

**Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School
Archdiocese of Birmingham**

**Minutes of the Full Governing Body Meeting (held remotely due to
COVID-19)**

Thursday 21st May 2020 at 6.30pm

Present:

Mrs. Rachel Gavin	(RG)	Staff Governor, Headteacher
Mr. Patrick Fitzpatrick	(PF)	Foundation Governor (Chair)
Mr. Luke Thompson	(LT)	Foundation Governor
Mr. David Connolly	(DC)	Foundation Governor (Vice-Chair)
Mrs. Karen Barker	(KB)	Foundation Governor
Mrs. Rebecca Stimpson	(RS)	Foundation Governor
Mr. Ken Ingram	(KI)	Foundation Governor
Mrs. Amy French	(AF)	Co-opted Governor
Mr. Mark Artherton	(MA)	LA Governor
Mr. Adam Smith	(AS)	Parent Governor
Mrs. Nicola Edwards	(NE)	Staff Governor

Apologies

Mr. Miles Saunders	(MS)	Foundation Governor
--------------------	------	---------------------

In attendance:

Mrs. Joanna Hackett	(JH)	Clerk
---------------------	------	-------

The meeting was quorate and commenced at 6.45pm.

Opening Prayer

1. Welcome and Apologies

PF welcomed everyone to the meeting.
Apologies were received and accepted from MS.

2. Notification of urgent AOB: none.

3. Declaration of interests for this meeting: none.

4. School response to Covid-19 (re-opening)

Papers had been circulated prior to the meeting.
PF explained that RG has prepared a preliminary risk assessment in line with the government advice on re-opening schools to Year 6, Reception and Year 1. The government has asked schools to make their own decisions based upon the risk assessment. The school needs to consider whether it can control the spread of corona virus through social distancing measures. PF visited the school yesterday, went through the risk assessment with RG and asked her to consider options.

Capacity. There are seven classrooms available. One classroom must be kept available for keyworker children. Implementing social distance measures will only allow 8 to 10 children per classroom, with a maximum capacity of 55 children within the six remaining classrooms. This will only allow two year groups to return (there are 22-24 children in each of Reception, Year 1 and Year 6). RG completed a separate risk assessment for Reception/Year 1 and Year 6. The risk assessment shows high risk for Reception/Year 1, as it is not believed that children of that age would be able to socially distance themselves from each other, even with only 8 per class. The Year 6 risk assessment shows low risk as they are more likely to adhere to the rules put in place. The educational imperative for Year 5 is high, with SATs next year, and they would also be more able to adhere to the rules. The proposal is therefore to open to Year 6 as soon as possible (Wednesday 3rd June), over three classrooms, and then to open to Year 5 on 8th or 15th June, once lessons have been learned from the Year 6 return.

A governor asked whether the classroom for keyworker children would be just for existing children or new keyworker children. RG responded that there are currently 5 keyworker children attending school; there is capacity for 10 children. This may have to be on a part-time/rota system if numbers exceed this.

A governor asked whether staggered weeks could be introduced, so that on some weeks Reception children could come to school. RG explained that this has been considered, but it does not reduce the risk sufficiently.

A governor asked whether it is likely that most other schools will come to the same conclusion, that it is not possible to take all children from Reception, Year 1 and Year 6. RG responded that all schools have been asked to complete an individual risk assessment, and she does not know what other schools will be doing.

A governor queried whether the school is allowed to go against government advice by bringing in Year 5, and whether this risks confusing parents. The governor also queried where in the advice it stipulates that children must be 2m apart, as this means that only one third of the school can be brought back. In terms of protecting the vulnerable and getting children back to school, this plan does not achieve either. PF explained that in the government advice, it says that schools do not have to follow the advice if they are unable to. The decision lies with the governing body. Some other Henley schools will be doing a similar plan to this one. Government advice is contradictory regarding social distancing. There is a large workforce that will be at risk if social distancing measures are not implemented, which is backed up by unions.

