

Oswald Road Primary School Governing Body Meeting Minutes

Quorum: 6 - met at this meeting

Chair: Richard Price

Date of meeting: 11 July 2016

Venue: Oswald Road Primary School

Approved as a true and accurate record.

Name..... 

Date..... 21.9.16

Chair of Committee / Governing Body

Attendees

| Name | Governor Designation | Term of Office End Date | Present – P Apologies – Ap Absent – A |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Richard Fletcher (RF) | Co-Opted | 13/12/19 | P |
| Richard Price (RP) | Co-Opted (Chair) | 31/03/18 | P |
| Tom Grimshaw (TG) | Co-Opted | 14/07/19 | P |
| Joanna Dennis (JD) | Co-Opted | 14/07/19 | P |
| Simon Bentall (SB) | Parent | 23/09/18 | P |
| Ellie Russell (ER) | Co-Opted | 31/03/18 | P |
| Sheila Newman (SN) | LA | 31/08/18 | P |
| Ali Ayub (AA) | Parent | 05/01/20 | P |
| Caroline Taylor (CT) | Staff | 29/11/19 | P |
| | | | |
| Ann Kerrigan | Co-Opted | 08/11/19 | Ap |
| James Britton | Co-Opted | 23/09/19 | Ap |

| Also Present | Role |
|--------------|---|
| Jon Beisly | Acting Headteacher |
| Gerard McCoy | Clerk - AGM Clerking and Administration Service |

Agenda Items

| Item | Apologies |
|------|---|
| 1 | <p>Governors noted the apologies for non-attendance submitted by James Britton and Ann Kerrigan.</p> <p>There were no issues raised with the above apologies and these were accepted by the Governing Body.</p> |

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept apology submitted. | Governing Body | |

| Item 2 | Declaration of Pecuniary Interests | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|----------------|------|
| Sheila Newman declared an interest as an elected Councillor for Manchester City Council. | | | | |
| There were no other declarations of pecuniary interest. | | | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | | | Owner | Date |
| • Noted – declarations of interest as above. | | | Governing Body | |

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|-------------|
| Item 3 | Minutes of the Previous Meetings (14.12.15 and 29.03.16) and Matters Arising | | |
| <p>Minutes of the Meeting – 14.12.15</p> <p>Governors reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting; the document had been circulated in advance. The document was considered in relation to the appointment of Richard Fletcher and there were no issues raised; the minutes were approved as a true record and a signed copy was retained on record.</p> <p>Matters Arising.</p> <p>There were no matters arising to address in relation to these minutes.</p> <p>Minutes of the Meeting – 29.03.16</p> <p>Governors reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting (29.03.16) and there were no issues raised in relation to the document. A copy of the minutes was signed and retained on record.</p> <p>Matters Arising.</p> <p>There were no matters arising to address in relation to these minutes.</p> | | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | | Owner | Date |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – minutes of the previous meeting (14.12.16) as a true record. | | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – minutes of the previous meeting (29.03.16) as a true record. | | Governing Body | |

| Item 4 | Headteacher's Report |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>The Acting Headteacher presented his report which had been circulated prior to the meeting and the following points were raised in discussion.</p> <p>It was confirmed there was an error in the report concerning exclusions – the 'typo' related to the fact that in Summer Term 1 there were two fixed term exclusions, not 211, and in Summer Term 2 there were 11 fixed term exclusions.</p> <p>Q. Why was there such a dramatic increase in the fixed-term exclusions?</p> <p>A. This related to a pupil who has previously been out of education for approximately 10 months and was now at risk of permanent exclusion. The school had sourced support from Bridgelea outreach and is currently attempting to secure an assessment place at the Bridgelea Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) from September 2016.</p> | |

Q. Why was the situation escalated?

A. The pupil was in danger of being permanently excluded due to the recent extreme and dangerous behaviour

Governors noted the on-going improvements in attendance at the school – which was 96.7% for the Summer Term and this represented 96% for the academic year as a whole.

The Acting Headteacher confirmed that the school had been focusing heavily on monitoring attendance and the school had seen a reduction in the number of pupils requesting 'flexi-school' arrangements.

It was noted that the target for 2016-2017 was 97%.

