



AGREED MINUTES

GIRTON GLEBE PRIMARY SCHOOL

LOCAL GOVERNING BODY MEETING

Held on Tuesday 24th May 2021 at 18.15 – by zoom

LGB Governors Present:

Rowena Barnes (RB – Chair); Drew Spencer (DS – Head); Colin Black (CB); Corinne Garvie (CG); Peter Goodwin (PG); Nigel Howlett (NH); Margaret Hyde (MH); Alex Read (AR); Kathryn Bigg (KB); Anyela Carmargo Rodriguez (ACR)

Others in attendance: Tom Austin (TA) – Associate Member; Ryan Kelsall (RK) – Trust representative

Cam Clerk: Katie Tween (KT)

Apologies: Jo Pyle (JP) – Associate Member

Governors Not in Attendance: Pieter Wallace (PW)

The meeting took place remotely due to covid-19. The meeting was quorate and RB took the chair.

MINUTES

		<i>Action</i>
1.	Welcome and apologies	
	The Chair welcomed attendees. Apologies were accepted from JP. No apologies had been received from PW. The meeting was quorate.	
2.	Business Interests	
	Declarations of Interest to items on this agenda There were none.	
3.	Minutes of last FGB meeting, Action Points & Matters Arising: 16 March 2021	
	The draft minutes had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Item 7 – CG noted that she had also completed the Safer Recruitment training. There were no other comments, minutes were agreed as an accurate record and the minutes were APPROVED . The draft confidential minutes had also been circulated in advance of the meeting. Governors asked if there was any update on SmartKidz' use of the new space. The Head explained that SmartKidz were using the hall at the moment and would continue to do so until the building work was completed. They were happy with the new allocated room and thought it would be an improvement.	

Version 1: 31/01/2021

Signed & Dated:  08.07.2021

Page 1 of 9



	<p>The Chair requested that the “Confidential” title was made more prominent, but there were no other comments and they were agreed as an accurate record. Subject to that formatting change they were APPROVED. The action points were then reviewed.</p> <p>Action Point: <i>NH to return Pecuniary Interest form – Done.</i></p> <p><i>DS to arrange a staff governor election – DS reported that nobody stood for election, but there were several nominations for JP to stand again. It was therefore agreed that JP would be staff governor for a further term.</i></p> <p><i>RB to send CB the 2019 newsletter. CB to produce a draft for 2021 – Done. This was sent via ParentMail. Governors noted that they had not received much recently on ParentMail. DS agreed to copy RB in to future correspondence for her to circulate.</i></p> <p><i>RB to send round a safeguarding training signing sheet. All to access training, complete form and return to CG. Signed sheets had been received from PG and KB but not all governors had accessed the training: the Chair agreed to send the link to the training again and emphasised that all remaining governors must complete the training as part of their safeguarding responsibilities.</i></p> <p><i>RB to amend the name of each to “protocol” and to circulate the governor visit template separately. In progress, action to remain open.</i></p> <p>Progress on the website update was also discussed. The Clerk advised that she had nearly finished putting together the information but that the school would also need to update GIAS. The Clerk agreed to liaise with the school to ensure that this was completed.</p>	<p>KT/JP</p> <p>DS/RB</p> <p>RB/All</p> <p>RB</p> <p>KT</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Trust Matters</p>	
	<p>a) Cavendish School</p> <p>RK provided an update. He noted that progress was being made quickly: the Estates team had been on site for over two weeks. They were re-purposing the temporary staff room for SmartKidz, partitioning off the attached classroom to create new space, refurbishing other areas and converting the corridor area into a Therapists’ area. The toilets were also being re-done to include unisex cubicles and some larger toilets. The fencing contractors were also booked to put in higher fences and the current fencing could be re-purposed by Girton Glebe. The doors would also be updated with a separate locking system. The work should be completed by the first week in June.</p> <p>The Head confirmed that the work was going well and that the space looked very different.</p> <p>Governors asked the following questions:</p>	



