

The Axe Valley Community College

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FULL GOVERNING BODY
Thursday 13 February 2014
6.00pm in the Conference Suite, Sixth Form Centre**

Initials	Eligible to attend	Attending	Type of Governor	Office terminates
GW	Dr Graham Watts (Chair)	Y	Community	12.09.2014
CW	Dr Carol Woodhouse	Y	Community	05.10.2017
GG	Mr Graham Godbeer	Y	Local Authority	10.04.2017
CS	Mrs Carol Simpson	N	Local Authority	23.11.2014
RC	Mrs Ruth Coghlan	N	Parent	25.05.2015
DM	Mr D Mortimer	Y	Parent	29.11.2016
MS	Mr Martin Smith	Y	Headteacher	
GK	Mr Geoff Kerr	Y	Local Authority	27.07.2014
SE	Mrs Stephanie Evans	Y	Parent	07.07.2014
HR	Mr Harvey Robinson	Y	Parent	07.12.2015
LWai	Mrs Louise Wain	Y	Parent	07.12.2015
WC	Mrs Wendy Cryer	Y	Local Authority	17.04.2016
HB	Mrs H Burnett	Y	Parent	08.02.2016
JB	Mrs J Boulton	N	Community	16.10.2017
DM	Mr Darren McCleod	N	Community	16.10.2017
VP	Dr Vincent Parkes	Y	Staff	16.10.2017
RS	Mr Rob Selby	N	Staff	11.12.2017
LW	Miss Lin Walkerdine	Y	Clerk	

1	Apologies from the following members of the governing body were received and sanctioned: Carol Simpson, Jane Boulton, Darran McLeod, Rob Selby, Ruth Coghlan, Harvey Robinson	
	<p>Presentation: Rupert Carr and Kate Pemberton The Reach Program Initial Briefing 13 February 2014</p> <p>i) Reach – the school response to increased government funding. ii) FSM – those who have applied, granted and currently receive free school meals iii) Pupil Premium – the government funding responses to the achievement gap for FSM includes FSME6 and LAC (Looked After Children) iv) The College VA is -25 for 2013 and predicted as -20 for 2014 (PP) v) A PP register was put together by KP – a total of 138 pupils overall who are a mixed group regarding socio-economic environment and academic ability. vi) The funding for 2014-2015 will be £935 per student vii) The School Environment for Reach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Reach Co-ordinator appointed • Improved data analysis and accountability • Centrally Identified Students (CIS) Priority for PP • Specific Reach Program Report Card and analysis against targets • Intervention group priority • Smaller class sizes <p>viii) Summer School and enhanced transition for new Year 7 students particularly PP (2 weeks over the Summer holidays) ix) Aspire will be increasing the number of PP students x) Supervised study area/club with IT facilities provided at lunchtime</p>	

	<p>xi) Contact with parents to encourage attendance at parent evenings</p> <p>xii) Future developments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking attendance more closely and reporting on the data • Incentive schemes • Additional tutoring and other evidence based interventions • Bursaries – this is an issue regarding option choices and funding of trips etc • Linking with the Accelerated Reader (AR) Scheme <p>Q&A</p> <p>WC: relies on self-reporting? FSM is self-reporting, Primary School children are identified within their application however if circumstances change parents need to inform the school. Some parents have informed the school that they are not FSM.</p> <p>WC: is there a stigma in being a PP student? There is some sensitivity regarding this. There are very few occasions when they meet as a group however approach is differentiation in the classroom and managed socially within the College. The Study Club is available to all but PP students are prioritised.</p> <p>GW: how do Government know the number of pupils? Through census and SIMS.</p> <p>SE: are parents informed of the impact of intervention in a user-friendly way?</p> <p>DM: interventions in place but how do you get students to raise their own expectations to achieve better? Similar to Aspire programme regarding coaches and workshops open to all but prioritised for PP students.</p> <p>GK: account for additional money in specific terms e.g. smaller class sizes</p> <p>RC: Advised to ring-fence the funding.</p> <p>GW: Governors are accountable to publish the expenditure and impact for PP funding and a plan for this year to be uploaded onto the website. Ofsted have published a list of criteria for PP and do scrutinise during Inspection.</p> <p>MS: key is to show that the gap is narrowing. Develop unit costs for certain elements e.g. music tuition may make reporting more efficient.</p> <p>WC: children of armed forces included? Do attract some funding but not as much as PP and does not need to be accounted for in the same way. There are 2 students in the College.</p>	
2	<p>Declaration of Pecuniary Interest in the Meeting None declared.</p>	
3	<p><u>Minutes of the FGB Meeting 12 December 2013</u> These were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chair.</p> <p><u>Minutes of the Extraordinary FGB on 16 January 2014</u> These were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chair.</p>	
4	<p><u>Matters Arising</u> i) Acronyms to be included in the minutes.</p>	
5	<p><u>Chair's Business</u> <u>Co-operative Trust Status</u> i) A presentation given at the last meeting was informative but agreed to postpone the decision in the light of restructuring and redundancy. The benefits for school improvement were not clear and the College has many of the co-operative values in place.</p>	

