

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

Meeting of:	Behaviour Attitudes and Personal Development Committee
Date/Time:	17 th October 2019 5.30 pm
Location:	Patcham High School – Conference Room
Distribution:	Governors, Penny Denman, Ed Hall, Rachael Strong
Quorum	3 governors required to be present for decisions to be binding. The meeting was quorate throughout.
Present:	Governors (voting) Rachel Christy (RC) Caroline Greenfield (CG) Chair Steve Horne (SH) Andrew Saunders (ASD) Mike Sandeman (MSD) Other (non-voting) Ed Hall (EH) Director of Sports Rachael Strong (RS) Director of Maths, for item 7.1 Penny Denman (PD) Assistant Headteacher
Apologies:	Natasha Marris (NM) – accepted

MINUTES

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
1	WELCOME, APOLOGIES and DECLARATION OF INTEREST CG opened the meeting and discussion turned to item 7.1 Apologies and interests were considered. The absence of Jackie Ashwood was noted. A message was received from SH indicating he would be late. All governors could take full part throughout.	
2	CHAIRING THE COMMITTEE CG repeated her request that another governor took over the chairing of this committee. No nominations were received. She agreed to chair this meeting.	SFS
3	MINUTES OF LAST MEETING Papers: Minutes meeting May 2019 The minutes of the meeting on 23.5.19 were agreed to be an accurate record and signed accordingly.	
4	MATTERS ARISING The action points would be followed up	
5	SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN Papers: School development plan; change to statutory policy/document requirements Governor monitoring of the sections of the school development plan were allotted: 2.1 MSD and CG 2.2 RC 2.3 CG and MSD	JA SH CG RC MSD

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>3.1 and 3.2 SH 3.3 JA</p> <p>Governors would attend governor day or make separate arrangements to visit the school accordingly.</p> <p>The terms of reference were in course of being amended to include the new Ofsted framework, the school development plan priorities and any changing statutory requirements. MSD and CG would then draw up the agenda plan, liaising with PD re any changes to reporting.</p>	MSD CG
6	<p>SAFEGUARDING Papers: Child protection policy (including statement of procedure for allegations against staff); safeguarding audit.</p> <p>The audit was received. PD confirmed the training had now been completed. The safeguarding link governor confirmed the document had been reviewed during a visit to the school and she was very pleased with the effectiveness of the policy. PD took questions.</p> <p>Do teachers need to remember all the details – it is a huge document? PD explained that it was more for reference as the teacher’s role was straightforward and most of the work was completed by designated staff.</p> <p>How is safeguarding this term? Still very high, averaging 70 – 80 per week.</p> <p>Are they of a similar nature as before? Yes</p> <p>How many of those are serious and time consuming? About 50%.</p> <p>How does this benchmark with other schools? I do not have the information. I imagine it is similar as the things we are dealing with are societal.</p> <p>Are the majority of the incidents outside or inside school? Probably outside, home circumstances but the feelings these raise will be carried into school.</p> <p>Does feeling low count as safeguarding? We log it and put in some support.</p> <p>We know this has been more prevalent in lower years, has this carried on? Yes. Depending on what they are saying then it could be immediate action, calling an ambulance if necessary. We cannot be complacent we need to be more overt about wellbeing and getting children involved and helping each other. Our procedures are fine but this would not help in extremis. Social media is awful in these circumstances.</p> <p>Governors were aware CAMHS could not be relied upon and PD indicated that ideally the school would have a mental health nurse. It was recalled that the current policy of non exclusion was a great method to improve safeguarding.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">❖ The child protection policy 2019 was recommended for full governing body approval.</p>	CG
7	<p>BEHAVIOUR and ATTENDANCE Papers: Attendance reports; termly behaviour report (tabled)</p>	

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>7.1 Attendance RS talked to the attendance reports already circulated and drew governors' attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance was below the level of the previous year but the figure was similar to other local secondary schools. It was still a whole school priority. • There was still a big gap for the disadvantaged and it was a priority for this year. • We have the same proportion of persistent absentees, high numbers in the 92-95% bracket and fewer with 100% attendance. • The tracking will be used to put in interventions particularly in January and February. • The school plan had been changed a little and tutors now worked with 5 key students each week. • Teachers were more aware of monitoring attendance and how it impacts on progress. She would be drawing more attention to the reduced level of attendance in year 11 and teachers are to be more proactive. • Period 1 absence was being tackled and a new truancy system was being trialled which was linked to the behaviour system. This was a better way of tracking and now interventions need to be put into place. • The year to date attendance was 95.17%, slightly down on last year. The main causes being holiday and illness. There had been minimal impact due to the climate day protests. Absence was strongest in year 10 and 11 and disadvantaged pupils. <p>The list of interventions was considered and RS drew attention to changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form time had been stripped back to enable more focus on conversations with pupils re attendance. • It was very data driven. • There were more home visits. • A mini bus driver was now in place to pick up 9 or 10 pupils <p>Governors noted there was a drop in attendance during January due to sickness and July due to holidays. In addition the ranking of schools in terms of affluence matched the ranking of attendance.</p> <p>The pupils collected by minibus, were they not coming in before? They are the year 11 pupils that miss lesson one a lot. Does it negatively impact on the days when they are not running the service? Beforehand 5 did not come in at all but now they are coming in when they are driven. Are we still looking to get our own minibus driver? No Are they far away? It is a mixture. There is only one from Patcham. Why is it those specific cohorts that are difficult? Year 10 have a lot of</p>	

