ATTENDING :	
Donna Bryant	**DBr**
Sean Davis	**SDa**
Charles Hodson	**CHo**
Kristin Pryor	**KPr**
Marc Talbot	**MTa**
Kevin Thomas [for HAr / PJo]	**KTh**
Chris Webb	**CWe**
In Attendance	
Richard Lawrence	**RLa**
Karen Teague	**KTe**

APOLOGIES :	
Helena Arnold	**HAr**
Peter Johnson	**PJo**

		ACTION
3.	**WELCOME AND DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS**	
	The Chair welcomed all those present. Under **Declarations of Pecuniary Interests,** no declarations were forthcoming.	
4.	**MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING**	
	The minutes of the previous meeting, on 25th January 2018, were agreed to be an accurate record and were duly signed.	
	Matters Arising included:	
	Categorisation of DSEN children. DBr had spoken with the Trust's SENCo Network Lead on the need for clarity and uniformity regarding the thresholds for pupils above universal service. This need had been acknowledged and was being dealt with as an ongoing action.	
	ACTION. SENCOs to look at how DSEN children are categorised within the register of need to ensure consistency.	DBr / DLe / HMa
	Overview of Risk. Committee members were asked to consider the depth / breadth of the information presented at the current meeting. DBr would then look again at the overview of risk if the members deemed this was not what they needed.	
	Data Sets. Commentaries and colour coding [where necessary] had now been added to the data sets for clarification.	
	Breakdown of Risk. It was pointed out that it would be difficult to further break down information for SEND children, for example, without it being possible to identify individual children – particularly in the smaller schools. Committee members were again asked to look at what was presented at the current meeting and DBr would then look again at the breakdown of risk if the members deemed this was not what they needed. DBr added that she was confident headteachers knew their children well and were very able to discuss individuals if challenged on this as evidenced by school visits.	

5.	**SCHOOL RISK REVIEWS AND SUMMARY OVERVIEW OF CURRENT ISSUES**	
	SCHOOL RISK REVIEWS	

SCHOOL RISK REVIEWS

Individual schools had been Red, Amber, Green rated regarding the following criteria:

- Analysis of data
  - Attainment
  - Progress
- Leadership changes
- Governance challenges

An overview of each school and highlighted any broader factors for consideration had been undertaken by the CEO and Hub Leaders..

DBr and RLa talked members through any red or amber categorisations and gave a rationale for why schools had been categorised in this way.

Q. Why have the legacy issues that have been noted arisen?

A. Moderation has previously taken place through the Local Authority but without a sufficient degree of robustness, and using a different methodology which resulted in figures being over-inflated at the end of the key stage. Better categorisation and benchmarking is now in place.

Q. Going forward, how can the Trust prevent a similar situation developing?

A. Management of this includes cross school moderation, agreement around standards, schools not working in isolation, a greater degree of challenge from Hub Leaders / CEO, and use of external additional testing to give another benchmark. Moreover, any anomalies will now become evident during the data drop comparison work and steps will be taken to tackle this at an earlier stage.

Q. Is staff churn evident across the Trust?

A. Whilst some schools are experiencing a degree of churn, this pattern is not uncommon and many schools are very stable. The added support and flexibility of working as a Trust is also affording better scenarios than would otherwise have been the case.

New intake numbers for September 2018 were down across the area, due to a fall-off in the birth rate and a corresponding trend downwards, accordingly to a Local Authority forecast. Parental choice means that some schools become overwhelmed with more than an equal share of vulnerable children. The answer is for the community perception of all of our schools to be that the needs of the vulnerable are met everywhere.

Q. How do you test how robust narratives are?

A. Headteachers know individuals well and are very able to discuss them in detail. It would be good to look at a standard pro forma for writing up these case studies across the Trust schools.

Action: Look at those making exceptional progress / achieving above the expected standard [particularly disadvantaged pupils] as well as those under achieving. **DBr / RLa**

CHo left the meeting, with apologies, at this point.

SUMMARY OVERVIEW

A Summary of Spring Drop Primary Data Sets: Teacher Assessments v FFT50 Target based on prior attainment was presented. This highlighted key concerns and recommendations, as well as analysing gaps and risks. Committee members were assured that measures were in place to address any concerns that had arisen.

A Summary Overview of each of the secondary schools was presented. These included progress and attainment; disadvantaged and SEND; concerns across subjects or year groups.

QUALITATIVE JUDGEMENTS SHEET

In addition to the above, a Qualitative Judgements sheet had been compiled using data from the risk evaluation document for each school in order to give a clear overview of the Trust as a whole.