	<p><u>Terms of Reference for Pay Committee</u> i) The Terms of Reference for Pay Committee was approved with the caveat that Mr G Kerr be removed from the TOR Pay Committee. Chair of Committee to be nominated at the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Term Dates 2015-2016</u> i) Requests from parents. DCC Term Dates need to have Professional Development Days added – on next agenda.</p> <p><u>School Pastors</u> To be discussed at the next C,T&L Committee meeting</p>	<p>MS</p> <p>CW/MS</p>
6	<p><u>Headteacher's Report</u> i) The paper was noted. Governor Challenge: Is the Year 11 predicted data more robust? MS confirmed. Two reasons why teacher predictions can be wrong – inexperience in assessment and examination criteria for marking changes and staff are using historic processes. Staff can get a wide range of results dependent on student engagement. SE : 10 weeks of school time remaining for Year 11 are there assessments which haven't been taken into account. Confident that departments are where they should be? DM: there has been some differentiation in departments between predicted and actual grades. MS: Challenging targets set – consistency is the issue. GW: concern that some staff are better at giving indicators than others – SLT to ensure the definition of prediction is made clear for all staff. DM: better, more accurate predictions are an indication of improved monitoring MS: not an exact science –there is a correlation between teachers understanding assessment criteria students knowing what they have achieved – where weaknesses in subjects, students have believed their work is better than it is. HB: are NQTs given support in making predictions? VP: often lack of confidence in using the system. Using the last result may not be the best representation of that student – more testing has produced more data sets but not sure that all teachers are doing exactly the same. HB: opportunity for moderation for inexperienced staff? MS: Departments will meet to support new staff. Incentivised examination marking to gain better understanding of the marking scheme. DM: more informed staff may impact on the achievement of students</p> <p><u>What is the impact of the Subject Support Plans on Achievement?</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. English are above the targets set in the Support Plan for both progress and attainment. Very good impact overall. 2. Science are on target for Year 11 Attainment targets but below for progress. KS5 are below for AS Biology and Chemistry but on target in AS Physics and A2 Biology, Physics and Chemistry. Good impact overall. 3. Languages are below progress target but in line with attainment. Good-to-reasonable impact overall. <p>There is evidence to show that where a support plan is employed it has impact.</p> <p>MS to report to the next CTL Committee on the review of English and Science.</p>	

GW: Technology support plan?

MS: In 2012-2013 made good progress and attainment but now seem to be struggling. MS has directed the Line Manager to find out the reason and report back.

Teaching

Lesson observation and Learning Walk data for first half of 2013-14

Thirty four lesson observations have been conducted between September and 3rd February. 15% were graded Outstanding, 67% Good and 18% Requires Improvement. These are slightly above the targets set out in the College Development Plan. More data will be available by the end of this half term.

Thirty four learning walks have also been undertaken; these are shorter, unannounced drop-ins for approximately 10mins. These have focused on Learning and Progress and Attitudes / Behaviour. The data is slightly more positive than the lesson observations with 23% Outstanding, 62% Good, and 15% Requires Improvement.

Priority is to reduce the number of lessons judged Requires Improvement. To tackle this the focus will be on providing targeted training and coaching support for all teachers and putting in place rigorous, developmental support plans for individual teachers where there are concerns. Staff need to be made aware of the new grade criteria regarding lessons which has the focus of learning and progress. Previously if students were engaged in the lesson it would be judged Good. Target is to reduce the number of RI lessons to 5% and staff need to be quicker and more rigorous in responding. It is anticipated that there will be a growth in support plans as a result.

To ensure the College is targeting areas for development quickly a new database is being used to record areas for improvement following each lesson observation. This will allow senior and middle leaders to see patterns quickly and address themes quickly.

SE: realistic to allow staff time to adjust to new grade criteria – teachers finding uncomfortable? Affecting morale?

MS: rigorous in tackling Grade 3 teaching by providing good quality support.

VP: Capita critical of Ofsted – purpose of lesson observations – teacher centred.

GW: Ofsted Criteria for Learning Walks?

Use the same as for lesson observations.

Behaviour

Data on Rewards and Sanctions up to 31st Jan 2014

SE: Why do Years 7 and 11 achieve most? Does it make a difference?

