



Minutes of the Full Governors Meeting held on Wednesday 23rd September 2015

Present: Mr C Webb (Chair), Mrs D Bryant, Mr B Drew, Mr D Reynolds, Mrs V Tatham, Ms A Gilbert, Dr P Foster, Mr C Leathley, Canon D Miller, Mrs J Sargent, Dr A Upton. Mr D McDonald, Mr G Vallender, Mr D Robson
Not Present: Mr A Horne, Mr M Higgs
In Attendance: Mrs S Bayes (Clerk to Governors), Mrs J Hart

1. Apologies submitted and accepted:

Mr A Horne, Mr M Higgs

2.	Declaration of Business, Pecuniary or Other Interests	Action
2.1	AUp declared that he was involved in the setting up of a new Multi Academy Trust.	
3.	<p>Initial Review of Exam Results and Implications for Change (JHt)</p> <p>3.1 JHt explained the KS4 Attainment floor target. It was likely that English and Maths would be above the as yet unknown national floor standards. Had there been any challenges this year? There had been a few but a favourable outcome would not change the data. Better than Expected Progress in all subjects was not as good as it should be and there were not as many A and A* grades as expected. Could this be because primary schools were pushing students to get level 6s? There had been an embargo on KS2 SATS for this year group so KS2 levels were based on teacher assessment. Had the level 5s made expected progress? Yes, on the whole but they had not make better than expected progress. This had happened County-wide. .</p> <p>3.2 It was difficult to predict the Value Added for this year due to changes made to the rules about which qualifications were eligible. However, the estimate was that the KS4 VA would be over 1000.</p> <p>3.3 Closing the Gaps had been a success. The overall gap had narrowed significantly from 42% to 30%. What had been done to make that change? Disadvantaged students had been brought to the fore. Every class had a seating plan, disadvantaged students were asked the first questions and their books were marked first. Attendance had been looked at. RAG meetings led to bespoke interventions and the findings of each intervention had been broken down. These were looked at and successful ones continued. Were these interventions sustainable? Yes, as they were funded by Pupil Premium.</p> <p>3.4 The emerging issues at KS4 were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with high prior attainment have not progressed as well this year • The College achieved fewer A and A* grades than in previous years • Fewer students were making better than expected progress – this can be seen in a number of subjects </p>	

<p>3.5</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.7</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>3.9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BTEC courses now included final exams which made them less accessible to some students • Forecasting accuracy still needed to be improved <p>Would an outside person look at the qualitative information and ask is this school coasting? Because the college was so aware of what was going on and had systems in place we could prove we were not coasting. Ofsted would make their judgement on our capacity to improve and we have demonstrated we do have capacity to improve. They would recognise the infrastructure changes that were also being made.</p> <p>Now qualifications have a fixed number allowed at each grade it would be challenging for staff to reach their targets for progression appraisal.</p> <p>P16 was split in to academic attainment and vocational attainment. The academic average points score had dipped from above C to below C mainly because of the upper middle ability underperforming and some U grades. Could this be because of student choices? Sometimes students had to take a subject they were not particularly interested in as funding was based on student hours and resulted in a lack of effort on their part. The entry requirements for some subjects are being raised as evidence shows that for some subjects higher GCSE grades were needed to ensure success. Some students will be looked at individually and a probationary period could be introduced.</p> <p>The BTEC courses had been very successful, with strong performances for both average and total points scores. However, BTECs were changing to become more exam based which could affect future results.</p> <p>How many students had gone on to university? 83 had gone this year, and some students had taken up apprenticeships or joined the forces.</p> <p>The emerging issues at P16 were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many U grades being certificated • The Alps reports indicated that there were still some persistently blue subjects • Students with B/C targets had under-performed, typically achieving C/D grades • Forecasting accuracy needed to be improved 	
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>	<p>Election of Chair</p> <p>There had been several nominations for Chris Webb to retain his position as Chair. He left the meeting</p> <p>Chris Webb was elected unanimously as Chair. CWe returned to the meeting.</p>	
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p>	<p>Election of Vice-Chair</p> <p>There had been several nominations for David Miller and Chris Leathley to retain their positions as Vice-Chairs. They both left the meeting.</p> <p>David Miller and Chris Leathley were elected unanimously as Vice-Chairs. DMi and CLe returned to the meeting.</p>	

<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p>	<p>Instrument of Government</p> <p>CWe drew Governors' attention to the Instrument of Government, as there had been a slight change of terminology. Community governors had been removed and replaced with Co-opted governors. This move came about to ensure boards had the breadth of key skills needed. Although HCC Governing Board was well represented in most areas, a governor with legal knowledge would be an asset. A recent parent governor resignation meant that we could look for someone with legal expertise as a replacement. DMc would ask HoPs if they knew of any suitable parents.</p>	<p>DMc</p>
<p>7.</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p>	<p>Adoption of Policies</p> <p>a. Code of Conduct for Governors</p> <p>b. Governor Visits Policy and Protocols This made clear what the purpose of the visit should be and was in line with recent governor training. The Chair emphasised that governors were not there to judge. If the governor visit report form was completed visits would not trespass in to inspection.</p> <p>The recent structured conversations were very useful. Link governors were thanked for attending.</p> <p>c. Health and Safety Policy</p> <p>d. Charging Policy A charge of £5 per child had recently been introduced as a contribution towards the cost of out-of-school-hours clubs. Staff were to be commended for giving up their time to run so many varied clubs. This was a strictly not-for-profit exercise but would help with the cost of consumables and transport.</p> <p>All four policies were adopted and approved.</p>	
<p>8</p> <p>8.1</p>	<p>Approval of Educational Visit to Iceland</p> <p>The Geology department wished to take a group of P16 students to Iceland. This would be a repeat of the very successful trip last year. Governors approved the visit.</p>	
<p>9</p> <p>9.1</p>	<p>Ratification of Policies by Sub-Groups</p> <p>It was agreed to circulate all new/updated policies to all governors for comment before they were sent to the relevant committee/sub-group for approval and adoption.</p>	<p>SBy</p>
<p>10</p> <p>10.1</p>	<p>Discussion on Academisation</p> <p>DBr showed a PowerPoint presentation exploring the very early steps the Co-operative Trust would need to look at if it decided to become a Multi-Academy Trust (MAT). It was emphasised that these explorations were still at the initial stage. DBr and CWe would be visiting a MAT in Stoke next week to see how it operated.</p> <p>DMi, A Gi and JSa left the meeting</p>	

10.2	After discussion, governors agreed that they were happy for the explorations to continue.	
10.3	A letter was tabled that could be sent to all parents of students at all schools in the Trust, explaining that the Co-operative Trust would be exploring the various multi-academy options. Governors agreed that they were happy for the letter to be sent out to HCC students' parents. DMc left meeting	
10.4	CWe would keep governors informed of any developments, and would feed back to them after the Stoke visit.	

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 7.10pm

Chair's signature..... Date.....