

# RAVENSWOOD SCHOOL



## MINUTES OF THE FULL GOVERNORS MEETING 4.45pm – Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> May 2016

Ref	Agenda Item	Action by
1	<p><b>ATTENDANCE</b></p> <p>Philippa Clark (PC) (Headteacher) Mike Evans (Chair) Neil Brooksbank (NB) Cate Hill (CH) Jill Iles (JI) Stuart Iles (SI) Heather Pickstock (HP) Pam Pollard (PP) Graham Shrubsole (GS) Andy Thatcher (AT)</p> <p><b>School Officers</b></p> <p>Mark Senior (MS) Katie Barnes (KB)</p> <p>Dawn Perrett (Minutes) (DP)</p>	
2	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>Apologies received and accepted from Sally Crook (SC)</p>	
3	<p><b>DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTERESTS IN ANY AGENDA ITEM</b></p> <p>None declared</p>	
4	<p><b>A.O.B.</b></p> <p>ME Confidential Matter PC Tesco Bid PP GANS</p>	
5	<p><b>MINUTES OF MEETING – 30/03/16</b></p> <p>After the date of previous meeting and the spelling of Campus corrected, the minutes were accepted and signed as a true record of the meeting. ME said a copy would be sent to NS Governors Services, as usual.</p>	
6	<p><b>MATTERS ARISING FROM MEETING 30/3/16</b></p> <p>Action Points</p> <p>ME mentioned that he had not spoken to SI as he had managed to amend the School Financial Values Standard.</p> <p>PC reported that a meeting of the Esafety Committee is in hand.</p> <p>ME mentioned that things had progressed with Facebook and Twitter and hoping to go live with these later this year.</p> <p>PC mentioned that at the time of the last meeting part of the work at Westhaven to develop a specialist place accommodation was having difficulties on site. Ravenswood were asked to help out but since then a different solution has been found and we are no longer needed.</p> <p>PP asked if the Voyage Learning Campus was for pupils who had been excluded from all schools and how then would they fit in with us. PC said we would have worked on a solution but no longer needed to do so.</p>	

Ref	Agenda Item	Action by
7	<p><b>HEADTEACHERS REPORT</b></p> <p>PC reported that a lot has been achieved since December and up to April.</p> <p>Priority 1</p> <p>A lot of time has been spent working with staff and ensuring the strategies used in this school are consistency is very important.</p> <p>Learning without Limits is the latest ethos on how to teach. PC/MS have been attending lots of meetings on this. MS mentioned that the children are challenged to set their own challenging targets; they can choose. NB has been in class when this is put into practice and it's exhilarating to see, children choosing their own learning level.</p> <p>PC also mentioned that a lot of work has been happening within middle leadership.</p> <p>PC thanked AT for all the work done on Health and safety. Safeguarding, all up to date with training.</p> <p>Information to parents is being worked on and a lot is happening behind the scenes in readiness for documents to go on the website.</p> <p>Priority 2 and 4</p> <p>A lot is happening to support colleagues and improving the quality of teaching, enabling teachers to know their own strengths and how to improve on their weaknesses. MS/KB are working a lot with the Heads of departments, with some progress being seen.</p> <p>Parents evenings – again a lot going on behind the scenes on this.</p> <p>Priority 3 PC thanked KB and her team for the work done on behaviour and it is really improving across the years. A lot of work has been done on the all aspects of the child from personal development, dressing, mobility, relationships etc.</p> <p>Priority 5</p> <p>Plan for early years – development of child lead play and moving forward to enabling children to play with other children in different areas, creating community links.</p> <p>Priority 6</p> <p>Post 16 – similar progress being made with middle leadership. Developing of careers and work experience for the children. Brief discussions have taken place with senior leadership and some of the targets won't be achieved this year but will be the focus of next year's plan.</p> <p>Pupil Progress – the report shows that a lot of improvement has taken place. MS reported that the tracking system is really helpful but with some small cohorts, it only takes one child for the results to change the school evaluation. Discussions are happening with the teachers whose children require improvement and most of them have a reason for the lower result. SI asked what the difference between inadequate and good was. MS said it was 22% of not achieving. For example in a class of 8, it only takes 3 children to not make adequate it will show as inadequate. It is a fine line.</p> <p><b>Challenge question:</b></p> <p>Jl asked if the targets changed or do they stay consistent over the years?</p>	

