



## Easingwold School

### Minutes of the meeting of the Full Governing Board of Easingwold School held on Monday 13 February 2017.

**Present:** Mrs Christine Cookman (CC), Mr Chris Gill (CG), Mr Neil Hawkins (NH) - Chair, Mr Neil Millan (NM), Chris Platt (CP), Mrs Fiona Rafferty (FR), Mr Steve Smith (SS), Mrs Elaine Walker (EW) and Mr Jon Wright (JW).

**In attendance:** Lesley Barber (LB) - Clerk, Amanda Bramley (AB) NYCC Lead Advisor, Paul Brockwell (PB) - Interim Headteacher, Martyn Johnson (MJ) - Assistant Head, Nick Horn (NHo) NYCC Lead Advisor, Mary-Louise Priest (MLP) - SENCO, Emma Robins (ER) - Deputy Head, Karen Shires (KS) - Assistant Head, Chris Tiffany (CT) - Assistant Head, Justine Ventress (JV) - Assistant Head, Mark Welborn MW (School Business Manager).

No	Minutes	Action Points
2.17.1	<p><b>Consideration of Absences</b> – <i>Agreed: That Governors consented to the absences of Mrs Diane Clarke (DC), Mr Hugh Porter (HP) and Mr Rob Pritchard (RP).</i></p> <p>The Chair introduced the new Parent Governors: Chris Gill, Chris Platt and Elaine Walker.</p>	
2.17.2	<p><b>Consideration of confidential items:</b> There were no items identified at this stage, however, if necessary items would be identified as confidential when they were discussed.</p>	
2.17.3	<p><b>Declarations of Interest / Hospitality</b> – none declared</p>	
2.17.4	<p><b>Consideration of Minutes of meeting held on 16 January 2017.</b> Agreed: <i>That:</i> <i>a) the public minutes of 16 January 2017 were agreed to be a correct record; and</i> <i>b) the confidential minutes of 16 January 2017 were agreed to be a correct record.</i></p>	
2.17.5	<p><b>Matters arising</b>  <b>a) LA Support Arrangements circulated (JB NYCC)</b> – this had been circulated.  <b>b) Parents informed of Action Plan, ASDAN. (PB)-</b> PB confirmed that updates had been provided to Parents via letters.  <b>c) Progress 8 information circulated</b> – this had been circulated.  <b>d) Behaviour Policy amended – website/parents informed (CT)-</b> CT said that the website hadn't been updated. Mark forward.</p>	<p>CT to update website with revised behaviour policy.</p>

	<p><b>e) Dates for School Council</b> –NH said that meetings took place on alternate Thursdays 12.30 to 1.15pm in BS1. He had contacted the Council to ask if he could attend a future meeting and field questions. PB explained that the School Council reported back to him and Governors were welcome to attend that meeting too. The frequency with which Governors should attend was discussed; it was decided to agree this once NH had met with the Council. KS said that the Council was happy for Governors to attend.</p> <p>NH also reported that following comments made in the Governor Review, he had agreed with PB that he, along with other Governors, would attend a future Staff meeting to start the process of improving relations.</p> <p>In addition, following the Governance review, he suggested appointing Steve Smith as Joint Chair of the Board; Steve would focus on teaching and learning aspects of the school and he would do the rest.</p> <p><i>Agreed: That Steve Smith was elected as Joint Chair of the FGB to take office until the first meeting of the Autumn Term, with specific responsibility for teaching and learning issues.</i></p>	
<p>2.17.6</p>	<p><b><u>UPDATE ON PROGRESS BY SLT AND HEADTEACHER</u></b>  Governors considered reports as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exclusions Data</li> <li>• Absence Data</li> <li>• Yrs 10 and 11 Tracking Data</li> <li>• Action Plan – update on teaching and learning actions.</li> <li>• Proposed Y9 Option Blocks</li> <li>• SENCO Update</li> <li>• KS5 Update</li> </ul> <p>PB updated Governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governors were directed to an Ofsted document “Sustainable Improvement Journey from Special Measures”. This was a useful tool. EW referred to a document by the Education Development Trust (her client) which was based on a survey of Head Teachers 2017. She would forward this to PB.</li> <li>• IRIS system (lesson recording for teacher self- development) – this was now well used and was embedded into departments. Emma Taylor (ET) was responsible for this area of work and she was working with 13 teachers identified by Faculty Heads as needing immediate support and action; they would be encouraged to use it. The Maths department were using the system.</li> <li>• Lesson observations – the 13 teachers identified for support would receive lesson observations by PB. He had met with the Unions to discuss this process and how teachers would be used to support their colleagues. ET would support them with issues identified through this process.</li> <li>• Teach meets – informal opportunities for staff to share good practice, held monthly. Think, Pair, Share had been the focus at a recent one.</li> <li>• New Feedback policy for CPD.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PB to circulate link to Ofsted document.  EW to forward document to PB.</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer and self-assessment more evident in classrooms.</li> <li>• Faculties had been given their review report following the QA process (evidence collected such as classroom displays, behaviour for learning, book scrutiny etc.). Faculties would produce an Action Plan for their department by half term. SLT meetings would focus on ensuring these actions were followed up, together with a focus on Years 11 and 12 progress.</li> </ul> <p>Governors asked questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How was Maths challenge being improved for years 7-9?</b> PB explained that robust conversations had been held with the Head of Maths; books had been reviewed with him from another school and he had accepted the need for additional challenge at this school. There was a review of Maths by the LA the following day. NHo explained that this would include lesson observations, learning walks, work scrutiny, meeting with the Head of Faculty and pupil voice. A report would be ready very quickly, if possible on the day. The focus was on KS3 and 4. The issue of underperforming low and high prior attainers would be the focus, together with the disadvantaged student gap.</li> <li>• <b>What support was being provided to teachers/leaders to drive the improvement?</b> PB said that staff were being supported both internally by the SLT and also from staff at St John Fisher, weekly meetings were held with the Head. He acknowledged that there was still a lot to do, but felt that the balance was right. AB commented on the need to ensure that the actions taking place were bringing about the necessary improvements; evidence of improvements must be able to be demonstrated to the HMI. It was important, she said, that staff and Governors could explain what had changed “as a result” of the actions taken to improve.</li> </ul> <p>CT highlighted the main points from the attendance and exclusion data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disadvantaged students continued to cause concern regarding attendance; there was a small group of PP students with complex issues which were being addressed through Heads of House, the Prevention team and LA enforcement team. A lot of interventions were in place, but it was proving difficult to improve the attendance for a small number of individuals.</li> <li>• The four-week monitoring process, following warning letters at the end of the previous term, had had a positive impact. 39 out of the 49 had improved their attendance. Congratulatory letters had been sent to those who had improved. Those who hadn’t improved would be followed up.</li> <li>• Congratulatory texts had been sent to disadvantaged students with 100% attendance for the half term. This would be rolled out to all students with 100% attendance by the end of the half term.</li> <li>• Exclusion data was positive in comparison with last year and national figures. SEND figures were, however, higher than national. He noted, however, the figures in brackets indicated that this related to only one student. (NHo commented on the quality of this data, the indication of the number of students involved was particularly useful.)</li> </ul>	<p><b>NHo to circulate Maths Review</b></p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Year 11 students the focus was on ensuring that they remained in school and minor infringement of the behaviour policy was currently being overlooked for these students; exclusion was not seen as a punishment by some. Parental engagement was particularly strong for these students. A Governor commented on the positive figure for Disadvantaged Children of 53.4% achieving over 95% attendance; he acknowledged the hard work which was being put in to improving the attendance for this group of students, some of which were very difficult to influence.</li> <li>• John Eggin Trust interventions would help to provide a group of students with support for self-esteem, aspiration and confidence issues which should impact on their behaviour.</li> <li>• Restrictive Physical Intervention (RPI) training was due to take place.</li> </ul> <p>MLP highlighted the main points of the SENCO report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turbulence in staffing – there had been some staffing vacancies which had meant that providing support to all students with an EHCP (Education Health Care Plan) had been challenging. Three new GTAs had been appointed on Friday and this should lead to increased stability.</li> <li>• There were several students identified as needing an EHCP in school; this required a significant level of staff support and interventions in order to evidence the need and secure a Plan.</li> <li>• The Youth Centre (Youthie) was closing in its current format as Amanda Gledhill was moving on. A process of handover of information regarding the needs of individual students which she had supported was taking place.</li> <li>• Some sixth form students provided reading intervention to students in Years 7 and 8. This would continue as some impact had been demonstrated; testing had shown that 65% had made some improvement in their reading age. A new CAT test should help the Yr 7s to improve.</li> <li>• Sound training for 12 students had shown good results and all had made gains; this had been targeted at Year 9s middle ability students identified as at risk of underachievement.</li> <li>• The Literacy Champion (Kirsty Fulford) had introduced an accelerated reader intervention. PB noted that 40 students had been identified as having a reading age below their actual age. The intervention was software based. This would help to ensure all children were able to access the entire curriculum. NHO commented that the system was a reliable improvement model which was supported by Ofsted.</li> </ul> <p>Governors asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Why was Youthie Closing?</b> MLP explained that it was due to Amanda Gledhill leaving the school and this was being used as an opportunity to identify the particular things which were most beneficial to the students; the service would be relaunched at a later date. PB said that the building would be revamped to provide a central hub for all support services in school; there would be additional pastoral support staff in school in the longer term.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The level of improvement for students undertaking the reading support with 6<sup>th</sup> form was disappointing at 65%, was it only for year 7s?</b> MLP said that it was for Year 8 students too, that year group had shown the greatest improvement. She felt that some of the students hadn't engaged well in the test, which may explain the results.</li> </ul> <p>MJ highlighted the main points from the data circulated for Years 10 &amp; 11:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress 8 predictions were moving in the right direction at <b>-0.12</b></li> <li>• The accuracy of the predictions was improving by checking staff predictions against mock exam results; SLT/PB ensured that the predictions were realistic. It seemed that most teachers had 'under' rather than 'over' predicted when compared with mock exam results.</li> <li>• Disadvantaged Students – Maths and English interventions were in place to focus in particular on middle ability disadvantaged students.</li> <li>• The recommendations of the Disadvantaged Students Review were being implemented. Heads of House were mentoring Disadvantaged Students and providing useful feedback to the subject teachers.</li> </ul> <p>Governors asked questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How many PP students were being supported by Heads of House?</b> MJ said there were 24. PB explained that he and ER were identifying when students needed particular interventions in those subjects; this was based on the weighting given in Progress 8 to those subjects.</li> <li>• <b>Which papers had been used in the mock exams?</b> PB said that the papers were specimen papers. The papers had been externally verified.</li> <li>• <b>Were all Progress 8 subjects under scrutiny to deliver quality teaching?</b> PB said that there was an issue with some less able students following courses which were not accredited and wouldn't count under the Progress 8 measure. This had been addressed by introducing new courses. Humanities teaching would be reinforced in Year 8.</li> </ul> <p>ER circulated an Action Plan update sheet and highlighted the main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional support had been provided in maths for 64 Y11 students; some had made progress (mock results) showing that the intervention had had a positive impact.</li> <li>• A curriculum reduction for 10-11 students had been discussed with them and their parents to ensure they achieved the best possible outcomes. Some were not keen to drop subjects and felt that they could still be successful.</li> <li>• A small number may not be able to fill all 8 "buckets" for Progress 8, but school would do what it could to maximise their results for the remaining subjects.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction of ECDL (European Computer Driving Licence) was helping to improve the Progress 8 results and the employability of students. Over thirty students were studying for ECDL.</li> <li>• An additional vocational course in IFS (Certificate in Financial Studies) would be added for Year 10 students.</li> <li>• Science – additional ISAs would be provided.</li> <li>• Staff were providing revision courses at Easter and half term.</li> </ul> <p>PB noted that a revision timetable had been provided for all subjects; attendance was being encouraged by the “PromPass” rewards system. Fortnightly assemblies were being held for Year 11 to provide encouragement. Year 11 parents would be invited to attend a Parents’ Evening to advise them on how to support their children in the exam period.</p> <p>NHo commented that there was a picture of improvements with behaviour for learning from the students. He suggested tracking attendance at the revision events taking place out of school time to help demonstrate and evidence this. AB suggested that Governors may wish to request a Student Voice exercise in order to further evidence improved behaviour for learning.</p> <p>JV highlighted the main points in the Y9 Options Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A different approach had been used, four “free” option blocks would be offered, with the caveat that most students would be expected to study a language and history/geography to maximise the number of students following EBACC choices.</li> <li>• More vocational courses were to be offered, these provided more practical options whilst retaining GCSE equivalence.</li> <li>• Core RE/PSHCE provision would be delivered through drop down days/sessions.</li> <li>• The timetable would be weekly rather than the current two week system.</li> <li>• Maths, English and Science would be allocated sufficient time to ensure success at an average of 5 hours per fortnight (spread over two years, delivered as 2 or 3 hours per week and then swapped).</li> </ul> <p>Governors and LA asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Would students have free choice?</b> JV said that they would have more flexibility of choice, but would be guided if it was felt they had not chosen wisely. PB explained that he and the SLT had looked at the options from the position of various different abilities and genders of students to try to ensure that it could accommodate many different interests and abilities. The aim was for a “broad and balanced” curriculum as required by Ofsted.</li> <li>• AB asked about the provision of careers and education guidance following the comments in the Ofsted report; she noted that external advice had been paid for by school. She referred to Ofsted’s comments on PP student outcomes in particular. PB said that MJ and CT were taking this forward. She also reminded Governors that they must ensure that core RE/PSHCE ((Personal, Social, Health and</li> </ul>	<p><b>ER/PB – track attendance at revision sessions for students.</b></p> <p><b>PB – student voice/ survey regarding behaviour for learning.</b></p>
--	--	--

	<p>Citizenship Education) was delivered to statutory requirements in the drop down days. JV noted that careers guidance was provided in school by Lorna Smeeton; a programme was in place to ensure each child had access to advice from her on a regular basis. PB said that he would mention the availability of careers advice at the Option Blocks Parents evening. NHO asked about the PSHCE delivery; JV assured him that this was embedded within subject teaching and that there was an audit trail to evidence this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Why was there no computer science option?</b> PB said that he recognised that this was a gap, but he could not guarantee quality teaching on this subject. This was a common issue for schools with this subject. He noted that it would be necessary, if a suitably qualified teacher could be found, to teach it from Year 7 in order to offer it at KS4.</li> </ul> <p>KS presented her paper on KS5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications to join post 16 courses were down on previous years (80 applications so far). Six of the applications were from PP children, however based on KS2 data there should be 13 out of the 24 capable of studying A levels. Interviews with the remaining seven would be arranged to check their plans.</li> <li>• The Collaborative was under discussion and courses would only be delivered where they were financially viable.</li> <li>• The SMID system was being used as a tool in preference over ALPs. The system provided more timely data reports once information had been input. Mock results were lower than predicted; work was underway with individual faculties to identify how to make improvements. Year 12 Jan 16 results of +0.28 was an improvement on last year at this time -0.29. Year 13 steady improvement.</li> <li>• Work shadowing opportunities were in the process of being arranged for all students (following Ofsted comments). Regular careers advice was offered.</li> </ul> <p>Governors/LA asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Were there any targets for Years 12 and 13?</b> PB commented that setting a target at this stage was unlikely to be useful.</li> <li>• AB commented on the need have available retention figures i.e. the number of students starting a course and not seeing it through, perhaps linking this to entry level questions (Grades required to begin the course). In addition, the destination for sixth form students should be tracked where possible. KS said that not all students were applying to go to university; many of those who were not intended to apply for an apprenticeship (the application window for that option was not yet open in some cases). AB noted that the measure was to track students two terms after they left school.</li> </ul> <p>JV gave a presentation on British Values. The PowerPoint presentation would be circulated to Governors.</p> <p>JV gave so examples of how British Values are embedded in the subject teaching in school. (Women scientists, holocaust in humanities subjects).</p>	<p><b>JV British Values presentation to Governors via LB.</b></p>
--	---	---

