



FARINGDON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Meeting	FCC Full Governing Committee	Where	Virtual – on Teams
Date	Tuesday 26 th November 2024	Time	6.30pm
Attendees	Governors: Paul Ray (Chair), Jane Braddy (JBr, co-Vice Chair), Kathleen Thomas (KT), Samantha Gould (SG), James Barnes (JB), Jonathan Dennett (JD, Executive Headteacher) Additional Attendees: Paul Dipple (PD), Cheryl Lingard (CL – Observer), Samantha Fountain (SF – Observer)		
Apologies	Jane Hulse (JH, Co-Vice Chair) Gill Day (GD),		

Minutes

No	Description	Action
1	<p>Standing Item: Welcome, Apologies, Resignations, Governor Terms of Office, Agenda for today</p> <p>PR opened the meeting at 6.34pm, welcoming the committee. He informed the committee that they were hoping to have appointed a permanent Clerk by the following meeting, thanking them for their patience in the meantime.</p> <p>It was noted that apologies had been received from JH and that GD was absent without apologies.</p> <p>CL was confirmed as attending her second meeting in an observer capacity whilst awaiting the completion of the onboarding formalities.</p> <p>PR extended a welcome to SF on behalf of the committee. It was noted that SF was also attending as an observer and would be joining the committee once her onboarding was complete.</p> <p>PR informed the committee that they had just interviewed for another new Governor, whom he hoped would be able to join them at the January LGC.</p> <p>PR confirmed that there were no resignations to share with LGC. Likewise, there were no Governors whose terms of office were ending soon.</p> <p>PR shared the agenda with the committee, noting that it was on GovernorHub also.</p>	
2	<p>Standing Item: Notice, Confidentiality and Quorum Requirements</p> <p>PR reminded the committee of the strict confidentiality of the meeting. It was noted that the meeting was quorate.</p>	
3	<p>Standing Item: Declaration of Interest / Pecuniary Interests for tonight's meeting</p> <p>PR invited the committee to share any declarations of interest pertinent to the agenda, of which there were none.</p>	
4	<p>Standing Item: Approve minutes of 8th October 2024</p> <p>PR invited the committee to share any comments regarding the minutes from the meeting on 8th of October 2024, of which there were none.</p>	



	He noted that the minutes could now be signed as approved on GovernorHub. – Action PR	PR
	Standing Item: Any Out of committee activity	
5	<p>PR invited the Governors to share any updates they had on out of committee activity since the last LGC meeting.</p> <p>SG noted that she had met with the Art, Music and Drama group from the school and that she had a report regarding the meeting to complete and upload for the committee. – Action SG</p> <p>PR reminded the Governors of the importance of meeting regularly with their link subject leads and reporting back to the LGC.</p>	SG
6	<p>Behaviour</p> <p>PD joined the meeting at 6.54pm.</p> <p>PD began by highlighting the school's vision and aim, noting that they had worked hard since September on implementing their 'Ready, Respectful, Safe' agenda, and on creating a pyramid around their values of 'Belong, Believe, Aspire, Achieve,' allowing them to translate those key values into practice.</p> <p>PD informed the committee that they recently held a briefing where they discussed what could be done by teachers to encourage students into their lessons, and what kind of language teachers should be using when doing so, in line with messaging from the Trust conference day in October. He noted that the aim of this work was to nurture students and to deescalate any conflict, bringing them back into class and allowing them to thrive and, importantly, feel a sense of belonging. PD added that they had also worked with tutors, noting that their role was integral in championing a sense of belonging in students.</p> <p>PD impressed upon the committee that the focus on translating their values into practice had been somewhat of a change for staff and, therefore, the suspension figures within the report were not necessarily an indicator that the focus was not working, but rather that it was an ongoing process that they were at the beginning of.</p> <p>PD noted that they had broken down their suspension data via year group and that it was clear that there was a specific challenge in year 8 and year 9, both of whom had new Heads of Year this year. PD commended the Heads of Year for the work they were doing, adding that the school were working closely with them in line with their coaching model to ensure that they were also championing the school values. He added that they had also worked on how to focus on and interrogate their data to allow their tutors to use that data to progress their students, celebrate their successes, and provide challenge where needed.</p> <p>PD explained that they would present this data each term, allowing comparison to the previous term, and to the same term in the previous year. He highlighted areas of progress, in green, for Governors, noting that it was an ongoing focus and would take time.</p> <p>PD progressed to discuss internal truancy, highlighting for the LGC that their biggest challenge in this area was their female cohort, therefore they were looking for strategies to engage them, noting that they strongly believed that their 'belong' agenda was critical here.</p> <p>PD continued by highlighting the final table, which he noted demonstrated the support that they had from staff regarding their focus and agenda, with a clear increase in the positive points tally. PD extended thanks to Danielle Masters for her work surrounding this. He</p>	



stressed for Governors the importance of the positive points for helping build relationships and providing students with a sense of achievement.

