



---

---

The Vineyard School Governing Board

---

---

**Minutes of the Full Governing Body held via Zoom on 6 December 2021 at 6 pm**

Governors present:

Antony Cook AC  
Chloe Garth CG  
Frances Bracegirdle FB  
Simon Williams SW  
Firas Ali FA  
James Lane JL  
Charlotte Axbey CA  
Fliss Buckles FB  
Lynne Woolley LW

Kirsty MacEachen KM  
*Alice McArdle* AM

In attendance:

Richard Rosewell RR Associate Member  
Laura Reilly via remote  
Daisy Dempster via remote  
Matt Collier  
Matthew Paul - MP - AfC via remote  
Claire Briggs - CB - AfC via remote  
Sarah Herbert - SH - AfC via remote

Jackie Dutton Clerk - via remote

The meeting was quorate.

Item	Action
<b>1. Welcome and apologies for absence</b>  Everyone was welcomed to the meeting – the meeting was being recorded.	
<b>AfC - Special Resource Provision - taken first on the agenda</b>  Claire Briggs, Matthew Paul and Sarah Herbert were present from Richmond AfC.  MP explained that there were not enough special school places in the borough and there was a potential for a specialist resource provision at The Vineyard- this was an inclusive school that was popular and oversubscribed. A document had been put on googledrive.	



AC noted that the intention was to be supportive of the school values and inclusive ethos - MP said that as a management team and as a governing body it needed to work for the school, staffing and governors.

There had been some questions around management time and this had been fully factored in. It was important to understand the benefits and implications of the proposal.

***Q Being responsible for the unit - what did this mean for governors - what extra training and preparation would governors need to run the special unit?***

A This would be part of the normal role of support and challenge for governors. If governors wanted additional support then they could partner up with another school who had a special resource provision.

SH said that AfC would offer a Service Level Agreement for support - a formal review would be done with the provision every other year and they would encourage the SEND governor to be involved in that process. There would also be an agreement that a steering group meeting would be run annually with an officer from AfC to be a link.

***Q The building could have been let out and so the school would have a loss of revenue - would the school be compensated?***

***Q Also there was a query about the position - it might not be the cottage now but the green room? It had not been decided to use the caretaker's house - there could be other options for that.***

A If it was surplus to school use then it might be sold - the council would need to go through a process for that

(plan shared on screen)

MP said that any serious proposal should be put in writing to the Properties Team at the Council. The neighbours behind it had expressed an interest but no firm conclusions had been reached.

***Q Would the governing body be consulted?***

A Yes governors would be consulted

CB said that Ridge and partners were appointed in November to look at the options for a location :

- Former caretaker's house
- Internal alterations to two KS1 classrooms
- New build at the top of the KS2 playground
- Maria Grey Nursery building - lease to 2025
- Temporary Green Room location

The school thought the Green Room was the best location as it was near the main school. It was a temporary building which had been in use for 13 - 14 years - some maintenance work was needed. The feasibility of this had been completed and could be shared with governors but should be kept confidential. It was agreed to concentrate on this location and take the design to end Stage 3. Surveys would be done - ground investigation, drainage/transport assessment etc and a design up to the point where a planning application could be submitted. A design was shared - CB could send a proper drawing of the design and where it had got to.

***Q Where was the path for Yr 5/6 entry?***



A That would not be there - part of the transport assessment would be a second entrance - also about cars coming into the area/parking etc for the planning application. Governors thought that part of the previous discussions was that there was a second entrance - CB did not think this was the case.

***Q Is there a plan for a second entrance?***

A No you would have to say you want to use it and how to maintain a second entrance in that location would need further thought.

RR noted it was not part of that design but the path would need to be redirected. There should be a way to incorporate that.

These were still high level plans at the moment - there were a lot of trees and habitat so this was still being considered to see if it was feasible. Survey information should be back in early January 2022 and then this would be drilled down into a more detailed design with entrances/parking. One resident had already contacted her as they had seen the surveyor on site. AfC could make sure there was still an entrance.

Governors felt that a governor working party was needed to move on the programme.

There would be a pre planning informal discussion with planners early in January 2022, the consultation process would be early 2022 and a paper would go to committee in early 2022. MP said that whatever the governors felt would be helpful- he did not want to rush into a decision but if the opening date of September 2023 was to be achieved, there was an element of urgency as planning can and did take a long time. If governors felt they had enough information to take the proposal into a more detailed stage then more information could be shared as Ridge & Co worked.

***Q Were governors happy to go to the next stage?***

A Governors agreed this - subject to questions asked. A working group was needed to stay close to this - JL and CB would be involved. Three or 4 governors would be needed.

AfC staff left the meeting.

**Data presentation - documents on googledrive**

Matt Collier had taken on the role of Assessment Lead and the data had been discussed at the S, D & P committee meeting. Data was not yet ready to come to FGB.

Assessments had changed from GLS to Rising Stars - PIRA, PUMA and GAPS (spelling and grammar). Tests were carried out termly and were more user friendly. They were well received by parents and a workshop had been held the previous week. There had been a few teething problems which had been addressed.

**Laura Reilly shared a screen - Yrs 3 & 4**

There were more new starters than leavers but the new children had little English. There was an increasing EAL need (English as an Additional Language) -the EAL lead was working in Yrs 3 and 4 once a week to give scaffolded support in English lessons. Outcomes had not hit the data yet.



There was increased engagement in class and a marked improvement in written work. For maths and GAPS this was better than average non EAL across all. When looking at EAL this captured all EAL including non-typical pupils - eg bilingual - and so was a positive statistic - the school could target those who needed help those most in need of help for classroom support but staff availability was a challenge. The school would like to increase this support from once a week. There was a significant difference in reaching greater depth in reading compared to maths.

In Yr 3 children did not perform as well in the reading assessment. It was the first time the children had used the Rising Stars assessment on line and there were character limits in the data. The school was also looking at how to deliver reading sessions.

In Yr 4 a sample of 10 children were to take the reading assessment that week on paper to see if it could be a test issue or putting answers in online v. a written paper test.

***Q how many got all three - reading, writing maths***

A 56% got that at Age Related Expectation (ARE) . There were different scores to hit for ARE.

For KS2 SATs the standardised scores were 100 or above.

FB noted that reading was not as good as maths across the school and reading on a screen might be implicated so paper would be used in the Spring assessments.

***Q When you look at the categories EAL always come up and some children had no English but Bilingual children were included in EAL so would lift the data - was that fair?***

A That was a fair point - the data was taken from SIMS and most EAL children were not typical. This could be broken down by codes and could be tracked more in lower years. Dual nationality children were classed as EAL. This could be broken down further in the future from internal tracking

In Yrs 3 and 4 it was a top priority to get them assessed asap. Teachers needed resources to get the additional support needed.

Yr 4 data - there were slightly more leavers than starters. Two children had one to one support for EHCPs. There were 57% with EAL - this would include bilingual children, 39% in Yr 3. Five children were SEND support - 2 in Yr 3, 4 were Pupil Premium - 1 in Yr 3.

Across the year more children had achieved the expected standard and above in maths (84%) and GAPS (83%) than reading (63%). More children had achieved greater depth in GAPS (46%) than maths (36%) and 5% in reading. This would be investigated to see what happened with reading to check if it was the test technique and also to look at book club sessions. Learning walks would take place in the new term.

For SEND children the average score in GAPS was higher than in maths and reading. SEND children score was higher in GAPS than in maths and reading. EAL children were working above the expected standard in maths and GAPS and at the expected standard in reading.

Across Yrs 3 and 4 teachers led planned and resourced interventions with specialist teacher for language or music. Two or 3 interventions of 15 minutes for reading and maths were run and children 'on the cusp'/working towards were targeted. This had not impacted the data yet - children would be evaluated the following week. Progress should be seen in children in the lower band.



## Reception - Daisy Dempster

Reception was very different - a screen was shared - there was a whole new curriculum and new curriculum statements. The year group was not yet full with 88 pupils.

(bad connection and clerk/governors unable to hear)

DD left and rejoined

There were 3 EHCPs - all full time one to one support.

Bad connection again - DD had sent a report in - Clerk to check she had this -it was not on shared drive

**Yr 1** - all three classes were fairly in line.

(Clerk then thrown out of on line access at 7 pm and rejoined)

There had not been a chance to plan interventions yet. Gender and EAL data was looking good.

Year 2 - there was a higher number of EAL children and one class was slight more highly performing. There was a need to look at planning to meet the needs of the class and challenging children. Paper tests were the way forward. Staff were looking at greater depth data. In maths the average grade was 108 so there was a need to challenge children.

### ***Q What used to happen for assessments? What is the difference?***

A Assessments start in Yr 1. The GLS test would have been reading, also science, twice a year - now there is reading, maths and SPAG 3 times a year. There was a query if autumn tests should be done in Yr 1 or wait longer.

**Yr 6** This had a high number of EAL children - but many were not typical as bilingual. There was about 6% Pupil Premium. There were 3 EHCP children all working significantly below Yr 6 level.

Maths and SPAG were strong for the year group and reading was low across the cohort. SATS for reading for done this week - most averaged 37 out of 50. The book club sessions would be changed to focus on comprehension ready for the SATs in May 2022. Some interventions had been run to support children who had fallen behind.

**Year 5** There were 9 spaces in the year group. There were 3 children with EHCPs - one was leaving at the end of the Autumn Term. There were high numbers of EAL children - 48%. Some EAL children were having additional reading sessions/interventions to help support reading. Of the children who joined some were new to English or had safeguarding issues.

There had been some successes - children who were at age related for KS1 maths were now at greater depth so had shown good progress. SPAG was strong in the yeargroup English had one session a week allocated to a grammar focus. There was a 13 point gap for boys v. girls in maths - planning would be reviewed to look at how to engage girls.

***Q Would governors see reports for each term on assessments? Reading was a concern so governors would like to see progress in this.***



A Parents would get test reports and progress reports . There were predicted Hodder scale scores that the children should get. Matt would also have access to more analysis in the dashboard.	
<b>Return to Main agenda</b>	
<b>2. Declarations of interest</b>  Forms were on the google drive for governors to complete and return to the Clerk. There were no declarations of interest in the agenda items.	Govs
<b>3. Membership of Governing Board</b>  a) No governors had been appointed since the last meeting  b) Lynne Woolley's term of office would expire on 11 December 2021 so this was her last meeting. Governors were very sad to lose her as she had been a wonderful governor and had shown great insight - she was thanked for her efforts and would be sorely missed. LW said she had enjoyed being a governor and was also sad to go but would now be able to spend more time with her family.  There was no other governor whose term of office would expire before the end of the academic year.  c) There was a vacancy for an LA governor and from 11 December 2021 there would be a vacancy for a co-opted governor.  d) Associate Member - RR was confirmed as an Associate Member with voting rights on any committee he was on.	
<b>4. Appointments for the year</b>  Link governor responsibilities - a list of proposed links had been put on googledrive. Those in square brackets had not been discussed with the governor yet. A working party for the special resource provision was also needed and another role would be an Ofsted link governor.  Link governors would work with the appointed staff member in school. FB noted that NR and Mary Wakefield worked together so should not be linked. Daisy Dempster was the lead in EY.  Links were discussed and would be confirmed outside the meeting. Racial justice was a new role and a governor was needed for this - there were 41 nationalities represented in the school. AC would follow this up. Governors were asked to be clear with staff leads about visiting.  Committee membership would be delegated to committees - a new chair would be needed for S, D and P as LW's term of office was ending before the end of term.	AC  AC Govs  S, D & P
<b>5. Code of Conduct</b>  This was agreed by all governors - a list of signatures would be obtained at a face-to-face meeting.	When possible
<b>6. Terms of Reference and committee membership, Scheme of Delegation</b>  Wording was needed re data protection for Resources and also re curriculum multi media - Simon Williams would talk to AC off line. This would be clarified at the next Resources Committee.	SW Resources



<p><b>7. Minutes of FGB meeting held on 14 July 2021/minutes of committee meetings</b></p> <p>The Clerk had been unable to access these because of IT issues accessing the previous Clerk's files on the school server and AC did not have a copy. James Durham was working on this.</p> <p><i>Resources minutes</i> for 29 September 2021 and 16 November 2021 were on googledrive.</p> <p>Quotes were coming in for the H &amp; S of the wall and replacement fire doors. (difficulty hearing - bad connection/loud noises)</p> <p>Governors had looked at the IT equipment and catering contract. For the catering contract the School Business Manager had met with Radish (current contractor) and had obtained a good deal to stay with them so the school did not need to spend money on retendering. They were to install £5K of new equipment over the next years. Food and refreshments had been provided by them for the Yr 6 evening recently. The price of school meals had not gone up.</p> <p>S, D &amp; P - minutes of 11 October 2021 and 22 November 2021 were on googledrive. Governors had been updated on the new assessments format. Governors had gone through the feedback on staff wellbeing led by Mary Wakefield.</p>	
<p><b>8. PPG report (Pupil Premium Grant)</b></p> <p>The strategy had to be published on the website by 31 December 2021 and there was a government template for this. This had been discussed with FA. Information was also on the website about the recovery premium funding. A large number of PP children were also SEND and this impacted their results. A lot of the funding had been used for staffing with qualified Teaching Assistance - the use of an Educational Psychologist also used much of the funding. Governors were asked to read the report on the website and send any questions to CA.</p>	Govs
<p><b>9. SIP report (School Improvement Partner)</b></p> <p>A draft report from Cathy Clarke was on the shared googledrive - this included suggestions for questions for governors to ask which was very useful. Actions would be embedded in planning. This would also be referred to in Item 11 - Head's update. The final version would go on googledrive.</p>	Govs FB, Clerk
<p><b>10. Chair's Actions</b></p> <p>No actions of an emergency nature had been taken.</p> <p>There would be an extra bank holiday in this academic year because of the Queen's Jubilee in June 2022. Schools could choose where to take the extra day and it had been decided to close a day earlier in July - on 20 July 2022.</p>	
<p><b>11. Head's update</b></p> <p>This was on googledrive. FB said she had had a very warm welcome to the school.</p>	



<p>The school was on a journey to the next inspection which was likely next year. It would be good for governors to attend training courses for this as the Ofsted framework had changed.</p> <p>There were daily struggles with managing staff sickness absences. This was high compared to the equivalent period (September - November) in 2020. There were 72.5 days absence for teaching staff compared to 16 days in 2020. Of these, 37 were pregnancy related and 8 days were Covid related. This meant there was still a high number of absences even once pregnancy and Covid days were taken out. For support staff in 2021 there were 91.5 days' absence (of these 19 were Covid related) compared to 65 days in 2020. The school was not in lockdown during the relevant time in 2020.</p> <p>This level of absences put a lot of pressure on the staff in school and would need further analysis, some might be due to mental health and anxiety issues. The procedures for returning from sickness absence would be reviewed.</p> <p>A teacher would be leaving at the end of term and had been replaced on a temporary contract for one term by an experienced teacher - the school might discuss extending this contract to the end of the Summer Term. This would be announced to parents - he had already worked for two supply days this term. Two student teachers would be qualifying at Easter 2022. A staff member would be joining in Yr 3 for one term.</p> <p>Feedback on staff mental health had been given by Mary Wakefield and a children's survey had just been completed.</p> <p>Attendance - this was 94% which was a bit lower than desired. This was the same for many schools.</p> <p><b>Q Yr R and 2 absences seem high?</b></p> <p>A Yr 2 was because of Covid and parents' reactions. Some children in Yr R were 4 year olds so not at statutory school age - however missing school meant missing education. A workshop might be held in January as all children should be in school when well.</p> <p>Covid - staff had had positive tests with an outbreak in Yr 2 and now Yr 6. The specialist teaching model had been suspended and bubbles were back. RR had contacted Public Health England (PHE) to check guidance. The school had been asked to take some precautions at amber level. The increase in Yr 6 had been reported that day and information correctly shared with PHE - no information had been received yet on actions to take. This was likely to be increased ventilation, no assemblies and use bubbles. Some parents had decided to keep children at home and were encouraged to test at home. Some had taken PCRs and then returned to school but guidance had to be followed - generally parents had been very good.</p> <p>A parent had asked about air filters - the Business Manager was dealing with this enquiry.</p> <p>Development priorities :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assessment lead - now Matt Collier</li> <li>2. Develop wider curriculum - why are we teaching the curriculum we are teaching</li> <li>3. Develop teaching of reading across the school - new programme published end of July. An audit had been done and an action plan will be created</li> <li>4. Confirm expectations of good teaching and outstanding teaching across the curriculum</li> </ol> <p><b>Q Could the caretaker's cottage be investigated for curriculum use eg music?</b></p>	<p>FB</p>
---	-----------





<p>A This would be discussed further in S, D &amp; P or at FGB meetings. The Green Room was used for music.</p> <p><b>Q Ofsted framework - what were the changes?</b></p> <p>A FB was trying to find courses on this - two subject leaders had been on a day course. CA had attended training and had notes she could work on with FB. There had been some significant changes to the framework.</p> <p>8.02 FB left the meeting.</p> <p><b>Q What is the strategy for the school to get the right outcome from Ofsted - to close the gaps?</b></p> <p>A The SIP would give support over the next two terms - leaders knew what they needed to work on in the short term. FB was looking for training on this. Communication would also be needed with parents to communicate that the framework had changed and schools who were outstanding in a previous framework were unlikely to remain outstanding. Currently the school self-evaluated as good in the new framework. With more time to come before the next inspection this could improve in some areas.</p> <p>Governors would be brought in for discussions during an inspection and would have to answer questions appropriately. The work of the governing body would also be evaluated. Governors would need to talk about the role of governors for appropriate challenge and support of the school leadership.</p> <p>Getting a Good judgement was not a reflection that there was a drop in standards but just that there was a new framework and new expectations. Parents also needed to know that they had a part to play with reading at home and support at home for the school.</p>	<p>S, D &amp; P</p> <p>CA</p>
<p><b>12. Admissions</b></p> <p>It was agreed that the LA Admissions criteria were used as the LA managed admissions.</p>	
<p><b>13. Meeting schedule</b></p> <p>S, D &amp; P - 27 January 2022 7 pm</p> <p><b>FGB 22 March 2022</b></p>	
<p><b>14. Policies</b></p> <p>The Lettings policy was discussed and agreed in Resources - this was <b>agreed</b></p> <p>ECT (Early Career Teachers - was NQT) - minor amendments had been made. ECT teachers now trained over 2 years not 1 and there was a more thorough programme - this was <b>agreed</b>.</p> <p>Safeguarding and Child Protection - this was from the LA policy with only changes for the school name and DSLs (Designated Safeguarding Leads) details. FA was the Safeguarding/Child Protection governor. This was <b>agreed</b> and would go on the website.</p> <p>Charging and Remissions - to come to the next meeting</p> <p><i>Governor visits</i></p> <p>Governors were now allowed back into school - AC had written a policy and then found a previous one - structures and a template had been put in. AC would send this round for comment. The NGA also had a template.</p>	<p>FG/RR</p> <p>Nxt mtg</p> <p>AC</p>



The Clerk would find out how governors accessed training available from AfC

Clerk

The meeting finished at 8.17 pm with no Part 2 items