



A brighter future for Nottingham children

# Education Improvement Board

Minutes of the Meeting of the Education Improvement Board of 11 July 2018.

**Present:**

Sir David Greenaway (DG)	University of Nottingham
David Anstead (DA)	Nottingham City Council (Education)
Cllr Jon Collins (JC)	Leader Nottingham City Council
Matt Lawrence (ML)	LEAD Teaching School Alliance
John Dexter (JDe)	Nottingham City Council (Education)
John Dyson (JDy)	Raleigh Trust
Pat Fielding (PF)	Nottingham Schools Trust
Wayne Norrie (WN)	Greenwood Dale Academies Trust
Kevin Fear (KF)	Nottingham High School
Chris Hall (CH)	University of Nottingham
Sian Hampton (SH)	Archway Trust
Yultan Mellor (YM)	Nottingham College
Matt Varley (MV)	Nottingham Trent University
Jo Moore (JM)	Nottingham Trent University
Cllr Neghat Nawaz Khan (NNK)	Portfolio holder Nottingham City Council
*Johnny Kirk	Nottingham City council (Admissions)
Phillip Burton (PB)	Nottingham City (DAISI)
*Gillian Heath,	Nottingham City (DAISI)
*Zarina Connolly	Consultant (Evaluator)
*Rebecca Montecute	Sutton Trust
(* Invited guests)	

**Apologies:** Rebecca Meredith – Transform Trust  
Alison Michalska – Nottingham City Council (Education)  
Andy Burns – Redhill Academy Trust

Sir David welcomed Isabella Kisielowska (IK) and Karen Smith (KS) (who have jointly taken over from Jen Hardy) and are supporting John Dexter.

**1) The minutes of the last meeting of 21 March 2018 were accepted as a correct record.**

**2) Matters arising and Chair's update.**

- Amanda Spielman HMCI will now be attending the November meeting.
- Recruitment and retention remains a concern. JD has been in touch with Derby LA and also made contact with Glasgow with a view to a conference in late November. He has also refreshed the Teach Nottingham website and twitter account to highlight opportunities. JD is looking with NCC colleagues at ways to use these facilities to boost recruitment and retention of school staff.
- EIB agreed to creating a fixed-term project group to look at employability and progression within the work of all other EIB sub-groups. Sam Webster was suggested as Chair.
- It was agreed that minimising the use of exclusion should feature as a main agenda item at the November Board meeting.

**3) Standing Items.**

- CH updated EIB on the business sub-group meetings since the last EIB. As agreed, this group has now been wound up in accordance with the new EIB structure.
- The budget update report was noted. JDe is still exploring the detail, however it was noted that around one year's worth of funding, at the current rate, still remains.

**4) Update from EIB sub-groups and projects:**

- JDe updated EIB on the progress made with the new headteacher groups. In future JDe will circulate a short report with the EIB papers, including proposals for future EIB funded activity.
  - A. *15 Primary Heads* had been invited to an initial meeting to discuss the group's purpose. Ten attended and three sent apologies. Discussion focused on 'the use of exclusion' and 'transition'. The group identified poor communication as an area for improvement. They are also keen to showcase good work.
  - B. *The Special School Heads* group also raised issues around communication between themselves and the secondary mainstream. Seven were invited, six attended and one sent apologies. They are keen to look at the brokering of movement between special and mainstream, making better use of their expertise. Progression and the links to FE were discussed and a meeting between the heads and FE was arranged.
  - C. *The Secondary Heads* are more established now. They discussed attendance, children awaiting a place and transition, including that of SEND students. As a result of discussion around data, JDe is to meet with DAISI and the heads to negotiate needs. 13 attended.
  - D. *The Deputy Heads group* is being coordinated by Pete McConnochie. Only one school did not attend. Issues discussed included the use of exclusion, knife crime and the benefits of deploying police officers in school based activity.
- *Vulnerable children's group.* JDy reported a proportion of permanent exclusions aligned with support from social care continues to rise and surprisingly a number of families with children permanent excluded also experience periods of homelessness. Employability remains a key focus for the PRU. Of 88 students leaving the PRU in the summer, 60 have college places, twelve of which are traineeships, eight have been seen by Futures and have options are still seeking placement with one currently in secure accommodation, and 2 registered for intensive support, and one on an EHCP. There are 158 pupils on Unity roll at July 2018, in Sept 2018 this will be 123. Present projections suggest this will become 163 by summer 2019. The proportion of pupils within key stages permanently excluded with special educational needs continues to rise (86% KS2; 64% KS3 and 45% KS4). JDy has undertaken two days working with Barnsley LA. They have a similar contact to Nottingham, with similar permanent exclusion numbers but have stronger funding.
- There are ongoing concern regarding child exploitation amongst excluded girls and the growing number of boys actively involved in criminality. This, along with 'off rolling', continues to be a concern. It was suggested by WN that this be raised with the local MAT's who work in Nottingham secondary schools and their Chairs of Governors. This was supported by CH. JC suggested the Police could also be involved at the meeting. DG moved that such a meeting be called for early in the new academic year.
 

**Action: David Greenaway and John Dexter**
- The difficulties around exerting leverage on schools to reduce the use of permanent exclusion was acknowledged, however it was agreed that the current situation is not sustainable.
- The work of Helen Blackman's team at NCC was acknowledged and highly praised by WM.

#### 4) EIB project review:

- Karen Smith has been in touch with leaders of all the current projects sponsored by the EIB. The paper circulated contained updates and the impact they have had so far.
- Peter McConnochie from NCC (formerly of NCSEP and chair of the deputies group) will help gain a clearer insight into the projects through school visits to seek on the ground impacts and collect suggestions for future work.
- The lack of clarity around the impact measures for the projects was raised by board members and the evaluator and accepted.
 

**Action: John Dexter and Peter McConnochie**

#### 5) Evaluation:

- Zarina Connolly thanked JDe and IK for their support in collecting information.
- Concern was raised over the loose impact measures which made impact very difficult to assess for both individual projects as well as the work overall. However softer impacts from EIB projects were evident such as improved teacher confidence, successful collaboration and the sharing of good practice.
- It was suggested that the EIB look next at the impact on disadvantage pupils and the benefits of early intervention.

- Discussion followed on the nature and role of the EIB, including the need to accelerate progress. Issues raised included the make-up of the board in terms of representation as well as broader secondary engagement and communications.
- The Board thanked Zarina for her help.

**Action: John Dexter**

## 6) Admissions

- DA explained that the purpose of this agenda item is to develop the discussions raised by the presentation given at the last meeting and to present the key messages of the 'admissions paper' that was circulated ahead of this meeting.
- Becky Montecute from the Sutton Trust commented on the national picture.
- The EIB had previously noted the following facts about admissions in 2016:
  - A. There is a net migration of pupils from Nottingham to Nottinghamshire.
  - B. Nottingham loses a higher proportion of high attaining children to Nottinghamshire secondaries. The pupils who transfer into the city are on average lower attaining than existing Nottingham pupils. Consequently, the city's attainment at Key Stage 4 is always likely to be below average even if progress at secondary is outstanding.
  - C. The pupils who are leaving the city do so through parents exercising their right to express a preference for their secondary school.
  - D. Equality of access for disadvantaged students:
    - In the schools which are oversubscribed, application of the admissions criteria results in disadvantaged students having a markedly lower chance of being accepted.
    - Disadvantaged students appear to apply for places in schools where there are higher proportions of disadvantaged students and vice versa. This is probably related to geography but perhaps also to low aspirations.
- SH welcomed the clarity of DA's paper.
- Options discussed were to:
  1. Take no action, however this will not help close the attainment gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged secondary students.
  2. Take action. This will inevitably have challenges with some perceived 'winners' and 'losers' with the losers wanting to be heard.
- DA asked for agreement to move to a more balanced admissions process. In Brighton and Hove LA, for example, this is likely to have contributed to a marked improvement in achievement over the last ten years.
- Options discussed were:
  - A. Random Ballot. This would be difficult to manage
  - B. Agreeing distributions by ability of 20% across 5 banding groups. This would need a city wide assessment during Year 5. It was likely to be difficult to agree the common assessment and there could be opposition to more testing.
- Secondaries can specify a proportion of pupil premium places to be prioritized which means that those oversubscribed secondaries would be asked to take a fair proportion. This would need agreement from all schools as they are their own admissions authorities.

**It was agreed unanimously that doing nothing was not an option** any longer, and agreed after discussion that balloting or banding both had a number of difficulties so were discarded.

- There was general support for making pupil premium a higher priority admission group at around the 20% mark in all secondaries. SH said she would be happy to look at this with her schools and WN was confident his schools would be in support.
- SH asked if the schools which are expanding and having additional places funded by the LA could have this as a required criteria? This was agreed.
- JDe asked if DAISI were able to do some modelling of how this may look. PB agreed they could.
- DG concluded that prioritising a percentage of pupil premium places was the preferred way forward and 'the right thing to do'.
- Next steps are to meet with the Secondary Heads and Governing bodies as engagement is needed, along with the Academy CEOs and Sponsors. JC is happy to support an additional meeting. There are now two agendas for secondary heads: exclusion and admissions. Clarity is needed on the proposals being put to secondary heads on both issues.

**Action: Jon Collins**

- JK offered to draft an over-subscription-criterion and a few suggested models for admissions and to liaise with DAISI to model the impact of each. 20% pupil premium for all city secondaries may be too low an allocation.  
**Action: Johnny Kirk and Philip Burton**
- Realistically we need to look at two years hence to allow for the required consultation in 2019 -2020 for minimum 6 weeks and the change will be ready for Sept 2021 documentation for admissions in 2022. DA to produce a list of steps for consideration by the Admissions sub-group. **Action: David Anstead**
- This item is to be on the agenda again for the November meeting for report backs and to progress further.  
**Action: John Dexter.**

## 7) AOB

There was no other business

Reminder date for the next meeting is **21<sup>st</sup> November 2018** then 20<sup>th</sup> March 2019 and 10<sup>th</sup> July 2019