



Easingwold School

Minutes of the meeting of the Full Governing Board of Easingwold School held on Monday 16 January 2017.

Present: Mrs Diane Clarke (DC), Mrs Christine Cookman (CC), Mr Neil Hawkins (NH) - Chair, Mr Neil Millan (NM), Rob Pritchard (RP) - Executive Head, Mrs Fiona Rafferty (FR) (Item 5 onwards), Mr Steve Smith (SS) (Item 5 onwards) and Mr Jon Wright (JW).

In attendance: Lesley Barber (LB) - Clerk, Janet Bates (Principal Advisor NYCC), Paul Brockwell (PB) - Interim Headteacher, Emma Robins (ER) - Deputy Head, Martyn Johnson (MJ) - Assistant Head, Mary-Louise Priest (SENCO), Karen Shires (KS) - Assistant Head, Chris Tiffany (CT) - Assistant Head, Justine Ventress (JV) - Assistant Head, Mark Welborn (School Business Manager).

No	Minutes	Action Points
1.17.1	<p>Consideration of Absences – <i>Agreed: That the absence of Mr Hugh Porter (HP) was consented to. Steve Smith had informed the clerk that he would be late arriving.</i></p> <p>The Chair noted that there had been a resignation since the last meeting: Andy Follington.</p>	
1.17.2	<p>Consideration of confidential items:</p> <p>The Chair noted that OGAT required their report to be confidential and that it was meant for Governors only.</p> <p><i>Agreed: That the item on “OGAT’s Due Diligence and Health and Safety report” and the urgent item on the Restructure were agreed to be confidential and any associated reports would not be available for public inspection and the items were excluded from the public minutes.</i></p>	
1.17.3	<p>Declarations of Interest / Hospitality – none declared</p>	
1.17.4	<p>Consideration of Public Minutes of meeting held on 5 December 2016.</p> <p><i>Agreed: That the public minutes of 5 December 2016 were agreed to be a correct record</i></p> <p><i>The Deputy Head noted that Miss E Taylor’s correct job title was Associate Head.</i></p>	
1.17.5	<p>Matters arising</p> <p>a) OGAT Chair visit – RP reported that the Chair of OGAT had visited the school.</p> <p>b) Resource Centre – NH reported that he had asked OGAT to return the Resource Centre to its original condition and they had agreed to do this.</p> <p>c) Performance Management Targets and Review - PB explained that he</p>	

	<p>was still working on SLT performance management targets, the process of setting appropriate targets for all staff had begun. The targets must relate to the Action Plan. He explained that the Action Plan had been submitted to the DfE, who had commended the robustness of the document. Staff targets must relate to the achievement of a good Progress 8 score.</p> <p>d) Additional NYCC funding for Maths interventions – The Chair explained that Janet Bates, Principal Advisor NYCC would update Governors on NYCC support for the school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She noted that the Statement of Action for Easingwold School had been accepted; it was currently still uncertain whether the School would receive an Ofsted Monitoring Inspection. Ofsted’s letter had indicated that they would not provide such an inspection; however, the Regional Commissioner had indicated that there would be a monitoring visit. In response to a query, she indicated that it was likely to be February or March (6 months after the initial judgement). • She had brought a copy of the support arrangements the LA would put in place to the meeting and would circulate this to all Governors. <p>The Chair noted that there had been an undertaking to keep parents informed of progress; how would the statement of action be reported to them? PB and RP undertook to ensure that Parents were aware.</p> <p>Fiona Rafferty and Steve Smith arrived 6:10.</p> <p>Janet Bates continued to update Governors as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An LA led review of Governance was due to take place the following day. PB noted that a Disadvantaged Student review was due to take place that week. • An SLA would need to be signed by the LA and Governors to clarify the contracts of Mr Pritchard and Mr Brockwell. • The surveyor was due to carry out an assessment of the building issues in February half term, as far as she was aware. PB commented that the timing meant that the students would not be disrupted, which he appreciated. JB noted that it was unlikely, however, that the LA would be in a position to provide funding to remedy the building issues identified by OGAT. In response to a query from the Chair, she suggested that funding would have to come from DfE. The Chair asked who would approach DfE in this regard; JB said that it would probably be the sponsor academy. Governors commented that given the sums involved it was unclear who would take over the school. <p>Governors asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had the school received its 10 days of support yet from NYCC for maths? RP explained that the Y TSA (Yorkshire Teaching Schools Alliance) had been in school to undertake an “audit” of maths provision in school; the focus would be on stretch and challenge 	<p>Janet Bates to circulate LA support arrangements to all Governors.</p> <p>RP/PB would inform parents of the Action Plan.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>within lessons to ensure they were pitched at the correct level. This process had started pre-Christmas. They had also been involved in checking marking mock exam papers. The feedback had noted that the departments had marked harshly, but uniformly. Good practice systems were being copied from RP's school, such as schemes of work to assist in improving the department. PB noted that the school was working closely with feeder primary schools to ensure that they were aware of the start position required by pupils on joining the Secondary School.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were teachers being rotated in exam classes as previously suggested? PB explained that this hadn't been required in the end as a good cover teacher had been employed, and maths teaching was being supported by some SLT who were experienced maths teachers. The sixty students identified prior to the last FGB meeting as needing additional support were receiving intervention in core RE/PE time. In all there would be an additional 11 weeks of additional maths teaching time provided. • Were parents and students supportive of these interventions? PB said that they had generally been well received, some parents had approached him and asked for their child to be included; but the interventions were not needed for all. <p>e) Dates for School Council – LB would circulate the dates once she had them.</p>	
<p>1.17.6</p>	<p><u>UPDATE ON PROGRESS BY SLT AND HEADTEACHER</u> Governors considered reports as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour Policy amendment • Exclusions Data • Absence Data • Yr 11 Tracking Data • Action Plan – update on teaching and learning actions. • Proposed Y12 Option Blocks • SENCO Update <p>PB updated Governors on the Action Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan had been RAG rated (Red, Amber, Green). • The KS3 numeracy catch up was being delivered by MLP (SENCO), the Associate Headteacher and Headteacher. There were groups of 7/8 students identified as performing below required level with the intervention being delivered on Wednesday and Fridays. Additional groups were participating in sessions delivered during registration. In addition, support was being delivered in a similar way to students struggling with English. This had been highlighted as "Amber" – impact needed to be monitored. • Maths leadership was being supported within school. • Quality assurance of teaching was currently being undertaken with a focus on homework, marking, display in class, feedback given to students. This had begun in the Maths department and would be rolled out through the school. In response to a Governor's query regarding how staff were reacting to the external input, PB said 	

	<p>that staff accepted the judgements which were evidence based.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty meetings were held every two weeks and these focussed on: Y11 data and progress and their Faculty Action Plan – review on progress. Each faculty had a SLT link who had helped them write an action plan. By the end of January or early February each faculty would have an action plan in place, written by the Faculty and agreed by SLT link. Each Faculty Head had been asked to “rate” the staff in their team on a four point scale from “outstanding” to “needs action” – these assessments would be challenged if they were considered to be incorrect by SLT/PB. • Quality First had not been introduced yet, more work was needed and more lesson observations needed to be completed. • A Pupil Voice survey had been completed which would give a baseline position on pupil’s views. • Data was available on individual pupils (Governors had seen this at the December meeting). Department Heads were receiving this data and it was shared with each class teacher involved. • TA audit had not started yet. Teaching staff had received training on how to maximise value of TA support. (Should be Amber – work started) • IRIS system was being accessed by the Maths department - staff would be encouraged to use the system to improve quality teaching. • Action Plan point 2 “Raise achievement and improve teaching, particularly for disadvantaged pupils”. Heads of Faculties had audited teacher’s skills, self-review of teachers would take place through the Performance Management process. A CPD process had begun, the first Inset day of the year had focussed on classroom strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Think – Pair – Share b) 3B4ME c) Student response model This had been well received by staff; CPD would continue to be delivered with a specific focus on teaching and learning. • The culture within the School was shifting, lesson observations were accepted by staff now. In the past there had been a “closed door” approach and this had radically changed. SLT were spending a lot of time walking around the school and going into classes. Visits by concerned parents, prospective parents and the local MP had been positive and had resulted in positive feedback. • Staff now recognised that they would be challenged in a positive and supportive way and they had trust in the SLT. • Volunteers had been identified to come in and help KS3 with their English skills. • Curriculum Plan – there had been considerable focus on Y11 curriculum to improve the life chances of students. ECDL (European Computer Driving Course) had been provided. This course was able to be included in one of the “buckets” for Progress 	
--	---	--

