



## Quality of Education Committee Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Quality of Education Committee	<b>Where</b>	Via Teams
<b>Date</b>	Thursday 11th November 2021	<b>Time</b>	4.30 p.m.
<b>Attendees</b>	Paul Turner (PT); Louise Warren (LW, Director of Education); Sarah Church (SC); Rev. Jason St John Nicolle (JN)  Apologies: Chris Price-Smith (CP-S)  Clerk – Alexandra Molton		

No	Description
	<b>Procedural Matters</b>
	<b>Apologies for absence and acceptance/non-acceptance.</b>
1	PT welcomed attendees to the meeting. Apologies were sent and accepted from CPS.
	<b>Declaration of personal or business interests.</b>
2	No declarations were made at this point in the meeting.
	<b>Minutes of the last meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2021 and actions (circulated with the agenda).</b>
	The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record of the meeting.
	Update on the actions was as follows:
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC confirmed that a draft visit form has been sent to LH and circulated to the rest of the Board for approval. Trustees will be asked to input their thoughts before a final draft is circulated.</li> <li>- AM confirmed that she had carried out her actions from the last meeting.</li> <li>- AM had compiled a table about mobility within Trust schools and uploaded this to Governor Hub before the meeting.</li> <li>- LW confirmed that this year at Watchfield, 199/391 children are from a military background. SC reminded the committee that current and former service families are eligible for additional grants for the school. LW confirmed that for current students this is £310 per year per pupil.</li> </ul>

	<b>LW confirmed all are current military</b>
4	<p><b>Approve Terms of Reference for 2021/22.</b></p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that she has added in details of the strategic plan for this year. The committee are still liable for the part of the Trust Risk Register which relates to a significant Safeguarding concern or two or more schools being graded as Requires Improvement by Ofsted. Staff updates for this year to the Academy Improvement Team (AIT) were confirmed by LW.</p> <p><b>ATCION: Clerk to compile the final version and circulate this to the committee.</b></p>
	<b>Ensuring Accountability</b>
5	<p><b>To receive a report from Rebecca James (RJ).</b></p> <p>LW summarised the aims of the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To consider how well the PP children have settled into FCC;</li> <li>- To learn more about where there are among PP student and how they might need further support;</li> <li>- To understand more about PP students and their behaviour;</li> <li>- To create an accurate picture of need.</li> </ul> <p>LW explained that RJ is an English teacher at FCC and is new in her AIT role, which is her first lead practitioner roll. The role involves working one day per week for the Trust, looking at Y6-7 transition and particularly how to make this transition smoother and more successful for PPG and SEND pupils. RJ had sent a report to the committee, on the current Y7s.</p> <p>RJ reports that the current Y7 PP students are a more settled cohort than the previous year but it is also a needier cohort than the previous year, with lots of anxiety across the cohort, partly as they have not had the same level of transition as has taken place in previous years. The year group in general is being described by teachers are being less independent in their learning and more anxious than previous years. There are also lower levels of parental engagement.</p> <p>RJ explained that staff have tried to engage with parents at recent parents evening but without success and this is the area we currently need to focus on. The Head of Year is suggesting a more straightforward approach to engaging with parents of Y7 PP students.</p> <p><i>Do we know why parents are not engaging? Is it practical issues – i.e. because people are at work during the day?</i></p> <p><b>ACTION: LW to follow this up with RJ to obtain more specifics about the perceived reasons behind lack of parental engagement.</b></p> <p><i>Is the lack of engagement due to parents not wanting to come into school because of concerns about Covid?</i></p> <p>LW: RJ has suggested that they also don't want to engage remotely.</p> <p><i>Do we need to find out more about the needs of these parents?</i></p> <p>LW: Many of these parents are those who found that school did not work for them and we need to</p>

find a way to help the children to see that there are jobs out there for them and their foothold to these is academic success.

LW pointed out that the year group includes 40 PP students, amongst whom there is already a trend of truancy and regular behaviour issues already. The committee recognised that for some of the students, attendance is already as low as 75%, with some already refusing to attend school at all.

