

**East Midlands Academy Trust**

**Minutes of the Standards and Performance committee meeting held on the 31<sup>st</sup> January  
2020, 10:00 at Northampton International Academy, NN1 1AA**

These minutes reflect the order of the agenda, not necessarily the order of discussion

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
1. Welcome	<p><b>Present:</b>  <b>Leigh Jones</b> (Trustee: Acting Chair)  <b>Jon Harris</b> (Trustee)  <b>Stephen Morales</b> (Trustee) (by phone)</p> <p><b>Josh Coleman</b> (CEO: EMAT)  <b>Katy Russell</b> (Head of School Development: EMAT)  <b>Lorna Beard</b> (Lead Academy Improvement Partner: EMAT)  <b>Giles Osborne</b> (Lead Academy Improvement Partner: EMAT)</p> <p><b>Simon Woodhouse</b> (DPH PWS by phone. Item 7 only)</p> <p><b>Anthony Greenwood</b> (Independent Chair) – Observer</p> <p><b>Joan Martin</b> – EMAT Member</p> <p><b>Monica Juan</b> – minutes – (Head of Governance: EMAT)</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced AG as the new independent Chair of S&amp;P. AG will be chairing the committee from the next meeting. There was a quick round of introductions by all members of the committee. The Chair reminded all that the matters discussed in this meeting should remain confidential until such time as the minutes are ratified and signed off.</p>	
2. Apologies	Apologies were received by Fiona Wheeler	
3. Quoracy	The meeting was confirmed as quorate.	
4. Declarations of interest	LJ asked if there were any declarations of interest pertaining to this agenda in addition to those already recorded on the annual Register of Interests. None were declared.	
5. Minutes of S&P committee, 3rd October 2019 & matters arising not appearing on the Action Log	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2019 had been distributed with the agenda for this meeting and were agreed to be an accurate representation of the meeting. The minutes were duly signed by LJ.</p> <p>There were no matters arising not already on the agenda for this meeting.</p>	

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
6. Actions arising from the meeting held on the 3rd October 2019	1) Present report to next TB S&P committee meeting on impact of PP spending across all schools (JC): <b>Trustees agreed that the report should be presented at the next TB meeting</b> 2) Speak with NS to see if anyone at Aspens can help with catering tuition (ED): <b>This action related to PWS. JC informed that although this particular approach had not been effective the school had been able to successfully appoint a teacher.</b> 3) Investigate the use of remote technologies to deliver catering classes (ED): <b>This action related to PWS and was connected to the action above. JC explained that over the past year six of the schools in the trust had had their IT systems successfully upgraded. The decision had been taken to wait until PWS had had its Ofsted inspection before carrying out any work in the school. JC confirmed that the work would start shortly.</b> 4) Send biographies of MK, NP and CW to this committee (JC/CN): <b>Done</b>	Impact of PP spending across schools report to be presented at TB meeting.
7. Review of Data: i. Year 13 ii. Year 11 iii. EYFS	<p><i>i. PWS Y11 GCSE tracking report had been distributed with the agenda for this meeting. Context was set out in the document.</i></p> <p>SW explained that this year was a slightly smaller group with 163 students. This was the final year affected by the 2-3 tier change. Although performing slightly better than last year cohort at this time, SLT had identified specific areas and groups to focus on.</p> <p>SW stressed that, as this was a very intensive time for students, focused interventions and revision sessions had been put in place to support them during this time taking particular care in their mental wellbeing. Revision sessions would also be offered during the Easter Holiday.</p> <p>SW draw attention to the difference of attainment between girls and boys. Historically PWS had had a significant gap between both groups with girls showing better progress than boys. As current mock results showed that the gap was closing slowly. There was particular focus on interventions with boys in order to accelerate this process.</p> <p><b>JC noted that the report showed a concern around disadvantage children and asked SW to clarify this point.</b></p> <p>SW explained that overall progress for disadvantage children in 2019 was above national average. However, this year's (24 students) cohort ability was slightly lower. There were also some concerns around attendance, particularly with boys, which the school was working on. A member of staff had been allocated to deal with this issue as the school was aware that disadvantage students tended to underperform during exams and did not progress as well as other groups.</p> <p><b>In response to a question around the makeup of this particular cohort SW explained that there was an even split between boys and girls.</b></p>	