PD noted that he and JD had begun the process of looking into how to audit the implementation of the positive relations from staff and had decided upon a series of culture walks, based upon the themes of their agenda – 'Ready, Respectful and Safe.' He noted that the first walk would happen before the Christmas break and would focus on the first theme, 'Ready', and they would identify three points on which to concentrate that would help them identify which staff were implementing the theme well and which staff required further support or training.

Lastly, PD informed the committee that they would now be sharing with staff, on a daily basis, the sanctions that had been issued to students, to create a culture of transparency and to allow the tutors - and all staff - to support those students and to have the necessary conversations with them surrounding reintegration. He added that, since the start of the academic year, they had been working to improve the reintegration process and had made it standard procedure that every student who was suspended received pastoral support plan. PD explained that this was common practice across the UK, however ordinarily only after multiple suspensions; the students at FCC were receiving the plan after the first suspension in the hope it would negate the need for further suspensions.

PD invited questions or comments from the committee.

It sounds as though the focus has shifted more onto the staff and the expectations of how they interact with and treat the students, rather than being more heavily focused on the students and the expectations of their behaviour; would you say that is correct?

PD explained that it was in part, and that much of their work was influenced by the book 'When the adults change, everything changes' by Paul Dix. He explained that the book was well known in education across the UK and essentially taught that if they could create a climate of positivity within the school then they would see that reciprocated in positive behaviour from the students. PD clarified, however, that this did not mean they were not also focusing on the students, noting that they were leading assemblies on their values, as well as rewarding those students who were displaying the right values and behaviours.

JD added that it was not a case of either staff or students, rather every message surrounding positive relationships, expected behaviours and aligning with the school values and being ready, respectful and safe was shared with both students and staff. He noted that the most fundamental part of school was the relationships and atmosphere within the classroom. He commented that they must focus on having classrooms where the atmosphere was one of belonging and mutual respect between staff and students, whilst maintaining clear consequences and clear systems in place for managing students who did not meet their expectations.

PD added that one of their biggest successes was that all students and staff had a clear understanding of their expectations and their values which was a strong foundation upon which to build their positive relations.

In the last meeting we discussed a small cohort of students with troublesome behaviour, who were responsible for many the suspensions. Is that still the case? Is the focus on them or has that evolved?

PD noted that there was still a small cohort of students with challenging behaviour, however their positive relations messaging was not directed exclusively at those students; it was for the whole school. Regarding that cohort specifically, PD noted that the biggest change would be the way in which they had tightened up their suspension procedure and their reintegration



