



## Governing Board - Minutes

**Meeting Date:** Wednesday 18 October 2017  
**Meeting Venue:** TG9, Temple Grove, Gildredge House  
**Meeting Time:** 5:15pm

**Governors:** Julian Mace (JM), Chair  
Louise Baxter (LB), Vice Chair  
Alison Allart (AA)  
Martyn Ashley Taylor (MA)  
Steven Blower (SB)  
Selene Edwards (SE)  
Sara McKenna (SM)  
Gabrielle Mace (GM)  
Joel Newman (JN)  
Trevor Scott (TS)  
Fiona Walker (FW)  
Matt West (MW)

**Ex officio:** Stuart Reeves, Head Teacher (SRv)

**Also in attendance:** Paul Barber (DHT) (*Teaching & Learning*)  
James Towner (AHT-A&C) (*Assessment & Curriculum*)

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

**Apologies:** Paul Amos (PA)  
Rachel Moreton (RM)

## Governing Board - Minutes, 18 October 2017

Item	Discussion	Action	Date
1.	<p><b>Welcome and apologies for absence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair welcomed Governors and SLT to the meeting.</li> <li>Apologies received from RM and PA – accepted by the Chair.</li> <li>Chair began by saying that he feels sometimes we don't celebrate our successes enough. He said the 'buzz' at the recent Year 7 Open Evening was fantastic and the event was so well attended that the Head's speech needed to be repeated 3 times to fit everyone in.</li> </ul>		
2.	<p><b>Declarations of Interests</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No declarations of interest were made.</li> </ul>		
3.	<p><b>Minutes of the Governing Board Meeting – 20 September 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair clarified that (<i>Item 1</i>) MA is in fact a 'Co-Opted' Governor, not a 'Community' Governor.</li> <li>Chair annotated the above point on the hard copy and signed the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting.</li> <li>Chair advised he will consider the pink paper minutes from the September FGB meeting and will sign them at the December FGB meeting.</li> </ul>	Chair	Dec FGB
4.	<p><b>Action Summary Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair walked Governors through the individual items on the Action Summary Report. This prompted discussion on the following points contained therein: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facebook – SRv has met with some of the parents who run the critical Facebook page and has arranged to hold a meeting with them in school to discuss their concerns. <b>Governors commented</b> that this is a positive development. SRv to report back to FGB on progress.</li> <li>The new school website has gone live but there are some concerns with some pages and a list of these is being compiled and will be sent to the website developer to resolve. <b>Chair stated</b> that it is not yet completely compliant. SRv confirmed this is a work in progress and it will be soon.</li> <li>MW advised that the Highways Department of ESCC would have completed a Highways Audit when the school opened and unless there is an accident outside the school it is highly unlikely that ESCC will be prepared to spend any money on highways enhancements outside the school. <b>Chair suggested</b> this did not seem an appropriate position for ESCC to take as at that time the school had less than 200 students, whereas it now has over 1000. Clerk to discuss again with ESCC's Road Safety Team Manager in recognition of the massive increase in student numbers.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SRv  SRv  Clerk	Dec FGB  ASAP  Dec FGB
5.	<p><b>Items not already on the agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None reported</li> </ul>		
6.	<p><b>Chair's correspondence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair advised that since the last FGB he has received a letter from the EFA which states that it 'appreciates the actions the school has taken to improve its budget deficit'. It does conclude, however, that if there were to be a significant deterioration in the financial position then the school could still potentially receive a 'Financial Notice to Improve' letter. <b>Governors asked</b> if the size of the sixth form Pupil Number Adjustment (PNA) could be classed as a 'significant deterioration'. SRv confirmed it is possible but that he will talk about his plans to prevent this from being repeated again next year, later in the meeting.</li> </ul>		

