

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

Meeting of:	Student Family and Community Committee
Date/Time:	11 th May 2017 5pm
Location:	Patcham High School – Meeting Room
Distribution:	Governing Body, Penny Denman, Rachel Strong
Quorum	3 governors required to be present for decisions to be binding
Present:	Members of governing body (voting) Helen Arnold-Jenkins (HAJ) Stephen Berry (SB) Caroline Greenfield (CG) Chair of Committee Natasha Marris (NM) Mike Sandeman (MSD) Andrew Saunders (ASD) Lee Watts (LW) Claire Wilkins (CW) Other (non-voting) Penny Denman (PD) Assistant Headteacher Rachel Strong (RS) Maths Director (observing) Mark Warner (MW) Deputy Headteacher, Safeguarding lead Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk

MINUTES

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
1	<p>INTRODUCTION CG opened this meeting attended by the full committee and welcomed LW. No new declarations were made when invited and all governors and the associate member were entitled to contribute and vote throughout.</p>	
2	<p>SAFEGUARDING – review of child protection policy 2.1 Policy wording. Governors had recently received the 2017 child protection policy that had already been considered and recommended for adoption by the safeguarding link governor. MW drew attention to the changes and it was agreed that wording stating the requirement to ensure all safeguarding instances were to be recorded on the CPOMS systems would be included by the end of the year to allow time for access difficulties to be resolved. Governors recommended speedy implementation as a priority. How are staff reminded of the contents? It was part of their induction and staff sign to confirm they have read the keeping children safe in education documents. In addition from time to time MW circulated sections. PD was taking over from MW as DSL ❖ The up-dated policy was approved. The wording would be reviewed after half-term 2018.</p>	

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>Should any further comments on the policy arise these were invited by email.</p> <p>2.2 Safeguarding termly report. The report was tabled and accepted. Governors noted that as a percentage of incidents mental health concerns had increased and boys seemed to be more open in disclosing this. A dramatic decrease in E-safety was thought to be due to the 'no phones in school' policy. Can we benchmark the total incidents with other schools? That might be possible. It was acknowledged there might be differences in the rate of reporting. If a pupil was having difficulties with E-safety out of school would that be of concern to school? It would spill over into school. Governors appreciated Vicky Knowles' work, the huge amount involved and the benefit of having a well-trained safeguarding team. They were pleased to learn the team made full use of the opportunities to discuss issues amongst themselves for challenge and support and that all safeguarding issues were discussed with the headteacher.</p> <p>2.3 Governor action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The safeguarding link continued to visit the school at least half-termly and confirmed the Single Central Record had been checked. The annual report following the safeguarding audit would be completed before the end of term and circulated. • Another governor had attended the local authority governor safeguarding training. <p>MW was thanked for his work and left 17.21</p>	<p>CG</p> <p>JJ</p>
3	<p>MINUTES OF LAST MEETING These were agreed to be an accurate record and signed accordingly by the chair at the end of the meeting.</p>	JJ
4	<p>MATTERS ARISING It was noted the 'studybugs' app had not been amended. All other items not completed or covered elsewhere were to be carried forward.</p>	
5	<p>SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN SFC 5.1 Pupil premium/disadvantaged students The up-dated pupil premium annual strategy report had been considered and was accepted. Case study headlines had also been considered which showed that the students with the greatest gains had been those incentivised by the use of an individual approach and some kind of positive reward. A report from Ruth Astley and Mary Reid had been received. They had recently completed MAs in education and wanted to ensure school practice was research led, had reviewed school practice and instigated change. What was needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A tighter rein on spending from the pupil premium budget • An overview of disadvantaged pupil progress • Regular reviews on the school calendar for all pupil premium groups • Alignment of the focus of spending to feedback and the highest 	

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>possible standards of teaching and learning. The many actions listed to achieve these had been taken although consultation with the Children in Care support co-ordinator with regard to looked after children (LAC) and post LAC to ensure that all funding possible is applied for and used to ensure progress, was still in course. Governors passed on their thanks to Ruth and Mary for all their hard work.</p> <p>What was behind the drop in persistent absence from 22% to 4%? It was a different cohort. Who will the pastoral team report to? Following the restructure there would be 5 heads of year, reporting to PD and 5 pupil premium advocates who would report to the headteacher. Who will be looking after the looked after children? Vicky, who will now report to PD.</p> <p>5.2 Reports from governors [Note: numbers in brackets relate to the school development plan] Individual governors reported back on their allocated areas. 5.2.1 (4.1) Attendance - covered in item 5.1/5.3 5.2.2 (4.2) Punctuality - covered in item 5.1 5.2.3 (4.3) Pastoral support. This was on track and ongoing. All interventions were logged on SIMS. 5.2.4 (4.4) Short term placement for students with challenging behaviour. The Bridge centre for learning was set to open. It was on track. 5.2.5 (4.5) Improved culture of care and respect. Feedback from the visits on governor day showed most agreed phone and uniform expectations were on track but whilst it was clear the behaviour for learning policy was shared by staff, some interpreted it differently. This was acknowledged by PD who went on to explain the current focus was on not letting pupils out of lessons and communicating this to supply teachers. Routines were established and Toot Toot was running in key stage 4. Is it being used? Yes and we think it is going to build, I would like to keep it. Staff being aware of vulnerable students and strategies for intervention had been evidenced as had increased accountability. 5.2.6 (4.6) CEIAG development – this had yet to be actioned by the link governor. PD informed changes had included improvements with options days and a one to one interview with the head of year or senior staff in year 8.</p> <p>With respect to next years' actions, governors intended to join in with the school development meetings with the senior leadership team.</p> <p>5.3 Behaviour termly report The report from PD had been circulated. Further information was provided. 5.3.1 Attendance. (Which had improved to 94%). The attendance officer had commented that the improvement had not happened before</p>	CG

