

## CAMDEN'S CENTRE FOR LEARNING

### GOVERNING BODY

### MINUTES OF MEETING

Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> October 2016 at 5pm

CO-OPTED (13)	LOCAL AUTHORITY (1)	ASSOCIATE MEMBERS
Tony Burgess, <b>Chair</b>	Adam Kybird (part meeting)	Robert Specterman*
Jonny Bucknell*		Chris Jackson*
Gaby Thomas		Hilary Forbes*
Liz Rattue		
Wendy Eager*		
Brenda Maragh		
Rosemary Smith		
Victoria Bowes*		
Catherine Getz*		
Sandra Wallman		
Simone Paul		
STAFF (2)	PARENTS (3)	OTHERS PRESENT
Jeanette Lowe, <b>Director of CCfL</b>	Jackie Poole*	Graham Watson – <b>Clerk</b>
Ashley Summercorn*	Maggie Harvey*	
		<b>*Denotes Absence</b>

	ITEM	ACTION
<b>1.</b>	<b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b>	
	The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting. Apologies were received and noted from Jonny Bucknell, Catherine Getz, Victoria Bowes and Ashley Summercorn.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA</b>	
	There were no declarations of interests.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 7<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2016</b> (circulated)	
	<p>The Chair reported that Ruth Bromley had resigned before the previous meeting, and therefore her name should be removed from the list of governors on the minutes. Subject to this amendment the minutes of the previous meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2016 were approved as a true and accurate record and would be signed by the Chair at the end of the meeting.</p> <p><b>Matters arising:</b></p> <p><b>Item 3.3)</b> The Director reported that the comparative data available from Camden and the DfE was limited. She had found some data on a DfE website but generally relevant comparative data was scarce. Helen McNulty, Camden's senior SEND Adviser had been unable to obtain data nationally. The Director</p>	

	<p>had spoken to Camden's Data Consultant, Kellyanne Wray, regarding RAISEonline data and she was happy to do a presentation for governors at a future Governing Body meeting. It was an area of which governors should be aware. It was <b>AGREED</b> that she would liaise with Kellyanne to arrange a possible date.</p> <p><b>Q Was comparative data relevant eg to an Ofsted Inspection?</b> Some comparative data was relevant eg Deprivation and PRU attendance data. Because the PRU and Special School was an integrated provision comparisons were difficult. Comparative data of integrated provision was not produced nationally, and every local authority organised this provision in its own way. Ofsted were aware of this and would take this into account during an inspection, often preferring internal data produced by CCfL.</p> <p>The minutes were received.</p>	<b>Director</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>GOVERNORS PLANNING MEETING 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2016</b> (circulated)	
<p><b>4.1</b></p> <p><b>4.2</b></p> <p><b>4.3</b></p>	<p>The Chair reported on the Planning Meeting which had taken place on 13<sup>th</sup> September.</p> <p>At the meeting governors discussed the imminent Ofsted Inspections at the Special School and both PRUs.</p> <p>An invitation to Pete Dudley, Camden's Director of Education for Aspiration and Achievement, had been confirmed and the meeting took place at the KS3 School on 27<sup>th</sup> September.</p> <p>Gaby Thomas reported that she <b>had</b> attended an Ofsted Briefing in Camden. It was a general briefing for headteachers and was mainly geared towards the Primary sector. General points arising from the meeting had already been planned for by CCfL.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>GOVERNANCE OF THE SCHOOL</b> (circulated)	
<b>5.1</b>	<p><b><u>Committee and Governor Responsibilities</u></b></p> <p>At the Planning meeting the Chair had outlined a revised structure around committees and individual governor responsibilities. This involved committees becoming the main focus for detailed work of governance, with particular responsibilities for writing and updating policies and monitoring aspects of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) relevant to the committee's terms of reference. Individual responsibilities of governors would derive from their membership of committees and would be guided by decisions made by the committee on how best to monitor their individual areas of the SIP.</p> <p>The format of the list of committee and governor responsibilities would be retained, but would work to the new structure and roles.</p> <p>The following Link governor responsibilities were <b>AGREED</b>,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simone Paul to be link governor for Child Protection and Safeguarding;</li> <li>• Rosemary Smith to be link governor for SEND;</li> </ul> <p>The Chair agreed to retain his responsibility for monitoring the school website, and Brenda Maragh would provide school support. This was becoming an increasing area of work due to statutory government requirements to record data on school websites. The Director said that the website was updated every half term. Gaby Thomas suggested devising a pro</p>	

5.2	<p>forma for the School Data Manager to send to staff for suggested updates to the website. The Director said that this issue will be discussed at a staff meeting the following day.</p> <p>The Clerk reported that the DfE had set up a new section for governor data on its Edubase website. It required details of all governors, including details of the appointing body, date of appointment and term of office. Also required (but not for publication) were details of each governor's post code, date of birth and nationality.</p> <p>Governors expressed some concern at the information required and requested the Clerk to ascertain why this data was required.</p> <p>The Clerk also reported that there was a statutory requirement for schools to record on the school website individual governor attendance over the last academic year. It was <b>AGREED</b> the Clerk would forward some examples.</p> <p>The Chair reported that the governor Code of Conduct would be amended to incorporate the additional statutory responsibilities. The amended draft would be circulated to governors and the agreed document will be submitted for signature at the next governing body meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> December.</p> <p><b><u>Governing Body Membership and Vacancies</u></b></p> <p>The Chair reported that Ed Magee had stepped down as an associate member of the governing body</p> <p>He was currently looking into filling the governing body vacancies by contacting 'Inspiring Governance', an organisation which matched potential governors with interested schools. The Director reported that she would gauge interest from parents in becoming parent governors at the next Parents Open Day on 4<sup>th</sup> November. It was suggested that a member of the multi agency teams be considered as a co-opted governor. It was <b>AGREED</b> that the Director would approach the managers of the teams to gauge interest.</p>	<p><b>Director</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Chair</b></p> <p><b>Director</b></p>
5.3	<p><b><u>Governor Skills Audit</u></b></p> <p>The Clerk collected completed skills audit forms from governors who were present. Those governors who had not completed the forms would be requested to do so.</p>	<p><b>Chair/Clerk</b></p>
5.4	<p><b><u>Register of Governors Interests</u></b></p> <p>The Clerk collected completed 'register of interests' forms from those governors who were present. Governors who had not forwarded their complete form would be asked to do so.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Adam Kybird joined the meeting</i></p>	<p><b>Chair/Clerk</b></p>
6.	<p><b>ATTAINMENT AND STANDARDS REPORT</b> (circulated)</p>	
	<p>The Director presented her Report supported by Gaby Thomas and Liz Rattue. The format of the Report followed the main Ofsted headings.</p>	

<p>5.1</p>	<p>The following points were highlighted,</p> <p><b><u>Characteristics of Students</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were 98 students on roll in the last academic year; 41 students attending KS3, and 57 students attending KS4. There were increasing numbers educated on site due to better facilities and resources.</li> <li>• Girls continued to be in the minority, accounting for 24% of the school roll.</li> <li>• The number of students eligible for free school meals (FSM) had been increased from 48% last year to 59%. The Camden average was 27%.</li> <li>• There were a significantly high proportion of students who have statutory social care involvement, with 43% in 2015-16.</li> <li>• 21% of the school population last year were classed as CIN and 11% had a Child Protection Plan; this compared to 26% classed as CIN in 2014-15. In contrast, the average number of students with a Child Protection Plan in Camden was 1%.</li> <li>• A total of 11% of CCfL students were identified as LAC on roll compared to only 0.6% in Camden as a whole. In 2015-16 all but one of the LAC students at CCfL were placed in Specialist Children's Homes due to the complexity of their difficulties. <b>Q What was the difference in the FSM and LAC data between the Special School and PRUs?</b> At the KS3 PRU 39% of students were eligible for FSM; 64% with statutory social care involvement; and 4% LAC. The breakdown for the KS4 PRU was 43%, 32% and 12% respectively. The breakdown for the Special School was 79%, 45% and 15% respectively.</li> </ul>	
<p>5.2</p>	<p><b><u>Leadership and Management</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All 3 schools were due Ofsted Inspections. The Camden Professional Partner, Mark Vickers, has undertaken monitoring visits and is due in again this term. The Director will circulate his report when complete.</li> <li>• Whole school objectives included achieving best practice in teaching and learning; participation in learning communities; developing appropriate curriculum pathways to meet the needs of the students, including those with complex needs, to ensure appropriate accreditation and progression in post 16 pathways; a new approach to coaching. <b>Q What are 'learning communities?'</b> They were groups of staff sharing and disseminating best practice, observing and learning from each other.</li> <li>• There were some gaps in support staff provision due to long term staff absences, but these would be resolved shortly.</li> <li>• Feedback from parents was very good, and feedback from students was generally positive. 100% of students reported that their behaviour had improved. <b>Q Do you compare similar data from other</b></li> </ul>	<p>Director</p>

5.3	<p><b>schools?</b> The Director replied that she was not sure if this data was published. 'Parent View' published surveys only if sufficient parents responded. At CCfL few parents had computers and therefore surveys were distributed by hand. She will look at school websites to see if their surveys were published.</p> <p><b>Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Liz Rattue reported that the Senior Leadership Team were looking at differentiation, focussing on students' needs.</li> <li>In KS4 lessons were 'good' or 'outstanding'. In KS3 lessons were also generally 'good' or 'outstanding'. Two teachers who required improvement had since left the school.</li> <li>It was hoped the new Learning Communities will improve this performance even further. <b>Q Who makes the assessments?</b> Senior leaders within the school, assisted by the Camden Professional Partner, Mark Vickers, who moderated the assessments.</li> </ul>	Director
5.4	<p><b>Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall there was a dip in attendance from previous years to 75%, which was disappointing. The main issues were persistent absence for a small cohort of very complex students and absence due to poor punctuality. Students are marked as absent if they arrive after the registers close at 9.45am. However, this still compares well with national average absence of PRUs compiled by the DfE of 68.5%. The school needed to look at the overall figures for London.</li> <li>Attendance rates without including lates after 9.45am was 81%, which was still higher than the national average. <b>Q How many students was this?</b> The Director replied that she did not yet have this data but would compile and inform governors. <b>Q What were the reasons for the drop in attendance?</b> There was a more complex cohort, and a particularly high proportion of non attenders amongst LAC students. Further work was required to drill down on the reasons for the dip in attendance. <b>Q Could the LAC attendance data be examined in more detail to look at reasons for the drop in attendance?</b> Yes this would be done and the data supplied to governors.</li> <li>Although the number of exclusions had increased the number of days lost has decreased. This was due to the school's policy of reducing the number of longer term exclusions to minimise the impact on students' education.</li> <li>The data also showed the number of repeat exclusions.</li> </ul>	LR  Director  Director
5.5	<p><b>Outcomes for Children and Learners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Special School there was a small cohort this year. 50% of students achieved A*-C grades at GCSE; an increase from 33% in 2015. Although this was very good, because of the small cohort it was difficult to extrapolate trends</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the PRU the school achieved its first ever grade A* GCSE, which was in Spanish. The percentage of students achieving grades A*-G increased in all categories from last year. Every student achieved 3 A*-G grades, including English and maths, which was up from 94% the previous year.</li> <li>• Students generally achieved higher rates of attainment in non-core subjects. They do better if testing is based on course work rather than examinations. Results at GCSE were particularly good and have been consistent over several years.</li> <li>• The Senior Leadership Team tried to ensure qualifications offered by CCfL were on the Ofsted approved list and suitable for students. <b>Q Did students choose subjects in which they excelled or those which would give them a better chance of finding employment?</b> Students needed to consider both aspects. CCfL staff gave students guidance in this area.</li> <li>• There were no attainment gaps between Pupil Premium and non Pupil Premium students.</li> <li>• Whole school pupil progress across all 3 core subjects has remained broadly in line with last year. Over two thirds of all students made at least expected progress across English, Maths and Science.</li> <li>• Y11 students had made good progress during the year. However, this had not generally been reflected in examinations. Staff, led by Curriculum Leads, needed to improve students' information retention skills and primary understanding.</li> <li>• Assessment was based on the new assessment model developed at the school. All students were making better than expected progress. However, staff needed to interrogate the data and determine if the learning trajectories were optimised for each student. <b>Q Are staff able to map student attainment from the time they start at CCfL?</b> Yes; KS2 baseline data was available to staff when a student came on roll; and progress and attainment could be mapped during their time at CCfL.</li> <li>• 40% of students were reintegrated into mainstream education, compared to 13% last year.</li> </ul> <p>On behalf of the Governing Body the Chair thanked the Director and Heads for the presentation and their input into the Report. It reflected very good work and effort by all staff. The Report was received.</p>	
7.	<b>ISSUES FOR GOVERNOR DISCUSSION</b> (circulated)	
	<p><b><u>Impact of White Paper: Meeting with Pete Dudley</u></b></p> <p>The Chair reported that at the meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> September Mr Dudley had given a presentation on the implications of the Government White Paper for Camden and CCfL. He felt it was a useful meeting but outcomes were still unclear and required more clarity regarding government legislation.</p>	

	<p>The Director reported that she would be meeting the Head of SEN Funding the following week and would discuss this issue with her.</p> <p>Governors agreed that it would be beneficial to the school and increase their knowledge to arrange more visits to the school. It was therefore <b>AGREED</b> that governors would email school staff in their areas of responsibility to arrange meetings.</p>	<p><b>Director</b></p> <p><b>All governors</b></p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES</b> (circulated)	
	<p>The Chair referred governors to the minutes of the Curriculum, Pastoral and School Improvement Committee, and Finance, Staffing and Remuneration Committee which had previously been circulated.</p> <p>The minutes were received.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>	
	There were no matters of health and safety to discuss.	
<b>10.</b>	<b>CHAIR'S/GOVERNORS ITEMS</b>	
	There were no Chair's or Governors' items.	
<b>11.</b>	<b>STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE ITEMS</b>	
	There were no additional issues of PRU governance to be considered.	
<b>12.</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
	There was no other business.	
<b>13.</b>	<b>CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS</b>	
	There were no confidential items to discuss.	
<b>14.</b>	<b>MEETINGS SCHEDULE FOR 2016/2017</b> (circulated)	
	<p>The meetings schedule for 2016/2017 was confirmed.</p> <p>The next full governing body meeting will be on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> December 2016 at the KS4 School Agincourt Road.</p>	

There being no further matters to discuss, the Chair thanked all for attending and for their work throughout the year. The meeting was closed at 7.00pm.

Signed:  Date: 06-12-2016

**Tony Burgess, Chair of Camden's Centre for Learning Governing Body**