



Quality of Education Committee Minutes

Meeting	Quality of Education Committee	Where	Via <u>Teams</u>
Date	Thursday 23 rd September 2021	Time	4.30 p.m.
Attendees	Paul Turner (PT); Louise Warren (LW, Director of Education); Chris Price-Smith (CP-S); Sarah Church (SC); Rev. Jason St John Nicolle (JN) Apologies: Clerk – Alexandra Molton		

No	Description
	Procedural Matters
1	Apologies for absence and acceptance/non-acceptance. PT welcomed attendees to the meeting. No apologies were sent to the meeting and the meeting was quorate.
2	Declaration of personal or business interests. None were made at this point in the meeting.
3	Minutes of the last meeting on 24th June 2021 and actions (circulated with the agenda). PT asked SC if she had completed her action to write a draft set of guidelines for Trustee school visits. SC confirmed that she has not yet completed this action but will do so as soon as possible. All other actions were confirmed as completed.
4	Review and confirm Terms of Reference for 2021/22. LW confirmed that following a conversation with Anne Lynn (AL), the responsibility for confirming that Heads have read and understood the Pay policy, Appraisal policy, Financial Manual and Scheme of Delegation for the year will be moving over to Resources from next year as this action is more in line with the remit of this committee. SG has already actioned this. <i>How effective can we be in delivering on our ToR?</i> PT: We use the Scheme of Delegation and Strategic Plan to populate our Terms of Reference for the year and hold LW / the Trust to account through the year against these. LW confirmed that her role is the link between the schools 'on the ground' and the committee as a

	<p>more strategic and questioning body.</p> <p>PT reiterated that the committee needs to remain strategic and Trust-focused, which means that it is not always necessary to have school-level details on all occasions.</p> <p>The committee recognised that the success of the committee it down to members about asking the right questions of LW to ensure that it receives a full, Trust-wide picture.</p> <p>SC suggested that there is a section in the Strategic Plan for this year which references the Resources committee but should be QoE.</p> <p>ACTION: Clerk to check this with Sandra Green (SG).</p> <p>ACTION: Clerk to add in details of the Strategic Plan to the ToR for this year and circulate to the committee.</p>
	Ensuring Accountability
5	<p>Review and approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk Register <p>This was not provided to the committee ahead of the meeting, so will be looked at again at the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: AM to check that safeguarding is included in the Risk Register.</p> <p>ACTION: Clerk to upload the Trust Risk Register into the meeting folder when the minutes for this are confirmed, to allow committee members to review this before the next meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scheme of Delegation <p>As this has not yet been approved by the Board, the committee considered the Activity Planner for the year and approved this, agreeing that this highlighted all of the areas expected to be under the remit of this committee this year.</p> <p>ACTION: Clerk to circulate the Scheme of Delegation to the committee for information, once it has been approved by the Board.</p>
6	<p>Receive report on Heads and policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appraisal Policy - Financial Manual - Pay Policy - Scheme of Delegation <p>LW confirmed that the Heads have been contacted and asked to read these policies and raise any queries directly with the Central team, as above.</p>
7	<p>Safer Recruitment across the Trust</p> <p>PT informed the committee that the requirements of this have changed considerably in accordance with the new KCSiE and therefore anyone who has completed this training before will need to do this again in light of these changes. At least two people on any interview panels across the Trust need to have carried out this new training going forward.</p> <p><i>What are the key changes?</i></p>