	<p>process, noting that they had held several panels regarding suspensions since September. PD extended thanks to the Governors who had supported with these. He added that they did not want to permanently exclude any students, however they were progressing towards that with some.</p> <p><i>Regarding the pastoral support plans in place for some students, how are we managing these? Have we succeeded in recruiting pastoral support staff?</i></p> <p>PD commented that it had been a challenge and that they were yet to recruit a pastoral support assistant. JD added, for clarification, that the pastoral support plan was a process needed if they were looking to manage a move for a student or manage a permanent exclusion, though agreed that having sufficient staff to support this had been challenging. He noted that this could be viewed positively, as those staff who had once fulfilled the role had grown within it and moved into other positions within the school, however recruiting a replacement was an ongoing issue.</p> <p>JD reassured the committee that, despite the ongoing obstacle of recruitment for the role, they received substantial external support from Trust Inclusion lead, Leah Spiers, Trust Safeguarding lead, Lynne Hammond, and Claire Roberts and Charlotte Kitchen from OCC. He noted they were hopeful not to get to the point of permanent exclusion however, if they did, then he was ensuring that they were laying the foundations now to be able to demonstrate that they had done everything possible to ensure the move was successful.</p> <p>PD informed Governors that pastoral support plans did not always need a huge deal of input as it was dependent on the reason behind the challenges. He explained that during the process they would discuss the strengths and developmental needs of the student, with input from the student themselves and their parent or carer, and then from which they would create three clear action points. Therefore, depending on the challenge faced by the student, it could be a relatively simple process. PD stressed that the most important aspect was ensuring the communication was clear in terms of what was needed and what was expected.</p> <p>Governors thanked PD and JD for their responses and for their ongoing work and support for staff and students.</p> <p>PD invited the Governors to approve the Positive Behaviour and Relational Policy. JD extended thanks to PD for the exceptional work he had done on the policy, ensuring it was in line with the school values whilst maintaining the foundations of the policy which had been provided by Leah Spiers (LS), in line with the CLT policies. JD noted that LS had moderated their policy. It was agreed that Governors could have until the end of the week to approve the policy out of committee. – Action All Governors</p>	<p>All Governors</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Safeguarding Plan</p> <p>Regarding safeguarding, PD noted that they needed Governors to read and approve their Audit 175 report before submission to OCC. As the Governors were yet to have sight of the report it was agreed that this would be shared out of committee for Governors to read, and that they would return their approval out of committee too. – Action JD / Action All Governors</p>	<p>JD / All Governors</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>SLT Update</p> <p>JD led on the SLT update, noting that he had shared with the committee the updated SLT restructure, which was a model that would run until the end of the term, and highlighted the</p>	



<p>approach they had taken to each area of the SDP (School Development Plan). JD noted that this was an important change, providing further tenacity for each member of staff involved.</p> <p>JD informed the committee that Assistant Headteacher, Linda Sutton (LS), would be stepping down from her role at the end of the year and for budgetary reasons, as well as due to the size of the SLT, they would not be appointing a replacement, and therefore he had also included in his plan an interim model showing how they would distribute and delegate LS's existing roles.</p> <p>JD explained that Maria Button would manage the CPD and was experienced in that area, including having experience of Blue Sky, which was the new CPD and learning platform used by the school. He continued by noting that they would then advertise for a new staff member to manage the initial teacher training role on an interim basis, and they would also be tasked with managing three interns and having oversight of some of the ECTs. JD explained that they would offer that role for the remainder of the academic year, but beyond that would look to provide further opportunities for middle leaders to step up via secondment or project roles and spread leadership across a wider pool of staff, creating additional capacity for the SLT. Further to that, it would create CPD opportunities and career progression for their middle leaders, expanding the work they were doing without increasing the size of the SLT.</p> <p>JD invited the committee to share any questions or comments on his SLT update.</p> <p>Governors thanked JD for his update, noting that it would be good to be given the opportunity to meet with the new members of the SLT and for the LGC to become familiar with the team.</p> <p>JD informed the LGC that he would arrange for the members of the SLT to join the remaining LGC meetings for the year, allowing them to meet the Governors and to provide an update on their roles and development priorities.</p> <p>PR actioned the clerk to create a timetable for attendance of the SLT at meetings. – Action Clerk</p>	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>9 Heads Report</p> <p>JD explained to the new attendees how the Headteacher's report was structured, noting that it was a leadership report contributed to by all members of the SLT, providing oversight of the different areas of the school.</p> <p>JD noted that their three main priorities were attendance, behaviour and culture within the school, quality of education, and CPDI. He explained that on every third Friday they would focus on all those key priorities, ensuring they remained current within the work of the school.</p> <p>JD informed the committee that he had framed the school's ambitions within the report, alongside their KPIs, which he noted the Governors could use to measure their progress and provide support and challenge to the school. He noted that the aim of his report was to ensure that the LGC had an abundance of key, relevant information to allow them to provide strong, effective governance and support the school effectively. JD explained that he had included a list of key challenge questions that Governors could use to ensure accountability from the school and that they, as a committee, maintained effective strategic oversight. JD continued by noting that he had also include sources of evidence for his report, which consisted of their internal work, Governor work, and external work from the Trust or their SIPs (School Improvement Partners).</p>	



Following his summary, JD invited questions on his report from the Governors.

Regarding data for the English and Maths 4+, that is a big jump from 58% to 84%; would you describe that as being an aspirational target or is there some realism behind that target?

