

**MINUTES**  
**Standards and Curriculum Committee**

23<sup>rd</sup> November 2022

5pm

This meeting was held via 'Teams'

**Present:** Kate Evans (Chair)  
Nicky Dunford (CEO)  
Cheryl Mathieson (CM)  
Graeme Scott (GS)

**In attendance:** Max Thomas (MT) - Woodleigh Hub LB Representative  
Corinna Tigg (CT) - Raleigh Hub LB Representative  
Jo Carter (JC) - Woodleigh Hub LB Representative joined at 6.00 pm

**Minutes:** Charlotte Roe (GP)

**In Attendance:** Lizzie Lethbridge (LL) and Sarah Clarke (SC) for items 9 and 10

| No | Item   | Action |
|----|--|--------|
| 1. | <b>Welcome and apologies</b><br>There were apologies from Fiona Walters and Rebecca Sear. Jo Carter sent apologies for her absence at the beginning of the meeting.  |        |
| 2. | <b>Declarations of interest</b><br>The CEO is a trustee of the Bearnes Education Foundation. Graeme Scott is Executive Chairperson of the Mario Framework. Kate Evans is Director for Education of the Good Shepherd Trust, Diocese of Guildford.<br><br>There were no other declarations of interest lodged.  |        |
| 3. | <b>Any other business</b><br>There was no other business.  |        |
| 4. | <b>Approval of meeting minutes (circulated before the meeting)</b><br>The minutes of the meeting were approved as accurate record of the meeting.  |        |
| 5. | <b>Matters arising from minutes of 14<sup>th</sup> September not on the agenda</b><br>5.5.4 <b>Allocation of Trustees to schools</b> –CM reported that it was discussed at Full Board; it was agreed that it was difficult to attach a trustee to a school. The GP would keep a record of visits made by the Trustees. It was noted that this was a transition year with several governance changes therefore 'visits to schools' would be reviewed regularly throughout the year.<br>5.7.1 <b>Footpath to Cheriton Bishop</b> – The CEO reported that a parent had taken this complaint to Ofsted who subsequently investigated. The outcome was that the Trust had done everything needed such as a risk assessment and addressing any potential safeguarding issues. Since the investigation DCC had advised the Trust that the footpath could be moved and there was a possibility removed altogether.<br>5.10 <b>Clarification around supporting the education of Ukrainian children</b> - The CEO reported that the Ukrainian family had not taken up the part time timetable. The CEO added that DCC had advised her that though it was not usual, it was acceptable for Ukrainian children to attend a part time timetable if the school had done due diligence around the alternative provision. The Chair reported that guidance from the government was that Ukrainian children enrolled in schools should study the full English curriculum. |        |
| 6. | <b>Governance (circulated before the meeting)</b><br><b>Terms of Reference</b> – the meeting considered the constitution and Terms of Reference. The Chair of Full Board reported that she had made small grammatical changes on Sharepoint.<br>6.2 <b>Actions Plans</b> - The Chair asked whether the committee see external action plans such as Ofsted. The CEO said that every academy action plan included external action plans. Local   |        |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    | <p>board governors review the action plans on their visits in schools – MT confirmed that he had had sight of these on his visits to schools. The Chair proposed that there was a standard agenda item for any action plans from the previous term to be presented to the S&amp;C committee in future. This was agreed by the meeting. Following a question from CT it was agreed that the local board governors would ensure that they would review the action plans and would raise it at their next LB meeting.</p> <p>6.5 The Chair asked that SEND was included with Pupil Premium in the regular scrutiny of pupil outcomes.</p> <p>6.6 The Chair asked when Academy Trust Strategic Improvement Plan (ATSIP) was available for approval. The CEO said that it was in Summer term and discussions around this document started in the February before. It was agreed for it to be presented in the late Summer term first S&amp;C and then Full Board.</p> <p>The Chair raised the possibility of moving the start times of meetings earlier. It was decided it was not possible due to work commitments of the local board governors.</p> <p>The Chair proposed that moving forward, she would highlight the focus for the following meeting so LB can use this in their school visits and report back to the following S&amp;C meeting.</p>  | <p>GP</p> <p>LB Govs</p> <p>GP</p> <p>Chair/ LB gov's</p> |
| 7. | <p><b>Away day feedback</b></p> <p>The CEO reported that the Away Day was held on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2022. The CEO outlined the content of the meeting; all the comments were gathered and collated into a report. The CEO said that the meeting was positive and productive. The way forward was still not clear however another meeting was arranged for 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022. At the next meeting the focus will be to keep shaping the way forward to be more effective in governance trust wide.</p> <p>MT added that it was a positive meeting and all governors felt heard.</p>   |   |
| 8. | <p><b>Local board reports</b></p> <p>The Chair thanked the LB governors for their reports.</p> <p>Totnes Hub report <b>(circulated before the meeting)</b></p> <p>The Chair asked how the Trustees know whether the KCSie had been read and signed by all the local board governors. GP and JC confirmed that it was recorded by the clerks and sent to HROM and recorded on the single central register.</p> <p>Woodleigh Hub report – <b>(circulated a report before the meeting)</b></p> <p>It was noted that attendance was looking a little low across the schools however it was felt that was due to illnesses such as colds and chicken pox. The CEO asked for progress following a new school joining the hub. JC said that it felt it was currently a transition period and that the local board governors' priority was to get to know the school better.</p>   |   |
| 9. | <p><b>Internal Quality Assurance (Presentation by LL; report circulated before the meeting)</b></p> <p><b>Questions were raised and answered before the meeting using the Trustee Question Sheet (Appendix 1)</b></p> <p>LL was invited to address the meeting. LL outlined the EIT impact on the schools using a case study of one of the schools. The CEO said that from her point of view the school that was highlighted, the headteacher was initially overwhelmed and the support by the EIT was clear, progressive, and empowering which brought around speedy positive change.</p> <p>GS asked whether there were common barriers across the Trust and what challenges were expected with the new Ofsted benchmarking of schools. LL said that the barriers were often the leadership which was essential to bring positive change in schools. The support is mainly focussed on the coaching of the Head Teacher to bring around improvement to ensure that the work was ongoing after EIT have left. The EIT provide clarity, systems around processes and making heads accountable. The current framework brings heightened expectation around curriculum sequence and developing subject leadership; the EIT have been supporting Academy Heads through the process. SC added that one of the barriers she had identified was changing the mindset, so the approach was asking more questions rather than giving answers. SC said that most of the schools were doing great work. Another identified barrier was staff crumbling under Ofsted pressure, so EIT put staff through a similar experience to empower the staff for when Ofsted visit. SC added that now Academy Heads were asking for EIT to validate their own evaluations of the quality of education for their school rather than avoiding it.</p> <p>CM noted that curriculum was a flag for several schools, and asked why that was, and what was being done to address it. LL said that a substantial amount of work had been done around this area.</p> |   |

