

## Standards and Curriculum Committee MINUTES

Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2023  
5pm

Please note: This meeting was held via 'Teams'

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

**In attendance:** Rebecca Sear (RS) - Totnes Local Board (LB) Representative  
Max Thomas (MT) - Woodleigh LB Representative

Lizzie Lethbridge (LL) – Director of Education (Items 5.6, 6 and 9)  
Andy Keay (AK) – Director of Standards and Outcomes (Items 5.6, 6 and 9)  
Sarah Clarke (SC) - Director of School Improvement (Item 7)

**Minutes:** Charlotte Roe (GP)

No	Item	Action
1.	<b>Welcome and apologies</b> The Chair opened the meeting with a welcome. The apologies from Graeme Scott and Corrina Tigg were <b>accepted</b> . LL also gave her apologies for partial attendance. These were also <b>accepted</b> .	
2.	<b>Declarations of interest</b> 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.  There were no other declarations of interest lodged.	
3.	<b>Any other business</b> There was no other business.	
<b>For discussion and agreement</b>		
4.	<b>Approval of last meeting minutes</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 25 <sup>th</sup> January 2023 were <b>accepted</b> as a true record.	
5.	<b>Matters arising from minutes of 25<sup>th</sup> January 2023 (not on the agenda)</b> 5.6 Progress data for pupils who have had specific interventions. A report by the Director of Standards & Outcomes and questions raised by the Trustees from the report had been circulated before the meeting. The questions the Trustees had raised before the meeting were: <i>It's good to see earlier identification of concerns and better use of data to formulate responses – any examples of impact this year?</i> <i>Given the challenge in maths, particularly for girls, what is our current mid-year data telling us about impact of actions to address this?</i> <i>What was the RWM outcome for PPG and how does this compare with RWM and non-PPG peers?</i> <i>What were progress scores for SEND pupils like – what is the picture across the Trust?</i> <i>Are there schools were PPG and SEN achieved +ive progress scores in published data?</i> <i>At this mid-point of the year, what is the summary evaluation of progress towards end of year targets for this year?</i> <i>With KS1 Maths below national figure and focus on writing and oracy, are we still ensuring the arts are being given sufficient time and focus?</i>	

	<p>AK reported that girls (years 1-3) were outperforming boys. Year 4 girls were in line with boys and then Year 5-6 boys outperform girls. This reflected the national picture. The Trust were narrowing the gap. White Rose was being used and embedded trust-wide, providing consistency. <i>The Trustees commented on the trend and asked whether boys accelerated, or girls stopped progressing?</i> AK said the theory was it was due to the mathematical skills supporting the learning which the White Rose programme should address. <i>Keeping standardised testing in mind, questions were asked around pinpointing the gaps in learning, and whether the Trust would consider the economy of scale achieved through purchasing as a Trust, thus providing Trust wide gap analysis.</i> The DoE said that girls were better at reasoning in the earlier stages and once calculation skills were introduced, boys seemed to accelerate. This was being addressed by the EIT.</p> <p>The DoE and AK reported that the curriculum had not been narrowed and arts were still being taught. The EIT ensured that there was a broad and balanced curriculum trust wide. The assessment was around whether the pupils were learning what was being taught rather than national assessments. CPD curriculum days during this academic year had significantly supported the heads to deliver a broader curriculum. It was added that the learning in these areas gave the pupils transferrable skills in other curriculum subjects. The CEO said there had positive feedback from schools in the process of joining the Trust on the CPD curriculum days.</p> <p><i>Following a question from Trustees, AK shared the combined outcomes for the disadvantaged children compared with the non-disadvantaged children – 35% PP achieved reading, writing and maths compared to 69% non-PP. AK added the percentages in each school varied depending on the amount of PP children – for example one school had only 1 PP while another school had 75% PP children. AK reported that EIT had focussed on the disadvantaged learners to address the lower than national average progress to identify the gaps across the trust. It was noted the starting points for this group was lower than historically. The DoE said the Trust had engaged with the Southwest Disadvantaged Group which had supported the EIT to focus on this area and form strategies to support these learners. The Trustees asked which subject was the weakest, and so preventing PP pupils achieving the national standard of ARE in RWM combined?</i> It was reported it was writing across the trust and language linked gaps in formative years. It was noted that non-PP children were also benefitting from the PP focussed strategies resulting in non-PP children progressing as well. It was added focussing on accelerated progress gave a strong indication on success. AK added that he was working with the Inclusion Hub Lead to develop the data around PP learners. The CEO highlighted that the disadvantaged focus began at the beginning of the current academic year, so it was too early to measure the true impact. AK reiterated that it was a 3-year strategy and depending on the stage the school were on reflected how the PP children were performing – it was not a ‘quick fix’. <i>The Trustees asked whether the data reflected learners that were purely PP and had no other need such as SEND?</i> About third had SEND needs as well. AK <b>agreed</b> to review the data on just the remaining 2/3 ascertain their outcome. The Inclusion Lead was working with AK to unpick these learners to pinpoint the barriers to learning.</p> <p>It was reported that, the data showed the SEND learners made good progress – <i>Following a request from Trustees it was <b>agreed</b> to aggregate the Y6 Progress Scores for SEND pupils and PP pupils seen in IDSR data to highlight which schools were making good progress with their SEND learners in order support other schools in the Trust. It was noted that the glitch with Power Bi had been resolved and groups could now be targeted across the Trust.</i></p>	<p>AK</p> <p>AK</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Focus:</b> Mid-year pupil outcomes and progress towards targets  AK and LL updated the meeting on the mid-year pupil outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KS1 – Reading – Target 72% Currently 67% - with 16% within 1 sub level of achieving so on track.</li> <li>• KS1 – Writing – Target 72% Currently 60% with 19% within 1 sub level of achieving so on track.</li> <li>• KS1 – Maths – Target 75% Currently 68% with 16% within 1 sub level of achieving so on track.</li> <li>• KS2 – Reading – Target 74% Currently 64% with 17% within 1 sub level of achieving so on track.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KS2 – Writing – Target 76% Currently 58% with 15% within 1 sub level of achieving so on track.</li> <li>• KS2 – Maths – Target 76% Currently 60% with 16% within 1 sub level of achieving so on track.</li> </ul> <p>AK reported that the EIT reviewed the data and worked with the Academy Heads to highlight the gaps and agree strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Following a question from Trustees</i>, AK reported that Reading, writing and maths – Currently 62% with 18% within 1 sub level of achieving so on track.</li> </ul> <p><i>The Trustees asked that this information was shared ahead of time to allow questions and informed discussions within the meeting.</i> Following a question about phonics, AK explained that the data was based purely on an end of year national test. He added that there would be ongoing assessments by teachers throughout the year however does not feed into the Trust data. Following a discussion, AK <b>agreed</b> to research possible avenues to evidence phonic mid-year assessments.</p> <p><b>Update on focus visits from Local boards</b></p> <p>The local governors reported that in their visits to schools, individual teacher assessments were discussed in conjunction with baseline assessments to monitor progress across all year groups and wondered if there was any way that could be fed into S&amp;C. It was agreed that it would be good for the trust to understand any issues so support could be put in place in a timely manner. AK said EIT reviewed targets and progress regularly to ensure that the learners were on track – there should be no surprises.</p> <p>The first headline of end of year outcomes would be available on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2023 and it was <b>agreed</b> if possible, these would be included into the General Meeting with the Members on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2023.</p>	<p>AK</p> <p>AK/GP</p>
7.	<p><b>Focus:</b> Progress through the ASIP</p> <p>A report by the Director of School Improvement was circulated before the meeting. The questions raised by the Trustees before the meeting were:</p> <p><i>At the mid-point of the year, there is more to do to complete aims priority 2 and 3. What are the challenges that slow progress in these priorities (Oracy and pedagogy) versus P1 (behaviour)?</i></p> <p><i>If local boards were to carry out focus visits, what differences would they see, and what aspects are already evidently consistent across all schools?</i></p> <p><i>What do we expect to see in pupil outcomes as a result?</i></p> <p>SC started by outlining the rationale behind the ATSIP (Academy Trust School Improvement Plan). SC illustrated the research behind the plan. The trust was following a 3-year approach in line with Education Endowments Funds (EEF) research. SC reported that the language was being embedded. The reason why priority 1 seemed to be further along was because it was related to the ‘Explore and Prepare’ stage. Priority 2 and 3 would now start emerging as a natural progression. 3 schools were piloting the knowledge and expertise stage in terms of the relational approach. It would then be rolled out next year as part of the deliver phase - oracy and feedback was part of the deliver phase. Within the report SC showed the breakdown of each academies’ position within the ATSIP priorities. <i>A local Governor Chair asked why one of the Totnes hub schools had not reached the embedded stage?</i> SC explained that this academy had joined the Trust later so had not taken part from the beginning so was behind in the process. <i>A Trustee pointed out that some of the academies had achieved excellence, and asked whether the expectation was all the other academies would also achieve this and what was needed to ensure this happened?</i> SC explained that as the Trust was growing, the challenge was how to move forwards together at the same time addressing individual school needs - especially new schools to the Trust. SC explained the principles around how the EIT supported each school. SC added that oracy had become an integral part of the Trust’s teaching approach as it was felt it was vital for the pupils. SC explained that the programme was comprehensive and once the academies had been through it, excellence would be a natural consequence.</p> <p>SC said that local boards in their visits should be seeing that academies were at different stages. The aim was to bring the whole Trust to the same dialogic teaching where each pupil was taking charge of their own learning.</p> <p>SC outlined how the ATSIP would impact on pupil outcomes. She explained that across the Trust there were strong indications of progress through data, vocabulary, and</p>	

	<p>questions being asked. At the end of this academic year, the data would be able to illustrate the impact of the ATSIP for individual academies and trust-wide. <i>The Trustees asked about narrowing the gap for the disadvantaged children and how oracy was supporting this.</i> SC said the EIT's initial findings on oracy learning were showing a significant impact for disadvantaged children. These learners were showing confidence and resilience to tackle more complex tasks. SC added that it was difficult to provide hard evidence but was confident that it was starting to have an impact. <i>The Trustees asked if data could be presented to show the comparison of disadvantaged learners in schools further in the programme with disadvantaged learning in schools who were at the beginning of the programme to try to pinpoint the impact. It was also asked that termly milestones were added to the ATSIP around expectations of progress and outcomes.</i> SC said that at the end of the 'prepare' stage, a comparison was done with the 5 pilot schools with the rest of the Trust. It was evident that the oracy strand was making a difference.</p> <p><b>Local Board Feedback</b></p> <p>It was noted that the Trustees had received 2 sets of minutes from the local board as part of a pilot scheme around the sharing of information. <i>It was noted that one of the academies used standardised testing and the Trustees asked if this was a trust-wide practice?</i> The CEO said it was up to individual academies using their resource budget. This academy used it, as it was recognised there was inconsistency in judgements. The outcome provided the Academy Head a clear picture of the learning across the school and create a tight programme to address the gaps and have an impact of the learning. It was noted that the EIT were overseeing this. There was a discussion again around the cost and economies of scale if used across the trust.</p> <p><i>* Additional visit notes from the Woodleigh board were circulated to the S&amp;C Trustees on 15th May 2023. These were read by the Trustees and it was noted (via email) that they were detailed and informative.</i></p>	
8.	<p><b>Local board reports</b></p> <p>8.1 Committee to note any additional verbal updates from local board Chairs. The Trustees considered the questions raised through the Local Boards minutes. <i>Questions around the relationship between SIAMS and governance were asked.</i> The CEO reported that Sharon Lord (SL) had a wealth of experience in this field, and she had drawn up an action plan to address this. The GP reported that she was meeting with SL to review ways of reporting and evidence the Christian distinctiveness of the schools across the Trust. The meeting noted that the Ethos committee needed to be separate to governors with only a Foundation governor crossing both.</p> <p><i>Local boards raised questions around centralising safeguarding as Academy Heads were spending a disproportionate time on chasing external partners to address safeguarding concerns.</i> The CEO reported recent Ofsted inspectors had highlighted the inadequate provision from the LA and the Trust should continue demanding a response around safeguarding concerns. The Trust were able to evidence that safeguarding was strong across the trust. Academy Heads know that if they were not getting a response from external partners, then to escalate it through her. The issues around centralising safeguarding was around confidentiality and context. It was added that the Trust were investigating electronically safeguarding reporting systems which could provide the Safeguarding Lead in EIT an alert to any issues across the trust giving an improved oversight.</p> <p>8.2 Update on local governance make-up. The CEO presented the proposal on the local governance make-up. It was noted until it was agreed by the Board of Trustees on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2023 it was confidential. The Local Chairs thanked the CEO for her reports and added that it would 'calm the waters' at local governance level.</p> <p>8.3 The Governance Professional updated the meeting on the new procedures to ensure a more cohesive approach between the Trust and local governance. It was noted that Moorland and Totnes were able to directly feed into this meeting's focus. It was felt that with some tweaks this was a positive start.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Action Plans</b></p> <p>Post Ofsted action plans from 2 schools were circulated before the meeting. <i>The Trustees commented that they were different in layout and content and asked which version proved the most effective?</i> LL reported that both originally looked the same however one had evolved to reflect more detailed and comprehensive objectives. The</p>	

