



## Minutes of the Full Governors Meeting held on Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> March 2015

**Present:** Mr C Webb (Chair), Mr G Vallender, Mrs D Bryant, Mr B Drew, Mr T Gundry, Mr A Horne, Mr C Leathley, Canon D Miller (part), Mr D McDonald, Dr A Upton, Mr D Reynolds, Mrs V Tatham, Dr P Foster, Mr S Richards

**Not Present:** Mrs J Sargent, Mr D Robson, Mrs A Gilbert, Mrs S Collins, Mr M Higgs

**In Attendance:** Mr N East (part), Mr D Lewis (part), Mrs J Hart (part), Mrs S Bayes (Clerk to Governors)

**1. Apologies submitted and accepted:** Mrs J Sargent, Mr D Robson, Mrs A Gilbert, Mrs S Collins, Mr M Higgs

| 2.        | Declaration of Business, Pecuniary or Other Interests  | Action |
|-----------|--|--------|
| 2.1       | There were no new declarations   |        |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>Minutes of the Full Governors Meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014 (Appendix A)</b>   |        |
| 3.1       | The minutes with one amendment were signed as an accurate record of the meeting.   |        |
| 3.2       | It was noted that answers to questions needed to be more precise.  |        |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>Matters arising from the Minutes of the Full Governors Meeting of of 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014</b>  |        |
| 4.1       | 5.1 The training log had been updated by the clerk.  |        |
| 4.2       | 12.5 The chair had emailed governors a governance structure chart and would be emailing again at the weekend.<br><br>20.2 Health and Safety had been added to the agenda as a standing item.   |        |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>Head Teacher and Senior Leadership Team's Report (Appendix B)</b>   |        |
| 5.1       | DBr drew governors' attention to the proposal for a revised Trust Governance Model. Work needed to be done on bringing about the proposed changes, especially slimming the Board from 40 trustees to 14. Some trustees, such as HE partners, could possibly be more interested in being involved with the work stream rather than governance. Deciding how to slim down and who to lose was difficult. It may be that a meeting was needed to decide how to expedite this, which could be the AGM, but if it could be done before that it would be better. The HE partners were Falmouth, Truro, Marjon Exeter, and Cornwall College. There could be a conflict of interest as, for example, Truro has a fairly aggressive marketing policy which was probably not in the best interests of the Cooperative. Marjon was the best natural partner because of their values. <b>What was the view on reducing numbers on the Board from primary schools?</b> Heads were |        |

|     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| 5.2 | <p>happy with it, but the Trust had not heard back from their governing bodies. Information from Trust meetings could be shared with governors in their school full meetings. Governors who were very keen to stay on could join as a parent or community member or be part of the governor stakeholder group. From these groups they could be elected to the board via the stakeholder forum. The Trust could be a standing item at Governor Network meetings. The Trust needed to be ready with its own plan regarding the way forward with academisation and cluster groups. Heads were meeting with County next week to find out their view, and then would meet to put a blueprint together.</p> <p><b>How much of an impact was the decline of numbers in the census going to have?</b> There would have a significant effect on funding as the size of Yr 11 affects the following year's P16, as an average of 70% stay on. PLa was working with Mullion to raise our profile from Yr 10. There would be 230+ in Year 7 in September. The College was trying to track numbers from primary schools for future years but this was difficult, as children moved around from school to school.</p> |  |
| 5.3 | <p><b>Were the two members of staff with extensions to contracts permanent?</b> Yes, both had done well in their secondment positions.</p>  |  |
| 5.4 | <p>It was pointed out that there could be a problem with the online homework diary if the software was being written by one person. Documentation was needed. This was a new piece of software being developed privately by a member of staff which the college was buying in to.</p>   |  |
| 6.  | <p><b>Term of Office – Foundation Governor</b></p>  |  |
| 6.1 | <p>Canon David Miller's term of office expired on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2015. CWe reminded governors that there were moves afoot to change the structure of the governing body, focusing more on parent governors and on skills sets. The NGA recognised the diocese as one area where the link to a governing body was beneficial. AHo proposed that DMi continue for a further four years, which GVa seconded. This was accepted unanimously.</p>   |  |
| 7.  | <p><b>Quality Improvement Plan Report (NEa) (Appendix C)</b></p>  |  |
| 7.1 | <p>Before the QIP item, there was some discussion on the best way for governors to receive their meeting papers. It was decided to send out everything electronically and have paper copies available for the meeting and a couple of days earlier, in case anyone wanted to collect them.</p>  |  |
| 7.2 | <p>QIP NEa explained that the QIP did not match exactly with the SEF as the SEF was driven by Ofsted needs and so was more constrained. The QIP had a broader vision, including the site and infrastructure, and the Co-op Trust. It was a working document so should be changing regularly.</p>  |  |
| 7.3 | <p><b>In the T&amp;L section, what was meant by the deliberate practice approach?</b> Traditionally, in-service training has focussed on several of separate things, but repeating and embedding new practice has been shown to have better results. Teachers had been allocated to an 'action learning set' that would decide to work on one thing that would make a</p>   |  |

