

The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Meadlands Primary School

Approved Minutes of the meeting of the Full Governing Body held at the school on Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 6.00pm

**Constitution, Membership and Attendance**

<b>PARENTS -2</b>	<b>LA-1</b>	<b>STAFF-2</b>	<b>COOPTED -10</b>
Annabelle Hughes (AH)	Penny Frost (PF)	Sophie McGeoch (SMcG)	Karen Harrison (KH)
Nigel Seymour (NS)		Sarah Taunton (ST)	Charlotte McIntyre (CMcl)
			James Greenbury (JG)
			Fiona Stewart (FS)
			Carolyn Dodds (CDo)
			Richard Smith (RS)
			Andree Frieze (AF)
			<b>Marc Rust (MR)</b>
			Ulrich Tiedau (UT)

bold = absent

**Apologies:** Marc Rust

**Absent without apologies:** None

**Also attended:** Alex Colclough (AC)  
Matt Brown AfC Data Manager  
Wendy Norman-Clerk

<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies and Welcome</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.1	Apologies were received and accepted from Marc Rust.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Declarations of Material Interest</b>	
2.1	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 disclosed.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Minutes of the Last Meeting</b>	
3.1	The Minutes of the last meeting were reviewed. The Minutes of the meeting of Thursday 12th October 2018 were <b>agreed</b> and signed as a true and accurate record.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
4.1	Using the Summary of Actions from the previous FGB meeting the Chair focussed on the only matters not arising elsewhere in the	

	<p>Agenda:-</p> <p>4.2 (1.3) All declaration of Pecuniary Interest forms had now been received and the Register of Interests schedule updated to go on the website.</p> <p>4.3 (3.5) Annabelle Hughes and Nigel Seymour were to be the two governors with parent governor status in terms of the Instrument of Governance.</p> <p>4.4 (7.7) Governors comments on SDP had been sent to HT. The SDP had now been finalised and Governors were provided with the parent version of the Plan.</p> <p>4.5 (8.1) SCL for safeguarding had been reviewed and signed.</p> <p>4.6 (9.2) Governors had reviewed training needs and AH had attended Getting to Grips with Governance in the autumn. UT was booked to do the same course shortly and the clerk drew attention to further dates in February when this could be undertaken.</p>	
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.6</p>	<p><b>Analyse School Performance</b></p> <p>Matt Brown (MB), Achieving for Children's (AfC) Data Manager was welcomed to Meadlands School and introduced to governors.</p> <p>MB introduced Analyse School performance (ASP) as the successor system to RAISE on line being the Ofsted Inspection Data Report dated 4<sup>th</sup> January 2018. The presentation of the school's data results was given in the context of the Summary Report which had been tabled. This was similar to the RAISE online dashboard. The school had the full report but the summary was presented a being more user friendly.</p> <p>MB then spent an hour taking the governors through the document highlighting the most important parts and explaining the different ways in which the data was portrayed and could be analysed.</p> <p>Page 1- MB drew governors' attention to the "Areas to Investigate" headline which summarised key 2017 results as well as the summary of 2016 results. Regarding the Coasting Summary, Meadlands had not been coasting in either 2015 or 2016 and was not expected to be coasting in 2017 (update due end Jan 2018). MB also explained that the introduction/summary page of the document was incomplete in that it did not mention KS 1.</p> <p>Page 2-related to whole school context and summarised the school's ethnicity (nb data only captures individual ethnic groups of &gt;5%) showing that 65% pupils were white British and 18% were Asian or of non-white background.</p> <p>School level trends from 2015-2017 were also shown relative to national position on P 2. These showed the school to be closely related to national trends in terms of % eligible for FSM, pupils with SEN support and school deprivation indicator. However the school was in the top quintile for % of pupils with English not believed to be first language and % of pupils with SEN statement or EHC Plan. The school</p>	

