

The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Meadlands Primary School

Minutes of the Full Governing Board (FGB) Meeting held in school and via Zoom App
on
Thursday 17th March 2021 at 7.30am

Constitution, Membership and Attendance

PARENTS -2	LA-1	STAFF-2	COOPTED -8
Alida Hawthorne (AHa)	Penny Frost (PF)	Sophie McGeoch (SMcG)	Nigel Seymour (NS) <i>Chair</i>
Christina Powell (CP)		Sarah Taunton Johnson (STJ)	Annabelle Hughes (AH) <i>Vice Chair</i>
			Ulrich Tiedau (UT)
			Chloe Walkom (CW)
			Lisa Fairmaner (LF)
			John Cannon (JC)
			Kasia Oberc (KO)
			Vacancy

bold = absent

Apologies: Alida Hawthorne, Christina Powell, Sophie McGeoch, Ulrich Tiedau, Kasia Oberc, Wendy Norman (Clerk)

Absent without apologies: None

Also present: Jess Bunker (JB)
Karen Heaton (Data Protection Officer) (part)

1.	Apologies, Welcome and Declarations of Material Interest	Action
1.1	The meeting started at 7.30 am. Apologies were received and accepted from Alida Hawthorne, Christina Powell, Sophie McGeoch, Ulrich Tiedau, Kasia Oberc and Wendy Norman (clerk)	
1.2	Governors were reminded of their duty to declare any direct or indirect pecuniary interest which may relate to any matter under discussion on the agenda and none were declared.	
1.3	No governors attended virtually via Zoom app.	
1.4	Chair checked those present were happy for meeting to be recorded and started recording of meeting for benefit of those absent. Due to the absence of the clerk due to Covid the Minutes were to be produced from the recording of the meeting.	

<p>2.</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>2.3</p>	<p>Actions Log</p> <p>Chair reviewed the FGB Actions Log. Most open actions could be closed as actions had been undertaken or were covered as agenda items this meeting.</p> <p>Items on the Log remaining open/ongoing were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPG Audit-been moved to new school year due to resourcing challenges. Not a statutory requirement this year. • 2 further governor link reports had been undertaken. • Succession Planning document still to be produced by Chair- shortly • No Writing Link Governor still. LF volunteered to take on the role and was thanked. <p>Closed items included:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DP inventory had been updated • Confirmed that PPG Report and policy were connected. • AfC had confirmed that a penalty clause existed in Nursery Build project 	
<p>3.</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p>	<p>Chair's Remarks</p> <p>Chair stated that two most important aspects of the meeting were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour Policy development • Consideration of first Draft Budget <p>JLT would also be presenting during the meeting.</p> <p>Chair commented it would be the Clerk's last meeting before leaving the post but had Covid and could not therefore attend. Chair thanked her for her 10 years' service and contribution. Chair read out the good wishes of Clerk to the school going forwards.</p> <p>Recruitment for a replacement clerk would take place and AfC were assisting Chair and School Business Manager in this regard. Governor suggestions on this also put forward. LA Governor supplied a contact email address of Sarah Perrett of Ham and Petersham Magazine to support any recruitment campaign.</p> <p>Final aspect to be considered in meeting was the ongoing impact on well-being of school community of the ongoing war in Ukraine.</p>	
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p>	<p>Data Protection Officer Presentation</p> <p>Karen Heaton (DPO) joined the meeting via Zoom App and was introduced to governors.</p>	

