

Minutes from the Onewhero Area School Board of Trustees extraordinary meeting held Tuesday 28th January 2020, 6pm in the OAS staffroom

Item no.	Item
1	Everyone was welcomed to the meeting, this was followed by a karakia.
2	<p>Attendance</p> <p>2.1 Present: Aaron Reese, Owein Greaves, Tina Klay, Jo McIntosh, Rima Taua (arrived at 7:21pm), Cushla Carey, Simon Craggs, Stacey Ingram (minute taker).</p> <p>2.2 Apologies: Chris Lees, Rereokeroa Shaw, Rachel Hagan.</p> <p>2.3 Declaration of conflicts of interests or pecuniary conflicts - nil</p>
3	<p>Administration</p> <p>3.1 The election of Board Chair for 2020 took place. Aaron Reese was nominated Tina Klay, this was seconded by SC. There were no other nominations. AR accepted the nomination and was appointed Chair for 2020.</p> <p>3.2 The election of the Deputy Chair for 2020 then followed. TK advised that she was not running for this role this year and talked around the detail of why she was not able to commit. AR nominated Owein Greaves, TK seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. OG accepted the nomination and was appointed Deputy Chair for 2020.</p> <p>3.3 It was decided that the allocation of trustee portfolios would be left to the first monthly meeting to be held in February due to 3 members not being present at this meeting. It was requested that SI email all members meantime to determine their interest in staying with their current portfolio.</p> <p>3.4 Confirmation of the November meeting minutes was given.</p> <p>RESOLUTION That the November 2019 minutes be approved. M. Tina Klay S. Simon Craggs</p> <p>3.5 The proposed dates for the 2020 monthly Board meetings was tabled and a brief discussion held around the intention of agenda items where meetings were scheduled where there would not be a lot of school time to report on due to the holidays falling within that month.</p> <p>RESOLUTION That proposed monthly Board meeting dates for 2020 be approved. M. Jo McIntosh S. Owein Greaves.</p> <p>3.6 AR talked through the casual vacancy for a staff rep position which needed to be filled. The by-election detail was discussed and confirmed as follows.</p> <p>(a) Lee-Anne Annemans was appointed to the returning officer role for this election. It was agreed that additional hours worked outside of Lee-Anne’s normal hours in order to complete the returning officer duties would be paid at her existing rate.</p> <p>(b) Date of election was set as: 13 March 2020.</p> <p>RESOLUTION That the details listed above under (a) and (b) are approved. M. Tina Klay S. Simon Craggs.</p> <p>3.7 SC talked through the Fuji Xerox contract and the benefit of updating this, he also gave the background around the existing agreement and how resigning a new agreement for the remainder of the term would be positive for the school. It was advised that this was the best option in terms of what had been presented. There was a discussion around this with the intention to move forward with the updated contract.</p>
4	<p>Strategic decisions and discussions</p> <p>(a) Proposed 2020 Annual Plan tabled. SC was asked to share his view on the big things for 2020. SC advised the key things talked about with SLT don’t necessarily fit in to the strategic aims. SC said they had talked about changing the student and staff culture – the big focus on raising the bar and lifting aspirations. With students we intend on doing this through strengthening the academic mentoring program. YR 9 to 13 students would have a goal setting focus and that their first day back would be</p>

around this. The goals would then be shared with whanau (3 way conference) with whanau. The goals would be recorded and there would be check ins with the student to monitor progress. SC said that with staff, this was around a culture of leadership and talked about professionalism, policy, deadlines being met and having high expectations of student achievement. There would be a big focus on building the capability of middle leaders – this would be started with a review of middle management. These actions should strengthen the role of SLT and free up more time. SC advised that this was the only school he knew that did not have a middle management pastoral structure. This would start with the review, then build capability in middle leadership, training to lead not manage. SC advised that he had done his masters thesis around middle leadership.

