

<b>BOARD:</b>	<b>QEC SECONDARY COMMITTEE</b>	
<b>TRUST:</b>	DARTMOOR MULTI ACADEMY TRUST	
<b>DATE:</b>	31 <sup>st</sup> March 2022	
<b>TIME:</b>	4.00pm – 5.30pm	
<b>VENUE:</b>	Remote via Teams	
<b>PRESENT:</b>	P Last (Chair), T Skeaping (TS), K Scrivener (KS) S Biddles (SB)	<i>Trustees</i>
	S Jones (SJ), Barbara Manning (BM), M Greener (MG)	<i>Executive Team</i>
	A Sweeney (AS)	<i>Secondary Leadership Board</i>
	R Mullens	<i>Associate Member</i>
	R Alford – Holsworthy (RA), D Benzie – Tavistock (DB)	<i>LSB Representatives</i>
<b>ATTENDING:</b>	M Wintrip (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><b>Welcome and Apologies:</b> As attendees were arriving at the meeting SJ apologised that the report initially made available for this meeting, was not the most up to date. This issue had been addressed earlier today, when the correct report (QS2) had been made available.</p> <p>Those present were welcomed by the Chair to the meeting and introductions were made.</p>
2.	<p><b>Procedural items:</b></p> <p>2.1 <b>Apologies for absence</b> KS mailed to say she would be late arriving. S Meredith said they will try to attend.</p> <p>2.2 <b>Confirmation of quorum</b> The meeting was confirmed as quorate</p> <p>2.3 <b>Declarations of interest</b> No pecuniary or personal interests were advised for any agenda item for this meeting.</p>
3.	<p><b>Minutes:</b></p> <p>3.1 QEC Committee members to ratify/approve the minutes from the meeting of the QEC Secondary – 17.02.2022 - QS1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Action (1): TS said that she had not raised missed some typos and in the previous minutes and she will email MW (Clerk) with amendments.</b></p>

	<p>TS also raised that reference had been made to a specific named school in the Ofsted update part of the agenda, it was agreed that this is not normal practice.</p> <p><b>Action (2): Sentence referring to the school to be removed by the clerk before finalising the minutes from 17.02.2022.</b></p> <p><b>Committee members AGREED that the minutes were a true and accurate record of the meeting. The Chair to sign via Governor Hub <u>once minutes adjusted.</u></b></p> <p>DB joined at 4.28pm KS joined at 4.35pm.</p>																
4.	<p><b>Matters Arising from the Minutes</b></p> <p>4.1 Update on Action Points / Matters raised from the meeting held on the 22.10.21:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="225 714 1517 1079"> <thead> <tr> <th>Agenda Item</th> <th>Action</th> <th>Actionee</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3.1</td> <td>MG to check minutes and adjust accordingly.</td> <td>MG</td> <td>Completed</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.1</td> <td>MG to ask JH to organise a short-term rota for a governor from Okehampton LSB to attend each QEC meeting.</td> <td>MG</td> <td>Completed</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.2</td> <td>LSB to look at attendance next half term.</td> <td>MG to ask JH add to LSB agenda</td> <td>Completed</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>5.1 Chair noted that SB, who is currently able to represent the Okehampton LSB, addresses this action. However, we will be looking for more input of this type moving forward.</p>	Agenda Item	Action	Actionee	Status	3.1	MG to check minutes and adjust accordingly.	MG	Completed	5.1	MG to ask JH to organise a short-term rota for a governor from Okehampton LSB to attend each QEC meeting.	MG	Completed	6.2	LSB to look at attendance next half term.	MG to ask JH add to LSB agenda	Completed
Agenda Item	Action	Actionee	Status														
3.1	MG to check minutes and adjust accordingly.	MG	Completed														
5.1	MG to ask JH to organise a short-term rota for a governor from Okehampton LSB to attend each QEC meeting.	MG	Completed														
6.2	LSB to look at attendance next half term.	MG to ask JH add to LSB agenda	Completed														
5.	<p><b>Matters brought forward at the direction of the Chair</b></p> <p>None noted.</p>																
6.	<p><b>School Improvement, Teaching &amp; Learning</b></p> <p>6.1 <b>School Improvement Update</b> Report was distributed before the meeting (QS2).</p> <p>Chair thanked SJ for the apology about the report. Chair referred the committee to the correct report and suggested a brief pause to review the updated information.</p> <p>Chair asked if there were any key points or questions - he then raised one received by email from KS.</p> <p><b>Why is there no mock results data in HCC RAG rating?</b> Chair noted that those figures do appear to be in the report.</p> <p>AS confirmed that the 1<sup>st</sup> round of MOCK data is in the report for HCC and the second round is currently being processed.</p> <p>Chair suggested KS being given the opportunity to ask her questions when she arrives, to ensure clarity.</p>																

General discussion followed around the fact that the Y13 Tavistock data is not in the report, and this may be what was meant.

**Chair said he presumed this data is missing because it is still to be processed?**

SJ – pointed out that this will always be an issue whilst we try to align the schools within the Trust. She suggested that AS could perhaps send the missing Tavistock data ahead of next meeting separately. Then the committee would have equivalent mock data to compare.

**Action (1): AS add missing mock data to report, to be circulated ahead of next meeting.**

Chair drew attention to page 3 and said that it was a helpful tool. He focused on the staff CPD line and asked:

**Why is there no INSET day at the start of the summer term?**

AS stated, that they had not traditionally had one. He explained why and noted that this year is an example of where the summer term is short and exams therefore, start quickly. AS described how the focus is on front loading the September then revisiting in the January. He said that schools have been told that they can embed the third day where they wish.

**Chair asked if there was enough time to deliver what needed to the teaching staff?**

AS said that it is important to note that portions of meeting time can be dedicated to areas of CPD. Schools are in different places but taking the same approach to this. AS does not feel anything is being lost in this approach and the September launch is a natural start. The INSET day in January is the first all MAT schools and the timing at the end of a long term, frames the second term. He also feels it is important for schools to have flex with the third day.

SJ wanted to clarify a few points, as this comes under remit of, D Develop. She stated that there are five INSET days. Two of these are collapsed to give meeting time through the year. There is always one in September as this is when you are launching pedagogical curriculum initiatives. SJ explained that this is why we moved the Improvement Plan timetable, so we are ready for it's launch in September. She affirmed what AS had said, in that, INSET is frontloaded. She explained how the first two terms are development time and then the summer term is for consolidation and working on the Improvement Plan. SJ said that other days can be allocated as INSET depending on the local community. For example, Tavistock Goose Fair is a day where local schools have traditionally closed. So, it is used to train teachers. This illustrated the point that there is flex in how / when the third day can be used. She went on to say that collapsed time can be done in one or two hour blocks. SJ stressed that CPD is delivered cooperatively with staff and works through a model of dissemination from leads in driving teams.

**SB asked – Are staff able to balance workload and well-being if being asked to attend additional two hour meetings?**

SJ said that there are meetings most weeks and CPD sessions are planned with a view of not overloading staff. For example, not in weeks where there are parent evenings. She explained that staff are gaining that time back, often tagged onto the summer holidays. She said that CPD is enjoyed by staff, as they lead it. This means that it is generally welcomed.

**TS – Referring to the SEF Improvement Plan / KPI –what happened, in relation to the Okehampton Ofsted preparation moving from a green to an amber?**

AS explained that giving a "green" RAG rating in September was overly ambitious. When subsequent work was done with subject leaders, where they unpicked elements, they

established that they were not as secure as they had thought. This was a common theme across the schools when principals were reevaluating each area more deeply.

