



## Governing Board - Minutes

**Meeting Date:** 3 May 2017  
**Meeting Venue:** TG9, Temple Grove, Gildredge House  
**Meeting Time:** 5:15pm

**Governors:** Julian Mace (JM), Chair  
Louise Baxter (LB), Vice Chair  
Paul Amos (PA)  
Neil Best (NB)  
Steven Blower (SB)  
Selene Edwards (SE)  
Gabrielle Mace (GM)  
Adam Molloson (AM)  
Rachel Moreton (RM)

**Assoc. Governor:** Sara McKenna (SMc)  
**Ex officio:** Stuart Reeves, Head Teacher (SRv)

**Also in attendance:** Janice Logan (DFA)  
Danny Simmonds (DSi)  
Paul Barber (PBa)

**Clerk to Governors:** Steve Quayle (SQ)

**Apologies:** Aidan Delaney (AD)  
Trevor Scott (TS)

**Absent:** Alison Allart (AA)

---

## Governing Board – Minutes, 3 May 2017

Item	Discussion	Action	Date
1.	<b>Welcome and apologies for absence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apologies received and accepted by Chair.</li> </ul>		
2.	<b>Declarations of Interests</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No declarations of interest were made.</li> </ul>		
3.	<b>Minutes of the Governing Board Meeting – 30 March 2017</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair highlighted that the minutes stated that the next safeguarding monitoring visit will happen before the Safeguarding Team’s visit, when, in fact, it was agreed it would take place afterwards.</li> <li>Chair signed the minutes as an accurate record of the FGB Meeting on 30 March 2017; with the above amendment appended.</li> </ul>		
4.	<b>Action Summary Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Chair has marked off a number of actions on the FGB Action Summary Report as having been completed, and/or no longer relevant.</li> <li>Chair asked the Clerk to send the Action Summary Reports for the Education and Enterprise Committees to LB and TS respectively for them to mark off any actions which have been completed and/or which are no longer relevant.</li> <li>Once the above exercise has taken place Chair asked the Clerk to combine the three Action Summary Reports into one document with three sections and circulate this new combined document to all Governors.</li> </ul>	Clerk  Clerk	12/5/17  2/6/17
5.	<b>Items not already on the agenda</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None reported.</li> </ul>		
6.	<b>Chair’s correspondence</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair has received correspondence from the school’s bank that SRv’s name has been added to the bank account and LGi’s has been removed.</li> <li>Chair has received 2 letters from the office of Caroline Ansell, MP for Eastbourne, stating that she understands the issues regarding school funding and she is on our side with this and is trying to press the case for Eastbourne schools, which have suffered disproportionately. She has also asked the School’s Minister to visit Eastbourne schools. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SRv asked if we should invite Caroline Ansell into the school. <b>Governors suggested</b> we should invite all the main Eastbourne parliamentary candidates into the school and that this would represent an excellent learning opportunity for students.</li> <li>Chair also advised Governors that separately the Mayor of Eastbourne has expressed an interest in visiting the school and that we should try to accommodate this too if possible.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SRv  SRv	By 8/6/17  TBC
7.	<b>Governance Matters</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Proposal for 9 FGBs a year incorporating committee business</b> - Chair advised Governors that the lead Governors – JM, LB, TS and GM met with SRv over the Easter holidays and SRv had proposed a new structure for Governors meetings of 9 FGBs a year which will include sections on Education and Enterprise business. Furthermore, SRv, JM, LB, TS and GM are looking at creating an agenda schedule for the 9 FGB meetings. <b>Governors stated</b> they felt this was a good idea. <b>Vote = Proposal for 9 FGBs approved by Governors.</b> Chair advised that this will inevitably mean some of the Governor policies will need rewriting.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Update on the vacancy for new Governor</b> – Chair advised there has been no action on the vacancy for a new Governor – Chair will liaise with TS on this – it is hoped that people will become aware of this vacancy through word of mouth, the school’s bulletin, ‘SGOSS’ and the ‘Inspiring Governance’ platforms. Chair advised there is a national initiative to encourage younger people to apply to become Governors too.</li> <li>○ <b>Confirmation regarding responsibility for updating Edubase</b> – agreed immediately prior to the meeting that the Clerk and Kate Richardson will liaise to get the Edubase list up to date so it can be sent to ESCC Clerking Service. JLo confirmed she informs Companies House separately regarding Governor personnel changes. It was pointed out that this required immediate action.</li> <li>○ <b>Review and ratify the Governors monitoring visit policy</b> – Chair admitted the proposed document is very wordy but suggested that it remains as it is because it includes very useful information and provides a good monitoring visit format. SRv stated the policy has a requirement within it for Governors to judge teacher’s ability which shouldn’t be for Governors to decide due to a lack of expertise. Accordingly, JM to look at policy again. Chair asked Clerk to send a Word version of the updated document to all Governors.</li> <li>○ <b>Formalise, with actions, monitoring visits for summer term;</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Safeguarding</b> – This is scheduled for Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> May and will focus on Prep &amp; Twilight and therefore will take place between 2.30pm-5pm. There will be a fire drill at the same time. RM and AA are actioning this. The external Safeguarding Review will take place next Friday 12 May. Chair and RM to attend.</li> <li><b>b. Lower school</b> – this has been postponed and needs re-booking. However, LB and SRv confirmed it would be of more value to look at Middle/Upper school. LB and SRv to organise areas to be monitored. <b>Governors suggested</b> Y10, Y12 and Y13 Core.</li> <li><b>c. Quality of teaching (book look)</b> – this will focus on year 10 with core – a volunteer is also needed.</li> <li><b>d. Staff performance reviews, target setting and structure</b> – SRv confirmed there will be an Inset Day on 30 June which will introduce this subject – but this will only be the start of the process, so he will use the month of July to get it ready for rolling out the new processes for October. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Chair confirmed that going forwards, Governors will have sight of a full monitoring visit timetable for the next school year – Chair to prepare this.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Chair/TS</p> <p>Clerk/KR</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>LB/SRv</p> <p>Chair +1</p>	<p>12/5/17</p> <p>12/5/17</p>
8.	<p><b>Safeguarding update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding Training for Governors is now booked in for 8 June. <b>Governors asked</b> if there is anything on the agenda at the Inset Day on 30 June which might relate to safeguarding. SRv advised he will circulate a guide to Governors of what is being covered on the inset day.</li> </ul>		
9.	<p><b>Headteacher Matters</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Headteacher’s Report (including Data Summary &amp; Sixth Form Strategy)</b> – Chair explained to Governors that the previous structure of L&amp;M meetings, followed by SPG meetings, leading to the FGB meetings was now viewed as overly long-winded and the Lead Governors have decided to move away from this structure. Chair also explained that the previous SEF process will continue in a different format going forwards, but a standing item on all FGBs going forwards will be the Head Teachers report.</li> <li>• SRv thanked Chair for this explanation and proceeded to walk Governors through his HT report:</li> <li>• SRv advised it has been very busy first few weeks and he has been made to feel very welcome by all. He has now met all the staff and students. He has met with a few people outside the school too: the Eastbourne Education Board, where he has attended 1 meeting which was quite fruitful. He has met with Jenny King and the</li> </ul>	SRv	June FGB Agenda

