

Guildhall Feoffment Community Primary School

Minutes of the FGB – Curriculum Full Governing Body meeting of Guildhall Feoffment Community Primary School held at the school at 6.00pm on Tuesday 10th June 2025.

Present:	Ros King	(RK) - Chair
	Andy Mathews	(AM) - Headteacher
	Shan K-Don	(SKD)
	Kristian Lee	(KL)
	Meghan Rich	(MR)
	Tiffer Robinson	(TR)
	Sumathi Sundram	(SS)
	Lara Knights	(LK)
	Lydia Mahoney	(LM)
	Stephanie Ward	(SW)
In attendance:	Becky Poynter (Governance Professional)	

1	<u>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u>	
1.1	<u>Apologies for absence</u> Ben Tanner, Fiona-Catherine Thompson	
1.2	<u>Consent/Non Consent</u> Governors consented to these absences It was noted that TR would need to leave the meeting at 7.15pm.	
2	<u>PECUNIARY AND OTHER INTERESTS</u>	
2.1	There were no declarations of pecuniary interest declared for this meeting.	
3	<u>CHAIR'S ACTION / UPDATE</u>	
3.1	RK reported that the solar panel installation application seemed to be progressing. Four electricity meters and two rooves were proving something of a complication but the application was in the process of being drafted. RK thanked those governors who had been in to school, monitoring the administration of the SATS papers. She commented that when she had attended the pupils had experienced a nice breakfast, were very relaxed and seemed to be taking everything in their stride.	
4	<u>MINUTES</u>	
4.1	The minutes of the Curriculum meeting held on 29 th April 2025 (copy in Minute Book), having previously been circulated, were confirmed , and signed by the Chair.	

5	<u>SUBJECT LEAD INSIGHTS REPORT – Alice Spencer PE</u>	
	<p>RK was pleased to welcome Alice Spencer to the FGB to speak about her role as PE lead.</p> <p>Example lesson plans were shared with Governors.</p> <p>AS explained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PE had been one of the deep dive subjects during the Ofsted inspection. • This was AS's 3rd year as PE lead and the 2nd full year of using the Complete PE scheme to plan and support lessons. • It was felt that colleagues needed something to support PE lesson planning that would provide uniformity across the school. • The scheme could be adapted by teachers and was adaptive for SEND pupils. • There were video resources on the website to share with pupils. • Lessons linked to prior learning with warmups linking to previous lessons. • High level vocabulary and questioning linked to oracy. • Every year group experienced two hours of PE per week as per DFE guidelines. • This was slightly different in year 4 who had an hour a week with a cricket coach and then a full day every two weeks. • All KS2 classes attend sessions at the rugby club at least once a half term. This was to combat the limited outdoor space within the school. Pupils worked with trained coaches, and it provided good Continual Professional Development (CPD) for staff. • Pupils in year 5 went swimming in the Autumn term. It was noted this was in line with DFE guidance and was still more than several schools offered. • This year, 41 of 49 achieved their 25-meter swimming certificate. • Abbeycroft leisure put on a free swim/lunch for Pupil Premium pupils during half term. • Bikeability was made available to year 5 pupils, funded by the sports premium grant on a first come, first served basis. 44 of 52 pupils in the year group participated. • There was also a learn to ride course in the Easter holidays for pupils who couldn't ride a bike, so everyone had the opportunity. • Some parents still had reservations about taking up the offer. To combat this, it was already being discussed with the current year 4 families. • In her role as mental health lead AS had produced a newsletter on Children's Mental Health Week in February which included simple ways to look after their wellbeing. (Copy shared with governors) • Year 5 and 6 pupils had participated in the London mini marathon initiative. This involved running a 2-mile course in one go and pupils appeared to enjoy the challenge. • Younger pupils undertook the 2-miles over the week. There had been lots of parental involvement. • The Residential Trip had previously only been for year 6 pupils. This year was AS's first experience of going and it became apparent how frightening some pupils found it. There were lots of tears with some children not wanting to do it at all. • The resilience around the residential trip needed to be built up so next year, all KS2 pupils would have some sort of residential experience. year 3 to spend 1 night in school; year 4 to have 1 night at Burwell House, Newmarket (with a mock TV studio activity), year 5 to spend 2 nights at Graffam Water and the year 6 trip would take place as usual. • The theme for this year's sports week was the Women's Euros. Freestyle football workshops would be held for all pupils. The Tesco grant had been used to purchase new books related to this topic. Guildhall Feoffment was the only school in the Bury area with a girls only team. A Football club runs at the weekends. 	

