

**PATCHAM JUNIOR SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODY  
MINUTES**

<b>Meeting of:</b>	<b>Full Governing Body</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2019 5.30 pm
<b>Location:</b>	Patcham Junior School
<b>Distribution:</b>	Full Governing Body and Website
<b>Quorum:</b>	For decisions to be binding at least 6 governors were needed. The meeting was quorate throughout.
<b>Apologies:</b>	Ruth Nilsson - accepted Nigel Stock - accepted
<b>Present:</b>	Governors (voting) Isabelle Bagley ((IB) Anabel Carrington (AC) Derrick Davis (DD) Tamsin Hinton-Smith (THS) Marion Rajan, (MRJ) Chair of Governors Mark Rodericks (MRD) Andrew Saunders (ASD) Danny Simpson (DS) Alister Sutherland, (AS) Headteacher Jack Tyler (JT)  Other (non-voting) Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors

**ACTION PLAN SUMMARY**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
22.1.19	MRJ	Follow up absence.	
2.2	DS	Liaise SB re benchmarking ready for budget discussion	19.2.19
2.2	ASD	Report back re appraisal comparisons	26.2.19
3+	All	<b>Note date and prepare re input to SD/IP</b>	
4.1	MRJ	Co-ordinate/delegate	
3	JJ	Finalise and circulate governor day notes	24.1.19
3	<b>ALL</b>	<b>Send in any visit reports</b>	<b>31.1.19</b>
4.1	MRJ	Co-ordinate gov input to sdp/sip	
4.2	AS	Provide SEF as paper for next FGB	19.2.19
4.3	DS	Liaise FWG and have SFVS for relevant FGB	
5.2	AS ASD	Take forward negotiations liaise other governors.	21.3.19
6	JJ	Take action re records	29.1.19
6.3	AS	Circulate audit and progress with updating DP policy.	19.2.19

**PATCHAM JUNIOR SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODY  
MINUTES**

	<b>DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS</b>	<b>Action</b>
1	<p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>1.1 MRJ opened the meeting and welcomed JT the newly elected parent governor. General introductions followed.</p> <p>1.2 Apologies were considered and Andrew Joinson's absence was noted. MRJ would follow up.</p> <p>1.3 JT's declaration of interest had already been considered and no new declarations were received from the governing body. DS spouse worked for the school. All governors could take full part and vote in this meeting.</p>	MRJ
2	<p><b>LAST MEETING</b></p> <p>2.1 The minutes from the meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2018 were agreed to be an accurate record and signed by MRJ accordingly.</p> <p>2.2 Matters arising.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work was ongoing relating to the appraisal 'audit'.</li> <li>• The benchmarking item would be staffing and DS would liaise with the school business manager.</li> <li>• The school partnership advisor had not completed a written report of the visit.</li> </ul> <p>All other items had either been completed or would be addressed later on in this meeting.</p>	ASD DS
3	<p><b>CHAIR's REPORT</b></p> <p>Governors had already considered the report which was accepted. Further information was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategic meeting was set for 4.3.18 and would be facilitated by Shelley Baker, a National Governance Leader and some governors had already met with her in preparation.</li> <li>• The notes from the general feedback session of governor day would be circulated. AS was thanked for welcoming governors and they had been delighted to evidence their vision re the atmosphere of learning, curriculum and ethos of the school was in place. Feedback from pupils had been candid and positive. Governors were reminded to forward their reports from individual focus areas were to be forwarded to JJ.</li> </ul> <p>AS reported that teachers had appreciated governors attending and the feedback, especially as it had been a typical day.</p>	All to note  JJ  All
4	<p><b>STRATEGIC ITEMS</b></p> <p>Agenda papers received and considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School improvement plan 2018/19</li> <li>• Governance section of the Ofsted handbook</li> <li>• Schools Financial Value Standard 2018/19 part completed</li> <li>• School Inspection Data Summary Report (IDSR)</li> <li>• Performance Tables 2018 Brighton and Hove</li> </ul> <p>4.1 School Improvement Plan</p> <p>Governors noted the updated version of the school improvement plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AS informed that his increased knowledge of the school would enable next year's plan, to be developed with the assistance of the school partnership advisor, would be shorter and more focussed. This was welcomed. Input from governors was invited and they could consider this over the next few weeks and discuss further at the strategic meeting.</li> <li>• The deputy headteacher informed pupil safety and well-being survey would again not be the local authority's but school-based.</li> </ul>	MRJ

**PATCHAM JUNIOR SCHOOL**  
**GOVERNING BODY**  
**MINUTES**

- AS informed and governors agreed the school improvement plan was on track.

