

**GOVERNING BODY FOR ST JOHN'S CE PRIMARY SCHOOL N20**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE SCHOOL ON  
TUESDAY 20 NOVEMBER 2018 AT 19:00**

**MEMBERS**

**FOUNDATION GOVERNORS**

Mrs Lynne Evans (*PCC*) (Chair)  
Mrs Imogen Hall (*PCC*) (Vice Chair)  
\* Ms Loretta Okpokiri (*LDBS*)  
Mr Jaime Goumal (*PCC*)  
Mrs Rachel Adams-Constantine (*PCC*)  
Mrs Alice Gavin Atashkar (*Deanery/Synod*)

**LA GOVERNOR**

Christine Richardson

**EX OFFICIO PRIEST IN CHARGE**

Revd. Lynn Davidson

**PARENT GOVERNORS**

Dr Ajanta Kamal  
Mr Rupert Coles  
Mr Ben Pullenayegum

**EX OFFICIO HEADTEACHER**

Mr Curtis Sweetingham

**STAFF GOVERNOR**

Mrs Donna Tidiman (maternity leave)  
Mrs Alison Cruickshank (interim)

**ASSOCIATE MEMBERS**

Mrs Catherine Mitri

\* Denotes member NOT present

**In attendance:** Elina Burgess

**MINUTES**

**PART I**

*Opening Prayer by Reverend Lynn Davidson.*

		<b>Action</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome, attendance and apologies</b>	
1.1	The Chair opened the meeting and noted that apologies had been received from Loretta Okpokiri as she had just returned from holiday that day. Loretta's apologies were accepted.	
1.2	New governors Alison Cruickshank, Ajanta Kamal and Rupert Coles were warmly welcomed to the meeting and introductions from all governors took place, including an outline of their committees and professional skillsets.	
1.3	The Chair advised that Elina Burgess was attending as an observer only as her tenure as a Parent Governor	

	had come to an end.	
1.4	The Chair then proceed to thank Elina for all of her work and being such an integral member of the Board, being the longest serving governor and part of the Ofsted Committee and presented her with a small gift from the Governors as a way of thanks.	
1.5	EB responded to say that it had been an amazing time to be a governor and the journey that everyone had been on was huge. She wished the Board every success in the future.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Register of Business Interests</b>	
2.1	The Chair confirmed that all new governors had completed their Register of Business Interests and this was now final and uploaded to the website.	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Declaration of Pecuniary Interests</b>	
3.1	None received.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Minutes of the FGB held on 11 September 2018 Part I and Matters Arising</b>	
4.1	Governors agreed that the minutes were a true reflection of the meeting and the Chair signed the Part I Minutes for file.	
4.2	No matters arising	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Committee Reports – Verbal updates</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Personnel</b>	
5.1.1	Further to the minutes of the Personnel meeting circulated, the Chair outlined the main activities of the recent meeting.	
5.1.2	Both Chair and Vice Chair of the Personnel Committee had been elected and the Terms of Reference had been approved.	
5.1.3	The HT Performance Review had been scheduled with	

	an external advisor and the PM Review Panel.	
5.1.4	Anonymised appraisals of teaching staff had been reviewed to check that they were being conducted.	
5.1.5	The Committee discussed and approved the pay for all teaching staff to be in line with the Pay Policy (previously approved). The Committee also discussed the government funding the difference between the standard 1% pay rise annually awarded to teaching staff and the 3.5% pay rise that has been strongly recommended for M1 and M6's. The Committee agreed to apply the recommended pay rises across the board of all teaching staff because otherwise we would not be in line with the Pay Policy that was recommended by LDBS and if the Committee had failed to do so, teachers would be on a completely different pay scale to their peer groups at other schools.	
5.1.6	With regards to the funding from the government, for various reasons the school ended up a little bit in the black rather than in the red, so we were not losing money	
5.1.7	It was noted that support staff are due to be getting a much larger percentage pay increase as recommended by their various unions. The school have not yet had confirmation on the exact increase or whether any funding will be forthcoming from the government to cover the costs. It could cost the school an additional £25k.	
5.1.8	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>MOTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">RESOLVED that, because of its nature, the business to be transacted be treated as confidential and not for publication. Discussion moved to Part II.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Part I Resumed)</p>	
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Admissions</b>	
5.2.1	Chair of Admissions Committee provided a verbal update on their recent meeting. The panel met due to a couple of proposed changes to Admissions Policy. At the meeting it was decided that the school did not need to go to formal consultation for a revision to the policy as it would, indeed, remain unchanged.	<b>JG chase LDBS &amp; LA for updated parish road</b>

5.2.2.	Roads on the Parish list still need to be updated despite liaison with LDBS and the LA.	<b>list</b>
5.2.3	A second proposed change was whether the school needed to amend the policy to allow for classes of more than 30 pupils due to exceptional circumstances. Having re-read and discussed the policy, governors decided that the provision was already included.	
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Teaching &amp; Learning Standards</b>	
5.3.1	The Chair of TLS outlined that the structure of TLS meetings has changed. One is held during school time and one in the evenings. The school time meeting would always include a governor visit to classrooms and, where possible, pupil voice and meetings with subject leaders. The evening meetings would focus more on data and policies.	
5.3.2	In the recent school visit, governors met with a random selection of children receiving interventions and also met with the Inclusion Leader. Having already met with the Maths and English subject leads, Inclusion was the next logical step, especially with SEND being a prominent focus of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).	
5.3.3	Governors reported that it was a joy to go around the school. They saw a mix of activities from YN in the library, YR having a very calm reading session (English), Y1 doing gym (PE) in the hall with all of the equipment out, Y3 were learning about the Stone Age (history), Y4 were making volcanoes (science), Y5 were just coming back from swimming and Y6 were doing maths. It was a great example for the governors of a broad and balanced curriculum with lots of fun learning.	
5.3.4	<p>RAC outlined the learnings from the pupil voice session. She summarised that the randomly selected group of children were given large sheets of paper and asked to show visually what they were learning in their interventions.</p> <p>Some examples were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I do rapid maths at school and I think it's really fun and it helps me a lot. Some things are tricky though and if they are, we go over it again.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We can have a chocolate finger if we remember a full stop and if we work really hard, we can use an app.</li> <li>- When asked if they like the sessions, the reply was "I like biscuits, so why not?"</li> </ul> <p><b>Q: A governor asked how the child is involved in the decision to be included in the intervention.</b></p> <p>A: They are all away of why they are there, but take on board the question and something to think about in future.</p>	
5.3.5	<p>Governors heard about the session with the Inclusion Leader and how the interventions were a new programme that the school has implemented since September. Sessions were aimed at directly targeting children who need a boost. It was too early to tell whether the sessions were successful, but new micro-tracking is being used to keep up-to-date with what is happening in every session. The TAs were really enjoying ownership of the sessions and were delivering the "off the shelf" products exactly as instructed. This also helped in case of absence in that any other member of staff could pick up the folders and deliver the lessons as planned.</p>	
5.3.6	<p>Governors then heard about the TLS evening meeting, which was moved in order to help staff not to have to spend too many late nights at school that week. It wasn't quite as streamlined as usual due to some governors not being able to attend and the HT being called away periodically to deal with urgent school business. However, it was an excellent meeting by way of progress and content.</p>	
5.3.7	<p>The committee had a great religious life update including learning about the service that children attended at St Paul's Cathedral, how the Faith Council is really well established and how the school contributes to the Church Magazine. There was also a discussion about sharing RE data at future TLS meetings.</p>	
5.3.8	<p>The committee talked about Pupil Premium (PP) but noted that the strategy is due to be rewritten for the new financial year. The gap is diminishing but this is still a great focus in the school. The committee did not discuss SEND or Safeguarding in detail as they were both being covered elsewhere. The HT noted</p>	

