

## Godolphin

### Local Governing Body meeting

Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> February 2021

4pm via Google Meet

<p><b>1. <u>ATTENDING :</u></b></p> <p>Becky Hosking (Vice Chair) Emma Ivey (Chair) Sarah Knight Lucy Wandless (Executive head teacher) Holly Williams</p> <p><b>In Attendance:</b> Pat Nicholas (Clerk to the Governors) Elizabeth McIntosh, prospective parent governor</p>		
<p><b>2. <u>APOLOGIES :</u></b></p> <p>Received and accepted from Steve Polglase, Antony Foden and Richard McKie.</p>		
		<b><u>ACTION</u></b>
<b>3.</b>	<b><u>WELCOME AND DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST</u></b>	
	<p>Mrs Ivey welcomed governors to the meeting. Staff governors declared an interest as paid members of staff. No other new interests were declared.</p> <p>Mrs Ivey welcomed Mrs McIntosh as a guest to the meeting.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b><u>MINUTES FROM THE 28.9.20 MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING</u></b>	
	<p>The minutes and confidential minutes of the 28.9.20 meeting were accepted as an accurate record, and would be signed by the Chair at the earliest opportunity.</p>	

5.	<p><b><u>FEEDBACK FROM THE TRUST BOARD</u></b></p> <p><i>Governors asked when the next Trust Safeguarding training for governors would take place.</i></p> <p>Mrs Wandless led safeguarding training for governors on the 18<sup>th</sup> November 2020.</p>	
6.	<p><b><u>FEEDBACK FROM THE FORUM</u></b></p>	
	<p>An online Forum which focused on PHSE was held in mid-December; while this was not well attended, there were some useful discussions.</p> <p>It was suggested that a Google survey be carried out to find out what times or days of the week suit parents and stakeholders better, or perhaps vary the timings across the year, and limit the meetings to half an hour. Governors agreed to the survey.</p>	
7.	<p><b><u>NOTIFICATION OF ANY NEWLY APPOINTED GOVERNORS/RESIGNATIONS</u></b></p>	
	<p>There had been no resignations or newly appointed governors since the last meeting.</p>	
8.	<p><b><u>HEADTEACHER'S REPORT</u></b></p>	
	<p>Mrs Wandless' report was circulated by email in advance of the meeting. The main points discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number now attending was 38%, which was a significant rise from the figure in the head's report. The school was predicting higher numbers after half term. This was due to the classification of vulnerable children and critical workers, and that parents felt it was safe for their children to attend school. Mrs Wandless explained that she would have preferred to keep a minimal staff in school with some working from home; this would have offered capacity should someone fall ill or need to self-isolate. Mrs Wandless offered her thanks to staff for covering a staff member who was recently off sick. The school was also using short term supply cover.</li> </ul> <p>Q: Was the use of TAs to support the children in class working? A: Ideally, the TAs would support in class to leave the teachers to focus on the remote education, but often the teachers needed to help the children in class, too.</p> <p>Q: Could the school use the catch-up funding to support the additional staff hours? A: Some TA hours were being used to provide 'catch-up'. However, this would not cover all of the additional TA hours. The costs would need to come out of school reserves. It was hoped that these costs could be offset against other areas e.g., savings made on staff training and school trips.</p> <p>Q: How are staff getting the right work/life balance? A: Mrs Wandless explained that it had been quite frustrating for staff this week as there had been serious internet issues, which the school appreciated were out of their control. Before this, it had been a very positive 5 weeks, with great engagement with parents and children. Teachers were spending more hours than usual on planning. Mrs Wandless thanked Mrs Ivey for checking in with her on a regular basis. The meeting heard that Mrs Bryant was in regular contact with all the head teachers to offer her support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The internet issues had raised a potential safeguarding concern. If the connection was lost at school during a live lesson or Google Meet, the children would still have the code and could meet without a member of staff</li> </ul>	

	<p>being present. Mrs Thomas, however, was able to go home and join the classrooms to remove the codes, to break the connection for the children.</p> <p>Q: How does the school measure the engagement with the remote education? A: Mrs Knight shared figures for the engagement for each year group. The vast majority of families were engaging with Google Meets daily and submitting work regularly. The engagement was much better this time than for the previous lockdown school closure.</p> <p>Q: Were children making progress? A: Yes. Teachers have commented that work in general is of a good standard. IT skills were much better and pen licences were still being earned. There were some dips in areas such as spelling and handwriting. The new Chromebooks were being loaned out to families that needed them.</p> <p>Q: Were risk assessments in place? A: The operational risk register had been revised to address the latest lockdown restrictions. This was a dynamic risk assessment, reviewed weekly and then shared with trustees. The risk assessment is also shared weekly with staff and weekly updates are also highlighted to staff.</p> <p>Q: Were Free School Meals vouchers available for families? A: Yes, for those not attending school, and for all eligible families over the half term break. Mrs Wandless thanked Mrs Thomas and the Trust Central team for sending the necessary information to the Trust office on a weekly basis. The Light and Life Church in Helston was offering support for families in difficulty.</p> <p>Q: Were staff engaging with the Covid19 testing? A: Staff were taking part, but this was not compulsory. Governors heard that this was an additional measure, and all other protective measures remained in place.</p> <p>Q: How would assessment be carried out? A: The EYFS profile assessments would be carried out by Mrs Bradbury when the children return. Y2 and Y6 would be assessed using past SATS papers. Other year groups would be assessed using the PiRA (Progress in Reading Assessments) and PuMA (Progress in Maths Assessments).</p> <p>Q: How would any gaps in learning identified be addressed? A: The catch-up plans would be put in place as soon as possible, in much the same way as same as when children returned in September 2020.</p> <p>Mrs Ivey thanked Mrs Wandless for her report.</p>	
9.	<p><b><u>SAFEGUARDING (GOVERNOR'S) REPORT</u></b></p>	
	<p>Mrs Williams' report had been circulated before the meeting.</p> <p>Q: What was the online culture among Godolphin families? A: There were some families who limited the use of devices at home, and others who allowed children to spend a lot of time on the internet. The school raised awareness of online safety with parents via regular newsletters. In school, if a child informed staff of something that they had experienced online that was not appropriate, then teachers would speak to parents. Staff monitoring was ongoing, and there was a robust filtering system in school.</p> <p>The recent DSL monitoring visit report was available in the shared area governor monitoring file. This was completed with Paul Hunkin, executive head teacher at</p>	

	Crowan and Wendron.	
<b>10.</b>	<b><u>HEALTH &amp; SAFETY UPDATE</u></b>	
	The Trust Estates team were completing any external repairs. The compliance checks that were suspended at the start of lockdown had now been reinstated. Any emergency repairs indoors were permitted.	
<b>11.</b>	<b><u>STRUCTURED QUESTIONS</u></b>	
	<p><b>Staff Wellbeing</b></p> <p><b>Curriculum</b></p> <p>Q: Was the remote education able to provide the same curriculum?</p> <p>Q: Were there any particular areas that were difficult to provide in the remote format?</p> <p><b>Training &amp; Development of the LGB</b></p> <p>Q: What training is currently available?</p>	<p>Covered under item 8: Head teacher's report.</p> <p>A: Teachers had taken care to cover all subjects, and match the normal curriculum as closely as possible.</p> <p>A: Certain subjects that were often more topic based weren't being covered as much but the planning would ensure that there would be more of a focus on these areas when the children return.</p> <p>A: Trust governors training had been arranged and the dates shared with governors. Mrs Ivey had attended the Chairs network meetings with Mrs Bryant and found them very useful.</p>
<b>12.</b>	<b><u>FEEDBACK ON GOVERNOR MONITORING VISITS</u></b>	
	<p>Mrs Ivey 4.12.20 – School closure</p> <p>Mrs Williams 9.12.20 – Single Central Record</p> <p>Governors received the reports and there were no questions.</p> <p>Q: Were there plans for the Trust to send a survey to parents?</p> <p>A: This was unclear, however if not, governors agreed to conduct their own survey as part of their governor monitoring with stakeholders.</p>	
<b>13.</b>	<b><u>FOCUS ITEMS AND UPDATES</u></b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Operational risk register</u></li> </ul> <p>Covered under item 8: Head teacher's report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>PAN/AN</u></li> </ul> <p>The County admissions team had set up a new system, the 'Schools Admission Module', which made it easier for school to keep track of the PAN (pupil admission number) and AN (actual number).</p>	

	<p>The PAN was different for each year group depending on the numbers admitted. Mrs Wandless proposed a change in some year groups, to help to manage the intake overall and keep classes of a similar size.</p> <p>Q: How could the school grow the school with lower numbers in some year groups? A: The school can change the PAN/AN year on year, and the proposed changes still left 12 places across the school.</p> <p>Governors agreed to the changes as proposed.</p>	
<b>14.</b>	<b><u>IMPACT &amp; EFFECTIVENESS OF LGB SINCE LAST MEETING</u></b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governor monitoring visits had been completed.</li> <li>• The Chair had been in regular contact with the head teacher.</li> </ul>	
<b>15.</b>	<b><u>URGENT MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION</u></b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A staff and governor survey from the Trust had been sent out on the 28<sup>th</sup> January. Governors were asked to complete this before the 12<sup>th</sup> February deadline.</li> </ul>	
<b>16.</b>	<b><u>MATTERS TO BE RAISED WITH THE TRUST BOARD</u></b>	
	<p>Would there be another Trust-wide remote education survey for parents?</p> <p>Governors felt that the system of separate email and google accounts was complicated and not 'user-friendly', and could potentially cause governors to be less willing to engage with their role.</p>	
<b>17.</b>	<b><u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u></b>	
	<p>Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021 4pm <b>informal</b></p> <p>Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> June 4pm 2021 4pm <b>formal</b></p> <p>Trust Board meetings for 2020 – 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2020</li> <li>• 28<sup>th</sup> January 2021 (AGM followed by Trust Board)</li> <li>• 18<sup>th</sup> March 2021</li> <li>• 13<sup>th</sup> May 2021</li> <li>• 8<sup>th</sup> July 2021</li> </ul>	

The meeting concluded at 6.10pm

**Chair's Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_