|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>7.4</p> <p>7.5</p> <p>7.6</p> | <p>difference and have impact and they would pursue improving this aspect of their practice. This gave staff ownership of their training and self-responsibility to develop themselves. Colleagues were finding this to be a positive approach with positive outcomes in terms of learning conversations amongst colleague. The impact would need to be evidenced through college monitoring activities going forward.</p> <p><b>It would be useful to have timescales for each action in the QIP.</b> This was noted. The impact of the actions needed to be seen by the link governors eg SEND.</p> <p><b>In the section ‘Establishing mastery approach in KS3 – differentiated homework’ did students get different homework depending on their capability? Did that give teachers more work?</b> Yes that was the expectation. The new online homework diary meant that the different levels of homework would be easier to access. For teachers it should be a key part of their planning.</p> <p><b>How were the Year 7 Friday ‘drop-in’ sessions working?</b> These came out of discussions around transition and wanting to try a ‘school gate’ approach. Every Friday from 3.30 to 4.30 KTr and DLe were available to meet Year 7 parents without an appointment. On balance this has been a success. It was initially trialled until Christmas but has carried on because of parent take up.</p>  |  |
| <p>8.</p> <p>8.1</p>             | <p><b>Safeguarding and Local Offer (DLe) (Appendix D)</b></p> <p>DLe explained that the SEND Code of Practice was updated at the start of year and again in the last month. Changes which impacted most significantly were:</p> <p>a) A clearly worded statement from the DfE that there was an over-identification of students with SEN. If class teachers were doing a good job then a wider variety of learning needs could be met in the classroom so extra support was not needed.</p> <p>DMi joined meeting</p> <p>b) A need to publish annually the SEN report. DLe showed governors where it was on the College website. The format used came from the LA, as parents had requested all schools use same format for continuity.</p> <p>c) There was no statutory obligation to publish a local offer. This version had been written by DLe with input from key staff and SLT, based on the existing policy. Future versions would be written following consultation with stakeholders</p> <p>d) SEN were additional to or different from peers’ needs in that help was needed make the required progress. Behaviour was no longer deemed to be a SEN, but seen as a symptom or indicator of an underlying need. Young people seemed to be suffering from more emotional mental health needs. This may impact on our staffing in time. At present there were 200 pupils currently on the Register of Need (RoN), but with the new code this would reduce to approximately 100, which would have a knock on effect on the structure of the SEN support team. <b>How did we tie in the explicit requirement to increase teacher skills in CPD?</b> This year there had been 3 twilight sessions covering dyslexia, attention deficit and autism.</p> |  |

