

Ted Wragg Multi Academy Trust

Isca Academy

Delegated Governing Body Meeting

Wednesday 12th February 2014

5-8pm

Attendees Lewis Banfield, Beverley Martin, Gina Woodcraft, Bernard Dugdale, Rachel Brown, Brahm Norwich, Ian Rogers, Simon Weir, Beverley Martin, Kate Campbell-Bellis, John Staddon, Tracey Spink, Nigel Watts, Anne Oxborough, Ruth Cheesman	
Chair Gina Woodcraft	Clerk Ruth Cheesman

Note: Late arriving – Nigel Watts, Left at 7.30pm Kate Campbell-Bellis

1. Apologises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None received 	
2. Declaration of Interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KC-B declared an interest in Item 13 and 14 on the agenda 	
3. Minutes of Last Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point 4 – BD sent in corrections to minutes but these have not yet been amended. BD not concerned about this. • Point 5- RF happy with the T & L Committee meeting minutes • Point 8 – Governor Feedback – it was decided that this would be reported on later in the meeting • Point 9 – Future Proposals for the Academy – this is still ongoing 	Action 1 – RC to liaise with BD about corrections to minutes
4. Approval of minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed – It was proposed by Gina Woodcraft and this proposition was seconded by Bernard Dugdale and unanimously agreed by all. 	
Employer Voice – <i>additional item not on agenda</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HC raised the topic of Employer Voice - she has met with RB and KC-B about this. RB has since spoken to colleagues at Isca as well. • This issue was also raised in the T & L meeting on January 29th 2014 (see these minutes). • HC suggested waiting a few more terms for the ongoing changes at Isca to become embedded before asking for employer feedback. • GW asked RB <i>if she felt that the employees needed their voice heard.</i> • RB stated that some staff felt that communication was not always effective and that they sometimes felt that decisions were being made and staff were not informed about them soon enough. • RF asked <i>what the forum was for raising staff issues with the Senior Leadership Team (SLT)</i> • BM stated that there were structures in place for raising issues and SW added that there were meetings and support in place and that some of the issues raised 	

	<p>currently by staff were possibly due to the changes taking place at Isca and more being asked of staff as a consequence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RB added that it may be useful to inform staff that change can cause anxiety and inform staff of how they can get their voices heard by SLT. • HC highlighted the importance of Governors knowing what the procedure is for staff raising issues with the SLT. • BD asked <i>the SLT what structures were in place for the employer voice.</i> • BM said the each staff member has a Line Manager and the necessary structures in place. That there are lots of changes taking place and as staff are not involved in the meetings that occur they may feel that change just happens – not part of the process as confidential. • SW added that the problem can often lie with staff not necessarily liking the answer given to their question and that some messages the SLT have had to give recently are very hard to hear. • HC highlighted the role for Governors in listening to staff but felt that this should be actioned in the future rather than now. • IR <i>wanted to know if staff are given reassurances about changes and structures occurring.</i> • HC also commented that it was important for staff to know the direction that Isca was moving in and that the Governing Body were always making decisions with the students best interests at the forefront. • RB further added that there were additional tasks asked of staff and that this can add strain to some staff. • AO felt that listening to the Employer Voice (staff issues) was a very important matter and should not be left for a few terms. She felt that staff should give constructive suggestions for improvements and communication and what staff would like to see happening. • GW asked <i>how this could be done</i> • BM informed the Governing Body that next term (March) an outside agency has been tasked with producing and disseminating an Employer Voice questionnaire and collecting feedback. SW added that AM and SW devised the questions to be asked. • BN asked if the Governing Body could ask BM to look at the questions to be asked to see if all concerns are covered and if not then a more personal series of questions should go out to the staff to cover the issues raised during this meeting. • BM stated that there were also frustrations from the SLT that instructions were sometimes not implemented and that sometimes information was not being passed on by 	
--	--	--

