



Minutes of the meeting of the Local Governing Body of Cottingham High School.  
Croxby Meeting Room, Cottingham High School. Wednesday 11 September 2019 at 5.30pm

## **GOVERNORS PRESENT**

Mr A Brattan (Chair, AB); Mrs S Barker (SB); Mr J Dodd (JD); Mr D Ellis (DE); Mr D Haywood (DH);  
Mr J Leeming (JL); Mr J Mason (JM); Mr L Wilson (Headteacher, LW)

## **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mrs N Carlisle (Assistant Head, NC); Ms K Jordan (Deputy Head, KJ); Miss J Tuffs (Clerk to LGB),  
Mrs S Young (Director of Education, SY)

Throughout these minutes a question is indicated by Q followed by the initials of the questioner  
and a comment is marked by C.

## **1.0 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

AB welcomed everyone to the meeting.

## **2.0 APOLOGIES**

Mr E Blair.

**Resolved:** That consent was given to the absence of the above governor.

## **3.0 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

No declaration of interests were received. AB stated that the pecuniary interest and data collection  
forms issued were to be completed and returned at the end of the meeting.

## **4.0 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

**Resolved:** The minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2019 to be confirmed as a correct record and  
signed by the Chair, AB.

## **5.0 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

**5.1 ACTION:** LW to amend the Disadvantaged cohort Basics targets to 4+ 45% and 5+ 25%  
and Progress 8 to +0.24 on the SDP (minute 45.0). Completed.

**5.2 ACTION:** JR to feedback to the next LGB regarding the Disadvantaged seminar at Bishop  
Burton College (minute 49.0). To be discussed at the next meeting.

**5.3 ACTION: JT to send out email with reminder on how to log on to the Learning Link and details of the two modules to be completed by end of July (minute 49.0).** Done, however it was requested that JT re-send a reminder again.

**5.4 ACTION: AB to liaise with Gilly Stafford regarding the vacancy on the LGB (minute 49.0).** Done.

**5.5 ACTION: AB to send out letter of thanks to Co-op manager (minute 50.0).** AB to send letter before the next meeting.

## 6.0 RESULTS – N Carlisle

Governors were given an overview of the Year 11 provisional data. NC explained that the Attainment 8 estimates currently used to calculate Progress 8 is 2018 national data as the 2019 figures are not released until the end of October.

### Key headlines

	Progress 8		Attainment 8	
	17/18	18/19	17/18	18/19
<b>All</b>	0.24	-0.06	48.86	48.52
<b>Disadvantaged</b>	-0.39	-0.86	37.31	36.59
<b>Other</b>	0.46	0.16	51.97	51.68

	Basics 9-4		Basics 9-5	
	17/18	18/19	17/18	18/19
<b>All</b>	71%	65%	48%	42%
<b>Disadvantaged</b>	44%	37%	25%	19%
<b>Other</b>	78%	73%	56%	48%

NC stated that the Progress 8 was down on last year but was still in line nationally. Disadvantaged Progress 8 score stood out but was adversely affected by 3 students who had mental health and attendance issues. Their individual progress scores were -3.8, -2.9 and -2.8. If the 3 students were discounted the Progress 8 score for DA would have gone up by 0.3, and this would have also had a positive effect on the whole cohort Progress 8.

Q: (AB) Were there 27 Disadvantaged students in the cohort?

C: (NC) Yes.

Q: (AB) Are the results lower than predicted?

C: (NC) Yes unfortunately. There were a couple of subject areas that affected us negatively and we will be working closely with them this year. We want to be better. Staff work very hard to achieve better than expected.

Q: (SY) What was the KS2 average point score for the cohort?

C: (NC) In line with national.

C: (LW) It is worth noting that all but two schools within the East Riding dropped between 2-4% for Basics compared to last year.

C: (NC) Looking at data for English and Maths, the national picture has dropped for those subjects.

NC stated that for the Basics 4+ and 5+ outcomes, Cottingham ranked 7<sup>th</sup> out of 18 East Riding schools and ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> for Ebacc entries.



Attainment 8 analysis showed the results were in line with national figures for all buckets, with the exception of the open bucket falling slightly below.

Progress 8 analysis was also broadly in line but the open bucket was -0.21. NC explained that the lower than expected outcomes were partly due to the BTEC Health & Social Care Tech award where the grade boundaries were changed less than week prior to the results being published. This led to 17 out of 26 students dropping 1 grade.

Q: (JM) Did you go for re-moderation? This has happened previously with other qualifications.

C: (SY) Re-moderation wasn't an option. Pearson looked at the comparable outcomes to retain the value of the qualification.

Q: (JM) Are you considering moving to another exam board?

C: (NC) I believe we are looking at this, however their decision was upheld by OFQUAL.

Q: (DE) If you knew about the higher grade boundaries, what would you do?

C: (SY) Some students would have had the opportunity to re-sit their exam.

