



## The Vineyard School Governing Body

### Minutes of the School Development and Pupils Committee meeting held via Zoom on 27 January 2022 at 6 pm

Governors present:

Kirsty MacEachen KM Chair  
Frances Bracegirdle FB Headteacher  
Antony Cook AC

In attendance:

Richard Rosewell RW Deputy Head, Associate Member  
Matt Collier MC  
Charlotte Axbey CA  
Mary Wakefield MW  
Jackie Dutton Clerk

The meeting was quorate.

Item	Action
<b>1. Welcome</b> Everyone was welcomed to the meeting. It was agreed that Kirsty MacEachen would chair this committee this term.	
<b>2. Apologies for absence</b>  AC had notified the meeting he would be late. Apologies had been received from Fliss Buckle and Simon Williams - these were accepted. Alice McCardle was not on this committee. It was noted that the term of office for Lynn Wooley had ended on 29 November 2021. Chole Garth had resigned on 26 January 2022.  This committee was now low on numbers and new governors would be approached to join this committee.	AC
<b>3. Declarations of interest</b>  There were no declarations of interest in the agenda items.	
<b>4. Election of Chair</b>	AC

<p>AC would be speaking to Liz and Nicola about joining this committee. He would also contact FB ,SW and Nicola about this and also check with SW about his ability to attend meetings currently.</p> <p>A date for the next meeting was set - 10 March 2022 6 pm - FGB was on 22 March 2022. A permanent chair would need to be found. Reports would be sent out in advance and loaded onto the shared drive folder for the meeting.</p> <p>Policy updates - Policies needing review should be sent to KM - a workplan would include policies to review in committee before going to FGB.</p> <p>There was an Ofsted framework meeting on 21 March 2022. There was a good article in Governing matters - KM would look for this to circulate to governors. The community would need some information on the new Ofsted framework and how many outstanding schools would be moving to Good. A strategy for the school would be discussed - where it was heading, what to focus on - this would be from the School Improvement Plan.</p> <p>Maths and English advisors were coming into school before July- in June the School Improvement Partner would be coming in and carrying out a review - that would also feed into the improvement plan. There was already a vision and a set of values - if the layer in between was improved it would help deliver the vision and values. Enrichment and cultural capital were also important.</p> <p>Trips and visits could be more strategic - how would the school want to be part of the community. The new learning area would be part of the overall picture. KM would start a draft of what would go into a strategy document and governors should sent any useful information to KM</p> <p>The Ofsted framework was very supportive - what is right for children to learn more and remember more. KM and AC would discuss this further.</p>	<p>Govs</p> <p>KM</p> <p>KM</p> <p>KM, AC</p>										
<p><b>5. PASS - Mary Wakefield - Autumn 2021 results</b></p> <p>MW would send the Clerk the slides to put on the shared drive.</p> <p>PASS - Pupils and School Survey- this was evidence of pupils’ perception of school and their learning - it was statistically reliable. It could spot attitudinal or emotional wellbeing before it impacted on school performance. It would give an overview and teachers could look more at individual pupils. Out of 398 pupils, 558 had completed PASS - there were some absences due to Covid. It was run from 25 November to 9 December. There were 247 Yr R and KS1 pupils who took PASS and 311 KS2 pupils took PASS - it would be repeated in 6 months’ time. Scores were on a traffic light system.</p> <p>The Yr R and KS1 PASS had 4 elements</p> <p>Yr R</p> <table data-bbox="159 1724 718 1915"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Percentile score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Feelings about school -</td> <td>72.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Preparedness for learning</td> <td>63.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Learner self-worth</td> <td>82.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Response to learning</td> <td>47</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Percentile = standardised score (compared to all Reception students nationally)</p>			Percentile score	• Feelings about school -	72.6	• Preparedness for learning	63.1	• Learner self-worth	82.3	• Response to learning	47
	Percentile score										
• Feelings about school -	72.6										
• Preparedness for learning	63.1										
• Learner self-worth	82.3										
• Response to learning	47										

KS1

Percentile score

- Feelings about school - 34.8
- Preparedness for learning 63.1
- Learner self-worth 51
- Response to learning 59.6

. Percentile = standardised score (compared to all KS1 students nationally)

KS2 PASS had 9 elements

Lower KS2 Percentile score

Feelings about school	51.1
Perceived learning capability	61.7
Self regard as a learner	64.4
Preparedness for learning	54.6
Attitudes to teachers	48.4
General work ethic	58.8
Confidence in learning	60.1
Attitudes to attendance	59.8
Response to curriculum demands	57.2

Upper KS2 Percentile score

Feelings about school	41.6
Perceived learning capability	52.5
Self regard as a learner	64.4
Preparedness for learning	43
Attitudes to teachers	29.8
General work ethic	58.8
Confidence in learning	52.1
Attitudes to attendance	59.8
Response to curriculum demands	71.2

Yrs 3 and 4 were high compared to national data. Feelings about school need to be monitored.

