



### Quality of Education Committee Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Quality of Education Committee	<b>Where</b>	Via Teams
<b>Date</b>	Thursday 28th September 2023	<b>Time</b>	4.30 p.m.
<b>Attendees</b>	<p><b>Committee Members:</b> Paul Turner (PT, Louise Warren (LW, Director of Education), Samantha Brady (SB), Richard Evans (RE), Sharon Farrell (SF), Liz Holmes (LH)</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b> CP-S.</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Sarah Gristwood (SG)</p> <p><b>Clerk:</b> Alexandra Molton</p>		

No	Description
	<b>Procedural Matters</b>
1	<p><b>Apologies for absence and acceptance/non-acceptance.</b> Apologies were sent and received from CP-S. MS was not in attendance.</p>
2	<p><b>Declaration of personal or business interests.</b> None were made at this point in the meeting. SB declared that she needs to leave the meeting just before 6pm.</p>
3	<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2023 and actions (circulated with the agenda).</b> The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p>
	<b>Ensuring Accountability</b>
4	<p><b>To receive reports on Trust schools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Attendance</b></li> </ul> <p>SG had provided a report on attendance to the committee ahead of the meeting. The data included all schools except ASH as they are not yet on Bromcom. SG explained that there is a slight discrepancy between the data and Bromcom but this will be investigated.</p> <p>SG drew Trustee's attention to the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FCC below national average by nearly 2% and high rate of PAs particularly SEND and PP pupils.</li> <li>All PAs on FFT 34.4% FCC against national of 27%. This was most marked in Y11. FFT figures show FSM Y11 68.1% against national of 82.9%. School Y11 SEND on FFT 72.7% against national of 83.7%</li> <li>Best year group attendance in school Y7 at 91.2% against national of 92.8%</li> <li>TEP below national average for all pupils by nearly 2%. TEP PP better attendance similar to all pupils.</li> <li>SEND all below non SEND most significantly at TEP and Watchfield who have the highest numbers. 51 SEND pupils at FVP and attendance overall only just below all pupils and close to national which is positive.</li> <li>John Blandy have worked hard on attendance and are above national for all pupils. Small % of PAs</li> <li>Watchfield PP also in line with all school pupils.</li> </ul> <p><i>What is the target for attendance?</i> SG: 96% is deemed good. Last year Primary was 93.8% nationally and 93.8% for the Trust. TEP was</p>

slightly lower than the national average at 91.95%. FCC was at 88.3% against a national of 90.7%

*What is SENK and SENE?*

SG: On the SEN register at school support (SEN K) or with EHCPs (SEN E).

*Is this showing persistent absences?*

SG: Persistent absence is attendance under 90%.

*What is unauthorised absence?*

SG: Where the school has not been informed of a reason for absence or does not deem the reason to be acceptable.

SF explains that there were a few children who were on a variety of timetables last year – some on reduced or school refusers, who might be included in this data.

SG explained that absence can be unauthorised or might be due to a health issue. Social and emotional issues can also be at play, which can be hard to unpick. Parental mental health can also be an issue, with the impact of Covid or parents being a bit over-protective. We have seen a change in attitudes on getting kids into school since the pandemic. There is not a one size approach for all – we need to deal with each case individually. We need to work with families to try and understand the reasons behind absence and offer support for getting children into school and help support schools in their work to deal with attendance.

*I am surprised to see that PPG children attendance is pretty good.*

SF: SEND children have tended to be the trickiest ones to get into school.

*100% of LAC children at TEP were under the desired attendance.*

SF: This may just be down to one child.

LW explained that Heads last year agreed to have a stronger approach to unauthorised holiday absences this year and have subsequently had training on conducting this. OCC will be conducting the admin for any penalties which are issued.

SG explained there is a new Attendance Officer at FCC to track attendance better.

RE explained that a team of 4 in the central team are working together to pull together policies, procedures etc. to focus on attendance this year and support schools across the Trust.

SG explained that the Trust has been invited to take part in an OCC study on the links between attendance and deprivation.

