

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The paper outlined the analysis but had not yet given an overview of the understanding of ‘why’. Was there any evaluation as to why outcomes were low in EYFS and with such a wide gap for PPG, and what made the difference in Y1 Phonics to narrow their gap?</i> The DoE reported that the context around the SEND was the need had doubled across the Trust with high speech and language need and challenging behaviour. The difference in Y1 to narrow the gap was due to tracking, rigor of delivery of phonics and interventions. • <i>Given the data at the previous meeting was incorrect was the corrected data available and had it altered the targets which should be aspirational?</i> The DoE said that the targets were revised during Outcomes meetings. The DoE agreed to ask the DoDSO for the information required by the Trustees. • <i>It was noted that there was still outstanding information: attendance for PP and SEND, baseline information from 2022, and progress scores, and the Trustees asked was there any update.</i> The DoE agreed to ask the DoDSO for the information required by the Trustees. • It was noted that the Chair in her meeting with EIT would share other schools who were ‘bucking the trend’ around boys’ writing and achieving national averages or above at Greater Depth. 	<p>DoE</p> <p>DoE</p>
6.	<p>Focus: Vision and values with a <u>LEARNING WALK</u> to evidence that the vision and values and (for CofE schools) Christian distinctiveness are present.</p> <p>Sharon Lord (SL), the Trust’s RE Lead was invited to talk to the Committee about the vision and values and Christian distinctiveness. SL informed the meeting that at the beginning of the year there was a SIAMS inspection of Diptford where vision and values was judged as strong. The areas of development were the governors’ monitoring – to address this SL and the GP had together implemented a robust monitoring process to align the Ethos groups with the LACs. SL had also worked with the Dioceses to develop a monitoring enquiry system, and these were circulated with the Ethos members to support their discussions and visits in the schools. The Ethos groups were also being encouraged to consider the impact of the focus during their visits. The LAC clerks were on board in ensuring the Ethos minutes were made available for the Trust’s governance monitoring process. An annual monitoring schedule had been drawn up. ToRs had been reviewed. Agendas and minutes were more standardised to support the focus during meetings. It was noted that it was a work in progress. SL updated the Trustees on the individual CofE academies around their vision, values and Christian distinctiveness. It was added that the Trust vision was being reviewed and SL was looking forward to being involved in evolving the theological routed Christian aspect of the vision. <i>The Trustees asked questions around the small groups within the schools and combining the groups.</i> SL said that was a possibility and she was also encouraging schools to look to the community for members as well. The Trustees commented that it was good to read the quotes from the pupils and it gave confidence that the Trust was aligned with the children. <i>The Trustees asked how often vision and values should be reviewed?</i> SL said that her understanding was that Governors would look at Vision and Values annually however the Ethos groups meet each half term to give a good understanding of the Christian distinctiveness of the Trust’s Church schools. <i>The Trustees asked whether it needed to be annually?</i> The meeting agreed that the Trust was driven by its vision and values, and it should remain annually. It was noted that the CofE schools’ vision and values seemed to come strong within their schools and wondered if there was some learning for the Trust’s community schools. The DoE said that the community schools did have strong vision and values and discussed how to evidence this more effectively. <i>The Trustees asked about sharing practice where there were strong links with the local Church.</i> SL said it was variable, however looking at the Trust’s CofE schools there were strong links in all the schools. It was felt that the Diocese could support the vicars with training around the SIAMS inspection. The DoE updated the meeting on how collective worship looked over all the schools in the Trusts and said it was strong. The Trustees said that the reports from Harbertonford and Morchard Bishop showed strong reporting and understanding of the CofE ethos.</p> <p>The visit notes (circulated with the agenda) from the Governors of the Local Advisory Committees (LAC) were considered and the Chairs of the LACs were invited to bring forward any comments/questions from the LAC meetings. The Trustees commented that the visits notes and Minutes showed good challenge and effective professional relationships between the governors and Academy Heads. It was further noted that because the information</p>	

