

# Oswald Road Primary School Governing Body Meeting Minutes

**Quorum: 5 - met at this meeting**

**Approved as a true and accurate record.**

**Chair: Richard Price**

**Name.....**

**Date of meeting: 14 December 2015**

**Date.....**

**Venue: Oswald Road Primary School**

**Chair of Committee / Governing Body**

## Attendees

Name	Governor Designation	Term of Office End Date	Present – P Apologies – Ap Absent - A
Simon Bentall (SB)	Parent	23/09/18	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
Ann Kerrigan (AK)	Co-Opted	08/11/19	P
Ellie Russell	Co-Opted	31/03/18	P
Sheila Newman (SN)	LA	31/08/18	P
James Britton (JB)	Co-Opted	23/09/19	P
Caroline Taylor	Staff	29/11/19	P
Deborah Howard	Staff (HT)	N/A	Ap

Also Present	Role
Sarah Nicholls*	School Business Manager (Present for Item 8)
Jon Beisly	Deputy Headteacher
Richard Fletcher	Observer
Gerard McCoy	Clerk - AGM Clerking and Administration Service

*\*left meeting early.*

## Agenda Items

Item	Apologies
<b>1</b>	<p>The Governors noted the apologies for non-attendance submitted by Deborah Howard.</p> <p>In the absence of the Headteacher, Jon Beisly, the Deputy Headteacher (DHT), was attending the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed Richard Fletcher, a prospective new governor who had been invited to observe, and also Caroline Taylor the newly elected Staff Governor.</p> <p>The Governors in attendance introduced themselves.</p>

Governors agreed to address Item 11 after Item 3 to allow the School Business Manager (SBM) to leave the meeting earlier.		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – accept apology submitted.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – agenda item change of order.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	

<b>Item 2</b>	<b>Declaration of Pecuniary Interests</b>	
<p>James Britton declared an interest as an employee of Trafford Council. Sheila Newman declared an interest as an elected Councillor for Manchester City Council.</p> <p>There were no other declarations of pecuniary interest.</p>		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – declarations of interest as above.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	

<b>Item 3</b>	<b>Minutes of the Previous Meetings (09.11.15) and Matters Arising</b>	
<p>Minutes of the Meeting – 09.11.15 Following a review of the previous minutes there were no issues raised in relation to the accuracy of the document; it was agreed that the minutes represented a true record of the meeting.</p> <p>A signed copy was retained on file at the school.</p> <p>Matters Arising. Page 1: Item 3 – Vice Chair Governors considered the previous proposal to nominate James Britton for the role of Vice Chair. There were no additional nominations and following the format previously agreed by Governors JB was elected unopposed for a term of one year as Vice Chair.</p> <p>Page 11: Item 10 – Governor Visits It was confirmed that the Governor visits process had been established and a draft calendar for forthcoming events was being finalised. The document would be circulated to Governors.</p> <p>There were no additional matters arising that had not been included in the current agenda.</p>		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approved - minutes of previous meeting (09.11.15) as true record.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – James Britton elected as Vice Chair for one year.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – complete and circulate calendar of events for Governor visits.</li> </ul>	SBM / DHT	

<b>Item 11</b>	<b>Finance</b>
--------------------	----------------

Sarah Nicholls, the School Business Manager (SBM) presented her report and the following points were raised in discussion.

**Confidential Item**

The matter raised at the previous meeting as a confidential item was addressed at this point – the discussion was recorded as under Confidential Appendix A – the appendix was not available for public circulation.

The SBM presented her narrative report and the following documents which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Budget changes

Budget Monitoring

Cash Flow Forecast

Remote CCTV quote

Costing for remaining window replacement

Governors noted that the astro-turf costings were now included and the funds have been secured for the project, although they have been entered into an incorrect cost centre.

Governors reviewed the budget changes sheet – which took into account a claw back due to a change in pupil numbers and also an additional PE grant.

Q. Does 'Commando Joe' cost £13,750?

A. No – the ledger code relates to Commando Joe and other assessment schemes.

Q. The overall changes represented £13,000?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the position of outstanding amounts owed by some parents?