Upper KS2 attitude to teaches was 29.8 percentile but if it was at 31 it would be moderate. Some KS2 figures were low.

Whole school summary

Strengths - preparedness for learning - pupils feel they have tools in place to learn

Feelings about school - Pupils felt secure, confident and included in their learning community

Areas for development - Response to curriculum demands - a learner's motivation to use and persist in the use of skills and strategies learned to complete tasks set in the curriculum

KS 2 - Learner self regard - pupil's self awareness as a learner, including levels of motivation and determination

**Q Self regard as a learner was a concern - did the school know who scored this?**

A Teachers had been asked to look at the whole class reports - they could see and highlight orange or red indicator children so children could be identified throughout the school where there should be a focus.

**Q What would the plan be once identified?**

A There were staff meetings every week and phase meetings termly - the next steps would be to dig deeper - there were more questions to ask to get more information, and ideas for intervention. ELSA sessions could be offered to those in need - there was one fully trained ELSA and one in training. A Children's Wellbeing practitioner (CWP) was continuing to support families - they worked with the parents of children who were experiencing mild to moderate anxiety or common behavioural difficulties. Children's mental health week was 7 - 11 February - there was a focus on growing together. Teacher CPD - there was a focus on teaching and learning - currently this was focused on curriculum design but the next step would be focus on the delivery of our curriculum as a school. Teacher CPD in March would focus on scaffolding learning in the classroom

There was a good link with CAMHS locally - CAMHS was specific to parents on a programme.

Governors felt the poor self regard was an issue - it would be important to track this.

The Behaviour policy would be updated to support children's engagement and motivation and also in the school environment there would be a shift in focus for displays and the website on valuing perseverance, effort and progress.

**Q Were there any worries consistent across the school?**

A Class teachers had the best relationship - some pupils just needed nurture time.

**Q What about the upper KS2 relationship to teachers - what was that?**

A Matt might have more information - this would be monitored.

**Q Was there any link to families and pressure on getting to the right school?**

A Teachers would look out for patterns.

It was important not to panic children so they did not want to complete surveys - staff would not make this obvious .

Governors thanked MW for this important piece of work - MW would come back to governors with teacher learning taken from PASS and on identifying issues and solutions that were most productive.

**Q Are there any national programmes that could be accessed eg MIND?**

A There was a link to MIND Richmond.

6.31 pm MW finished

Matt Collier - specialist model

**Strengths**

- High engagement from UKS2 children - teachers were passionate about subjects
- Range of experiences which may not have been thought of due to lack of confidence from teachers

- Planning was thorough and well thought out - well executed lessons and specialist teachers able to identify gaps in learning
- Movement breaks and change of classroom/subject has helped children in the UKS cohort as well as staff, Yr 5 cohort have a range of needs
- Full curriculum entitlement offered 0UKS2 have all subjects, every week which was not currently implemented in all year groups.

#### *Weaknesses*

- Rigidity - does not allow for flexibility - sometimes a few additional minutes were needed
- Feedback was tricky to delivery in limited 1 hour slots, handover of information at parent consultations were also harder due to specialist teachers
- Relationships were more challenging to forge with children - for some attachment issues were made worse
- Less year group team cohesion - affected things like planning for trips
- Over time staff have wanted to teach their own class, one teacher one person responsible for progress, provision and outcomes

#### *Moving forward*

- The model will cease after February half term
- Yr 5 and 6 teachers were in discussion about planning for after February half term
- There may still be some specialist teaching in wider curriculum subjects only - some staff interested in this
- Planning for subjects will still likely be done by the specialist in each team
- Communication to parents, children and staff yet to be drafted but will go out asap

#### ***Q Could there be a hybrid model - perhaps 60% one teacher and other teachers for the remaining 40% - every subject would be different in a high school?***

A That was considered but there was a timetabling issue - French, PE and music had fixed slots. It was preferred to go back to traditional primary teaching. The bond with a primary teacher was a special relationship and some children had not coped well with the transitions. Also with 3 classes per yeargroup there was support for planning from colleagues. The aim would be a core teacher for maths and English but some subjects might swap teachers eg art or computing. There would be no setting by ability. The move to stopping the model at half term had happened quickly - this was a sign that it was not working as well as it was hoped.

6.41 AC joined

#### ***Q How had Covid affected this?***

A FB noted it may just have been the wrong model for a primary school. RR supported this - he had supported the model but had underestimated the effects of it. Some children had found the movement unsettling and tiring, particularly in Yr 5. It was a good model to try but it was right to end the model now.

#### ***Q Was there any advantage for some subjects?***

A Scheduling/timetabling was an issue. A hybrid had been discussed and there were some subjects taught that way eg French, music and possibly art.

