

BOARD:	QEC SECONDARY COMMITTEE	
TRUST:	DARTMOOR MULTI ACADEMY TRUST	
DATE:	Thursday 27 th May 2021	
TIME:	4.00pm – 5.30pm	
VENUE:	Remote via Teams	
PRESENT:	C Gould, P Last (Chair), J Savage, M Witzel	<i>Trustees</i>
	S Meredith	<i>Associate Member</i>
	D Morrow	<i>CEO</i>
	D, Brett, S Jones, A Sweeney	<i>Secondary Leadership Board</i>
	L Ellicott (Holsworthy)	<i>LSB Representatives</i>
ATTENDING:	T Skeaping (TS), M Greener (Clerk)	

The Code of Conduct requires trustees/governors to be honest and open with regard to conflicts of interest (either real or perceived). Trustees/Governors must not use their position for personal gain in business, political or social relationships. Therefore, a governor who has, or may be perceived to have, such a personal interest in a particular matter under consideration should declare that interest, withdraw from all discussions relating to it and take no part in any vote on such matter.

Items marked * are those in which a majority of governors may have an interest because of some shared attribute. When considering these items, trustees/governors should aim to achieve a balanced view, paying particular attention to the sources of information and advice, and remind themselves of their duties to act in the public interest.

Actions, **red** Questions raised, **blue** Points agreed, **green**

Item	
1.	<p>Welcome and Apologies: Those present were welcomed by the Chair to the meeting. The Chair asked each attendee to introduce themselves to the committee.</p> <p>The Chair advised that the main purpose of this meeting is to establish what the committee wants to review moving the forward and the information required to support this.</p>
2.	<p>Procedural items:</p> <p>2.1 Apologies for absence The Clerk advised that apologies had been received from Dee Benzie ad these were accepted by the committee.</p> <p>2.2 Confirmation of quorum The meeting was confirmed as quorate (4).</p> <p>2.3 Declarations of interest No pecuniary or personal interests were advised for any agenda item for this meeting.</p>
3.	<p>Discussion on Committee Terms of Reference</p> <p>The draft terms of reference were circulated prior to the meeting which have been reviewed extensively by the Chair, PL and SM. The Chair noted they were keen to have the same set of TORs for both primary and secondary boards and noted that SIAMS was not relevant to the secondary schools currently but could change in the future.</p> <p>MW made several comments regarding the TOR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should it be 4 trustees instead of 3 for decisions to be made? - Is an hour long enough for a meeting?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can the bullet points be numbers instead? - Queried the wording of the KPI personal development section. <p>PL advised that following discussions last night it was agreed that it was important to have a foundation trustee / governor present for all agreements that relate to a church school and this would be reflected across all TORs</p> <p>The committee AGREED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To amend the number of trustees required for a quorate decision - To alter the bullet points to numbers - To alter the time of the meetings to 90 minutes. - To include the word 'monitor' after 'recognise' in the TOR to cover MW's point that the committee needs to have the power to challenge and scrutinise where required <p>TS asked if PL was satisfied his comment on the TOR had been addressed – he confirmed this was the case.</p> <p>DM requested that it be made clear to the Chair and Vice Chairs from LSBs are Bonzie not part of the quorum e.g. voting on decisions.</p> <p>The Chair of the Secondary Committee confirmed with the Chair of the Primary Committee that he was happy with the amendments listed above. CG confirmed this was the case and AGREED with the amendments.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action: Clerk to ensure changes are made to TOR and sent to Chair for confirmation and that this is reflected across all trust TORs</p> <p>The Committee AGREED subject to the above amendment to APPROVE the draft terms of reference.</p>
4.	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>Nothing as this was the first meeting for the committee but remains a standing item moving forward.</p>
5.	<p>Matters brought forward at the direction of the Chair</p> <p>None noted.</p>
6.	<p>School Improvement, Teaching & Learning</p> <p>6.1 A summary was given by SJ which covered the need for valuable data in order to be 6.2 able to move schools forward. Until the SEF review has taken place and agreed the 6.3 improvement plans cannot be created.</p> <p>Trustees have already been receiving valuable data on attendance / SEND etc which is robust but it is now important to link all the areas together. The SEF summary will risk assess the schools which will have highly descriptive operational information but it is important for trustees to have this narrative to form judgements. Actions can then be taken to make improvements.</p> <p>SJ advised that the Academy Improvement Plan has not yet been finalised as many discrepancies were found and that cost improvement training is underway with staff. A robust review process is being developed using peer to peer and external safeguarding elements.</p>

SJ advised that the report to the committee will be RAG rated around the SEF to start to show patterns developing and providing opportunities for challenge. It is important that it is transparent and rigorous but does not increase work load exponentially.

