CLF Post 16 Academy Council Meeting
Redacted minutes

Meeting Date:	**24th April 2017**
Location:	**John Cabot Academy Media Room**
Time:	**16:00 – 18:25**

Present:	Guy Keith-Miller (Chair)
	Kath Cooper
	Marian Curran
	Mark Woodgate
	Dereth Wood
In attendance:	Andy Hunter
	Lucy Gibert
Apologies	Roger Dickinson
	Chris Millward
	Steve Topham
	Student 1
	Student 2
	Dan Nicholls

Minutes

Item	Description	Action
1	**Introduction, Membership & Apologies**	**GKm**
	GKM enquired as to the progress of the recruitment of a replacement support staff councillor. LG advised that this has been circulated for expressions of interest by Monday 8th May.	**LG**
2	**Declarations of Interest**	**GKm**
2.1	There were none on this occasion.	
3	**Minutes of Previous Meeting**	**GKm**
3.1	Previous minutes were confirmed as an accurate reflection of the meeting.	
4	**Matters Arising from previous minutes**	**GKm**
	Key actions from the extraordinary meeting held on 3/4/2017 are as follows. Full minutes will be available for the next meeting. • GKM took an action to speak with colleagues and review the management of change process. GKm reported that he had raised with the Chair of the COAC and started this process. • Academy Council sought further assurances around funding model relating to average class sizes). • KC has checked with SL who confirms the 5-year forecast suggests this is affordable. The funding model for September 2017 has been agreed with SL. Average class sizes for September 2017 has not changed as legacy small classes affect the averages. (14-16 per class). Benchmark packs have been generated by finance on 3 and 5-year plans. SL to share the 5-year plan.	**GKm** **SL**

	KC confirmed that the proposed structure allows for growth but at this point, there will be no deputy/AP. The Post 16 strategic direction will be collaborated with the other Principals and they, with the Executive team, will cover where necessary. • KC was asked to add this to the risk register; This has been done (item P16-4, Align Strategy) • Overall council supported proposal. KC announced to staff 04/04/17 following board approval.	
5	**Student Newsletter**	
	Item deferred until the next meeting. LG to circulate the newsletter received from the students.	**LG**
6	**Risk Register**	
6.1	**Risk Register P16-17 – Outcomes.** AH presented the data on target grades and average point scores. • The data was questioned closely by MC and DW to gain greater clarity on what it represented. Particular attention was given to the prediction of E+ being the target average grade for year 12. MC questioned the credibility of the data and expressed concern regarding the target average grade. AH advised that data is input into Sisra Analytics and it generates the grade. AH assured the Academy Council that this is more accurate than last year. KC to review & revise data. • Strategic overview - MC advised that it would be more helpful to show academic and vocational data separately as there is potential for it to be confusing in its current combined state. MC advised that it would be possible to see more clearly, where the issues are when you compare with the Black Box data and can measure progress over time. KC will do another data set with these shown separately. • The VA was questioned as MC felt the formula was not accurate (bottom figure). The VA informs the progress of the class but does not identify which students it is making progress. The VA is a collective score for each grade within the class and then the total column questioned. MC requested that more strategic data should be presented over time, comparative to see journey, KC will review the data and resend for members. • DW questioned provision of GCSE resit Maths and English provision. KC explained that significant value is placed on resit maths and English at CAB, but the teaching quality requires improvement. Work with the Academy is ongoing, including instances of performance management, however progress has not been as fast as hoped. Alternative provision has been put in place to support these students. • MC asked how many maths students have been dual entered. KC responded that none had, as they are all Level 1. Anyone on a D or lower is entered into functional skills. KC advised that a stepping-stone is in place with a different teacher to support these students. • DW questioned whether all students need to do the new qualification?	**KC** **AH/KC**

