governors noted the wide-ranging community engagement at both schools. <p>b. <u>Risk Register:</u> the top three risks were unchanged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collett Satellite: Risk level maintained at 25 – consultation completed. Funding for increased needs: Risk maintained at 25. Additional pupils: Risk maintained at 25. New risk: capacity survey by HCC. Staff Recruitment: Risk reduced to 20. Q Did the DfE/HCC capacity surveys include the new satellite provision? Ans: No. Q Was it likely that pupil numbers at St Luke's would increase following the capacity survey? Ans: Unknown. Meetings had been arranged at both schools; there was a discrepancy between what the capacity survey recommended on paper and what the reality in each school was. The capacity survey had been based on a complex formula involving net square footage area. 	SHA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC had prepared a presentation to share with capacity survey team which highlighted the errors in this formula and the need to consider context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collett School DfE and HCC capacity survey range: 69-80 pupils (pupils on roll: 128). St Luke’s school: DfE and HCC capacity survey range: 178-233 (pupils on roll: 182). Q How did HCC’s recommended class size for LD/SLD pupils fit into this? Ans: The recommended staffing ratio of 8:1 related to the number of staff in a room rather than the size of the room itself. Q Did the number of pupils in wheelchairs impact the survey? Ans: No. Both schools have been classified as “ambulant” as less than 10% of cohort are in wheelchairs. Q Who would be responsible if there were an accident and the cause was over capacity at Collett, fire evacuation for example? Ans: This line of enquiry would be explored during the meeting. <p>c. <u>Collett expansion</u>: see separate paper circulated in advance of the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The expansion had been delayed, and a staggered opening had been suggested by HCC, this would need to be carefully considered by SLT prior to agreement. Teaching staff had already been recruited for the new building – joining in September. HCC had agreed to fund these salaries. Recruitment for support posts (TAs and admin/site staff etc) had been delayed until there was more certainty on when the building would be ready. Q Would recruitment be challenging? Ans: Hopefully not, job adverts at The Collett always attracted high numbers of applicants. Q How confident were SLT that HCC would honour the commitment to cover the cost of teaching staff from September? Ans: Reasonably confident. The school was keen to expand and support SEN provision in Hertfordshire but would walk away if HCC was not prepared to fund the expansion fairly. <p>d. <u>School Development Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See update in Executive Headteacher’s report. ID asked all governors to read the SDP in full and refer to their link section in the SDP prior to making a school visit. Their visit should focus on seeing that element of the SDP in action. SEA visit: Monday 30 June – governors were invited to attend. 	
8.	<p>School Budget: Collett</p> <p>The F&R committee had met on 24 April and 13 May to review the year end monitor (P12) for 2024/25 and to consider which budget scenario should be selected for 2025/26. See minutes from both meetings for more information. The following documents had been circulated in advance of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year-end monitor 2024/25 Proposed budget 2025/26 Proposed budget 2025/26 operations director’s update 	
8.a	<p>Collett Year-End</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The year end carry forward figure was £641,290. This was above the figure originally predicted due to an accounting error by HFL financial services team. The in-year deficit was noted as: £9,283. The final outturn was within £10,000 of the original budget as set in May 2024 if the accounting error was disregarded (£130,887). Governors noted how impressive this achievement was given the constant changes in income/expenditure. 	
8.b	<p>Collett: Proposed budget 2025/26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different budget scenarios had been considered by the F&R committee. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See report papers for summary of budget drivers. The budget had been complicated by the need to account for the expansion of the satellite building without knowing what the actual occupancy costs would be or when it would be open. Predicted in-year deficit: £204,627 Projected year-end carry forward (as of 31 March 2026): Positive £436,663 <p>Governors APPROVED the proposed budget for 2025/26.</p>	
9.	<p>School Budget: St Luke’s</p> <p>The F&R committee had met on 24 April and 13 May to review the year end monitor (P12) for 2024/25 and to consider which budget scenario should be selected for 2025/26. See minutes from both meetings for more information. The following documents had been circulated in advance of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year-end monitor 2024/25 Proposed budget 2025/26 Proposed budget 2025/26 operations director’s update 	
9.a	<p>St Luke’s Year-End</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The year end carry forward figure was £154,326 of which £12,463 was a ring fenced carry forward for sports premium leaving, £141,863 as pure revenue. The in-year deficit was noted as: £231,401. The final outturn was within £14,000 of the original budget as set in May 2024. The anticipated payment of £321,000 from HCC as promised by Hero Slinn had not been paid, the new enhanced top-ups were meant to cover this differential - which they did not. 	