SM joined at 4.27pm

SJ advises that the TIP has historically not been rigorous alongside the data. The new format will tell us where schools are at whilst at the same time helping review the processes in place. Once the data is available it will allow the community cohesion challenge and review the ways of considering different voice groups.

AS joined at 4.29pm

MW noted the large amount of work required but it was going in the right direction.

SJ advised she is keen to build on what works already and makes sense to allow alignment of the schools so we can know then better.

TS requested that there be one academy improvement plan as the LSBs need to see implementation of the ring-fenced groups. One document should work for everyone.

DM thanked SJ for her summary and advised the committee that whilst working at pace is important so is ensuring that depth is achieved. It is important to move beyond a series of tactics to create a genuine strategy. Important work into governor training on the subject of the quality of data is also required. Qualitative data is as important as quantitative.

LE raised the need to have this information sooner rather than later for those members of the committee who come from a non-education background.

SJ confirmed that a suggested format would be available for review and discussion at the next meeting.

Action: SJ to provide suggested format of reports for the next meeting.

MW noted that he appreciated that taking time was important however given possible Ofsted inspections on the horizon have we got time?

SJ advised that the data Ofsted require is already inside the schools but we can do better than that.

TS asked if data gathering will be half termly as per the primaries?

SJ confirmed that assessments would be at the end of each full term.

DM confirmed this was due to the methodology being different in secondary and that he is comfortable with 3 assessment windows.

TS requested that we have a halfway house approach to data for the next meeting as it has been 6 months since the board last saw any data.

SJ confirmed this would be possible but the data could not be used to compare across the schools. The plan is to produce better outcomes for students.

TS understood this new approach however is concerned how the board is supposed to triangulate information when they know little about Y2-13 students.

Action: Clerk to add IDSRs to GovernorHub

AS advised that for too long the emphasis has been on internal data and the focus now needs to be getting teachers confident on quality assuring the curriculum.

	<p>CG echoed TS concerns as the board does need some way of knowing the schools' position as the board is responsible. As stated by DM at last night's meeting Ofsted will ask to speak with the Chair of the QEC Committee and the Chair of the LSBs.</p> <p>SJ advised that the intention is to keep the basic outline of the reports with more ambitious targets in the plan. SJ noted that IDSR's cannot be used to compare against 2019/20 data</p> <p>DM updated the committee following a meeting with the regional Ofsted lead this morning it was confirmed that HMI inspectors do not want to see false comparisons of data and this has contributed to the downgrading of some schools.</p> <p>DB advised that this year's data will be more meaningful than ever as teachers know the gaps well and moving forward with a plan in place.</p> <p>6.4 Curriculum Development</p> <p>The Chair apologised – this item should not have been on the agenda</p>
7.	<p>Ofsted</p> <p>The Chair confirmed this topic had been covered in the discussions above.</p> <p>DM confirmed that due to the timing of the trust formation all schools are now in the Ofsted window however inspections are 8/10 months behind planned routine. It may well be likely that the MAT undergoes a review and an overall judgement of schools is given.</p>
8.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>Advice note for Trust boards on the process for awarding grades Document was circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair advised the board is seeking assurance that the process for awarding grades is robust. DM confirmed this is the case.</p> <p>SJ advised there has been a rigorous quality assurance process and cross school working has been in place. Students are not allowed to know their grades until results day. Appeals process will be handled by schools and not exam boards this year.</p> <p>AS advised that guidance was received very late but the team has come together to share and bounce ideas and meetings have been productive. The QA process has been a huge amount of work for staff.</p> <p>The Chair advised it was good to see collaborative working.</p> <p>MW asked whether standardising was happening across the three schools? AS confirmed this is not the case but the mechanisms are the same. DM advised that the time constraints have prevented this from happening. HODs are working together and the process is robust and will stand up to scrutiny.</p> <p>LSB Minutes A discussion on the committee reviewing LSB minutes was had as to whether it would be better for summary reports provided by the Chairs as it can be difficult to get a sense of what is urgent.</p> <p>It was AGREED that minutes should be sent to the committees as it's a useful tool to evidence triangulation but the minutes would not be a standing agenda item. The Chair noted that the action tables on the minutes should flag any issues up.</p>

	The meeting ended at 5.45pm
--	------------------------------------

Action Log from 27th May 2021 QEC Primary Meeting

Agenda Item	Action	Actionee
3.	Clerk to ensure changes are made to TOR and sent to Chair for confirmation and that this is reflected across all trust TORs	Clerk
6.1	SJ to provide suggested format of reports for the next meeting.	SJ
6.1	Clerk to add IDSRs to GovernorHub	Clerk