Hove Learning Federation
Full Governing Body Meeting
Tuesday 11 June 2026 at 6.00pm
Portland Road

WEST HOVE INFANT SCHOOL
A family of friends

HOVE JUNIOR SCHOOL
LEARN

Name	Type of Governor	Present	Apologies
Madeleine Southern	Headteacher	Yes	
Katie Kershaw (Chair)	Co-Opted	Yes	
Louise Wilkinson (Vice Chair)	Co-Opted	Yes	
Marcel Amour	Co-Opted	Yes	
David Karp	Co-Opted	No	Yes
Sarra Lee	Parent	Yes	
Lorna Cummings	Co-Opted	Yes	
Oyinkolade Akinleye	Co-Opted	Yes	
Lisa Marshall	Co-Opted	Yes	
Caroline Kemp-Harris	Staff	Yes	
Tom Edwards	LA	Yes	
Amir Khodavirdipour	Parent	Yes	
Maria Puertas	Co-Opted	Yes	
Celia Normington	Co-Opted	Yes	
Abby Hedger-Jones	Associate	Yes	
Sam Ledger	Head of School	No	
Niamh O’Shea	Head of School	No	
Rachel Jeffers	Head of School	No	
Sarah Shaw	School Business Manager	No	
Tom Way	Clerk	No	

Quorum: 13 out of 14 governors were present. The meeting was quorate (at least 50% attending).

Questions from the governors are highlighted in **bold**.

---

1. Introduction

Welcome

KK welcomed all to the meeting.

Apologies

Governors noted apologies from DK.

Notification of any urgent business

Brunswick Primary School collaboration. See item 3.

Declarations of Interest

N/A

2. Minutes of FGB meeting held on 24.03.26

Approval

All governors confirmed their approval of the minutes.

Matters arising

N/A

Progress on actions

The following actions have been met:

Item/Action	**By**	**Person responsible**
5.1 MS to agree Ofsted training date with Dave Cole for the summer term 2026 with FGB	**Summer FGB**	**MS**
5.2 MS to share the BP collaboration action plan and summary with governors	**Summer FGB**	**MS**
7.1 TW to circulate details of the NGA finance training to all governors	**Summer FGB**	**TW**

There are no outstanding actions.

3. Brunswick Primary School (BPS) collaboration and shared leadership

Following the EFGB on 19 May 2026, a proposal was submitted to the Local Authority outlining the support HLF needs to continue the shared leadership arrangement with Brunswick Primary School for a further two years and to continue to explore collaboration. The proposal was developed by the SLT and set out the financial and strategic support required (see paper on GVO).

The LA response was received 10 June 2026 and circulated to the board by email.

MS and LC provided a summary of the response and key implications for the board. The board discussed the response and whether a vote could be taken based on the information received.

It was noted that the proposed structure is not designed to be implemented by September 2026 but instead provides a long-term framework with progress towards it over time.

MS & LC led a discussion on the proposal.

Questions from governors:

Q: Referring to our proposal to the LA, are items in red what is required for us to be able to support BPS or would they be needed regardless?

A: If the shared leadership and collaboration go ahead, these are the measures we would need to put in place. They are also areas we need to strengthen at HLF because of rising SEND need and increasing funding pressures. We are managing very challenging behaviour linked to increasingly complex needs. While we have previously had the capacity to do this, the combination of a reduced SLT, greater levels of need and the additional demands created by SLT time at BPS now makes this much harder to manage. We worked with our SPA to ensure this continues to support our school improvement plans for HLF.

MS: The LA has been very responsive and has discussed the proposal with us. They have committed to providing us with this support. This includes increase SPA time (2 days more per term = 12 days instead of 6)

Q: Is this as well as the SPA time BPS get?

A: No, it is the total number of days for both. It is 12 days SPA support in total to be used across the Federation/Collaboration as needed. It does not include coaching support for SLT or Headteacher appraisal If you take out the extra coaching we have from the SPA, this basic support is substantive. We can spend these days as we want to across the organisation (BPS, HLF) and phases (EYFS, KS1/KS2). Coaching will be continued and is really valued by our SLT.

LA has committed to the ongoing Oak Room SEND provision at BPS which receives £30K funding pa. The LA has encouraged us to bid for similar funding for WHIS and HJS which we are keen to do. Likely we would be successful for at least one as this is what all schools are expected to be doing in the next 2-3 years as part of running their SEND provision, as per the White Paper. They will support us in developing the bids.

The space for provision will need some building work to achieve it. We have the Virtual inclusion lead from the LA coming in to look at the environment for us at HLF to work towards the bid.

SEND

Q: What is IIS?

A: Inclusive Intervention Space is specialised environments designed to support students with SEND. At BPS they have a specialist teacher and classroom for pupils in the morning. They then go into class in the afternoon. Criteria for IIS is tight because it is expected to be high quality.

Q: Does the £30K cover the staff?

A: Yes. It is for the running of the provision; there is a separate budget for setting up the environment. The £30k is received each year.

Q: Do we have to do this anyway, even if we were not collaborating with BPS?

A: Yes, we are already looking at this in HLF but if both HLF and BPS had this provision it would make it easier to manage SEND across the whole group. Oak Room is very strong provision so we can learn from them.

Q: Does BPS have more space for provision than HLF?

A: Yes, they have more internal and external space.

Q: Could this be used for other pupils, e.g., from HLF?

A: Yes, they could in the future. When the current Y6 leaves this will create additional space. We could use it as a provision for pupils who need it from any of our sites. Future goal might be to specialise different provisions in the federation in different locations. This would only be open to BPS-HLF pupils.

Q: Could we apply for one £30K for each school but just use one location?

A: Yes, potentially. Down the line it would open up flexibility if we could use one place for provision if that was the most effective way of doing it.

TLR expenses (Teaching and Learning Responsibility payment):

LA has proposed an additional £10K for TLR expenses to help with the collaboration. This would be for one year. This has been very useful to date has it has allowed an experienced year leader to work with BPS.

Q: Is this a sufficient/meaningful amount?

A: it would make a significant difference. We could not do it without this. It pays for the uplift in TLR and backfill in the classroom at HLF.

Q: Is it at the lower end of the TLR3 range?

A: Yes

Q: Are you comfortable that this amount covers it?

A: Yes, it is what we have invoiced them this year

Q: Does the £30K contingency funding come far enough to cover all our costs in regards to the collaboration?

Not enough to cover all costs but it is as much as the LA can commit to. This will increase capacity at BPS but it will take some time to work through how we manage leadership at HLF. HLF is experiencing an unusually high level of complex needs, which will make this challenging. We need to review our model and think creatively about what will work. This will require careful planning and cannot be put in place by September due to recruitment timescales.

Currently we have Heads of Schools and Year Leaders managing these high needs and challenging behaviours, but we need a Head of Safeguarding and Behaviour to enable us to deliver what is needed. This funding will help, but we need to work through what it will look like over next 1-3 years.

Q: If BPS got a good Ofsted result, would this funding and support from the LA stop?

A: No, the LA recognises that there needs to be an ongoing transition so it would not result in anything being pulled.

Q: Are we seeing a higher level of need at HLF or is it a national picture?

A: It is a national, but it is particularly high in B&H. At HR we are expecting 18 pupils with SEND in YR September 16 with complex needs, including some non-verbal or with high medical needs. In the past, these pupils may not have gone to mainstream schools, but now all schools are expected to be able to accommodate their needs. This changes how you manage classes and requires more specialist and tailed spaces with suitable resources etc.

Initial Teacher Training (ITT)

We already take lots of teacher students, and we benefit from having them. LA will support us to explore becoming an ITT training provision. There are none currently in Brighton. Would be an extra workload but it comes with funding and income. We would also benefit from training up our own staff. Needs more research to see if viable but can be good for larger organisations or MATS.

Q: Is this something that collaboration with BPS enables?

