

**Meeting of Full Governing Board  
27<sup>th</sup> November 2023  
4.30pm in School Library**

**MINUTES**

<b>Governors Present:</b>	James Bennett, Matt Hillier, Emma Morey, Catherine Packham, Bronagh Shevlin, Bridget Taylor (Chair)
<b>Officers Present:</b>	Teresa Dee (Clerk)
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Sara Bailey, Andrea Cumming

	<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Action</u>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p><b>a) Welcome</b> The Chair opened the meeting with a welcome.</p> <p><b>b) Apologies for Absence</b> Apologies for absence received from Mick Baker, Rachel Borland, and Dick Knight.</p> <p><b>c) Declarations of Interest</b> The declarations register was included within the meeting papers , there were no declarations in relation to agenda items. The Clerk reported that the process for compiling the register had been completed for 2023/24 and that forms where positive declarations had been made had been considered by finance group and were ready for signing off by the Chair of Governors and Headteacher.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Last Meeting Dated 15<sup>th</sup> October 2023</b></p> <p><b>a) Approval of Minutes</b> The Full Governing Body reviewed and approved seven pages of minutes from the meeting held on 16th October 2023. The Chair signed the minutes as conformation of their accuracy.</p> <p><b>b) Actions and Matters Arising Not Included Elsewhere on Agenda</b> School Attendance – In addition to the comments about seeking best practice from schools doing well with attendance there had been a suggestion to look at schools in other seaside towns with slowing absence or improving attendance.</p> <p><b>ACTION – Benchmark attendance against other seaside town schools with a view to learning best practice from those seeing an improving position.</b></p> <p>WiFi Access – Guest login provided for the meeting, this would be ongoing. Governors should be able to access wifi using their school logins but some set ups prevented this. IT support to be considered or start of next meeting.</p>	<b>MH</b>

	<p>Annex A of KCSiE – Governors were asked to sign a log to conform that they had read Annex A of the keeping Children Safe in Education 2023 document. This was signed by those governors present.</p>	
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Chairs Update</b> The Chair advised that she had attended a Chairs’ meeting during which alternative provisions were discussed alongside the budget challenges being face by many schools.</p>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Headteacher’s Report /Update</b> The Headteacher presented his report to Governors highlighting the following key points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the latest Year 11 student data there were projections that attainment 8 score would be at 48.84 and progress 8 around 0 due to a currently negative progress 8 projection from the English department. It was noted that the biggest issue being faced with the current year 11s was attendance with 20 students not attending school and therefore likely to significantly impact outcomes.</li> <li>• There had been a lot of discussion within the Local Authority about support children with special educational needs (SEN). Over a year ago the board had supported with the submission of a bid for a resource provision, nothing had been heard since. Space for breakout rooms was needed which the current provision was unable to provide. Governors’ agreement to submit a joint letter about the SEN situation was sought and provided.</li> <li>• Three staff members leaving the school leaving gaps to be filled from recruitment , with an additional gap due to long term absence.</li> <li>• Attendance running at 87.5% in year 11, being below national average. The year group also had a higher ratio of boys than usual. Disadvantaged attendance was running at 76% , also lower than national average. School leaders saw year 11 attendance as a limiting factor in terms of attainment.</li> <li>• Safeguarding in the school was judged as effective by Ofsted , systems had been put in place and training undertaken by staff and governors at the start of the year. Ongoing regular messaging was being planned to reinforce the awareness of safeguarding procedures. An additional staff member had been appointed to the safeguarding team to triage the reported incidents on CPOMS, the safeguarding software.</li> <li>• Racism related incidents were the highest type of incident recorded in CPOMs for year 7, possibly due to students not having benefitted from the school anti racism work. There were also a number of repeat offenders in year 7 requiring some changes to tutor groups.</li> <li>• In year 11 the highest type of recorded incidents was harmful sexual behaviours, In response the organisation WISE were coming into school to do some training.</li> </ul> <p><u>Questions and comment from Governors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could planning permission be sought for other uses should the resource provision not go ahead.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the nine students in year 7 identified as repeat offenders come from the same primary school?</li> <li>• Are some parents saying that their child needs to be grouped with another child?</li> <li>• If an assessment states that a child needs to be with another child that it places the obligation on the second child to provide support for the psychological benefit of the first child.</li> <li>• With the new appointment to child protection is there a more proactive stance being taken?</li> </ul> <p><u>Response to Governor comment and questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue was that the planned build was on an existing car park designated as field by the Department for Education (DfE) and if built on an alternative area would need to be freed up for car park/open space. There were also concerns about increasing school capacity longer term in a reducing cohort of student situation across the city. The school view was that the SEN provision at the school in terms of space was insufficient. The Chair added that discussions had been held at a Chair's meeting where the question of timing around a resource provision was raised without a clear response having been received.</li> <li>• A large number of year 7 repeat offenders had come from the same primary school. They were not all in the same tutor groups , some were not originally due to come to the school coming in at a later date due to friendship connections. The group were meeting up at break and lunch times. Consideration being given to structuring year 7 differently next year with separation of tutor groups based on friendships from separate teaching groups. This would enable flexibility should students need to be moved from either teaching or tutor groups.</li> <li>• It was becoming more common for parents to request their child be placed with another and getting assessments and professional reports to back the requests up.</li> <li>• With the introduction of CPOMS the amount of safeguarding concerns and incidents that crop up necessitate another staff member to support with triaging to ensure the more serious issues are dealt with promptly and as a priority.</li> </ul>	
5	<p><b>Ofsted Outcome Report /Impact on School Development Plan</b></p> <p>In addition to a recent Ofsted inspection the school had a Challenge Partners review. The outcomes from both were presented to Governors with the following points highlighted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The breadth of the curriculum and ambition for learners came out strongly in both reports.</li> <li>• The two processes were very different, with challenge partners being a more collaborative style of review, this time without gradings as they had already been completed by Ofsted.</li> <li>• No real surprises and in line with school's own self evaluations though there was some frustration that the quality of education had not been judged short of being outstanding as there was not consistency in every department.</li> <li>• There were deep dives by Ofsted on the first day of inspection into PE, Maths, English, art, geography, and languages.</li> </ul>	

