

ENFIELD LEARNING EXCELLENCE PARTNERSHIP BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday, 8 February 2021 at 10am

Virtual meeting held via Microsoft Teams

ATTENDEES

Marcia Headon	Enfield Learning Excellence Partnership Board (Chair)
Tony Theodoulou	Executive Director of People - LA
Peter Nathan	Director of Education - LA
Lucy Nutt	Head of School and Early Years Improvement Services – LA
Jo Fear	Head of Admissions and Attendance
Linda Stone	Head of Curriculum and Standards - LA
CLr Rick Jewell	Cabinet Member for Safeguarding, Education & Children's Services
CLr Michael Rye OBE	Shadow Lead Member for Education
Androulla Nicou	Deputy CEO ELT
David Medway	Headteacher of Kingsmead School
Dominic Smart	Headteacher De Bohun Primary School
Dominic Spong	Headteacher George Spicer Primary School
Felicia Ferraro	Business Support Manager, SEYIS
Gail Weir	Headteacher Waverly School
Indigo Wolff	Chief Executive London Diocesan Board
Karen Jaeggi	CEO of Attigo Academy Trust
Kate Roskell	London Diocesan Board
Kate Turnpenney	CEO Children First Academy Trust
Kurt Hintz	Principal – College of Haringey
Martin Lavelle	Headteacher Southgate School
Mary O’Keeffe	Headteacher St. Ignatius College
Nicki Jaeggi	Headteacher Churchfield Primary Schools
Nigel Spears	Interim Director Diocesan of Westminster
Nuala Husband	Headteacher, Firs Farm
Peter Sweeney	Interim Director Diocesan of Westminster
Sujal Zaveri	Manager, Governor Support Service
Minute Clerk: Elaine Dodson	

MINUTES

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Peter Nathan (PN) welcomed the group to the meeting, and invited attendees to introduce themselves.

The meeting was chaired by Marcia Headon

The Chair reviewed the Minutes and action points of the meeting held on the 1 October 2020.

NOTED the completion of all action points by PN:

- i. Circulation of the Public Health briefing notes (Point 2: Q1)
- ii. Sharing Borough date specifically Turkish/Greek pupils (Point 4)

NOTED The Minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2020 were confirmed and agreed as a correct record.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

NOTED the Terms of Reference had been circulated in advance of the meeting and the Chair requested feedback and comments.

RECEIVED the following questions/comments:

Question: [Martin Lavelle \(Point 3\)](#)

How would we determine significant improvement on the baseline data for the highlighted targeted groups?

PN discussed the different target options:

- i. All pupils London average
- ii. Black Caribbean peers London average
- iii. White Turkish KS2 peers London average
- iv. Peer group overall achievement

The London average data outlined that there was a difference in outer London. London generally has lower achievement levels with certain groups i.e. Black Caribbean pupils, Turkish pupil which should be a focus. Other groups cited within the borough included Romanian/Bulgarian pupils. A further large group of concern is white working class boys.

Lucy Nutt (LN) commented that London tends to outperform national average; we could use ambitious London targets for now.

NOTED the discussion around specific groups:

- White British boys and girls
There is a gap between boys and girls, and boys are underperforming.
- White Turkish
In Edmonton White Turkish were a group who had always under achieved.
The Chair stated that Turkish boys should be included, as they were a group of significant interest.
- Amend the category from Turkish to Eastern European to encompass other groups.

AGREED the following KPI amendments:

- i. the word “significant” be removed and replaced with “at least London average”.
- ii. List specific groups i.e. White Turkish, Black Caribbean.
- iii. Change the category from Turkish to Eastern European.

NOTED that

Q1: Martin Lavelle (Point 7)

No permanent exclusions from Enfield schools by 2025, is this realistic or desirable? Presently the fixed term exclusion level is at a relatively high level.

Cllr Michael Rye concurred and believed it was unrealistic to state zero exclusions.

LN acknowledged that there was considerable work to undertake, and schools would need to be supported to achieve this target. SIS had worked with EPS re: Trauma Informed Practice, and there had been a lot of work taking place behind the scenes in terms of targets.