	<p>LW: Sally Robins (SR) did the NSPCC training at the end of the summer and confirmed that there are lots of new processes that need to be followed and areas where guidelines have been tightened up. PT and JN agreed to undertake this training on behalf of the committee and they will contact SG to confirm how to access this.</p>
8	<p>Review in-year pupil transition data</p> <p>The committee reviewed the data which had been provided by LW before the meeting.</p> <p>LW confirmed that WAT have the biggest mobility amongst their students as of 1/9/2020 they had taken 114 in-year and 147 had left in-year.</p> <p><i>How many children are on role at WAT?</i></p> <p>LW: 350 approx (tbc)</p> <p><i>Is their capacity just over 400?</i></p> <p>LW: Yes. It is a 2 form entry school with Nursery.</p> <p><i>That is a very high level of mobility- does this include the Reception children?</i></p> <p>LW: I agree that this does seem high and I will check the data with the school again.</p> <p>JBL and SHR did not return the data so LW will also chase these up.</p> <p><i>The number of EAL starting every September is also a real challenge for the school.</i></p> <p>LW: It is and requires a lot of resource from the school. The most effective way of analysing this data is by looking for trends. I will create a table of all schools when this is received, for future comparison.</p> <p>ACTION: Clerk to upload to GovernorHub when this is completed.</p> <p><i>Could we have data from WAT for last year and service/non-service children for comparison?</i></p> <p>LW: I will ask the school to provide this.</p> <p>LW informed the committee that BUC, L&F, FIS and WAT now have nurseries on site which are part of the school.</p> <p>In 2020 11 children from BUC Nursery then joined a Reception cohort of 15.</p> <p>17 children from the Nursery at WAT then joined a Reception cohort of 48.</p> <p>18 Nursery children from FIS joined a Reception cohort of 61 at the school.</p> <p>4 children from the Nursery at L&F joined a Reception cohort of 18.</p> <p>JBL and SHR are currently looking at their nursery provision with the aim of making this in-house in the longer term as it is a real benefit to the children's first year at school if they have already had a Nursery year in the same setting.</p> <p><i>Are these Nurseries part of the school or part of the Trust?</i></p> <p>LW: Part of the Trust.</p> <p><i>How many of those children at WAT are service children?</i></p> <p>ACTION: LW to find out the figures for this.</p> <p><i>There are lots of local independent providers for nurseries in this area; do we want more children in our nurseries or do we want these children in our nurseries because it is a benefit to them when they</i></p>

start in Reception? Is there any loss to the children completing their Nursery year at one school and then moving to another school for their Reception year?

LW: It is a significant benefit for the children to carry out a Nursery year at the same school as their Reception year. The children are more settled and ready to learn from the start of the year.

LW confirmed that FIS currently have spaces in their Nursery as there is lots of competition for nursery provision in Faringdon with other providers able to offer longer days than the school.

I am surprised at the figures for L&F, with only 4 from their Nursery moving into their Reception class.

LW: It was only their first year of having a Nursery at the school so this will grow over time.

LW informed the committee that the Central team have been liaising with the Preschool in Faringdon which is next to the school as they might join the Trust in the future.

September transition

FIS and FJS have reported that the new Y3s have settled really well into their new school. Children are more independent this year, probably because parents have not been allowed into school much over the last year which has meant they have had to do more for themselves.

LW reminded the committee that this should be the last year that we are looking at this transition from FIS to FJS as the new schools will be all through primaries.

The Academy Improvement Team has appointed a new practitioner for the transition from Y6 to Y7; Rebecca James (RJ). CAT tests have been carried out for the Y7 children as FCC felt that without the usual SATS of last year this would be a useful way to capture where the gaps are in learning for the children who have moved up to Y7 this year.

The feedback from Y7 teachers so far is that the children are settling well and behaving well so far, and that they are well prepared and conscientious. The cohort seems to have better cultural knowledge than the previous cohort, possibly from spending more time among adults over the last 18 months. However they are quite a needy year group and staff are needing to provide some extra resources for the student and finding that they are struggling to work independently, lacking in resilience and needing more reassurance than they would expect at this stage. There are also student who are struggling with grammar and writing sentences and punctuation compared to what the teachers would expect at this age.

LW reminded the committee that Trust schools completed the 2019 SATS tests in-house last year and these were internally marked and the results added to FFT. Miss Nicholls as Head of Y7 and RJ will continue to work with the Y7s to help them to transition into Secondary school this year and RJ will be working with Primary schools in the Trust to keep improving the arrangements for future transition.

LW reported that 93 Y11 students stayed on to Sixth form at FCC last year, which is around 42% of the cohort. The choices of those that left offer less academically-focused options for post-school plans.

There is a new Deputy Head of 6th form this year, and this is a key post to support Maria Button to