	that an awful lot of work still needed to be done on PP to close the gap.	
5.3.9	Governors heard that the TLS structure had changed a little in that SLT would give reports at the committee meetings with the link governors providing the challenge. It is hoped that this would avoid repetition at meetings and also reduce SLT workload.	
5.3.10	SEND policy was updated and ratified.	
5.3.11	The big success story was the unvalidated data for YR, Y2 and Y6 in the 2017-18 school year. Congratulations were given to the Y6 teacher specifically.	
5.3.12	Brief discussion about EYFS working at GLD as this should have been higher given the trajectory of previous years. It was noted, as every year, that in a one-form entry school, data will be very much cohort specific.	
5.3.13	With regard to KS2 data, writing results were a little lower than the other scores, but this is not an issue of concern to the Board given that the assessment differs and that the assessment method is a concern nationally, not just at St John's or within Barnet.	
5.3.14	A governor noted that the attainment overall was something to really celebrate.	
5.3.15	The HT thanked the governor for her support and presented a new document referred to as SOAP (School on a Page) which outlined key school information for governors. The document clearly showed many achievements to celebrate, although one area still to work on was PP.	
5.3.16	Going back to data, the HT noted that KS1 to KS2 progress measures were a big factor as to whether the school could move from Good to Outstanding on future Ofsted inspections.	
5.3.17	The HT provided an explanation of the progress scores. DfE give a point score to levels achieved in Y2 (old style 3, 4 etc.) and then given a score for their achievements in Y6 with a starting point of zero (0). For example, reading points are +2.07 which means our children achieved 2 points above national average. Maths was +1.94 – again a positive.	

	<p>Writing however was -1.49 (negative) and despite being negative, was considered to be in the “average” band of progress.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked why it was deemed average.</b>  A: The DfE look at all schools nationally, their band and scores achieved.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked where it is shown what the average band is?</b>  A: There isn’t anywhere – you are told by DfE.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked if the average was against broadly similar schools?</b>  A: No, it is against all schools nationally.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the TLS Chair for such a comprehensive verbal report.</p>	
<p><b>5.4</b></p>	<p><b>Finance &amp; Premises</b></p>	
<p>5.4.1</p> <p>5.4.2</p> <p>5.4.3</p>	<p>Chair of the F&amp;P committee advised that the committee has been split into two separate reporting formats since September due to the “Priority List” taking up too much of the meeting. As such, the committee would meet face-to-face to coincide with filing deadlines of finance documentation to the LA, which is three times per year.</p> <p>The committee now convenes via telephone dial-in (not minuted) to discuss the Priority List two or three times per term. There is an ever-growing list of maintenance that is required and there is not enough money to keep on top it; as such the committee must prioritise – hence the “Priority List”.</p> <p>With regards to the budget, it was reported that the LA had changed the format of how finances were recorded which was incredibly frustrating and did not allow the committee to fully grasp the details of the budget. Everything that was previously a plus is now a minus and vice versa. It was commented that if you had any knowledge of how a budget normally works, the new reporting was nothing like that. The committee could not stress that enough and so have complained to Nick Adams, within the LA Finance department.</p>	

5.4.4	Finances were noted as broadly being OK for this current financial year, not great the year after and worse the year after that. A further meeting was planned for January and the committee would provide a more detailed report at the next FGB.	<b>Action: F&amp;P provide detailed report at next FGB</b>
5.4.5	The only streams of controllable income were Breakfast Club and After School Club. The numbers are doing well there which is a positive stream of income.	
5.4.6	There are challenges around staff pay increases but thankfully there is help from the government this year. It was acknowledged that the assistance was likely to be one-off and that these increases would therefore continue to be a great challenge.	
5.4.7	<p>Other news is that pupil roll for nursery places fell from 26 to 20 which meant that the school received less funding than expected, but the same model of staff has to be paid for. The Board will need to keep a careful watch and decide whether it will be feasible to keep the nursery open in the future if pupil roll continues to fall.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked if the fall in numbers was due to only having one intake of pupils vs staggered intake.</b></p> <p>A: No, it is due to parents choosing to keep their children at private nurseries instead.</p>	<b>Action: F&amp;P Committee to review each meeting and bring any proposals to FGB for changes to provision</b>
5.4.8	Discussion took place on the school nursery needing to run to school hours and within term time constraints whereas private nurseries do not.	
5.4.9	It was noted that it is now increasingly difficult to run a one-form entry school as there is no benefit of scale. Tight staffing models, very little controllable income and increasing costs are only likely to make this situation considerably worse.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Barnet Council Consultation – Update</b>	
6.1	The Chair took the opportunity to follow on from the Finance update with an update on the LA Consultation on financing and moved the item up on the agenda.	
6.2	The Chair thanked the Board for their considerable input and feedback to the previously circulated	

	<p>Consultation Document and advised that the Chair, Vice Chair and Chair of F&amp;P attended a recent group meeting of various governors within Barnet in order to gauge opinion on the consultation.</p>	
6.3	<p>Out of that meeting, an open letter was created and sent to the Director of Education and Skills (LA) voicing Barnet Governors' concerns and raising questions of the consultation to be addressed at the forthcoming presentation to governors on 14/11/18.</p>	
6.4	<p>The Chair summarised that the meeting on 14/11 was very busy and estimated that around 70% of the Borough's schools were represented, quite unprecedented. The Director of Education and Skills had been told by LA Officers that his department needs to make cuts and the proposals were approved by the Chief Executive of the LA prior to them being announced at the Schools Forum, and then sent to schools.</p>	
6.5	<p>As a result of the meeting, various conversations with other schools in the Borough and conversations between the HT, DHT, Chair and Vice Chair and taking note of the Board's feedback, the school has decided to vote NO to all 3 proposals.</p>	
6.6	<p>The Chair advised that it was not a decision taken lightly and amongst the group people had different leanings. However, with making sure children are at the centre of our thinking, it was felt that because the school simply does not have the money (and as governors we have financial responsibility for the school) we could not vote yes to any cuts to our budget.</p>	
6.7	<p>The vote would be cast by the school and the responses then go to the Schools Forum. The SF then have to vote on the proposals/consultation, based on responses from the schools. It was noted that the Schools Forum was in the main, made up of Headteachers and Governors and thus, whatever the majority vote ended up being, it would be expected to be replicated by the vote within the Schools Forum.</p>	
6.8	<p>After the Schools Forum meeting, the decision then goes to the Children's Education and Safeguarding Committee (CES). If votes to 1 and 3 on the consultation are "No", the CES decide whether to refer to the Secretary of State. It eventually goes</p>	

<p>6.9</p> <p>6.10</p> <p>6.11</p>	<p>back to the LA around February.</p> <p>The Chair summarised that there were several processes involved and the only thing the school could do was cast their own vote. The Chair and HT would be attending the Schools Forum meeting (HT as lead representative, Chair as alternative) and therefore would have a further vote and be in a stronger position to affect the outcome than many other schools.</p> <p>The Chair updated the Board on the group “Barnet Governors” in that they were aiming to be a collaboration amongst all governors (as opposed to just Chairs and Vice Chairs) and hoped to be one voice, standing shoulder to shoulder with HTs.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked if the Chair had a sense of how schools were going to vote?</b></p> <p>A: A HT survey had been sent out asking schools if A) they had good reserves and the cuts would not make much of a difference or B) their finances were tight or in deficit and the cuts would make a huge difference to their viability or ability to provide education. The result was over 90% B. Therefore the sense is that schools would vote “No”.</p> <p>The Chair recalled a conversation at the Director’s Briefing with Alison Dawes (LA pupil roll forecaster) who advised that pupil rolls are set to fall for at least the next 5 years within the Borough. Numbers had peaked in Barnet a few years ago, with a number of expansions at that time; now Barnet is on a drastic decline. However, some areas in the Borough are still oversubscribed by way of applications vs places and the LA are having to provide additional educational facilities. St John’s was in Planning Area 2 which is set to see a drop over next 5 years, despite all of the new residential developments. There are projected spaces in schools in our Planning area and this could pose difficulty for us in the future. The Chair concluded by stating that the Board must have a strategic plan for this going forward and it must not be ignored.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked if St John’s was typically oversubscribed?</b></p> <p>A: Yes in the main school but this year have taken a hit on nursery places.</p>	
------------------------------------	---	--