7.	<p><b>Governance Matters</b> <b>PERSONNEL MATTERS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead Governors have looked at all Governor’s skill sets from the recently completed Skills Audits and have identified which areas of responsibility they would like each Governor to focus on as Link Governors, detailed in the Link Governors’ paper. Vice Chair stated that if any Governors are not happy with the areas they have been assigned, or would like to take on more, they should feedback to Lead Governors. Chair asked all Link Governors to ensure they bring to future FGBs any areas that need dealing with that fall under their area of responsibility, at the appropriate time.</li> <li>• SRv advised he is concerned that the school currently does not have an IT strategy and the costs of refreshing the school’s IT equipment will be significant and will become a problem in around 18 months’ time. SE confirmed she would be happy to get involved in this issue. SRv would like Governors to chair an operational group to formulate a vision for IT over the next 5 years. TS confirmed he is happy to work with SE on this. <b>Governors asked</b> about the prospect of students being asked to ‘bring their own’ IT equipment and whether this was feasible. SRv advised that the operational group would be making this sort of decision. SRv will organise an initial scoping meeting for the group.</li> <li>• JN advised he would like some more areas of responsibility – Vice Chair to organise.</li> <li>• <b>Governors confirmed</b> it is correct that there is no Data Link Governors for Years 8 or 10. <b>Governors suggested</b> that the Year 11 Data Link Governor could link in with Year 10, and likewise the Year 9 Data Link Governor could link in with Year 8.</li> </ul> <p><b>PROCEDURAL MATTERS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair referred Governors to the ‘Monitoring Summary Overview’ paper and asked Governors to initiate contact with the school to make arrangements for their visits and to get dates in diaries as soon as possible by contacting the appropriate teacher or person responsible, and copying in the Chair and SRv. SRv asked if all these visits will be completed this term – <b>Governors advised</b> some of them have already been done.</li> </ul> <p><b>POLICIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair revisited the Monitoring Visit Policy paper and reminded to Governors that they are not qualified to make judgements on the quality of teaching, which is a matter that should be taken up with SLT, unless there is a clear safeguarding issue involved.</li> <li>• Chair apologised for the wordiness of the policy but confirmed its contents are all important.</li> <li>• <b>Governors asked</b> if the forms in the appendices <u>must</u> be used – Chair confirmed not.</li> </ul>	SRv	TBC
8.	<p><b>Finance Matters</b> <b>BUDGET MONITORING REPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead Governor for Enterprise walked Governors through the Budget Monitoring Report, in the absence of DFA. <b>Governors queried</b> why we do not yet have the revised income forecast predictions available when this is driven by pupil numbers which are already known. SRv advised the school is still awaiting final figures from EFA, and that the PP money comes in later in the year. <b>Governors asked</b> at what point income ceases to be indicative and becomes confirmed. SRv was unsure. <b>Governors commented</b> that the earlier we know this information the better.</li> <li>• SRv has asked DFA to send out expenditure reduction plans to each department asking how they propose to cut their costs. However, he does not think it is achievable to make cuts of £200k. SRv advised he is working on the worst case scenario of a 3% increase in the funding formula, which would equate to £125k. SRv confirmed we can apply for a deferred PNA repayment and then become more realistic about sixth form numbers going forwards. The minibus is also a concern as it is getting old. SRv confirmed the budget for SEN money from ESCC is not confirmed yet because ESCC have significantly overspent on this budget line. The school’s start up match funding income is reducing each year and this year is the last year we will receive it. Income from universal free school meals may increase slightly. SRv confirmed that there is also a claw back due of £25k for a previous year’s PNA.</li> </ul>	All Gvrns	ASAP

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SRv confirmed he has gone through every budget line seeking out savings. Buildings maintenance has a very small budget, which is a concern, so the school is having to hope for a mild winter to keep gas costs down. PP money is yet to be received and it may end up being a bit higher than £96k. Of that, 56k is spent on staffing, so 40k is the working budget for PP. SRv is attempting to reduce all departments' budgets but needs to be mindful of the impact this could have on teaching and learning. The budget for IT is £80k, but this is nothing like the amount that needs to be spent.</li> <li><b>Chair stated</b> the only places we can realistically find extra income is through income generation and by increasing sixth form numbers. SRv confirmed we are predicting 75 sixth formers joining in September 2018, which equates to about 14 subject courses running. <b>Governors asked</b> about the difference between the proposed 14 subject courses and the prospectus which states 18-20 courses will be offered, and suggested this might cause us to lose some of the 65 internal students who have attended open events, which is a big risk, especially as we have only managed to attract 35 external students to the open evenings. SRv advised it was a decision that has to be made and it could save £60k. He stated that we need to get better at accurately forecasting sixth form numbers and err on the side of caution and then be pleasantly surprised if we end up with more students. SRv advised that he has intelligence that suggests we will end up with 75 sixth form entrants next September, not 120. <b>Governors requested</b> DFA to model the revised sixth form numbers and asked if the Lead Governor for Enterprise could come in to school and discuss this with DFA and SRv and then SRv and DFA can report back about this at the December FGB.</li> </ul> <p><b>INCOME GENERATION REPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Governors asked</b> why the forecast for income generation is reducing from £40k to £33k, and whether this is because there are less opportunities to rent out space as the student numbers are rising. <b>Governors asked</b> if we are utilising the extra opportunities by having extra space capacity on Monday and Friday afternoons. SRv advised that staff are advertising this extra capacity and <b>Governors asked</b> if the projections should be higher on this basis. SRv advised that sometimes regular bookings have had their hires interrupted due to parents evenings, etc, and some of them get fed up with this and go elsewhere. <b>Governors suggested</b> setting a dedicated night for parents evenings so this does not happen. <b>Governors asked</b> if there are any proactive attempts to bring in money rather than waiting for people to approach us, SRv advised there are but this is an embryonic initiative. <b>Governors asked</b> about how the hire income is split over the weekend as opposed to weekday evenings. SRv reminded Governors the school is very limited on how much it can be used at weekend due to planning conditions, which we are trying to get lifted with a planning application. SRv is trying to work out a realistic target for income generation going forwards. The largest income we receive is from summer schools and it would be feasibly possible for Year 12s to start their summer break a week earlier and finish term with a home-based reading week, which would enable an extra week of summer school bookings, but there is a real concern this would eat into teaching time. <b>Governors and SRv confirmed</b> we don't want to go down that route. SRv confirmed that £40-£50k is the maximum potential in terms of lettings income.</li> <li><b>Governors asked</b> how we benchmark our hire prices and whether we are more competitive for lettings than private schools. <b>Governors commented</b> that our lettings do not come up on a Google search, so knowledge of availability must only be spreading by word of mouth. SRv confirmed there is not much budget for marketing. <b>Governors asked</b> if we could take a more proactive approach to lettings income as the paper does not talk about any dynamic actions and it needs to be far more demonstrative about how we're going to achieve these aims. <b>Governors asked</b> what is holding us back and what the plan is and where the business case is for investing in marketing activities. <b>Governors commented</b> we need to know what we are marketing and we need a focus on what are we aiming for. <b>Chair commented</b> that the screens in the Atrium were 'sold' to the Governors as an income generation investment, but still have not brought in a penny in income. <b>Governors talked</b> about a previous school which employed a proactive marketing position. <b>Governors commented</b> there is anecdotal feedback that it is quite difficult to make contact with the right person in the school when enquiring about new lettings. SRv agreed to take it back to team that we need a more dynamic approach.</li> </ul>	<p>TS/ SRV/ DFA</p>	<p>By Dec FGB</p>
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------