PN agreed that fixed term exclusions were high, and some schools appeared to be overusing them. Furthermore, Peter stated that the LA needed to work with these schools to reduce the numbers. PN would take this to the Secondary Heads Group to discuss further both exclusion targets.

ACTION: PETER NATHAN

NOTED that

Q1: Mary O’Keeffe raised the issue of including Post 16 Education, Autism, Speech and Language to the KPIs?

The Chair thought this was slightly premature, but it could be revisited at a later stage.

Commented [MH1]: Should be included but more work needed to be done to determine the correct KPIS

Q2: Mary O’Keeffe asked with regards to Post 16 data; which proportion of students are staying in the borough? Are schools engaging with the Enfield offer?

Kurt Hintz confirmed that there were a range of ways schools could engage i.e. A levels and different vocational provision. There were new initiatives with a wider set of targets to consider.

PN had discussed with Andy Johnson further KPI progress to Higher Education and to focus more widely, not just concentrating on A Levels.

NOTED that:

- i. Post 18 Level 3 provision in London had dropped 20%.
- ii. The number of adults with Level 3 is 63%
- iii. Enfield ranked 24 out of 32 in London at present

RESOLVED for PN to arrange a meeting to discuss Post 16 with Kurt Hintz and Andy Johnson.

ACTION: PETER NATHAN

NOTED that

Q1: Martin Lavelle (Point 12) Having sufficient spaces in primary and secondary and special schools.

Martin requested clarification that this was based more around special schools.

PN confirmed this was correct. Discussions were taking place regarding provision on alternative sites, but more work needed to be undertaken. Over supply could be changed to just Special schools which was agreed.

The Chair concluded by stating that more work needs to be undertaken on the KPIs going forward.

RESOLVED to accept these KPIs following the group discussion and review the KPIs in six months.

ACTION: CHAIR/PETER NATHAN

3. COVID-19 UPDATES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOLS STANDARDS, SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND MENTAL HEALTH

RECEIVED an update from PN:

There was good news, in that COVID numbers were coming down from 1,200 cases

per 100,000 to 192 per 100,000. The vaccination programme had really taken off in Enfield and the Dugdale Centre was now open as a Vaccination Centre. Consequently, it was anticipated that the Government would meet its vaccination target on 15 February.

It was hoped that schools would open on 8 March, but this of course was subject to an announcement from the Prime Minister. Headteachers were voicing that children need to be back in school.

NOTED that

a) Remote Learning Offer

It was now a legal requirement to have the School's Remote Learning offer published on your school website. This comes into effect on 12 February 2021.

The key issues being reviewed were:

- the quality of Remote Learning from the first lockdown to the present
- how catch-up would work?
- providing mental health support for Headteachers
- ensuring that a senior member of staff was responsible for mental health.

b) Mental Health Issues

Martin Lavelle stated that his school with 1,500 pupils was actively supporting 170 pupils with mental health issues (up from 140 pupils last week), and this was a real concern.

A staff/pupil survey had been completed and the feedback was, that they felt lonely, isolated in their rooms and worried about their work/transition/next steps. There was also concerns around support for Year 13 preparation for going to university.

The overview in respect of online, face to face lessons was encouraging and the pupils were engaging with this method of learning.

David Medway echoed Martin's comments. Since September 2020 mental health referrals to the Safeguarding Team rose dramatically. More funding is required to access support from professionals. Place2Be for a short time each week is not sufficient. However, the team is doing a fantastic job under the circumstances.

Pupils are struggling as they had no idea of what their future looks like.

There had been a higher rise in girls self-harming, which is picked up more quickly when the pupils are in school. In lockdown it is more challenging to spot the signs.

Androulla Nicou: Families and parents could not cope with home learning. There had been a real change from the last lockdown and we had provided a lot of support to families, which had been well received.

Karen Jaeggi: There is a need for more collaboration and networking across schools in Enfield.

Mary O’Keeffe: Mental health issues were significant. Transition from Year 11 – Year 12 consolidation. 50%-60% of the syllabus was being examined – reteaching GCSE skills onto university? Current Year 11 have concerns over their ability to access courses.

