



# ManorAcademy

Excellence Through Innovation

## MINUTES OF THE EXTRA ORDINARY MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS HELD ON MONDAY 25 APRIL AT 5.15PM IN THE BOARDROOM

### PRESENT:

("A" denotes absence)

Mr N A Melton (Chair)  
A Mr N Perry (Vice Chair)  
Mrs M J Lovell  
Mr G Taylor  
A Mr D Stanley  
Mr J Sale  
Dr W Pearce  
Mr C Richards  
Mrs D Trusler  
Mr M Douglas  
Ms R Jones  
Mrs S Tryner

### IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs H Robinson (Clerk to the Governing Body)  
Mr R Gladwin – Deputy Principal  
Mrs K Kerry – Deputy Principal  
Mrs A Bett – Director of Maths  
Mr C Hudson – Vice Principal/SENCO  
Mrs R Stanford – Vice Principal

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

D Stanley – work commitments  
N Perry – Child Care issues  
The Chair accepted the apologies

### **2. Declaration of Interest**

- None

### **3. OFSTED REPORT**

The Principal advised that documentation had been uploaded on to the Ofsted Portal which indicated there was a pre-judgement before coming into the academy. She had lodge a complaint with OFSTED regarding this and other aspects of the inspection.

The Principal contextualised the main sections of the Ofsted Report.

#### **Judgements**

**Effectiveness of Leadership and Management is inadequate**

**Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment is inadequate**

**Personal development, behaviour and welfare requires improvement**

**Outcomes for pupils are inadequate**

**16 – 19 study programmes requires improvement.**

## Summary of key Findings

- Bullet Point 3 referring to Maths declined in 2015. The declination was a marginal percentage and other schools with a similar result this was not included on their Ofsted front page
- The behaviour of some students impedes other student's learning relates to one student.
- The curriculum changes mid- course have inhibited students results. **The Directors asked for clarification**  
*The Principal confirmed it was some students who were not doing well in their elective subjects and needed further intervention in their English, Maths or Science.*
- Leaders have an over generous view of how effectively they have led the school. **The Directors asked what this referred to.**  
The Principal clarified this by explaining that under the current framework the Academy could not have a 'Requires Improvement' category again therefore had to aim for a 'Good' outcome.

The 5 strengths indicated that

- The Leadership team have strengthened with recent appointments as well as improving leadership in other areas. The Principal explained that the subject area was in particular Maths with the appointment of the Director of Maths. With regard to teaching and learning all maths lessons were judged good or better.
- The restructure of the Governance was a strength however as with the leadership appointments were referred to as 'embryonic'
- The marking showed consistency which the Directors have been able to confirm with their monitoring visits.
- Children feel safe at the school and the parents feel their child is safe.

The key areas for improvement:-

- Raise academic achievements and progress in all subject areas especially Mathematics
- Improve the quality of teaching and learning by building on the strongest practice
- Improve the quality of leadership and management.

The Principal and Directors examined the details and the principal continued with adding context to the report.

- Senior Leaders have been slow to address the recommendations from the previous inspection report. The Principal referred to the previous two Section 8 reports which were very positive and therefore the recommendation was to continue with current practice.
- Overestimated predictions – This was already known by the Directors had already challenged the Principal regarding this  
**The Directors asked for confirmation that processes had been put in place to ensure this did not occur this year.**  
*The Principal confirmed this and explained the external ratification in place.*  
**A Director asked why the inspectors believed the current predictions to be over inflated.**  
*The Deputy Principal confirmed that it was because the mock examination the Year 11 students had taken was a particular difficult paper given deliberately to get an accurate picture of the attainment. The grade boundaries had also been moved. The inspectors would not accept the predictions at the end course which were higher. They only accepted the current attainment.*
- Pupil Premium impact – the Principal explained that the Inspectors did not examine or ask about the gaps. However the report refers to the gaps which in reality some have reduced.
- In some subjects work was repeated – **The Directors asked for clarification which subjects**  
*The Principal confirmed it was hospitality and it was because the students had not achieved their target grade.*
- EBACC—most of the students are taking it and the results which was close to national was not taken into account
- The data for Year 7 to 10 were not examined.

- The Academy is benefitting from the Red Hill Alliance however the academy hasn't improved.
- The CPD is too slow to be put in place. **When the Directors questioned this the Principal explained that it was a different pool of teachers.–**
- Governance are evolving and developing however have relied too much on Senior Leaders also the need to evidence the impact of Pupil Premium expenditure.
- The Ramp and MVC were not investigated.
- **Teaching and Learning** Criticism relating to inconsistency relating to high expectations from students. The Principal explained that work had already started on this point. Staff and students had been issued with a series of non-negotiables to raise expectations.
- Student passports for SEND students. The Principal confirmed that all SEND students have them. **The Directors asked if teachers used them**  
*The Principal confirmed that the teachers did not use and personalise the consistently. The SENCO is already addressing this issue.*
- Behaviour in classroom the Principal confirmed that the Inspectors are referring bottom set of year 11 English students
- Positive feedback was received about marking
- **Personal development** The Principal believed that the comment relating to the 'leaders did not foresee all the risks' was inaccurate as they had foreseen the risks had put measures in place however cyber bullying is carried out on other mobile devices not just I pads.
- The Careers provision given to students is good however because English and Maths results are not high enough then it limits career progression therefore it has to be a requires improvement
- All the work carried out by the Flourish team for the wellbeing for the students has not been mentioned.
- **Behaviour** – the Principal confirmed that the Academies attendance is above average but a limited comment of 'just above average. This was not in line with other Ofsted Reports as they had not put the limiter in.
- Some students show a lack of respect in the café **The Directors asked for clarification.**  
The Principal confirmed it was relating to one student not a few who was leaving through the wrong door and the supervisor challenged him.
- Exclusions are below average
- **Outcomes** – The Principal questioned the comment regarding Maths declining considerably as it was a 2% drop on levels of progress.
- Science – students are now taking 2 Sciences. Some students who were taking triple were not able enough and therefore were taken off the course to concentrate on other subjects.
- EBACC is only 1% below average
- Although it states English is significantly below average the Raiseonline report does not indicate that it is sig -
- **16-19 study programmes** – the Principal referred to the section relating to attainment being below average however this is not accurate according to published statistics.
- **Quality Assurance** – the Principal referred to the section relating to 'beginning to monitor. The Academy development plan had identified it as an area for development.  
**The Directors asked what documentation the Inspectors had access to.**  
*The Principal confirmed that they had had access to the QA system, Academy Development Plan and SEF (School Evaluation Form). They also had access to a large amount of data analysis however they did not study it. A large percentage of the judgement appears to be based on the 2015 examination results*

There was a discussion regarding why the Report had taken over 8 weeks to arrive. There was also questions and a discussion regarding the complaint the Principal had made to Ofsted. **The Directors agreed that the complaint must not be a distraction and impede the action plan.**

The Directors discussed the report and did not feel it accurately reflected the Academy. A Director suggested that the Academy should counteract the report by publishing a response in the CHAD. A discussion took place regarding this.

The Directors confirmed their support of the Principal and the other leaders. However the judgement would not change and the Academy needed to focus on improvement for the best possible outcomes for the students.

**The Directors agreed to form a working party who held the Principal and Senior Leaders to account on their progress on the action plan and work towards a successful Section 8 Inspection expected in 3 months.**

**Directors to email Clerk for inclusion.**

#### **4. MAT**

The Chair and Principal updated the Directors on the next steps.

Meeting ended at 18.45