	<p><b>Governors suggested</b> employing a marketing person working on commission. <b>Governors stated</b> it is wholly unacceptable we are not visible on the web. <b>Governors suggested</b> that toilets, showers and changing facilities are very important in helping to improve sports related lettings. SRv commented that it was possible that hiring temporary toilet facilities might help to increase hires and we will find out a bit more about these as we will be hiring some for the mock exams. <b>Governors commented</b> that a local pub are now successfully hiring out their function room for exercise classes and asked if we are turning away small business too easily when it might grow and become more beneficial in the longer term. <b>Governors asked</b> if we have anyone on the staff who could drive income generation. <b>Governors asked</b> if there is a charging schedule for lettings. <b>Governors asked</b> if we know what other schools in Eastbourne do regarding this as when the auditors were asked they suggested £200k was achievable, but all agreed this seemed way too high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SRv said we have two root causes which are preventing our ability to develop this – one is the methodology we use (which we can change), and the other is that the support staff have no capacity. <b>Governors talked</b> about getting our name on the internet before we become more dynamic and finding out where the demand is so that in time we can target that demand. <b>Governors asked</b> about our record in advertising lettings opportunities at open evenings.</li> <li><b>Governors asked</b> if there is a combined vision in terms of fund raising because there is overlap and confusion about the difference between donations to the school via Just Giving, the Foundation and FOGH. There is a feeling the Foundation targets the community but ends up focusing on the same people as donate to the school and FOGH. <b>Governors suggested</b> SRv should arrange a meeting with FOGH and the Foundation and reset these arrangements, however SRv requested Governors organise and chair this meeting and agree an overarching strategic approach because we need clarity on the strategic oversight of who does what. SRv wants to be able to tell people who want to help that they can either donate skills to the school or they can donate to FOGH by attending FOGH activities, or they can get involved in larger sponsorship type deals via the Foundation. <b>Governors asked</b> about Gift Aid and whether donations to the school would be better funnelled through FOGH or the Foundation so we can benefit from the Gift Aid.</li> </ul> <p><b>CHARGES &amp; REMISSIONS POLICY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Governors noted</b> that the policy on inclusion does not support a ‘first-paid, first-served’ type approach, and asked if we follow this same methodology for Twilight. SRv advised we set aside spaces for families in receipt of PP and offer those spaces for free. <b>Governors suggested</b> we should be mindful of those families who don’t receive PP but who are on the cusp, as often these families are hard hit too. <b>Governors criticised</b> a recently advertised school trip which requires a payment of £39 per child with just 3 weeks’ notice that some parents are going to struggle to afford just before Christmas. SLT advised they are moving to a position where they will be able to advise parents of all trips for the whole year in advance so that parents can pay a regular monthly amount to cover all trips across the year. SM confirmed that in the lower school parents already get told about all trips for the whole year ahead. SLT confirmed they have blocked some trips from going ahead due to the cost to parents. <b>Governors asked</b> if this year-long plan will be ready at admissions time so that all the information will be available for the new Year 7s. <b>Governors mentioned</b> that the Year 9 rugby trip next year has still not been confirmed. <b>Governors requested</b> consistency across funding for sports trips.</li> <li><b>Governors asked</b> for confirmation that if we are making a charge for a trip it should at least break even as in the past we have often run Twilight activities at a loss which has led to a necessity to reduce provision. SRv confirmed the provision of Twilight now costs a lot less since the changes. SLT stated that the process of organising trips has improved massively and now includes the cost of cover staff, if appropriate. SRv also advised the school does not now pay deposits until we have received enough money to know we can afford to pay for the trip. <b>Governors asked</b> why we always use coaches for trips instead of considering a train for older students. SLT will find out if trains can be cheaper. <b>Governors asked</b> how coaches are sourced and SLT suggested they may be able to find an exclusivity agreement with a coach company for regular use at a discount.</li> <li><b>Governors asked</b> if there has been any negative feedback about voluntary contributions for trips and whether there has been push back by some parents feeling they are subsidising</li> </ul>	Chair	TBC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Governors asked</b> if there has been any negative feedback about voluntary contributions for trips and whether there has been push back by some parents feeling they are subsidising</li> </ul>	SLT	TBC

