

**Standards and Curriculum Committee
Minutes
10th December 2024
5pm
Held online via TEAMS**

Attended: Christine Cottle (Chair)
Kate Evans (Vice Chair)
Nicky Dunford (CEO)

In attendance: Oliver Heathman (OH) - Moorland Hub LB Representative
Cat Radford (CR) - Trustee Appointed Governor Totnes Hub LB Representative.
Nanya Coles (NC) - Parent Governor Broadhempston
Lizzie Lethbridge (LL) - Director of Education
Charlotte Roe- (GP)- Governance Professional
Sharon Lord (SL) - R.E & SIAMS Lead (Item 9)
Louise Warren (LW)- AH for Tedburn (Item 6)
Sarah Clarke (DoSI)- Director of School Improvement (Item 7)

Minutes: Nicol Bush- Clerk to the Trust

No	Item	Action
1.	Welcome and apologies The Chair opened the meeting with a welcome. Apologies were received from Cheryl Mathieson and Max Thomas.	
2.	Declarations of interest The CEO is a trustee of the Bearnas 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.	
3.	Any other business 3.1 Data reporting- The annual Trustees report for year ending 2023-20245 had highlighted issues around the educational outcomes; they were below national average. This was raised by the Audit Committee meeting on 5/12/24 for discussion by S&C. The Trustees/Directors discussed the tracking of last year's Y6 pupil outcomes at length and it was requested that EIT looked at the data without the new schools that had joined the Trust in the last 3 years and reviewed the data to get a full analysis for that cohort, which included PPG and SEND progress. <i>The Trustees asked whether the Trust achieved the targets that were set in September 2023 and the schools that achieved them, what were the outcomes?</i> The CEO responded that she would investigate tracking of the data with the DoSI AK and would provide a response accordingly. It was noted that such requests for data were discussed as main agenda items and as matters arising at successive meetings of the S&C committee.	CEO/AK
4.	Approval of last meeting minutes For approval: The minutes of the meeting held on 15 th October 2024 A Trustee requested a revision to the 15 th October 2024 S&C minutes to reflect the in-depth discussion around KS1 and KS2 data.	

*PLEASE NOTE - The underlined text below, was the in-depth discussion on data that had been missed in the S&C minutes- 15th October 2024 and were added retrospectively by the Clerk as requested by the Trustees.

The following questions were raised by the Trustees-

Outcomes are disappointingly low (although more positive when schools newest to the Trust are removed from the data). It was noted that this cohort was recognised as low attaining in Y5: why not earlier than that? what were their outcomes in Y1 Phonics?

With a known low attaining cohort, and high SEND, how was progress calculated for them, and what evidence was there of good progress?

AK responded that KS2 had a weaker cohort the previous year, which was partially due to 19 SEND pupils being included in the cohort, as well as the impact of Covid.

AK noted that if the Trust removed the newer schools from the cohort, there was approximately 32% of SEND pupils that achieved reading targets, compared to 84% of non-SEND pupils, 13% SEND pupils achieved writing targets, compared to 68% of non-SEND pupils and the picture was similar in Maths where 25% of SEND pupils achieved targets compared to 78% of non-SEND pupils achieved targets set. AK added that PP pupils were 30% behind compared to non-PP pupils across all areas. **The Trustees asked the following questions how the performance of vulnerable groups, including SEND and PPG compared with their peers?**

The Trustees asked did the Trust know why PP pupils were so far behind? AK responded that a high number of PP pupils were also SEND pupils, so they fell into both categories.

The Trustees raised that they would like to see the data separated where the Trust could see pure PP pupils' data where they were not SEND and see the progress.

AK responded that going forward, it would be possible to pick and separate the data to look at the pupil progress within schools and internally.

Improvement in Writing and Maths were included in the ATSIP : what was the analysis of the outcomes that would guide the improvement needed? How would any improvements be measured?

