

Dorset Studio School

Minutes of the Governors meeting held on Thursday 9th February 2017, 4.00pm in the Dorset Studio School

Governors (GB)	Kaye Chittenden; *Andy Daw; Peter Edwards; Michael Foley (Director); *Mark Gibbens (Chair); *Avril Harrison; *Robert Lasseter; *Annetta Minard (Principal); *Luke Rake (Director); *Jim Tirrell (Director); *Martha Vigar (Parent Governor); *Alex Williams (Parent Governor)
Other Attendees	*Vanessa Gifford (KMC Clerk); *Chris Pedder (Deputy Principal, Finance & Corporate Services KMC)

* *Indicates actual presence at this meeting*

AGENDA ITEM		ACTION
1.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Representatives of Kingston Maurward College (KMC) and The Thomas Hardy School (THS) reaffirmed their standing declaration of interests in items relating to the financial / legal relationships between those sponsoring bodies and the Dorset Studio School (DSS).</p> <p>There were no further declarations of interest.</p>	
2.	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Kaye Chittenden, Peter Edwards and Mike Foley.</p>	
3.	<p>MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 8 DECEMBER 2016</p> <p>The Governing Body (GB) APPROVED the minutes of 8 December 2016 as a true and accurate record and APPROVED them for website publication.</p>	
4.	<p>MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES</p> <p>The following matters were NOTED from the minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clerk confirmed that the regulations stated “A Parent Governor must be a parent of a pupil at the Academy at the time when he/she is elected.” Therefore, it was the Clerk’s view that the Parent Governor could remain until the four year term of office was up on 18 October 2019. 	





5.	<p>PRINCIPALS REPORT</p> <p>The following points were NOTED from the Principals Report:</p> <p>Data Analysis The Principal circulated the updated Academic Action Plan for information.</p> <p>Year 11 This was an unusual cohort of low and middle ability students, who tended to work at lower levels in previous schools, mainly due to social and emotional behaviour patterns that prevented them from achieving to their full potential. There had been concerns at the beginning of the year regarding high attainers but quality assurance and linked working with THS, as sponsors, indicate that were now where they should be and could possible gain further. Focus was being put on Levels 4 and 5, as this is the band for the majority of the cohort.</p> <p>The outcome of every student in Year 11 was known with progress and attainment 8 being allocated to 'buckets' with key priorities for the students to work towards. If necessary, intervention for special educational needs (SEN) was implemented. Every student had a clear destination and met with their mentor on a 1:1 basis every week.</p> <p>Year 9 and 10 These students were on a 'flight path' with a 6 weekly progress cycle and action plan being undertaken, to move along the progress line. This information had been fully shared with the students who were clear on what was expected.</p> <p>At the start of Year 9 these students should no more than -2.9% away from their end target, and the aim was to be at 0 for the start of Year 11. At the start of Year 10 students should be no more than -1.5% away from their target, and by the end of Year 10 it was forecast that they would be half a grade away. The Principal considered that the 6 week progress review was effective and the targets were achievable.</p> <p>It was noted that every child had a template and every 6 weeks the attainment grades were plotted and students were being encouraged to improve their own grade on the template. It was agreed that the needs of the students were the priority, not those of the school. Letters had been sent home informing parents and carers of the targets.</p> <p>Whole School Progress Progress 8 Year 9 -1.43% away from benchmark No difference with SEN, with students making as much progress as others. Pupil Premium students were doing better than others Attainment of girls was just above boys Average grade 29.09</p>	
----	--	--





	<p>Year 10 -0.77% away from benchmark SEN – slightly lower attainment Pupil Premium – higher attainment Girls slightly above boys, with girls being the high attainers Average grade 36.33</p> <p>Year 11 Progress 8 -0.66% away from benchmark, which was slightly lower than anticipated but the students had progressed from the last report. Girls were slightly higher than boys Average 38.47% (just under a grade 4) The students had just completed mock exams therefore this would give another indication of progress. There was no concern over differentiation between characteristic groups.</p> <p>GCSE's The GB questioned how confident the staff were on delivery of the changes to GCSE's. The Principal advised that there were national concerns with no benchmarks available for comparisons. There was much ambiguity with different words and language used. Nationally, there was some concern over the new system, however the Principal was working with THS to moderate and was confident that the DSS was working in the correct way. Concerns were expressed that youngsters needed time to adapt and the changes implemented for the following year were unfair.</p> <p>School Evaluation Form (SEF) The updated SEF was NOTED with the red highlights indicating the documents that backed up the statements. Members were requested to read and verify the judgements, however three external verifications had graded the DSS as 'Good'.</p> <p>Attendance The Principal confirmed that attendance was slightly down but she had no concerns, it had been a bad month for illness but was still just under 95%.</p> <p>External Validation The External Validation Report was NOTED, and the Principal confirmed that there were no issues that had not been highlighted in the action plan. Governors considered it to be a positive report.</p>	
6.	<p>DEVELOPMENT PLAN</p> <p>The Development Plan 2016/17 was MONITORED and the GB was pleased to note that all actions had been initiated, and nothing remained in the 'Red' rating.</p>	





