



Minutes of the Extraordinary Full Governing Body Meeting

Held on Tuesday 5 May 2020 at 7.00pm

Attendance

Karen Donald	✓	Rachael Wheeler	✓
Louise Druce (Headteacher)	✓	Simon Williams (Chair)	✓
Viv Gery	✓	Helen Vidal	✓
Stuart Getty	✓	In attendance	
Susie Hayward	✓	Richard Baker	Apologies
Rebecca Jennings	✓	Joanna Lee (SBL)	✓
Kate Kellett	✓	Louise Wheatley (Clerk to Governors)	✓
John Mackintosh	✓		

The meeting was conducted virtually. The meeting began at 7.00pm.

Agenda Item
<p>1. Apologies for Absence Apologies for absence were received and accepted as above.</p>
<p>2. Declaration of Interest There were no declarations of interest.</p>
<p>3. School visits including residential updates</p> <p>Processing a refund for High Ashurst JL presented governors with an update surrounding trips and residential scheduled for the summer term. The school had received a refund from High Ashurst for the Y4 trip and this was being held on account towards trips for Y4 in the next academic year. Regarding the Y3 Golden Hinde residential, refunds had been received from the Tower of London and the coach company, however not yet from the Golden Hinde. The Golden Hinde were processing refunds for trips up to the end of May but no decision had been made for trips in June. JL outlined worst case scenario resulting in the deposit made being held for the following year.</p> <p>For the Y6 residential, PGL have indicated they are hoping to open in July and therefore the school is still waiting for a decision to be made.</p> <p>JL shared that all other trips from now to the end of term had been cancelled.</p> <p>VG asked in the instance of where monies have been refunded to the school, were some parents needing it refunded. JL indicated yes this had been the case for two families and the school was responding to requests on a case by case basis when contacted. JL shared that the school had made the decision to hold the money for Y4 to the following year due to the costs incurred refunding the money through World Pay.</p>
<p>4. SAfE – Summer review and webinar update LD presented governors with an update regarding SAfE and their role.</p> <p>KK asked if the schools was still seeing similar numbers attending the child care provision. LD indicated it was but anticipated numbers to increase in the coming weeks. KK asked whether there were any more vulnerable children attending. LD indicated that recently 3 or 4 extra places had been offered to vulnerable families over the last week. LD shared the background to one vulnerable child who the school have recently been able to help.</p>

	<p>SW asked how the staff were coping in the current climate. LD praised the positivity of the staffing team but also highlighted the different challenges being faced by staff members. HV flagged the different workloads being taken on by different staffing groups.</p>
<p>5. Re-opening priorities and what will guide our decisions discussion</p>	<p>LD presented governors with an update surrounding staffing numbers should the school be required to open in the coming weeks. LD indicated that there were 15 teachers who would not be in due to having received a 12 week letter or are currently shielding or needing to protect family members.</p> <p>SH asked what was expecting to be announced and what was being prepared for. LD outlined different examples of returning to school that she had considered. LD highlighted her concerns regarding social distancing in school and the impossible task to enforce this in primary school. LD also outlined the difficulties faced in the upper years with reduced number of teachers available. SH asked would the ideal scenario be. LD indicated that the focus would be on Y5 and Y6 and following that Reception. SH asked if it was anticipated if parental discretion would be accommodated regarding children returning to school. LD shared that each family would be able to make their own decision about their child attending school, if the school was open for their child's year. LD also indicated that absence wouldn't be monitored. JM asked if it would be a decision for the governors to make regarding how the school returns. LD indicated yes it would be along with following guidance from the government, Surrey and what she as Headteacher would be advising would be a plan that would work.</p> <p>A discussion took place surrounding PPE and face masks.</p> <p>JM asked if the school was considering consulting parents. LD indicated a decision would be made as to what is best for the children within the governing body. LD shared that the school would most likely obtain an indication from parents if they would be likely to send their child if the school was open for their year group.</p> <p>SW highlighted his support for the school opening for Y5 and Y6 and also outlined other concerns which were outside of the school's control surrounding government decisions.</p> <p>LD highlighted the support being undertaken in providing books for particular children and also an increase in families taking up the free school meal hampers.</p> <p>SH asked about the method in which schools are advised as to decisions made. LD indicated that the school was only finding out at the same time as everyone. JM asked about the involvement of trade unions and LD outlined their operating practices.</p> <p>SG asked if there were any safeguarding concerns and LD indicated there were and outlined steps being undertaken.</p> <p>VG asked if some of the vulnerable families can come into school on some occasions and LD indicated that was so but the government had stipulated what vulnerable meant.</p> <p>KDonald asked if some teachers might not return if their union was advising against it and LD responded that it would be down to the union and whether they formally voted to strike or not.</p> <p>LD updated governors on the Home Learning Passports moving to a daily format in the coming weeks so if a child wasn't in school on a particular day, work could be undertaken at home.</p>
<p>6. Policies to be agreed</p>	<p>Questions were asked surrounding the policies as detailed in Appendix 1 and both policies were subsequently agreed and approved by the governing body.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour Policy • Safeguarding Arrangements COVID-19
<p>7. Date of next meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 May 2020 at 7.00pm <p>SW thanked all the staff and governors for their time spent in these difficult times.</p>

