

Full Governing Body	
Date/Time:	24 th November 2015 6pm
Location:	Patcham Junior School
For:	Full Governing Body, Website
Attendees:	Danny Simpson DS Ashley Seymour Williams (ASW) Headteacher Valerie Williamson (VW) Derrick Davis (DD) Nicky Caldwell (NC) Marion Rajan (MRJ) Iseult Hull-Flower (IHF) Chair of Governors Shadric Toop (ST) Mark Rodericks (MRD) Andrew Saunders (ASD) Trevor Howson (TH) Debbie Willsher (DW) Janet Johnson (Clerk)

	DISCUSSION AND DECISION	ACTION
1	Welcome and apologies for absence IHF opened the meeting. Sarah Fitzjohn Scott (SFS) had sent her apologies which were accepted. Adam Smith (AS) was absent.	
2	DECLARATION of Interest in items on the agenda. No new interests were declared. No withdrawals were required.	
3	MINUTES OF LAST MEETING. Subject to a minor amendment the minutes of the meeting 15.9.15 were agreed as an accurate record and signed accordingly.	
4	CHAIRS' REPORT Governors had already received this report outlining chair's visits since the last full meeting. Further examples of collaborative working were given. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A meeting with local school governors to further closer working was imminent • The safeguarding governors and Designated Safeguarding Links were meeting • VW had participated in the City Partnership for Education (CPE) governors section – report discussed at item 6.4. • IHF had received and circulated feedback from the joint inset day with Patcham High School and Westdene Primary which had been successful. • ASW described the increased networking by teachers and informed the teaching assistants now had their own forum. Each TA had their own specialisms and would share their expertise with PHS and Westdene. <p>It was agreed visit reports should continue to be circulated and JJ would put them on Google drive.</p>	
5	MATTERS ARISING (if not covered elsewhere) IHF has asked Tamsin McDonald from CPE to attend an FGB All other matters had been completed or were being monitored elsewhere.	IHF

<p>6</p>	<p>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT - PROGRESS REPORTS and Suggestions for Change</p> <p>6.1 SCHOOL VISION</p> <p>Further to previous discussions in meetings and by email the school vision was now confirmed as</p> <p>❖ Engage Encourage Endeavour, unlocking potential in every child.</p> <p>It was easy to remember and although would not please everyone would be useful to encourage discussion and focus future work. A governor had connections with copywriters and they had contributed to the process. It was decided to review in September whether it is helping drive the school forward. ASW would take it to parents.</p> <p>6. 2 CURRENT POSITION</p> <p>6.2.1Stakeholder views</p> <p>The staffing survey and pupil feedback was now due. AS would be reminded. JJ reminded governors survey questions could be used to assist in gauging the success of policies.</p> <p>Governors had attended at the recent parent evenings, where parents complete a survey and ST now gave his initial findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 103 responses, covering a third of children had been received. • Parents were very keen to offer views • Open questions were asked – what at the school went well? and even better if? There were no tick boxes. • There were more positives than negatives • Positives: Highest was friendly atmosphere (words used by 33% of respondents), then good teachers, good communications school to parents (20%), Newsletter and blog, approachable, happy child, varied and holistic curriculum (10%), extra-curricular activities. • The positives had a pattern; the negatives seemed to be one-offs • Negatives: Not enough variety of sport (6%), not competitive enough (4%), 6% wondered why there was no swimming, 6% said communication was not good enough (c.f. positive) • Some of those with negative feedback had some good suggestions for improvement <p>ST would circulate the results for further analysis. TH would meet with the PE co-ordinator. IHF and ST would liaise with ASW to consider further action and agree a joint response to parents. The survey response would be very useful and ST was thanked for his continued good work.</p> <p>6.2.2 Should evaluation judgements of the school change? Do plans or focus need to change?</p> <p>ASW had summarised the School Self Evaluation in his headteacher's report already circulated and considered by governors. The full Self-evaluation in the format previously agreed by governors would be circulated. This comprised an overview followed by the outstanding grade statements taken from the new Ofsted framework, which governors had agreed was the aim of the school. For each descriptor evidence and a grading had been given. A single page quick visual representation was under consideration. The evaluation included a statement as to why it was not graded the one above or below.</p>	<p>IHF</p> <p>AS</p> <p>ST TH IHF</p>
----------	--	---

Re data on entry. Why were only 85% working at Age Related in Maths?
This is mainly due to the change in expectations in the new National Curriculum and Assessment without Levels. We have given them the new style test and for most it will be fine but it is a concern and we are tracking it carefully. We are identifying the thresholds, setting numerical targets for grades to identify children who are off track and there are booster programmes in place.

What was the outcome of the school parent forum on assessment without levels? About 20 parents attended, ASD confirmed it was a useful session.

Were parents confused beforehand? Yes and we will continue to think about how we communicate this change. Pupils will not be given a level but a raw score, for example.

- **National Results and School Self Evaluation**

Governors had already reviewed the results and progress of the school at previous meetings and considered the RAISE on line, Fischer Family trust and Ofsted dashboards as they had been released over recent weeks. ASD summarised the significant information following the release of national data.

- The school was in the top 6 % nationally in terms of average point score and this was a cause for celebration.
- For value added in RAISE and FFT because the prior attainment is not of a normal distribution but skewed to a higher level it is difficult for PJS to increase their value added as this would require level 6.
- The massive increase since 2013 was expected. It showed the progress made over the last couple of years and pupil progress figures were significantly better.
- Pupil progress by group was above national progress, significantly so in some areas.
- The school had a higher percentage of higher attainers and lower percentage of pupil premium children than national average. There were no other items of note on the context of the school.

How is science assessed? It is done by teacher assessment.

On national split there is a higher percentage of higher attainers based on prior results and lower pupil premium numbers. There were no other items of note on the context of the school.

For Department for Education comparative data, can you see where your school is ranked nationally? It depends on which category you look. The school partnership adviser had met with ASW to discuss the RAISE results.

- The Local authority was not setting targets this year because the position with Age Related assessment was not clear.
- Disadvantaged pupils and Free school meal pupils would continue to be a focus. At PJS on RAISE there had been lots of significant improvements and the Ofsted dashboard showed the disadvantaged doing well
- Boys outperformed girls in writing and had a good 3 year trend but girls still also improved.

Why do you think that happened? It is a matter for reflection. The L6 skews it in maths but the writing is interesting. MRD recalled there was a focus on it a few years ago and small but relatively important changes had

<p>been made eg. the topics covered so it might have been that. A governor commented that it was good to see that the areas we had been concerned about and narrowing the gap have done well. The focus has paid off. Our disadvantaged do better than the National Average; however, there is still an in school gap. Governors agreed it is difficult to make much of the results when it relates to one child or just a few. Last year it was just 8; this year there are more, including many with SEN so different results would be expected.</p> <p>ASW had the view the data would be in the outstanding category but a couple of years would be needed to enable further embedding of the changes.</p> <p>There had been no real surprises in the data. The evaluation was accepted and no changes to plans were required. Governors requested staff be congratulated.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress against plan 	IHF
<p>6.3. COMMITTEES Curriculum</p>	
<p>MRJ gave a brief report on the outcomes of the meeting and confirmed the committee had agreed the areas for focus and scheduled work. PSHE and British values would be discussed at the next meeting. The SEN policy had already been circulated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The minutes were accepted including the SEN policy and terms of reference approval. 	JJ
<p>Resources. Pay Committee.</p>	
<p>This committee had only just met so the minutes had not been circulated. DS advised the committee had considered the budget and the underspend was now up to £19k as a result of making savings to expenditure but the three year projection was required as a deficit may be indicated that would need to be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The pay policy had already been circulated to governors. DS advised the changes recommended at Resources committee and the policy was now approved subject to those changes being made. ❖ The scheme of delegation had been circulated to the full governing body as a paper for Resources committee. DS listed the changes to the previous scheme approved by the governing body that had been recommended at Resources committee. These were agreed. There being more than three quarters of governors present this was sufficient for the amended scheme to be approved. 	JJ
<p>The committee was determined to ensure at least good financial management and would be involving more governors in reviewing the systems. An interim evaluation indicated just a few areas where control could be tightened or better evidence obtained and work had been scheduled to address these by the end of March.</p>	JJ
<p>Staffing. All the recruitment last year was on a one year contract so we will need to think how we can safeguard the frontline roles in the event a deficit is forecast.</p>	

How many staff are on this contract? No teaching staff but there are 3 learning support assistants a Finance Assistant and another.

