

# WHEELERS LANE PRIMARY SCHOOL

## MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> December 2016	
Type:	<b>Full Governing Body Committee</b>	
Present:	Mrs Sara Pecheur Mrs Jenny Uppal Mrs Anne Bates Mrs Tomina Sagheer Mrs Sheila Jones Mrs Celine Finn Mrs Bushra Zarif Mr Zaheer Bhatti Mrs Vina Sharma Miss Kathryn Barnes	SP – Head JU - Chair AB TS SJ CF BZ – Vice Chair ZB – Chaired the mtg VS KB
Minuted By:	Mrs Elaine Ascough	

1.	<p><b>Welcome and Apologies</b> Everyone was in attendance.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Minutes of the Meeting of 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 4 – BZ to VS to be changed</li> <li>• SP commented that she found out she had been awarded a one point increment by reading the minutes, JU apologised for this.</li> </ul> <p><b>The governors approved the minutes and JU will sign them.</b></p>	EA
3.	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VS has signed the GB Code of Conduct</li> <li>• SP advised that there was presently a parent governor election and the deadline is Friday 9<sup>th</sup> December at 3.15pm. JU is concerned that one candidate works for the Birmingham Education Partnership and asked what the impact of that could be, SP advised that she would write this on the pecuniary interest form and this information is posted on the website but does not see why this would be an issue. SP advised that she did write this in her statement.</li> <li>• ZB asked if the complaints procedure was on the website, EA was not sure but will be working on documents for the website so will look at this.</li> <li>• ZB said that he will format a central log where actions will be placed after a meeting, this will serve as a reminder to those who have actions to do and everyone can see whether they have been done or not. ZB will let EA have it in a word format. EA will take ownership of this by updating and distributing it. VS felt that it would be useful when actioning points that the 3 core functions of the GB are noted against the action.</li> </ul>	EA  ZB/EA
4.	<p><b>Pecuniary Interests – Verbal Update</b> Everyone in attendance confirmed they had no verbal update to their signed pecuniary interest declarations.</p>	

<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Safeguarding Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BZ advised that she met with JR this week to complete the safeguarding report. BZ explained the LA recommend this as a guide to self-audit. BZ advised that they had identified some areas of improvement and this will be looked at termly. BZ explained that they had sampled personnel files and looked at the single central record. BZ advised that all was in order but it had a raised a question over staff references from before January 2014, it is thought that the SCR did not require that information before this date. EA has booked in an audit with Ellen Osbourne from BCC HR team and will seek advice about this.</li> <li>• SP advised that the CPOMS system was in place now and staff would be trained to use it on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> January training day. Historical information is presently being input, either by flagging whether a child has a file, or a CAF. Attendance concerns can be logged too. SP is impressed with it so far and TS confirmed that her school have used it from September and it does seem a really good system.</li> <li>• VS asked if the governors should sign to say that they have seen the 'Keeping Children Safe in Education' and BZ agreed that although the governors have had the document it is recommended that people sign to say they have had it. SP said that the CPOMS training would naturally include safeguarding, with possible new governors coming on board it can be re-visited.</li> <li>• VS advised that she had done an on-line Prevent course and found it quite informative, KB advised that all staff have done it in school as it is a requirement.</li> <li>• SP advised that the Birmingham Safeguarding Board's safeguarding policy is having a codicil written at present, which will be received shortly; this involves the addition of 'sexting', as it is not included in the policy that was updated in September.</li> <li>• SP confirmed that safer recruitment training had been booked for several staff</li> </ul>	<p>EA</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Pupil Premium Review of Term &amp; Action Plan</b></p> <p>Four reports had been previously distributed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Pupil Premium Report – Academic Year 2015/16</li> <li>2) Pupil Premium Review – Action Plan</li> <li>3) Pupil Premium strategy statement</li> <li>4) Impact of PPG</li> </ol> <p>SP advised that the reporting requirements for pupil premium on the website had altered slightly, a report is now required at the beginning of the academic year to outline the decisions on how the funding will be spent and then the report at the end of the year should demonstrate expenditure and impact.</p> <p>ZB asked if there were targets linked to PP and SP advised that it is part of the teaching staffs performance management. SP explained that there is a breakdown of desired outcomes for children but as per the pupil premium review, the focus should be on progress not attainment.</p>	

