

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Strategic Governing Body of  
Breakwater Academy and High Cliff Academy  
Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> April 2018 @ 6pm at High Cliff Academy**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
Helen Hewitt (HH)	Co-opted STEP Governor (Chair)	Present
Johnie Davies (JD)	Co-opted STEP Governor	Absent
Cliff Robinson (CR)	Co-opted STEP Governor	Present
Helen Day (HD)	Co-opted STEP Governor	Apologies
David Laird (DL)	Co-opted STEP Governor	Present
Ian Rogers (IR)	Head Teacher, Breakwater Academy	Present
Becky Viner-Waite (BVW)	Staff Governor, Breakwater Academy	Present
Abby Kilgarriff (AK)	Head Teacher, High Cliff Academy	Apologies
Becky Packham (BP)	Staff Governor, High Cliff Academy	Present
Brendan Clemens (BC)	Parent Governor, High Cliff Academy	Present
<b>Other Attendees</b>		
John Halliwell (JH)	STEP Executive Head Teacher	Present
Jennese Alozie (JA)	STEP Head of Standards	Present
Sally Franceschi (SF)	Deputy Head Teacher, Breakwater Academy	Present
Jackie Wales (JW)	Business Manager, BWA and HCA	Present
Sarah Morgan (SM)	Clerk to the SGB	Present

<u>No.</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Action</u>
<b>STEP First – We are all one Team</b>		
<b>1</b>	<p><b><u>Welcome, Apologies and Housekeeping</u></b>            HH welcome everyone to the meeting, especially David Laird, new Co-opted Governor. Everyone introduced themselves around the table. Apologies had been received from HD and AK and these were accepted. Noted that JD was absent and SM would check on his attendance this year. IR explained the evacuation procedures should the fire alarm sound.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<p><b><u>Quorum</u></b>            SM established that the meeting was quorate.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p><b><u>Declaration of Pecuniary Interests and/or Conflict of Interests</u></b>            There were no interests declared by those present regarding agenda items.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<p><b><u>STEP Governance / SGB Membership</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointment of David Laird, Co-opted Governor, noted</li> <li>• Resignation of Craig Marsh, Parent Governor for Breakwater, noted. Craig had felt he was unable to commit to the SGB due to work and family commitments but would be very interested in returning should his circumstances change in the future. SM had sent IR the documents for a Parent Governor election and this would be arranged in due course</li> <li>• Craig’s departure left a vacancy for Pupil Premium and Academy Website Monitoring Governor. DL agreed to take on this role and he would meet with IR to discuss further</li> <li>• SM to check that HD was happy to continue as CLA/SEND/Inclusion Governor</li> <li>• As Safeguarding Governor, JD was due to check the Single Central Record with JW the</li> </ul>	<b>DL SM</b>

	following day	
5	<p><b><u>STEP Board of Trustees Update</u></b> An update had been previously circulated and there was nothing specific for JH to highlight.</p>	
<b>STEP Way – We agree to do things like this</b>		
6	<p><b><u>STEP Policies and Procedures</u></b> Governors noted that several STEP Policies had been reviewed, updated and approved by the STEP Board of Trustees in March and these were listed in the Trustees Update.</p>	
7	<p><b><u>Safeguarding</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed that all governors had undertaken safeguarding training in this academic year but SM would confirm this with JD</li> <li>• Noted that four governors had received Safer Recruitment training</li> </ul> <p>IR reported that BWA had received a County Safeguarding Audit in January and had been chosen as a ‘sample school’. An East Sussex Rep was due to visit at the end of May. SM to ask AK if an audit had taken place at HCA.</p> <p><b>Q – How easy was it for pupils to understand who the Safeguarding Leads were?</b> A – Pupils were expected to approach any member of staff they trusted / felt comfortable with. The DSLs were there for the adults. BP added that all staff had access to a computer and CPOMS so they could submit any issues and refer to the DSL. JH added that it was important for the Academies to build a strong curriculum which routinely incorporated safeguarding</p> <p><b>Q – Who completed the attached HCA document on ‘Building a strong safeguarding culture’?</b> A – This had been completed by the STEP Safeguarding Lead plus Jeremy Meek, Executive Headteacher in Hailsham, who were in the process of visiting all STEP Academies to assess risks and make suggestions for improvements</p> <p><b>Q – Are you (IR) happy with the Safeguarding processes in place?</b> A – Yes. There was much work going on and safeguarding was a standing item at the weekly SLT meetings</p>	<p><b>SM</b></p> <p><b>SM</b></p>
<b>STEP Up – We all succeed together</b>		
8	<p><b><u>Educational Standards</u></b> <b>a) <u>Head Teacher Reports</u></b> <b><u>Breakwater Academy</u></b> A report had been circulated prior to the meeting and BC had also carried out a Standards Review (report attached). BC highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BC was impressed how IR knew all of his students</li> <li>• The data in the report for Year 6 was where the pupils were at now, not what their predicted SATs were</li> <li>• There had been an issue with intervention capacity in the Autumn term due to the loss of a TA but this had now been resolved</li> <li>• Year 6 revision sessions had been run in the Easter holidays and these had been successful with 15 pupils attending one day and 16, the other. They also included the targeted pupils</li> <li>• The results would not meet the targets set at the start of the year as three high achieving pupils had left Year 6 and been replaced with lower achieving pupils</li> <li>• IR had explained in detail what strategies were in place to push the pupils and BC acknowledged that the team were doing all they possibly could including the Head and Deputy picking up extra classes in the mornings. BC was impressed with the provision being provided</li> </ul>	