A: We could use space at BPS.

Q: Does the income stream offset the cost of ITT?

A: Yes, income would offset costs.

Q: Could we just rent room from BPS if we were not collaborating with them?

A: Possibly but would need proper research

BPS budget

The LA response confirms that they will continue to support BPS licenced deficit. MS advised that the LA recognises that HLF board would not want to federate with a school in deficit and understands the reasons for this.

LA response confirms that they are committed to exploring further funding opportunities arising through the White Paper. They do not know what this might be yet and need to work with the DFE on future funding.

LC noted that our proposal was written to directly align with the LA's focus on City Child, the White Paper, Experts at Hand and Family Hubs, creating a coherent direction of travel. MS noted that the LA is now clear about their direction.

Q: Could this change with local elections in May 2027

A: The direction of travel is as per the White Paper which is nationally driven so unlikely to change as result of local changes to council.

Q: Was there any discussion about how the LA will manage its relationship with Schools Forum? It is an influential group, so what do they think its view of this arrangement between BPS and HLF would be?

A: Funding support for this collaboration and school improvement comes from the School Improvement Funding and the LA's contingency fund, which is not part of the Schools Form. Anything further funding may have to go through them but would be a BPS request not HLF.

Q: Re LA comments about licence deficit. Are they talking about BPS or both BPS and HLF?

A: Both

Q: Our donor made their contribution to remove our deficit, not to support another school. Whilst there were no conditions associated with the donation the board feels a moral duty to ensure that distinction clear. Is it?

A: Yes, we are using this opportunity to do more for our SEND provision and the BPS collaboration will help us to this and will help children in our schools.

Q: In the past the LA has given us funds which have then been withdrawn. What assurances have they given us on this?

A: We would need to build this proposal into a signed MOU so that there is firm commitment. Having to pay back what we were given at the start of the academic has impacted on what we could do this year. This was a unique situation and would not expect this to happen again.

Q: Does the Schools Forum understand the situation BPS is in?

A: Yes, they see finances and will know staff changes.

Q: Would other schools have wanted to opportunity to do this with BPS?

A: BPS has previously worked with other schools, but the proximity of HR is huge factor in this. It is much easier and more feasible when located close together. HLF is also in a particularly strong position to help.

Q: Could we do this with another school next year, or in future?

A: Yes possibly, this may work in line with White Paper expectations for local MATs.

The board discussed whether there was a need to respond to the LA with further requests or clarifications but felt that this was a strong response and was not warranted. Some caveats should be added such as strengthening the support in our bids for IIS, as having this funding would have an especially big impact, and clarification required around support for the licenced deficit. The LA response includes:

"A commitment to continue to support the licensed deficit while it remains within the agreed parameters. This could include a further increase in the debt to cover short term expenses to build this model."

MS to explore this with LA to understand the exact meaning.

The Board agreed that an addendum to the existing MOU to cover this response from the LA would be an appropriate next step.

Q: What is the SLT view on the LA response?

The SLT shared their view that this will be a hard journey, but we have a strong team in place. We need to create additional capacity considering what we know is coming for SEND provision and the commitments from the LA are essential for delivery.

Q: Does this meet all the requirements in our proposal?

A: Not everything we asked for but the additional SPA and coaching time is particularly valuable for SLT and supports professional development.

Board agreed to return to vote on BPS collaboration once finance discussions are complete. See item 4.

BPS Collaboration discussion continued (post item 4):

Q: How does the continued BPS collaboration impact the two governing boards?

A: We would need to strengthen the collaboration between the boards but there would still need to be two separate boards. There is currently no plan to integrate committees, for example, but this could be explored, as well as other opportunities to work together more efficiently across the organsiation.

Q: If we attract more students this is good news for our income, but do we know where are they coming from? Is it BPS?

