

**Grange Infant School**, Franklin Road, Gosport. PO13 9TS,



**Minutes of the Grange Infant School meeting of the Full Governing Body  
Tuesday 18th July 2017 at 5.30pm**

**Present:**

J Heath (JH)	Co-opted Governor (Chair)
E Yeats (EY)	Parent Governor
S Duffy (HT)	Headteacher
T Woodcock (TW)	Local Authority Governor
C Matthews (CM)	Co-opted Governor
A Bailey (AB)	Co-opted Governor
J Shearsmith (JS)	Co-opted Governor

**In Attendance:**

S Myers (SM)	Associate Member
C Harman (clerk)	Local Authority Clerk

**Apologies :** None

**Absent:** None

**Quorum:** present(4 required)

**GOVERNORS KEY ROLES: Support and Challenge**

Agenda Number		Action Points
1.	<b>Welcome and Apologies for Absence:</b> The chair opened the meeting at 5.37pm and welcomed everyone.  The chair confirmed that all Governors were in attendance.	
2.	<b>Declarations of Pecuniary Interests:</b> No additional declarations were made.	
3.	<b>Agree Any Other Urgent Business:</b> None	
4.	<b>Ofsted feedback</b>  HT explained that all Governors had been sent the Ofsted report and could see the feedback from Ofsted. HT said that the school was delighted with the good rating.	

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

	<p>The Governing Board wanted to pass on their congratulations to the HT and the school.</p> <p>It was felt by all that the comments and feedback given in the report were even better than those given on the day of the inspection.</p> <p>HT explained that now the school has received it's good rating, they will focus on further improvements to the school and a new school improvement plan will be actioned focussing on areas for development from the Ofsted report and from the this year's data set. Reading into writing was an area focussed on by Ofsted so this will form part of the plan.</p> <p>Some areas will stay as a focus from the previous SIP such as teaching and learning which will always remain a firm focus for the school.</p> <p>It seemed the Ofsted inspectors were incredibly fair and gave the school the opportunity to find the information they needed. Ofsted inspectors commented that they had a really good feeling when they came into the school.</p> <p>Governors said that this was a great end to a great year.</p> <p>HT confirmed that the next Ofsted visit would be in 3 -5 years. There is a need now to find a way of keeping high expectations and maintaining a balanced workload. This year there has been a lot of hard work put in by the teachers and the HT is very pleased with the results.</p> <p>SM said that they will not be getting rid of practices because the systems are working.</p> <p>HT explained that she will be doing a 'what's next' session for staff.</p> <p>A Governor suggested this was now all about working consistently.</p> <p>HT said that this is a good school due to the staff that work here.</p> <p>A Governor said that she feels happy for her child to go into any of the classes and work with any of the teachers. The Governor has confidence in the teachers to support the children.</p> <p>The Governor also added that the 'meet the teacher' sessions have been very successful, and it has worked moving them to July.</p> <p>Governor asked has it made a difference for next year's intake?</p> <p>HT said that it has. The school is pleased with the 90 reception children confirmed for next school year, with a waiting list, although these parents had signed up to the school prior to the Ofsted rating</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>which is especially pleasing. Post Ofsted there are more families interested in years 1 and 2. It has been noted that a number of the children transferring in have a special educational need so the school is ensuring planned support for next year</p> <p>Governors congratulated the HT again on an incredible year and an amazing Ofsted report.</p>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Head teachers written report</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	<p><b>SATs results to targets</b></p> <p>HT explained that she had given Governors a longer report including the previous phase data as this would work as a good comparison.</p> <p><b>Year 2 data</b></p> <p>HT explained that the year 2 end of key stage results are extremely positive this year and something to be proud of. All subjects are in line or above where they were last year and we have seen percentage increases in the number of children working at greater depth. This has been particularly pleasing in writing as this has been an area of focus</p> <p>The school has a strong and effective year 2 team and teachers have ensured that they are using data analysis to support children and target gaps which has led to a good set of results.</p> <p><b>Year 2 Maths</b></p> <p>HT explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 84% of children are children are working at ARE with 25% of children working at exceeding. Targets were set at 85% for ARE and 20%+ for greater depth</li> <li>- The gap between disadvantaged and non is 16.6 %. This is in line with last years in-school gap so has not widened which means the school should also be in line or thereabouts with national. The school has yet to receive the national score. This is a pleasing result but the gap between disadvantaged and non will always be an area of focus for the school.</li> <li>- There is a 8% gap between boys and girls which is not significant but this is an area that will be looked into moving forward.</li> <li>- Service and EAL children are performing well above cohort averages at 96% and 95%</li> <li>- 47% SEN children achieved ARE, which is pleasing as last year's national was 40% but the school will continue to work towards</li> </ul>	

	<p>diminishing the difference.</p> <p>A Governor commented that it is good to see a SEN pupil exceeding.</p> <p>HT explained to Governors that the child had SEN due to a medical condition.</p> <p><b>Year 2 Reading</b></p> <p>HT explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 82.7% of children reached ARE with 30% of children at exceeding. This is a positive picture and is in line with end of year targets set at 85% ARE and 30% GD. HT pointed out that from the SATS results some children could have been ARE however they had to look back at their work throughout the year and some were not working consistently.</li> <li>- Disadvantaged data shows that for ARE, the gap is 2%. This is a very positive picture and shows the gap diminishing. The school gap at this time last academic year was -14%. If we compare this data to last year's national, we would be ahead by 3% which is very pleasing indeed. This is particularly positive as there are more children this year that cross over into the SEN/DIS bracket. HT explained that this was the 4<sup>th</sup> year of a positive upward trend.</li> <li>- There is a minimal gender gap of 5% between boys and girls. Service and EAL children are again outperforming the cohort at 92% and 90%.</li> <li>- SEN- 42.1% of children achieved ARE this year. This should be in line with national and will continue to be a focus but national results are not through yet.</li> </ul> <p><b>Year 2 Writing</b></p> <p>HT explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 74 % of children are currently working at ARE with 22% of children working at greater depth. For greater depth, this is an improvement of 9% on last year's end of academic year data, which is very pleasing to see.</li> <li>- Disadvantaged data shows that there is a 17% gap. Our school gap at this point last year was -19%. Last year it was -16% behind the national non disadvantaged and if you compared against last year's data, the school would now be -8 behind which again is very pleasing.</li> <li>- There is a 14% gap between girls and boys which remains an area of focus but if you look at it in terms of children it is a difference of 4 more boys performing at ARE than girls.</li> <li>- Service and EAL are again outperforming the cohort average at</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>92% and 90%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SEN continue to be an area of focus with only 10% of children achieving ARE. This will form part of school improvement for next academic year.</li> </ul> <p><b>Year 1 data</b></p> <p>HT told Governors that the data for year 1 is a positive picture. The end of year data sits more or less in line with where the school was at this point last year.</p> <p>It is slightly lower than last academic year but it should be noted that the year group is considerably smaller with current data based on 70 children. This means each child is worth a larger percentage than last academic year. There has also been considerable turbulence across the last half term with 11 children transferring in or out of the year group. Year 1 has lost high achieving pupils and has received children who are working below expectation. In Phonics week, the school had 4 new children start year 1.</p> <p>The year 1 team have worked hard to get to know these children as quickly as possible and have spent time moderating with their year group and with year 2, to ensure that assessments for these children are accurate. The year group has 21% children with SEN needs and 42% of our disadvantaged children in year 1 also have SEN, which is impacting on their progress towards ARE.</p> <p>HT explained that due to this cohort she may not be able to guarantee the percentages that were achieved this year. There could be a drop.</p> <p><b>Year 1 Maths:</b></p> <p>HT explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 72.9% of children achieved ARE in phase 4. This is pure data and does not include children working towards. Last year we achieved 76%. The target for the year group was 80% but the school is pleased with the result, especially in light of the turbulence over the last half term. Year 2 have moderated judgements with year 1 and with cluster and teachers are confident that judgements are accurate.</li> <li>- 22% of children are working at exceeding. This is a good result and is in line with end of key stage results in year 2 and puts the children in a strong position for greater depth next year.</li> <li>- The gap between disadvantaged and non was 28.9% at phase 3 but this did include those children who are working towards. These children have now been taken out and the end of year gap sits at 39% with 9 out of 19 children achieving ARE. Analysis of the group shows that 42% of this group have SEN, and this has impacted on the children reaching ARE. Although not all children have reached ARE, their books show significant progress which is being carefully tracked and monitored against prior phases to show their development. The school will</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>continue to focus on disadvantaged as an area for improvement in 2017/18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a minimal gender gap with a 4% difference between boys and girls. Forces children are performing above the cohort with 90% of children achieving ARE</li> <li>- EAL children are now in line with the cohort with 77% of children working at ARE (They were slightly behind in prior phase).</li> <li>- 8 children identified as having SEN were working at ARE in phase 3. End of year data now shows that 9 children (43.8%) achieved ARE. These children as above are being carefully tracked so that their progress can be evidenced against prior phases.</li> <li>- Year 1 has some exceeding children, some who need support and those who are just doing well. It has been recognised that more needs to be done with these children who are just doing well.</li> </ul> <p><b>Year 1 Reading:</b> HT explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 74% of children have finished the end of year at ARE compared to 78.9 at the end of phase 3. This is the same percentage as the end of last academic year. This is particularly pleasing as 78.9% included those children working towards whereas the final figure is pure. It is slightly below the 80% target but again the year group have had to work with a significant amount of turbulence so I am pleased with the result. 37% of children are working at exceeding. This is a significant rise from the previous phase where the figure was 18%. Intervention to ensure that children have the opportunity to be working at greater depth has had significant impact and children's ability to decode is strong with 84% of children achieving the phonic screen test. However, in some cases fluency is holding them back. Next year the school needs to continue to ensure that the focus is on the children who are working just below ARE to support the expected standard.</li> </ul> <p>A Governor asked if they take a reading book home with them.</p> <p>SM told Governors they do and they are encouraged to read three times a week.</p> <p>A Governor asked what if the book is not changed who picks up on it?</p> <p>SM explained that this would be the responsibility of the class teacher.</p> <p>HT said that children are encouraged to change their own reading book.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>HT went onto explain that Hannah Satchel had queried the year 1/2 phonics data. If children do not pass in year 1 they re-take in year 2. In the last cohort 96% of children passed in year 1. 29 children had to retake in year 2. One of these children didn't pass.</p> <p>This year 86% of children passed the phonics screen test. 15 children had to retake in year 2. 4 didn't pass, all with significant needs making total percentage passed 75%.</p> <p>That is why there is a need to look at numbers not percentages. Reading contd:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The gap between disadvantaged and non is 16%. It was 15.1% at phase 3 but included working towards. This is a pleasing result particularly the percentage crossover of disadvantaged and SEN children.</li> <li>- There are no significant gender splits. There is currently a 2% gap between boys and girls.</li> <li>- Service children are performing above the cohort at 86.4%.</li> <li>- EAL children are working in line with the cohort at 79.6%</li> <li>- SEN data has stayed static with 5 ( 31.3%) of children working at ARE. Those children tracking below are being carefully monitored to ensure that we can prove progress against prior phases.</li> </ul> <p><b>Year1Writing:</b> HT explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 70% of children achieved ARE at phase 4. 72.4% achieved ARE at phase 3 but again this included working towards data and phase 4 is only the children who did actually achieve ARE. Target was 75% for this year based on end of Key Stage in 15/16 being 69% and 74% this year. 70% is a pleasing result and books show that good progress has been made in writing this year.</li> <li>- 22% of children are working at greater depth. This is an excellent result with a 10% rise on key stage results from last year and is in line with year 2 this year.</li> <li>- The gap between disadvantaged and non is 34%. In phase 2 it was 25% but again this included the close to children. As for reading this will be an area of focus next year but as previously 42% of this particular group also have a special educational need which has impacted on attainment.</li> <li>- There is a minimal gender gap of 3% between boys and girls. This is positive as it has been an issue in the past. Service children are outperforming the cohort at 86.4% of children achieving ARE.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EAL are outperforming the cohort at 76.9%.</li> <li>- SEN has remained static at 37.5% reaching ARE. These children are being tracked against prior phases to show progress.</li> </ul> <p>Governor asked that some of the data shows low numbers working below for service children and EAL. Could these children also be SEN? Or are they the same children.</p> <p>HT explained that these are not the same children due to the children that have moved in and out of the school.</p> <p><b>Early Years</b></p> <p>HT explained, when looking at the report that last year's figures were in red.</p> <p>HT told Governors that this year the school achieved a GLD result of 73.7% which is very pleasing and a 4% increase on last year's result For the ELG in reading, writing and maths the school has matched or exceeded last year's result across all 3 subject areas. Number results at exceeding are particularly pleasing with a 10% increase on last academic year.</p> <p>Reading is an area that is looking more static, so this will be an area for improvement for next academic year. Overall this is a good set of results.</p> <p>There are gaps between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged children. These children have been analysed in terms of those who are SEN and those who are not. If you take disadvantaged as a group including other groupings, there is a gap of 11% in reading, 22% in writing and 29% in number.</p> <p>If you take out the SEN/disadvantaged children, there is a +7% gap in reading, a 0% gap in writing and a -4% gap in maths. These are all a significant improvement on the previous phase and last year but will continue to remain a focus for the school. Because the group sizes are small, each child that moves makes a significant difference so the teachers are continuing to target and can show evidence of progress in books.</p> <p>The breakdown of reading, writing and maths at ELG is a positive picture with an increase in writing and number on last year's results. Reading has remained static. Reading will be a focus for next year's school improvement.</p> <p>Those children identified as having SEN are continually monitored and intervention groupings are in place to support these children in catching up. Progress is tracked individually against the month bands and although these children are not currently reaching ARE, evidence of progress is tracked and can be seen in books.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Forces children are tracking in line or above cohort averages.</p> <p>EAL are in line with cohort percentages across all 3 phases. There are some gender gaps appearing between boys and girls, although not too significant, this will also be an area of focus.</p> <p>HT said that she had received some questions that morning. HT reminded Governors where possible to send questions in advance to give her enough time to prepare.</p> <p>Question received in advance - Governor asked there is an increase in exceeding but there is no movement from below. How many are close to secure?</p> <p>HT explained that this data is pure data and includes no working-towards children. This is different from phase 3 data which will show this.</p> <p>Question received in advance - Governor asked the data for Maths shows 10 fewer children in below. Can this be explained?</p> <p>HT explained phase 3 data shows 11 children at exceeding. Phase 4 data shows 19 children at exceeding. That means 8 have jumped from secure.</p> <p>Three out of the four children who are below are new children to the school.</p> <p>Question received in advance - Governor asked what additional resources will be used as year 1 moves into year 2?</p> <p>HT explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They are planning to do 3 extra phonics lessons a week run by the HT</li> <li>- They have identified children that will need additional support.</li> <li>- The budget is tight but they have kept the catch up TAs</li> <li>- There will be extra targeted support in the afternoon through catch up intervention</li> <li>- There are smaller class sizes this year so for now teachers will be able to give extra targeted support.</li> </ul> <p>SM added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There will be a slightly earlier transition</li> <li>- The children will visit their new classroom and teachers twice before the end of the year.</li> <li>- Year 1 have already done a cold task in preparation</li> <li>- They are aware of SEN and gaps</li> <li>- The communication between teachers has been brilliant.</li> <li>- There has been a good transition and handover.</li> </ul> <p>Question received in advance - Governor asked when looking at year 2 in all areas is there any progress from below?</p>	
--	---	--

<p><b>5.2</b></p>	<p>HT explained that the phase 2 and 3 data is pure data. This was so HT can understand what they are working towards for phase 4.</p> <p>In reading they have 5 working towards. In writing 8 working towards and in maths 4 working towards. These children are not below.</p> <p><b>Professional day closures next academic year</b></p> <p>A Governor asked when the twilight sessions would be to make up for an extra inset day?</p> <p>HT explained the proposed inset days for the new school term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- September 4<sup>th</sup> 2017- Induction/ Safeguarding/ Prevent/H and S/ Code of conduct/ School improvement</li> <li>- October 30<sup>th</sup> 2017- ADHD awareness led by Lennox Centre and a team building session.</li> <li>- December 21<sup>st</sup> 2017- In lieu of 3 twilight training sessions across the Autumn term. These sessions would cover Growth Mindset, Moving the learning environment and curriculum forward and literacy and reading session hosted by Hannah Satchel.</li> <li>- February 9<sup>th</sup> 2018- Phase 2 data and the school therapy team will give a training session on early intervention.</li> <li>- May 3<sup>rd</sup> 2018 (Polling)- Moderation and data analysis of phase 3 data</li> <li>- 6<sup>th</sup> July 2018 -Transition</li> </ul> <p><b>The professional day closures for next academic year were voted for and unanimously approved.</b></p>	
<p><b>5.3</b></p>	<p><b>Attendance and exclusions</b></p> <p>HT explained that overall attendance data is looking positive with attendance currently at 97.1 for the end of the year. This is above national.</p> <p>SEN data which has previously been a problem is also now looking positive at 96.7 with persistent absence for SEN only 1% behind at 95.7.</p> <p>Whole school persistent absence is still an area of focus with attendance at 93.5 but it has been targeted over the summer term and they hoped to see a significant increase on the spring term data.</p> <p>FSM persistent absence is also being carefully tracked, as it has increased since Summer 1 but the fall is based on 2 children and the children have been off for genuine sickness.</p>	

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

5.4	<p>HT said she encouraged questions from the Governing body to challenge the data.</p> <p>Governor asked has the data been drilled down to class level? Are there any gaps or concerns?</p> <p>HT said that they had looked at all the data. One class in year 1 was lower which had a NQT teacher but there was no cause for concern.</p> <p>Governor asked whether the HT expects to face any challenges with the new staff structure?</p> <p>HT explained that there were 4 strong teachers in year 2. Due to the new structure, 1 will move to year 1, bringing their vast knowledge from year 2. One teacher will move from year R to year 1. And the year leader will remain the same and they are very strong and stable.</p> <p>Governor asked with the children moving out of the school do we know why? Was it for a negative reason?</p> <p>HT explained that there had been no negative feedback and most have been due to forces movement.</p> <p><b>School Improvement plan</b></p> <p>HT explained this was not sent to Governors as it needs to be updated. The RAG rating will be updated and anything in amber will be carried over to the next SIP.</p> <p>A Governor asked if the board could have a copy of the new and previous SIP to compare.</p> <p>HT said that she would do this.</p>	
5.5	<p><b>Review of reports from HT</b></p> <p>Governors felt that the reports whether written or verbal were always very detailed. And there is a good explanation with the data.</p> <p>One Governor asked if they could have the progress tracking data as well as this was useful.</p> <p>HT will organise this data.</p>	
6.	<b>Governance</b>	
6.1	<b>Governor development/action plan/SEF</b>	

	<p>Governor asked why there now was a need for this document as their actions were also in the SIP.</p> <p>General discussion took place over this question and it was decided that the document should be kept and updated.</p> <p>The chair said there was a need now to do a Governing body self - evaluation. They would also need to add in any new actions from the Ofsted and SIP.</p> <p>The chair went through the outstanding action points from the action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The chair needs to review the SEN action plan but hasn't had time to do this but will make it a priority.</li> <li>- Most of the pupil conferencing has been done</li> <li>- Skills audit has been done and the board is not lacking anything.</li> <li>- There is still a vacancy for 1 parent and 1 co-opted Governor.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Update Governor action plan - Chair</b></p>
<p><b>6.2</b></p>	<p><b>Dates for next year</b></p> <p>The chair confirmed the meeting dates had been sent out. The schedule of business will be sent shortly as she is still working on this.</p> <p>Governor raised that the finance meeting is on 19<sup>th</sup> June but the budget needs to be signed off at the end of May.</p> <p>The chair said she would review the schedule and make amendments.</p>	<p><b>Amend meeting dates – Chair</b></p> <p><b>Send out schedule of business – Chair</b></p>
<p><b>6.3</b></p>	<p><b>Officers for next academic year</b></p> <p>The chair confirmed that she will not be able to continue as chair next school year and therefore in September there will be an election of the new chair.</p> <p>The chair then went through and confirmed Officers role for the new year:</p> <p>JS – Remain as DTG and Health and Safety</p> <p>JH – Remain as SEN and take on LAC</p> <p>CM – Remain as Maths</p> <p>AB – Remain as Literacy but will take on Early Years</p> <p>EY – Remain as Safeguarding</p> <p>TW – Finance</p>	

6.5	<p>TW and CM – to work on SEFs</p> <p>TW – HT performance managers role – will need to do training</p> <p>CM - HT performance managers role</p> <p>Pay Committee – JS, JH and EY</p> <p>The chair said that she would like a website check to be done every term. This will involve checking the website and feeding back any amendments that need to be made.</p> <p>CM – Autumn JH – Spring EY - Summer</p> <p>The chair asked if they needed a pupil premium Governor or can we incorporate it into Maths and Literacy?</p> <p>After a discussion it was agreed that it can be incorporated into Maths and Literacy.</p> <p>The chair said that she would like to look into a policy review programme so it was clear what policies needed reviewing at what time.</p> <p>HT added that last year a lot of the policies were out of date and were amended, so there should be few changes this year.</p> <p>Governor asked where does Prevent sit?</p> <p>It was agreed this would sit with EY with Safeguarding.</p> <p>Governor asked if they needed to report on SMSC?</p> <p>After a discussion, it was agreed that this will be part of the HT's report.</p> <p>Governor asked do we need a Science Governor?</p> <p>The chair felt this was useful but the board was spread too thin at the moment. If they found a new Co-Opted Governor they could be the lead for Science.</p> <p><b>Review communications to Governors</b></p> <p>The clerk asked Governors what communications were useful to be sent to them.</p> <p>Governors confirmed that they receive the Governor Services newsletters, including the training updates. Therefore, the clerk will</p>	
-----	--	--

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

6.6	<p>stop sending these out. Governors also receive the NGA newsletter so there is no need to send this one.</p> <p>Governors did still feel the schools' communications were useful.</p> <p><b>Review induction plans for new Governors</b></p> <p>Discussion took place over the existing induction sheet for new Governors.</p> <p>Governors felt that a lot of this was on the website already and the induction template needed to reflect this.</p> <p>CM said he would amend and then feedback the new version to Governors for their approval.</p>	Review and amend Gov Induction – CM								
6.7	<p><b>Review Governor training</b></p> <p>Governors discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- TW needs to attend Performance Management</li><li>- CM and JH want to attend Understanding Data – there was a discussion as to whether this would be useful for whole governing board training; however it was decided that Governors individually decide if they need it.</li><li>- AB has her introduction training session still outstanding.</li><li>- JS told Governors the benefit of the Strategic Finance training</li><li>- No other gaps were identified.</li></ul>									
6.8	<p><b>Review Governing Monitoring</b></p> <p>Three Governing Monitoring Forms were submitted for this FGB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Early Years Pupil Conferencing</li><li>- PHSE lesson observation</li><li>- Year 2 Pupil Conferencing</li></ul> <p>There were no questions regarding these reports.</p>									
7.	<p><b>FGB Meeting Minutes13<sup>th</sup> June 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Approval and Matters Arising</b></li></ul> <p>The chair made one correction -AB is now a Co-Opted Governor, not a Prospective Governor. This was amended on the minutes.</p> <p>The minutes were then unanimously approved as a true record and signed by the chair.</p> <table><tr><th>Action Number</th><th>Agenda item</th><th>Action Details</th><th>Responsibility</th></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Action Number	Agenda item	Action Details	Responsibility					
Action Number	Agenda item	Action Details	Responsibility							

Approved by FGB/Signed by Chair:

	32	5	Review physical restraint log (termly) and report to GB	JH – Carry forward	Look at minutes and feedback - Chair
	35	7	Send governors draft report on governor activities for the web site by 31/7/17	JS – Confusion around this action	
	37	7	Send revised induction procedures to next FGB for approval to include prioritising safeguarding	Clerk To be added to the July agenda Completed	
	39	1	HT to organise recruitment of staff governor	HT – Completed	
	53	8.2	Add Visits to agenda and check on EY's visits and report back	Clerk– Confirmed one had been missed off and one received on the day. But will be done in the future. Carry forward	
	54	9	To review HT's tracked changes of meetings and report back to Chair and HT	Clerk – Completed	
	For action 39 HT confirmed that two applications had been received for staff Governor and a vote will take place. But there will be a new staff Governor for the FGB in September.				
8.	Agreed Urgent Business: None				
9. 9.1	Policies for approval/ratification: Review Health and Safety Policy Governor fed back that the policy includes the safety and resources committee which have ended. HT will amend.  Governor asked do staff have manual handling training and is this monitored?  HT confirmed that yes, Sue Fairs does this.				Amend and re send H&S Policy –to be reviewed next FGB - HT
9.2	Review the Home school agreement (non-statutory)				

	Governors were happy with this policy and no amendments were made.	
<b>10</b>	<p><b>Correspondence:</b> The chair confirmed these had been sent out but as of next FGB it would be just the Schools communications and any additional useful documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fortnightly Governor Services newsletters</li> <li>• Fortnightly Governor Services training update</li> <li>• NGA newsletters</li> <li>• Schools communications</li> </ul>	
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>Items for the Next FGB Agenda Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> September 2017 at 5.30pm</b></p> <p>The chair is still working on the schedule of business. Governors will be updated with the focus and agenda items when they receive the agenda.</p> <p>However, two points from this meeting will need to be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review Governor Induction Plan</li> <li>- Review Health and Safety Policy</li> </ul>	

## ACTIONS AGREED

Action Number	Agenda item	Action Details	Responsibility
55	6.1	Update Governor action plan	Chair
56	6.2	Amend meeting dates	Chair
57	6.2	Send out schedule of business	Chair
58	6.5	Review and amend Gov Induction	CM
59	7	Look at minutes and feedback on item 35	Chair
60	9	Amend and re send H&S Policy – to be reviewed next FGB	HT