

**GOVERNING BODY**

<b>Meeting of:</b>	<b>Full Governing Body</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> December 2016 5.30
<b>Location:</b>	Patcham High School – Library
<b>Distribution:</b>	FGB and website
<b>Quorum</b>	8
<b>Present:</b>	Governors (voting) Stephen Berry (SB) Di Bonner (DB) Sarah Fitzjohn-Scott (SFS) Caroline Greenfield (CG) Juliet Greenwood (JG) Anthony Lawes (AL) Natasha Marris (NM) John McKee (JM) Headteacher Charles Miller-Cooper (CMC) Mike Sandeman (MSD) Andrew Saunders (ASD) Geoffrey Theobald (GT) Other (non voting) Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk
<b>Apologies:</b>	Laura Carney (LC) Ant Craggs (AC)

	<b>DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION, WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b> SFS opened the meeting. Apologies were considered and accepted. Sally Killick's absence was noted.	
<b>2</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> No new declarations were made when invited. All governors could contribute throughout.	
<b>3</b>	<b>MINUTES OF LAST MEETING</b> The minutes were agreed to be an accurate record and signed by the Chair accordingly.	
<b>4</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE</b> There were no matters arising.	
<b>5</b>	<b>HEADTEACHER'S REPORT</b> 5.1 Governors had already received and considered the report and RAISEonline 2016 unvalidated summary along with the school development plan. This had been brought up-to-date with headway on developments and adjusted to give the necessary emphasis to progress for the disadvantaged group of pupils. This had been required following	

**GOVERNING BODY**

	<b>DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>the receipt of the comparison with National Average (NA) figures. For the most part this was as expected and whilst great results for this group had not been expected and there had been a diminishing difference on attendance, attainment 5A*-C including Maths and English and 3 levels of progress in Maths, there had been particularly poor progress by the disadvantaged group for the progress 8 measure which had not been anticipated. In some areas progress was in the bottom 5% or 3% in the country which was absolutely not the vision of governors. Case studies were available for the 7 pupils that had brought the results below NA.</p> <p>5.2 Knowing governors were keen to understand why the school had not been expecting these results and to ensure issues were addressed immediately for this priority group, the report focussed on what had happened, what the school had already been doing differently that would help the group and further responses to the situation. JM was confident actions were in place so the results would be better in future and indeed progress 8 in year 11 as at December 2016 for this group overall was -0.34. (-0.7 August 16 for the previous cohort) PE was the only subject that had not improved.</p> <p>GT arrived 17.38</p> <p>5.3 What had happened? The following were described in detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasis on A* to C rather than progress 8 by the school, the LA, in performance management and on the development plan</li> <li>• Shortage of maths and English teachers meaning gaps less able to be addressed</li> </ul> <p>ASD arrived 17.50</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient entries in progress 8 qualifying subjects</li> <li>• Greater representation of the group in poorer performing subject areas</li> <li>• Insufficient advocacy and scrutiny</li> <li>• Expectations should have been higher</li> <li>• Missed opportunities to use non GCSE qualification</li> </ul> <p><b>How did Brighton and Hove fare as a whole with the disadvantaged group?</b> Overall a similar pattern. One school was worse and just one had some areas significantly better than NA. We had even received a letter from the LA congratulating us on the performance. On all these identified factors changes have been made, we need to look at current cohorts.</p> <p>Governors were acutely aware the Brighton and Hove colleges needed pupils to attain 5 A*- C grades to go on their courses and the largest destination would not accept pupils without English and maths C or above. They recalled prior discussion on the conflict between higher progress 8 score for the school and fulfilling needs of some pupils. It was also recalled Brighton and Hove had the lowest NEET figures in</p>	

**GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTION
	<p>the country.  <b>What can you do with persistent absentees?</b> We are now expected to bring them to school.  <b>If these children have medical conditions they are not supposed to be penalised but it seems as though the school is.</b> I am looking at the guidelines and will present that it is illness not truancy.</p> <p>5.4 What are we doing differently?  Governors could confirm the long list of these that they were already aware of from the development plan, their visits and meetings this term.</p> <p>5.5 Further responses to RAISE online</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 Pupil Premium Advocates</li> <li>• Redeployment of 2 Lead Practitioners</li> <li>• 2 new tutor groups led by senior leadership team</li> <li>• Review and reschedule of off-site provision</li> <li>• Maximising entries</li> <li>• Ensuring high quality teaching</li> <li>• Attendance drive</li> <li>• Use of European Computer Driving Licence</li> <li>• Focussed learning walks</li> <li>• Deployment of coaches</li> <li>• Relentless and forensic focus</li> </ul> <p>5.6 Additional queries  <b>Are the children that don't come in living away from the school?</b> Yes, we have some temporary housed 15 miles away and one 26.  <b>I thought the Wolfe report was supposed to get rid of non GCSE subjects?</b> It retained the ECDL and many academies used this to improve their progress 8 figure.  <b>What would pupils do with it?</b> The college would count it.  <b>What about the high attaining pupil premium group – would they do this?</b> The main reason we didn't do it was that it was expensive and the funding would cover it. I can deliver it for them without affecting the other subjects and it could start with current Y11.  <b>Who currently controls the pupil premium budget?</b> An assistant head teacher. JM is overseeing it.  <b>Do you agree it together?</b> After April I will take it over. We think it is working but perhaps could be better directed. It was used in a different way. Coaches are now working with the right students and with higher aspirations. The whole staff is on board following an emergency meeting.  <b>Will you have to release them out of teaching to fulfil the advocacy role?</b> No. I have seen a similar model in the States.  <b>Are you going to allocate a case load?</b> I am leaving it with them. Out of the 32 it would probably be 8 each.  <b>Is 32 just year 11?</b> Yes. It isn't sustainable in this model but we can adjust it. It is important the school isn't seen as failing this group.</p>	<p>JM Chairs</p>