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 8.2 | <p>Currently data for students showed that learners who were on the RoN were not making the same attainment levels as students who were not, but were making same if not better progress in KS3. Under the new code with only half the learners this could have a knock on effect as there could be more sharply targeted intervention. In KS4 progress was also positive. A coherent data system was in use to inform tracking. Some details still needed ironing out as students coming through from primary schools who had historically been on RoN were not necessarily still on. This could be done during the transition process.</p>   |  |
| 8.3 | <p>The policy needed to be updated to include the new code and data system. Staffing needed to be looked at, as did parent communication, and the data to reduce numbers.</p>  |  |
| 8.4 | <p>DLe tabled the Pupil Passport. IEPs were useful for monitoring some pupils but were not useful to support teachers in the classroom. The front sheet of the new passport helped members of teaching staff and also the learner with what their needs were, what their strengths and weaknesses were, and what support would be in classroom to help; eg a dyslexic student might have a writing frame, or coloured overlay. <b>Where would this passport be held?</b> In the staff area of the intranet in the SEN pupil passport folder. As the review process continued IEPs were being replaced with passports. The second page showed the key elements of review which should happen termly.</p>  |  |
| 8.5 | <p><b>Could you give an example of someone who is on register before that could be removed under the new Code?</b> A number of students on the register under 'social emotional behavioural difficulties' were going to Phoenix sessions. This could be looked at as an after school activity and not necessarily reviewed termly. Another example was students who saw a college counsellor would appear on the RoN but this could be seen as a non-educational support structure. Currently the RWi programme, which was having a significant impact on literacy skills, sat as a separate class so could be seen as differentiated rather than special. No decisions have been taken yet as it was a sensitive issue - parents could be upset if they believed support was withdrawn. However, this was not about withdrawing support which would still be targeted at the point of need.</p> |  |
| 8.6 | <p>Whenever a student was not making the requisite progress this would be picked up in the termly RAG meeting so intervention could be given to get them back on track, but this would not necessarily be seen as a SEN. The student would go on the RoN eventually if progress had not been made by the second or third RAG meeting.</p>  |  |
| 8.7 | <p><b>Was there a link between SEND and G&amp;T?</b> It could be argued that G&amp;T students have SEN though best practice said not to include them on the RON. The RAG Monitoring process looked at all students and their progress so G&amp;T students would go through a cycle of support if not making the expected progress.</p>   |  |
| 8.8 | <p><b>Did students on the register attract extra funding?</b> No. The College had to find first £6000 from the College budget for SA+ or statemented students. Those with statements needing funding above £6000 were granted 'top up' from the High Needs funding block held at county.</p>   |  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 8.9   | <p>Disadvantaged children in Yrs 7 8 and 9 were making appropriate levels of progress but not in Yrs 10 and 11. There had been a lack of continuity between KS3 and KS4 assessments but the new system was now addressing this.</p> <p>DLe and AUp left the meeting</p>  |  |
| <p><b>9.</b></p> <p>9.1</p> <p>9.2</p> <p>9.3</p> <p>9.4</p> <p>9.5</p> <p>9.6</p> <p>9.7</p> | <p><b>Year 11 Forecast Data (JHt) (Appendix E)</b></p> <p>The figures had changed slightly since the dashboard had been sent to governors because of changes to English following moderation of controlled assessment.</p> <p>JHt explained the Yr 11 Dashboard which compared this year with the previous two years. The progress figures for English were encouraging compared to last year and the Maths figures were in line with last year. The VA was currently 1021 but would change as the formula was due to change; however it should still be above 1000.</p> <p><b>Looking at the VENN diagram from last year, the majority of those who failed the EBACC failed on the English. Was it more evenly split this year?</b> Yes. There was also a gender split with boys obtaining the required Maths grade and girls English. RAG meetings were showing who needed intervention to achieve C grades.</p> <p>The gender gap was closing but girls were still outperforming boys. There was a positive column for the disadvantaged gap which was now 26%, down from 40% last year. The SEND gap column was mixed, because there were fewer students so greater volatility. This would become even more noticeable if the number of RoN students dropped.</p> <p>The disadvantaged student gap was very large so was the first topic for discussion at RAG meetings. Individual students were tracked very closely, as could be seen on the Attainment Analysis sheet. PA stood for Prior Attainment. It was worth noticing that several levels were teacher assessed. RAG meeting information went back to the HoF, tutors, teachers, mentors etc. The College knew exactly where each individual student was in terms of achievement data at any time. If these forecasts were correct, this would give the College a positive RAISEonline.</p> <p>DBr wished to record everyone's appreciation of the work JHt has put in to produce and record this data.</p> <p>The data just discussed had been only for Year 11. Were governors happy to see this and P16 at Full Governors meetings, with the finer details being discussed at L&amp;T? This was agreed.</p> |  |
| <p><b>10.</b></p> <p>10.1</p>   | <p><b>Pupil Premium Update (DMc) (in Appendix B)</b></p> <p>DMc had had a meeting in November with the College SIP, which resulted in SLT deciding to focus on 3 key objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify students, and get them to where they needed to be.</li> <li>2. Find which strategies were working and which were not.</li> </ol> <p>Read Write inc was working well, with some students increasing their reading age by 3 years. Heads of Progress had different foci for mentoring. LAI was working with Year 8 boys which had led to them modifying their behaviour in the classroom. The study support programme for this year 's Yr</p>  |  |

