



Cambridgeshire
County Council



**Meeting of the Full Governing Body of Castle School
held Monday 7th March 2016 at 6.00 pm in the School**

Present: Mary Langran (Chair) (MLa),
Nick Brenton (Vice Chair) (NB),
Carol McCarthy (Head Teacher) (CM),

John Bastable (JB),
Helen Dolling (HD),
Kate Dove (KD),
Janice Frankham (JF),
Elvira Spronck (ES).

In Attendance: Sally Hempson (School Business Manager)
Ann Trenchard (Camclerk) (AT)
Carol Rule (CR)
Peter Nemes (PN)

The meeting started at 6.00pm and was quorate.

1.	Welcome & Apologies for Absence <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ML welcomed governors to the meeting.• Apologies were accepted from: Jane Elliott-Poxon, Leslie Leech and Mark Littlewood.
2.	Declarations of Interest regarding items on the Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
3.	eSafety and Acceptable Use Policy –This statutory policy is for formal approval. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CR introduced the GB to the eSafety and Acceptable use policy so far.• CR noted that schools are being encouraged to have eSafety challenges, and members of their community acting as champions. A Slideshow created by a pupil was presented to the GB as an example of such championing taking place in the school already.• It was also noted that there are currently 2 eSafety lessons at the start of

each term.

- School needs to have an Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) that accompanies the eSafety policy. It was noted that there were elements of overlap with the code of conduct.
- The Head added to Carol's presentation: the amount of information available increases regularly. Safeguarding work increases. It was challenging to create a succinct Castle document rather than a large safeguarding file. The eSafety kit grows daily, including a basic checklist and advice and guidance on other policies. The head felt that the policy needed some additional fine tuning, the next step being to create an AUP.
- A governor challenged the policy's apparent lack of coverage of the Prevent strategy. CR replied that there was a filtering system with firewalls that prevented staff, visitors and pupils (p5) accessing materials including extremist material. The Head acknowledged the need to be able to cross reference this with other training, signposting the Prevent elements.
- CR indicated that the list at the back was still developing. This was because of the need to include input from so many members of staff – it is not limited to a single member of staff. The Head emphasised that the wider audience will read and comment, but that they would invest in carrying out the policy rather than contributing further to its development.
- Another governor indicated that he felt that the board's ownership came from whether or not it signed off on it. He questioned the generalisations on eSafety, which he felt it was more of a position, a statement, rather than a policy as it lacked rules guiding how staff and pupils would conduct themselves. The Head agreed that further work was needed. The governors indicated that they would be happy to accept it as a work in progress – a first draft.
- It was felt that a governor should work with CR on the next draft. The Chair indicated that the GB was looking for an umbrella document that outlines who is responsible for what. A governor offered to share an example of a previous policy that the board had ratified. It was recognised that the eSafety policy that had previously been ratified needed to be updated.
- JB volunteered to support CR further. He suggested that he ask Sarah Roberts for further support. CR indicated that she would also contact Sally Elding.
- The Head suggested that Carol be given some non-contact time to enable her to give the policy the time and attention it needs to develop. The Chair questioned the feasibility of doing so. The Head reiterated that time

	would need to be found.
4.	<p>Behaviour Management Policy - This statutory policy is for formal approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PN gave an overview of Behaviour Management in the school. • PN summed up his position on behaviour management with the image of a treadmill of challenging behaviour – there are three stages – in the red (climbing up hill with no view at all) in the yellow (closer to the top) or in the green (walking down hill with a nice view, feeling we have wiggle room and being able to get back into the green if something were to come up). The model can be applied to the individual, the class, or indeed the whole school. PN reported that it is a school staffs’ job to do what they can to get a school into the green. When in the red, the increased stress leads to issues for both staff and pupils. • PN emphasised the need to be proactive rather than reactive in approaching behaviour, whilst acknowledging the difficulties in doing so. He acknowledged that all behaviour is a form of communication – “my pad needs changing”; “my history includes DV, and so when I get stressed I can’t regulate my moods and my anxiety levels go through the roof” or “I’m worried that I won’t go home again”. Everyone is a “wheel of needs” - we all need to eat, know our purpose, feel important. If needs are not being met it is challenging to function. There was a long slide discussing proactive approaches. • Planning based on accurate assessment of pupils’ academic, communication... • Wanted to move away from just considering behaviour management. • Considered two of the monitoring systems. • Schools need to look at behaviour incidents – breaches of H&S generate an incident form. There were about 950 forms in the last year, each time a form is completed it is logged on a database, that records which pupil has had what sorts of incidents, and the number of occasions restraint holds(?) were used. The data is also logged by date, enabling the member of staff accessing the spreadsheet to see who was involved on a given day. • The speaker reported that of the top 13 challenging pupils, the vast majority’s number of incidents decreased. • A governor asked a question about the sorts of behaviour captured. PN indicated that the school had tried to expand on the definition of behaviour, considering whether a behaviour is helping a child to learn or not. Therefore behaviours where children are disengaged from activities and lesson are also recorded as they cause concerns.