	<p><i>Q./ When will the space be available to use?</i> A./ From the end of June, the Business Manager will start using it. Girton Glebe staff will be invited to meet the Cavendish staff and to look at the space. Girton Glebe parents will also be invited in. In July the 10 Cavendish school families will be coming in to look around.</p> <p><i>Q./ Had Girton Glebe parents been informed?</i> A./ Yes, they were now aware of everything – a letter had gone to all parents. RK had not received any feedback since, DS had received one question about the outdoor space from a parent but nothing else. RK was hopeful that it would be beneficial in the short term for Cavendish but leave a positive long-term impact for Girton Glebe.</p> <p><i>Q./ Could governors also be invited to see the new space?</i> A./ Yes – RK agreed to arrange this with the Business Manager.</p> <p><i>Q./ What about car parking and taxi drop offs?</i> A./ Logistics had not yet been finalised but it was agreed that it was important to engage with the residents of the lane that may be used. It would be better if taxis could come down the lane one at a time, but it also had to be manageable for Girton Glebe and not upset local neighbours. A communications plan would also have to be devised.</p> <p><i>Q./ The Pavilion was also being refurbished so there were likely to be a lot of contractors on site – concerned it might be chaos.</i> A./ The Head would liaise with the Cavendish Business Manager. He agreed that they needed to be careful if there were going to be an additional ten cars around the site. Speaking to the Parish Council was also already on the list.</p> <p>There were no further questions on the Cavendish School update. The Chair reminded all that the Eastern Learning Alliance AGM was going to be on the 8th June at 6pm at Chesterton Community College. CB agreed to attend and to report back to the next LGB.</p>	<p>RK</p> <p>CB</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Chair’s Report and Update</p>	
	<p>a) Chair’s Report The governance section of the website was in the process of being updated and as part of this work, the governors’ terms of office had been checked. NH, CG and RB were all re-appointed in 2018 and AR was appointed in 2018. Based on the agreed three year terms for co-opted governors, their terms of office were all finishing in September. The Chair asked them all to consider whether they would like to continue for another term or stand down and to let her know. It was agreed that they would all meet with CB to discuss.</p> <p>b) Terms of Reference The LGB had never had Terms of Reference before but had been asked by the ELA to put some in place. The Chair had used the Terms of Chesterton Community College’s LGB as a guide and had produced a draft which had been circulated to all</p>	<p>NH, CG, AR, RB, CB</p>



in advance of the meeting. She noted that there was a whole section on membership and chairing and that, in line with the Scheme of Delegation, the LGB should comprise of: 4 Parent Governors, 2 Staff Governors, 4 Co-Opted Governors plus the Head and a representative from the Trust. The Chair noted that as governors changed, they could naturally move towards that composition. She also noted that six of the governors were parents, so although not all were in place as Parent Governors, there was good representation of the parent body which was important.

Governors made the following points:

- The document referred to areas of responsibility being in the Scheme of Delegation – it would be helpful to have these in the Terms of Reference rather than having to look at a separate document.
- Further clarification was needed as to who was responsible for strategic decisions – was it the LGB or the Trustees?
- The Budget was no longer approved by the LGB. It was clarified that the LGB would have sight of it, but did not have decision making power. It was agreed that “approve” should be changed to “review”.
- For pastoral concerns and safety, it was unclear whether they were responsible for deciding the safeguarding policies or for reviewing their implementation. It was clarified that some policies were local but that there were also trust-wide policies. Safeguarding was part of the SDP so did come under the LGB remit.
- For meetings, it was clarified that the 7 day notice referred to the date of the meeting and the agenda. Other papers should also be circulated 7 days in advance but this was not always feasible.
- For Resources, how often should the LGB be monitoring the expenditure – does “regular” mean every meeting? The Trust wasn’t set up to provide a financial report at every meeting but it was agreed that this was not necessary.

The Chair agreed to contact Jenna Bickley (of the Trust) to clarify some of these points. The Clerk advised that once a draft Terms of Reference was agreed then this should be sent to Jenna who would arrange for it to be agreed by Trustees before the next academic year.

c) Swimming Pool Plaque.

Good progress had been made – the plaque had been made and looked very nice. It was going to be put on the school wall as part of a ceremony on 3rd July at 2.30pm. The ceremony was being self-funded by the ex-pupils. There were going to be approximately 60 people attending and they will be based in Cotton Hall from 12pm onwards. Governors will provide a swimming pool cake for afterwards which will cost £75. The Chair was trying to locate the FOGG display with old photographs, or alternatively would make a slideshow of old photographs. There was also a copy of the original souvenir brochure. The Chair asked governors to attend on the day if possible, to talk to the group and answer questions about the current school. AR, CG, NH, TA and MH all said that they should be able to attend. They were also hoping to involve Year 6.