Ref	Agenda Item	Action by
	<p>PC said they stay the same.</p> <p><b>Challenge question:</b> Post 16 why are so many in the red? Why have they not made the same progress?</p> <p>MS reported that there had been an issue in one class and this was being resolved.</p> <p><b>Challenge question:</b> JI asked how much time had been lost.</p> <p>MS stated that the problem had been highlighted in November and addressed straight away.</p> <p>The figures implied that it was more than one class that had not improved satisfactorily. PC reported that another class had had 3 teachers in a short space of time but now a full time teacher had been appointed. Some improvement had happened since December but not as much as the school would have liked.</p> <p>JI wanted it noted that she had real concern for Post 16 children.</p> <p>PC mentioned Senior Leaders are also concerned, particularly as progress was outstanding across Post 16 last year.</p> <p><b>Challenge question:</b> HP asked if there was anything the governors could do to assist and support the teachers and school with this problem.</p> <p>PC suggested perhaps the new permanent teacher may benefit from more time to submit her assessments.</p> <p>SI asked how many Post 16 students are new to the school? – about 4 so not a high percentage. There are 29 Post 16 students.</p> <p><b>Behaviour of pupils</b> 90.4% of pupils had made improvement in their behaviour. KB reported that a lot of improvement had occurred in reducing the use of the physical restraint/thinking room. A lot of training had been focused on how to respond to the child. The thinking room is used more as a room to cool down in rather than a restraint room. The figures have dropped dramatically.</p> <p>NB asked why there was a blip on MLD going from low to high. KB report that it was 2 children, with understandable reasons that had caused this.</p> <p>SI asked what the difference between high and low was. KB said high was more than 3 times, low was 2 or 3 and very low was 1 The figures show an average per child in the group.</p> <p>SI asked how 90.4% was measured. KB said the figure was no. of incidents per child and not just how many bands they had moved.</p> <p><b>Challenge question:</b> CH asked Post 16 restraint is a lot lower than other groups, is it linked to the inadequate learning figures. KB stated that it was only really 3 children who have incidents so no there is no link.</p>	<p>MS/KB to look and see if additional time for assessments may help new teacher.</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action by
	<p>ME asked if all students are going on to FE. PC said 1 was going into employment but the rest were going to college.</p>	
8	<p><b>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT LEAD PARTNER REPORT</b> PC reported that Mary Saunders had produced a report which was really useful and good to have someone external to evaluate what the school was doing. Huge progress has been made in three departments. KS4 report was not here that day. However, the evidence of progress in this department was lacking.</p> <p><b>Challenge question:</b> PP asked why under KS4 does it ways 'individual learning targets were not so evident and pupils were less able to say what they were learning. Why didn't they know what they were learning? MS said it was very disappointing but the problem had been highlighted and an action plan was in place.</p> <p><b>Challenge question:</b> PP asked what would be the follow up to the action plan. MS reported that there is a review meeting every 3 weeks to look at issues and how teaching and behaviour management can be improved.</p> <p><b>Challenge question:</b> PP noted that in Post 16 the report stated that there was a structure in place for recording their progress but it had not been updated. MS reported that a new teacher had started and the recording had not been done. The teacher acknowledged her mistake and it has now been rectified.</p> <p>HP said it was evident that being a teacher is a small part of what a teacher has to do these days with a lot of time spent on admin. ME said that Mary's report had been very positive.</p>	
9	<p><b>IMPACT OF 6 TRAINING DAYS.</b> ME reported that since notifying the parents of an extra training day no issues had been raised. He then thanked PC for her detailed report on what training had taken place. 70 staff had been to the training and found it very useful. The annual MAPA training takes up a day of training and so to have an extra day really helps. JI asked if all staff came to the training. PC said yes they had all come as they are contracted to do so. CH asked if the parents were notified as to what training was done on inset days as this would be helpful if parents knew. It was agreed that it would be mentioned in the newsletter. ME said the one key thing to him was that staff were fresh to training, as he had personal experience of being tired after a day's teaching and then had to do some INSET. ME mentioned that at present only 5 days were allocated to training for next year. PP proposed that 6 days were set aside again next year.</p>	<p>PC to inform parents of content of training days in newsletter <b>ME to write article for newsletter.</b></p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action by
	<p>CH seconded the proposal.</p> <p><b>A vote was taken and the governors unanimously agreed to this.</b></p>	
10	<p><b>CFR REPORT</b></p> <p>PC showed the accounts and mentioned that money is put into cost centres and they are linked to ledger codes. The accounts will be posted onto the website.</p> <p>SI asked what the difference was between fixed budget and current budget.</p> <p>PC said the fixed budget was set in April 2015 and the current budget was probably from March.</p> <p>SI asked why there was a big difference between Current and Actual budget. £2,000,000 and £2,200,000.</p> <p>PC said she would need to come back with an answer.</p> <p>SI also asked why E03 and E07 were so different, much bigger than budgeted.</p> <p>PC said she would check ledger codes.</p>	PC to check CFR figures
11	<p><b>APPROVAL OF BUDGET 2016-2017</b></p> <p>ME reported that the figures had been updated since the document was circulated. An updated budget was circulated. Staff costs should now read £1,827,643. ME also said that the budget was a snapshot and could change depends on number of children coming to school. ME reported that PC/PR/MS had spent a lot of time on this and he thanked them for their hard work.</p> <p>AT asked what was included in the estimated additional income.</p> <p>PC stated it included top up money and premium money. The school gets money for 108 children and then is topped up if more children attend but isn't reduced if it's less. The top up figure ranges from £6000 - £36000.</p> <p>SI it is hard to accept a budget when you don't have confidence in the figures.</p> <p>ME We are confident of the figures at this moment in time. According to the NGA, 10% of schools will submit a deficit budget this year.</p> <p>SI asked what happens if we go into deficit, we only have a small margin.</p> <p>PC said redundancies.</p> <p>AT said we could raise money in other ways.</p> <p>SI said he was worried about the budget</p> <p>HP asked if we have a reserve pot. PC said no we didn't, and if you do it could be clawed back.</p> <p><b>The governors unanimously agreed to adopt the budget.</b></p>	PC to submit approved budget to NS
12	<p><b>NORTH SOMERSET SEND STRATEGIC REVIEW</b></p> <p>PC mentioned that 3 years ago NS did a review of special schools and they want to do it again. There is a new proposal to look at SEND provision across NS. They are planning a visit in July but already running behind schedule. Mary Saunders will be part of the visit. 3 years ago NS focused on Post 16 and maybe we could look at developing early years.</p> <p>Jl said we need a vision so that we don't let them dictate to us.</p> <p>PC suggested we could expand Post 16</p>	

