



IEB Meeting

IEB Minutes – Through School

Date of Meeting:	20 December 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
	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
	Br Haroon Rashid (HR)	-	Parent Representative
	Br Shahzad Alim	-	Parent Representative
	Mrs Chito Sutton (CS)	-	Clerk to the IEB

Absent: Dr Rizwan Syed - IEB Member

ITEMS DISCUSSED	ACTION	COMMENTS
1. Prayer		
2. Discussion with Parent Representatives HR – Reported to the Board that he and Sr Tahira met the parents following the last meeting and parents were positive about their feedback. Added that the 200 parents who signed up supporting the Focus Group represented half of the school pupils. Reiterated that the Focus Group supports the IEB and following the previous IEB meeting, they e-mailed the Strategic Director for Children and the Regional Schools Commissioner. They have received a response from The Strategic Director who informed them that he will be in touch in the new year but yet have to hear from the Commissioner. Informed the Board that there were mixed reactions from parents to the Headteacher's letter		

regarding the de-segregation of Year 5 pupils in January. Parents were unhappy that they were not consulted before this decision was made especially as the Head Teacher had informed them that there would be no change before September 2018. Advised that it would be helpful if communication with parents was managed better.

SC – Said that he had not received any complaints from the parents of Yr 5 pupils. One parent asked how the split will be made but was more concerned about the de-segregation of secondary pupils.

HR – Agreed that the main issue is the de-segregation of the secondary pupils.

Requested that parents be consulted first before a decision is made, not after, as engagement with parents would be useful.

Asked who would be the chosen sponsor when the school converts to an academy?

DW – Replied that the IEB and Local Authority were still looking for a suitable sponsor, even if there was no doubt that the school will become an academy.

HR – With the IEB now in existence for a number of years, asked if they were aware of any interested sponsor?

DW – Said that he could not name names until the Local Authority and the IEB have spoken to and approved the sponsor.

HR – Informed the Board that the Parents Focus Group's plan of action was to liaise with Birmingham City Council and to approach prospective sponsors who they believe will support the school ethos.

DW – Assured the parent representatives that the IEB fully supports the school ethos. He said that he has a good idea of how longstanding academies operate due to his involvement in the academisation process for Birmingham City Council for the past five years.

Added that the Local Authority is only interested in sponsors that will support the school ethos.

<p>HR – Asked what the IEB’s position was on the Court of Appeal ruling?</p> <p>DW – Replied that the school has no choice but to comply.</p> <p>HR – Said that surely with said ruling, there is now an urgency to academise.</p> <p>DW – Cautioned that the LA/IEB cannot be hasty if it will result in a detriment to the school.</p> <p>HR – Asked why the de-segregation of Yr 5 pupils could not happen in September 2018?</p> <p>DW – Replied that delaying de-segregation was considered a big gamble. The IEB expects OFSTED to make an unexpected inspection in early January 2018 and could not risk being criticised of non-action in complying with the ruling. The IEB was not prepared to wait for OFSTED to decree a compliance date.</p> <p>DJ – Said that she shared the parents’ concerns/frustrations. Assured the parents that there was no willingness on the IEB’s part to mix secondary pupils but is considering how best to protect the school in the short and long term. It was important to show OFSTED that the school was implementing the ruling. The Headteacher’s letter was clear that the de-segregation of Yr 5 pupils was not a pre-cursor to the de-segregation of higher years. Parents should trust the IEB to protect the school.</p> <p>Added that, at this point in time, sponsors were not willing to speak out because of the school’s issues. Said that it was okay for parents to look for other sponsors.</p> <p>Informed the parent representatives that the IEB believes that the solution for the school lies outside the current school premises.</p> <p>She met with the Strategic Director last week and again assured the parents that the IEB were on their side even if they differed on strategies used.</p> <p>DW – Reiterated that based on his experience as Chair for the last four years, he was pretty sure that OFSTED will inspect the school in January and cannot risk being accused of not doing anything to comply with the court ruling.</p>		
--	--	--