6.	**PERFORMANCE AND PROGRESS DATA - PRIMARY**	
	Data presented and discussed for Spring Term 2018 included: **Data Drop Spring 2018 – A** breakdown of individual school data and that for the Trust as a whole, with a commentary. This incorporated aspects such as Average / Expected / Difference, as well as Just Below / Within / Secure. The direct comparison of data served to highlight any data anomalies and subsequently to encourage the CEO / Hub Leaders to ask questions of schools where such anomalies occurred as these occurred. RLa stated that, whilst there was still an element of uncertainty around where to place a piece of work due to the lack of clarity at a national level, he was confident the Trust-wide moderation now in place would increase staff confidence in this respect. Schools working together on a more regular basis had already pulled earlier differences together so this was a further benefit of joint working within the Trust. **Target setting vs FFT 50 – A b**reakdown of % pupils working at greater depth or at expected standard within each school and within the Trust as a whole, with risk rating and a commentary. As FFT 50 was the average performance for all schools with similar KS1 performance and targets were based on prior attainment, this seemed a reasonable set of targets at which to look. It was noted this was very useful for identifying whole Trust priorities, such as greater depth and aspects of writing / maths. RLa was thanked for his presentation and hard work. He left the meeting at 7.15pm.	
7.	**PERFORMANCE AND PROGRESS DATA - SECONDARY**	
	Data presented and discussed for Spring Term 2018 included: **Key Stage 3, 4 & 5 Data Trends, Autumn Term 2017 to Spring Term 2018 for Helston Community College** • KS3 Year 9. Overall, Gender, Disadvantaged, SEND, Prior Attainment. • KS4 Year 10. Overall, Gender, Disadvantaged, SEND, Prior Attainment. • KS4 Year 11. Overall, Gender, Disadvantaged, SEND, Prior Attainment. • KS4 Closing the Gap Data Trends. Gender, Disadvantaged and SEND Gaps. • KS5 Year 12. A-level, Academic, Applied General, Tech Level, Grade Distribution, Alps Grades, English and Maths Progress Measures. • KS5 Year 13. A-level, Academic, Applied General, Tech Level, Grade Distribution, Alps Grades, English and Maths Progress Measures. **Key Stage 3 & 4 Data Trends, Autumn Term 2017 to Spring Term 2018 for Mullion School** It was noted that, due to a software issue, an incomplete set of data was available for Mullion School at the time of this meeting. • KS3 Year 9. Overall, Disadvantaged, SEND. • KS4 Year 10. Overall. • KS4 Year 11. Overall, Gender, Disadvantaged, SEND, Prior Attainment, More Able • KS4 Closing the Gap Data Trends. Gender, Disadvantaged students and SEND students. **Comparative Data for KS4, Spring Term 2018 – Helston Headline Measures and Mullion Headline Measures** • KS4 Year 10. Overall. • KS4 Year 11. Overall, Gender, Disadvantaged, SEND, Prior Attainment, More Able. • KS4 Closing the Gap Data Trends. Gender, Disadvantaged students and SEND students.	

	Discussion was had around what level of dip would be concerning, whether there would be any merit in using absolute numbers rather than percentages and ways in which to ensure any gaps were not widening.	
	Committee members noted the addition of a commentary to the data had been very helpful, as had the up / down arrows used to draw attention to key figures.	
8.	**BEHAVIOUR AND ATTENDANCE DATA**	
	Behaviour and Attendance data was presented and discussed for Spring Term 2018, including: • **Migration.** In / out of the Trust and within the Trust. • **Attendance**. Overall, FSM, CiC, Services, CP plan, SEN support and EHCP. • **Wellbeing**. CAMHS referrals, Safeguarding referrals, LADO referrals. • **Staffing.** A number of factors were negatively impacting on attendance, including: • Exclusions • Elective home education • A growing number of children with mental health issues not coping with school, despite all the support that was in place. This is a national issue and one that is not being adequately addressed at a higher level. Measures such as attendance meetings, robust figures around absence being sent out, etc. had been put into place and these were having an impact in some instances. Measures for tracking persistent absence were also planned. Staff absence was not deemed to be a particular issue but a better way of recording staff absence was being looked into to ensure this could be accurately monitored. **Action: Source Local Authority figures regarding attendance for comparison and look at what can be learnt from areas where attendance excels.**	**DBr**
9.	**RISK REGISTER OVERVIEW FOR STANDARDS**	
	A brief overview of those elements of the Risk Register pertaining to standards was presented to committee members. It was noted that strategies were in place to manage the identified risks, that systems would prompt an intervention where an issue was flagged and that the Trust's recruitment process was becoming increasingly efficient. Committee members were satisfied sufficient strategies and measures were in place.	
10.	**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**	
	Committee members agreed the quality and depth of all the paperwork provided had been good, and had matched the requirements of the committee well. **Action: Work on agenda timings to give more time to the earlier in-depth items.** 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 7.55pm.	**DBr**
11.	**DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**	
	The next meeting of the Trust Standards Committee will take place on a date to be confirmed in November 2018, from 6.00pm, in the Trust Conference Room.	

Chair's Signature _____ **Date** _____