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Disadvantage students' attendance was 92% compared with 95% of Y11 as a group. The school was monitoring this closely and had put interventions in place to get these students back into school. There was a tutor group for disadvantage children with specialists in English and Maths working closely with this cohort.</p> <p><b>In response to a question about persistent absence SW explained that currently there was one particular student that hardly attended school and a couple of students with mental health issues being closely supported by the school with reduced timetables.</b></p> <p>Currently there were 22 SEN Y11 students, attendance at 91.1% SENDCO had met individually all of them to make sure that tailored support was provided and students had access to all the resources they need.</p> <p><b>In response to a question about the progress in Maths compared to other years SW explained that currently there was a stronger Maths team in school that was prioritising Y11 students and already focusing in individuals to improve progress and skills, particularly in Foundation and Higher. The school was confident that results would improve.</b></p> <p>SW clarified that although MFL was not showing a high intake, currently only one group for French and Spanish, future groups numbers were already looking promising due to a more stable MFL team.</p> <p><i>ii. PWS Y13 Mock Report had been distributed with the agenda for this meeting. Context was set out in the document.</i></p> <p>SW clarified that there was an amendment to the current paper presented to the group. Previous week performance tables had been released for KS5 and the Value Added had changed from 0.15 to 0.08. This was because changes had happened nationally but also because PWS had a couple of what was commonly known as 'ghost students'. These were Y13 students that had started the year at PWS but had not completed it and have since moved to another institution. SW explained that overall the school was pleased with the data as it showed a positive VA figure.</p> <p>Y13 first set of mocks were taken in November, the second would be taking place after half term. The current cohort (72 students) showed strong academic focus and so far had performed much better than last year. There were robust mentoring systems in place and the quality of teaching was good. Ofsted had validated this during the recent inspection.</p> <p><b>In response to a question about the current situation with Business studies SW explained that due to changes in the business team a different timetable had been put in place resulting in the current cohort being taught by a very experience teacher with a good track record in Business A level results. Economics, a very small cohort with only 5 students, was also being delivered by this teacher.</b></p>	

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<p><b>A question was raised about progress for boys in Y13 being better than girls in contrast with Y11 where girls' progress was better.</b></p> <p>SW explained that it was usual for students that do well at GCSE to carry out in Y13. Boys in the current Y13 cohort were particularly focussed and showed great aspirations. Different initiatives had been put in place to keep the momentum, including rewards to maximise progress.</p> <p><b>In response to a question regarding indication of progress in final destinations SW confirmed that this year there had been 4 offers for Oxbridge universities in comparison with 1 last year.</b></p> <p>LJ thanked SW for his report and invited him to comment in the PWS recent Ofsted experience.</p> <p>SW explained that the inspection process had taken place over two days with five inspectors plus a QA inspector. Day 1 had focussed in deep dives, lessons chosen were English, Science, History, PE and Technology. Incidentally, these had been the particular specialisms of the inspectors.</p> <p>Deep dives were an intense experience, including meeting with Head of subjects, looking at the 3is, lesson observations, book scrutiny and interviewing students.</p> <p>Day 2 had been specifically focussed in SEN and disadvantage students and how the provision that had been described to them was being reproduced in lessons.</p> <p>There were 77 lesson observations over the course of two days. Some members of staff had been seen up to 4 times while others had not been seen at all. Inspectors spoke with a great sample of staff and students.</p> <p>Feedback had been very positive with the areas of improvement identified as expected: Development of quality of education and depth of curriculum, SEND provision better embedded and the offer of a wider curriculum for post-16.</p> <p>Inspectors highlighted the strengths in work experience and the work with disadvantage students.</p> <p><b>A question was raised about the Ofsted scrutiny of leadership around the financial element.</b></p> <p>JC confirmed that there had not been analysis of financial expenditure during the meeting with governors and trustees. LB made clear that there had been questions around SEND and whether PWS was receiving adequate funding. GO clarified that as the new IDSR had a financial section and as this had not showed any particular issues it might explain the lack of questions around this section.</p>	

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<p>SW explained that inspectors had not asked to see a great deal of DATA, compared with the previous inspection two years earlier. They had mainly concentrated in lesson observations and quality of teaching.</p> <p>As Ofsted confidentiality rules had changed slightly, SLT was able to communicate judgement to all staff on Thursday morning. SW reiterated that the staff morale was very good and praised how well students and staff had performed during the process.</p> <p>Trustees and CEO asked SW to pass their congratulations and thanks to all members of staff.</p> <p><b>In response to a query around support for SEND students and their families LB confirmed that since the SEND audit last November the SENCO had started a parent forum.</b></p> <p><i>SW left the meeting at 10.55am.</i></p> <p><i>iii. EYFS Baseline Autumn Assessment had been distributed with the agenda for this meeting. Context was set out in the document with KR pointing out that EY was an ongoing concern.</i></p> <p>KR clarified the reasons for not presenting data for phonics, Y2 and Y6. Data had not been included as they it was being currently assessed and therefore information would be included at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>In response to a query around EY's concerns KR expressed her reservations around the robustness of moderation across the trust and how this needed to be tightened moving forward. The use of the assessment tool across all schools was being closely monitored.</b></p> <p>LB clarified that the trust was seeing the impact of those children that had not received rigorous support before coming to school thus arriving with a higher level of needs. This was due to the lack of service provision from the LA and the EAL community having different expectations regarding EY and what entails for the child in the school setting.</p> <p><b>In response to a question raised about how the trust was addressing these particular issues</b> KR explained that the trust was now tracking reception attendance figures, although not statutory, as they had a huge impact on Y1. There was an understanding that the makeup of the reception intake was changing and therefore the trust had to adapt its provision accordingly. As a result of this the trust had established contact with an EY specialist with experience in Ofsted and EY national projects, to engage with schools to see how they could be supported. This intervention would start with Shepherdswell and if successful would be extended to the other schools. The current AIPs would QA the support.</p>	<p>KR to present, phonics, Y2 and Y6 data at next S&amp;P meeting.</p>

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<p>A discussion took place around the trust strategy to develop EY provision and the need to extend the nursery provision across the trust.</p>	<p>KR to present EY provision report at next S&amp;P meeting.</p>
<p>8. School Effectiveness and Improvement Framework</p>	<p><i>The document 'School Effectiveness Team Report 2019-2020' had been distributed with the agenda for this meeting. LJ asked the committee if they had any questions pertaining to the document and asked GO to articulate the highlights.</i></p> <p>GO reported that recent Ofsted inspections had validated the AIPs team transformation. New ones had joined in September and during the autumn term all of them had been QA by the SI team, with some performances being currently reviewed. HTs had been asked to support the QA process and the feedback had been very positive.</p> <p>LB clarified that the support plan RAG rated the progress in each school. HR business partners were currently working with leadership and although some training for governors had been delivered it had not been systematic. This would be addressed with the new Head of Governance in post.</p> <p>LB explained that Shepherdswell Academy had been moved to intensive support with additional emphasis being placed in Leadership.</p> <p><b>In response to a query about Ofsted inspecting outstanding schools JC clarified that although there was a real risk that Shepherdswell Academy could be inspected in the short term, the trust had proactively put in place a robust plan to support the school and its staff.</b></p>	
<p>9. Performance Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. NIA</li> <li>ii. PWS</li> <li>iii. Stimpson</li> <li>iv. Orchard</li> <li>v. Shepherdswell</li> <li>vi. Hardingstone</li> <li>vii. Castle</li> <li>viii. Trust overview</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Performance Reports for all schools for Autumn 2 had been sent out with the agenda for this meeting. Highlights were presented:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. NIA – Persistent absence and sixth form data and provision would be highlighted in next report.</li> </ul> <p>There have been some leadership developments (<i>please see confidential minute</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. PWS – Numbers were continuing to raise, showing a positive curve.</li> </ul> <p>Quality of teaching had improved considerably and staff members were feeling optimistic and engaged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Stimpson – Showing high level of sickness again (worth noting that the autumn term had shown a spike of low attendance across all schools in the trust)</li> </ul> <p>The intake of pupils in nursery had doubled since January.</p>	



Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<p><b>In response to a question about staff attendance and acceptable benchmarking</b> GO responded that the DfE was currently using teacher sickness levels as a measure to monitor staff absence and this was considered acceptable. A trustee pointed out the difference between sickness and absence and asked for the wellbeing of staff to be closely monitored.</p> <p>There had been a serious safeguarding issue, however all procedures had been followed appropriately.</p> <p>iv. Orchard – High level of sickness due to an outbreak of norovirus (around 40 kids missing in one day) H&amp;S procedures were promptly followed.</p> <p>The committee discussed the SEND lack of provision and support from the LAs. JC explained that the Trust had offered the LAs to extend SEND provision within the trust however none of the LAs had comeback with a proper plan to move the initiative forward. This issue would be raised during the SEND conference that EMAT was organising for the current year.</p> <p>v. Shepherdswell - Notice outbreak of norovirus.</p> <p>AIPs were closely monitoring the situation in school and supporting leadership to write the SEF and prepare all documentation ready for Ofsted <i>(please see confidential minute)</i></p> <p>vi. Hardingstone – Attendance being monitored.</p> <p>Currently dealing with two complaints, although not formal as they had got through the formal process.</p> <p>vii. Castle – A Curriculum review had been conducted by Simon Webb.</p> <p><b>In response to a query regarding the SEF grading for Hardingstone and Castle LB explained that in relation to the new Ofsted framework she was confident both schools were currently good.</b></p> <p>viii. Trust Overview - Most had been cover in individual school reports.</p> <p><i>GO left the meeting at 12.00pm</i></p> <p>JC clarified that the finance element had been taken out of the reports as it was not a direct responsibility of LABs, however governors were encouraged to still pose challenging questions about how funding and particularly extra funding was being allocated and used.</p>	<p>Performance report to show monitoring of staff wellbeing</p> <p>Agreed to report only formal complaints</p>

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Regarding GAG pooling and the Integrated Curriculum Planning tool used to set the budget for each school, JC explained that initial scepticism had settled down and the academic and central team were due to meet to review in year budgeting, and again to sign off the next budget.</p> <p>JC acknowledged that there was a need to strengthen the way information around finance was communicated and therefore had agreed that HTs should be privy to the information the Trustees receive to ensure transparency. Information would be uploaded to GovernorHub.</p> <p>Trustees encouraged and thanked everybody for the work done so far.</p>	
<p>10. Safeguarding matters (if not discussed at item 9) inc:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. pupil attendance</li> <li>ii. exclusions</li> <li>iii. Children missing education</li> <li>iv. Private fostering</li> </ul>	<p>Exclusion Log document had been distributed with the papers for this meeting.</p> <p>Safeguarding matters had been discussed at earlier points in this meeting. There were no further safeguarding matters.</p>	
<p>1. Any other business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Admission Policy 2020/21</li> <li>ii. Admission Policy 2021/22</li> </ul>	<p>MJ clarified that ALL admission authorities were required to determine their schools' admission policies annually and MUST send the determined arrangements to the local authority (NCC)</p> <p>The Trust had to publish a copy of their determined admission arrangements for September 2021 on the school's website (by 28 February 2020) and display it for the full academic year in which applications were to be made.</p> <p>MJ explained that the academies websites should had 3 admission policies on the website: the recently determined 2021 policy; the 2020 policy (for entry in September 2020) and the 2019 admission policy which would operate for any in-year applications in the 2019-2020 academic year. MJ reported that currently only the 2019 admission policy appeared in all websites thus making the Trust not compliant.</p> <p>The Trust Board was responsible for Admissions, but as the next meeting would not take place until April 2020 MJ asked trustees to consider the papers presented for approval.</p> <p><b>The committee unanimously APPROVED the documents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Admission Policy 2020/21</li> <li>II. Admission Policy 2021/22</li> </ul> <p>Trustees asked for Admissions Policy Consultation to be added to the next Trust agenda for discussion.</p>	<p>MJ to send a copy of the full determined arrangements to the local authority (NCC &amp; MK) by 15 March 2020 and arrange the update of all Academy websites.</p> <p>Consultation for new Trust admissions policy to be added to TB agenda for next meeting.</p>



Agenda item	Discussion	Action
12. DONM	<p><b>Dates for the academic year 2019-20 have been set.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> of May 2020 at 14:00 at Hardingstone</li> <li>• Monday 13<sup>th</sup> of July 2020 at 13:00 at Shepherdswell</li> </ul>	Calendar appointments have been sent

**The meeting closed at 12.00pm**

FINAL

Actions from the EMAT Standards and Performance meeting - 31<sup>st</sup> January 2020

Action	Owner
1. Impact of PP spending across schools report to be presented at TB meeting.	JC
2. Present, phonics, Y2 and Y6 data at next S&P meeting.	KR
3. Present EY provision report at next S&P meeting.	KR
4. Performance report to show monitoring of staff wellbeing	KR/GO/LB
5. Performance report only to show formal complaints	KR/GO/LB
6. Send a copy of the full determined arrangements to the local authority	MJ
7. Arrange the update of all Academy websites.	MJ
8. Add agenda item to TB meeting - Consultation for new Trust admissions policy	MJ