



**Sussex Road Community Primary School**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of the Governing Body**  
**held on 7 June 2020 at 10.00am through virtual governance arrangements**

	<b>Present:</b>	Nicola Furlonger (Chair) Sarah Bowles (Headteacher) Andrew Chesworth (AC) Alison D'Alton (SBM) Vanessa Lines (VL) Andrew Pembroke (AP) Clare Robertson (CR) Louisa Rowlands (LR) Emma Sangster (ES) Michael Webber (MW) Jo Winker (JW)	
	<b>In attendance</b>	Carly Birkett, (Deputy Headteacher (DHT)) Lesley Hardwick (Clerk)	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> There were no apologies, although John Thompson was absent. The Chair confirmed that he had asked for a further leave of absence until September, and that, although she had asked him if he would be able to attend virtual meetings in the meantime, he had not yet responded on this point. The Clerk confirmed that the meeting was quorate.		
<b>2.</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF BUSINESS INTERESTS</b> No declarations of interest were received in respect of any item on the Agenda.		
<b>3.</b>	<b>REVIEW OF RISK ASSESSMENT</b> The Chair commented that a great deal of work had gone into producing the Risk Assessment and thanked the HT, DHT and SBM for preparing it.  The Chair asked the HT if the Risk Assessment had highlighted any areas of particular concern for her. The HT confirmed that she believed that everything possible had been done to mitigate the identified risks, and that the overall level of risk was low. She pointed out that it would not be possible to eliminate risk entirely, as some were outside the school's control or came from children's home environment. She commented that this was particularly the case regarding the safeguarding of vulnerable children, as the School was not seeing these children every day, as it would have done previously and because she was aware that in some instances, although the School had done everything possible in terms of referrals to and liaison with outside agencies, social workers had had to drop cases where they had not been able to elicit any response from parents. The HT also suggested that maintaining supplies of PPE could become a high risk issue, as sourcing supplies of appropriate PPE of the right 'grade' was extremely difficult. She thanked the SBM for her continuing work in this but remarked that a sudden increase in demand for PPE from staff could result in a shortage. The HT finally advised that she was aware of an increase in anxiety amongst staff as the date for the wider reopening of the school approached, and particularly concerns that they could take infection back into their homes, especially where they had family members who were 'shielding'. She reported that one member of staff would be taking unpaid leave as a result.  In response to a question, the DHT advised that she had nothing to add to the HT's summary, although she confirmed that she had spoken to a number of staff who were anxious or upset over the past week. She added that the wellbeing of those staff who had		

expressed concerns would be closely monitored. The HT commented that it was possible that some of the more anxious members of staff might subsequently decide to take the option of unpaid leave, and pointed out that this could have an impact on staff cover. **A Governor asked what steps had been taken to help staff manage their anxieties.** The DHT advised that having the opportunity to come in to see the changes that had been made had been helpful for some staff, but commented that these anxieties were personal to the member of staff concerned and dependant on individual circumstances. However, she hoped that the level of anxiety would fall once staff and children returned to school. The HT added that the virus had impacted on individual staff and families differently, with some having lost family members, or suffered illness themselves, and commented that mixed messages in the media also raised anxiety levels. **A Governor asked why the School had not furloughed those staff who felt unable to return to work, suggesting that it was unfair to penalise them for these concerns by only offering unpaid leave.** The HT confirmed that this action had been taken on SPS advice and explained that organisations who were publicly funded, such as councils and maintained schools, were not allowed to furlough staff. The Clerk added that schools were only able to furlough staff whose salaries were fully paid through a private income stream and another Governor commented that schools were continuing to pay contractors during the closure period for the same reason. **A Governor asked whether staff who did not feel able to return to work could work from home instead, for example undertaking planning for home-school lessons, which would take pressure off other staff.** The HT advised that the members of staff concerned did not have an appropriate skill set to do this and that it would be asking them to take on a different role.

**A Governor noted that the pre- and post-action risk levels had not been RAG-rated in a few sections of the draft Risk Assessment, although the risk and action sections had been completed in full.** The HT confirmed the RAG-rating for these sections:

- PPE – pre-action risk Amber, post-action risk Amber
- Catering – pre-action risk Amber, post-action risk Green
- Finance – The HT advised that she would discuss the ratings for this section further with the DBM
- Attendance – The HT commented that some of the actions within this section had also been covered within other sections. She pointed out that Persistent Absence levels varied across the school, with the year group with the highest PA rate (Year 4) not yet returning to School. **A Governor asked what safeguarding action was being taken in these cases.** The HT confirmed that where PA levels were high, the family would be receiving regular phone calls to check on wellbeing. **A Governor questioned the action that would be taken where a family had indicated that a (vulnerable) child would be coming into school, but subsequently did not come.** The HT advised that the child would be on the School's attendance register in this case, and that the family would be contacted if they did not arrive in school.
- Staffing (contractors) – The HT confirmed that she would check this further with the SBM but suggested that the post-action risk would have to remain 'amber' as the mitigation actions ultimately depended on actions taken by contractors.

