

East Midlands Academy Trust - Standards and Performance committee

 Thursday 17th June 2021 at 1.00pm. Meeting to be conducted virtually.

Fourth S&P meeting of academic year 2020/2021

These minutes reflect the order of the agenda, not necessarily the order of the discussion.

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
1.Welcome	<p>Present: Fiona Wheeler (Trustee) Ayo Salam (Trustee) Stephen Morales (Trustee)</p> <p>Josh Coleman (CEO: EMAT) Katy Russell (Head of School Development: EMAT) Lorna Beard (Head of Safeguarding & Inclusion: EMAT) Giles Osborne (Lead AIP: EMAT) <i>Joined at 1.30pm</i></p> <p>Claudia Wade (Chair) Jo Trevena, (NIA HT) Andy Johnson (NIA) Jo Daniels (NIA) Connor Leason (NIA) Liz Dormor (PWS HT) Simon Woodhouse (PWS) Monica Juan – minutes – (Head of Governance & Compliance: EMAT)</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chair reminded all that the matters discussed in this meeting should remain confidential until such time as the minutes were ratified and signed off.</p>	
2.Apologies	Apologies had been received, and were accepted, from Bernard Weiss, Leigh Jones and David Houghton.	
3.Quoracy	The meeting was confirmed as quorate.	
4.Declarations of interest	<p>The Chair asked if there were any declarations of interest pertaining to this agenda in addition to those already recorded on the annual Register of Interests.</p> <p>FW declared that she currently had a child in NIA Y11.</p>	
5.Awarding Teacher Assessed Grades 2021 school's report: PWS & NIA	<p><i>Papers had been distributed with the agenda.</i></p> <p>PWS: LD and SW shared a presentation on the screen a ran through the highlights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments had taken place before the Easter break and Summer half term. • Marking and moderation had taken place within subjects • Evaluating the evidence and assigning a grade had been completed by Monday June 7th 	

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centre Policy had been submitted to JCQ and agreed with no changes • The Internal Quality Assurance took place on 8th & 9th June • Students had met with SLT afterwards to receive evidence details and sign the candidate confirmation form. Attendance had been high with Y13 at 95% and Y11 86% • Those not attending had been contacted subsequently by email/phone • Mitigating circumstances had been taken into consideration, with most of them already known by SLT. These were around mental health concerns and bereavement. • Final TAG decisions had been made during 15th and 16th June and would be submitted to the board's websites on 18th June. • External moderation by exams board would begin on Monday 21st June. • The Appeals policy would be finalised prior results day in August. <p>In response to a question from a trustee regarding what grade boundaries had been used during the awarding process SW explained that most subjects had used 2019 boundaries. The access to boundaries from November 2020 had been more challenging as the entry sample was very small for some subjects and the exams boards had created some boundaries which appeared to be lower than previously.</p> <p>In response to a question from a trustee regarding the awarding process and whether the trust could take away any lessons from the experience SW explained that one of the vital messages that had been cascaded to students had been the importance of building up good work evidence, as anything could count towards their grades in the future. The process had also been great CPD for teachers, helping them to build day to day internal systems.</p> <p>In response to a question from a trustee regarding the pupils' response to the process SW confirmed that the response had been overall very positive, with the majority of students accepting the evidence presented to determine their grades as expected.</p> <p>In response to a question from a trustee regarding the SLT meeting with the Heads of Subject and whether there had been any discrepancies in the assessment grades given LD explained that Chemistry results had immediately appeared to be higher than expected. However, after rigorous internal assessment the consensus had been that a combination of high achievers plus an excellent subject teacher had been the reason for the cohort achieving high grades.</p> <p>SW briefly explained the context and trajectory of DATA for Y13 and Y11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 13: Able cohort, with average calculated across 2017/2018 & 2019. TAGs were higher than average but not higher than 2020. 	

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Y11: First cohort since new Y6 SATS. Able group with an increase in vocational subjects. Disadvantage had continued to attain well and SEND students had performed better. Gap between Boys and Girls had diminished. Core subjects remained stable and had not moved away from 2019. <p>Trustees praised the level of rigour and integrity that had gone into the assessment process and the level of detail and analysis and thanked PWS staff for their dedication. LD thanked SW for his excellent and tenacious work.</p> <p>NIA: JT and AJ shared a presentation on the screen a ran through the highlights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar approach to PWS had been followed and best practice had been shared. First set of results for KS4 and KS5. No previous comparative DATA. Y13 - not home-grown cohort. Y11 - small cohort, large EAL numbers and low attainment with turbulent history. Robust QA had taken place focused on analysis, interventions and evidence as there was no prior DATA to compare with. Set of mocks had taken place before lockdown. Exam's officer had devised new system to collate all evidence. JCQ grade descriptors used throughout the process to generate grades, providing consistency. Bespoke 1-2-1 teaching had been deployed to support students that had struggle during lockdown. Extra sessions had been offered to students to achieve any necessary evidence missing from their files. Mitigating circumstances guidance had been published on the website and evidence collected through applications on the school website, assessed and passed on to heads of subject for their reflection against evidence for learners. External moderation had taken place regularly, working closely with PWS, HAT and Silverstone. All Deadlines for JCQ have been met on time. TAG uploading had been completed, ahead of the 18th of June deadline. Governance monitoring had taken place to assess process rigour. <p>AJ gave a brief outline of results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 13: All students recruited from other schools, with some learners having lower entry requirements, that had proven a challenge when trying to raise the value added. Large cohort (107 students) Around 18 different courses had been offered. 	

Agenda item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year 11: Cohort with a substantial number of pupils who had been new to the country in Y5. Students performed better than anticipated showing a positive Progress 8. <p>In response to a question from a trustee challenging the high Progress 8 score and whether enough scrutiny had taken place to justify it AJ explained that DATA had been scrutinised rigorously and there was enough evidence to show that the process had been followed properly, with results scrupulously marked against the grade descriptors. AJ clarified that understanding the makeup of the cohort was an important factor to take into consideration. From the total of 161 learners only 119 had counted towards P8, as so many had joined after KS2. A handful of high achievers from that 119 had had a significant impact on the result's average. Another group of students had joined NIA with low SATS results but had made excellent accelerated progress which had also positively impacted the score.</p> <p>Trustees discussed whether such high Progress 8 score for the school's first-time results could adversely affect subsequent cohorts and how the narrative would be sustained moving forward when official DATA would be published. JT reassured trustees that grades were not being inflated in terms of attainment and pointed out how much lower the NIA results were compared with PWS. A proper breakdown of DATA would be presented at the NIA S&P meeting.</p> <p>Trustees praised the level of rigour and integrity that had gone into the assessment process and thanked JT and AJ for their presentation and commended the inclusiveness and progress made by the school. Trustees asked for their gratitude to be cascaded to all NIA staff.</p>	
6. Policies for review	<p><i>The 'EMAT Behaviour policy' had been sent out with the agenda for this meeting.</i></p> <p>Trustees ratified the policy presented.</p>	
7. AOB	<p>Trustees thanked CW for chairing the meeting.</p> <p>There were not AOB</p>	
8. DONM	<p>Dates for the academic year 2020/2021 have been set.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tuesday 20th July 2021 at 10am 	<p>Calendar appointments have been sent</p>

The meeting closed at 14.26pm