*What is the background behind the attendance data? 94% seems low for the whole year group.*

LW: 94% is low for the year, but many of these absences are probably due to pupils self-isolating.

*The attendance is made to look worse due some of the Covid-related cases where children have had to isolate for 10 days, which is a greater proportion of their time at school at this early part of the year.*

*What are the Safeguarding issues here –how do we know that those who are absent from school are safe?*

LW confirmed that FCC has a policy for checking in with students who are disengaged and not attending school for a period of time.

LW pointed out that only a few of the PP students in Y7 are in any the nurture groups set up to support them. There is already a culture of disengagement with school and lack of aspiration among some of these students which we need to address.

LW has asked RJ to do some book scrutiny for PP pupils to find out how they are actually performing at school and get some idea of their level of academic aspiration and engagement. Y7 is the key time to catch these children and make a difference to their secondary school career.

Due to Covid, there is very little data about this year group and Y8 compared to previous years, with much of it teacher assessed. CAT tests took place among the Y7s and Y8s at the end of September. Scores among the PP pupils in Y7 were below the average for the year group in all areas, with the average score across all areas 101.3 and 96.7 among PP students.

Plans for this year:

- Working on engaging more with the parents of PP children.
- Having more visits to and from FCC for the Y6 students, and more opportunities for integration.
- IT can be an issue for those who have borrowed a piece of kit in Y6 but had to return these before moving on to Y7. We need to make sure that students all have access to reliable IT at home to support their learning.

*Could the students keep the IT equipment and ask FCC to donate to the schools to purchase new equipment?*

LW to investigate this.

**ACTION: LW to ask RJ for another report in the Spring term (March), in order for the committee to**

	<p><b>have some comparative data and analysis.</b></p>
6	<p><b>To receive a report on school recovery strategies/Catch up funding.</b></p> <p>LW made these available on GovernorHub before the meeting and confirmed that she has not yet received one from FCC or WAT. All schools have used the same template to produce their reports.</p> <p><i>If the impact at each school shows anything in particular it would be good to track back to see if there is any best practice or shared learning which can be captured.</i></p> <p>LW: Absolutely and the fact that we will have the funding again this year also makes this valuable to document.</p> <p><b>ACTION: AM to put together a document to show how the funding has been used effectively across the Trust.</b></p> <p>LW explained that most schools found their own in-house tutors to use for catch up sessions rather than using the national schemes as we already know that children learn better with adults which they already know. In many cases this funding has been used for extra TA time within the classroom, extra ELSA support and extra resources.</p> <p><i>Could we rely on receiving this catch up funding over these last two years?</i></p> <p>LW: News about the catch up recovery funding this year came late in the summer holidays so many of us then used this to sustain strategies which were already in place. When we received the first tranche of funds last year we then went into another lockdown so funds had to be redeployed in the some cases.</p> <p><i>How will the funding ending this year affect schools which have been working better due to the funding? Will this being removed result in an inevitable return to previous struggles for some?</i></p> <p>LW: Schools might take a hit. However you cannot tell what will happen with funding; for example Sports Premium funding has been doubled this year.</p> <p>Post meeting note: schools have to submit a 3 year plan for PP funding.</p> <p><i>Can we ask schools what strategies have worked best for them?</i></p> <p>LW: I am hesitant to ask them for further work on this as they have already produced reports, but I will pull together this information from their reports.</p>
7	<p><b>To review school risk assessments.</b></p> <p>LW had uploaded these to GovernorHub ahead of the meeting and confirmed that green on the risk assessments denotes positive changes whereas red denotes negative changes.</p> <p><u>FCC</u></p> <p>Overall the school is stable and in a good place. Leadership culture continues to build a positive ethos.</p> <p>The quality of education has been regraded at a 2. There was an increase in 2021 of students staying</p>

at FCC after GCSEs. Progress and outcomes for PP, LA and SEND pupils is a focus

Leadership has been rated as 1-2 as this continues to improve under the new Head and other leaders are being developed through a coaching model.

