



A brighter future for Nottingham children

Education Improvement Board

Minutes of the Meeting of the Education Improvement Board of 21st November 2018.

Present:

Sir David Greenaway (DG)	University of Nottingham
John Dexter (JDx)	Nottingham City Council (Education)
John Dyson (JDy)	Raleigh Trust
Pat Fielding (PF)	Nottingham Schools Trust
Wayne Norrie (WN)	Greenwood Dale Academies Trust
Chris Hall (CH)	University of Nottingham
Sian Hampton (SH)	Archway Trust
Phillip Burton (PB)	Nottingham City (DAISI)
Nick Lee (NL) (Alison Michalska)	Nottingham City Council (Education)
Chris Rolph (CR) (Jane Moore)	Nottingham Trent University
Richard Pierpoint (RP) (Andy Burns)	Redhill Academy Trust
*Amanda Spielman (AS)	Ofsted – Chief Inspector
*Jonny Kirk (JK)	Nottingham City Council (Admissions)
*Gillian Heath (GH)	Nottingham City (DAISI)
(* Invited guests)	

Apologies:

Rebecca Meredith	Transform Trust
Cllr Neghat Khan	Portfolio holder Nottingham City Council
Cllr Jon Collins	Leader Nottingham City Council
Kevin Fear	Nottingham High School
Matt Lawrence	Teaching School Alliance LEAD

Sir David welcomed Amanda Spielman Chief Inspector of school to the EIB meeting and stated he looked forward to sharing some of the work we do with her, and hearing her responses..

1) The minutes of the last meeting of 11th July 2018 were accepted as a correct record.

- John Dexter (JDx) – broader inclusion work within the city highlighted and how we are working with different stakeholders i.e. our colleagues in the police, health for example tackling knife crime. New sub-group to do with progress and pathways to employment/FE/HE.
- JDx – EIB Project Review. We are tightening up objectives and each of the project leads are being asked to evaluate their work. Sub-group are looking at what work we might commission in the future.
- Wayne Norrie (WN) – asked about a conference/meeting focused on exclusions. Sir David confirmed a conference on inclusion/off rolling hadn't yet been scheduled, but was still planned. Sir David stated he had a meeting with Cllr Collins and the idea is to have a one day event but need to be confident we have the appropriate representation to get this going.

Action: Sir David and John Dexter

2) Business Documents:

- Budget, Sub-group Feedback & Projects - These documents were circulated previously to allow more time for discussions with our guest Chief Inspector. Prof Hall asked if sub-group feedback could include clearer actions

Action: John Dexter

3) EIB Overview.

Sir David discussed the purpose and role of the EIB. An Education Challenge Board was established when a number of secondary schools in the City were put into special measures in 2013. Nottingham as a City has issues of being disadvantaged and faces a lot of challenges. For instance we have high levels of turbulence, mobility and a high proportion of English as an additional language where we are 12% above the national average.

In November 2015, the EIB was established and constructed a 10 year plan called Ambition 2025. This plan has deliverable targets which focused on teacher recruitment and retention, mathematics, transition from primary and English. The projects we have commissioned range from science across these areas to literacy.

Membership consisted of CEOs, Councilors, Council Leaders, City Head Teachers, College, and University personnel. We are all volunteers and the purpose is to: bring ideas together; develop the existing vision for education in our city and create a long-term strategic plan with clear priorities and timelines; and to promote collaboration.

4) Key Stage Outputs from 2018:

Philip Burton presented detailed data and the discussion points from the presentation were:

- DG observed that there has been some evidence of improvement. AS (Chief HMI) noted the evidence of the challenges.
- PF – stated that we have the statistics but now we have to think what action to take. In key stage 2 for instance we have work to be done around reading. Maths however is moving in the right direction but elements still need to be looked at. PF says that reading is the next push – some heads have introduced methods to help with reading but they are long term in their effectiveness.
- WN – no surprise with the statistics. Huge impact in trying to be inclusive with costs financially, in performance outcomes too, but there is a moral duty. WN stated that the poorest children in our community are not getting the appropriate funding from pupil premium. He added that there are a handful of children who are in prison and there is a need to understand what true inclusion means – including the issues around off-rolling
- John Dyson (JDy) added that he was not surprised at the data as many pupils are in difficult circumstances.
- AS - told asked Board not to be frank in their discussions and assured them as that would be most helpful to her..
- Sian Hampton (SH) – stated whilst we can compare different schools as we have the benchmarking data nevertheless the question remains what are we going to do with it. There is a lack of resources within different services e.g. social care and that it remains a complex picture.
- Nicholas Lee (NL) – confirmed that measures have been put in place with social care i.e. funding and targets
- JDy – spoke about the high costs of managing permanent exclusions. The City cannot manage the costs as there are financial and challenging circumstances.
- Gillian Heath noted that we are looking at this in a retrospective way and asked if secondary's might be prepared to share their subject choices so that the board can see what is happening now as opposed to the backward view, and that this might allow a helpful look at the use of resources. This would give us an opportunity to look forward facing as opposed to retrospective. GH asked how we use the intelligence we have?
- JDx talked about SSIF bids and whether they have made a difference? JDx to action – secondary heads. **Action: John Dexter**
- Sir David reflected on the socio-economic challenges we face.

