The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames and the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Minutes of the Virtual School Governing Board Meeting held: Tuesday 03 December 2019 3.30 pm



## **Constitution, Membership and Attendance**

Director for Education Services	Charis Penfold (CP)
Director of Social Care	Alison Twynam (AT)
Virtual School Head Teacher	Suzanne Parrott (SEP)
Head of Governor Support	Angela Langford (AL)
Primary Headteacher (LBR)	Carmen Palmer (St Richard's CE Primary School) (CPa)
Secondary Headteacher (RBK)	Tom Gibson (The Holy Cross School) (TG)
Primary Headteacher (RBWM)	Gemma Donnelly (GD)
Foster Carer	Ruth Sinclair (RS)
Kingston and Richmond CCG	Vicky Fraser (VF)

Apologies (in bold): Gemma Donnelly, Angela Langford

Also attended: Paul Chapman (Deputy Virtual School Head) and Julia Hunt (Clerk)

1.	Apologies/Declarations of Interest	
1.1	CP opened the meeting and apologies were recorded as above.	
1.2	On behalf of the Board, CP welcomed Sara Freitag (Virtual School EP), Collette Carter	
	and Marzena Bryk (Finance) and Paul Chapman (Deputy Head). The agenda running	
	order was adjusted to accommodate the external presenters.	
2.	EP Overview (Sara Freitag)	
2.1	SF gave an overview of the role of EPs in the Virtual School. Three part-time EPs	
	support the Virtual School and their responsibilities are broadly divided over the three	
	boroughs although there is some crossover. Their role comprises of five elements;	
	training, child focused work, research, SEND, and consultation/supervision.	
2.2	EPs are available to CYP wherever they are in the country and often identify unmet	
	learning needs. Their support reduces exclusions and support schools to reduce	
	unnecessary placement moves.	
2.3	The EP's role is crucial in supporting the statutory role of the Virtual School to train	
	and upskill others and achieves this through a variety of training opportunities.	
2.4	Consultation/supervision and reflective practice are evidenced based and effective	
	means of giving psychology away, empowering and skilling up others who work	
	directly with CYP.	

2.5	Numbers of CLA with SEND are significant and so EPs work closely with the SEN Team and meet half termly with them to discuss practice and streamline processes. EPs also have close links with EHS permanency team to ensure the right resources are being	
	deployed.	
2.6	Ruth Sinclair joined the meeting	
2.6	Research plays a key role and CLA are an under researched group. Among the many research projects, EPs worked with PALAC to identify the needs of Unaccompanied	
	Asylum Seekers which led to a co-produced guidance for schools. This research	
	supported the Transition Hub bid.	
	Q. Are the EPs full time?	
	A. No, 2 days are allocated to Windsor & Maidenhead, and 2 days across Richmond	
	and Kingston. There is an EP shortage nationally with insufficient numbers to	
	currently support statutory responsibilities, so adding capacity is an ongoing	
	challenge.	
	Q. What access do CYP who are at risk of permanent exclusion have to neuro	
	developmental assessments and how does this work in practice?	
	A. The Virtual School are linking in with Dr Pooley but access to this is very variable.	
	Q. Will this change with the Transition Hub?	
	A. Not necessarily as it is an NHS service.	
	<ul><li>Q. Is there speech and language therapy in the Transition Hub?</li><li>A. It is an option. If the Hub is located where it is expected, then yes.</li></ul>	
2.7	Governors discussed the need to share the preventative work undertaken by EPs to	
,	help the group of vulnerable children on the cusp of care who are experiencing fixed	
	term exclusions. It is key to help schools be the stabilising factor in their lives when	
	everything else is changing.	
	Q. How successful are we in liaising with out of borough CYP?	
	A. it is a capacity issue and is particularly challenging for those CYP moving quickly	
	around in multiple placements.	
	Q. Are you liaising with Dr Pooley and the permanency services about these	
	children? This needs to be joined up and triangulated.	
	A. Yes with the SDQ initiative we are looking at how we are going to monitor this	
2	across services.	
3. 3.1	Finance Update (Collette Carter and Marzena Bryk) The Finance Team gave an overview of how the Virtual School is financed and how the	
J.1	funding is allocated.	
3.2	The Virtual School receives funding of £467,600 from the three boroughs via the	
	Dedicated Schools Grant, council funding and the Previously Looked After grant (this	
	grant is allocated by academic year rather than financial year). In addition the Virtual	
	School receives a total of £561,200 PP+ funding equating to £2,300 per pupil.	
	Q. Does the Virtual School get audited?	
	A. Yes, the accounts are audited by internal and external auditors and in addition a	
	report is presented at Council level.	
	Q. In terms of PPG how do we audit it is being appropriately spent?	
	A. Marzena Byrk meets with Sam Connor regularly to monitor this spend and SEP	
	meets weekly with Sam Connor. Money is accounted for on the PEP child by child	
2.2	and a breakdown of PPG spend is circulated to governors.	
3.3	It was agreed AT would make a link governor visit to discuss PPG spend in more detail	AT
	and give an update at the next FGB in March.	^'

3.4	Governors discussed the criteria for allocating PP+ funding and it was agreed a "deep	
	dive" should take place at the March FGB meeting. SEP outlined that the strategic use	
	of PP+ was reported in the circulated PP+ Narrative. Additionally, each pupil's impact	
	is collected via PEPs and collated into a report. Use of PP+ is closely monitored both	
	within the Virtual School at weekly meetings and with Finance. Reports are shared	
	with the LInk Governor for PP+ and the VSH's Line Manager. Impact reports of PP	
	funded interventions and training are shared with partners there are likely to be links	
	between positive outcomes and the use of PP+. CP to consider the format of the PP+	
	funding and protocol "deep dive". for additional feedback next term	СР
4.	General Update (Charis Penfold)	
4.1	Following Social Care focus visits and their feedback, a Careers Officer has been	
	appointed for CLA. This role will offer advice to pupils from Year 9 to support their	
	long term career discussions and to help us address the number of NEET CLAs. It was	
	agreed Governors would review the impact of this appointment in Autumn 2020.	
	Rochelle Watson, Post 16 Outreach to present to FGB in March 2020	
4.2	Kingston's ILAC inspection (Ofsted's Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services)	
	was very positive – the report will be published on 19 December.	
4.3	In 2018 The Virtual School's responsibilities were expanded to include CYP up to the	
	age of 25. By establishing a Virtual College this would provide an opportunity to look	
	at leaving care and how services support these young people. Work needs to be done	
	on encouraging an attachment aware community, not just in schools and Ian Thomas	
	is already working with local businesses.	
	Q. Do those young people who have been moved out of the borough return?	
	A. Yes, broadly at aged 16-17 which is why a Virtual College would be so important.	
4.4		
	and SEP is now line managed through Social Care in RBWM.	
	Q. Who made this decision?	
	A. The Joint Directors of Children's Services after a consultation period.	
	Governors expressed their concern that they had not been consulted and CP agreed	СР
	to take this back to CLT.	
4.5	Governors discussed the need for the FGB to ensure education remains a key focus.	
	CP confirmed she will be meeting with CLT to discuss the Virtual School governance	
	arrangements and will feedback to the FGB in March. In light of this it was agreed the	CP/Clerk
	Terms of Reference be reviewed at the March meeting. SEP outlined that a Virtual	
	School sits between Social Care and Education and has equal responsibilities to	
	provide support and challenge in both areas. The guidance for Virtual Schools is that	
	they should be line managed either by the Director of Education or Social Care (ref	
	Handbook for Virtual School Headteachers, National Association of Virtual Schools).	
	SEP reassured Governors that she would be attending the same meetings in both	
	directorates as before and that the Virtual School function of championing education	
	would not change. The change in the level of reporting line would raise the profile of	
	looked after children's education; provide better opportunities to influence and was	
	therefore a positive development for the looked after children in our care.	
	TG left the meeting	
5.	Virtual School Headteacher's Reports	
5.1	SEP summarised the key attendance headlines. For 2018/19, average absence	
	figures nationally were 4.5%. Locally they were 4% in Richmond, 4.1% in Kingston,	
	and 3.9% in RBWM.	