	<p>The Governors questioned how the Duke of Edinburgh Scheme was progressing and the Principal informed them that it was very popular, with the students just having undertaken a very successful caving trip.</p>	
7.	<p>MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS TO 31 DECEMBER 2016</p> <p>The Management Accounts to 31 December 2016, reflecting the up to date funding position, were SCRUTINISED. The following key points were NOTED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Deputy Principal, Finance & Corporate Services KMC confirmed that the DSS was in a good position, with income currently being ahead of budget but was likely to be a timing issue. • A Rates Rebate had now been received which was good news. • It was confirmed that agency costs had been resolved and the projected £25K was not anticipated to be overspent. • A net effect of £86K surplus was noted, assuming there was no clawback with the 16-19 allocation, but this would be kept in reserve. The projected surplus included initial setting up costs. • The Deputy Principal, Finance & Corporate Services KMC had produced a cashflow report which was noted. The decline for 2015/16 was noted as the payment of the rates bill. • It was noted that the projection for Dual Registration would probably increase as there had been 10 students on dual registration when the Principal arrived and she had now managed to clear them all from the census. • The GB questioned what the impact of changes to funding would be and the Deputy Principal, Finance & Corporate Services KMC, advised that he understood that in Dorset £200 per head would be lost, therefore he did not anticipate that the DSS would be badly hit, although there would be a funding cut with the timescale being in 2 financial years. 	
8.	<p>GOVERNORS' ACTION PLAN</p> <p>The Governors' Action Plan was NOTED, and the following points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The action plan had now been RAG rated on progress. Contact had been made with staff on the red action, but a meeting still had to be arranged. • The Principal reported that she had received no contact from Dorset County Council regarding the transport letter. It was noted that Swanage Free School was in a similar position and had also sent in a representation. It was agreed that this issue was a bigger problem for DCC rather than just sorting the transport for the DSS, it was the principle of the policy which required reviewing. • The bio-security issues were being progressed. 	
9.	<p>CAPITAL UPDATE</p> <p>The Principal advised that she considered Post 16 to be un-viable economically and the best possible way forward was to consider enrolling students for Years 7 and 8, however</p>	





	<p>currently this did not follow the Studio School protocol. It was agreed that the Principal should write to the School Commissioner for support, however it was agreed to wait until there had been feedback on the capital issue below before writing.</p> <p>The Principal reported that she had met with a representative from the DfE regarding the DSS building not being fit for purpose. Coincidentally the school had been at maximum capacity during the visit with mock exams being undertaken. The representative was therefore able to understand the issues that the school was facing with exams; showers/lockers; canteen facilities.</p> <p>The representative took on board all the issues and agreed to report back to the DfE to find a solution. He suggested that rather than extending the current building it may be possible to erect a sport centre opposite, but he would report back in two weeks. The Principal emphasised that once at full capacity the current building would be unusable and the GB would have no option but to close, which would be very disappointing for a 'Good' Studio School. The Principal advised that there was no cut off for numbers to remain viable, as the same staff were required for 10 students as for 30, and a vibrant future was hoped for.</p> <p>It was agreed that the next step would be to invite the Schools Commissioner to the DSS for a visit. It was noted that David Nicholls of the Studio School Trust was visiting on 1 March.</p>	<p>AM</p> <p>AM</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>WORK EXPERIENCE/EMPLOYER ENGAGEMENT</p> <p>The Principal advised that an Employer Engagement Forum had been held the previous evening, with the involvement of current students. Destination data had been shared with the employers and it was considered that the group would share the messages to other employers. Feedback sheets had been completed by the employers and a report/summary would be shared with the GB at the next meeting.</p> <p>The GB was pleased that the event had been a success and the employers were engaged. The initial message from employers was that the school had a mixed intake however after the event they understood the high attainment of at least 40% of students and meetings would continue to be held.</p> <p>The Principal agreed to share the Employer Engagement Report with the Corporation of KMC for information.</p>	<p>AM</p> <p>AM/VG</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>STUDENT DESTINATIONS</p> <p>The GB was pleased to NOTE the positive destinations of Year 11 which would influence the strategy for all partners. It was especially pleasing to not that 10 students had been offered an Apprenticeship with current work experience employers.</p>	





	The Principal confirmed that registrations for September 2017 were the same as last year, with 70 applications but many having the DSS as their second choice. It is anticipated that there is likely to be an intake of approximately 40.	
12.	CORPORATE RISK REGISTER The Corporate Risk Register was CONSIDERED and it was agreed to add the following further risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Failure to build more space	CP
13.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS FOR REPORT There was no further business discussed, except the Chair thanked everyone for a good, positive meeting, especially the Principal for her good work.	
14.	2016/17 The following dates were NOTED for 2016/17: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 30 March 2017• 18 May 2017• 6 July 2017	
<i>The Meeting closed at 5.45pm with no further business</i>		

Chair Date

