

THE GOVERNING BODY OF RUSHEY GREEN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Minutes of a meeting of the Governing Body of Rushey Green Primary School held at the school on Monday, 27 June 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT

Ms C. Banning
Mrs K. Fearnley
Ms J. Greene
Ms A. McGarrigle Vice Chair
Ms Y Morris Headteacher
Ms S. Phipps
Canon C. Pickstone
Ms R. Pott-Negrine
Mr G. Rees Chair
Ms C. Thomas

Also present:

Mr M. Grocock Deputy Headteacher
Ms J. Purkiss Assistant Headteacher
Mrs J. Woods Clerk

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received with consent from Ms Bird, Mrs Coban, Mr Edwards, and Ms Montague. Apologies were received after the meeting from Ms Gregory.

Governors were reminded that they must declare conflicts and pecuniary interest before items were discussed, and must withdraw from the meeting while the item was under discussion.

2. TO AGREE THE BUSINESS FOR THE MEETING

The order in which items were to be discussed and those items which would be considered as urgent business was agreed.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

(a) To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2016

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2016 be approved as a correct record.

(b) Matters arising

(i) Page 4, Minute 4(b)(ii) – School website

Ms Greene confirmed that all of the photographs of governors that she had taken had been passed to the school. It was **RESOLVED** that Ms Morris would ask Howard Hawes to check that these had been uploaded and that the school website was now fully compliant.

(ii) Page 4, Minute 5(a) – Changes to the Governing Body

Mr Rees informed governors that Ms Burnage had decided not to join the Governing Body.

Governors noted with great regret that Ms Fearnley had decided to resign from the Governing Body and this would be her final meeting. The Chair thanked her for her many years of service to the school, and governors wished her well for the future. Ms Fearnley said that she did not wish to sever all contact with Rushey Green and hoped that she would still be invited to attend key events.

Governors were also saddened to learn that Mr Edwards had decided to resign from the end of term due to health and family issues, and paid tribute to his significant contribution over a number of years.

It was noted that there would now be three vacancies for co-opted governors. The Clerk had provided copies of further potential applicants which Mr Rees said he would discuss with Ms Morris as soon as possible.

(iii) Page 4, Minute 5(b) – DBS checks

It was noted that the school office was arranging for any outstanding DBS checks to be carried out in order that all governors met the requirement to have a valid DBS check from 1 September 2016. Ms Morris confirmed that a system was in place to ensure that checks were renewed when necessary.

(iv) Page 4, Minute 5(c) - Governing Body self review

Governors discussed proposals for the Governing Body self review process. It was suggested that the list of 20 questions which governors should be asking should be discussed on a rolling programme at future meetings. It was **RESOLVED** that the Clerk would send a copy of the 20 questions to the Headteacher and Chair, and that two questions would be included on each future agenda for discussion.

(v) Page 5, Minute 5(d) – Review of link governor responsibilities

Governors discussed the current vacancies for link governor responsibilities. It was noted that a new safeguarding link governor must be appointed to replace Mr Edwards from the end of term, and it was **RESOLVED** that the Chair would ask Mrs Coban if she would be willing to take over this role. Governors were asked to give some thought as to whether they would like to take on any of the other vacant roles, for further discussion at the next meeting.

(vi) Page 6, Minute 6(b) – Early Years

Mr Rees informed governors that a quotation had been received for the creation of a soft play area for the Early Years, which would be much higher if a spongey cover was selected. In view of the current financial pressures, he did not feel that it was appropriate for the school to spend this much at the current time. Ms Thomas pointed out that the outside Nursery play area got very muddy in winter, and was becoming hazardous; it was also pointed out that there was a requirement for the children to spend a significant amount of time outside and to have free access to an outdoor area. Ms Morris said that it would be necessary to utilise the rest of the playground when it was not in use, and that the Nursery gate in Penerley Road could be used as an entrance/exit. She said that further discussion would take place around timetabling, but if it was not possible to meet the statutory obligations, the situation would be reviewed.

It was suggested that fundraising could help to raise money for the resurfacing, but Mr Rees said that the RGSA were paying for the new planters, and would have just £1,000 left. There was discussion about possible future fundraising opportunities, and it was suggested that it could be made clear that all fundraising events would be aimed at raising money for the soft play area. It was also suggested that a fundraising thermometer board could be placed in Reception, which would show the balance of the RGSA funding after the summer fair.

