



IEB Meeting

IEB Minutes – Through School

| | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Date of Meeting: | 22 November 2017 | Time of Meeting: | 2:00-4:15 PM |
| Venue: | Sunshine Room | Minutes Taken by: | Chito Sutton |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Attendees: | Mr David Willey (DW) | - | Chair, IEB |
| | Ms Debbie James (DJ) | - | IEB member |
| | Mr Richard Beamish (RB) | - | IEB member |
| | Dr Rizwan Syed (RS) | - | IEB member |
| | Br Arshad Mohammed (AM) | - | Head Teacher |
| | Br Shawkat Chowdhury (SC) | - | Deputy Head Teacher |
| | Mr Anthony Bolton (AB) | - | Strategic Business Manager |
| | Mr Steve Edmonds (SE) | - | School & Governor Support |
| | Sr Tahira Rafiq (TR) | - | Parent representative |
| | Br Haroon Rashid (HR) | - | Parent representative |
| | Mrs Chito Sutton (CS) | - | Clerk to the IEB |
| Absent: | Tim Boyes | - | BEP |

| ITEMS DISCUSSED | ACTION | COMMENTS |
|---|--------|----------|
| 1. Prayer | | |
| 2. Discussion with Parent Representatives DW – Welcomed the parent representatives and after introductions, informed the parent representatives that following the Court of Appeals ruling, the IEB has asked for a meeting with the Local Authority's Strategic Director which has been scheduled for next week, 29 th November. TR – Thanked the IEB for agreeing to meet with them. Explained that that they were selected by the parents following a meeting last Monday, 20 th November to be their voice/conduit and to meet with the IEB to relay their concerns, including some parents' lack of information or misinformation about the future of Al Hijrah School. The parents have asked for a feedback after. Parents also would like an open dialogue with the IEB. HR – Said that he has been involved with the | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>school for the past 10 years when his children started attending the school. Al Hijrah is the most over-subscribed school in the UK.</p> <p>Said that the parents were all united on the issue that is now facing the school. Reiterated that he and TR were elected by the parents to form a panel and represent not just the school children but also their faith as they have a responsibility to the wider Muslim community.</p> <p>Thanked the IEB for their time and asked what the parents can do for the future of their children. They needed to know what the IEB's position is on the Court of Appeals' ruling and what can the school do?</p> <p>DW – Told the parent representatives that there were varied options to consider but could not disclose what they were before next week's meeting. He gave them a historical background on how the IEB was appointed to the school and the challenges it faced and continues to face. Reminded them that the statement given to parents at the beginning (2014) remains unchanged, ie. both the Local Authority (LA) and the IEB will respect the ethos of the school.</p> <p>HR – Said that the parents were not into a blame game and recognise that the IEB have a difficult job to do. However, they would like to know where the school is now with regards to what was said years ago? What is the IEB's stand on segregation?</p> <p>DW – Assured the parents that the IEB, on any option discussed with the LA, will do all it can to support the school ethos within the law and the school's limited financial resources.</p> <p>HR – As a lawyer, he understood the IEB's position but asked if the option for the school to be re-designated in the same way as a school in London could be considered. Also wanted to know if the LA supports the school?</p> <p>DW – Informed the parents that the LA has always supported the school from the very beginning.</p> <p>SE – Said that the LA are already considering options for the school.</p> <p>HR – Reminded the IEB that a second site for the school had been considered for the past 10 years but no decision has yet been made.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>DJ – Said that due to an Academisation Order imposed on the school because of it being in special measures, the option to re-designate cannot yet be considered.</p> <p>Assured the parents that the school was working with the Department of Education, the LA Strategic Director for Children and the Regional School Commissioner and that the IEB will do its best for the school. However, the power to make the final decision is outside the IEB's hands.</p> <p>HR – With the board being only an interim, the parents are keen to find a viable solution. Asked what was happening with academisation?</p> <p>SE – Said that there were options that will be considered but for various reasons a solution has not yet been found.</p> <p>HR – Asked if a re-designation will have to be placed on hold until the academisation issue is resolved?</p> <p>SE – Replied that it was not inconceivable for both to happen at the same time.</p> <p>RB – Said that the Court of Appeals instructed the Department of Education to give the school reasonable time to implement its ruling. This could well mean allowing the Year 11 pupils to finish. Regardless, it is crucial to note that the school does not have a lot of time left. Academisation may be further down the line, so there may be a need to consider other options in the meantime.</p> <p>HR – Said that, as a lawyer, he understood the ramifications of the ruling. It must be followed. The parents are content with being an academy. Asked the IEB to consider this in tandem with segregation in accordance with their faith. Further asked what the parents can do to help?</p> <p>DW – Replied that parents will have to wait until after the meeting with the LA next week as there is no shortlist of options as yet.</p> <p>HR – Asked if there was a finite time limit?</p> <p>DW – Said that the judgment was not specific on this.</p> <p>DJ – Added that what is most important at this stage was clarity on parental views. Do parents want a status quo of staying on the current site with</p> | | |
|--|--|--|

a mixed school or a single sex education for their children?

TR – Said that the parents' biggest concern is the Islamic ethos. Segregation is foremost. Girls she has spoken to said that mixing with boys will inhibit them.

