

**MEETING OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE OF BOLTON IMPACT TRUST**  
**HELD VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM ON**  
**FRIDAY 3 MARCH 2023 AT 11.00AM**

**Present:** M Sidebottom (MS) - Chair of the Committee, P Hodgkinson (PH) – Executive Principal, D McKeon (DMc) and P Norton (PN)

**In Attendance:** R Leonard (RL) - Vice-Principal, A Woosey (AW) – Director of Standards and E Stoddard (ES) – Clerk to Trust

**M SIDEBOTTOM IN THE CHAIR**

**1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Trustees were welcomed to the meeting, there were no apologies for absence.

**2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

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

**3. NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of Any Other Urgent Business reported.

**4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

A copy of the minutes of the last meeting held on Friday 11 November 2022 had been circulated with the agenda papers and had been approved at the autumn term Trust meeting.

There were no matters arising, which were not covered on today's agenda.

**5. TRUST STANDARDS REPORT INCLUDING OUTCOMES**

The autumn term 2022 Standards report had been uploaded to the Gateway. AW explained that the report provided headline figures for the Trust.

AW reported that there had been a slight dip in data, but this was a reflection of the new systems that had been put in place and had been expected. AW reported that she was confident in the data that had been presented as she had conducted many Academy visits and moderation exercises had taken place. AW stated that the above expected data was accurate and showed a positive picture.

Trustees were directed to the suspensions data and informed that the total number of fixed term suspensions for the autumn term was 101, just slightly higher than autumn 2021; however, the number of sessions of suspension for autumn 2022 was 226.5, compared to 173.5 in autumn 2021. This was an increase of 53 sessions. Lever Park had managed to reduce suspensions from 27 in autumn 2021 to 14 in autumn 2022; however, Youth Challenge's suspensions had increased. A Trustee asked why the number had increased. RL explained that there were several reasons for the increase with the main reason being that children had joined from other APs with very complex

needs and extreme behaviours. Over a third of the cohort were new in September, so this was having an impact. RL stated that a lot of work was being undertaken on this, including the consistent application of the Behaviour Policy. RL and PH would be meeting with the Academy Lead next week to put a Rapid Improvement Plan in place. RL stated that some improvements had already been seen as there had been an average of 8 exclusions a week in autumn, but this has since reduced to 4.5 in spring, with further improvements expected in summer. The Chair stated that he acknowledged how challenging this situation was for the Trust as schools were also encountering the same issues with behaviour. It was agreed that this would be added to the Risk Register for on-going monitoring.

DMc joined the meeting.

A Trustee commented that there had been no exclusions at Lever Park in spring 1 and this was a huge improvement from two years ago.

A Trustee asked for an update on attendance. Trustees were advised that attendance across the Trust in the autumn term was consistent with last term and autumn 2021 data. Actual data showed 79% attendance, which was above average for Alternative Provisions. PH advised that there would be a 2-day attendance review across the Trust after Easter. Academies had dedicated attendance teams in place and strategies were in place to improve attendance. A Trustee commented that he could see transformational data at Lever Park. PH stated that a lot of work had taken place and the impact of this could now clearly be seen.

**Agreed:** That behaviour and exclusions at YC be added to the Risk Register

**Action:** PH (add to Risk Register)

ES (add to Risk & Audit agenda)

## 6. QUALITY OF EDUCATION

### **Trust Curriculum Statements and Curriculum Timetable**

A detailed Curriculum Report had been uploaded to the Gateway. There were five themes that linked the curriculum throughout the Trust and AW provided an overview of this.

AW reported that a curriculum had been designed, which would be taught in key stage groupings and tiered based on ability rather than age. For every subject the key component knowledge in both key stage 3 and key stage 4 had been identified and each key stage had been divided into either 3 or 6 separate units or themes which could be delivered in half-termly or termly sections over just one academic year. These were logically sequenced so that knowledge was built upon knowledge throughout the term, moving through the entering, emerging, developing and securing stages. Pupils would be placed on the stage that matched their ability and would be expected to move through the stages as they make progress. Pupils could be grouped according to stages, but there would also be the flexibility to teach all or several of the stages in one key stage group using adaptive teaching. There would be a focus on depth of learning for all pupils including those who would be with the Trust for a short period of time.

A Trustee asked if any pupil could still join the curriculum at any point and have sequence of knowledge. AW stated that this was the case and although everything

could not be delivered in two terms there would be a focus on mastery within a term. A Trustee commented that this was a very innovative approach, which showcased the skills of the teachers. RL stated that the next part of the journey would be ensuring that all teachers had the skills and support to do this, and quality assurance would take place within classrooms. A Trustee asked if this was happening in other APs. RL stated that other APs were not talking about this in this depth. Some AP provision mirrored mainstream resulting in the curriculum being too diluted and some were at the other end of the spectrum where it was so personalised that it was just a process of gap-filling. RL added that she felt BIT had found a balance between the two. The Chair concurred that this was excellent and added that some mainstream schools did not have such a detailed curriculum plan.