### Progress 8 components

	Progress 8		English		Maths		Ebacc		Open	
	17/18	18/19	17/18	18/19	17/18	18/19	17/18	18/19	17/18	18/19
All	0.24	-0.06	0.45	-0.08	0.08	-0.06	0.17	0.10	0.28	-0.21
Female	0.43	0.18	0.76	0.34	0.17	-0.09	0.33	0.26	0.47	0.19
Male	0.06	-0.36	0.16	-0.57	0.00	-0.03	0.02	-0.09	0.09	-0.69
Dis	-0.39	-0.86	-0.33	-0.68	-0.61	-0.85	-0.33	-1.03	-0.34	-0.80
Low	0.27	0.42	0.05	0.22	0.04	0.35	0.29	0.34	0.56	0.68
Mid	0.40	-0.16	0.74	-0.14	0.12	-0.30	0.33	-0.10	0.43	-0.14
High	0.08	0.01	0.30	-0.03	0.05	-0.19	-0.02	0.31	0.03	-0.40
SEN K	0.30	-0.28	0.17	-0.72	0.46	-0.48	0.39	-0.30	0.21	0.16
SEN E	-0.47	0.31	-0.52	-0.49	-0.72	0.57	-0.64	0.41	-0.09	0.58

### Key summary:

- Disadvantaged Progress 8 very disappointing
- SEND (although very small cohort) performed well in the open bucket
- Progress overall for SEND E very good
- High starters progressed well with the exception of the Open bucket
- Some strategies need time to embed and have impact
- New Assistant Headteacher solely in charge of KS3 to embed interventions and focus groups early on

Q: (JD) Have you got a sense of which interventions were the most successful?

C: (LW) When we looked at the Disadvantaged cohort, we looked at attendance, attitude to learning, attendance at P6 and the amount of time in isolation. We set up a tutor group with specific focus on this cohort. Year 11 attendance usually drops against national, however attendance was good, attitude to learning improved over the year, attendance at P6 was 86% and very few students spent a day in isolation. We decreased all the negatives but possibly too late to have a big enough impact on outcomes so we are looking at intervening lower down the school. In Year 11 we also have the raising standards team and an Assistant Headteacher responsible for Disadvantaged. We feel we couldn't have given them a better platform to do well.

C: (SB) The first point has got to be getting the students in and improving engagement.

C: (JD) There should be a reasonable timescale for things to work. Year 10 is a key year.

### Maths and English attainment

	All students				Disadvantaged students			
	% 4+		%5+		% 4+		%5+	
Subject	Coll 4	Actual	Coll 4	Actual	Coll 4	Actual	Coll 4	Actual
Eng Lang	68	65	49	49	50	41	22	26
Eng Lit	77	76	47	57	48	59	50	33
English (basic)	80	79	52	52	59	52	26	30
Maths	71	70	47	47	41	41	26	26

- Based on 2018 outcomes, all subjects at 4+ were higher than national
- Accuracy of collection 4 predictions was good

NC analysed subject headlines for 'All' and Disadvantaged students showing accuracy against predictions as well as outcomes versus FFT50 and FFT20 targets. The table also showed the subject progress indicator (SPI) used by SISRA as part of the data collaboration that compares subject outcomes with over 1,200 other schools with similar ability students. The table showed 60% of subjects to have a positive SPI. Positive performances this year were seen in Engineering, Business and Computing. However NC stated that a key focus this year will be Humanities and Technology.

Q: (JM) I don't feel the teacher predictions are as accurate as they should be. Looking at Maths their predictions were pretty accurate, however looking at Geography for collection 4, 80% of students were predicted 4+ but actually only 52% achieved this. Technology is similar whereby they predicted 70% of students would achieve a grade 4 or above and only 25% did. Are subject teachers predicting too high; are they under pressure to enter a more positive result? How robust is the moderation during the academic year?

C: (LW) I believe there are three areas where predictions versus outcomes are not good enough. They are Geography, History and Technology. However some cohorts can be quite small which can skew the figures. We need to look at how the subjects are assessing those students and how robust are their systems. Exams review meetings are due to take place shortly analysing the results in more detail.

C: (DE) I do recall there being an issue with Geography and History predictions for the last couple of years, although the teachers are very good.

C: (LW) A review was taken of those areas looking at a 3 year trend. We are aware, however, that the new specifications are significantly different.

Q: (DE) Is this looked at from a Trust level?

C: (SY) Yes, from a Geography perspective there has been a self-supported review scheduled already by leaders and a focus on Humanities with a Geography specialist. Also another leader look at common assessment in Year 7 which can't be measured due to no national benchmarks. Collaboration is already happening.

Q: (JD) How do the predictions affect outcomes – what could happen if predictions are inaccurate?

C: (NC) This could affect intervention, ie. the wrong students being intervened with or the wrong students being invited to P6 and put on the LT mentoring list. We would rather staff be accurate with predictions so we can investigate and put something into place.