SC then spoke of the learning focus being on maths and gave a handout to all members to read, SC advised that this was a strongly researched program. SC talked of Trevor and Rebecca Bills both having facilitated the program and advised that it has strong success rates in Maori and Pacific Island student results – this was a focus. SC continued that in terms of learning, they would be building on the local curriculum to put it in to practice in learning – using businesses, environment etc. and implementing in planning.

SC spoke of the focus on communication and that he was taking the lead on this, rebuilding trust and relationships. There were strong expectations of implementing the comms plan. SC confirmed that the community would be invited in to participate, instead of just being told what is happening. SC talked about himself being the liaison person with the community.

SC advised that those were the main focuses of the year, that there were other things in the plan that were peripheral but the above is what he sees as being key.

AR asked around the positive learning culture wording, questioning if this was behavior management. SC responded that the focus was on building a strong learning culture.

TK said that overall she felt that there weren't any measures detailed in the plan – asking how would SC know / measure success. TK continued that ultimately the Board needs to ensure student achievement, and questioned how the Board would know if there were no measures put in place of achieving the plan. SC responded that he felt he had tried to do this by putting in actions column. TK gave an example of the waka motif – asking SC how he measure this. SC responded that by the students being able to identify things and what they meant. It was said that the actions work towards the outcome. SC responded if every single action had to be measured how this would work. TK explained further by giving an example of the taniwha / challenges – the measure could look like a percentage of students would be able to recall this by a particular timeframe – 'Success is determined as 80% (or whatever % is agreed to) of students being able to recall.....'

AR suggested that they start working through the plan and ask questions by page. SC was asked to explain the waka motif (river and waka) and the 5 taniwha challenges and what this means. SC responded that this is the values, 5 competencies they want students to have. SC clarified that this would be stepped back, these competencies are what we want kids to be. AR asked for clarification on what they were. SC said they had not been set as yet. AR asked what this was replacing, SC described it as a new layer that they don't have currently. CC asked how the students would know this detail. SC said this would be communicated from a senior level, whanau and teachers and then talk through with students, it becomes part of conversations / goal setting. CC asked how goal setting would go. SC said that communicating this would start from word go this year.

OG said that he was used to seeing smart plans with dates detailed however there were no timeframe indicators in the plan. SC said that some will have, however some will build in to other ones. OG asked if that level of detail will be in the final plan. SC said he would add in outcomes and this level of detail. OG continued that at Board meetings they would then know what needs to be talked about due to timing of actions. JM asked about layering in something new, asking if there would be a bit of resistance re the change. SC responded that he didn't see it has change, it was just strengthening what they are already doing. JM asked what the measure would be. SC said that student feedback around current program had been variable. JM said that there had been feedback from some staff that it was quite loose. SC said that they would work collectively on building the program, therefore people would be accountable for it. JM talked about smart goals and flexible goals if they are not working. If it wasn't working what was the pull back, if it's not all falling in line with the plan what was the flex. SC advised that if it's in the plan it needs to be approved by the Board if changes are made. SC gave an example of the change made last year with regard to the expanding the student council.

AR highlighted that there were a few things linked to whanau time and asked how it would be consistently rolled out. He suggested that there needed to be a clear plan, and discussion – this is an expectation so everyone knows and is on the same page. SC responded that he had completed a whanau time job description last year but it wasn't front loaded enough, he said he would use the job description for discussion. AR continued that the plan needed to be introduced and communicated with the community and articulate the expectation to students as well. He emphasized the importance of communication to the community and sending out the plan/detail, that will help with accountability for teachers, students and whanau if everybody knows about it and are on the same page. It was an expectation that this was to happen. AR added that timelines definitely needed to be added in. TK asked if SC couldn't measure every action, how would he understand that it's actually happening, that just because he tells staff to do something doesn't mean that it will happen and be consistent. SC responds that if students can't articulate it, then the teachers are not discussing and doing what they need to. TK asks does that mean SC will have checks across term 1, 2, 3 and 4 –this is exactly what she means by having measures in place. SC said he would look at more check ins and when they should be. OG suggests that SLT should spot check whanau meetings and that this should be in place to measure this particular action. TK adds that if teachers are asked to do something but no one ever checks in around that it suggests that it's not that important. If the checks are in place it reinforces the importance of that objective. SC said that he was really trying to pull back on pastoral work to be able to get in to classrooms and have / hear the conversations. CC said that students liked it when the Principal comes around and visits classes that it gives the students a chance to interact with SC and build a relationship.

AR noted that the first objective said to 'implement phase 1' – asking if phase 2 was coming. SC responded that phase 2 is checking in on classrooms and checking in on pedagogies. This year was 'high level' as opposed to concrete engagements in local curriculum. AR said he wasn't sure the actions linked to other objectives. SC responded that all of this is unique to OAS, its local curriculum, it's not just about being out in the community, it's about our uniqueness. SC continued that all of this stuff ties in to how we do things here. The river journey ties in with local context. AR questioned if there was specifically a step where a local curriculum is embedded. SC responds that this is more phase 2 and not this year. JM asked if there would be the expectation that some will happen this year. AR adding that a big piece of the local

curriculum work had been done last year gathering information, this took a lot of community time and we need to communicate / update if we are not doing this year. TK said it would be good to understand what JL communicated, and if we spoke to RS would her expectation be it gets implemented this year. SC references page 4 detail around the Maori Education plan which ties in – it's listed under 'Community', saying that it was categorised separately but ties in. AR says in order to help us agree can JL put something together for roll out – highlighting the need to do something for community. SC explained that they did hold a parent / whanau meeting at the end of last year. TK noted that it hadn't been held on a good day to do it given school had finished for the year. AR reinforced that there needed to be an update and plan communicated. TK asked if there was a log of who attended each meeting, that they could be directly communicated with along with other communication mediums. AR continued that we need to make sure when we do consultation that the school then communicates back. If we don't front foot this after asking for so much, this may result in some people being unhappy.

OG asks SC to tell them about the 'led by' section, was SC comfortable that he had sufficient talent to implement everything – was there anything SC needed from the Board. TK requested SC put actual names in there so they understood who was leading the action. OG asked if SC was comfortable that he had the right teams in place, had they been delivering. SC replied, yes and no and that quite a lot work done, just need a bit more clarification around what is expected / terms of reference etc. TK referenced the learner profiles on page one and if there was a reason why they were these particular year groups. SC responded that these were the key transition points when students were graduating and progressing through different points, for example play based learning in to learner agency. CC asked what learner profiles would consist of. SC responded that this would be key skills. JM asked if SC could share this so they know what they are. It was agreed this would be shared and SC would sent out. SC said that all the documents would be collated together and when ERO come in term 4 this is what they would give them. AR talked about the need to communicate these with the community and be proactive once we have the stuff in place, we want people to have this information and asked how they ensure this happens. How will SC communicate and catch people up on this progress. SC advised this would be an email through kamar. OG asked if there could be a note along the lines of 'important information via kamar, please look out for this' put in all mediums; newsletter, facebook, website etc so it is not overlooked and missed. TK asks how the students will be measured on the different profiles. SC responds that the students will be able to self-assess, peer assess and parents will also see and that will be the measurement. AR asks around assessment through NCEA and PAT testing, there was a discussion around this - SC was asked to add these measures in to flesh out more. AR talked about Play Based learning and that this has been implemented for a couple of years now, how do you get measured on this. TK said that she was interested in the answer to this as her son is transitioning from year 2 to year 3 - how is the success measured from the implementation of Play Based learning. AR said it would be good to understand what you would expect to see versus what you actually see and if we are getting the results, is our implementation and how we are doing it achieving the results we set out to achieve, and did we know what these are. AR asked how do we ensure good ideas are implemented well, monitored and assessed by achievement. SC responds that they still have reporting strategies in place, reporting on other curriculum levels as well, however it was harder to capture the students 'want' to come to school and being engaged in learning etc. SC continues that they are still doing reading, writing and maths. AR asks having done Play Based learning how