Can you think of ways of dealing with this through the TA forum? We are going to have to think of all different ways of sharing resources and how we use them. We also have more children than usual that need individual needs assistants.

So there isn't the money available to safeguard the contracts? We have to for INA and we do get some funding.

Do you have any sense if we would be a winner or loser in the fairer funding review? Brighton and Hove is probably just below average so in theory we should benefit but it depends if they reduce the overall budget. Governors agreed the difference in funding between and within authorities was shocking.

The minutes were accepted.

Strategy Group*

The notes were accepted.

6.4 TRAINING

City partnership

VW had attended the governors meeting of this group and reported an overwhelmingly positive view of the potential of the partnership. Governors were well informed and there were lots of new initiatives. It had recently gained charitable status and it was also suggested as an opportunity of getting funding without LA funding. The trustees had good contacts. ASW had met them and confirmed they had a good range of skills and were very interested. All the schools were like minded and PJS were grouped with St Bartholomew's and St Pauls, for example doing challenge meetings. Governors were agreed it was a good form of support especially as that from the LA had dropped off. Suggested it might be possible to raise concerns with Ofsted conduct as a group.

IHF would circulate the minutes.

IHF

Governance and Strategy Partnership meeting

ASD and IHF had attended this and ASD gave a brief summary of the discussion. Further details had already been circulated. He added

- Tom Bewick presentation supported the view that demographics dictated outcomes.
- No further information was forthcoming on the SEN proposals when asked
- When asked, although not particularly keen, more academies were not ruled out.
- Data presented by the LA showed significant improvements with the exception of maths. ASW noted a couple of years ago a big investment had been made so the apparent lack of impact was an issue.

A governor had considered the actions of PJS governing body and found it compared very well with those of outstanding governing bodies in the 'effective governance' document as well as appendix 4 of the Ofsted guidance on inspecting governance.

There were no recommendations other than to continue with best practice.

7	<p>Clerk up-date Governors had found the news items and material circulated informative. JJ sought opinion on the practicalities of using the school email system and explained when and how to encrypt emails. Instructions would be put on google drive. Governors would maintain their school emails and an email to the working email would be sent prior to sending emails via the school email system.</p>	
8	<p>How have outcomes improved as a result of this meeting? It was too soon to say. Date of Next meeting – 27th April. VW gave her apologies. Items for Next meeting – (Effectiveness of GB session?)This was not discussed.</p>	
9	<p>AOB This was taken during point 6.2.2 Head teacher's report In what way are other schools learning from us? With BCPfE for example re marking, learning walks have been done here and the practice has been taken elsewhere. Some of the Junior heads and staff have been here for monitoring a range of things, to learn how we have made rapid progress and re Achievement for All. It is good to have such external challenge. Something the school has found is that although other schools might do more marking than us, ours is more strategically directed and has a bigger impact.</p> <p>A governor was able to provide more information on radicalisation risk assessments and agreed to send it.</p> <p>The large number on roll was noted. What year do they come in? It varies. Are there any that present a challenge? Not particularly Could there be more than 32 in a class. It is possible but not practical or likely.</p> <p>How does the overall number (now 14%) classed as SEN compare with other schools? Nationally and citywide there are slightly fewer but it varies. Pupil premium numbers were 3% up on last year.</p> <p>There being no further items to discuss the meeting closed at 20.00</p>	

..... signed dated

	OWNER	ACTION	DUE BY
5	IHF	Follow up CPE presentation	
6.1	IHF JJ	Note for Sept FGB	
6.2.1	AS	Take action and report back re staff and pupil survey/voice	Feb
6.2.1	ST ALL	Finalise survey results presentation and circulate Use survey to inform work and reports	Dec Ongoing
6.2.1	TH	Take forward findings with PE co-ordinator/liase govs/ASW as appropriate	
6.2.1	IHF ST ASW	Liaise re feedback to parents and taking forward learning points from survey	
6.2.2	IHF	Take action if required.	
6.3	JJ	Up date policy TOR website records	