4.2	DPO referred to the School's DP audit which took place November 2021. Documents in place had been reviewed and refined. Internal Security Measures document was being prepared.	
4.3	<p>Headline points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School had 'moved up a level' since the previous audit. • It was a 'difficult and important' area covering data, privacy, Subject Access Requests (SARS) and individual rights but also information and security. • Deputy HT STJ had been working hard on it and had done a very good job. • There had been one SAR in the past year which had been resolved but took a lot of time. Care has to be taken with SARS as they can become litigious. When a SAR is first received school has to be careful and tight and in its responses. • A couple of minor privacy of information breaches in past year due to human error (eg a report in wrong folder) 	
4.4	DPO concluded that every year the school was building on this area and getting better.	
4.5	Chair thanked DPO for her presentation and commented favourably on the school's increasing capability on DP as a result of STJ's hard work.	
4.6	<p>Governor Question:- Does DPO expect to see SARS increasing in education setting?</p> <p>DPO:- No not generally but potential there especially when change occurs either in staffing structure or in delivery of services. SARS are generated by unhappy parents so discussion with parents and good liaison can help reduce potential for SARS which are very time consuming on staff time once they are submitted.</p>	
4.7	<p>Governor question:-Clarification of SARS-what exactly do parents want?</p> <p>DPO:-Questions on themselves or their children.</p> <p>Gov:- Often in area of SEN relating to disputed SEN appeals. If parents met with early on they can be avoided. Meadlands was pretty good at that.</p>	
4.8	DPO asked FGB what training existed and it was confirmed that training on DP provided by David Cowley of AfC to all staff had taken place within the last month.	
4.9	DPO suggested that a training session on spotting Phishing emails might be advisable for staff to assist in detecting them. Phishing was becoming more prevalent. Dep HT STJ confirmed it could be included in part of School's annual Online Safety training.	STJ

<p>4.10</p> <p>4.11</p> <p>4.12</p> <p>4.13</p> <p>4.14</p> <p>4.15</p>	<p>Governor Question:- How was information retained? Dep HT:- DfE policy on info retention was followed. Dep HT STJ explained how it was followed and how sensitive information was mostly kept on other databases eg CPOMS. Most sensitive information passed on with children to their next school.</p> <p>SEN information was deleted once Dep HT JB had confirmed it could be deleted without any repercussions from parents. Discussion took place amongst governors on information retained in school to provide staff training and how to anonymise children by redacting names etc. This data was not shared externally.</p> <p>Chair suggested statutory training on DP similar to Safeguarding, to protect the school. Also that there were statutory time limits to meet on SARs (albeit which could be extended depending on circumstances.)</p> <p>Dep HT STJ confirmed there was a SAR flowchart to assist staff on timing requirements.</p> <p>Chair summarised that it was important for the Information Asset Register to be linked to DfE requirements and for audits to be designed to check policy is followed and practices up to date.</p> <p>Governor question:- Was there a Link Governor for this area and should there be one? Chair:- Good question and possibly yes given it was similar to H&S for which there was a Link Governor. LG for this welcomed by Dep HT. Chair to consider.</p>	<p>NS</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p>	<p>Leadership and Management</p> <p><i>HT Report/ SDP updates/SEF updates</i></p> <p>HT's report had previously been shared via GovernorHub and in HT absence Dep HT STJ would be addressing questions raised.</p> <p>Questions raised via GovernorHub were taken first.</p> <p>Governor question:-Re Covid update and decision to 'remove home schooling' option, how many pupils will this impact given current Covid numbers? Dep HT STJ:- Given full provision now occurring back in school eg clubs, parent workshops, assemblies etc it was no longer sustainable to continue full home schooling option. However, a dedicated page on school website would identify objectives and web links/resources for absent children to refer to for continuation of appropriate year group learning when away from school. System in place after Easter.</p>	

	<p>Currently parents have been asked to specifically request home learning to reduce heavy levels of contact with teachers by email.</p>	
5.3	<p>Governor question: - When teachers have COVID is there any remote learning opportunity for children? Dep HT JB:-If a teacher was well enough this could work but currently they have only had one case who was very poorly. Other teachers stood in. Would be considered on a case by case basis.</p>	
5.4	<p>Governor question: - With no COVID rules after Easter would teachers with Covid still be offered the choice to teach remotely? Dep HT:-Depends on cohort but generally better to have teacher in the classroom to provide more effective education.</p>	
5.5	<p>Governor question: - Re CPOMS (Safeguarding software) analysis does SLT have any thoughts about apparently high ratio (49%) of SEND registered children being involved in negative behaviour? Dep HT JB:-School was not concerned at percentage since the vast majority of incidents were of very low level, for example a small push in the playground or an inappropriate word being used. Most is related to the need for social rules learning. Whilst it is difficult to prove Dep HT believed that part of reason for this was that children with reduced school experience, due to COVID school closures, had missed out on the learning of social rules and socialising. This particularly affected Yrs 1 and 3.</p>	
5.6	<p>In addition there was only one child who has been involved in a significant number of occasions and the school was on top of this. Several children had been noted for 3 or 4 incidents but the vast majority only one.</p>	
5.7	<p>Governor question: - How many children were recorded across the school? Deputy HT STJ: - 40 children over all of whom 16 were SEND registered. 9 of the 40 were involved in 3 or more incidents and most appear only in connection with one incident. Deputy HT JB:- commented that in view of school's belief that safeguarding can never be over reported it is possible that a greater number of children registered as SEND would be recorded than non SEND children due to the possibility of Safeguarding context.</p>	
5.8	<p>Governor question: - Could SLT comment on the impact of the war in Ukraine has had on pupils and the school generally? [This was answered under 5.13]</p>	
5.9	<p>Governor question:-Were parents aware of records kept via CPOMS?</p>	

	<p>Dep HT STJ:- Yes if there were a significant number or a pattern emerging, otherwise no.</p>	
5.10	<p>Governors then discussed this in relation to Subject Access Requests (SARs) and the balance that needed to be taken in school about keeping records, informing parents etc. It was agreed that in the main measures taken in school should remain in the school unless the level was such that parents should be informed.</p>	
5.11	<p>Governor suggestion:- Did there need to be a policy setting this out so that if protocol was questioned by parents the policy existed to demonstrate it had been thought through?</p> <p>Chair suggested SLT consider this and also check there is no unconscious bias in reporting between SEND/non SEND pupils.</p>	SLT
5.12	<p>Governor comment:- This links to Behaviour Policy and the approach taken by teachers to issues. Good training and supervision needed on this.</p>	
5.13	<p>Governor question:- Was the school anticipating any influx of refugee children and if so what provisions had been made for this?</p> <p>Dep HT JB:- The school had identified three families of Ukrainian or Russian origin and had reached out to them. The families had been very grateful and appreciated the contact. There were only a small number of very directly affected pupils but in general there had been lots of questions from Children about the war. Careful teaching had taken place in KS 2 regarding anxiety and the war. PHSE lessons had covered this mainly in KS 2. With younger children in KS 1 it had been dealt with on a child by child basis. It had not been such a general issue for this age group. In addition information had been sent to parents on the topic of news and children.</p>	
5.14	<p>Deputy HT STJ would be attending training in week commencing 21st March regarding the national scheme to support Ukrainian families in UK. The local authority was expecting the first Ukrainian refugee families in the same week. However because Meadlands had very few school places it was likely that if fewer refugee children would become Meadlands' pupils. More spare places existed in other local schools and especially in Kingston.</p>	
5.15	<p>Governor suggestion:- School may be required to go over capacity to accommodate refugees and deputy HT agreed. The school would do what was necessary.</p>	
5.16	<p>Governors were informed that the possibility of a school fundraiser for Ukraine had been considered but after discussion by SLT it was</p>	

	<p>decided not to pursue this, due to the concerns of pupils over the war and School's approach to dealing with it, the current cost of living crisis and the fact that many parents would have individually already donated to Ukraine charity support.</p> <p>5.17 Instead parents had been signposted to where continuing support for Ukraine could be given, should they so wish.</p> <p>Following further discussion, Governors agreed this course of action.</p> <p>5.18 Governor question:- Had there been any impact on school of families hit by cost of living crisis? Dep HT JB:- PPG pupil numbers had risen during Covid period and was expected to rise again as a result of the cost of living crisis.</p> <p>5.19 Governors discussed the situation for families not in receipt of benefits assistance and also the general situation that 1 in 5 families on Universal Credit were slipping into debt. The crisis was affecting everyone. School acknowledged it was more difficult to identify the families 'just about managing'. School conscious of the squeeze on everyone and was being very careful re cost of school trips and being as economical as possible, finding alternative payment options etc.</p> <p>5.20 Governor question:- Back to CPOMS- what is relationship between records on here and SEND? Dep HT ST:- offers to bring this to next FGB to explain. Governors agreed.</p> <p>5.21 Governor question: - HT report refers to staff wellbeing –and the impact of workload, budget restrictions etc on staff- Was the school tapping in to all that's possible regarding volunteers? Dep HT STJ: - A volunteer's coffee morning was attended by 21 people and 9 have so far been secured as regular volunteers. Some still needed to undertake Level 1 LSCB safeguarding training and STJ hoped for additional volunteers. It was working well with volunteers' skill sets being matched to the needs of the school. Eg reading, SEND, maths.</p> <p>5.22 Second drive to recruit volunteers would occur after Easter. Time requirements of safeguarding training were putting off some potential volunteers.</p> <p>Additionally there were parent volunteers.</p> <p>5.23 Governor comment: - Volunteers required management as well as recruitment and this was also a time take on staff.</p>	<p>STJ</p>
--	---	-------------------