	<p>8. A Part time teacher had experience of delivering this subject and it was going well. Forty students were undertaking this course. There was some overlap between ECDL and Wider Key Skills which meant that one of the ECDL modules could be signed off. This would improve the Progress 8 score of the school as well as providing students with a more valuable qualification. There had been a lot of comments on social media about the ASDAN qualification; this was not an accredited course. There were only 9 students studying it anyway and it was ultimately not a good course from an employability perspective. PB undertook to communicate with parents of affected students on this point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Skies Programme – an intervention programme for vulnerable students in Year 7 aimed to improve aspirations and raise confidence. • A letter had been sent to parents setting out what was being offered in terms of interventions to students. Assemblies had taken place with Year 11 students giving them opportunities to engage and encourage their independent spirit. In February parents of Y11 students would be given advice on revision strategies, providing support for their children in terms of stress identification and exam preparation. • A “prom passport” had been introduced which encouraged students to attend revision sessions in exchange for discounts off their prom tickets. It was hoped that this incentive would appeal to all students including disadvantaged students. • Improving leadership and management. New action plans were being developed based on the Quality Assurance process. The skills of middle leaders had been audited. The role of SLT had been clarified and amended to enable delivery of challenge to staff and the provision of data to enable targeted interventions to be identified. All line management meetings were now minuted and the minutes and actions seen by PB/ER. The Governance Review was taking place the following day and the PP review that week. If Ofsted were not intending to visit then an external review of leadership and management would be commissioned by PB/EP. <p>Governors asked questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a disappointing amount of “red” (no progress) in the report, could PB comment on the reasons. PB explained that he had focussed on the urgent things in the report. For example, Quality First cannot begin as staff weren’t ready for it yet; they needed more direct guidance before they could start on the coaching and self-evaluation necessary under the process. He hadn’t moved away from mixed ability classes yet; he was focussing in year 11. If OGAT were not in place in September this would be looked at. Lesson observations would start as soon as quality assurance process had been completed. He said that he acknowledged that there were a number of “red” areas, but he felt 	<p>PB to communicate with affected parents on ASDAN qualification.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>that there were legitimate reasons why each one had not been actioned to date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should more priority be given to lesson observations bearing in mind the concerns raised about teaching? PB said that all SLT had been in maths lessons, some lesson observations and learning walks had been undertaken, a lot had been done. This would be followed up by formal individual teacher observations starting in April. • Were there many students with empty “buckets” in Year 11? JV noted that there would be some students with empty buckets whatever the school tried to do, however, most students studied nine subjects. Each student had been looked at and their options discussed with staff. • Was ECDL an “easy subject” being used to “fill a bucket” and improve the Progress 8 score for the school. RP noted that there were often changes to the qualifications accepted by the Government under Progress 8, it was important that the school kept on top of these as they were judged by this criteria. ECDL courses were considered to be useful in terms of employability. There were other courses which could be classed as “easier” than some academic subjects and the school would also be offering Independent Financial Studies (IFS) to Year 10 students. Other schools provided similar course options. • Governors commented that a Challenge Partners visit had taken place in the past, but had not helped Governors to identify areas of concern. RP said that the review would use an HMI or ex-HMI under Ofsted conditions. <p>CT presented his paper on Exclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was an error to correct in the figures for “No SEND”, which should read 1.4% rather than 0.14%. This figure was still well below the comparable national figure of 2.9. • There had been one permanent exclusion in this academic year; this was the subject of a Panel meeting that Friday. • Twelve students had received fixed term exclusions since the start of the term compared with 16 the previous year. The reduction in exclusions was a result of positive steps being taken such as increased parental engagement, a change in strategy and internal exclusions. • PB noted that one of the behaviour managers had resigned and it was a credit to CT, PS and the Heads of House that the exclusion picture had improved. Governors echoed his thanks to the staff members mentioned. <p>CT referred to his paper on attendance data and behaviour policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the turbulent times experienced in school over the past four weeks and a bout of illnesses absence had already risen this term. • 49 letters had been sent out to parents at the start of the term where absence in the previous term had been a concern. 39 of these students had shown an improvement but the rest had not. This approach was new and triggered a four week monitoring period. The letter referred to the next steps in the process if no 	<p>Action: MJ to circulate Progress 8 information to Governors.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>improvement was seen, the prevention service and LA would be involved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were some deep rooted issues with some of the persistent absentees which may not be easily resolved. Staff would continue to work closely with the students and families concerned. • The amendments to the behaviour policy were recommended following an incident with misuse of a laptop. Following discussion with the Head they felt it would be useful to clarify the Behaviour Policy to set out what type of behaviour warranted an exclusion. <p>MJ presented his item on Y11 Tracking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were gaps between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged for Progress 8, Attainment 8 and 3+LOP English; however, these were still above previous year’s results. • SEND results – there had been some difficulties with attendance at Mock exams which were reflected in the results. PB noted that consideration would be given to how pupils could be encouraged and supported in attending examinations, discussions would be held with parents and information on stress would be shared. <p>Governors asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the figures compare to last year’s results? PB explained that the tracking was based on teacher’s estimates of where students were currently. Data from Mock examinations would be used to update those estimates. These tracking figures already indicated an improvement on last year’s figures and this was only one term into the academic year. Significant interventions would start to have an impact on results. He noted that Progress 8 projections had been affected by significant non-attendance of disadvantaged students in particular. Boys had shown improvement, with figures being “green”, whereas there were some concerns about girls although the figures weren’t significant. • When would it be possible to put 2017 targets into the Action Plan, this was needed for Governors to be able to measure progress? MJ said that the next tracking point was at the end of that week. PB confirmed that by the next FGB targets would be in the Action Plan. He also explained that the data collection process was more robust than in the past, mock data had been collected and this would be collated with the tracking data proposed by teachers. • How would data be presented to Governors in future, currently there had been a focus on Year 11. PB said that future data would include all students at their current position. There would continue to be a strong focus on Year 11, but the School was also working hard on literacy and numeracy for years 7/8, Year 9 options, running intervention groups as necessary, removing some courses, IFS Level 2 application to run the course was submitted. The curriculum would be adjusted to ensure that all students were following accredited courses in future. • How confident could Governors be that students were progressing at the appropriate level? PB said that he was 	<p>CT – ensure behaviour policy updated on website. PB to mention in school newsletter.</p> <p>Next FGB – Action Plan circulated including targets 2017. PB</p>
--	---	---