6.	<p>VS commented that the report on the website was 14/15, SP advised that now the GB had seen the 1516 report, it would be uploaded. SP advised that the website should hold a 3 year history of PP.</p> <p>JU thanked JR for addressing the issues from the review and thanked her for her hard work in putting the reports together.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Raise on Line &amp; Dashboard – Unvalidated Date</b></p> <p>The ROL and Dashboard had been distributed in advance of the meeting. TB had written a summary of the reports and this had been previously distributed too.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP reported that the report used to have ‘G’ pages, these signified the pages that governors should read, but they no longer do this. As the reports are very lengthy, TB has summarised the key headlines, thanks go to TB.</li> <li>• SP explained that she had attended a training course with BEP on how to read the data reports, and she asked why on our Inspection Dashboard report it stated that WLPS had no strengths in 2016; SP said that it is the first item you see on the front page and is an extremely demotivating statement. It seems that they collate the entire nations results and only the top 10% are deemed to have a strength, so the other 90% will get the green box stating they have no strengths.</li> <li>• BZ asked if school had identified issues as the KS1 data is in red, SP replied that school were aware of them so the report was no surprise. SP explained that the low results are partly due to the change in the curriculum and the higher expectations of the children, but also moderation has been an issue across the city. JU felt that having results below the national average couldn’t just be down to the change of curriculum and SP explained that where tests are externally marked, for example the KS2 SATs, school have done very well, but KS1 are internally marked, moderated and validated and school feel that the results are correct, however, moderation has been a national issue and school feel that it is likely that other schools have been more generous with their marking, whereas it is felt that Birmingham LA schools may have been a touch too harsh.</li> <li>• SP also explained that the ROL data has never made a comparison from Early Years data to KS1 data, but this year they had which was unexpected; the KS1 data was historically judged on attainment rather than progress from Early Years.</li> <li>• CF asked what strategies had been put in place and SP replied that the focus is now on deeper learning, therefore more time is allocated to each topic, this was the outcome from a KS1 Maths audit. For writing, an interim document was received by schools very late so the planning had to be adapted, so there were elements that had been not taught and had to be fitted in quickly. This interim document was only intended for a short period but is still in place.</li> <li>• VS advised that she met with Sue Stone as Link governor to English. VS agreed that writing is significantly below where it needs to be but felt reassured that there are clear actions in place to address this. VS asked whether there was anything specific in the School Improvement Plan to</li> </ul>	

7.

address this and SP replied that there is for overall standards and improving progress but it is more specific to KS1. SP told the governors that there were issues with the KS1 standardised test scores and the Teacher Assessments and that it was not fair on our children going from year 2 to year 3. BZ asked how the children were being supported with this and SP replied that children were having interventions. BZ asked how it was being monitored and SP said there had been book trawls and SMT had gone through the planning and felt that there was progress being made in English and Maths. VS asked what schools stance was on interventions and children being taken out of the classroom and SP replied that it is first quality teaching initially (from the teacher in class) and if it is felt that a child or group of children have not grasped what was taught in the lesson, there will be short burst intervention in the afternoon, as it is felt that children need help there and then before moving on to something else. KB added that she felt this was better as children were not missing the same lesson, such as art, and this improves their motivation. VS agrees that it has to be a balance and the well-being of the child has to come first. SJ asked if interventions were only in afternoon and SP replied that they were as English and Maths was taught in the morning and children must not miss these lessons.

- CF asked if there was any correlation between poor attendance and poor progress and SP said that with some children it is a factor. KB added that some children struggle in class for all sorts of reasons, some will have more emotional needs and may have a difficult homelife or issues at home and explained that Mrs Laffey, the Learning Mentor, has time with some children but obviously there is only one of her. TS asked how many children would normally take part in an intervention and KB said it could be 6 to 8 children, other times it could be a one-to-one. KB explained that it would be part of the child's IEP, for example it could be for fine motor skills, this is a barrier to learning which has a massive impact on progress. SP said that Mel Fisher monitors interventions very closely. JU said that she had met with DL a while back and told the GB that this was her area of expertise. JU feels that emotional development is not given enough weight as a barrier to learning but knows that DL works very hard with the children; KB added that DL is incredibly stretched and simply does not have enough time to see all the children who do need support. JU agrees that DL is over stretched and it is difficult to support emotional development without a good infrastructure. JU feels that this is not an easy field and that teachers have inadequate training on this. BZ asked if the numbers of children needing support would warrant another person and SP replied that it would vary from time to time which children needed what, BZ asked who monitors workload and impact of the learning mentor and SP replied that ES did. ZB wondered that as the school budget was healthy at the moment whether anyone could come in to help on a fixed term basis rather than a permanent contract. CF suggested that there were packages that could be bought into. VS feels that it is more important for school to have the right infrastructure in place, that the environment is right, that it is correctly assessed and monitored, and the right level of expertise is in

7.	<p>school. SP added that school really suffers from lack of space and this is an issue for DL, as more often than not she would need a private quiet space and this can be difficult. SP advised that school buy into Dare2Dream, a gentleman comes in one afternoon a week to work with children who are particularly struggling but again, it is difficult to find him a space to work.</p>	
8.	<p><b>STEP Update / Academisation</b></p> <p>The STEP letter to parents, which was very much the same as went to staff and governors, went out Friday 18<sup>th</sup> November (slightly earlier than the agreed Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup>). The GB were in receipt of 5 letters regarding academisation, one of which was a freedom of information request. STEP minutes from 2<sup>nd</sup> December were circulated along with information that Swanshurst had posted a message on their website that they were moving to formal consultation, and also that WLTC's GB had met and decided to move forward too. At the STEP heads meeting it was decided that those schools who wanted to move forward to formal consultation would decide by or in the January GB meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VS feels the GB should be extremely cautious in following someone else's timeline and should only decide in consideration of WLPS and its pupils, staff and community, and will not feel under pressure of from other schools.</li> <li>• BZ asked what the history was with the STEP group and SP replied that it was set up between the Heads of local schools with a view to working in close partnership. The STEP group is set up as a company with the Head's acting as the directors. STEP was formed and had initially wanted to employ an Educational Psychologist that would work for all 7 schools, unfortunately this was far more difficult than expected and did not come to fruition. SP told the GB that although the schools felt it better to work together it was never set up to eventually form a MAT. JU has previously told the GB that she felt that the Chairs had very different opinions to that of the Heads, and states that very early on when STEP had formed she was told by one of the Chairs that the STEP group had been formed in preparation to go MAT. JU feels it is important to have trust in those that WLPS will be entering into what could be a lifelong partnership. CF recalls Carol coming to talk to the GB about setting up the STEP group and at no time was academisation mentioned and AB agreed that at the time it made sense to pool resources, to work together and the key element was to employ an Ed Pysch.</li> <li>• SP said that a lot of the questions that were being asked was that of the intended MAT structure, but until it is known who is moving to formal consultation the question cannot be answered.</li> <li>• BZ feels a key question is whether WLPS can join the MAT at a later date, if this is the decision. SP said that should the secondary's decide to definitely academise, the primary's need to know whether they can join later, this may be something that has to be written into the MAT setup, but this will need to be clear.</li> <li>• ZB thinks that the GB are not prepared with the full facts to enable it to make an informed decision and asked if WLPS did go to formal consultation could this process be stopped should it be decided not to academise. KB asked</li> </ul>	

8.	<p>even if WLPS decided not to go to formal consultation would the GB still have access and input to the academisation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• JU had written a letter from herself, not on behalf on the GB, to the STEP group voicing her concerns on how the STEP group is operating. JU told the GB that she feels it is clear that STEP cannot deliver and that it has proven not to maintain autonomy. VS agreed with JU that it was wrong to be forced into a position to send the letter out to parents without the GB having read it, in hindsight changes would have been made, but the GB were not given the opportunity.</li><li>• KB asked if the Headteachers would be taking it in turns to be CEO of the MAT, SP said that this would not be permitted with a MAT, but KB said it has been reported back from a member of staff at a STEP school that this is what the staff have been informed</li><li>• JU is concerned about how decisions are being made and who is driving this forward as she has been to one meeting since the summer and finds the GB is a position that it has to vote to go to formal consultation or not now. JU feels the meetings are not properly minuted and they are not operating transparently enough. VS feels that the GB have a fundamental and moral obligation to staff and parents.</li><li>• KB confirmed that the NUT teachers had voted against moving towards academisation, this was confirmed in an e-mail to the GB.</li><li>• JU feels that WLPS have worked very hard to secure good relationships with their parents and do not want this undermined, it is about working in partnership with parents. JU added that some parents have started a 'Save our School' campaign.</li><li>• VS advised that the evidence of research done in 2016 shows no significant improvement in primary academies. VS also feels that once a school has gone through formal consultation it is inevitable that academisation follows; 100% of schools that put the application form in has gone on to be an academy, no school has decided not to do it.</li><li>• JU feels that nothing this GB aspire's to is driving this fast rate and when she asks the question why is this moving so fast, no-one can answer</li><li>• ZB asked whether it would be good to disengage from STEP whilst the GB decide the way forward for WLPS and VS agrees that the GB's duty is to worry about WLPS and not other schools.</li><li>• CF agrees that nothing she has read has persuaded her that academisation is the way forward and feels that political leaders and decision makers may change again. SP said that although the government has said it will not force schools into academisation, the schools commissioners still states that it wants all schools to be such by 2022. SP worries that if schools do not academise voluntarily what steps may be made that push schools to do it.</li><li>• SP advised that the schools who have agreed to go to formal consultation will set a meeting but that would only be for those schools, and not likely to be open to everyone but JU feels that this is excluding WLPS from the process and that was not what was agreed; it was agreed that all STEP would be</li></ul>	
----	---	--

<p>8.</p>	<p>involved in the process even if they decided to join the MAT in the future. SP feels there would not be any point in attending a meeting that decides the plan on how to formally consult if the GB had decided not to do it, whereas JU feels this it is important to be part of the process and to have our views heard. BZ asks if it is an individual schools choice or whether the STEP group of schools will decide this together, and thinks that WLPS should take ownership and seek to start a 'pre-consultation' process with staff and parents, hold open meetings and seek to ensure transparency. TS is keen that school does not start the process off with a negative atmosphere and VS agrees that parents and staff should be united on the decision whether to move to formal consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JU believes that WLPS have to continue to attend the STEP meetings regardless of having made a decision at this time to continue to fact-find. JU thinks that WLPS should be honest with STEP and say that school is not ready to go to formal consultation as yet but still wish to be a part of any MAT decisions to enable school to join it at a later date as has been previously discussed and agreed. ZB asked where this agreement is in writing and JU is worried that it may not be in writing as she does not feel the meetings have been accurately minuted. JU also feels that the relationship within STEP needs to be clarified before pursuing a MAT commitment with them.</li> <li>• SP distributed a power point slide presentation that she had been given which had come from the education show</li> <li>• BZ asked SP if any of the Heads feel the same as WLPS and SP answered that she is only aware of the intentions of the two schools that have publicly declared they are going to formal consultation, she was not aware of how the other GB's felt, not until the decisions are fed back after the January meetings.</li> <li>• CF shared her opinion that WLPS were very fortunate to have a great staff and would hate to see them demoralised over this issue. CF thinks it is difficult to know whether academisation would have any impact on jobs eventually, it is well known that schools budgets are being cut so this may be what is coming without academising. BZ said that they were told on the finance training course that the LA would not 'top slice' from an academy's budget. SP gave an example of part of this 'top slicing' - £20k funds union time for going to union meetings etc.. and even though a lot of schools have academised in Birmingham and therefore are no longer 'top sliced', it would seem that the funding has not dropped accordingly, they still receive the £20k; even with far fewer schools paying for it. CF agrees that the Birmingham LA needs to revisit its budget.</li> <li>• ZB feels that the GB need clarity on the question of whether we can still be part of the process without going to formal consultation, JU but wonders who gives that answer as it appears that people have different views</li> <li>• CF suggests that the GB puts together a list of questions that SP could take to the next Heads meeting. JU asked SP who within STEP is making the decisions as she feels that the Heads say one thing and GB's think another. BZ said she understands how difficult it must be to have the decisions made</li> </ul>	
-----------	--	--

8.

because the process has not started yet, so there will be questions that there are no answers to as yet, they will come in time as the process gets underway and SP agreed and added this is why the two schools have made the decision to move to formal consultation, so they can start to answer questions that parents are asking. JU disagrees and thinks the GB should know the answers before making the decision. VS feels once the formal consultation has been lodged with the Dfe the timeline will dictate and she is worried that the GB will be swept away with it, whereas if the GB decide to do a pre-consultation and take the time to talk to parents and staff it will naturally come to a conclusion and drive itself, whichever way. JU agrees that debate is required and VS believes that it is here and now that debate has to start but CF thinks the GB have to be mindful that the decision affects future parents and staff, many of our parents will take part in the debate and have their opinions heard but they will leave, and it is more than likely that they will follow on to an academised secondary school, the decision has to be the best choice for the future of WLPS