results compare to previous years, TK questioned what was the comparable data. AR continued how do we know we are doing well enough, that this is working. SC responds that you will see in data, and it was looking good from preliminary data, writing had lifted in year 4 - positive lift. AR continued that with student achievement data when / what is the measure that we can say yes this is working, we need to be clear as to the what, the why and the results and how it would be measured. There was a discussion around this and it was agreed that SC needs to put some detail in the plan around this to ensure the right results and outcomes for the kids.

TK referred to the last point at the end of page one asking what the actual 'desired outcomes' are that are being referred to here as it didn't say. SC responded that this is what the profiles are. TK requested that the reference 'based on learner profiles' needed to be added to be clear on this. TK also questions if student achievement needs to be added to this same bullet point so it reads 'Measure student engagement and student achievement.....'. AR asks around the second to last bullet point that has RW leading it – how does this action happen and asked if this not already implemented. SC referred to feedback Bek Galloway gave, there wasn't the leadership or will to put in to place prior. SC continues that RW is the new Middle School team leader and that he will ensure this happens and support RW in this. JM asked how SC copes with opposition from teachers around Play Based learning and Student Agency. SC responds that JL has been quite clear that this is the direction we have headed in. JM asked around Bek Galloway and data on achievement, SC says if you visit the website you will see this. JM confirmed she had however she had not seen any actual achievement data detailed. SC said he would request from Bek and provide this to the Board.

JM said she had a general comment and feedback that most parents want to see student achievement up front however this was currently on the last page of the plan. SC replied that it was no problem to move this up front and would do this on the next version.

Everyone was then asked to move on to page 2 for comment. OG said he wanted to keep coming back to what support SC might need and how do they make sure that things are implemented well, that everything gets done and done correctly. SC responded that everything would be put in place. AR reinforced that the big thing is actually doing it. OG asked SC again what support could the Board provide. There was a discussion about the leadership review and SC was asked what support he might need specifically for this. OG added that this is huge and could be a whole term of work for SC to get through, there was a discussion around this with SC explaining there was a process, support and guidance. OG highlighted to SC that the communicating and consultation part would be challenging. OG asked SC to think about what this looks like, the challenges and what needed to happen. OG talked about the EO role and the flow on effect from this. There was a brief discussion around this. OG asked what they can do as a Board to support SC through this, SC replied that he was not sure other than to support him in the regular catch ups with the Board Chair (to act as sounding board). SC continued that he didn't think there was anything financially or anything from a professional development aspect and that the only thing would be when the report comes back for the Board to support it and give it the go ahead for SC to move forward with.

CC questioned the role of the Academic Captain (student) and what this was. SC responded that this has been put in place to lift academic focus in school. AR asks if we have that in place now. SC confirms that a student has been appointed to the role this year.

TK talked about a lot of the initials under led by being the same. And that maybe we could build in to the Board meeting program to have a staff member along to provide an update on the key initiative they are aligned to in the plan so the Board can hear directly from them. AR added that they could target something and then cover in-depth. TK added that this holds people accountable about how they are progressing with their key actions and that this supports SC at the same time. SC responded that it says LT that is for 'Leadership Team' and would be him. AR asked that a key be added so they understood the person or team leading the 'Action'. OG asked what happens if a member doesn't do what they are required to do, did this matter. SC responded yes because every other member will be asking them, plus it will be part of the appraisal process.

AR asked what the leadership model reference was. SC advised that a lot of people talk about leadership and what they think it is and that this was about developing a common understanding of what leadership is. AR asked what we do with the model. SC responded we break it down by year level so kids know, if they want to be a leader this is what they need to know / do. AR asked if this could be something that relates to the learner profiles, could this be linked to that page one objective/action and would it make more sense for it to be part of that as opposed to a stand-alone section. There was a discussion around this and it was agreed to include in the profiles.

