

Attendees			
Melvyn Allen (MA)	Chair - Co-opted	Darius Campbell (DCa)	Foundation PCC
Maxine Slate (MS)	Vice-chair - Parent	Gill Thaxter (GT)	Foundation - PCC
Annie Mitchell (AM)	Ex-officio - school	chool Alex O'Shaughnessey Four (AS)	
Rev Paul Roberts (PR)	Ex-officio - Foundation	Anne Gledhill (AG)	Foundation - SDBE
Adrian Deller (AD)	Foundation PCC	Rebecca Ross (RR)	Parent Governor
George Whicheloe (GW)	Foundation PCC	Kirsty Wyatt (KW)	Staff Governor
Chris Greaves (CG)	Foundation PCC	Trevor Meadowcroft (TM)	Local Authority
Apologies			
Karen Newsome	Assistant Headteacher	Sickness	
In attendance			
Fiona Lee (FL)	Deputy Headteacher		

No	Item	Actions
1	MA thanked the governors for their engagement and responses by email giving their views about reopening the school given the recent Government announcement that schools should plan to reopen from the 1st June for some year groups and that a discussion in person was the most appropriate approach.	
	MA said that since the Easter Holidays, the Chair, Vice Chair and Safeguarding Governor had been having a fortnightly meeting with the SLT and that he had had many other telephone conversations with AM. In addition, both MA and GW as Chair of Personnel, were attending a	



	concerns first hand and to MA reminded Governors to Body was legally the emp of care towards the safety in mind during the discuss Governors would be bound personal opinions. The meeting would be info update to the governors a	that as a voluntary aide loyer of all staff meanir and wellbeing of staff sion, and that once a de d by the group decision ormal with no agenda,	ed school, the Governing ng that there was a duty which they should keep ecision was made, all n regardless of their with AM providing an		
2	 AM explained the rationale behind the selected year groups: Y6 to assist in the transition to secondary school YR & Y1 to maximise their core learning schools which will ensure that they are able to access the curriculum in future year groups AM explained that following the Government announcement, she had sent a Google Form to parents of the YR, Y1 and Y6, being the prioritised year groups, asking them whether they would expect to send their children back to school. There was a straight Yes/No option to assist in planning, with the expectation that those who stated No were most likely to be fixed in their opinion and so the Yes respondents were the maximum expected class size. The positive responses broke down as: 				
	Reception	Year 1	Year 6		
	15	21	18		
	AM said that she had earlier that day attended a conference call with the LA and other local headteachers but that there was very little guidance coming from the LA. The general expectation was that they would not open on the 1st June. Previous conversations with other headteachers in both the Coulsdon				



share opinions and thoughts. The Coulsdon Cluster felt that a consistency of approach within the local area would be desirable.

The SLT felt that YR were probably the easiest year group to cater for since they had their own entrance.

The plan would be for a small number of children to sit within a 'bubble'. Although the Government talked of a maximum 15 children, under current distancing guidelines this was not felt as feasible and Oasis had suggested 4-7 children within a pod.

There would also be additional vulnerable and key worker children likely to attend from 1 June as well as the lockdown was eased, for example those of teachers. The school is currently set up to have 17 children split into two classes but the expectation was an increase to 21 requiring the use of a third classroom.

In preparation of the expected announcement, the school would be closed over half term and a deep clean had been organised.

AM said that there were a lot of unknowns to deal with, notably that children would have had varying experiences both positive and negative outside of school. There is also anxiety amongst the staff, notably TAs around their own safety and also that of the children One member of staff had already contacted the headteacher and Chair to express their concerns.

AM explained that given the number of vulnerable and key worker children, the constraints on the school meant that it was not possible to accommodate all year groups and maintain social distancing.

The GB agreed with this assessment and after discussion, it was agreed that YR and Y1 would be prioritised. The GB also expressed their disappointment and sadness at the fact that Y6 would not have a satisfactory end of their time at the school, but felt that the maximum benefit would be for the younger children.

It would not be possible to accommodate a morning/afternoon rota system because of the need to perform deeper cleaning between the two groups and staff numbers would not support it.



In response to the possibility of using alternative venues to expand capacity, AM indicated that all venues would need a safeguarding lead, and currently two out of the three trained staff were on sick leave. In addition, each new venue would need a thorough risk assessment carried out which the SLT did not believe would be feasible given all the other demands on their time currently.

Since staff needed to remain with their pod, concern was expressed as to how those remaining at home would continue to have the same learning opportunities as those in school, regardless of year group, without overburdening the staff since the online provision was time consuming in its preparation. It was agreed that for those new year groups only, the school would offer a four day school week, leaving the Friday for staff to work from home on their PPA. The SLT would also seek to find an extra 1/2 day each week for every teacher to have as PPA time as well.

This PPA time would extend to staff in the classrooms with vulnerable and key worker children, however those children would still be offered a five day school week.

At the end of the meeting the GB voted on the following proposal:

Group	School week	Return to school
Vulnerable and key worked children	5 days	1st June
Year R	4 days	Wednesday 3rd June Two days to readapt then a four day week
Year 1	4 days	Wednesday 10th June Two days to readapt then a four day week

This proposal meant that SLT could monitor and adapt procedures before the full complement of children were in school at the same time.

00	170	HUN	
g	a a	A S	Y
		N.	
9420	-	100	

	The GB voted for the proposal 15-1
3	In a subsequent conversation between AM and MA on Friday 22nd May, the dates for return were delayed by one week for Year R and Year 1 children and the GB were advised via email.
	 This was because of a two main reasons: An increase in the number of vulnerable and key worked children expressing a desire to return to the school, including some who would require additional support The general delay in reopening for schools around the borough
	In addition, this would have the benefit of allowing the SLT to incorporate the latest Government guidelines into their risk assessments, without the need to rush or work over the much needed half term. It also meant that should there be a delay to reopening, parents would have more time to react.
	No objections were received in response.

hely Ale CHALOF GOVERNORS

14 - JULY - 2020