

Minutes of Full Governing Board meeting, held virtually via Microsoft Teams, on Wednesday 13th May 2020 @ 5.30pm.

Present: Debbie Coslett (DC), Interim Chair
 Roger Lockwood (RL), Vice Chair
 Patricia Smith (PS)
 Graham Wells (GW)
 Su Harwood (SH)
 Jason Scott-Taggart (JST)
 Hannah MacDonald (HM)
 Anita Lawrence (AL)
 Roger Salwey (RS)
 Owen Robinson (OR)
 David Sumner (DS)
 Claire Berry (CB)
 Eleanor Wilkes (EW)
 Justine Mountford (JM), Principal

In Attendance: Theo Richards (TR), Vice Principal
 Liana Richards (LR), Vice Principal
 Sophie Hanson (SHa), SBM
 James Cunningham (JC), Assistant Principal
 Sarah Morgan (SM), Clerk to Governors

Apologies: Carly Sargeant (CS), Assistant Principal

No.	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
1	<p><u>Welcome & Introductions</u> DC welcomed everyone to the meeting, which was being held remotely due to schools being partially closed because of the Coronavirus.</p>	
2	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u> Apologies had been received from Carly Sargeant.</p>	
3	<p><u>Declaration of Interests</u> There were no conflicts of interest declared by those present regarding agenda items.</p>	
4	<p><u>Any Urgent Items</u> There were no urgent items presented.</p>	
5	<p><u>Minutes of Last Meeting, Matters Arising & Action Points</u> The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 21st April 2020, were approved. These would be signed at the next meeting held at the school. There were several matters arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>DC to raise issue with FSM voucher scheme with ESCC</i> – DC reported that the Government were working hard to provide an efficient system • <i>JM to add bulge year to next report</i> – Carry forward • <i>Governors to send details of any training undertaken to SM</i> – This was ongoing. DC added that governors should have received log in details that day to Educare. She requested that governors access the online training and complete, as a minimum, PREVENT and Safeguarding training as soon as possible. All completion certificates to be then sent to SM <p>All other items had been dealt with or were agenda items.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">JM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ALL</p>

6	<p><u>SLT Report on School Closure Updates</u></p> <p>JM and her Senior Leadership Team had produced a comprehensive report covering various areas. Since the report, the Government had indicated that Years 10 and 12 may return to school in June sometime. Plans were in the very early stages with the SLT considering what this may look like. The DfE were due to put together a framework for Primary Schools, who were expecting to receive children back to school first, in Early Years, Reception, Year 1 and Year 6. However, the NEU and the NASUWT were against the possible 1st June return so this may be delayed.</p> <p>Q – What external marketing had been done (referred to in the report)? This was mainly Facebook, with other things in the pipeline. JM had created an audio PowerPoint and was approaching Primary Schools with this</p> <p>Q – Were more real-time, online interactions planned, such as live classrooms? JM explained that the advice generally was that schools should not do this due to safeguarding and technology issues. She was however, considering online chat live where questions and answers could be submitted (no video or sound). There could also be more pre-recorded lessons, but not live streaming. JM added that no other local Heads were using live classrooms and DC confirmed that the ESCC safeguarding guidance was that no live lessons should take place</p> <p>Q – The report mentioned the Governor Visit Day, scheduled for 17th June. Was this still taking place? JM had shared a document on ‘Governor Remote Monitoring Visits’ and she was happy for a visit day to take place. She confirmed that this would be remotely, even if some students were in school. DC was conscious that the governors needed to be seen to be supportive and not ‘checking up on staff’, although perhaps, governors should be somewhat visible. The current priority was monitoring school provision during closure but a virtual visit day could take place in early July</p> <p>Q – There were currently, gaps in governor links (Link Governor document 5b). Could this be addressed? JM had added in frequency to this document plus ideas for agenda items. She stressed that it was crucial for governors to start carrying out monitoring visits. SM would re-circulate the list, along with the remote visits paper, and ask for governors to indicate their preference. GW felt that it would be useful for governors to state what experience (and/or interests) they could bring to the role, although DC stated that having no educational experience could be seen as a strength. Some felt that an overview / guidance / expectations was needed and DC agreed to put something together, which GW offered to support. DC concluded that training was needed so governors knew how to support and challenge and get the balance right</p> <p>Q – It was good to see the parental engagement comments. But what are your greatest challenges for returning to school? JM responded that a big challenge was anxiety for all. Some students had found they liked working from home and they would need convincing to return to school, for instance. There was also the challenge of how to make the school a safe place and how to get that message across. Bus transport was another issue and staggered starts would not work</p> <p>Q – How would the school be able to address the significant challenge of those students who had not completed work at home and would therefore fall drastically behind? DC responded that there was a Recovery Plan Checklist due out the following week and she acknowledged that this could be a huge problem. Along with the issue of work, there would also need to be reinforcement of the culture and standards expected at school, once students returned</p> <p>SHa reported that she was liaising with Amanda Dann, Childcare Manager, over the plan for re-opening the Nursery at some point. Currently, it was open on Tuesdays and Thursdays. DC emphasised the need for appropriate risk assessments, to ensure the safety of staff and pupils.</p>	<p>SM/ALL</p> <p>DC/GW</p>
---	---	----------------------------