RB



	<p>The Head Teacher then gave an update on the swimming pool itself. They had been preparing the pool for re-opening: it needed heavier cleaning than normal as it had not been open since 2019. They had been aiming to open after half-term, but the maintenance check had identified that the boiler was not fit for purpose and had to be condemned. There was also a problem with the heat exchange and the boiler room itself needed structural work. It was likely to cost approximately £13000 – the school did not have the money so the pool could not be re-opened this year. The staff had been made aware and the parents would be written to. They were looking at whether they could get to Impington VC for swimming next year, but in the meantime were making fundraising plans. The ex-pupil swimming pool plaque group were aware and supportive and the school was also going to approach Girton Town Charity and FOGG. The Chair agreed that fundraising was a good plan and she hoped that The Feast would also be supportive. The pool had a legacy within the village because it had been built by parents, so it was hoped that the fundraising would be successful and they would be able to get it re-opened next year. NH offered to look into any subsidies or grants that may be applicable.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Head Teacher Report</p>	
	<p>The Head had circulated a written report in advance. He made the following additional points:</p> <p><u>Staffing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They had run an internal advert for the Foundation Stage vacancy. It was hoped that the current temporary post-holder would be made permanent. • Another member of staff was leaving due to re-locating. The school was advertising the post as a KS2 post and had so far received 8 applications. Any governors available for shortlisting should let DS know. • Jo Pyle, as Assistant Head, would move down to Year 2 to give better coverage of senior leaders across the three key stage areas. • There were two vacancies in the cleaning team so they would also be advertised shortly. <p><u>Attendance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures were slightly below where they would aim. Some of that was down to a couple of high needs children who had been off school for some time. The school was aware and monitoring this. There was also some long-term sickness. <p><i>Q. Had there been any bubble closures?</i> A./ No</p> <p><i>Q. There would normally be a governor visit on attendance - would there be value in doing that soon?</i> A./ Yes, but it might be better to do that remotely initially.</p> <p><u>Pupil Progress</u></p>	<p>All</p>



- Staff had done baseline assessments after the Easter break; these were not the typical assessments but instead were aimed at identifying gaps so that teachers could tailor provision.
- There were some general trends in areas that children were struggling with:
 - fractions and percentages
 - spelling, including statutory words
 - letter formations
 - written and mental calculations on positive and negative
 - writing stamina
- Teachers had also found that independent working was not as strong as it had been; teachers were having to do a lot of modelling and scaffolding before setting pupils off on individual tasks.
- TA agreed and added that some children needed very little catching up whereas others, including those who had traditionally needed more support, needed more. Teachers from IVC were helping in English and support was also being delivered in classrooms by teachers and Teaching Assistants. Pupils were becoming more resilient and independent.

Q./ Were the groups that had fallen back the vulnerable pupils?

A./ It was a mixture. The contextual picture was important. They were aware that pupils had missed a chunk of education and they needed to know where to focus on. Now gaps had been identified, they could use interventions including using the catch-up funding. Each of these interventions would be measured and at the end of term the data would be on pupil reports and would come to LGB.

Q./ Were there any plans for summer catch-up sessions?

A./ Yes, these were being run out of hubs for the most vulnerable pupils. IVC was hosting a hub and pupils would be identified by their school based on strict criteria, including pupil premium. RK added that it was prescriptive who could access these sessions; there were strict parameters and not much flexibility. The hubs would be focused on Year 6 and Year 7 pupils.

Q./ Who would be teaching at the hubs?

A./ Teachers and Teaching Assistants – it was voluntary. There was also a national tutoring programme.

Q./ Will you contact parents to identify/inform them what children need?

A./ This would be part of the normal communication between staff and parents. Teachers had an open dialogue with parents and would also use reports.

Q./ What about the next academic year, for pupils who were still behind – would there be continuing support structures?

A./ Yes, there would need to be a heavy focus on transition and handover from teacher to teacher to cover what individual children needed. This would be a key focus of the second half of the term.



Q./ Parents generally felt very positive – they felt children were making progress and were happy to be in school. Will you be working with parents on the catch up the children need?

A./ That was good feedback to hear. The next step was the report home. It was a double duty: it was important for parents to ask teachers what their children needed as well as waiting for teachers to tell them.

Q./ When would it be appropriate to review the impact of the catch-up funding?

A./ Towards the end of the summer term. There was a trust-wide survey going out after half-term and the data would come back to the next LGB. They had carried out a survey during lockdown and then this one would be done once the children had been back in school for a period of time. The survey was being provided free of charge by a company but the questions would be tailored to the different schools across the trust.