	had more girls than boys in the recent past.	
5.7	MB explained that P 3 outlined these characteristics in more detail for 2016-17 and showed the prior attainment of pupils relative to the national averages. The data showed that the school was doing better (and in some cases much better) than the national averages in all years for reading. Only in writing in Yr 2 and Yr 6 did the school fall marginally lower than the national position in terms of writing. In mathematics the school was above national position or very marginally under for all years except Year 2.	
5.8	MB went on to explain that pages 4, 5 and 6 of the report showed completely new figures as this data was recorded differently in the past under the old system.	
5.9	Absence statistics showed only autumn and spring terms. Meadlands was under the national average in terms of absence and this was good.	
5.10	Exclusions, shown on P 5 relate to just one pupil in 2014 and there had been no exclusions since.	
5.11	<b>Governor question:-</b> Why is some data relating to 2017 and some not (as with the absence data)? MB explained that this depended on data collection times and that school would have more up to date data.	
5.12	<b>Governor question:-</b> Could coasting criteria be explained? MB explained the criteria which are set out on P 1 of the report. School would only be coasting if criteria applied over three years. Meadlands would not be coasting for at least three years.	
5.14	P 6 related to KS 2 data compared with KS 1 results and trends over time in reading writing and mathematics. MB explained that this was the single most important page for Ofsted.	
5.15	'All' related whole cohort and the other statistics related to low, middle and high achievers at KS1 and disadvantaged pupils. The latter comprised mostly, but not exclusively PP pupils. Numbers in brackets related to pupil numbers (important in a small school). Pale grey shading indicates low pupil numbers and MB warned to be careful with use of statistics.	
5.16	Overall these showed the school to be performing extremely well in mathematics in 2017.	
5.17	They also showed that low KS 1 achieving pupils had moved to become in the top 24% in the country for reading at KS 2 in 2017.	
5.18	MB encouraged governors to examine the other results on the page in more detail.	
5.19	MB explained that the following pages went into more detail eg Reading Progress on P 7. He outlined to governors how to interpret the presentation of data including that the centre line on Reading Progress data chart related to the national average and that the school's results needed to be to the right hand side of this, which is where the school was. The horizontal lines represented the confidence level of the data. There was therefore a high level of confidence that the cohort attained a	

	well above national average result in reading. Additionally MB pointed out that the vertical green line (at 0.03) shown on the disadvantaged pupils data represented the overall <b>non</b> disadvantaged pupils and was designed to highlight Closing the Gap data.	
5.20	P 7 Scatter diagram shows each pupil and represents them by gender, whether disadvantaged or not and whether SEN.	
5.21	P8 data relates to Reading Attainment and MB explained that the scatter diagram on this page showed a horizontal red line which represented the national average that individual pupils were being compared with.	
5.22	The bar charts were showing in light blue the % achieving expected standards and the dark blue bars showed % achieving higher than expected standards. These showed that Reading attainment for all pupils was above national average and those achieving a high standard also exceeded the national average. Disadvantaged pupils were also either meeting or exceeding national averages in both expected and high standards of attainment.	
5.23	Writing progress (teacher assessed) data was detailed on P 9 and presented in similar way to Reading. The school was achieving higher than national average progress for all pupils and also those who were low, middle and high achievers at KS1 and also disadvantaged pupils who were shown as achieving better than the <b>non</b> -disadvantaged national average.	
5.24	MB invited governor questions on Reading, Writing and Mathematics. He commented that for Mathematics Meadlands was in the top quintile and for other subjects was in the second quintile ie top 40% in country. Governors were informed that Maths results were good because there had been booster classes amongst other things.	
5.25	Discussion then moved on to Writing as detailed on P 10 which was teacher assessed and hence the scatter diagram had a more uniform appearance. Maths progress on P 11 had a more scattered appearance as it had been actually tested whereas teacher assessment for writing placed children in bands.	
5.26	Pages 12-14 continued to represent KS2 data (Mathematics attainment, English Grammar Punctuation and Spelling and Science attainment.)	
5.27	MB then introduced the KS1 data on P 15 which detailed those pupils emerging, meeting expected, exceeding expected standards in reading and Writing and the data for disadvantaged pupils.	
5.28	Presently for EY there was attainment data rather than progress data.	
5.29	<b>Governor question:</b> - When Ofsted question governors on progress they can therefore only be asking about KS2? Yes, MB responded-Be aware of P6 of the document in relation to such questions and use <b>School's internal data.</b> ASP is all historic data and School's own data will be more up to date and details pupils still in the school and who are actually receiving the education not those who have moved on to new year group.	

