

Wednesday, 29 April 2026 at 17:30
 Sixth Form, Teignmouth Community School, Exeter Road

Present
Karl Devincenzi (KD) - Governor, Curriculum & Delivery
Samantha Horne (SH) - Governor, Inclusion (Disadvantaged & SEND)
Laura Parfitt (LP) - Governor, Behaviour, Safeguarding & Attendance
Jane Russell (JR) - Governor, Curriculum & Delivery, Vice-Chair
Michael Wigmore (MW) - Governor, Chair
In Attendance
Chris Darvill (CD) – Assistant Headteacher
Lauren Fletcher (LF) - Potential New Parent Governor
Rachel Hill (RH) - Local Governance Officer (LGO)
Apologies
Laura Milsom (LM) – Sixth Form Consultation
Samantha Atkinson (SA) – Assistant Headteacher
Rachel Wickham (RW) - Headteacher
Gaby Willis (GW) - Trust Governance Officer and Company Secretary
Jim Prior (JP) – Co-opted Governor
Absent without apologies
Jessica Phillips (JP) – Co-opted Governor

1.1	Welcome and Apologies
DISCUSSION	
MW welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were noted from GW, LM, RW, SA and JPrior. MW welcomed CD and LF. At the suggestion of RH, the attendees introduced themselves for the benefit of LF, a potential new parent governor.	

1.2	Declarations of Interest
DISCUSSION	
MW asked for any declarations of interest. None were declared.	

1.3	Presentation by Chris Darvill – Behaviour & Attendance
DISCUSSION	
CD presented an update on the school’s position regarding Behaviour and Attendance under the new Ofsted	

framework, where they are assessed together.

Behaviour

CD expressed concern that the school was not meeting the 'expected' standard in establishing high expectations built on positive relationships. CD noted that while initial strategies had stabilised the school, progress had plateaued and the strategies had 'passed their sell by date'. This was attributed to a focus on compliance which had de-skilled staff in building warmth and connection. Survey data supported this, with adult-student relationships identified as a significant outlier and half of students feeling teachers were unfair. CD also noted that disadvantaged students were disproportionately affected by the current policy.

The LGB discussed the long-term plan to shift from a compliance-based policy to a relational approach. JR noted that teachers had been de-skilled by previous policies prioritising control over connection. The school intended to work with St. Peter's School in Exeter on their successful relational support plan. The approach would involve a slow, evidence-based implementation over two years, starting in September, to ensure it was done rigorously. This would include staff training, action research, and involving students in designing the new approach to foster a sense of belonging and empower all teachers to do more relational work.

Attendance

CD provided an update on attendance, reporting a more positive situation. Overall attendance was slightly ahead of the previous year and persistent absence (PA) had decreased, though a recent slip was noted as a potential risk. The school was on par with Devon averages but behind national figures. The school had shifted its focus to students on the cusp of persistent absence, using scripted tutor conversations and 'Be your best' sessions to foster connection. A case study by 'Impacted' had highlighted the school's good work in this area.

The LGB discussed the broader implications of the relational approach, including its potential to improve staff well-being and reduce stress. CD emphasised that the approach was about fostering a whole-school culture of connection and trust. He noted that the government's white paper supported this direction, making it an opportune time for the school to lead. Concerns were raised by KD about whether Ofsted would accept the long-term timeline, but CD was confident that the evidence-based, gradual approach would be favourably received if it demonstrated clear progress.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

<p>Clarity was sought on whether Ofsted had already requested a data upload from the school.</p>	<p>It was explained that some data, such as registers and suspensions, is automatically uploaded nationally and accessible to Ofsted. However, it was clarified that Ofsted does not rely solely on school-provided data; they cross-reference national data with conversations involving staff, students, and parents to assess consistency.</p>
<p>Concerns were raised, based on parent and pupil feedback, regarding a perceived lack of mutual respect between teachers and students, with some students feeling they should not respect teachers who treated them poorly.</p>	<p>The concern was fully acknowledged as the primary issue the school needed to address. It was explained that survey data identified adult-student relationships as a key weakness, attributed to a previous behaviour policy that, while stabilising the school, had de-skilled staff in forming positive relationships. A new, long-term relational approach was planned to rectify this by shifting from a compliance-based model to one fostering mutual respect and belonging.</p>
<p>An inquiry was made about the progress on building</p>	<p>It was explained that new concepts were being gradually</p>

<p>positive relationships and the feasibility of implementing restorative conversations, given time constraints.</p>	<p>introduced to prepare staff for a larger initiative in September. This included reframing the 'relational approach' to mean high support and high challenge. It was noted that while immediate full implementation was challenging, the school planned to train staff gradually to ensure meaningful restorative conversations could be embedded sustainably.</p>
<p>The feasibility of the proposed two-year timeline for cultural change was questioned, particularly in the event of an imminent Ofsted inspection.</p>	<p>Reassurance was offered that Ofsted inspectors, as experienced school leaders, would likely favour a well-considered, sustainable plan over a short-term fix. It was believed that demonstrating a clear, evidence-based pathway for improvement would be received positively.</p>
<p>Clarity was sought on why 'trust' was the lowest-scoring area in the recent staff survey.</p>	<p>It was suggested that staff may feel disconnected from the trust, as communication was often filtered through the school's senior leadership rather than being direct. The physical presence of the trust on the school site without regular interaction was also thought to possibly contribute to this feeling.</p>
<p>The potential of using an AI platform to support staff in developing communication skills, particularly for parent interactions, was raised.</p>	<p>It was agreed that such a tool could be beneficial for staff training, particularly in reducing anxiety around parent communications and providing unbiased feedback on interactions.</p>
<p>SUPPORT</p>	
<p>LP commended the pre-holiday emails sent to parents, which encouraged engagement and provided an opportunity for parents to report issues affecting attendance. She suggested reordering the email to prioritise the key question about holiday experiences, ensuring parents were more likely to engage with the content.</p>	
<p>DECISIONS</p>	
<p>The LGB agreed to support the school in adopting a gradual, evidence-based approach to implementing the relational model, inspired by St. Peter's School in Exeter. This would involve staff training, action research, and student involvement in designing the strategy.</p>	
<p>ACTIONS</p>	
<p>CD to email the LGO the updates to the behaviour and attendance document and for the LGO to upload to GovernorHub.</p>	<p>CD, LGO</p>
<p>Develop and implement a relational approach to behaviour and attendance, involving staff training, action research, and gradual rollout starting in September.</p>	<p>CD, RW</p>
<p>Conduct pupil voice surveys before the end of the summer term to establish a baseline for student perceptions of fairness and relationships with staff, with follow-up surveys planned for the next academic year.</p>	<p>CD</p>
<p>CD to consider the use of an AI platform for staff training in communication skills, particularly for parent interactions. SH to send CD the link. Newly appointed parent governor LF to be involved.</p>	<p>CD, SH, LF</p>

Reorder the pre-holiday emails to prioritise the key question about holiday experiences, ensuring greater parent engagement.	CD
--	----

1.4	Presentation by Laura Milsom -Personal Development and Wellbeing (Ofsted Prep – Personal Development and Wellbeing in GH)
	It was agreed to defer this item to the July LGB meeting.

1.5	Sixth Form Consultation – discussion led by Chris Darvill
------------	--

DISCUSSION

The LGB discussed the closure of the sixth form. MW set the context, explaining that while the decision was difficult, it was financially inevitable, with the main school having subsidised the sixth form for at least three years. The LGB expressed frustration at the speed of the process and being informed after the decision was made. LP highlighted the shock and disappointment felt by the community, noting she had heard the news from her child rather than through official channels. The consensus was that the primary issue was the manner and timing of the communication, rather than the decision itself.

JR reflected on the LGB’s historical involvement in discussions about the sixth form’s viability, noting that concerns over student numbers and financial sustainability had been raised for the past four years. It was noted that the closure would allow for resources to be reinvested into the main school. JR confirmed she would continue as link governor to monitor the process until 2027. CD added that the closure would also allow for the reallocation of teaching resources and the introduction of new initiatives.

The LGB explored the implications of the closure for students who would need to transition to other providers. CD mentioned that the school was organising a trip to Newton Abbot College to support students, while SH raised the importance of providing guidance for those pursuing apprenticeships or other pathways.

The LGO invited the LGB to formulate questions for the trustees for at their upcoming meeting on 12 May. KD suggested asking about improving communication, while SH and JR proposed clarifying the LGB’s role in the sixth form transition process. MW indicated he would draft a question for the trustees reflecting these points.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

Clarity was sought on why the LGB was not involved in the decision-making process or given the opportunity to state its case to the Trust before the decision on the sixth form's closure was made.	It was explained that this was a Trust-level decision and that due to legal implications, the initial process was restricted to a small group of senior leaders. It was acknowledged that the Chair had engaged with the Headteacher to ensure oversight of the process. The resulting communication challenges were also acknowledged.
---	---

Concerns were raised regarding the timing of the consultation and decision-making process, particularly its alignment with governor meetings.	It was noted that the consultation window did not align with governor meetings due to scheduling discrepancies between trust and LGB calendars. The decision was made at an extraordinary trust meeting, not the standard February trust meeting.
---	---

The feasibility of a temporary closure or suspension was questioned, given the emotional and generational	It was explained that the sixth form had been financially unsustainable for several years, with the main school
---	---

significance of the sixth form to the community.	subsidising it by approximately £500,000 annually. A temporary closure was not considered viable, and it was noted that the school was at risk of being re-brokered if the financial situation continued.
Clarification was sought on the LGB's future role and the support being offered to pupils affected by the closure.	It was confirmed that the LGB would continue to oversee the transition process until 2027, with link governors remaining engaged. Reassurance was given that support was being provided to students, including a trip to visit Newton Abbot College to explore alternative options, and a focus on other pathways such as apprenticeships.
SUPPORT	
The LGB acknowledged the difficult nature of the decision to close the sixth form and recognised the financial realities that necessitated it. There was a shared understanding that the closure would allow for the reallocation of resources to benefit the broader school community.	
ACTIONS	
Draft and submit questions to the Trust Board regarding the LGB's future role in the sixth form closure and the improvement of communication systems between the LGB, the Trust Board, and the Headteacher.	MW, LGO

1.6	Re-appointment of Michael Wigmore as co-opted governor and recommendation to Trust Board	
DISCUSSION		
MW raised the matter of his re-appointment as a co-opted governor, noting that his term as a parent governor was due to expire on 16.05.2026. MW sought consensus from the LGB for his re-appointment as a co-opted governor.		
DECISIONS		
The LGB agreed to re-appoint MW as a co-opted governor and recommended this appointment to the Trust Board.		
ACTIONS		
Re-appoint MW as a co-opted governor and recommend this appointment to the Trust Board.	LGO	

1.7	Re-appointment of Jane Russell as co-opted governor and recommendation to Trust Board	
DISCUSSION		
RH confirmed the re-appointment of JR as co-opted governor for recommendation to the Trust Board. The term of office expiry date was noted as 16.05.2026, and the relevant redacted application was available in the governance hub (GH).		
DECISIONS		
The re-appointment of JR as co-opted governor was accepted by the LGB for recommendation to the Trust Board.		
ACTIONS		
Re-appoint JR as a co-opted governor and recommend this appointment to the Trust Board on 12.05.26.	LGO	

1.8	Accept resignation of Jess Phillips as governor and recommend to Trust Board	
DISCUSSION		
MW formally acknowledged the resignation of Jess Phillips from her role as governor. It was noted that JessP had stepped back due to juggling multiple commitments and had submitted her resignation on 09.02.2026. The LGB accepted the resignation and agreed to recommend it to the Trust Board.		
DECISIONS		
The LGB accepted the resignation of Jess Phillip as governor.		
ACTIONS		
Recommend the acceptance of Jess Phillip's resignation to the Trust Board.		LGO

1.9	Appointment of Lauren Fletcher to LGB as parent governor	
DISCUSSION		
MW introduced the appointment of LF as a parent governor, noting that she would assume the parent governor role previously held by himself. MW highlighted the need to discuss LF's potential link responsibilities within the LGB, particularly in the areas requiring additional resilience (Safeguarding and SEND). LF explained her motivation for applying, citing her professional experience managing a diverse team and her personal transition as a parent of children moving from primary to secondary education. She expressed interest in bridging the gap between parental perspectives and professional communication, particularly in parent engagement and safeguarding. MW suggested that LF could contribute to strengthening safeguarding and SEND resilience, acknowledging the critical nature of these areas during Ofsted inspections. JR supported LF's potential link to parent engagement, referencing past Ofsted questions about parent voice and engagement, which the LGB had previously struggled to address. LF agreed that parent engagement felt like a natural fit given her professional background in senior leadership.		
SUPPORT		
The LGB welcomed LF as a parent governor.		
DECISIONS		
LF was appointed as a parent governor to the LGB, pending recommendation to the Trust Board.		
ACTIONS		
Determine the specific link responsibilities for LF, focusing on areas such as safeguarding, SEND, or parent engagement. LGO to recommend this appointment to the Trust Board.		MW, LF, LGO