	<p>FOGH and has also met with the Local Authority and has offered his support and help, and hopes that this will become a reciprocal arrangement going forwards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re OFSTED areas - some time spent with the SLT prioritizing the key areas of work needed and the 'to do now' box was quite large, especially in relation to getting the finances under control.</li> <li>• SRv advised that he is working towards a September 2019 financial model with income estimates. He is setting a rigid target of 78% of income to be spent on staff, with 1/5 of this support staff and 4/5 being teaching staff. He proposes to model this and see what it looks like and then work backwards to set a structure in place for 2018 as a stepping stone towards the 2019 model.</li> <li>• SRV spoke of potential cost synergies around school Middle Leadership structure. He is exploring these areas. <b>See pink paper.</b></li> <li>• SRv has identified urgent things he wants to look at – safeguarding, the net capacity survey and attendance as a priority, as is updating the website, although this is less easy than he first thought due to the amount of control we have over the site. To this end he is meeting KR and Firebrand later in the week to discuss.</li> <li>• By July, SRv plans to implement a different structure regarding CPD. A Teaching and Learning Assessment model is currently being devised by PBa, whereby teachers will observe each other teaching so everyone is clear about expectations regarding the quality of education, to get a consistent approach and then we can assess if the Gildredge House quality of teaching pentagon is still fit for purpose.</li> <li>• Personal development – behaviour generally is very good – although SRv believes some of systems will creak with 150 more students coming into the school in September 2017, so some need to be re-thought through.</li> <li>• Early years – SRv said that the outstanding nature of this provision hits you really hard. Head of Lower School is very clear about who is doing well and who needs support.</li> <li>• SEN is a growing area – more SEN students are coming in due to there being fewer spaces in special schools. East Sussex CC has a big deficit on its SEN provision and this is a real pressure point which we need to keep our eyes on in the future.</li> <li>• Sixth form is an area of concern – the study programmes need work and we would still hope for more applicants – but on the positive side there is now a 6<sup>th</sup> Form strategy group including governors. SRv met the group earlier today to work on ways of increasing the number coming in in September 2017.</li> <li>• SRv asked Governors for debates/decisions on the following four elements of his HT Report:</li> <li>• <b>2.2 See pink paper.</b></li> <li>• <b>3.0 – Monitoring visits</b> – SRv stated that the SLT will have observed all staff by half term which will mean there will be data for Governors to look at. <b>Governors stated</b> it would be preferable to complete a learning walk. SRv stated we could show a quick observation and the quality of the subsequent feedback conversation. <b>Governors asked</b> if we could do this as a staggered visit and then what comes after it – could this cover the book look. PBa advised it might be useful to be part of feedback conversation and have a book look at the same time. PBa advised that by the start of Friday he will have finished the schedule for observations for the rest of term. SRv advised that for completeness he should teach a lesson himself and be observed too. PBa to arrange. PBa agreed with Governors to set up an observation after half term.</li> <li>• <b>5.1 Data</b> – SRv asked Governors if they have enough info and the right type of data. <b>Governors stated</b> that data has never been presented in a format that allowed us to see clear progression. SRv advised that in his data the progress levels have been added so Governors can make a comparison. SRv advised that Early Years data is in different format. In future SRv wants to draw the Governor's attention to aspects he is concerned about. <b>Governors asked</b> for information about ongoing comparators, rather than just a snapshot, but stated that they liked the new format</li> </ul>	<p>SRv</p> <p>SRv</p> <p>PBa</p>	<p>July 2017</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Early June</p>
--	--	----------------------------------	---

