



Present: Sophie Boyack (Chair)
Phil Grundy (Principal)
Andy Sikora
Tracy Penfold
Ginette Hogan
Claudine Crossley

Also present: Dave Brown (Trustee)
Alan Benton (Trustee)
Richard Palmer (Trustee)
Nick Hyde - Deputy Principal
Tom Capewell – Deputy Principal
Danielle Stephens – Head of 6th Form
Jacob Adeshina – new CFO
Tim Morris – Company Secretary
Sue Gill - Clerk

Summary of actions:

5.9	Staff survey results to be shared with Trustees
5.10	Draft parent survey to be shared with Sophie Boyack and Tracy Penfold

1. Welcome and Apologies

- 1.1 Trustees was welcomed to the meeting.
- 1.2 An apology for absence was received and accepted from Christina Proffitt.

2. Declaration of Interest

There was nothing to declare regarding the agenda items.

3. Update of staffing appointments and recruitment

3.1 The following was highlighted:

- Phil Grundy welcomed Jacob Adeshina who will be covering her post when she goes on maternity leave.
- All posts except for Health and Social Care had been appointed. to. Four people were to be interviewed for this post.
- Mrs Payne, Head of Human Sciences, will be leaving and a member of the leadership team will be leaving
- Sharon Marsh was on long term sickness. The long-term cover teacher has been retained into the next academic year.
- Gill Howard-Smith (SENCO) was due to leave in the summer term, but had volunteered to remain in school for another term. She will oversee the induction of the new SENCO at that point.

Q1 Had the resignation deadline passed or was it after half term?

A: It had not yet passed, as it was and the end of half term. There had been national discussion as to whether the deadline would change as more flexibility should be offered given the current circumstances, but it was not confirmed.

Q2: In the current climate could the school be in a worse position?

A: Grateful for colleagues who indicated their positions at the start of the new year hence the school was able to recruit early. The Science, PE and History posts had all been filled by trainee teachers already working in the school.

- Trustees noted that the school was trying to come up with centre assessment grades. These will not be confirmed as results until the examination board looked at what was submitted. There was a huge undertaking by staff at classroom level and the work of the Heads of Departments (HOD). SLT was looking through the grades and asking questions of the HOD.

4. Update of the school's KS4 and KS5 Centre Assessment Grades (predicted) - grades) – (Nick Hyde and Danielle Stephens)

4.1 KS4

This item was presented by Nick Hyde.

4.1.1 Work on this was significant and staff tried to make the grades as accurate as possible. The level of detail and process was taken seriously. Each department looked at individual students' tracking data, mock results, final grades and target grades in the last three years. This was checked and cross checked and a rationale was written and presented to the Senior Leadership Team (SLT), who began the process of estimated grades. The HODs were personally inputting the grades onto SIMS.

4.1.2 The HODs would suggest amendments and this would be carried out before each subject was signed off. Once completed, permission was granted for the data to be uploaded. An additional layer was that schools were charged with the challenge of giving students an estimated grade as close as they would if they sat the examination. The school would also have to submit a rank order of students. The examination board will take the estimated grades and look at the history of results in the last three years without bias. It was stressed that this was not moderation. Every school grade in every subject would be a calculated grade.

4.1.3 Q: It was known that students could re-sit examinations. For those students on the cusp, was there something the school could do?

A: It was recognised that progress the last two years had been average and not as good as expected. That was the genuine progress that Year 11 was expected to make. They came in with stronger KS2 results and fewer students were less motivated compared to previous years. There had been positive progress scores and the analysis might be different from the examination board. If students were not happy with their results, they could re-sit examinations in the next academic year. An appeal can only be lodged if the school did not correctly follow the process. All schools will generate estimated grades slightly higher.

4.1.4 Trustees felt that this was a fair approach and had the confidence that the school had got the estimated grades correct. They voiced their concerns that the students were deprived of the opportunity to sit examinations.

Q: Do the students do better in final examinations than mocks, taking into consideration there was no data to support this?

A: Every subject grade was looked at for mock and final grades for the last three years. In most cases students went up a grade. There was a need to look at every department approach to come up with a professional decision.