A. The school was making progress in this area and the issue would be re-addressed in the New Year.

Q. Have many parents taken advantage of the 'PayPal' system?

A. Not many, but the school will promote this facility. The school would also prompt eligible parents to register for free school meals (FSM).

Governors discussed the process by which the school cross-checks those families eligible for FSM and promotes the option. It was recognised that the school communicates the option to all new parents starting in Nursery as part of the induction pack.

There were no points of discussion raised in relation to the budget changes and these were approved by the Governing Body

Governors noted that the cash flow forecast demonstrated the school bank account would remain in credit for the remainder of the current financial year.

There were no points raised in relation to the cash flow forecast and this was approved by the Governing Body.

There were no additional points raised in relation to the finance documents considered and it was agreed to accept these documents into the record of the meeting.

The SBM confirmed she had been in discussion with Manchester City Council (MCC) in relation to MCC providing additional funding support for the window replacement project. The outcome was that MCC considered this was not possible in the current financial year, but the option would be re-considered in the next financial year (2016-2017).

In relation to the astro-turf, it was confirmed that the quality was of an appropriate standard and the project was proceeding.

Governors discussed the remote CCTV / security project which had been costed at £4,150 through MCC – this covered the 'at risk' area and not all of the grounds. Although in principle it was considered necessary Governors were concerned that this would represent value for money.

Q. Does the costing exclude the on-going service fee?

A. Yes.

Governors discussed the extent of the coverage offered within the contract – which was understood to be 24 hours per day. In addition it was noted that there was some uncertainty with what was represented by 'MCD'.

The SBM confirmed that she would investigate other quotes / suppliers and also contact school using the scheme to determine if they considered it represented a worthwhile option.

#### Contract Cleaning

The SBM confirmed that the tendering process for the cleaning contract was now underway – the closing date for submissions was 31 December 2015, and there were two tenders already submitted.

Q. What was the position of the existing staff in relation to the potential contracting out of cleaning services?

A. The staff were under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations (TUPE) and their original contract terms would be carried over to the new contract.

#### ICT Write-offs

The SBM presented a series of ICT assets including printers, monitors, laptops and PC units that were considered as having zero value.

Q. Do any of the items still work?

A. They are either broken, damaged or are now obsolete.

Governors discussed that write-offs and the option to recycle items where possible. It was confirmed that this would be achieved with undamaged monitors and printers, but would not be possible with the PC units and laptops.

There were no additional issues raised and the Governing Body approved the ICT assets write-offs.

#### New Governor Induction Pack

The SB confirmed that the newly drafted induction pack had been completed and the new Staff Governor (Caroline Taylor) had reviewed the document from the standpoint of a new governor.

The Chair confirmed that he and Ellie Russell (ER) would work through the document with each of the newly appointed / elected Governors in the forthcoming weeks.

### Parent Governor Elections

The SBM confirmed that the election process had been completed today with 141 parents taking part in the voting – two parents had been nominated and the vote was 71 / 70. There were a number of recounts to ensure the final result was accurate. Due to the timing of the election and the current meeting it was not possible for the newly elected Parent Governor to attend this meeting; they would be invited to the next meeting.

### SFVS Self-assessment Document

The Chair confirmed that tomorrow he would be working with the SBM to draft the updated SAFVS self-assessment document. The final version would be available at the next scheduled meeting for a full review and approval by Governors.

There were no additional points raised and the Governing Body agreed to accept the SBM report into the record of the meeting.

<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved – budget changes.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved – cash flow forecast.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed – accept finance documents into record of meeting.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action – source additional remote CCTV quotes.</li> </ul>	SBM	January 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action – contact schools using remote CCTV security to determine value for money.</li> </ul>	SBM	January 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action – confirm meaning of MCD.</li> </ul>	SBM	January 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved – ICT assets writ-off.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action – work through Governor Induction Pack with new Governors.</li> </ul>	Chair / ER	January 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action – review SFVS self-assessment document.</li> </ul>	Chair / SBM	January 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action – SFVS self-assessment document to be agenda item next meeting.</li> </ul>	HT / Chair / Clerk	29.03.16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed – accept SBM report into record of meeting.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	

<b>Item</b>	<b>Headteacher's Report</b>
<b>4</b>	Jon Beisly, the Deputy Headteacher (DHT), presented his report on behalf of the Headteacher who was currently on sickness absence leave. The report had been circulated in advance of the meeting and the following points were raised in discussion.

Q. There was an issue with the persistent absence (PA) designated pupils and the 'flexi-school'?

A. The situation involves nine pupils and the school has met with all of the parents involved. Most of these parents have signed a contract based on attending the flexi-school one Friday every third week – this was agreed prior to the summer break. However, some families have not complied with the agreement and four families had been issued with fixed penalty notices and fines; an additional fine was in the process of being issued.

Governors were advised that the school was now providing additional pastoral support in order to encourage attendance and this was having a positive impact in some instances. However, from January 2016 the school would be taking a more rigorous approach to attendance.

The Chair provided an overview of the approach to the 'flexi-school' and the school promoting a transition period. The rationale for the flexi-school would no longer apply from January 2016 when a full range of pastoral support would be available.

Sheila Newman confirmed that she had been approached in relation to the issue and that the Local Authority considered any unauthorised absence should be pursued.

It was recognised that the new approach had been approved by the Governing Body previously – that a new policy was in place and that issues would be addressed in line with the agreed process. It was also recognised that the policy needed to be applied equitably.

Q. The school has changed the designation when recording absence for those attending the 'flexi-school'?

A. Yes – on advice from MCC the 'flexi-school' could not be considered as 'education off-site'.

Q. It has been suggested that other schools were using the designation of 'education off-site'?

A. Yes, but not in the MCC area.

Governors discussed the behavioural system involving issuing 'red' cards. It was noted it represented a process of monitoring and providing a structure for behaviour management. The cards were used as a 'trigger' for consequences.

Q. Was the process effective?

A. It could be more effective- the school was reviewing the approach as it was not being applied consistently.

Q. The fixed term exclusions – how long were they for and did this involve separate pupils?

A. There were two fixed term exclusions, each for one day. Both incidents involved the same child and one incident was a physical assault against a member of staff.

Q. What actions have been taken to address the issue?

A. There was a behaviour plan in place for this child and the school was receiving additional support from the pupil referral unit (PRU). The child in question was receiving 1:1 support and although there had been improvements in behaviour the child was at crisis point – there were very complex family issues to be taken into consideration.

Q. Could this possibly lead to a permanent exclusion?

A. Not yet, the school would continue to work with the PRU to prevent this from happening.

Q. Were the parents engaged?

A. Yes – the school has established on-going meetings with the parents, but was conscious that they were struggling to manage the situation and maintain their work roles.

Q. Was the child in the special educational needs (SEND) cohort?

A. No – not currently and the process to achieve the SEND designation was drawn-out. The child had completed a CAMHS (child and adolescent mental health) assessment with no issues raised. However the school was aware of at least one issue that had not been addressed and was pursuing the matter.

Governors recognised that the current threshold was now much higher in attaining an education health care plan (EHCP).

Quality Assurance (QA) Report.

The DHT confirmed that the school had been subject to a QA assessment – carried out by Deborah Hunton; commissioned by MCC. The final report will be circulated to all Governors.

As part of the assessment the 2014-2015 school data was reviewed and the targets for Key Stage 1 (KS1) and Key Stage 2 (KS2) for 2015-2016 were established.

Q. There was an issue with maths – what actions have been taken?

A. The school has introduced additional interventions and support aimed at KS2 and specifically Year 6. However, the school has identified a number of pupils with dyscalculia.

Governors discussed the challenge for the school that the government had not yet published the STATs tests pass mark – that this may be calculated after the actual tests were completed. But it was recognised that this was a national issue for all schools.

The DHT confirmed that prior to the commencement of her sickness absence the Headteacher had been involved with the local cluster in formulating an approach to address the issue.