Q. How many penalty notices has the school issued?

A. Seven during the course of the year.

Q. Did this relate to different families?

A. Yes.

Q. Was the issue of absence mainly related to families taking holidays during term time?

A. Yes in some cases, although there were also instances involving persistent absence (PA) and punctuality.

The Chair confirmed that there were still requests for the flexi-school, but the school was continuing to adopt the approved policy; and the outcome had been some penalty notices. The Chair and another Governor held a meeting with one family to discuss the matter.

Q. The PA data has increased since the previous year?

A. There was a change in the boundary at which pupils were designated as PA – it was 85% attendance and since September 2015 it was 90%. In addition, there were now more pupils on the school roll.

Governors noted that based on the 90% level PA was 6.5% and at 85% level PA was 2.3%.

In addition, Governors discussed the impact of the new Behaviour Policy which now involved pupils not taking part in 'free-style Friday' as a consequence of behavioural issues.

The Acting Headteacher confirmed that there had been an initial increase in the number of pupils missing the free-style Friday event, but this had reduced back down again. In addition, it was confirmed that the school was now using the 'Child Protection On-line Monitoring System' (CPOMS) to record all behavioural issues; and the 'red card' system was no longer used – instead the Lunchtime Organisers (LO) reported any behavioural issues which were then recorded through CPOMS.

Governors reviewed the section relating to attainment and achievement – this aspect of the school was graded as 'good' in the school's self-evaluation, and also by Ofsted at the previous inspection and the Quality Assurance (QA) professional.

It was especially noted that Early Years (EY) was demonstrating a three-year positive trend with 69% of pupils reaching a 'good level of development' (GLD). It was also

noted that 90% of the Year 1 pupils achieved the expected standard for the phonics screening. This represented a 12% increase on the previous year and two pupils were within one mark of the expected standard.

In addition, Governors recognised that 89% of the Year 2 pupils re-taking the phonics screening passed on this occasion – this represented 16 of the 18 pupils involved.

Governors also recognised the results from the Year 2 national tests:

Reading - 80%

Writing - 63%

Maths - 73%

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPAG) – this was not completed due to the test paper being inadvertently published on-line prior to the actual test.

Governors noted that the school had exceeded the national standard in writing by 6% and maths by 3%.

Governors also noted that the predicted outcomes were based on earlier data and were considered accurate at the time of publication; it was appreciated there was a clear difference, which related to the limited baseline from previous outcomes.

In relation to the Year 6 national tests, Governors noted the following results:

Reading - 63%

Writing - 80%

Maths - 62%

SPAG - 67%

Combined reading, writing and maths (RWM) - 47%

Governors recognised that the writing result exceeded the national average by 12%, but the combined RWM was two children short of equaling the Local Authority (LA) average of 49.3%. The national average was 53%.

In relation to the teaching and learning aspect of the school, it was understood that the school's self-evaluation was 'good' and this was supported by the QA professional and the previous Ofsted inspection.

The Acting Headteacher confirmed that the school was being supported by Deborah Hunton as the School Improvement Partner (SIP) especially in relation to the lesson observations. Where less than 'good' practice was recorded the school was initially providing support for the teachers concerned.

In addition, the school was developing the 'assertive mentoring' programme in order to support pupils through regular assessments and this was accompanied by close monitoring by the teachers. The programme was also designed to tailor additional support and interventions for specific pupils.

Governors also considered the 'First Class at Numbers' programme which supported pupils with maths and involved real life situations – the programme built confidence in pupils through a very structured approach.

Q. Could the programme be extended to other year groups?

A. Yes to some extent it could be applied to Year 3 and Year 4.

Q. The report suggests that greater rigor should be applied; how would this have an impact?

A. The phase leaders have been in place since January 2016 with each member of the senior leadership team (SLT) 'adopting' a phase leader to mentor. Phase leaders were more involved with the lesson observations and assessments as per the actions proposed following the previous Ofsted inspection. However, the school was still attempting to quality assure the process to ensure it was effective.

The Acting Headteacher confirmed that the school would have a new Acting Deputy Headteacher (DHT) from September and with this additional capacity in place additional observations would be carried out.

Governors appreciated that there had been significant changes in the SLT with the substantive Headteacher taking maternity leave. The self-evaluation for leadership and management was considered 'requires improvement' (RI) as the team had yet to 'prove itself'.

Q. Would this necessarily mean that the overall judgment of the school was RI?

A. No.

The Acting Headteacher reaffirmed the SLT as consisting of: an Acting Headteacher; an Acting DHT; two Assistant Headteachers (AHT); and phase leaders.