	<p>others – SRv confirmed he is not aware of any such issues and it's generally well accepted and is commonplace in lots of schools. <b>Governors stated</b> the subsidised subject revision guides through the school are good. <b>Governors asked</b> if teachers are getting paid overtime if they are on trips outside of school time – SRv confirmed not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Chair asked</b> if Governors were happy to approve the policy – carried.</li> </ul>		
	<p><b>Safeguarding Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RM not in attendance tonight – so safeguarding to be discussed in HT report.</li> </ul>		
	<p><b>Teaching &amp; Learning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair thanked LB and GM for their informative monitoring report, along with DHT. <b>Governors asked</b> if we are completing these termly, SRv advised that he thinks it's crucial that it is completed termly. <b>Governors asked</b> if it would continue as a learning walk, rather than a formal visit – confirmed.</li> </ul>	LB/GM	TBC
9.	<p><b>Pupil Premium</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DHT advised Governors that all staff who are receiving UPS payments now have some substantial 'wholeschool' areas of responsibility. One of these is Karl Hector who is looking at a raft of evaluation techniques to examine what we're spending PP money on and questioning if we're spending money in the right place. Karl is reporting back to SLT on the rationale for spending this money and the SLT would like to invite him to attend the FGB in December to present to Governors about exactly what he's been doing. DHT advised Governors that Karl started the process by examining PP research and looking at what the evidence shows works really well, and is now looking at how we disseminate that practice through the teaching staff to ensure we are all using evidence-based practice. Carl will present to staff on 6 November with the full authority of the SLT. SLT confirmed they are really excited about what he's doing and he has really instilled confidence in them. Karl is the gatekeeper of the PP money and all requests go to him where he will look at the rationale and evidence before approving the spend, or not. DHT stated Karl has identified a balance between those things that improve academic progress and those which affect wellbeing. <b>Governors suggested</b> some of them should meet with Karl before the December meeting to be informed ready for FGB. Clerk to invite Karl to December FGB.</li> <li>SLT stated that to satisfy the PP rules we need to evidence that PP students are making progress in line with non-PP students. SRv confirmed OFSTED will want the school leaders to know what impact the PP money is having and know that this is being regularly checked. SRv confirmed he wants to mainstream PP as much as possible as the empirical research suggest this has the biggest impact. <b>Governors asked</b> if there is consistency across the school, SRv advised not currently. <b>Governors suggested</b> that EYFS students often do not have access to PP money.</li> </ul>	Clerk	ASAP
9.	<p><b>SEN</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SRv stated he is happy to proceed with this policy and put it into practice. SRv advised that a review of Year 7 shows an inconsistency of practice – with some staff needing training, and some thinking it's not really their job to get involved, but with most of them it boils down to a fear of the unknown. SRv stated he is very keen on implementing the policy better than has been done in the past. <b>Governors asked</b> when this clarity of approach will be delivered. SRv stated the Governors Monitoring Policy will oversee this.</li> <li><b>Governors commented</b> that the 'Gifted &amp; Talented' section seems short.</li> <li><b>Governors asked</b> if the policy should contain information about how parents can get involved if they're not happy as it doesn't really say much about this. SRv said this is covered by general concerns under other policies. <b>Governors suggested</b> all policies should be linked to one another, where appropriate. <b>Governors asked</b> if the level of parental engagement is sufficient</li> </ul>	SLT	TBC

	<p>and if there should be more than just the standard parent evenings for SEN students. SRv will look at the ESCC policy instead and see if this policy deals with this better.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Governors asked</b> if there are cost demands involved in delivering the policy, SRv advised there are and that with cutbacks and with ESCC overspending by £4m on SEN there is less money and fewer TAs and INAs and we are seeing pressure about how we deal with SEN and use teachers to do this instead of passing it to SEN-specific staff. SLT advised that research says the best use of money is by improving great teaching and learning and it's about mainstreaming them as much as possible. SRv asked ESCC if the focus can be on training and is awaiting a response. AA &amp; LB agreed to come into school and meet with <b>Head of Individual Learning</b> and will bring this matter to the December FGB. Chair stated that Governors will not be asked to approve this policy now and will bring the discussion forward to a future FGB.</li> </ul>	AA/LB	Dec FGB
10.	<p><b>Attainment Data</b> <b>ATTAINMENT DATA - YEAR 11</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chair stated</b> that Governors can only really see the impact of the SLT's works via the attainment data, and by the December FGB we should have more information about student attainment.</li> <li>• SRv says he plans to give top line figures to Governors. SRv asked the SLT to talk through data with the Governors. SLT advised the school is working against key benchmarks, and there are a number of areas which need development and flagged them up in the report; although we have set ourselves very high benchmarks, some of which we are already achieving. SLT explained the information in the report has come from two strands of data – current performance and predicted performance – and there are various points throughout the year where these results may fluctuate, because, for example, when mock exams are taken some of the syllabus is yet to be covered, so it may not continually improve at every stage. SLT explained that if a cell comes up in pink on the report then it generates a question about why this is happening.</li> <li>• The trigger measures being used to generate a pink cell are: if the % of pupils predicted to achieve 4+ is less than 76%, if the % of pupils predicted to achieve 5+ is less than 55%, if the % of pupils predicted to achieve 7+ is less than 22%, or if the difference between the current and predicted grades is greater than 20%. SLT confirmed there is also another check applied which is the English and Maths combined data.</li> <li>• SLT reminded Governors that what cannot be read from the data is how these figures relate to last years' attainment figures, or against other schools. He confirmed our prediction does place us on a comparison with the very top schools in East Sussex.</li> <li>• <b>Chair thanked</b> SRv, AHT and SLT, and stated this is the first time we've seen meaningful data and that Governors look forward to further updates on progress. <b>Chair confirmed</b> the numbers of GH students following the EBAC is high, and we should highlight this when it comes to results. <b>Governors asked</b> if there will be a whole data drop before the December FGB. SLT advised they have already had another data drop and they are using this to validate the predictions and they will then receive mock exam data in Term 2, but not by the time of the December FGB, although by then they should have more data around attainment. <b>Governors said</b> the data will help to formulate monitoring visits going forwards and asked for some narrative to the figures to help provide some context. SRv advised the data doesn't give the whole picture as there is always context to be considered. He explained there could be differences in the assessment regime of the departments, or there could be differences in expectations between different staff. <b>Governors asked</b> for information of how many classes there are in each subject. <b>Governors asked</b> if it was possible to add all the information together to enable total predictions of attainment for each student.</li> <li>• SRv suggested he would present the information from Progress 8 to Governors. <b>Governors asked</b> what would happen if we got a low Progress 8 score, SRv advised we always need to put it into context. SRv commented that if the figure is around 0 then the SLT are doing a good job, and if the figure is around 0.5 then they are doing an outstanding job.</li> <li>• <b>Governors asked</b> if we can revisit the predictions against what sixth form courses we are planning to run next year to ensure the A-Levels on offer flex appropriately.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Governors asked</b> whether there can be a trigger point where the data appears to show there will be no progress between now and the future and asked shouldn't we be asking questions as to why this would be the case. SRv suggested the SLT would challenge staff in this instance about why they are not expecting improvement.</li> <li>• <b>Governors suggested</b> that using percentages may skew some of these results because some subject cohorts are low in numbers and the use of percentages may mask some issues, or alternatively make things look worse than they are. SRv suggested he would add a key showing how much of the whole percentage each student equates to so this is more transparent. <b>Governors stated</b> that in EYFS they already include the numbers of students in their equivalent data. <b>Governors suggested</b> that the attainment and progress of EYFS should be discussed at the next meeting.</li> <li>• <b>Governors queried</b> the English and Maths combined scores and asked whether it is correct there are currently no Year 11 students who are expected to achieve a 7+ in both subjects.</li> <li>• Vice Chair stated that Governors need to come to next FGB with more of a critical eye on these figures as to where interventions are needed. SRv said he would include a narrative going forwards which would answer some of the questions Governors have without them needing to ask the questions. SLT confirmed the lower school data will continue to be presented in the way it has always been done.</li> <li>• SRv thanked AHT-A&amp;C for how quickly he has got to grips with this amassing and presenting this data since he started at the school in September.</li> </ul> <p><b>MONITORING VISIT ASSESSMENT &amp; DATA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monitoring report was agreed and approved.</li> </ul> <p><b>ASSESSMENT FOR GOVERNORS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair thanked AHT-A&amp;C for the excellent assessment document.</li> </ul>	SLT	Dec FGB
	<p><b>Headteacher's Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SRv talked Governors through his new proposed performance management policy and talked about targets for his Headteacher's appraisal.</li> <li>• New Safeguarding software went live today, which should save lots of time on manual processes.</li> <li>• There are so far 160 applications for Year 7 next September. <b>Governors commented</b> that it is really hard to see patterns in these applications, and although 1<sup>st</sup> choices seem to be down a bit there seems to be lots more 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> choices than usual.</li> <li>• Good work has been done relating to SEN through the Monday CPD sessions.</li> <li>• Attendance figures are much better than previously – there is a massive improvement across almost all years and this is a credit to AHT-B&amp;A and his team, including the new dedicated Attendance Officer who has bolstered the pastoral team, alongside work with ESCC's ESBAS team, which has had a big effect. SRv confirmed he is continuing not to authorise any time off for holidays, which has been a culture shock for some. He cautioned that it is still early days and as we approach the colder months there may be an increase in absences, especially given the warnings about a potential flu epidemic this winter.</li> <li>• <b>Governors asked</b> about part time staff who don't work Mondays and how the new CPD process includes them – SRv confirmed it was a tough problem to overcome but that he is trying to develop a culture where CPD happens all the time, not just on Mondays or as a result of attending a training course. From 6 November the school will get into a regular pattern of meetings across all school staff, which will generate more CPD opportunities. SRv and DHT are also in middle of rewriting the school's CPD policies which they will share with Governors at the next meeting.</li> <li>• <b>Governors asked</b> SRv for his views on his proposed continual performance management process – he responded that the shift away from an annual APC conversation will show benefits, but it has become clear that line managers will need to have good coaching skills and this will result in considerable training money needing to be spent.</li> </ul>	SRv/ DHT	Dec FGB

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SRv confirmed he will require sign-off for the new policy from Governors. <b>Governors asked</b> for reassurance the new system is robust enough to deal with poor performance, if this is required. SRv confirmed that early on it would be identified if a staff member was not meeting their objectives and they would be made aware they are in danger of moving onto the conduct management policy. <b>Governors asked</b> if this new policy is commonplace and would new teachers recognise it, whilst acknowledging that the former process was not fit for purpose, and this new policy is welcome. DHT confirmed it is different from other schools he has worked in because it is moving away from an annual or bi-annual appraisal and focusing on a continual requirement to meet specific standards and deliver high quality provision to students and to each other. SLT stated that many staff have shown initial signs of approval and we need to galvanise that goodwill and get it ready for implementation on 17 November. <b>Governors stated</b> it is progressive, and SRv added that it gives staff something to celebrate each time they achieve an objective throughout the year. SLT confirmed there is now no one receiving a performance-related management pay grade who does not have responsibility for a 'whole school' project. <b>Governors asked</b> if staff will have a personal development record. SRv advised that everyone will be required to complete a self-review. <b>Governors asked</b> if this can be tied in with staff welfare survey. Chair advised that as the policy is being launched on 17 November he would ask TS, LB and FW to review the policy and devolve Board approval to them to ratify this and for that ratification then to be confirmed at December FGB. SRv asked if Governors would like a summary of the staff welfare meeting minutes, but <b>Governors commented</b> that a survey questionnaire would be better and asked if there is a standard questionnaire which could be used.</li> <li><b>Chair expressed concern</b> that the absences for Year 11 remains stubbornly high and asked what is being done to address this. SLT advised these students are being repeatedly reminded that absence can adversely affect their results. SRv advised the school continues to hold celebration assemblies for those students who have no days off. <b>Governors asked</b> SRv to consider those students who have a long term illness and the fact they are never able to get recognised for 100% attendance. SRv advised he will establish a process whereby those students are not classed as 'absent' if they are attending appointments for their long term illness related appointment.</li> </ul> <p><b>TS left meeting at 8.15pm</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Governors asked</b> about if Year 11 students are receiving support for stress and mental health issues. SRv stated he is aware he is putting pressure on the staff to improve their performance and is alive to the potential that this pressure to perform could well filter its way down to the students, which can put them under stress. <b>Governors asked</b> if there are interventions in place to support Year 11s. AHT-A&amp;C is holding a meeting to look at working with staff and students about this. <b>Governors commented</b> that some schools have a mental health first aider who is able to cascade training to other staff – SRv asked for contact details to be sent to AHT-A&amp;C.</li> <li>The school has been invited to send 3 students and 2 staff for an all-expenses paid trip to the Youth Centre School of PuTuo District in Shanghai, China. SRv explained that he and DFA will attend as the staff members and that all Year 12 students have been asked for an expression of interest if they wish to go and 9 of them have applied. SRv asked Governors for permission to talk to the Chinese school's managers about the possibility of them investing in GH in return for access to use the school in the future as a base. <b>Governors asked</b> how the winning students will be chosen and whether the second staff member places should also be awarded as the result of winning the place. <b>Governors asked</b> that as our main focus currently is on Finance would it not be more beneficial if DFA remained in school working on that. SRv confirmed that for the school this is a business opportunity as we are seeking investment. Chair asked Governors if anyone has any objections to SRv's proposed absence for this trip – none forthcoming – so carried.</li> <li>DHT requested to defer the discussion on student leadership to next FGB meeting – Chair agreed.</li> </ul>	<p>TS/LB/ FW</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>HT</p> <p>DHT</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>Dec FGB</p> <p>TBC</p> <p>Dec FGB</p>
--	---	--	--