**TS - Does same apply to HCC autumn term Implementation Quality of Education, which moved from green to amber? Were they looking at different aspects e.g. inclusion?**

AS said, he thought it did apply and that this was the outcome of taking a balanced approach over different subject areas. He remarked that it shows the power of the process and it ensures principals and senior leaders know exactly where they are. They then know where to put the emphasis, effort and resource.

TS agreed that this was positive and shows how information is being unpicked, driving CPD and allowing for deeper knowledge about schools.

**Chair asked if there were any other questions about the paper?**

AS made reference to page 2 of the document and informed the committee that since this version was put together more rows have been added. These include planning around D-Serve, namely HR and finance, to enable a view of that workflow.

Chair directed an action.

**Action (2): Committee to look at the expanded parts of document - page 2 - at the next meeting to gain a view of the additional elements.**

SJ explained that some of the data has a "health warning." Specifically Progress 8 data. Reason being, there is a degree of unknown information for this year, like algorithms and grade boundaries. Grade boundaries are calculated after results are known nationally. SJ said that Maths and English is firmer data but there will be further changes in this next year also.

SJ stated that this information is best used for comparative purposes across schools and subject areas and to monitor progress. She suggested that this data should be used to inform about trend and monitoring progress of vulnerable groups. SJ said that when collating data for this meeting we should be looking at trends over time for micro cohorts, e.g. SEN children. The information we have does not enable us to compare ourselves nationally.

**TS sought further clarity - Is that because people use different grade boundaries in each school? Can we compare between our three secondary schools? Is the HCC 19.6% "Strong Pass" figure due to a poor Maths or English result? Or both?**

*16.28pm DB arrived*

SJ said that this was a fair question, and that actual results and grades are easier to comment on as marking has been standardised. It is the progress measure that is difficult to be sure about. She said that schools can be compared on actual results and as we move forward and collate more data it will be a key question to ask. SJ handed to AS to comment on the HCC figure.

AS – Picked up on the figure for those achieving a strong pass in HCC mocks which was 19.6% which is in line with the low performance of 2018. He compared it to TCC (22.7%) and OCC (32%.) AS does not perceive this result to be a big issue at HCC and but it does need to be unpicked. He noted that, the maths mocks were held before Christmas and the results were very low, which pulled the overall result down. AS stated that the principals are aware of the reasons and are closely monitoring this subject area. He noted that even in big schools the outcomes for individual pupils can have an impact on the broader results.

TS pointed out different data to AS for TCC, on the report she was looking at (TCC 42.7%) other committee members confirmed this.

TS went on to say that, going forward, this committee would like to see information specifically relating to micro cohorts.

**TS asked - What pupils are they who are achieving a Strong Pass? Do they include, for example, those on Pupil Premium?**

SJ felt this was a good challenge. She stated that this is the first time we have had such data in nearly three years and the ability to answer questions will improve over time. SJ wanted the committee to note that this is a current and not a predicted view, in that they are actual results.

TS acknowledged what SJ had said and noted that how this topic ties to the attendance figures, which will be looked at shortly. She extended appreciation for the report

**TS asked - What reassurance do we have, that at executive level there is triangulation by the principals over these micro cohorts? Is it right that they have the data, it has just not yet been collated across the Trust?**

AS agreed, that data and platform is there and is inputted in a more timely way than before. Although "not there yet" all the mechanisms are firmly in place.

**SB asked if heads know what the mock results for their disadvantaged pupils are? He also asked if that information could go in the results table?**

SJ stated that information is known and could be in the report.

**Chair proposed an action to add information about micro cohorts. He asked AS, SJ & RM what lines should be included?**

AS said that we could start with disadvantaged and SEN data and review going forward. He added the point that being mid-transition to Arbor is a factor and there is on-going work with them and Cicero making data & reports available, as required.

**Action (3): Exam results for disadvantaged and SEN cohorts to be added to the report for the next meeting.**

16.35pm KS joined the meeting.

Chair explained to KS the status of discussion and asked the group if there were any further questions?

**TS said that it would be useful to know what the stance is on Ebacc? What different options / plans do we have available for 2023/24?**

**Chair asked AS if the committee could have, for the next meeting, a written rationale describing for the schools approaches to Ebacc?**

AS said yes that will be captured as part of the options booklet for all three secondary schools. He said that at the moment all three are encouraging take up of Ebacc, where appropriate. He explained that there was more clarity previously about the national "ambition" for Ebacc take-up. The direction of travel is less clear now but, he said that schools are not being told that it must be done.

SJ interjected saying that schools should be on an upward journey with targets of 23% to over 50% opting for Ebacc. She noted that Ebacc can sometimes be in conflict with a

broad and balanced curriculum and that a three-year KS4 can be helpful to mitigate that. She feels that nationally the picture is not clear. Locally children are directed towards the Ebacc option, but they do not always want to do it as it may conflict with their preferred option choices, e.g. creative subjects.

**TS asked whether we, as a Trust, have an aligned vision for Ebacc? Are the heads agreed? What is the Trust stance?**

SJ said that the stance is in line with her previous statement. In that the Trust schools are on an upward journey where they are actively encouraging pupils with different aptitudes and aspirations to choose subjects, that suit their onward journey. She noted that for some Ebacc may not suit, due a preference for creative and / or technical subjects, which are also deemed to be important. She stated that the suite of qualifications offered by Ebacc are desirable but not essential.

**TS sought clarity and asked: We are strongly encouraging children because we think they are a strong suite of qualifications? Is that in contradiction with the view that the technical and creative subjects are important?**

SJ further explained that the approach is not to fix children onto a set pathway. She said that children are encouraged but there is an acceptance of personal choice. The levels of children choosing Ebacc is monitored and over time should see upwards of 50-60% opting in.

SJ highlighted that the length of KS4 varies between our schools and that there is a current debate about whether a three-year KS4 broadens or narrows the curriculum (which she illustrated with "for and against" examples) and that the Ebacc is linked to this debate.

AS raised how languages are central to the discussion around Ebacc. The teaching of languages at KS3 is key to supporting this transition to languages at KS4. He said that moving forward, to ensure longevity, we should be looking at pupil experience and languages as a thread across all key stages.

TS reminded the group about pupil and staff "voice" consultation work done prior to the transition to a three-year KS4 and that she assumed this would be replicated by other settings if they undertook to change.

SJ confirmed that it would and continued the topic of a three-year KS4. She said that it could be seen as a brave decision. That there had been successful methods of doing Year 9 transitions and that it may be time to look at alignment, with the prospect of further curriculum and subject changes. She said that institutions with a 6<sup>th</sup> form can have a different view. Either way changing the model can be a complex operational matter and it is worth putting the discussion back on the agenda.

**DB said that SJ has answered most of her questions but that he still most wanted to know about alignment?**

SJ replied saying that as each school is inspected as a single entity alignment would not come up in an inspection. However, there must be a firm justification for a three-year KS4. There are lots of for and against and she re-iterated that it is time for secondary schools to re-open the debate.

The Chair pointed out that EEF are currently doing a survey about this question of two- or three-year KS4. He asked if SJ and her team could monitor the progress and outcomes of this? If kept updated this committee could keep it as a topic on the agenda and develop an understanding of the arguments for and against.

**Action (4): SJ team to monitor progress and outcomes of “What works at KS4, two or three years of study?” and report back to QEC sec committee.**

SJ said that the existence of this piece of work confirms that there are multiple schools of thought. She said that a good challenge on the agenda for this committee is:

**Can we justify the KS4 arrangements in our schools?**

KS asked a question that had already been answered. SJ latterly offered to have a separate conversation with her to answer her questions and bring her up to speed.

**6.4 Safeguarding update**

Chair suggested that the committee look at the safeguarding section of the report next.

BM relayed her apologies, the report had not been updated with the additional, most recent data.

Chair accepted the apology and offered the committee reassurance by confirming that the missing data had recently been scrutinised and extensively challenged at the Safeguarding Lead Forum, (for which he is also Chair.) He suggested this committee be provided with the minutes from that meeting.

**QEC Sec Committee agreed that would be acceptable.**

MG pasted the link for the said minutes into the meeting chat.

**Chair asked BM to summarise what the overall trends were and what stood out?**

BM summarised with the following headlines:

Mental Health was the subject matter of 40% CPONs logged between November and February demonstrating the notably high levels.

There are plans in place to develop support within schools and staff are being nominated and trained as Mental Health Leads.

Statutory partners are offering poor response levels, which is in line with the national picture.

Research is being done by the Anna Freud Institute into this.

Mental Health is also directly linked to attendance levels and persistent absence data will be monitored and included in safeguarding work.

Sexual harassment in primary schools has dropped but continues to be present at secondary level and toxic masculinity have been identified as an issue for KS4 boys.

**Chair asked if there were any further questions for BM?** None were raised.

Chair thanked BM for the consistently excellent data that is provided.

**6.2 Pupil Attendance patterns**

Chair referred the group to Page 10 section 2 – data from Arbor from Sept to March and opened the floor to questions.

**TS asked to be reminded of the national picture for attendance and how we compared?** She acknowledged the impact of the local COVID situation.

SJ stated that the figures show us to be below the national average. She highlighted how persistent absence is the biggest concern and that it has spiked due to COVID. She

outlined how school closures, to whatever degree, take the schools weeks to get back to normal attendance levels. She described it as a complex picture and that mental health, is an issue at higher levels than she, personally, has ever known and gave some examples. She said that she is confident in our strategy, and we compare well nationally but we do have issues with attendance across all schools.

BM agreed that part of the strategy is ensuring appropriate interventions are offered, there is an increasing focus on early help. She raised how the situation is exacerbated by the LA not meeting their requirement to provide an education package for children who can't attend school due to illness. This provision should be offered when a child has missed 15 days of school and they have been certified medically unfit to attend.

**SJ asked rhetorically: what are we doing?** She went on to answer that we are reorganising our work around attendance and safeguarding and putting more personnel in place, to better coordinate the work. These development will be explained in detail on 5<sup>th</sup> April. We are re-organising the Trust as the strategies for attendance historically used have ceased to have an sufficient impact.

SB commented that the attendance figures for HCC seem more stable. **He asked if there was a reason for this? SB also asked if there anything we can do about the LA not complying?**

BM described how the LA Inclusion Service are responsible for provision of education for medically unfit child and that they should be held to account on how their resources are used.

**RA asked if that means that what we do next is therefore, not reliant on LA services?**

SJ responded and said that the LA's have a statutory duty that does not transfer, and we must work with them. However, if there appear to be gaps in provision and no lines of accountability, we can do more for ourselves to improve the experience of our children.

Chair noted that these same discussions had taken place at the Safeguarding Lead Forum. One outcome was suggestion was made by the Trust Board to the CEO to embed Early Help Coordinators into secondary academies. He said that the Trust Board are equally frustrated with the LA and their lack of response. He highlighted how BM is working hard on holding them to account and is trying to find out where the approximate £1.8million, given to Devon for this purpose, is being spent.

**TS asked if the reason for our attendance figures is that, within this cohort, we have a high number of children who are persistently absent?**

SJ explained the complexity of the data and how it is difficult to categorise, analyse and maintain a true picture. There are a few fixed truths e.g. older children have weaker attendance and all schools struggle to maintain attendance at certain times of year. She described the issue as frustrating and unresolved, as there is no simple reason or solution for children not coming to school.

Chair reassured the group that there is lots of work being done to improve attendance across the Trust.

**TS noted that as parent she seemed to be receiving less direct comms about attendance. She enquired if this is because the schools are using a different strategy? TS also asked if we would we tell parents when we have an issue?**

SJ responded by saying all parents are not being messaged. The method is through specifically targeted letters, that incrementally increase in their strength of wording. She noted that these letters have prompted complaints but that they are proportionate to the level of issue.



	<p><b>Chair asked if any further questions?</b> Chair extended his thanks for the report and said it is helpful to have such high quality information.</p> <p><b>6.3 Curriculum Update</b></p> <p>Subject / Faculty updates given in the main body of the report QS2 and considered as part of open questioning in 6.2. No specific comments or questions raised.</p> <p><b>6.5 Exam update</b></p> <p><b>Chair asked if anything had significantly changed since we last met?</b> AS responded by saying the status was the same as per last meeting 17.02.22. He said that everyone is working hard to get year 11 ready for their exams. There are 4 weeks until GCSE's start and everyone knows what they are doing.</p> <p><b>6.6 Ofsted Update</b> Chair raised how one of the Trust's primary schools had had an Ofsted visit earlier this week.</p> <p><b>Chair asked if there were any comments? Implications?</b> SJ described some "knowns" in that; schools will be inspected separately; Ofsted teams are in Devon this week; there can be a pattern of consecutive schools being inspected within trusts. SJ's view is to anticipate one secondary and one more primary being inspected.</p> <p>SJ continued to say that the preparation processes that have been put in place have proven to be effective (e.g. practice, guidance documents and training) and we are therefore well placed to receive an inspection at this stage.</p> <p>Chair re-iterated how the preparation had stood the chosen primary school in good stead this week and that this was positive news.</p> <p><b>Chair asked if there were any further questions or comments under this item?</b></p>
7.	<p><b>Risk Register Review</b></p> <p><b>Chair raised how the Risk Register has not changed since it was first produced and asked the group if there is, in the light of the discussions, anything that needs to be changed? He gave an examples of Is there an increase in the risks under Safeguarding or of failing Ofsted?</b></p> <p>TS responded by saying that staff and children absences effect the quality of education. With COVID being high these risks are increased.</p> <p>Chair asked: <b>Do we feedback that the COVID risk cell is increasing? Or do we undertake to monitor it?</b> TS pointed out that with the COVID restrictions being lifted we won't have the same degree of protective measures.</p> <p>SJ said schools are following UKHSA (previously Public Health England) advice. e.g. good ventilation. She said that schools plan to use up the 10 weeks' worth of testing left, for staff to test twice weekly.</p> <p><i>17:29 KS left</i></p>

8.	<b>Wellbeing</b>  No reference to this item to record.
9.	<b>Date of next meetings:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16<sup>th</sup> June 2022 @ 4pm</li> <li>• 14<sup>th</sup> July 2022 @ 4pm</li> </ul>
	Chair asked if there were any final comments – he thanked the group for their contributions, questions and challenges. He extended his thanks to the executive team and closed the meeting.  <b>Meeting ended at 17:30</b>

### **Action Log from 31.03.2022 - QEC Secondary Meeting**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Actionee</b>	<b>Status</b>
3.1(1)	TS to email MW with amendments (typos) for the minutes of 17.02.2022.	TS / Clerk	Completed
3.1(2)	Sentence referring to the school to be removed by the clerk before finalising the minutes from 17.02.2022.	Clerk	Completed
6.1(1)	AS to add missing TCC mock data to report, to be circulated ahead of next meeting.	AS	
6.1(2)	Committee to look at the expanded parts of document QS2 (page 2) at the next meeting to gain a view of the additional elements of HR and finance.	All	
6.1(3)	Exam results for disadvantaged and SEN cohorts to be added to the report for the next meeting.	AS	
6.1(4)	SJ and team to monitor progress and outcomes of "What works at KS4, two or three years of study?" and report back to QEC Sec committee	SJ	