|     |   |                         |
|-----|---|-------------------------|
|     | <p>The meeting referred to the questions posed to AK around data analysis (<b>Appendix 2</b>). The Chair raised a concern that the full analysis for last year's data had not been presented to S&amp;C yet. CT added that her understanding was that Power Bi should be able to give the information from SIMS. The Chair said that the meeting needed the analysis of Pupil Premium v Non-Pupil Premium. Following a meeting with EIT, the Chair added she was reassured that schools understood the individual educational needs of their children however the trustees needed an overall picture, including the identification of Trust wide trends and patterns to inform improvement planning. GS said that timescales to resolve this gap in data was needed. The CEO said that Power Bi gives lots of information of individual schools, but it does not give trust picture. The CEO added that AK was working hard to resolve this. It was agreed to leave this with EIT and added that the trustees would like it to be resolved by the Spring meeting when S&amp;C review the mid-year data.</p>   |                         |
| 10. | <p><b>Visions, Values, SIAMS (Presentation by EIT; report circulated before the meeting)</b><br/> SC added that the information in the report came from Sharon Lord – RE lead for the Trust. It was noted that SIAMS currently were behind schedule with inspections. It was felt that the Church schools of the trust were in a strong position and any schools that were ragged amber was due to new Academy Heads. Sharon Lord was supporting these schools. It was noted that currently the concerns were around local boards understanding exactly what Christian distinctiveness looks like and being able to articulate what made the school distinctively Christian. GS asked whether Trustees should visit schools using the 7 SIAM inspection strands as a point of reference. SC said that clarity was needed in how information should be shared with Trustees. CM said that in meeting with Christina Mabin (from the Diocese), it was shared that there will be training for trustees around the new SIAMS framework in the new year. JC added that some LB governors regularly attend the ethos committee, and it was a standard agenda item on Woodleigh hub meetings. CT said that they also had it as a standard agenda item. The Chair said that the trustees were considering ways how to get the information from grass roots to Trustees. SC asked whether the work that Sarah Cox was doing around Vision and Values could be shared with the EIT. The Chair said that there was a proposal to have a day with a facilitator to work on this focus with Trustees, governors and the EIT.</p> |                         |
| 11. | <p><b>Safeguarding (2 reports circulated before the meeting)</b><br/> Referring to the two documents that were circulated before the meeting, GS said that one of the documents was to provide a critical assurance that safeguarding was in place. Following a question from GS, it was agreed to have a 3<sup>rd</sup> column to outline evidence with an oversight from the CEO. The CEO added that other staff and trustees could also contribute to this 3<sup>rd</sup> column. GS said that he would meet with the Safeguarding Lead when the tri-annual reports were due for S&amp;C and Full Board, so he was able to provide context and answer any questions. The Chair asked whether the trust could put in place some systemic support such as supervision for DSLs, network groups and C-Poms. The CEO raised a concern whether C-Poms would ensure that safeguarding issues were addressed properly. The Chair responded that she felt currently the schools know the children well individually, but, without a consistent system it was difficult to get a trust wide picture to identify any trends emerging. CPOMS would also enable the Trust DSL to have oversight of 'live' concerns and support as necessary.</p>   | GS/<br>CEO/<br>Trustees |
| 12. | <p><b>Trust Risk Register</b><br/> The CEO reported that there had been an Internal Audit for the Trust that week which highlighted inconsistencies across the trust schools. Some schools' trust registers reflected more depth than others. The CEO added that she would be asking the academy heads to address this in her next meeting with them. CM added that there was still some work needed to ensure that the school risk registers link better with the Trust risk register and to ensure that Trustees were comfortable with the new system. It was agreed to await the outcome of the internal audit.</p>  | CEO<br><br>GP           |
| 13. | <p><b>Strategic Plan</b><br/> There was one priority – To improve the statutory function of Board monitoring of school performance and improvement across all Trust Academies. The Chair said the S&amp;C were making progress. Currently there was an annual theme plan outlining a focus for each S&amp;C meeting with the trust wide focus of disadvantaged children intertwining throughout. More staff were joining the meeting to update the trustees on trust progress. The Chair had met with the EIT regularly and it was an evolving process – the Chair</p>  |                         |

|     |  |                      |
|-----|--|----------------------|
|     | felt she was getting a clearer picture of the teaching, learning and standards. The EIT were working on a new 'School on a Page' to give Trustees a clearer overall picture.   |                      |
| 14. | <p><b>Policies (circulated before the meeting)</b></p> <p>It was agreed that the EYFS and SEND policy would be reviewed by the trustees electronically for approval at the Full Board meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2022.</p> <p>The Safeguarding policy was circulated before the meeting. There was confusion over the origin of the policy and the meeting brought up several comments and questions. It was agreed that the CEO would return the policy to the Safeguarding Lead and Academy Heads for amendments. The policy would then be circulated again electronically for approval at Full Board on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2022.</p>   | GP<br><br>CEO/<br>GP |
| 15. | <p><b>Evaluation of governance impact</b></p> <p>The Chair asked the meeting for their comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEO welcomed that other members of staff were being invited to address the meeting – bringing a different perspective on the progress across the trust. CM echoed this.</li> <li>• CT said that she welcomed the annual theme plan as it supported the local governors to have a focus in their visits to the schools.</li> <li>• GS welcomed the time allowed on the agenda as it gave clarity of how much information was needed – The Chair asked were the times appropriate. The meeting said they felt they were.</li> <li>• The Chair said that she found the question sheet created by the GP was useful and asked for it to be continued.</li> </ul> |                      |
| 16. | <p><b>Theme for next meeting</b></p> <p>Provision and Impact of SEND<br/>Pupil Premium strategies and Impact<br/>Member(s) of the EIT to be invited to the next meeting to present this.</p>   |                      |

## Appendix 1



## Standards and Curriculum Committee Agenda: 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2022 5pm

### Questions from Trustees/Governors

| Report/Attachment               | Question  | Answer  |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Pupil outcomes follow up report | It's disappointing that our chosen data analysis software is not answering basic questions such as Gender and PP data. Can we calculate this another way please, as it is necessary for leaders, governors and trustees to perform their roles effectively? | <p>It will answer all of these quickly, the last summer data has a technical fault when filtering - AK trying to get this resolved as soon as possible, as soon as this is sorted these can be answered. AK</p> <p>AK has been working with Power Bi to resolve the issue which is a glitch in the filtering system- he demonstrated this to me. He also tried to calculate this from access to the data on SIMS which feeds Power Bi, but it was almost impossible as PP children are not identified. He is going to go back to Scomis again to try and get the situation resolved. ND</p> |

|                        |   |  |
|------------------------|---|--|
|                        |   |  |
|                        | Why don't we routinely calculate progress scores? This is particularly important for SEND and PPG, as well as for all pupils.     | We currently do - all on main data spread sheet for each school, each year group within school. AK will refine this on December data drop for specific groups. AK<br>AK does this from the data – see table below and we use this to identify Trust level trends. ND   |
|                        | It's helpful to have the proportion of SEND within the PPG cohort. What were the outcomes for 'pure' PPG?                         | Will look at numbers for this year and give the proportions within each cohort. Outcomes for last July for pure PP are on data sheet. AK<br>At school level this is done at ATSSEO meetings where individual children are identified and their attainment and progress is discussed and targeted, however it is then difficult to pinpoint this child within the cohort in Power Bi.<br>AK can calculate going forward as he gets around to all schools. ND  |
| Strategic Safeguarding | What external verification or QA do we have to validate our RAG ratings?  | Report discussed with GS, use of external Devon Audits, 3 recent OFSTEDs (TSM, Y, CB) - how else can I validate? AW<br>Also, scrutiny of websites and SCR by HR Lead. Possible checks of Safeguarding records- as AW has more time ND  |
|                        | Are we satisfied with the yes/no answers – do we need to know where to find the evidence?   | Evidence is: ATSL audits, OFSTED reports, staff files (safer recruitment), staff training logs, child files, SCR, Trust Wide Action Plan, school chronologies of training, LSC days, Local Board minutes, S175 audits and school action plans, Trust Wide Staff knowledge audit (Dec), MSF rolling training programme and materials, AH minute records, policies. AW<br>HR SCR and website checks<br>Safeguarding Focus of the Month is provided by GM so staff get a consistent training session every month- evidenced for Ofsted in all schools |
|                        | Will there be an action plan for the Amber actions?   | Annual Action plan runs from January to January - drawn together following S175 audits, staff knowledge audit and will now include the 'amber sections' from the report Graeme asked me to complete. AW<br>Safeguarding has always been a strength in all Ofsted Inspections- AW   |
| Safeguarding policy    | There remain some typing errors that need addressing<br>CP Governors and Chairs of Governors need updating following resignations | Gov professional will check typos and basic updates- names, dates, links etc before policies go out.<br>Names will be replaced wherever possible with roles- where this is not possible it is  |

|                             |  |   |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
|                             | <p>Safeguarding statement could include training for all staff on receiving disclosure, to ensure children's concerns are appropriately heard and recorded regardless of who they choose to tell.</p> <p>Policy aims need higher profile for adults whose behaviour may cause harm</p> <p>Should FII be included as an example of when parents would not be consulted?</p> | <p>acceptable that changes will only be updated at review date.</p> <p>Other suggestions from Trustees are normally added to policy as tracked changes for discussion. ND</p>   |
| EIT report (internal QA)    | <p>Would it be appropriate / possible for S&amp;C to have oversight of the Ofsted Action Plans for xxxxxxx, xxxxxxx, xxxx and xxxxxxxxxx? It would be helpful to know the up-to-date impact of support, and current evaluation / headlines</p>   | <p>Action Plans can be made available, but I would also expect an EIT member to explain in more detail the reasons for and ongoing impact of actions- to give depth to understanding. ND</p>  |
|                             | <p>xxxxxxxxxxx: how are they managing expectations of staff and community to be judged as Good under current framework?</p>  | <p>Xxxxx is highly experienced as an AH- she is very clear with staff &amp; parents that they are working to a good judgement. EIT are regularly completing LSC days which would reflect this as an outcome now- good QFT consistent. xx is quick to ask for support and recognises issues- but there is always a possibility that an Inspection can bring surprises.</p> <p>Everyone is thoroughly aware that a judgement of Outstanding is not an expectation. ND</p> |
|                             | <p>Question from CM:<br/>Several schools are showing "Curriculum" as a flag. Why is this?</p>  | <p>Curriculum is under development in terms of embedding the intent so implementation may be 'patchy' or there maybe some curriculum areas that are not as impactful as others. When it could affect the outcome then it remains a flag until it is fully resolved that way the AH knows there is still work to be done. ND</p>   |
| SIAMS and vision and Values | <p>How can S&amp;C and the full board support schools' feeling part of the Trust / how can we develop our knowledge of schools? Would it be helpful to have a similar RAG register to the Ofsted summary?</p>  | <p>Invite SL (RE Lead) to talk to S&amp;CC to hear how she supports each of the Church schools-ask her where she feels Trustees can support/ how she can provide the info you require. ND</p>   |
|                             | <p>Most need support with work on vision and values. How does / will this fit with the Trustee work on V&amp;V led by SC?</p>  | <p>V&amp;V for SIAMS is a bit different and SL has worked hard to support AH to address through effective biblical links.</p> <p>We have yet to move the Trustee V&amp;V work forward, but I would expect SC to liaise beforehand. ND</p>   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | What would be valuable from S&C to support this work?  | SL to speak? Giving better understanding and therefore more pertinent challenge? ND   |
|  | Question from CM:<br>What can be done to ensure evidence of leadership at all levels is there?<br>How can we improve the communication/understanding between the different groups? | RE Subject Lead (school-based) will have evidence of their monitoring,<br>AH will also have their perspective and records- Collective Worship (CW)<br>EIT same Visit Notes.<br>SL will have her meeting notes so there should be programme of CW, staff meeting and INSET records.<br>We will need to look at Trustee understanding by Sept 23 when the new SIAMS comes into play.<br>Communication between the groups is in place but we do not hold written evidence- Ofsted do not require it- it should be evident!<br>ND |

## Appendix 2



### Update on questions raised during the presentation from Andy Keay at S&C Committee Meeting 14.9.22

#### 1. What are the reasons behind the data that is red?

xxxxxxx – data all red - Picture of instability (staffing, behaviour) but improvement is needed at pace. This year, much more secure staffing in place and support is in place from the EIT.

xxxxxxx – did change to 60% after appeal, also 1 child missed attaining by 1 mark – would have been 80%

xxxxxxx – staffing issues across the year, under performance overtime, - robust systems in place and staffing changes to impact on this.

xxxxxxx – weaker cohort in writing

xxxxxxx – 2 children – each 20% missed maths by 1/2 marks

xxxxxxx – 3 children – all SEN - 60% of cohort

xxxxxxx – M/W below – standards and practice not as strong - Culture of complacency being addressed by new AH

xxxxxxx – R – 2 children just below

xxxxxxx – poor cohort – SEN and mobility within the year.

Reasons vary school to school – these are looked at by AK/LL in S and O meetings. Some data was expected, and others were due to 1/2 children who didn't achieve as expected.

**2. Can we have more information about gender gaps, SEND outcomes, and outcomes for pupil premium children.**

Currently Power Bi is having technical difficulties, which are being fixed by SCOMIS, once these are sorted. I will be able to send across the gender difference for each year group for reading, writing and maths.

SEND outcomes across the trust – please see the breakdown of SEND outcomes for each year group across the trust.

Majority of SEND children are working well below ARE, especially in Writing. Many SEND – 36 are at xxxxxx, which impacts on the overall academy data. Majority of EHCP children are working significantly below.

PP numbers  
increased by 27  
since April

Reading now 24% below at S compared to 29% below at S/D in April - gap narrowed by 5%

All year groups below that of whole cohorts, with Y1 27% below, Y2 26% below, Y3 36% below, Y4 16% below, Y5 4% below and Y6 12% below

Maths now 24% below at S compared to 30% below at S/D in April - gap narrowed 6%

All year groups below that of whole cohorts, with Y1 22% below, Y2 24% below, Y3 35% below, Y4 21% below, Y5 10% below and Y6 24% below

Writing now at 35% below at S compared to 33% below at S/D in April - gap narrowed by 2% and 8%.

All year groups below that of whole cohorts, with Y1 25% below, Y2 28% below, Y3 20% below, Y4 10% below, Y5 10% below and Y6 29% below

60 out of 180 (33%) are SEN - 26% 47 and 13 EHCP - 7%

**3. When pupil premium children are compared with non-pupil premium children, how wide is their achievement gap? Does it narrow during their time in Link schools? Is it wider than before the pandemic?**

Currently Power Bi is having technical difficulties and I can't access this information to show the gap between PP and non-PP. As soon as SCOMIS have sorted this I will forward this onto you.

The picture above shows that compared to the whole cohort they are behind in each subject and that gap is undoubtedly wider than non-PP

We haven't figures for pre pandemic as we weren't using Power Bi for the whole academy. Gaps for lots of children are wider than, so PP children will also be wider if not more so.

\*Trust approach - our ATSIP encompasses our disadvantage strategy which focuses on areas that will have significant impact on pupils who encounter disadvantage (based on research), including a relational approach, oracy and feedback.

**4. How many / what proportion of pupil premium children achieve at greater depth? (in either one subject or in RWM combined)**

Across the academy we had 0 PP children achieve greater depth in RWM combined. Across the academy we had 12 children in total achieve this. We should undoubtedly have more, but this is a result of two lockdowns for these children during the pandemic.



In Reading we had 56 children (29%) and 0 PP Children. In writing we had 14 children (7%) 0 PP children. In Maths we had 38 children (20%) 0 PP children.

5. **Do we have any first calculations of progress using the DfE prior attainment group calculations?**

No – we don't use these and haven't done for many years.