JD noted that the targets reflected the individual cohort and so would vary year on year, and therefore it was not necessarily a big jump, but rather was reflective of the past attainment of that cohort. Before continuing, JD gave a brief overview of the work of Fisher Family Trust (FFT) to the new Governors to help them better interrogate the data before them.

JD explained to the committee that the FFT 20 targets would put them in line with the top 20 levels of progress nationally and that, whilst their current professional predictions for English and Maths 4+ were 13% below that aspirational target, they were also 13% above the level achieved the previous year. JD clarified that this was because of the improvements predicted in Maths, and an improved 'marry up' between those grades for individual students. English and Maths 5+ were also predicted to be 13% higher than last year's results and, if achieved, both sets of results would represent a considerable increase.

Governors suggested that perhaps FFT50 should be included on the progress data check.

JD noted that he would add FFT50 as a benchmark for what would be considered average attainment, however added that he was keen to continue using FFT20 as it was aspirational. –

Action JD.

JD highlighted for the committee that there was significant progress predicted for this year, particularly in maths, and that he was hopeful that they would be able to continue on the current trajectory and have those predictions realised with the end of year results.

Does FFT consider the cohort's SATs results? As this cohort did not do any, could that have potentially skewed the data and be why the predictions are higher than normal?

JD commented that it could potentially have had an impact, however noted that even without focus on the FFT20 predictions, if the cohort could achieve the professional predictions he would be pleased and it would be a considerable increase on previous results.

JBr joined the meeting at 6.51pm.

JD invited any further questions from the committee on the quality of education data.

Historically maths at FCC needed further development; considering this, do we know if the professional predictions for maths this time last year were accurate and in line with the attainment we saw at the end of the year?

JD explained that they could be more confident regarding the accuracy of the predictions this academic year, as they had completed a considerable amount of work with the Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire maths hub, as well as with King Alfred's school, who he noted had a strong, high performing maths department. JD noted that there had been a lot of moderation of the maths department and commended the two Heads of Department for embracing the support and development provided to them.

Governors extended thanks to JD for his update on the quality of education section of the leadership report.

PR invited JD to highlight any other aspects of the report he felt were pertinent for discussion.

JD informed the committee that they were undertaking a significant amount of work surrounding inclusion, equality and diversity, and that Danielle Masters was leading on that new position within the school. JD noted that there were attitudes from outside of the school community which were being brought into the school community and needed addressing, as well as issues highlighted in the report around racism and homophobia. Further to that, there

JD



	<p>had been instances of behaviour from a small number of students which had been intimidating for some of their female members of staff. JD commended PD's swift and proactive response to this issue, noting that he had put into place a monitoring programme and staff were aware they could raise any intimidating behaviour, and it would be followed up on quickly. He added that consistent messaging had been issued to the students and to their parents about how they engage with staff.</p> <p>Governors extended thanks to JD.</p>	
10	<p>Pay Committee</p> <p>PR informed the LGC that the pay committee had met with JD the previous evening to discuss the pay report, explaining that this outlined the decisions made by the school following teachers' appraisals as to whether they were eligible to change pay grade. PR noted that most teachers had successfully progressed to the next pay scale, however clarified that there were several who were at the top of their pay scales and therefore, despite positive appraisals, were ineligible for recommendation for progression. Further to that, he noted that some of the teachers who were currently on the middle scale chose not to move to the upper pay scales but may do so in the future.</p> <p>PR shared with the committee that the pay report had included a strong focus on CPD for both teaching and non-teaching staff, and that it was clear that teachers were granted the opportunity for additional development internally and, where available, externally too.</p>	
11	<p>Link Governor Roles</p> <p>PR reminded the Governors that they also needed to assign all Governors to link roles so that there was clear focus on where each Governor would be providing dedicated monitoring and support to the school.</p> <p><i>Are we moving away from Governors being subject leads? Last year I was English lead, but Ofsted seemed less concerned about the 'deep dive' monitoring and the suggested link roles on GovernorHub are mostly all new.</i></p> <p>JD responded, explaining that, as a Local Governing Committee rather than a Local Governing Board, as they were historically, there were some areas that they no longer needed much involvement in as they were covered by the main Trust Board. Rather than having links to specific subjects, JD noted that he had found it to be more effective to have Governors who could align their expertise with a particular role – for example, a Governor with educational knowledge or background could conduct broader monitoring for a number of subjects from a quality of education perspective, or a Governor with finance experience could take on the finance link role and meet with JD for finance and budget updates. JD noted that he preferred this model as it granted both the school and the LGC more flexibility with their monitoring.</p> <p><i>What is filtering and monitoring?</i></p> <p>PD explained that filtering and monitoring was a newer aspect of safeguarding, that came into effect the previous year, regarding students and staff accessing material on the internet that could be of concern. Historically, PD noted, this would have been flagged to IT, however since 2024 it was under the ownership of the safeguarding team to assess what had been flagged and deal with it appropriately. He added that, if it was a staff member who had been flagged for an inappropriate search, this would be managed by JD and handled as a disciplinary if necessary.</p>	



	<p><i>Could you argue that attendance comes under safeguarding too?</i> PD confirmed that attendance often did come under safeguarding, noting that poor attendance was arguably one of the biggest indicators of neglect.</p> <p>It was confirmed that JBr would take on filtering and monitoring and attendance link roles, and that one of the new Governors may also support with one of the roles with a view to succession planning. Clerk to add filtering and monitoring and attendance as link roles to JBr on GovernorHub. – Action Clerk</p> <p><i>If we were at the school on a monitoring visit for our link role could we request to visit a department that we have an interest in?</i> JD noted that he would put together a schedule of monitoring visits with Governors. – Action JD</p> <p><i>Presumably it would be good to have a few Governors whose role involved monitoring teaching and learning too.</i> JD agreed.</p> <p>PR commented that he was conscious he did not wish to wait until the January LGC to finalise their link roles and, therefore, would create a table and assign roles to the Governors and issue for feedback out of committee. He confirmed he would contact the new Governors who were yet to have access to GovernorHub individually for their input. – Action PR</p> <p>KT asked that she not be allocated Health and Safety due to it being a conflict as her subject, DT, was often a focus of the Health and Safety visits.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Clerk</p> <p style="text-align: center;">JD</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PR</p>
12	<p>Self Evaluation (SEF) Summary</p> <p>JD began by explaining that previously he had modelled the SEF on the Ofsted criteria for outstanding and good for different areas of the school and used those criteria to highlight developmental priorities however noted that, having been recently inspected by Ofsted and with Ofsted intending to consult soon on a new evaluation schedule, he had chosen to focus on their recent Ofsted report instead. Further to that, he had also used the notices of visits from Rick Holroyd, Rachel Cave and Matthew Evans, gathering all the information that they had received from internal and external reviews, plus Governor and staff feedback, which he had then used to create a concise document; FCC Rapid Improvement Plan 2024-25.</p>	
13	<p>School Development Plan</p> <p>JD informed the Governors that CEO Richard Evans (RE) had requested a working document of the school’s priorities and therefore the Rapid Improvement Plan was filterable to the high, medium, and longer term priorities. He highlighted on the document that each action was assigned to a member of SLT, as well as being available for Governors to take a lead on monitoring.</p> <p>JD informed the committee that, by the next meeting, the KPIs would be included for each area listed on the plan so that the progression was clearly trackable. He noted that this could support them in their link Governor roles as, should they have a particular interest in a certain area of development – staff wellbeing, for example – then they could refer to the document to understand the progress being made in that area.</p> <p>PR clarified for the Governors that there was also a SDP for the longer-term goals of the school, however this was a specific rapid improvement plan requested by RE with short term targets and measures that they could focus on, as an LGC, to allow them to hold JD and the</p>	



	<p>school to account. He noted that the document would be very useful for Governors to reference in upcoming meetings.</p> <p>JD informed the committee that he had also created a further document which supported this, which outlined the visions for each element of the school, and where each member of SLT had been asked to create the vision for their area as part of their professional development.</p> <p>Governors agreed with JD that the detailed, comprehensive, but concise document was a great tool for helping them maintain a strategic oversight of the school's priorities.</p>	
<p>14</p>	<p>Governor Monitoring of SDP</p> <p><i>Can we confirm that, for future meetings, our monitoring of the SDP will be done via the rapid improvement plan that we have just discussed?</i></p> <p>JD confirmed that would be the case, noting that it was an opportunity to reduce the length of the Headteacher's report, allowing it to be more accessible and also to mitigate the risk of repeating information. He noted that the Governors' closest focus should remain on the SDP.</p> <p><i>I think that would be good; we could link the data behind some of these targets with the report, so it becomes more concise and closely focused on the data.</i></p> <p>JD agreed with Governors.</p> <p>PR invited Governors to share any questions or comments, of which there were none.</p>	
<p>15</p>	<p>Uniform Policy</p> <p>JD informed the committee that, since taking over the Headship, he had received a lot of feedback from both staff and students regarding the uniform and, particularly, its accessibility for students who were neurodiverse or had sensory issues.</p> <p>JD noted that currently, when the weather became too hot for the usual uniform, students were permitted to wear their PE kits to school, however he was suggesting moving to a simple, summer uniform. He noted that he would not be requesting students wear a branded polo shirt as part of the summer uniform, as it was an unnecessary expense. He added that a jumper would be optional and therefore he felt that a simple, unbranded white shirt or polo shirt and shorts, trousers or skirt would suffice. Though the expense was a consideration, he noted that the biggest factor for him was ensuring students were comfortable, and for those students with sensory sensitivities, that they remained comfortable and able to learn, or to focus on exams. JD informed the Governors that he had received positive feedback from staff on this proposal.</p> <p>The second proposal JD shared with Governors was a potential consultation on the uniform as a whole. He explained that the blazer was the most expensive item, even if parents chose to purchase a plain one and sew on a patch, and highlighted that most adults no longer wear blazers or suit jackets and ties for work, if that was what the blazer had been modelled upon originally. JD noted that his suggestion was that they could move to an FCC jumper or sweatshirt, which would still look smart and, as well as significantly reducing the cost for parents, would negate the need for frequent conversations with students around tucking in their shirts. He informed the committee that he would like to put the proposal out for consultation, as it would be a significant saving for parents, alongside being more practical, from an ease of washing perspective, and by changing from navy to black trousers and skirts which were more readily available. He invited Governors to share their opinions on the proposal.</p>	



I think the idea of having black trousers or skirts is far better than navy, which can be hard to source. I am slightly anxious that there is a significant drop in smartness from a blazer, tie, shirt and trousers to potentially just a polo shirt and trousers at times. There has always been an argument that the students are very smartly dressed at FCC and that, in theory, cultivates a respect for the school. Though conversely, perhaps it could be argued we have not seen that respect from past behaviour.

JD noted that the biggest reason to remove the blazer was the cost and comfort, and that an effective and tidy uniform could be had without the current cost implications, and would be more accessible to students with sensory issues.

I like the idea of a V-neck or round neck sweatshirt with a shirt and tie in the winter; now that we have the clip-on ties rather than the conventional ones, I believe that makes them more comfortable for students. Regarding the colour of the trousers, we changed from black to navy originally as it made it more difficult for students to wear fashion-trousers, as there was an issue with the girls wearing trousers that were inappropriate for school. I like the school blazer but agree that it is too expensive. Lastly, regarding polo shirts, they will go grey quicker than the shirts. We used to have a short-sleeve, summer shirt which they could wear untucked, though that also had the badge on and so was costly.

JD thanked KT for her comments.

I also agree that the blazer is unnecessary, and a jumper would be perfectly smart. It is worth considering that KA's went the other way, from sweatshirts and polos to a stricter uniform policy as it was too untidy; we ought to be cautious not to go too far. I personally prefer shirts to polo shirts.

JD clarified that the polo shirts would only be for the summer uniform, though added that perhaps a plain short sleeve shirt could be considered as these would be able to be purchased relatively cheaply from supermarkets. JD drew the comparison with Larkmead, noting that their jumpers and ties looked very smart, and so similar could be implemented at FCC.

I like the idea of the iron-on logos; the supermarkets sell cheap blazers and uniform, and that would allow us to maintain the same level of formality. My concern is that a more causal approach could result in a reduction in desirable behaviour from students, and that the uniform gives the students a sense of belonging to the school.

JD commented that he felt like many of the students would feel part of the school regardless of the uniform. He commented that the strict uniform requirements resulted in staff having discussions and conflicts with students unnecessarily and a smart, but simple, uniform could resolve so many of those conflicts.

He explained to Governors that, if they were to change the uniform, they would first look at various examples from other schools and the reasoning behind their choices.