SG highlighted that those children with multiple vulnerabilities are most at risk of having poor outcomes –low attendance, SEND, PPG, FSM.

*What are PA and SA?*

SG: Persistent absence or severe absence.

*Attendance for the PPG group at FCC attendance is very low – have they checked out of learning? They are a very small cohort (37?) Are their interventions not working?*

RE: we are seeing this a lot in Secondaries – it's linked to mental health and is an impact of Covid. Year 11 tends to be the worst group for this and this is the group that OCC want to focus on specifically.

*We need to get more information about more specific numbers of pupils which make up these groups.*

**ACTION: SG and team to work with schools to drill down into data and track trends which can be addressed.**

*Could we look at the specific reasons for absence in more detail? I.e. holidays, mental health etc.?*

*We need to ensure that we are tracking attendance right from Primary to ensure that children are coming to school because this gets harder as they get older and move to Secondary.*

LW: The attendance for Year 7 is the best in the school and then it starts to dip. We need to make sure that children are engaged with Secondary school and that we are providing an engaging curriculum

with exciting teaching which makes pupils want to be at school.

SF explained that some work was started last year to try and target those families for whom persistent non-attendance and lack of engagement passes down through generations, looking at how we can support these families.

*How do we coordinate our actions and change behaviours and cultures to make an impact on the data? There is a rising level of persistent absence.*

*We need to ensure also that Heads are taking the same approach across the Trust.*

SG confirmed that the Trust Attendance policy needs to be updated as the OCC model policy has been updated. We are also hoping to work more with specific cases in schools to try and support children back into school.

*What timescales are we working to, to try and make an impact? What support do we need at Trust and LGB level?*

LW: FFT includes weekly attendance data for each school and we can compare this against national each week. We can give a comparison of how schools compare this year at the next meeting. It will be a big focus across the Trust for this academic year.

*How are sanctions different for those who take a few days off for a holiday but otherwise have good attendance compared to persistent absentees?*

LW: OCC advises that those sitting below 90% need to be on a parent contract, followed by another contract if this is not adhered to, then if they break this they are referred to OCC for penalties. It is a very time consuming process to do this for all absentees under 90% and we have to prioritise

PT confirmed that we will be monitoring attendance at each of our meetings through the year.

*What support is needed from governance to ensure we can be successful in addressing this?*

RE: We have put a strategy in place to help LGBs to monitor this over the year and to give them a better picture of what is happening and why. We then need to ensure we are following procedures and using best practice to try and tackle those persistent absentees.

**ACTION: RE, SG, and LW and Leah to work on this further. Update to come to a future meeting.**

- **Bullying**

SG had provided a report on bullying to the committee ahead of the meeting.

SG explained that we need to work on having consistent categories on CPOMS across all of the schools to ensure that potential cases are being recorded in the same way. At some schools only senior members of staff can confirm if a case is 'bullying'.

We need a better understanding of child on child abuse, consistent categories and the same recording across the Trust in order to get a better picture of this.

*So by Easter we should have more consistency?*

**ACTION: SG to work on this.**

Lynne Hammond started as the new Trust Safeguarding lead and she will be working on CPOMS across the schools.

We have JIGSAW for PSHE in the primaries and now Y7 and 8 but we need something similar going through all year groups at FCC.

SG confirmed that there are definitions in place for different safeguarding issues; we just need to make sure that incidents are being consistently reported.

- **Safeguarding**

SG had provided a report on Safeguarding to the committee ahead of the meeting.

Some children may be part of different categories in the report over the year but this gives a snapshot of the picture last year.

SG suggested that we need to do some work on how we are tracking all of the different elements of

Safeguarding and ensure these are being recorded thoroughly.

SG explained that CPOMS is not being used consistently for reporting Safeguarding.

SHR record every Safeguarding concern which is why their figures are so high. However, Trustees recognised that the context has changed at SHR over the last few years so they do now have a higher level of need.