Capacity is rated as a 2. Two members of staff are working for the Academy Improvement Team.

Non-educational is graded as a 2. The attendance of PP, SEND and exclusions need to be monitored.

#### L&F

The school was rated as level 1 in all areas. The 2019 SIAMS inspection was graded as Good, the Governance review was graded as positive in March 2019 and the Safeguarding review in April 2019 showed excellent practice.

The school has a very committed and established Head who is focused on the school and is less involved with contributing to the Trust.

The school will be inspected as part of the new outstanding schools' legislation. Staff need to continue to develop knowledge of sequencing of subjects through the school but there is a good awareness of the new framework and the Curriculum review in 2019 showed that pupils are strong on knowledge.

#### BUC

The school was graded as level 1-2 in quality of education as some work needs to take place to secure a sequenced knowledge rich curriculum in all areas.

A subject review in June 2019 showed that the school is excellent in reading and maths provision but pupils need to be able to talk about their learning in Foundation subjects better.

Non-educational was rated as 2. The staff changes in 2021 need time to embed and get established.

#### FIS

The school has been rated at 2 in quality of education and 3 in leadership, capacity and non-education as there are currently lots of areas of risk here. The excellent Head is leaving in February 2022 which has unsettled the Deputy Head and the SENCO is leaving in December to spend time abroad. There is also an imminent move to new school site and development to an all-through Primary, with a leadership review imminent. However pupils have made good progress in reading and writing in particular.

#### FJS

Quality of education remains at grade 2/3 due to low standards in Reading in 2019. This showed improvement in 2020 with TAs in Y6.

Leadership remains at level ½ with a new Deputy appointed in 2020 and a Co-Headship for one year.

Non-education has been moved to level 3 due to the risks of becoming an all-through Primary in September 2022 and an imminent staff structure review.

Premises issues have been resolved.

#### WAT

Quality of education has been moved to a level 2 as Phonics has improved following the introduction of Read Write Inc., which will take time and need support to embed.

	<p>Leadership and capacity has been reduced to a grade 3 as a rapid increase in SEND and SEMH needs has put pressure on leaders and staff. The previous Deputy also did a term and resigned, leaving at the end of last year. There is a new Deputy, SENCo in place and new phase leads.</p> <p>The school is now receiving support from another Trust Head 3 days a week but following and EYFS review in November 2021, JH is likely to move across and start supporting the school with EYFS 1 day per week. This will mean JS can then be at SHR mid-week, which will be a benefit to them as they will have 3 maternity covers in place after Christmas due to pregnant staff leaving school at 28 weeks to then work at home due to Covid.</p> <p><u>JBL</u></p> <p>The risks remain at a level 2 across the board.</p> <p>The new Head is establishing well and a new deputy was appointed for September 2021. One teacher on a support plan which appears to be successful.</p> <p>The school is growing with a new building which is being managed well.</p> <p>Outcomes in 2020 and 2021 were low and a new teacher in Y6 is cautious. There is also a high level of SEND in Y3.</p> <p><u>SHR</u></p> <p>The risks have changed to level 1-2 in leadership and 3 in capacity. The Head is currently supporting the Head at WAT which has reduced capacity. There are also three staff, including the Deputy, will also be working at home until their maternity leave begins due to Covid. The school are also struggling to recruit a SENCo.</p> <p><i>Is it a blanket approach across the Trust for pregnant staff to be stopping working at school at 28 weeks?</i></p> <p>LW: The Trust decided to do this going forward to keep these staff safe.</p> <p><i>Will this impact upon their maternity leave time?</i></p> <p>LW: They will be working remotely from home and planning lessons until their maternity leave officially starts.</p> <p>Post meeting update: new guidance is that an RA and OH report is needed but if safe these staff can be in school.</p> <p><i>Is there a new school being built in Shrivenham?</i></p> <p>LW: Anne Lynn in the central team is leading on this project which is only just getting started but yes that's the plan.</p>
8	<p><b>To receive an update on Watchfield Rapid Improvement Plan.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To receive Watchfield Governance Review report</li> </ul> <p>LW had uploaded this to Governor Hub ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>LW confirmed that no details of the Ofsted visit have been sent out yet.</p>