SE: takes up a lot of teacher time?

MS: rewards and sanctions are part of ethos of the school and would feel its absence if not in place.

GW: If we don't know the impact of Rewards and Sanctions, Governors should find out.

Comparative Exclusion Data for Autumn Term

Exclusion data on Raiseonline and therefore Ofsted monitored. FTE and also management time involved.

From this data it is noteworthy that TAVCC has a higher rate of Fixed term Exclusions (FTE) than other schools in East Devon.

	<p>The Autumn Term data for last few years is interesting: 2009/10 – 36 FTEs and the total for all schools in East Devon was 242 2010/11 – 34 FTEs / 206 2011/12 – 19 FTEs / 220 2012/13 – can't find but suspect our level was high 2013/14 – 26 FTEs / 106</p> <p>The College needs to develop alternative internal solutions rather than FTE where possible but there will be circumstances when it is necessary. This should be debated by staff and a management decision made. SE: same students? This needs to be examined. GG: no permanent exclusions – used to have 2-3 per year seeking alternative provision – often nothing to offer.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> FTEs often have very little impact on student behaviour. Full day's isolation may have higher impact in some cases. To achieve this we need to increase capacity for isolation. Criteria could be developed to structure decision making process, based on Behaviour Policy. Work set for the day should be challenging. The new leadership structure will support this.</p> <p><u>Leadership</u> <u>Effective Use of Assessment Data Strategy</u> Overall the second cycle worked more effectively and the system is beginning to bed in. The Achievement Committee is aware of the need to focus in on impact of intervention and greater accountability.</p> <p><u>Lesson observation training</u> Fifteen middle and senior leaders complete a three part Lesson Observation training programme. Kate Mythen, who recently qualified as an Ofsted inspector, delivered training on Ofsted Framework. All participants applied training to real observations and then conducted a follow up session focusing on skills of recording. All remaining middle leaders will have undertaken training by end of Spring term.</p> <p><u>General</u> i) Pupil numbers are currently 790.</p> <p>ii) <u>Student numbers applying for places in Sep in Year 7</u> Early data obtained (before official release) shows that we have 119 first choice applications, 62 second, and 28 third. Total 209 applications for 150 places. We have assumed 130 in our budget forecasts. Given 119 first choice we may well exceed forecasted figure. This will have an impact of number of classes in Year 7 next year as currently we are consulting on 4 for some subjects. Numbers over 130 will make this unviable. 76 students are applying for Sixth Form. HB: 130 unviable? MS: Can be managed with number of classes.</p> <p>The Chair thanked MS for his report.</p>	
8	<p><u>Budget – Admission to FIPS</u> i) Notification from FIPS in support and to give the go ahead to proceed and appoint a Maths Teacher ii) Consulted with Trade Unions last week and seemed positive – the Unions were supportive and understood the situation. They were sympathetic to the</p>	

	<p>approach made by MS using LA processes in an open transparent way.</p> <p>iii) MS presented to Staff the restructuring process who are now aware of the report. The Consultation Period has begun and is on track.</p> <p>iv) Governors thanked MS and SLT for their hard work which has been carefully thought through.</p> <p>v) MS will provide a detailed section in the College newsletter and a press statement will be issued to emphasise there is a rigorous plan to move the school forward. Positive stories will also be published.</p> <p>vi) This may impact on Year 5s who have yet to make their choices.</p>	
9	<p><u>Year 7 Catch Up Premium</u></p> <p>i) Governors need to know about this funding.</p> <p>ii) £500 per student for those who are below Level 4 on entry in either English or Maths. The total funding is £10k approx.</p> <p>iii) This funding is accountable and is used for additional TA support in English and Maths.</p> <p>iv) SE: why Year 7 and not in Primary School? Was Year 6 last year.</p> <p>v) Needs to be reported on College website.</p> <p>GG: impact? Too early to assess – finding different approaches to classroom practices e.g. Numicon</p>	MS
10	<p><u>Ofsted Focus</u></p> <p><u>The position of RE in the Curriculum- outcome of consultation to inform final decision</u></p> <p>i) HB gave results of the parent consultation. Total number of responses was 90 parents. The results were 84% for reduced RE and 16% for compulsory RE.</p> <p>ii) Governors of CTL discussed this and made a recommendation for RE as a Core Subject to be on the FGB agenda for consideration.</p> <p>iii) Staff consultation – less about RE and more about reduction of teaching time for Option subjects in general. More choice i.e. 4 options (including RE).</p> <p>iv) SLT recommended in light of the staff consultation that RE is an Option subject and reduce number of Options to 3 to create more time per option.</p> <p>LWa: small number of responses (10% approximately). Students will have to choose between History/Geography plus 3 choices.</p> <p>MS: overall, slightly more choice than last year.</p> <p>v) ICT is now an option subject.</p> <p>vi) In summary, people do not want the compulsory RE.</p> <p>CW: Having asked parents for their opinion – good PR in terms of consultation and need to respect parental opinion.</p> <p>Results of consultation to be published in the newsletter.</p> <p>VP: parental perception is lack of weight of RE.</p> <p>GW: if RE is removed as a compulsory subject – Governors will expect the delivery of RE to be of a high standard.</p> <p>HB: Taught by specialist qualified RE teachers in sufficient depth to meet government guidelines</p> <p>CW: Team teaching a possible solution? Different options are possible. SL for RE to be out of tutorial system.</p> <p>GW: A vote was taken In favour of retaining RE as Core subject. One vote was received however several Governors expressed their concern..</p> <p>GW: A vote was taken In favour of RE as an Option Subject. Ten votes were received.</p> <p>GK: Based on the outcome of the parental survey and recommendations from SLT, the strategic decision is to have RE as an Option Subject but would want to know how RE is delivered</p>	HB

