



**ManorAcademy**

Excellence Through Innovation

Principal: Donna Trusler

**Minutes of the Autumn Term Governors Joint Curriculum and Guidance and Support Committee**

**Held in the Boardroom on Monday 23 February 2015 at 3.15pm**

To be quorate the meeting required three members to be present. The meeting was quorate with six members attending at the beginning of the meeting.

**Present**

Neil Melton	Vice Chair of Governors (Chair)
Margaret Lovell	Chair of Governors
Michael Douglas	Governor
Gail Shelton	Governor
David Stanley	Governor
Bill Pearce	Governor
Amanda Williams	Governor (from 4.15pm)

**In Attendance**

Katrina Kerry	Deputy Principal
Robert Gladwin	Deputy Principal
Chris Hudson	Strand Leader Flourish (until 4.09pm)
Hazel Robinson	Clerk to Governors (minutes)

**1. Apologies**

The Chair of the meeting accepted the following apologies:

Joy Parnham                      Work commitment

**2. Declaration of Interests**

None.

**9. Attendance**

The Strand Leader for Flourish gave a presentation of the Academy's current performance on attendance.

The absence for the academy for half term one was 5.87% which although appeared to be doing well the national figure for 2014 had reduced to 5.1% so therefore the academy's percentage of attendance was below the national figure. Pupil Premium students tend to miss 7.9% of their sessions which is higher than the national figure. Whereas non PP students miss 4.9% therefore there is gap of 3.1%.

Persistent Absentees at 8.5% are significantly above the national average Raiseonline 2014 figure of 5.8%. The percentage of sessions missed by Pupil Premium students is 11.87% whereas non pupil premium are 6.9%, a gap of 4.97%. The governors questioned why the persistent absentee figure was so much higher. The Strand Leader explained the system where two ladies work hard in attendance ringing home and when a student's attendance drops to 85% they are referred to targeted support with the local authority. In his opinion this was not particularly effective. There have been a few new admissions from other schools which have impacted on the figures. Also there had been some staff changes which impacted on the efficiency of the team.

A governor suggested that they could instigate an attendance panel. The governors also commented on the presentation of the data would be difficult to read for a layperson which makes an assessment

of the academy performance more difficult. It would also be more helpful if there was a benchmark figure of a target for pupil premium for something to be able to monitor against targets more effectively.

A Deputy Principal with responsibility for attendance clarified that in terms of pupil premium the target has to be the same as non pupil premium or all students as the gap should not exist. The analysis of the attendance figures has been moved to the data team so this should improve analysis.

The Strand Leader also added that students who were listed as persistent absentee may only be one day short of 85% so more targeted work needed to be carried out with them. The governors challenged why students who were problematic were being admitted to the academy couldn't they be refused. The Deputy Principal confirmed that as the academy is not full there are only a few circumstances such as a problematic year group that this could be the case. The governors wondered if the academy was taking more students than others in this category however the Deputy Principal believed that it was distributed around the schools who were not full. He added that the aim was to drive forward raising attendance with those students who had a greater potential to improve it. There was some instances where holidays had taken place out of school which now count as unauthorised absence. The governors were asked for feedback on feasibility of fining parents for taking their children out of school during term time.

A discussion took place regarding the feasibility of fining parents and moving targeted support. The governors asked that more information is sought regarding the success and impact of fining parents at other schools.

**Action: Strand Leader of Flourish to research fine strategy at other school/LA**

## **10. Flourish Report**

- Seclusions – the Strand Leader explained that the data in the Autumn Term must be discounted as it was not accurate. In summary the % of students in Year 11 had the highest seclusion rate of 12.6%, 4% of whom were repeat seclusions. Year 8 was the second highest with 11.9% with 4% of repeat offenders.

The Pupil premium gap for year 8 was 24.5% and there had been an introduction of using support mentors who were part of the flourish team to work with pupil premium and support mentors to try and raise outcomes and reduce behaviour incidents. Have support mentors and send students have a learning assistant mentor. Taking on this to try and raise outcomes.

- Altex – the Strand Leader presented to the committee the half term 2 figures for altex. The number who have been in Altex. The percentage of students in Year 8 was the highest at 6.9%, 2% of whom had been in a repeat Altex. Year 9 showed an increase from 2.3% to 6.4%, 3.5% of which were repeat Altex. The gaps between pupil premium and non pupil premium for Year 8 is 6.8% which is a reduction from half term 1 of 10.9%. However Year 9 had increased to 10.1% from no gap. The SEND gaps were also an issue in Year 8 it was 8.2% and in Year 9 13%. He acknowledge that this was an issue which he was taking steps to address with the additional sanctions such as Learning Behaviour Plan and ABC Contract.
- Exclusion - the Strand Leader presented the half term 2 exclusion data. The greatest number of exclusions was in Year 9 where 2.3% of students had been excluded. There was a gap of 8% between pupil premium students and non pupil premium students in year 9 and a 7% gap between SEND and non SEND students in Year 9 also. However the whole school exclusion gap had reduced to 2.89% a reduction of 4%. The national figure for exclusions was 6.87% so there the number of exclusions although an increase from half term 1 was significantly below average at less than 2%. The governors asked why there had been an increase in exclusions. The Strand Leader advised that it is because there was a co-hort of students where the other sanctions were not proving effective. The introduction of the ABC contract had increased exclusions with the process of increased sanctions developed to deal with poor behaviour. The governors asked how the Pupil Premium statistics compared with the national figures. The Strand Leader advised that there was not Pupil Premium statistics available however there was free school meals and the academy were below the average of 16.34%

### **11. ABC Contract**

The Strand Leader explained this is a graduated approach to behaviour. The Academy Behaviour Policy is a contract between the academy, parents and student and there are three expectations. The behaviour of the student is unacceptable the first ABC contract would be a day in ALTEX Then goes in increment to 10 day ALTEX when a governor behaviour panel is convened. This leads to second stage ABC contract which is a route from a one day exclusions to a 7 day exclusion to potentially a permanent exclusion.

### **3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Joint Curriculum and Guidance and Support minutes of 3 November 2015. Agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Vice Chair of Governors.

### **4. Reconstitution of Governors**

The Chair of Governors updated the committee on the recent changes. The members decided to reconstitute the governing body from 1 March 2015. Therefore all parent governors who no longer have children at the academy have finished their term. The arrangements regarding these governors was explained.

### **5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Dr Pearce nominated Mr Melton as Chair of the joint committee. Mr Melton accepted the nomination. Mrs Williams seconded. The governors agreed unanimously.

Dr Pearce nominated Mr Keward as Vice Chair. The governors to delay this as Mr Keward's absence meant that he was unable to accept the nomination.

### **6. Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes**

- Item 11 – Pupil Premium – The Chair of Governors updated the committee in that the academy had been visited by the DFE and their advice was to commission an independent Pupil Premium Review which is in process of being arranged.

### **7. Progress towards Targets**

- Stage 3 - The Deputy Principal for Progress and Achievement gave a presentation. As a result of the DFE visit the feedback was the FFT (Fischer Family Trust) target was not aspirational enough. The DFE referred to the Raisonline national average only and therefore the academy was no longer going to use FFT.

5 or more A\* - C in English and Maths- The target is 62% - the national figure is 55%. In autumn the academy was 44% and now in Spring 1 it had increased to 51%. It seven more students converted to C's or above in English and Maths it would place the academy in line with the national average. The starting points at KS2 of the students was being examined. The target for 3 levels of progress in English is 78%, the national figure is 70%, in autumn it was 57% and in Spring 1 data collection it has increased to 64%.

In Maths the school target for 3 levels of progress is 70%, the national figure is 70%, and Autumn 1 is 50% and Spring 1 it is 55%. Therefore the academy is moving in the right direction. The governors questioned how they could be assured the data is correct. The Deputy Principal explained that there was a process of triangulation where to ascertain the grade the students took mock papers, their books and whatever they had on their devices and it all agreed so that was the grade inputted onto the system. The Deputy Principal continued by advising the governors that the academy was focussing on 4 levels of progress so that the targets were more aspirational. The target for the academy was 26% however the 4 levels of progress national figure for English was 32% the academy figure was 18%. The national average for 4 levels of progress for Maths was 29% and the academy is currently at 11%. Therefore there is work to be done to improve progress.

The governors were concerned that the interventions in English do not seem to be taking as long as in Maths to take affect. The Deputy Principal confirmed that in Maths it is taught slightly different as it is topic based. The interventions this year are not specifically aimed at just the more able or disadvantaged students but the aim is to raise the aspirations of all students.

The governors asked questions regarding Maths and the Maths team. The Deputy Principal in response believed that the students worked better with a consistent teacher. The academy had invested an additional £100,000 in Maths teachers and a large amount of work had been done to develop a cohesive team. The Year 11 group is 172 and when a governor thought the targets were unachievable she confirmed that the targets had to be aspirational. They could not be reduced because the academy had to strive to achieve examination results at least in line with the national average. This would be inhibited by the historical examination results that students achieved in Year 9.

The Deputy Principal continued the presentation which included the EBACC (English Baccalaureate) figure which was currently at 31% which was above the academy target of 25% and above national average of 24%. The presentation included a bar chart which gave a different visual representation of the different groups: Key Stage 2 Banding; Gender, PPI, SEND, G&T. The governors discussed the graph and the possibility of the lower ability and the SEND students having a parents evening due to the lower performance. The Deputy Vice Principal thought this may be difficult as some parents of the students like to keep their issues private. Therefore it is more likely to be dealt on an individual basis. Also some of the groups are not large groups, for example there is only one statement student in Year 11. Some of the lower ability students although not achieving 5 or more A\*-C including English and Maths would be making 3 or 4 levels progress from the starting point. The governors thought it would be useful and would give more perspective if the graph had the number of the students in the group on the graph.

Pupil Premium the Deputy Principal outlined the recent figures for Pupil Premium students. The national average for pupil premium students achieving 5 or more A\* - C is 44%, the school results in 2014 were 19% and the Spring 1 data collection calculated at 44%. The national average for non pupil premium students is 72%, the school exam results was 59% and the Spring 1 data was indicating 69%. Therefore the national gap was 28%, the school gap in 2014 was 40% however the Spring 1 gap was 25% which was less than the national average. In addition the number of pupil premium students achieving 5 or more A\*-G at Spring 1 is 98% and the non pupil premium is 99%. Therefore the gap of 1% is substantially less than the national average of 10% and the academy results 2014 of 15%.

This in her opinion is a direct result of having a fully inclusive intervention programme for all students achieving progress.

The governors questioned if the intervention programme included all pupil premium students. The Deputy Principal explained that in September the data for Year 11 which had been collected in the summer of their year 10 was examined. All pupil premium students who were not achieving either 3 or 4 levels of progress were put on an intervention programme.

The governors asked if there was a focus on intervention from achieving a D to a C. The Deputy Principal confirmed that she had studied who was achieving a C or above in English or Maths and not in the other subject who would make a difference to the performance figures this included pupil premium and non pupil premium students. As a result 38 students who if they achieved their 5 or more A\* - C in English and Maths would bring the academy in line with the national average. The academy was also looking at the students who were not achieving 3 or 4 levels of progress. Also the gifted and talented shows the stretch and challenge intervention is working. The DFE have recommended that the Academy have some softer targets to include more groups.

- Post 16 -The Deputy Principal outlined the key performance indicators for the Manor College.

KPI	Expected	Spring
Average points per candidate/student	620.39	598.44
Average Points per entry	186.15	179.56
Average Points per candidate excluding hairdressing which is not A level point score equivalent	644.39	621.29
Average points per candidate excluding hairdressing plus 3 students who are not taking 3 A levels	684.81	667.93
Average points per candidate ( 3+ A Levels)	712.13	687.13

The governors complimented the Deputy Principal with the clarity of the statistics provided.

**11. Governor Monitoring**

The Chair of Governors had undertaken a monitoring visit to Enigma which was being uploaded onto Blue Wave Swift

**12. OFFSITE VISITS**

The Chair of Governors had reviewed the list and there was one incident on the ski trip where a student slipped on the slopes and injured their knee. They were treated at a private clinic.

**13. Racial Incidents**

There was no racial incidents to be reported.

**14. DETERMINATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY**

Students names on Post 16 presentation

**15. DATES FOR NEXT MEETINGS**

9 June 2015

*Meeting closed at 17.26*