	<p><i>Governors agreed that part of this discussion should be regarded as confidential.</i></p> <p><i>Agreed: That the report was noted.</i></p> <p><b>Senior Leadership Team staff left at this point.</b></p>	
<p>2.17.7</p>	<p><b><u>GOVERNANCE REVIEW</u></b></p> <p>PB reported that a meeting was scheduled with OGAT, Neil Hawkins and the LA to discuss Academisation issues. Kevin Hollinrake MP was involved in securing a resolution.</p> <p>AB commented on the need to ensure that Governors and the leadership team had a strong narrative to describe how progress was being made in school. Clear evidence was required.</p> <p>PB explained that HP and SS had worked up a Governance Action Plan in response to the Governance Review report.</p> <p>The Main points of the Review required changes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity of Vision</li> <li>• Training for Governors – Data, Ofsted, PP</li> <li>• Self-Evaluation</li> <li>• Improving others confidence in the Board (students, parents, staff)</li> </ul> <p>The Away Day scheduled for 4 March would focus on many of these issues.</p> <p>AB asked whether there was an Induction Package in place? JW was leading this process. She asked that Governors were reminded to undertake online training as follows: Safeguarding, Child Protection, Prevent.</p> <p>Governors discussed the need for a separate School Improvement Group. It was agreed that Steve Smith would lead on this. He would circulate some suggested Terms of Reference for agreement at the next meeting; however, the main focus would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Progress against the Ofsted Action Plan and School Improvement Plan</li> <li>2. Progress against targets for all pupils and various groups</li> <li>3. Reports on quality of T&amp;L and progress here</li> </ol> <p>Governors agreed the following: That:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The group would include 5-6 Governors to be agreed by NH</li> <li>b) Meetings would be held monthly and report back to FGB</li> <li>c) Lesley Barber would clerk the meetings</li> </ol>	
<p>2.17.8</p>	<p><b><u>ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:</u></b></p> <p><b>a) Governor vacancies update</b> – NH would consider the option of co-opting some of the unsuccessful Parent Governor candidates, once clarity on OGAT’s position was known. The Staff Governor election</p>	