OG asked what the consequences were for students who didn't exhibit these.

7:21pm – Rima Taua arrived.

AR highlighted that page 2 has massive chunky objectives / targets and that it will be a massive piece of work. SC responded that this falls on his shoulders. TK suggested that a timeframe needed to be implemented to ensure it's doable. JM asked that when setting the new structure how much did SC handle and what was the process. There was a discussion around this. SC talked about communication issue and it was a leadership challenge. OG stressed the importance of articulating this so staff understood the why behind the change. There was a discussion around the terms of reference Peter Gall has been given by SC and what levels he was looking at and how this happens. JM spoke of some of the staff feedback being around having deans in place. SC said that this is part of what he would expect to see from the review as we were one of the few schools that didn't have deans in place.

AR then asked everyone to move to page 3 to the Environment section and ask questions on this section. OG asked what is behavior management / consequences currently, were there detentions and withdrawals. SC responded that no there wasn't and that it was a case by case scenario at present. SC then talked about PB4L and putting a matrix in place. SC advised that the PB4L matrix they had in place before he started was thin, he'd looked at others which are much more specific. SC continued that PB4L do work in consultation with staff. AR asked if PB4L is a component of behavior management, SC clarified that it's the whole behavior management system – it's an approach. OG asked if the community knows about it, SC talked about the previous matrix and how it was too generic. OG asked SC what he wants to see, SC responded that he doesn't want a prescriptive one that doesn't allow for consequences and not punishments. JM responded that this is a tricky balance, sharing some feedback received through exit interviews indicates that some staff were under reporting behavior and that what the Board looks at was not an accurate picture and that restorative practice was not being evenly supported by SLT – they had felt unsupported in this. There was also feedback coming through that students were not being disciplined enough. AR said he had also had feedback that some staff were not putting incidents in kamar as there were no consequences any way and that

they didn't feel like anything was happening when they had been entering it in to kamar. JM summarised that potentially the situation is worse due to reporting not always being entered in to kamar. TK said that this could only mean that it would be worse than what has been reported to the Board. OG asked how this gets tightened up to ensure it is captured accurately. AR suggested that structure would help – structure what the rules are and gave an example of a standard situation *'if I do this then I can expect this to happen'*. AR reinforced that there had to be structure to it. It was also said that parents want to know. If it happens once in a term and is addressed it shouldn't happen again and if it does then something else triggers for the second instance. It was said that parents / whanau can help reinforce. SC said that's where structure is important and expect SLT to pick up second incident and send letter home. OG questioned if it is structure or process. SC responded that this is not a written down process. OG replied that they need to have a behavior management plan in black and white. SC then made reference to having a flow chart that explains *'if this happens, then this happens as a result'*. TK said that this needs to be presented in term 1, then a review set to ensure it's measured and establish if it is working. SC responded that if he doesn't have the structure in term 1 sorted then this could fall over and that he needed deans to pick up the repeat offenders. AR responded that he assumes in term 1 that there would not be a lot of instances and emphasizes that we cannot start the year not having a behaviour management process in place. There has to be a starting point and then the process evolves from the starting point. TK agreed saying that there needs to be a transition plan for now and it then reworked once structure is in place. SC says that SLT should only be dealing with major incidents or repeat offenders. AR asked what is happening around kids showing disobedience in the classroom, interrupting and stopping the class from learning. SC said that with students that they know from last year they will be having big whanau meeting to front load this and hear from them as to what their experiences are, they had used this initiative at the end of last year. AR said that the expectation that this will not be tolerated / continue needs to be set.

It was raised that SC look at moving bullet point 6 on page 4 to sit within behavior management section.

AR requested that SC remove the wording *'designed by Playscape'* from page 3 as this is not yet committed to. It was raised that the behavior piece was a monumental change. SC disagreed saying that compared to a lot of other schools our kids were well behaved, saying it's not mayhem out there with no consequences. AR highlighted that behavior had been flagged as the number one thing in both the staff and community feedback. SC said don't want to get hysterical about it, it was not absolute mayhem and said at the end of the day suspensions and stand-down's had been quite high. JM responded that we don't want to suspend kids, this is a terrible outcome for them, SC replied that some were inevitable. AR said this needs to be up and going fast, and it may mean that the initial process is managed by SC with SLT. Adding that it was imperative to communicate out what is up and running and where you are going to start the year off and ensure the plan and clear processes are understood by everyone. This can then be reviewed with any structure changes made. It was highlighted that it was important to communicate this to staff, students and families so they know what to expect.

It was suggested that bullet point 3 on page 3 could be moved to sit with same sort of stuff so it was all in the one place.

JM asked what AWE meant, in last bullet point on page 3. SC responded that it gives Wellbeing data. OG questioned if this was a school wide priority, SC said they had already been working on for 2 years an established a base line. There was a discussion

around wellbeing vs behavior. SC said that some kids don't and can't manage their wellbeing. OG asked if we are then catering to an individual, saying it feels like a lot and questioned if we needed to action now. AR questioned if it was about actually doing something now and that last year had been about learning about wellbeing and collecting information, questioning that shouldn't the focus now be on executing strategies from the information gathered and analysed. OG continued that he was nervous that there is a lot of change in the plan, JM agreed saying that the feedback from staff was that there was a lot of change. OG continued that the focus on behavior and leadership structure was a lot of work for SC and did this need to be now. OG asked SC what he thought, that there was a lot in the plan and he needed to be mindful of the workload. SC said he thought that they would do stuff anyway. OG questioned if this was the case did it need to be in the plan if it was a 'business as usual' item. The bullet point around 'litter and clean ups' was then questioned as to why this was in the plan as it definitely felt like a 'business as usual' item as well, it was agreed that it shouldn't be an annual plan focus. It was highlighted by AR that we needed to do less things and do them better. RT asked SC if there was any assistance he could get. SC responded that he had lots of support networks he uses, that his mentor principal was his 'go to' person, plus Peter Gall, responding that he had lots of people.

TK talked about the comms plan, it has been fully implemented and there were instances where it was clear it had not been used, TK asked how it will be measured to ensure it is used moving forward. SC said that this will be through staff culture, there will be clear expectations around policy and communication and that there will be no more excuses and failure to follow. AR questioned if it needed to be in the plan, TK stated that communication was a common theme that came through in the survey and that until it is business as usual it needs to be in here to ensure it has the focus. There was a brief discussion around one incident.

There was a query raised around the evening Te Reo classes and who was taking them / where etc. It was asked if RT was doing or was this a school initiative – understanding around this was sought to establish if it should be sitting in the plan. There was a brief discussion around this.

TK questioned as to why the annual Communication survey to parents / whanau was not in here. SC responded that it was in last years and therefore becomes business as usual. It was agreed that due to the extent of the feedback from last year's survey that this needed to stay in, with the intention of moving to business as usual the following year dependent on outcome of results.

OG asked around the goal setting conferences – where would all this stuff be tracked, visited and shared. SC responded that staff will be documenting this. OG asked what this will look like, how will it work in a group setting. AR suggested a template be developed to use to ensure this is done reasonably consistently. OG asks what happens if this is not done. SC responded that they will be held to account and that it will not be a good look in front of the parent if they are not doing this. AR said that there needs to be a check put in place around this.

AR asked around it being mentioned earlier in the meeting that goal setting was year 9 and up. SC advised with year 9 and up the focus is on lifting the bar. SC said they hadn't decided if this is whole school or not, however they were definitely doing from year 9 and up. It was questioned why this wouldn't happen from year 7 up to set expectations. AR continued that we get a whole lot of kids coming in new to our school from year 7, this would be a good place to start. The goals could get more specific as they go up in years. AR advised that it was imperative that there was a clear plan and clear expectation communicated to staff to work with, they needed to

have something consistent to work from. There was the need to make it clear to the middle school team leader and that this be rolled out. SC acknowledged that there would be more work in year 7/8 due to bigger class sizes. AR suggested that maybe the plan is done at school and emailed or sent home so it doesn't impact on teachers with late nights holding meetings at school.