<b>7.0</b>	<b>Headteacher Report</b>	
7.1	The Chair invited questions and comments on the HT report, page by page.	
7.2	<p>Page 4. A governor commented that 98% attendance is fantastic and commended the SLT on all of their efforts.</p> <p><b>Q: Page 4. A governor queried the number of the pupils on roll = 230. Was that YR-Y6 or including nursery.</b></p> <p>A: Included nursery. Full from YR-Y6 (210) and the 20 additional were nursery numbers.</p> <p><b>Q: Page 5. A governor asked what constitutes children with medical conditions as the numbers seem very high.</b></p> <p>A: Anything the parents disclose. Many of these are allergies and could just be "hayfever".</p> <p><b>Q: Page 5 A governor asked what is the difference between the categories of vulnerable and disadvantaged children. Throughout the Report there numbers are similar, but different terminology is used, which governors found confusing.</b></p> <p>A: Disadvantaged pupils is any child that has received Free School Meals (FSM) in the past 6 years and also service children who are deemed disadvantaged because their schooling could move around a lot. HT will double check use of consistent terminology for next HT Report</p> <p><b>Q: Page 6 Leadership and Management. A governor noted that there were blanks against "sharing of planning with colleagues" and asked the reason for this</b></p> <p>A: Lots of sharing of planning with colleagues takes place informally and specifically with KS Leaders, but there has not been the opportunity to conduct this formally yet this term. When conducted formally, feedback is offered.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor noted that a therapy counsellor was mentioned in the report and asked the SLT to provide more information?</b></p> <p>A: School has had one counsellor through the resilience project with the LA. A gentleman comes in every Wednesday to provide a therapy</p>	<p>HT review HT Report and consistent use of terminology for disadvantaged and vulnerable pupils</p>

	<p>session with 4 children. The therapy has parental support and feedback has thus far been very positive.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked how the children were determined for the therapy sessions?</b></p> <p>A: Discussion amongst SLT as to who they felt needed it most. Discussion with relevant parents too.</p> <p><b>Q: Page 7. A governor questioned the comment "battling KS1 data" and asked for more information.</b></p> <p>A: The HT responded that all schools are battling progress data but he wanted to talk about the writing in particular. The HT outlined challenges in assessment methods as follows:</p>	
7.3	At KS1 SATS, points are allocated to pupils for working towards, working at and working above.	
7.4	At KS2 SATS, a different set of points are allocated to pupils for the same boxes.	
	<p>WB: 94-104</p> <p>WA: 105-110</p> <p>GLD: 111+</p>	
7.5	Even though a pupil could achieve a score anywhere from 94+, their writing paper would only be allocated one pre-determined score. Working towards (94), working at (104) and working above / GLD (111).	
7.6	Example: If a pupil received 10 points at KS1 (working at), DfE would fully expect them to be at the same level at KS2, if not greater. Score for combined Working At at KS2 is 105. Writing is one point lower from DfE (104). If that "10" child therefore obtained Working AT at KS2 in writing, they could achieve 108 BUT would only be given a score of 104 meaning that their progress was deemed to have not been met, because the WA score is 105.	
7.7	The Chair noted that external moderation is frequent at St John's which does ensure that governors know the teacher assessments are sound.	
	<p><b>Q: Page 9. A governor queried the acronym MFL.</b></p> <p>A: Modern Foreign Languages</p>	