Governors noted the improved data in relation to the Early Years (EY) and the improvements in pupils attaining a 'good level of development' (GLD) – now 67%. This was above the national average and the on track data predicted 71% for 2016.

Governors noted that in relation to KS1 83% of pupils attained the phonics screening test.

The targets for the Year 2 tests were:

Reading - 82%

Writing - 84%

Maths - 86%

In relation to KS2 the targets were for achieving the national standard:

Reading - 95%

Writing - 94%

Maths - 75%

and for exceeding the national standards:

Reading - 38%  
Writing - 72%  
Maths - 55%

There were no points raised in relation to the above targets and these were approved by the Governing Body

#### Staffing Structure

The DHT presented an overview of the current staffing structure.

Governors noted the increase in maternity leave although two members of staff were returning from their maternity leave.

In addition the cover arrangements for the Year 6 teacher currently on sickness leave were noted.

The DHT confirmed that the newly qualified teachers (NQT) have settled into the school.

Q. The size of the inclusion team has increased?

A. Yes – there were more pupils receiving 1:1 support.

Q. Were these usually part-time staff?

A. The situation varied depending on the needs of the pupils; the school had to meet the cost of the additional support from the budget until an EHCP could be secured and with it the extra funding. However, the process was drawn-out.

Governors recognised that the current contract for the Communications Manager was for a fixed term; this would need to be reviewed in the New Year. It was noted that the DHT and the Headteacher had already met with the Communications Manager; he was aware of the forthcoming review. It was also considered that he had been an integral part of the school team.

The Chair requested that the DHT and the Headteacher prepare a briefing document in relation to the role of the Communications Manager and the value the role brings to the school.

Governors noted the teaching and learning responsibility (TLR) roles, both temporary and permanent; it was also noted that these would be reviewed following the interviews scheduled for Wednesday.

Q. Were there any Governors on the interview panel?

A. No.

There were no additional points raised in relation to the staffing structure and this was approved by the Governing Body.

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

<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Action – circulate QA report.</li></ul>	DHT	January 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Action – prepare briefing paper re Communications Manager role.</li></ul>	HT / DHT	January 2016

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved – KS1 and KS2 targets for 2016.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved – staffing structure.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed – accept Headteacher DHT report into record of meeting.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	

<b>Item 5</b>	<b>RAISE Online Review</b>	
<p>ER presented her report in relation to the recent teaching and learning review carried out by herself, Tom Grimshaw and the DHT. Governors also considered the RAISE Online data.</p> <p>As part of the process the review considered the context of the school especially in relation to the FSM cohort. There was consideration of the potential incentives the school could offer in order to encourage eligible families to apply for FSM.</p> <p>Q. Was the additional funding actually spent on these pupils? A. Yes – but there was also a benefit to the pupils across the school with additional interventions.</p> <p>Governors were aware that the additional benefits for pupils would act as a significant incentive for parents. It was appreciated that the incentives / benefits needed to be tangible.</p> <p>Q. When was the ideal time of year to encourage parents? A. The Summer Term was the most effective period as it allowed the maximum amount of time for applications to be processed.</p> <p>In addition the review also considered the attendance data and the issues discussed as part of Item 5 above.</p> <p>The review group also considered the attainment for KS1 – and noted it was above the national average in reading and writing. But it was appreciated that the lower attainers needed to make more progress – the school was providing additional support for this purpose.</p> <p>However, it was noted that maths was still in need of further development. In addition Governors noted the extent of change in the maths curriculum.</p> <p>Q. The KS1 English as an additional language (EAL) cohort was above the national average in English, but below in other areas? A. At this point in their education they are still in the early stages and they 'catch-up' in KS2.</p> <p>In addition it was noted that Year 4 and Year 5 were in line with the national average and Year 6 had a large number of higher attaining pupils.</p> <p>Governors noted that KS2 was excellent – above the national average in most areas including maths.</p> <p>Q. What was the school's position in relation to Singapore maths?</p>		

A. The Headteacher and the maths lead have attended initial training in the programme and visited a local school that has already been using the programme for two years.

In relation to EY it was noted that there was a difference between the boys and girls cohorts in attaining a GLD.

The school confirmed that there were more pupils in the EAL cohort and part of the issue was recognised as the balance in the outdoor provision. This aspect had been identified by the school and was targeted as a focus in the next round of funding - in order to make it more attractive to the boys' learning. The girls were noted to have spent a greater amount of time inside making use of the resources more directly linked to learning.

Q. What activities could engage the boys outside?

A. The provision would be adapted to involve more writing and maths skills in the different themed areas.

The school advised that the EY staff were creative and flexible, but vandalism was an issue with resources – hence the CCTV project as discussed above.

Governors recognised that the 'white British boys' cohort was still an issue for attainment and discussed the school tracks this issue; especially with the use of the data dashboard.

Governors requested that the school considers the issue of EAL pupils further and benchmarks the EAL data with other schools.

Governors discussed the uptake of pastoral support in line with the educational support to enable pupils to progress.

The DHT emphasised the different pastoral areas and the range of extra-curricular activities offered by the school – this represented a diverse curriculum. But it was also noted that feedback from parent Governors was that the school does not over-emphasise the educational issue.

There was a further discussion relating to the different methods used by the school in order to celebrate success and the ethos of the school in developing resilience.

The Governors considered the progress of pupils from KS1 to KS2 and this was seen as excellent – with 65% of overall pupils beyond the expected level and 85% of the disadvantaged pupils beyond the expected level; this was across reading, writing and maths.

Q. Do these results reflect the impact of the intervention / support work?

A. The school considers the interventions overall as successful, but still needs to determine which were most effective and understand 'why'.

Governors noted that there was a three year trend of closing the gap in both KS1 and KS2.

Life Without Levels.

The DHT delivered an overview of the presentation designed to support parents and prepare them for the changes. A full copy would be circulated off –meeting for Governors' information.

Governors recognised that the information following pupil progress meetings with regards to the percentage of pupils on track to hit year group expectations could be shared after the meeting.

The DHT confirmed that a summary of the schools position would be circulated prior to the next meeting; it would provide greater detail.

There were no additional points raised and the Governing Body agreed to accept the teaching and learning review report into the records of the meeting.

There were no additional points raised and the Governing Body agreed to accept the RAISE Online report into the record of the meeting.

<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – benchmark KS1 EAL data with other schools.</li> </ul>	HT / DHT	January 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – circulate life without level presentation for parents to Governors.</li> </ul>	DHT	January 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – accept teaching and learning review into record of meeting.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – accept RAISE Online report into record of meeting.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	

<b>Item 6</b>	<b>Behaviour and Safety of Pupils / Safeguarding</b>
	<p>The DHT presented an overview of the revised Behaviour Policy which had been circulated prior to the meeting, and the following points were raised in discussion.</p> <p>It was noted that the changes to the policy were designed to improve the behaviour management system and lead to greater consistency of approach.</p> <p>The new approach would be introduced in January 2016 and integrated with the behaviours associated with the 'Rights Respecting School Award' (RRSA). It would highlight the consequences and the different levels of behaviour, and link rewards to the curriculum and topics.</p> <p>Q. How would it be communicated?  A. The pupils were involved in determining the different levels of behaviour and the associated consequences – in this way the actions and consequences were more closely linked and with the opportunity to 'earn-back' some points.</p> <p>Governors considered the aspect of promoting the positive aspects with 'house points' and 'always badges'. In addition it was discussed that those not involved in behavioural issues would be named in 'Free-style Friday', in order to highlight trends, but not 'name and shame'.</p> <p>Q. Was the system computerised?  A. No.</p> <p>Governors approved the policy in principle, but recognised that it needed to be developed into a final draft, which could be made available to Governors at the next meeting.</p>

Governors requested a feedback report from the DHT to highlight the roll out of the revised policy and the initial impact.		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approved – Behaviour Policy in principle with above proviso.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – provide feedback report on roll out and impact of policy.</li> </ul>	DHT	January 2016