- 4.1.5 Nick Hyde talked Trustees through the KS4 Analysis Tool Centre Assessment Grades (CAG) 2020. The document highlighted every subject and drilled down in detail gender, special needs, EAL etc. The data was generous, but this will be slightly reduced by the HODs before submission.

Q: This was drilled down and the CAG increased?

A: There was not much difference to go from yellow to green. Teachers' estimated grades erred on the side of caution. Data was increased by +.2 from the spring term. There was genuine challenge in some subjects like Geography and History.

- 4.1.6 The disadvantaged gap was closing and looking positive. It was noted that the examination board will not make any amendments to individual grades. They will not be adjusted down.

Q: Last year results achieved were close to .0. Was the school predicting that accuracy of previous estimates?

A: The school was slightly positive. Last year's prediction was almost 0 to +02. The school also had an external analysis from the Fischer Family Trust (FFT). It was noted that 80% of schools in the country used this.

- 4.1.7 Trustees noted the moderation report, which was being used as a guide. Many things were flagged up when looking at specific students i.e. Spanish. The cohort was 16 students, with the MNE reference at +1.52 and lower prior attainment was +4.56. It was noted that there were four students who were native Spanish and Portuguese speakers.

- 4.1.8 It was felt that Trustees were a good sounding board. Regarding the impact of the results, the next steps will be the Sixth Form admission.

Q: Due to the coronavirus pandemic, there was a smaller movement into the Sixth Form. Students were unable to visit on taster days and unsure of their grades. Was there any indication of that?

A: All internal and external students attended a guidance assembly with current Sixth Form students before the lockdown. They were also seen by a member of the SLT. Any student not able to attend the guidance assembly were sent a different conditional letter. There was a lot of external interest. It was hopeful that numbers will not be affected.

4.2 KS5

This item was presented by Danielle Stephens.

- 4.2.1 Information was shared with the Trustees at the meeting (spreadsheet), noting the results obtained from each department over the last five years. Value added at the different levels was noted. Attention was drawn to the CAGs analysis report.

- 4.2.2 Chemistry was black 6, this year it was predicted as red 1 (an increase of 5 grades). This was used as a measure of where the school was. How each department predicted grades was shared with Trustees (same as KS4). The performance of the current cohort was also taken into consideration, along with the three-year trend.

- 4.2.3 The big picture was that the school was doing all it could with the current challenges and will upload the grades after adjustments.

- 4.2.4 Sophie Boyack formally thanked teachers for going above and beyond their remit to ensure that students were getting the grades that they deserved. The level of diligence was impressive.

Dave Brown left the meeting at 11.25am.

5. School's strategy for opening the school for more students

- 5.1 Phil Grundy highlighted the document sent to Trustees prior to the meeting. Plans were changing all the time and challenges were potentially pulling the school in different directions, as guidance received had diverse interpretation. Trustees' views were encouraged.

- 5.2 Three examples of questions for consideration were noted:

5.2.1 Are students expected to observe social distancing from each other and from their teachers?

The school was expected to implement social distancing between students and teachers. This was not seen to work effectively in society. This was tested with provision for the children of key workers, social distancing was not taking place all the time.

5.2.2 How many students are expected to back in school? For how long? How frequently?

Guidance included Years 10 and 12. Exact numbers were not known. Plans being made now was not for a full return. There was face to face contact to supplement teaching.

5.2.3 What safety precautions are we expected to put in place to safeguard students and staff? E.g. PPE? Hand sanitiser?

Guidance might change. It was reminded that anyone using public transport was expected to wear a face mask. It was possible to maintain social distancing on site, but it could not be guaranteed along with wearing PPE. Primary schools removed this as they could not make this happen. Secondary schools were able to offer face to face support as a supplement for students taking examinations in the next year.

- 5.3 Trustees noted the possible timeline. The school was not committed to it, but was unsure if there would be staff to deliver lessons and students to attend. Highams Park would not be aiming to re-open on 1 June 2020. It would be preferable for staff to come into school to look at their classrooms first. Year 12 students would be the first cohort to return as a trial, followed by Year 10. Prior to all this, the numbers of staff and students need to be known. Draft timetables were produced.

- 5.4 The school had gone through practical steps to prepare for the re-open of the school and plan further steps/actions. The site team was working to get the classrooms set up. It was agreed to use the 25 largest rooms spread across the school. The entrance to the school had been marked out with 2m zones outside the toilet areas, canteen and other areas. There was an obvious need to manage areas even with reduced numbers of potential gatherings.

- 5.5 Test classrooms had been set up for Trustees to view. Students would attend school on a rota basis, which would be subject lead. The largest room can accommodate 10 students under the 2m rule. Teachers would need to lead three to four lessons in order to cover all students. Online teaching will continue.

Q: Combined and triple Science GCSE, how will that work?

A: This would be treated the same way. Triple Science was not an option. There will be some independent work and online teaching, as not all

Science teachers were available. The school was trying to avoid arbitrary teaching.

- 5.6 The value of teachers was not just for academic development of students, but mental wellbeing. It was helpful for students to have some contact with teachers and return to school.

Q1: Would it be possible to give students extra face to face contact through online means?

A: There were other platforms to have interactive lessons i.e. Google classroom or Microsoft Teams.

Q2: Would that meet the same kind of needs? Was there value in spending time on 'virtual lessons'?

A: This was looked at; some teachers were already using online platforms in a limited way and were learning to develop their use of technology during this time of lockdown.

- 5.7 There was minimal contact with students via Zoom or telephone. From the first week of the lockdown Form Tutors were linking with students. The Heads of Year were also making contact, not about lessons, but as a general hello and checking whether coursework was being completed.

- 5.8 The planned further steps included staff and parent surveys to gauge their views on the return to school. Trustees agreed that there was a right to accommodate everyone, but the survey to parents and staff would give a sense of the uptake.

Q1: When asking parents, were they willing to send their children back to school?

A: The survey will be ending at the end of the week. The priority was the staff followed the parent survey.

Q2: How did the school clarify attendance data for individual students?

A: All students were expected to attend school.

- 5.9 The school had been in discussions with the local teaching unions. Andy Sikora was currently in a union meeting. Local representatives will be given a further steer on how to negotiate the return to school. Staff could not be imposed to work in school.

Q1: What about school uniform? Some students would have grown out of their clothes, do they need to wear uniform if they were coming into school at least once per week?

A: There was an expectation to wear uniform. Those students currently in school were not wearing uniform. No decision was taken, but that could be amended, especially as the relevant shops were closed.

Q2: What about the use of hand sanitiser?

A: Everyone was reminded all the time to wash their hands. It was very difficult to forget. It was recognised that some people felt unsafe to come into school, which was understandable, especially those who had to commute.

Q3: What was the repercussion if a student walking to school came into contact with a teacher that had come into school on public transport?

A: Desks had been adequately spaced to observe social distancing. However it was recognised that there would be difficulties when teachers had to assist students with their work etc. Maintaining the 2m social distancing could not

be guaranteed for staff and students. It was acknowledged that the school would not be able to support the returns of Years 10 and 12 without guidance.

Q4: Was there anything the Trust Board could do when the survey results were known?

A: The results will be known before opening was confirmed. This will be shared with Trustees.

Action: Staff survey results to be shared with Trustees

- 5.10 Trustees felt that everything had to be done to guaranteed everyone's safety. By the end of the half term break, there should be a definitive decision on whether schools will open on 1 June 2020. Guidance for secondary schools had not been received. It was agreed that Phil Grundy will send the draft parents' survey to Tracy Penfold and Sophie Boyack before sending to parents by the end of the week.

Action: Phil Grundy

Q1: When will the grades be submitted?

A: In approximately two weeks.

Q2: Again was there anything the Trust Board could do to support the school?

A: The school will continue until it was able to open fully and provide staff and students with normality.

- 5.11 Thanks were extended to all staff. It was confirmed that the school will not be opened on Bank Holiday Monday but would be for the rest of the half term holiday.

6. Support Staff increments

Prior to the meeting, Trustees were reminded that support staff increments was an item placed on the agenda for the meeting on 27 April 2020. Trustees formally approved the increments (totalling £9,000 and included in the approved budget 2020-2021).

The meeting ended at 12.25 pm.

Chair: (print)

..... (sign)

Date: