

<b>Full Governing Body</b>	
<b>Date/Time:</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> March 2017 5.30 pm
<b>Location:</b>	Patcham High School – Library
<b>Distribution:</b>	FGB and website
<b>Quorum</b>	9
<b>Present:</b>	Governors (voting): Stephen Berry (SB) Di Bonner (DB) Laura Carney (LC) Sarah Fitzjohn-Scott (SFS) Chair of Governors Caroline Greenfield (CG) Anthony Lawes (AL) Natasha Marris (NM) John McKee (JM) Headteacher Charles Miller-Cooper (CMC) Carmelo Rafala (CR) Mike Sandeman (MSD) Geoffrey Theobald (GT) Lee Watts (LW) Claire Wilkins (CW) Other (non-voting) Helen Arnold-Jenkins (HAJ) Associate Member Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk
<b>Apologies noted:</b>	Juliet Greenwood (JG) Andrew Saunders (ASD) Anthony Craggs (AC)

	<b>DISCUSSION and DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION, WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b> SFS opened the meeting and a warm welcome was extended to LW. General introductions followed.	
<b>2</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b> No new declarations were made when invited and SB reminded all his spouse was the area representative for NASUWT. It was agreed all governors could take full part in the meeting.	
<b>3</b>	<b>MINUTES OF LAST MEETING</b> These were approved as being an accurate record of the meetings on 1 <sup>st</sup> December 2016 and 20 <sup>th</sup> February 2017 and signed accordingly. The minutes of 20 <sup>th</sup> February 2017 were to remain confidential until the end of the restructure process as it was considered there was a possibility they could give some staff cause for concern.	
<b>4</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE</b> There were no actions not completed or monitored elsewhere and no further matters arising.	

	DISCUSSION and DECISION	ACTION
5	<p><b>HEADTEACHER's REPORT</b></p> <p>5.1 Governors had only recently received</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the report</li> <li>• mock exam results for spring 2017 and predictions for spring 2017 using the 4matrix tracking system</li> <li>• up-date on progress on Ofsted areas</li> <li>• latest up-date on school development plan</li> </ul> <p>5.2 JM now talked to these and further information was provided</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deferred changes for improvements in the long-term were now going to go ahead but the possibility of short-term difficulties had been identified.</li> <li>• The consultation process relating to staffing restructure had caused some upheaval, lots of uncertainty and much time was being spent with staff and responses from unions. The 30 day period ends on 5<sup>th</sup> April. All those at risk had been spoken to before and after the launch meeting and understandably frustrated about shrinkage in their area. HR advice was being sought and followed to support staff experiencing particular difficulties and the Chair of Governors would continue to meet with any as appropriate. There had been some staff changes that would result in amendments to the restructure document.</li> <li>• The school remained good with strengths and plans were being actioned to address the budget deficit and further align expenditure with the curriculum.</li> <li>• Admissions. The school was oversubscribed and 86% had put them down as first choice and confirmed they are coming.</li> <li>• Progress 8 would not be known until mid-September at earliest and the issue of which tier of paper to take was still unresolved.</li> <li>• The joint development day at Longhill had been successful.</li> <li>• The published admission number increase had not been taken to the school adjudicator yet and it was expected local academies would object to an increase.</li> </ul> <p>5.3 <b>Governors were aware predictions for year 11 outcomes could not be reliable and noted there was a big difference between the predictions and the mock results. They pressed for evidence supporting the assertion all would be well and there would not be a minus 1.3 score for Progress 8.</b> JM informed the school was planning properly, teaching to the specification, observations of teaching had shown progress and exam preparation was proceeding as usual. Material given to students had been harder; there was a lot more intervention and the pupil premium advocates were working well. There was a continuous assessment process along with moderation by Varndean and Dorothy Stringer. Governors recognised this and lamented the position the government had placed schools in but acknowledged all were in the same position.</p> <p>5.4 <b>Has press coverage [incorrect] of the recent incident affected admissions?</b> No.  <b>Was it a racial attack?</b> We think so but the pupil wasn't known to the</p>	

	<b>DISCUSSION and DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>attackers, who were known to the police. Governors had been kept apprised of the incidents of a couple of weeks prior and JM gave a full narrative and up-date. Governors expressed their shock that not only had the police response been unsatisfactory and they had even given the press incorrect details but in the absence of a parent to take forward criminal proceedings, delays were continuing to be experienced. JM advised there was now a way of monitoring the alarm system and he had been in discussion with the Chief Inspector and Community liaison officer to ensure improvements going forward.</p> <p>Governors had been concerned with the effects on pupils and JM confirmed that on the next school day the true situation was explained to all pupils at the school and that those excluded were being educated elsewhere. He reported that anecdotally most children were a bit embarrassed that it happened at the school and had been reassured by the strong action taken.</p> <p>A governor had been at the school at the time and had been impressed with the action being taken. Other governors had evidenced the impressive actions of other students. Governors felt the school had acted well and were reassured procedure had been followed and all were safe.</p> <p>There were no further questions. Further comments were invited by email. Discussion turned to item 7.4</p>	
6	<p><b>CHAIR's REPORT</b> Governors had already considered the report. It was agreed changes to links should be communicated to SFS by 30.3.17 Names of volunteers by 30.3.17 were requested to meet to review the self-evaluation of the school and governor knowledge of the school by Ofsted area. GT arrived 19.07</p>	<p>All</p> <p>All</p>
7	<p><b>IS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ON TRACK?</b> <b>7.1 COMMITTEES</b> 7.1.1 Steering Group. Although not a committee, this group had met and discussed progress on Ofsted matters and discussed the potential for a restructure.</p> <p>7.1.2 Resources The minutes were accepted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <b>The Financial Scheme of Delegation was ratified and signed by the Chair of Governors.</b></li> <li>❖ <b>The transfer from Resources to SFC committee for the monitoring of the Health and Safety policy was agreed.</b></li> </ul> <p>A governor added that the local authority had advised at the schools' forum that any overspend on budget would need to be financed from the market.</p> <p>7.1.3 Teaching Learning and Outcomes The minutes were accepted.</p> <p>7.1.3 Student Family and Community</p>	

	<b>DISCUSSION and DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>The minutes were accepted.  The parent survey was proceeding to plan. MSD had agreed to be vice chair.  <b>What is the current attendance figure?</b> 93.9%, it has improved.  <b>What is the position re the staff survey?</b> Staff have been thanked for their participation, a group of governors had met and passed on recommendations to JM. Governors would continue to monitor.</p> <p>It was agreed that at future meetings this section would include specific mention on progress of the improvement plan.</p> <p><b>7.2 GOVERNORS</b>  This item was not taken.</p> <p><b>7.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM TRAINING</b>  Members of the governing body had attended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance Strategy and Partnership meeting</li> <li>• Raiseonline for secondary schools</li> <li>• Clerks' forum</li> <li>• Leaders' business meeting</li> <li>• Governor induction</li> <li>• Good governance</li> </ul> <p>There were no recommendations appropriate for this forum.</p> <p><b>7.4 PUPIL PREMIUM and CATCH UP</b>  Governors had recently received the up-dated pupil premium report which was now on the website. The issue continued to be on the agenda of every meeting.  The report had been subject to a full review by JM, the school business manager, the pupil premium advocates, lead subject practitioners and now took a more robust format. It was considered to follow statutory guidance and took on board good practice. The catch up premium report was also included.</p> <p>A governor reported that the pupil premium plan had been trialled since January.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The weekly reviews had resulted in amendments. A number of initiatives had been researched and trialled and those not proving useful were being dropped.</li> <li>• Pupils had changed from specific revision sessions to general sessions and attendance had improved.</li> <li>• The mentor role had developed and there had been a lot more contact with parents and the relationship building had been very positive.</li> <li>• The disadvantaged pupil profile at the school was diverse.</li> <li>• Attendance had improved and the coaches were valued.</li> <li>• The school was trying to support design technology and history which had larger proportions of disadvantaged pupils.</li> <li>• The advocates were working hard and teacher support was growing. A greater awareness of those pupils in each subject had been reported and there were lots of case studies.</li> </ul>	<p>CHAIRS</p> <p>SFS</p> <p>SB SFS to review</p>

	<b>DISCUSSION and DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	Governors accepted the report and requested an anonymous case study be circulated. Outcomes would be reviewed in the autumn term. Discussion turned to item 6.	
<b>8</b>	<b>SAFEGUARDING</b> Governors had already received and considered the bulletin on child sexual exploitation, the reminder of the DfE document keeping children safe in education and now undertook to work through a quiz to reinforce knowledge.	
<b>9</b>	<b>SCHOOL FINANCIAL VALUE STANDARD</b> The SFVS had been reviewed and considered by governors. They now approved the document including the plan for 2017/18 which was signed by the Chair of Governors. There was a need to review the continuity plan by November 2017 and ensure the PFI company were capable of providing it.	

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