**GOVERNING BODY**

	<b>DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>5.7 Additional governor responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A governor had been in discussion with the Assistant Headteacher and supported use of a case load to provide the holistic view that she had felt was missing.</li> <li>• Whilst acknowledging the premise and opportunities of the proposed tutor groups, governors were uneasy and had a raft of queries but were reassured that the initiative would be withdrawn if tutees felt bad and if they did not want to move.</li> <li>• A governor informed there was research to show that schools that do it right supported the whole school for example by improving attendance repetition in lessons is reduced.</li> <li>• The positive attainment in some subjects such as modern foreign languages and art was celebratory.</li> </ul> <p>5.8 The report was accepted. Governors agreed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee chairs would reassess the allotting of actions of individual governors on committees to take into account the amended school development plan and the headteacher report actions. They would evaluate the impact of changes.</li> <li>• When visiting and in committee the issue needed to be raised and flag any problems to SB</li> <li>• Pupil Premium would be on every meeting's agenda</li> <li>• SLT would report to Steering Group, including in terms of progress 8.</li> </ul>	<p>Chairs</p> <p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>Chairs JJ JG</p>
6	<p><b>CHAIR's REPORT</b></p> <p>Governors had already received and considered the report. They were pleased to note the school partnership advisor had been complimentary about the school at his visit and had confirmed the school development plan was good and appropriate. They agreed safeguarding would be a standing item on the agenda for the full governing body. A video and quiz for the attention of all governors would be circulated for training purposes.</p> <p>Governors concurred that the national results showed the performance of disadvantaged pupils was not good enough and they were pleased that it was being acted on. They agreed the governing body needed a co-ordinated approach to monitor improvements and interactions whether by email or visit reports were requested to keep a short record on the form provided. In the light of the amended development plan Chairs of committees agreed to confirm the governor links to JM by 5.12.16. In discussion a move from subject to school improvement links was thought more apposite with current priorities and a review of governor days was also required. Governor links and reports would be considered two weeks in advance of meetings.</p> <p>❖ <b>Governors had already received and considered the application for Co-opted governor from Lee Watts. He was now co-opted to the governing body with immediate effect.</b></p>	<p>SFS JJ</p> <p>SFS</p>

**GOVERNING BODY**

	<b>DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	The parent governor elections were in course. The report was accepted.	
<b>7</b>	<p><b>IS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ON TRACK:</b></p> <p><b>7.1 COMMITTEES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Group. The notes were accepted and thanks passed on to DB and JM for the ongoing work on the budget.</li> <li>• Resources Committee. It was confirmed the next budget meeting was on 5.12.16 with Andy Moore from the local authority. The minutes were accepted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The Pay Policy had already been considered by governors and was now formally approved.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Teaching Learning and Outcomes. The minutes were accepted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The terms of reference were approved.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Have we got the curriculum option models yet? A governor confirmed they had just been received and following discussion as to how to take this forward it was agreed this would be by an extra TLO meeting to which Chairs of other committees would attend. The meeting would take place before 12.1.17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Family and Community Committee. The minutes were accepted.</li> </ul> <p><b>7.2 GOVERNORS</b></p> <p>Governors had already received and considered the pre-application advice from BHCC and the sports hall up-date which a governor now talked through. The pre planning meeting was very positive. A consultation was the next step and this would be 25<sup>th</sup> Jan 6pm in hall. The community would be invited and the plans available. Studies had shown there were not enough of the proposed facilities in the area. A meeting including the PFI partners and the LA had been scheduled to check the extent to which current utilities could meet increased demand. Costings were awaited. Thanks to all involved were proffered.</p> <p><b>7.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM TRAINING</b></p> <p>A governor had attended safeguarding training and been impressed with the training and the resources involved. He reiterated how vital the work was and the high numbers involved here.</p>	SFS
<b>8</b>	<p><b>TRAINING session – safeguarding</b></p> <p>This session would be delivered out of meeting, by email and video. All to confirm when completed.</p> <p>There being no further business the meeting closed at 19.49</p>	SFS All

..... **Signed** ..... **dated**

**GOVERNING BODY**

	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>Due By</b>
5.6 5.8	<b>JM Chairs</b>	Oversee action re pupil premium budget and evaluation of outcomes	ongoing
5.8	<b>Chairs All</b>	Review and co-ordinate individual governors work to ensure realigned with amended school development plan and HT report actions. Ensure system for evaluation of impact of changes.	10.12.16
5.8	<b>All</b>	Raise any issues re SDP following visits or committee meetings to SB	Ongoing
5.8	<b>Chairs</b>	Pupil premium to be on every agenda	Ongoing
5.8	<b>JG</b>	Liaise with SLT for information, including on Progress 8 to be provided to Steering Group	16.12.16
6	<b>SFS</b>	Safeguarding to be on every FGB agenda	Ongoing
6	<b>SFS</b>	Co-ordinate up-dated governor links and advise all governors and JJ	16.12.16
7	<b>SFS</b>	Arrange additional TLO meeting	10.12.16
7	<b>SFS</b>	Circulate safeguarding training session	31.1.17