

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

**Thursday 25th January 2018,
in the MAT Conference Room.**



	<p><u>ATTENDING :</u> Helena Arnold Donna Bryant Charles Hodson Peter Johnson Kristin Pryor Marc Talbot</p> <p>In Attendance Richard Lawrence Karen Teague</p>	<p>HAr DBr CHo PJo KPr MTa</p> <p>RLa KTe</p>
	<p><u>APOLOGIES :</u> Sean Davis Chris Webb</p>	
		<u>ACTION</u>
3.	<p><u>WELCOME AND DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS</u></p>	
	<p>In the absence of SDa, PJo was elected to the role of Chair for this meeting and welcomed all those present.</p> <p>Under Declarations of Pecuniary Interests, no declarations were forthcoming.</p>	
4.	<p><u>MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING</u></p>	
	<p>The minutes of the previous meeting, on 28th September 2017, were agreed to be an accurate record by those who had been present and these were duly signed.</p> <p>For the benefit of those attending for the first time, it was reiterated that the role of Hub Council representatives on the committee was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To scrutinise data at committee / hub level and ask the CEO, Hub Leaders, etc to act on the findings where appropriate. • To provide a clear, joined up communication flow between the committee and the hub councils. <p>Matters Arising included:</p> <p>Flowchart. As considerable changes were happening and it was increasingly hard to keep ahead of the curve, DBr instead provided committee members with the appendices of the '2017 School and College Performance Tables: Statement of Intent' as these explained where the key data sets were from and highlighted critical points.</p> <p>SENCO networking. The secondary SENCOs were still to look at the categories used for recording children on the register of need so the action was to be carried over to the minutes of this meeting.</p> <p>ACTION. Secondary SENCOs to look at how DSEN children are categorised within the register of need to ensure consistency.</p> <p>Outliers. Applications in the case of outliers in GCSE had been made but not all individuals were removed from the data as a result and there was no form of appeal.</p> <p>Risk Register. Committee members requested that this be added to the agenda as a</p>	<p>DBr / DLe / HMa</p>