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>persistent absence including some with 0 percent attendance. Is it valuable the staff that have done the home visit? yes, relationships have improved? Parents do appreciate the support.</p> <p>RS added that next year attendance during exams for year 11 could not be included and schools in the local authority had agreed to share attendance figures. She had attended Dorothy Stringer and their actions were not so very different and she will press ahead with making tutors more proactive. A visit to Kings School, who had a different cohort, would also be made. Governors noted that one school coded absence in a different manner.</p> <p>RS confirmed she would give a briefing at each committee meeting. Governors thanked her and she left. Discussion turned to item 1.</p> <p>7.2 Conduct summary 7.2.1 Governors examined the tabled paper which PD talked through and took questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new intake was a diverse confident bright cohort. • There were more pupil premium children in the younger years and it was very similar to the 2010 whole school. <p>Exclusions continue to be nil. Is this unanimously agreed? As a group we have always reached a conclusion to find an alternative solution. If they are not excluded, does it affect other students? No it does not encourage them. Is it a badge of honour? It can be and it is definitely felt to be good to have a day off. Is it a danger to other pupils? A two day exclusion would not change that. We are the only school in the local authority with this policy and it is a cultural change so some of the general staff are not yet up on it. We have removed all of the administration from having disruptive pupils in lessons.</p> <p>7.2.2 Reflection Room Governors noted the numbers attending the 'reflections' room had reduced and there was also a change in which subjects pupils were being removed from. It was noted science has reduced but was still high. Why? Science is lagging behind in terms of pupils feeling it is as important as the other core subjects. This year staff were more stable so familiarity and consistency will continue.</p> <p>Last year the numbers increased during the day but now it was more consistent. The school was happy it was working well. Are teachers sometimes a little hasty in removal? Yes it will happen on occasion. We have made it clear that warnings should be written on the board so it is unequivocal. The perceived lack of warning is the complaint from children. Governors thought the system was clear and simple.</p>	

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>7.2.3 The Bridge. The long list of interventions provided for those in the Bridge was noted. Attendance continued to be expected to a revolving door for most and that some year 11s would remain permanently. What is the capacity? Up to 21 but 14 at one time. How do you decide which subjects they come in to school for? It is the ones they are good at.</p> <p>Steve Horne arrived 18.42</p> <p>The interventions appear to be rehabilitative. Does it make a difference? It keeps the pupils here. It allows us to put the interventions in and in a few cases they come back into the main school for at least a while but they may then need more. The main thing it does is keep them in a mainstream school and relatively stable. We cannot change their home circumstances. Do these interventions cost money? Most do not. Some we buy into the Brighton and Hove Inclusions Service for. PD listed them.</p> <p>There were no further questions and PD was thanked for her report.</p>	
8	<p>DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS Attendance had been discussed at 7.1 and there were no further questions.</p>	
9	<p>SUPPORTING PUPILS WITH MEDICAL CONDITIONS PD informed there were now a few more pupils on the register but no issues arising. The policy would be reviewed annually.</p>	
10	<p>COMMUNITY/STAKEHOLDERS The governor staff survey responses (40 no.) had been received and the preliminary results now reported. There had been fewer responses than the previous survey, which had similar questions.</p> <p>A flavour of the responses were:</p> <p>Do staff share a strong collective vision? Agree/Strongly agree. One support staff member strongly disagreed. Additional comments – generally good vision and some have brought up actions to improve which will be explored as consistency was sometimes a problem.</p> <p>Do staff treat each other with respect? Strongly agree. Although some support staff had previously indicated they are sometimes treated as though they are not so important. In discussion it was noted that some teachers were better than others at showing appreciation and that support staff included administrative staff. PD informed the SENCO would be including teaching assistants more in their involvement with pupils and this should assist in this aspect.</p> <p>Were school leaders supportive of staff? The vast majority agreed. Typical comment was: 'leadership were always happy to discuss any issues and I always feel supported'. My workload is manageable. More disagreed here. In discussion it was recalled this was being followed up through Quality of Education</p>	

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	ACTIONS
	<p>committee and it was noted that responses may be due to trying to respond to the level of need of pupils. Discussion regarding changes to appraisal objectives and attendance at break and lunch ensued. It was noted the change of focus on appraisal should assist as would the change in observations.</p> <p>If you are an upper scale teacher would you still have responsibilities beyond your class? ED informed that it was and it was still focussed on teaching and learning.</p> <p>Will this mean the extracurricular offer will suffer? No.</p> <p>Would centralised homework detentions be useful? PD had the opinion it would be unmanageable.</p> <p>The way forward.</p> <p>A governor informed the headteacher had already convened a meeting of some staff in response to some other feedback and governors would discuss this survey with him, observing confidentiality as appropriate. Some areas that might reduce staff workload and stress were put forward such as behaviour at lunch and break, availability of teaching assistants in lessons, fewer reports and administrative work and increase in frequency of socialising. Feedback to staff would be given and the next survey would take place in February.</p>	MS
11	<p>POLICIES</p> <p>JJ drew governor attention to the DfE's updated statutory policy and document list. This would be included in the committee's annual plan.</p>	
12	<p>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS (with prior agreement of chair)</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed 19.25</p>	

ACTION SUMMARY

	OWNER	ACTIONS	DUE BY
		23.5.19	
3	CG	Follow up with HK any further information required	
13	SFS PD	Meet re behaviour principles, accessibility plan and equality information/objectives	
		17.10.19	
2	CG SFS	Take forward Charing issue	
5	JA SH MSD CG RC	Make arrangements for monitoring, liaise CG/MSD/SFS with any queries. Report back to committee	Next meeting
5	MSD CG	Draw up amended TOR and annual plan, circulate to committee for comment	5.11.19
10	MS	Oversee actions from survey ensuring discussed with JM and feedback to staff. Next survey February	

Signature noted in minutes of meeting 12th March 2020