

Present: Kate Evans (Chair)
Nicky Dunford (CEO)
Cheryl Mathieson (CM)

In attendance: Rebecca Sear (RS) - Totnes Local Board (LB) Representative
Max Thomas (MT) – Mid Devon LB Representative
Oliver Heathman (OH) - Moorland Hub LB Representative
Corinna Tigg (CT) – East Devon Hub LB Representative

Lizzie Lethbridge (LL) – Director of Education
Andy Keay (AK) - Director of Outcomes (for item 7)

Minutes: Charlotte Roe (GP)

Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair – The meeting elected Kate Evans as Chair of the Standards and Curriculum Meeting.

No	Item	ACTION
1.	Welcome and apologies The Chair opened the meeting with a welcome. Apologies from Graeme Scott were accepted .	
2.	Declarations of interest The CEO is a trustee of the Bearnas Education Foundation. Graeme Scott is Executive Chairperson of the Mario Framework. Kate Evans is Director for Education of the Good Shepherd Trust, Diocese of Guildford. There were no other declarations of interest lodged.	
3.	Any other business An email had been received from a governor regarding a concern that she wished to bring to S&C, and it was proposed that the EIT would address it in the first instance. It was agreed that the DoE would contact the governor direct.	DoE
4.	Approval of last meeting minutes For approval: The minutes of the meeting held on 21 st June 2023 were accepted as a true record. The Chair agreed to sign accordingly	
5.	Matters arising from minutes of 9th May 2023 (not on the agenda) 6.5.6 Update on research on possible avenues to evidence phonic mid-year assessments. AK reported that there was no way under the present tracking system to record this. Currently the predictions were done at the end of the year. AK reassured the meeting that in the Standards and Outcomes meetings throughout the year the Academy Heads were held to account on the pupils' progress. The DoE added that there was a phonic check in February so that could be used to monitor any additional support needed for pupils to ensure the required standard was being met. Non-PPG and SEND data – It was noted that this remained a priority for the Trustees. The baseline was still required to plot progress for these groups. AK explained that as the Trust has grown it had become apparent that the present tracking system could not provide the data needed; therefore the Trust were looking at changing the data tracking	AK

	<p>The CEO updated the meeting on the other learnings which had informed the moderation processes across the Trust. <i>The Trustees asked what would be different this year from the lessons learnt?</i> The DoE reported that cross school moderation was more rigorous and been moved into hubs with a lead. There were now more face-to-face moderating meetings allowing teachers to review books and share practice across hubs. It was also noted the new identified moderator would ensure that training on moderation had been understood and embedded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>PPG outcomes were significantly lower than their peers, and lower than national averages for PPG nationally. However, this was a Trust wide priority last year. The Trustees had not seen the requested data for non-SEND PPG for July '22 that would have informed a baseline for measuring impact of the improvement priority, and this data was still missing from this latest data set. Please explain how this wide achievement gap will be addressed. Was the gap increasing? Was 'monitoring /rigor' enough to make a difference?</i> AK explained that this would be addressed by the new system. • <i>Boys' KS2 reading: if the figures were correct, what was the evaluation of the very wide achievement gap with girls, and well below national averages, particularly when set against their outcomes in Writing which were above national averages, and only a negligible gap?</i> AK confirmed that the figures were not correct and confirmed that boys were below girls by about 10% in reading. <i>The Trustees asked for the Trusts evaluation.</i> The CEO said that boys liked factual books rather than non-fiction and the Trust needed to look at the two genres and what could be done to encourage the boys reading. <i>The Trustee asked if there were any schools within the Trust who were 'bucking the trend'?</i> AK said that he would investigate however suspected that it was not the case. AK reiterated that the schools do focus on boys 'writing'. The Chair said that she could help with sharing practice of other schools who had narrowed the gender gap. This was welcomed by the EIT. • Targets: <i>(described as aspirational)</i> AK said they were lower but were realistically aspirational, as they reflected the latest data across EYFS. • Phonics: <i>why were the Trust targeting lower outcomes this year in Y1, and only 75% by the end of Y2, when 88% achieved it this year?</i> AK reported that numbers changed according to the current children's ability. AK said that the numbers were related to re-takes and with additional support it was expected that at the end of KS2 there would be an improvement. The CEO clarified the numbers and it was noted that the actual number was higher than 75%. AK said that he could provide the actual numbers for the meeting. The DoE said that it was Trust practice to track phonics of each of the pupils throughout the year for both Year 1 and then retakes in Year 2. • KS1 targets <i>looked good at ARE, but were low at Greater Depth, and there was no target for RWM.</i> AK said that most of the children across the Trust had to work hard to achieve ARE and so greater depth was significantly harder and only a few children in the Trust would achieve it. It was the Trust's aspiration to get more pupils working at this level. • KS2: <i>There was no target for RWM.</i> AK reported it was 69%. <i>Why were the targets below national averages in Writing and Maths? How would the Trust measure progress for end of KS2 this year and in '25, with no published KS1 score? Could the meeting see a table of academy progress scores for this year please?</i> AK reported that there would be no progress measures for these children. The meeting discussed the impact of COVID on this cohort of pupils. Trustees cautioned attributing lower outcomes to COVID, when national averages were higher. • <i>When do schools see the trust-wide data – some evidence in governor and LAC minutes that they would find this useful for their own self-evaluation?</i> AK 	<p>KE</p> <p>AK</p>
--	--	---------------------

	<p>confirmed that all the schools received trust-wide data which enabled the schools to share good practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>From the minutes of governor and LAC meetings it was noted that there was a lack of SEND and PPG data (Moorland Hub) and that they would find this useful.</i> AK said that this information was available within each individual school. Changing the tracking system to Arbor would enable the schools, LAC and Trust obtain a better picture. • <i>There needs to be a greater emphasis on proportions achieving Greater Depth. This was also noted in Totnes minutes, as well as a question regarding provision and expectations for High Prior Attaining pupils. What evidence do the Trust have that teacher were teaching at this level?</i> AK said that every Academy Head was carefully looking at these pupils and identifying what needed to be done. As reported before the numbers were lower as the concentration was to get pupils to ARE. DoE said that data target on teacher appraisals was to identify greater depth as well as below ARE – there were exemplars to support teachers to achieve this. • <i>Many of the governor visit reports evidence fluent data analysis from Academy Heads, and explanation to governors, and yet there seemed an over-reliance on EIT data analysis, support for targets and ‘approval’.</i> AK explained that within the Standards and Outcomes meetings the aspirational targets were collected from the Academy Heads. Approval was not needed though there would be discussions around whether the targets were aspirational if the EIT judged them not to be. The LAC Chairs said that more access to information for governors going into meeting on data would be helpful. DoE said that the tracking system that was being investigated could support this. The CEO explained that Arbor was not just a data system but a whole system requiring a substantial piece of work moving the information from SIMS to the Arbor and warned it would not happen overnight. 	
8.	<p>Focus: Academy Improvement Planning</p> <p>EIT to give an overview of Academy Improvement Planning considering pupil outcomes and other agreed priorities such as current year’s focus: - Relational Approach. The DoE said that reports were circulated before the meeting. DoE said that the EIT had adjusted how they worked to reflect the changes and growth within the Trust. The DoE shared the report and explained the rationale behind the priorities over the next 3 years.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked what the success criteria were as it was the S&C Committee’s role to monitor progress and evaluate impact?</i> The DoE recognised that that this year this would be refined to reflect progress and impact on improving provision pupil outcomes and shared the report how this would be achieved. The Trustees remarked that the reports were comprehensive and clear.</p> <p>Update on focus visits from Local Advisory Committees – the minutes and the focus visits notes from the Local Advisory Committees were circulated before the meeting. It was noted from the visit notes that it was clear that the governors had a comprehensive understanding of the data within their schools.</p> <p>Totnes LAC</p> <p>RS confirmed that the data discussion covered the questions that she had been asked to raise around standards and outcome.</p>	
9.	<p>Local board reports</p> <p>9.1 Committee to note any additional updates from local board Chairs and from LAC minutes. The LAC Chairs were invited to summarise on item 7, 8 and 9.</p> <p>Totnes LAC</p> <p><i>RS asked how inclusive could the Trust be for families that do not want a CofE school to help them feel confident to attend?</i> The CEO said that all the schools benefitted from the Christian ethos regardless whether they were CofE – to date there had never been an issue. Most of the schools in the Trust were part of the village community with</p>	

churches being part of it. Christian distinctiveness was not forced and was invitational. The Trust's Church schools were not faith schools and were inclusive and stories underpinned the learning. Community schools were encouraged to be spiritual and focus on personal development. The DoE added that this was an OfSTED requirement. *Trustees asked how the question had been raised: were there families reporting that they did not feel included?* RS explained that it had originally come from a member of the LAC as they believed that families had gone to another village school due to their own village school being CofE.

Part time working – RS said there was long discussion in the Totnes LAC about effective communication between part-time staff. The CEO said that this was a big issue in education and the Trust were receiving more flexible working requests. The CEO said that the Trust tried to ensure that all part time staff were on at least a 2-to-3-day contract – it was added that this was a learning curve as it was a change in practice. The CEO reassured the meeting that the Trust were aware of the change in work/life balance and that staff were being supported without impacting the pupils and learning. The CEO added that a recent CST conference focused on work/life practices, so it was a national picture.

East Devon LAC

CT explained that the East Devon LAC had not met due to unforeseen circumstances. *CT asked whether the relational approach was showing an impact on supporting the SEND children.* The CEO said for some pupils it had benefitted them; others it would take more time. The CEO reported that there was internal additional provision being looked at within the Trust – setting up a unit to support the more challenging pupils.

Mid-Devon LAC

MT explained that no questions had been raised by his governors as they had been dealt with within the meeting or by asking the Academy Heads for clarification.

Moorland LAC

OH reported that in the Moorland LAC meeting concerns about support for the SEND children and the funding with some cases that were challenging had been raised. The CEO said that the Inclusion Hub (IH) was set up to support this issue. There was a new Director of Inclusion to lead the IH get the best for the pupils using external agencies if possible. The CEO said that in the first instance pupils start in mainstream and then find that they cannot access and need specialist provision. The CEO said that she and the DoE were meeting to review the staffing levels across the Trust and what was needed to support staff to ensure there was capacity to support the SEND children. The CEO added that recruitment continued to be difficult. The Trust recognised the difficulties and assured the meeting it was being addressed.

The Trustees remarked that the Governor visit reports, and hub minutes mostly evidenced effective debate, with some challenge and asked how useful the governors found the format and questions? Was there any mileage in sharing examples to share strong elements? The LAC Chairs said that their first meetings were significantly more focussed with good discussion and the information was pertinent. The governors had a clear understanding of what was expected. The CEO asked about the LAC make-up – and whether it had contributed to the greater depth of impact. The LAC Chairs said that the LACs were full and that the governors now attending had a feeling of purpose. The visit notes supported the practice with a more structured approach. It was added that the LAC agenda was to be amended to avoid duplication. *The Trustees commented that the meetings were now set in a prescriptive process and how did governors feel about this?* – the LAC Chairs said that it worked well, resulting in a huge improvement and more balanced sense of reporting. RS added that now she was not attached to one school, she was planning to visit all the schools within the Totnes LAC. The Trustees said that they would like a mid-year re-visit of the new procedures with the governors. The Trustees thanked the GP for the work with the LACs and the new procedure.

9.2 Trustees reviewed and approved the Terms of Reference for the Local Advisory Committees – approval was agreed by email.

10. **Action Plans**

Action plans from previous term to be presented to Trustees to include progression. Part II was taken.

11.	Safeguarding GS to give any safeguarding updates	
12.	Trust Risk Register – The Chair said that the next two items would be postponed as clarification was needed to ensure that the two plans along with ATSIP were intertwined. The GP was asked to arrange a date with the Trustee Committee Chairs, CEO, the DCEO and GP. The CEO outlined the work that was being done with the Academy Heads to ensure consistency across the Trust on completing the Risk Registers. Trustees to consider report from DCEO on the following risk categories: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding • Education Standards and Achievement 	GP
13.	Strategic Plan - School Improvement and Safeguarding 13.1 Review of 2022/2023 plan 13.2 Update on 2023/2023 plan	
14.	Policies 14.1 Meeting to discuss stress test to ensure against systemic adverse equalities impact. – this was postponed due to time constraints. 14.2 Special Needs and Disability policy – The Trustees asked for some amendments to be made. It was agreed that with the amendments the policy was accepted . 14.3 Safeguarding Policy Link 2023 – Apart from some minor typing errors there were no amendments. The meeting recommended for the policy to be taken to Board of Trustees for final approval. 14.3 Supporting pupils with medical conditions and administering medicines - The Trustees asked for some amendments to be made. It was agreed that with the amendments the policy was accepted . 14.4 Intimate Care policy - The Trustees asked for some amendments to be made. It was agreed that with the amendments the policy was accepted .	GP GP
15.	Evaluation of governance impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased that the LACs were in a better position following the governance review. • Visit notes were professionally written and showed support and challenge 	