AK responded that there were no KS1 progress data measures for last year's Y6 and the current year's Y6 due to that year group being impacted by Covid19. The data EIT inputted in the summer term was not an accurate reflection of where those pupils were, which was why there were large gaps in data.

AK said the EIT team were working on this with the Trust's Maths lead and the Y6 maths papers would also be analysed to investigate the weakest areas and build a package to understand where the focus needed to be and where more support was needed in terms of teaching.

LL added that the extensive audit flagged up the Trust trends, where the Trust started a whole-Trust program with Babcock to create a baseline on how to use the book-writes.

LL added that this linked to adaptive teaching and pupil assessment and through the rigorous work the Trust was doing with the schools through Ofsted training and through writing and making sure children mastered those basic skills before moving on, all of which formed the foundations of the Trust's ATSIP and flowed into schools writing their own ASIPs. AK added there were moderation sessions built in for school hubs and EIT were going into schools to focus on writing and unpicking with AHs. LL said each DoSI had 8/9 schools each, to allow a deeper understanding of each school. AK said the EIT were directing their improvement team more to support all of the above.

The Trustees asked whether the Trust baselined those pupils in Y3?

AK responded that those pupils were loosely baselined on the spring term data, in terms of the progress measures the Trust did not have a set one for the Y6 outcomes and added there would not be a national data published to compare to.

AK raised that the new system had a built-in internal progress filter for each year group, which also meant SEND and PP pupil progress could also filter out. LL added that EIT were rigorously and intensively tracking pupils on an individual school's basis, with 11 schools joining the Trust since covid. LL said individualised tracking was happening, and the new system would hugely help with the tracking.

AK said the 4 new schools that had recently joined the Trust would join the figures towards the end of the year, but added the pupil numbers were so low, it should not impact the Trust too greatly.

	<p><u>The Trustees asked whether the Trust tracked progress across a key stage? AK responded that it was tracked internally at each school, all measures in schools were teachers' assessments at Y2 and EIT could look over each key stage ongoing. AK added each school had the same mark sheet on SIMs.</u></p> <p><u>The Trustees asked how did school targets contribute to and inform Trust targets?</u></p> <p><u>AK responded that adapted forms were used when going into schools, to challenge and make sure schools were setting realistic expectations for pupils to achieve, these were then layered into AH appraisal targets and then into Teacher targets, which showed that accountability flowed back into schools onto AHs and staff.</u></p> <p><u>How does that then filter into the targets that were presented?</u></p> <p><u>AK responded that after the data drop in December, targets would be reviewed and kept as a working document.</u></p> <p><u>AK presented the Aspirational data 2024-2025 document, Trustees discussed the Trust targets and as set out in the Trust strategic plan; it was requested for the S&C committee to approve the Trust targets.</u></p> <p><u>The meeting approved the targets and raised that the targets would be revisited at the mid-year meeting to see how well the Trust was progressing towards those targets.</u></p> <p>The Trustees agreed that with the necessary amendments, to approve the minutes as a true record. The Minutes were signed electronically by the Chair of the Committee.</p>	
5.	<p>Matters arising from minutes of 15th October 2024 (not on the agenda)</p> <p>5.1 Pupil Premium Data</p> <p><i>*PLEASE NOTE - <u>The underlined text below, was the Director of School Improvement- Andy Keay response retrospectively as he did not attend the meeting.</u></i></p> <p><u>These were the gaps between PP and non-PP for each subject.</u></p> <p><u>In 22/23 the gaps were</u></p> <p><u>R - 19%</u></p> <p><u>W - 10%</u></p> <p><u>M 10%</u></p> <p><u>This was with 29 PP children, compared to 56 children in 23/24.</u></p> <p><u>So, the gap was widening, but the number of PP that year was nearly double.</u></p> <p>5.2 ATSSIP plan 2024-2025 (Revisit requested from 15.10.24 meeting)</p> <p>5.3 SEND data</p> <p>5.4 Review of the Pupil Premium white paper document</p> <p>The above items were discussed in item 3 of these Minutes and the response would be provided by the CEO and AK when investigating the data reporting request in item 3 of these Minutes.</p>	
<p>Reports on the foci and previous minutes were circulated before the meeting. Questions from the Trustees raised from these reports were circulated to relevant EIT/SLT members, the responses were then shared with the meeting. (see Appendix 1- some questions were Part II and were recorded accordingly)</p>		
6.	<p>Presentation by LW on PSHE/RSE across the Trust</p> <p>(The PSHE/RSE report was circulated via email to the Trustees/Directors/LAC Chairs before the meeting)</p> <p>LW presented the PSHE/RSE document to the meeting and gave more context to the document. The following questions and points were raised by the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Does the Trust have a parent leaflet that would give some helpful conversation starters or guidance for parents to respond to the questions asked by their children.</i> LW responded that most of the Trust's schools used 3 different versions of a scheme called "Jigsaw" which provided a useful leaflet for parents. The half term before schools started to teach RSE in the summer term, LW circulates a leaflet containing regular questions children might ask, such as questions on the menstrual cycle etc. as well as an overview of what would be taught in RSE, the 	