Q. Had the school carried out an induction process for the incoming Acting DHT?

A. Yes – there had been a series of meetings with the SLT and the phase leaders; additional meetings with the Acting Headteacher; and there would be designated time during the summer break. The Acting DHT was already involved in a wide range of areas.

The Acting Headteacher confirmed that the LA had sourced an experienced headteacher to provide additional mentoring support.

In relation to behaviour and safety, the school's self-evaluation judgment, and that of the QA professional and the Ofsted inspection, determined this aspect of the school as 'good'. In addition, the recent Section 5 inspection carried out by Her Majesty's Inspector (HMI) had determined safeguarding across the school as secure with robust and effective monitoring systems in place.

Governors discussed the importance of attendance and the rigor with which the school approached the issue. It was also appreciated that a number of parents had made requests for additional information.

Q. There appears to be a small number of parents making 'extreme' demands for information?

A. Yes – there were a growing number of parents, but they represented a small minority. This had involved subject access requests which were time consuming to address and impacted on the capacity of the SLT and the Acting Headteacher.

In addition, it was appreciated that there had been requests from parents that the school did not record information concerning their children on CPOMS.

Q. Why would parents not want the records maintaining through CPOMS?

A. There was very little difference between CPOMS and the previous system involving hard copy files – similar information would be recorded. However, CPOMS represented a more efficient means of collating and retrieving the information. But

some parents claim the information recorded was not accurate, although the staff have been trained not to include personal views of opinions; simply to record facts, further training is due to be put in place in September during a whole staff INSET.

The Acting Headteacher provided an overview of the process used in dealing with a subject access request and the redaction of information that it was not appropriate to release.

Governors understood that some parents were very sensitive about the issue and it was confirmed by the Chair that the school and Governing Body had sought advice in terms of legal and HR support.

Q. Do the requests relate to pupils that were a concern for the school?

A. The school has sourced support from HR and legal to ensure that the relevant information has been released and that the school was meeting its statutory obligations for all parents whilst following guidance set out in *Keeping Children Safe in Education, July 2015*.

Governors also noted that there was an increasing phenomenon surrounding people instigating freedom of information requests and subject access requests.

Q. Was there a legal limit to the number of subject access requests from an individual?

A. No.

The Chair confirmed that he had met with one family in an attempt to mediate a way forward considering a series of subject access requests. It was appreciated that the process was 'time-expensive' and the school may need to investigate a means to address the issue more effectively.

The Acting Headteacher confirmed that the school had established a new role, a Senior Lunchtime Organiser, in order to address a point raised by HMI at the recent inspection. As part of the feedback the school had also established an art club and more structured clubs at lunchtime in order to support pupils. The art would be provided through an art teacher who would also provide PPA cover for the teaching staff.

Q. What support was there for pupils currently?

A. One teacher and one sports coach.

Governors commented positively, on the school's success in achieving a Level 1 in relation to the Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA). It was recognised that the assessor had been very positive about the school's approach and especially in relation to the pupils' adoption of RRSA appropriate language.

It was appreciated that the Chair of Governors and Caroline Taylor had represented the Governing Body and met with the assessor as part of the assessment process.

The Acting Headteacher confirmed that Helen Woolf the special educational needs co-ordinator (SENCO) had recently successfully completed her Master Degree in SEND – it was with a distinction too.

There were no additional issues raised in relation to the Headteachers report and Governors agreed to accept the report into the record of the meeting.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed - accept Headteacher report into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |

| Item 5 | Committee Reports |
|-------------------|---|
| | <p>Committees' Terms of Reference (TOR).</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that unlike the previous meeting, all Governors had reviewed the draft terms of reference; the documents had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>There were no issues raised in relation to the TOR and these were approved by the Governing Body.</p> <p>Resources Committee – 11.05.16</p> <p>Richard Fletcher (RF), as Acting Chair for the recent Resources Committee meeting, presented the minutes which had been circulated prior to the meeting – the following points were noted in discussion.</p> <p>It was appreciated that the Committee had reviewed and approved the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2015-2016 budget closedown 2015-2016 budget surplus / analysis of reserves 2016-2017 budget 3-5 year budget projections 2016-2017 staffing structure EYFS Play-area quotes Shelter quotes Scheme of Delegation Operational Financial Procedure Photocopier quotes <p>There were no points raised in relation to the matters approved by the Resources Committee and these were ratified by the Governing Body.</p> <p>There were no additional points raised in relation to the Resources Committee minutes and Governors agreed to accept the document into the record of the meeting.</p> <p>Teaching and Learning (T&L) Committee – 29.03.16</p> <p>Ellie Russell (ER), Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee presented the minutes of the meeting held 29.03.6. It was appreciated that the document corresponded with the verbal report provided to the previous Governing Body (29.03.16).</p> <p>There were no issues raised in relation to the document and it was approved by the Governing body.</p> <p>Teaching and Learning (T&L) Committee – 11.07.16</p> <p>ER presented her verbal report in relation to the T&L Committee meeting that had convened prior to the Governing Body meeting.</p> <p>Governors noted that the Committee had discussed the data in relation to the phonics screening, the percentage of pupils attaining a GLD and the outcomes from the Year 2 and Year 6 national tests. It was also appreciated that the Committee had</p> |

compared the school data for these areas with the national standard / average in each of the subject areas. There were additional comparisons with each of the year groups in all subject areas with the corresponding national data. The Committee had especially noted the three-year trend of improvement in relation to EY and the standard of reading with the younger year groups.

However, it was also appreciated that additional work was to be targeted at Year 3 and Year 5 in the future.

The Committee had discussed the national floor targeted of 65% and it was noted that the year groups that were on / under this point would represent a major focus coming into the new academic year. It was appreciated by the Committee and the school that these areas needed to be raised to the 'secure expected' by the end of 2016-2017.

As a result, reading was determined as an area of focus, particularly in relation to comprehension skills and writing would be an additional area of effort – in this instance the emphasis would be on SPAG as it represented approximately 30% of the marking scheme.

Q. What was the issue with maths?

A. It was seen as mainly a lack of 'stamina' and better understanding of the test papers by the pupils. Part of the impact was the lack of exposure to earlier test papers and learning to focus on a consistent approach to solving the problems presented. A more focused approach to formal calculation methods being taught across the school was also going to be addressed next year.

It was understood that the school had identified that girls were especially in need of additional maths support and boys were in need of additional writing support. In addition, it was recognised that there was still a 'gap' in relation to the Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) eligible pupils / the disadvantaged pupils. Therefore, the school was investigating which of the current interventions were having the desired impact and which were not. As part of this approach the school was developing an 'Inclusion Team' rather than groups of teaching assistant (TA) staff focused on different targeted groups.

Governors discussed the establishment of 'pre-teach Friday' as a means of introducing the next topic to pupils as a preparation mechanism.

Q. Would this be aimed at small focus groups or the whole class?

A. It would be for the whole class with an element of identifying those who would need additional support.

Q. What additional resources did the school require in support?

A. The school was investigating the expenditure of the PPG funding and how this was allocated. In addition, the School Improvement Plan was being streamlined with a reallocation of resources aimed at teaching and learning rather than the interventions not having the expected impact. There would also be a rationalisation of staffing – an outgoing TA would be replaced by a teacher which would allow for smaller more focused teaching groups.

Governors appreciated that the results were disappointing and there was a concern with the incoming Year 6 group being a more challenging cohort than the previous group. It was also appreciated that the situation represented a risk to the school.

In addition, staff needed to be aware that the Governing Body recognises that there was a great deal of good work ongoing across the school, but the national tests represented one of the measures by which the success of the school was judged.

Governors appreciated that the Acting Headteacher would be meeting with the staff this week – the issue raised would be openly discussed.

It was understood that the Committee had reviewed the teacher assessments in relation to the actual outcomes and although not accurate it was appreciated they had been based on the earlier experiences; these would be considered in light of the outcomes.

Q. How did the school compare with the neighbouring schools?

A. Anecdotally the combined score for some of these schools was in the region of 60%-70%.

Q. Has the school resubmitted any test papers for re-marking/

A. The school had reviewed any test papers with borderline results, but determined that the marking in these cases had been accurate.

Q. How did the school consider these results in comparison with the previous year / years?

A. The results were not directly comparable as this year involved a new curriculum and revised / more challenging national tests.

Governors also noted that the Acting Headteacher had also commissioned Deborah Hunton from the LA to carry out an addition teaching and learning review to determine if there was any extra learning to source from the outcomes.

There were no additional points raised in relation to the Autumn Term QA report and it was approved by the Governing Body.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved – committees' TOR. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified – 2015-2016 budget closedown | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - 2015-2016 budget surplus / analysis of reserves | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - 2016-2017 budget | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - 3-5 year budget projections | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - 2016-2017 staffing structure | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - EYFS Play-area quotes | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - Shelter quotes | Governing Body | |

| | | |
|---|----------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - Scheme of Delegation | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified - Operational Financial Procedure | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratified – Photocopier quotes | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – accept Resources Committee minutes into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved – T&L Committee minutes 29.03.16 | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed – accept verbal feedback from T&L Committee meeting 11.07.16 into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |

| Item 6 | Behaviour and Safety of Pupils / Safeguarding | | |
|---|---|----------------|----------------|
| <p>The Acting Headteacher presented his report in relation to behaviour and safety of pupils / safeguarding and the following points were noted in discussion.</p> <p>The report was based on the behaviour and safety of pupils / safeguarding aspects of the Headteacher’s report – see Item 4 above.</p> <p>In addition, the Clerk confirmed that copies of the most recent guidance had been included in the supporting documents for the meeting; the documents were available on the Google Drive used by Governors.</p> <p>Governors recognised that the guidance relating to Disqualification by Association was issued in June 2016 and applied from that time. However, it was noted that the Keeping Children Safe in Education guidance was currently for ‘information purposes’ and was not scheduled to come into effect until September 2016. It was also noted that all Governors were expected to reading and understand Section 1 of the guidance as an integral part of their role.</p> <p>There were no additional points raised in relation to either document and the Governing Body agreed to accept both into the record of the meeting. In addition, Governors also agreed to read Section 1 of Keeping Children Safe in Education.</p> <p>There were no additional points raised in relation to the behaviour and safety of pupils / safeguarding and Governors agreed to accept the report into the record of the meeting.</p> | | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | | Owner | Date |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agreed – accept guidance Disqualification by Association into record of meeting. | | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agreed – accept guidance Keeping Children Safe in Education into record of meeting. | | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Action – read Section 1 of Keeping Children Safe in Education. | | Governing Body | September 2016 |

| | | |
|--|----------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept behaviour and safety of pupils / safeguarding report into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |
|--|----------------|--|

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Item 7 | Governors' Action Plan Review |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|

The Chair presented his report in relation to the Governors' action plan and the following points were noted in discussion.

It was confirmed that both of the long term outstanding complaint panel reviews had now been completed and the Clerk would provide a verbal overview of the panel's recommendations – see Item 9 below. These points would be considered and if necessary the action plan amended to take into account any additional actions. It would also allow the Governing Body to work towards completing one of the other outstanding actions – to address the current Complaints Policy.

In addition, the Chair confirmed that he had agreed to attend a series of courses organised by Manchester City Council (MCC) and the Manchester Teaching Schools Alliance (MTSA).

The Chair confirmed that a new Communications Manager had been appointed and was settling into the role – they were already having an impact. This included some 'fresh' ideas carried forward from their previous role; they were efficiently going about the task of publicising the positive aspects of the school; and the communications processes were already becoming more streamlined.

Q. Was the role a permanent appointment?

A. Yes – the successful candidate had previously held a similar role at quite a high level.

It was proposed that, as the actions had been met and were being completed, the action plan would not represent a 'standing item' in future, but Governors would commit to embedding the actions.

There were no issues raised in relation to the above proposal and it was approved by the Governing Body.

There were no additional points raised in relation to the Chair's report and it was agreed to accept the report into the record of the meeting.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved – discontinue with Governors action plan as a standing item. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept Governors' action plan report into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Item 8 | Policies for Review and Approval / Ratification |
|---------------|--|

Anti-Bullying Policy.

The Acting Headteacher presented the Anti-Bullying Policy for consideration – it was noted that the document had been circulated in advance of the meeting, and the following points were raised in discussion.

Governors recognised that the document contained minor amendments from the previous version of the document. The changes related to ensuring the document was still effective and current as part of an annual review cycle; and it was

appreciated that the policy had been applied consistently and effectively.

Q. There have been media reports of increased occurrences of hate crime since the recent referendum – was this an issue for the school too?

A. One parent reported that a racist comment had been made to their child, but this was an isolated incident and not typical. The school addressed the issue in line with the current policies and procedures. The school was also using the RRSA programme as a tool to raise awareness amongst pupils in relation to rights and responsibilities. However, in this instance the school appreciated that the child involved did not really understand what they were saying – they had simply repeated words that they had heard.

There were no additional points raised or noted in relation to the revised Anti-Bullying Policy and the document was approved.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved – anti-Bullying Policy. | Governing Body | |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Item 9 | Complaint Review Panels – Feedback and Recommendations |
|-------------------|---|

The Clerk provided a verbal report in relation to the feedback and recommendations following the recent complaint review panels. It was appreciated that the panel had met that afternoon in order to finalise the decision for both complainants and also draft their response to the complainants.

Governors noted the following recommendations:

- The Governing Body should ensure the introduction of a robust and rigorous code of conduct / e-mail / media / acceptable use policy in order to support the school in understanding the importance of managing professional communications.
- The Governing Body must review and revise the current policy in relation to complaints including the processes and procedures. The school requires a robust and supportive policy that provides a rigorous structure that can be effectively applied by the school and the Governing Body. The adopted document must then be published on the school website and provided to complainants to ensure all parties understand the protocols involved.
- The Governing Body must ensure that the members of the SLT and Governors have received effective complaints training and have a good understanding of the adopted policy.
- The Governing Body should complete a review process of the resolved complaints (those at level two or above) at the end of each academic year. The process may be carried out by an independent person and should be continued for a period of not less than two years. The rationale is not to re-open and investigate resolved complaints, but rather to identify areas of improvement and best practice; to glean any learning from past experiences.
- Governors need to be conscious that they must manage the dissemination of information when initially addressing complaints in order to prevent other members of the Governing Body from being 'tainted' and therefore impacting on their perceived impartiality.
- The Governing Body should adopt a more robust process of managing draft minutes / documents and approving the final document that has been determined as the 'true record' of a meeting.

In response the Chair provided an overview of the complaints received in the current academic year. This included a complaint related to CPOMS and also a series of subject access requests, both of which having been noted earlier in the meeting although the particulars were not discussed.

In addition, it was noted that the Chair and an additional Governor had met with a family to resolve an issue relating to the flexi-school programme and non-attendance at the school. It was also appreciated that there had been a number of complaints raised in relation to the 'Commando Joe' programme during the Autumn Term. These complaints had all been addressed.

Governors recognised that many of the recommendations were either already addressed or were in the process of being addressed. The main issue of reviewing the current Complaints Policy had been deferred until Governors could include any feedback from the complaints review panel meetings.

Governors agreed to establish a working group consisting of Ali Ayub, Ellie Russell and Simon Bentall to review a series of complaints policies in order to source best practice.

In addition, the Chair confirmed that he would work with the Acting Headteacher to provide a summary of the complaints addressed in the current academic year and any actions gleaned from the process.

There were no additional points raised in relation to the above feedback report and it was agreed to accept the report into the record of the meeting.

In addition, Governors agreed to adopt and apply the recommendations presented by the complaints review panel.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – complaint policy working group established with membership as above. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – accept report in relation to complaints panel review into record of meeting. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – adopt and apply recommendations from complaint review panel. | Governing Body | |

| Item 10 | AOB |
|---|------------|
| <p>Additional Documents The Chair confirmed that some additional documents had become available for consideration, but it would not be appropriate to address these at this stage as they were quite extensive. These documents included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit Report – final draft Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plan Strategic Risk Register <p>It was proposed that the review and consideration of the documents was delegated to the Resources Committee and the outcome reported to Governors.</p> <p>Academisation</p> | |

The Chair confirmed that there was no update to provide in relation to the academisation process. It was recognised that the focus for central government was not aimed at academies currently and therefore the Governing Body would maintain a 'watching brief'.

2016-2017 Meeting Schedule.

The Chair presented the proposed 2016-2017 meeting schedule which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

There were no points raised in relation to the document and it was agreed to adopt the schedule.

Governing Body Membership.

The Chair confirmed that Caroline Taylor (CT) had tendered her resignation as a member of staff and would be leaving the school prior to September 2016. As such the role of Staff Governor would be open and the school would organise an election at the start of the new academic year.

The Chair thanked CT for her support of the school and the Governing Body and wished her well for the future.

| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | Owner | Date |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action – maintain 'watching brief' in relation to academies. | Governing Body | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed – adopt 2016-2017 meeting schedule. | Governing Body | |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Item 11 | Date of Next Meeting | | |
| Governors noted that the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday 22 September 2016 at 6.15pm | | | |
| Resolutions / Agreed Actions | | Owner | Date |
| • Agreed – next meeting as above. | | Governing Body | |