	<p><u>Finance Update</u> DC invited RL to provide a summary of the current financial position of the school. RL explained that the main school budget had moved from a £47k deficit to a £159k surplus last year, carrying forward a £111k surplus into the current financial year (2020/21).</p> <p>Predictability over Year 7 numbers in September was an issue this year. For 20/21, there were two scenarios; 120 students for a four-form entry or 135 students for a five-form entry. SHa had therefore set two budgets accordingly. The four-form entry would see an in-year £7k deficit with a Positive Carry Forward of £104k at year end and a five-form entry would see an in-year £57k deficit with a Positive Carry Forward of £55k at year end. Looking further ahead, even with this year's carry forward and based on the more favourable four-form entry, 2021/22 predicted an in-year £157k deficit and 2022/23 predicted a £258k deficit. The deficits would have to be addressed through staff reductions or gaining a significant number of pupils.</p> <p>The Extended Schools budget had received a £15k carry forward into this year and would have broken even at year end. However, with the COVID closures, both provisions could conclude the year with a £89k deficit to carry forward. The school had applied to furlough staff, which would reduce this to £14k.</p> <p>SHa concluded that she had put together key strategies but governors needed to keep up the challenge. County would not allow a deficit position and they would challenge the figures.</p> <p>TR and JC had gone through the Sixth Form curriculum model in minute detail and produced a three-year model.</p> <p>Q – Were there any indicative figures for Year 12 in September? JC was hoping for 60 but he would have a more accurate estimate the next day as he was still working on this</p> <p>A confidential minute was taken at this point.</p>	
7	<p><u>KS4 and KS5 Predicted Grades</u> TR presented and he had shared a report that day (attached). He explained that it was a significant process to grade and rank each student in every subject, with up to 50 students in each grade. TR explained the process undertaken, which was detailed in his report.</p> <p>The school had completed the data on 29th April and this was then submitted to the Fischer Family Trust (FFT). They were currently moderating the grades and their report was due on 15th May. Challenge conversations with Heads of Subject would then take place before JM signed off the grades on 1st June for final submission. The accurate inputting of grades and rankings into the system was crucial.</p> <p>JC had carried out a similar process for A Levels using ALPS Connect. Both he and TR were carrying out their own internal analysis to highlight those subjects that had been generous or harsh.</p> <p>Q – Are the extra checks (FFT) recommended? TR explained that the FFT had offered this service and it was being widely used by other schools. FFT analysed school data, that's what they did</p> <p>Q – Was there any advantage to using this service? The Government would apply a similar statistical analysis so this would place the school in a stronger position for accurate results</p> <p>Q – Would the appeals process cause more work? DC reported that Ofqual had stated that parents would not be able to appeal against grades this year. Only schools could appeal 'on</p>	