	<p>vocabulary used in the classrooms and the reasoning behind using the correct terminology for a child's body parts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If a child asked questions outside of their appropriate age-range, would the Trust consider this as a safeguarding concern and how would the Trust support parents with that?</i> LW responded that historically disclosures had been made during PSHE/RSE lessons, highlighting the importance of teaching this subject. In the event of any concern raised staff would follow the Trust's safeguarding procedures. The meeting discussed what consent meant from a child's point of view. LL reassured the meeting that consent was taught early on to help children understand. 	
7.	<p>Presentation on Wellbeing results by DoSI- Sarah Clarke. (The Wellbeing report was circulated via email to the Trustees/Directors/LAC Chairs before the meeting)</p> <p>SC presented the report to the meeting and gave a more in-depth explanation. The following points were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIT reported they had looked at the wellbeing survey results as a whole Trust and as individual schools. SC reported that there were no schools that had scored high or low on the spectrum and wellbeing was strong across the Trust. • Having looked through the analysis, EIT noted the high SEND need across the Trust was pivotal in forming a picture. It was noted that SEND was having an impact on the SEND children and other pupils. • The wellbeing survey analysis identified that pupil enjoyment in going to school was low. A question that had been submitted prior to the meeting was discussed further- <i>How could the Trust share good practice amongst schools?</i> SC said this was scheduled in to be discussed at Academy Headteacher (AH) level. The AHs would be encouraged to ask more questions on an individual level; a detailed analysis would follow. SC added that the survey had helped the EIT to focus on specific areas. • SC explained that EIT had deliberately made the questions quite broad, due to too many specific questions originally. EIT had a procedural set-up to ensure all questions were supported and all schools were setting up the survey in a similar way allowing the survey outcomes to be more aligned. SC added that all future surveys would adopt the same set up. 	
8.	<p>Focus: SEF Overview – An EIT overview of the quality and impact of school self-evaluation, practice to share and/or support needed, and its role in informing academy improvement planning. (An example of a SEF was shared via email to the Trustees/Directors/LAC Chairs via email before the meeting)</p> <p>LL updated the meeting on the SEF cycle and shared her response to the points raised on the question sheet (Appendix 1 on page 5 of the minutes) and the following additional questions were asked:</p> <p>The following questions were asked in the meeting in addition to appendix 1.</p> <p><i>Were Ofsted inspections led from the SEF or did they come up independently?</i></p> <p>LL responded that the EIT team and AHs knew the schools well and were highly skilled, they evaluated well and were able to identify areas that needed work before the inspections. LL added EIT were always able to predict actions in school reports. LL said that Ofsted would check that leadership and management were evaluating the school accurately and effectively. The CEO added that now the team were in geographical hubs, EIT's knowledge of the schools was strong and the areas that needed work, as well as supporting Academy Headteachers. The CEO added that she had been proud of how well everything had come together.</p>	