LW pointed out that the levels of MASH referrals gives a clearer picture of the situation – 43 referrals at FVP last year, which shows a really high level of need at the school. We should be concerned that there were only referred 4 at FCC.

SG explained that FCC used several different systems to record different things so it can be tricky to pull all of this data together.

*What are strengths and needs forms?*

SG: External forms, to try and pick up needs for families early. They are used for any TAF involvement. They are a lengthy document and time consuming to complete but support is available for this.

*CiN and CP numbers – how do we know that these are accurate?*

SG: These are legally generated so we know that these are accurate, but cases involving TAF may not be as accurate.

*Who is responsible for CPOMS in each school?*

SG: Any staff member can add incidents or concerns. The Safeguarding lead should be monitoring these regularly and have an overview of the situation.

*What are the timeframes for this?*

SG: LH will be leading on ensuring consistency going forward. We need to find out from FCC how they record their information to get a better understanding behind this.

LW explained that the actions being taken on Safeguarding incidents is correct; it is just the coding of these that needs to be clarified across the Trust.

SF explained correlation between LAC children and MASH referrals at FVP last year.

SG pointed out that there was a high number of CPOMS incidents reported at TEP last year but not corresponding Safeguarding incidents – which needs investigating. It could be due to recording by previous leader.

- **Child on Child abuse**

*What is the definition of this?*

SG: Child on child abuse recognises that children can abuse each other (it's not just an adult-child thing). It was previously called peer on peer abuse but this implied the children involved were of a similar age so the term was changed.

It involves any abuse between children- and includes physical, verbal and sexual behaviours, it can also include bullying which includes cyber bullying and can include incidents from inside and outside the school environment.

*What is the difference between this and bullying?*

SG: It is possible for incidents to be logged under both categories, and others too.

SF suggested it is the behaviour which needs to be logged.

- **Suspensions**

SG provided data for 21/22 and 22/23.

SG explained can be hard to unpick the reasons behind these incidents. Several of these children would benefit from being in a more specialised therapeutic setting but there are not enough spaces for them. Several of these children have reduced timetables or support from external agencies.

SG wasn't able to obtain the number of pupils suspended, which would help to give the data more context.

**ACTION: SG to try and get this data from FCC.**

21/22 wasn't a full academic year with lockdowns and isolations so it not comparable with last year or this year.

SG: Nationally pre-Covid levels were lower than last year.

*We need to drill down more into this data.*

SG: I can provide this for Primaries for PPG, FSM, SEND children and a few service children. It is harder to do for FCC as there are so many more cases. We know that the majority of suspensions are applied to SEN / PP pupils. This is to be avoided and their provision needs to be better.

*It is concerning that there appears to be issues with data recording at FCC.*

LW: We need to raise the profile of these reports. There is a new Behaviour policy at FCC this term which will hopefully have an impact. We need to ensure that the school is providing an engaging, positive place for students to be and for them to want to behave well and engage there.

*Return to school interviews do not appear to be taking place at FCC consistently, or data being provided to the LGB regularly.*

LW: RE has employed a Head (Rachel Cave) to help to improve this at FCC. To be looked at again in November.

*How many of these become PEXs?*

SG: Two PEX's took place FCC last year but I don't have the data for the PEX. You cannot transform a suspension into a PEX.

LH confirmed that these were for another incident, not persistent behaviour.

SF confirmed that we almost had a PEX at FVP but the child moved schools before it got to this point in the process.

*What is Rachel's remit?*

RE: A wide variety of areas. We are going to put together an 18-month plan for improvements at FCC. Six week rapid action plans have been set up too so these changes are manageable and measureable.

*Are you talking to the LGB about this?*

RE: We are looking to improve governance too and ensure that the LGB are well-informed and know how to question the Head and Deputy Heads and where to direct their questioning.

*How efficient is it putting together a policy in terms of getting down to grass roots?*

RE: Each school should have someone leading on monitoring these figures. We want to set up attendance champions in each school.

LW explained that we will have one policy on exclusions across both VAT and FLT.