<p>5.30</p> <p>5.31</p> <p>5.32</p> <p>5.33</p> <p>5.34</p> <p>5.35</p> <p>5.36</p>	<p>P 16 provided the same data for Mathematics and Science and P17 for Phonics. Since the majority of Yr 1 pupils remained into Yr 2 the 2016 Yr 1 children are the 2017 Yr 2 pupils.</p> <p>The data showed that 100% 2017 Yr 2 pupils met the expected standard in phonics having improved upon the 80% who met the expected standard while in Yr 1.</p> <p>MB explained to governors that Early Years (EY) data was expected to be added in to document in future. This would be likely to cover meeting and exceeding goals in Reading, Writing and Mathematics and proportion with a GLD (Good Level of Development).</p> <p><b>Governor question:-</b> How do these results compare with other Richmond Borough schools? In particular where does school fall regarding progress? MB to provide this information but considered Meadlands to rank quite high in Borough.</p> <p><b>Governor comment:-</b>Position of school needs to be considered in light of context of cohort characteristics and not in isolation.</p> <p><b>Governor question:-</b> Presentation has been very interesting-what is of most interest to staff from the report? HT commented that it is a very useful tool-to look at in October and assess trends, relationship to national position. Current position is that cohorts have moved on, school is using internal data to achieve progress. Currently concerning significant groups, the PP progress is not as good as same time last year and therefore lines of enquiry are suggested to improve the situation. In summary the report is good for comparison but is only one of many tools for tracking progress.</p> <p>MB was thanked for his presentation and explanations and he concluded by warning governors to use the report carefully as some data was not present and to look at full report for some of the further information available eg girls/boys achievement (which in this report is only shown on scatter diagrams).</p>	
<p>6.</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p>	<p><b>Committees</b></p> <p>The terms of reference of each of the two committees were reviewed and <b>agreed</b> by the governors.</p> <p><b>Teaching and Achievement</b></p> <p>The minutes of the T&amp;A committee meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017 had been circulated and were received. The Chair then summarised the key areas discussed at the meeting:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports from subject leads on Reading, Writing and EY had been received. Increased % of boys making expected reading progress and renewed focus on spelling in writing.</li> <li>• An update on Challenge project had been received- higher level questions and projects to develop learning behaviour.</li> <li>• CtG data had been presented by the HT-numbers on the register had slightly increased.</li> <li>• PP audit had occurred in November. SIP had been very supportive and stated Meadlands gave strong support to PP</li> </ul>	

<p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>6.6</p>	<p>pupils. Assistant HT would be revamping website on PP Action Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governor visit reports had been presented by CMcl and PF</li> </ul> <p>The chair also reminded T&amp;A committee members of the invitation for nominations for the role of vice chair which would be voted on at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Safety and Resources</b></p> <p>The minutes of the S&amp;R committee meeting of 11th January 2018 had been circulated and were received. A summary of key items discussed was given by the Chair:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding audit reported on (see FGB item 9)</li> <li>• Finances reported on (Reserves were £110,000 at start of year; planned reserves at end of year to be £60,000 but currently looking like being £75,000 due to savings). Steve Llewellyn stated that this was healthy relative to other schools but care needed going forwards not to have too high a reserve at end of year.</li> <li>• Fundraising-decision taken not to ask parents for regular giving. However a £25,000 project to upgrade MUGA (multi use games area) would be launched with parental contributions being looked into as one source of fundraising for it.</li> <li>• SFVS-self assessment of school's controls and capabilities showed it to be strong enough. Chair comfortable with the assessment and governors comments sought on the document. If no comments by 2<sup>nd</sup> February it would be deemed approved.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor question:-</b> What was level of SEN funding? £14,000 more than expected.</p> <p>Chair then explained that a reduction in funding of 1.5% per annum was taking place and that, when costs taken into account (eg teachers' salary increases the real impact of reduced funding was 3-4% pa. This was the financial context the school needed to operate in.</p>	<p>T&amp;A govs</p> <p>Govs</p>
<p>7</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p> <p>7.4</p>	<p><b>Head Teachers Report</b></p> <p><b><i>Autumn term full school progress report</i></b></p> <p>The HT had previously circulated her report which reviewed autumn term data and invited governors' questions prior to the meeting. She then summarised important aspects of the report and those areas on which governor questions had been received.</p> <p><i>School Characteristics</i></p> <p>She outlined that the school roll was really healthy with only spaces available in Yr 2 (the entry year affected by the expansion of The Russell School and by RI Ofsted findings of Meadlands).</p> <p>Intake for September 2018 was set to be the highest ever.</p> <p>Numbers of children on Safeguarding Register had dropped (but changes all the time) and also some children who may be borderline</p>	