	<p><i>Was there a SEF available for the Trust as a whole, rather than per school?</i> LL said that currently the SEF documents were just with individual schools.</p> <p><i>What evidence could Governors look at to verify what they saw in the SEF?</i> LL responded that there was an opportunity on the school's SEF for AH's (Academy Headteachers) to cross reference the evidence that was linked to the discussions and noted the purpose of the SEF was to capture evidence that could not be found anywhere else. The Trustees/Directors had a robust discussion around LAC governor's knowledge on the SEF document and how they got their information on it and how their views / input was represented on it. The GP said she had made a note to speak to LAC Governors about using the SEF as their evidence to back up what the AH's were saying. LL added, the SEF was additional evidence. The ASIP reflected the current school improvement, but the documents worked alongside each other.</p>	GP
9.	<p>Focus: Vision and values with a <u>LEARNING WALK</u> to evidence that the vision and values and (for CofE schools) Christian distinctiveness are present.</p> <p>The SIAMS annual report 2023-2024 report was circulated via email to Trustees/Directors/LAC Chairs prior to the meeting by Sharon Lord.</p> <p>SL presented the SIAMS annual report to the meeting and the following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools had done well across the Trust in understanding the Christian distinctiveness, all schools across the Trust including community schools had sets of visions and values. • During Ofsted inspections, it had been recognised that it had been helpful having a strong, supported and knowledgeable Headteacher. • Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the visions and values was not as strong as it should be, schools were relying on the ETHOS groups to undertake monitoring and evaluating. Some schools were struggling to recruit members for the ETHOS groups. • School updates- <p>South Devon Hub: Landscope- had been working with their ETHOS group for several years and had been monitoring effectively. Diptford-had improved, SL was supporting the ETHOS group. The school had done a lot of work on spirituality and how to flag up in the curriculum. Harbertonford ETHOS group had been invigorated, members had been reminded of their roles and SL had explained the monitoring schedule. SL had planned training to develop the definition of spirituality.</p> <p>Mid Devon Hub: Ilsington- Had a new AH, SL had explained the role of the ETHOS group and would support the school to get the group up and running. Morchard Bishop- There had been a few issues, which were now in hand SL was supporting.</p> <p>East Devon Hub: Drakes and Otterton- Both small schools with small ETHOS group numbers which needed to grow but were still managing the monitoring schedule.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked how was the Trust capturing the monitoring and evaluating?</i> SL explained ETHOS groups did the monitoring for the 6 elements, 1 per half term and the triangulation happened in the following ETHOS meeting and points from that meeting, then flowed into the LAC meetings. SL added that each school was monitoring 1 element which was discussed at the LAC meetings.</p> <p><i>How could the Trust engage more parents in the ETHOS committees?</i> SL responded that it was a good point to raise and was worth exploring.</p>	SL
10.	Local board	