5) Admissions Project Update:

- JDx spoke to an up-to-date presentation from the decisions taken at the June EIB. A reminder that the Board wanted school admissions to use their admission codes to encourage a fairer distribution of the PP cohort with all schools taking at least 20% Pupil Premium offer for each City school. Almost all our secondary schools are oversubscribed. Next on the schedule is to hold a meeting with Heads, CEO's and governors of individual schools, to include a forum/event for all Headteachers/CEOs.
- JK reminded the Board that he is reporting on pupil admissions (in year) to Lord Agnew every 2 weeks with information from across the City and the data is important and not always forthcoming. Timescale to have any discussions about admissions changes using pupil premium criteria ready for consultation in October 2019.
- CH reminded members of the overall aim and a need to look at schools which are doing well as they don't always have the same number or share of deprived children, pointing out that transport networks across the city is good to enable changes to codes.
- DG observed that universities had to widen access and this was an acceptable part of public discourse and asked why this wasn't the same case with schools?
- AS - pointed out that this as a universal service and is a bottom-up approach. This is different to the way universities operate.
- JDy however says that with the higher performing schools might risk their outcome with potential dips if they take more PP.
- JK - Nottingham Free school is the only secondary school which has pupil premium on the list of criteria but it is worth noting it is quite far down on the on their admissions criteria and therefore not used as an over subscription criteria
- SH was surprised the process for consultation and change had not been started yet.
- JDx – to send the OECD report and to follow up the action outlines. **Action: John Dexter**

6) Exclusions:

Including case study:

- JDx presented on permanent exclusions in the City WN and SH shared their experiences of working to avoid PX completely and the challenges presented.
- AS spoke about an EPI study which was completed by 321 students and looked at how many completed year 11 in a mainstream school. The figure was minimal and long-term successful re-integration is minute.
- JDy explained the PRU, in particular the Y11 cohort stating that level 2 passes are greater than level 1. NEET figures are much lower than national and that 14% still had no destinations but that Futures and the Trust were monitoring.
- NL - To help with inclusion over exclusion the LA had designed Routes to Inclusion (R2i). This programme is an intervention process which is going to be from early years and beyond. There is a toolkit for assessment which is

linked to early help and trauma informed practice. We have received very positive feedback. The key is that it brings together all the links and ensures schools have a multi-agency approach.

Reasons for Exclusion:

- PF – said that he is not surprised persistent disruptive behaviour is one of the highest as it is a vague and grey area, we need to see why. Do we know what those pupils need? Are they bored? Schools face pressure to produce results especially when they are in special measures.
- AS – gave her insights; it could be an inappropriate curriculum or poor teaching. There are a number of different reasons that leads to exclusion: peer pressure, gangs, children themselves, background etc. Children come into school themselves at 4/5 years old. LA's focus on statutory work. She was not opposed to PX being used and countered in some countries where PX was abandoned educational performance was declining. AS stated that she is more worried about children who go through the 'back door' not those who leave in a manner that is monitored.

Case Study:

WN reflected on Nottingham Academy, one of the largest schools in Europe. At the moment it is going through a process of amalgamation. Exclusions have gone down but says that he works closely with like-minded trust and wants others to join as well. MAT's should work closely together. Curriculum – boredom sets in with a very rigid curriculum. Teacher training is negatively perceived. Between 2003-2018 there was a big shift of all out of practical subjects such as D & T replaced by B Tec's etc. which are arguably less challenging. Questions why practical subjects have been set-back. National data doesn't show individual need.

SH said that her inclusive trust policy was data driven saying that many PX children would end up in prison or have serious mental health issues. Hence they are starting a pilot scheme where Bluecoat Academy and Nottingham Academy are working together. Bluecoat have two inclusion provisions within schools where they place children in order to try and get them back into mainstream school. They have an offsite provision for key stage 4 where they work closely with parents and children. SH added that a lot of children need an early diagnosis where they need clear information from primaries – transition. For instance a child should have gone to a special school as can't meet the child's needs in a mainstream school.

- Chris Rolph – suggests that MAT's can stand up and say what they're doing well and should be willing to work together to find inclusive aims. He added that in his experience a managed move was most successful as they have a shared responsibility and asked how effective the FAP and MM processes were.
- AS said she would like to see this at MAT level, how it operates as we need to do something different going forward – we must always be trying to deliver what children need.
- WN observed that some relationships in the City were stopping partnership work together and a call for a more open discussion.

Actions to revisit the plans for a cross City discussion on inclusion John Dexter and Sir David

7) AOB

There was no other business

Sir David thanked Amanda Spielman (and the members of the board) for their attendance.

Reminder date for the next meeting is **20th March 2019** and 10th July 2019