	and need attention.	
7.5	<b>Governor question:-</b> If at Meadlands PP pupil numbers are falling, Safeguarding statistics are improving and the school roll is healthy-is this a function of the area becoming gentrified? Deputy HT suggests that the answer could be derived from deprivation data but that there had been much change over the last 10 years. House prices had risen and there was a lack of affordable larger housing.	
7.6	Governors, including those who were familiar with the area for many years discussed the matter and a parent governor suggested that currently with demand for school places parents have little real choice over schools.	
7.7	The LA governor contributed that her involvement in social issues connected with the various local schools had been sought only once in connection with Meadlands, none with The Russell and several with St Richards.	
7.8	The HT and Deputy HT commented in response to the governor's follow up question that the school was proud to be all inclusive and to offer places to children who may be denied a school place by other schools in spite of perhaps challenging circumstances. Whatever change was happening in the area it would continue to have that objective. Challenges changed and though the number of Free School Meals (FSM) pupils had dropped, the number of EAL (English as an additional language) had risen in recent years.	
	<i>Effectiveness of School Leadership and Management</i>	
7.9	HT reported in the governor visits which had taken place since the last FGB meeting.	
7.10	Regarding extra curricular clubs, HT reported that 51% of PP pupils attended a club and 63% of SEND children attended one. (This was part of the Action Plan for SEND).	
7.11	Continuing Professional development (CPD) for staff had improved to a good provision now. Sarah Taunton had started the SWLSEP leadership programme and Jess Bunker had begun NPQSL senior leadership training. Dani Mace had been offered a fellowship with LRTT and would be working in Ghana for three weeks at the end of the summer term.	
7.12	The Teach Direct Scheme was in progress and support staff would benefit from a Teach Meet event this term.	
7.13	A VIP morning is due next week for parents to come into school and talk with pupils.	
7.14	<b>Governor question:-</b> Why had the HT assessed the school overall as Good and not Outstanding in her report? HT explained that this was because she wanted to be really secure in its position before assessing it as such and whilst many areas were outstanding, there were some areas that were good rather than outstanding. The School Improvement Partner (SIP) would soon be visiting the school again to	

	validate HT's judgement through lesson observations.	
7.15	HT explained that it took time for new teachers to get into the Meadlands way of teaching. HT wanted school to be consistently outstanding and not in particular areas only. She sought both core and non core curriculum to be outstanding. In addition to the SIP visit a senior leader from a local school had also been invited to observe Meadlands and comment critically to assist the SLT in getting to outstanding.	
7.16	<b>Governor comment:-</b> welcomes collaboration with other schools and the HTs involvement now with Greycourt School where she led whole school training on the primary curriculum as well as two day inspection of Grey Court. Useful learning exercise for both schools.	
7.17	<b>Governor question:-</b> What had the HT learned from this? HT responded that leadership (middle to senior) was important, that leadership should be research focussed, and that when a school is outstanding it is at cutting edge and uses its research.	
7.18	HT commented that she had taught Spanish to Yrs 7/8/9 at Greycourt and Greycourt teachers had swapped to Meadlands to teach Yr 5/6, following which a discussion on best practice in transition had taken place. This evidence had now fed in to the Meadlands' discussion on curriculum delivery.	
7.19	Although HT described Multi Academy Trusts (MATs) as being a low priority presently, the collaboration between Meadlands and other primary and secondary schools in the local area was very important and successful. She reported to governors that Meadlands had a strong status in the area now.	
7.20	<b>Governor question:-</b> How is attendance at Meadlands? Could the report to governors highlight persistent absenteeism? Yes, HT will do. HT went on to explain the process of following up absentees with parents/carers and the involvement of the Educational Welfare Officer (EWO). 96.5% is attendance target at Meadlands (much higher than other schools). A warning goes to families of pupils on 92% attendance as 90% is threshold. Absenteeism tends to be illness related in younger pupils and welfare related in older ones.  <i>Outcomes for Pupils</i>	SMcG
7.21	The HT introduced the Whole School Academic Target Data, outlining that middle leaders were responsible. Key children are identified by subject leaders and the information is shared with class teachers.	
7.22	<b>HT highlighted certain areas:-</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Nursery there had been a drop between baseline and expected outcome in writing and as with whole school this was to be a focus of effort. It was typical as children integrated into school at different times and not alarming.</li> <li>• KS1 was a real strength of the school. In both attainment and progress. Yr2 targets on track to be met.</li> <li>• Yr 3 target setting had been changed since previous years and as curriculum demanded more pupils were now given time to</li> </ul>	

