

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Corporation  
held on Monday 17<sup>th</sup> June 2019 at 8.00am  
in the Boardroom of Matthew Boulton Campus**

<b>Present:</b>	<b>Apologies:</b>
Sir Dexter Hutt (Chair) (SDH)	Dan Zastawny
Cliff Hall (Principal) (CH)	
Veronica Docherty (VD)	
Keith Horton (KH)	
Michele Larmour (ML)	
Hilary Smyth- Allen (HS)	
Simon Thompson (ST)	
Amardeep Gill (AG)	
Angela Myers (AM)	
Prue Huddleston (PH)	
Iqbal Mohammed (IM)	
Jane Smith (JS)	
Daniel Millington (DM)	
Sam Coles (SC)	
<b>In Attendance:</b>	
Louise Jones (LJ)	
Liam Nevin (LN)	
Martin Penny (MP)	
Steve Benger (SB)	

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Dan Zastawny.

**Declarations of Interest and Matters Arising**

No declarations were received in addition to those contained in the register.

SDH welcomed Steve Benger to the Corporation meeting and explained the role that SB would have at the College

**Item 1 – Stourbridge Disaggregation**

LN explained that due diligence had been ongoing since the last meeting of the Corporation and the commercial terms were now substantially agreed, subject to the approval of the Corporation. In addition, an equality impact assessment had been completed as part of the due diligence and this had been circulated to the Board and would be discussed during the meeting.

The Corporation thereafter received a presentation from LN, LJ and MP. LN advised that the Heads of Terms had now been signed and whilst these were substantially as discussed by the Corporation previously, the outcome of the negotiations in respect of TUPE was that ten staff that were originally expected to transfer, would not do so. Dudley College (DC) had agreed to meet the redundancy costs of seven of these and Halesowen College (HC) had agreed to ring fence suitable vacancies for three staff. BMet would also be required to provide an indemnity to DC and HC in respect of any claims brought by staff that did not transfer.



LJ updated the Corporation on progress against the key work streams and summarised the current position and outstanding risks. It was noted that the trade unions and some local politicians had expressed opposition to the potential closure of Stourbridge College and the Mayor of the Combined Authority had written to the College seeking certain reassurances.

MP summarised the options available to the College if the transfer did not proceed and LN stated that the Corporation now needed to identify any concerns with the commercial terms as presented, as it was proposed to bring the Transfer Agreement to the next meeting of the Corporation. In this respect, the Board should have regard to the equality duty and the equality impact assessment as set out in the supporting paper, and governors were encouraged to probe any issues of concern.

CH referred to the equality impact assessment and stated that there was largely no detrimental impact on students with the exception of a small group of students who would require additional support.

IM queried the arrangements for supported transport for disabled students and CH advised that this was in relation to students who required special arrangements in order to travel safely. DC provided free bus passes and HC ran a large network of buses to the College but it was accepted that additional support would be needed for some students.

IM asked whether the College had any feedback from disabled students or their parents on whether the proposed measures were suitable. LJ advised that there had been individual conversations with parents to discuss the impact of the transfer and the transport arrangements to their new place of study. Parents had also been re-assured that the staff and learning assistants would transfer and would continue to teach existing classes and the Independent Living Centre at Brierley Hill would continue providing the same education and training.

CH stated that further conversations would be had with the affected parents to ensure that they were satisfied with the arrangements. He acknowledged that the arrangements could be disruptive for some students who found change difficult.

IM stressed that whilst the Board should not expect universal acceptance from the affected parents it was important that it had some information on the views of the parents of disabled students before it.

SDH stated that, in his experience, it was important to ensure that students settled quickly and that concerns were addressed promptly following the transfer as parents would want to be assured that the new arrangements were working effectively for their child.

HS stated that it was not clear the extent to which the support being proposed was additional to that already provided. In addition, the EIA focussed on transport but the discussion had already identified other material factors including the retention of the same teachers and teaching assistants. ML supported this point and stressed that the document should provide an audit trail of the personalised support being offered to disabled students. It was agreed that the EIA would be updated to address these points.

**Actions:**

- **Further conversations to be had with parents of disabled students to gauge their views on the support being provided.**
- **Equality Impact Assessment to be updated to identify other material factors in addition to transport (including continuity of teaching staff and assistants)**
- **Re-present EIA at the next meeting of the Corporation**

The remainder of this item is recorded in a confidential minute.

**Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 11 July 2019**



Signed.....

② HAI

Chair

Date.....

11.7.19.