	It was agreed that an effective system for provision is to be put in place and a report on progress in Autumn Term.	MS
11	<p><u>Governor Development Plan</u> <u>Outcome of governor annual self analysis</u> i) Analysis of Self-Review was presented by the Chair. ii) List of skills produced by NGA – the GB as a whole should have these skills. iii) Some skills need addressing either by training or future appointments e.g. legal iv) Less than 50% ‘feel confident in certain skills’ is highlighted. Where numbers high the GB is in a good position. v) HB: no zero categories vi) School Improvement – newly joined Governors unsure of role of Governor. Need to consider how best to offer training to them. vii) Crib Sheet giving guidance on how governors obtain information viii) New governor pack to all Governors. ix) Performance Management and Related pay needs to be followed through. x) AOB section removed from agenda was recommended. Major items on next agenda to encourage inclusion. Items for the next meeting to replace AOB. xi) Governors thanked the Chair for the collation of the report.</p> <p><u>Consultation on re-constitution</u> i) Proposal all maintained school GBs will be reconstituted in September 2015 based on Governor skills. ii) Respond by 14 March 2014.</p> <p>A reminder of the HR training at 6.30pm 3 March at TAVCC.</p>	<p>GW</p> <p>GW/LW</p>
12	<u>Committee Minutes</u>	
	<u>Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Committee</u> i) The minutes were noted .	
	<u>Site and Buildings Committee</u> i) The minutes were noted .	
	<u>Finance and Personnel Committee</u> i) The minutes were noted .	
	<u>Achievement Committee</u> i) The minutes were noted .	
13	<p><u>Regional and National News - DfE/DAG/NGA/Babcock</u> i) DAG Conference 9.00am 17 May 2014 recommended event. To book a place visit the dag website www.dag.gb.com DAG are developing their communications strategy to improve their access to Devon Governors via the website, briefing papers and newsletters and gain feedback. Protocol for DAG reps at various meetings has been developed.</p> <p>iii) Axe Valley LC Budget monitored by Governors.</p>	

	iv) Babcock Pupil Data Performance Data training CW attended – more Achievement Committee members would be useful as worked on College data. FFT Dashboard summary in 4 pages – useful guide for Governors. MS/KC to email FFT dashboard to Governors.	MS/KC
14	AOB i) Thanks to Governors who have helped at Parents Evenings. ii) Extraordinary FGB 13 March – SE apologies iii) PTA Quiz – Governors team to attend 16 th March	

The meeting closed at 9.00pm

Next FGB meeting 6.00pm on 27 March 2014

Summary of Action Points

Minute	Action	By Whom	By When
5	Term Dates 2015-2016 on next agenda	MS	Mar 14
5	School Pastors to be discussed at next C,T&L Committee Meeting	CW/MS	Mar 14
6	MS to report to the next CTL Committee on the review of English and Science.	MS	Mar 14
9	Year 7 Catch Up Premium to be reported on the College Website	MS	Mar 14
10	RE in the Curriculum: results of parent consultation to be published in the College Newsletter	HB	Mar 14
10	RE in the Curriculum: It was agreed that an effective system for provision is to be put in place and a report on progress in Autumn Term.	MS	Oct 14
11	New governor pack to all Governors.	GW	Mar 14
11	Items for the next meeting to replace AOB on the agenda	GW/LW	Mar 14
13	MS/KC to email FFT dashboard to Governors.	MS/KC	Feb 14

Signed
Graham Watts, Chairman

Date.....