*What is the role of the attendance champion?*

RE: To promote a restorative approach to behaviour and promote good attendance. We need one key person at each school to understand how behaviour is key to addressing issues.

**To receive a report on results:**

- **GCSE**

LW explained that it was a disappointing year for results. Key indicators were down on last year.

P8 is -0.45 which is the lowest ever but this is yet to be confirmed.

AT8 is also lower than it has ever been. (Post meeting note that FFT indications are slightly more positive.)

5

% in English and Maths at 4+ is down to 61%; this was 70% in 2019 and 68% last year.

English and Maths at 5+ is at 39% (51% in 2019 and 36% in 2022) – this is where we have put in resources.

% grade 7-9 was 28.5% in 2019, 19% in 2022 and 22.2% in 2023.

The data shows that the achievement gap is widening for SEND and PP pupils.

Henry Bew (HB) has provided some more detailed analysis of the situation and plans for action. This needs to be clarified to teachers as some are unsure where we are. There have been lots of new initiatives and changes put in place.

Maths results were worse this year than last year and there is now a bigger gap between English and Maths results. We need to build challenge within the curriculum.

LW explained that FCC has still not resolved the issue with Head of Maths. This is on-going.

85% attendance for Year 11 last year. Engagement and learner attitudes were low. We need to be clear about the effective teaching framework and what good teaching looks like.

FCC has brought back academic coaching which has been really successful in the past.

We need to work harder at preparing our pupils for these exams.

Reading will be a focus across the school this year.

More deliberate practice is needed.

The better performing subjects were art, chemistry, food tech, RE and languages.

*The results from last year are not on the school website.*

RE: Results last year were not validated but will be this year.

SB left meeting at 5.56pm.

*Why are effort grades so low?*

LW: Suggested it could be down to low staff morale, low engagement from pupils. However there was an increase in those achieving grades 7-9s this year.

LW explained that we need to look at creating a more inspiring environment and culture at FCC for teachers and pupils alike.

In Maths there are issues around pacing lessons, engaging pupils, and pupils unable to see that they are achieving. HB seems to have a clear picture on what needs to change.

Maria Button (MB) is also looking at what actions FCC need to take to improve results.

LW confirmed that FCC has very aspirational targets this year and achieving these would bring the school back into the bracket of at least in line with national standards.

SF suggested that the schools being focused on behaviour so much can impact on the school's ability to monitor Teaching and Learning, which quickly impacts on staff morale.

*Is it possible for Rachel to come to our next meeting to give an update?*

RE: Yes.

LH suggested that information about the current Year 11 mocks results should be available for review at the next meeting.

- **A-Level**

LW explained that results have also dropped this year in each band.

Those achieving A/A\* went down from 30% last year to 16.7%.

67/83 pupils are going on to University; 25% to Russell Group.

Nine students are going to do re-takes this year as Y14s

All have a progression route.

	<p><i>Is this a national picture?</i> RE: Yes, and we are being asked to compare results this year to 2019. This year is a key year in terms of improving outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Primaries</b></li> </ul> <p>LW explained that we use top 50% on FFT for target setting in some of our schools and top 20% in others.</p> <p>There will be no progress scores for next year as these children had no benchmark from KS1 due to Covid. The benchmark on entry to school will take place from Rec 2022/23.</p> <p>The main target for all schools this year is writing, which is bringing down the combined measure.</p> <p>Early Years and Phonics are a success for us across the Trust.</p> <p><i>Any concerns?</i> LW: FVP is a bit of a concern but this is due to their high-needs children. We need to look at KS1 provision at TEP as we didn't see as strong data at the end of year 2 as we had hoped. SHR results were not what we expected so need to keep an eye on this too.</p> <p><i>How are the new Heads and Exec Head doing in Faringdon?</i> LW: There has been a really strong start to the year for them all.</p> <p><i>Can we link staff up to drive together improvement across the Primaries?</i> LW: We do this as Heads and subject leaders will meet together in three twilights across the year. LW has asked for recommendations for an excellent teacher list to share across the Trust to celebrate good practice.</p> <p><i>What is the issue with HR at SHR?</i> LW: Changes in leadership and issues with Exec Head/Headteacher situation, challenges in teaching, staff morale needs rebuilding, changing demographic (more safeguarding cases).</p> <p><i>We need to keep an eye on Year 2's as they missed their nursery year at school due to Covid. Should we be putting in support in SHR as it was an FLT decision to move to an Exec Head model?</i> LW: FLT will be looking at what is needed and putting in place plans with the SLT.</p> <p><i>How can we be confident about the quality of teaching at SHR?</i> LW: We don't have any weak teachers at the school, only one less experienced in their year group. I am convinced by the strategies which have been put in place to monitor the quality of Teaching and Learning at the school.</p> <p><i>The school's next challenge will be moving to a new school building, which is taking up much of the time and energies of the Head and Exec Head.</i> SF: This happened with FIS – we did not realise the emotional connection staff and pupils had with the previous building and this transition took some time to get used to.</p>
6	<p><b>Peer reviews</b> FVP and TEP peer reviews are taking place before October half term. Updates on these to come to the next meeting.</p>
7	<p><b>AIT staffing update</b> LH started on Monday and will be meeting with 18 school Heads and DSLs. Trust SEN Lead advert will be going out shortly (to work across the two Trusts for 3 days a week). Leah from VAT is leading on Inclusion with SG supporting.</p> <p><i>What happens if the merger with VAT doesn't go ahead but we are sharing staff?</i> LW: They would stay working individually for each Trust and being part funded by each.</p>
8	<p><b>Ofsted</b></p>

	<p>LW has attended meetings led by RE to make sure FVP and TEP are Ofsted-ready. Tracey has done lots of work over the holidays to prepare and had a great handover with SF to ensure documents are ready and she understands the SDP and context behind this. Heads are just looking at preparing staff and subject leaders to be ready to meet with Ofsted.</p> <p>SF has volunteered to be an Associate Governor for the FVP/TEP LGB to help with Ofsted this year.</p> <p>LW confirmed that we are expecting a monitoring inspection at L&amp;F – possibly before Christmas. She is making sure that we have addressed all of the issues which have been raised. The Trust is also looking at governance at the school to ensure that this is robust. Clare Sylvester is Acting Head three days a week at L&amp;F and will continue in post until we find a substantive Head as well as remaining to aid transition</p> <p><i>What are we doing to ensure the curriculum at L&amp;F is in a good place?</i> LW: Clare is driving this and newer staff are doing well at getting up to speed. Much work has also taken place on Safeguarding at L&amp;F following the last Ofsted inspection.</p> <p>Ashbury last inspected in Dec 2019. LW to check if they will be in the 4 year cycle due to being an academy converter.</p> <p>FCC possible Ofsted this year too.</p>
9	<p><b>Board visits to schools</b> PT explained the aim is for Board members to meet regularly with school leaders and governors to improve links between each level of governance. <b>ACTION: QoE committee members to consider how they might take on liaison roles with PPG, SEND, Safeguarding Trust leads.</b></p>
	<b>Strategic Matters</b>
10	<p><b>Updating our Terms of Reference for 2023/24</b> AM had provided a draft ToR based on the new strategic priorities for the Trust for this year and the updated Scheme of Delegation. The committee discussed the value of introducing a scheduled meeting in term 1 to look at data for the previous year in Safeguarding/Attendance/Bullying and results. <b>ACTION: AM to add this into the ToR and publish.</b></p>
11	<p><b>Committee roles</b> Covered in item 9.</p>
	<b>Conclusion</b>
12	<p><b>Any Other Business (please notify the Chair before the meeting).</b> PT explained his Olympic Security encounter, with a message that we need to ensure that everyone working for the Trust has an idea of what the vision is for the Trust. LW suggested that the new SDP document will help staff and governors to see how the vision for the Trust links to school aims and priorities.</p>
13	<p><b>Future meeting dates:</b> Have already been confirmed for the year.</p>