



## Quality of Education Committee Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Quality of Education Committee	<b>Where</b>	Via Teams
<b>Date</b>	Thursday 13 <sup>th</sup> May 2021	<b>Time</b>	4.00 p.m.
<b>Attendees</b>	Louise Warren (LW, Director of Education); Chris Price-Smith (CP-S); Rev. Paul Walker (PW); Sarah Church (SC); Jason St John Nicolle (JN); Joe Winter (JW)  Apologies: Paul Turner (PT)  Clerk – Alexandra Molton		

No	Description
	<b>Procedural Matters</b>
	<b>Apologies for absence and acceptance/non-acceptance.</b>
1	Welcome to attendees. No apologies and quorate.
2	<b>Declaration of personal or business interests.</b> None.
3	<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021 and actions (circulated with the agenda).</b> The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting. Update on actions are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LW confirmed that LB carried out a re-audit of WAT and there were some outstanding actions which she is now helping them to resolve. LW confirmed that these are related to policies rather than the culture of the school.</li> <li>- LW emailed the committee the national figures on attendance and exclusions to compare to the FCC data; JW to join this meeting to discuss the data in more detail LW has discussed the logging of bullying and discrimination on school records with Heads and they have agreed when incidents should be logged as behaviour rather than bullying or discriminatory incidents. LW suggested that a more definitive Trust statement on how to record and react to bullying and discriminatory incidents would be helpful for staff.</li> <li>- SC confirmed that WAT do have a Safeguarding governor already in place. SC has contacted all of the Safeguarding governors across the schools to introduce herself and offer support as needed. SC will be led by LB on the best time to offer the WAT Safeguarding governor more specific support as there is already lots of activity taking place at the school.</li> <li>- Liz Holmes (LH) has drilled down into the FFT data and discussed with LW what this shows about our schools. LH felt that some key information and graphs for the Board would be useful as a snapshot of the situation across all schools rather than necessarily providing them all with a log in to the system. LW will provide this information for the Board.</li> </ul>

- LW confirmed that PT did add in the suggested elements from the last QoE meeting into his report to the last Board meeting.
- LW confirmed that staff have volunteered to staff a summer school to help children to catch up over the summer holidays and Rachel Kenyon (RK) is taking this forward. This will initially be offered to the PP and vulnerable children and those moving from Y6 to Y7. The school will take place over 2 weeks during the summer holidays and funded by the summer DFE Catch-up funding.

*How are staff feeling about offering this over the holidays?*

LW: Staff have volunteered to take on this extra teaching over the holidays and will be paid for their work.

**Ensuring Accountability**

**FCC and exclusions (JW).**

JW shared a report on the attendance and exclusions data at FCC for this year so far and 2019/20. The attendance target at FCC is 96%. This is high for a Secondary school but the school always sets it at this level. Usually FCC sits at around 95% but the figure was only 94.3% in 2019/20 but this was an unusual year.

FCC has introduced an X code to use for absences, which indicates that students are not at school due to following government guidance regarding Covid self-isolation. Using the X code effectively removes a child from the attendance figures.

Earlier this year Y11 had to isolate as a year group for two weeks so they have the highest X code results for the year so far. Up to 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021 the X code was used to record 42.2 % of absences including national lockdowns.

Attendance across the school so far this year is 94.9% (of the time that pupils were able to attend school). This is an improvement compared to attendance levels in 2019/20 – in some part due to using the X code to log absences which would previously been logged as illness.

Illness absence last year was 3.6%; this year it is 3%.

Holiday absence for T1 and T2 has dramatically reduced this year, from 0.24% in 2019/20 to 0.03% in 2020/21.

*The X code means that each student that does attend has a greater effect on the data as a whole.*

JW: Yes, every pupil attending school makes a difference to the figures.

4

JW explained that attendance at FCC is very high compared to other Secondaries this year; some others have attendance as low as 88%.

There are 1,300 children at FCC and only one child has not returned to school which is due to their own medical issues and individual circumstances. FCC is still maintaining regular contact with this child.

There is a worrying trend around PPG attendance figures over the whole school. It is concerning because they are lower than the average for the year group – and also because these figures get worse as the children move through the school. This is also a national trend as well as a school one.

*We have seen this trend as children move through school before. It is the level of pastoral care and relationships with the children which make the difference. What support does FCC offer the children in these ways?*

JW: Within school relationships between children and staff are generally very positive. The biggest difference I have seen is where there are higher levels of parental engagement and parental support. There are small numbers of PPG children in school which means that each one makes a bigger impact on the overall figures. This means that you cannot compare year groups as these children make up a different number within each year group. Some students in Y11 have attendance figures of less than 30% and the school is doing all it can to try and get these children to school – home

visiting; offering to bring them to school and back home; reduced timetables. However if the parents of these children are not engaged this makes a huge difference in getting the pupils to engage with school.

*What is the main reason for children not attending school?*

JW: Many of the absences are due to mental health issues – particularly anxiety. We are working with some of these children in Y11 to try to engage them with education in some form in order for them to move on to something positive. Some of the pupils have engaged with attending sessions at college rather than coming into school, which we have set up to try and ensure that they leave school with some qualifications, but it is a struggle to keep these children engaged.

*There is work to be done in Y7 with these children in order to prevent the problem increasing as time goes on.*

JW: We are working on this with these pupils but each case is very individual and we need to be aware of this when putting appropriate support in place.

*What in-school support is in place without formal outside agency involvement?*

JW: We have increased the levels of pastoral care in school, and the team now consists of five staff. We need to target the resources into the places where it can make the most positive difference. We are working with Y10s this year to focus on PPG and attendance and the pastoral lead who is leading on this is meeting with these children to provide targeted support to try and encourage them to attend school. We are also focusing on the children with 90-95% attendance to get them into school more and often find that parental engagement is more positive which means we are more likely to make a difference here.

JW explained that this pattern is the same for SEN children across the school. The SEN EHCP children are a very small number of children and overall there are only about 20-30 pupils with SEN across the school. Some of the children are both SEN and PPG pupils and these children are more likely to have poor attendance which impact upon the data.

LW reminded the committee about the passports which were introduced last year for the PPG children which follow them through the schools and allow them to record personal successes and achievements in their learning.

Attendance of PPG will always be a challenge compared to non-PPG children but all we can do is to try and make an impact upon this.

*Does this attendance data feed into the FCC Safeguarding policy and flag any concerns about the PPG children who are not in school?*

JW: It is included in our policy but we have a system in place to keep sight of these children and if a child is not seen by a member of staff for two weeks we are obliged to report them as a missing child.

*Did the figures show that the gap was lessening before the Covid situation?*

JW: Covid has certainly had an effect in KS4. Anecdotal case studies lower down the school are far more positive than higher up the school.

*This shows then that the strategy for spending the recovery funding is key. Is there any thinking about how we might change the way these children are schooled in order to make a positive impact on the lower attendees?*

JW: Yes there is some thinking about this but it is harder to put this into practice. We have trialled this on a small scale with children being on Google Classrooms in another room in school whilst the

teacher is teaching the main of the class. We are exploring how this might work in the future but there is not currently any Government guidance on this.

The committee considered the data on exclusions at FCC.

There were 43 exclusions in terms 1 and 2 in 2020/21, which were connected to 28 students.

37% of these exclusions were connected to PPG children although this is less than last year

60% of Fixed Term Exclusions (FTE) were connected to SEN pupils.

75% of the exclusions were related to students in Y9 and Y10 students.

Only 2% of all students were excluded for a Fixed Term.

Reasons for exclusion:

- Refusing to co-operate is a big issue. These children have usually been in contact with several different staff members with lots of escalation before we consider a FTE.
- Persistent disruptive behaviour. These are usually cases where this behaviour has continued across the week and we consider a FTE as final step. For some of these children it can help to re-set their behaviour and they are better behaved when they return to school.

*Is there any argument for a cooling off base in school?*

JW: We have some provision for this in school already. A number of children have cooling off cards which they can use if staff feel that these students need to leave the classroom for some time out.

We also have an exclusion room which is staffed which is mainly used by students who do something fairly serious but we are trying to avoid issuing a FTE. This does not work for all children but can be helpful in some cases.

*How do staff judge the difference between violent behaviour and pupils physically assaulting one another?*

JM: Violent behaviour is usually less active but more serious behaviour rather than causing each other actual harm.

*Is it harder to get together evidence for appeals against FTEs?*

JW: No, as incidents are logged on Edulink – for both good and bad behaviour. In the last 5 years we have never had someone appeal a FTE.

*There are comparatively low numbers of bullying and discriminatory behaviour in school; how do you classify these?*

JW: Low level incidents are of more concern as there is then a disparity between the reporting of the incidents and the amount of incidents taking place. Now it is easier for staff to log incidents staff are reporting these more often. A couple of children have been excluded for discriminatory language this year.