9.b	<p>St Luke’s: Proposed budget 2025/26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different budget scenarios had been considered by the F&R committee. See report papers for summary of budget drivers. Predicted in-year deficit: £344,536 Projected year-end carry forward (as of 31 March 2026): Negative £190,210. It was noted that Sports Premium would be withdrawn in 2027 and the DfE had no plans to replace this grant, which was a legacy from the 2012 Olympics c£16,000 pa. Governors were aware that HCC had been notified that the school would be submitting a deficit budget, to date there had been no response. Q Was it possible to make changes to the class/staffing structure to reduce costs? Ans: No. There were already 9.2 pupils per class and all benchmarking ratios showed that staffing costs were within acceptable range. Three financial reviews had been commissioned by HCC in recent years; there were no further cuts that could be made; the school was underfunded for its size and make up of pupils. Capital projects planned for 2025/26 related to essential R&M only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essential IT upgrades Air conditioning in 5 classrooms. Replacement flooring. <p>Governors APPROVED the proposed budget for 2025/26.</p>	
10.	<p>Policies for approval</p> <p>There were no policies due for review at this time.</p>	
11.	<p>F&R Committee update</p> <p>NG referred to the minutes of the F&R committee meeting held on 24 April and 13 May 2025 and highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The last two meetings had been focused on budget planning. MS was thanked for her work in this regard, preparing a number of fully costed budget scenarios for each school. A capital bid at The Collett was progressing; cladding, roofing, drainage. There was no update on the capital bid at St Luke’s. There had been a reduction in the number of notifiable incidents at both schools. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The H&S inspection visit at St Luke’s had been undertaken; there were not issues to raise. 	
12.	<p>Governor Impact</p> <p>a. <u>Governor visits</u>: The following visits had been made since the last meeting, see visit reports on Governor Hub (Action: Governors to write up visit report following each school visit):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA visit: Helen Harrison & Kirsty Turner H&S inspection visit: Edward O’Laughlin Safeguarding: Gemma Luke Finance: Nick Griffith <p>b. <u>Governor training</u>: The following training had been undertaken since the last FGB meeting, ID reminded governors of the expectation to commit to one training module per term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safeguarding Children: Edward O’Laughlin - 18 March 2025 Exclusions: Kirsty Turner – 18 April 2025 Disciplinary hearings: Kirsty Turner – 21 May 2025 Action: NG to recommend the best Modern Governor finance training modules to be undertaken <p>c. <u>Governor vacancies</u>: There was currently a LA governor vacancy.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>NG</p>
13.	<p>Any other business</p> <p><u>St Luke’s staff survey results</u>: the results of the St Luke’s staff survey had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many of the metrics were strong: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am proud to be a member of staff at this school: 94% agree or strongly agree Pupils are safe at this school: 100% agree or strongly agree Leaders support staff well in managing behaviour: 91% agree or strongly agree The school deals with any cases of bullying of pupils effectively: 87% agree or strongly agree The question relating to governors was the least well supported answer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governors make a positive contribution to the school: 38% agree or strongly agree, 65% neither agreed nor disagreed. Q Could governors do more to raise their profile with staff? Ans: This matter had been raised in 2024/25 and governors had launched a series of governor coffee mornings with staff which had not been well attended and had been mostly used to raise grievances about terms and conditions or pay. The following was agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLT to provide an update in the staff briefing on the main items of discussion at each FGB meeting – text to be provided by chair/clerk. Governors to attend staff INSET day training to give 10 min presentation on what the roles and responsibilities of the FGB were and what good governance should look like. 	
14.	New risks identified during the meeting: None.	
15.	<p>Items for further discussion</p> <p>There were no new items for further discussion. The high profile of SEN within the local council was noted; SEN was its number two priority.</p>	
16.	<p>Meeting dates for 2024/25</p> <p><u>FGB meetings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting 1: Monday 23 September Meeting 2: Monday 25 November Meeting 3: Monday 20 January Meeting 4: Monday 17 March Meeting 5: Thursday 22 May Meeting 6: Thursday 3 July **NEW DATE** 	

“Our Vision is a world where people with learning disabilities thrive”

	<p><u>Finance & Resources Committee meetings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting 1: Wednesday 23 October ▪ Meeting 2: Tuesday 10 December ▪ Meeting 3: Monday 24 February ▪ Meeting 4: Thursday 24 April ▪ Meeting 5: Tuesday 13 May ▪ Meeting 6: Monday 7 July 	
--	---	--

Actions Agreed			
	Action	Who	Status
1	ID/SHA to meet with CS and discuss role of EDI link governor	ID/SHA	
2	NG to chase training team for response to complaint re in-house training on risk management	NG	
3	ID to complete Collett H&S visit	ID	
4	DA to advertise governor vacancy on Federation website.	Donna Able	
5	PMB/JC to review the comments in the St Luke’s staff survey about pupils “going missing”	PMB/JC	
6	Agenda item at next FGB meeting: review of draft 50-year strategy.	Clerk/SHA	
7	Governors to write up visit report following each school visit and link each visit to an area of the SDP	All	
8	NG to recommend the best Modern Governor finance training modules to be undertaken.	NG	
9	Governors to attend staff INSET day in September to give 10min overview of governance/ role of FGB	All available	