		Г
5.2	Persistent absence nationally was 10.6%, Richmond was 5.7%, Kingston 9.6% and	
	RBWM 6.7% all below the National level. Although Kingston is still quite high, it was	
_	previously at 27% and demonstrates a consistent improvement trend.	
5.3	The Virtual School produce reports on a by pupil basis to assess attendance patterns	
	and themes and in October, 19% went on holiday in term time which is a concern as	
	this requires approval from the Virtual School and SEP has received no such requests.	
	In addition, there was 44% sickness and SEP will consider both of these further. 9%	
	were due to exclusions and 22% were school refusal.	
	Q. Are there any differences between in borough and out of borough?	SEP
	A. SEP agreed to look into this further.	
5.4	Governors discussed whether these absences are medical appointments inaccurately	
	categorized as sickness. CLA often have complex medical needs which require	
	numerous medical appointments which often need to take place during school hours.	
	SEP explained that VS training to professionals highlights the importance of avoiding	
	booking appointments during school hours as these can build up and impact on	
	progress. Governors thanked SEP for the clear new format of the reports.	
5.5	SEP updated Governors on the Transition Hub. The Hub was created following a	
	successful collaborative bid by the Virtual School, Barnet Virtual School and St Mary's	
	University. The Hub offers support to the child, carer and the receiving school during	
	the early phases of transition. The short term intended outcomes of the Hub are to	
	facilitate more effective transitions into mainstream and/or care placements and	
	ensure greater school and foster carer placement stability.	
5.6	GD submitted some comments on the SIP Report which was not covered at the	
3.0	meeting – Clerk to ask SEP to feedback directly to GD.	Class.
6		Clerk
6.	Reflections from the New Deputy Head, Paul Chapman	
6.1	PC briefly summarized his experience prior to joining the Virtual School and shared his	
6.3	thoughts on his first few months in post.	
6.2	In terms of learning and progress, although the cohorts are small every child is	
	important. 71% of eligible students (7 students) achieved the expected standard in	
	Phonics which is well above the national average. At KS1 (3 students) all are making	
	good progress from their starting point.	
6.3	At KS2 (8 students) exceeded the national average for CLA and non CLA students.	
	Progress 8 scores were: Richmond +0.33, Kingston -0.44 and RBWM -0.62. National	
	CLA is -0.96.	
6.4	The percentage of pupils achieving English and Maths 4+ was 44% in 2019, compared	
	to the National CLA average in 2018 of 17.5%. All three boroughs exceeded the 2018	
	national average for attainment 8 and English and Maths 4+.	
6.5	PC reminded governors of the mountain categorization used to monitor student	
	progress and ensure all levels of ability were supported with interventions.	
6.6	Two Celebration of Achievement events took place this term and were well received.	
6.7	At the PAN London Virtual School Conference, London boroughs met to build	
	networks, to learn from each other and to share good practice.	
7.	Minutes of the last meeting and Matters Arising	
7.1	Minutes of the meeting dated 8 July 2019 were agreed as an accurate record. All	
	actions were complete, subject to the following updates.	
7.2	Action 5.1.2 - SEP/AT to discuss the inclusion of risk assessment reports on a child's	
	file following a school's RI judgement. It was agreed it is appropriate for this risk	
	assessment to be held on the Ofsted Huddle.	

7.3	Action 6.5 - SEP to provide a breakdown of CLA SEND in and out of borough for the	Clerk
	November meeting. It was agreed a "deep dive" on CLA and SEND (including sub	
	groups) be placed on the Summer meeting agenda.	
7.4	Emerging groups and those at the edge of care should also be a future agenda item.	
7.5	Governors agreed that the meeting time should be extended to 1hr 45 minutes.	
8.	Date of Next Meeting	
8.1	18 March 2020.	

The meeting ended at 5.15 pm	
Signed by the Chair	 
Date	

## **Summary of Actions**

Item	Action	Responsible governor
3.3	AT to make a link governor visit to discuss PPG spend in more	AT
	detail and give an update at the next FGB in March 2020	
3.4	CP to consider the format of the PP+ funding and protocols	СР
	"deep dive"	
4.5	CP to feedback to CLT governors' concern at not being consulted	СР
	about SEP's line management changes	
4.6	CP to feedback on Virtual School governance arrangements at	СР
	March FGB	
	Terms of Reference to be reviewed at March meeting	Clerk
5.3	SEP to consider differences regarding in and out of borough data	SEP
	on persistent absence	
5.6	Clerk to ask SEP to feedback to GD on comments submitted in	Clerk
	relation to SIP report which was not covered at the meeting	
7.3	CLA/SEND Deep Dive to be placed on July agenda	Clerk