**A Governor asked if the scheduled Fire Drill had taken place.** The SBM confirmed that a fire drill would be held on the morning of 8/6/20.

**In response to a question, the HT confirmed that children with SEND were likely to have been attending school during the closedown period and would remain in their existing 'bubble' if this was the case.**

<p><b>A Governor asked what action would be taken where a child persistently breached the social distancing guidelines.</b> The HT noted that some schools had indicated that they would exclude a child in these circumstances, as this would be potentially putting others at risk, but that there had been no official guidance on this. She added that it was accepted that younger children would not be able to self-distance consistently, although she suggested that social distancing was more likely to be an issue with parents at drop off and pick up times. She confirmed that any issues would be considered taking account of the age of the child and the context of the incident(s) and remarked that it would be likely that the child concerned would have wider issues and might already be receiving additional support. <b>A Governor commented that persistent breaches of social distancing by one child could make other children nervous or anxious.</b> The HT suggested that in extreme cases it might be necessary to take a child out of their 'bubble' and provide 1:1 care in another area of the school. A Governor remarked that it was difficult to predict how individual children might react to returning to school. The HT pointed out that under the School's Behaviour Policy children were treated as individuals and confirmed that this would continue. The DHT commented that from the experience of the Key Worker and Vulnerable children who had been coming into school, children had taken note of the new restrictions, and had adjusted to them well. The HT pointed out that it would be important not to give children mixed messages, as they were expected to socially distance outside school.</p> <p><b>A Governor asked whether the wellbeing of less experienced staff taking a group of children on their own would be monitored as these staff might be particularly anxious during this time.</b> The HT commented that, although some staff who would be teaching bubbles would be less experienced than others, all staff who were teaching would have taught children on their own previously and that they would not be being asked to do something that was outside their current job description. She added that the school was not be required to follow the national curriculum for the children who were in school, although it was being followed on the home learning programme.</p> <p><b>A Governor asked how any non-Covid related emergency would be dealt with when staff were on their own with a group of children.</b> The SBM confirmed that there would be a first-aid kit in every classroom and that staff would be able to contact the Office for assistance in the usual way.</p> <p>A Governor noted that it was appropriate that the post-action risk level would remain Amber in some cases, as some risks could not be mitigated away entirely. <b>It was noted that the CYP with SEND section had been RAG-rated Green before mitigating action, and Amber afterwards.</b> The HT confirmed that this section should be Amber in both columns. <b>The SEND Governor pointed out that the School and GB's statutory responsibilities towards children with SEND remained in place and that direct lines of communication should be maintained. The Clerk advised that Statutory monitoring (Safeguarding, SEND and Health &amp; Safety) should continue and asked the relevant Governors to arrange virtual monitoring discussions with the relevant member of staff during Term 6 and produce a report on the conversation for the Term 6 FGB meeting.</b></p> <p><b>A Governor asked whether all children who needed them had been allocated laptops.</b> The HT confirmed that this was the case. It was agreed that the text in the Risk Assessment should be amended to 'some' children, as laptops had only been only given out where they were needed. The HT added that where younger children were concerned, when they were in school the teacher would bring up the relevant pages from the school website onto the whiteboard, whereas older children would be working independently.</p>	<p>Monit-oring Govs</p>
---	-------------------------

**A Governor suggested that the Risk Assessment should make reference to the advice from the LA regarding children attending on a part-time rota basis, as this would support the stance that the School had taken.** The HT remarked that she was pleased that she had waited until the LA's advice had been published before taking a decision on this as she was aware that some schools that had offered places on a part-time basis had subsequently had to withdraw them. **In response to a further question she advised that it was possible for children in the Key Worker group to attend on a part-time basis and explained that this enabled the bubble for these year groups to be larger, on the basis that the children would not all be in school at the same time.** She also confirmed that primary schools were not able to change the member of staff allocated to each bubble (unless this was due to staff absence), whereas secondary schools were able to do so because the whole year group were not expected to be in school at once. **A Governor asked that the RA should include a statement that the School had followed the LA's advice, as this had been an important part of the decision process, although another Governor pointed out that the RA was not designed to go into minute detail. In response to a further question the HT confirmed that the isolation period in respect of the outbreak involving staff/children would end on 8/6/20**

**A Governor asked about the contract cleaning arrangements.** The SBM advised that the usual team of 5 operatives was now back in place and praised the work that they had done, including working longer hours and completing a number of full deep cleans.

The SBM commented on the difficulties of obtaining PPE supplies. She explained that she could not order PPE from the majority of her normal suppliers, because their supplies were all reserved for the government/NHS and that others had advised that although they had supplies in stock, they could not be sent to schools. She confirmed that she was sourcing whatever she could from the internet but that there was a risk that suppliers listed online might not be genuine or that the PPE might not be of an appropriate quality, and that some sites would not sell to customers with business accounts. She added that she had been able to source some supplies of visors from other local schools who were producing them themselves but that disposable items were more difficult to source and pointed out that she still needed to demonstrate that she was doing her best to obtain value for money. The Vice Chair asked the SBM to contact him if she continued to have difficulty in sourcing PPE. **A Governor asked whether the situation regarding PPE was critical.** The SBM confirmed that she was comfortable that there was sufficient PPE on site to open the School, but that she would need to source more, and that this was likely to have an additional cost. She added that staff had all been briefed on remaining safe and secure on site.

**In response to a question, the HT confirmed that the school would be fully staffed for September and that the DHT and SENCO had continued to recruit since the lockdown.**

**A Governor questioned the financial impact of Covid-19 for the School.** The SBM confirmed that she had submitted the estimated costs between April and September to the LA, but pointed out that some expenditure had already been budgeted for, and that the School was in a more positive position financially than many others. She confirmed that none of the issues referred to in the Risk Assessment would impact on the School's ability to open on 8/6/20.

The SBM reported that she was expecting BT to come onto site to check on the phone lines and had a list of their working requirements. She added that she would expect contractors to assess the potential risks to their staff before coming on site and that she would provide them with details of the School's expectations. The HT added that Nourish

	<p>had wanted to come onto site to deep clean the kitchen, but had not been allowed do so because there was not sufficient space for this work to be completed safely.</p> <p><b>A Governor noted that it was anticipated that the ‘gap’ between vulnerable and SEND children and their peers would have increased by the time that all children returned to school and asked if it was possible for the School to estimate the impact on Sussex Road children.</b> The HT agreed that the gap would have widened but pointed out that it would not be possible to measure it until the School could see what children had produced at home and the impact of the lockdown on their progress. She pointed out that Sussex Road was providing a higher level of support to vulnerable and SEND students than many other schools, with children receiving personalised work packs, delivered to their homes, and receiving regular targeted support from TAs. <b>A Governor commented that this reflected the high quality of SEND leadership in the School and pointed out that the SLT and GB needed to make sure that robust succession planning was put in place.</b> The HT added that all teaching staff were determined to do their best for the children and suggested that parents might not be aware of the amount of work that went into producing the personalised workpacks and providing individual and personalised feedback to each child. <b>A Governor suggested that the School should be proactive in promoting what it had done.</b></p> <p><b>In response to a question, the HT confirmed that all staff had received a personalised ‘induction’ into the new arrangements and had had the opportunity to raise any questions and concerns.</b> The Chair confirmed that the Risk Assessment was a detailed and robust document, although she pointed out that it would be subject to constant change, <b><i>It was agreed that the FGB should receive an update at its next scheduled meeting and that in the meantime the Chair confirmed that she and the Vice Chair would continue to liaise with the HT and leadership team.</i></b></p> <p>Following the above discussion, Governors confirmed that they were confident in the HT’s risk assessment from their informed knowledge of the school and risk assessment, the KCC return to school guidance and government guidance.</p>	
4.	<p><b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p><b>Outcomes from PHE investigation</b>  <b>In response to a question, the HT confirmed that the investigation had now been closed and that all recent testing had produced negative results.</b> She advised that the PHE still suspected that the case that had triggered the investigation had been picked up from within the school, as there had been no other known source of contact, but that the testing had been carried out at too late a stage to confirm this. She also advised that, to date, there had been no direct communication from KCC to parents, and that the School had therefore addressed the PHE activity in itself in a letter home. She also reported that schools would not be expected to ‘close’ a bubble unless and until there was a positive test result, although any child or member of staff displaying symptoms would be sent home until the test results were known, and that if the test proved to be positive all children and the member of staff working with them would be required to self-isolate for 14 days even if they did not develop any symptoms. <b>A Governor asked how bubbles would be covered if the member of staff became ill with a non-Covid related condition.</b> The HT confirmed that schools were able to bring in supply staff although the SBM pointed that support staff would only be allowed on site with a completed Risk Assessment. It is possible that the bubble would have to ‘close’.</p> <p><b>Communication on School website</b>  <b>A Governor noted that letters and other communication sent to parents since the lockdown had not been uploaded to the School website, so that they would have</b></p>	