Mr Rees informed governors that planning permission was not required for this work.

(vii) Page 9, Minute 12 – Single Central Record

Ms Morris confirmed that the termly inspection of the Single Central Record had taken place.

4. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES, LINK GOVERNOR REPORTS, VISITS TO THE SCHOOL, AND TRAINING

(a) Reports from committees

(i) Premises Committee

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 June 2016 were circulated. It was noted that there had been an ongoing technical problem with the control system for the classroom thermometer/thermistor and tannoy system and the BMS technicians were working to resolve this. There were also issues with the airconditioning system, and some of the taps were overheating.

Governors were pleased to note that the school had now received the first payment for electricity generated through the solar panels; a cheque for £2,900 had been received for a nine month period.

Mr Rees said that the playground was now being used in a zoned way, but the markings were still to be completed. He informed governors that two significant accidents had taken place on one piece of the playground equipment and this was now being monitored very carefully. In both instances, the injuries had been caused by genuine accidents, and neither child had been using the equipment inappropriately. Ms Morris said that the school would also be considering the height of children before they were allowed to use this equipment.

There had been no progress in letting the school on a commercial basis to help with the budget, and this would be kept under review.

(ii) Finance and Personnel Committee

The minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 3 and 16 May had been circulated with the agenda. It appeared that some governors had not received copies of the budget documents, and Ms Morris agreed to check with Mr Hawes that they had been circulated to everyone. In accordance with the authority delegated by the Governing Body at the last meeting, the Committee had approved the budget at the meeting on 16 May. The intention was to move from a deficit of £117,000 to a surplus of £20,000 at the end of the year; however, it was pointed out that the loan to cover the licensed deficit was interest free, and provided the amount outstanding was reduced, it would not be necessary for the entire amount to be repaid in one year. However, Ms Morris stressed that she was keen to get back to a balanced budget as soon as possible.

(iii) Curriculum Committee

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 23 May had been circulated with the agenda. Loxane Wallace and Elton Crawford, the joint English co-ordinators, had given a very interesting presentation to the Committee on raising achievement. They had presented their action plan, which had been focused and realistic, and Canon Pickstone said that it had been clear that the Plan was working well because standards were improving. The Committee had discussed the introduction of the 'Big Write' next year, which was a whole school event where all children worked on the same subject, for example, children at another school had arrived into school to find a crashed alien spaceship.

The English and Library Policies had been reviewed and approved. The Committee had also discussed the Attendance Policy in the light of the recent

well publicised court case. An amendment had been agreed and the Policy had been approved. The Community Cohesion Policy had also been reviewed and approved.

Ms Thomas commented that the English co-ordinators were working very well with staff on an individual basis to provide support, hints, and help with reading corners. It was agreed that there was now much more of a team feeling among staff.

(b) Visits to the school, meetings attended, and other activities

Mr Rees reported back on recent Superdads activities. There had been a fairly good turnout for the sponsored walk, and the weekend trip to Macaroni Woods had just taken place.

Mr Rees informed governors that he had been in school to watch his daughter when she played piano to the younger children in the dinner queue. Ms Morris said that the children had been very impressed, and it was noted that the Music Co-ordinator was looking at the possibility of Mrs Fearnley's grandson coming into school to play the guitar.

Ms Pott-Negrine had visited the school for a learning walk. She said that she had found this very enjoyable and it had been extremely helpful to observe the different classes and see the work that different year groups were doing, as well as being able to see how well classroom behaviour was managed.

Ms Greene had accompanied Reception on a trip to Horton Kirby on a very rainy day, but which had been enjoyable.

Safeguarding

Governors considered the report from Mr Edwards on his visit on 8 June to monitor the Single Central Record. The report summarised the statutory guidance and the information which should be provided for individuals. It was noted that Teresa Beard, the Senior Admin Officer, had day to day responsibility for carrying out checks and verifying information, but Mr Hawes was also fully conversant with the systems. Mr Edwards had scrutinised the administrative process that was followed when new staff were appointed, and had examined the Single Central Record to ensure that all necessary checks had been made and recorded appropriately. Concern had been expressed by Ms Beard and Mr Hawes about the delays in receiving DBS clearance on some occasions, which could be caused by the complexity of the information being checked. However, this was not always the case, and some very straightforward applications had taken an extremely long time. If there was a delay in obtaining DBS clearance for a new member of staff, they would still be able to start work at the school, but would have to be monitored very closely until clearance was obtained.

