**Baguley Hall Primary School**

**Governing Body Meeting Minutes**

**School: Baguley Hall Primary School**

**Quorum: 6 (Met at this meeting)**

**Chair: Carol Steedman**

**Clerk: Colette Garner**

**Date of meeting: 18 November 2019**

**Venue: Baguley Hall Primary School**

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Designate**  **Governor type** | **‘End of Term of Office’ date** | **Present (P)/apologies (Ap)/absent (A)** |
| Kate Bulman | Headteacher (HT) | N/A | P |
| Carol Steedman (Chair) | Partnership | 23/03/23 | P |
| Peter Renshaw | Co-opted | 26/03/22 | P |
| Laura Lodge | Co-opted | 01/09/22 | P |
| Donna Cunneen | Co-opted | 31.08.20 | P |
| Mike Allison | Partnership | 15/07/23 | P |
| Qasim Zafar \* | Co-opted | 20/05/23 | P |
| Katie Framm | LA governor | 30/11/21 | P |
| Claire Goulding (DHT) | Associate | 22/03/23 | P |
|  |  |  |  |
| David Boyle | Co-opted | 22/05/20 | Ap |
| Lynn Daly | Parent governor | 20/05/23 | Ap |
| Victoria Cook | Staff | 12/12/20 | A |

*\*Joined the meeting late – see item 6*

**Others present**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
| Colette Garner | Clerk (One Education) |
| Anne-Marie Dorsey | School Business Manager (SBM) |