cover sheet with info boxes. **Governors stated** we need to work towards some form of 'RaiseOnline' type data. SRv would like to report this data 6 times a year including levels of attainment with progress reports to see how that's changing. This would be produced as a percentage of students currently working at levels 9-4 in each subject, and would state any proposed interventions. **Governors asked** about whether staff will need training to enable this to be completed properly. SRv stated PBA is working with the incoming AHT about this already, so we don't have to redo it all again when he starts. SRv advised the current process of staff assessing the level themselves is not consistent. PBA advised incoming AHT has some very good ideas about assessment and he will pitch his finished idea. **Governors asked** if this means we won't get years 7, 8, 9 data in full?—PBA advised this is not the case. SRv advised Governors are welcome to review whatever data they want, but he will indicate where his concerns are. **Governors asked** for the headline figures whatever —SRv agreed. **Governors asked** about moderation of the data and comparisons with national averages and local schools, and also whether the lower school data will look the same. SRv said the data will be produced 6 times a year for the upper school and 4 times a year for the lower school. **Governors asked** what the AC and P means on the progress data report. SRv/PBA advised 'P' means practical, 'A' means assessment, 'C' means classwork. **Governors stated** that Maths, English and Science should be the ones Governors should be most concerned with. SRv stated that it's difficult to know what each grade relates to in the new grading system; because of NORM Referencing it can change from one year to the next. **Governors asked** if the school should enter students at AS level, and put them through an external exam rather than leaving it down to the teachers to assess this thus allowing them to continue on into Year 13. **Governors asked** if moderation costs the school money. SRv said moderating between centres is always good practice. SRv said it would be interesting to put everyone into an AS exam that wasn't published, but the school is not allowed to do that. DFA said we need to make sure we use the information; **Governors agreed** that last year there was a failure to use the data for any purpose.

- **Governors asked** about Year 2 Boys Maths figures —SLT advised that the assessment and exam paper used within the classroom all went well but when they took the actual test paper it didn't show any progress. SRv and Head of Lower School have discussed whether it is an ability/skills issue. SRv advised it could be a training problem or it could be an assessment issue. SRv confirmed that the delivery of Maths and the delivery of Reading are equally good. **Governors asked** about Summer-Born boys. Associate Governor to Lower School confirmed that over half of the current Reception children are summer born, and some will still be 4 years old at the end of the school year. For boys especially this sometimes means they are immature and not ready to write. **Governors asked** what happens if we don't get 75% on GDL —SLT confirmed we will get a letter of concern. **Governors asked** if we get a higher proportion of SEN students because of being an outstanding school, and if so what strategies could put into place for this. SRv said it is possible to separate the data to demonstrate that non-SEN are beating targets whereas SEN are working to a different bar. **Governors pointed out** that often children don't get diagnosed as SEN until they come to school. **Governors asked** if children don't get picked up as SEN until they are part way through their journey and we don't get enough funding for these students then children who don't have SEN are not going to be getting the best. SRv stated we need to budget by pre-empting this, for example not by simply recruiting a new INA every time there's an SEN child but instead we could group them together and employ an experienced practitioner who would be cheaper than paying say 5 INAs. SRv stated that none of our vulnerable and/or SEN children are exceeding, for example some of them might not need INAs, but they might need speech help. This is why transition before they come into school is so important. SLT confirmed they currently do home visits for first three or four days and then stagger them in.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SRv stated that due to previous leadership in English Year 10 are playing catch up. DHT confirmed that interventions are happening with this cohort. Previously there was a period of 3 years with the previous Head of English claiming that 98% were making outstanding progress. <b>Governors challenged</b> this data at the time. <b>Governors asked</b> if we are going to get one more set of data in this format this year. SRv said next dataset might be current attainment which will give us a baseline for Year 10. <b>Governors stated</b> that without this we cannot know if these interventions are working.</li> <li>• <b>7.3 Sixth Form Strategy</b> – Chair asked if Governors wanted to debate the proposed Sixth Form Strategy as the Lead Governors have already approved it in principle at April SPG. <b>Vote = Governors Approved Sixth Form Strategy</b>, without discussion.</li> <li>• <b>Pupil Premium (PP) Report</b>  <b>Governors asked</b> about the pupil premium progress report. DHT advised there's not a clear strategy for these students at present. The data tells us in some areas PP progress is satisfactory but there is too much red and amber on the report, and we do have some money for PP which has not been allocated yet. The money received has been spent on resources, but this is not making much impact at the moment. <b>Governors asked</b> how this money narrows the gap. SLT advised we need to be able to compare PP with non-PP, and this is something incoming AHT will be working on. SRv said Governors need to be absolutely confident what the £82.5k for PP funding has been spent on and that the interventions are routed in evidence. <b>Governors asked</b> how the funding is tracked. SRv stated they can produce a detailed list of spending, and which students accessed which interventions. <b>Governors agreed</b> this approach and asked for a case study. SRv confirmed that Ofsted are very interested in PP and vulnerable students. <b>Governors requested</b> PP info to be included in HT report going forwards. <b>Governors asked</b> if there is a correlation between PP and attendance, and that maybe this should be factored into the data. DHT said we can look into the possibility of utilising some PP money to get them into school. SRv said this is another reason we need to have an Attendance Officer from September to help support this problem. <b>Governors stated</b> there is a lot of research about PP and there are 'PP awards', so what are the techniques that are winning those awards and how do we ensure what we do is bedded in research? <b>Governors asked</b> SRv to update Governors about PP going forwards. SRv said every 6 weeks there will be a data drop and this will feed into executive summaries to help build the report.</li> <li>• <b>Prep &amp; Twilight Report</b>  This was due to be discussed at the Extra FGB on 23 May but SRv advised Governors that a decision on this has now become very urgent and operational matters now hinge on this. Chair asked what decision was required from the Governors at this meeting. SRv/AHT reiterated this could not really wait until 23 May. The Board accepted this discussion could take place at this meeting, regarding the proposals put forward by SLT. <b>Governors stated</b> that the summaries in the report circulated were very negatively weighted against Prep/Twilight. AHT said the findings weren't balanced either and the summaries merely replicate this. <b>Governors asked</b> if staff like Prep or not. SRv responded that there are mixed feelings about it, but it is commonly considered to be less impactful in Years 9 and 10, and that staff would prefer a more manageable structure. <b>Governors raised</b> anecdotal feedback that Prep could be a barrier to learning because of parental misconceptions that all homework was completed at school. SRv thinks there is an opportunity to do some work around how to complete independent learning and teach this to students. AHT confirmed that the findings show twice as many weaknesses as strengths. <b>Governors asked</b> what staff expectations are around Prep/Twilight when they first come into the school. DHT advised that when interviewed they are asked about their</li> </ul>	<p>SRv</p> <p>SRv</p>	<p>June FGB</p> <p>June FGB</p>
--	---	-----------------------	---------------------------------

thoughts on the extended school day and that they understand the expectation to complete 2 Preps and Twilights a week, but this has grown massively as the school has grown. We cannot continue to grow this provision anymore because we can't employ that many more teachers, therefore the current model doesn't work, due to the capacity of the buildings and staff. Currently there are occasions where 80 students are being overseen by 2 teachers doing Prep in the dining room. If we're going to offer Prep we need to make it worthwhile and at the moment that's not always the case. SRv said the expectations on current staff needs to be raised and in his opinion it is not clear when staff come on board what is expected of them. **Governors asked** if the commitment requirement is pro rata for part timers – confirmed yes. **Governors asked** if there are any staff who don't do any Prep or Twilight sessions. DHT advised there are almost none, but there are 1 or 2 part timers who have to finish at 3pm so cannot provide any Prep/Twilight sessions. DHT stated that although these sessions are a strong USP of the school it means CPD for staff cannot happen and this has to be squeezed into 20 minute sections during lunchtimes, and it is impossible to get all the Heads of Faculty together, for example. DHT advised it is affecting the provision of CPD which we promise staff when they come to work here, and it means we can't moderate effectively either. SLT confirmed they are not saying we should abolish Prep/Twilight because some of it makes a real impact, but Governors should consider how far are Prep and Twilight stopping staff from making real progress on the critical factors of the school. **Governors stated** that if we lose Prep/Twilight it could have a big impact on admissions. DHT said in his opinion most students and their parents are not choosing their secondary schools based on the extended day. AHT explained the 1265 model to Governors, (the annual working hours expected of a teacher), and explained that we cannot keep to the 1265 model with all these things in place. **Governors asked** about Year 10 not doing Twilight at the moment and future Year 11s receiving revision support which impacts workload even more.

#### RM left meeting at 7.30pm

**Governors stated** they appreciate we need to be realistic and the current status quo is not sustainable. **Governors stated** they would want more detail regarding the new proposals.

DFA stated the school is currently having difficulty with a group of parents who simply refuse to pay for the twilight activities and because the model is based on a contribution basis it is difficult to do anything about this. DFA stated the administration for Prep/Twilight is extensive. Often the externally provided, expensive Twilight courses were the ones the school couldn't get enough people into, so these didn't work. **Governors asked** about losing two days of income. DFA stated that we don't currently get all the income in and it is hugely subsidised in any case. **Governors asked** if there was capacity within the support staff to supervise Prep, although there were comments that this could dilute the offer. The SLT has looked at using Sixth Formers to run Prep, but this didn't work. DHT stated that students are allowed to opt out of Prep, but **Governors questioned** this. DHT said some outside clubs around town don't run at the right time for students to attend these at the same times as Prep/Twilight. DHT also stated that resourcing Prep is a problem, as there are not enough laptops to go around, whereas if students go home they can use their own IT. **Governors said** often the students who would benefit most from Prep are the ones who are not attending it, especially in year 10. **Governors asked** if there is any correlation between those that opt out and the performance data. DHT said we can't run intervention groups because of Prep and Twilight commitments. DHT said AHT's proposed model does still provide for an extended school day. **Governors said** students shouldn't be allowed to opt out of Prep and Twilight before the new proposals are agreed. **Governors said** if staff don't agree with the concept they might see this proposal as a middle ground. **Governors**

	<p><u>asked</u> why it is urgent they make a decision today. SRv said it has implications on CPD, timetabling, the pastoral structure, etc. AHT said the new model also frees up time to complete safeguarding better. <u>Governors asked</u> if they could have a report on the impact of the proposals. SRv said this would have to be from September and could be presented at the second meeting of the school year. <u>Governors asked</u> what Inset Days are for, if not CPD. <u>Governors asked</u> if the proposal is that every Department would be doing staff training every Monday. SRv explained there would be a rotation every Monday for different purposes. <u>Governors asked</u> how the lower school fits in with these proposals. AHT explained the current arrangements within the lower school, which are not proposed to change. <u>Governors asked</u> about the potential for a Double Prep session for older age groups. SRv said the proposed model could provide for intervention sessions and would also enable Friday detentions as well as potentially Saturday morning detentions, which would be a powerful deterrent. SRv advised certain pupils would be held back for interventions within the new model. <u>Governors considered</u> whether 'less is more' by providing it over 3 days instead of 5. <u>Governors asked</u> what the plan would be for parents who cannot change their work hours. DHT advised this is another reason why we need to communicate the changes ASAP. DHT would hope this would minimise the impact on parents. <u>Governors asked</u> if this would have a knock on effect to the extra week's holiday afforded to the school in the October half term. SRv said he wants to preserve the two week October half term and this is for the school to decide. <u>Governors concluded</u> that the proposals are not desirable but they can see the need for change, especially for CPD. Chair explained that parents will be aware of the ongoing national school funding issues, but there will be a huge amount of parents who won't agree with these proposals. SLT advised that a lot of parents are opting their children out anyway. DHT reiterated we need to be clear and strong in our communication to ensure parents understand that the remaining three days will be a quality educational provision rather than 'childcare'. <u>Governors expressed concern</u> that in the model Year 9s won't be doing Prep and Twilight, especially when there are suspicions that some staff will leave work early because of this change. SRv said there are suspicions some staff are leaving early already and this needs to be dealt with by changing their expectations. SRv reiterated that the structures as they stand are not sustainable and that it would help to increase staff morale by offering them Friday afternoons to complete their PPA. <u>Governors asked</u> for clarification that we are proposing to reduce from 15 sessions of Twilight per week, down to 6 sessions. <u>Governors asked</u> for clarification of the proposed model by Year group so they can see the impact for each year group. <u>Governors asked</u> how the car park would be managed with everyone leaving the school at 3.15pm with the new proposal. <u>Governors suggested</u> it could be based on who pays first but there are issues around this for vulnerable students. <u>Governors commented</u> on the perceived value of the some clubs. <u>Governors asked</u> if there was any suggestion that the new model would improve outcomes. AHT said what we need to work on is quality and the new model would help to deliver this. <u>Governors talked</u> about local businesses getting involved. SLT said this is something to look into. <u>Governors asked</u> how many students opt out at the moment. SLT response was 206. <u>Governors stated</u> that not everyone in Years 9, 10 and 11 want to do sports. <u>Staff Governor disagreed</u>. SRv said the fact it's an opt-in service creates a register and he is very concerned about the safeguarding aspect of this. <u>Governors asked</u> if there is scope for staff to be running extra support sessions for GCSEs and A-Levels as a result of being freed up from a lower provision of Prep and Twilight. <u>Governors asked</u> how much is the lower school hall used. SLT responded it is used virtually to capacity. <u>Governors agreed</u> they needed to come to a decision. Chair asked if Governors were happy to vote on the principle of the SLT proposals. <u>Governors asked</u> if this is the only model being considered. This was confirmed. <u>Governors confirmed</u> they were unable to come to a full and final decision in this meeting. SRv commented that the biggest sticking point appears to be Year 9 being included in Prep. <u>Governors confirmed</u> the</p>	SRv	Oct FGB
--	--	-----	---------

	<p>SLT need to re-think how we can include Year 9 into the model. SRv said the SLT will need to re-model Years 7, 8, and 9 included in Prep and how the management of the car park on Friday and Monday afternoon will be overseen. <b>Governors stated</b> they are concerned by the erosion of the USP of Gildredge House. DFA suggested there was the possibility of bringing in an external provider for Friday nights for those who wanted to opt in. Chair asked fellow Governors if they felt they were able to make a decision pending confirmation of Year 9 being included in Prep and a solution to the car park issue on Friday and Monday. Chair asked SLT how much this proposal would be saving the school financially. SLT confirmed none because it would be about using the same staff hours in different ways. <b><u>Vote = Approval of DSJ's proposal 'in principle', but with more information to follow.</u></b></p> <p><b>PA left meeting at 8.25pm</b></p> <p>Chair confirmed that as this discussion has item has been taken tonight Governors no longer need to meet for the Extra FGB on 23 May so this meeting is now cancelled. <b>Governors asked</b> when they would be able to have the extra information. SLT stated it would be sent out on Monday evening.</p>	SLT	8/5/17
9.	<p><b>Education Committee Matters</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair of Education confirmed that all the below Education Committee questions, except Question 11, have been addressed as part of the HT report and the discussions relating to data and the supporting papers. SRv confirmed the response to Question 11 will be included in the HT Report for the June FGB.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>How is the Pupil Premium money being used and how are the students that attract it directly benefitting? What evidence is there to support any impact?</i></li> <li><i>Is the website legally compliant? Has it been recently audited?</i></li> <li><i>How are students currently being safeguarded? Specifically between 3 and 5pm, how is the Prep and Twilight system being managed (including opt outs), is it working effectively? Do students benefit from Prep and Twilight, what is the impact and evidence?</i></li> <li><i>What are the current GCSE predictions? What is being done to intervene with those students not reaching their full potential and predicted grades? What is the impact of these interventions?</i></li> <li><i>What are the predicted 6th form numbers for 2017? Is there a recruitment action plan?</i></li> <li><i>What are the predicted AS and A Level results? What is being done to intervene with those students not reaching their full potential and predicted grades? What is the impact of these interventions?</i></li> <li><i>What is being done to ensure there is consistency in performance management of all staff?</i></li> <li><i>How is transition from lower to middle to upper school being managed? Are subjects being mapped throughout the school?</i></li> <li><i>The students that were exceeding when they joined us at reception or year 7, are they still exceeding? If not why not? What are the gaps? Is this something we need to look at?</i></li> <li><i>How is bad behaviour from students being dealt with within the school?</i></li> <li><i>How is using 'show my homework' assisting learning and students/parents? Is it working? Is it having an impact on progress or attainment?</i></li> </ol>	SRv	June FGB

	<p>12. From Education Committee - How are interventions working with students not progressing in science? Can we ask the same if all subjects?</p> <p>13. How do you propose to engage the current year 10 and get them to attend the 6th form?</p> <p>14. What plans are there to develop the student leadership programme?</p> <p>15. What additional support do we provide to SEN children? Could this be the focus of a monitoring visit to include a book look?</p> <p>16. How do you propose to present the attainment and progress data to us for all year groups? In what format and how regularly?</p>		
10.	<p><b>Forward Plan for Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Board to delegate strategy for 'planning meetings' going forwards</b> – there was insufficient time for this item to be discussed, due to the extended discussion around Prep/Twilight</li> </ul>	June FGB Agenda	
11.	<p><b>Any other urgent business</b></p> <p>Chair proposed that because the 23 May Extra FGB is now cancelled governors decide now on the school uniform proposals. This proposal was accepted. <b>Vote = Governors Approved new uniform policy.</b> This to allow trousers for girls as an option on the proviso that these are the official item from our school suppliers. <b>Governors added</b> that we need to address relaxing the Sixth Form uniform. SRv confirmed this and stated that compulsory PE in Year 12 can also have a negative effect in attracting students into the Sixth Form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Governors asked</b> for an update on the timetabling exercise to ensure we don't have a problem again in September like we did last year. SRv confirmed this should be completed by half term.</li> </ul>	SRv	June FGB
12.	<p><b>Review upcoming meeting dates for remainder of school year</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governor Safeguarding Training – Thursday 8 June, 6-8pm</li> <li>• FGB - Thursday 22 June 2017, 5pm</li> <li>• <b>The Extra FGB Meeting, scheduled for 23 May, is now cancelled</b></li> </ul>		
13.	<p><b>Meeting Close</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair closed the meeting at 8.35pm</li> </ul>		

Signed..... Chair

Dated.....

S. Quayle  
Clerk