--	--

The meeting finished at 8.00pm

Advice given by Governors at this school is incidental to their professional expertise and is not being given in their professional capacity. Governors must respect the confidence of those items of business which a Governing Body decides and not disclose what individual Governors have said or how they have voted within a meeting.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 1

The following questions were asked by RW and responded to by LD:

With regards to the step system, are there examples of behaviour that would warrant an instant step for each level (as is the case for a step 5 in the Behaviour Policy)? It would be particularly useful to understand what examples of behaviour would justify an instant step 4?

There is no exhaustive list as it would take forever but as a general guide it is for when learning is disrupted or someone isn't following the Behaviour Code but is not as serious as a Step 5.

2. How is consistency measured between staff for the issuing of steps and the number assigned?

Record sheets, behaviour on the parents' eve proformas. However, it is not as cut and dry as different cohorts of children will mean that the number of steps will never be uniform throughout the school.

3. With the changes being proposed for steps 4 and 5, has there been an increase in the number of children receiving these and/or the number being given out overall to the same children? Where impact is mentioned as being one of the reasons for the proposed changes, have you noticed a general rise in continuous poor behaviour?

No increase in number. Kathryn reports on the number given to the same children but over time, before the pandemic, this had decreased. The impact was more around the teachers time and the impact it had on the children by speaking to the parents. We think the time would be better spent with the children. There is a lot of time wasted in trying to contact parents and then them not calling back or teachers being met with defence because they have tried to talk to parents at the gate when it is not the best place to have a quick conversation before a club starts, for example.

4. In terms of staff workload and wellbeing, will the reflection session with the child be less time intensive than the communication with parents? Or is this a longer term strategy to minimise the need to issue steps?

Yes, less intensive but more meaningful and may reduce step 4s. However, I think that some people avoid giving step 4s due to the time it takes and doesn't really change the behaviour.

5. Will the proposed changes for steps 4 and 5 eliminate verbal communication with the parents about the behavioural incident outside of parents' evening? If so, could this affect the school/parent cohesive relationship to improve the behaviour?

For Step 4, it will lessen the communication but I think it will lessen 'bad' communication on our side due to a lack of time for all. At present, it can be a rushed conversation at the gate, or a call at work etc. and this has led to more problems than it solves. Hence the change.

For Step 5, there is still an opportunity for parents to talk to a member of the LMT.

Do you think it would lessen the concern for the child to receive a step 4 if that were the case?

Additionally, could a step 3 (leaving the classroom) feel a more significant discipline measure for a child than that of the proposed step 4?

No for both questions because the Step 4 chat would happen at a breaktime so is more significant.

I note that the Behaviour Policy on the website is dated 5th December 2019 (i'm assuming this be when it was last reviewed?)

Yes

If so, the following points are likely to have already been discussed/considered. Whilst reading through 'The Guidance for Governing bodies' in relation to behaviour and discipline in schools, I noted they recommend the following:

Our policy follows a model set out by Surrey but I will ask Kathryn to look into these specifically.

1. **Searching pupils** (including identifying in the school rules which items are banned and may be searched for) When first reading this (it also refers to screening), my instant reaction was that this was most relevant for secondary schools. However, with the rise of both gang and drug culture and the growing concern of younger children being exploited in this area, I would be interested in your views. The guidance advises schools should make clear which items are banned with the ability for staff to ask children to turn out pockets or look in bags (with the pupil's consent).

At Stamford Green our main issue is with mobile phones being handed in and this is covered in our A to Z Guide.

2. The power to discipline beyond the school gate

The guidance refers to bad behaviour occurring when travelling to and from school and whilst wearing school uniform. Once again, I know there will be few children this relates to within our school community because of

their age. However, have you ever experienced any issues in this area, perhaps with year 6 children in particular who may be travelling to/from school by themselves?

No but we have dealt with online bullying issues that have happened out side school.

3. Pastoral care for school staff accused of misconduct

This is set out in a different policy