	<p>middle managers to all staff promptly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BD suggested that when communication failed the management were ultimately responsible. • BM said however that the business structure was there and therefore middle leaders can be held to account if necessary. • LB – staff reviews are a good time to set objectives. • BM finished with saying that the SLT were aware of which staff were feeling pressurised and that there were now formal ways for communication and also forums for staff to voice concerns and worries informally – e.g. the staff room. 	
<p>5 & 6 Head Teacher's Report and feedback</p>	<p>GW, BD and HC sent questions to BM in advance of the meeting regarding the Head Teacher's Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GW opened this discussion with asking <i>if the report was giving the Governors what they needed for their roles.</i> • AO and IR said that they thought the report was excellent and BD said it was the best information received yet. • AO asked if it was possible for each key heading to have pertinent issues for consideration as a summary. BM said that these were currently at the end of the section but could be put at the front if that's what was wanted. • IR said that he felt NW and RF (as the curriculum team) are the people who should be asking the questions about the report as it was their area of expertise. • RF stated that he has questions about the report but didn't know if this meeting was the correct forum for them. • GW suggested that it may be useful if RF had sent an email to the Governing Body explaining that he had questions about the report so the Governing Body knew that the curriculum team was doing their job. • BM said that the intention would be to give Ofsted the Head Teacher's Report – which would become a series of reports as time goes on. • GW <i>asked how important it was for Ofsted to see questions from Governors about the report.</i> • BM said that it was very important as it is used as evidence. • GW – the report is useful but we must be able to understand it. • BD noted that the figures for both controlled assessment and exams were 62 % in November but 57 % in December – he queried if the discrepancy had been due to mis-labelling. BM said that this was due to inconsistencies in earlier marking of work and that predictions for grades were broadly on target. • 'Achieved' in the Report should have read 'Current 	<p>Action 2 – BM to place pertinent issues for each section at the beginning of the section rather than the end – for next report</p>

	<p>Attainment’ – then the statistics make sense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GW asked <i>if it would be useful for Governors to have a training session to discuss issues raised in the Head Teacher’s Report.</i> • BM said that she planned to pick certain aspects of the Head Teacher’s Report to discuss during each meeting <p>Time was then given to discussing the In Year Progress in Maths for Year 11 on page 4 of the Head Teacher’s Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BM noted the following: That level 4C and below was low ability and 5C and above was high ability. ‘Other Level’ on the table referred to pupils that has been abroad, in private education, etc and that in this category the middle ranking students’ progress was not included. Other categories were ‘B’ which was ‘below level of test’ and ‘N’ which is ‘no grade’. • TS asked (according to the figures in the Head Teacher’s Report) <i>if we consider that 4b is an ‘average child’ then are we happy that they have a 50% chance of getting a C or above?</i> • BM added that the data that was being looked at was taken at Christmas time and most children will not be taking their exams until June and TS asked <i>if Isca had grade predictions for June.</i> • BM stated that they were also looking at what it takes to move students up a level – and that staff used the colour of the table (on p. 4) to help them in knowing where students were and where they could get to. • TS asked <i>how many children in Year 11 who were on the 4b/c level had been spoken to about their future and how they move forward to ensure that they get the grades they need.</i> • SW informed everyone that they had had Minimum Expectation Meetings with students and that all Heads of Houses know each Year 11 student and what they need to focus on and had held individual meetings and that students were very aware of what they needed to do. <p>The next table discussion was the Free School Meals +6 found on page 5 of the Head Teacher’s Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BM showed how this table can highlight the differences between FSM and non FSM students – for example, it highlighted that no FSM +6 students were doing music and that the school didn’t know this before. • BD <i>enquired if FSM +6 was a good indication for disadvantage.</i> • TS stated that it can be misleading due to what makes a family qualify for FSM – for example a person who works 	<p>Action 3 – RC to ensure that time built into agenda for Gov meetings for training on Head Teacher’s Report and to record as training</p>
--	--	--