	<p>process would take place after the staff meeting attended by Governors. JW asked for volunteers to mentor the new Governors; volunteers were JW, NH and CC. PB invited any Governor to visit the school; he was happy to show anyone round.</p> <p><b>b) Policies – mark forward.</b></p> <p><b>c) Minutes from Health and Safety Committee –</b> JW asked about the OGAT Health and Safety report and how it was being taken forward. PB and MW had been tasked to look into the issues raised by the report. NH noted that there were two Health and Safety reports to consider, OGAT and NYCC.</p> <p><i>Agreed: That a report on progress on the urgent issues regarding Health and Safety identified in the OGAT and NYCC reports should be presented to the next meeting.</i></p>	<p><b>PB to report back on progress on Health and Safety issues raised by OGAT and NYCC reports.</b></p>
<p>2.17.9</p>	<p><b><u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u></b></p> <p>The dates of future meetings were noted:</p> <p>Mon 13 March 6.00pm          Mon 24 April 6.00pm          Mon 15 May 6.00pm          Mon 12 June 6.00pm          Mon 10 July 6.00pm</p>	
<p>2.17.10</p>	<p><b><u>URGENT BUSINESS:</u></b></p> <p>It was agreed that an update could be given on the Staff Restructure – it was agreed that the item should be regarded as confidential and excluded from the public minutes.</p>	