|            |  |  |
|------------|--|--|
|            | <p>11 was not working well; it may have been better if it had started in Yr 10.</p> <p>3. Classroom seating plans were important as teachers needed to know who and where disadvantaged children were. Teachers had been asked to make disadvantaged children a priority when asking questions and when marking books.</p>   |  |
| 10.2       | <p><b>How long would a strategy be piloted before you decided it was working/not working?</b> The College started to analyse in January what was impacting and what was not. Next year there would be 'milestones' built into the plan.</p>  |  |
| 10.3       | <p>Attendance was checked for each individual disadvantaged student and followed up if there was a problem, meeting with the parents every few weeks.</p>  |  |
| 10.4       | <p>It was difficult to compare behaviour year on year. There had been an increase in reported behaviour this year: the individuals were known and were getting support. There was a great difference between the number of sanctions given by different faculties which was being looked at, but individual faculties had consistent numbers year by year.</p> <p>DBr had talked to students who said low level disruption was a concern in some classes, so this was being looked at. Mobile phones were sometimes a problem. Low level disruption would be minimal if planning and teaching was good. <b>Was it a small number of students who were getting multiple sanctions?</b> Yes, and support had been put in place for them. <b>It would be useful to have a breakdown of how many had had 5 or more, 10 or more, 20 or more etc.</b> This year the internal exclusion room has been reinstated, so less fixed term exclusions and more internal exclusions.</p> |  |
| 10.5       | <p>DMi and BDr left the meeting</p> <p>In assembly the award for most TRICs but also most sanctions had been given to the same tutor group, which could send mixed messages. This would be looked at.</p>  |  |
| 10.6       | <p>Very few disadvantaged children were participating in enrichment activities. The college would be looking at this, to raise the numbers.</p>  |  |
| 10.7       | <p><b>What was the difference between 'attitude to learning' and 'disrupting learning'?</b> Disrupting learning could be affecting other students and attitude could be refusing to engage.</p> <p>CWe thanked DB for his comprehensive report</p> <p>TGu left meeting</p>   |  |
| <b>11.</b> | <p><b>Health and Safety Report (AHo) (verbal)</b></p>  |  |
| 11.1       | <p>Governors had overall responsibility for health and safety in the College. AHo had spent 3 hours that day with the Site Manager going through Cornwall Council's safety audit.</p>  |  |
| 11.2       | <p>The College had a legal responsibility to have a signed H&amp;S policy. This needed to be upgraded and signed off as a matter of urgency.</p>   |  |
| 11.3       | <p>There was no record of staff having signed to say they had read and understood the H&amp;S policy.</p>  |  |
| 11.4       | <p>The risk assessment and H&amp;S culture in College was good.</p>  |  |

|  |  |            |
|--|--|------------|
| <p>11.5</p>  | <p>Specific site related assessment needed to be done in the D&amp;T and Art departments. AHo would be meeting PMA to discuss trip risk assessments.</p> <p>In general security and awareness of COSHH in cupboards could be tightened. Time and budget could be a factor. The College purchased 12 days of Council time; this could be used for them to meet with faculties and discuss each area.</p>  | <p>AHo</p> |
| <p>12.</p>   | <p><b>Receive the Approved Minutes of the Meetings of</b></p> <p>a. L&amp;T            29<sup>th</sup> January 2015 (Appendix F)<br/> b. Resources    5<sup>th</sup> November 2014 (Appendix G)<br/> c. Resources    5<sup>th</sup> December 2014 (Appendix H)<br/> d. Resources    14<sup>th</sup> January 2015 (Appendix I)</p> <p>The minutes of the above meetings were received.</p>  |            |
| <p>13.</p> <p>13.1</p> <p>13.2</p> <p>13.3</p> <p>13.4</p> | <p><b>Chair's Report and Summary</b></p> <p>CWe had items to discuss but as only 10 governors were now present he would email the information out.</p> <p>It could be that some items could be looked at in committee rather than at Full Governors meetings, and be presented in report but not as a separate agenda item.</p> <p>DBr reported that the eclipse would be viewed from inside, via a College webcam. Texts outlining this and safety measures had been sent to parents and put on the website and staff had been notified.</p> <p>CWe thanked DBr and the staff for the professional and positive way in which the recent high profile visits had been handled.</p> | <p>CWe</p> |

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 7.30pm.

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