<p>5.24</p>	<p>Governor comment:-Governors take up time as well-were governors taking up too much time? Deputy HT JB: - Governors were mindful of the workload on staff and recent adjustments in staff roles meant there needed to be adjustments of governors’ expectations on staff eg PPG review delayed as JB had greater workload with change of teaching role. There was much going on at school presently.</p> <p><i>Policies Approvals</i></p> <p><i>Behaviour Policy Update</i></p>	
<p>5.25</p>	<p>The latest iteration of the new Behaviour Policy had been shared in advance on GovernorHub. It would become less of a guide and more of a policy as it became finalised.</p>	
<p>5.26</p>	<p>The background to the development of the new Behaviour Policy was shared as a pre-recorded audio PowerPoint by the HT, who was unable to attend the meeting.</p>	
<p>5.27</p>	<p>Summary of presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour Policy development was based on Attachment Theory and from ‘attachment aware’ standpoint. • Success of school was based on relationships between children, parents and community • Behaviour was linked to relationship between child and adults, based on how to avoid danger and keep safe. First 5 years (and especially first 3) of child’s life were the most critical in developing strong positive relationship determining behaviours in teen/adult life. • School was therefore crucial in helping to influence future behaviour. • The fundamental choice of how discipline is undertaken – ”frighten a child” into good behaviour? or “educate” them into good behaviour? • Previously approaches were more ‘Behaviourist’, based on rules, rewards and sanctions of a repetitive nature. This comprises passive control, obedience and placed fault on a child taking no account of the child’s needs. HT explained this approach did not work for children from the Care System or those who have experienced trauma. • Whilst Meadlands’ existing Behaviour Policy was aimed at understanding children within the caring and kind environment the school stood for, many aspects still reflected the behaviourist approach (rewards and sanctions) and whilst aims of rewards and sanctions were good, it did not necessarily take account of need. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If behaviour policy was right for the most challenging children it would be right for others too. • HT had worked towards, and achieved, the Attachment Aware School's Award in 2021. This involves a non- judgmental approach, looking to the 'why?' something has happened, was responsive not reactionary, and focused on relationships. It was inclusive and assisted LAC, SEND children especially in EY. • All staff had received Attachment Aware training (DEP HT JB was SEND lead for staff on this). Pastoral leader also trained to high level. Staff SG training level also very high. • Behaviour Policy had been drafted, shared with staff, developed and shared with Link Governor. Policy had been revised in light of comments and a parent working party (of diverse composition) had also undertaken work with it sharing ideas and comments upon it with HT and Link Governor. 	
<p>5.28</p>	<p>Link Governor then outlined the feedback from Parents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very open discussion. • Strong supportive group, largely in favour of approach to shift direction of policy. • Some concern over the loss of celebratory rewards in current system. E.g. celebratory reassembly. Easier to lose punitive element of current approach. • Link Governor shared views of different parents and children on the approach. • Communication between parents and school outlined. Less reliance on email post Covid. Face to face conversations on any issues. Parent with background in communications had offered support in achieving this. • Parents on board with approach but one parent voiced concerns that the policy should be more supportive of victims of negative behaviour. • Link Governor had full confidence in HT's judgement on communications and parents had enabled a very helpful discussion. 	
<p>5.29</p>	<p>Link Governor then outlined next steps on policy:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy would be finalised, put to staff and version written for parents. This could possibly be shared during an 'In safe hands' event and with workshops on attachment and behaviour. • JLT be working with staff on of pupils' version. • Further CPD for staff next school year. • Recognised that there may be early challenges when policy is first implemented. <p>Chair thanked the link governor for all her work, report and attending parent workshop.</p>	

5.30	<p>Governor suggestion: -Regarding transition from email to face to face contact, there could be a log kept at the school gate in morning which noted issues to be passed to class teachers from parents. This would be an auditable method of communication where actions can be tracked in central system.</p> <p>Dep HT JB:- Possible. Would be considered.</p>	
5.31	<p>Governor question: -The home school agreement seemed to have different text now. Governor felt it was too easy to break a prescriptive contract and that it should tie in closely with behaviour policy. Could the wording be less directive? Governors discussed this.</p> <p>Governor comment: - The suggested log may not work for working parents not present at school gate. Email better method of communication.</p> <p>Dep HT JB:- Parents do have individual staff email addresses so that contact was possible for those parents. Teacher workload needed to be balanced.</p>	
5.32	<p>Governor comment:- Agreed with whole concept towards shift in Behaviour Policy but was concerned that it did not necessarily reflect what children see in the wider world outside school- where attachment theory was not the basis.</p>	
5.33	<p>Governor comment:- Felt Behaviour policy reflected behaviour in modern workplace in her experience (co-operative).</p> <p>Governor comment:- Not all workplaces-some were built on leaders 'punishing' others.</p>	
5.34	<p>Chair commented that school was aware of the importance of transitioning children to secondary school where the same basis was not followed.</p>	
5.35	<p>Link Governor commented that behaviour policy based on attachment awareness can help children feel more secure and develop greater resilience which may be required later.</p>	
5.36	<p>Governor comment:- Positive behaviour may need rewarding and other behaviour may require managing. Teachers would have to continue to take into account continuity for children when put into practice. Re Home School agreement, much is quite didactic and maybe JLT need to reflect on content and the language.</p>	
5.37	<p>Chair summarised Board's agreement to the approach being taken to developing the new Behaviour Policy.</p>	

<p>5.38</p> <p>5.39</p> <p>5.40</p>	<p><i>Marking and Feedback Policy</i></p> <p>Governors were to note no changes since last review in 2021</p> <p><i>Relationships policy</i></p> <p>Governors were to note no changes since last review in 2021</p> <p><i>Home / School Agreement</i></p> <p><i>This item was taken later in the meeting to enable JLT to present to the Governing Board (rather than be pre-recorded).</i></p>	
<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>6.6</p> <p>6.7</p>	<p>Budget and Resources</p> <p><i>Draft first Budget 2022-23</i></p> <p>The first draft 2022/23 budget summary and figures (together with a summary note) had been shared via GovernorHub prior to the meeting and had been discussed at the FSG meeting on Monday 14th March.</p> <p>Chair reported to FGB that FSG had discussed the main factors affecting the Budget (Curriculum, Behaviour Policy, new Nursery Building additional resources) and other risk factors such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased energy costs • Potential pension liability (awaiting advice of pension dept) • Rising inflation • Improvements to school estate <p>Chair thanked School Business Manager for her sound financial management which had greatly assisted school.</p> <p>School was in good position financially with healthy out turn for 2021-22 and predicted healthy out turn for next 2 years. School's external financial adviser had commented that not many schools were in this position, leading to questions of 'should more money be spent?' or saved to weather difficult periods ahead?</p> <p>With regular monitoring by FSG it was possible to make decisions about spending/saving money as year progresses.</p> <p>Governors thanked Chair for his summary document explaining Budget position which he had circulated.</p> <p>Governors' questions were then invited.</p> <p>Governor question:-Some aspects of the budget seemed very varied e.g. agency/supply teaching costs and varied insurance costs. Was there an explanation?</p>	

<p>6.8</p> <p>6.9</p> <p>6.10</p> <p>6.11</p>	<p>Chair:-Some costs existed one year but not necessarily the next e.g. pension liability provision or insurance changes. It was nuanced.</p> <p>Governor question: - With regard to school catering could the costs suddenly increase if a contract ended?</p> <p>Chair:-SBM may need to respond to this. Catering contract is with a firm which is part of consortium.</p> <p>LA Governor:- Difficulties with school meals contracts at present. Not easy to deal with-there may be some cutbacks in school in future.</p> <p>Governor comment: -in terms of revenue vs. expenditure an excess of 5% is shown in Yr 3. What is the right way to look at the excess? An excess/cushion? or money that is not being spent on assisting children's learning?</p> <p>Chair: - There was no right level of excess. School had aspirations, and checks occurred with the HT to ensure all needed to be happening in school was happening. Holding some excess funds was prudent but could be spent if needed.</p> <p>Governor: - Reserves were confirmed as shrinking so the excess was not building up.</p> <p>Governors agreed the first draft Budget which would be submitted to AfC by 31st March. Final budget would be submitted in June.</p> <p><i>Nursery Build update</i></p> <p>This item was not discussed.</p>	
<p>5.</p> <p>5.41</p> <p>5.42</p> <p>5.43</p>	<p>Leadership and Management (continued)</p> <p><i>Home / School Agreement</i></p> <p><i>(Item taken out of agenda order to enable JLT to present to the Governing Board).</i></p> <p>Three JLT pupils (two from Yr 4 & one from Yr 6) attended the FGB meeting and presented the content of the new Home School Agreement. They shared the wishes for children and parents that they had worked on.</p> <p>Governor question:- Should some of the parent's responsibilities transfer to children when they were in Yr 6 eg packing own school bag?</p> <p>JLT Member:- Yes</p> <p>Governor Question: - Would it be good to have children helping parents get children ready?</p> <p>JLT member:-Yes it would be good to do things together.</p>	