	<p>16 hours a week and gets working tax credits does not get FSM – this could mean that some student who were really disadvantaged would not be classed as FSM +6 and could fall below the radar for help at school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BM said that she had previously spent time looking at both FSM and postcodes as a proxy for disadvantage and that both had merits. However as Devon is a rural county there can be very contrasting houses and therefore households within the same postcode and so this can be misleading as an indicator of disadvantage so in a rural setting FSM can be a more reliable indicator. • BM went on to say that FSM +6 very clearly identified a group of students who were not doing as well as they could which allows Isca to work with them but it is also important to look at other students too, to make sure that no one goes unnoticed. • AO looked at biology, chemistry and physics data and asked <i>why there seemed to be a bigger gap between FSM + 6 and non FSM students.</i> • RB answered that she had been doing Quality Assurance by looking at Year 11 marking, teaching, data and there is now an awareness of this gap so actions can be put in place. • TS – Noted that it has been positive to have this data and thanked the school. • AO asked for clarification on Ofsted’s grading. • BM stated that less than 1 is Outstanding, 1.5-1.7 is Good with Outstanding features and up to 2-2.9 Requires Improvement. • BN asked if <i>it would be possible for the standard deviation of the data to look at variations in teaching in the Head Teacher’s Report to be included</i> but BM said she would be uneasy about this as it could identify staff too easily. 	<p>Action 4 – BM to put Ofsted’s grading in next Head Teacher’s Report</p>
<p>CDPLS - Central Devon Personalised Learning Service</p> <p><i>This was an additional conversation had at the meeting which was not on the Agenda</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JS asked about BM’s work with CDPLS and why the Governing Body were not made aware of it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This appointment had only just commenced and there had not been a full Governing Body meeting since. • RF said that the Ted Wragg Trust (TWT) had raised their concerns that BM’s new responsibility with CDPLS should not impact on Isca – that was their main concern. • Deborah Mayhill (TWT) has asked that the Governing Body question the SLT to ensure that this new role did not affect Isca due to an increased workload. • BM said that the role with CDPLS was autocratic and very different from working at Isca and that she felt this new role was a positive one as CDPLS staff are learning from Isca which is now seen as the more experienced 	

	<p>institution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SW added that SW and BM now spent more time with one another as they have been able to reduce their teaching time as a consequence of this new role. • BD asked <i>if the Governing Body was Delegated or Observational – as this would have an impact on whether they were meant to have been involved in the decision of working with CDPLS.</i> • GW stated that the Governing Body were to agree all policies and that this has been previously minuted. • RF said however that BM was an Executive Principal which meant there was an expectation that she would take on other leadership roles at other institutions. • BN added that the TWT should be clear on what ‘Delegated’ meant and that indeed some particular decisions may not be ‘Delegated’ – the responsibility of the Governing Body. • GW asked RF if he could ask the TWT what this means. • IR noted that as this new appointment had taken place in December the Governing Body should have been informed about it sooner as it could have led to problems if they were asked about it. • JS added that Isca should get some positive publicity about this new role as they are being a ‘flagship’ school for CDPLS. • GW stated that the message going forward was that if BM is asked in the future to take on another responsibility then agreement of the Governing Body should be gained. 	<p>Action 5 – RF to ask the TWT what they understand as ‘Delegated Governing Body’</p>
7. Teaching and Learning Committee report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AO said that the minutes for this meeting were clear and proposed that there should be a standard item on the T & L committee agenda should be the Head Teacher’s Report • TS <i>asked if the T & L committee members should attend the next Year 9 options evening which is on the 26th February.</i> • SW said that there was a new format for the evening. • TS <i>asked if parents could be given more notice about the evening</i> but BM stated that the date had been known since the beginning of the year. 	<p>Action 6 – RC to now send out T & L committee minutes to all.</p> <p>Action 7 – RC to send out reminder about Options Evening</p>
8. Pupil Voice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HC - It was felt that all Governors should be involved in this process and the SLT need to give their views on a School Council. • It was also identified that it was important to talk to Year 7 and get general views on feedback and marking. • SW said that any feedback would be extremely useful. 	
9. Ted Wragg Trust	<p>GW had three main issues to discuss in relation to the TWT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engagement and Training 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GW felt that training was needed – both new Governor and Governor training and that the Babcock training should be used fully. <p>2. What does ‘Delegated Governing Body’ mean</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GW felt that any proposals from the school must have the support of the Governing Body and also a full Risk Assessment in place. ○ Anything that goes to the TWT must have first been seen by the Governing Body <p>3. TWT structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GW stated that when she attended a meeting the TWT felt low key and welcoming but we must not forget that it is voluntary and that the TWT are also learning as they go and the relationship with Isca is new to them too. ○ RF noted that funding of the TWT also needs due consideration – as it stands now the TWT do not receive funds from the school but fund go to to support the students. ○ GW stated that the TWT does need more funding and that there are suggestions as to how to go about this. <p>RF said that he has written a report to the TWT about Isca.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TS highlighted the day that was held with St James’ school and TWT which was very successful - there were media and industry people involved in the TWT – useful connections. • TS asked RF <i>if the TWT feel more stretched than they did then.</i> • RF said that some members of the TWT have now been lost and TS <i>asked if they were looking to recruit more members.</i> • RF said that they were. • SW noted that that Challenge Partners had a similar impact to the TWT in that it increased opportunities with different ideas and approaches – although not specifically through the TWT it did connect with the wider community. 	<p>Action 8 – RF to email the TWT report to the Governing Body</p>
10. Budget	<p>This was led by LB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LB started by saying that there was a funding request – looking to recruit an Apprentice for the finance team so they can work more effectively now a new system has been put in place. This will cost in the region of £13,000. This would then release other team members who will be able to work more efficiently – this has been agreed. • IR has offered to help the finance team in the interim. • LB noted that January 2014 financial figures showed Isca to be in good position but LB would like a more accurate 	

	<p>reporting mechanism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LB stated that there is a carryover of about £200,000. • LB also said that as Isca is an Academy VAT can be recovered but this is something that TWT needs to address. • LB finally discussed the need for Auditors – this is a TWT issue. The University of Exeter have agreed to audit but an external Auditor is also required. RF said he would contact Debra Myhill to decide how to proceed with this. <p>Pupil Premium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BD asked <i>what the Pupil Premium was for each student.</i> BM sent the figures and they are attached to these minutes. • IR raised the issue of the DfE directive for funding/consultation paper – IR asked if he could be informed when this happens as most likely a meeting at Sandy Park. 	<p>Action 9 – RF to speak to Debra Myhill to decide on how audit will happen.</p> <p>Action 10 – RC to find out when meeting at Sandy Park will occur and inform IR</p>
11. Strategic Away Day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GW asked for confirmation as to which Governors were able to attend this day. 	<p>Action 11 – GW & RC to send out email/agenda to Governors who are able to attend regarding this Away Day.</p>
12. Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies agreed by all Governors 	
13. SEN TA Restructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BD started by saying that the historic TA structure had been organic and drifted into. • After much consultation the SEN TA structure has been reworked. TS noted that there had been a number of meetings and in depth discussions to re-grade staff and that the staff have taken ownership of this new structure. • BD said that the Trade Unions also approved of this restructure. • BD noted that this process had highlighted that there was no provision for children on the autistic spectrum. • BN said that not only was training important for TAs but also the opportunity for them to be able to meet with the teachers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A Grade B TA should also undertake basic training in Teaching and Learning. • BM stated that this had been taken into account – that they were aware of strengths and weaknesses of the 	

	<p>team. For example TAs taking on more of a welfare role – breakfast and before school club.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HC <i>asked if it was possible to make a requirement for literacy and numeracy skills for job.</i> • RB said that this could be a requirement for additional learning. • BM finished saying that there was now more flexibility in the new structure. 	
14. Staffing Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 2 minutes 	
15. Agreed Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Governors happy with actions. 	
16. Date of next meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd April 2014 5-7.30 pm 	
AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BD and TS noted it was good to see a musical being performed at the school. • Additionally TS wanted to say that the school and staff should be commended for their Ten Tors training in any weather – not all schools/staff are so dedicated. 	

Meeting finished at 8pm.

Summary of actions arising

Action 1 – RC to liaise with BD about corrections to minutes

Action 2 – BM to place pertinent issues for each section at the beginning of the section rather than the end – for next report

Action 3 – RC to ensure that time built into agenda for Gov meetings for training on Head Teacher’s Report and to record as training

Action 4 – BM to put Ofsted’s grading in next Head Teacher’s Report

Action 5 – RF to ask the TWT what they understand as ‘Delegated Governing Body’

Action 6 – RC to now send out T & L committee minutes to all

Action 7 – RC to send out reminder about Options Evening

Action 8 – RF to email the TWT report to the Governing Body

Action 9 – RF to speak to Debra Myhill to decide on how audit will happen

Action 10 – RC to find out when meeting at Sandy Park will occur and inform IR

Action 11 – GW & RC to send out email/agenda to Governors who are able to attend regarding this Away Day