#### 4.2 School Self-evaluation

AS had spent a day with the school partnership advisor on the school self-evaluation. It had been a very useful exercise. The initial assessments were that each 'Ofsted' area was Good with outstanding elements. **Some governors had already met with him and provided challenge** as they felt it had been possible to interpret the evidence as outstanding. As a discrete item it was possible for governance to be regarded as outstanding.

Governors confirmed they found the self-evaluation, the leadership opinion of the school, useful to have as a document to know the school and as a framework for reviewing it. They requested the fully completed form for the next meeting.

AS

#### 4.3 SFVS

This had now been completed in part by the school. DS would oversee completion and evidence checking with the finance group. It would be ready for FGB approval.

DS

**Has there been an update re the finance work following the departure of the finance assistant?** AS informed the recruitment of a replacement had been paused to use capacity in school by adjusting remaining employees' hours worked. The possibility of setting up a Finance Assistant apprenticeship was also being investigated.

- ❖ In discussion it was confirmed that in general, changes to the staffing structure required the approval of the governing body, as did taking on contracts over the headteacher's monetary limit. This adjustment was minor and received the approval of the governing body without further ado.

Governors supported the use of apprenticeships if it was of benefit but recalled it had raised difficulties in the past. Following a request from the bank it was noted the departing finance assistant had been removed as signatory on the account.

**Has the business continuity plan been reviewed?** It has only just started. Governors suggested prioritising reviewing plans for dealing with the more likely minor disruptions in view of back up expected from the local authority in the case of a major incident.

**Is the asset register up to date?** We have it.

#### 4.4 Education performance data.

A governor with data experience and who had recently attended refresher Analyse School Performance training presented the key exhibits.

##### 4.4.1 IDSR

Areas to investigate.

- The progress areas were in the top quintile or significantly above average. Governors commented that it did not make reference to the teacher assessed writing.
- Attainment was all good for example 85% made the expected standard in reading writing and mathematics. Governors agreed that the three year average was a much fairer judgement.
- Absence. This was slightly below the national average for schools with a similar level of deprivation and governors knew this had been skewed by

**PATCHAM JUNIOR SCHOOL**  
**GOVERNING BODY**  
**MINUTES**

two pupils.

Context. There was nothing significant for the groups Special Educational Needs, English as an Additional Language, Girls, Number on roll or prior attainment. The school had the same number of ethnic groups as the average (mean).

Overall there were no surprises, including with writing.

**What is driving writing slipping to the bottom 20%?** Lower attainment at Key Stage 1 where it is the higher attainers whose writing is dragging the scores down. The progress of the disadvantaged group is positive.

Governors asked questions to ascertain how the school used the data. It was referenced in the self-evaluation, the school improvement/development plan. The question level analysis function was not looked at recently as results had been good (not lots of questions that many missed) – so its usual usefulness as a general picture was not needed so much. It was quite time consuming and backward looking and this year it is better to look at the current cohort and find the gaps in understanding from current assessment processes. MRD informed he gave it a general review and fed back if there was something significant.

**How frequently do you look at progress data?** Termly and in year 6 more like half-termly.

**Who do you share the data with?** The whole school, it works its way down. Senior leaders, year group leaders, teachers in data health checks and we say to the teaching assistants to make sure they know who are off track on their scatter graphs. We also review how much progress the children are making each term within the class, for example in year 5 they may have made high progress since year 2 but we need to know how much progress has been made that term. This brings forth interesting results.