<b>Item 7</b>	<b>Pupil Premium Grant (PPG) Funding</b>	
The Chair proposed that this item was deferred to the next meeting.		
There were no issues raised and this was agreed by the Governing Body.		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – defer PPG funding report.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – PPG funding report to be agenda item next meeting.</li> </ul>	HT / Chair / Clerk	29.03.16

<b>Item 8</b>	<b>Governors' Action Plan Review</b>	
The Chair presented the Governors' Action Plan and Governors considered the continuing progress made.		
It was noted that the new governor induction programme / pack was now in place. In addition the Chair and ER have agreed to meet with each of the newly appointed / elected Governors as discussed above.		
In relation to 'bespoke training' for Governors in their roles this was being scheduled – including complaints training and finance training; these would be scheduled in the first half of the next term.		
In addition Governors noted the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>election of a Vice Chair had been completed – as above</li> <li>schedule of Governor visits and the calendar of events was being completed</li> </ul>		
In relation to complaints these were being monitored – currently there were no complaints although there had been requests for clarification and these have been addressed.		
Q. How many have been received? A. A handful related to the 'military aspects' of the Commando Jo' programme. All teachers have been monitoring the impact of the programme and a feedback report would be available at the next meeting.		
The Chair confirmed he would update and re-circulate the action plan.		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – update and re-circulate action plan to Governors</li> </ul>	Chair	January 2016

<b>Item 9</b>	<b>Parental Survey</b>	
<p>The Chair confirmed that by the closing date the school had received 170 responses to the questionnaire.</p> <p>Although there had not yet been the opportunity to analyze the responses in detail, initial feedback was that there were no real areas of concern.</p> <p>The school would collate the responses and be supported by Governors – the full analysis would be available in January 2016.</p>		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>		<b>Owner</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – parental survey analysis to be agenda item next meeting.</li> </ul>		HT / Chair / Clerk
		<b>Date</b>
		29.03.16

<b>Item 10</b>	<b>Policies for Review and Approval</b>	
<p>Governors noted that the only policy for review was the Behaviour Policy – this issue had been addressed as part of Item 6 above.</p>		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>		<b>Owner</b>
		<b>Date</b>

<b>Item 12</b>	<b>School Improvement Plan</b>	
<p>The Chair proposed that the Clerk would re-issue the mind-maps which had been circulated prior to the previous meetings – this would ensure each Governor had a copy and could review the documents off meeting.</p> <p>Governors noted that the SIP leads were scheduled to meet together – 23 March 2016 and this would be an opportunity for Governors to meet with the area leads.</p> <p>In addition the DHT would issue a half page summary of the priorities and impact for each area.</p> <p>There were no issues raised in relation to this proposal and it was agreed by the Governing Body.</p>		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>		<b>Owner</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – recirculate mind-maps to Governors.</li> </ul>		Clerk
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – review mind-maps off meeting.</li> </ul>		Each Governor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action – half page mind-map summary to be circulated to Governors.</li> </ul>		DHT / Clerk
		<b>Date</b>
		January 2016
		January 2016

<b>Item 13</b>	<b>Governing Body Meetings / Committees</b>	
<p>Governors considered the establishment of the a committee structure and agreed the following committees and membership:</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Committee: Ellie Russell; James Britton; Tom Grimshaw; Joanne Dennis; Simon Bentall; Deborah Howard.</p> <p>Resources Committee</p>		

Caroline Taylor; Ann Kerrigan; Sheila Newman; Richard Price; Richard Fletcher; Deborah Howard.		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – committees and membership as above.</li> </ul>	Governing Body	

<b>Item 14</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
The Chair prompted Governors to make use of the link to the latest version of the Governors’ Handbook.		
There was no additional business for discussion and the meeting was closed.		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>

<b>Item 16</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
Governors agreed the following dates for future meetings:		
Resources Committee - Thursday 11 February at 6.30pm		
Teaching and Learning Committee – Tuesday 29 March at 5.00pm.		
Governing Body – Tuesday 29 March 2016 at 6.15pm.		
<b>Resolutions / Agreed Actions</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Date</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed – date and time for next meetings</li> </ul>	Governing Body	