<p>HR – Said that he understood the IEB’s position although the parents would prefer the de-segregation of Year 5 to take place in September.</p> <p>SC – Said that the parents he spoke to were concerned that the de-segregation of upper years will follow after Year 5.</p> <p>SE – Repeated the point that caution should be exercised in that it was better to bottom out the pros and cons of statements first before public announcements are made due to risks involved.</p> <p>HR – Asked what checks and balances the school has when choosing a sponsor?</p> <p>DJ – Assured the parent representatives that once a sponsor is named, there will be full consultation with parents on what path the sponsor will take with the school.</p> <p>DW – Said that it was important to get a sponsor with historical evidence of supporting the school ethos.</p> <p>HR – Asked what will happen if a sponsor came along, acceptable to the LA/IEB in principle, but a full consultation with parents results in the parents rejecting the sponsor?</p> <p>SE – Reminded the parent representatives that it will be the Regional Schools Commissioner who will have the casting vote.</p> <p>DJ – Said that it was to no one’s interest to come up with a solution that parents will not be happy about.</p> <p>HR – Said that he did not agree with DJ’s statement. The court ruling was not to the parents’ interest.</p> <p>DJ – Replied that the IEB had a different remit.</p> <p>HR – Asked if the ruling will be taken to the Supreme Court?</p> <p>DJ – Said that that was not even the IEB’s decision to take. The IEB can only give its opinion.</p> <p>HR – Assured the IEB that he and SA will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inform the parents that the IEB was in their corner and are working towards the same solution; </p>		
---	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ascertain who the power brokers are and submit their petition to them, and find other sponsors. <p>He acknowledged the baggage that the school was carrying.</p> <p>SE – Advised that everyone should not look at individual elements but all the elements joined up when coming up with a solution.</p> <p>SA – Asked the Board how they could help further? Said that keeping parents on board was a challenge in itself and recognised the difficulty of different stakeholders being involved but wants to support the IEB and future sponsors. Assured that they will keep the parents engaged in a positive manner.</p> <p>DJ- Thanked the parent representatives for what they were doing. Asked them to keep up the sense of urgency by following up their cause with the Local Authority and to approach anyone who can further the cause.</p> <p>SE – On the Local Authority’s perspective, having a continuous dialogue would be extremely helpful even if it appears frustrating at times.</p> <p>Said that a wider parental engagement would only be helpful if was meaningful. An endorsement from Birmingham City Council and the IEB may help in the direction the representatives were going.</p> <p>Assured HR & SA that the BCC was taking the commitment to an Islamic ethos seriously.</p> <p>DJ – Suggested that at the next meeting, regular agenda items are dealt with first and the parent representatives be allocated a 15 minute slot at the end of the meeting at 3:45pm.</p> <p>RB – Asked the parents to keep up the pressure as some agencies involved do not work at the same speed as the school/IEB.</p> <p>DW – Thanked the parent representatives for their support.</p>		
<p>3. Apologies: None received</p>		
<p>4. Declaration of Business Interest</p>		

No changes declared		
<p>5. Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising</p> <p>Minutes finalised following amendments</p>		<p>Chair signed minutes 21/12/2017; redacted minutes posted on the school website on the same day.</p>
<p>6. Head Teacher's Report</p> <p>SC – Reported that the data was the same as the last meeting based on Autumn 1.</p> <p>AM – Said that attendance was 94.5%, down from the last term.</p> <p>SC – Further reported that the Autumn 1 data prediction of 90% was optimistic especially with the behaviour issues of Year 6 pupils this term.</p> <p>Disruptive students have been taken out of classrooms and gradually sent back. School held Saturday and booster classes. He himself has managed an intervention group of Year 6 pupils in Maths and Reading.</p> <p>The school held workshops for Key Stage 1 & 2 parents to teach them how to support their children.</p> <p>Said that he joined a working group of senior leaders from schools of similar background to Al Hijrah that share best practice, discuss issues, and visit each other's schools. He is scheduled to visit St Bernard's after the holidays.</p> <p>In Maths, there was not one single issue identified for the KS2 score. None of the teachers spoken to last year raised any issues. The Secondary Maths Leader has been asked to support the Primary in 2018 and will visit St Bernard in January 2018 to observe good practice.</p> <p>DJ – Suggested that the school take up the offer of BEP for a free 10 days' support for Primary.</p>	<p>SC-to provide Maths action plan/ interventions at next meeting</p>	<p>Actioned</p>

<p>SC – Also said that with the OFSTED reporting that the area outside Reception needed improvement, he will visit Harborne Primary School to look at their arrangements.</p> <p>Improving the area has started but due to finance restrictions, work cannot continue. A further sum of £1k is needed. There is a plan that can be shown to OFSTED that can be displayed outside the reception area in the Main Office.</p> <p>Said that the 2017 results showed that disadvantaged pupils were an issue. This is now being addressed. The school has signed up to RADI as recommended by Tim Boyes, BEP, and will be free.</p> <p>DJ – Said that the gap of disadvantaged pupils in every year was not bad. They appear to be doing better this year but require regular review.</p> <p>SC – Reported that a designated lead to look at disadvantaged pupils has been appointed who will be liaising with teachers.</p> <p>On behaviour, issuance of red cards in primary has not been an issue. Teachers have been provided with speakers so that they can be heard better in the classroom. They have also been instructed to implement a classroom strategy of ‘good to be green’ and issue positive rewards as well as mentor individual pupils.</p> <p>There was a slight increase in the number of red cards issued to Year 6 pupils but there was a drop in majority of the secondary classes.</p> <p>Said that the school started cracking down on pupils disrespecting teachers and fellow pupils last September resulting in a 57% reduction in offenses.</p> <p>There was also a substantial reduction in anti-social behaviour this term.</p> <p>On exclusion, there were 11 this term as compared to 21 last summer term. One pupil who was a candidate for a permanent exclusion has instead transferred to Waverley School on a managed move that is working so far.</p> <p>The school is trying to utilise the support of other schools eg, Waverley, Ark Boulton, etc on managed moves, through a sharing panel</p>	<p>SC – provide the members with a copy of the plan.</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
---	---	-----------------

<p>composed of Deputy Head Teachers. It will be a reciprocal basis.</p> <p>DJ – Said that the use of managed move to other schools rather than exclusion is commendable.</p> <p>RB – Said that the arrangement is a two-way street.</p> <p>SC – Said that he raised the issue of AH's small classroom sizes to the sharing panel and asked AB to check the legal requirement on the number of pupils for the classroom size but was told that there was no such requirement as far as Health & Safety is concerned other than entrance and egress should not be blocked.</p> <p>On attendance, Reception was 2% down from the previous report. The compulsory age for education is 5 and a lot of children in this class are aged 4 which means that compulsory attendance cannot be imposed. Parents are aware of this.</p> <p>Reasons for non-attendance across the school are medical illness, parents pulling children out of school to be home educated, and pupil going missing.</p> <p>RB – Said that attendance is normally better in the first half of the term.</p> <p>SC – Added that cold periods also affect attendance. He therefore hopes that next term might be better.</p> <p>AM – Said that the key thing is that the school has a good procedure for tracking attendance.</p> <p>DJ – Asked if the school was exacting fines from families who pull their children out of school?</p> <p>Also asked SC that for next time, to add a column in the report showing overall summary for primary and secondary levels, as this will be an issue for OFSTED, as well as to look at school's overall procedure on attendance checking on disadvantaged pupils as 5% does not make sense. Need to check proportion.</p> <p>RB – Asked if parents were pulling their children out of AH as a result of the school ruling?</p> <p>AM – Said that vacated pupil places have now been filled. Some pupils go off roll with the</p>	<p>SC – to add column for overall summary and review data on disadvantaged children</p>	<p>Actioned</p>
--	--	-----------------

<p>approval of the Local Authority even before the process is completed.</p> <p>Reported that some parents were agitating other parents on the issue of segregation. Thankfully, other parents were counter-challenging them.</p>		
7. Finance & Staffing -CONFIDENTIAL		
8. Future Direction & Development of School CONFIDENTIAL		
<p>9. Any Other Business</p> <p>RB – Said that he met with Sr Saima and discussed Safeguarding and he will send the report to the IEB at the next IEB meeting. Their next meeting will be on 18th January when he will look at the Single Central Record.</p> <p>AM – Said that the Section 175 Audit on Equality Objectives needs to be revised for next year.</p> <p>DW – Asked AM to email the details to the IEB so that these can be minuted at the next meeting</p>	AM – to email Equality	Sr Saima sent report to RB including action plan. Next meeting is 01.03.18
<p>10. Minutes of Governance Review- 13 Dec 2017</p> <p>Minutes of the meeting approved.</p>	CS – to forward approved minutes to SE	Actioned 01/01/2018
11. OFSTED Annual Report - CONFIDENTIAL		
12. Date of Next Meeting: 24 January 2018		

Minutes Approved:

David Willey
Chair of Interim Executive Board

Date