Gail Weir: Parents mental health is a critical problem. We are supporting families who are juggling looking after special needs children, supporting other siblings, home schooling and working.

There had also been a huge rise in staff mental health concerns. Staff are finding it difficult to cope and are struggling.

Dominic Spong: The school were piloting a Barnet/Enfield/CAMS mental health scheme, which was showing positive impact. He suggested that the borough could look at this as a borough wide approach.

d) Borough Response

The Chair believed that it was important to have a borough wide approach. This included complete borough sampling and picking up what is not on the website.

LN informed the group that a lot of support and initiatives were already in place for Enfield maintained schools:

- LA completed a website audit at the beginning of term.
- SIA conversation re Remote Learning Offer.
- Checking assessments
- Professional Learning twilights – available free to ALL schools
- Blended Learning
- TT education offer – hotline specific
- Supporting delivery of remote learning
- Next half term picking up on the SIA discussions.

RESOLVED that mental health needed to be monitored, as it had been raised as an issue. Mental Health to be added to the next Agenda.

ACTION: PETER NATHAN

Androulla Nicou: “As part of a Trust, I wish to congratulate Enfield, Peter and his team for their exceptional support, during this very pressured time for schools. They have provided relevant information and kept schools regularly updated on COVID, and Government advice.

Parents are struggling no matter what their background or ethnicity and are finding it difficult to cope with working and home schooling. It is important to enable pupils to access hardware; we have moved lessons more online, rather than paper based and the children are loving the face to face remote learning.

Staff are struggling with the workload and having to deal with their own family. “

4. **RECENT OFSTED INSPECTIONS/LA SEND INSPECTION**

LA SEND Inspection

RECEIVED information in respect of the SEND visit in advance of the meeting.

REPORTED that LA SEND and our new Head of SEN, Barbara Thurogood, received a three-day Ofsted visit which was held virtually. The visit went very well.

Areas to focus on:

- Digital Poverty
- Isolation
- Mental Health

Recent Ofsted Inspections

RECEIVED the two latest Ofsted notifications in advance of the meeting.

Although most pupils were performing well, some were falling behind. It was shared that it was not healthy for children not to be in school, and not good for their mental or physical wellbeing.

5. **WORKING GROUPS UPDATES**

a) Data Group

RECEIVED an update from LN.

NOTED that the Profile was confidential and must not be shared outside this meeting.

The Data Group was working on protocols to share with Primary and Early Years which the LA tended to receive. Secondary schools received KS4/KS5 data from the DfE, in the summer, but some were reluctant to share with the LA due to concerns around GDPR. LN reminded schools and academies that the LA had a right to this information.

Sharing data between schools was good practice and it was important for school improvement. Francesca Falcini was taking this to the Data Leads in Secondary schools.

The profile had picked up and identified some groups i.e. Bulgarian, Gypsy Roma Travellers, that do not self-identify. Ethnicity school profiles fall from Prospective Lite contextually. LN welcomed feedback.

NOTED comments:

- i. Trend information overtime could be included.
- ii. Borough Profile can't be too long, just key headlines.
- iii. Keep as simple as possible.
- iv. Put in graphs which could be understood more easily.
- v. See analysis – the Data Group have met a couple of times and are moving forward on shared protocols.
- vi. Census query. The source, data and date would be added next time by Francesca Falcini.
- vii. EHCP be included in data set. Have some charts ranked in order of EHCP, taking out additional resource provisions, as this is completed separately.

NOTED by LN regarding EHCP. We can discuss with the Head of SEN about including EHCP in the profile, but we need to decide what to focus on. The profile cannot be 100 pages long, and it would be helpful for data to be shared across the groups.

Androulla Nicou acknowledged all the hard work that had gone into the data sharing protocols. Well done Lucy.

Question Karen Jaeggi: Moving forward when we do not have any data, can this be taken back to the Data Group to discuss?

LN: How we work 2020/21 outcomes will be a debate for the Data Group. We need to see what will be most helpful for schools.

For example:

- Look at maths
- Issues around writing
- Consider Ofsted internal data
- Look in our profile, where we are as a Borough

Martin Lavelle: Thank you to the Data Team for keeping up to date, which would have been a challenge.