*Are we confident that we don't discriminate against students based on their race or ethnic background?*

JW: We do consider this element of the data but I am not aware of any particular trends here.

*Levels of FTE among SEN children are even higher than PPG children; is this of concern?*

JW: We have a few very challenging SEN children in particular this year and there is a bit of a trend. We are always considering whether we are meeting the needs of the children. Each letter confirming a FTE gets sent to the SENCo and Inclusion Manager as they need to be aware of these. This also sometimes means that this can identify SEN needs which have previously not been recognised. We are mindful of not positively discriminating towards PPG or SEN children and ensuring that we take the same approach with all children who are behaving badly at school.

The committee thanked Joe Winter for attending the meeting and for his report on attendance and exclusion levels at FCC which the committee found very interesting and insightful.

	<p>The committee agreed that significant difference can be made by relationship building between staff and pupils and were hopeful that as the culture of our schools changes we can see this positive impact evidenced.</p> <p><i>Do the FLT need to start looking at a Trust behaviour unit for our schools?</i>  LW: This is something that Helen Cox is starting to look at for the Trust in relation to SEND and SEMH needs.</p>
5	<p><b>Exclusion data from across the Trust.</b></p> <p>Following the questions raised on this data at the last meeting, LW confirmed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The FTE at JBL was due to one pupil who has since been relocated to another more specialist provision.</li> <li>- The 'PS' on the WAT data referred to 'Preschool'.</li> <li>- The 91% attendance figure at L&amp;F included the last lockdown. This has now been corrected and this figure is now up to 98% for T4.</li> </ul> <p><i>What time period does this data relate to?</i>  LW: 4 weeks of full school opening in T4. Within this context the exclusions at FCC in T4 look better than other terms. The attendance figures at FCC for PP and SEND are also better in T4 than in T1 and T2.</p>
6	<p><b>The Trust's Culture:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bullying Policy/Statement</li> <li>- Developing Behaviours for Learning.</li> </ul> <p>LW confirmed the Trust has booked Ron Piper to hold a training session on creating a highly positive culture focusing on the importance of relational currency.</p> <p>Phil Bevan (PB) has been speaking to staff this term about approaches to behaviour at school. He is focusing on all staff to try to create some consistency between the ways in which staff react to certain behaviours in class.</p> <p>Betsy de Thiery is carrying out an online session with staff on the next inset day in June to do trauma training for all Primary staff.</p> <p>We have also looked at ways of supporting children to be proactive in learning to recognise their feelings, how this effects their behaviour and think about how to seek support to get back into the 'green zone' and be ready to learn.</p> <p><i>How do we measure the successes of this system? How can we see that these changes have been taken on board and enacted by staff?</i>  LW: It will take time to grow across the schools and the Trust wants staff to be on board with this new approach.</p> <p><i>Does this cultural change come in at the appraisal level for staff? Could we look to include elements of this when setting staff targets for the future?</i>  LW: It will be on the strategic plan for the Trust but it is hard to gauge how this will filter down to school SDPs.</p> <p><b>ACTION: LW will consider in more detail how to filter this cultural shift down to school strategy level.</b></p> <p><i>Will this cultural change be included in the 5-year plan?</i>  LW: This was looked at during the last Heads meeting. Staff need more time to consider where the Trust wants to be in 5 years' time. Duncan Millard (DM) has asked for written feedback from staff</p>

