

# BASSINGBOURN VILLAGE COLLEGE

## Minutes of the Local Governing Body meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017

<b>Present:</b>	Stephen Morris (SM) (Chair)	George Lynn (GL)
	Peter Bolton (PB)	Ken Murphy (KM)
	Alison Butterworth (AB)	Peter Nussey (PN) (from item 4)
	Dushy Chetty (DCh)	Vickey Poulter (VP)
	Duncan Cooper (DC)	Chris Roope (CR)
	Rachel Dix-Pincott (RD-P)	Simon Sagers (SSag)
	James Dow (JD)	Sue Speller (SSp)
<b>In attendance:</b>	Jeremy Brock (JB)	
	Vanessa Larkin (VL)	
<b>Minutes:</b>	Hilary Forrester (Clerk)	

	ACTION
<p><b>1. Apologies and welcome.</b></p> <p>SM welcomed everyone to the meeting. This would be the last meeting for James Dow and Peter Nussey whose terms of office had come to an end. Governors thanked them for all their work. There were no apologies for absence.</p>	
<p><b>2. Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interests.</p>	
<p><b>3. Minutes of last meeting/matters arising</b></p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2017 were approved and signed.</p> <p><u>Policies:</u> These had been finalised.</p> <p><u>Risk register:</u> DC would develop a risk register for the LGB this year based on the one from the Trust.</p> <p><u>Staffing update:</u> VL gave an update on maths staffing. Maths was fully staffed. The Head of Department responsibilities had been delegated to individuals within the maths team with support from JBr on data. Fortnightly meetings were taking place with the Head of Maths from Sawston to give support. A specialist Maths TA was in place and students were receiving 50 minute lessons, with the additional time for maths coming from Science and PE. Extra tuition was being provided for PP students. <b>Q:</b> How are the maths team coping? <b>A:</b> VL responded that the two new members of staff from the agency had been observed by Vickey and were doing well. The other two teachers are being supported by mentors. Depending on arrangements with the current temporary staff contracts, we may need to recruit again after Christmas. <b>Q:</b> Are the stronger teachers taking Year 10 and 11? <b>A:</b> Yes.</p> <p>VL showed governors some maths resources that would be going to all Y11 and Y10 to help with revision. Governor welcomed this initiative.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> VL to get a quote from Quick Print to produce the sets of cards.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> Is liaison with the Head of Maths at Sawston an ongoing arrangement. <b>A:</b> yes. <b>Q:</b> What are the medium term plans for Head of Maths? <b>A:</b> This is still under discussion.</p>	VL

SSag had received a communication from a parent who was happy about the extra support provided in maths last year and asked whether it would be the same this year? DC confirmed that the support would be starting earlier and outlined what would be provided.

**3. Ofsted report**

DC informed governors that he felt the Ofsted report was good and captured the College's core ethos. The area for development would be around pupil premium students making accelerated progress. Ofsted recognised there was still a gap to fill even though the college does a good job. This has been added to the improvement plan.

KM felt that the report was validation of how good the staff are and congratulated everyone involved.

**4. Exams analysis – Presentation by DC/VP**

DC took governors through the exams analysis information. A-Cs had dropped slightly and English Literature had dropped by 2.5%. Maths information reflected the new GCSE grading.

**Q:** Are grade 9s a fixed percentage? **A:** No, this year they turned out to be 3% and there is still uncertainty for next year. DC noted that for the higher paper, the language of the questions is much harder to understand and it may be better for some students to do a foundation paper where the questions are more accessible. **Q:** There was criticism that students only needed 18% on the higher paper for a level C. Does that put pressure on the schemes of marking? **A:** They were about right. DC clarified that a question level analysis had been done for the maths paper and the information would be used to plan future schemes of work. Geometry and measurement were identified as weak areas and these would be a focus for Y8 onwards.