5.44	Governor question: -would parents and children discuss the home school agreement at home? JLT member: - Yes it might be a help.	
5.45	Dep HT STJ question: - Would it be a good idea if a school suggests that parents sit down with children and discuss the content of the home school agreement? JLT Member: - Yes. The governing board thanked the JLT for their presentation.	
7.	Behaviour and Attitudes <i>Attendance Update</i>	
7.1	<i>Governors had been asked to note the latest data which had been shared prior to the meeting via GovernorHub</i>	
8.	Personal development	
8.1	Due to lack of time, the presentation on Pastoral Care by Claire Davies was shared via GovernorHub rather than presented at the meeting.	
9.0	Governance	
9.1	Due to lack of time the following items were not discussed. <i>Succession Planning</i> <i>Upcoming Governor Visits</i> <i>Training</i> <i>Confirm Link roles and visits schedule</i>	
9.2	LF would now be the Writing Link following her volunteering for the role earlier in the meeting.	
9.3	Link Governors for Early Years AH and CW had undertaken a school visit regarding Early Years and met with Laura Tadman (EY Lead) on 16 th March 2022. Their written report, when complete was shared subsequent to the meeting via GovernorHub.	
9.4	Link Governor's Safeguarding Visit report for Spring Term had been shared via GovernorHub prior to the meeting.	
10.	Safeguarding and Single Central List Update	
10.1	The updated Single Central List was not discussed but was signed following the meeting.	Chair
11.	Minutes of the last meeting –	
11.1	Due to lack of time these were not discussed.	

11.2	The minutes of the last FGB meeting on 27 th January 2022 were received and agreed via GovernorHub subsequent to the meeting as a true and accurate record and would be signed by the Chair.	Chair
12.	Matters Arising	
12.1	Due to lack of time this was not discussed.	
13.	Reflections on the Meeting	
13.1	Due to lack of time this item was not discussed.	
14	Date of Next Meeting	
14.1	The date of the next FGB meeting was scheduled for Thursday 19th May 2022 6.00-8.00pm	Chair

The meeting ended at 9.24am

Signed by the Chair _____

Date _____

Summary of Actions

<i>Item number</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible governor/ Associate Member</i>
2.2	Succession planning document to be circulated	Chair
4.9	Phishing training	STJ
4.15	Consider Link Gov for Data protection	Chair
5.11	Check no unconscious bias re SEND reporting in CPOMS	SLT
5.20	Explanation to FGB in May on relationship between SEND/CPOMS	STJ
10.1	Sign SCL	Chair
11.1	Sign FGB Mins Jan 2022	Chair

List of documents:-

- Draft Agreed FGB Minutes of 27th January 2022
- FGB Actions Log 17th March 2022
- FGB HT Report March 2022
- Meadlands 2022-23 Budget-Final
- Meadlands Budget 2022 Draft 1 Summary
- Attendance Data March 2022
- Behaviour Policy presentation on Attachment (Govs) March 2022
- Draft (vers 3) Relationships, Communication and Behaviour Policy March 2022
- Pastoral Care presentation March 2022 (via GovernorHub)
- Meadlands Fire Risk Assessment March 2022
- Safeguarding Visit Report March 2022
- Meadlands Playground Design Ideas
- Home School Agreement Policy March 2022
- Coming out of Covid-letter to parents for Govs' info