- ZB asks what if the funding is stopped at 2020 and school has decided to move forward, VS feels that not rushing into it with STEP it may mean that WLPS have more of a choice which MAT they join. CF agrees that when entering a process like this, it is difficult to anticipate what the future holds for example, heads change and come with different ideas, governors will come and go, the government may abandon MATs, and current MATs may be disbanded; it's been seen before with Grant Maintained school; parents will leave and perhaps new parents will come in being used to the idea of academies
- CF said it is clear that WLPC GB are not ready yet to make the decision to move to formal consultation and believes it is still in the fact finding stage, CF explained that although on a personal level she is against academisation, she is open to be better informed, and feels it may be an amazing opportunity, but the GB need more information at this point in time
- BZ said that the GB need a working group with a clear agenda and timeline, they can seek information, views and then deliver a pro's and con's reality which will enable people to make a decision. CF agreed that not enough is known about the different MAT models. **All governors agreed that they do not want to move to formal consultation now and that a working party should be set up to find out more information.** The working part needs to have people with different views on it, it is of no use to have a working party where everyone is of the same opinion, it needs to have a breadth of experiences and views to work. There will need to be parents, staff and governors on the working party.
- SP thinks that the next STEP meeting is open to Head's, Chairs and Vice Chairs and will advise the date when known
- VS asked if anyone had looked at the Nfer website as she feels they have a lot of useful information, and they are an independent body. JU said that the NGA website has a lot of good information too.



<p>8.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was decided that the working party will work to a deadline of Easter to enable a decision to be made and discussion took place regarding whether this was a long enough period but SP suggests that should this prove not to be long enough it can simply be extended but it is important to have a workable timeline. KB said this gives 13 weeks.</li> <li>• JU advised that now she has resigned as a governor she feels she will have more time and would like to spearhead the working party. AB agrees that the working party will need a dedicated person independent from the GB. JU said the PCF can help to get parents engaged in the debate</li> <li>• AB suggests that communication needs to be sent out as soon as possible to parents to make WLPS's intentions clear which will help allay parent's fears and unrest. The governors agree that that letter will advise parents and staff that the GB do not feel they are in a position to move to formal consultation and intend to continue to gather information to become better informed about the prospect of becoming an academy, or not. BZ asks if, out of courtesy, it would be better to inform STEP first but EA advised that the Freedom of Information request will need a response by the 15<sup>th</sup> December so governors agreed that the letter should go out before school breaks for Christmas and this same letter should be used to respond to the FOI request. JU volunteered to write the letter to parents as she was going to write to the staff thanking them for their hard work this term anyway. VS asked if it were possible to send a translated version out to those parents who have English as a second language as the whole community needs to be involved and JU replied that this was a question that the PCF posed to parents but they answered that this was not required.</li> <li>• ZB suggests that governors come to the next meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> January with a list of questions that can be asked of STEP. BZ asked if it were possible to get an expert in to talk to the GB at some point.</li> </ul>	<p>JU</p> <p>ALL GOVS</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>Full Cheque Book Decision</b></p> <p>An explanatory letter had been distributed to governors at the last meeting. AB spoke to the GB and invited questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AB explained that school can only apply for full cheque book status whilst it is a LA school, and that this will be the case for at least a year (which is the minimum requirement) so after the academisation conversation, AB is confident we can go ahead with it.</li> <li>• AB explained that school are already partial cheque book but full cheque book would give school so much more flexibility, and give school control over the whole budget.</li> <li>• TS asked if it would be cost and time effective and AB replied it would make the system so much easier. As school are partial cheque book now, systems are in place regarding signatories, divisions of funds and procedures so none of this will change.</li> </ul>	

9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BZ advised that the Finance training that herself and ZB had attended did recommend that schools go full cheque book.</li> </ul> <p><b>The Governing Body approved Wheelers Lane Primary School to go to full cheque book status. The Chair of Governors will sign the paperwork.</b></p>	
10.	<p><b>Policy Ratification</b></p> <p><b>Behaviour Policy updated school policy</b>  This policy had been presented to the Curriculum and Community Committee on 1<sup>st</sup> October, JU had wanted to see more detail in the policy and had made notes, and was hoping to meet with ES before she went on her maternity leave. This is the policy that school is working to so would like it ratified to enable school to update the website. SP advised that ES had just been on restorative justice training so was going to be updating the policy again. JU will e-mail ES to see whether she received her notes as she is interested whether ES did not receive them or if she decided not to include them. JU is very happy that the policy will be amended to reflect restorative justice as this covers a lot of JU's suggestions. SP thinks it may be updated by Easter.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed by CF and seconded by BZ</b></p> <p><b>Data Protection Policy- HR policy</b>  This is a BCC HR policy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed by ZB and seconded by TS</b></p> <p><b>Whistle Blowing and Serious Misconduct</b>  This is a BCC HR policy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed by AB and seconded by SJ</b></p> <p><b>Pupil Premium</b>  This is a school policy. TS was surprised to see it on the agenda as it is going to be updated, SP advised that she had very slightly tweaked it for the September 16 new academic year so it needs ratifying now to enable it to go on the website. JR will be updating the policy which will be presented to governors at a future date.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Proposed by TA and seconded by AB</b></p>	
11.	<p><b>Link Governor Update &amp; Feedback</b></p> <p><b>BZ &amp; JR Safeguarding 18/11/16 &amp; 6/12/16</b>  See item 5 - Link governor feedback form to follow</p> <p><b>TS &amp; JR Pupil Premium 28/11/16 – feedback on 5<sup>th</sup> January agenda</b>  TS will distribute the Link governor feedback form</p>	<p>BZ</p> <p>TS</p>
12.	<p><b>Governing Training Feedback</b></p> <p>BZ – Safeguarding Children 221116  JU – Performance Management of HT 281116  TS – Performance Management of HT 281116</p>	

	<p>BZ – School Finance 011216 ZB – School Finance 011216</p> <p>Due to the time restraints, this item was not discussed in depth. All the feedback forms have been made available to everyone.</p>	
13.	<p><b>Secondment Update</b> SP had written a report and it had been distributed prior to the meeting. Due to time restraints it was decided to discuss this at the 5<sup>th</sup> January meeting alongside the Headteachers report. SP was thanked for her report.</p>	Next agenda item
14.	<p><b>On going governing body development and effectiveness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EA advised that not everyone had replied to the e-mail requesting dates and times available for the meetings with Andy Staples. EA will collate the responses and let governors and Andy Staples know of the date and time chosen.</li> </ul>	EA
15.	<p><b>Governing Body Vacancies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ZB advised that he had signed up to the ‘Inspire The Future’ website with a view to searching for potential new governors. Discussion took place and it was decided that KB would approach people on line to ask whether they would like to become a governor with us and ask them to complete the application form.</li> <li>SP advised that ‘Inspire The Future’ is a huge site and TB is going to sign school up to it as there is a wealth of information and resources. SP said that TB will look to get volunteers to come in and talk to the children to support the curriculum, perhaps to run a careers fair; JU is keen that parents be involved in that too.</li> <li>CF confirmed that her friend is completing the application form but was unable to do it electronically as they document must have been corrupt, so has now completed it by hand and will forward it to school</li> <li>The voting deadline for the parent governor election is tomorrow at 3.15pm. EA will notify the candidates when the votes have been counted and verified, and welcome the newly elected candidate to the GB. EA will process the appropriate paperwork with them. BZ, as Vice Chair will make contact with them with a view to welcoming them and perhaps meeting with them together with SP, this will ideally be done before the next meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> January but there is only a week left of school and 2 days at the start of term; so this will need to be arranged. VS offered her assistance if needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Thanks to AB and JU</b> The Governors thanked AB and JU for their time as governors and their commitment to WLPS. AB has served as a governor on and off for twenty years, starting at the old Junior school. As previously discussed AB will still continue to attend the finance meetings in her capacity as office manager who manages the schools finances. As discussed earlier in the meeting, JU would still like to be involved in the Academisation working party.</p>	<p>KB</p> <p>EA</p> <p>BZ/SP</p>

16.	<b>Correspondence</b> <b>Confidential item</b>	
17.	<b>Any Other Business</b> There was none as the meeting had over-run.  The meeting finished at 8.05pm	
18.	<b>Date of Next meeting</b> Thursday 5 <sup>th</sup> January 2016.	