

MEETING OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

BOLTON IMPACT TRUST

FRIDAY 6 MARCH 2020 AT 11.00AM AT YOUTH CHALLENGE

Present: M Sidebottom (MS) -Chair of the Committee, B Atkinson (BA), P Hodgkinson (PH) – Executive Principal and D McKeon (DMc)

In Attendance: R Leonard (Vice-Principal) and E Stoddard (ES) –Clerk to Trust

M SIDEBOTTOM IN THE CHAIR

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Trustees were welcomed to the meeting. No apologies for absence had been received as all Trustees were present.

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

No declarations of pecuniary interest or conflict of interest were made.

3. NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There were no items of Any Other Business reported.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

A copy of the minutes of the last meeting held on Friday 15 November 2019 had been circulated with the agenda papers.

Matters Arising

MS asked for an update on cross-over collaborative work with primary schools. RL stated that this would be covered in the Lever Park verbal report.

5. PUPIL OUTCOMES

A Trust Standards Report for Autumn 2019-20 had been uploaded to the Gateway.

Forwards Centre

Quality of Education - Impact

MS asked about the difference between the Forwards Centre progress and national progress. RL reported that the Forwards Centre measured progress against national mainstream targets and the Forwards Centre's own expectations. Pupils were baselined on entry; they would work towards the national targets and be assessed after four weeks. At this point an appropriate target would then be set depending on several factors. Teachers would now be asked to re-baseline pupils mid-term if they

felt it was appropriate. RL added that Forwards Centre targets were very specific and personalised, and pupils needed to meet Age Related Expectations (ARE) in each area. RL reported that there were several layers of quality assurance within this process, including the Academy Lead, Link Governor and School Improvement Partner. PH added that the system was very robust and had been recognised as such during the recent Ofsted inspection.

DMc asked if curriculum intent was secure and asked about breadth of curriculum. PH stated that the reason the Forwards Centre had not received outstanding in the recent Ofsted inspection had been the Curriculum Intent. The inspector had placed a big focus on the 66-week children, but not as much on the 29-week pupils. Some of the longer-term pupils had met Phase 1 targets and had moved onto Phase 2 and discussions had taken place about the opportunities available for these pupils. PH stated that the feedback had been taken on board and a detailed curriculum plan was being produced. DMc stated that disadvantaged and more vulnerable pupils would likely respond well to changes in the curriculum with more opportunities for learning being provided.

Attendance

MS stated that the overall attendance of 93% was excellent for Alternative Provision (AP). RL reported that only 9 pupils had attendance below 90% but 2 of these pupils had significant medical issues. The Academy was working with these children and families on an individual basis and their attendance was tracked weekly.

Youth Challenge Primary

Quality of Education

MS asked how progress was measured at Youth Challenge Primary. RL explained that pupils attended YC two days per week, they were baselined upon arrival and tested when they left the provision. The focus was to get these pupils back into mainstream provision. BA stated that communication with the schools would play a big part in this. RL stated that the communication with schools was excellent and this was essential to secure EHCPs. The Academy worked with schools every Friday providing support, and this was having a significant impact.

DMc asked if the new curriculum was showing impact. RL stated that the new curriculum was proving excellent in engaging pupils. RL added that this work had started before the framework changed so this was now embedded. It was noted that a teacher from Youth Challenge Primary would be linking with the Forwards Centre in a collaborative approach.

Behaviour

MS referred to the 2 pupils whose behaviour was a cause for concern and asked how long they had been at YC. RL explained that these pupils needed a five-day placement at the Forwards Centre, but this provision was currently full. It was felt to be in the pupils' best interest to keep them at YC so their behaviour could be managed until a place became available at the Forwards Centre.

DMc stated that he felt the report needed more statements on intent as this did not seem to be as clear in the primary reports as it was in secondary. RL stated that she was currently working with all Academy Leads to produce consistent reporting formats.

Personal Development

MS referred to the destinations data and stated that 100% of pupils returning to mainstream was excellent. PH stated that there had been no bounce back, and this had been supported by the work that the Academy staff were undertaking with schools on a Friday.

Youth Challenge Secondary

Quality of Education

MS asked why more pupils were making expected or above expected progress in Maths (68%) than in English (56%). RL reported that every pupil's progress had been looked at in detail and many were still struggling on the first round of PPEs to translate their performance ability into the formal exam. Sitting the exam remained the main issue; however, two rounds of mock exams had taken place, and these had shown an increased length of stay in the exam. DMc stated that there needed to be a focus on exam technique and stamina. If pupils stayed in the exam for at least one hour then all pupils would achieve at least a Level 1 in English, which would reflect positively on outcomes. MS stated that there maybe needed to be a focus on the short, sharp questions. PH stated that the main issue was resilience so the initial focus would be to get the pupils to stay in the exam, then the focus could move onto exam technique. DMc asked if the Academy provided interventions such as revision camps the day before. RL advised that this was carried out the morning of the mock exam and had been reasonably successful; however, the next mock exam would start at 9am, which was likely to present issues. Both MS and DMc stated that they would be happy to provide support in this.

Personal Learning Centre

Quality of Education

DMc referred to the Keeping Safe category of Phase 1 outcomes, which had an improved score of -2. RL stated that this was due to external factors beyond the school's control.

Attendance

RL reported that the attendance figures demonstrated an overall improvement in attendance for all groups compared to their most recent school data. The attendance figure of 56% was below the national but attendance had improved by 2% for this cohort compared to their previous school attendance. MS stated that more information was needed on context. PH stated that the PLC was receiving pupils who had been B-coded and added that the PLC would now benchmark pupils against their first term.

Park School

Quality of Education

Trustees were informed that 60% of students were making expected progress in Maths and 67% in English. DMc stated that the 60% in Maths should be able to be moved on quickly using schemes such as Hegarty Maths. PH concurred that focus should be placed on this and tasked RL to look in detail at Maths at Park School. MS and DMc offered their support in this. RL reported that she would provide an update at the next meeting.

MS asked why ICT and Science were slightly below the other subjects. RL explained that the ICT teacher had been absent, so the curriculum had needed to be adapted to accommodate this. The teacher had returned to work but was on a flexible return. RL added that she would investigate Science further and feedback to Trustees.

Trustees thanked RL for such a detailed report. The Chair stated that it was clear that there was now much more focus on Phase 2 outcomes, which evidenced how far the Trust had moved on.

6. QUALITY OF ASSESSMENT, TEACHING & LEARNING

A Teaching and Learning Report for Autumn Term 2019/20 had been uploaded to the Gateway.

Forwards Centre

RL reported that teachers at the Forwards Centre were observed during the autumn term and all lessons were judged as good or better. Overall judgements were based on a triangulation of ongoing evidence. DMc asked if there was a focus on learning. RL stated that future reports would be in a different format as the Trust was starting to change how they looked at Teaching & Learning and the curriculum. RL reported that she had started conversations regarding the curriculum in some academies and learning walks had been scheduled in all academies. PH stated that the Trust would create an AP diving system.

Lever Park

The Trust Board having designated details of the discussion that followed as confidential in accordance with Article 125 of the Articles of Association, this information is excluded from these minutes.

DMc asked if the induction process was robust enough. RL advised that this was discussed last night in terms of staff wellbeing. RL stated that the Trust needed to develop a central induction process as currently each academy had an individual handbook so there may be some inconsistency. DMc stated that staff may be required to work in different academies within the Trust so there needed to be a consistent approach. RL advised that Academy Leads had agreed with this.

Park School

The Trust Board having designated details of the discussion that followed as confidential in accordance with Article 125 of the Articles of Association, this information is excluded from these minutes.

7. SELF-EVALUATION UPDATE

The current SEFs for each Academy had been uploaded to the Gateway.

The Trust Board having designated details of the discussion that followed as confidential in accordance with Article 125 of the Articles of Association, this information is excluded from these minutes.

BA asked if the numbers for Lever Park in Year 7 and 8 were as planned. PH confirmed that Lever Park would be two form entry in September.

DMc stated that he liked the Vision Statement, which was included on the front page of each SEF but noted that each statement differed. DMc stated that there was a Trust Vision Statement in place and suggested that this be used by each academy so there was a clear focus. RL concurred that each academy should be following the Trust Vision and stated that a piece of work was needed to incorporate this. Trustees agreed that this would help the Trust evolve.

8. FORWARDS CENTRE OFSTED INSPECTION

The Ofsted inspection had been discussed under Pupil Outcomes at the start of the meeting.

9. LEVER PARK SUPPORT - CONFIDENTIAL

The Trust Board having designated details of the discussion that followed as confidential in accordance with Article 125 of the Articles of Association, this information is excluded from these minutes.

10. DATES OF NEXT TRUSTEE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Agreed: That the next meeting dates be as follows:

Friday 12th June 2020 at 11.00am

11. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of Any Other Business.

12. CONFIDENTIALITY

Agreed: That the following matters discussed at this meeting be designated as confidential in accordance with the Academy's Memorandum and Articles of Association:

Minute Number 6 (Lever Park – 1st paragraph)

Minute Number 6 (Park School)

Minute Number 7 (SEF – Park School – 1st paragraph)

Minutes Number 9 (Lever Park)

With no further business the meeting closed at 12.40 pm

SUMMATIVE ACTIONS

Minute Number	Responsible	Action
---------------	-------------	--------

Signed as a correct record: _____

Date: _____

(Chair of Standards Committee)