	<p>lead the 6th form.</p> <p>LW reported that of the 2020 A-level students 68% of the cohort went to University; 43% to those within the Russell Group and 100% had a progression route out of A-levels.</p> <p><i>What is the quality of our careers advice? What system is in place to deliver that?</i></p> <p>LW: This is delivered either through Maria Button, Head of 6th form, or through advice given through the students' time in the 6th form by a dedicated careers advisor. There is also a programme of life skills such as cooking, and managing money which the students complete in their last year at school.</p> <p><i>Is any careers advice given prior to 6th form?</i></p> <p>LW: I will check the level of this.</p> <p><i>What advice are students given when choosing GCSE choices?</i></p> <p>LW: I will find out what specific advice is offered during year 9, for students choosing their options for GCSEs. There is a parent meeting and students are guided by form and subject tutors as well as Head of Year.</p> <p><i>How do the primary schools promote career choices through the younger years of schooling? How do we make sure that all choices promote opportunities across the genders?</i></p> <p>LW: Each school is in charge of its own curriculum so this is hard to monitor. LW will raise this at ALT in order to put this in Heads' minds for this year and ensure it is addressed in all the schools.</p>
9	<p>Outcome data :</p> <p>Targets were set based on previous results, so we are not accounting for the effect of Covid in this way. Outcomes reflect the school closure for part of last year.</p> <p>WAT data includes EAL children – the results of some nationalities can be taken out at KS2. The results include high-mobility.</p> <p>Children who are coming in below target will be picked up and supported as needed to help them to work towards their original targets.</p> <p>The data is just based on the results of core subjects but we also need to look carefully at outcomes from Foundation subjects.</p> <p>LW reported the results to the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EYFS <p>LW has collated data from across the 6 schools.</p> <p>Most schools came in below target, with WAT a significant outlier, coming in at 22% below target. L&F reported results above target. Overall the Trust results were 68.2%, against a target of 76.3% and 2019 result of 75% (national data 2018 was 72%).</p> <p><i>When is the data on EYFS data taken – at the start or end of the year?</i></p> <p>LW: June.</p> <p><i>Why are the results from WAT so much below target?</i></p> <p>LW: Partly due to Covid school closures. James Hood (JH) was supporting the EYFS here in terms of establishing basic routines, ensuring that profiles and assessments were correct, setting out</p>

behaviour and setting high expectations for the children.

LW advised that the next step is to involve the OCC advisory team in an audit of EYFS at WAT. The committee agreed that it was a good idea to involve an external body in the review process.

There are new EYFS curriculum and assessment procedures this year, with much more focus on really knowing the children and their next steps rather than collecting evidence of what the children can do. JH will visit all schools in the spring term to check how they are getting on with the new curriculum.

- KS1

Most schools were on or close to target, with WAT the lowest performer. They have had sustained issues with Phonics particularly due to the ages of the EAL children. This has improved from previous years due to the use of Read Write Inc. BUC and JBL were below target, with Y1 struggling with remote learning and the quality of teaching on return which focused on wellbeing rather than academic results. The Trust came in at 65.5% against a target of 79.7%, and a 2019 result of 79% (national data 2018 was 72%).

We will carry out the Phonics tests in November this year for the previous Y1s (current Y2), who did not complete this in June this year.

Where are we in terms of use of the recommended Phonics schemes?

LW: Most schools are using Read Write Inc. SHR are hoping to use a scheme which still focuses on letters and sounds. Lots of work took place last year in terms of matching the Phonics teaching with the books which the children are reading. LW would like to appoint a Reading Lead on a TLR to focus on this for the year.

Reading also came in below target across the Trust, with a result of 76.3% against a target of 82.3% and a 2019 result of 85%. WAT and SHR were the most below target in Reading, with children at SHR particularly struggling with remote learning. These children had also missed out on strong teaching in Y1 too; we have our eye closely on their Y3 and will ensure that these children who underperformed as Y2s are targeted with the additional catch up funding. The results here met the national levels from 2019 of 75% but we want to see this improve back up to target.

Writing stamina and fluency was an issue during remote learning particularly for WAT and SHR. This took the Trust results here to 10% below target across the year. Writing will be a target for most school SDPs this year and the AIT will continue its work on writing moderation sessions for each year group.

Maths results at WAT in Y2 were much better as language is not so much of a barrier to understanding the subject. All schools came in just below national, with SHR the most marked below. Maths will be a focus for the Y3s at SHR this year. The Trust results were 75.7% against a target of 82.8% and against a 2019 national level of 75%.

- KS2

Reading for all schools was not far off target, with JBL the most under target. JBL felt that their

children had suffered from not having the booster groups which they would usually put in place in Y6. LW has already fed back that the teaching should be consistent enough throughout the primary school years to mean that these sessions are not so key to the success of the cohort.

All schools tested children using a 2019 Reading SAT for a standardised approach. The Trust results overall were 80.5% against a target of 86.2% and a 2019 national level of 83%.

The lowest performers in Writing were FJS and WAT, which are the Trust schools with the most SEN and PP children and potentially less parental engagement than other schools. Both schools were aware that writing stamina had suffered during lockdown. LW informed the committee that there can be some issues with parental engagement among the PP children which does make a difference to the children's outcomes. Schools are constantly trying to engage with these parents as we know the value of this. The Trust results of 76.4% were below the target of 87% but not far from the 2019 national level of 78%.

Maths at KS2 was a fair way below target – particularly at FJS and WAT. Fewer than 40% of children at WAT in Y6 met the expected standard in Maths, which is worrying. The effect of the bubbles meant that schools could not set pupils which has been effective in the past and TA's could not move between bubbles to provide support. The Trust results came in at 74.4% against a target of 90.7% and a 2019 national level of 76%.

Could we find out if the bigger primary schools have suffered in their results nationally?

LW: Our target was high for the year but we usually sit above that. LW will research.

- KS4

Results this year were comparable to previous years.

Progress scores are not being measured this year. FCC were pleased with their results and felt that they were very robust in their CAGs and moderation. Many students were adjusted as a result of the moderation work which took place.

Interesting to note that the drop for KS4 results between 2019 and 2021 is not nearly as large as that for KS1 and KS2.

SC: The offer from FCC was so vastly different from KS1 and KS2 as the children are older and found it easier to engage remotely without parental support.

LW: Teachers are so aware that these students need to get what they deserve and reflects their ability as this affects their future life chances.

How were the tests carried out?

LW: Tests were carried out at school and all groups were moderated after the marking took place. The current Y11s are a particular focus at FCC this year as these students have had Y9 and Y10 interrupted by Covid. There is also a significant level of higher need within the year group and a focus on those who are borderline grade boundaries. FCC has yet to find out how the assessments will be carried out for these students this year.

FCC are currently looking at exam prep for current Y13s who have done no formal school exams

	since KS2.
10	<p>Rapid School Improvement plan report</p> <p>Jude Scutt (JS) is supporting WAT 3 days a week. There are lots of new staff at WAT including a new Deputy and new SENCo, as well as a new SLT. LW provided a schedule of the planned support for the school on GovernorHub for the committee to review before the meeting.</p> <p>The SLT will be reviewing support staff deployment to ensure that staff are in the right places at the right times to support the children. JS feels that there is a need for more resource at the school.</p> <p>Numbers of EAL, EHCPs and additional need SEND children are so high that it is a worthy investment to ensure that staff all in the most effective roles and therefore this is the most urgent task to be carried out. The SLT are meeting AL about this next week.</p> <p>JS and Georgina Wintle (GW) are working on a communication policy at the school so that this message is clear across the school.</p> <p>There is a focus on providing high-quality teaching this year.</p> <p>The new SENCo is starting to work effectively and building relationships with parents and SEND children.</p> <p>The committee suggested that the Plan should to be shared with the Chair of the LGB, Ian Wright (IW) prior to being shared with the rest of the Board. LW will ask GW to share this with IW directly.</p> <p>A governance review is booked at WAT for the end of October with IW, GW, JS, LH and LW.</p> <p><i>Do you feel that the work you are doing to support WAT means that you are struggling to carry out all of the tasks required in your role as Director of Education?</i></p> <p>LW: Luckily the other schools are in a good place with strong leadership and SLTs in place. We need to ensure that JS is supported in her role helping the school. DM will continue to provide support to GW through her appraisal process.</p> <p><i>Is the Head still receptive to this support?</i></p> <p>LW: Yes, and the support will continue for this year with the hope that positive changes are forthcoming. It will reduce to 2 days in the spring and 1 in the summer in the hope that the situation is then sustainable.</p> <p>Thanks to LW and JS for all of their hard work and commitment to helping WAT to succeed.</p>
	Strategic Matters
	Conclusion
11	<p>Any Other Business (please notify the Chair before the meeting).</p> <p><i>Who will be replacing Lindsay Baldwin as Trust Safeguarding Lead?</i></p> <p>LW: We have offered this to an individual and we are currently trying to organise the correct safer recruitment checks for them. Sophie Dors is trying to track down the appropriate references from previous employment. Hopefully this new person will be in place after October half term.</p> <p>CPS reported that SHR, BUC and L&F are not on the list for SIAMS inspections this year and confirmed that the list is now available on the Church education office website.</p>

12	<p>Future meeting dates:</p> <p>The committee agreed to hold all meetings online via Teams unless there is a particular reason to meet face to face.</p> <p>11th November 2021, 4.30pm via Teams.</p> <p>20th January 2022, 4.30pm via Teams.</p> <p>10th March 2022, 4.30pm.</p> <p>12th May 2022, 4.30pm</p> <p>30th June 2022, 4.30pm.</p>
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

DRAFT