	<p>The meeting agreed to revisit the LAC questions that were raised in January. <i>A LAC Chair raised the issue of wrap-around care across the Trust.</i> The CEO said that this was currently being looked at, as the provision was not uniform across the Trust. Some schools' wrap around care was strong whilst other schools struggled to offer a comprehensive provision.</p> <p><i>The LAC Chair also asked on behalf of his LAC for clarification on how the Pupil Premium funding was being spent across the Trust.</i> The CEO explained that PP funding needed to be used effectively in a consistent way, which was towards TAs in schools and any additional funding would be used for residential etc. The CEO explained that guidance on spending PP money was very clear and said that it should be spent on quality first education.</p>	Chair
11.	<p>Action Plans Part II was taken</p>	
12.	<p>Safeguarding The CEO gave an update on safeguarding and there were no issues brought forward.</p>	
13.	<p>Trust Risk Register – Trustees to consider report on the following risk categories (to follow): -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding • Education Standards and Achievement • How the Trust use the Risk Register, who populates it and who was held account for it? • Amended Risk Register document review and approval <p>The Trustees/Directors discussed the Trust risk register, and it was agreed to roll item 13. over to the Board of Trustees meeting for a deeper discussion on the risk register categories to ensure the system provided a clear, robust picture of the potential risks across the Trust.</p>	
14.	<p>Strategic Plan - School Improvement and Safeguarding 13.1 Update on 2023/2024 plan –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Improvement • Safeguarding <p>The Trustees raised that the strategic plan was scrutinised at the previous S&C meeting and there were no additional comments to be brought forward.</p>	
15.	<p>Policies 14.1 Early Years Foundation Stage- This policy was approved. 14.2 Complaints Policy 2024- This policy was recommended to go to the Board of Trustees for approval. 14.3 Curriculum policy – deferred from previous meeting. 14.4 Teaching and Learning policy – deferred from previous meeting.</p> <p>The above policies were requested by Trustees to be deferred to the next S&C meeting.</p>	
16.	<p>Evaluation of governance impact – Principle 1: Delivering the Academy Trust's charitable Objects</p> <p>The Trustees congratulated CC on successfully chairing her first meeting on the Committee.</p>	

The meeting ended at 7pm.

Signed by the Chair.....on 4th February 2025.

(Appendix 1)

Questions from Trustees/Governors for S&C Committee meeting- 10/12/24

Report/Attachment	Question	Answer
-------------------	----------	--------

Safeguarding- CPOMS reports.	How do Trustees want Safeguarding Reports to look and what information would be helpful?	This was addressed at the Board of Trustees meeting on the 15 th December 2024.
(Matters arising from S&C 15 th Oct 24) on Pupil Premium gap.	A LAC Chair previously raised that it would be useful to look at the gap for the outgoing Y6 (now in Y7) particularly at the Phonics data and the PPG gap from Phonics to Y6. If we looked at those Schools/Pupils that were in the Trust when those pupils were in Y1, what was the value added through being in the Trust for those Pupil Premium children? Had the Trust narrowed the pupil's achievement gap? Is this data showing PP outcomes at ARE at Y6, if so what were the outcomes for non-PP? Or is the data the gap with non-PP peers? Is the gap narrowing?	Now all but the new school who joined in September are all on the same system, we will be able to filter this and compare the gap between PP and non PP. The data and gaps we had at year 6 for school on the system was Reading 30% Writing 24% Maths 37%
Wellbeing Survey	I agree with the questions for consideration that are listed: it would be very useful to see the responses school by school, and this would also assist EIT in sharing the best practice of those schools achieving more positive results.	Addressed in the S&C meeting on 10 th December 2024.
	I agree that the questions are too vague: 'what is expected of me at school', 'use the things I'm good at' etc. What are the plans to improve this for next time?	Addressed in the S&C meeting on 10 th December 2024.
PSHE/RSHE presentation	Who is this training for: Governors / Trustees / parents / teachers and support staff?	The PPT that was sent to the S&C committee is an outline of PSHE and RSHE across the trust. It was created for trustees; it is not intended as a training PPT for staff. Training on PSHE and RSHE is conducted within schools on a yearly basis, as part of their curriculum quality assurance. PSHE and RSHE updates are circulated with AH's to deliver in their own schools. Ofsted training/resources (led by LL) outline AH responsibilities clearly when it comes to statutory duty.
	There is no mention that PSHE and RHSE are compulsory, and that schools have a statutory duty to have regard for Government Guidance	Amended slides 2 and 3 to make this clearer. Please see slides 2 and 3 on the presentation, which explains the statutory and non-statutory Government guidance for PSHE and RSHE teaching in Primary schools.
	For additional resources our Church schools may find the materials published by Bristol Diocese ('Goodness and Mercy') very helpful (and for non church schools too as there are very clear progression maps). These materials are designed to support the Jigsaw curriculum.	This was noted by SL.
	What do pupils and parents say about the teaching of PHSE and RHSE?	This could be information which the Trust could gather from parents and pupils through the use of a survey. LW will look at putting together a survey in Spring 2025 to measure impact. RSHE

		curriculum is taught in Summer 2025 for Jigsaw.
	Where is the strongest practice in the teaching of PSHE and RHSE? What characterises this provision?	This would be monitored through EIT.
	Where there are support needs to improve provision, what are the main themes for support?	Training for RSHE teaching and the changes which came into the statutory aspects of RSHE curriculum May 2024. As PSHE/RSHE lead I circulate training and updates to AH's and they oversee the training in their own schools.
	How is the quality of provision in PSHE and RHSE quality assured?	This would be monitored through EIT. Between the PSHE/RSHE lead and AH in each school, they oversee their own monitoring of teaching and learning within their school on a yearly cycle.
LAC Governor Questions to be raised at S&C meeting.	Sports Grant- It was felt that Sports was seen as a strength and the loss of a considerable amount of funding had been disappointing- Was there an update for the Totnes LAC on the Sports Grant from the Trust? Was this a Trust decision?	Addressed at F&GP on 12 th December 2024.
	PTFA- Could the Trust arrange to bring together the Chairs of PTFA's support each other and bring forward fresh and new ideas.	Deferred to be discussed with the GP at the next LAC meeting.
	Parent Surveys- What is the value of Parent surveys, do the Trust act on the outcomes and Survey again?	We have yet to decide who leads on this. S&C? HR? EIT? Gov Prof?
	Absence of LAC Chair- How has the issue of the lack of Totnes LAC Chair been flagged up to the Trust?	This has been discussed at the Board of Trustees on 16 th December 2024, permission has been given for the GP to circulate a letter to all parents within the Totnes LAC.
	Safeguarding- Could the Safeguarding Trustee give an update on the expectations around the S175 audit? Support requested at Harbertonford.	The Director of Safeguarding reported that a draft S175 audit was completed by her and circulated to all the schools to support.
	Transport costs/provision of a Trust minibus in Mid-Devon? Rural schools are at a disadvantage due to the high cost of transport. This had also been identified by the Link PE team who are investing how to support the equal spread of PP as a large part of rural schools' money is spent on transport. The four Trust minibuses are all in the Newton Abbot area – could one of them be based in the Mid Devon area: are there not enough schools to warrant this?	
	Nurture space in each Hub: Following on from the S&C Minutes dated 09.07.24 with reference to a request to consider an Inclusion Hub in the Mid Devon area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What exactly would be offered in each Nurture space? • What time frame is being considered (governors 	There has been an amalgamation of several ideas, the development of a Resource Base- Littleham is under development by FM alongside ND and the LA. The Trust currently have an ad out to staff the RB. FM has been to visit one of good practice. This is to develop over this year, intent is that it will represent what we consider to be a sound model for other schools to

	<p>appreciated this initiative was in the early stages)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would this work in relation to children from other schools potentially joining and being temporarily added to one of the Trust schools to enable funding? Would this be for part of a day/part of a week? • The need identified by schools is for more SEND support within the mainstream areas. A separate nurture hub may not support a 'silent sufferer' within the classroom – someone not as loud but requiring equal support. • Nurture groups constantly change due to their nature: how would this be managed? • Enrichment days are held too far away – can they be arranged closer to Mid-Devon? • Some special events or days seemed primarily aimed towards SEMH but the picture is much wider, what broader SEND support is being considered within schools? <p>A governor also asked how will East Devon schools who have recently joined the Trust be able to interact with the Inclusion Hub? How will SEND need and provision be spread?</p>	<p>replicate. LA is guiding where/what, not the trust.</p> <p>Nurture spaces are different – the intent there is to replicate the Woodland Wolves/nurture course approach in each geographical hub. There is no action plan for this currently.</p> <p>SEND provision is developing – the trust hub model now offers SEND leads across each hub, and a wealth of additional support.</p> <p>All schools across the Trust have an Inclusion Review led by the IIH and all schools (including new) have access to support.</p> <p>The new system the EIT have developed is that DoE/DOSIs are leading termly planning meetings to identify where the needs are and allocate resources accordingly.</p>
	<p>Does the Trust have a mental health and wellbeing specialist for pupils; someone who could be deployed across the Trust?</p>	<p>There isn't a specialist employed but this lies within the inclusion hub.</p>
	<p>Staff Wellbeing- Is the Trust doing enough to support its Academy leaders?</p>	<p>Yes. There are layers of support in place and layers of leadership that support the AH team. If LACs have evidence to the contrary, I'd be very interested to unpick this further.</p>
	<p>After-school Clubs/Wrap-around care- What forum was there for Academy Headteachers to discuss club provision? Linked to the after-school club provision varying substantially across the Hub schools</p> <p>Wrap around care- Was becoming a challenge, some families had left school due to the lack of wrap-around care, some external providers cancelled last minute, which then impacted on staff having to stay until the end of sessions.</p>	<p>Fortnightly Academy Head meetings. Regular meetings/communication with DOSIs.</p> <p>ASC is challenging to maintain, particularly in small schools. Difference between external provider 'clubs' and after school care.</p>
	<p>PP white paper review- Update requested on plans for pupil premium funding 2024-25.</p>	<p>This was discussed in the S&C meeting on 10th December 2024.</p>
	<p>Lack of heating at Hennock- Was there a plan in place for whether the CIF bid was successful or not?</p>	<p>This was discussed at the Board of Trustees meeting on 16th December 2024 and answered by the DCEO via email on November 29th 2024 The</p>

		<p>DCEO answered- The fireboard on the boiler at Hennock had deteriorated and needed replacing. The board's job is to provide heat shielding otherwise the boiler would alarm and trip out. The lengthy time taken to resolve was mainly down to the contractor getting the size wrong which meant it had to be re-ordered several times before it was finally fitted successfully on Monday. The boiler itself is only 6 years old, but it is oil fired hence why the DCEO was trying again for CIF funding to replace it with a more eco friendly version, most likely air source heat pumps as was put in at Morchard Bishop following CIF funding. Last year the Trust were 1 point away from qualifying for CIF funding so are very hopeful of this year's submission and this outage sadly has demonstrated further evidence of need for funding which will only strengthen our submission. At a cost of circa £300-400k, if the CIF bid was unsuccessful, then the Trust will have to continue with the current arrangement.</p>
	<p>I.T equipment at Bearnese- Staff commented on learning walk with Governor on I.T equipment-not enough, state of repair, additional security features added by Limbtec impacting usability of IT equipment; constantly sorting out pupil login details and passwords.</p>	
	<p>Pupil Conferencing- Highlighted by LC as a useful tool for gaining pupil voice during visits.</p>	<p>The DoE agreed this would be a positive way forward.</p>
	<p>R.E- Might there be some resources and sources of best practice that could be shared with schools, such as Bearnese, to enhance the teaching of R.E?</p>	<p>SL – RE curriculum and SIAMS lead. Leads termly hub meetings. AHs need to ensure attendance.</p>
	<p>Cultural capital- Could Governors be given pointers in what to look for in displays, questions for staff, questions for pupils on their school visits.</p>	<p>It was agreed that training on this area would be useful. The LAC clerk would add to the agenda for Governors to discuss training dates.</p>
SIAMS report	<p>Did any of our schools receive a SIAMS inspection in the past year? If so what was the feedback?</p>	<p>Yes, Drake's. Positive feedback. Different 'grading' system but would have been outstanding under previous framework.</p>
	<p>It would be interesting to know more about how schools develop spirituality and an understanding of spirituality?</p>	<p>Happy to lead training, or Sharon L would I'm sure.</p>
SEF Review	<p>This document shows a clear intention, with a cycle of activities across the year, feeding into CPD. How does the Self Evaluation process at Academy inform improvement priorities, and at Trust level, inform allocation of support and brokerage of school to school support?</p>	<p>The 'Long AH' meeting mid-year is planning for the year ahead.</p>

	<p>If the ATSIP is reviewed in July, why is the new one generated in Feb / March (half way through the year?)</p>	<p>The July review is done within EIT so we have a clear idea about impact of the ATSIP that has been in place that year. The new ASTIP for the immediate year ahead has already been developed, shared, co-constructed, communicated and AHs have built their ASIP around it. Feb is for the following year so we are planning 6-8 months ahead.</p> <p>Feb is where we hear AH voice and add to the picture or the year ahead to co-construct the areas we want alignment on and where we will collaborate. Their own ASIPS based on their individual needs are reviewed termly. It's a cycle not an event and the ATSIP runs over a 3–5-year cycle so we are always ahead and future-gazing.</p>
	<p>It would be helpful to know the impact of 'milestones met': what difference is intended and then seen / evidenced, by meeting the milestones – both in quality of provision and, most importantly, in pupil outcomes (in their widest sense)?</p>	<p>Under development. Systems for review and impact are evolving, including to ensure that costings and CPD needs are clear from Mid-year (the year before). DoE has built into appraisal, EIT cycle of business and termly DoSI review in order that I sharpen this aspect.</p>
	<p>For the 'context' sections in the SEFs it would be helpful for Leaders, governors and trustees to know how the school compares to Devon and national averages.. (SEND, PPG, LAC, Attendance etc)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>The structure of the SEF, with the sentence starters will be supportive of HTs (any feedback?). How does EIT oversight ensure / assure all SEFs reflect the individuality of the school and are an accurate summary? What evidence do you expect to be noted / signposted to verify the judgements? Where can governor and trustees (and EIT) find such evidence? Would it be helpful to have a separate column / highlighted / bracketed notes / hyperlinks?</p>	<p>Feedback: positive. AH say the stem sentences are helpful. Some still try to answer each, rather than be guided. New hub structure means that DOSIs are developing a deeper understanding of their hub schools and co-constructing SEF docs. Evidence (as noted on the doc) should be to enhance other available information, not duplicating, e.g., wider opportunities, examples of excellent behaviour, cross reference to impact of school improvement work. Hyperlinks should go in the current format, in the evidence/impact column. The SEF should hold a space for the AH to cross-reference evidence of impact if useful to them.</p>

Data predictions for 2024- 2025

School	EYFS	Phonics Y1	Phonics Y2	KS1 ARE				KS2 ARE				KS2 GD			
	GLD			Reading	Writing	Maths	Overall	Reading	Writing	Maths	Overall	Reading	Writing	Maths	Overall

National 2024	2023														
	67.2 %	2023 - 79%						2024 -74%	2024 -72%	2024 -73%	2024 -61%				
Littleham	75% 6/8	60% 3/5	80% 4/5	56% 5/9	56% 5/9	67% 6/9	56% 5/9	64% 7/11	64% 7/11	64% 7/11	64% 7/11	9% 1/11	9% 1/11	9% 1/11	9% 1/11
EAST HUB	71% 22/31	57% 6/28	85% 11/13	63% 20/32	59% 19/32	75% 24/32	56% 18/32	71% 30/42	64% 27/42	74% 31/42	64% 27/42	21% 9/42	12% 5/42	14% 6/42	12% 5/42
Academy Overall	76% 136/178	80% 183/228	74% 42/57	77% 167/216	71% 154/216	79% 172/216	69% 150/216	79% 194/246	71% 174/246	79% 195/246	76% 186/246	22% 53/246	9% 23/246	16% 40/246	9% 22/246