

**SCHOOL ORGANISATION PROPOSALS: PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH ADDITIONAL LEARNING NEEDS (ALN)**

**EMOTIONAL HEALTH AND WELL BEING PROVISION FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY AGED PUPILS**

Appendix 3: Notes of meetings with Governing Bodies and Staff



**Present:** Richard Portas (SOP), Jennie Hughes (ALN), Sarah Pritchard (SOP), Brett Andrewartha (BA), Ceri Tanti (SOP), Louise Flynn (HR), The Court School governors

*Please note: The following is not a transcript but a contemporaneous note of the meeting*

**The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

RP opened the meeting and welcomed governors and outlined details of the proposed changes.

There was a presentation from BA which set out the following:

- What is being proposed?
- Background
- Sufficiency of places
- Distribution of places
- Proposals for The Court School
- Fairwater Primary School site
- St Mellons CiW Primary School site
- Condition Categories
- Suitability
- Proposed SRB accommodation
- Quality and Standards
- Transport Matters – Fairwater Primary School site
- Transport Matters – St Mellons CiW Primary School site
- Benefits of the proposals
- Potential disadvantages and risks
- Alternative options discounted
- Finance
- Human Resources
- What happens next?

### **Questions and responses**

**G - governors will discuss the proposal at the end of the meeting once the local authority officers had left but asked whether any governors had questions to ask of the officers before they left the meeting.**

**G - the consultation document refers to a 'new build' on the Fairwater site, but to redevelopment of the current accommodation on the St Mellons CiW site, which was a concern, as The Court had been promised new, custom-built buildings. The Court already has to work around the constraints of an old building and the need for frequent repairs.**



RP confirmed that although the consultation document refers to taking over the current buildings at the St Mellons CiW site, the building would be demolished and a new build building put in for The Court, as it would not be feasible to convert the existing building; this will be confirmed in the next cabinet report. The business case will need to set out the best option, and the reasons for this, and in this case demolition and re-building would be the best way forward due to the constraints of converting an older building.

**G - hope that the school would get a chance to input on the design as they have a lot of ideas and experience to offer and have made useful developments at the current Court building.**

RP confirmed that the staff and leadership team would be consulted as part of the design process; it gives them the opportunity to think outside the box and come up with new ideas for the spaces. RP cautioned that although it is positive for the school to have the opportunity to be involved in the design the downside is that it can prove time-consuming.

**G - governors would also like to have input.**

RP confirmed that governors had input at other schools however in practice it was usually better to nominate one or two governors to take part in planning meetings.

**G - what is planned for the site at Ty Glas, as there was mention of special school provision potentially moving there.**

RP - a report was discussed at the October Cabinet setting out proposals for Greenhill School to be relocated to Ty Glas site. RP agreed there is a link between the Court and Greenhill and will look to bring together while working through the projects. The proposal for Greenhill School to move to Ty Glas will be out for consultation soon and RP welcomed feedback on this.

**Headteacher - the leadership team are already finding the project resource intensive; don't have lots of additional capacity, as a small school. Would like it to be borne in mind, happy to help as much as possible, but are already spread thin.**

RP - conversations need to take place early on in the process regarding what we can do to support process, as needs senior management input to be successful. Staffing and financial model critical; one of the challenges but also an opportunity.

**Headteacher – question from a governor not on call, why two sites and not one big site?**

RP said that two sites would provide a spread across the city. Also felt that having the full cohort on one site may be hard to manage. Allows for potential to grow in future.

**G - an important factor is preserving what the Court has developed over the years, a nurturing, warm environment that parents trust in. Need a bigger school as high demand but see benefits in having two sites so can keep more nurturing environment rather than go bigger and compromise the provision. Also provides opportunity to reduce travel distances for pupils, particularly for younger ones.**



**G – is there any danger of rivalry between the sites?**

JH - this is why it's beneficial to have the sites under one governing body, rather than as two separate schools.

