



MINUTES – LOCAL ADVISORY BOARD

Date: 24th September 2019

Venue: Red Oaks Primary School

Time: 18:00

Attendance:			
Governors		Governors	
Dan Blagg (DB)	Parent	Victoria Robinson (VR)	Community
Ian Burgess (IB)	Incoming Chair	John Robinson (JR)	Community
Fred Child (FC)	Outgoing Chair	Mangala Sekhar (MS)	Community
Craig Clements (CC)	Parent		
Gillian Cullen (GC)	Parent		
Nicole Deacon Willis (NDW)	Staff		
James Lee (JL)	Deputy Head		
Others			
Geoff Bryan (GB)	Observing	Emma Maddison (EM)	Clerk
Kathryn Hopes (KH)	Observing		

1	Opening
1.1	<p>Welcome & Handover to New Chair:</p> <p>Outgoing Chair FC welcomed the Board to the first meeting of the year, the first since academisation took place on the 1st August 2019 so therefore the first meeting of the Local Advisory Board (LAB). FC added that it was with great pleasure that he now handed over to IB, the new Chair of the LAB.</p> <p>Thanks were extended by IB, on behalf of the Board, to FC for all of his hard work and dedication during his time as a Red Oaks governor & Chair, particularly during the academisation process.</p> <p>IB welcome and introduced observers Kathryn Hopes and Geoff Bryan who are both interested in joining the LAB. The LAB currently has two vacancies. Kathryn’s biography has already been shared with governors. IB proposed that once a meeting can be arranged with the Head a vote by email could then take place. Geoff is known to Red Oaks as he is the Trust’s IT director. Geoff is also a governor of the LAB at Lydiard Park Academy. IB suggested that a vote on Geoff joining the LAB is taken at the end of the meeting. Both Geoff & Kathryn have children at Red Oaks.</p> <p>Vice Chair:</p> <p>IB proposed that John Robinson continue as Vice Chair for the following 12 months. This was seconded by CC. All governors were in favour.</p>

		<p>Reconfirm Governor Positions & Terms of Office:</p> <p>IB confirmed to the Board that the TPAT Trustees have confirmed that all terms of office will be carried over. New terms are 4 years.</p> <p>Review Outstanding Actions:</p> <p>There were six outstanding actions carried forward from the previous meeting on the 9th July:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="528 434 1310 1346"> <thead> <tr> <th>Action:</th> <th>By whom</th> <th>Completed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Chair/Head to invite Kathy Clarke to discuss Board's role in progressing lower ability children.</td> <td>Chair/Head</td> <td>Defer till November 2019 meeting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chair to arrange 1:1's with governors post-academisation.</td> <td>IB</td> <td>Ongoing – Chair will now arrange.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree Link Governor Roles at September 24th meeting 2019</td> <td>IB</td> <td>Ongoing</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Governors to return declaration of interest forms at the meeting on Sept 24th</td> <td>All</td> <td>Ongoing</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Governors to read the Code of Conduct (& Keeping Children Safe in Education) for Sept 24th</td> <td>All</td> <td>Completed 24/09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree presentation themes once SDP ready</td> <td></td> <td>Defer till November 2019 meeting</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Action: Clerk to contact Chair & Head about inviting Kathy Clark in to talk to governors about progressing lower ability children Action: Chair to arrange 1:1's with all governors Action: Link Governor roles to be agreed once the new Ofsted Inspection Framework has had time to establish Action: Clerk to remind governors to return outstanding Declaration of Interest forms to school office Action: Presentation themes to be confirmed at November meeting</p>	Action:	By whom	Completed	Chair/Head to invite Kathy Clarke to discuss Board's role in progressing lower ability children.	Chair/Head	Defer till November 2019 meeting	Chair to arrange 1:1's with governors post-academisation.	IB	Ongoing – Chair will now arrange.	Agree Link Governor Roles at September 24 th meeting 2019	IB	Ongoing	Governors to return declaration of interest forms at the meeting on Sept 24 th	All	Ongoing	Governors to read the Code of Conduct (& Keeping Children Safe in Education) for Sept 24 th	All	Completed 24/09	Agree presentation themes once SDP ready		Defer till November 2019 meeting
Action:	By whom	Completed																					
Chair/Head to invite Kathy Clarke to discuss Board's role in progressing lower ability children.	Chair/Head	Defer till November 2019 meeting																					
Chair to arrange 1:1's with governors post-academisation.	IB	Ongoing – Chair will now arrange.																					
Agree Link Governor Roles at September 24 th meeting 2019	IB	Ongoing																					
Governors to return declaration of interest forms at the meeting on Sept 24 th	All	Ongoing																					
Governors to read the Code of Conduct (& Keeping Children Safe in Education) for Sept 24 th	All	Completed 24/09																					
Agree presentation themes once SDP ready		Defer till November 2019 meeting																					
1.2		<p>Apologies and Declarations of Interest:</p> <p>Apologies were received from Rachel Surch & Jackie Peterson. Nicole Deacon Willis asked to leave the meeting early at 7pm. There were no declarations or conflicts of interest in any agenda items.</p>																					
1.3		<p>Notification of Items of AOB:</p> <p>There was one item for AOB: Set Performance Management Dates</p>																					

