

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

Meeting of:	Quality of Education Committee
Date/Time:	16 th June 2020 5pm
Location:	Virtual Meeting – MS teams
Distribution:	Governing body, website M Newman, M Warner, J Hall, R Strong
Quorum	3 governors required to be present for decisions to be binding. The meeting was quorate throughout.
Present:	Governors (Voting) Sarah Fitzjohn-Scott (SFS) Chair of Governors Jamie Guiver (JG) Catherine Jordan (KJ) Natasha Marris (NM) Andrew Saunders (ASD) Chair of QE Committee Alex Sheppard (AS) Richard Eves (RE) - accepted Alexandra Sheppard (AS) Other (non-voting) Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors M Newman (MN) Deputy Headteacher M Warner (MW) Deputy Headteacher J Hall (JH) Director of Science
Governor Apologies	John McKee (JM) Headteacher – accepted

MINUTES

DISCUSSION and DECISION	
1	WELCOME, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATION OF INTEREST ASD opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. Apologies and interests were considered. All governors could take full part throughout.
2	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING Paper: Minutes from meeting 21.1.20 The minutes were agreed to be an accurate record and signature authorised. The action points were updated.
3	SUPPORT FOR PUPILS AT HOME Paper – Home learning documents The paper was received. It covered the wide variety of work offered. Governors acknowledged there were many positive actions and invited MW to provide more information about the concerns. These were surrounding the disparity in confidence and learning; numbers of those accessing the learning materials, the balance of learning and well-being. Mitigating actions included:

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

DISCUSSION and DECISION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining contact with pupils to encourage engagement and phone calls to parents for those with concerns. • Ensuring provision of lap tops for pupils if they will engage. • Reviewing attendance and intentions to attend. • Recording levels of engagement to indicate areas of concern re current wellbeing and for which families to contact to try to remove barriers to learning. It also informs provision and groupings for next year • Review at Head of Curriculum Area meetings. <p>Will it be difficult timetabling catch up lessons? MN: It will be more of an issue with English and maths. Subjects with fewer classes will not be able to have lots of groups.</p> <p>Are there any resource implications – for summer activities or whatever you think is needed? MW: Yes there will be resourcing implications. We need to be able to give provision.</p> <p>It is probably a common theme across all schools. How are other schools managing re home learning and with the shared problems? MN's deputies' group had not disbanded and he informed it appeared to be 25-30% non-engagement locally and nationally. Each school had their own methods and there was a variety of blended learning. This school was probably ahead pastorally. He felt that the DfE and Ofqual would have to recognise that next summer in the exams as it was not a level playing field.</p> <p>Governors thanked MW.</p>
4	<p>GCSE GRADING Papers: process for grading and provisional results</p> <p>4.1 The papers were received. Governors considered the process had been very thorough. One had been involved from a governor point of view for scrutiny and been very impressed. MN was invited to comment and then took questions.</p> <p>He detailed the staged approach and added it had been a thorough, smooth process but time consuming. The results were fair for the individuals and it was hoped there would not be many moderations.</p> <p>Is there a percentage of schools they will moderate? No. They will moderate if there are discrepancies. In the main our results are in keeping and show a normal pattern.</p> <p>Is your approach comparable to local schools? Ours was more rigorous. It was robust from the outset. We only talked about marks for the first 3 weeks and then ranking of pupils which helped, before seeing what the grades were. A governor confirmed the meeting attended was very robust. Another governor confirmed they had been following the process and considered it had been very rigorous</p> <p>Was there any external moderation of the process? No. I would have liked someone to have come in. I came up with a process that was informed externally. . All the exam boards are doing a different thing.</p> <p>Is there likely to be any appeals process? They can take the exam in Sept /October.</p> <p>4.2 Results (subject to moderation by the exam boards)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The attainment 8 score had risen from 47.68 to 50.52 meaning average grades essentially rose from 4.7 to a 5.0.

