

Minutes of the Southerly Point Co-operative Multi-Academy Trust Standards Committee Meeting



**Thursday 28th September 2017,
in the MAT Conference Room.**

<u>ATTENDING :</u>		
Donna Bryant Sean Davis Peter Johnson Kristin Pryor Marc Talbot Chris Webb		DBr SDa PJo KPr MTa CWe
In Attendance		
Richard Lawrence Karen Teague		RLa KTe
<u>APOLOGIES :</u>		
Susan Reynolds		SRe
		<u>ACTION</u>
3.	<u>WELCOME AND DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS</u>	
	<p>DBr welcomed all those present and invited the group to elect a Chair. SDa was duly elected to this role.</p> <p>There were no declarations of pecuniary interests to be made at this time.</p> <p>Terms of Reference for the Committee</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scrutinise the outcomes / progress towards outcomes of each school through school level / MAT-wide data and ensure robust actions are taken to address emergent issues or to promote excellence. 2. Scrutinise Behaviour and Attendance data to ensure robust actions are taken to address emergent issues or to promote excellence. 3. Review Risk Register in respect of school and MAT. In practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance data • Behaviour and Attendance data • Trust Plan and school priorities • RAG ratings and success criteria • Relationship between Local Governing Bodies, Hubs / Hub Councils and the MAT as a whole. 	
4.	<u>INTRODUCTIONS</u>	
	<p>SDa invited members of the committee to introduce themselves to one another.</p> <p>The Standards Committee was to comprise:</p> <p>Trustees Sean Davis Peter Johnson Kristin Pryor Susan Reynolds Donna Bryant [CEO]</p>	

	<p>Hub Council Representatives</p> <p>Charles Hodson [Kate Wilson as reserve] - Mullion Hub Marc Talbot [Trefor Bowen as reserve] - Parc Eglos Hub Chris Webb [Dave Reynolds as reserve] - Wendron Hub</p> <p>Committee members were reminded that, in this role, they were here for the children of all the MAT schools. When scrutinising data, it was important to be mindful of: the context of each individual school; the many reasons why data can be negatively skewed by individual children [needs, high mobility, etc] even if they have made good progress on an individual level; confidentiality.</p>	
5.	<p><u>OVERVIEW OF SUMMER RESULTS</u></p>	
	<p><u>PRIMARY RESULTS</u></p> <p>Items presented and discussed included:</p> <p>CORESTATS – MAT analysis [2016 and 2017 data].</p> <p>EYFS; Y1 phonics; KS1 and KS2 figures for Reading, Writing, Maths. Included were FSM6 figures. National comparators were included where available. Looked at % Expected Standard, % Higher Standard, Scaled Scores and Progress.</p> <p>Year on year standards [2016 and 2017 data together].</p> <p>EYFS; Y1 phonics; KS1 and KS2 figures for Reading, Writing, Maths. Trust and national averages were included for comparison.</p> <p>CORESTATS for individual schools [including examples of Headlines data, KS2 Attainment Summary 2017 and KS1-2 Attainment Matrices].</p> <p>As no attendance data was available nationally yet, it was not possible to make comparisons in this respect. The attainment summary was useful as this allowed schools to pull out particular groupings and pull out evidence to support judgements.</p> <p>Analyse School Performance [Raise replacement].</p> <p>It was noted the ASP documents were significantly lighter than the old Raise Online documents and rather minimal. EYFS and Y1 phonics data was still to follow.</p> <p>RLa highlighted the importance of ensuring schools were familiar with this format if OfSTED were to ask about this.</p> <p>It was pointed out that writing had been a challenge as the DfE had expected to see almost every type of punctuation, sentence construction, etc. in all pieces of work to denote secure fit and this forced punctuation into places it did not easily fit. However, the DfE had relented for this year so teachers would have a little more flexibility. Schools were moderating between themselves to better determine what good looked like and to ensure the evidence was there to support judgements. Those schools who had been moderated by the Local Authority had come out well in this.</p> <p>Q. How do we address the outliers?</p> <p>A. It is important to understand the story behind any data - to look at each child and make sure their progress is robust. It is useful to document the difference these children would make to data so this can be explained to OfSTED if a school is challenged. Evidence and quality of Teaching and Learning should be clear in books and the classroom.</p> <p>Q. How do we get a consistent level of self-evaluation across MAT?</p> <p>A. RLa recommended a piece of work which could be undertaken through a single self-evaluation tool linked into OfSTED criteria and the risk of standards not being met. This would be evidence based, linked to the schools' own self-evaluation practice and monitored at hub level. The outcomes could then be passed on to the Standards Committee / Trust Board for scrutiny and discussion.</p> <p>Action: RLa to look into this further.</p>	<p>RLa</p>

The importance of looking at progress over time to gauge a direction of travel, trajectory and so on was acknowledged. Jason Hurr was bringing the internal tracking system up to date across the MAT. All schools currently had the basic package for this and some bought into a greater level of analysis.

Q. Going forward, is it worth while having a more consistent approach regarding the level of analysis that is bought into?

A. There could certainly be some merit in an increased degree of uniformity.

Action: DBr / RLa to look into a cost-benefit analysis.

RLa asked committee members if they could determine what information would be required and how this might best be presented in future meetings. It was decided that, at the next meeting, the information presented would include:

- An update on what progress had been made in different cases, particularly in relation to 'red' schools. Committee members were reminded that the current data was based only on standards and so must be handled sensitively.
- A paragraph on each school, to give an overview of the current picture across the MAT, and a RAG rating for each school.

SECONDARY RESULTS

Items presented and discussed included:

Headline measures for KS4 - Helston Community College and Mullion School.

Foci:

- All Students
- Gender
- Disadvantaged Students
- DSEN Students
- Prior Attainment Groups
- Closing the Gaps
- Strongest Performing Subjects
- Weakest Performing Subjects

Committee members were asked to bear in mind certain caveats, such as: a number of challenges were pending for both schools; the national travesty around marking; changes to how progress 8 is calculated; english and maths scales having moved to 1 to 9, though it was hoped that changing coefficients for calculations going forward would mean it would be easier to make comparisons.

It was recognised that gaps might draw the attention of OfSTED so both schools would need to look at this.

Headline measures for KS5 - Y13 at Helston Community College.

Foci:

- A-level Average Points Score
- A-level Level 3 Value added
- Academic Average Points Score
- Academic Level 3 Value Added
- Applied General Average Points Score
- Applied General Level 3 Value Added
- Tech Level Average Points Score
- Portion of Grades Achieved
- Alps Grades
- Strongest Performing Subjects
- Weakest Performing Subjects
- English and maths GCSE resit progress

Priorities - Mullion School and Helston Community College.

DBr / RLa

	<p>DBr asked committee members if the content and format for the secondary level data presentation were appropriate. Attendees confirmed they were appropriate but suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A flow chart to demonstrate how everything fitted in and what flowed into where would be a useful addition. • More information around the weaker performing subjects would be helpful as this would allow committee members to understand and scrutinise these areas more fully. <p>Discussion was briefly had around the frequency of subject reviews, how these inform subject action plans and whether a greater level of accountability might be necessary in certain instances going forward.</p> <p>Action: DBr to produce flowchart for committee.</p> <p>Action: SENCOs from Helston Community College and Mullion School to get together to check on how they categorise DSEN children to ensure consistency.</p> <p>Action: DBr to speak with WRa / WJe on applying to have outliers removed from data.</p>	<p>DBr</p> <p>DBr</p> <p>DBr</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></p>	
	<p>Q. <u>Do we need to monitor the monitors?</u></p> <p>A. A monitoring system is already in place through the Hub Leaders and the CEO. The impact of what schools are doing should show itself in their data and be reflected in external reports from SIPs etc. Data sets could be made available for meetings if committee members deemed this appropriate.</p> <p>Action: DBr to ensure Trustees know where risks are. Cf. risk register; strategic and reputational risks; how risks are being managed; how early warning signs are being identified and responded to; etc.</p> <p>There was discussion on the relationship between Local Governing Bodies, Hub Councils and the MAT as a whole. The need to look at avoiding too much duplication and streamlining the system as far as possible was recognised.</p> <p>There were no further matters to be raised at this time so the Chair thanked everyone for attending and drew the meeting to a close at 8.30pm.</p>	<p>DBr</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p><u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u></p>	
	<p>The next meeting of the MAT Standards Committee will take place on Thursday 16th November 2017, from 6.00pm, in the MAT Conference Room at Helston Community College.</p> <p>Thereafter, meetings for the current academic year will take place on:</p> <p>Thursday 25th January 2018</p> <p>Thursday 10th May 2018</p>	