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Apologies** | | |
| Apologies were received and accepted from David Boyle and Lynn Daly. | | | |
|  | **Action decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **Declaration of Pecuniary Interests** | | |
| There were no declarations of pecuniary interest expressed in connection with any item on the agenda. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **Chair and Vice Chair Elections** | | |
| Chair election  Carol Steedman was nominated and re-elected as Chair for a period of 1 year, unanimously. The Chair informed governors that it would be her 4th and final year as Chair and she hoped that another governor would be willing to take over next year.  Vice Chair  Peter Renshaw was nominated and elected as Vice Chair for a period of a year, unanimously. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Carol Steedman elected as Chair * Peter Renshaw elected as Vice Chair | Governing Body  Governing Body | 1 year  1 year |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **Appointment of Governing Body Clerk** | | |
| Governors approved the appointment of One Education as the Governing Body clerk. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * One Education Ltd appointed as the Governing Body clerk | Governing Body |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **Minutes of the Previous Meeting (15/07/19) and Matters Arising** | | |
| The minutes of the meeting held on 15/07/19 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting. A copy was signed for retention on file.  Matters Arising  Page 12, The Slack information platform has been trialled by a number of governors who have found it useful to informally share information. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Minutes of the meeting held on 15/07/19 approved | Governing Body |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **Headteacher’s Report** | | |
| The HT informed governors that she was presenting her report in a new format called School On A Page (SOAP), along with the recent Quality Assurance (QA) Report, the Summary Self Evaluation (SEF) and School Development Plan (SDP). All the reports had been circulated in advance of the meeting and included in the meeting papers. The following points were raised/highlighted in discussion:  SOAP  The one page report contains much of the information that governors need in an easily accessible format. Governors are not expected to retain all the data and important headlines about the school and given the short notice that schools receive from Ofsted, the SOAP will be particularly useful to governors.  The report contains a section on each of the following: School Context; SDP; Self Evaluation and Overall Effectiveness of the school; 2019 Pupil Outcomes; Quality of Teaching; Pupil Premium; Sports Funding; Areas to Celebrate.  *Q. Do governors think that SOAP contains the information that governors require?*  Yes. Governors are very positive about the format of the report.  *Q. What about in-year progress and attainment?*  SOAP does not contain in year school data. Classroom Monitor, the school’s integrated tracking system, includes statutory external test results and internal test results which will be discussed and reports shared at standards and curriculum committee meetings. A selection of reports, including Fischer Family Trust (FFT), will be provided for governors to review and decide which they feel gives them the best information.  *Q. Does the HT think that SOAP contains the information that governors need?*  The original SOAP came from a conference that the Chair attended. The HT has adapted the format to include the school improvement objectives and to include more information about the quality of teaching, measured against progress, across all year groups.  Quality Assurance (QA) Report  This time last year the school received a very challenging QA report. Improvements over the year are reflected in the current report, with movement from Requires Improvement (RI) to Good. The focus of the QA visit 4.11.19 was the Quality of Education (emphasis on the curriculum) and Leadership and Management.  The Chair had also attended the meeting and informed governors that the QA professional had been impressed at the progress the school had made in a year, especially with regard to the reading and the ongoing work around Read Write Inc (RWI).  The HT, DHT and Chair alongside the QA professional, reviewed the Ofsted handbook bullet points and grade descriptors for Quality of Education and agreed that the best fit is ‘good’. The report comments that a great deal of work has been undertaken in readiness for the new framework and the school knows what needs to be done next.  *\*Qasim Zafar joined the meeting*  *Q. What is deep dive?*  Ofsted’s previous focus was around data and tracking and progress. Future inspections, under the new framework will be different. The inspection starts with a lengthy phone call with school leadership the day before. Part of the conversation will be about the curriculum, in particular Intent, Implementation and Impact. On the day of the inspection, inspectors will follow up with subject deep dives involving discussion with the Subject Leader, looking at books and talking to pupils and teachers. Staff will need to know how their area of subject fits in with the subject area across the school.  The Subject Leader for history has devised an Intent, Implementation and Impact Template that will be used for the other subject areas.  *Q. Is the aim to make teaching more relevant to children?*  Yes. The content needs to be relevant to the pupils of Baguley Hall.  The SDP highlights the need to look at opportunities locally to support the curriculum. For example, if the scheme of work includes the study of named artists, there should be examples of that artist’s work within the Manchester area,that the children can go and look at.  *Q. Are the teachers enthused?*  It involves considerable change and additional work and can feel quite overwhelming. Most are teaching 9 subjects. As teachers become more familiar with the changes to the schemes of work and can see the cohesion and impact on the pupils, they will be increasingly enthused.  *Q. Are the changes to the curriculum affecting the way teachers teach?*  Teachers are aware that they have to demonstrate impact. Decisions need to be made about whether the particular area of the curriculum is knowledge based or skills based. In reality it is often a mixture of both.  *Q. How does the school demonstrate impact?*  The school needs to be able to demonstrate that children have retained what they have learnt. At the end of each unit of work there will be some kind of quiz or assessment. When children revisit the same topic area, further up the school, there will be a preliminary quiz or assessment to check retention and, if necessary revise any areas before moving children on in their learning.  Summary Self Evaluation and School Development Plan (SDP)  There have been changes to reflect the new Ofsted headings.  The report begins with the strengths from 2018-19, followed by an overview section highlighting the School Improvement Priorities, which are also highlighted in the SOAP.  There then follows a more detailed section on each of the Ofsted areas (Quality of Education, Behaviour and Attitudes, Personal Development and Leadership and Management). The SDP also contains a child friendly section which has been produced for the pupils.  The HT highlighted the success criteria which are now very measurable with either a ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ or a percentage figure, allowing governors, and others, to more closely monitor and review the SDP.  One of the main areas of development in 2019-20 is to improve outcomes in reading supported by the introduction of RWI. The school has completed a great deal of work and individual success criteria have already been met.  The cost of the RWI is considerable. Resources and training are a one-off cost this year and need to be seen as an investment.  RWI guided reading started at the end of last year. Subject based reading books are included in the scheme, which supports one of the aims that by the end of primary school, children are sufficiently good readers to be able to read subject specific books to help them with their learning. KS1 children learn to read and KS2 children read to learn.  The school has identified texts, which are information books for each of the subject based topics.  The school continues to use the Accelerated Reader Programme, which is very motivating for children. The programme gives clear information about children’s attainment and progress and whether intervention is required. It also demonstrates which children may need additional time, for example, to complete maths tests.  The school has received a maths audit visit, which has generated an action plan and the Maths leader has half a day every other week to work on the plan.  The Gap analysis and revised 2 year topic cycle has been highlighted in green to show that the work has all been completed.  Attendance continues to be a challenge and a school focus as part of Behaviour and Attitudes. Children who are below the age related expectation are, in many cases, children whose attendance is poor.  The school spent around £7,500 on Attendance and Behaviour Awards last year, and will be making savings this year by giving less costly awards, such as in-school party games.  The school has received anti bullying training from Stonewall, with a particular focus on the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) agenda and on supporting those children. The recent anti bullying week had an LGBT and protected characteristics focus and used recommended texts as part of the week’s activities.  *Q. Use of the Green Button to ensure timely support provided. What does that mean?*  Part of the school’s behaviour system. There is a green button on all the classroom screens, which sets an alarm off, allowing support to be provided quickly.  One of the priorities is to gain the Healthy School Silver Award. The school needs to obtain contributions from all of the staff that are involved in healthy school activities to be awarded silver, which would be a truer reflection of the school than the current Bronze Award.  The school is trying to reduce the single use plastic in the school as part of the pupil voice activities. Initiatives such as providing loose crackers and a slab of cheese to cut from, rather than the current system of individually wrapped cracker and cheese portions.  One of the key areas of Leadership and Management is to be in a position to submit a balanced budget in 2020-21, The school budget is under pressure with the pay award, pension changes and in particular for the school, the number of higher needs children and the fact that not all the year groups are full. Every place which is not filled equates to £4,000 that the school does not have.  The school is looking at a massive deficit of around £250,000 cumulative next year if savings are not made.  The number of Educational and Health Care Plans (EHCPs) and the associated costs makes the school different from other schools locally. The school has 24 children who have an  EHCP and the school has to pay £6,000 towards the cost of any additional support entitlement, amounting to £144,000 from the school budget, which is considerably higher than other local schools who do not have the same number of high needs children.  