1.10	Skills Audit 2025-26	
DISCUSSION		
Following a query from MW, the LGO confirmed that the Skills Audit 2025-26 had been completed by the LGB and the final dashboard was available in Governor Hub. The Chair recommended that the LGB review the training suggestions provided by the National Governance Association (NGA), located in the far right-hand corner of the dashboard.		
ACTIONS		
Review the NGA-recommended training suggestions provided in the Skills Audit 2025-26 dashboard.		LGB

2.1	Matters Arising from meeting held on 04.02.2026
DISCUSSION	
The LGB discussed the staff absence data. It was noted that context was required to interpret the figures, although LF provided some external benchmarks for comparison. The LGB agreed to carry the item forward to the next meeting to be discussed with RW for contextualisation.	
ACTIONS	
Carry staff absence data forward for discussion at the July meeting. RW to contextualise data.	

2.2	Agree as a true and accurate record
DISCUSSION	
MW asked the LGB to confirm that the minutes of the previous meeting were a true and accurate record, and the LGB agreed.	

3.0	Feedback from IET	
DISCUSSION		
MW raised the absence of a formal mechanism for the LGB to provide feedback to the Trust, noting the previous 'chairman's meeting' structure had been discontinued by the new Chief Executive with the intention of it being replaced. MW acknowledged that while the lack of a formal feedback vehicle was a concern, a degree of flexibility was justified during the transition period. However, he indicated that prolonged delays might prompt further inquiry with the Trust, particularly if urgent matters arose. He reassured the LGB that he could still contact Katie Quinn directly to raise any significant concerns. The LGO clarified that trustees could still be approached with questions, and LP observed that minutes of LGB meetings remained available as a record.		
ACTIONS		
Follow up with the Trust to establish a formal feedback mechanism for the LGB if no progress is made in a timely manner.		MW

4.0	Chair's Update	
DISCUSSION		
MW provided a verbal update on a recent school self-assessment meeting he attended on behalf of the LGB. He noted that attendees included key representatives from the trust, such as the Chief Executive (PC), the HR Director, the Property and Health and Safety Director, the CFO, and RW. The purpose of the meeting was to evaluate the school's performance from multiple perspectives, with each representative presenting their view before collective challenge and discussion. MW reflected on the risk of the group developing an overly optimistic view of performance, but observed that this was mitigated by external validation from entities like Windsor Academy Trust and Tagrack. He expressed a desire to involve other members of the LGB in future meetings to add another dimension to assurance and provide a broader perspective.		
ACTIONS		
Involve additional LGB members in future school self-assessment meetings to provide		MW

broader assurance.

5.1 Reports from Link Governors - Safeguarding, Behaviour & Attendance

DISCUSSION

LP presented her report on the safeguarding visit, conducted with Sarah Minty Dyke (DSL) and Rachel Hart (DDSL). She highlighted significant concerns regarding the increased threshold for external support services, such as social care, which has resulted in the school's safeguarding team bearing a substantially greater workload. LP noted that the safeguarding team, comprising only two staff members, is overwhelmed and at risk of burnout, despite their dedication. The reduction in external agency involvement has shifted additional responsibilities onto the team, leading to potential gaps in support for vulnerable students.

MW acknowledged the severity of the issue, citing examples from exclusion meetings where early intervention could have prevented escalation had external support been available. MW and LP discussed the broader systemic issue, including the financial constraints faced by Devon County Council, which have contributed to the raised thresholds for service eligibility.

The LGB explored potential avenues for addressing the safeguarding team's capacity issues. MW proposed engaging with the SENDCo (FT), a contact with links to Devon County Council, to discuss whether recent financial adjustments (e.g., debt relief for local authorities) could lead to improved support for the school. LP and SH agreed that MW and SH should follow up with Fran and report back at the next meeting.

SH proposed exploring community volunteers to support pastoral care, though LP and RH expressed reservations about the feasibility of involving volunteers in safeguarding-specific tasks, such as reviewing CPOMS entries. LP clarified that safeguarding duties required professional oversight and could not be delegated to volunteers.

LP mentioned that staff morale within the safeguarding team remains low due to the increased workload, exposure to abusive communications from parents (including social media trolling and abusive emails), and the emotional toll of their roles. Despite these challenges, the team remains committed to their work.

MW raised the topic of auditing the Single Central Record (SCR), a critical document for Ofsted inspections. LP confirmed she had not yet reviewed the SCR due to the absence of Ellie Walker (EW), the relevant staff member. The LGO clarified that the school had recently audited the SCR internally, suggesting LP coordinate with EW to review the findings.

LP acknowledged the difficulty in scheduling meetings with EW due to time constraints but committed to arranging a discussion before the next LGB meeting.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

<p>The possibility of using community volunteers to support the safeguarding team was questioned.</p>	<p>It was noted that this would not be feasible for core safeguarding duties, such as reviewing CPOMS entries, due to confidentiality and professional oversight requirements. However, it was acknowledged that volunteers might be able to provide pastoral support.</p>
---	--

<p>A query was raised regarding the status of the Single Central Record (SCR) audit.</p>	<p>It was explained that the school had recently audited the SCR internally. LP committed to meeting with Ellie Walker (EW) to review the findings before the next meeting, though time constraints had previously hindered this.</p>
--	---

SUPPORT	
The LGB acknowledged the dedication and hard work of the safeguarding team, despite the challenges they face.	
ACTIONS	
Engage with the SENDCo (FT) to discuss potential support from Devon County Council for the safeguarding team and report back to the LGB at the next meeting.	MW, SH
Meet with Ellie Walker (EW) to review the Single Central Record (SCR) before the next LGB meeting.	LP

5.2	Reports from Link Governors - Enrichment & Careers
DISCUSSION	
MW summarised the report from the link governor for Enrichment & Careers, noting that it was well-received and addressed multiple aspects of the school's provision, including inclusion, discipline, and SEND. MW also mentioned that a follow-up meeting had been arranged with JP and himself to discuss the report further.	

5.3	Reports from Link Governors - Inclusion (Disadvantaged & SEND)
DISCUSSION	
SH reported that a planned meeting with the school's SEND team had not taken place as scheduled due to a miscommunication regarding the date, which fell on the last day of the school holidays. A new date for the meeting was subsequently arranged.	
The LGB discussed the importance of incorporating parental perspectives on SEND matters. MW proposed exploring ways to gather input from parents. SH and JR supported this, and SH suggested forming a steering working group comprising parents to ensure their voices were heard in a constructive manner, noting she knew parents who would be suitable for consultation. The LGO highlighted the potential role of LF, the newly appointed parent governor, in assisting with facilitating this.	
ACTIONS	
Discuss with the SENDCo (FT) the best way to establish a parent steering group for SEND and explore methods for incorporating parental perspectives on SEND matters.	MW, SH, LF

5.4	Reports from Link Governors - Curriculum & Delivery
DISCUSSION	
JR and KD reported on their recent governor-led student voice sessions focused on curriculum and delivery. The sessions involved two groups of students, including a sixth-form group and a group of vulnerable students with SEND. The LGB discussed the positive feedback from students, who expressed pride in being part of the school and appreciation for initiatives such as praise points and golden tickets. JR highlighted the success of personal relationships in supporting vulnerable students, including a formerly homeschooled pupil who praised the school's integration efforts.	
Concerns were raised by students regarding teaching to the test, a lack of expectation around homework (attributed to primary school culture), and inconsistent handling of disruptive behaviour in lessons. This feedback had been passed to SLT member SA for further action.	

The LGB noted that the student voice questions provided by SLT were heavily focused on teaching and learning rather than broader well-being or belonging. JR and KD suggested adapting future questions to include more well-being-focused queries, aligning with feedback from CD on the importance of relationships in teaching. JR also proposed observing classroom teaching directly to assess whether recent training on structured teaching methods had been effectively implemented or if a return to more relational, personalised teaching was needed.

The LGB debated the effectiveness of the current student voice process. SH shared concerns that the school's internal student voice was not functioning effectively. JR explained that governors had taken on the student voice sessions to alleviate workload from school staff, though acknowledged that the current format may need revisiting to ensure broader representation and focus. KD added that the sessions also served as preparation for Ofsted, providing students with experience of engaging with external visitors.

The LGB discussed potential improvements to the student voice process, including conducting sessions outside of a curriculum-focused framework to capture a wider range of student experiences. SH volunteered to lead a revised approach. JR and LP suggested informal classroom drop-ins as a way to observe teaching practices firsthand, though KD cautioned that such observations would only provide a limited snapshot unless conducted systematically across all lessons. MW suggested a 'walking tour' with brief drop-ins to gain a broader sense of classroom environments.

A wider discussion took place regarding teaching methods. JR expressed concern that teachers had to 'unlearn' a set way of teaching to return to a relationship-based approach. LP noted that a 'blanket approach' can stifle spontaneity, while SH found it surprising that teachers needed to be taught empathy. MW suggested that teachers likely implemented the required processes in different ways.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

Clarity was sought on how the students for the governor-led student voice sessions were selected.	It was explained that the students were designated as the most vulnerable, including those with SEND, to mirror an Ofsted-style selection process rather than a random sample.
The source of the list of questions used for the student voice session was queried.	It was confirmed that the questions were provided by SA.

SUPPORT

The LGB acknowledged the positive aspects of the student voice sessions, particularly the students' pride in the school and their appreciation for initiatives like praise points and golden tickets. JR highlighted the success of personal relationships in supporting vulnerable students, including a formerly homeschooled pupil who praised the school's integration efforts.

DECISIONS

The LGB agreed that future student voice sessions should be adapted to include more well-being-focused questions and potentially conducted outside of a curriculum-focused framework to capture a broader range of student experiences.

ACTIONS

Adapt the student voice questions to include more well-being and belonging-focused queries for future sessions.	JR, KD
Lead a review and revision of the student voice process to ensure broader representation and effectiveness.	JR, KD
Follow up with SLT on student concerns regarding teaching to the test, homework	JR, KD

expectations, and behaviour management in lessons.

5.5	Reports from Link Governors - Leadership & Management Delivery Management Accounts and Risk Register
------------	---

DISCUSSION

MW provided an update on the school's financial position for period six, noting that the budget was £170k adrift. MW reassured the LGB that this discrepancy was due to school improvements being funded from the revenue budget, which would later be reallocated to capital. It was confirmed that key budget indicators, such as staff costs, were within expected parameters.

The LGO highlighted that the updated risk register was available in Governor Hub for review. It was noted that the SEND row required a minor update by the Headteacher to remove a reference to a former staff member, Polly Brock.

ACTIONS

Update the SEND row in the risk register to remove the reference to Polly Brock and reflect current circumstances.

RW

6.1	Policies and Procedures - Provider Access Policy
------------	---

DISCUSSION

The LGB noted that the Provider Access Policy had not been received from the school. The LGO confirmed she would remind the school again and stated that once the policy was received, it would be uploaded to the documents for approval policy folder on Governor Hub and circulated to the LGB for consideration between meetings.

6.2	Policies and Procedures - ICT and Internet Acceptable Use Policy
------------	---

DISCUSSION

RH reported that the ICT and Internet Acceptable Use Policy had not been received from the school. The LGO confirmed she would remind the school again and stated that once the policy was received, it would be uploaded to the documents for approval policy folder on Governor Hub and circulated to the LGB for consideration between meetings.

ACTIONS

Follow up with the school to obtain the ICT and Internet Acceptable Use Policy and Provider Access Policy. Once received upload them to the policies for approval folder on Governor Hub, and notify the LGB for consideration between meetings.

LGO

6.3	Policies and Procedures - IET Confidentiality Policy
------------	---

DISCUSSION

This policy has been approved by a quorate of governors.

7.0	Governor Training
------------	--------------------------

DISCUSSION

There was no training to report.

8.0	Actions from Meetings	
DISCUSSION		
<p>It was agreed that the Chair, MW, would take responsibility for following up on outstanding actions for the SLT from the February meeting with the Headteacher.</p> <p>The LGB considered how to structure the follow-up process of actions from meetings, with suggestions including assigning clear owners and including outstanding actions as a standing agenda item. It was agreed that actions from meetings would be extracted by the LGO and uploaded to GovernorHub following the meeting for governors' attention. A list of standing actions would also be included with the Agenda.</p>		
QUESTION AND ANSWER		
<p>Clarity was sought on the process for ensuring the completion of actions assigned to the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) in relation to the February 2026 minutes.</p>	<p>It was noted that outstanding actions should remain on the agenda to hold the SLT to account. The Chair, MW, would address these directly with the Headteacher.</p>	
ACTIONS		
<p>Extract outstanding actions from the February 2026 minutes and provide them to MW for follow-up with the Headteacher and SLT if required.</p>	LGO	
<p>Follow up with the Headteacher on outstanding actions identified from the minutes.</p>	MW	
<p>Actions from meetings would be extracted by the LGO and uploaded to GovernorHub following the meeting for governors' attention. A list of standing actions would also be included with the Agenda.</p>	LGO	

8.0	Date of next meeting	
DISCUSSION		
<p>The LGB confirmed the date of the next meeting as Wednesday, 8th July. KD gave his apologies for this meeting.</p>		

This task/communication has been supported by AI tools in line with the Trust's Safe and Secure AI Protocol. All content is subject to human oversight and professional judgment.