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

DISCUSSION and DECISION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English and Maths at 4+ were up from 71% to 78% and for 5+ from 46% to 55%. Weaker subjects remained as Engineering (DT), iMedia (ICT), Latin and combined Science based on progress. • Note: <p>MN was invited to comment and informed all subjects were on the upper end of fair achievement. The 5+ in maths improvement had been the aim. Triple science had come out very strongly as we would have hoped. Combined science was also up on previous years. Some subjects were still a bit lower. Spanish is better as smaller group. French is the biggest weakness but had biggest cohort. English has a normal set of results.</p> <p>4.3 Gender and disadvantaged gap What about the two focus areas – gender and disadvantaged? The gap has closed from .48 to .24t re disadvantaged and girls performed a bit better than boys so a normal pattern followed. Are there any signs of improving results for boys? MN we are seeing that the attainment 8 gap narrowed quite a bit. Boys pushed further ahead in maths and closed the gap in English. We had more higher-attaining boys than girls.</p> <p>Whilst the closure of gaps is to be applauded we would not want to see a widening next year. MN informed that had been a factor in their deliberations.</p> <p>4.4 We understand the position you are in and you don't want to stray from your normal distribution; however, you have invested a lot in improvement and we would have expected the results to have improved significantly anyway. MN informed that this aspect had been raised nationally and Ofqual had responded that they would not look at improvements and trajectories. This stance had not been received well by schools.</p> <p>Have Ofsted confirmed there will be no inspections next year? MN Certainly up until Christmas and they have said they are not looking at the data. MW cautioned that the position could change. A governor informed the local authority had seconded an HMI inspector.</p>
5	<p>YEAR 10 PLANS MW gave an update on the wider reopening for year 10s. He added that numbers so far had exceeded expectations and some were attending that had not been expected.</p> <p>As more return, will it have an impact on home learning? At the moment blended working works well. We are having to adapt – and he gave examples. Might there be benefits in the future – for example sending in lessons if a teacher knows they will be absent? MW: yes. That is a good idea. The grading process was good professional development for everyone and gives mock exams more meaning for pupils.</p> <p>Reflecting on the levels of non-engagement in year 10, will you be considering dropping a subject to aid catch up on core subjects? MN: we don't know what the process will be and there may be strong lobbying resulting in support for learning which has not happened since March. The disparity between families is huge. It is likely we will have to adapt what we do but we are loathe to do so.</p> <p>Do you have the capacity to offer an online curriculum for those shielding? We barely have the capacity at the moment.</p>

**PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY**

DISCUSSION and DECISION	
	Governors considered it was not only the actual learning but the behaviour for learning that was being missed.
6	<p>LOOKING AHEAD TO SEPTEMBER</p> <p>MN informed that for timetabling purposes they were assuming all pupils would return but he was expecting to have to write another timetable. MW added that at present they were having to be reactive but were hoping for clarity, including from the exam boards. All schools have been choosing what they have been teaching from the curriculum and some may prove not to be examinable.</p> <p>Do you have any additional plans for year 6/year7 transition? MN informed that parents were assuming we are open but it cannot be done at the moment as the school could not accommodate visitors. Talks had commenced but there was not a decision yet as to the nature of any delayed start for other years.</p> <p>What about exchange of information in terms of SEN etc? Yes a lot is being exchanged there have been lots of meetings with parents remotely.</p> <p>A lot of primaries are putting a lot of emphasis on year 6. It would be useful to know what all the other schools are doing. MN I have a meeting tomorrow with all the other schools. We don't know yet.</p>
7	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>Opportunities to refresh elements of the curriculum were going to be a future agenda item. Will it be part of the mix in the near future? MN: we do not have a lot of energy for this at the moment but people are adapting and delivering remotely is meaning they are reflecting on content. We haven't captured that or asked people to do that at the moment as we are checking they are all right. If we can harness what we have learnt from that then we will.</p> <p>JH added science had started the journey of looking at the curriculum back in January and there was a lot ready for September for the new years' 7 and 8.</p> <p>A governor noted that there was a move to change the curriculum regarding racism.</p> <p>There being no further business, ASD thanked all for their participation and the meeting closed 18.13</p>

ACTION LIST

	OWNER	ACTIONS	DUE BY
7 21.1.20	ALL	Submit governor day/other visit reports	Ongoing. Include 'virtual' meeting reports.
8 21.1.20	MW/ASD	Arrange for presentation of required information at next meeting C Gormley/ or other staff.	Next face to face meeting.
10 21.1.20	MW NM SFS	Investigate and report back with recommendations for evidencing statutory duty is met, and, if required, policy for approval.	30.6.20
Update 16.6.20	ASD	Review this action point.	

Signature authorised at meeting 1st December 2020