	1.4	<p>Adoption of previous meetings Minutes:</p> <p>The Chair invited adoption of the Minutes from the previous FGB meeting on 9th July 2019. IB proposed the Minutes as an accurate record of the meeting, this was seconded by VR. The Minutes were signed by the Chair.</p> <p>CC asked the Board if the Minutes could be replaced with Action Logs & Key Points. FC advised that Minutes are an Ofsted requirement.</p>
<p>2 Performance, Standards & Behaviour</p>		
	2.1	<p>Head Teacher's Report:</p> <p>Governors were invited to submit questions to the Deputy Head in advance of the meeting. The responses were posted to Governor Hub ahead of the meeting and are posted below.</p> <p>From Ian Burgess:</p> <p>1. The 'Pride of Red Oaks' initiative sounds good and I would like to know if the school thinks the LAB could support this initiative The 'Pride of Red Oaks' is an initiative to encourage children to take pride in their environment- classrooms and corridors etc. Rachel and James will then monitor the classrooms and provide 'scores on the doors' with winners being announced termly and then an overall winner at the end of the academic year. In terms of LAB support this could be supported during focus days – an evaluation could be made of the learning environment during visits. Governors are also welcome to come in at the end of the school day and support with the scores on the doors!</p> <p>2. With regard to the SDP. What areas, if any, are the school considering carrying forward to this academic year. The SLT have produced a draft SDP for the coming year. One of key priorities is to continue the progress we have made in Maths over the previous year. We have carried this over from last year.</p> <p>3. With regard to attendance. Each term we see a number exceeding 30 plus with less than 90% attendance. Are there are pupils who did not achieve 90%+ for the full school year 41 pupils under 90% from Sep 18 to Jul 19. Their attendance is routinely monitored and advisory letters are sent to them when needed. We look at the % under 90% each term. Quite often there are genuine reasons but where there are not, we involve EWO (Education Welfare Officer) if appropriate.</p> <p>A couple of observations and questions from me:</p> <p>1. Overall the day looks very positive with many areas in excess of the national/locally set standards. The school attainment including CLAN look very positive. Well done to all concerned for these results.</p>

		<p>2. KS1-KS2 progress is again positive. Good performance against LA average and from memory a good step forward from 2018 Thank you – last year was a good year, in no part down to the hard work and dedication from all the staff.</p> <p>3. With regard to Reading and SPAG. - Both Years 3 and 4 seem slightly off track and I wondered if this is evidenced in previous years with these 2 cohorts. - Do we have any specific concerns about these 2 cohorts in this area and if so is there any specific plan to address? I have looked back at the data and this has been identified in previous progress meetings. The year groups in question have been below their KPI for the year and where applicable national averages. This is not something that has just happened between years. We have identified the issues for these year groups and continue to work on them through a combination of precision teaching, over learning, interventions and guided lessons. In both the year 3 and 4 cohorts the spelling element of SPAG is the area that is affecting the attainment of the children. We have introduced for this year, a programme focusing on the spelling morphology. The expectation in spelling from Year2 to 3 and then 3 to 4 also increases. With regard to Reading the expectation from Year 2 to Year 3 increases. The children struggle to complete the paper in time. Guided sessions are run to help increase the children’s stamina and short burst sessions are undertaken to increase confidence. We are also looking at the banding of the Reading assessment paper to make sure that the pass mark is not too high.</p> <p>From Nicole Deacon Willis:</p> <p>Prior to TaHMs (Targeted Mental Health Service) training for parents, will teachers be given a refresher? There will be a twilight session on mental health awareness delivered by Dr Pooky Knight Smith in Term 1, there are also training opportunities for teachers via our online training system Nimbl. Teachers who have children who are open to TaHMs are invited to meetings and are involved in feedback with our TaHMs representative.</p> <p>With our new focus on both Curriculum and workload, would SLT be able to outline expectations when leading a subject – i.e. what is enough, what is too much? As you know, leading a subject - alongside what is required to achieve consistently ‘good’ teaching and learning environments – is a huge amount of work. As teacher accountability and expectations for subject leadership increase, most teachers are already responsible for more than one curriculum area on top of their teaching workload. Is there a way of making this more sustainable? Thank you for your question. Managing teacher workload is always high on our list of priorities. The changes to the Ofsted framework – and in particular curriculum and subject leadership have been discussed by SLT and will form one of the priorities on the SDP for this year. We are already looking at ways to support staff in subject leadership as well as managing workload and effective prioritisation. We hope to develop links with other</p>
--	--	---

		<p>schools in order to share best practise and provide a support network. We hope to use the links with Abbey Park school to develop effective and sustainable curriculum leadership.</p> <p>From Vicki Robinson:</p> <p>Regarding last year's year 1 phonics results falling below national average and this now being a focus in year 2. What is being done in year 2 to combat this?</p> <p>Thank you for your questions. There are 14 children who did not pass the phonic screening check, however based on their starting points from Reception this represents an improvement year on year. Phonics and sentence level intervention groups have already started. With phonics being taught in lessons throughout the week. These children will receive extra support. Reading is a high priority in the year group. Children to access Reading Buddy in the afternoon. We have a Reading intervention taking 7 Yr 2 children, daily and target readers established – every child to be heard at least once a week.</p> <p>Also in reception it has been noted about reading and writing affecting the overall GLD (Good Level of Development) which is well below national average and particularly a weakness in boys which is again a focus for this cohort this year. What is being done to combat this now they are in year 1? The Year 1 teachers had a detailed and extensive transition into Year 1. These children were discussed with the class teachers and their specific needs discussed. The Year 1 teachers have continued to use the ILD to assess and observe the children. They have had all the assessments and data from last year and know which areas of the curriculum need to be addressed. The Year 1 teachers have subsequently tailored their classroom environment to match that of a Reception class. Teachers modelling writing whenever possible so that the children are exposed to writing opportunities. The free flow environment has enabled the children to access writing opportunities on a regular basis. Target readers to read every day and then hopefully other children twice a week. Story before home time every day. Phonics teaching to address the gaps in knowledge.</p> <p>From Mangala Sekhar:</p> <p>Q's for Head's report: "Pride of RO" is a great initiative! It will be good to see children take responsibility of their immediate environment. Well done!</p> <p>1) Awesome idea of introducing Dash into the school! I think most kids will develop a lovely bond with him. What are the long term plans for keeping him please, and how is he cared for when school is shut (evenings, weekends and hols)?</p> <p>The plan is that he will be trained as a therapy dog for the children to access. He is owned by Emily Maxfield and as a result spends all the time when not in school with her.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>2) Do we have a training on curriculum and the new changes planned for this year please? I'm very interested in attending. I think I missed the last one. That is a good question. We hope to run training for Governors later in the year. Rachel intends to do an update on what we have done so far in the next meeting</p> <p>3) Under the H&S updates- what is "PAT testing" please? – this is routine electrical safety checks for equipment.</p> <p>4) Attendance - I'm concerned about the numbers in the table for attendance <90%. They seem a little high to me. Would you know if this is on par with figures from other local schools please? Are these numbers linked to same set of children missing lessons each term? What % of these kids are non-SEN/PP (Special Educational Needs/SEN) as they would be the ones we could focus on to improve attendance. Rachel and I don't have any LA data and don't know if other schools monitor the way we do so there is nothing to compare with. In Rachel's last EWO update meeting with our attendance officer, she shared our process and attendance figures and was assured these are excellent. Rachel monitors any children and families that repeatedly dip below 90% but the majority are either children under 5 and non- compulsory school age which you cannot enforce. They may also be those with long term illness or repeated illness that is accounted for or unauthorised holidays. If there are reasons unaccounted for or reasons of concern, parents are spoken to and made aware that EWO are going to be contacted. This amounts to very few, maybe a handful each year</p> <p>Q's for Attainment summary: 1) For Reading across the years, overall improvement for disadvantaged and SEND groups makes huge leaps between T4&6 while overall it isn't reflected (smaller change). Did we not observe a similar level of improvement among the rest of the children? We would expect the children in these groups to make accelerated progress because of their starting points. They receive regular interventions to help support this.</p> <p>Q's for 3 year maths data tracker: 1) I appreciate that you are maintaining a 4-year tracker, as it helps with checking progress of each cohort. It's lovely to see that most cohorts have been attaining above NA (National Average)! 2018/19 maths data shows girls didn't achieve as well as boys in KS2 (yr6) with boys attaining higher than NA, but the same cohort in KS1 (yr2) 2015/16 had girls' attainment higher than NA? and performed better than boys? Please confirm if I understood this correctly? So should we be looking at why this drop occurred across yr3-6 for girls and boost their maths skills? We looked at boosting STEM focus for girls as part of last year's SDP, hopefully we can extend it to this year too? Thank you for the observation. Trends in year are monitored within pupil progress meetings. These meetings focus on all groups including boys and girls and trends are identified within these meetings. Boys and girls' attainment and any imbalance in both has been discussed at our last round of Progress meetings (completed last week) and the attainment gap</p>
--	--

		<p>between boys and girls was highlighted on the T1 attainment priorities document.</p> <p>SDP 2018/19:</p> <p>1) Where the final T6 assessment shows red RAG rating, are we pulling these into this year's SDP? We should try to extend ambers into this year too. These will have been added to the attainment priorities document. We have discussed these children at progress meetings and we will revisit them at the next round of progress meetings.</p> <p>2) Where we had a cost associated with an SDP action and final assessment shows red, are we able to confirm whether that action was incomplete and money spent, or action not started and money banked for use this year? Without knowing the specific action within the SDP I cannot comment on this. However, this is something we look at and monitor throughout the year.</p> <p>3) there is a mismatch in the first page of the termly assessment sheet. The term mentioned in top right corner doesn't align with the actual term assessed. Just requires a minor correction to the document.</p> <p>From Dan Blagg:</p> <p><u>Attainment Summary:</u> Apologies if this has already been asked, but can you explain the colouring rationale? On the front sheet it appears to be inconsistent... e.g. in the T6 reading column, in reception and Yr 1 scores of 79 and 69 are green, yet a higher score in Yr 3 is marked red? This is because the threshold marks for attainment levels e.g. WW (Working within), WA (Working at) are different in different year groups. Scores are also RAG rated against national outcomes at the end of each phase. This means that the expectations in F stage, KS1 and KS2 are different. There is a table showing the expected outcomes in each term for each phase in each subject.</p> <p><u>Heads Report:</u> What is the reasoning for not replacing TA's who have left? There were a higher number of children with needs who left Y6 than have currently been identified in the new cohorts (this may change). We have therefore been able to manage with the staff we have. If there are any more children given funding, we will recruit suitable staff to support. We have one child currently waiting to come into Y4 who has a high level of need and we are in the process of recruiting.</p> <p>There were no further questions. IB asked JL for any observations or comments he had following the questions. JL responded that the broad nature and type of questions were interesting and covered many different aspects of the report. JL continued that the questions on the Head Teacher's report are a tool for helping governors to understand and he wants the answers to be of use. The governors had a general discussion around the possibility of the deadline for questions to be moved to the Thursday before the meeting so</p>
--	--	--

		<p>that the questions & answers can be collated and posted for governors to be given more time to read the document. IB concluded that there was room for further discussion on this.</p> <p>It was also discussed if the Head's report and other papers could be posted 10 days before the meeting rather than week. JL added that RS does prefer to be able to provide the most up to date information as possible for governors</p> <p>Action: To further discuss changing deadline for Head's questions to the Thursday prior to the meeting to Head's report & posting of report & papers 10 days in advance of meeting.</p> <p>Governors also asked for a glossary of terms to be provided on the agenda and other documentation.</p> <p>Action: Glossary to be included on the agenda & other documentation.</p>
2.2		<p>Finance:</p> <p>Finance Report:</p> <p>The Clerk advised the board that JP, who was absent from the meeting, was happy for governors to submit any questions on the report in the meeting which she would then be happy to answer afterwards. IB observed that if the LAB still had responsibility of the school budget and spend then the LAB would still need to see a financial breakdown. FC advised that it is within the LAB's remit to monitor the school budget continuing that the LAB can specify which reports and figures they would like to see. Governors agreed that they would like to see more figures. IB concluded that there needs to be a link governor for finance and that the LAB can have further discussions on what figures they would like to see.</p> <p>Action: LAB to decide what financial reports & breakdowns they would like to see</p>
2.3		<p>Raising Standards/SDP:</p> <p>Attainment Data:</p> <p>IB observed that the data broadly is looking very good. JL added that following on from data training that governors are asking more informed questions. JL continued that the maths data is good and that Foundation stage is below National Average but above trend. JL added that the SDP reflects the direction that the school wants to go in. Governors discussed if there was a possibility of presenting the data in a way that was more of a summary, or if it could be presented in a way that would help understanding. GB observed that now the Academy has moved from SIMS to Arbor that there is the potential for data to be automated. The Board recognises that the Head spends a lot of time managing data so if software could be made available which could assist with this it could be beneficial.</p>

		<p>FC suggested that the Board request the type of data that they would like to see and wondered if it was further broken down if it would be easier to understand.</p> <p>JL added that there is less emphasis on data now with Ofsted.</p> <p>IB added that the Board needs data to compare year on year adding that if there is too much data then this should be fed back. CC added that the Board needs enough data to be able to challenge.</p>		
	2.4	<p>Policy Changes:</p> <p>IB explained that there are a number of policies for review and proposed that they are approved in one block.</p> <p>IB asked if governors had any questions or observations. MS pointed out a couple of small typing errors on the Health & Safety Policy.</p> <p>Action: Clerk to email Ellen to advise her of correction to Health & Safety Policy 2019-20.</p> <p>IB proposed that all the listed policies be approved. This was seconded by DB. All governors were in favour</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Safety Policy 2019-20 • Annual Safeguarding Handbook Parts 1 & 2 2019-20: • Performance Management Policy 2019-20 • Religious Education Policy 2018-19 </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors Statement - Code of Conduct & Behaviour 2018 -2019 • Behaviour & Learning Charter • Governors Behaviour Statement 2018-19 • TPAT Scheme of Delegation 2019 • TPAT Terms of Reference 2019 </td> </tr> </table> <p>IB reminded Governors about the new Terms of Reference and Scheme of Delegation and suggested that as these are such important documents, governors print themselves copies off to refer to.</p> <p><i>FC left the meeting at 7:20pm.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Safety Policy 2019-20 • Annual Safeguarding Handbook Parts 1 & 2 2019-20: • Performance Management Policy 2019-20 • Religious Education Policy 2018-19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors Statement - Code of Conduct & Behaviour 2018 -2019 • Behaviour & Learning Charter • Governors Behaviour Statement 2018-19 • TPAT Scheme of Delegation 2019 • TPAT Terms of Reference 2019
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Safety Policy 2019-20 • Annual Safeguarding Handbook Parts 1 & 2 2019-20: • Performance Management Policy 2019-20 • Religious Education Policy 2018-19 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governors Statement - Code of Conduct & Behaviour 2018 -2019 • Behaviour & Learning Charter • Governors Behaviour Statement 2018-19 • TPAT Scheme of Delegation 2019 • TPAT Terms of Reference 2019 				
3	Support			
	3.1	<p>Revise Link Governor Structure:</p> <p>IB suggested to the Board that perhaps Link Governors areas could be changed to KS1 & KS2 for example, rather than subjects as he felt this was more in line with the SDP (School Development Plan) and how the school is structured.</p> <p>MS felt that there was more value to keep Link Governors to subjects as she felt it lined up more with the new Ofsted focus of 'Intent, Implementation and Impact' and enables progress to be seen through the year groups. MS expressed concern at losing that.</p>		

		<p>DB added that he felt key stages would be more interesting as then you can cross coordinate. GB added that curriculum based makes sense as it would work well with transition.</p> <p>JL added that there were clearly benefits to both but there would not be enough governors for each subject adding with Key Stage you could only see limited people therefore curriculum based would be better.</p> <p>MS wondered if as Lead Primary the Link Governor structure would then be followed by joining primaries.</p> <p>IB suggested that Red Oaks is the lead primary but also has to remain the principle focus of the Board, whilst passing on best practice.</p> <p>JL added that Reading, Writing & Maths are the keystones of data but the new focus is not so much on data but looking at the ‘untestable ‘</p> <p>CC added that perhaps it is too early at this stage. IB agreed and suggested that time is given for the new Ofsted framework to bed in first and until the LAB has more governors. IB added that perhaps larger link responsibilities could be split.</p> <p>JR expressed that he would like to be the Finance Link Governor. IB proposed this and it was seconded by CC. All governors were in favour.</p> <p>JL suggested Reading, Writing and SpaG and EYFS as Link areas.</p> <p>IB suggested that computing be considered as it is on the SDP.</p> <p>IB concluded that he will speak to RS but suggested that Link Governors stay as they are for now.</p> <p>Action: IB to discuss Link Governor roles with RS</p>
3.2		<p>Governor Training & Feedback:</p> <p>TPAT Training Schedule:</p> <p>The Clerk had posted the TPAT Proposed Training Schedule for governors to governor hub prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Governors confirmed in the meeting that they had seen this and the Clerk also pointed out the mandatory Safeguarding and Prevent training modules.</p> <p>Nimbl Training:</p> <p>JL demonstrated the Nimbl training website, explaining that it’s possible to search and access CPD at your own pace. Governors have been sent Nimbl logins to their new school email addresses.</p> <p>JL explained that this is a tool also used in school adding that there are lots of topics with reading and self-evaluation elements. JL explained most modules on average are 1-1.5 hours long and progress is automatically saved.</p> <p>IB asked all governors to sign in and look at what was available.</p> <p>Action: All governors to login into Nimbl</p>

	3.3	<p>Admin:</p> <p>Time was set aside in the meeting for the handing in and completion of forms. Governors were reminded about Section 128 & DBS checks and receiving NGA emails.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hand in forms: • Code of Conduct • Declaration of Interest form • Sign insurance declaration • Sign to agree: 'Keeping Children Safe in Education 2019' read & understood • Sign to agree: 'Safeguarding Handbook 2019-20' read & understood • Reminder: Section 128/DBS checks • All aware of new Focus Day dates: 21/11 26/02 02/20 • Reminder: are governors receiving the NGA Friday email/Logged on to new website. <p>Action: Clerk to re post information to Governor Hub on how to contact NGA</p>
4	AOB & Any Other Points	
	4.1	<p>AOB:</p> <p>Matters Arising: Set Performance Management Panel Dates:</p> <p>Following a request from the Head, IB asked if MS & JR were available on the 6th Nov to look at applications for the Upper Pay Scale.</p> <p>Action: IB, MS & JR to confirm availability for Performance Management Panel</p> <p>ID Badges:</p> <p>JR asked if governors could be given their own ID badges. The Board felt it was important not just for times when they were in school so they can be more easily identified as governors but also for events such as Parents' Eve.</p> <p>Action: Clerk to ask Head/Trustees about ID badges</p> <p>Voting:</p> <p>GB & KH were asked to leave the room. IB proposed GB as a community governor, explaining that he comes highly recommended from RS & FC.</p> <p>Governors did discuss if the commitment of a Full Time job and also being a governor at LPA if this would be too much.</p>

	<p>IB suggested that governors discuss this with him.</p> <p>GB was invited back in and having had these concerns put to him explained that he was happy to take the commitment on. GB left the room and IB proposed GB as a Community Governor to the Red Oaks LAB. JR seconded this and all governors voted in favour.</p> <p>IB explained that KH will need to meet Rachel and if both are happy to proceed, an email vote could then take place.</p> <p>Action: IB to inform Clerk & Board of outcome of meeting between KH & RS</p> <p>Both GB and KH were welcomed back. IB welcomed Geoff to the Board.</p> <p>Action: Clerk to start New Governor process with IB</p>
4.2	<p>Date of Next Meeting:</p> <p>19th November 2019 - 6pm</p>

The Meeting concluded at 20:07 pm

Full Governor Board Meeting Dates 2019/20
24 th September 2019 @ 18:00
19 th November 2019 @ 18:00
28 th January 2020 @ 18:00
10 th March 2020 @ 18:00
19 th May 2020 @ 18:00
14 th July 2020 @ 18:00
Focus Days (Times TBC)
21 st November 2019
26 th February 2020
2 nd July 2020

Action:	By whom	Completed
Chair/Head to invite Kathy Clarke to discuss Board's role in progressing lower ability children.	Chair/Head	Defer till Nov 2019 meeting

Chair to arrange 1:1's with governors post- academisation.	IB	Ongoing: Chair will now arrange
Link Governor roles to be agreed once the new Ofsted Inspection Framework has had time to establish	IB	Ongoing
Clerk to remind governors to return outstanding Declaration of Interest forms (and any other forms) to school office	All	Ongoing
Presentation themes to be confirmed at November meeting	Head	Defer until November 2019 meeting
To further discuss changing deadline for Head's questions to the Thursday prior to the meeting to Head's report & posting of report & papers 10 days in advance of meeting	All	Completed
Glossary to be included on the agenda & other documentation	All	Agreed
Action: LAB to decide what financial reports & breakdowns they would like to see	All	
Clerk to email Ellen to advise her of corrections to the Health & Safety Policy 2019-20.	Clerk	27/09
IB to discuss Link Governor roles with RS	IB	Completed
All governors to login to Nimbl	All	
Clerk to re post information to Governor Hub on how to contact NGA	Clerk	07/11
IB, MS & JR to confirm availability for Performance Management Panel	Clerk/IB	03/10
Clerk to ask Head/Trustees about ID badges	Clerk	04/10
IB to inform Clerk & Board of outcome of meeting between KH & RS	IB	22/10
Clerk to start New Governor process with GB	Clerk	03/10

Signed:	Print:
	Signature:
Date:	