A: LA has said they would do some analysis on where pupils are coming from, but this has not been received yet. We think some will come from the BPS pool, so there is limited opportunity to increase numbers. There is still a risk that what we do could increase BPS numbers at HLF expense. However, numbers this year look very good (60 HR, 120 at SR) and appear to be stable in the coming years. This year, Middle Street pupils are coming into all year groups at HR increasing our numbers.

Vote:

Governors are asked to vote on the development of the existing collaboration between Hove Learning Federation and Brunswick Primary School in the following ways:

1. To approve the extension of the current Memorandum of Understanding for a further two academic years, from September 2026 to September 2028.
2. To approve the continuation of the Executive Headteacher arrangement across Brunswick Primary School and Hove Learning Federation for the duration of this period.
3. To agree a commitment to commence a due diligence process, with a view to exploring options for a more formalised partnership in the future, which may include federation

Results:

YES	12
No	1

Governors noted that this is dependent on a signed MOU with the LA containing their commitments as per their communication on 10 June 2026. Governors discussed that for reasons including current financial challenges, the White Paper and community views, a soft federation is the most appropriate model to pursue.

4. Finance

Update/current outturn

[Advance discussion on GVO]:

Q: Re the 10% increase in wraparound prices - did we see any demand drop off as a result and/or what was parent sentiment - any challenges around affordability?

MS: We haven't seen any drop off in demand and bookings/enquiries for September are already looking positive. We actually have had to increase staffing numbers on Wednesdays and Thursdays as these are our busiest days and we were having to turn down bookings. Just under 40% of parents use child care vouchers to pay for wraparound care so I don't think affordability is a key factor.

Q: Regarding Breakfast/After School club rate increases - a 40% increase over the plan period feels significant. Has any risk in falling numbers due to affordability/value for money been built in? Have parents been asked how satisfied they are with the clubs? Also, what actions are driving the staff turnover efficiency saving of 0.25%. Have we seen these levels in recent years?

MS: 10% increase year on year might seem significant but we have to treat our wraparound provision as a business and we need to account for increasing staffing costs, resources and rising energy costs. If we do not increase our prices, it is likely our income will reduce. With regard to parent satisfaction, I have not heard any negative feedback but it would be good to include this question in the next parent survey.

Staff turnover is often recommended for larger schools with a staff headcount of more than 100 (which includes us). In year 2, we will be spending £6.7m on staffing and by year 5, we will be spending £7.4m. The 0.25% turnover represents a very small amount of saving when compared against the total staffing expenditure. Staffing movement varies from year to year, with some years having more turnover than others.

[Advance discussion on GVO end]

Note budget approved at F&L 14.05.26, however, since then a budget input error regarding insurance has been identified following the Holland Road flood.

The school submitted a claim for £56,879 following the flooding at Holland Road in the Autumn term 2025. The reimbursement was due to be paid in May 26, and a budget was set of this amount as income in the new 25/26 budget plan.

Schools Finance had already accounted for this income as part of the closedown process in April and accrued (carried over) this as outstanding income.

This means the budget currently assumes that we will be receiving more income than we actually will.

What we're doing about it

The approved budget included an extra £35k in the buildings budget, ring-fenced specifically for some further outstanding invoices related to the flood. Therefore, we can reduce the buildings budget by £35k and reduce the insurance income figure by £35k. This brings the error down from -£56k overstated to -£21k overstated.

The changes need formal approval by governors (called a "virement" – a transfer of funds from one part of a budget to another).

Q: Have we decided how to save £21K. Do we have to tell LA how we will do this?

A: Budget remains tight and we can use money saved from the building budget to offset this.

The changes need formal approval by governors (called a "virement" – a transfer of funds from one part of a budget to another) and this needs to be recorded at the FGB meeting. The board voted to approve the virement.

5. Governance

Appointments

AHJ term extension as Associate Member was extended for one year.

Strategic Priorities

Away Day:

- The board agreed that the July away day would be used to review governor strategic priorities. MS and LC will share the school priorities, which are currently in development.
- Vice Chair will share the annual governor survey next week for completion before the away day so that the results can be shared and explored with the board.
- A calendar for the year, along with an outline of roles and responsibilities any gaps, will be prepared and shared for the away day.
- Dave Cole, SPA, will be providing some updated Ofsted training for governors.

It was also noted that a governance framework will be needed for the collaboration with BPS, including working parties and alignment between the two governing boards and their committees.

6. Headteacher's update

WHIS/HJS Head's Report

[Advance discussion on GVO]:

KK: Great to see the writing subject review and the increased engagement this is having - thank you to all involved. Thank you for the detail on the Junior Behaviour report - it is good to see the levels decreasing but clear to see the challenge presented and the level of input, work and support needed here. It is good for governors to be able to see this level of detail and we thank you not only for pulling it together but for the work you are doing to support all of those involved. I note the not categorised number of bullying instances and that you call out the need to dig into this further. Thank you for flagging. ON LAC safeguarding - thank you for the update and for the details on merging the two SCRs. Appreciate this is a significant volume of work but good to see this will reduce duplication and that you also considered risk management during the transition. Please let us know as Governors if there is anything further you need us to discuss/do on the DBS check review of 3-year renewals. Thank you for the comprehensive mental health report - lots of great work going on and we appreciate the workloads in this. Fantastic to see the highest levels of engagement in the

Bounce Together surveys and nice to hear about the Voice boxes - hopefully the engagement levels for both continue. Thank you for the data analysis and noted on the attainment figures. I will review the C&I minutes as assume this is something discussed there too

Q: Regarding HLF Junior Behaviour Report - while all incidents obviously need to be addressed at an individual level, if we're looking at it from a macro level or in terms of trends it's hard to put these figures in context - are there any benchmarking or LA data that would help to frame it for governors?

MS: Individual schools do not share their behavioural incidents and may have different reporting systems. We can benchmark across the sites.

Q: This is a very thorough and informative report, with clear strengths in how leaders understand and reflect on the school's provision. The belonging survey highlights a lower sense of belonging for SEND, disadvantaged and some ethnic groups. Could you share the key actions taken in response and how these are supporting those pupils?

MS: There is a belonging action plan that has been put in place and it will be a whole school priority in September.

Q: Thank you [for the Holland Road SPA report], hugely interesting. Having read the bit about 'psychological safety' does PoET embrace this approach explicitly - which I assume aligns with the concept of being a psychologically informed organisation? How are we working to create this environment?

NO'S: The section on Psychological Safety and Trust is directly linked to the culture we are trying to build. One in which people feel safe, open to reflection and willing to be part of learning walks. This will build from positive experiences of year / phase and senior leaders being in classrooms and noticing both successes and areas for potential discussion, with the feedback discussion a joint effort to find strategies for excellence. Coaches and coachees coming up with the 'how' together. This approach involves both the coach and the coachee understanding their responsibilities within our professional growth approach. Within this, we are also supporting our year and phase leads in how to open feedback conversations, encourage self-reflection, garner belief that change can be achieved and the potential reactions they may face. By practising feedback conversations and sharing their experiences, leaders can create a support structure for both them and the teachers in their teams. Our aim is that no member of staff feels negative, overwhelmed or unsupported. We want to create a culture where all parties believe in high aspirations and development.

[Advance discussion on GVO end]

MS confirmed that the Head's reports and Spring Term SPA Reports had been circulated in advance. There were no further questions on the Head's reports.

SPA Report:

Used SPA time to talk through professional development of staff, developing learning walks and scripts etc. In next C&I meeting MS will include more information about monitoring, appraisal and coaching developments.

Key focus was "Principles of Expert Teaching" (PoETs): Executive SLT has taken on board a lot of feedback from staff on this and taken time to list to year leaders and teachers to make sure it works well.

Feedback from Staff Governor was that the reflection from SLT has supported staff. Focusing on one principle per term is good and has been very successful in helping to embed it into daily practices.

Next steps are to build on what we've done so far. This is challenging because of the stretch with BPS, but this has gone up another level. The embedded culture and wide range of experience at HLF supports this.

DC felt that we have moved on again in the Curriculum and Teaching area since our Outstanding Ofsted results, which is very positive.

7. Governor Strategic Direction

Brunswick Primary Working Party Updates

Strategy meeting took place today with BPS SLT. CC (Y6 lead) attended and talked through work undertaken. MS to share minutes with Chair. Next governor collaboration meeting date to be confirmed (currently 15 July TBC). Group to consider inviting the LA to this meeting to finalise the MOU.

The board needs to consider which governors will work on the collaboration group from September following LM and LW departure.

8. Committee Updates

Safeguarding committee feedback

A joint Safeguarding and SEND Monitoring meeting took place on 8 June, notes will be circulated once final. OA called out key highlights, including a review of Singe Central Record, DBS renewal cycle and pupil voice meeting with Years 4 and 6.

SG committee is looking for a new governor to join SG committee next year.

Finance & Leadership committee

Refer to discussion regarding the virement in item 4.

There was also some discussion about staff wellbeing and workload pressures, which were reflected in the heads' report.

Curriculum & Inclusion committee

[Advance discussion on GVO]:

LM: Not being a member of this committee - it is so helpful to have such thorough minutes which allow me to have a better understanding of the curriculum work. So great to hear about the increased parental engagement in the parent sessions - and that we are running sessions on behaviour. Thank you to all staff involved in those sessions. I can see how hugely beneficial they would be for parents in giving them extra tools - and also for children if they see that consistency of approach between home and school.

KK: Agreed with LM - these are so beneficial for those not attending this committee. Thank you to all for the comprehensive make up of them. I was pleased to hear about the engagement increases and the astounding amount of work that has gone into Mastering number. This really is exceptional. Thanks for flagging the English link role and this is something we need to ensure happens asap.

[Advance discussion on GVO end]

The committee update was covered at the previous FGB. Three monitoring visits took place this term, focusing on pupil voice, maths, and English, including reading for pleasure.

Governors noted clear consistency across sites. Although pupil groups differed in ability and need, these differences were being managed consistently, with routines and expectations embedded across all sites. This was described as impressive.

Maths fluency was highlighted as a particular strength.

9. Equalities

Anti-Racism update

[Advance discussion on GVO]:

KK: Thank you so much for all the ongoing work on this - this truly is so valuable to everyone in the school and I know governors are very appreciative of the high level of commitment and engagement here. The initiatives taken on and delivered really stretch the boundaries for inclusion and we are so thankful for having staff who are so passionate about bringing so many of these things to our children and their families in such a creative way.

[Advance discussion on GVO end]

See slides in GVO for latest update. Activity continues to be embedded in daily routines in the classroom and via events and activities. Looking to establish P/C meetings at HR, perhaps inviting established PR/SR attendees to come to the first one to help get it off the ground and make it feel welcoming and to share experiences. Future planning taking place for more school-wide events which complement the school year.

Antiracism Conference is taking place next year and they would like to sell our Bowls of Belonging book and showcase our My Hair, My Heritage project as examples of great practice.

10. Policy Reviews

a) Parents & Carers Code of Conduct

[Advance discussion on GVO]:

Q: Thank you - seems to read well and thank you CKH for great feedback. Wondering whether we have engaged with parents in developing this? If so - this could possibly bring a greater sense of shared ownership or co-design that could strengthen the Code of Conduct - maybe the Parent Working Group? Maybe we have already done this - but communicating it within the COC could be beneficial. Please could you say how this is communicated to parents - is it in the initial onboarding process for new parents/children, are there reminders, etc. Thank you.

MS: This is shared at the start of the year with all P/C and in starter packs for new P/C. Individual classes are re-sent it with personalised message if there have been incidents for example, with a class Whatsapp group.

[Advance discussion on GVO end]

Governors confirmed their approval of this policy.

b) School Complaints

[Advance discussion on GVO]:

MS: This is a model policy agreed with the unions and LA.