A governor asked how the staff feel about the plan and whether they have been involved in the risk assessment. RG responded that a survey has been conducted to find out their needs, limitations etc in terms of a return to school. Two members of staff have to shield at home. Staff are ready to return but are apprehensive. PF explained that social distancing measures are to protect staff

and it is likely that these measures will need to be in place until the end of July. PF will write a letter to all parents to explain the plan.

A governor asked whether parents have been consulted. RG explained that all parents of Reception, Year 1 and Year 6 children have been contacted and asked whether they would send their child back to school. Out of 24 Reception children, 6 have said they will send their child to school, although of these, 3 were wavering on this. In Year 1 (out of 22), 7 have said yes, which has since fallen to 6. In Year 6 (out of 24) only 10 parents have replied; 6 said yes, 3 said no and 1 said maybe.

A governor asked how SEND children would be able to adhere to the social distancing rules. RG explained that staff have been in constant contact with the vulnerable children. No parents of vulnerable children currently want them to return to school. The school is required by OCC to complete risk assessments for each EHCP child and review them weekly, which is being done.

A governor expressed concern regarding how children would react if they become ill and have to be looked after by a member of staff wearing full PPE.

The headteacher explained about the staggered start and finish times for each class. Each child will be in a sub group (Year 6 A,B,C etc) and each sub-group will have a ten minute slot to arrive at school. They will arrive through the bottom gate and use the hand sanitization station, through a coned area. The playground will be split into three spaces, each to be used by a sub-group, with staggered play times. Some schools have written a home-school agreement for parents to sign, as a way of ensuring parents will adhere to the measures.

A governor questioned why parents have to wear face masks on drop off and pick up; this is likely to alienate parents and there is no evidence that it is needed outdoors, and may discourage parents from returning their children to school. RG explained that it was questionable whether parents should be encouraged to return their children to school at the current time. The wearing of face masks cannot be enforced, just suggested by the school.

A governor asked whether it is possible to enforce a one-way system around the school. RG explained that the risk has been mitigated by children entering the classroom through the outside door, and only leaving the classroom to go to the toilet. A governor suggested hiring portable toilets if there are not enough toilets for each sub-group to have their own. PF explained that the requirement for children to wash their hands will be reinforced.

A governor asked why the risk assessment says that children will not be expected to be outside much. RG explained that children will have a morning and lunchtime play outside. They will have the same number of outside breaks as before, but the times may be shorter to allow for the staggered break times. Sports lessons have not yet been considered. The school day will be slightly shorter to accommodate the staggered start and finish times.

A governor asked whether the school will be open 5 days a week, as another school are closing on Wednesdays for a deep clean/PPA time. RG stated this has been considered, but it is difficult to justify needing to do a deep clean on one day but not on other days. There will be extra cleaning equipment in classrooms and staff would be asked to use this. There will be two members of staff in each sub-group so they can release each other for PPA time.

Another governor stated that the face masks for parents should not be required. The governor suggested that rather than trying to involve all staff in opening up the school to only a small number of children, the staff resource would be better spent in working on improved remote schooling for all. Another governor felt that was not the governing body's decision to make, and stated that the children who do attend school would receive good quality teaching.

A governor asked whether the remote learning would continue. RG explained that the same curriculum would be offered to those at school and at home, teaching to the summer learning objectives. Teachers are receiving limited feedback from parents even though this has been repeatedly asked for, so it is difficult to judge how the children are getting on.

PF asked for votes on whether governors agreed with the proposed plan of Years 6 returning on 3rd June and Year 5 returning on 8th June; overall the governing body AGREED with the plan. A letter with the decision and rationale will be sent to parents tomorrow (PF and KB to review the letter drafted by RG). If government advice changes in the meantime, the school/governing body will respond to this.

PF thanked all governors for their input and governors thanked RG and her team for all their hard work.

Closing prayer

Meeting closed at 7.15pm

JH 23/5/20