Mr Edwards had been impressed by the depth of knowledge and commitment to ensure that the systems in the school were fully compliant, and felt that the practice at Rushey Green was the best he had seen in many years as a governor at a number of primary schools.

Numeracy

Governors considered the report prepared by Mr Rees on numeracy. He had met Paul Rowbotham and Naseem Badar because of Carol Gordon's continued absence. It was noted that in general Mr Rowbotham had responsibility for Key Stage 2 and Ms Badar had responsibility for Key Stage 1, although there was a great deal of co-operation between them both. Mr Rees said that he had observed a general feeling of confidence in teaching and learning in maths which he had not seen before to this degree. He highlighted the work being carried out in Year 6 and informed governors that of the 60

children in this cohort, 26 were in the top group, and had achieved an average of 78% in the recent mock SATs test; it was thought that the threshold for exceeding age related expectations under the new testing system was likely to be 70%. This group of children had then completed a past GCSE paper, and the average mark had been 70%, which equated to a grade C pass. However, one child had achieved the equivalent of an A* grade, and would be going to grammar school when s/he left Rushey Green.

Mr Rees said that children were put into sets in Years 5 and 6, and because so many children were in the top group in Year 6, the size of the other groups was smaller, and there were just 12 children in the bottom group, which enabled teaching to be focused at an individual level.

Mr Rees drew governors' attention to the Pupil Premium data which was appended to his report. It was noted that some of the funding was used to finance the extra resources needed to allow for setting in maths. In general, the outcomes for Pupil Premium children were very close or above the attainment of their non Pupil Premium peers. The progress figures appeared to be extremely high, and it had been felt that this could be because staff were pessimistic with their baselining when the new assessment system was introduced. He felt that the attainment data was more reliable because staff had now been using this for a year, and he was confident that the staff knew the individual children very well. Although the data looked very positive, it would not be possible to judge how well the children had done until the SATs results were published in early July and comparisons could be made with other schools locally and nationally. It was noted that there were 19 children on the SEN register in Year 6, many of whom had significant needs, which would skew the figures for this year.

The report appended Pupil Premium data which showed progress information for each year group, together with information on the initiatives used at Rushey Green.

Ms Greene said that a couple of parents had asked for clarification about the process for learning the basic mathematical functions, and it had been suggested that one class did not appear to have covered subtraction. Ms Morris said that each class in the year group concerned should be learning addition and subtraction together, and agreed to investigate this. It was **RESOLVED** that the Calculation Policy would be added to the website.

(c) Governing Body training

Ms Pott-Negrine said that she had been unable to attend the summer term induction session but would endeavour to attend the autumn term session once the date was available.

5. HEADTEACHER'S REPORT

The Headteacher's report had been circulated and included items on the diary overview, school roll, staffing, reading and writing moderation, the School Achievement Review and Raising Attainment Board, data, induction, SEND provision, attendance, and Pupil Premium. Ms Morris answered questions and elaborated on areas of her report.

School roll

There were now 560 children on roll between Reception and Year 6, with just 10 vacancies across the school; there were also 78 children in the Nursery, 15 of whom were full time. The school was still expanding, and it was noted that next year would be the final growth before the school reached its 3 fe capacity, with the exception of the current Year 2 where there had not been a bulge class.

Staffing

One permanent teacher was leaving at the end of term, together with three of the temporary teachers who were returning to Australia. Ms Morris said that seven new permanent teachers

had been recruited, three of whom were NQTs. One of the new teachers had already started at the school and had taken over a class when the temporary teacher had left in May. The Chair asked whether having three NQTs would put a significant pressure on the school in terms of support. Ms Morris said that in a school the size of Rushey Green, this would not be an issue.

Reading and writing moderation

Moderation had been carried out in reading and writing. Some of these sessions had been part of the work with other schools, and in addition the Early Years and Key Stage 1 SATs had been moderated by the local authority School Improvement Team. The feedback given from the moderators confirmed that teachers knew the children very well and were very familiar with the curriculum. Further evidence was requested for 3 of the 18 children who had been included in the sample for the Year 2 moderation to finalise the judgments on their attainment levels, and this would be provided later in the week.

School Achievement Review and Raising Achievement Board

The main issues discussed at the Raising Achievement Board had been the improvement in marking and the books which had been sampled.

Data

Governors were reminded that the new assessment system had now been introduced, and Rushey Green was working with John Sinnott on the new tracker. Once the SATs results had been published, it would be possible to benchmark attainment and progress with other schools.

Induction

Ms Morris said that an induction day had been organised for new teachers on 18 July, when they would have the opportunity to come in to meet their new classes and talk to the current teachers. This would be followed by a staff meeting at the end of the day, prior to two INSET days at the start of the autumn term.

Special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)

Ms Purkiss highlighted key areas from her comprehensive report on SEND which had been included in the Headteacher's report.

The SEND Policy had been updated in May 2015, and had been reviewed by the previous SENDCO; the Policy was due for review again next year, unless an earlier review was needed as a result of policy changes.

The main additional needs identified at Rushey Green were hearing impairment, autism, speech, language, and communication needs, and specific learning difficulties. Ms Purkiss said that the school currently had 2.5 days speech and language therapy support due to the high level of need. Although Rushey Green had the Centre for the Deaf for children with hearing impairment, Ms Purkiss said that there were more children with autism at the school than hearing impairment. The school worked closely with Watergate, Drumbeat, and Brent Knoll to try to move on the children with the most extreme needs, including two non verbal children. It was noted that there were currently 26 children with EHCPs/statements across the school, which was the highest ever total.

There was discussion on the need for significant differentiation of the curriculum in view of the high proportion on children with complex needs and Ms Morris said that she had been meeting parents with the most severe special needs and had discussed options for them moving to special school. Ms Purkiss informed governors that some children with special educational needs also had health needs; there were currently two children with diabetes, one of whom was injecting, and six with epilepsy, and the education of these children suffered because of their regular hospital appointments.

The report included a chart showing progress broken down into groups. This showed that 51% of children with SEND were making a good level of progress, against 70% of non SEND

children. Governors noted the tables on the following pages which gave a breakdown of attainment and progress of SEND and non SEND children by year group, with explanations of particular issues. Ms Purkiss said that the school would continue to try to close the gap, but stressed that despite the significant difficulties, SEND children at Rushey Green were making good progress, but from a lower starting point.

Governors noted the destinations of pupils with SEND who were leaving the school in July. One child in Reception with Downs Syndrome was moving to Watergate, and a child in Year 1 was moving to Drumbeat. Of the six children leaving Year 6, one would be moving to Greenvale but the rest would be going to mainstream schools in Lewisham and Greenwich.

Attendance of SEND children was monitored closely by the Deputy headteacher, and it was noted that the attendance of this group tended to be comparable with non SEND children. Only one child on the SEND register had been excluded this academic year. A number of SEND children came from families where there were issues around housing and domestic violence etc, and the school worked closely with Social Care to try to provide support. There were several families in temporary accommodation, a number of whom had been placed outside the Borough, which could impact on punctuality as a result of long journeys to school.

Ms Purkiss outlined the systems in place at Rushey Green for identifying SEND pupils and tracking progress, and said that these systems would be updated to reflect latest trends.

The report included a list of the agencies the school worked with, and Ms Purkiss said that she was keen to establish further partnerships to bring about a more inclusive approach and to ensure that all children received the maximum benefit. She said that she was also trying to establish an open door policy so that parents could come into speak about needs and perceptions, which would feed into the Policy for the future.

In respect of resources, governors were reminded that the school was responsible for paying the first £6,000 of each statement. The school was trying to allocate and prioritise the budget carefully to stretch resources, but need continued to outstrip demand. Ms Purkiss said that she was looking at the development of more inhouse training for staff to help them to support the increasingly complex range of needs.

Three children with EHCPs were expected to move to Reception in September, but six children were leaving Year 6.

Governors noted that there were currently six looked after children at the school; one of these children had moved to a new placement out of the Borough and was currently travelling to school by minicab with an escort, but would be moving to a school closer to home in September.

There were currently nine children subject to a Child Protection or Child in Need plan. Ms Purkiss said that three of these were in the process of being closed and three others were being closed.