#### ***Q How about how you communicate this so it is not seen as a complete failure - more a general direction of travel and some subjects might go forward in the model?***

<p>A This would be considered - the project had helped to optimise teaching in the school. Some parents would be happy with this decision. The model had run for half the year but if this was not working why continue for another half the year.</p> <p>MC would send the Clerk the slides for this project report.</p> <p>RR noted how hard the teachers had worked on this model which had tested their skillset - and how dedicated they had been. Governors applauded this effort. The decision did not need to go to FGB as it was a decision for the leadership team. Governors had been involved and informed about the model and supported this decision.</p> <p>6.56 MC was thanked for his work on this - he left the meeting. This had been part of his qualification and it had been submitted 2 weeks previously.</p>	<p>MC</p>
<p><b>6. Date for deep dive - not discussed</b></p>	
<p><b>7. PPG report - CA</b></p> <p>The PPG strategy was on the website - with a lot of other information. The government now provided a template with an emphasis on linking to the new Ofsted framework and culture capital. There were also links to SEND and a need to highlight strategies around wellbeing, behaviour and attendance. One to one support and tutoring interventions were used.</p> <p>Recovery premium was given in September and could be merged with this funding. A big percentage had been spent on wellbeing - PPG families got priority for the ELSA/CWP. The school had low numbers of PPG children, some post Looked After Children but no Looked after children. Information on the website was compliant with requirements.</p> <p><b>Q 25% of PPG children were SEND - was that in line with averages - it must impact progress/attainment?</b></p> <p>A CA did not have the national figures but PPG numbers in school were low - the definitions for SEND were subjective and could vary between schools.</p> <p><b>Q It was more complex if there were SEND and PPG - was there a problem with implementation because of availability of agencies?</b></p> <p>A The school might not have to report numbers at all as they were so low. There was some definite overlap but the data was not hugely comparable as there were small numbers.</p> <p>All PPG families had accessed interventions which met their needs.</p> <p><b>Q Did this feature in the post Covid recovery plan too?</b></p> <p>A It was all part of holistic funding - some had been used for staffing. The school had a national tutor led tranche which had to be used by July - this was in response to Covid and it was not known if it would continue. This funded 15 hours for 17 pupils - the school topped up this funding. Tutoring would start after half term - children had been identified. Yr 5 had historically had high needs and some had been particularly affected by Covid. There would be some provision for teacher led support in the Summer Term.</p> <p><b>Q The PASS survey showed a high proportion with low self regard - that could be an indication of early mental health issues - if Covid absence had driven that did the school use money to help the wider body of children?</b></p> <p>A Staff were looking into this - there was targeted academic funding to raise academic levels.</p>	

<p>New testing PIRA and PUMA did a gap analysis and there were interventions to match. PASS results would be part of how progress was monitored.</p> <p>There was also a focus on a higher pace in the classroom - behaviours might be less challenging if there was higher self esteem.</p> <p>CA left 7.10 pm</p>	
<p><b>8. Attendance</b></p> <p>A document was sent out. Staffing had been a major challenge in the first 3 weeks of the term. There had been 18 staff members off for Covid and 3 for other illnesses. Pupil attendance had been low 93% for the year to date, 91% this term.</p> <p>Since September, 178 had tested positive for Covid. There were two members of staff off with stress. Low staffing levels did have an impact on the teaching and learning of children. A maths review was due the following Monday and that had been cancelled as the lead staff members was off sick. There was increased strain on the remaining staff in school. A large number of staff were missing school - help had been offered to two families to get the children in but the families were resistant.</p> <p>Even apart from Covid the attendance was not great - 165 children had had attendance letters not related to Covid. There were 34 families on holiday in term time.</p> <p><b>Q Was that consistent with other schools?</b> A it was not compared formally with other schools but it was known there was a similar picture in other schools too.</p> <p><b>Q Was there any response to the letters?</b> A Some parents were fed up they had been sent a letter - a follow up letter would be sent in a few weeks.</p> <p><b>Q How much of the absence is actual illness?</b> A This was not known and it was not known what levels were historically RR felt that absences were worse than in previous years - parents were staying away longer and taking holidays as they had not seen family for a long time. The EWO was visiting the school the following week - they would want the school to push hard on this.</p> <p><b>Q Was there anything needed from governors? Did a message need to go out that children all needed to be back in school?</b> A There might be a change in March that only people with symptoms would have to stay home. This message could be reinforced then.</p>	
<p><b>9. Covid recovery plan - discussed</b></p>	
<p><b>10. Policies</b></p> <p><b>Safeguarding would go to FGB.</b></p> <p><b>Remote learning</b></p> <p><b>Q What was being provide for children off with Covid - was there any sign that requirement might end?</b> A The portal was being used and families were directed to that. It was extra work for teachers - there was no information on that requirement ending. News and information was monitored.</p>	

Remote learning policy - RR and FB would review this.	RR, FB
<p><b>11. Minutes from last meeting</b></p> <p>These were agreed as an accurate record and would be signed by KM.</p> <p>At the next meeting there could be presentations on two different subject s- science and geography - a hybrid meeting (some in school some remoted) might be needed. KM and AC would discuss this and a draft strategy framework - they would arrange to meet and check FB's availability too</p> <p>The meeting closed at 7.56 pm with no Part 2 items.</p>	<p>KM</p> <p>Nxt mtg</p>