Ref	Agenda Item	Action by
	<p>SI asked if there was a lot of interest in this  PC reported that with no marketing there are 3 or 4 a year. West Haven have no real Post 16.  JI asked if we could carry on from the work done 3 years ago rather than start from scratch.  CH said it was frustrating that this began 3 years ago and nothing happened until now.  More to be done in the summer and autumn.</p>	
13	<p><b>EXPLORING MULTI-ACADEMY TRUSTS</b>  ME reported that PC/ME had been to lots of meetings and had a useful discussion with Mr Wade, Head of Nailsea School. A MAT can be set up with up to 5 schools, which gives us lots of possibilities in Nailsea. There are lots of things to consider like staff salaries, how governing bodies would work. We need to ensure that whatever path we take the school, staff, pupils and governors are taken into account.  JI asked what would happen if we didn't join a MAT  PC said that the government want all schools to join by 2022. Some schools are setting up in regions not counties.  ME suggested the best way forward was to join in a new MAT and not join an existing one.  GS asked if each MAT had their own governors or did each school have their own.  PC said that it depended on the structure chosen by the MAT  AT asked how was the budget worked out for a MAT  PC said there would be other channels available to gain money but the executive head would take at least 5% of the budget. There are huge decisions ahead.  SI asked how many schools were academies at present.  PC said in NS there were 60% Secondary Schools and 25% primary schools.  SI said we were limited who we could set up with.  It was suggested a special school MAT was contacted in Birmingham to get some advice.</p>	<p>PC/ME to continue to research MATs and keep governors informed.</p>
14	<p><b>CONCERNS RAISED BY STAFF – UPDATE</b>  ME reported that a letter had been sent to staff and a meeting had taken place on 22/4/16. ME had asked Sue Ivermee to write something for governors. It was agreed that ME circulate to staff via the Ravenswood Post.</p>	<p>ME to circulate message from Sue Ivermee via newsletter</p>
15	<p><b>REPORT FROM BUSINESS COMMITTEE 4/5/16</b>  No questions for GS re the meeting. GS said it was a good meeting and again thanked AP/AT for his H&amp;S document.  HP has spoken the man the bank about fundraising opportunities. It would be helpful if had specific item to raise money for. AT has list.  HP has written to Sainsburys and still awaiting reply.  HP has been to garden centre and is hoping to receive wheelbarrows soon. They are happy to give away broken bags of compost and plants for the allotment. We would look at this again in Autumn.  HP said she had sent an email to ME about setting up a Ravenswood Partners Scheme, where companies could be business partners and help with fund raising, work on projects etc.  <b>JOURNALS AND VIREMENTS</b> none.</p>	

Ref	Agenda Item	Action by
16	<b>REPORT FROM PUPIL COMMITTEE</b> No questions but JI should be listed under apologies.	
17	<b>MONITORING OF SAFEGUARDING</b> PC reported that Julie Davis had produced a good set of data which was easy to follow. PP asked if the online safety booklet could have an issue number on it. PC report that no number was needed as there was only ever one copy available.	
18	<b>REPORT FROM SWLC</b> PC reported that lots of activities had taken place. The French trip and sports activities. There will be a Duke of Edinburgh challenge coming up with pupils, teachers and parents being encouraged to take part. Hoping to have more contact with parents and pupils from Westhaven and Baytree Schools, with them coming to some of our events and visa versa.	PC - arrange for Ravenswood events to be advertised to parents and families at Westhaven and Baytree.
19	<b>TESCO BID</b> PC mentioned that we are applying for money to improve ground works of up to £12,000, with suggestions for a go-kart track. PC/AP/ME have been looking into this and have quotes. Application needs to be in on Friday 27 <sup>th</sup> May.	
20	<b>POLICIES FOR APPROVAL</b> None	
21	<b>CORRESPONDANCE</b> None	
22	<b>AOB</b> ME a confidential matter was discussed after school staff had left and it was approved.	ME to write letter
	<b>DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING</b> 4.45 pm Wednesday 20 <sup>TH</sup> JULY 2016	
	<b>MEETING CLOSED AT 6.55pm</b>	

**SIGNED..... DATED .....**