C: (NC) Open bucket subjects look like they have a really positive SPI score but it doesn't correlate to the progress 8 open bucket score of -0.21. This is due to some students not taking all 8 subjects and also the lowest of the English grades go into the open bucket.

Q: (DE) What are the FFT targets?

C: (NC) They are calculated from Fischer Family Trust (FFT) and are based on the student cohort taking that subject.



Q: (SY) Are there lessons being learned from Engineering, ie. are those strategies being shared across departments?

C: (NC) We believe the fantastic Engineering results are due to the tenacity of the teachers and the relationships they have. There are meetings scheduled through the year where Area Leaders are able to share.

Q: (AB) Does Engineering have exams?

C: (NC) Yes, there are 7 elements however the grading system is quite harsh – the students could achieve merits and distinctions in 6 of them and not pass 1 and they fail the qualification. The results are testament to the staff.

Q: (DE) What is the gender split for Engineering?

C: (NC) It is more male orientated but more girls have chosen it in Year 10

Q: (JD) Can we encourage more Disadvantaged students to take the successful courses?

C: (NC) We encourage students to choose what they are passionate about. However we are undertaking a curriculum review this year.

C: (LW) We have made the decision that students choose the best route for them and what the school feels it should be rather than forcing them down a particular route.

The outcomes of the early entry GCSE English Language were outlined as below:

- 69% of Year 10 students gained a grade 4 in English Language
- 48% of Year 10 students gained a grade 5 in English Language
- Awaiting the outcome of a small number of remarks
- The early entry strategy has been analysed and is continuing this year

Q: (DE) What do students do in their Year 11 English lessons?

C: (NC) They study English Literature.

C: (KJ) If students want to re-sit, we accommodate that in Year 11 even though it doesn't improve school headlines. It can be motivational when students achieve a grade they wanted.

Q: (SY) What were the Leadership priorities in 2018 and what are they for 2019?

C: (LW) Our priorities last year were Disadvantaged, accuracy of predictions and High starters. For this year we are undertaking a curriculum review and will be focussing on Humanities and Technology.

C: (AB) Whilst there must have been a disappointment not hitting all the targets, well done to all staff. Disadvantaged will remain a focus. Also well done to the Sixth Form and a fantastic 50% enrolment from Year 11.

SB, NC and SY left the meeting at 6.50pm.

## **7.0 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **7.1 Exclusion Training**

AB discussed the Exclusion training run by the Trust on 25 September and 26 September. AB, SB, JD, LW and T Guzdek to attend.

### **7.2 Governor Training**

AB reminded the Governors of the two mandatory training modules that must be completed: Safeguarding and Progress and Attainment modules.

### **7.3 Standard LGB Agenda**

AB stated that the Trust are revising the standard LGB agenda to reflect the new OFSTED framework.

#### 7.4 Link Governors

AB informed the Board that the Trust has asked for every LGB to have a link governor for Pupil Premium (DA), Safeguarding and SEND. DE was confirmed as the Link for Pupil Premium and SB for Safeguarding and SEND. AB asked for any volunteers to be the link for SEND as ideally SB is not the Link for two areas.

#### 7.5 Careers

AB explained that he had attended a careers convention with the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) discussing what support is available and the importance of maintaining links with industry. AB stated that the convention went through the expectations of the level of support schools should provide in relation to the Gatsby benchmarks. One of the benchmarks is to have a careers lead in school and also it is expected that there is a Link Governor to help facilitate links in industry and to bring in speakers.

*C: (JD) This could benefit Disadvantaged students, give them ambition which could help narrow the gap. If there isn't anyone else, I would like to do this.*

*C: (LW) We are reinstating Year 10 work experience. We have appointed two members of staff in school to lead and manage this and one of their roles is to be find aspirational work experience places. We are constantly looking for contacts to bring them in as speakers to raise aspirations.*

*C: (KJ) We are well ahead of meeting the Gatsby benchmarks.*

*Q: (AB) Is it possible for K Dimmack to come and present the careers opportunities to the LGB?*

*C: (KJ) I think she would be very happy to do this.*

*C: (LW) Before the next meeting there will be a final SDP for 2018-19 and the 19-20 SDP will be raised at the next meeting.*

**Resolved:** JD to be the Careers Link Governor.

**ACTION:** K Dimmack to present at the next LGB meeting (minute 7.5).

#### 8.0 NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting will be on 17 October at 5.30pm.

The meeting ended at 7.20pm.

#### 9.0 ACTION POINTS

**9.1 ACTION:** JR to feedback to the next LGB regarding the Disadvantaged seminar at Bishop Burton College (minute 5.2).

**9.2 ACTION:** JT to send out email with reminder on how to log on to the Learning Link and details of the two modules to be completed ASAP (minute 5.3).

**9.3 ACTION:** AB to send out letter of thanks to Co-op manager (minute 5.5). AB to send letter before the next meeting.

**9.4 ACTION:** K Dimmack to present careers opportunities at the next LGB (minute 7.5).