NOTED by LN that this would be taken back to the Data Group for further discussion.

ACTION: LUCY NUTT

b) Families Emigrated

Commented [MH2]: Is this a working group?

Question Martin Lavelle: Is there an admissions report of families who left in the first lockdown?

Jo Fear responded that families that left in the first lockdown were European families and no data was presently available. The admissions team was recently receiving this information from schools.

LN added that once the LA had the borough profile it would be easier to monitor.

c) Disadvantaged/Underachieving pupils'

The Marc Rowland, Disadvantaged Pupils Work report was circulated in advance of the meeting.

PN discussed the good practice the document referred to, and gave an overview of the project:

- i. 21 schools are involved, split into two cohort – 10/11 schools.
- ii. First cohort commencing in late March 2021
- iii. Following the first cohort there would be an interim report in September 2021.
- iv. Second cohort commencing September 2021
- v. Marc would spend a day in each school looking at policies, processes, interviewing staff and reviewing practice.
- vi. Each school would receive a report as an outcome from the visit.
- vii. There would be a final report which would be feedback via the Headteacher briefing.

Peter informed that the team would review the research and see what was going well, what to do next and other schools may wish to engage with the project.

NOTED by the Chair that it was important that the board received a report on the impact and outcomes of this intervention.

PN had attended a meeting last week, regarding raising the achievement of Black Caribbean pupils. He shared the meeting document, which he would circulate to the group. The project that had the most impact was the Brent – Champions programme” – Orlene Badu.

A conversation could be held with other groups mentioned and purchasing the Central training self-audit tool could be investigated.

AGREED that PN would obtain a copy of the report and circulate to the group.

ACTION: PETER NATHAN

d) Good practice applications

Commented [MH3]: I may be confused but is this the same as 8 below?

Eight good practice applications had been received, which were HMI sound. We need to discuss with schools to disseminate and link the Champions group between the two.

NOTED the group felt that it was critical that the borough share outside and bring expertise in. The work of Orlene Badu was crucial and it was exciting to take this forward.

David Medway stated he was happy to support this group.

Comments:

Karen Jaeggi: As a Trust we have worked with Professor Paul Miller, examining the curriculum we deliver. Hopefully, it would form part of the Champions programme, raising the aspirations of the pupils. Turkish should be a separate group.

Karen Turnpenney: Hackney has a diverse curriculum. Different schools with different issues.

David Medway: Invest in the correlation between pupils in certain group. Structured issues need to be addressed.

Androulla Nicou: Exciting to take this forward and learn from previous Greek/Cypriot underachievers.

PN: All groups are different. We need to work to empower communities; cultural and linguistic issues are important. Look at data, engage and analysis. It will be interesting to see how this project develops.

6. **SEYIS – Consultation/update on principles of service changes due to funding reduction**

NOTED PN shared on screen the draft “Principles of SEYIS Redesign”. Peter was meeting with staff on Friday to discuss. Please note that this item is confidential and must not be shared outside of this meeting.

The reason for this redesign was partly due to Schools Forum deciding to remove the £208,000 contribution to the SEYIS team, to support the school improvement function. This leaves a considerable budget shortfall. The service would still receive funding from the School Brokerage Grant.

School improvement should provide a vital service for the borough, promoting excellence in education and supporting schools in difficulty and improving attainment. Some primary headteachers have asked for a different model of support.

Some traded services were not currently achieving full cost recovery on the service provided. These include the CLC (IT service) and Careers Service and in this financial year the Schools Swimming Service. The Professional Learning team was a critical part of the service offer however, it needs to meet the costs of providing this service.

There needs to be clarity over the leadership of the borough’s work and support for early years.

There was a gap in support for schools in terms of safeguarding advice, support and guidance.

How we move forward: Comments and questions from the group

Question: Teaching Hub in North London managed by Brent. PN awaiting confirmation on that point.

Comments summary:

- Safeguarding is an important issue and it was agreed that it would become more critical.
- A Safeguarding lead was essential.