DJ – Asked if parents would consider a mixed primary up to Year 6 with segregation starting at Year 7?

TR and HR – Both agreed to segregation in Secondary School.

RS – Asked that when implementing the judgment, if no space is available thereby limiting options, would parents consider de-segregation or a one-sex education?

HR – Replied that this was discussed by the parents who preferred segregation of boys and girls on separate sites or same site as opposed to a mixed secondary school.

TR – Shared that one parent suggested an all-through single sex school, ie, all through boys school or an all-through girls school.

RB – Said that he looked a various options from school closure to integration so it was important to be clear on what parents will and will not tolerate.

HR – Replied that although the judgment was vague enough for a delay, it was inconceivable that parents will accept a mixed school.

TR – Said that it was comforting to know that the IEB was working towards a solution that parents want as parents thought that the IEB had a hidden agenda.

HR – Told the IEB that there were two things to say from the parents:

- that they were all united following Monday's meeting, and
- that they were giving the IEB the benefit of the doubt as it has now been 4 years since the IEB was set up.

Further, they wanted to know what the roadmap is to get the school out of the situation?

SE – Assured the parent representatives that the LA was working with the Regional Schools

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Commissioner on a way forward for the school.</p> <p>DJ – Informed the parents that the IEB was pushing hard and that parents can assist by writing to the Strategic Director and Regional Schools Commissioner to reinforce what they believe is best for their children.</p> <p>HR – Said that they will write to these officials on behalf of the parents.</p> <p>RB – Said that there was no reason why there should not be substantial contact between parents, school leadership team and the IEB.</p> <p>TR – Asked for further discussions between the Parent Steering Panel and the IEB as and when more options/solutions are found.</p> <p>AM – Said that all parties must work together and be active in supporting each other.</p> <p>SE – Said that AM's point is good as when a solution is put on the table, a pre-consultation and statutory consultation follow, and between these two stages, parents can help consider the potentials of said solutions.</p> <p>HR – Asked if any interested academy has come forward?</p> <p>DJ – Said that one was being considered but it was too early to report on its outcome. Assured the parents that the IEB are doing what it can to ensure that the school ethos is followed.</p> <p>DW – Asked the parents if there were anything else they wanted to raise?</p> <p>RS – Asked for an interpretation of the judgment. Does it mean no segregation? What will parents tolerate down the line?</p> <p>HR – Said that a year and half down the line, parents may tolerate the odd mixed assembly or mixed lunch break but parents are not that keen.</p> <p>TR – Advised that there is a need to manage the parents' expectations and to keep them in the loop. Parents were accepting of the judgment and just want to know what they could do to help push forward the school ethos.</p> <p>RB – Said that at the parents meeting he attended</p> | | |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>before October half term, the parents asked very pertinent questions.</p> <p>SC – Said that in his discussions with parents, they wanted to have regular contact with the IEB.</p> <p>AM – Said that communication with parents was very important and would stop others feeding the wrong information into the vacuum.</p> | <p>AM/SC to arrange for Parent representatives to attend the next IEB meeting.</p> | |
| <p>3. Apologies: None received</p> | | |
| <p>4. Declaration of Business Interest</p> <p>No changes declared</p> | | |
| <p>5. Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising</p> <p>Amendments given.</p> <p>Matters Arising:</p> <p>Carry Forward Items/Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AM to bring PM sample objectives at next meeting • All actions under Head Teacher’s Report | <p>Clerk to amend</p> | <p>Minutes amended and emailed to Chair 22 Nov 2017</p> |
| <p>6. Future Direction & Development of School CONFIDENTIAL A detailed discussion followed</p> | | |
| <p>7. Policies</p> <p>DW – Asked if the 4 policies for approval by the Board are based on the Birmingham models?</p> <p>AB – Confirmed that they were based on Local Authority models but that the Pay Policy and the Managing Attendance Policies contained changes that had been notified to the Unions last year and subsequently approved by the IEB. There were no further changes.</p> <p>DW – Asked what the changes were from last year?</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>AB – Reported the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Fair Access Policy – is actually a BCC policy and is merely a protocol between BCC and Birmingham schools on admissions (2) Pay Policy – adjustment in pay scales in accordance with the 2017 School Teachers’ Pay & Conditions Document. Options selected by the school are unchanged from last year’s policy. (3) Managing Attendance Policy – Although based on the BCC model, absence trigger points were amended last year and the unions were notified. (4) Safeguarding – the only change is the replacement of the IEB Safeguarding Lead from David Willey to Richard Beamish. <p>IEB – Approved all 4 policies.</p> | | |
| <p>8. Finance/Staffing (CONFIDENTIAL)</p> | | |
| <p>9. Head Teacher’s Report</p> <p>To be discussed at next meeting.</p> <p>DJ – Asked that the Board spend more time on this section concentrating on data.</p> <p>SC – Reported that there were four open cases involving Safeguarding with one relating to child protection.</p> <p>RB – Informed the Board that he was coming into school to liaise with Sr Saima and also to look at the Single Central Record.</p> | <p>Clerk to move this item to No. 6 in Dec agenda.</p> | |
| <p>10. Any Other Business</p> <p>None</p> | | |
| <p>11. Date of Next Meeting: 20 December 2017</p> | | |