	<p><i>Do you think the support which went in over and after OFSTED is moving things along fast?</i></p> <p>LW: Yes. The main update is regarding the EYFS review which has been a concern for a while. The Inspector saw early reading at the school as positive with Read Write Inc. being introduced but the OCC advisor thought that leadership is an issue. JS, GW and the new Deputy with the new SENCo are able to move change along quickly and need to be encouraged to do so. One of the Reception teachers has resigned so we will need to recruit for this. It will be helpful to share the final OFSTED report with the staff. There has been lots of involvement of external people – such as the Maths hub – to provide training and resources to school. The inspector thought what he saw in maths was good and showed fidelity. Funding has been provided which will result in training for all staff in Read Write Inc. and matched reading books for phonics.</p> <p><i>What is the capacity at the school if we remove the support of JS?</i></p> <p>LW: The transition to JS only being there for two days a week and JH one day will help to prepare the school for this. DM will be clear when appraising GW that the pace of change needs to speed up and she needs to step up to meet this challenge.</p> <p><i>What provision do the governors have in terms of Clerk?</i></p> <p>LW: This has been difficult. There are also issues with timely communication and information sharing between the Head, Chair, Clerk and LGB.</p> <p><i>There are also lots of governors leaving the LGB as they are military families who move on. It makes it hard to build a team.</i></p> <p><i>Have we got a replacement teacher yet for EYFS?</i></p> <p>LW: A new teacher is likely to start at February half term or Easter. We are advertising. JH will be working with the EYFS lead at school.</p> <p><i>JN is looking to offer 0.5 days weekly pastoral support in whatever way the Head felt was useful.</i></p>
9	<p><b>To receive school peer reviews reports.</b></p> <p><i>How does this work?</i></p> <p>LW: We have a peer review policy, with me leading on the review, together with another colleague from a Trust school and an external person. The review focuses on whatever the Head decides is useful.</p> <p>There were no reviews to consider at this meeting. FIS and FJS are planned for term 2.</p>
10	<p><b>To receive an update on the Academy Improvement Team.</b></p> <p>LW confirmed that the Trust have now recruited a new Safeguarding Lead; Gemma Rogan, who is currently working at WAT as the pastoral lead. She has excellent experience across the board and is really great at managing people. Gemma will be starting on the AIT in January so we can backfill her</p>

	<p>position at WAT.</p> <p>Laura Wright has resigned the Family Worker Trust role as she has been offered a voluntary position to move forward her career which she would like to take up instead. LW confirmed that we will wait to recruit for this post until Gemma is established in her new role.</p> <p>HC is having a positive impact on SEND across the Trust and will be coming to our next meeting to reflect on the annual SEND reports from schools.</p>
11	<p><b>To receive an update on Learners' First.</b></p> <p>AM had uploaded the strategic plan for this year to GovernorHub ahead of the meeting, which showed the plans for Learners' First for this year. LW will RAG these before Christmas but gave an overview of the situation:</p> <p>Pupil progress is very ambitious as we have a number of children who are not on target across the Trust at the moment.</p> <p>Data is not as important as the inspection framework has changed but progress data is still important and we need to keep looking at books and checking what children know and what they can remember.</p> <p>There is some nervousness about setting ambitious targets across the schools as a result of the last two years.</p> <p>This year will be the first formal assessments for GCSE and A Levels. It will be interesting to see how pupils perform both at FCC and nationally.</p> <p><i>We need to recognise the impact of the last two years but it seems unfair to lower expectations for the children. Showing the shortfall in data terms is important.</i></p> <p>LW: I am getting push back from Heads about the target setting and remaining aspirational with high expectations but also being realistic about those children who aren't going to get there.</p> <p>Teachers want pupils to feel challenged but not set unrealistic targets which are not achievable.</p> <p><i>Are teachers worried about judgements being made upon their teaching?</i></p> <p>LW: No, more that they don't want to put unrealistic expectations on children or teachers when they are aware that they need to rebuild before progress can be made.</p> <p><i>We need to keep setting high expectations for these children and realise that there is a journey back to a place where children are able to achieve again; we need to make sure children still feel aspirational.</i></p> <p>The group discussed how the children are measured by the end of KS2 and the impact of where they were in their school career when the lockdowns hit and therefore how much time they have to get back to where they would have been by the end of KS2.</p> <p>Heads are under a lot of pressure at the moment as there are so many staffing issues within all of our schools due to Covid so we cannot push too hard on asking Heads to go too far with their target setting at the moment as it is very much not 'business as usual'. They will use catch up funding to get</p>

	<p>every child as far as they can.</p> <p>JH is not currently working in his role across the Primary schools but hopes to go out to see them all in the Spring to support the establishment of the new EYFS framework.</p> <p>JS and DM have facilitated science leads across the schools working together to prepare for deep dives – they are now visiting each other’s schools to carry out deep dives on each other. This model will be expanded to history and art this year.</p> <p>LW informed the committee that there were visitors to ALT yesterday and the group got to hear about the inspection experiences of others. This was interesting and useful and it seems that the visit can vary significantly depending on the particularly inspector that you get. JBL is likely to be inspected next.</p> <p>Gemma Rogan will pick up on wellbeing and mental health from Doreen Harris when she starts in the New Year. SC left at this point in the meeting and confirmed that this will be her last meeting on the committee, and she is leaving the Board at the end of the calendar year. The committee thanked SC for all of her hard work and insight during her time on the committee and the Board.</p>
<b>Strategic Matters</b>	
12	<p>Discuss and confirm remit of Trust surveys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parent</li> </ul> <p>Each school sends out their own parent survey – previously we have added in questions about the Trust. Schools tend to do their own surveys at different times of the year so it is hard to compare these.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pupils</li> </ul> <p>These have been carried out in each school in their own ways. We do not have a universal one across the Trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Governors</li> </ul> <p><i>Do these get done every year? Have we done a governor survey recently? Feel that a governors’ one is where we might need to focus this year.</i></p> <p>JN agreed to meet with PT to discuss the remit of this and possible questions. PT asked LW and AM to input if they can think of anything to add in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff</li> </ul> <p>This survey has just been carried out – DM and SF will now look at how to share the information with staff.</p>
13	<p>To review Trust policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NQT</li> </ul> <p><i>What is the role of the LGB in this?</i></p> <p>LW: The new ECT framework is over two years with lots of support – it should be included in the Headteachers report to the LGB.</p> <p>LW confirmed that this is a model policy which will be the first ECT policy in place at the Trust.</p> <p>All committee members confirmed that they were happy to approve and accept the policy.</p>

	<p><b>ACTION: AM to add the FLT logo and letterhead and send out.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Charging and remissions policy</li> </ul> <p>This was approved already in July 2021.</p> <p><b>ACTION: AM to check that the same policy is out in all schools and check minutes to see if it was noted as agreed in the committee minutes last year.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data protection policy</li> </ul> <p>AM informed the committee that there will be a new GDPR company coming in so she will check with JR if this will be reviewed as part of this.</p> <p><b>ACTION: AM to check data protection policy with JR.</b></p>
	<b>Conclusion</b>
14	<p>Any Other Business (please notify the Chair before the meeting).</p> <p>JN confirmed that he is double checking about how to carry out Safer Recruitment training.</p> <p>Thanks again to SC for her work on the committee.</p> <p><i>What is happening with the leadership of FJS and the new FIS going forward?</i></p> <p>LW: There is an extraordinary meeting next week to review this.</p>
15	<p>Future meeting dates:</p> <p>20<sup>th</sup> January 2022, 4.30pm.</p> <p>10<sup>th</sup> March 2022, 4.30pm.</p> <p>12<sup>th</sup> May 2022, 4.30pm</p> <p>30<sup>th</sup> June 2022, 4.30pm.</p>