OG asked if there was an updated roll number, SC responded that he had had a look in kamar however it didn't show all new enrolments, but it was around 540. SC said that the school started on 515 last year. AR asked as far as the students that have left do we know why they have left, SC said that yes he had been told. AR said it would be good to have this information for the first meeting to understand this.

AR then asked everyone to move on to the last page 'student achievement targets' to discuss. OG asked where we landed in terms of NCEA results. SC said that there had been a number of students relying on externals, advising that externals are harder to achieve. SC said that it's important that students have a plan. There was a discussion around this and having the balance of internals vs externals. It was asked if we are setting our students up to sit externals and that we wanted students to be well equipped to do well in externals. SC advised that the kids that are wanting to go on to uni do well and get externals. There was further discussion around this and an example SC gave and how internals work for all kids. OG asked how external results went, were there key themes / areas. SC responded that he hasn't analysed and dug deep in to the data as yet. He said that it makes the most sense to give kids the opportunity to get across the line. AR responded that he is just saying to do both and it would be good to review how we are preparing kids for externals. The stats detailed in the plan were discussed, OG asked if this was achievable. SC confirmed that it was doable. AR asked if cohorts were looked at when setting the targets / %, saying that it was important to look at this and acknowledge different cohorts. OG asked if the results were shared with the community, SC responded yes – every year via the school newsletter. OG asked if SC gets feedback or questions around the results once published, SC responded no not really.

It was suggested that bullet points 4 and 5 can be combined and put together. It was suggested that the wording 'or other professional engaged' be added after Bek Galloway on the 3rd bullet point as this was very specific to one person and if something happens we need the ability to have a secondary plan.

Bullet points 8 and 9, on page 5, seem to be repeated from earlier actions discussed – eg: goal setting. This needs to be consolidated to only feature in one place. AR asked around the goal setting, there was a discussion around doing this really well, consolidating and put templates up, we can then see what the students plans generate as a result, helpful for tracking also. SC said he was not sure there was a place in kamar to record but he would look in to this. There was further discussion around the goals being written down and students sticking to them, AR saying that the template would require a review section and that whanau teachers hold the students to account, SC added and parents as well.

There was a discussion around the target of 70% pass rate for Maori students at NCEA level 2. OG asked where the pass rate was for 2019, SC said nowhere near 70%.

There was a discussion around setting the target around this for the next few years to see it increase, giving example of a variation of 10%, then the following year a variation of 8% until we get to a point where it's the same. There was a discussion around how this could work and what has worked in past. OG asked if the person leading this required any supports to be put in place to help.

AR asked around the 2nd to last bullet point, questioning if this should be monitored by whanau teachers and not SLT. SC responded that by having SLT involved added

more weight to it and gives more of a priority. SC continued that it was extra important for these students. It was agreed that it should be implemented as 'SLT review in conjunction with whanau teachers'.

AR noted that the actions for Years 3-10 one year or more progress in writing and maths seemed quite light to achieve this target. SC said that there would be all sorts of actions in the classroom to achieve this. SC continued that they changed the focus of writing and have had some big gains as a result. JM questioned if parents would also want to see reading in there as well. SC responded that reading sits ok, that we sit above NZ standard.

AR questioned writing being in here if we have implemented something that is working, doesn't this then become business as usual. AR asked if the Bek Galloway action detailed is new to what we have done. SC responded not really, no – it was around consolidating. AR recommended that if there are actions to put in around writing that are new then to leave in however if not it was just business as usual and didn't need to be in plan.