	KC - Yes it is a requirement to the Post 16 funding that all students are taught the appropriate level of course to meet their starting point and be given an opportunity to move up to a GCSE in Eng or Maths. Do they have one chance to pass it, or will they move to the new curriculum? KC confirmed that they would have one chance. At what point do we look at functional skills for students that do not pass their GCSE again? KC advised that we will be running both courses next year so will assess individual needs. MC asked how many had expressed a desire to go onto Higher Education. She advised that they would need maths to do this. KC answered that approximately 30%, the rest will go on to apprenticeships. KC was actioned to assess what else can be done to support students in this cohort. • Further questions and concern was raised following the quality of the data. KC accepted that the data should be checked and will review and recirculate the strategic data analysis.	**KC** **KC**
6.2	**Risk Register - Red Risks** **P16 – 11** The red risk relates to teaching staff attendance and delivery of Post 16 lessons. This year 5% of lessons have not been delivered. KC has raised the concern at Leadership Forum, at 1:1s with the Academy Principals, at Principals meetings and with Executive Principal. Individualised reports on the impact that this is having on the students have been produced. GKm has raised this at COAC, scrutiny meeting and with Executive Principal. Initially an agreement was made that period 1 & 4 would be covered by the relevant academy, however: BBA – 75% have been covered KOA – 40% CAB – Not covering HWA – Not covering JCA – Not covering. By failing to provide cover, there has been a significant impact on the students. KC has been told that there is no budget to provide P16 cover. This year, if there was a surplus, we could have it, but there is none. There are also Union restrictions on asking teachers to cover other lessons that need to be taken into consideration. • GKm asked for clarification to the reported £100k surplus. KC advised that this, in effect, is artificial funding and has been put to one side by finance as a reserve. Due to an adequate agreement not being reached, KC has put two Post 16 cover teachers into the budget forecast so that we can be self-sufficient, one at JCA, one at BBA to cover peripatetic teachers. • MC asked about long-term staff absences. KC advised that some progress has been made and that agreement has been reached whereby these would be covered by the academies. The agreement is to be confirmed by Principals in 2017/2018. • GKm asked whether the actions taken have mitigated the risk and whether it should still be regarded as high. KC confirmed yes; however, this will	

	reduce when our new structure is in place. Any planned teacher absence will need to be cleared via KC first (meetings, courses, trips etc) so that we can plan; only sickness therefore will need responses on the day. All students will be expected to stay on site, as it is directed learning time, if more than one teacher is absent, there will be one room for all students to do their work with the cover teacher. We will make good use of the tracking system – SSLs will go to lessons to make sure that work has been set and the students are clear of their expectations. Under no circumstances will Post 16 lessons not be delivered. This remains a key concern and will continue to be monitored by the Academy Council. **P16 – 14** Underperforming teachers is high risk and high impact. 18 teachers are being performance managed currently but only 2 of these are on the teaching staff for next year. They will still be teachers but not for Post 16. KC has requested that Post 16 teaching staff to received separate KS5 performance targets, which will be managed by KC separately from academy Principals, who will manage their performance up to KS5. KC to report progress at the next meeting. **P16 – 15** Until outcomes improve this is still graded as Requires Improvement (RI) & the quality of T & L is 60% RI. An overhaul of KS5 pedagogy, Quality Assurance and a strategy to improve are planned. **P16 – 16** • Student attendance at CAB is a concern and effects overall numbers. • MW advised the council that at St Brendan's they have incentives to maintain high attendance. MW suggested whether we should consider this? KC advised that we have celebration assemblies, raffles, Principal commendations, so there are already similar things in operation. We have a more robust management system in place, which is always improving; we have a new work policy being approved and improved data collection to ensure it is more accurate. • DW asked if attendance is no better; but we just know where we are more accurately? KC confirmed that was the case. • KC –said that the new work policy and tracker system should improve this and will be effective. • KC explained that the barriers to some students attending is significant and in some cases hard to manage. There are safeguarding links for students with long-term absence. • DW expressed that it would be helpful to understand what we can do to improve next term. KC was actioned to look at options beginning at tutor level and to look specifically at BBA where good practice of handling attendance has been identified.	**GKm** **KC** **KC**
6.3	MW asked for clarity over his role regarding the risk register items he has been allocated. KC working with Head of Compliance to ascertain role profiles. This has not been straightforward, as this is not done for any other council. Action KC to draw up role profiles and circulate.	**KC**

6.4	, this be ed Gray, HR Manager.	**All**
7	**Finance report**	
	KC presented the finance reports on behalf of SL. The synopsis gives the overview and shows that due to restructuring and cost savings we have sufficient funds to move us through the next three years. £14k has been saved on exams and there is a forecast £28k surplus in April. KC advised there is no reserve budget currently for Post 16. If there is a surplus at the end of the year, it normally goes into a reserve, which, in order to access, you have to put a bid in for educational projects. KC wants it to be ring fenced so that we can access it ourselves for whatever we need it for without having to go through this process and potentially lose it. Action for SL to be at the next meeting, to look at forecasting, the reserve, class sizes and viability.	**SL**
8	**Principals report**	
8.1	• GKm informed the council that a new Principal Report structure was being used and asked for feedback. Any changes will need to be fed back centrally as all are now using this format. • DW – Found it harder to read quickly & understand than the previous version. • GKm – It is not easy to see if the data is good or bad – perhaps put a snapshot in to show any trends/context/improvement. • LG – layout changes (i.e. portrait to landscape) may make it easier to read – more on one page. • DW – The risk register is the most powerful thing – perhaps put items relating to that first. Feedback impact with key case studies.	**All**
8.2	Black Box Data: • MC expressed concern regarding the accuracy of the data. The Value Added totals are not accurate; and miscalculations mean that grades are incorrect. Maths remains a concern. MC explained how she presents Assessment Point (AP) data, which was taken on board for future AP drops. • GKm thanked KC for providing the data relating to U grades. U grades remain a concern. KC has put in place interventions to address. • MC congratulated HWA for excellent Sociology results. KC advised that the teacher responsible is helping legacy students to achieve their goals. • KC explained that the biggest risk continues to be teaching and learning (T & L) which remains unsatisfactory. • MC to share her template with KC to help inform decision-making. • KC asked if our data manager could spend time with MC's data manager to share good practice. MC agreed. KC to arrange.	**MC** **KC**
8.3	• MC enquired whether we have taken into account "fitness for study"? Ongoing issues with mental health mean some students need support to attend so they do not lose their place.	

	KC advised that anyone on the safeguarding register is not included in the work policy and each is dealt with individually by the SSL depending on their own circumstances. • GKm questioned three permanent exclusions listed in the report as he had no record of these. KC advised that these happened before census therefore were not true permanent exclusions; all were found alternative provisions. GKm asked that the language is changed and that they are not referred to as Permanent Exclusions.		
9	**Policy Approval**		
	To be deferred to the next meeting. Please email your comments on the SEND / any other policy to KC. The Exclusion policy needs to reflect the CLF central policy. KC to review to ensure compatible and make relevant post 16 alterations. To be brought back to the next meeting. The CLF do not have a central policy that can be used therefore this is a priority. GKm reminded KC that Post 16 specific policies needed to be brought to the Academy Council for approval before implementation. Timeline needed before the end of the year to be compliant. Each policy should have a cover sheet with approval and review date and Committee responsible.	**All** **KC**	
10	**Executive Principal update**		
	Apologies given by DN therefore no update available at this time.		
11	**Safeguarding Update**		
	Reported in Principals Report.		
12	**Chair Update**		
	GKm updated the Academy Council with regards to actions from COAC and the most recent Board meeting. He advised that the CLF Growth strategy is being raised at the board meeting next week. This will look at the fitness for expansion. KC questioned the approval of a Post 16 free school bid by Oasis John Williams. MC advised that this is a Post 16 centre for the school, not a stand-alone Post 16 provision like the one we are bidding for. KC – requested clarity on when the Post 16 bid will be assessed due to comments from the RSC relating to no further Post 16 bids being approved until after a Post 16 strategy for Bristol is approved? GKm advised that due to the announcement of the election Wave 12 has been put back. We intend to submit free school application at the next opportunity. We will assess the requirements at that stage.		
13	**Academy Improvement Plan**		
	GKm asked KC to outline how the AIP is used within the SLT. KC advised that the Post 16 SLT review the AIP every half term, adapting and updating milestones and ensuring appropriate ownership. Items are also included with in the Risk Register depending on their impact. The Risk register identifies continuing risk and is a global document. The AIP gives a further break down. KC – When a process is raised as a challenge, it will be documented on the AIP to manage its improvement.		

	MC – The AIP only tells the action to be taken, not where we currently are. To challenge the items, we need to understand this. MC suggested the addition of Red/Amber/Green (RAG) grading. This has too much detail, need to know the current situation, where the issues are, and how to address them. GKm suggested a "progress check" column & mark the RAG score there. Also populate the date column to show when it was last reviewed. DW – the AIP is brilliant but can sometimes find it hard to see the wood for the trees. We should look at 2 or 3 sections per meeting, and then pick the next ones to be reviewed at the following meeting. This will demonstrate the process of scrutiny and look at key areas where progress may be slow. GKm and KC to discuss this when agenda setting.	**KC** **KC** **GKm/KC**	
13	**AOB**		
	None		

Meeting closed 18.25