

School Improvement Committee – Part I Minutes							
Date/Time	31:01:18 4.00pm	Location		Okehampton College			
Attendees	Initials			Attendees	Initials		
Daryll Chapman	DC	Tania Skeaping	TS	Ian Courtney	IC	Marilyn Livingstone	ML

Apologies	Initials	Reason (Category of Trustee)
Lee Rose	LR	LGB Meeting

ACTIONS
DECISIONS
QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

In Attendance	Initials	
Hazel Fox	HF	Vice CEO
Sally Wood	SW	Clerk to Trustees

Minutes to
Attendees
Apologies

1 - Apologies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apologies were accepted from LR.

2 – Declaration of Interest
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trustees present completed their register of business interests and were reminded to declare any conflict of interest that may arise during the meeting

3 – Election of the Chair – School Improvement Committee
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TS was elected Chair of the School Improvement Committee for the period of one year.

4– Election of the Vice Chair – School Improvement Committee

- Trustees agreed not to elect a Vice Chair for the School Improvement Committee.

5 – Terms of Reference for the School Improvement Committee

- Trustees discussed that they should not be the first port of call for issues that may arise, but more the 'last line of defence'. Trustees would be monitoring whether action taken is working or not.
- Trustees considered the scope of the Committee and under what circumstances would they recommend to the Full Trustee Board to review delegation and that there may be a period of time where this Committee would effectively be the Teaching & Learning Committee for a Cluster / School.
- Trustees referred to one of the guiding principles behind the MAT which was School Improvement and acknowledged this Committee was about championing School Improvement across the MAT, getting value for the Trust and ensuring that money was being spent correctly.
- Trustees considered some of the key statements they would want in the Committee Terms of Reference
- Trustees agreed that the LGB would continue to undertake visits, but it is hoped that Trustees could be invited to join those.
- Trustees agreed there may be times when it was necessary to invite a Head / Chair of a LGB to the Committee to provide further information.
- Trustees discussed the importance of consistency in the reporting data from the Schools and talked about how that input could be assessed with a focus on knowing that there was validity and credibility in the data.
- DC advised that the individuals responsible for secondary data were due to meet soon to agree common data timelines and that this Committee would receive termly papers on Primary / Secondary predictions along with associated action being taken where needed.
- Trustees discussed the three levels of challenge from the LGB to DC / HF and then to Trustees
- Trustees noted that Neil Swait was completing an external review of the primary schools based on OFSTED criteria and Trustees recognised that a similar piece of work would be beneficial for the secondary schools Trustees talked about cross phase working and how that thinking could be encouraged, but recognised this was a longer term action, although this could be simple actions as well as longer term initiatives.
- Trustees also acknowledged the need for sustainability for small Primary Schools and the need to develop them further.
- Trustees agreed that all Schools should be being pushed to 'outstanding'

Action:

CLERK to draft terms of reference and send to TS
CLERK and TS to finalise Committee Terms of Reference
CLERK to ensure cross phase working is a standard agenda item for the Committee

6 – Policies

- Trustees considered the model Provider Access Policy and noted this was for Secondary Schools and was required to be on the websites.

- Trustees agreed that strong links should be made with local employers and that they also had a moral / legal obligation to provide careers information to pupils.
- It was agreed that the Clerk would circulate the draft policy to the Heads of the Secondary Schools and ask them to respond with comments at the next Executive Leadership Group.
- Trustees agreed that this Committee would review what had been provided on an annual basis.

Action:

CLERK to circulate draft Provider Access Policy to Secondary Heads and ask for comments
DC to finalise draft Provider Access Policy with the Executive Leadership Group on 22:02:18.

7 – Overview of Data

- Trustees were provided with data for each Secondary School, but acknowledged that further data needed to be included with it.
- Trustees noted that the progress 8 figure for Okehampton College was 0.18 in 2017, but due to disapplying pupils, this had increased to 0.26. Holsworthy Community College had also had a number of pupils disapplying, but these were processed in October so their progress 8 was adjusted at that time.
- DC advised this had led to the average being realigned so some schools have gone up, like Okehampton, but Holsworthy College and Tavistock College had both gone down. In the case of Tavistock College, the shift downwards was enough to shift them into the below average category with a progress 8 of -0.21.

Trustees asked why the figures had gone down if Okehampton College had gone up.

DC responded that some schools had now done better and some worse, but the average had changed across the country because the data is now validated. If the average was 0 and some schools went up, then some would have gone down. For Holsworthy, they were -0.56 progress 8 after exam results, then this improved to -0.18 because of the disapplying pupils, but had since slipped down further because of the changed average to -0.20.

Trustees asked why pupils would be disapplying

DC responded it was typical in cases where pupils were not in School, ie mental health or if they had spent time at Schools Company. There was certain criteria and quite lengthy accounts had to be provided for these applications. DC added he anticipated that the criteria for these would be tougher or ceased totally in future.