	<p><b>been seen by parents, but not by other Governors or stakeholders. He expressed some concern at the perception that this might give to third parties such as Ofsted.</b></p> <p>The HT pointed out that she would not wish parents to compare one school's actions against another and had therefore decided not to upload letters which had been sent directly to the relevant parents. The Chair noted that she and the Vice Chair had seen all the letters that had been sent. <b><i>It was agreed that the Clerk would create an appropriate folder on the Governors' Sharepoint site to enable correspondence to be shared with the whole FGB. It was also agreed that there should be a note on the website to confirm that all relevant communications were being sent directly to parents/cares for the time being.</i></b></p> <p><b>Wider reopening of the School</b>  <b>In response to a question, the HT confirmed that the School would not be able to open to additional year groups unless the current social distancing restrictions were amended or schools were able to offer part-time attendance.</b> She pointed out that, under current guidance, schools were required to give priority to vulnerable children or children from key worker families.</p> <p><b>Policy approvals</b>  The Clerk advised that the LA had produced a further Addendum to the Child Protection Policy and that other statutory/model policies were also likely to be changed as a result of Covid-19. <b><i>It was agreed that any amendments to statutory policies were to be approved by the Chair through Chair's Action and ratified at the next FGB meeting.</i></b></p> <p><b>Governor Terms of Office</b>  The Chair reported that two Governors' Terms of Office would be ending at the beginning of July and would either be dealt with through Chair's Action or at the next FGB meeting, once discussions had taken place with the Governors concerned. She suggested that it might be necessary to bring the next scheduled FGB meeting forward to accommodate this.</p> <p>There was no other urgent business.</p>	<p>LH</p> <p>SB</p> <p>SB/NF</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>CONFIDENTIALITY.</b>  No items of confidentiality were identified</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>  It was confirmed that the next meeting would be held on 15/7/2020 at 6.30pm, and would probably take place virtually.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 11.18am</p>	

Signed.(Chair).....Date .....

## ACTION LOG

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Details	Deadline	Responsibility	Status
16.9.19 17.10.19 29.11.19 17.3.20	5 3 3 9	Governors to contact the Chair if they are aware of a potential governor with Safeguarding experience	End T2	All	On going
29.11.19 10.2.20 17.3.20 11.5.20	7 3 7 3	A Safeguarding visit to be carried out during Term 3	End T6	MW	To be completed by the end of T6 if possible
10.2.20	4	HTs' reports to meetings where the SP is not on the agenda to include a summary of progress against key milestones	Ongoing	SB	To be taken forward
10.2.20 17.3.20	7 3,7	A Condition Report to be prepared and discussed with the Health & Safety Governor	17.3.20	ADA	To be taken forward
17.3.20	4	The DHT to report to Governors once more skills progression documents had been completed	11.5.20	CB	To be taken forward
17.3.20	5	Future monitoring visits to review the use and impact of PE Funding	End T6	JW	To be taken forward
17.3.20	7	The HTs direct input into safeguarding to be discussed during a future visit	End T6	MW	To be taken forward
17.3.20	7	A Health & Safety site visit to be arranged	End T6	AC/ADA	To be taken forward
17.3.20 11.5.20	9 3	A meeting to be arranged with a potential Co-opted Governor candidate	11.5.20	LH/MW/NF	Initial discussions to take place with potential governors with no formal action to be taken until September
17.3.20	9	Discussions on the 2020/21 Strategic Plan to be fed back to the GB	End T6	SB/CB	To be taken forward
17.3.20	9	PPG provision and spend to be discussed as part of L&M Monitoring	End T6	NF	To be taken forward
11.5.20 7.6.20	1 1	John Tomlinson to be contacted by the Chair regarding non-attendance at FGB meetings	End T5	NF	Completed – further leave of absence requested
11.5.20	8	Details of forthcoming TEP Governor Training webinars to be sent to all Governors	End T5	LR	
11.5.20	9	Comments on the draft Recovery Plan for Governance to be sent to JW	End T5	All	
7.6.20	3	Statutory monitoring (SEND, Safeguarding & Health & Safety) to be completed remotely during	15.7.20	Monitoring Governors	

		Term 6 and reported to the Term 6 FGB meeting			
7.6.20	3	The FGB to receive an updated Risk Assessment at its next meeting, with liaison between the Chair, Vice Chair and HT continuing in the meantime	15.7.20	SB/NF/MW	
7.6.20	4	A 'Correspondence' folder to be created on Sharepoint.	12.6.20	LH	
7.6.20	4	A note be included on the website to confirm that communications to parents are being sent directly and not uploaded to the site	12.6.20	SB/ADA	
7.6.20	4	Amendments to Statutory Policies relating to Covid-19 arrangements to be approved by Chair's Action and ratified at the next FGB meeting	15.7.20	SB/ADA/NF	

APPROVED