	<p>which will then go to the Board for review before the plan is pulled together.</p> <p><i>Is this worth looking at again in July?</i> LW: Worth looking at this again later in the year after the inset day with Ron Piper.</p> <p><i>Should all governors and Trustees be included in these cultural changes?</i> LW: Yes, it is a matter of how to include the whole school community in the process and engage with individuals on all levels of the Trust.</p>
7	<p><b>Report of Church schools in the Trust (CP-S).</b> CP-S presented her findings to the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is a strength of the Trust that the MAT does focus on a values culture and this helps to support the church schools’ ethos, which is shown in the SIAMS evaluations of our Church schools.</li> <li>- It is a real strength that the Director of Education of the Trust is the Head of a church school and understands the value and importance of this aspect of the schools. There is a vulnerability in that we would be significantly negatively affected should LW leave the Trust and the Board should consider this in terms of succession planning at Executive level.</li> </ul> <p>LW added that it is helpful that CP-S emphasised that there is a new SIAMS inspection schedule and schools now have to put forward a case for Excellence. This grading is very rare and expectations need to reflect that the new ‘Good’ grade is considered to be the new gold standard.</p> <p><i>The report does not include any information about the benefit of the link with the Board of the Diocesan reps– would it be useful to link this in?</i> CP-S: The focus of the report was around the ethos of the church schools. The Trust is very fortunate in that the Diocesan Trustees at this time are all experienced in the education environment and have really good understanding of schools.</p> <p><i>Would it be helpful to explain what the ‘Link to biblical teaching’ means in a church school?</i> CP-S: I included this as many schools’ reports include that governors need to understand more about what demonstrates a Christian vision. It is important that a Church schools’ vision, and its associated values, is grounded in a clear theology firmly rooted in a Christian narrative.</p>
8	<p><b>Report on SEN (PW and LW).</b> PW informed the committee that he is leaving the committee due to a re-appointment and asked for a new link governor to be put in place soon to continue to provide support to Helen Cox (HC) as Safeguarding lead for the Trust.</p> <p>LW confirmed HC is working an extra day for the Trust at WAT to help to support their emerging nurture hub. It is likely that the role will be increasing to work 2 days a week permanently for the Trust from next year.</p>
9	<p><b>Report on risk assessment of schools.</b> This was reviewed by LW, Sally Robins (SR), AL and DM this week. The information was added to GovernorHub for the committee to review.</p> <p><b>FCC</b> The school was judged at level 2 risk across Outcomes, Leadership, Capacity and Non-educational.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The school has an excellent Head who is driving things forward and leading on developing his leadership team and improving working with the school LGB.</li> <li>- The new block has now been completed but there is a terrapin classroom which is of concern. The Trust continues to submit CIF bids to replace this and need to consider how to fund this in the future.</li> <li>- 2019/20 data showed progress of +0.26 for GCSE with English and Maths at grade 4+ at 75%.</li> </ul>

However when progress was measured against other schools in 2020 the progress score fell under 0. +0.24 progress at A level and 63.7% A\*-B grades (compared to 2019 national data).

- Attendance of PP and SEND pupils needs to be monitored but there is a focus on progress and outcomes for these pupils. 2 members of staff work for improvement team across the Trust. Full support of 3-18 vision and increased joint working.

#### **Longcot**

The school was judged at level 1 for risk in all categories. The school had a good SIAMS inspection in November 2019 and a positive Governance review in March 2019, as well as an excellent Safeguarding review in April 2019.

#### **Buckland**

The school was judged at level 1 in Outcomes and Leadership but at a level 2 in Capacity and Non-educational. The school had an Outstanding SIAMS inspection in January 2016 and a subject review in June 2019 showed excellent maths and reading provision.

- There is a reduced capacity as LW only works 3 days a week as a Head for the school.
- The schools' Victorian building needs a higher level of maintenance.

#### **FIS**

The school was judged to be at level 1 in Leadership , level 2 in Outcomes and Capacity and level 3 in Non-educational.

- The school has a strong SLT, as well as a positive and supportive culture.
- Good progress has been made with reading and writing but a challenging cohort entered Reception in 2019 and subsequently missed part of the school year.
- There is a high level of need across the school.
- The PP review in January 2019 and Governance review in February 2019 was positive.
- Very strong Head who is also making a significant contribution to the Trust as a whole, supporting WAT, leading on the Trust CPD hub and the future of school provision in Faringdon.

#### **FJS**

The school was judged at level 2/3 in Outcomes, level 1/2 in Leadership, level 2 in Capacity and level 3 in Non-Educational.

- There have been several on-going issues to do with buildings maintenance which are pulling on the school's reserves.
- There are concerns about Maths standards post-lockdown but levels in Reading have been retained.
- The school has a new Deputy Head who has had a powerful impact and is non-teaching. However the Head has requested a reduction to work 3 days a week from September 2020 This Co-Headship will take some time to bed in and some support will be needed during this transition.

#### **WAT**

The school has been judged at level 3 in Outcomes, Leadership and Capacity and level 2 in Non-Educational.

- The Deputy Head, who was making a positive impact, has resigned. There have also been resignations from key staff members, including the SENCo. Some of this can be attributed to staff reflections post-lockdown and some are connected to leadership issues. DM and LW and Jude Scutt (JS) from SHR will be supporting the school here.
- Phonics at the school has continued to improve following the introduction of Read Write Inc. but needs to monitoring to ensure that this is embedded.
- High numbers of EAL student as well as a rapid increase in the numbers of children with high

level and complex needs has put pressure on staff and resources.

- SR has been coaching on leadership at WAT but we need a more extensive support package in place from September.

*WAT has always had issues with the mobility of the students, the international cohort and increased housing in the village, plus the school has a fairly new Head. What is going wrong?*

LW: There has been a gradual deterioration over some time. We have put in place increased leadership support since September but issues like lockdown and having a new Head, plus a Deputy being absent for most of the autumn term, as well as a rapid increase in the levels of SEN children and some serious Safeguarding issues has put the school under great strain. The new Deputy had not been a Deputy before and was not able to get established in the role before lockdown took place. We have met with staff to assure them that the Trust will offer support to staff as needed and remains committed to the improvement of the school.

*What would you see as the next appropriate action to be taken by the Board regarding WAT?*

LW: This is something to be discussed with the Chair of Governors, DM and LH to find out if the LGB need further support. The current situation has been brought to a head by the resignation of the Deputy as staff felt that she was making a difference. The Trust is hoping to recruit for this post soon.

*The committee agreed that the situation at WAT is a good reminder that all schools can be vulnerable and change can happen very quickly.*

#### **JBL**

The school was judged at level 2 in Outcomes, Leadership and Capacity and level 3 for Non-educational.

- A new Head has been appointed to the school, who was one of the previous co-Heads so she knows the school very well. A new Deputy should be appointed soon.
- KS2 results for 2019 including performing at greater depth were good.
- Some support still in place for teachers and new teacher in Y6 as well as an NQT.
- The staff and children are really living the ethos of the school and the culture review in December 2018 and Governance review in February 2019 were both positive.
- The school has a historical deficit which is still impacting upon their finances.
- High level of need and EHCP children which puts pressure on resources.

*Not very good results for Maths?*

LW: What I saw at the school in children's books showed a high level of work so we have had some discussion about teacher assessments and how these are being carried out to ensure they are truly reflective of standards.

#### **SHR**

The school was judged at level 2 in Outcomes, level 1 in Leadership and Capacity and level 3 in Non-educational.

- There is an outstanding Head and a great Deputy Head in place.
- There is a strong teaching team with a good morale and appetite for change.
- An EYFS teacher works 1 day a week for the Trust leading on PP across the Trust.
- The school has good outcomes overall but progress has been an issue in the past.
- The school is running at a deficit and we will have a new school in SHR over the next few years which will bring change.

#### **Assessment outcomes and what assessment will look like across the Trust in 2021.**

- 10 Head have decided to use 2019 SATS papers for Y2's this year and these will be moderated with teacher judgements and in-school assessments to inform a final grading.

	<p>Heads will also be using 2019 Phonics tests and 2019 SATS papers for Y6 children. The Y11's have just completed another set of GCSE mocks and these will be moderated. A meeting has been put in at the end of June to look at the CAG judgements on these.</p> <p><i>What have Heads decided to do about the multiplication Maths tests?</i> LW: Each Head will be deciding if they want to use the trial but most Heads seem willing to try them.</p> <p><i>What year are these for?</i> LW: Y4.</p> <p>There will be a new EYFS baseline coming into school from September, which will involve baselining the children within the first 6 weeks of them joining Reception. Trust staff will be attending training on this. A new EYFS curriculum will be coming in from September and James Hood will be leading on establishing this across the Trust.</p>
	<b>Strategic Matters</b>
11	<p><b>'Thank you' day.</b> LW confirmed that Heads liked the idea of this but were wary of how this would take place before the end of the school year. Heads are looking at adding this onto the inset day on the Friday before the October half term and making the Thursday a Trust-wide wellbeing day instead. Trustees to confirm they are happy to support a sixth Inset day next year.</p>
12	<p><b>Contribute to ideas vision in 2026.</b> LW invited the committee to consider whether it wants to contribute to this and the Trust strategic plan for the next 5 years.</p> <p><i>The committee agreed that the summer governor's conference might be a good forum for this. This is due to take place on 10<sup>th</sup> June at 6.30pm.</i></p>
	<b>Conclusion</b>
13	<p><b>Any Other Business (please notify the Chair before the meeting).</b> PW confirmed that this will be his last meeting and thanked the committee for their support during his time on the committee. The committee thanked PW for all of his contributions during his time on the committee and as a Trustee.</p>
14	<p>Future meeting dates: <b>24<sup>th</sup> June 2021</b>, 4.30pm. The committee agreed to meet via Teams.</p>