The HT has recently met with the Senior QA for Special Educational Needs and with the school’s Senior QA to discuss the issues. A number of suggestions were given, all of which the school is doing. Schools with similar numbers of children with EHCPs have Resource Provision. Discussions are ongoing.  A further pressure on the school budget is a result of having school places available. About 7 years ago the school was asked to move from 2 form entry with an intake of 60 pupils to 2 ½ form entry with an intake of 75 pupils. Classes cannot be amalgamated, especially in the infant department, because at any time the school needs to have the capacity to take 75 pupils in a cohort. There are currently only 2 year groups with over 70 pupils. The school’s retention of classes to accommodate 75 pupils is an added financial burden.  *Q. Can the school reduce to 60?*  There is a consultation period. The school would have to consult now for changes to take effect from September 2021.  *Q. Can the school give the LA an ultimatum, either the school intake is reduce to 60, or the LA provides additional funding?*  The LA will not give any extra money.  The fact that the school is not full is one of the reasons why children with high needs join the school. The school also has a good reputation for being able to manage and support high needs children.  *Q. Is there a discussion to be had with LA about school being happy to have SEND children as long as that comes with additional funding such as that received by schools with Resource Provision?*  Resource provision is generally for a particular specialism such as speech and language. High needs children at the school have a variety of needs, with many having attachment and associated emotional and behavioural  The school considers that one of the most effective ways to make savings would be to become a 2 form entry school.  There are 64 children in Year 6 divided between 3 classes. Savings could be made if there were 2 classes of 32.  *Q. If the intake number reduced to 60, would that apply to all years?*  Yes, however not immediately. It would take time to work all the way through the school.  *Q. Could the school still be asked to take more children?*  Yes. Additional children bring additional funding of £4,000, which is positive.  Cohorts do change from year to year. The current Y6 are very engaged and motivated learners.  *Q. Could the school be more demanding of the LA and say that the school is happy to have SEND as long as additional resources are provided?*  The school is not the only school with a projected deficit. The LA does not provide additional money to schools in the same situation.  *Q. Has there been any response from the LA following the submission of the Period 6 monitoring and associated budget forecast?*  No  The school is spending considerably more on top up funding of £6,000 for every high needs child, than neighbouring schools who only have 6 high needs children, compared to 24, making a difference of £108,000. In addition to that is the £150,000 that the school does not get because the school is not full and the £142,000 spent covering staff absence last year.  *Q. Is the £6,000 spent on the teacher’s salary?*  No  *Q. Is the school spending the £6,000 on employing more Teaching Assistants (TAs) than other schools?*  This may be the case, but the individual child still needs to have an individual plan with those hours allocated to them. Payment of speech and language assessments or Educational Psychologist assessments can also come out of that £6,000. The school does have to itemise and show how the child is being supported with the £6,000 before top up funding is provided.  *Q. Would it be more cost effective if the teacher could spend an additional hour at the beginning or end of the day with the SEND child?*  The school would not expect the child to be in school for a longer time than other children.  *Q. Could time be allocated to a child over lunchtime?*  Yes. The school would have to be able to demonstrate that the child is receiving additional and different support than their peers.  The school employs 1-1 support workers funded for an individual pupil, who also support other children. It is not necessarily good for a child to constantly be attached to an adult on a 1-1 basis. Some children manage well even when their 1-1 support worker is off but others really struggle.  The high number of SEND pupils also has an impact on staff wellbeing because of the challenge it presents to staff on managing such a wide range of needs, including covering any absence of 1-1 support workers. There are occasions when one child may be really struggling and the person supporting that child needs a change. There is a Whatsapp group for reporting staff absence which results in a great deal of pressure and stress for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) who are contacted early in the morning and have to find cover before school begins.  The school has worked hard to reduce the SEND numbers overall by being very clear on how children are assessed and differentiating between children who have fallen behind and those with genuine SEND.  *Q. Is there an element of money given for special needs as part of the basic budget that the school receives?*  Yes, although the amount is not based on the school’s percentage of SEND pupils.  *Q. Is it a set amount for each school?*  It is based on a formula of 50% Free School Meals (FSM), 25% the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) and 25% Prior Attainment. A neighbouring school gets more than this school, because their FSM and IDACI figures are higher and their prior attainment is lower, even though they have far fewer high needs children. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Provide the Standards & Curriculum Committee with a selection of internal and external attainment and progress reports | HT | 13 Jan20 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **Committee Meetings – Feedback and Updates** | | |