<p>7.8</p>	<p><b>Q: Page 10. A governor asked what inspirational courses the SLT were planning to attend and what impact the school would see as a result of this training.</b></p> <p>A: The course intends to change mindset. The author of a book is running the course, which is very popular and not often available. The HT had attended a course by this author in the past and felt that his learnings were reflected in the school that St John’s was today. It is similar to Growth Mindset.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor noted that the number of child protection cases had increased.</b></p> <p>A: These were due to external factors and not related to what happens in school, but SLT do have to deal with it in school time. This information is confidential and governors are not presented with detail.</p> <p>Page 11. A governor commented that there was a lot of good news reported, especially the behaviour in class and around school and commended the SLT</p> <p><b>Q: A governor queried whether the log for bullying was correct in that the number consistently showed as zero (0). The governor wondered whether “alleged bullying” might be a better term to use and allow more transparent reporting to governors. Governors (plural) expressed concern that “zero bullying” was not perhaps a true reflection of school life, because they would expect the school to be dealing with allegations.</b></p> <p>A: SLT explained that they were confident with the tracking of behaviour, but could include another column, although wanted it noted that it not be of benefit to SLT, merely a governor reporting mechanism. SLT also explained that they do have ZERO bullying (in terms of repetitive incidents). Whilst allegations are made, when they are fully investigated it has transpired that it is not of the repetitive nature which makes it bullying.</p>	
------------	--	--

7.9	<p><b>Q: Governors suggested that perhaps learning from experience of other schools and recording allegations could nevertheless be adopted. This would show that the school is reacting to anything that may be an issue, they are investigating and recording – which is a success story of dealing with allegations of bullying.</b></p> <p>A: The SLT noted that they do record, but they do not believe it useful to anyone to report on every incident of alleged bullying.</p> <p>Governors resolved to take to TLS committee under pupil welfare.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked if any of the accidents on the log, were premises related?</b></p> <p>A: No</p> <p><b>Q: Page 12. Governors acknowledged the resilience work and commented that the Online Safety training event for parents was excellent and well received, with over 45 people in attendance. A governor asked whether this could be repeated annually and perhaps allow Y6 pupils to attend with their parents.</b></p> <p>A: Agreed.</p>	<p><b>IH to discuss with SLT PRIOR to TLS to agree strategy</b></p> <p><b>AGA / CS plan for 2018-19</b></p>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Governing Board Skills Audit</b>	
8.1	The Chair gave thanks to the Board for completing and returning their individual Skills Audit forms and outlined that these had been input to a matrix (provided by National Governor Association (NGA)).	
8.2	The Chair was delighted to report that the Audit showed that the Board has good skills to operate, with only one line where collectively the Board did not have a lot of experience “inspection and oversight in school sector”. It was noted that only time can provide that.	
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Policy Review</b>	
9.1	A governor commented noted that as governors, we should only be focussing on the strategic elements of policies as opposed to the day-to-day operational	<b>CS/CM to update</b>

	aspects of how the policies are enacted. The governor requested that "General principles" be inserted to the beginning of every policy for review.	<b>policies as and when.</b>
9.2	<b>Charging &amp; Remissions</b> No changes on policy – duly RATIFIED	
9.3	<b>Whistleblowing</b> No changes on policy – duly RATIFIED	
9.4	<b>Governors Allowances</b> No changes on policy – duly RATIFIED	
9.5	<b>Safeguarding &amp; Child Protection</b>	
9.5.1	Revd Lynn provided a summary of the key changes in the new legislation.	
9.5.2	Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSiE) has been updated from September 2018. One of the main changes is the use of language throughout the policy. Safeguarding Children’s Boards are <b>transitioning</b> to Safeguarding Partnerships. The language "transition" is used a lot throughout the new legislation. Partnerships are going to be comprised of local authorities, police and commissioning groups. Schools have not been specifically included in the partnership, although it is expected that they will still be key players even though not named as part of the group.	
9.5.3	There was also an interesting change in language when referring to "professionals" which has now changed to "practitioners" which could be seen as individuals being more actively involved.	
9.5.4	Guidance is now given with an emphasis on children with SEND, caregivers, looked after children. Guidance is also given on peer-on-peer abuse, sexual violence and sexual harassment. Guidance is given on contextual safeguarding, meaning that any assessments taking place should take into account that abuse against children could be multi-layered and multi-faceted. If a child, for example, was subject to neglect, they may (as a result of neglect) end up in a vulnerable position and fall prey to other abuse outside of home. The guidance is now saying that we have to be aware of this and any assessment has to look at the wider picture.	

<p>9.5.5</p> <p>9.5.6</p> <p>9.5.7</p>	<p>The new legislation provides clarity around schools having their own safeguarding policy on issues that are important to them (i.e. personalise, don't just use model policies off the shelf).</p> <p>The use of reasonable force is mentioned. Whilst recognising in the guidance that sometimes a child may need to be restrained because they may end up harming themselves, now guidance exists to say that individual plans should be created for children in order to minimise the likelihood of challenging behaviour in the first place.</p> <p>GDPR and Data Protection Act – KCSiE guidance makes it clear that neither the act nor the guidance prevent or limit the sharing of information when it comes to keeping children safe. Schools can share data without consent if the situation merits it.</p> <p><b>Q: A governor noted that there were some inconsistencies in the actual policy and could the following amends be made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FGB ratification not TLS</li> <li>- St John's C E Primary School / vs The School</li> <li>- P13 – staff discussing relationships with children. Make clear it is staff disclosing their personal relationships with children.. not other way around.</li> </ul> <p>Policy duly RATIFIED</p>	<p><b>LE to amend and resubmit to SLT for final policy folder / website</b></p>
<p>9.6</p> <p>9.6.1</p> <p>9.6.2</p> <p>9.6.3</p>	<p><b>Resolving Complaints</b></p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked if the operational aspects of policies could be put as appendices so that governors only had to focus on a strategic overview.</b></p> <p>A: Not really. Policy is one document, but may be more helpful to try to include principles or statement as a intro to all future policies.</p> <p>BP had some amends and agreed to send to IH who would make the amends directly. Inconsistencies re BoG and governing body. Choose one (Governing Body) and stick to it.</p> <p>The policy was duly RATIFIED.</p>	<p><b>BP send amends to IH. IH make amends, submit final to LE</b></p>

9.7	<p><b>Handling Unacceptable Adult Behaviour</b></p> <p><b>Q: A governor asked if the school had behavioural contracts that determines how a meeting would be dealt with.</b></p> <p>A: No but all agreed would be very useful and governor was asked to send a sample to IH.</p>	AK send sample behaviour contract to IH
9.8	<p><b>Handling Unreasonable, Persistent, Harassing or Abusive Complainants</b></p> <p>The policy was RATIFIED</p>	
<b>10.0</b>	<b>School Improvement</b>	
10.1	The Board felt that the information received from the TLS committee had provided evidence of progress being made against the School Improvement Plan.	
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
11.1	The date of the next FGB meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 26 March 2019 from 6.30-9pm.	
<b>12.0</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
12.1	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>MOTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY</u></b></p> <p>RESOLVED that, because of its nature, the business to be transacted be treated as confidential and not for publication. Discussion moved to Part II.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Part I Resumed)</p>	
<b>13.0</b>	<b>Close</b>	
	The Chair thanked all for attending and closed the meeting at 21:15	