	<p>develop and meet targets by Yr 6. High targets along the way are still aspired to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yr 4 had received many observations with SIP and had middle leader assistance. Presently behind some targets but half term review would help identify particular areas to focus on. It is a challenging year group with many SEN pupils as well as PP children and those with safeguarding issues, many of which are intertwined.</li> </ul>	
7.23	<p><b>Governor question:-</b> Current Yr 4 appeared to do well on ASP data-how is this reconciled with above statement? HT commented that part of cohort is very able and part has great needs. The year group has very broad spectrum and has extra TAs to assist with this. Also a senior leader assists with setting more work for the more able children.</p>	
7.24	<p><b>Governor question:-</b> Can see the benefit of extra teachers but how does SLT manage with extra people in a class? HT responded saying there was more brainstorming and ideas circulated and experiences shared to move forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yr 6 current data looked like some targets might not be met but HT reassured governors that data was looked at every week and advisors brought in to assist where necessary. HT was confident Yr 6 would move on quickly. Experience had shown that it may be advisable to alter Yr 5 teaching to assist pupils meet Yr 6 challenges eg hour long comprehension practice.</li> <li>Yr 5 children were being screened to show which children needed to make larger steps. Such reports shared with Class teacher and support staff. HLTAs could give 1:1 support in writing and maths where required.</li> </ul>	
7.25	<p><b>Governor question:-</b> Are targets for Meadlands aiming to put school in top 10% for progress nationally? HT confirmed this. As a small school it may end up being in top 15% as small number variations in pupils individual circumstances had greater effect on school results.(1 pupil can equal 3-4% of cohort.)</p>	
7.26	<p><b>Governor comment:-</b> Some of outcomes of data (good years/less good years) are hard to interpret especially for governors not on T&amp;A committee. Could it be colour coded to assist? Chair of T&amp;A committee explained that Closing the Gap (CtG) data identified progress and which pupils needed to be assisted.</p>	
7.27	<p>HT explained that fundamentally target data was a tool for the school and worked well. It was non colour coded so that governors could analyse and not be dictated to.</p>	
7.28	<p>Chair suggested governors could meet with HT outside of FGB meeting to understand how the school uses the data.</p> <p><i>AF left the meeting at 7.55pm to attend another meeting.</i></p>	
8.	<p><b>Review of SDP and spring term priorities</b></p>	
8.1	<p>The review and spring term priorities had been set out in HT report under Item 7.</p>	

