

NOTICE
OF
MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FORUM

will meet on

WEDNESDAY, 24TH JUNE, 2020

At 5.00 pm

in the

VIRTUAL MEETING - ONLINE ACCESS, RBWM YOUTUBE

TO: MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FORUM

COUNCILLORS DEL CAMPO, STUART CARROLL (CHAIR) AND DAVID COPPINGER
(VICE-CHAIRMAN)

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS DAVID HILTON, SAYONARA LUXTON AND AMY TISI

Karen Shepherd – Head of Governance - Issued: 16/06/2020

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Mark Beeley**

The Part I (public) section of this virtual meeting will be streamed live and recorded via Zoom. By participating in the meeting by audio and/or video you are giving consent to being recorded and acknowledge that the recording will be in the public domain.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any Declarations of Interest.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the Part I Minutes of the meeting held on 26 th February 2020.	7 - 10
4.	<u>SCHOOLS DURING COVID PERIOD</u> To hear a verbal report on the above titled item.	Verbal Report
5.	<u>WORK BEING CARRIED OUT AROUND DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AND PUPIL PREMIUM</u> To hear an update on the above titled item.	Verbal Report
6.	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u> Tuesday 20th October 2020 at 5pm Tuesday 9th February 2021 at 5pm	-
7.	<u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC</u> "That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on item 8 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act"	-

PRIVATE MEETING - PART II

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
8.	<u>MINUTES</u> To approve the Part II minutes from the meeting held on 26th February 2020. <i>(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Governmet Act 1972)</i>	11 - 12

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in the discussion or vote at a meeting.** The speaking time allocated for Members to make representations is at the discretion of the Chairman of the meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, after speaking, Members should move away from the panel table to a public area or, if they wish, leave the room. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any licence to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FORUM

WEDNESDAY, 26 FEBRUARY 2020

PRESENT: Councillors Catherine Del Campo, Stuart Carroll (Chair) and David Coppinger (Vice-Chairman)

Also in attendance: Lindsay O'Connell and Helen Huntley

Officers: Clive Haines and Andy Carswell

APOLOGIES

None.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

MINUTES

Members stated that there had been some omissions from the minutes of the previous meeting. It was agreed that the minutes would be circulated amongst members once the amendments had been made.

EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECTS TO SUPPORT PUPILS IN RECEIPT OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING AS A RESULT OF LOW INCOME

Pupil Premium Children School Admission Policy

Clive Haines, Schools Leadership Development Manager, told the Forum that the proposals had been discussed at the primary and secondary school cluster groups. The feedback showed that primary schools were of the belief that the proposed changes were better suited to secondary schools, due principally due to the community values associated with a primary school environment. Secondary schools questioned at the cluster groups were supportive, but raised concerns at how school transport for disadvantaged pupils would be funded. It had been agreed to set up a working group of officers and secondary school headteachers to look at the cost and funding implications and for a briefing paper to be presented.

Clive Haines confirmed that all schools in the Royal Borough had had an input and been consulted, as all schools had a leadership representative at the cluster groups. Overall the feedback had been positive. The proposals were to be discussed further at a forthcoming BASH meeting and a working party would be set up, although there was currently no timeframe for this. Cllr Del Campo stated she was more comfortable with the proposals being implemented at secondary level, although she added that the concerns she had expressed previously remained. However she said it was important that the modelling and risk analysis was carried out.

Regarding a question from Cllr Coppinger about schools that had a Pupil Premium admission criterion, Clive Haines stated that these did not include, and made no reference to, school transport. Therefore the admission policies for these schools would need to be amended if the proposals were to be adopted across the board.

Years Pupil Premium Project

Lindsay O'Connell informed the Forum that 14 schools and five nurseries were now involved with the project, which was an increase. All had submitted baseline data and been booked onto CPD courses. All schools had been given the opportunity to attend what had been branded as 'nosy network' meetings, where staff would visit other settings to speak to their counterparts and learn of good practice.

Lindsay O'Connell stated that a bespoke CPD menu had been created, so that schools and nurseries requiring assistance were able to pick and choose where they needed help. There had been a perception that asking for help had been a sign that the school was doing something wrong.

Clive Haines told Members that the data showed an increase in nine percentage points relating to attainment by disadvantaged children. At Key Stage 1 attainment levels had been maintained in reading and writing and had improved in maths, which indicated the Early Years Project had had a positive impact. It was noted however that attainment levels were not as good at Key Stage 2. The full results were due to be discussed at a forthcoming Cabinet meeting.

It was clarified that none of the nurseries involved in the project were LEA funded, and that they were all linked to schools in deprived areas of the Royal Borough.

Pupil Premium Network Meetings

Clive Haines told the Forum that there was an intention for Pupil Premium to be the focus of a longer term three-year strategy, rather than a one-year strategy. It had been noted that national recommendations regarding interventions often did not work at schools in the Royal Borough that had small cohorts of Pupil Premium children. Some schools only had one or two Pupil Premium children attending and instead interventions needed to be made on an individualised basis. Pupil Premium children tended to do better at Key Stage 4, which was thought to be because they had greater choice of subjects and could study subjects they found more interesting.

The Forum was told that the Champions Network meeting would be taking place the following day. Meetings were well attended and Champions would go into other schools to look at examples of good practice.

REPORT ON THE QUALITY INCLUSION MARK FOR SCHOOLS IN RBWM

Helen Huntley, an inclusion consultant, introduced the item and explained to the Forum that schools were able to apply for an inclusion mark, where the schools would be accredited for their inclusive practice. Governors, headteachers and teachers, SENCOs, support staff and parents would all be quizzed on that school's inclusivity, and lessons would be observed. Some pupils would also be questioned; they would be chosen specifically, with some having special needs and others not. The adjudication panel would include a SENCO and/or headteacher from another school in the Royal Borough. So far eight schools had been awarded the mark, three were due for inspection in March and six more later in the year. All of the schools to be judged hitherto had been awarded the mark.

Helen Huntley said the process had provided a good celebration of inclusive practice and this information had been freely shared. Schools which had considered putting themselves forward for the mark, but did not think they were ready, were asking for SEND reviews to help prepare for the mark. A development plan would be put together to work towards this.

As none of the schools to be inspected so far had been rejected for the mark, there were still concerns as to how to have conversations with a school that was not considered to be inclusive, and also if it should be made public that a school had been rejected in its application for the mark. It had not yet been decided if schools to be awarded the mark should be re-inspected again in a few years' time. On the other hand, some schools had raised concerns

that they might become regarded as a 'honeypot' for children with special needs due to the inclusivity of the school, when there was no desire for this to happen. Helen Huntley suggested that greater transparency in terms of highlighting which schools had a high proportion of EHCP pupils may help, and discussions were taking place with the CYPDS to look at the feasibility of this. The Ofsted framework showed that the organisation looked favourably on schools that could demonstrate good inclusivity.

It had been decided not to rank a school's inclusivity and give out, for example, gold, silver and bronze awards; a school either succeeded in being awarded the mark or it did not.

The Chairman asked what could be done to reverse the situation where certain schools felt they were a 'honeypot' for those with special needs. Helen Huntley said greater funding and transparency were important; some schools had said they had a large number of children with special needs, but the data did not support this. Officers were working with the CYPDS team to boost transparency and relay to parents that being an inclusive school was good for pupils.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The dates of forthcoming meetings were confirmed as follows:

June 24th 2020

October 20th 2020

February 9th 2021

The meeting, which began at 5.00 pm, finished at 5.42 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank