



Present: Tracy Penfold (Chair)
Phil Grundy (Principal)
Alan Benton
Sophie Boyack
Dave Brown
Claudine Crossley
Ginette Hogan
Richard Palmer
Christina Proffitt
Andy Sikora

Also in attendance: Tom Capewell and Nick Hyde (Deputy Principals)
Jacob Adeshina (Chief Finance Officer)
Tim Morris (Company Secretary/Secretary to the Board)
Sue Gill (Clerk to the Trustees)

Action summary:

4.4	KS5 summary to be shared with Trustees
5.9	Significant changes to the risk assessment to be shared with the Trustees. Behaviour Policy addendum to be emailed to Trustees
6.2	Principal to convey Trust Board thanks to staff for work carried out during the lockdown

The meeting was recorded.

1. Welcome and Apologies

- 1.1 Tracy Penfold welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- 1.2 There were no apologies for absence as all Trustees were present
- 1.3 The Clerk confirmed that the meeting was quorate with 10 Trustees present.
- 1.4 There was one item of Any Other Business - Communications Policy.

2. Declaration of Interest

There was nothing to declare in regards to the agenda items.

3. School opening and risk assessment

To be discussed later in the meeting.

4. Centre Assessment Grades (CAG) Update

- 4.1 Trustees were reminded that at the last meeting they looked at the school's initial CAGs. There was detailed internal scrutiny of the data prior to it being sent to FFT for further analyses prior to further scrutiny. An ALPs analysis was also carried out for KS5 data analyses with further scrutiny of the information gathered. Feedback was given to all Heads of Departments (HODs) in all subjects where the value added score sign was different from last year. Different outcomes due to factors like group sizes and cohort would be expected to give some variation in some subjects

compared to previous years. No further information regarding tolerance levels had been received from Ofqual.

- 4.2 Following the FFT report which indicated anomalies, it was necessary to adjust some grades changed higher and lower. The HODs were asked to confirm the grades which appeared outside a reasonable range, e.g. Spanish had 16 students, with the residual being 1.5 grades higher. This was explained by a number of Lower Attaining Students being native Spanish speakers. The school had tried to stay to the information given by teachers focusing on the most likely grades the students would have achieved had the exams gone ahead. Attention was drawn to the final CAG summary, which showed how changes made at the different stages of the process at KS4 at the individual subject level. The average score across all subjects has moved from +0.4 to +0.3 through challenging HoD on their original predictions. The students' grades still show better than national progress. It was felt that the small changes made were now the right to be submitted.

Q1: What about last year's Progress8?

A: It was -0.07, which implied an increase of one third of a grade for this year.

Q2: Was the previous years' results on this chart?

A: It was provided at the last meeting.

- 4.3 Trustees thought that it was useful to see how the CAGs had changed through this process. In reality there were significant increases in Geography and History from last year and these subjects' grades would most likely be adjusted by the examination board. The examination boards were expected to make fine adjustments.

Q: Assuming that it was expected to 'knock down' and not bring up?

A: Generally most schools would put in slightly positive residual than what is expected. In reality not all students would get the submitted CAG. This was a similar pattern being reported everywhere else, the Progress8 score is slightly higher than before and it was anticipated that it would move down.

- 4.4 The KS5 summary was shared with Trustees. It was noted that there were four tiers of scrutiny.

Q: Did teachers feel that the old CAGs were optimistic and slightly downgraded because of the school's GCSE performance? Was the school selling the students short over the performance from the last three years?

A: No colleague had found this process easy or comfortable, the grades they submitted were carefully considered. Colleagues wanted to do it correctly and be able to provide students with genuine grades. Staff were aware of the potential process of amendment by the examination boards and were anticipating some disappointment. Circumstances were different for every student. It was recognised that the process for staff was difficult and they approached the task seriously and what was submitted had been scrutinised, discussed and carefully considered.

- 4.5 Trustees noted the amount of work undertaken by all staff in this. TP added that they had to do CAGs, as well as carrying out risk assessments, remote learning and looking after key worker students.

- 4.6 The school was now approaching the end of the two week window to upload results to the examination board and assured Trustees that they had been thorough enough

to ensure no errors in the process. Out of 74 entries, 72 had been uploaded. There was an appeals process, which focused on ensuring the school had properly followed the process. The school has been clear over the guidance given to staff. Depending on the results, staff will have to manage discussions with students and parents.

Q: What about examinations in the autumn term?

A: Students will have the opportunity to re-take the examinations in the autumn term.

5. Update of School's strategy for opening the school for Year 10 and 12 students

- 5.1 There had been changes in the interpretation of the policy and government guidelines. The biggest limiting factor that had become clearer was that the school could not admit more than 25% of the year group on the same day. Initially the focus was to create continuity of learning with particular groups and keep it close to 'the normal' as possible. Teachers would need to engage with 'a bubble of students'.
- 5.2 Training for staff will start during the week beginning Monday 15 June 2020. Students will return on Monday 22 June 2020. There was a need to build staff confidence in a balanced way. Staff have had to develop new key skills, such as TEAMS lessons and blended teaching. This situation was thought likely to continue to some extent into the next academic year.
- 5.3 It was questioned whether coursework was being marked and whether the students will be with their usual teacher. It was noted that the intention that students see their own teachers, but that would be dependent on those teachers being in school. The vast majority of staff who were not on the vulnerable list were willing and able to return to school.
- 5.4 In terms of marking work, this was a challenge. It was not an easy process to manage though there were some e-learning packages which automatically marked work. It was recognised that there could be difficulties in some subjects and that there could be long term implications. Receiving feedback and potential blended learning in September 2020 could reach a critical point if the students operate in a vacuum, without feedback, this would cause a problem. Hence some contact with key year groups before September would be helpful and to know how staff were using IT during the process. The school will become better equipped on digital online marking going forward into September, but if this was not the case, it would be something to consider in the longer term.

Q: With the proposed plan for the return of Year 10 and 12 students, were some teachers coming into school every day and others not? If so, how was this being addressed?

A: There were different models, which had not yet been shared with the wider staff group. It was recognised that circumstances of staff would be different i.e. how they travelled to school. The detailed timetables have yet to be issued. The priority was to give the students the best educational experience without putting staff at risk. It was recognised that staff would be anxious etc.

- 5.5 The views of those Trustees who were parents were sought. They felt reassured that students will be observing the social distancing in the class and around the school. The management of students around the school could be managed as they were older, but it was thought class management would be harder. Confidence needs to be built. Systems were in place to assist staff to manage this without being confrontational so that they can get on with the process of teaching and learning. Students will be in their blocked bays. There can be no collaboration or group work. Staff will be more confident in that environment over time.

- Q: Will anyone from the Pastoral Team be on site if students need to talk to anyone?**
- A: Staff will be available, but not necessarily the same staff member for Years 10 and 12. The school was trying to organise a way to assist those students in need of pastoral and mental health support through the Education Psychology Team, so they could receive intensive support.
- 5.6 Assemblies (maximum of 30 students) will be an important activity within any group of students. It was recognised that some students will be glad to be back in school, whilst others may have different views. They will be told of the offer of support.
- Q1: Will a video be sent to parents with a formal message including the date of return?**
- A: This meeting was a sign off of Trustees' approval to take this next step of action. The school was keen to inform parents pending government decisions as a caveat. Parents needed to have the chance to consider this and see the risk assessment.
- Q2: Was the school being flexible on footwear?**
- A: The wearing of uniform was important. Those arriving at school without full uniform would not be turned away. The message to parents was whilst the school could not take away all risks, the assessment was carried out to minimise risk, but could not promise to eliminate all risk. This would apply to both students and staff.
- 5.7 Trustees were talked through the risk assessment document, which had been shared with the union representatives (teaching and non-teaching) and HR advisers. Once approved, it will be made available to staff. Regarding face masks, this could be worn by both students and staff if they wished. Concern was expressed about everyone wearing masks in class and it was questioned that if everyone maintained the 2m social distancing, there was no need for them. It was thought that some individuals might want to wear masks for various reasons. Some members of staff from the BAME community were particularly concerned about returning to school and will want to wear masks as they were identified as being of higher risk. It was important for staff to show and share their experiences with their class. This could be a by-product of the learning experience.
- Q1: Will the AstroTurf in the playground be used in the short term?**
- A: No. The short term model was no lunch break or other breaks in the day. The Year 10 and 12 students will only be in school for half days. The only issue was the children of key workers, a discussion will have to be had on how they will be managed.
- Q2: There will be biometric readers in the canteen, in the long term this would need to be rethought when the school becomes fuller?**
- A: There were different options, students could be issued with a card. The cost was unknown. All options could be looked at.
- 5.8 The school was adamant that the windows would be opened during lessons, so that fresh air could circulate around the classroom.
- 5.9 All Trustees were in favour of model F risk assessment how it currently stood, subject to any input from other external parties. It was agreed that as a working document, it would be subject to change/updating. If there were significant changes, they would be highlighted to the Trustees.

Action: School.

Q1: Was the risk assessment a template or did the school construct one?

A: The school used a template recommended by the local authority. The original (from Mossbourne had 37 categories and a point score system, which was meaningless as individual scores would vary).

Q2: Has the Behaviour Policy been updated in preparation for the return of the Years 10 and 12 return?

A: Certain things were amended as an addendum. There will not be provision for staff to remove students to the isolation room. This document will be sent to Trustees via email.

Action: Tom Capewell to send Behaviour Policy addendum to Trustees.

Q3: What about sanctions/consequences of deliberate coughing on each other and staff?

A: There were no tiers of sanctions. Those who do this intentionally would be excluded.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 Communications Policy

6.1.1 The policy was shared with Trustees and covered how teachers were making contact with students and parents from their own homes during the lockdown. This was a guidance measured approach and will be added as an addendum to the Safeguarding Policy (LBWF policy).

6.1.2 When staff made calls, they were asked to log brief notes. It was recommended to speak to the parents first. Although teachers used their own mobile phones to make contact, they did so without passing on their numbers. If there were any safeguarding issues, teachers knew who and how to pass on their concerns.

6.1.3 Trustees agreed the addendum to the Safeguarding Policy.

6.2 Vote of thanks

On behalf of the Trustees, the Chair thanked staff for the work they had carried out during the lockdown and for putting systems in place for the return of students.

The meeting closed at 7.28pm.

FOLLOWING THE MEETING:

7.1 The Chair reported that she had taken Chair's action Thursday 11 June 2020 to approve the Safeguarding Policy addendum for use during the time the school remained closed due to COVID19 to all but Key Worker and vulnerable students. The school had been using this since the beginning of April 2020

Chair: (print)

..... (sign)

Date: