

<b>Bedale High School</b>		
<b>Minutes of the Full Governing Board Meeting held on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> November 2018 in Room 2 at 6.00pm</b>		
<b>Present:</b> David Atkinson (DA), Stuart Bentley – Joint Vice-Chair (SB), Andy Childe (AC), Kate Davies (KD), Linda Donaghy (LD), Mark Hughes (MH), Steve Ingram – Joint Chair of Governors (SI), Estella Prince – Joint Vice-Chair (EP), Anthony Rawdin – Headteacher (Head), Jan Reed - Joint Chair of Governors (JR) and Guy Watkins (GW)		
<b>In attendance for all or part of the meeting:</b> Sarah Allsop (SA), Matt Gill – Deputy Head: Curriculum (MG), Kate Loundis – Senior Improvement Advisor (KL), Denise McFarlane – School Business Manager (DM), Lesley Sweeting – Clerk. (11 Governors +4)		
<b>Apologies:</b> None		
No	Item	Action
<b>PROCEDURAL – Part A</b>		
<b>GB18/25</b>	<b>Welcome</b> JR opened the meeting, as Chair, at 6.00pm and welcomed governors.	
	<b>Apologies</b> There were no apologies. <i>The clerk was delayed and arrived at 6.07 so the presentation element of agenda item 7 was taken before the rest of the procedural items.</i>	
<b>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT - Part B</b>		
<b>GB18/27</b>	<p><b>Presentation – Teaching and Learning Team</b> ( including impact of Y TSA Links and CPD Opportunities)</p> <p>SA used slides to share the following with governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every teacher needs to improve – not because they are not good enough but because they can be better.</li> <li>• A diagram of the teaching and learning vision was displayed.</li> <li>• PGCE students’ ideas for Self-Assessment Starter tasks.</li> </ul> <p>Year 9 concerns led to SAS time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas of focus – based on the AP1 data: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Narrowing the gap between girls and boys performance</li> <li>2. Improving the performance of high prior attaining students</li> <li>3. Closing the gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Strategies being employed. Recording of vision, action and impact.</li> </ul> <p><i>GQ: Some of these are whole class activities – are there individual strategies for these underperforming and disadvantaged groups?</i> Answer: Yes there is differentiation e.g. the high prior attaining boys doing a ‘walking, talking life gallery’ helping them to ‘see’ strategies clearly.</p> <p><i>GQ: Is there a danger in so many strategies being used that it will not be clear which have had the impact?</i> Answer: It may be difficult to extrapolate one but most staff will make the connection with the activities.</p> <p>The Head explained that SAS time was developed because of concern with a particular year group but can be introduced across the whole school. A variety in quality is being seen, differentiation is taking place but there is variation in the working out of it. On</p>	

**GB18/27  
continued**

observation the Head has seen excellent re-cap activities where the more able can develop different ideas. It also provides a quiet down time for reflection.

The Yorkshire Teaching Schools Alliance (YTSA) programme CPD sessions to date have included:

Reinforcement of the strategy of key command words, oracy across the curriculum, supporting pupil premium and other opportunities to learn from other schools. Teachers have choice within the programme. MG was involved in the development of the YTSA where schools were asked what areas they would like to focus on and Bedale asked for work with high prior attainers and narrowing the gap. MG is delivering some 'polishing pedagogy' training for recently qualified teachers.

*GQ: So it is not just our students we are trying to develop but also our staff.*

*Answer: Metacognition will be a strand within appraisal and CPD and staff will be able to see what works for them*

*GQ: Will we see some short term and some longer term improvements which will take time to embed?*

*Answer: Wave one is the drive to improve the overall quality of teaching. Metacognition as a concept will take time to embed. But staff need to know their learners and plan according to the class in front of them.*

The programme is practitioner-led and teachers can take nuggets away to apply in the classroom. SA gave an example from art of working with clay 'the art of imperfection'. It is an opportunity to bounce ideas off each other, to make links with other teachers and share examples of outstanding practice. All the sessions are based around theory – which staff can disagree with, but it opens up discussion.

Part of the SA work has been to support under-performing staff.

It's to do with acknowledging this particular method isn't working – is there another way to do it – it also promotes unity and team spirit in departments.

The metacognition is in three strands – encouraging independent learners, mentoring for learners and challenge.

T & L developments include:

- Examples of good home learning being shared in twilight sessions. Teachers have brought their examples and shared ideas. Staff are looking at homework timetables to ensure that timings are appropriate and that work is achievable.
- Form time is being used to look at revision tactics and implementation of strategies. SAS is being included in lessons with recall of specific phrases e.g. 'empty hands'.
- 'Books don't Lie' – book looks to monitor marking and the use of the green pen etc.
- Introduction of T & L nuggets from CPD into lessons.
- Increasing sharing of ideas – including across departments: SA illustrated with some examples of a French SAS task and a Drama task.
- Positive effect on removals has been seen – in year 9 it was 1.6 per day – it is now down to 0.9

*KL Question: How do you quality assure – so that you know the developments are having impact?*

*Answer: Green folders are used to store information – conversations had regarding use*

<p><b>GB18/27 continued</b></p>	<p>of the nuggets. Feedback from faculty leaders – very positive staff feedback on SAS time which may mean it is extended to other year groups. Data is triangulated by using lesson feedback, book looks and student voice. (MG did an impromptu Year 11 student voice activity on 16/11/18)</p> <p>MT explained that it is important that it is happening in all classrooms. Initially there was considerable variety seen but the good examples are now being shared. <i>GQ: What difference has that made?</i> Answer: This has only happened over two weeks so far.</p> <p>AC added that metacognition was the main strand introduced before half term but that other areas are now also being looked at – transition between activities in lessons for example. Heads of Faculty quality assure by looking at learning walks and then book survey information.</p>	
<p><b>GB18/28</b></p>	<p><b>Teaching, Learning and Assessment Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work has been done on all areas of the SEF of which this is a major part. The section of the 'Going for Good' document relating to Ofsted Section 1 on Teaching Learning and Assessment was circulated prior to the meeting. There have been significant steps forward made in the first half term.</li> <li>• Capacity in the team has been increased, demonstrated by SA's role. Last year the faculty leaders were still developing into their new roles and now they are 'hitting the ground running'.</li> <li>• The feedback is good, particularly as regards the year 11 data. Outcomes for students are improving, with the exception of PE where the outcomes were much lower than expected despite three very good practitioners.</li> <li>• The focus areas are those of last year but school this year feels differently in regards to teaching and learning. Staff are routinely discussing their practice facilitated by MG and team.</li> <li>• Home learning is still being improved and in the classroom there is a focus on lesson openings. High expectations need to continue. Additional areas of focus are metacognition and also behaviour for learning rather than just behaviour. The challenge for pupils and staff is to be the best that they can be.</li> <li>• Planning for high prior attainers continues to be a big focus and staff need to ensure that feedback in class and books drives student progress.</li> <li>• Teachers will be challenged where they are not engaging all students all the time and supporting them with establishing clear routines and higher expectations. We need to ensure that all teachers are setting challenging work, in and out of class, in accordance with student targets.</li> <li>• Continued efforts will be focussed on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Securing further improvements in the quality of teacher planning</li> <li>❖ Ensuring that all student books consistently reflect good practice – most do and interventions show improvement.</li> <li>❖ Strengthening assessment practice at Key Stage 3 and 4 – the AP1 results are the best since the Head came to Bedale</li> <li>❖ .Continuing to support students' development as learners – this is a long-term investment</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<p><b>GB18/28 continued</b></p>	<p>❖ Ensuring that Home Learning helps to accelerate student progress in all subjects. It is a marker of how far the school has come as to how well these are embedded.</p> <p>There is enough evidence to suggest we are now 'good' but we need to make sure it is embedded.</p> <p><i>Governor Comment: Our self-evaluation as a school is what we will very much be judged against and we need to know exactly where we are and where we need to be.</i></p> <p><i>GQ: In the past results have differed from those predicted – can you now see an assessment change there?</i></p> <p>Answer: We can't make a judgement on teaching and learning unless the data suggests it is accurate. Predictions are good – the SLT current predictions are lower than the staff's but some teams had high expectations which were met.</p> <p>AC commented that command words are being used in the classroom and that the challenging questioning and accurate assessment need to start in Year 7 and be embedded throughout Key Stage 3 and 4.</p> <p><u>SDP1 Link Governor Visit Feedback 25/10/18 –KD</u></p> <p>It was the books that let the staff down on this visit. The teaching was good and the students were engaged in the learning. Science and English were both good – the issue was in Maths. KD was visiting classes with MG and was interested to see the work of the HTLA because of her professional role – but it wasn't working. It was not an able Maths group and some students didn't understand the task.</p> <p>During the learning walk several assessment lessons were going on and they looked at books.</p> <p><i>GQ: What happened subsequent to that disappointing lesson?</i></p> <p>Answer: That particular Maths lesson was disappointing – MG then looked at the books and asked questions around how the HTLA was being used. AK has done visits to this particular group as there are a number of students with SEND and kinaesthetic methods are needed.</p> <p><i>GQ: Does this raise a question as regards faculty leadership?</i></p> <p>Answer: MG has gone to the faculty leader and let him take it forward. They will do a follow-up learning walk together. The SLT do get feedback re assessment for learning from the faculty leaders but there are some weaker staff and we need to know our teachers well.</p> <p>The Head explained that it would be expected that there would be feedback to view in books but that structured testing and students being given opportunity to revisit topics is a big part of assessment.</p>	
<b>PROCEDURAL – Part A continued</b>		
<p><b>GB18/29</b></p>	<p><b>Confidential Items/Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest in respect of items on today's agenda. <b>Confidential Minute GB18/24</b> of the FGB of 16/10/18 remains confidential and as such will be filed separately and excluded from the public record.</p> <p>There were no items of today's business deemed confidential at this point.</p>	
<p><b>GB18/30</b></p>	<p><b>Notification of Other Urgent Business</b></p> <p>One short item of urgent business was declared and was dealt with at this point:</p> <p><u>Music Trip:</u></p> <p>Liz Lumsden is hoping to take a group of Key Stage 3 and 4 musicians to Malta for three or four days during the Easter break in 2019. It is being staffed with the addition of two adults from outside of school. The travel is with Rondo Travel whom the school have used before. There will be between 30 and 40 students with 4 staff. The proposal will be circulated. There are no financial implications for the school. <b>Governors are happy for this to proceed.</b></p>	

<b>GB18/31</b>	<p><b>Minutes of the Full Governing Board Meeting 2018</b></p> <p>The Chair advised that the minutes would be considered page by page for both accuracy and matters arising.</p> <p><u>Approval of Minutes:</u> The minutes of the Full Governing Board meeting of the 16/10/18 including the confidential minute of the same date were duly <b>APPROVED</b> as an accurate record, and signed by both the co-chairs.</p> <p>As a matter of accuracy it was noted that KL sent apologies for 16/10/18.</p> <p>There were no matters arising which are not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.</p>	
<b>FINANCE PART C</b>		
<b>GB18/32</b>	<p><b>Budget Monitoring Report</b></p> <p>The September monitoring report was made available on the secure part of the website before the meeting. DM highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £13,000 estimate had been included for the teacher pay grant. The details have now come through and that estimate is confirmed.</li> <li>• There have been some small improvements on supplies and services.</li> <li>• The overall improvement is around £25,000 of which £13,000 is the teacher pay grant.</li> <li>• The format coding for the LA has changed and supply is now coded under supply teachers.</li> </ul> <p>There were no questions from governors regarding the monitoring report.</p>	
<b>GB18/33</b>	<p><b>Finance – discussion regarding LA involvement to date</b></p> <p>A short written report was circulated to governors and the Head highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A meeting is planned on 26<sup>th</sup> November with Martin Surtees as the projected figures show an in-year deficit of £136,000 which would make a total carry forward deficit of £301,000. We are not entirely sure that this figure is accurate. In preparation for this meeting the leadership team have started to look at how further reductions in staffing and other costs might lead to the budget being a balanced one.</li> <li>• An extra amount has to be factored in for leadership because of Tom's uplift but it looks as if this was included twice in the figures. A reduction of 1.9 FTE staff had already been included in the initial round of discussions so what is being suggested is additional to that. Whilst technically this is possible there are significant ramifications. Full year projected savings could be £84,000 but for the next financial year only 7/12 of this benefit would be derived - £50,000.</li> <li>• The school could reduce the PAN substantially to a three form entry. At the moment the number of pupils for September 2019 is 88, which is the maximum for three forms. However at this time last year there were 72 and the number rose by 10 by entry date. If there is a similar increase to 98 or 100 that would mean a low four form entry. The PAN can't be changed mid-year because it has to go to consultation. Years 8 and 9 are particularly small for a four form entry – if we dropped down it might give up to £100,000 savings however it becomes more difficult to get quality teaching whilst making these reductions and looking forward the local number of pupils in forthcoming years is on the increase.</li> <li>• This is a mid-term report, after the meeting with Martin Surtees and KL there will be more to bring back to governors for discussion. Governors will need to think</li> </ul>	

<b>GB18/33 continued</b>	<p>strategically regarding the change to Bedale School a three form entry would mean. There is also concern that the cutbacks suggested might make it difficult to maintain good pastoral support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governors were concerned not to replicate the Review Committee discussions by going into the detail at this point.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: Governors to read the remainder of the report in preparation for future discussion at a later date.</b></p>	<b>All govs.</b>
<b>GB18/34</b>	<p><b>Health and Safety Report</b></p> <p>Two terms of statistics in the form of a written report and graphs were circulated to governors prior to the meeting and DM reported the following to governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a continuing decreasing trend of incidents. The serious incidents are reported to the LA e.g. needing a visit to hospital.</li> <li>• Lunchtime is still the time when most incidents occur.</li> <li>• Some of the Bunsen burner mesh gauzes were found to contain asbestos – all were replaced.</li> <li>• A practice evacuation of building in case of an incident was carried out and the process was then tweaked to improve it. Lock down procedures have been tightened up.</li> </ul> <p><i>GQ: Have the lunchtime activities impacted on the incidents?</i>  <b>Answer: Yes – space on the field for football etc. extra-curricular activities and use of the MUGA.</b></p> <p><i>GQ: What was the residential trip where there was an incident?</i>  <b>Answer: A Bush-craft trip in Year 8</b></p>	
<b>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PART B continued</b>		
<b>GB18/35</b>	<p><b>Assessment – AP1 data/ SDP 3</b></p> <p>GW and SB carried out a link governor visit in relation to SDP3 on 16<sup>th</sup> November, meeting with MG and with AK. The written report has been circulated to governors. Their focus was on the AP1 data especially in regards to disadvantaged students, boys, SEN and closing the gap.</p> <p>They were concerned by the figures for disadvantaged and Pupil Premium (PP) children and the discrepancy in outcomes for boys as compared to girls.</p> <p>AK took them through the new approach to PP but this will take some time to embed. They felt, that to prove that measures are working, the need is to focus on one group - Year 8 which is two thirds boys, and monitor progress for disadvantaged and for boys versus girls. The boy-girl gap is biggest in this year group and is particularly wide in literacy.</p> <p>MG added that it is also about working with the parents of the boys concerned as well as looking at the design of the curriculum and use of metacognition etc.</p> <p><i>Advisor Q: The focus so far has been on quality first teaching, if this is now good why has it not had an impact on raising the achievement of the disadvantaged pupils? Why is there still that gap?</i>  <b>Answer: There is a boys' maturation issue. The gap is not in all subject areas – French and History are excellent for instance.</b></p>	