- Ofsted were pleased with the wide range of clubs and lunchtime sporting opportunities offered.
- There were several paid for clubs, but PP families could use their money towards these activities.
- Interschool competition participation had improved, and success was slowly coming. year 5 and 6 pupils could see that their hard work was paying off.

AM commented that the previous PE schemes of work had been disheartening for some staff. AS had researched various options before adopting this scheme and staff confidence in teaching PE had improved.

RK noted that the main thing was to make sure everyone could teach it. Staff agreed.

SK **asked** for more insight on how swimming was affected by increased costs

AS stated, that heating costs had increased for the pool. AM confirmed that the pot of money hadn't gone up but there had been a 25% to 30% increase for transportation and a 35% to 40% increase in swimming costs. It was confirmed that the sports premium grant couldn't be used to support swimming expenses.

AM was hopeful that the sports premium grant would remain, but the current Government spending review might make a difference to this income.

KL **asked** about the expectation on swimming in KS3 and 4. It was good to fulfil the curriculum expectations in primary but was that sufficient for secondary schools. Was that something that should be considered.

AM confirmed the 25-metre benchmark by the end of KS2. There were a handful of pupils who hadn't met that standard and this would be shared with the secondary provisions so that they could try and make up the deficit. Some secondary school have pools on site but it's not an option for primaries to offer sessions once a week.

MR **asked** how long pupils spent in the pool.

AS confirmed session were 30 minutes long.

LR **asked** about the size of the groups.

It was confirmed there were small groups for the non-swimmers. For the pupils who could swim there were around 12 pupils per group. AS commented that parental engagement made a difference to the pupils swimming ability. If parents were on board with cycling and swimming it made the job of the school much easier.

KL **asked** that similar data be shared around swimming and bikeability at the appropriate meeting next year.

AM confirmed he would include it in the data section of the SEF.

SKD **asked** about participation rate in clubs

AM confirmed that every child had taken part in at least one club in school.

AS noted that despite being a small site they made the best use of facilities. Club attendance was offered in the morning before school.

It was noted that for Pupil Premium children whose school attendance may be an issue, their extra-curricular club attendance may be adversely affected.

There being no further questions, RK thanked AS for her informative presentation.

AS left the meeting a 6.24pm

6	<u>HEADTEACHER'S REPORT</u>	
	<p>The Headteacher's report had been circulated on Governor Hub.</p> <p><u>SATS</u>. There would be no official data until the July meeting. Phonics: predicted outcomes were between 86% to 91% achieving the level. It was noted one year 1 child who joined the school last week, had no English that would have an effect on results, but it is still felt they would be in line with the last couple of years. The year 4 Multiplication check was being carried out this week. The pupils seemed very confident.</p> <p><u>The SEF</u> had been updated in line with the feedback from Ofsted Some of the grades had increased into the "comfortably good". The ambition was for subject areas to be more embedded to move attainment towards the upper end of good. Governors noted that subjects graded as 5 in the SEF, were still being adopted with new curricula. RK commented the SEF was very encouraging.</p> <p>AM confirmed he intended to create a less detailed version of the SEF considering the inspector's engagement with the document. RK said it would be useful to review the current year as well as plans for next year at the last meeting in July.</p> <p>SKD asked about a resources bank for science AM confirmed that pupils were doing science exploration outside during the summer term. There are science resources in the courtyard area.</p> <p>SS asked if the school undertook visits to the Cambridge Science Centre as there had been activities for children over half term. AM confirmed that they had taken year 3 pupils to the Whipple Museum of the History of Science but on reflection it was more suited to older pupils. He confirmed that the year 6 pupils were going to the Science Museum in London next month Governors discussed the various opportunities for science activities in Cambridge which were child friendly. Governors were assured that information was shared with parents.</p> <p><u>The Summer Holiday Club</u> would be taking place in the first two weeks of the summer. RK asked about the take up and whether families could afford it. AM confirmed indicative daily bookings as ranging from 43 to around 24 or 25. This was considered more than enough for the provision to be economically viable.</p> <p>SKD asked for clarification of "The Mix" AM confirmed with was the breakfast and after school wrap around provision.</p> <p><u>The following events</u> were taking place and Governors were very welcome to attend. School Fete: 5th July from 1.00pm to 5.00pm.</p> <p><u>Performances</u>: Year 4 The Lion King, year 6 The Greatest Showman. Governors were invited to contact the office for availability at the afternoon performances. It was noted that all dates were included on the newsletters. After discussion, AM confirmed he would check that all governors were on the newsletter circulation list. RK asked that dates be shared by emails or put on governor hub.</p>	<p>AM AM</p>

Governors were reminded all dates were on the website.

Writing Moderation: RK noted AM's comment that this had "been interesting" and **asked** for further detail.

AM confirmed that this was a biannual event involving staff from various schools across the town and they had taken a different approach this year. Previously, teachers had been asked to undertake the same writing activity and share the outcomes, but that hadn't really unpicked the nuances of how to arrive at a writing judgement. There was a huge list of criteria to consider from the different genres in pieces of writing undertaken over the year. You couldn't determine a judgement from one piece of writing. This year, teachers were asked to bring writing books for pupils at different levels, for example at the border line of working towards/at expected and from expected/greater depth. One or two schools were being overly generous in their assessments, but GF judgements were broadly in line with the other schools.

RK **asked** what the year 7 teachers had learned.

AM confirmed that secondary staff had brought a selection of year 7 books and primary colleagues had found it somewhat disheartening as the standard of pupils writing appeared to have gone backwards. English lessons at KS3 were more about reading, understanding plot lines, texts etc, than writing. Consequently, no one appeared to be picking up on grammar or punctuation. There was a real difference in focus from year 6 to year 7 and although primary colleagues understood the reasons, it was still galling.

It was noted that the AQA Science paper had dropped the requirement for standards of grammar and punctuation.

AM felt that there may be big changes to the expectation on writing following the curriculum review being undertaken by the DFE.

Governors discussed the difference between primary and secondary approaches to writing, the level of writing expected at Year 6 SATS and GCSEs, that as GCSE and A level course work was computer-based and spell checks and grammar checks were standard, whether the impact of AI would mean that the teaching of grammar and punctuation might become redundant.

AM also noted that Jamie Oliver had recently met with Bridget Philipson to raise the profile of support for dyslexic pupils. All of this would be part of the discussion, and it would be interesting to see the outcomes of the review.

Safeguarding. At the last meeting AM reminded Governors that 29 pupils were being monitored. He confirmed that it was currently 38 but noted that the safeguarding team hadn't yet met to consider removing children from this status. This would happen later this week.

SKD **asked** for further clarity on Question 53 of the Safeguarding Review which had only been "partially met." This question related to all staff understanding the behaviour policy/code of conduct which includes pupils' safety outside school, including online.

AM confirmed that some staff needed additional training, and this was a work in progress.

Assessment and Data Analysis.

Governors noted the year 4 attainment analysis document which was self-explanatory. and showed remarkable movement within the year.

KL **asked** if the discussion about support staff would adversely affect the brilliant progress of the current year 4 pupils.

	<p>AM confirmed not because September's year 5 cohort (the current year 4s) would get more support. RK was grateful for the detailed data report and asked that thanks be recorded to the year 4 team.</p>	
7.	<p><u>STAFFING</u></p>	
7.1	<p><u>Recent Recruitment and Promotions</u> AM reported that A class teacher was finishing his ECT and leaving to take up a post at a private school in Ipswich. An advert had been placed in advance of the 31st May deadline. Interviews had taken place the week before half term. An experienced teacher had been appointed to cover. It was noted that she knew the school well as she had taught in every year group across the school except EYFS but was happy to teach there. She was very competent and had lots of experience. She was currently teaching 4 days a week and worked one day a week for "Grammarsaurus".</p> <p>Another appointment had been made of an experienced practitioner who taught at University Primary School in Cambridge and more recently had worked in the SEND unit at Sybil Andrews School with highly special needs pupils. She had decided to return to primary school teaching and would be teaching three day a week to cover the 2 EYFS classes. It was noted she was also a music specialist. AM confirmed that they had received 30 applications and shortlisted 8, interviewing across two days. The quality of applicants had been exceptional.</p> <p>TR asked if this number of applicants was usual. AM said that there were always a fair few ECTs looking for posts at this time of year. He also thought that anecdotally, teachers working in academies were looking to return to Local Authority maintained schools. SW asked why that might be. AM felt it was the nature of way staff were constricted in academies. There was a lot less autonomy as a teacher. An Academy would have created or bought in its own curriculum and teachers didn't have the opportunity to go off script. He also felt that academy leadership was quite pressurising.</p> <p>A key stage 1 teacher would be taking maternity leave and internal arrangements had been made to cover this post. SW asked for confirmation of timetabling arrangements in EYFS. It was confirmed that one teacher would be working 4 days and the other 3 days; effectively the classes would be operating as one unit with 3 teachers working across the two classes. It was confirmed that conversations around subject leadership hadn't happened yet.</p> <p>Governors were made aware that a member of staff was again unwell and future staffing arrangements were a little unclear. Governors discussed implications for cover within the school. AM confirmed that other teaching staff had stepped up to support. Governors wished the member of staff well. SKD asked about cover arrangements. AM confirmed cover was being provided with supply teachers. SKD asked if one of the applicants previously interviewed could be employed. AM said that it was a part time post so probably not. SKD asked about the position of Teaching Assistants.</p>	