AW advised that the Trust now had a whole school curriculum statement, which included a personalised section for each academy. Every subject had a curriculum statement and examples of the English and PHSE statements had been uploaded to the Gateway.

Trustees were informed that Knowledge Organisers had been built to help pupils to organise and retrieve key component knowledge in individual themes and topics. They were also used as a teaching tool to check for understanding or for what prior knowledge the pupils had before teaching a unit of work. A Trustee stated that this was very positive and would have a big impact, but the difficulty may be finding the capacity for teachers to complete such detailed work. RL stated that she was aware of this, and a lot of work was taking place. She had found that once teachers had started this, they had quite enjoyed it with some already ahead. However, this would continue to be closely monitored and Academy Leads would need to take ownership of this.

A Trustee stated that Director of Subject models had been discussed previously and asked if this was any capacity for this, even on a temporary basis. PH advised that relationships were being cultivated with high achieving Trusts who were willing to share their school support teams in return for BIT providing behaviour work so this could be an avenue for this model to be implemented. A Trustee stated that it would be very beneficial to utilise this support whilst at the same time developing as Subject Specialists within the Trust.

### **Academy SEFs**

A copy of the Academy SEFs had been uploaded to the Gateway. PH reported that he had retained the SEF work and provided an update. All academies were using the same template, which were now personalised. The SEFs were also aligned to the individual academy SIPs.

The next stage in the process would be to freeze the SEFs to enable them to be analysed. Each academy would receive a mock Ofsted call, and this had been welcomed by the Academy Leads.

A Trustee referred to the Park School SEF and stated that this seemed to ask questions rather than providing a statement. PH explained that this SEF had a different format due to the Academy Lead's absence, but the questions would translate into areas for development.

A Trustee asked if there were clear identifications of judgements for each academy. PH stated that this was not encouraged in the SEF as there would no longer be graded

inspections; however, the Central Team had robust judgements in place for each Academy.

RL reported that the YC LGB had suggested a SEF capture sheet to capture the main strengths and areas for development. This had been produced and would be provided to the LGB on a regular basis. RL stated that this could also be provided to the Standards Committee as a snapshot of the SEF.

## **7. TERMLY SAFEGUARDING REPORT**

A Safeguarding Report for the autumn term and spring 1 half term had been uploaded to the Gateway.

RL provided an overview of the report. Positive handling incidents at The Forwards Centre were high but this was normal in primary settings and no major concerns were reported.

Trustees were informed that One Education would be conducting an external Safeguarding review, which would include a SCR monitoring check. The Trust had also arranged a safeguarding audit for each academy from the LA Safeguarding Team in the summer term.

RL advised that DSL capacity continued to be an issue due to the increased workload; however, all DSLs had taken up the offer of supervision from the LA by a qualified social worker. Sessions had commenced and the feedback had been positive.

## **8. SECONDARY EXTERNAL ADVISOR REPORT**

T Purcell had conducted visits to the Trust in spring 1 and the focus of the visit had been to review aspects of the Quality Assurance Cycle and to support the further development of this process, focusing specifically on the work of the Central Team. A copy of the report had been uploaded to the Gateway.

RL reported that the visits had been useful and some areas for development had been highlighted. A Trustee asked if the Secondary External Advisor review was needed as it seemed to be a duplication of the work that RL and AW were carrying out. PH explained that T Purcell was quality assuring the work of RL and AW but added that this had been discussed previously as to the value of the visit. PH added that he felt Trustees should have some external quality assurance in addition to the information provided by RL and AW but added that this role may evolve as the Trust continued to work collaboratively with other MATs. Trustees agreed that this role currently served a purpose and should continue until a point in time where another suitable option was available.

## **9. OUTWARD FACING AND SCHOOL TO SCHOOL SUPPORT**

PH advised that the Central Team changes were now in place and his main role as CEO was to focus on outward facing work. However, this would currently focus on networking and school to school support rather than expansion.

PH provided an update on the following areas:

Minerva Learning Trust, Sheffield  
Mercia Learning Trust, Sheffield  
Outwood Grange  
Geshar School, Middlesex

The Bridge Short Stay School, Ellesmere Port  
Woolston Brook Special School, Warrington  
Impact Academy, Wigan  
Bolton School  
Wave Academy Trust, Cornwall

**10. ECT POLICY**

A copy of the ECT Policy had been uploaded to the Gateway.

**Agreed:** To approve and adopt the ECT Policy

**11. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of Any Other Urgent Business.

**12. DATES OF NEXT STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Friday 9 June 2023 at 11am

**13. CONFIDENTIALITY**

**Agreed:** That none of the matters discussed at this meeting be designated as confidential in accordance with the Academy's Memorandum and Articles of Association.

With no further business the meeting closed at 12.00 pm

**SUMMATIVE ACTIONS**

<b>Minute Number</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Action</b>
5	PH	Add YC behaviour and exclusions to Risk Register
5	ES	Add YC behaviour and exclusions to Risk & Audit agenda)

Signed as a correct record: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Chair of Standards Committee)