- A governor asked who contributed to reports. PN confirmed that all members of staff wrote reports, and then they are filtered by senior teachers before they arrive to PN for processing.
- PN showed the GB a chart indicating how pupils were engaging. Ticks indicated that pupils were participating, T = threatening. Other behaviours noted included not listening and sleeping. This enables staff to notice patterns, the Head citing examples where she had then been able to support pupils to manage their own behaviours effectively.
- PN then showed the governors his engagement database. Pupils can get up to 29 ticks in a day. Data broken down into half termly averages. Data can be sorted and this enables the team to identify problem areas.
- A governor asked how often the forms are completed. PN indicated that the forms were completed every day for every pupil. Peter indicated that it was a rough science, the data was soft. The Head indicated that it gave teachers a tool to talk to students about their behaviours. PN indicated that it enabled staff to go into meetings with graphs, enabling them to highlight good and bad days – enabling staff to be more objective in their recognition and identification of problems and issues.
- PN indicated that some pupils had had these for the last few years. Graphs enabled members of staff to see a trend over the year, giving staff perspective and a larger context regarding pupils' behaviours. It also allowed teachers to praise pupils by highlighting times when they have made progress, rather than focusing on the occasions when they did not.
- PN felt that more and more members of staff were starting to use analytical language to describe behaviour, he felt that this change was being led by pupils.
- A governor asked whether the data was analysed in context of communication(?) ability. PN replied that it was recognised that “engagement” was different for each child, and allowances are made as a result of this recognition of one size does not fit all. Improvement for some may mean better communication, for others it would be more structure. For others, they may need a more enjoyable/engaging curriculum.
- PN discussed four case studies. The data enabled pupils to keep incidents in perspective – not feel victimised when they needed to be discussed because the behaviour and not the child per se is the focus. The data enabled staff to identify the causes of pupils falling asleep – after particular activities, for instance.
- Tick charts are now also being sent home, with parents being asked to focus on the positives to improve communication. Similarly, the charts are being used to improve communications with external staff.

- A governor asked how often parents saw the charts. It was reported that parents saw them as often as they requested them – some more than others. The charts were not always to alert parents to negative behaviour, but also being used to celebrate positive behaviours. Charts are also being used to motivate children, by taking a positive approach to the chart's use; "You got 12 ticks today, let's try and get 13 tomorrow!"
- Engagement charts enabled a pupil who was in denial/unable to reflect on his behaviour to do so, leading to improved behaviour.
- PN has started doing a Behaviour Matters newsletter this year. 95% of Castle pupils score 25 ticks per day. A governor asked whether it was on the website. Another asked for whom the letter it was. Peter confirmed that it was not yet on the website, and that the letter was available for all in the school, with families able to access an anonymised version through the website.
- A governor asked whether interventions were included. PN confirmed that they went into the behaviour support plans.
- A governor asked whether it would be useful to have an aggregated report broken down by phase. PN indicated that he did not do that as children were so individual. A governor wanted to know what the school was doing to try to achieve that perfect 29 across all pupils. PN indicated that he would be happy to do this, as he felt the data was the key to achieving better behaviour. PN explained how the tick charts evidenced the changes.
- The Chair acknowledged how hard the school is working on behaviour management. The possibility of a negative impact of a single low lying element on the data due to the small sample sizes was acknowledged.
- The Head commented that the recording was one thing, the other was the provenance. It was noted that behaviours may be diagnosis led, or the result of issues at home that the school can support with. She acknowledged that this was a tool to build children's and families' resilience to such issues, rather than to cure them.
- A governor sought clarification about whether the data could be used to identify whether there are events happening each half term that the governors ought to be concerned by. PN confirmed that this was a possibility.
- A governor commented on being impressed that the number of challenging incidents had dropped VERY significantly over the course of a term for new starters. Discussion developed into remarks about peaks at transitions between KS2 and 3. The Head commented on the enablement

	<p>of the tool to tell a behaviour story. The Chair commented on their utility for pupils' lives outside of school, after Castle. It has potential utility when working with Adult Services' Transitions Team (16-25), who take a very data-led approach. Similarly when a child needs to be relocated to an additional or alternative placement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A governor questioned whether staff had fed-back about the labour intensiveness of the charts. PN emphasised that the charts do not need to be completed at the time. Peter commented that some teachers chose to record only incidents or moments of non-engagement, and that blank squares on forms were therefore interpreted as ticks. • It was hoped that the tool could be used again (having been used in the past) to support funding discussions. • The Chair recognised that NB's governor visit confirmed Peter's data. • A governor asked whether the Positive touch and Physical Interventions policies would be reviewed. The Head commented that they did not need to review them in the immediate future. • The Head discussed the need for confidentiality. The Head asked for specific questions about this to go straight to her rather than through other forums due to the confidential nature of the data. • The GB was happy to unanimously approve the Behaviour policy. It was formerly approved.
--	---

Minutes:

<p>5.</p>	<p>Minutes of the meeting held on 5th October 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes had previously been circulated for review. The user-friendliness of the minutes was positively commented on, though a couple of minor corrections were noted. <p style="text-align: center;">Clerk to correct the minutes to reflect that Refit is the programme, and Bouygues is the company's name.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Clerk to also correct the number of incidents noted in the Personal Development Welfare part of the Head's report was corrected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Head raised an issue with point 1, and the need to manage potential parent governors' expectations regarding the workload. The Head felt it was important to make it a requirement of the process that parent governors talk to existing parent governors. This was echoed by another governor, who felt that candidates learned more about the responsibilities of the role only after agreeing to take them on. It was generally felt that suitable management of candidates' expectations would make succession planning easier and lead to more positive experiences.
------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are currently 2 vacancies, and there has been one 1 applicant so far. The process is on hold for the time being as the school will be advertising. • The Chair suggested that candidates met with her and the Head, attended a meeting, and had a one-to-one with an existing parent governor prior to applying. The need to ensure that parents understand a governor's strategic role with the aim of benefitting the school as a whole was emphasised. A governor mentioned that some schools had a governors' handbook that they need to read before being appointed to manage their expectations. <p style="text-align: center;">Clerk to circulate the governance handbook link to all governors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The possibility of having a governors' party was raised. It was suggested that the matter of recruitment could be combined with a more relaxed social event. The Head suggested that it could be accommodated prior to a FGB with an early start. • The GB acknowledged how difficult it was to recruit; the last recruitment event at a parents evening led to 4 candidates, only 1 of which went on to the next stage. The Head noted that we've time to put ideas together for the next FGB. The topic will be added to the next FGB agenda.
5.	<p>Matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting held on 25th January 2016</p> <p>3 – Update re. Bouygues' Desk Top Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was confirmed that the LA had given the go ahead for the school to receive a loan and so the school had progressed onto the next stage. The school is now waiting for Phil (who was this?) to confirm a time and date for the next meeting, where members of Bouygees will return to the school to discuss the technical side of Refit project. <p>6 - Chelsea's choice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Head reported back to the GB that the selected pupils had participated in the trip, and completed the pre and post-work, on the play that raised awareness of child sexual exploitation. The Head noted that the pupils and the accompanying staff had survived. <p>7 – update re Staff Retention working group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that JEP was unable to attend the FGB. The Chair indicated that she would catch up with JEP on this later after attending the staff retention course. Points about advertising were raised, with governors noting that the LA was in the process of setting up Service Level Agreements to advertise on the county's website for about £2.5k. <p>8 – update re School Website working group</p>

- The Head reported that she was still finalising the arrangements for an all-day meeting that will take place on 25th April where potential contractors will come in to give presentations on what they can offer the school. The Head voiced that governors were most welcome; that there would be two presentations in the morning, three in the afternoon and a suitable gap prior to the FGB that evening..

Head to circulate further details about the all-day meeting.

9 – update re GB training on Assessment without levels – CU/AH?

- The Head will be discussing it at the KIT (?) visit, and with Carol Underwood. It was felt that whether it is appropriate to have training on assessment without levels will depend on whether P levels will still exist after the Rocheforte report. Castle will not using B squared. Castle is currently using Casper to build up a profile. Caroline Underwood has asked the school to host a conference on this (Casper? Building profiles?) here. The Head recommends that the school waits until Rocheforte is finished, perhaps in the Autumn term, before this topic is addressed. Although there are no further details yet, it was reported that further information would trickle through to the GB in the Head’s reports.

Governor Development:

6. Governor Visits Spring Term

Governor Visits – reports for sharing, discussion and evaluation.

The Head had received brief feedback from most of the governors who had already visited the school. The link between governor scrutiny and external scrutiny was noted. It was generally felt that the first round had resulted in a series of Incredibly positive visits, which the school enjoyed.

The school is very pleased with the reports – both in terms of scrutiny they evidenced/enabled, and in seeing how effectively the school communicates what it does.

The Head reported that the school was very appreciative of governors’ time, interest and knowledge – positivity that was also expressed by the governors in relation to the staff and pupils at Castle.

A governor fed back from the Governor’s conference regarding the Ofsted talk, noting the similarities between governors’ visits and the new style of Ofsted inspections. It was suggested that NB’s pupil trail was particularly helpful to understanding the state of a Castle pupil’s “student journey” at this point in time, and that it would be very similar to what a second inspector would actually do whilst formulating their report on the school. The GB expressed their appreciation of the utility of their visits to Castle.

	<p>It was noted that most of the governors who had visited had expressed a desire for another visit to the school, and that some were already actively planning their next visit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See point 5 for minutes regarding parent governor recruitment.
<p>7.</p>	<p>Planning Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Head felt there was a need to regroup and reflect before considering what the second round of visits ought to focus on and how they should take place. • Head's next Q – what's the next stage? Where do we go next? What do govs want to ask Q?s about? What do the govs need to know? Not just so it's ofsted driven – but they do offer pertinent Q?s. JM commented that govs needed to know school's top 5 priorities and 5 weaknesses/areas for development. What makes us special, and what makes us unique. This to be added to the next agenda? • The Head indicated that the school's priorities were outlined in the School Development Plan (SDP). The Head asked governor's to look at the SDP and comment on this in relation to the governor's questions. <p style="text-align: center;">Head to email out the school development plan. Governors to consider their next visits to the school in relation to topics and issues raised in the SDP.</p>
<p>Committee Work:</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Minutes of the Finance and Personnel Committee meeting held on 8th February 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a meeting on the 21st March with the LA regarding the school budget. The school is expect Martin Wade, Rob Cottil and possibly also Judith Davis to attend. The school had asked the LA, through the school's financial advisor, what support would be available for the school given its predicted budget. • It was noted that next year's budget is not looking good either and the Chair warned that the deficit could be worse than 200k previously predicted. • There is a possibility that schools may be able to get loans in anticipation of the new fairer funding issues. At this point in time, however, the Chair could not recall where she'd read it – possibly in the editorial of the TES. It was noted that the loan for the next stage of the Refit project had been agreed. • Two spelling errors in the minutes were acknowledged (Jane's name, and the word clarify).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next Finance and Personnel meeting is on the <u>18th April.</u>
<p>9.</p>	<p>S.F.V.S. – for formal approval prior to submission to the local authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A governor asked who we benchmark against. SH acknowledged that it is against schools in the area, and then nationally. It was acknowledged that Rob(?) usually did this and that the information is/will go on the website. The matter will be on the next F&P agenda, along with numbers 14 (benchmarking) and 1 (Financial skills check for governors). The GB acknowledged the new requirement of number 25 for the school to have a business continuity plan. The Head indicated that she would like to see an example of one, and to have obtained further advice before they did so. SH acknowledged that Rob (Coteril?) had sent three templates. It was felt that there would be a need to duplicate work already done on how to set up a new school. The Head and governors expressed more immediate concerns over where the teachers and students would go in the event of an extreme event, which was down to the LA to answer. It was felt that the school could not do the business continuity plan until it had access to this information. It was generally agreed that the school has more complex needs (space, equipment) that depend on other fundamental issues. It was also noted that the Head was waiting for a continuity plan to appear on the Key. It was felt that most of the information would be in the critical incident form. It was generally felt that this was a matter that could wait, and that the GB would try to deal with it by the end of the year. A governor asked why the LA had not created it. It was recognised that academies had to have them, and the introduction of the need for LA schools to now have them also was a part of the process of a larger national drive towards academisation.
<p>10.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ZIT visit to go to FGB in June. The Clerk brought the CAP to the board's attention. It was noted that the school gained money from the partnership it is the only specialist school in the partnership. The Head indicated that although she believed she had already read and signed the agreement, she would check, and the document was signed by the Chair. Parent governors (see point 5) It was noted that the member of staff released to go to Bedford University to complete a part-time Primary PGCE over the course of a year at the last FGB was on the primary side of the school. The Head had since received a second request on the secondary side of the school to enable

	<p>a member of staff to complete a BA honours applied Ed Studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the member of staff was unable to transfer her credits and would therefore need to leave early on a Tuesday for the next year. The Head felt it would be feasible to accommodate both members of staff on this occasion, but that was all we could manage this academic year. She noted that there would be scope for supporting other members of staff similarly next year. • The governors agreed that there was a need to “grow our own” teachers. It was felt that we’d benefit from the activities. The governors unanimously approved the request without reservations. • The Head reported running the half marathon in just over 2 hours along with other members of staff. Phil managed it in 1 hour 38; Jez (who had a cold) in 2 hours 3. (Do you want this minuted? If so, what about the other member of staff’s time also?)
11.	<p>Items for the Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2016/17 Budget for ratification. • Equality and Diversity Policy • Parent Governor Recruitment – a formal discussion on how best to recruit 2-3 new parent governors.
12.	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>Monday 25th April 2016</p>

Meeting closed at 8.10.

Signed Date.....