	<p>AM confirmed that some had requested reducing their hours which would make balancing the budget a little bit easier. TA provision may be slightly more stretched next year, and levels of high needs support may also have an impact. Governors accepted that the position of TAs was not usually sorted until the middle of July.</p> <p>SKD asked if there was a deadline for TA resignations.</p> <p>AM confirmed that TAs had to give one months' notice.</p> <p>RK commented that the budget was still a work in process and new staff changes may have an effect.</p> <p>AM confirmed that whilst some staff were on the upper pay range, AM would always employ the best teachers for the school as that was the right thing to do. They had run the numbers through the staffing calculator and with TA reductions (including one retiring) the money saved would accommodate the salary changes.</p> <p>AM confirmed that, following agreement at the last meeting, the Co Headship had been announced in the newsletter on Friday.</p> <p><u>Consideration of Changes to the Staffing Structure.</u></p> <p>Governors were asked to consider the creation of two Assistant Head posts.</p> <p>The English and the Maths lead were both on the Upper Pay Scale and received TLR payments, this meant that their salaries were commensurate with the lower end of the leadership scale. Following the recent move to a Co-Headship model it was felt it would be sensible to add further capacity to the Senior Leadership Team (SLT). This would bring clarity to the staff around the leadership of the school. Although these staff members currently had senior responsibilities, there was no formal recognition in place which could cause difficulties with internal communication.</p> <p>RK reminded Governors this had been part of the discussion around the Co-Headship as there would no longer be a Deputy. AM confirmed that HR had advised there was no requirement to advertise internally and as the job descriptions were not changing, they could be re-graded.</p> <p>SKD asked if there would be any changes to the line management.</p> <p>AM confirmed arrangements would remain the same.</p> <p>LK asked if the staff involved would retain their positions as English and Maths leads. AM confirmed they would as AHT with responsibility.</p> <p>GD asked if there would be any changes to their teaching commitment.</p> <p>AM confirmed that with the change to the leadership scale their terms and conditions would change, however, this was accepted as part of career progression.</p> <p>RK formally proposed the creation of two AHT posts, appointing the English lead and the Maths lead, to these positions. AGREED</p>	
8	<p><u>SOFT FEDERATION OF LA SCHOOLS</u></p>	
	<p>RK thanked AM for providing the Memorandum of Understanding and invited him to outline the current position.</p> <p>AM confirmed that there had been several conversations across the Bury Schools Group and the Head at Lawshall Primary School had been working with the DFE on transition</p>	

and school to school support. The LA been part of the conversations about how to create a formal structure without becoming an academy or a hard federation. Under the proposals, schools would come together under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which would be reviewed annually, and schools could opt out on a yearly basis if they wished. The MOU set out the principles on how schools would work together, sharing CPD and expertise. Governors were reminded that Ofsted had asked several questions about external support, and it was felt this would provide a powerful model of collaboration between the 2 secondary and 18 primary schools.

SKD **asked** if the MOU was legally binding and was anyone represented from the schools' FGBs.

AM confirmed the MOU wasn't legally binding and that once it had been agreed, they would start to arrange working groups. There would be 8 working groups across the West Suffolk Maintained Schools. Starting to meet from September, the initial groups would be for Chairs of Governors, Heads and Leadership Teams, Inclusion and SEN staff and Finance and Business Staff. In January, further groups would include school leads for English, Maths and EYFS.

KL **asked** if it would be appropriate to have a governor representative at the Finance and Business Group.

AM clarified these groups were for staff to collaborate and support each other at an operational level so this Finance group was more for Business Managers. However, if a situation such as the issues with Arbor were to arise again, the group would have a stronger voice.

TR commented on the interaction between secondary and primary schools. He **asked** if there was any concern that the secondary schools might wish to dominate proceedings or disengage.

AM noted that there were only 3 LA secondary schools in the county. King Edward VI School (KEVI) in Bury St Edmunds, Thurston and Northgate in Ipswich. The latter two schools may be invited to join the partnership. He felt that the collaboration would benefit both sectors in areas such as streamlining the curriculum and transition arrangements.

SKD **asked** if this new arrangement replaced the Bury Partnership.

AM noted that the Bury Education Partnership was run by the Eastern Education Partnership, and it was felt best to keep the Bury Partnership separate from the Federation work. Governors discussed possible developments for working with schools outside of Bury St Edmunds.

SKD **asked** about arrangements should there be a falling out within the group.

AM said that he felt sufficient safeguards were in place as the group was not being run by any particular individual and responsibilities would be shared. Leaders were keen to collaborate, share good practice and learn from each other. He felt that as the groups would be co-chaired they could collectively employ the management of the meetings. In the longer term, there may be scope for the schools to employ staff to work across the group by pooling resources i.e. employ an Educational Psychologist from contributions made by each school. He felt this replicated the positive aspects of a multi-academy-trust without the top-down control.

AM **requested** governors review the MOU with any suggested changes to come to the July meeting.

TR left the meeting at 7.19pm.

ALL

	<p>RK asked what preparations were needed for the groups to be able to meet in September. AM confirmed further discussions were planned for July to confirm arrangements for September.</p>	
9	<u>SPORTS PREMIUM REPORT</u>	
	<p>There was no report from the link Governor, but SW confirmed a meeting with the PE lead had been arranged to take place on the 30th June.</p>	
10	<u>SEND PROVISION</u>	
	<p><u>Progress on adaptive teaching CPD</u> As FC was not present it was agreed to carry this item forward to the next meeting</p> <p><u>SEND Link Governor Monitoring Report</u> Governors received the report from the Link Governor for SEND. LM confirmed that she had visited the school and met with FC on the 22nd May and had had the opportunity to look round as well as review internal data. They had considered three main areas on the SEF; EHCP applications, the Dyslexia screening tool and quality first adaptive teaching. She had seen several examples of adaptive teaching and how this was being supported across the year groups.</p> <p>The Dyslexia Screening Tool has been purchased and had identified several children for additional support. There was also working going on to introduce a more dyslexia friendly ethos. The EHCP assessment process was robust but getting input and responses from the LA and other professionals was challenging.</p> <p>KL asked for some further information about the Dyslexia Screening Tool. AM explained about the levels of the diagnostic processes and how it could be used to further inform the support for an individual pupil. Two other assessment tools were also used to assess the precise nature of the condition. These were extremely useful in providing evidence to support an EHCP application but depending on the level of diagnosis required, could be time consuming taking up a day for each pupil. Governors discussed the challenges of the EHCP process</p> <p>KL asked if one of the outcomes of the strategic review of SEND and the EHCP process would be funding for such diagnostic tools. AM felt not as they would be too expensive to provide for each school.</p> <p>RK asked if more pupils with dyslexia had been identified. AM felt it was too early to say. They had targeted a particular year group for transition and additional support in SATS. Out of 7 or 8 pupils assessed about three-quarters of them had not been diagnosed with Dyslexia. However, those pupils would then be provided with additional support as the tool helped identify weaknesses within a reading profile for example, which may result in the pupil benefitting from revisiting phonics.</p> <p>KL asked how Governors could check back on the progress of the year 2 pupils. AM confirmed that assessment information would be brought the November and January meetings.</p>	

11	<u>SAFEGUARDING</u>	
11.1	<p><u>175/157 LA Safeguarding Audit.</u> KL was curious about the difference in data between this year and last and asked for some more detail. AM explained that the questions were not the same year on year as some are added and some removed so this made a direct comparison difficult.</p> <p>KL asked if any issues had come up for the second time. AM confirmed not. As it was an LA audit it was for their assurance that everything was in place.</p> <p>SKD commented on the signing in procedures and asked whether there were any plans to change from the paper-based signing in sheets. AM explained that to move to a digital system would just be too expensive (in the region of £3.5k) but confirmed that different signing in sheets were available which they may consider moving to use.</p> <p>RK noted that Q55 relating to the staff version of the acceptable use policy was only partially met and asked for further detail. AM confirmed that the current policy didn't include the use of AI. The one being shared with staff in September would rectify this.</p>	
12.	<u>LINK GOVERNOR MONITORING REPORTS</u>	
	<p>There were no reports to consider. RK asked if was to late in the term to conduct monitoring visits. AM felt not and would welcome governors to monitor the writing moderation at the end of June.</p> <p>SKD asked if there was a link governor for Art. RK confirmed not but noted its relationship to DT. SKD agreed to take on the role as long as both subjects could be considered in one visit. It was confirmed that although the subject leads were different, this could be accommodated.</p> <p>SKD asked who the link governor was for Health and Safety. It was confirmed no one at present. LK confirmed that if it could be linked to safeguarding, she would take on the responsibility. RK thanked both governors for taking on these additional responsibilities.</p>	
13	<u>POLICIES</u>	
	<p>Governors noted the Pecuniary and Business Interests policy and the requirement to complete this annually. AM confirmed he had circulated the current register and asked Governors to check their entry. Governors discussed what should be declared and were advised that it was best practice to declare anything that might be considered, discussed, or acted on at Governing Board meetings or in the wider school context.</p> <p>It was noted that amendments could be made on Governor Hub under each Governors Personal Profile. Governors were asked to update their interests by the next meeting</p>	ALL

14	<u>REVIEW OF THE MEETING</u>	
	<p>Governors felt that the meeting had been insightful and helpful.</p> <p>RK commented that she was relieved to see the improvement in the year 4 data.</p> <p>The collaborative working was interesting, and the MOU had provoked a good level of discussion and challenge and an assurance to governors that this partnership would be of benefit to the school.</p> <p>Governors agreed that the PE presentation had been very thorough, and the lead was obviously enthusiastic about her role. LK commented that she had seen her being very supportive of pupils at matches.</p> <p>RK commented that it would be useful to have another governor on the staffing committee. SS agreed to join and a meeting date of the 18th June 2025 at 1.30pm was suggested. RK would check the availability of those concerned.</p>	
15	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u>	
	<p>Tuesday 15th July 2025 3.15pm for 3.45pm meeting. FGB Ethos Committee Focus: Review of the year; SEF for School and Governors, Preparation for next year, SDP</p> <p>Governors invited to tea with staff and volunteers at 3.15pm.</p>	

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 19.42pm.

Signed _____

Dated _____

Action Log

Item	Action	Who	When	Status
6	AM to check Governors were on the newsletter distribution list. AM to share dates of events with Governors	AM	ASAP	
8	Governors to review the MOU and submit comments for the next meeting	All Govs	15 th July	
13	Governor to revise their pecuniary interests on Governor Hub	All Govs	15 th July	

DATES FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/56

Date	Time	Focus
16 th Sept 2025	6.00pm	Ethos: Elect Chair/Vice Chair, Board Review Consider School Development Plan 2025/26
9 th Oct 2025	9.00am	Pay and Staffing Committee: Teacher appraisal and development, teaching structure, promotion
4 th Nov 2025	3.30pm	Curriculum: To review school, local and national SATS data 2025
10 th Dec 2025	6.00pm	Resources: Approve mid-year budget review; SEFS
21 st Jan 2026	3.30pm	Curriculum: To review spring term assessment date and 3-year budget plan
24 th March 2026	6.00pm	Resources: To set the budget for the financial year 2026/2027
28 th April 2026	3.30pm	Curriculum: To review spring term assessment data and approve 3-year budget plan
9 th June 2026	6.00pm	Curriculum: To include Governor monitoring reports, PP, Sports Premium, SEND
13 th July 2026	3.15pm for 3.45pm	Ethos: Tea with staff and volunteer at 3.15pm. Meeting starts at 3.45pm. Review of the year, SEF for School and Governors. Preparing for next year, SDP