- The school's data had shown best outcomes ever and good progress yet Ofsted did not include a review of data within their inspection framework.
- On the whole it was noted that the school was calm with students feeling safe and cared for.
- No school is able to get the area of SEND quite right as there were issues of funding for an increasing demand. Those students that did get the support needed had good outcomes as seen in the school's data.
- There had been very positive feedback about PSHE at the school noting a broad and detailed curriculum and comprehensive careers programme.
- Implementation of policies was another area of inconsistency with the school uniform policy being highlighted. The school were aware that this was an issue following some challenging times following the introduction of that policy.
- Other areas for improvement were attendance, already a key area in the school development plan and low-level disruption by a small group of students.
- Challenge Partners had looked at leadership at all levels, at SEND and disadvantaged students. Within leadership they saw ambition, distributed leadership, and collaborative work. Consistency from all levels and embedding the "Stringer Way" was an area noted for development.
- The focus on adaptive teaching for disadvantaged and SEND students had been recognised by challenge partners whilst recommending that staff continue to identify and overcome individual barriers to attendance for the disadvantaged group.

#### Comment and questions from Governors

- PE could be seen as part of the curriculum and also as part of what keeps some children interested in attending school. Did the school want the same sort of pressure on that area of school to assess it?
- Was PE the only area of inconsistency?
- Governors had asked the question at a previous meeting what the biggest challenge to reaching and learning was and were advised that it was inconsistency, it was interesting that the same findings were coming out in inspection.
- It was students that had highlighted that low level disruption was an issue for them.
- How much weight can be given to the feedback from a small group of students?
- The student views on behaviour had been given quite a lot of exposure in what was quite a short report.
- To get a good judgement throughout the Ofsted process was an achievement that the school could be proud of. On another day the consistency may have been clearer enabling an outstanding judgement for quality of teaching and leadership.
- How does the school avoid staff deflation after the Ofsted inspection having put so much into it?
- As consistency has been an issue in the past, would school leaders agree with this?

- Was there room for more regular Ofsted style drop ins to avoid the element of surprise for individuals?
- Having got Ofsted out of the way it gave the school an opportunity to revisit the three-year vision for the school.
- In recent press articles there had been discussion led by Ofsted around the bond between parents and schools, how it had broken down and the impact on attendance and behaviour. For Ofsted to give such prominence to behaviour in the report in that context seemed unfair.
- It's a generation issue, parenting styles change over time the school has to adapt , have an open mind and be responsive and help parents to understand that their child's version of events may not always necessarily be correct.
- Where did the "Stringer Way" come from and how could it be used as a building block going forward?
- The "Stringer Way" would be a good opportunity to speak with a group of parents for whom some of the rules might be more problematic to help them understand why the school was tightening up.
- If the school can get students on board by listening to them and taking on board their thoughts it was more likely that there would be parent buy in.

#### Response to Governor comment and questions

- The lead inspector was a PE specialist with particular interest in that subject during inspection.
- The school were open about technology being a subject that needs further development and the School Improvement Partner is in to support here.
- Often students will not know what action that school has been taken to deal with behaviour issues.
- Ofsted had spoken to a group of five students at the end of the inspection, there had not been time to dive deeper into their responses.
- In the school's self-evaluation a grading of one (outstanding) had been given to quality of education and leadership, seeing that the outcomes were so strong. Leadership and management also included governance , the level of challenge and support from governors could be seen in minutes and from interviews with individual governors.
- School leaders make it clear that what they do is not just for Ofsted , processes are in place to drive school improvement. A planned inset day would cover of the lessons learned from the reviews and joint planning to seek continual improvement.
- Staff were given autonomy and there were a few longer serving staff members that had their own ways of doing things and had been more reluctant to follow newer policies.
- The curriculum learning walks were going to be changed with deep dives of department over one day, more in line with an Ofsted inspection. The school's partnership adviser was being used for a deep dive in DT department later in the week.
- The Ofsted framework changes over time, it had previously been focussed on data for example.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff are more challenged by parents , with high expectations put upon the school.</li> <li>• The “Stringer Way” came from staff and their concerns that behaviour wasn’t quite where they wanted it to be. The next stage would be to develop the culture with students and their learning in the classroom. The vast majority of students have a good relationship with staff members. The school was in a good position to now tighten up on some of the basics, such as being correctly equipped for lessons.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair on behalf of the Governing Board gave congratulations to school leaders and the team for the good Ofsted outcome.</p> <p><b>AGREEMENT – The Full Governing Board signed off the school’s development plan as presented within the meeting papers.</b></p>	
6	<p><b>Business Group</b></p> <p>The Business Group of Governors had met on 9<sup>th</sup> November, the notes from the meeting which also included consideration of pay recommendations as part of the groups remit on pay were included within the Board’s meeting pack. The Business Group proposed approval of four policy documents listed as 6b to 6d below.</p> <p><b>a) Budget Monitoring Report</b></p> <p>The Business Manager provided a brief verbal summary of the budget position as at the end of September noting that the business group had looked at the monitoring report in greater detail alongside additional financial information for school canteen and staffing going forward.</p> <p>Governors asked questions about the accounting methods for Duke of Edinburgh scheme and school trips and the level of contingency in those areas. There was brief mention of insurance for school trips and current position on the claim around the cancelled ski trip.</p> <p>Governors discussed a proposal to put an end to a discretionary payment that had been given to children eligible for free school meals (FSM) enabling them to get a snack from the canteen on top of their breakfast and lunch time meal deal. There was a reluctance to put an end to this benefit whilst noting that the cost to the school of providing a snack was significant given the number of FSM children. The introduction of a snack payment had been introduced as an incentive to attendance but had not really had the hoped impact and in most cases was not being used for healthy alternatives.</p> <p><b>ACTION – Further proposals on the snack payment for free school meals , possible alternatives and costings attached to come back to the board for consideration alongside the following year’s budget.</b></p> <p><b>b) Premises Management Policy</b>  <b>c) Allergens Policy</b>  <b>d) Pay Panel Report Including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Teachers Pay Policy</b></li> </ul>	SB, Bus grp

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appraisal Policy</b></li> </ul> <p><b>AGREEMENT – The Full Governing Board approved the following polices:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Premises Management Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Allergens Policy</b> – Annual review by Business Group.</li> <li>• <b>Teachers Pay Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Appraisal Policy</b></li> </ul>	
7	<p><b>Other Policies and Other Documents for Approval</b></p> <p>There were four additional policy documents presented to the governor for approval. A presentation was given on the changes to school uniform policy with the emphasis on safety, inclusivity, and ease of implementation. The key changes to policy and the reasons for them were outlined to Governors together with some information on how staff would be able to deal with non-compliance issues in a way that they felt comfortable with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>School Uniform Policy</b></li> <li>b) <b>Accessibility Plan</b></li> <li>c) <b>School Exclusion &amp; Suspensions Policy</b></li> <li>d) <b>Premature Baby Leave &amp; Pay Policy</b></li> </ul> <p><b>AGREEMENT – The Full Governing Board approved the following policies as presented.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>School Uniform Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Accessibility Plan</b></li> <li>• <b>School Exclusion &amp; Suspensions Policy</b></li> <li>• <b>Premature Baby Leave &amp; Pay Policy</b> – Three yearly approval with School Leaders as approving body.</li> </ul>	
8	<p><b>Governance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Consultation on Admissions</b> Governors were alerted to a consultation on school places at primary schools and admissions criteria at secondary school. The inclusion of an additional priority criteria for disadvantaged children and the implications of this were discussed. Governors were left to make submit their personal responses to the consultation having heard various opinions.</li> <li>b) <b>Nominations Panel</b> The nominations panel meeting had not been quorate and there were no notes or proposals for consideration from that meeting. A decision was therefore taken by the Chair and Headteacher to interview three potential governors with two proposals for appointment to fill the vacant Co-opted Governor spaces. It was noted that the Local Authority (LA) Governor position remained unfilled, the Chair would follow this up with the LA.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION – Nomination of two co-opted governors by email , all governors to respond with their comments and vote for or against appointment.</b></p>	All gobs

	<b>AGREEMENT – Catherine Packham to join the nominations panel.</b>	
<b>9</b>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p><b>a) Diversity on the Board</b></p> <p>The Clerk advised that the collection of diversity data had been completed with seven out of nine governors submitting a form. Potential ways of attracting younger candidates were discussed.</p> <p>Meeting ended at 6.45pm Date of next meeting</p>	

Minutes Approved

Signature.....

Date.....