Governors reviewed the English Language and Literature data. It was noted that due to curriculum changes, the IGCSE course was no longer accepted in the league tables. This had had a significant impact on the national picture. A few remarks were being carried out. The higher end grade boundaries were very close together with little difference in the marks. It was noted that Ofsted had set 5+ as the benchmark for reviewing schools' performance and so the college would be focussing on that area.

Raise Online has been discontinued and a new ASP (Assessing School Performance) system was due for release this term. The new system will look at trends overtime, progress scores, and quantiles for all students and larger groups. There would no longer be a national comparison for SEN. It is difficult to predict where children will be on the new GCSE grades so the Ofsted inspection team now has a statistician who can support analysis of the data. They will be focussing on larger groups over time so that inspectors can make judgements about school performance. Fischer Family Trust data is also available to compare similar schools over time, but as this is based on historic data it will become increasingly less reliable with the new GCSEs.

VP presented the exam data for comparison with last year, outlining general impressions on the results, areas of concern and risks for the coming year. Positive subject areas included French, Spanish, Latin, V Certs, Resistant Materials, Sociology and textiles.

Art had been submitted for a whole cohort remark and Drama were also appealing all the marking. There was discussion about the reasons for this, and the outcomes of the other remarking. **Q:** Do you use school performance as a criterion for remarking? **A:** In English it was based on the performance of the individual pupil. Some remarks did not improve the school results because the initial grade already met the requirement. There was also a risk that marks could go down as well as up.

**Action:** To have an update on exam remarks at the next meeting.

VP presented data on the impact of intervention groups. Students on the 4+ or 5- border were targeted for extra support. The interventions had worked better this year as the new strategy

DC/VP

was more focussed. DC outlined the exam follow up process and noted that team discussions had taken most of September and were still ongoing.

VP outlined areas for concern, including English progress, which had a downwards trend and the maths lower ability students who did not do as well compared to similar children nationally.

**Q:** Since the P8 score for English was 0, how is this the case? **A:** JBr explained that the figures for all P8 scores were accurate, but the college was seeking clarification for the English figure, as this may have been calculated incorrectly, or there may have been a change to the technical guidance after the exam.

Student grade target setting was discussed. DC explained how the process was being improved this year. He described the orange cards which had been given to staff for guidance on inputting pupil data. The cards show the likelihood of students securing the various grades. The grades are assigned either plus or minus, depending on how secure the pupil is at achieving that grade, eg 5- means they are 50% likely to get that grade or the grade below and therefore need extra support. This initiative was part of a number of changes to facilitate more accurate target setting this year.

There was discussion about the Art teaching and moderation. DC reported that he had attended a meeting of MAT Heads to discuss the subject results. Art was a concern for three of the schools and one other school had also requested a remark. Drama was also mentioned as a concern.

VP took governors through a presentation of the risks. These included:

- ECDL no longer being included in progress tables
- Change in exam structure (course and grading),
- New GCSEs with emphasis on application of knowledge
- Subjects to monitor closely were history, art, Technology, computing, catering, media
- Change in exam structure, course and grading.
- Other areas for focus were maths staffing, PP and attendance and forecasting.

Governors discussed and asked questions. **Q:** Is there a staffing risk for geography? **A:** All the GCSE Year 10 and 11 is covered.

VP reported that Year 10 may do the English Language GCSE this year as the Literature course was more technical. The core subjects are exam focused from Year 9, and the Year 7 work is linked to the GCSE assessment objectives. Last year for English Literature the Year 10s achieved an average point score that was only one point below the Year 11s.

**Q:** As 66% passed in Year 10 and 76% in Year 11, wouldn't it be better for the students to have one more year so that they could achieve a better grade? **A:** Pupils have the option to resit if they want to. The advantage of bringing forward exams is that this enables them to access and focus on a couple of the GCSEs a year earlier. Otherwise they are sitting eight or nine subject at one time. Taking a couple a year early also allows pupils to practise and prepare.

**Q:** Should they take less GCSEs so that they can get better results? **A:** That will be considered as part of the planning later, eg whether to put the options process back into Year 8 so that students have a longer time doing the GCSE courses, or whether to limit the number of GCSEs.

Actions in response to the risks included:

- Putting together context sheets noting the changing profiles of the cohorts from Years 7-9
- Not putting grades on the system without these being discussed and moderated by another team member
- Generating more creativity in the teaching and learning, eg by removing Ofsted grading for lesson observation and focussing on what is good, and what could be done better.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having more staff in leadership teams who will be visiting more lessons, supporting staff and learners.</li> <li>• Focussing on learning behaviour in the classroom with various projects already underway. VL explained what the teacher research groups was doing in terms of personalised CPD based on observations. Feedback would be given to staff in February.</li> </ul> <p>Governors confirmed that they found the data very helpful. The actions would be fed into the College Improvement Plan, which was currently being moderated by leadership team members.</p> <p><b>Q:</b> How will you manage the resources to deliver all those action points, will they be prioritised?  <b>A:</b> DC responded that the SLT had reflected on this and with the additional CALS this year the work was manageable. There would be a refocussing of priorities, developing and evolving what was already being done.</p> <p>There was some discussion about Data Point 4. It was noted that for a lot of GCSEs it was unclear what the different grades would be. DC circulated a graph showing DP4 compared to the exam results. This highlighted how close the forecasting had been to the actual grade in many cases. There were some discrepancies, and cohort size was also a factor, however, the forecasting was good overall.</p>	
<p><b>5. Yr 10 results review</b></p> <p>VP took governors through the Year 10 results for English Literature. The targets were based on end of Year 11. It was noted that Pupil Premium students did very well and achieved their targets. Some English Literature papers had been sent for remarking.</p>	
<p><b>6. KPIs – behaviour/attendance reports</b></p> <p>Governors acknowledged the paper circulated prior to the meeting. There were no questions.</p>	
<p><b>7. Improvement plan</b></p> <p>The first draft of the improvement plan was circulated. This was due to be reviewed by the middle leaders shortly. A revised draft would be considered at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Governors to send comments on the Improvement Plan electronically before the next LGB meeting.</p>	All
<p><b>8. Self evaluation calendar</b></p> <p>The updated version had been circulated and reflected the priorities in the Improvement Plan. There were no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>9. Link governor arrangements and chairing of future meetings</b></p> <p><u>Link governor arrangements</u> were circulated prior to the meeting. It was noted that with two governors stepping down, there were some gaps. It was agreed to fill the gaps by only having one governor per link area.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> SM to reallocate governors to cover of empty link governor positions and inform all of the arrangements.</p> <p><u>Chairing future meetings:</u> Governors felt that the previous rotation arrangement had worked well and should continue. It was agreed that DCh, SSag and CR would chair the next meetings in that order.</p> <p><u>Head teacher performance management:</u> DCh agreed to take over from SM in this process (DCh confirmed he had completed the appropriate training).</p>	SM

<p><u>Governor recruitment:</u> The LGB needed to recruit one parent governor and one Trust governor. It was decided that the best approach would be to wait until after the parent governor election before recruiting a Trust governor.</p>	
<p><b>10. Policy ratification, SRE, E-Safety, AfL</b>  Drafts of the policies were circulated prior to the summer break. The changes submitted had now been included as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SRE policy was now gender neutral</li> <li>• E-safety – allocated responsibilities had been added</li> <li>• AfL – the answers to questions had been sent out and the policy amended.</li> </ul> <p>PB noted that in the E-Safety policy there was some repetition on page 5 under ‘Use of the Internet’ and ‘Filtering...’</p> <p><b>Action:</b> PB to send E-safety policy amendment to VP.</p> <p>The policies were approved subject to the E-safety policy amendment.</p>	<p>PB</p>

Meeting closed at Closed 20:10

Chair .....