

CLF Post 16 Academy Council Meeting Redacted minutes

Meeting Date:	6 th February 2017
Location:	John Cabot Academy Post 16 Media Room
Time:	16.00 – 18.30
Chair:	Guy Keith-Miller
Present:	Kath Cooper Steve Topham Sarah Lovell Dan Nicholls Marian Curran Mark Woodgate Student 1 Student 2 Bryony Green Dereth Wood Lucy Gibert
Apologies	Roger Dickinson

Minutes

Item	Description	Action
1	Introduction, Membership & Apologies	GKm
	Support Staff councillor RA has tendered his resignation from the Council and this has been accepted by GKm, who has thanked him for his contributions. There will need to be an election to fill the vacant post, which will be held in Term 4.	KC/LG
2	Declarations of Interest	GKm
	There were none on this occasion.	
3	Minutes of Previous Meeting	GKm
	There was one update raised to point 6.1 (Finance Report) on the previous minutes: A £1500.00 central budget is available for training Directors, Academy Councillors and underperforming teachers. The minutes were otherwise confirmed as an accurate reflection of the meeting. GKm encouraged Councillors to sign up for training.	All
4	Matters Arising from previous minutes	GKm
4.1	LG confirmed that she is still chasing some outstanding councillor data. Please could you provide this as soon as possible.	
4.2	Point 7.4, Parent Survey – KC confirmed we are looking at centrally collating the feedback received from parents and via our numerous email addresses and creating a spreadsheet of all concerns and what action has been taken.	KC
4.3	P16 events that the councillors may be interested in attending will be circulated for your information. KC welcomed enquiries from councillors if they wish to attend the site(s) during the school day to see what goes on in Post 16.	LG All

5	Student Newsletter	ABC / LH
	<p>ABC confirmed that the newsletter circulated was the first one, and the content will be developed on an ongoing basis. MC asked how the content was decided upon – LH & ABC confirmed that they had canvassed the student population for their thoughts and were basing it on that. MC also asked how they saw this developing and ABC advised that successes, competitions, updated from each centre would be considered for inclusion. GKm invited them to go to UWE to see what they do as a student publication to get some ideas. GKm to discuss with KC.</p> <p>Communication has been a key topic for the student voice group and LH commented that they feel there are a variety of ways we can communicate with the students as well as this newsletter, depending in the subject matter – social media, email and letters. The CLF Post 16 Facebook and Twitter sites are being developed by LG and Tom Walker (Head of Post 16 at HWA)</p> <p>The full student voice/student reps group came together at City Academy recently. Strong opinions on the prom were raised which are being taken into consideration. Both were thanked for the work they have done on this project.</p>	GKm/KC
6	Risk Register – Educational Risks	KC
	<p>The Education risk owners were confirmed as MC & GKm, points 14 – 18 on the current risk register. KC advised that staff absence has been added as a high risk.</p> <p>P16-14: Rated as high, as some inconsistency remains. P16 pedagogy needs developing to resolve some of the risks in this area. Relationships with Principals and subject teachers are being developed to improve consistency across the multi-site provision.</p> <p>P16-15: KC Confirmed that significant progress has been made in being ready for Ofsted. DN commented that they could visit this year but would be more likely to visit when more movement will have been made since the last inspection. Post 16 will be part of the JCA review and the inconsistency of teaching remains a concern.</p> <p>P16-16: Teacher absence is a growing concern. To assist with this, funding may have been identified for a P16 cover teacher.</p> <p>P16-17: Results will be discussed as part of the Director Report.</p> <p>P16-18: The documents are more favourably aligned now.</p>	
6.1	<p>MM Risk Review – BG:</p> <p>This was a helpful opportunity to review whether adequate support/resources are being provided. One of the findings was that the use of the Risk Register across Academy Councils was inconsistent. The Post 16 one is considered good as it is used to add value to the agenda. BG has been asked to provide role profiles for the risk owners, but this is not used elsewhere and she is keen to see this develop and will work on it.</p>	BG

	<p>BG advised that she would expect to see some Council sign off on the mitigation of the red/high risk items to show that the Council has reviewed and challenged the point. In addition, it should be documented which meeting it was discussed at.</p> <p>GKm will take the risk register to the Chair of Academy Council (COAC) meeting, raise the issue of linking roles to the register, and enquire about councillor guidance on the responsibilities of being a risk owner. The risk owner will then be able to engage more with their topic to demonstrate it is being developed and tested.</p> <p>A discussion took place around the best way for KC to communicate with linked councillors, it was decided email was the most simple and timely method. Advice and guidance can be provided to KC on each point for development. KC will provide the Academy Improvement Plan (AIP) to each linked councillor to add a different level of detail. BG reminded that it is important to show you are getting value out of challenging and developing this.</p> <p>CM suggested a review of the items that remain red after mitigation; BG agreed it would be good to have the additional scrutiny.</p> <p>MC queried how we know that we have everything covered on the risk register – BG advised that we don't, it's an evolving document requiring constant testing and re-evaluating.</p> <p>DW enquired about the rating for Prevent – is this correct? KC will review the mitigation wording and review the rating. Discussion took place around what the status relates to, agreed that it needs to be clear.</p> <p>GKm stated that we should celebrate the strengths MM has identified – she was previously an Ofsted inspector so her review will have been robust.</p> <p>KC: We communicated with all teaching staff following the review – thanking them and referring to good practice and areas for development. We used the FNN evening to pick out threads of weakness and shared good practice over a number of topics to stretch and challenge. This was a positive and fruitful session and provides something to work on when the Post 16 pedagogy is reviewed.</p> <p>A coaching model is being considered that we may roll out across academies to encourage greater consistency in managing teaching and learning (T & L) across sites. Opportunities could be created to go to other P16 sites to see practice elsewhere. Good practice is evident where good collaboration is in place. This has been viewed as a positive step forward in a challenging agenda.</p>	<p>GKm</p> <p>KC</p>
--	--	----------------------

	GKm asked if drop in sessions were still being conducted. KC confirmed that yes, they are. Discussion continued around how the quality of T & L will shape future reviews of the teaching provision, and how we will work with the SLT in each academy to address concerns from the review.	
7	Finance Report	SL
	SL advised that the figures on the finance report are just this year as next year's forms part of item 8.	
8	Post 16 Strategy – Confidential Item	GKm/KC/DN
	<p>A post 16 strategy paper was presented to the board for information last week. A version of the paper had been circulated to the Council for discussion. GKm informed the Council that the post 16 Director post has now altered to become a Principal role and will shortly be advertised nationally. The successful candidate will then progress with shaping the leadership team.</p> <p>DN reminded everyone about the confidentiality of this paper. There are a number of changes in flow and funding is dropping rapidly. Concerns have been raised about the quality of education due to the number of sites over which we are operating. As a result we are planning to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the number of courses on offer from 150 to 100. • Aim for class sizes of 9 – 16 students. • Reorganise the leadership team. • Resubmit a Free School bid in March. • Reduce from six to two centres. This will provide less travel and more coherence for students. <p>Discussions are ongoing relating to the two centres that will be chosen. Due to the sensitivity of the discussions, this will be an executive decision. The Academy Council will be informed of the chosen centres when appropriate.</p> <p>GKm asked DN to explain how the two sites will be chosen and the process. DN advised that all Principals and KC had been involved in deciding which academies were best suited to the needs of Post 16. CM commented on the need for sensitivity regarding recruitment if course numbers are being reduced. All agreed.</p> <p>GKm informed the Council that we will be involved in shaping the Free School bid and it would be helpful to have the expertise especially of those involved in the last bid. GKm informed the Council that an initial discussion would be held on Thursday 9th February, anyone that is able to attend is welcome.</p> <p>MC asked how the Free School bid and the reduction of the leadership team sit together. DN clarified that the bid will take time to be approved and the school built, therefore it is unlikely that it will go live before September 2019. We need to have the SLT structure for September 2017 right; we don't want to keep reorganising but cannot future proof that far in advance. DW agreed that reducing to two sites would help P16 develop</p>	GKm

	<p>as an entity in its own right; students will be more strongly connected to the academies.</p> <p>DN – we will need to work hard to recruit students from Y11 to compete with St Brendan’s and the like. Falling numbers will affect future funding. DW commented that it would be useful to understand the risks in the new model and mitigate from the beginning. KC advised that in order to help mitigate against falling recruitment, we are re-interviewing all students that have selected CLF as their 1st or 2nd choice place of study to confirm the changes, help them with their choices and encourage them to still come. Only 8% of our current cohort does not travel at all, but in future approximately 60% will stay on the same site and will not travel. This may be a positive for some who are undecided. ABC agreed that he travelled a lot more last year and being more localised will be a benefit; people will have more of a connection with their site. He commented that it would be seen as a positive; the only issue he can foresee is if Y11 students want to stay at their own school for P16 and it is not one of the chosen sites.</p> <p>MC commented that a number of P16 provisions are reviewing their courses, particularly around performing arts. KC – some specialist subjects are at risk due to low recruitment; PE, dance, music; law. Some courses complement others therefore even with lower numbers may still run. Much of the reduction is in removing duplication and merging classes with low student numbers. A 5th block has been created to minimise clashes. GKm asked ST if he had any comments – he agreed that it is understandable, it’s down to funding, but staff will want to know where this is happening and what they will be teaching, this is where the main concern will be. Asking teachers to travel to another site may not be popular. KC enquired if ST thought that teachers would relinquish their P16 teaching if they were asked to travel. He said yes, it is a definite possibility. GKm asked if staff already have a provision to work across several sites in their contracts. DN confirmed yes. He also stated that we will work to ensure that those that travel are not unduly disadvantaged compared with those that do not.</p>	
9	Directors Report	KC
	<p>This report is larger than normal as it includes outcomes that had not previously been shared. GKm asked all Councillors to delete electronic copies of this report as it contains some student names. GKm reminded all that write papers for the Council, that student names should be anonymised, unless in exceptional circumstances – e.g. and outstanding achievement.</p> <p>GKm advised that the Gov.uk site is now up to date concerning rankings/league tables including those for Multi Academy Trusts. Some low attendance is reported compared with others. KC advised we are doing much better, improvements being made all the time. 50% at CAB now, a huge improvement on previous years. Students are now being held to account, 32 are on attendance plans, and we are supporting them on their journeys. GKm advised ‘regular’ attendance is defined by Ofsted as 100%. The Academy Council agreed to alter our attendance target to read 100%</p>	<p>Paper authors</p> <p>KC</p>

	<p>GKm enquired as to the reason our targets were lower than the Oxford Analytics targets. KC advised we made pragmatic decisions based on this but taking our actual results in to consideration. MC asked if these targets competed to National targets; DN confirmed that we have built ambition into the targets; it needs to feel achievable. ABC commented that they seem appropriate from a student's point of view. KC wanted the targets to be realistic and not be too much of a challenge, adding additional stress. We are still developing our target setting and we are taking care to set benchmarks that they can achieve.</p> <p>UCAS report – GKm asked what level of accuracy we had achieved – it was confirmed by KC that we had achieved 60% accuracy with actual grades against predicted grades. Discussion took place about the prediction of grades – are students being disadvantaged? ST commented that we might be predicting too high. DN – the figures are very promising; 75% got to their first choice university. KC - If we predicted differently, would they choose different universities? She acknowledged there has been a drop in applications – 186 last year, 130 this year. This may be down to a changing climate in options available, lots are choosing apprenticeships and some are taking gap years. 40% progress to Higher Education so we are in line with that.</p> <p>ABC asked at what point you decide not to enter someone for an exam if they achieved a mock U grade. MC advised that the mock is looked at, and a decision made at about this time of year whether it is appropriate or whether to enter them for something different, or just not enter then altogether. You need to assess how realistic that U grade was – what learning and work goes on after to support the student to pass an exam. ST concurred; some students have successful in-year tests, but get U grades in their mocks. This is possibly due to the timing – revising over the Christmas period can be difficult for a number of reasons, including family time and students completing paid work over the break. ABC said that the mock is not always a fair representation of the student's ability, as much work is put in after the mocks to support exam preparation.</p> <p>The content of appendix G1 was discussed in terms of U grades, P12/13. GKm asked for progress relating the report that was previously requested analysing D3&E3 predictions against actual results last year. KC reported that the data was difficult to obtain, but would be available for the next meeting.</p>	
10	Approval of exclusion and work policy	KC
	The Post 16 policy is still in draft as it is a legacy policy. It is on the website and a parent has questioned its draft status. GKm confirmed that it needs ratifying. KC to review the policy and bring to the Council for approval.	KC
11	Executive Principal Update	DN
	Nothing further to report as content covered earlier in the meeting.	
12	Safeguarding Update	KC
	The safeguarding of the mental health wellbeing of students is a primary concern. Appendix G3 was brought to the table due to the sensitive nature	

	<p>of the contents. This lists anonymised details of the provision of care currently being provided within Post 16.</p> <p>We are dealing with some very complex students and we are using exemplary practice to support them to achieve their best. Multi agency support systems are working; LH & ABC agreed that feedback about the P16 Counsellor was good. KC added we are looking at online counselling as an additional layer of support.</p> <p>Transport is being reviewed in light of the forthcoming changes. This will include the pick-up and drop-off points for the student buses to ensure their safety is being maintained, and that ID is being used to access the link bus.</p>	
13	Chair Update	GKm
	<p>GKm drew attention to the governance handbook – he will circulate the link to this. DN was asked to circulate the presentation given to the board. GKm advised that he has completed the National Leaders in Governance course and is awaiting the result.</p> <p>GKm again encouraged all councillors to take up the training opportunities recently circulated.</p>	<p>GKm/LG DN/LG</p>
14	AOB	
	None was raised.	

Meeting closed 18.30