JH agreed that the SLT were adopting a much more forensic look and had a real understanding of where the gaps were and where support was needed and this had a big impact.

**Q – The Year 6 pupils had had much better opportunities than last year’s cohort. Were they more confident?**

A – Yes, absolutely, they were much more resilient. SF, who taught the lower ability group, was getting much positive feedback from them as they felt valued and supported as they knew the teachers weren’t ‘writing them off’. The group supported and encouraged each other also

**Q – Was there a direct link between outcomes and the quality of teaching?**

A – The quality of teaching had improved significantly over time but the current Year 6 had received poor teaching for much of their time at Breakwater (formerly Meeching Valley). The targets were still below national average as they had only just started receiving good teaching. JH added that there was an expectation that all teaching was consistently good. The staff were a young staff and coaching and mentoring must continue

**Q – Was the quality of teaching meeting the standards?**

A – 66% of teachers were currently delivering good teaching consistently. Others were able to deliver good teaching but this was not yet consistent

JH concluded that the Year 6 pupils had been upskilled this year and this would be reflected in the results and improvements should be seen in all areas. JA added that she was confident the results would improve and there was an increase in all areas of just under 20%. This was still below national average but demonstrated the significant impact made at Breakwater. Next year, the challenge was to achieve national average.

**Q – Were the improvements across the board, seen in all groups?**

A – With SEND, yes – they were making progress this term. Attainment was not where it should be but progress was. Interventions were effective including the Pupil Premium children

**Q – How many children were represented by the 24 fixed term exclusions?**

A - These pertained to six children with most of the exclusions received by two children in particular (IR explained the reasons for this)

**Q - Could any of these escalate to permanent exclusions?**

A - Most were in Year 6 so, no. This was not in the best interests of the pupils. JH added that East Sussex were in a challenging position regarding provision for excluded pupils and the best safeguarding option was to keep the pupils in school

JH highlighted that there were some anomalies with Year 1 and Year 3 (showing a downward spike) and the SGB should keep this in mind for future challenging. Finally, BC praised the new ‘Philosophy for Children’ scheme stating that the impact was superb.

**BWA Data Pack**

A data pack from County had been circulated with the papers and the data mirrored that held by the Academy. JH confirmed that STEP contribute to data with the local authorities and Paul Glover met termly with East Sussex to discuss the Academies’ data.

**High Cliff Academy**

A Head Teacher report had been circulated prior to the meeting along with the County data pack and BC had also carried out a Standards Review (report attached). BC highlighted the following:

- A carousel had been set up in Reception directing children to different tasks

- Staff had received phonics training in January
- New books had been introduced to help with phonics in Years 1 & 2 (BP mentioned a thrilled parent whose child now wanted to read at home). The goal was for pupils to be competent and proficient readers by Year 3
- The KS1 benchmarks had changed as three pupils had left who had age related expectations
- Interventions in place included Maths Mastery
- AK was assisting with English planning and Chloe Parks, with Maths planning
- BC had asked AK how she felt about the high level of NQTs in the school and she had responded with “they were a strength. They were open to ideas, drove the CPD programme and showed great team spirit”

HH had been impressed by the CPD the Head Teacher was leading and the way the whole team were working together to develop the curriculum and their skills with new schemes such as Maths Mastery. BP agreed that it was exciting to be part of this at the start.

JA added the following:

- She had carried out a T & L review in January and whilst HCA was not there yet, they knew where they were heading. There were quite a few strengths identified and AK was building a safeguarding culture
- AK knew the T & L journey of each teacher
- Although national average targets would not be met, progress could still be seen
- Staff and governors want the school to improve but they need to be able to articulate this (to Ofsted)
- Staff recognized the key areas for development, such as reading and Maths Mastery, and these were works in progress
- There had been a significant shift in parental engagement. All staff were proactive in building stronger community links
- Progress was shaping the curriculum and staffing as teachers became reflective practitioners. This required constant monitoring and JA was at WHA the following day and her visit would include talking to children
- The role of the SENCo was being reviewed, for instance, how the role linked with attendance and progress (attendance was still an issue)

HH asked for a report next time on the impact of investment on the learning environment. This included good displays (reflective use of the curriculum) and the work completed to the outside areas in Reception and Year 1.

AK

**b) Standards Lead update**

This had been covered above.

**c) Review progress of AIP**

The updated AIPs would be circulated in July.

**d) Ofsted preparation update**

Ofsted were due soon at HCA and JA had delivered a training session to governors last month. HH had a meeting with AK following this and AK agreed to circulate a crib sheet for governors.

AK

**e) Lead Governor visits**

These had been covered but noted that JD had not submitted one for safeguarding. SM to follow up.

SM

**f) Governor monitoring visits schedule**

In March, governors attended a session at High Cliff to discuss progress on the SIP in more detail. They committed to more focus visits to enable them to see practice for themselves and also decided to

	<p>request more information on specific issues such as pupil well-being not covered directly on the agenda. Following this up, HH stressed that governors needed to be more active and involved in both schools including Learning Walks, to get to know the school. IR suggested afternoon visits would be best, grouped together if possible over two visits. Diaries were checked by those with them and governors agreed to come in on <b>Monday 21<sup>st</sup> May, from 1pm to 4pm at Breakwater</b> and they could observe 'Philosophy for Children' in action.</p> <p><b>g) Governor Day planning</b> Governors chose <b>Friday 29<sup>th</sup> June</b> for a Governor Day, to visit both Academies, subject to approval by AK.</p>	<b>SM</b>
<b>9</b>	<p><b><u>Financial Management</u></b> A confidential minute was taken for this item.</p>	
<b>STEP Ahead – We invest in our future</b>		
<b>10</b>	<p><b><u>Admissions Update</u></b> IR reported that 30 Reception places for BWA had been allocated for September (but one fostered child had since dropped out) and 30 for HCA.</p>	
<b>11</b>	<p><b><u>Governing Body Training</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All agreed that the Ofsted training and the Safeguarding training sessions had been good</li> <li>• Governor panel training was coming up next month and this would cover statutory guidance. SM urged as many governors to attend this as possible so that a pool of people could be called upon if needed</li> <li>• DL to inform SM of any relevant training he had undertaken</li> </ul>	<b>DL</b>
<b>12</b>	<p><b><u>GDPR</u></b> Several documents had been circulated prior to the meeting and JH explained that a policy would be in place by the end of May. Head Teachers had received training that day and governors would receive information in due course. To be discussed at the next meeting (agenda item).</p>	<b>SM</b>
<b>13</b>	<p><b><u>Engagement &amp; Communication</u></b> JH raised the issue of governor engagement and communication following some issues the previous term when several governors were not responding to emails from the Head Teachers and SM regarding a Governor Day plus Ofsted training. JH stressed the importance of responding to emails.</p> <p>BC voiced his own concerns over the difficulty of visiting two schools each term and that it was not manageable to read the volume of papers sent out with the agenda (29 this time). He worked full time and gave up 25% of his spare time to STEP. He felt the expectations were more than he had signed up for.</p> <p>JH stressed that his comments were not targeted at any one governor but as a collective body, governors needed to correspond and respond to emails especially when events were being arranged. BC felt that JH should speak to the individual governors and not the whole SGB. JH completely recognized that governors had other commitments but consideration did need to be given to arrangements being made behind the scenes by the Head Teachers and Clerk.</p> <p>HH added that governors seeing the school in action during the day was just as important as attending meetings and she urged governors to do this where possible. BC's visit as Standards Lead had been very valuable and he had fed back useful information to governors.</p> <p>JA asked if there was anything to take back to the Board and it was suggested that ways be looked at to streamline the number of documents provided at meetings.</p>	<b>JA</b>

	<p>BC suggested splitting the agenda into two sections, for each school and AK was keen to try this also. SM agreed to trial this next time.</p> <p>Governors requested that the Head Teacher's reports include an item on Local risk and steps each school was taking to mitigate this.</p>	<p><b>SM</b></p> <p><b>IR/AK</b></p>
<b>14</b>	<p><b><u>Correspondence to the Chair</u></b> HH reported that no correspondence had been received.</p>	
<b>15</b>	<p><b><u>Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising</u></b> There was one amendment to be made to the minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2018. SM would amend these to sign at the next meeting. SM would remind HD to carry out a SEND Visit at BWA. All action points had been addressed.</p>	<p><b>SM</b></p> <p><b>SM</b></p>
<b>16</b>	<p><b><u>Notes from the Clerk</u></b> SM had circulated three documents prior to the meeting; Being Strategic, Challenge &amp; Support and Head Teacher Questions. SM encouraged governors to refer to these documents in preparation for asking challenging questions at SGB meetings.</p> <p>Ahead of the implementation of the new GDPR regulations next month, SM asked governors to ensure that their laptops / phones / mobile devices (any devices which had access to STEP data) were password protected.</p> <p>Finally, SM asked governors to let her know if they added any training to the TTG or made any changes. DL asked if the system allowed for SM to be notified of any such changes and SM would follow this up.</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>SM</b></p>
<b>17</b>	<p><b><u>Any Other Urgent Business</u></b> There was no other business presented.</p>	
<b>18</b>	<p><b><u>Meeting Impact</u></b> This item was not discussed.</p>	
<b>19</b>	<p><b><u>Meeting Dates</u></b> The SGB would next meet on <b>Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> July @ 6pm at Breakwater Academy</b>. DL asked about meeting dates for next year and SM stated that they would be circulated soon, once the EMT and Trustees had approved them. DL was surprised to discover that governors themselves had no input into the dates and SM would pass his thoughts back to the Governance Team.</p>	<p><b>SM</b></p>
<b>20</b>	<p><b><u>Publication of Minutes</u></b> The financial items would be recorded as confidential (Part B).</p>	
<b>21</b>	<p><b><u>Confidential Matters</u></b> Members of staff left at this point (BP, BVW, SF and JW), 8.20pm, and a confidential minute was taken.</p>	

The meeting closed at 8.25pm.  
SM 270418

### Summary of Action Points

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>
4	<i>DL to meet with IR to discuss Pupil Premium and Academy Website Monitoring Governor role further</i>	<i>DL</i>
4	<i>SM to check that HD was happy to continue as CLA/SEND/Inclusion Governor</i>	<i>SM</i>
7	<i>SM to check that JD had undertaken safeguarding training this year</i>	<i>SM</i>
7	<i>SM to ask AK if a County Safeguarding Audit had taken place at HCA</i>	<i>SM</i>
8	<i>AK to provide a report at the next meeting on the impact of investment on the learning environment</i>	<i>AK</i>
8	<i>AK to circulate an Ofsted crib sheet to governors</i>	<i>AK</i>
8	<i>SM to ask JD about a Safeguarding Visit report</i>	<i>SM</i>
8	<i>SM to check proposed Governor Day date with AK</i>	<i>SM</i>
11	<i>DL to notify SM of any recent, relevant training undertaken</i>	<i>DL</i>
12	<i>SM to add GDPR to the next agenda</i>	<i>SM</i>
13	<i>JA to report back to the Board, to consider ways to streamline the number of documents provided at meetings</i>	<i>JA</i>
13	<i>SM to trial splitting the agenda into the two Academies at the next meeting plus add 'local risk' to the agenda</i>	<i>SM</i>
13	<i>IR and AK to include an item on Local risk in their reports and steps they were taking to mitigate this</i>	<i>IR/AK</i>
15	<i>SM to amend the last minutes</i>	<i>SM</i>
15	<i>SM to remind HD to carry out a SEND Visit at BWA</i>	<i>SM</i>
16	<i>Governors to ensure their mobile devices were password protected</i>	<i>ALL</i>
16	<i>SM to establish if governors made changes to TTG, if Clerks could be notified</i>	<i>SM</i>
19	<i>SM to pass on DL's thoughts on meeting date scheduling to the STEP Governance Team</i>	<i>SM</i>

Signed as a true and accurate record of the meeting	
Chair's Signature	
Chair's Name	
Date	