	<p>coming from the LACs was so thorough it was also showed a good understanding across the LACs.</p>	
7.	<p>Focus: SEF Overview – An EIT overview of accuracy and effectiveness of school self-evaluation</p> <p>The DoE was invited to address the meeting. An exemplar of the SEF proforma used across the Trust was circulated before the meeting.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked what was the origin of needing the pro-forma and whether the Trust expected all the schools to complete the same proforma?</i> The DoE reported that the proforma was an option for Academy Heads. It had evolved over the time. All schools must complete a SEF. It was based on the Ofsted headings. The proforma encompassed information that was required.</p> <p><i>A further question on the context was asked: whether the data needed a comparison with national averages (which if this was a Link-wide proforma could be prepopulated centrally?) and asked whether a more concise table of data would be easier to read?</i> The DoE said that the SEF did not need to include the data, as this is available in the public domain, so it was up to the individual schools. In a recent Heads' Day, data was a focus to support the AHs to understand how data informed their practice.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked about the 'Next steps' section and whether it could prompt Academy Heads to explain their understanding of 'why' for any areas of relative weakness / need for improvement?</i> The DoE commented that Heads were supported by EIT to be evaluative, and to demonstrate their understanding of performance and provision at their school, including any areas for development / relative weakness.</p> <p><i>The Trustees commented that sentence stems might be a bit 'leading' and restricting, given the range of contexts of the schools in the Trust and asked whether alternatively to pose questions to prompt evaluation and ensure all aspects of the evaluation framework were covered, perhaps with some models that demonstrated how to articulate impact /improvement, 'because' and validation succinctly?</i> The DoE said that this was to support Academy Heads. The DoE added that there were two versions of SEF proformas for AH to choose.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked whether as a Trust it was expected that Heads and LACs to include judgements for each section.</i> The DoE explained that the EIT go through the SEF as part of the Learn, Support and Challenge days. Recently these days had evolved to become more evidence based and Heads were now encouraged to tell the EIT what their judgement was rather than relying on the EIT to tell them. The EIT then quality assured. The DoE added that the EIT checked the SEFs before it was uploaded.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked how many schools used the proformas?</i> – The DoE said all the AHs chose to use the proforma adding that AHs individualised the proformas to fit their school strengths and areas of development.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked whether all the Academy Heads see each other's SEFs?</i> The DoE explained that the SEFs were uploaded to a confidential channel where only the Academy Heads and EIT had access and that they do look at each other's in line with the Trust's ethos of sharing good practice.</p> <p><i>The Trustees asked about how evidence was attached to the SEF?</i> The DoE said rather than attaching documents there would be a reference on the SEF of where the evidence could be found. <i>Following a question from a Trustee,</i> it was confirmed that the evidence was predominantly digital.</p> <p>It was noted by the meeting that the SEF should be for governance monitoring and to drive evidence informed improvement. It was added that the ASIP should be used in conjunction with the SEF to cross reference.</p>	

	<p>The visit notes (circulated with the agenda) from the Governors of the Local Advisory Committees (LAC) were considered and the Chairs of the LACs were invited to bring forward any comments/questions from the LAC meetings.</p>	
8.	<p>Local board reports</p> <p>8.1 The Minutes from all four LACs were circulated before the meeting. The Chairs were invited to bring forward any comments/questions.</p> <p>The Trustees extended their thanks to the LAC commenting how clearly child centred the visit notes were. The Trustees added that it was good to see that schools were addressing diversity by ensuring that the Trust’s pupils were partnering with other schools in other areas such as Bristol schools. The CEO said that the schools were also looking at visiting other cities to try to support the pupils with understanding diversity.</p> <p>The Trustees asked about the relational approach across the Trust and commented that it was a strategic approach and that it should be monitored properly and not taken for granted that it was something that the Trust had always done.</p> <p>OH gave an update of the Moorland LAC, particularly noting how positive it was that Wolborough gave the reason for joining was because their vision and values aligned with the Trusts’.</p> <p>The following questions were asked from the LAC Minutes. <i>Was there a possibility for the Trust to consider cost of living crisis related food parcels?</i> The CEO reported that the Trust were aware that in some of the Trust’s schools there were families experiencing hardship. To address this the Trust had linked with Kellogs and offered breakfast clubs. The Trust wanted to do more and though the school funding should be spent on education, the Trust recognised that if children were hungry this made it difficult for them to access their learning. <i>The Trustees asked if the Trust could link with food banks?</i> The CEO said that food banks were accessed. The CEO added that in the new year the Trust was looking to go into the community to set up initiatives such as food banks and provide training on managing finances for the parents. <i>The Trustees further asked whether the level of need to help with cost of living was increasing across the Trust?</i> The CEO said it depended on the location of the school. In some schools there were low numbers of families living in financial crisis – these were then managed internally. In schools where there was a greater need then the use of food banks, raising funds, breakfast clubs was more prevalent. <i>Had schools added the relational approach to their websites and was relational approach discussed at interviews with prospective staff?”</i> The DoE reported that relational approach was appearing in the school websites more and that in the last recent round of Interviews, questions around relational approach were being asked. <i>It was noted that LACs reported that recruitment and retention was still a concern across the schools – was there anything further that could be done?</i> The DoE assured the meeting that the Trust were very proactive in this area, trying to think of ways to attract staff. She added that full time posts were harder to fill so jobs were being advertised with the offer of part time would be considered. CM reported that in the Workforce group retention was always on the agenda with another survey to be circulated to the staff to help understand why staff stay with the Trust. A LAC Chair said though he was in a different work sector, it was the same picture – employers had to be more creative in what they offered prospective employees.</p> <p>8.2 It was noted that following the previous meeting there were a few amendments to the Terms of Reference for the LACs. It was agreed that the Chair of S&C and the GP would review the comments, recirculate to the meeting and the Terms of Reference for the Local Advisory Committees be approved via email.</p>	

		Chair/ GP
9.	Action Plans PART II was taken	
10.	<p>Safeguarding GS reported the following: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding Audits (Hennock, Ilington, Morchard Bishop, Stoke Gabriel, Otterton, Yeoford) • External audits booked for Spring 1 (Wolborough, Sparkewell, Stoke Gabriel) • Spot checks policies - focus on Intimate Care this term • SG policy updated, working on First Aid, Anti Bullying and Missing Pupils • Filtering and Monitoring Team set up and actions agreed (next meeting Feb, training to AHs/Staff Jan). • CPoms/My Concern exploring • Mop Up Level 2s, another session on 18th January 2023 • S175 audits ongoing - action plans to AW will create MAT action plan by early Jan 24. S175 is directly related to the requirement in Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSiE). • New MSF (monthly SG focus) training plan will be created following survey - Coming soon! • Currently collecting Autumn data - report to trustees early Jan 2024 	
11.	<p>Trust Risk Register The risk register report for the following categories were circulated before the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding • Education Standards and Achievement <p>The CEO reported that during the INSET day the expectation of how the risk registers were completed at school level was discussed to ensure a more consistent input from the AHs. There had been a review of all the risk registers which then fed into the central risk register. The process was becoming more effective. <i>The Trustees asked whether the new process had highlighted any unexpected new risks?</i> The CEO explained that the risks related to S&C were related to the Band 3 schools which was expected. The CEO added that this was being discussed regularly in the Senior Management meetings.</p>	
12.	<p>Strategic Plan - School Improvement and Safeguarding 12.1 Update on 2023/2024 plan –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Improvement – The Chair proposed, and it was agreed for the Strategic Plan to be reviewed at the Spring 1 meeting. The GP was asked to circulate the plan. The Chair added the text in bold was the new text for this year’s strategic plan, the overall theme / strategic priority had not changed from last year. • Safeguarding – GS discussed the items on the plan. He confirmed that he was meeting regularly with the Safeguarding Lead. A digital report was being created on what which one provided - this would be shared with CEO. The difficulty was value for money. It was important that the system robustly supported the Trust’s safeguarding practice. It was hoped that it would be ready to be presented to Board of Trustees in February. The Trustees thanked GS for his hard work. 	GP
13.	<p>Policies The policies were circulated before the meeting. <i>The Trustees asked about policies demonstrating how they were aligned with the Trust’s Vision and Values, as they come up for review and what was the reason why this was not happening yet?</i> It was agreed to discuss this further at Board of Trustees in February. It was noted that vision and values were being reviewed and it was suggested to wait until they were agreed before changing the policies.</p> <p>13.2 Collective Worship – Church Schools. The policy was circulated before the meeting. The Trustees asked the following questions: - <i>For CofE schools should the policy be clearer about school vision and values and how they link with the Trust? Also be more explicit about the support from the Trust regarding V&V and other distinctively Christian support?</i> The meeting discussed this question further. It was noted that the schools were individual,</p>	GP

	<p>however, to achieve consistency a general statement with the school attaching their own vision and value would be preferable. The policy was approved.</p> <p>13.3 Collective Worship – Community Schools. This policy was circulated before the meeting. The policy was approved.</p> <p>13.4 Collective Worship. This policy was circulated before the meeting. The policy was approved.</p> <p>13.5 Pupil Premium. This policy was circulated before the meeting. The Trustees raised the following questions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aims: should they emphasise the statutory elements of strategy, spending and reporting more clearly?</i> • <i>Purpose of the grant: LAC were missing; Cultural capital / wider opportunities to improve outcomes was missing (too focussed on attainment and progress?)</i> • <i>Was all spending governed at Trust level, or was some delegated to Academy Heads and LACs?</i> • <i>Were ALL staff really involved in data analysis? Would it be more accurate to say ‘effective use of data analysis, operationally and strategically, ensures all staff fully understand the context / barriers / aims?’</i> • <i>‘Maximising progress’: though attendance needed a high profile, should the policy place more responsibility on what the schools would do (rather than EWO) to promote good attendance (eg follow research and guidance from EBSA, or others?)</i> <p>The GP was asked to take the policy back to the policy reviewers with the questions raised and to present the policy at the next meeting.</p> <p>13.6 Intimate Care. This policy was circulated before the meeting. The policy was approved.</p>	GP
14.	<p>Evaluation of governance impact – Principle 1: Delivering the Academy Trust’s charitable Objects The Principles – Academy Trust Governance Code.html</p> <p>Review performance and value of meeting with Principle 1 in mind</p>	

The meeting ended on 19.15.