Q: I just wanted to ask a question about how we ensure that we maintain a positive, accessible culture around this policy? Although we have few complaints - in my experience the culture is strong - the Senior Clerk to Governors and Office staff are excellent at ensuring this policy is accessible for parents - our Clerk is very professional, open and supportive, we are open to accepting the complaint in any format if people find the form difficult and that staff and governors have worked hard to provide accessible communications throughout. Although really clear, the policy is understandably formal, quite complicated and possible not very accessible to people with little experience/confidence around formal policies and procedures or with English as an additional language. The summary is good - but maybe we could review the formatting and layout and somehow highlight the summary section?

MS: Updated.

Q: Just a thought but is it worth bringing up the two first parts of text around the difference between a complaint and comment and putting the table below that ahead of social media? I think it may read better to set the scene and then provide the table for alternate avenues/what isn't handled by the policy etc.

MS: Updated and edited.

Q: Would it be useful to include how complaints are considered at a macro level – e.g., outline how HLF would identify an uptick in volume or severity and then who/what fora are responsible for oversight? or perhaps this is covered somewhere else?

[Advance discussion on GVO end]

Governors confirmed their approval of this policy.

c) School Grievance

Governors confirmed their approval of this policy.

d) Staff Disciplinary

Governors confirmed their approval of this policy.

11. Governor Monitoring for Summer 2 Term

The following have taken place this term:
Maths
English
Safeguarding
SEND
Health & Safety.

Refer to GVO for reports submitted. Others will be shared ahead of July FGB. There are no other visits planned for Summer 2.

12. AOB

- **'PSHE Brighton',** a local organisation, has written to CKH and other educators in the city, regarding single sex toilet spaces in schools from September. There is no plan to respond. SLT will prepare comms outlining our position so that staff have guidance on how to respond, if asked. SLT and the Governing Board will consider the in-coming legislation to ensure requirements are met.

- Governor newsletter will be issued 12 June which explains the recent and up-coming changes to the board.
- KK has emailed staff re board changes

- **Training:** KK is doing some analysis about gaps in our training as a board and will share back the results. All governors are encouraged to explore training that is available.

Date of next meeting:	7th July 2026, 4.00pm Holland Road
Time closed:	8:00

*** Please see Action Points from this meeting below

Action points from FGB meeting held on 11th June 2026

Item/Action	By	Person responsible
MS to clarify points in LA response regarding support for licence deficit and in our bid for SEND funding.	Next FGB	MS
MS to share BPS strategy minutes with KK	19 June 2026	MS
LW to send governor survey for completion by all governors ahead of away day	19 June 2026	LW

Appendix (see below)

1. FGB Agenda 11.06.26 - final
10. Governor monitoring visit report H&S May 26
10. Monitoring Visit Report - Safeguarding - March 26
2. FGB minutes 24.03.26 DRAFT (final)
3. Governing Board Strategic Priorities - 25-26
4. Final Budget Plans - input error regarding insurance claim
4. Finance Update - amended for FGB
4. Finance Update - F&L Committee May 2026
4. Hove Learning Federation - Final Budget Plans
5. Document links for HJS Head's Report
5. Document Links for WHIS Head's Report
5. HJS Head's Report - Final
5. HR SPA Visit Report Spring Term 2026
5. Spring 2 phonics data 2026.docx
5. SR SPA Visit Report Spring Term 2026
5. WHIS Head's Report - Final
7. C&I minutes 19.03.26 DRAFT (final)
7. F&L minutes 09.03.26 DRAFT (final)
7. SG minutes 05.03.26 DRAFT CONFIDENTIAL (final)
8. Anti-Racist Working Party March 2026 V2
9a. HLF Parent and Carer Code of Conduct - May 2026
9b 1. HLF Amended Complaints Procedure Summer 2026 - Draft
9b. HLF Complaints Procedure Summer 2026 - Draft
9c 1. HLF Amended Grievance Procedure Policy May 26
9c. Grievance Procedure Policy May 26

9d. HLF Disciplinary Procedure Policy April 26