**Headteacher - support two sites, but feel it is vital to have senior management presence on both sites to ensure ethos of school is consistent and that it behaves and feels like one school, not two.**

**G (teacher at the Court) – recent situation where the Headteacher and Deputy Headteacher were off at same time. Staff worked really well, and school carried on but really felt the absence. Feel that there is a need for assistant head and deputy at both sites, and a psychotherapist on both sites would be helpful.**

**G – some members of staff have mentioned that they would like to invite officers from the Council in to see the spaces currently in use to give a better idea of how the spaces are used throughout the day, pinch points etc. A short visit doesn't give a full flavour and would like officers to spend a day at the school.**

**G - asked for a commitment on thinking regarding class sizes? would like assurances that class sizes are not intended to increase.**

RP - the consultation is on the scope of the school, class sizes not part of it. The size of class spaces would be in accordance with planning guidance. RP wasn't sure of the figure and said he would need to check.

**G - concerned on this point. Six learners per class would be ideal, currently working at 7, 8 per class which would be too much.**

SP confirmed that in initial planning meetings we have been working on basis of 36 learners per site, 6 classes, 6 learners per class. The Headteacher would be happy with this class size, feels very strongly on this issue.

**G - asked about the amount of outside space that will be available for the children; concerned whether there would be sufficient outdoor space, particularly at the St Mellons site. Although there are not a large number of children the outdoor space is vital, and at the current Court building there are outside spaces for each classroom.**

RP- we have to follow building bulletin guidance which sets out the amounts of space needed, including outdoor space.

SP advised that a multi-disciplinary meeting will be held at The Court on 19 January at 3.45pm – 5.45pm, with Senior Leadership Team/staff, Council Officers, the Project Managers (Aecom) & the Architects (HLM) to discuss/manage expectation about the new school buildings. This will be a 2-hour workshop to discuss adjacencies, what spaces work best, planning outdoor areas. SP said that governors would be welcome to attend.



**Schools Programme  
Record of Virtual Meeting  
The Court School Governing Body  
10 November 2021**



**Headteacher - would like to take the opportunity of the changes to rename the school, if possible, the name has negative connotations of being connected to the legal system.**

SP is looking into this.

There were no further questions.

BA - it would be useful if the important points raised today could be covered in the response from the governors to the consultation, e.g., need for small classes, nurturing environment etc.

The Chair thanked officers and governors. Council officers left the meeting to allow the Governors to discuss the consultation further.



**Schools Programme  
Record of Staff Meeting  
The Court Special School  
15 November 2021**



**Present:** Richard Portas (SOP), Michele Duddridge-Friedl (SOP), Brett Andrewartha (SOP), Jennie Hughes (Achievement & Inclusion), Sarah Pritchard (SOP), Anita Batten (HR), Rachel Burgess Willis (SOP)

*Please note: The following is not a transcript but a contemporaneous note of the meeting*

## **The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Michele Duddridge-Friedl (MDF) opened the meeting and welcomed staff.

MDF advised that notes of the meeting were being taken and would form part of the consultation feedback.

BA gave a PowerPoint presentation setting out details of the proposal based upon the contents of the consultation document.

The presentation covered:

- What is being proposed
- Background
- Sufficiency of places
- Distribution of places
- Proposals for The Court School
- Fairwater Primary School site
- St Mellons CiW Primary School site
- Condition categories
- Suitability
- Quality and Standards
- Transport Matters – Fairwater Primary site
- Transport Matters – St Mellons CiW Primary site
- Benefit of the proposal
- Potential disadvantages and risks
- Alternative options discounted
- Finance
- Human Resources
- What happens next?

### **Questions and Answers**

MDF invited questions from staff

The questions asked by staff are set out in *italics* below with the officer response given directly below.



**Q – What will the boundaries be with a new build site?**

A: Subject to Building Bulletin guidance and discussion with schools. Boundaries will be down to size of buildings and needs of school site. Part of the design process. We are looking at utilising the existing footprint.

**Q – How many classes/class sizes?**

A: Six classes of six pupils.

**Q – Why was the school never to be residential? Residential would-be life changing for the children.**

A: Residential places are through Social Services. The idea of combining residential with a day special school is currently not aspirational in Cardiff. Social Care and education are separate. Estyn likes to keep Education and residency separate. We can consider respite and enhancing facilities for children before and after school.