- Trustees were provided with validated progress (KS1-KS2) data for each Primary Schools and were advised the shading indicated small cohorts.
- Trustees were advised that if 100 percentile was showing for a School, that meant they were in the lowest 1% in the country.
- Northlew was used as an example with 97 percentile for reading, 99 percentile for writing and 100 percentile for Maths and Trustees agreed they needed to look for trends because a small cohort argument could not be made every year.
- Trustees noted that all of this data was the starting point i.e the results for last year.
- Trustees discussed the importance of having context to accompany the data.
- Trustees were advised that OFSTED were typically more interested in Q1 and Q5 quintiles in terms of significance.
- Trustees discussed the importance of the KS1 assessment being accurate and the impact on both Teachers and the expectations of the pupils for each key stage going forward if it wasn't accurate.

- Trustees agreed that they needed to look at each cluster systematically for data going forward so as to determine school improvement requirements.

Trustees asked how this data was being used alongside the visits that HF was making

HF responded she was already doing visits and was looking at moderation so that Y2 data was secure. This was being backed up by testing and also this data was being produced for each year group.

Trustees asked what they could expect at the next meeting

DC responded that the headline figures for the secondary schools would be available, but Trustees had seen the data based on the 2017 coefficients along with the progress 8 and attainment 8 data which formed part of the due diligence procedure. In future we will be collecting the in-year predictions for Trustees.

Trustees asked if that was realistic

DC said it would be displayed differently as coefficients have an impact on the data. Currently he couldn't assure Trustees that the data going in was totally robust across the secondary schools and there was a need to ensure the data was robust based upon assessment, moderation and professional dialogue.

- Trustees noted that in year 6 in the Primaries, accelerated progress tended to occur in the spring term with expected progress being achieved in the autumn term. Secondary schools typically see more progress in year 11 during the spring term as the urgency in the lead up to GCSE exams kicks in.
- Trustees noted that by March, the data is very close to outcomes, the difference being the swing from disapplied pupils.

Trustees asked how clear were the individuals making the predictions

DC responded they are not at this time, with only Maths and English results on the 9-1 scale in 2017.

- Trustees noted that each Headteacher would be asked for make assessments against each year in the School

Trustees asked if other secondary schools did the data predictions for each year group

DC responded that Holsworthy College were doing this, Okehampton College could provide this at KS3, but Tavistock College were not in a position to do year on year data. The mechanism for making judgements needed to be clarified before this could be done.

- Trustees noted it was easier with Primary data and that they would receive more data in the next 6 months than usual. HF would be quality assuring each moderation. Two members of staff would mark SATS and two further members of staff that have marked SATS for the Local Authority would be doing that across the Trust.

Trustees asked if there were any anticipated issues with the collection of data

HF responded no for Primary Schools. DC responded the issue with secondary schools was to reach a comfortable level with the accuracy of data.

8 – Risk Register

- Trustees noted that the Audit Committee had decided that each of the main committees would recognise areas of risk relevant to their terms of reference.
- Trustees agreed that the main risk for this Committee was performance of the Schools / Schools due OFSTED.
- Trustees agreed they would need to know who was responsible for monitoring the identified risks in case of resources required or ultimately relaxing the earned autonomy.

9 – Role / Structure of Cluster Committees for School Improvement

- Trustees agreed that good practice within the Clusters should be identified and shared.
- Trustees recognised that it was crucial for LGBs to understand data and be asking challenging questions and that there might be situations where Trustees would feed down questions to be asked at LGB level.
- Trustees discussed that they might take a certain number of Schools each when data was provided with a view to feeding back to this Committee, rather than looking at all 15 Schools.

10 – Communication

- Trustees discussed that whilst they had identified a Link Trustee for each Cluster, they could also invite Governors from the School Improvement Committees to attend this meeting if they wished to attend.
- It was agreed that at the upcoming Chair / Clerk session that lines of communication should be discussed as well as consistency in the LGB Committees and the minutes produced.

Action:

CLERK to circulate dates for the School Improvement Committee to the LGBs and invite Governors to attend if they wish.

11 – Protocol for Issues

- Trustees agreed that if issues were identified, they would raise these with the Full Trustee Board, but discussed the difference between DC raising concerns and a formal correspondence being sent from the Full Trustee Board
- Trustees were clear that the recommendation for escalation would come from this Committee, not DC / HF.

Trustees asked if the Executive Leadership Group meetings were minuted

DC responded yes and these would be available for the Trustees

12 – Annual Report

- Trustees agreed they would produce a report for the Full Trustee Board at the end of each year on the performance of the Schools which would in turn inform the report that the Full Trustee Board are required to produce for the Members.
- Trustees agreed it was beneficial to look back and see what has been achieved and what changes could be made going forward.

13 – Frequency of Committee meetings

- Trustees agreed that the Committee should meet every half term.

14 – Date of next meeting

- Okehampton College – Wednesday 21 March – 4.00pm

Action Table from 31:01:2018

WHO	WHAT	WHEN
CLERK	Draft terms of reference and send to TS	DONE
CLERK / TS	Finalise Committee Terms of Reference	DONE
CLERK	Ensure cross phase working is a standard agenda item for the Committee	DONE
CLERK	Circulate draft Provider Access Policy to Secondary Heads and ask for comments	DONE
DC	Finalise draft Provider Access Policy with the Executive Leadership Group on 22:02:18.	22:02:18
CLERK	Circulate dates for the School Improvement Committee to the LGBs and invite Governors to attend if they wish.	DONE