



---

---

The Vineyard School Governing Board

---

---

Minutes of Resources Committee meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2017 at 8am at the school

- Present:** Robert Stanton (RS)  
Melanie Bywell (MB)  
Graham Stewart (GS)  
Emma Tuck (ET)  
Ruth Whymark (RW)  
James Lane (JL)  
Christine Gooch (CG)
- In Attendance:** Wendy Robinson (School Business Manager)  
Anna Mantle (Clerk)
- Absent:** Richard Rosewell (Associate Member) (RR)

Meeting started at 8.04am

| Item   | Action |
|--|--------|
| 1. <b><u>Apologies for absence</u></b><br>Apology for absence received and accepted from Richard Rosewell.   |        |
| 2. <b><u>Declaration of Interests</u></b><br>No direct or indirect pecuniary interests were declared.  |        |
| 3. <b><u>Minutes of last meeting (8 November 2017) and matters arising</u></b><br>Following the last meeting, James Lane has agreed (as Health and Safety lead) to join the Health and Safety school tours on a six monthly basis. These tours will happen once per term in time for highlights to be presented at the appropriate Resources Committee.<br><br><b>Governors agreed that the minutes of the last meeting (8 November 2017) were a true and accurate record.</b>   |        |
| 4. <b><u>School Benchmarking Report Card</u></b><br>Governors were informed that the benchmarking report card is issued annually and compares "like" schools based on analysis of CFR codes (standard codes used to report spend). It is an analysis of spend undertaken in 2015/16.<br><br><b>Governors questioned the level of educational consultancy undertaken by the school, since it was highlighted as being higher than other schools in the benchmark group. They were reassured that this consultancy includes ICT.</b> |        |

8.07am Christine Gooch arrives

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 4. | <p><b><u>School Benchmarking Report Card (continued)</u></b><br/>Governors commented that it would be useful to look at benchmarking the school against local schools and discussed the difficulty of making direct comparisons. Governors agreed to compare local schools information annually at the Autumn term meeting.</p>  |  |
| 6. | <p><b><u>Funding Update</u></b> (copy of the presentation circulated with the draft minutes)<br/>GS presented his updated presentation on changes to the funding formula in light of the election in June 2017.<br/>The key changes since June are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transition phase to new funding formula doubled to 2 years</li><li>• Funding formula biased in favour of pupil-led factors and designed to reflect individual needs, to remove the “postcode lottery” discrepancies between Local Authorities</li><li>• There are no longer “winners” and “losers”. Formula will result in 1% cash uplift regardless of situation across 2 years.</li><li>• The funding is protected against inflation.</li></ul> <p>What does the situation look like for the Vineyard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If the funding formula was implemented in full it would represent a 10.7% uplift.</li><li>• School growth in numbers should improve the position as well.</li></ul> <p>What will happen during the implementation phase?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• During the transition period, the funds are still distributed to the LA to re-distribute, but they can only move 0.5% from one block to another, and these decisions are made in discussion with the Schools Forum.</li><li>• There is no 5 year guarantee for the budget.</li></ul> <p>Governors discussed the impact the special needs requirement in Richmond could have on the final funding received by the school. They discussed the timelines by which they will know the final budget figure for the next academic year (final figure confirmed in June).</p> <p>Governors also discussed the pressures on the budget, including that there is no extra budget to take account for pay rises, pension contribution and National Insurance increases, not to mention business rates.</p> <p>RW indicated that she is looking into staffing structures and outlined her plans to explore the possibility of employing unqualified teachers and supporting their training, as a means of creating opportunities for career development, reducing supply and support staff costs and improving staff retention.</p> |  |

8.55am Emma Tuck leaves.

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 6. | <p><b><u>Building Development Plan</u></b><br/>The report disseminated with the papers was a result of a walk around the school by Bob (caretaker), WR (School Business Manager) and RW. They identified actions which could be taken to bring the older half of school more up to the standard of the new half. This is the first draft of the plan and all proposed spend can be accommodated by Friends of Vineyard income that was allocated to building the meeting room, but was never spent.</p> <p>The plan proposes a significant redistribution of the use of different areas of the school, moving KS1 and Early Years into where Years 4, 5 and 6 are currently located, and moving all of KS2 into the same space. RW explained her rationale for proposing these changes in detail. Not only would the change allow the school to create a fulfilling, exciting and stimulating outside space for Early Years education (part of the statutory framework) and work on improving its outcomes within Early Years to bring them in line with the rest of the school. It would also allow Y3 to be located with the rest of KS2, and support a whole school philosophy.</p> |  |
|----|--|--|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Governors raised concerns about this proposal for change</b> following very quickly on the heels of significant building works, and about fatigue over this issue amongst the parent body. They felt that real benefit would need to be demonstrated before undertaking these works.</p> <p>RW explained that this was an issue that would be considered at the next stage when the leadership team carry out an opportunity and threat audit. She reiterated her concerns about the Early Years outcomes. She explained that she was keen to consider this now, before funding ringfenced for the development of the garden was spent improving an area that was not large enough and not fit for purpose, if there were other options.</p> <p><b>Governors also questioned whether the proposal would have a detrimental impact on Y5 and Y6 who would lose out on a shared area.</b> RW expressed her opinion that the space is not well used at present and that the shared area would benefit Early Years better to create open areas and zones and more free flow.</p> <p><b>Governors questioned whether there were extra funds or resources needed to undertake this proposal?</b></p> <p>RW explained that there were funds available and this was mainly an operational consideration. She invited governors to visit and look at the space.</p> <p>The issue of space redistribution will be added to the next committee agenda and mentioned at the FGB.</p> | <p>Add to FGB and next committee agenda</p> |
|--|---|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>7. <u>Appraisal Outcomes</u></b></p> <p>RW explained the current appraisal process and the process of moving across the payscales based on performance. Everyone who applied to go through threshold was successful, however two people did not apply; they felt that they had not made a sustained impact across the school, outside of their own classroom.</p> <p>Governors discussed the difference between in class impact and whole school impact. Job descriptions do not change for different payscales and <b>they questioned whether it was clear to staff what is required.</b> RW explained that some schools do make it explicitly clear how the different payscales are differentiated and this does ensure a level of consistency and clarity.</p> <p><b>Governors questioned how appraisals are moderated.</b> RW responded that all threshold applications and change of paysale appraisals are moderated by her.</p> <p><b>Governors asked who does appraisals?</b> RW explained that the appraisal hierarchy has stayed the same as previously for this round of appraisals. However, she is looking to redistribute the hierarchy in future so that she appraises the whole leadership team, including phase leaders. She also explained her plan to introduce an electronic appraisal system (Blue Sky) which helps to place the onus onto the individual to take responsibility of their development and progress through their whole career. .</p> <p>RW explained that at the moment administrative and support staff do not have formal appraisals. This will change with the introduction of Blue Sky.</p> |  |
|--|--|

9.25am Wendy Robinson leaves.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>9. <u>Pay consideration CONFIDENTIAL</u></b><br/>Separate confidential minutes taken and filed.</p> |  |
|---|--|

9.40am Robert Stanton and James Lane leave.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>10. <u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friends of Vineyard – requirement to review FoV articles and constitution, and explore whether it should merge with the PTA.</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|

Meeting concluded at 9.46am.

**Date of next meeting: 24<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 8am**

**Summary of action points:**

| <b>Action point</b>  | <b>Responsibility</b> |
|--|-----------------------|
| Add proposal to change classroom configuration to FGB agenda and next committee agenda | Clerk                 |