The report concluded with an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, which were based on Ms Purkiss' priorities.

The Chair commented that the level of special needs at the school appeared to be becoming more challenging and complicated. Ms Purkiss reminded governors that there was now an expectation that children who would previously have attended special schools were now accommodated in mainstream schools but with the same amount of resources. Although there was a very significant difference between the staff ratios at Drumbeat and Rushey Green, the school was still expected to provide the same level of support.

Mr Rees asked how the school dealt with children with particularly extreme needs who were inappropriately placed at Rushey Green. Ms Morris said that there was a need for greater dialogue with parents, and she had met several parents to explain what the school could offer, but to emphasise that Rushey Green could not provide the same level of support as the special schools. Ms Thomas said that in some instances, children with extreme needs were more manageable in Reception where learning was focused around play, but their needs presented more of a challenge once their education became more formal.

Ms McGarrigle asked about the crossover of pupils with SEND who were eligible for Pupil Premium. An in depth analysis had not been carried out, but Ms Morris explained how the Pupil Premium funding was allocated to support different needs in different year groups.

Ms McGarrigle asked whether there were sufficient places in special schools to enable the school to move children on. Ms Purkiss said that there was a shortage of special school places. Drumbeat did not maintain an ongoing waiting list, and it was necessary to re-apply each year; the other special schools had long waiting lists, but all special schools had very high entry thresholds. It was noted that discussions had been taking place on the possibility of increasing SEND capacity in Lewisham to cope with the increasing level of complex needs.

The Chair acknowledged that the situation was very challenging but congratulated the school for getting such good results. It was clear that Rushey Green was developing a reputation for being good with children with SEND, and he asked whether parents were choosing to send their children with SEND to the school. Ms Morris said that there was a high number of children with special needs in the area anyway. It was pointed out that the children were assessed against national expectations, which did not always show the progress the children had made and did not recognise the very hard work carried out by staff.

Ms McGarrigle asked whether there was sufficient training available for staff. Although training was available, it was pointed out that there were financial implications for attendance, with a cost of £300 per day for cover on top of course costs, as well as the impact of specialist support staff being away from school, but if Ms Purkiss was able to attend training on a regular basis, she would then be able to disseminate this to other staff at the school.

Ms Purkiss was thanked for her comprehensive report.

Attendance

Governors discussed the detailed report on attendance and punctuality which gave comparisons between all pupils, Pupil Premium, boys, girls, children with EHCPs and statements, and SEN support. The attendance target for the year was 96%, and the actual level was currently at 95.1%. The school had worked hard to maintain attendance and punctuality this year, and it was noted that the whole school attendance would improve significantly when the local authority gave permission to remove three children from the role who had now left the school and were living outside Lewisham.

Mr Rees pointed out that substantial difference in attendance and punctuality between all pupils and Pupil Premium children, and asked the reason for this. Ms Morris said that the difference was largely due to parental attitude, but there had also been a very high level of illness and many children were in temporary accommodation and were travelling a long way to school. Ms Badar was working very hard with the families of the children where persistent absence was an issue.

Mr Rees said that he had recently observed an attendance assembly, which he had found interesting. Ms Morris explained that the Senior Leadership Team was looking at how to deal with classes where there were a number of children with poor attendance, which impacted on the other children. Regular Attendance Panel meetings were held for children whose attendance fell below 90% and whose attendance had not shown signs of improvement.

The Chair recognised that the school had always carried out a great deal of work to improve attendance and punctuality during the time he had been a governor, and that attendance would be much lower if there had not been this level of effort.

Ms Morris informed governors that two families who had taken their children out of school for more than two weeks for holidays had been referred to Lewisham with a view to issuing fixed penalty notices.

Governors' attention was drawn to the sample attendance chart included in the report, and which was put on the wall for the Monday assembly. Several classes had 100% attendance during the week shown, but governors asked the reason for the low attendance for R3 for this week. It was noted that this had been due to an outbreak of chicken pox.

Pupil Premium

Mr Grocock introduced his detailed report on the Pupil Premium. Governors were reminded that schools received funding for disadvantaged children, which changed as children moved schools. At Rushey Green, 166 children were eligible for Pupil Premium, as well as 5 looked after children. The amount payable per pupil was £1,320, but was increased to £1,900 per looked after child, which gave a total of £228,620 for 2015/16.

The report broke down the proportion of children eligible for Pupil Premium in each year group and governors asked why such a small number of children were eligible in Reception. Mr Grocock explained that this was because Pupil Premium funding was only payable from the time a child became 5, and a number of Reception children would not yet have reached this age at the time of this data collection.

Governors were reminded that in the past eligibility for Pupil Premium had been based on eligibility for free school meals, but with the introduction of universal infant free school meals, it had become much more difficult to pinpoint eligibility, and the school was trying hard to encourage parents to apply for the Pupil Premium. The local authority had promised to provide a parent portal system to enable schools to check eligibility of parents, but this was not yet in place. Ms Morris said that Teresa Beard would produce a flier for circulation with the newsletter to encourage parents to apply for the Pupil Premium, and this would also be highlighted discretely when parent consultations took place. Mr Grocock said that when parents came forward, it was possible to use a system on the LGFL website to check on eligibility.

It was suggested that a link could be provided on the website to advertise the Pupil Premium, with the facility for parents to leave questions and contact details for the school to call them. Mr Grocock agreed to investigate this. It was also suggested that parents could be asked to provide their National Insurance number when they completed the Nursery application form to enable the school to check on Pupil Premium eligibility.

The report highlighted the ways in which the Pupil Premium grant was used, and it was noted that the funding was used in four broad categories: direct interventions (1:1 or small group support) to improve achievement; development work with teachers and support staff to improve targeted teaching; specific interventions to improve the context for learning for individuals or groups (eg mentoring); and tailored resources to impact on achievement of individuals or groups (such as iPads).

The majority of the funding was used on additional human support, and the report listed the staff who were funded through the Pupil Premium grant. A detailed list was given of the interventions currently provided at Rushey Green as well as places at services and clubs which were funded for disadvantaged children.

Detailed information was given on the impact of the Pupil Premium funding in terms of progress and attainment. It could be seen that in most year groups, Pupil Premium children were progressing at a similar rate to non Pupil Premium children; in many cases, Pupil Premium

children were making more progress in reading, but Mr Grocock said that this would be expected given the level of additional support which had been put in place. However, there was a slight anomaly in Year 6 where the position was reversed.

In terms of attainment, there were no significant gaps, with the exception of Year 6. Mr Grocock had carried out an analysis of this year group, and explained that although they had progressed well during the year, the cohort had a high proportion of Pupil Premium children, with a very high level of complex needs, including mental health conditions, which had impacted on attainment and the teachers had done very well to move them on.

Pupil progress meetings took place on a regular basis, and it was possible to put interventions in place quickly if any individual pupils were identified as falling behind and to address any gaps which were becoming apparent.

6. RAISING ATTAINMENT BOARD

Mr Rees said that he had received the draft minutes of the last meeting of the Raising Attainment Board which had been held on 14 June, but these had not been finalised. It was pointed out that these should be circulated to all members of the Governing Body, and it was **RESOLVED** that Ms Morris would check the minutes and send them to the Clerk for circulation.

It had been agreed that Ms Bird or Ms Montague would attend meetings, but neither had been able to be present for the last meeting, and Mr Rees asked for two colleagues to join him at the next meeting, which was due to take place on 18 October at 1.45 p.m.. It was **RESOLVED** that Ms McGarrigle and Ms Greene would both endeavour to attend

Mr Rees pointed out that if the SATs results were improved this year, it may not be necessary for the Raising Achievement Board to continue.

7. URGENT BUSINESS

No items of urgent business were raised.

8. DATES AND TIMES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The following dates and times were agreed for meetings of the Governing Body and committees for the 2016/17 academic year.

Governing Body

Monday, 3 October 2016
Monday, 28 November 2016
Monday, 23 January 2017
Monday, 13 March 2017
Monday, 15 May 2017
Monday, 26 June 2017

All meetings to start at 7.00 p.m.

Finance Committee

Tuesday, 8 November 2016
Tuesday, 31 January 2017
Tuesday, 9 May 2017

All meetings to start at 4.30 p.m.

Pay Committee

Tuesday, 1 November 2016 at 4.30 p.m.

Curriculum Committee

Monday, 7 November 2016 at 6.00 p.m.

Raising Attainment Board
Tuesday, 18 October 2016 at 1.45 p.m.