	<p>more detailed action plan proforma would now be adopted across the trust if an action plan was required. The EIT had also developed their dashboard to closely monitor the schools that were of concern. The Trustees commented that the more detailed action plan was easier to map out the progress of the school.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Safeguarding</b></p> <p>10.1 GS had circulated 4 reports around safeguarding before the meeting. <i>The Trustees asked about the volume of peer-on-peer incidents at one school and the general rise in behaviour incidents across the trust generally.</i> The CEO reported that monitoring of the accident's books could highlight issues quicker. It was suggested that local governors could support this. Relational behaviour was in its infant stage and should in time help to address peer on peer incidents. The recording in each school needs to be more consistent to the trust to minimise the discrepancies to give the Trust a clear picture. The Safeguarding Lead was working with the Academy Heads on this. <i>The trustees appreciated that supervision for DSLs was expensive and asked if someone internally could be trained.</i> The CEO said that the DSLs would benefit from consistent training and support. <i>The Trustees asked whether the audits could inform the Trust on areas of concern or best practice that could be shared.</i> The CEO reported that the reporting needed to be tightened up across the trust with an oversight to allow for support and challenge.</p> <p>10.2 Update on meeting with GS, Safeguarding Lead and GP on the interface between local governance and trustees on safeguarding matters. The meeting was postponed until 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2023.</p> <p>The CEO added that Wolborough would be joining the Trust in Autumn 2023 and the Head of that school would be able to support the Academy Heads as she had a wealth of experience in safeguarding.</p>	
11.	<p><b>Trust Risk Register</b> - Evaluation of risk related to quality of provision and standards and curriculum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CEO reported that the risk register proforma had been rewritten and sent to the schools. The Trustees were no longer risk owners, this had been transferred to EIT. Trustees were now overseeing the registers.</li> </ul>	
12.	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <p>The CEO reported that the Strategic Trust plan for 2023-24 had been created and he was in the process of populating it.</p>	
13.	<p><b>Policies</b></p> <p>There was a discussion about the process around reviewing and approving policies. It was noted that when the trustees reviewed policies there inevitably needed to be amendments which was difficult to manage within the meeting. It was agreed that for the current policies below, the GP would make the highlighted changes suggested by Trustees, circulate to the Trustees and they would be agreed by email. In future, the GP would 'drip feed' the policies to Trustees once they had been reviewed by school staff to allow time for review, and the amended version to be presented in the meeting wherever possible.</p> <p>13.1 School complaints  13.2 Children with health needs who cannot attend school  13.3 Public sector equality statement for publication  13.4 School uniform policy (to follow)  13.5 Missing pupil policy  13.6 Children in care policy</p>	
14.	<p><b>Evaluation of governance impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Chair thanked the meeting for reading the papers beforehand, the questions raised and the input from members of the committee.</li> <li>It was felt that the new process was a positive way forward for local governors and Trustees.</li> <li>The trustees said there was a lot of value of reading the minutes from the Local Boards.</li> <li>It was important that the local governors received feedback from the meeting.</li> </ul>	
15.	<p><b>Next Meeting's Focus</b></p>	

	<p>Wellbeing – pupils and staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oversight of support for wellbeing – highlighting strengths and plans for schools where this isn't yet consistent.</li> </ul> <p>How is pupil wellbeing prioritised and supported at the school? what routines / activities / interventions are in place? What impact is evident?</p> <p>Are there any groups or individuals who are not benefitting / engaging as much as others? (PPG, SEND etc)</p> <p>How do leaders and governors support staff wellbeing? What about ECTs? What about part time staff? How do governors support HT workload and wellbeing? Is there more that the Trust or governors could do to support HT wellbeing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Analysis and evaluation of surveys: what do pupils, parents and staff say? What changes could be made by the school and / or by the Trust?</li> </ul> <p>Quality of Teaching and Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact of planned CPD - has the planned CPD taken place? How was it prioritised - what was the rationale? What evidence of impact is there?</li> <li>▪ Progress of ECTs and impact of support and mentoring: Without breaking confidentiality, how effective is the ECT programme, and the expectations on mentors?</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

**Dates of next meetings**

**14 June 2023**