



The Vineyard School Governing Body

Minutes of the School Development and Pupils Committee meeting held via Zoom on 22 November 2021 at 6 pm

Governors present:

Lynne Woolley LW Chair
Frances Bracegirdle FB Headteacher
Kirsty MacEachen KM
Alice McArdle AM
Antony Cook AC
Chloe Garth CG
Fliss Buckle FB

In attendance:

Richard Rosewell RW Acting head
Matt Collier MC
Charlotte Axbey CA
Mary Wakefield MW
Jackie Dutton Clerk

The meeting was quorate.

Item	Action
1. Welcome and apologies for absence Everyone was welcomed to the meeting and introductions were made. No apologies had been received - Simon Williams was not present.	
2. Declarations of interest There were no declarations of interest in the agenda items.	
3. Election of Vice Chair CG was nominated and seconded as Vice Chair - this was agreed unanimously.	
4. Update on new assessment approach - Matt Collier MC was the new Assessment Lead. The Chair explained that data would normally go to the November School Development and Pupils meeting but under the new assessment structure this would now be done in January each year. He did have some data to share with governors and shared his screen. The school had moved from GL Assessment to Rising Stars assessment and would now get data in November, March and June annually. This would be for reading, comprehension, maths and GAPS	

(Grammar Punctuation and Spelling) . Assessments had been carried out the previous week and generally went well though there were some teething issues. This was for PIRA, PUMA and GAPS. KS2 children sat this on the laptops and KS1 children took this on paper. The laptops gave an immediate result and the paper process had to be marked and then uploaded - currently KS1 staff were inputting the data.

There was no extra time allowed for the grammar test as there was no functionality for this - the school does have some children entitled to 25 - 100% extra time so a work-round was used for this test and going forward a paper version would be available as a reserve.

PIRA - this assessed progress in reading assessment - there was a text limit in some boxes as this was auto-marked. This was not a problem in the lower year groups but there were some concerns about Yr 6 as the staff did not want to discourage them from writing in full sentences. SATS tests would be taken on paper next year. MC had spoken to Rising Stars and Yr 6 and perhaps Yr 5 would sit paper tests in the Spring and Summer Terms 2022.

The feedback from staff was good - they felt most tests were better suited to children and the questions were more child-friendly.

The data did not include out of year group tests - there were 2 in MC's class so the numbers would look low. Also there were some absent children who would be catching up that week.

In Yr 6 there were 90 in the cohort and 80 took the test. The average scaled score varies - around 92/93 or above would be working at the expected level, 112 would be greater depth. For PIRA the average scaled score was 100.4, for PUMA 110.1 and for GAPS 110.5. The average raw score - 78 were at the Age related expectation for PIRA, 87 for PUMA and 82.2 for GAPS

Some data showed high results, particularly for greater depth.

Q If middle maths, then grammar, what else is in PIRA - was it to do with data sets or is there a reason to be lower - non grammar, non maths?

A Good question and MC was not sure - the school had subscribed to an add-on to get an analysis of where the school was - with data broken down by contextual groups - for PIRA it was vocabulary and inference - that functionality would roll out that week. FB noted the reading test was more difficult.

MC noted that for maths and grammar there were right or wrong answers and so that was better for remote learning but reading was more 'grey'.

For Yr 5 there were 72 children and 10 were missing. The average scaled score for PIRA was 98.1, PUMA 106.5 and GAPS 109.5. There was a high number of SEND children in that cohort. The percentage at Age related expectation was 63.9 PIRA, 73.6 PUMA, 80.6 GAPS. Staff would be looking at how many were close to greater depth.

Yr 4 - there were 80 children, 10 missing. Average scaled score was 94.6 PIRA, 104.7 PUMA and 109.5 GAPS. PIRA greater depth was 4.5 and 38.2 for PUMA, 47.9 for GAPS.

In Yr 3 there were some high scoring children which brought the average scaled score up. PIRA 104.1, 108.1 PUMA and 109.3 for GAPS. 78% were at age related expectation for PIRA, 84.9% for PUMA and 82.1% for GAPS.

Q Do children get better as they move through the school?

A MC was not sure that data could be related to that, but the add-on reports might help with this. He would be digging down into the data the following week.