- Access to great people 2021 not 2010 model.
- Move in the direction of buying in top draw expertise.
- Buy in support that is required as an Academy.
- Have excellent expertise to really challenge schools.
- The best support and provision together.
- Access to what the very best schools have access to.

NOTED:

PN explained that some schools had accessed support which had made a real difference, using leads from the LA and people from outside.

LN had set up an external consultants list, with a wealth of expertise, and hence expertise could be sought rapidly when needed.

Anna Vaughan's PL offer had links with external providers, using their expertise and good practice in training. SIA conversations and a questionnaire around PL good practice gave the service a number of ways to strengthen their offer, when moving schools from good to outstanding. The team had tried to be responsive to school needs already and come up with a model based on local knowledge, ideas, development, priorities and links with expertise that may be external.

Karen Jaeggi: We need to move forward and commission different aspects of school improvement. Academies have different strategies, there is a place for PL but on a "pay as you go" basis.

LN: This is the model we are working towards.

Mary O'Keeffe: Expertise needs to be specific to buy in. We have bought in Christine Counsell and Pam Fernley.

LN: Confirmed that Pam Fernley is on our professional list.

Martin Lavelle: What implication is the £208,000 to SEYIS?

PN: The £208,000 is being removed, which is not unexpected, as it has happened in other local authorities. The present structure does not meet the needs of the schools. There are implications for staffing and hence the proposed service redesign.

The funds have been de-delegated and returned to schools.

Androulla Nicou: The de-delegated funds are from the maintained sector. It does not go to Academies.

PN/LN: It is good to receive feedback. We want to move forward with the best model possible. High quality is key and seems to be echoed by the group.

Cllr Michael Rye: The commission route is slow at preventing schools going into an Ofsted category.

PN: LN is developing a strong core offer which will be dependent upon how we manage with the resource going forward. Having soft information on a school, who may be attaining well, but may have other issues re: leadership. We need information and strong links which will be a challenge moving forward.

LN: the school interventions programme – recategorization meetings are in place. We have looked at information which will help identify early any issues, and SIA discussions form part of that. Whichever model we use there will be fewer SIA discussions. We hope to have set up something to see emerging school issues, before they become critical.

7. **SEND – Intervention/Prevention**

NOTED that the papers had been circulated to the group. An overview is given below:

- Speech and Language intervention project had gone through a number of boards.
- There is work still to be completed i.e. setting up/planning.
- Autism project is based around the Autism Service in the borough and what it is able to do and is 5 year project
- Speech and Language project is also long term (5 years), working with the health sector.
- Its aims are:
 - Easier access to provision.
 - Reduce number of ECHPs
 - Reduce high levels of financial impact

- In place by September. Recruitment is an issue but working hard to implement.
- SEND partnership to monitor outcomes and give feedback. Needs to be a longer-term plan, to make it easier to measure outcomes.

8. **GOOD PRACTICE DISSEMINATION PROJECT**

The guidance had been circulated for review.

PN: Discussed the project and timescale:

- i. HMI is working on applications.
- ii. Different schools would disseminate different projects.

- iii. Applications show excellent practice
- iv. Dissemination strategy though needs development
- v. Feedback to be given at the Head Teacher briefings – schools to give a short presentation.

Eight schools were presently taking part. Some schools were reluctant to join because of COVID.

Nicki Jaeggi: When looking to share good practice, can we be more specific about what the requirements are. This may be a way of getting more schools onboard.

9. **MEETINGS CYCLE AND DATES FOR THIS ACADEMIC YEAR**

The group had previously agreed to meet four times a year and the Chair would like to keep to this target. Schools will be challenged in March with the expected return to school for most pupils and it was agreed that the next meeting should take place in May 2021.

Meeting date: Monday, 10 May 2021 at 1.15pm (tbc)

AGREED that a meeting request would be sent.

ACTION: PETER NATHAN

10. **NOTED** possible Agenda Items for the next meeting.

- Exams
- Catch Up

If you would like an item added to the Agenda, please email the Chair and Peter Nathan.

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

NOTED that it is now a legal requirement to have your Remote Learning offer published on your school website. This comes into effect on 12 February 2021.

ACTION: HEADTEACHERS