11.	<p><b>Any other urgent business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SRv invited all new Governors into the school for a tour and to see it in action. <b>Governors suggested</b> some of the longer serving Governors would like to join in with this so the invitation was extended to all Governors who would like to attend and this will be combined with a behaviour learning walk. SRv will agree a date and invite Governors.</li> <li><b>Governors asked</b> SRv about progress relating to the September pink paper issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>PINK PAPER – CONFIDENTIAL</b></p> <p>The ‘pink paper’ refers to items which relate to a named person who works, or who it is proposed should work, at the school; to a pupil at, or candidate for admission to, the school; or to any other matter that, by reason of its nature, the governing board is satisfied should remain confidential.</p> <p>The School Governance (Roles, Procedures and Allowances) (England) Regulations 2013. Regulation 15(3): <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2013/1624/regulation/15/made">www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2013/1624/regulation/15/made</a></p>	SRv	TBC
12.	<p><b>Confirmation of upcoming meeting dates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thursday 7 December</li> <li>Thursday 1 February 2018</li> <li>Thursday 1 March</li> <li>Thursday 22 March</li> <li>Thursday 3 May</li> <li>Thursday 21 June</li> <li>Thursday 12 July</li> </ul> <p><b>Meeting concluded at 8.35pm.</b></p>		

Signed..... Chair

Dated.....

S. Quayle  
Clerk