<p>PIRA had dipped a bit - children would have missed time in the two lockdowns and could have missed early reading skills. Yr 3 were similar to Yr 6 28.6 greater depth for PIRA, 3.4% for PUMA and 47.9 for GAPS</p> <p>MC also shared graphs with governors for percentage at Age Related Expectation +. For grammar every year group was above national average. Yr 6 were lowest in grammar, Yr 3 were lowest in punctuation , Yr 5 were similar and Yr 4 was lowest in punctuation.</p> <p>MC and FB had spoken about the internal assessment systems - SIMs was used for management information system and did have tracking but was not fit for purpose. He had created a bespoke assessment system using an Excel spreadsheet for standardised scores for PIRA, PUMA and GAPS and teacher assessments - emerging, exceeding and expected.</p> <p>MC would email his slides to the Clerk.</p> <p>It was hoped to have some governor training on what to look for when using the new software before the January meeting.</p> <p>The Link Governor responsibilities were to be refreshed as part of the SDP focus on assessment and curriculum. KM was responsible for the curriculum - there would also be a link for assessment - these would be agreed at the FGB on 6 December. CG was interested in being the assessment lead - FB felt more than one person might be needed for that. The assessment link governor would meet with MC and report back to the January meeting. A curriculum lead governor would also be needed.</p> <p>The date of the January meeting needed to be changed as it classed in the school diary. Three dates were possible and were being checked.</p> <p>MC left the meeting</p>	<p>MC</p> <p>FGB</p> <p>LW</p>
<p>5. Well being survey</p> <p>MW shared her screen - the slides were on shared drive</p> <p>This had run from early September to 6 October 2021. A different survey had been used this year which came from the Anna Freud National Centre for children and families and was specifically for school staff. Responses had been received from 46 staff members. Next time staff would be given dedicated time to complete the survey - it took around 5 - 6 minutes.</p> <p><i>Staff wellbeing/perception of stress</i></p> <p>There was a short Warwick Edinburgh mental wellbeing scale for the last 2 weeks and a perceived stress scale of the last month- this could be benchmarked against research.</p> <div data-bbox="113 1615 1374 1906" style="background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 10px;"> <p>The Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (SWEMWBS): Overall, staff wellbeing is <u>similar to the average score for men and women in the general adult population</u> in England. (A study of adults in 2017 showed a mean SWEMWBS score of 23.7 for men and 23.2 for women. The Vineyard school staff have an average score of 23.21).</p> </div>	

Strengths: Staff are....

- feeling useful (84%)
- able to make decisions (80%)
- thinking clearly (78%)
- able to deal with problems well (73%)
- feeling optimistic about the future (67%)
- feeling close to other people (67%)

Areas of need:

- Staff have not been feeling relaxed (42%)

A score of 26 out of 35 indicated high wellbeing. This was similar to an average score for men and women in the general adult population. See strengths/areas of need above

Perceived stress - this result was moderate for perceived stress. An area of need was feeling nervous or stressed (42%, being unable to control things in life and feeling not able to cope with things. Workshops would be held - there was one to help support staff, what to do in leisure time to recover from the stress of work. There was information in the staffroom about a company to access re mental health and wellbeing. Information could be sent on managing workload - to do lists, 4 quadrants - urgent/important etc. Staff would also be asked for feedback on things to do.

The Perceived Stress Scale:

On average, staff have moderate perceived stress.

Strengths:

- Feeling confident in ability to handle personal problems (82%)
- Able to control irritations (69%)

Areas of need:

- Feeling nervous or stressed (42%)

Potential areas of need:

- Feelings unable to control important things in life (20%) but 40% felt are able to.
- Feeling not able to cope with things they have to do (22%) but 47% felt are able to.

Q 1 in 5 feels high, how far have you got for understanding the direct impact on children if a teacher was stressed?

A The indirect risk to children was the quality of teaching, the risk was to the teachers themselves. Not being able to control or cope was worrying.

Q Was there any risk to children if the teacher was stressed eg if they lost their temper?

A MW said that they had not seen any impact on children but she could look into this.

Q The score was in line with an average and was better than average if a male employee?

A The school want to try to be better than that - it would be better for staff and pupils

Q The staff not feeling relaxed - should we be aiming for staff to feel relaxed at work? Stress curves go up before down - a little bit of stress gives a better performance but would be destructive if too much?

A That could be down to interpretation too.

Q How about mental health first aid courses? A subscription for all staff to Headspace?

MW

A Headspace is free for educators - this was shared with staff the previous year but they could be reminded about this. This would be in the information at the workshop. CA was mental health first aid trained.

Resilience was also important - teaching was a stressful job but many jobs were stressful. A lot of things had been offered to staff and the school monitored take up.

Q Pre Covid one point was parents coming to speak to staff at the school gate or classroom door and being less than polite, had that changed?

A It was still an issue but was not as bad as previously. RR noted it had transferred more on line or in emails rather than the school gate. 34% found relationships with parents difficult.

Actions

Most staff felt work had a positive impact, they were encouraged to speak openly about mental wellbeing and were encouraged to seek help. They felt their manager would support them.

Areas of development -

- Workload/worklife balance
- Admin tasks
- Pastoral concerns relating to pupils
- Relationships with parents
- Uncertain if there was a mental health and welfare policy.

A policy would be created and accessible services would be shared with staff. The Headship team would look at the staff workload and look at streamlining admin tasks. Yeargroup emails would be set up and notice would be given for meetings. There would be a flexible working scheme and additional information on wellbeing would be put on the school website. A Festive Committee would be set up to organise social events.

CPD

There was emotion coaching recap and a workshop delivered by an Educational Psychologist on an inset day. There was also a resilience workshop by MIND and a mental health in schools training session in the Spring Term. There was training on the jigsaw PSHE programme and on how that supports pupils in mental health and wellbeing. A mindfulness in schools training session would be delivered in the Summer Term.

Q How does the pupil survey match up to the actions for mental health?

A That would be done the following week and MW could feed back to governors.

Q Last year there was a discussion on encouraging staff to be away from school when away from school ie not checking emails and there were actions from that. Is that still happening?

A MW did not know but there was some research on psychological detachment being important. There was no expectation to reply to emails at the weekends etc though CA noted it was difficult to tell staff when they could or could not work.

Governors thanked MW for her presentation.

7.17 pm MW left

6. Attendance

RR reported that the attendance and pupil numbers were similar to as they were at the last meeting.

<p>Q Are some children identified by the CAMHs worker? Will there be some SPA referrals to other services?</p> <p>A Parental engagement was important - for attendance, wellbeing and attainment. There was 100% parental attendance at school meetings.</p> <p>7.34pm FB left the meeting</p>	
<p>8. Covid 19 Recovery plan</p> <p>The school was looking at this including looking at specific children. There were only 30 PPG children so there could be an individualised focus. The school had identified that EAL children were badly affected. Catch up funding was used to employ a multi-lingual TA (also a qualified teacher of English as a foreign language in her own country) who was in school for 5 mornings to work with EAL children. Some children had been identified anecdotally in remote learning and some had been identified from attainment results.</p>	
<p>9. ECT Policy (Early Career Teachers)</p> <p>This was also taken to Resources Committee the previous week. This was a new policy - previously there were NQTs. The main difference was that the ECT programme was over 2 years, not 1. Teachers in the second year of the ECT programme did not have as much support as in their first year. The policy had come from The Key and had been adapted to the Vineyard. AC had a couple of small points he would send to RR.</p> <p>Q Re implementation - was it clear what the learning pathway was for the second year?</p> <p>A Yes it was very well organised - there were two teachers on their first year of the programme - both were doing well. The school bought into Wandle who oversaw this programme. There were regular mentor meetings and the programme was well structured.</p> <p>Q How much additional work would fall on the school?</p> <p>A It was a big commitment for the school - ECT teachers needed observing and monitoring so it would add to the workload. Next year in the 2nd year of this there would also be Yr1 ECTs too.</p> <p>TAP - Teaching apprenticeship programme- this was new to school and the apprenticeship levy funds were used for this. It was teacher training in school.</p> <p>Q Is the hope that the quality of support meant they would stay with the school - so was part of planning ahead for the workforce?</p> <p>A The TAP programme lasted a year and then they would be on an ECT programme.</p> <p>The policy was agreed with some typos from A to go to RR. It did not need FGB approval</p> <p>RR was thanked for his work and his presentation.</p>	AC
<p>10 Minutes of meeting held on 11 October 2021.</p> <p>These minutes would be put on the shared google drive for governors to approve. AC would need this emailed to him as he could not access the shared drive.</p>	
<p>AOB - A SEND governors was still needed</p> <p>LW would share the schedule of works.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 7.51 pm</p>	Govs LW