	<p>technical grounds'. Because of this, Headteachers were concerned that a number of parents, who were disappointed with the grades, could make Freedom of Information (FOI) requests instead. JM had been clear with parents so far that she could not give out any information and she did not intend to do so in the future. It was suggested that all local Heads send the same letter to parents, explaining the thorough process that had been undertaken, which was quality assured, and that the grades could not be challenged. The information from the Government (which was available online) could also be sent</p> <p>Q – What moderation has taken place for those subjects who over-predicted? Heads of Subject were spoken to and some provided a logical argument. JC added that nationally, a generous picture was expected. SH added that she was reassured that that the school followed a predictions process thoroughly every year, it was just the ranking that was new</p> <p>Q – Were there processes in place to deal with Subject Access Requests? There had not been any requests</p> <p>JST thanked TR and his team for the vast amount of work undertaken to establish the grades and rankings.</p>	
8	<p><u>a) Proposed Pastoral Restructure</u></p> <p>JM had submitted the amended documents to governors and ESCC HR Department were talking to the NEU rep this afternoon. The NEU were challenging the restructure and had indicated that they may escalate to a formal dispute. However, ESCC HR were satisfied that the school had followed the process correctly and even extended the consultation time. Additionally, the NAS rep had stated that the consultation was fair and they would not support a formal dispute.</p> <p>A confidential minute was taken at this point.</p> <p>DS mentioned that, with the proposed removal of the Year Leaders, this would put more pressure on the Tutors. However, GW stressed that, with the current budget issues, the school could not carry on with the staffing structure as it currently was. Others stated though, that the restructure was not being done as a cost cutting exercise. JM clarified that the restructure came about because of the safeguarding review and the formal complaint.</p> <p>Q – Is this the right time for a restructure? Yes</p> <p>Q – Will the Pastoral Admin Assistant be skilled? Hopefully. It depended on availability of appropriate candidates</p> <p>Q – Why were there ongoing issues with the NEU? Communication with staff had not been the best in the past and JM would try to rectify this. There had been a lot of changes and at a fast pace. CB added that many unions (in other industries) were using Covid-19 in their arguments and DC was happy that JM had taken advice all through the process</p> <p><u>b) Building Progress</u></p> <p>JM had included an update under item 5 (doc 5c) and she confirmed that the building programme was now four weeks behind schedule. But she knew that the developers would not want to be hit by the penalties for late delivery.</p> <p><u>c) Curriculum Planning</u></p> <p>LR presented and explained that the new curriculum plan had been set out in January. This area had benefitted from the lockdown as teachers had longer, uninterrupted time to spend on the</p>	

	<p>plan. The Term 6 curriculum would be added to the website this Friday. LR had advised Heads of Subjects to keep working on the original plan but to make sure it was accessible from home. 13th July was the final deadline.</p> <p>Knowledge needed to be at the heart of the curriculum, a change from the previous focus on transferrable skills. This change was in response to the new Ofsted Framework. Teachers had received online training and assessment needed to meet the curriculum plan.</p> <p>No one knew when students would be returning to school but when they did, there would be gaps. Staff would assess the gaps and then implement a recovery plan to support those who had fallen behind. LR was thanked for her report.</p>	
9	<p><u>Policy Approval</u></p> <p>DC stated that the Safeguarding Policy on the school website, was out of date and she had flagged this up. JM explained that Carly Sargeant, DSL, was leaving next week and her priority was dealing with the admin of a backlog of safeguarding concerns before she left and she was the only person who could do this. However, JM was confident that CS would update the policy before she left. DC asked JM to reinforce to CS that the policy MUST be updated.</p>	
10	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>Q – With CS leaving, can we discuss careers in Term 6? SM to add to agenda, although JM stated that not much had been done with careers this half term</p> <p>Q – Who is taking over responsibility for CS’s roles? Julie Nicholls would be DSL and Luke Fuller would deal with transition. An internal advert had gone out this week, for a one-year secondment. Interviews were scheduled for 14th June and governors were invited to be involved</p>	SM
11	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>The FGB were scheduled to next meet on Wednesday 8th July @ 5.30pm. However, DC felt that it was likely that an additional meeting would be called to discuss the warning notice.</p>	
12	<p><u>Meeting End Time</u></p> <p>The meeting closed at 7.15pm.</p>	

SM 140520

J. J. Costello

Approved by: _____ Date: 10/06/2020

ACTIONS

Item	Action	Who	By
5	JM to add bulge year to next report	JM	080720
5	Governors to access Educare & complete Safeguarding & PREVENT training (send certificates to SM)	ALL	ASAP
6	SM to re-circulate the link list, along with the remote visits paper, and governors to indicate their preference	SM/ALL	080720
6	DC to produce link governor overviews, with support from GW	DC/GW	080720
10	SM to add careers to next agenda	SM	080720