	<p>reassured by the data and interventions in school that right things were being done to ensure that Year 11 students could reach their potential. SS had visited the school, walked around classes and spoken to PB, he was confident that the school was making progress; there was a lot still to be done, however. In the period from 1 November to date, he felt that progress had been made, importantly a shift in culture had been achieved which was very important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had quality of teaching improved? PB explained that quality of teaching improvements was still a work in progress, marking, displays and CPD provision was being worked on to equip teachers better. Staff were open to support. <p><i>Agreed That:</i> <i>a) the reports were noted; and</i> <i>b) the revision to the behaviour policy was agreed to clarify the policy on exclusions.</i></p>	
<p>1.17.7</p>	<p><u>FINANCIAL MATTERS:</u></p> <p>Governors considered the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Budget and explanatory text • Start Budget Forecast Summary 16/17 to 18/19 • Revised Budget 16/17 five year • Comparison Start v Revised Budget • Monitoring Report Nov and explanatory text <p>The Business Manager highlighted the following (Further detail was included in the Business Manager’s written reports):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Start Budget did not reflect any restructuring plans. The Budget for 17/18 currently showed an in-year deficit of -£400k and this increased to a deficit of -£787k in 2018/19. • The in-year position at Start Budget was £258K deficit. The Revised Budget position is £255K deficit. A decrease of £3K. This is accounted for by a variety of variances netting off. <p>Governors asked questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What had been the impact of the current turbulence in school on pupil numbers? PB said that five more students had returned to the school since January, however, some students had left to go to private schools. A lot of parents were “holding off” with their decision and he was hopeful that there would be a stabilisation of numbers soon; parents were waiting to see what would happen in school. • The Chair noted that budget position as presented was not sustainable, but discussions about a proposed restructure later in the meeting would address this to some extent. <p>PB noted that discussions had taken place with Thirsk and Boroughbridge schools regarding Year 12 classes; some current group sizes were unviable.</p>	

	<i>Agreed: That the reports were noted.</i>	
1.17.8	<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:</u></p> <p>a) Governor Vacancies – The Chair reported that eight Governors had come forward for the three vacancies; therefore an election process would take place. Consideration could be given to co-opt those who were unsuccessful. Staff vacancies – RP would take this forward.</p> <p>b) Governance Review This was due to take place the following day.</p> <p>c) Policies The Chair noted that there appeared to be some outstanding Policies where a NYCC model policy couldn't be located (data protection and sex education). In order to take this forward, PB was asked to agree who the nominated staff member should be and adjust the Policy document for the next meeting. LB would amend the spreadsheet as necessary. <i>Agreed actions:</i> 1) PB to update staff responsible part of the document 2) LB to update the schedule as appropriate 3) JW to contact Katharine.bruce@northyorks.gov.uk to obtain a sex education policy.</p> <p>d) Link governors The Chair noted that there had been some criticism from Ofsted about Governor's link roles; this would be raised in the Governance Review meeting the following day.</p> <p>e) Membership of Committees <i>Agreed: the membership of Committees was agreed; new Parent Governors would be required to fill all the positions.</i> Staff other than PB and RP left the meeting at this point.</p>	<p>LB to forward Staff Governor election process to RP.</p> <p>PB to update staff responsible part of the Policy list.</p> <p>LB to update list and circulate.</p> <p>JW action.</p>
1.17.9	<p><u>DUE DILIGENCE REPORT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES</u></p> <p>This had been agreed as a confidential item, a confidential minute exists.</p>	
1.17.10	<p><u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u> The dates of future meetings were agreed as follows: Monday 13 February 6.00pm 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>	
1.17.11	<p><u>URGENT BUSINESS</u></p> <p>The following items had been included as urgent business: Staffing Issues Reorganisation and Redundancy Policy These had been agreed to be confidential items, a confidential minute exists.</p>	