**Q – What will the boundary between the schools look like?**

A: We will consider as part of the visioning process.

**Q – the process needs to be done hand in hand with us, as opposed to done to us?**

A: This will be a collaborative process.

**Q – Will we become a Federation with the schools we are co-located with?**

A: No. Not intended to be a Federation, although benefits for both schools around partnership and collaboration.

**Q – Will people have to re-apply for their positions?**

A: No. Only if it were a school closure. It will be up to the school to decide which staff to move to which site.

**Q – Is it planned that both sites will open at the same time?**

A: Unlikely, although a possibility. We envisage a gradual process. It will be planned as we move forwards.

**Q – Are the schools going to be geographically based, or based on need?**

A: Ideally would want pupils to be as close to home as possible. Aim is for specialist provision to be more localised and spread out across the city. We think this is the strongest model. We do recognise the challenges of working across two sites. We do not want to create two separate schools. We envisage one school across two schools.

**Q – A lot of consideration needs to be given to the boundary. The physical divide between the sites needs to be right. As Court school pupils may try to cause issues on the other school site. Also issues with The Court School name as people think it's something to do with the legal system.**

There were no further questions, MDF thanked staff and the meeting closed.



**Present:** Richard Portas (SOP), Michele Duddridge-Friedl (SOP), Brett Andrewartha (SOP), Jenny Hughes (ALN), Members of staff

*Please note: The following is not a transcript but a contemporaneous note of the meeting*

**The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Richard Portas opened the meeting and welcomed governors. The Chair of Governors advised that the invite for the meeting had not been received by all governors, however the meeting would go ahead.

RP outlined details of the proposed changes.

There was a presentation from BA which set out the following:

- What is being proposed?
- Background
- Sufficiency of places
- Distribution of places
- Proposals for The Court School
- Fairwater Primary School site
- St Mellons CiW Primary School site
- Proposal for Moorland Primary School
- Condition Categories
- Suitability
- Quality and Standards
- Transport Matters Fairwater Primary
- Transport Matters St Mellons CiW Primary
- Transport Matters Moorland Primary
- Benefits of the proposals
- Potential disadvantages and risks
- Alternative options discounted
- Finance
- What happens next?

### **Questions and response**

RP invited questions/comments

**Chair of Governors – issues around school entrance, traffic management and fencing to secure the school perimeter.**





RP – looking to bring forward fencing; recognise that access arrangements are important; will also be looking at social value as part of project with potential for investment.

RP – any questions can be sent over with all feedback welcome. A formal response from the Governing Body is expected however individual comments also welcome.

JH – would be looking to develop scope for mutual benefits; develop the relationship to benefit both schools.

RP thanked governors and the meeting closed.



**Present:** Michele Duddridge-Friedl (SOP), Brett Andrewartha (SOP), Jenny Hughes (ALN), Members of staff

*Please note: The following is not a transcript but a contemporaneous note of the meeting*

**The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Michele Duddridge-Friedl opened the meeting, welcomed staff and outlined details of the proposed changes.

There was a presentation from BA which set out the following:

- What is being proposed?
- Background
- Sufficiency of places
- Distribution of places
- Proposals for The Court School
- Fairwater Primary School site
- St Mellons CiW Primary School site
- Proposal for Moorland Primary School
- Condition Categories
- Suitability
- Quality and Standards
- Transport Matters Fairwater Primary
- Transport Matters St Mellons CiW Primary
- Transport Matters Moorland Primary
- Benefits of the proposals
- Potential disadvantages and risks
- Alternative options discounted
- Finance
- What happens next?

### **Questions and response**

MDF invited questions/comments from staff

**Q/C – presentation answered questions but would like to know what would happen regarding site access.**

BA – detailed design and access/site layout not considered at this stage of the process but will be if progressed. Opportunity to consider best options for a shared site arrangement.

MDF – if there are any further queries information can be provided as required; can also arrange follow up drop-in sessions if needed.



**Schools Programme**  
**Record of Virtual Meeting with Fairwater Primary School Staff**  
**Additional Learning Needs - The Court/Moorland Primary**  
**21 October 2021**



There were no further questions, MDF thanked staff, and the meeting closed.



**Schools Programme**  
**Record of Virtual Meeting with Governing Body**  
**Greenhill School**  
**19 January 2022**



**Present:** Richard Portas (SOP), Michele Duddridge-Friedl (SOP), Brett Andrewartha (SOP), Jennie Hughes (Achievement & Inclusion), Anita Batten (HR), Rachel Burgess Willis (SOP)

Cllr Jayne Cowan (Chair of Governors), Maria John (Parent Governor), Mark Thomas, Roger Stone.

*Please note: The following is not a transcript but a contemporaneous note of the meeting*

### **The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Michele Duddridge-Friedl (MDF) opened the meeting, welcomed governors and introduced officers.

MDF advised that notes of the meeting were being taken and would form part of the consultation feedback.

BA gave a PowerPoint presentation setting out details of the proposal based upon the contents of the consultation document.

The presentation covered:

- What is being proposed?
- Background
- Sufficiency of places
- Distribution of places
- Current EHW provision 11 – 19
- Demand for EHW places 11 – 19
- Take up of places at Greenhill
- Dutch Garden Centre site
- Ty Glas site
- Condition Categories
- Suitability
- Quality and Standards
- Transport Matters
- Benefits of the proposals
- Potential disadvantages and risks
- Alternative Options discounted
- Finance
- Human Resources
- What happens next?

### **Discussion points**

MDF invited questions from governors



The questions asked by governors are set out in *italics* below with the officer response given directly below.

***Q – Why were the timescales in the Consultation Documents and the presentation not given at the Cabinet meeting?***

A: The timescales given are part of the statutory consultation process.

***Q – Are you looking to make Greenhill a residential school?***

A – No. Not part of the proposal. Looking to double the size of Greenhill.

***Q – We cautiously welcome the Ty Glas site, but vehemently oppose the Dutch Garden site as it is too dangerous being next to a motorway and a junction with fast food shops. Would not work for the pupils. We would like to use the existing Greenhill site to build a new school.***

A – The Council isn't in ownership of the land outside the entrance to the school. Site access issues. Would not be able to develop the site with pupils on site. Significant commercial costs and would impact upon the pupils.

***Q – Where is the Risk Assessment for the Dutch Garden site?***

A – We are still at a very early stage and any risk assessments would follow as part of the planning application.

***Q – There is a risk that the pupils will be vulnerable to easy drug deals and County Lines activities if the school is situated so closely to a motorway. Also, the pupils would not be able to practice life skills, such as using local shops, catching buses, being part of the local community.***

A – Would be a fully secured site with safeguarding procedures in place. Access controls, CCTV, fencing solutions to reduce risks. There are benefits to the Dutch Garden Centre site – opportunities for animal care, horticulture, a good rural feeling site that can be landscaped to provide opportunities so that all pupils could spend time at both sites.

***Q – The junction is a problem – really concerned about the close proximity to fast food outlets. Pupils will go there, climbing fences. Could be tragic. The roundabout is also dangerous.***

A – We take these concerns on board and will consider all the points raised during the consultation.

***Q – What about access to the Dutch Garden site for parents? taking part in coffee mornings or attending meetings at the school site will be difficult for parents as well as pupils getting to the school. Safety concerns due to the proximity to a busy junction.***

A – General access to the site would be considered as part of the planning process. We are looking at the site as an overall package with the Llanishen site.

***Q – What about Green Wedge. Mainstream school planned at Ty Glas site?***

A – Green Wedge would be considered in detail at the planning stage. A secondary school has been proposed, but no more details are known at this stage. The



acquisition of the site is 100% funded by WG. The Greenhill proposal is moving ahead of the proposal that you have mentioned.

**Q – We have amazing staff at Greenhill School. If the school is split across two sites, would the current Headteacher have to fight for his role?**

A – Inappropriate to talk about individuals in this meeting. Would sit down and discuss your staffing needs and leadership team, considering different specialisms. If proposals go ahead, we will discuss with Governing Body.

**Q – Will all staff retain their grades and jobs?**

A – It's not a school closure. You would have to revise your structure to deliver.

**Q – Are all jobs safe?**

A – This proposal is not affecting the permanency of staff but would need to consider staffing needs to inform staff base.

**Q – When the new school is developed, what happens if we need new staff at different levels?**

A – Can't answer at this stage. But this proposal is about expansion, development. It's not a school closure.

**Q – Our current site at 7-8 acres is about the right size. We are concerned that the Ty Glas site may be too small.**

A – Sizes are in line with Building Bulletin Guidance. Carefully assessed by Technical Advisors.

**Q – The D rating in the consultation document is at odds with Estyn's view of the school.**

A – The D rating is in relation to Building, Condition and Suitability. Not a reflection of the teaching and learning at the school.

**Q – We are not opposed to the inclusion of girls at Greenhill School.**

A – Please include in your written response, along with any requests that you would like considered.

There were no further questions, MDF thanked governors and the meeting closed.



**Present:** Richard Portas (SOP), Michele Duddridge-Friedl (SOP), Brett Andrewartha (SOP), Jennie Hughes (Achievement & Inclusion), Sarah Pritchard (SOP), Anita Batten (HR), Louise Flynn (HR), Ceri Tanti (SOP), Rosalie Phillips (SOP), school staff

*Please note: The following is not a transcript but a contemporaneous note of the meeting*

## **The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Michele Duddridge-Friedl (MDF) opened the meeting, welcomed governors and introduced officers.

MDF advised that notes of the meeting were being taken and would form part of the consultation feedback.

BA gave a PowerPoint presentation setting out details of the proposal based upon the contents of the consultation document.

The presentation covered:

- What is being proposed?
- Background
- Sufficiency of places
- Distribution of places
- Current EHW provision 11 – 19
- Demand for EHW places 11 – 19
- Take up of places at Greenhill
- Dutch Garden Centre site
- Ty Glas site
- Condition Categories
- Suitability
- Quality and Standards
- Transport Matters
- Benefits of the proposals
- Potential disadvantages and risks
- Alternative Options discounted
- Finance
- Human Resources
- What happens next?

HR advised that they would be available to support with the HR activities that would result if the proposals went ahead, such as additional recruitment and support in moving to two sites.



## Discussion points

MDF invited questions/comments from staff

Staff had put together a document detailing comments and concerns. In general, the staff feel very positive – new sites good size, looking forward to new buildings, specialist provision at each site (mechanics, outdoor learning etc), being able to provide better depth of provision. Will be issue initially with Dutch Garden Centre site not being on a public transport route, Llanishen site ideally situated in terms of public transport and accessibility.

Opening up provision for female students is very positive, to be able to meet their needs.

Looking at doubling workforce, which is very exciting and opens up opportunities for progression and development for existing staff.

## Concerns

The following points were raised:

- room size – concerned at what formula used for determining sizes – need some larger rooms including kitchen facilities. Concerned at having to share user areas between classes, as this could be problematic for learners.
- Dutch Garden Centre location – very close to motorway and learners are vulnerable and sometimes erratic, sometimes leave site, would need to cross bridge, where there is a service station with fast food outlets, which would be a draw for students.
- County lines – vulnerable learners – ease of access for county lines issues as so close to M4.
- Learners may drop things off bridge onto motorway or even jump onto the carriageway, very serious concerns.
- Llanishen site – question re. sharing site with another school – if so, could be very difficult, as volatile learners, could be issues with having another school close by.
- Safeguarding concern with having female pupils, would it be 50/50 split? How that would work for the school. Eighty learners are a lot to have on both sites. Staff feel that working with more learners would dilute the offer.
- Would need to invest a lot of time in getting new staff ready. Wouldn't be able to hit the ground running as have taken years in getting to this position, getting staff





**Schools Programme**  
**Record of Virtual Meeting with School Staff**  
**Greenhill School**  
**13 January 2022**



skilled and getting to know the learners – would need a big investment early on to upskill staff.

- Would need to look at vehicles – currently have 4 vehicles in school – would need more.
- Transport issues – some learners doing travel training in sixth form – how would public transport access be to the Dutch Garden Centre site.
- Transition of staff and learners to new school, would new learners in Y7 start at new site or whole school move?
- Toilet areas – unisex or single sex? Would expect issues with learners if they were mixed.
- Need to allow for kitchen areas etc as shared areas don't work for EHW students.

#### **Officer response/further questions**

Don't yet have design, are at formative stages, as the consultation more on the principle of whether growing the school is a good idea and the sites work. Would be looking at having Education vision to set out teaching and learning perspective – from this would do design brief which inform the design, before it's finalised. School would have opportunities to input at each stage.

Sarah Pritchard would be working with the school to understand the school, understand its strengths and find out what is needed in the site to make the school work. We want to provide the most suitable buildings for your school. Details such as shared spaces, toilets etc will be part of this work. Also transition, staffing etc all considered there.

With regard to site-specific issues as we don't have design in place, we don't have detailed answers to these questions. Would also need to test out plans with statutory consultees such as highways regarding the plans as part of planning process.

With regard to the Dutch Garden Centre site, recognise proximity to the motorway as a concern; number of design solutions and would look to locate building as far as possible from motorway, about 150m at nearest point. Can look at orientation of the building, which can itself be a barrier, multiple layers of security and CCTV. Fencing of suitable height and robustness, not easy to climb, incorporated into design. Secure perimeter. Would think that County Lines risk could be mitigated entirely by design.

With regard to transport, currently having discussions with transport providers regarding possibility of bus links to Dutch Garden Centre site.

JH added that we are aware that it needs to be very secure, but also feel welcoming, and be nicely landscaped etc.



**Schools Programme**  
**Record of Virtual Meeting with School Staff**  
**Greenhill School**  
**13 January 2022**



Good to hear that the school is welcoming of the idea of accepting female pupils. EHW needs are very wide ranging and need to consider how we can meet the needs of all these pupils. Need to factor in to thinking, and how building and grounds need to be designed to facilitate that. Girls' needs can present differently and could be a wider range of needs – accept that we need to plan for this at early stage. Not likely to be 50/50 mix as more boys statistically need more provision; would estimate 25% girls but would obviously be on basis of need. Would also need to plan the introduction, as would need a reasonable cohort of girls in order for them to have peers. Suggestion to look at other EHW schools to see how other schools support their pupils; the girls who are placed at independent settings are in mixed sex provision.

Eighty pupils on both sites bigger, as currently school of 64; thinking around going to 80 is to provide enhanced opportunity for learners to stay on for post 16 pathways while still preserving 56 places for younger learners. Not anticipated that all learners would mix.

With regard to the Llanishen/Ty Glas site, looking to put a secondary school on other part of site; design is not planned to be a campus, but two separate schools; would look at design solutions including appropriate secure lines between schools. Also bearing in mind proximity of city centre and many of the same site security solutions being thought of for Dutch Garden Centre site.

With regard to transport between sites, as the school grows so will the budget and can be considered in due course.

With regard to transition of staff and learners into new site, significant need coming through, hence proposal for expansion; will need to do close planning with the senior leadership team to determine best path. Looking at four years to plan for this. Opportunity to plan and make the right provision to get to the best possible place.

Question from staff: excited, and see as a real opportunity, but extremely concerned about proximity of the Dutch Garden Centre site to the motorway; currently have risk assessments but the motorway is something we have no control over, and the school cannot be moved once in place. Some pupils thrive on challenge and being faced with multiple fences will be more determined to escape. There is also a real risk of suicide attempts or throwing something onto the motorway and causing potentially serious accidents. Very concerned about magnitude of risk.

Potential for a whole range of design solutions, doesn't just have to be fencing, however, RP said that the concerns have been noted.

Another staff member noted that the main issue is that it's on a junction, not just that it's next to the motorway, as there are services and access.

Question regarding whether the access could come from the other direction instead. Concern with taxis coming in from the roundabout, potential of congestion on the roads to the school if there is an accident on the motorway. If taxi stuck in traffic,



**Schools Programme**  
**Record of Virtual Meeting with School Staff**  
**Greenhill School**  
**13 January 2022**



possibility of learners choosing to get out of the taxi and try and walk to the school.

RP said that we will speak with transport for solutions to these issues. Looking at putting the entrance to the school as far away from M4 as possible.

Currently have neighbours close to the school who are very supportive to them. There is a large, gated community close to the Dutch Garden Centre site and interested in knowing if there's been any feedback from potential new neighbours to the school.

RP advised that so far, no feedback had been received.

Question re. whether site is to be shared with St Mellons CiW Primary School; rumour going around.

RP confirmed that this is not the case. The whole of the Dutch Garden Centre site is put forward for Greenhill; St Mellons CiW Primary School is going to relocate to the St Edeyrns redevelopment; consultation on proposal for the vacated St Mellons CiW site in Llanrumney to be used for The Court School is currently open.

Can vehicles go through from St Mellons to St Edeyrns site?

Definitely pedestrian access, but not currently vehicle access – and no plans for this.

Ty Glas site question regarding whether there are any concerns that people may have with a secondary school being next to an EHW school site. In the past some schools have objected to having Greenhill nearby.

Officers replied that if there are objections they will need to be managed as the secondary school idea proceeds. Currently no objections on this issue.

Officers outlined details of where the proposals are posted on the Council's website, and how responses can be made. Individuals and group responses are welcomed. Please note that group responses are treated as formal and would be published but individual ones are grouped and would be anonymised.

There were no further questions and the meeting closed.



**Schools Programme**  
**Cardiff West Community High School Virtual Meeting**  
**Governing Body**  
**Additional Learning Needs:**  
**Emotional Health and Wellbeing (EHW) (ages 11-19)**  
**26 January 2022**



**Present:** Richard Portas (SOP), Brett Andrewartha (SOP), Jennie Hughes (ALN), Louise Flynn (HR), Shirley Karseras (SOP), Martin Hulland (Headteacher), members of the Governing Body

*Please note: The following is not a transcript but a contemporaneous note of the meeting*

### **The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Richard Portas (RP) opened the meeting and welcomed attendees

At the request of the Chair of Board of Governors, no presentation was given due to time constraints, and they requested we went directly to Q & A.

Brett Andrewartha (BA) stated that this proposal was to formalise the provision that is currently in place.

### **Questions and response**

The questions asked by / comments made by governors are set out in *italics* below with the officer response given directly below.

**Q**     *What level of need will the children attending the SRB have compared to the children already utilising the facility?*

RP     There is no expansion to what is already in place being proposed. This process will formalise the arrangement that was piloted a few years ago ensuring the longevity of the provision. We also welcome any comments on how the SRB currently operates and seek to address any issues there may be.

**Q**     *Does the proposal involve providing provision for a greater number of pupils and therefore require extra staffing?*

RP     No. We are looking to formalise the specialist provision for 20 places which is the number of students currently accessing the SRB.

**Q**     *Will the provision be filled with pupils from outside Cardiff West Community School or outside the Cardiff West community?*

JH     The provision provided is specialist provision and therefore offered to pupils with this level of need across the city. However, there is no plan to increase the number of places above 20 places which is what you are operating with currently.



Schools Programme  
Cardiff West Community High School Virtual Meeting  
Governing Body  
Additional Learning Needs:  
Emotional Health and Wellbeing (EHW) (ages 11-19)  
26 January 2022



RP There are citywide proposals for ALN currently being consulted on. The aim is to have provision on both sides of the city so that people can access local provision.

***This would be our preference too to help promote our Active Travel Plan. The 20 places we provide are to pupils mostly from our community.***

Q ***How will the funding be affected if the provision is formalised through this proposal?***

JH We will continue to fund in the same way. There will be no difference and unfortunately no extra resources provided. It will be regularly reviewed with the headteacher to ensure that we have the correct resources in place.

Q ***Will there be a requirement for extra staff?***

JH There shouldn't be as the number of places is not changing. If, however there is a specific need for it in terms of pupil needs, then the Governing Body would be involved with that appointment.

Q ***Will there be any physical changes to the school site?***

RP There will be a site visit soon as we are also changing the number of Y7's entering the school. It would be useful to have a sense check of how all of the provision could work best within the school site. It may be that it is of benefit to relocate the SRB. There are currently lower numbers in post 16 so it may be better to utilise this space, or maybe not? There has also been a request to use partitions to reduce some of the larger spaces. We are happy to work with the school on what is the optimal arrangement.

***The Accelerate programme has been a great success which uses smaller spaces for years 7 and 8 and we would be keen that this is not compromised. With regard to physical changes to the school site, a site visit would be welcomed to have a walk through and reflect on how vulnerable learners interact with the building and identify any pinch points.***

RP There are spare spaces in the school, and these could be used to maximise the effectiveness of school operations.

***I understand the short-term benefits of this but in a longer-term level, we are hoping to grow our 6<sup>th</sup> form, so this would need to be carefully balanced.***

RP Not quite relevant to this proposal, but we are committed to making the 6<sup>th</sup> form a success so it would hopefully be a short-term option.



**Schools Programme  
Cardiff West Community High School Virtual Meeting  
Governing Body  
Additional Learning Needs:  
Emotional Health and Wellbeing (EHW) (ages 11-19)  
26 January 2022**



***We will submit comments but there are no concerns for us as things won't really change, it's just formalising the arrangement.***

***(MH) Aware of the process and that it's confirming what we already have. Our main concern is only how we manage that resource within the building, but it is a good exercise to review this anyway.***

The Chair of the Governing body thanked everyone for their attendance and brought the meeting to a close.



**Schools Programme**  
**Cardiff West Community High School Virtual Meeting**  
**Staff Meeting**  
**Additional Learning Needs:**  
**Emotional Health and Wellbeing (EHW) (ages 11-19)**  
**17 January 2022**



**Present:** Richard Portas (SOP), Brett Andrewartha (SOP), Jennie Hughes (ALN), Louise Flynn (HR), Hibah Iqbal (SOP), school staff

*Please note: The following is not a transcript but a contemporaneous note of the meeting*

### **The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Richard Portas (RP) opened the meeting and welcomed staff.

There was a presentation from Brett Andrewartha (BA) which set out details of the proposal:

- What is being proposed
- Background
- Sufficiency of places
- Distribution of places
- Current EHW provision 11 – 19
- Demand for EHW places 11 -19
- Proposal for Cardiff West Community High School
- Condition categories
- Suitability
- Quality and Standards
- Transports matters
- Benefits of the proposal
- Potential disadvantages
- Alternative options discounted
- Finance
- Human Resources
- What happens next?

Brett Andrewartha (BA) stated that this proposal was to formalise the provision that is currently in place.

### **Questions and response**

**Q - The school has been working well over last few years, only issue is space, it wasn't in our initial design, if you put that alongside the rapid growth of the school, there are competing pressures and meeting soon to discuss this. Working relationship with Local Authority, with just the practical and space issues to sort.**



**Schools Programme**  
**Cardiff West Community High School Virtual Meeting**  
**Staff Meeting**  
**Additional Learning Needs:**  
**Emotional Health and Wellbeing (EHW) (ages 11-19)**  
**17 January 2022**



RP- Will be doing a site visit. There are some areas in the school that are underutilised, want to make best use of space; also, birth rate is dropping off; we need to know the operation works well for you. Will look at initial space requirement in short term and then long term.

**Q - Funding currently only for the base staff. Is there any progress on additional funding to enhance the curriculum for the pupils? The finance does for example pay for additional utilities costs or the speech language therapy staff.**

JH- Happy to discuss vocational opportunities for the pupils further. In addition to that funding there is other special educational needs funding. Utilities is covered as part of whole school funding, not specifically SRB. Happy to discuss further anything else we need to consider

RP- Wanted to make sure we were following due process and formalising what exists already. You know more about this than us, you have access to the form.

There were no further questions, RP thanked staff and the meeting closed.