AR queried the very first bullet point on page 5, saying we must be doing more than PD to get the outcome listed. SC advised that the Developing Mathematical Inquiry Communities was a big program. AR responded that there is nothing detailed in the plan around a program and the timelines of the program, it was agreed that this detail and timing is required to go in. AR asked where the program has come from, SC responded that it's from Massey Uni and that there is a facilitator that works with the school. AR asked if we have them booked in to review, this was the ideal stuff for the Board to see. It was agreed that timing was to be detailed and that it also needed to include a 'review completed by' date in it. It was said that implementing change had been a weakness in the past and that we need to ensure that the learnings have been taken on board and change is well planned, communicated, measured and reviewed etc.

AR asked about overall targets, Bek Galloway had done some analysis stuff for us and that there were different levels within year groups – were there targets for where they are at. SC responded yes, student achievement. AR said that there are targets for NCEA stuff but shouldn't some other ones be in here as well. There was a discussion around this and it was suggested that there should be targets for reading, writing and maths – these 3 cover different areas kids prefer. CC asked about the kids that don't do well at PE, AR responded that the Boards priority is that we look at key academic. AR continued that seeing how they are progressing through middle school, how they are going and what can be done before that. He then questioned why wouldn't we give ourselves targets in these areas. JM asked if this could be part of the learner profile, SC responds that learner profile is more around skills vs academic. AR said that getting data and setting targets is key and that if they had of seen the year 10 struggles early they would have been able to do something, looked at methods and ways to catch them up. OG said that he thinks we need to get the basics right, that this plan has lots of work for SC and suggested that SC draw himself a timeline and identifies crunch areas. OG asked SC if he thought his plan is achievable, saying he thought it was a big ask and a lot of change. AR also recommended that SC look at a timeline. OG asked SC what supports did he need, put in the timeframes and see if he felt this was all possible. OG tells SC that there is also his own stuff and commitments to consider as well – eg Springboard Trust, which involved time away from school. SC confirmed this as being 9 days. OG asked SC if he has any supports around leading this stuff. SC confirmed he did, plus a professional learning group. OG asked if SC had gotten feedback around the plan and if any other Principals had seen it and given their thoughts. SC advised that he had last year. OG shared that in his world this is a lot of

	<p>work for a year on top of the business as usual stuff. SC responds that some of it is. OG clarifies that he is referring to change. OG asked when the plan has to be locked down by, SC advised by the next Board meeting, it will need to be approved then uploaded to MOE by 31 March. OG asked SC if he would share it with staff before it was locked down. SC responded yes that it was a staff plan. OG acknowledged that there is some pretty good stuff in the plan, and that it was positive.</p> <p>AR advised that CL had sent through feedback seeing he was not able to be present tonight and AR would go through this quickly now to check that there is nothing that has not already been covered. CL had concerns around implementation of change and new programs – that there needed to be proper project plans in place. CL had also said that excellent work had been done on the marae in terms of the local curriculum, however the rest of the community had limited knowledge. There needed to be follow up and communication. CL also wanted to ensure SC had enough behavior management resources. There was a discussion around PB4L. AR then continues, saying that CL had also raised a query around how academically strong students will be identified and stretched, SC advised that this will be through having stretch targets in their goal setting plans. CL raised a point around the use of research (in the 7th bullet point on page 5) it was agreed that SC is to review wording on this. AR continued that CL had also raised a query around Maori achievement which had been discussed earlier in the night. CL had also asked the question as to what the plans were with the non-academic year 12/13 students. SC advised that they would be well catered for. CL also raised his concern around English being merged with Integrated Studies however Wellbeing and Health were stand-alone subjects. AR suggested that the subject one pagers being developed and getting the content concise so people have a good understanding around content was big. AR said that this was important also for when kids join our school, it explains what we do here. SC thanked everyone for their feedback and support.</p> <p>(b) Discussion re vision statement – SC advised that he had sent out another draft however only got one person’s feedback. It was agreed that this requires further development / discussion, this needed to be worked on as early as possible.</p>
5	Karakia. Meeting closed at 9:05pm