Covid

- The picture remained the same; the roadmap easing had not meant any changes for the school.
- The risk assessment remained unchanged.
- Visitors could now be invited into school – some needed new DBS checks. The clerk advised that if governors had been attending regularly remotely then a new DBS was not required.

Q./ The new “Indian” variant was highly transmissible – could parents be reminded to wear masks on the school site?

A./ Yes and this was also a key central message from the Local Authority.

SEND

- There were 20 children on the SEND register, two with EHCPs and a further one due back from panel this month.
- The school was also writing two EHCP proposals for Year 6 children, with another two in progress.
- Two children were potentially transitioning from other schools who would come with EHCPs in place.
- SEND services such as Speech and Language therapists and Educational Psychologists were not currently providing support in schools as there were so many EHCPs to review that this service had been suspended during May.

Q./ What was the impact of the Educational Psychologists and others not being in school?

A./ They had shifted priority to ensure that the EHCPs were reviewed so it was a mixed impact depending on the school – Girton Glebe had one with the panel so it would be beneficial to have that one completed.

Curriculum

- The curriculum remained on the new mapping.
- The next few staff meetings will focus on the curriculum.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior leaders had already met and had noted strong work happening on History and Geography. • Curriculum leaders had finalised policies and lesson observations would be taking place after half-term. <p><u>School Meals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catering was now coming from Chesterton Community College. • The food was of a really good standard. • There had been a few logistical issues but it was going well. <p><i>Q./ Was the school kitchen being used?</i> A./ Yes – some of the meals came ready to serve, but other bits and pieces were cooked on-site. There had been a spot check visit by Environmental Health and the kitchen had been rated 5*.</p> <p><i>Q./ For the meals booking, would it be possible to include a default option in case parents forget to book in?</i> A./ Yes, they could look into that.</p> <p>Governors also asked about the new Reception intake. The Head advised that they had had 28 accepted places and they knew of two further children who were in the process of re-locating to Girton. They were trying to run as close to a normal transition as possible with various sessions including a story session, pre-school sessions and a teddy bear’s picnic with opportunities for parents to come in aswell. They were also holding a parents information evening. They were also hoping for a similar experience for the Year 6 leavers, with a leavers’ assembly, performance and picnic.</p> <p><i>Q./ Pupil numbers were looking better – do we know why?</i> A./ Partly down to EYFS – earlier issues had been addressed very quickly and parents were pleased with the provision. The school had a good reputation and that had been helped by good communication across the lockdowns. The split year groups were also no longer a factor.</p> <p>Governors were very pleased that the hard work put in was paying off and congratulated the Head.</p>	
7.	<p>Safeguarding</p> <p>The new Child Protection policy had been circulated to governors in advance. There were minimal changes; the Head drew attention to one sentence which referenced the Bruck Indicator which he explained showed what was acceptable or unacceptable language for children of different ages.</p> <p>Governors made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.68 needed Girton Glebe name adding to it - 6.22 – governors had not looked into SmartKidz before – should this be being done? 	



	<p>DS confirmed that he had looked into all of the SmartKidz paperwork and policies so it depended on whether that satisfied the governors or whether they also wanted sight of it themselves. The clerk advised that this would not have to be brought to the LGB but could be delegated to the Safeguarding governor. Following the discussion, governors were happy to approve the policy.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Governor Visits and Training</p> <p>The governor visits schedule had been circulated in advance – the following visits were discussed and planned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next Safeguarding visit needed to be booked. • It was agreed that a Health and Safety walk could be done in person, but preferably after 4pm. MH and NH agreed to liaise with DS to arrange. • The SDP would be reviewed at the next LGB • The catch-up funding review could be done face to face at the end of this term as part of the data scrutiny. It was agreed that this would be carried out by AR, ACR and CG. • The parent questionnaire had been done. CB agreed to circulate the letter that had gone with it. • Attendance could be reviewed by way of an online discussion. KB and CG agreed to do this using last year’s review as a basis. • For the behaviour review, DS agreed to send RB the term monitoring schedule. It could then be discussed with senior leaders even if retrospectively. • Vulnerable pupils review could be built into the data review. 	<p>MH, NH, DS KT</p> <p>AR, ACR, CG</p> <p>CB KB, CG</p> <p>DS</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>The clerk advised that the next meeting should remain a remote meeting. The Head requested that meetings were moved to a Thursday in future. It was aimed that the schedule of meetings for the next academic year would be made available at the next meeting.</p> <p>Next meeting to be held on Thursday 8th July at 18.15 via zoom.</p>	