9.	<b>Safeguarding and Single Central List Update-Update on Safeguarding Audit</b>	
9.1	The safeguarding governor reported on her findings from undertaking the Safeguarding Audit. Her report and the audit had been circulated prior to the meeting. She explained that AH was shadowing her safeguarding role and also undertook the governor visit with her, also meeting with the Deputy HT.	
9.2	FS reported on the Audit which took place over 3 hours on 10 <sup>th</sup> January and outlined what it comprised (meeting with staff, pupils and School Business Manager. Questions in a lengthy document needed to be addressed as part of the audit and the safeguarding governor confirmed that all staff had good knowledge of safeguarding procedures, that pupils were well aware and that child protection, behaviour and on line safety policies had all recently been updated.	
9.3	Within the borough the school was very good at safeguarding pupils and benefitted from AC's membership of the LCSB (London Councils Safeguarding Board) as well as other schools benefitting from her experience. The safeguarding link governor had now trained to level 3 and all staff and governors were receiving safeguarding training.	
9.4	Deputy HT explained that she had established junior safeguarding leads so that the JLT now covered all areas of school life. She outlined that recently there had been the safeguarding governor visits, joint monthly safeguarding visits with HT and a survey of pupils' online habits. The protocol for visitors to the school was that they would wear a green lanyard if they were DBS checked and red lanyards if not. This practice was welcomed by governors and it was suggested it should be a borough wide policy. Deputy HT to take this suggestion to LSCB.	
9.5	Additionally in terms of safeguarding it was reported that a new Safer Recruitment Plan was being developed for the school as well as a new Emergency Management Plan.	
9.6	<b>Governor question:</b> - Have there been any significant safeguarding issues at the school?-No there had been none.	
9.7	<b>Governor question:-</b> Did the deputy HT have enough time available to deal with safeguarding? Yes, 1 of 4 days per week was spent on safeguarding. Previously it had been 2 of 3 days so situation had currently improved but governors were informed that this could change quite quickly.	
9.8	The Deputy HT then described that currently there were no pupils with Child Protection Plans, one pupil with a Children in Need Plan, other cases where family support was involved and 4 referrals to Childrens' Services. There were 3 pupils receiving Early Health Assistance and 2 Looked after Children in school.	
9.9	Governors thanked the Safeguarding Lead for her report and her successful work and the Safeguarding Governor for her audit and report.	

9.10	JoG would update the list and it would be signed by the Chair.	JoG
<b>10</b>	<b>Governance and Training</b>	
10.1	The FGB had been informed that Emma Vetriano had resigned after attending one meeting and there was thus one vacancy for coopted governor on the FGB. The clerk confirmed that the names of the two new parent governors had been conveyed to the Local authority.	
10.2	The T&A committee needed a Vice Chair and nominations were invited to be conveyed to the Chair.	
10.3	Regarding training the clerk highlighted that specific training for parent and staff governors was available and also that Data Protection Training was also available and could potentially be important with the incoming new Data Protection regulations in May 2018. <b>Governors suggested and it was agreed</b> that a Data Protection item be included on the agenda of the next FGB meeting in April.	Clerk
<b>11.</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
11.1	The date of next meeting was agreed as <b>Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018</b>	
<b>12</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
12.1	The LA Governor informed the FGB that she had organised a symposium on the Mental Health of Children and Young People which was to take place at Meadlands School on Monday 19 <sup>th</sup> February at 7.30pm and to which governors were invited. As well as representatives of Achieving for Children, consultant psychologists, SENCOs and the head of the Emotional Wellbeing Service would be presenting on the subject.	

The meeting ended at 8.15 pm.

Signed by the Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Summary of Actions

<i>Item number</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible governor/ Associate Member</i>
5.33	Information to be provided on ASP as requested	Matt Brown
6.3	Nominations for VC of T&A cttee	T&A govts
6.4	Review and Comments if applicable on SFVS to JGr by 2 <sup>nd</sup> February	All govts
7.20	HT report to include figs on persistent absenteeism	SMcG
9.10	Update and sign SCL	JoG
10.3	Item on Data Protection-April FGB	Clerk

List of documents:-

- Updated terms of reference for the committees
- FGB Minutes of 12th October 2017
- T&A Committee Minutes of 18<sup>th</sup> January 2018
- S&R Committee Minutes of 11<sup>th</sup> January 2018
- SFVS Assessment Form
- HT Report-Autumn term
- Safeguarding Audit form
- Safeguarding Report
- Safeguarding Governor's Visit form
- Healthy Living Governor Visit report
- SMSC Governor Visit Report
- SDP-parent version
- Inspection Data Summary Report (unamended 2017) 4<sup>th</sup> January 2018

NB-highlighted sections reflect areas of particular governor focus in meeting