

Full Governing Body	
Date/Time:	27 th April 2016 6pm
Location:	Patcham Junior School
For:	Full Governing Body, Website
Apologies:	Valerie Williamson (VW) - accepted Derrick Davis (DD) - accepted
Present:	Governors: Adam Smith (AS) Ashley Seymour Williams (ASW) Headteacher Shadric Toop (ST) Mark Rodericks (MRD) Debbie Willsher (DW) Nicky Caldwell (NC) Marion Rajan (MRJ) Iseult Hull-Flower (IHF) Chair of Governors Ruth Nilsson (RN) Danny Simpson (DS) Trevor Howson (TH) Andrew Saunders (ASD) Other: Janet Johnson (JJ)

MINUTES

	DISCUSSION and DECISION	ACTION
1	<p>Welcome</p> <p>The meeting opened 6.15 following a presentation by ASW to governors on the white paper, 'excellence in education.' This included a review of differences between types of school, current academy options and an up-date on the actions of the main interested parties locally and nationally. It was clear the situation was fluid.</p> <p>Governors commented that there were many disadvantages to becoming an academy and the opportunities offered could be achieved by other means. They remained of the opinion that the mass change would not improve outcomes for children and indeed were alarmed at the difficulties that would be caused. They were pragmatic re the need to strengthen alliances, prepare to change to ensure the best outcome for Patcham children and keep a close check on the change of funding but were unanimous in not wanting to make any radical moves at present.</p>	ASW
2	<p>DECLARATION of Interest in items on the agenda.</p> <p>The spouses of DS and ST worked as Teaching Assistants at the school. No new declarations were made and no withdrawals from discussion were required.</p>	
3	<p>CHAIR'S REPORT</p> <p>3.1 The Chair's report had already been circulated and was accepted. IHF had been active in extending links with Patcham Infant School and the City Partnership. Governors were pleased to note the School Partnership Advisor had agreed with the school's evaluation of</p>	

	<p>teaching and learning as 'good'. A further report had been made following attendance at the City Partnership business planning day where the main part of the day was working on establishing the purpose, vision goals and values for the partnership.</p> <p>ASW advised another meeting is planned to look at the decision making process of the trustees. This was mainly to help with bids for funding for example to make a bid for help for families with autism.</p> <p>Governors agreed that there was a lot of uncertainty at present but being in a strong partnership was beneficial. There was a need to continue to consider what will be best for PJS and to maintain links with local Patcham schools. Progress on this had already been made, Chairs had met and the safeguarding governors were starting to liaise.</p> <p>3.2 Governors had already received and considered the application from RN to join the governing body. RN had been working with the GB for some months and had current experience of secondary teaching in a different local authority. Governors considered she would make a good addition to the team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ It was decided to co-opt RN on to the governing body. JJ would advise governor support and arrange for the completion of any remaining induction. A mentor was already in place and IHF would discuss focus roles with RN. ❖ 3.3 The local authority had produced a new model disciplinary policy and guidelines. This had been agreed with the unions. Governors had already considered the documents. ❖ It was agreed to adopt the disciplinary policy and guidelines. ❖ It was confirmed the power to dismiss rested with the headteacher. Any appeal or if the headteacher was not to hear the case would be heard and decided upon by a panel of governors. <p>3.4 VW had advised she would be stepping down at the end of the term. It was agreed it would be better not to seek a replacement at present and to recruit when particular skills or knowledge were required. IHF and DS would review the skills audit.</p> <p>3.5 Governors presence at the meeting to greet new parents to the school was agreed.</p>	<p>JJ</p> <p>IHF MRJ SFS ASW</p>
4	<p>Secondary admissions briefing</p> <p>ASD was on the working party for this review and the LA presentation had been circulated. A number of governors had attended the local presentation to the public. He now gave further information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was pressure on school places, • The location of the new school had not been confirmed. • The Dorothy Stringer presentation had been lively. ASW advised attendance had been poor in some other areas. • In option A governors agreed the 8% free school meal projection gave an incorrect impression of the area and did not reflect the current reality • Some Councillors were very keen on having a better social 	

	<p>mix in schools but they do depend on the tie break issue. The allocations would be very different depending on whether it was distance or random allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was hoped the faith schools would be willing to honour agreements re free school meal allocation. • The Council were collating feedback and there were different opinions depending on where you live. • The current system is for local children to attend local schools. All the aims cannot be met. <p>What is the timescale? 2018, and then as academies can have their own admissions policy it will be all changed again..</p> <p>Can you cross the boundaries? The sibling link is retained as is SEN and looked after children.</p> <p>Governors were concerned for the outcomes of vulnerable pupils with option B and C. They would have to travel furthest, attendance would be affected and they would be less likely to attend after school clubs, known to be beneficial.</p> <p>Under option B and C work done by schools with families would be lost. It would also be detrimental to pupils as having more destination schools would mean weaker links between the schools.</p> <p>It was also noted that parental preferences might change depending on which group the schools were aligned for an academy.</p> <p>No actions were required from governors at present.</p>	
5	<p>Headteacher's report</p> <p>Governors had already received the report along with the City partnership termly report. ASW advised and governors commended staff on their extra work to successfully continue to hold children's happiness and wellbeing in the forefront of their minds and making sure children are protected from stresses. Despite the pressure from the government to narrow the curriculum, PJS was managing to widen it.</p> <p>The School partnership advisor had attended and the quality of teaching and learning was continuing to improve. This echoed ASW and MRD's findings.</p> <p>Data had been reported on at Curriculum meeting the previous week. Looking at data very closely PJS was doing well when compared with other schools. The infant school was reporting age related expectation met rate as the highest in Brighton and Hove.</p> <p>Are the foundation subjects anything except maths and English? Mainly.</p> <p>Will you impose a fine for absence due to the 'Parent strike'? I am considering the position. My approach is likely to be that it will be an unauthorised absence unless attendance is already low.</p> <p>What are they trying to highlight? Children, particularly in key stage 1 being put under stress to do exams.</p> <p>What will the impact be? It will be in year 6 as they are now in the immediate run up to SATS.</p> <p>Re incidents against staff member; is that violence pupil to staff member? Yes, it resulted in an exclusion of one child with high end needs. Staff have had training and it didn't result in injury.</p> <p>How come there are cases of bullying? ASW we have reviewed reporting as there have been discrepancies between the safe and</p>	

	well at school survey and our reporting. It is now recording more clearly. The report was accepted.	
6	MINUTES OF LAST MEETING. The minutes were agreed to be an accurate record and signed accordingly.	
7	MATTERS ARISING (if not covered elsewhere) IHF would arrange for the City Partnership co-ordinator to attend a meeting. TH report would be circulated by next FGB he had visited the school. All other items had been completed.	IHF TH
8	<p>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT - Receive reports on progress against the plan and consider recommendations</p> <p>8.1 Current situation and process for planning for 2016/17</p> <p>8.1.1 Governors commented that it had been helpful to have a more rounded view of other subjects in curriculum area. School monitoring has worked well, linking to the school improvement plan and governors needed to ensure a focus on school improvement.</p> <p>ASW confirmed the long term objectives would be reviewed and he proposed returning to a termly spotlight model. Governors could arrange to attend school activities including evaluation sessions relating to the termly spotlight overview to aid governor monitoring and relevant staff could report to Curriculum committee.</p> <p>How do staff feel about the spotlight model? The staff governor advised they had had a better experience with it as it was easier to focus on priorities.</p> <p>What does the school partnership advisor think of the plan? The HMI wanted us to show all the things we were doing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ In discussion it was agreed the process would start now taking the long term objectives from the vision and including the Ofsted statements and other areas identified for focus to form an outline plan. Then following the examination of end of year data and discussion with governors at the next FGB the plan would be adjusted and ready for governor approval at the September FGB. <p>Apart from maths and English, how do you measure success and progress in the other subjects? In the past, when we had more time, we would look at others, for example do more science testing. We do still report a science assessment in year 6. For others we look at the quality of work across school. Subject leaders are developing portfolios for each year to exemplify good practice. A governor noted science planning has to be differentiated and you can see that in books.</p> <p>Is there some way as a governing body we can look at that? We can ask subject leaders to prepare a report to the link governor and we can discuss it at the next meeting. It will be qualitative because the data for reading writing and maths is so involved. Other schools don't have data. I and the Deputy HT can give our perspective and the school partnership advisor will give an</p>	

	<p>external perspective. We are looking at science assessment but looking at the development of scientific thinking rather than retention of facts.</p> <p>8.1.2 Comparison with other schools. ASD had prepared and governors had considered a table showing Brighton and Hove schools key stage 2 results 2015 and a ranking amongst 'similar' schools based on prior attainment nationally. In Brighton and Hove PJS was 13 out of 44 for Value added (progress) and equal top for average point score (attainment). Nationally it was ranked 39 out of 125. PJS increase in value added had been the highest in the city. Clearly a great achievement. ASD was thanked for his work and it was noted comparisons could not be on the same basis in future.</p> <p>8.2 Committees</p> <p>8.2.1 Curriculum. The meeting had only taken place the previous week and draft minutes recently circulated. MRJ gave a brief report of the meeting. The minutes were accepted.</p> <p>8.2.2 Resources, Pay and Performance Committee. Governors had already considered the minutes and School Financial Value Standard report. DS advised that since the meeting the outturn had increased to £41,854 credit. The 16/17 budget was £1,258k not including the carry forward of the outturn surplus and the plan projected a surplus at the end of 2017. The SFVS had been agreed. The minutes were accepted.</p> <p>8.3 Governors (if not reported elsewhere)</p> <p>8.3.1 Governor Visits. These had been reported by way of Chair's report or committee meeting.</p> <p>8.3.2 Governor Day. This had been a success. The notes were accepted. It was suggested governors from the infant school could be invited to attend and PJS governors expressed an interest in attending a High school governor day. (It was noted the Chair of Governors at the infant school had been invited as he was to this meeting but was not able to attend.)</p> <p>8.3.3 Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governor Closing the Gap Conference – IHF and JJ had attended and circulated a report drawing on feedback from governors at the Patcham schools. The main presentation had been interesting. The workshops varied in usefulness and both IHF and JJ reported PJS was acting in accordance with most of the best practice. - Clerk Forum JJ advised best practice had been shared regarding headteacher reports and information for governors. She confirmed all governors needed to have a DBS (ECRC) certificate by September. 	<p>IHF JJ SFS</p>
9	<p>Items for next meeting Data, school improvement plan.</p>	
10	<p>Any other urgent business There being no further business, the meeting closed at 19.55</p>	

	OWNER	ACTION	DUE BY
1	ASW	Circulate Excellence in Education presentation and related handout	
1	Open to all DS SFS	Attend LA presentation to governors	24.5.16
3.5	ASW IHF MRJ SFS Others?	Attend new parents meeting – ASW to confirm time	13.7.16
7	IHF	Invite Tamsin M to attend FGB	20.5.16
7	TH	Provide report	3.7.16
8.3.2	IHF SFS JJ	Liaise re invitations to governor day at PJS PHS	16.5.16

..... signeddated