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>so was commendable. It was attributable to the actions taken in the case studies and making tutors accountable had been key. There was more work to be done around consistency. These steps were explained including the new form showing how tutors steps contributed to improvements as although some actions were small, they could have a big result. It had been found tutors had the most effect with those at the high end of low attenders and the attendance officer with the worst.</p> <p>5.3.2 Exclusions. The 8 students accounted for most of the days. 5 had had needs identified that were better provided for at special schools or off-site. The others were either at a managed move that was working well or at another school.</p> <p>Are all allocated places at the connected hub taken up? Yes</p> <p>Are the ones going to special schools in y10/11? No, year 8; we have identified the problem.</p> <p>How is the Bridge being funded? It was part grant. The running costs were not to hand but it was known increased staffing costs were not expected.</p> <p>How did it go with the maths trial? RS informed the position now was that 3 of the 4 had improved. It had enabled the difficulties to be identified which then helped the behaviour.</p> <p>PD was thanked for her report.</p> <p>5.4 Feedback from Stakeholders</p> <p>Staff: In discussion it was agreed that in view of both the delay and current restructure process there would be no benefit in releasing the results. Governors remained grateful to staff for having completed the survey and an email had been sent.</p> <p>Parents: The governor group had presented questions for inclusion in a survey but at the moment parents were being encouraged to complete the Ofsted parentview questionnaire. This would be kept under review.</p> <p>Pupils: The survey was moving on and it was agreed there was a need to be clear regarding its purpose and what would be done following results.</p> <p>5.5 Personal Development</p> <p>Governor work had not been completed on this item.</p>	<p>CG JJ</p> <p>SB</p>
6	<p>POLICY REVIEWS:</p> <p>6.1 Supporting Pupils With Medical Conditions</p> <p>The up-dated policy wording had already been considered by the link governor and circulated to the governing body. PD now gave the verbal report to the committee which also included the progress of affected pupils as governors wished to assess whether the medical conditions were affecting progress. 35 students had a health care plan and of these 3 were considered to be at a disadvantage and this was mainly to do with reduced attendance. The rest were either self-managers or well supported.</p> <p>What steps have been put in place for the 3? They will be supported by the head of year, tutor and by close contact with parents.</p> <p>What are the common conditions? Diabetes, asthma, epilepsy. There is a wide variation.</p> <p>Does someone from the senior leadership team over see this now?Yes.</p>	

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>More than one governor could report they had seen the policy working well. They requested the school keep a check that any attendance rewards did not penalise this group of pupils. PD informed the whole process of being asked to check on the progress via the heads of year had been worthwhile.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">❖ The supporting pupils with medical conditions policy 2017 was now approved for ratification by the governing body. The next report would be due in summer 2018.</p> <p>6.2 Safeguarding/Child Protection (taken as item 2)</p>	
7	<p>EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMITTEE In discussion it was noted the committee had met each term this year and monitoring of the school development plan had improved significantly with governor effort now more strategic. Some work had not been completed and the new influx of governors, who were attending training sessions, was expected to rectify this. JJ gave advice re the governor role in reviewing policies and it was agreed the annual plan of work would be reviewed to align better with receipt of key performance indicators directly related to the vision. ASD would review the terms of reference in conjunction with the appropriate Ofsted criteria. Health and Safety would be adopted by this committee.</p>	CG MSD JJ ASD
8	<p>Any other Urgent Business In the absence of any further business the meeting closed 18.30</p>	
9	<p>Confirm work required for next meeting This item was not taken.</p>	

..... **signed** **dated**

	OWNER	ACTIONS	Due By
		From 1.3.17	
3.5	ASD	Deferred from previous meeting. Put forward amendments to Terms of Reference and Ofsted framework action.	
3.6	CG	Obtain school partnership advisor report	
3.9	CG	Allot/Chase work outstanding from previous meeting re Destinations and links with feeder schools School portal, Year 11/12 transition	
4.5	SB	Follow up and report back on 'Personal Development' 11.5.17	
2.3	CG	Provide safeguarding report	
5.2	CG	Organise SFC involvement with school self-evaluation and school development plan 17/18 development. Liaise JM	
5.4	CG JJ	Refine requirements and intentions for stakeholder information	
7	CG MSD JJ (SFS)	Plan action for 2017/18, liaise SFS as appropriate	
7	ASD	Review TOR and include Ofsted criteria as appropriate	