**This shows how much progress value each teacher has added. Do you do it for all subjects?** The foundation subjects. There is not a Key Stage 1 benchmark for others.

#### 4.4.2 Brighton and Hove Key Stage 2 results 2018

A governor talked to the table he had drawn up from his analysis of the results. This was comprehensive. Each of the 47 schools had been given a ranking when compared with 125 schools of their similar prior attainment. This school's rankings were: percentage making progress in reading writing and maths (combined) at **[5]** and above **[33]** expected; progress in reading **[6]**, writing **[2]** and maths **[1]**(single subject); average score in reading **[1]** and maths **[1]**; the disadvantaged combined expected progress **[3]** and reading **[1]**/maths **[1]** average score. It also showed the current **[18]** and previous **[28]** 'similar schools' ranking and Ofsted grades. Patcham Junior School had performed very well, having topped the rankings in 5 of those categories and overall ranked 4<sup>th</sup> locally. On the face of it the school appeared to have better outcome data than the outstanding schools and much better than those requiring improvement but of course other factors were not known.

The Ofsted framework that was under consultation received some discussion re timeframe. Governor monitoring would continue to include broad provision.

#### 4.5 Governor training

Governors had attended the following training:

- Analyse School Performance

**PATCHAM JUNIOR SCHOOL**  
**GOVERNING BODY**  
**MINUTES**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Induction – AC and IB had attended and completed these sessions. JT had booked onto the next session.</li> <li>• AC and ASD were attending the February governor briefing.</li> <li>• MRJ was attending finance and JJ Governor panels by way of refreshers.</li> </ul> <p>There were no issues arising.</p>	
5	<p><b>HEADTEACHER'S HEADLINES</b></p> <p>5.1 A brief report had already been provided. AS now informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The numbers on roll were now 366 with one space in year 5.</li> <li>• There was likely to be a small increase in Reception intake in 2019 at the infant school.</li> <li>• Westdene were still pursuing the reduction in published admission numbers.</li> <li>• Staffing movements.</li> </ul> <p>Governors gave support with regard to a potential problem with a pupil's family member experiencing difficulty. They checked the general process and a governor was able to provide a relevant contact.</p> <p>5.2 Solar panels.  AS informed the lease had been checked else and he had been advised that as the local authority had agreed it, it could be relied upon. Brian Deakin from the local authority had reported they had no objections to the school carrying out further negotiations as required to ensure they were comfortable with the agreement. When do we have to agree? The feed in from the government ends at the end of March. In discussion surrounding the possibility of costs being related to the consumer price index rather than retail it was agreed governors would continue to liaise and negotiate.</p>	ASD AS
6	<p><b>POLICIES</b></p> <p>6.1 Supporting Pupils with Medical Conditions</p> <p>The policy had already been circulated.  Do you have any pupils with long term needs? Yes.  Will you have to make changes to accommodate? Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The supporting pupils with medical conditions policy was approved as presented. It would be reviewed in 3 years and would be evaluated by annual report.</li> </ul> <p>6.2 Disciplinary policy  The clerk recommended the governing body consider clarifying the level of delegation for dismissal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ It was confirmed that the power to dismiss was delegated to the headteacher.</li> </ul> <p>6.3 Data Protection.  AS reported that the school business manager was leading compliance. Privacy notices were in place. The audit by Paul Platts, on behalf of the DPO company had taken place. The initial results were positive and the written report was awaited. It was noticeable that staff took care to store information carefully and keep computers locked. The data protection policy would be updated.</p>	JJ  JJ  AS

**PATCHAM JUNIOR SCHOOL  
GOVERNING BODY  
MINUTES**

	<p>6.4 Premises Management Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ A governor confirmed having evidenced that these documents were up to date. His previous suggestion of having a weekly rather than ad hoc check of a fire check matter had been adopted by the school.</li> </ul>	JJ
7	<p><b>Any other urgent business</b> (with prior approval of Chair) There being no further business, the meeting closed 19.06</p>	

..... signed ..... dated  
Signature noted in minutes 26.2.19