| Draft minutes and papers from meetings were circulated in advance of the meeting.  7.1 Standards & Curriculum Committee meeting 16/09/19  The committee chair provided a brief overview of the meeting. A number of items were reviewed and approved by the committee and require Governing Body ratification.  SEND Policy 2019  No issues were raised and the policy was ratified.  SEND Information Report  No issues were raised and the information report was ratified.  Teaching & Learning Policy, SEND section  No issues were raised and the policy was ratified.  Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy 2019  No issues were raised and the policy was ratified.  7.2 Pay Committee meeting 7/10/19  The Chair provided a brief overview of the meeting. The minutes from the meeting are confidential and were not circulated. A number of items were reviewed and approved by the committee and require Governing Body ratification.  2.75% Teacher Pay Increase applied across all points ratified  Pay Progression Recommendations ratified  7.3 Resources Committee meeting 21/10/19 and Finance Update  An overview was provided of the meeting along with an update for governors. The school continues to be very concerned about the budget, as reflected in the resources minutes and discussion in section 6 above.  *Q. A governor had submitted a question in advance of the meeting asking the HT for details of any plan to make budget savings.*  The Chair suggested that a working group be established to meet monthly and look at where savings can be made and start preparing for next year’s budget.  The HT and SBM have been looking very closely at the budget for next year and working on solutions to ensure that the school is in a position to set a balanced budget.  The HT reported that there is a potential to reduce the current in year deficit by about £6,000. With some big changes for 2020-21, including changes to the staffing structure, there are savings to be made resulting in a potential £239,000 reduction in the 2020-21 predicted deficit. This has been achieved without the need to make staff redundant. For example, by getting rid of all the printers and photocopiers, it would be cheaper to employ one member of staff to do all the reprographics from one computer.  The school intends to look at catering to see if savings can be made and whether it would be more cost effective to have an external provider, rather than in-house.  *Q. Did the school look at catering costs last year?*  Savings were made last year by cutting staff additional hours and reviewing the menu. The school did not look at the comparative cost of using an external provider.  *Q. Would the school have as much control over the menus if an external provider was used?*  No, however, other schools are satisfied with external providers and it could be that there are big savings to be made because of their bulk purchasing power. If staff are off for any reason, the external provider finds a replacement at no additional cost to the school.  *Q. What would be the impact of making such a huge £239,000 saving?*  The working group could look at the proposed savings and the likely impact of such savings.  *Q. If school was successful in reducing the admission number to 60, what impact would that have?*  It would take a number of years to filter through. It would mean that the school could immediately lose one teacher in KS1 next year.  *Q. At what point does school have to set the budget for next year?*  The budget starts in April. The school receives the indicative budget in February.  Governors agreed to form a budget savings working group and the first meeting will take place on Monday 9.12.19  A number of items were reviewed and approved by the committee and require Governing Body ratification.  6.1 Period 6 Budget Monitoring  Revenue Income £ 3,148,402  Revenue Expenditure £ 3,265,765  Revenue In Year balance £ 117,363 deficit  B/f from 2018/19 £ 161,409 surplus  Cumulative c/f £ 44,046 surplus  Capital Income - £ 9,357  Capital Expenditure - £32,329  Capital In Year balance £ 22,972 deficit  B/f from 2018/19 £ 32,972surplus  Cumulative c/f £ 10,000 surplus  In Year Balances  Revenue £117,363 deficit  Capital £22,972 deficit  Total £140,335 deficit  Cumulative Balances – including b/fwds from 2018/19  Revenue £ 44,046 surplus  Capital £ 10,000 surplus  Total Cumulative Balance £ 54,046 surplus  No further issues were raised and 2018/19 budget Period 6 monitoring was ratified.  Budget Changes  No issues were raised and the budget changes were ratified.  Cash flow forecast  No issues were raised and the cash flow forecast was ratified.  Dinner Money Policy  *Q. What are the provided refreshments as stated in the policy?*  Milk and juice which is part of the school lunch.  No further issues were raised and the Dinner Money Policy was ratified.  Teachers Pay Policy 2019  No issues were raised and the Teachers Pay Policy was ratified.  Service Level Agreements (SLA) 2019-20  No issues were raised and the SLAs were ratified.  MCC Data Protection SLA  No issues were raised and the MCC Data Protection SLA was ratified | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * SEND Policy 2019 ratified * SEND Information Report ratified * Teaching & Learning Policy, SEND section ratified * Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy 2019 ratified * 2.75% Teacher Pay Increase applied across all points ratified * Pay Progression Recommendations ratified * Period 6 Monitoring ratified * Budget changes ratified * Cashflow forecast ratified * Dinner Money Policy ratified * Teachers Pay Policy 2019 ratified * Service Level Agreements (SLA) 2019-20 ratified * MCC Data Protection SLA ratified * Working Group meeting to look at budget savings | Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Working Group | 9.12.19 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **8.** | **Governing Body Housekeeping** | | |
| The Chair introduced a number of items for governors to consider. All documents had been circulated in advance.  8.1 Terms of Reference  Following concern expressed at the Resources Committee, governors had met with the HT and after seeking advice from Manchester Governance and One Education, small changes were made to the resources section of the terms of reference.  No further issues were raised and the Terms of Reference were approved.  8.2 Code of Conduct  Governors considered the new NGA Code of Conduct however, they decided to retain their current Code of Conduct.  No further issues were raised and the Code of Conduct was approved.  8.3 Annual confirmation of eligibility forms.  All governors who were present at the meeting completed the annual confirmation of eligibility form.  8.4 Annual declaration of pecuniary interests forms  All governors who were present at the meeting completed the annual declaration of pecuniary interests form.  8.5 Annual skills audit forms  All governors will complete the Baguley Hall skills audit form and return it to the SBM.  8.6 Committee memberships  The following committee memberships were agreed.  Standards and Curriculum Committee  Kate Bulman, Laura Lodge, Carol Steedman, Lynn Daly, Victoria Cook, Peter Renshaw, Donna Cunneen and Clair Goulding.  Resources Committee  Kate Bulman, David Boyle, Carol Steedman, Peter Renshaw, Qasim Zafar, Mike Allison, Katie Framm  Pay Committee and HT Performance Management Committee  Carol Steedman, David Boyle and Katie Fram  8.7 Link governors  Literacy – Laura Lodge  Maths – Katie Fram  SEND – Donna Cunneen  Pupil and Sports Premium – Mike Allison  Safeguarding – Carol Steadman  Finance – Qasim Zafar  Health & Safety – David Boyle  GDPR – Peter Renshaw  Education Trips & Visits – Laura Lodge  Attendance – Carol Steadman  8.8 Governor vacancies  There is one parent governor vacancy. The recruitment process will begin with a letter to all parents this week, with the nomination period from Wednesday 20 November until Wednesday 4 December.  8.9 Governor Visits  Governors are making arrangements to come into school over the next few weeks.  A governor has recently been on training and mentioned that one of the speakers had explained how governor subject visits were conducted at the school the speaker was involved with. A discussion continued around governor visits. One of the issues is arranging for a group of governors to all attend on the same day because of work commitments.  8.10 Governor Training  The Chair updated governors on training opportunities.  The governors will be having a safeguarding refresher within the academic year.  One Education offer a variety of Governing Body training. Governors decided to ask One Education to provide ‘How Governors Can Help Maximise Pupil Progress’ training.  Manchester Schools Alliance offers training which 2 governors can attend, Safeguarding in March and Ofsted Ready in May. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Terms of Reference approved * Code of Conduct approved * Annual confirmation of eligibility forms completed * Annual declaration of pecuniary interests forms completed * Annual skills audit to be completed and given to the SBM * Contact One Education to arrange Governing Body training. | Gov. Body  Gov. Body  All governors  All governors  All governors  Chair |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **9.** | **Policies for Review and Approval** | | |
| Governors reviewed the following policies:  Pupil Premium Report 2018-19 for the website  The report had been discussed at the standards committee.  No further issues were raised and the report was approved.  Primary PE and Sports Funding statement 2018-19 for the website  The statement had been discussed at the standards committee.  No further issues were raised and the statement was approved  Complaints Policy  The updated policy was circulated to governors with changes highlighted.  No further issues were raised and the policy was approved.  Staff Appraisal Policy  The updated policy was circulated to governors with any changes highlighted.  No further issues were raised and the policy was approved | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Pupil Premium Report 2018-19 for the website approved * Primary PE and Sports Funding statement 2018-19 for the website approved * Complaints Policy approved * Staff Appraisal Policy approved | Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body  Gov. Body |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **HT Performance Management** | | |
| The Chair advised governors that the HT was successful in her performance management which took place on 13.9.19 and that new targets have been set for the current year. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **11.** | **Any other business** | | |
| Governors DBS checks are in the process of being renewed by the SBM.  All governors confirmed that they had read Keeping Children Safe in Education, part 1.  The School Academic Calendar 2020/21, which follows the LA suggested calendar, was approved. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * School Academic Calendar 2020/21 approved. | Gov. Body |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of next meeting:** | Monday 10th February 2020 @ 4.30pm |