JD informed the committee that they were looking to instil pride in the school in ways other than the uniform, such as the growth of the House system and the school environment. He thanked Governors for their comments on the proposal and noted that they would all be considered as part of the consultation period.

What would the consultation entail? Would it go to all parents?

JD confirmed that it would, and that there was a process to follow to do which he had discussed with the Trust Head of Governance and Policy, Vicky Roberts. JD commented that he felt the best way to instil pride in their students was with a sense of belonging, and that was achieved by more than a uniform.



	<p>PR highlighted that there was some urgency to this consultation as, in the new year, parents may begin to consider uniform for the following September, particularly those who were having children starting in year 7 and so would definitely purchase a blazer.</p> <p>JD agreed, noting that he was keen to run the consultation early in the new year. He added that he would ensure that any decision was finalised before prospective parents were aware that they had been accepted to the school and would ensure the changes were clearly communicated to the future parents.</p> <p><i>Do we have to give notice to PMG to let them know that they will no longer be selling blazers?</i></p> <p>JD confirmed that they would do, noting that he would follow up to find out what the notice period was. – Action JD</p> <p>JD thanked Governors for their contribution to the discussion.</p>	JD
16	<p>Health and Safety Update</p> <p>PR invited JD to share any updates he had on Health and Safety.</p> <p>JD noted that there were no significant health and safety issues to update on, however they would be having an audit from the Trust soon as part of the Trust’s regular review programme.</p>	
Strategic matters		
17	<p>Finance update</p> <p>JD informed the Governors that he had received an update that day that the budget for the end of the last academic year was now available and there would be a review of that the following week. JD shared his frustration that there was a lack of financial budgetary information for the current academic year – and that last year’s was so delayed in being shared. Despite that, he noted that he was keen to get a clear understanding of last year’s finances at the meeting the following week.</p> <p>PR provided input on the previous year’s expenditure, noting that there would be an overspend in their budget, due largely to the IT rollout and spend on alternative provision for those students who required it. PR continued by noting that they expected the same to apply to the current academic year, where phase two of the IT rollout was due, and students were still requiring alternative provision to support them in their learning.</p> <p>JD clarified for the committee that the IT rollout was a significant sum of money for necessary IT upgrades and therefore no further savings could be made in that area. Regarding alternative provision, he informed the LGC that they had been in discussions with the Local Authority to better understand what would be financed by them. He noted that they were having to cancel some of the alternative provision that was currently provided to make some savings to this aspect of the budget, explaining that, due to locality, alternative provision for students at FCC was often incredibly costly in terms of transport, which was rarely funded by the Local Authority. JD explained that FCC was not alone in this issue, and that it was a commonality in schools across the county. Due to this, he noted that they were looking to revive PD’s suggestion of a ‘school within a school’ and look to get a wholly inclusive curriculum which would allow them to keep those students requiring further support at the school.</p> <p><i>It is not sustainable to be using all our reserves on a small number of students and, mostly, their transport, which is not adding any value to the students. We need a change of policy to ensure we are keeping within our budget.</i></p>	



	<p>JD concurred, noting that there were some higher needs students who would be required to return to FCC and that would have an impact on behaviour within the school, therefore they needed to find a more sustainable, alternative provision where possible.</p> <p><i>Are there other alternatives in terms of transport?</i></p> <p>JD noted that they were looking for alternatives, noting that they would need to have the change in place for January.</p> <p>Governors thanked JD for his update.</p>	
	Other matters	
18	<p>AOB as notified to the Chair prior to the meeting</p> <p>PR noted that there were some questions on GovernorHub to share as AOB.</p> <p><i>Looking at behaviour within the school, in-school truancy appears to be increasing and is a regular issue for some students. How is this being addressed?</i></p> <p>PD responded that, on a short-term basis they had increased the suspension tariff for in-school truancy and that appeared to be having some impact. He added that, as part of their reintegration process, they would also be bringing in a bespoke form for internal truancy to support those students and their next goal would be to ensure that each of those students had a mentor to support them.</p> <p>PR invited the committee to raise any further items of AOB, of which there were none.</p>	
19	<p>Dates of upcoming LGC meetings</p> <p>21st of January 2025 at FCC – 6.30pm 18th of March 2025 at FCC – 6.30pm 13th of May 2025 at FCC – 6.30pm 8th of July 2025 at FCC – 6.30pm</p>	