	<p>standing item, after primary assessment, to ensure it fulfilled its obligation to look at any risk, or potential risk, and at how this was being mitigated.</p> <p>Action: KTe to add this to agenda as standing item.</p> <p>DBr to bring Risk Register to next meeting of committee.</p>	<p>KTe</p> <p>DBr</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><u>PERFORMANCE AND PROGRESS DATA - PRIMARY</u></p>	
	<p>Data presented and discussed for Autumn Term 2017 included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysing School Performance [ASP] - Example • Cornwall School Effectiveness - Categorisation - Example • Inspection Data Summary Report [IDSR] - Example • Internal tracking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Autumn Performance • Fischer Family Trust <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ School Dashboard and Extended School Dashboard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. KS1 - Example ii. KS2 - Example ◦ Collaborate - Demonstration • SPCMAT Risk Evaluation – Example <p>RLa advised the committee that much was new this year before looking at each individual school against judgements from the various documents above and explaining the reasoning behind this. He then shared a proposed [internal] judgement for where each school was currently, bearing in mind that the Trust had more information to draw on than County so knew the schools better.</p> <p><u>Q. What about the morale of staff if, for example, the Trust’s rating was lower than that of County?</u></p> <p>A. This was very much about discussion with headteachers and not about making a pejorative judgement so should not be perceived negatively.</p> <p><u>Q. How do Trust leaders account for the difference in categorisation by the Trust and SEC, for example?</u></p> <p>A. Far more is being factored in when making an internal judgement. If plans are in place to address any issues and internal assessments are showing progress, for example, this will influence how schools are categorised. The Risk Evaluation package will also demonstrate that the Trust is working towards a clearer, very thorough system of evaluation.</p> <p>Action: Going forward, add a statement to explain the nature of any difference and the reason for this, making it clear if a judgement is for where school is or where it is deemed to be moving towards, so context is clear.</p> <p>The Risk Evaluation package comprised: a self-evaluation judgement in each of the Ofsted categories; data analysis, which sits over the top of this; contextual analysis - quantitative judgements but backed up by evidence; judgements around processes. It would also look at well-being measures when fully implemented.</p> <p>Analysis would allow the CEO and Hub leaders to identify risks by school and risks by Trust so strategies could be put into place to address these. One potential Trust wide issue was greater depth maths and a number of measures were already in place. Eg. two Trust level focus groups for Year 6 pupils to raise attainment and Year 6 children from one of the small schools joining their peers at a larger school to enable them to have greater challenge. A maths project, brokered by the Maths Hub and the Trust’s Teaching School, to address greater depth maths as an issue was also about to start.</p> <p>Discussion was had around the level of detail committee members required in terms of attainment, risk awareness and so on. While they reserved the right to drill down in much greater detail should a particular risk arise, the committee would otherwise look at more general overviews but with mention of any red areas and taking into account</p>	<p>RLa / DBr</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tech Level Average Points Score • Grade distribution • Alps grades • English and Maths Progress Measure <p>Committee members suggested it would be helpful for a commentary to be added to the data sets and for the data to be colour coded for additional clarification. Both these measures were to be put into place for the next meeting.</p> <p>Q. <u>Are you as leaders confident there is sufficient capacity to draw comparisons if different packages are being used by the secondaries?</u></p> <p>A. Yes. While the packages used to crunch data are different, they are consistent in measuring below, on, above and allow us to draw useful comparisons so having the same systems would not necessarily be of any significant benefit. Going forward, it would be useful to look at greater standardisation but it is important to grow towards a consensus in this respect.</p> <p>Committee members recognised the current complications and vacillations, and were to monitor this in the meantime to ensure consistency.</p> <p>It was noted that recompense for Helston Community College may become necessary if JHa was to be asked to provide further detail for the committee in the future.</p>	<p>DBr / JHa to note</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><u>BEHAVIOUR AND ATTENDANCE DATA</u></p>	
	<p>DBr advised committee members that there was currently no easy way to extrapolate figures systematically so the figures presented were broadly a guide to what was happening. The aim was to design a SIMS look up chart that would produce a report that was consistent across all the Trust schools. However, the tables presented did serve to highlight outliers, pose questions for further exploration and flag up any potential risks within individual schools or across the Trust – particularly in relation to vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Attendance: 2016-2017 and Autumn Term 2017</p> <p>Foci:</p> <p>All Pupil Premium SEND Gaps in relation to PP pupils Gaps in relation to SEND pupils</p> <p>As attendance was linked to outcomes in schools, it was important that attendance concerns - especially with Pupil Premium children - were followed up. Recent Pupil Premium reviews had indicated that schools knew these children well and had individual plans for them. The schools were sharing strategies to improve attendance. Eg. Agreeing parameters for extraordinary leave; agreed coding of absence; trialling new letters to raise the profile of attendance; rewards systems, etc. A working party was in the process of producing a consistent attendance policy which was tougher on absence.</p> <p>Also briefly discussed, to provide a context for the above, was data for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migration • Exclusions • Referrals • Safeguarding <p>A number of issues or potential issues were identified. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget challenges having a significant impact on the secondary curriculum and therefore on the ability of schools to meet the needs of SEND children. • Current gaps continuing into GCSE year. • Universities making unconditional or low offers discouraging students from working to their full potential. However, measures were in place to counteract this, such as VESPA. 	

	<p>Action: Risk score card to be broken down into subject areas so easier to look at SEND and disadvantaged within each.</p> <p>Action: Timings to be added to agenda to ensure sufficient time is allocated to each item.</p>	<p>RLa to note</p> <p>KTe to note</p>
8.	<u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u>	
	<p>Hub Council representatives on the committee asked if a draft version of the minutes could be made available to them as soon as possible for reference prior to upcoming Hub Council meetings.</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.</p>	KTe to note
9.	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u>	
	<p>The next meeting of the MAT Standards Committee will take place on Thursday 10th May 2018, from 6.00pm, in the MAT Conference Room at Helston Community College.</p> <p>This will be the final meeting of the current academic year.</p>	

Chair's Signature _____ Date _____