<p><b>GB18/35 continued</b></p>	<p><i>GQ: Is there a gender bias in disadvantaged in all years?</i>  Answer: In Year 11 the disadvantaged gap is positive – but yes in other years – Year 8 the gender gap is the widest.</p> <p><i>Is the Pupil Premium strategy for 2018-19 on the website?</i>  Answer: We believe so but this needs to be checked.</p> <p><i>Governor Comment: A tiered system has been shown to work in other schools and we hope it will work here – with flexibility between groups.</i>  Response: Yes – but each cohort is very different.</p> <p><i>GQ: Do you track the funding for Forces children?</i>  Answer: Yes the PP statement shows this separately.</p> <p>MG shared the following points regarding the A1 data with governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In both Year 7 and Year 11 the data shows particularly clear strengths and progress. Attitude for learning is good; revision week and assessment week are now embedded with feedback being the most important part so that students and staff learn from the assessment.</li> <li>• Progress 8 forecast for end of Year 11 is +0.27 and at AP1 it is – 0.26. Some subjects stand out and the disadvantaged and gender gaps can be seen in the data.</li> </ul> <p><i>GQ: Will there be interim forecasts because the final results don't come till after GCSE?</i>  Answer: Yes – staff continually assess the current position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is encouraging that Maths is already at a positive +0.64. Greater consistency of staff is helping the groups. Faculty leaders are doing their own analysis of the AP1 data and then will have discussions with MG.</li> </ul> <p><i>GQ: Are you concerned about individual Sciences?</i>  Answer: Not at this point – some staff make very conservative under predictions.</p> <p><i>GQ: Although Maths was positive the progress for high prior attaining students wasn't good was it?</i>  Answer: The SLT need to have conversations with faculty leaders so that the staff own their own data and then look at who is under-performing and what is being done in the classroom to address the issues.</p> <p><i>GQ: How much progress in a year would you expect?</i>  Answer: The final prediction is based on ½ grade progress by end of year, with a degree of caution because of a possible raising of the grade boundaries in the new GCSEs. Maths and English are going into Year 3 of the new exam so are more stable in that respect.</p> <p><i>GQ: In IT the forecast is lower than the AP1 results- why is this?</i>  Answer: It may have been an easier exam at AP1.</p> <p><i>GQ: Where are the current areas of concern – is it Food Tech and Resistant Materials?</i>  Answer: Yes – and also PE and single Sciences. The key thing is the next steps being taken at classroom level.</p> <p><i>GQ: How many children with SEN are there in Year 11?</i>  Answer: There are two on an EHCP and another 13 or 14 in the support group.</p>	<p><b>AK</b></p>
---------------------------------	--	------------------

<p><b>GB18/35 continued</b></p>	<p><i>GQ: On the report to parents after AP1 you are saying that pupils will make ½ grade progress to the end of Year 11 – is this cautious in relation to the holistic grades where the projection is one or two grades higher?</i>  Answer: Yes – it depends on individual teacher judgement – it is not happening as a Year group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student voice feedback shows that Year 11 pupils are appreciative of the extra sessions and support they are receiving and their attitude to learning is getting there.</li> <li>• KL added that the challenge is the discrepancy between predictions and outcomes. Inspectors spend a lot of time in the classrooms, they will be looking at is the quality of teaching good and what are the SLT doing to improve outcomes? Triangulation with what is in the books, observed teaching and outcomes will be done but they will also focus in on what you receive additional funding for – that is SEND, LAC, PP and Forces children. These sub-groups will be looked at within subject areas too.</li> </ul> <p><i>GQ: What happens next – is support put in for individual pupils?</i>  Answer: Yes discussions will be had from the faculty leader’s point of view with the teacher and intervention actions agreed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current Year 10 cohort is very mixed which presents a challenge for differentiation. There are gaps between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students as well as between girls and boys. Forecasts are really good but need to be checked for accuracy. Some volatility is expected at the start of GCSE but there are big discrepancies e.g. PE is not doing very well at all.</li> </ul> <p><i>GQ: There are no separate sciences shown?</i>  Answer: Still following Triple Science at this point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 9 is the first group to start studying their GCSEs over three years. They have chosen four options rather than three. The Progress 8 measure has not yet been used with this group – it is still Attainment 8. Part of this Year 9 is the intervention group working with TK. There are some concerns with attitude to learning, particularly amongst the boys.</li> <li>• Year 8’s attitude to learning scores are shown in the summary. It was noted that their PSHE scores are very good.</li> <li>• Year 7 is the smallest Year group. The ALT scores already show a difference between boys and girls.</li> </ul> <p><i>GQ: Are these differences already noted when they enter from primary?</i>  Answer: We get scaled scores but their attitude to learning is gleaned from the primary teacher and from looking at their books.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All faculty leaders have done a much finer analysis of the individual issues in their area. It was noted that a ‘Going for Good’ document has been circulated for governors’ information, although not for discussion today.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>GB18/36</b></p>	<p><b>External Supportive Review Arrangements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An LA review is planned to focus on Teaching, Learning and Development. The head has a series of reservations about the tone and language of the recent letter from Jen Cave regarding this review and concerns about getting it approved by</li> </ul>	



**GB18/36  
continued**

NASUWT. A number of the core tasks planned are looking at certain things that he wouldn't expect to be included in a more developmental review and it reads more like a mock Ofsted.

- In preference to this, the Head is keen for colleagues Emma Lauder and Katie Hunter to carry out a review, using the model from the North Yorkshire Teaching Schools Alliance. It is hoped the external view will validate the internal judgements. A programme of the key areas of focus that they will report on is to be drawn up.
- MG explained that conversations around planning and pedagogy with Katie Hunter have proved very beneficial. The review would be rigorous in making judgements but give developmental feedback.
- The LA have a monitoring role and such a one day monitoring review will be planned with Andy Lancashire at the meeting with him on the 6<sup>th</sup> December.
- KL has been involved in a number of LA two day reviews and although comprehensive would argue that they are not 'mock-steds'. She would strongly advise such a two day review as they are quite different from a one day. It would be a whole school review and the report would make recommendations that can be acted upon. She has always found the feedback from such reviews very positive and believes staff would know what it was like to have a good experience and receive input.
- The Chair noted that there are two distinct positions – that of the LA and that of the Head. Governors agreed that it was the Head's decision. The Head admitted he was somewhat taken aback by the language of the LA letter and felt it might create an antipathy and damage relationships at a time when the leadership are seeking to take the staff with them. The two day review that had been expected was one similar to KL's description whereas Jen Cave's letter did sound like a 'mock-sted' scenario.

*GQ: Isn't this something designed to help us improve?*

*Answer: There is a distinction; 'mock-sted' is an inflammatory word. Also one of these reviews would be one day and the other two. We need something we can be honest about with staff.*

- AC as staff governor stated that he didn't mind who came in and that a fresh pair of eyes was needed – whether LA or external colleagues – and that either would be useful. The main purpose from his point of view is to quality assure teaching, provide reassurance that he is on track and suggest improvements. The way in which any review is done is important as staff have been through turbulent times and need developmental opportunities to be the result.
- The Head feels that the external review with Emma and Katie will meet these needs. From their feedback next steps can be identified and an LA monitoring review considered.

**Agreed: That the external developmental review go ahead and that the LA with the Head, Chairs and Vice-Chairs discuss the nature of a future monitoring visit.**

*GQ: Will we be prejudiced through this review with Jen Cave not going ahead now?*

*Answer: No but it was timed for this point in case you get inspected in January.*

<b>GB18/37</b>	<p><b>Governor Link Visits</b></p> <p><u>1.SDP2 Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare</u> LD and JR carried out a link visit focussing on SDP2 on 18/10/18. The visit report has been made available to governors. This area will be looked at in more detail at the next FGB with TK.</p> <p><b>Agreed: Governors to have attendance figures monthly rather than at alternate meetings.</b> Improving on-going attendance is still difficult as there are still some non-attendees. The first few days of November were good at 95% but overall attendance figures would be 2% higher if it were not for the few persistent absentees. It is clear that outcomes and attendance are closely linked.</p> <p><u>2. SDP4 &amp;5 Effectiveness of Leadership and Management &amp; Overall Effectiveness</u> EP and JR carried out a visit focussing on SDP 4 &amp; 5 on 09/11/18. The visit report has been made available to governors. The report outlines overall position of the school and looks at management of staff and leading in the different areas. The visit was done prior to the AP1 data being available. EP would like to do another visit to follow up on some of the points raised in today's discussions.</p>	<b>TK</b>
<b>OTHER BUSINESS Part D</b>		
<b>GB18/38</b>	<p><b>Safeguarding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA carried out a first link visit as Safeguarding Governor on 14/11/18. This was largely information gathering and looking at policies and procedures in place. The visit report has been made available to governors.</li> <li>• There was a serious incident in school on 19/11/18 which has resulted in a permanent exclusion. The matter has still to go to governor panel.</li> </ul>	
<b>GB18/39</b>	<p><b>Selection Committee Decision re Acting Headship</b> The Selection Committee recommended to the FGB the appointment of TK as interim acting headteacher from Easter to September 2019.</p> <p><b>Resolved: The FGB ratified the recommendation of the Selection Committee that TK be appointed as Interim Acting Headteacher from Easter 2019.</b></p> <p>NOTE: Any further plans regarding leadership going forward are to await the outcomes of the financial review.</p>	
<b>GB18/40</b>	<p><b>Governor Skills Audit</b> EP has still not received returns from all governors.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action: That EP prepares a report for the next FGB on those skills audits that have been received to date.</b></p>	<b>EP</b>
<b>GB18/41</b>	<p><b>Policies for Approval/Review</b> The following 2018/19 policies were made available on the secure part of the website for governors to review prior to the meeting. They were UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.</p> <p><b>a. Attendance Policy</b> <b>b. Relationships and Sex Education Policy</b> <b>c. Managing Allegations Against Staff – Policy &amp; Guidance</b> <b>d. Probationary Procedures for New Employees Policy</b></p>	
<b>GB18/42</b>	<p><b>Governor Attendance at Parents' Evenings</b> A governor asked whether they were needed to attend parent evenings. It was agreed that it was good for parents to be able to identify governors but that the preferred method would be to have a governor table where parents could meet one or more governors but where governors did not sit in on consultation conversations.</p>	

	<p>Although one governor said they had always found hearing feedback to parents a useful process it was felt that governor presence could potentially compromise professional conversations.</p> <p><b>Action: To have a governor presence at parents' evenings on a separate table – giving an opportunity for parents to speak with a governor representative if they so wish. This could also allow for the completion of parent surveys.</b></p>	<b>All govs.</b>
<p><b>Impact Statement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		
<p><b>The next meeting of the GB is confirmed as Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018 at 6.00pm</b></p>		
<p><i>Note: The colour coding links to the three key roles of governance questioning; <b>RED</b> for 'setting strategic direction'; <b>BLUE</b> for 'holding headteacher to account for educational performance'; <b>GREEN</b> for 'ensuring financial health, probity and value for money'.</i></p>		

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting at