

Minutes of the Quality of Education & Safeguarding Committee Meeting
Held virtually via Zoom on 4th July 2023

- A. **General Business Agenda: 10.00 - 11.00**
 B. **TPA Agenda: 11.00 – 11.30**
 C. **WPA Agenda: 11.30 – 12.00**
 D. **DPA Agenda: 12.00 - 12.30**

<u>Attendees</u>	<u>Role</u>
Alison Ashcroft (AA)	Principal at DPA (<i>non-voting</i>)
Daniel Barry (DB)	Parent Governor at WPA
Leah Basilone (nee Perring) (LB)	Principal at WPA (<i>non-voting</i>)
Sarah Bellingham (SBM)	OLT Governance & Communications Officer (<i>Non-voting</i>)
Stuart Bessent (SB)	Parent Governor TPA
Jodie Croft (JC)	OLT CEO and Board Director
Clive Davies (CD)	OLT Director of Education (<i>Non-voting</i>)
Dena Gill (DG)	Parent Governor at DPA
Alison Hill (AH)*	OLT Board Director
Chris Lamming (CL)*	DPA Staff Governor – Assistant Principal – Behaviour & Culture at DPA
Russ Massie (RM)	OLT Board Director & CHAIR
Erin Moscardini (EM)	Principal at TPA (<i>non-voting</i>)
Rachel Rees (RR)	Staff Governor at TPA
Hannah Robinson (HR)*	WPA Staff Governor
Ada Simpson (AS)	OLT Board Director

*Indicates in bold if someone did not attend

<u>Minutes</u>
A. <u>General Business Agenda Items</u>
1. Welcome & Identify AOB/Confidential
1.1 RM welcomed everyone and the meeting was declared quorate* (<i>see definition at base of minutes</i>). Apologies had been received from AH.
1.2 It was noted that all documents to be discussed in the meeting had been circulated by SBM prior to the meeting unless stated otherwise. It would be assumed that these had been read in advance.
1.3 No confidential items or AOB were declared for the agenda.
2. Declare any conflicts of interest with agenda items and/or updates to the OLT Register of Business and Pecuniary Interests, & declare receipt of hospitality
2.1 There had been no receipt of hospitality.

2.2 There were no conflicts of interest declared with the agenda items. There were no updates declared to the entries in the OLT Register of Business and Pecuniary Interests.

3. Receive and approve previous QES Committee minutes of 2nd May 2023 and discuss actions not on the agenda elsewhere

3.1 The QES committee minutes of 2nd May 2023 were approved unanimously by the committee. SBM would ask the Chair to sign them and would upload the approved version to the OLT website, as well as upload the record of attendance at this meeting. **ACTION – SBM**

3.2 The actions from that meeting were confirmed as completed or in progress or were on the agenda for this meeting, with the exception that CD would send an example streamlined SEF template to the Principals after the meeting. **ACTION - CD**

4. Receipt external annual safeguarding audit report for DPA & TPA (WPA to follow)

4.1 These reports were confirmed as received.

4.2 WPA's report would come to the next meeting, noting that Ofsted had already inspected the school this term including a review of safeguarding. **ACTION - LB**

4.3 The Committee expressed its thanks to the staff members who spent their time with the external auditors.

5. Policies for review/and approval

5.1 There were no policies for review at this time. JC confirmed the robust policy review process in place at the Trust, which was helping each school and the central team keep up to date with review and approval requirements per the Trust policy review schedule, contained in the Trust's Governance Handbook.

6. Collaboration between Trust schools

6.1 JC reminded the Committee about how the current Director of Education role would be split into two parts for 2023-2024: an academic advisor carrying out regular inspections and reporting on matters relevant to the SDP objectives per a focussed template, and LB leading on an internal Principals' network to facilitate short-term projects across the academic year to help each school meet its SDP targets.

6.2 The Principals had collaborated on a streamlined and updated SDP template, to help strengthen the SDP process across all schools.

6.3 Pupils at each school had collaborated with a professional musician to produce a Trust song promoting Trust values. JC welcomed feedback on that. A video of pupils singing the song would be put together in the autumn term.

7. Curriculum Focus: PE, History, & Geography

DPA

7.1 AA confirmed there were no changes to these curriculum documents shared the previous summer.

7.2 PE was being adjusted for the following year to streamline the range of sports offered and better ensure curriculum sequencing and progress in pupils' skills.

TPA

7.3 EM explained that the school had gone on a big journey this year with the history and geography curriculum. She was grateful for the support provided by LB and CD, which had helped to address sequencing challenges. She was in the process of engaging and updating on what items were being taught in which order and why.

7.4 PE was also in the process of being streamlined and better sequenced.

7.5 **Q:** Was EM confident that the specialist PE teacher at TPA could help map this progression and implement it as needed?

A: EM said she was and that he had put in a lot of work this academic year.

7.6 The Principals discussed the benefits or otherwise of having sports coaches take PE lessons versus class teachers at the schools. They shared examples of current practice at each school to include approaches taken on after school sports clubs.

WPA

7.7 LB confirmed there were no changes to these curriculum documents shared the previous summer.

7.8 **Q:** Had LB been able to book in swimming sessions for pupils for the autumn term?

A: Yes, these had been booked for the Year 3 and Year 4 pupils for September and October 2023 at the local pool, with summer term catch up sessions available for pupils needing those.

8. Governance Update Plans

8.1 JC referred to the Trust's Governance Handbook which was being updated for 2023-2024 and explained the updated sections relating to the QES Committee meeting structure, the enhanced role of the parent and staff governors, and the enhanced training programme on offer.

8.2 A Trust governance survey had also been circulated recently and JC was grateful for everyone's responses that before the end of term.

8.3 There were no questions on this item.

9. ATH 2022

Agree committee recommendation to trustees as to confidential status of the meeting's documents (excluding the agenda, approved minutes, & approved final version policies, which are for publishing) (Ref: 2.51 ATH 2021)

- 9.1** The committee discussed the confidential status of the documents being reviewed at this meeting, to include the internal survey data. It was agreed that other than the agenda, the approved minutes from the previous meeting and any approved final version policies, which would be published on the Trust or school website as appropriate, the remaining documents circulated for this meeting were confidential to the Trust and would not be published.
- 9.2** DG and DB left at 10.29, intending to return for the WPA and DPA agenda items later in the meeting.

B. TPA Agenda Items

1. Principal's Context Dashboard – Summer Term 2023

- 1.1** The Committee expressed its thanks to SB for his contribution to the Trust over many years, noting that his term of office was coming to an end.
- 1.2** EM would organise the process for electing a new parent governor as soon as possible.
ACTION – EM
- 1.3** EM shared her screen and discussed key data from the TPA Dashboard.
- 1.4** EM spoke about persistent absence figures and the reasons underpinning those, SEN pupil numbers and SEN support, pupil premium, EHCP numbers and applications in progress, pupil and staff absence rates, staff absence management, the latest fire drill and evacuation time, the recent lock-down drill, safeguarding (including receipt of Operation Encompass data, core group meetings, referrals information, pupil monitoring, and child in need plans), staffing and resources to include maternity returners, and behaviour management including planned communications with pupils and parents in the autumn term on perceptions of bullying and the key aspects of the behaviour policy.
- 1.5 Q:** TPA's EAL figure looked very high – was that the correct data?
A: Yes, it was accurate, but was based on the information provided by parents. Many pupils in this group were fluent in English as well as other languages.
- 1.6 Q:** Many schools were trying to break down the meaning of bullying into several parts to help pupils and parents distinguish it from one-off incidents of poor behaviour. Was that being done at TPA?
A: EM said she was incorporating the message that bullying meant that a behaviour was being carried out several times on purpose. It was not a one-off. She recognised the need to educate regularly about this.
- 1.7 Q:** Were there no staff vacancies at TPA currently?
A: There was now one vacancy, because a staff member had resigned the previous Friday unexpectedly. She was the EYFS Lead, however the assistant to this staff member had

agreed to stay on into the 23-24 academic year to provide cover and continuity whilst the recruitment process was ongoing.

1.8 Q: When was this staff member due to leave?

A: At the end of the summer term.

2. Analyse summer term progress and attainment data for all cohorts, and determine related implications and actions

2.1 EM summarised the TPA summer term data from the internal TPA dashboard, which was shown on screen.

2.2 EM and the Committee discussed a number of items in depth to include phonics outcomes in Reception and Key Stage 1, the phonics support and monitoring strategies in place for those year groups, GLD outcomes for early years and, the combined data for Reception and later year groups, as well as reading, writing and maths outcomes and progress, with weaker year groups identified.

2.3 Q: Did the Year 2 phonics figure show the whole picture, or did it just show those who re-took the assessment?

A: It showed the children who re-took it.

2.4 AA thought that this figure should show the overall data for the whole year group, as it might be misleading otherwise. EM would change that in her document. **ACTION – EM**

2.5 Q: Had the GLD results been submitted to the local authority yet?

A: Much of the school's had been submitted already, but EM was finalising the GLD data and would submit this soon.

2.6 Q: Who assessed that data, if this was not done by the local authority anymore and how could schools be confident in their judgement of the pupils' outcomes?

A: It was correct that there was no statutory moderation anymore. The Principals organised or purchased external moderation partners to help scrutinise and validate the data.

2.7 Q: Were new baseline assessments and progress measures in place from Reception?

A: That was correct. The baseline was taken within the first six weeks into Reception class, with the comparison taken in Year 6. The comparison was no longer with Year 2 data.

2.8 Q: Did EM have any worries about Year 1 GD?

A: No, she did not. EM explained that they had not wanted to put any pupil at GD unless they feel firmly within this category, noting the impact of the summer term on attainment levels.

2.9 Q: What did it mean to say that on paper a pupil met the GD standard but were not meeting that in practice?

A: JC explained that EM had not been at the school this time the previous year. Pupils could 'drop' hugely over the summer holiday and EM had done fantastic work since joining TPA.

2.10 RR joined at 11.03.

2.11 Q: Had EM inherited the current targets?

A: Yes, to the extent that her targets were matched to the previous year's end points. On reflection, EM thought it might have been appropriate to revise them mid-year. JC agreed that EM might not have set these targets had she known the pupils like she knows them now. This was something to reflect on for target setting the following academic year.

2.12 Q: Was there any disadvantage to using the White Rose maths worksheet structure?

A: EM recognised that this approach might not suit all schools, but for the current TPA staff group the structure had been very helpful. It ensured the same teaching across classes and was helpful for monitoring purposes. There were aspects of the programme which could be tweaked, such as lessons off worksheets, and the inclusion of more practical and/or group work in lessons.

2.13 JC asked EM to send her the average scores for the multiplication check in Year 4.

ACTION - EM

2.14 The Committee had no further questions.

3. Review progress against SEF/SDP 2022-2023

3.1 EM had inherited an SDP and had been adding to that over the year. One of the areas to focus on was enhancing the strength of the teaching at the school.

3.2 Q: How many new staff would be joining in September 2023?

A: Three, possibly four, with two of those being completely new to the school.

3.3 Q: Was there anything to add on behaviour management?

A: EM acknowledged that this was a key point from the pupil survey at KS2, and she would be focussing on that in September 2023, especially in relation to the behaviour of the year 5 and 6 pupils, to include in the playground at break and lunchtimes. This would include work with staff during the inset days in September and support offered by the senior team to the ECTs joining to help them understand and help maintain the expectations of the school's updated behaviour policy

3.4 EM expressed her thanks to CD, AA, and LB for their wonderful support in her first year of headship at TPA. JC offered thanks on behalf of the Trust to EM for her hard work and for her meeting challenges head-on this year. JC asked EM to pass on the Trust's thanks to her colleagues at TPA.

4. Pupil Survey Results 2023

4.1 All headteachers had received their feedback from the pupil survey, held annually in the summer term. A standard set of questions was used each year.

4.2 EM had already flagged that behaviour was an area of focus for the autumn term 2023 and that a range of strategies were planned in this regard.

4.3 RR, EM, and SB left at 11.32.

C. WPA Agenda Items

1. **Principal's Context Dashboard – Summer Term 2023**

1.1 DB and HR attended at 11.12.

1.2 The Committee congratulated LB on receiving her 'outstanding' Ofsted judgement this term, noting how thorough the inspectors had been and how much praise the school had received in the report.

1.3 LB discussed key items from the Dashboard shared on screen, to include numbers on the SEN Register, EHCP numbers and applications pending, support for SEN pupils not meeting the EHCP threshold, pupil premium numbers, safeguarding matters (including pupils on SIM or CP plans, children with Early Help care, other referrals, external agency involvement, and staff attendance at core group or other pupil safeguarding meetings), pupil attendance, staff absence, absence monitoring, and staffing and resources.

1.4 **Q:** Would LB have more SENDCo support in the 2023-2024 academic year?

A: Yes, HR would be supporting in a DSL role, and another colleague would be taking on the SENDCo role, meaning there was more capacity for this work within the school. LB already knew that some pupils due to join the school had higher needs.

1.5 RM made an offer to support to LB and AA (the Principals in Oxfordshire) with child protection and domestic abuse cases where appropriate. This was noted by both Principals who offered their thanks to RM.

1.6 **Q:** Of the SEN children at the school which LB had talked about, was it correct that just one or these was in the wrong provision?

A: It was possible that a few of these pupils were in the wrong provision looking longer term, however the school was doing its best. These pupils were fully included in the mainstream provision, with adaptations.

2. **Analyse summer term progress and attainment data for all cohorts, and determine related implications and actions**

2.1 LB then summarised the WPA summer term data from the internal WPA dashboard, which was shown on screen. LB ran through each year group to highlight key data, to include phonics outcomes and outcomes for reading, writing, and maths. She explained both the progress being made by pupils as well as the strategies in place or planned to address any areas needing more attention.

2.2 **Q:** Noting that the early years GLD figures were lower than LB had wanted, when had the new Reception pupils joined in year?

A: This was in March, in April, and in May. Two were non-verbal and two were on family social care plans, meaning lots of needs to be addressed.

2.3 **Q:** Linked with the positive progress made by Year 3 in writing, what had been the target for this?

A: LB explained that over half the class in year 3 had joined in September 2022, so were new to the school at that point. In July 2022, that group had been at 90% ARE. The new joiners had not been at that level, to include one whose ability was up to two years' below. LB had added notes in the narrative section of her report. LB was confident that by Year 6, the pupils would be achieving these targets.

2.4 The Committee and Principals agreed that it would be useful if the Insight template dashboard produced data on pupil premium with SEND, versus pupil premium without SEND, to enable a comparison of progress. LB was in conversations with Insight about this.

2.5 The Committee were asked if there were any further questions?

2.6 Q: What data was being tracked in respect of those pupils who were meeting one or two of the three key outcomes (reading, writing and maths), such as a child who was strong in maths and reading, but not in writing? How was the support tailored to children who had the mental capacity to succeed in all three areas but needed specific support in one or two?

A: LB explained that WPA used a 'power of three Venn diagram' approach, to identify which pupils would benefit from a push in one area, having shown strength in others. Pupils were typically strong in maths out of the three areas, as this skill was not so reliant on verbal skills and life experience, both of which had been heavily impacted by Covid.

3. Review progress against SEF/SDP 2022-2023

3.1 LB shared her SDP summary and spoke to the headline points.

3.2 One of the bigger focus areas longer term was the timely assessment and on-boarding of new pupils joining in year, so that they immediately become engaged in the WPA systems of learning and behaviour. Another key focus area was to set up transition processes ready for the first of WPA's Year 6 classes, which would be happening in two years' time. This included setting up relationships with local secondary schools.

3.3 The Committee had no questions for LB.

4. Pupil Survey Results 2023

4.1 All headteachers had received their feedback from the pupil survey, held annually in the summer term. A standard set of questions was used each year

4.2 JC and LB agreed that the results were really positive. LB had done lots of work with the pupils on behaviour expectations and the meaning of bullying. She planned to hold a coffee morning with parents on the same themes to ensure everyone was aligned on these important topics.

4.3 DB and HR left the meeting at 11.37. DG re-joined at the same time.

D. DPA Agenda Items

1. Principal's Context Dashboard – Summer Term 2023

1.1 AA discussed key items from the Dashboard. These included: pupil numbers on the roll, numbers on the SEN Register, EHCP numbers and applications pending, support for SEN pupils not meeting the EHCP threshold figures, pupil and staff absence and strategies for managing both to include referrals to the local authority in instances of unauthorised pupil absence, safeguarding matters to include fire drills, lock down drills, and several child protection, child in need and Early Help cases, as well as behaviour and fixed term exclusions, staffing for September 2023, complaints, and website compliance.

1.2 Q: Did the school refer cases of unauthorised absence to the local authority on the first occasion, or only for repeat occasions? Could the local authority issue a fine for a first- or one-off offence?

A: Any fine issued by the local authority was typically small, and therefore was unlikely to incentivise compliance with attendance requirements, especially if the family was saving far more on the cost of a holiday by booking in term time. However, it was important that a consistent and robust message was sent to everyone to ensure that families knew the school's stance on this.

1.3 Q: Did the total persistent absence figure include the nursery pupils as well?

A: No. Families' approach to nursery attendance was far different to families of school pupils. It was frustrating that many viewed nursery time as pure childcare. DPA regularly sent out the message that this was an educational nursery and that it was important for the pupils to be there during term times.

1.4 Q: Could families be told that if nursery pupils' attendance didn't meet requirements, the pupil could be taken off the nursery roll (being below statutory school age), assuming there were no safeguarding concerns?

A: AA agreed that this was a strategy it would be useful to explore further.

1.5 Q: Did DPA enter into attendance contracts with any of the parents of nursery pupils?

A: No, it did not, mainly due to not having enough time to do this.

1.6 Q: Was there a more general contract with parents which could contain specific requirements on attendance and an explanation of consequences for non-attendance?

A: There was a lot of information already in the admission form, for example a clear statement that the parent would bring the child in every day. AA would consider adding wording to say that in the event of low attendance, the school reserved the right to withdraw the child's nursery place with it.

1.7 Q: It seemed that there had been a racist incident, which was very unusual?

A: Yes, there had been, and it was extremely unusual for DPA. It had been carefully followed up by staff with everyone involved. The parents of the child who had demonstrated the racist behaviour had been upset to hear what had happened and had been responsive when spoken with. AA had also sent a strong message in her newsletter that day to explain that such behaviour was not tolerated at the school. AA would repeat the message at intervals over the following months. She was very proud of the school's diverse community.

1.8 Q: Would it be valuable to include data on the dashboards on other types of discriminatory behaviour, such as that linked with transgender individuals or other?

A: At DPA, staff were very clear with pupils in PSHE classes and generally about the behaviour expected. She did not think that further data categories of this type were needed at this time but was happy to keep this under review.

1.9 Q: Could these behaviour expectations be discussed in pupil assemblies?

A: That was already happening. CL added that the diversity of the books in the Trust's schools had been vastly enhanced, and now included a much wider range of authors and genres.

2. Analyse summer term progress and attainment data for all cohorts, and determine related implications and actions

2.1 AA shared her internal DPA data on screen. She highlighted outcomes for GLD in Early Years, and the outcomes per year group for reading, writing, maths, phonics, and greater depth achievement, as well as the targeted strategies for increasing progress.

2.2 AA explained that she had drilled down into what might have been causing lower than expected writing outcomes despite the extensive interventions and support which the pupils had received since September 2022. Based on a close review of the outcomes per year group at the end of summer 2023, it emerged that there might have been an issue with the way that the ReadWriteInk system in KS1 had impacted the grouping of pupils for reading and writing ability based on phonics outcomes. An example was that children deemed confident in phonics, but not as confident as others in that phonics group in writing, had been moved on too quickly in the writing group which comprised the same pupils.

2.3 The recently updated approach for writing and reading was to include a progression of skills approach and whole class English sessions every week. In particular, writing transcription was now involving a 'small steps of progression' process, akin to maths, with a specific layering of skills. Composition and vocabulary were already strong so it was hoped this would have the necessary impact.

2.4 Q: Was reading a strong part of ReadWriteInk?

A: No, the phonics awareness was the strong part. There was a reading comprehension element, but the books choice was not great. The school would strengthen this area via more exposure to whole class reading which should make a real difference.

2.5 Q: Was there a clear correlation between the use of ReadWriteInk and the lower-than-expected writing outcomes?

A: Yes, that was the case. Pupils needed to be able to put their ideas down on paper. The book bands and the class discussions had indicated that pupils' skills were further advanced, but they had not been able to show this in independent assessments. That might be linked with stamina levels during tests as well as levels of reading fluency. JC added that part of the rationale for taking pupils off ReadWriteInk earlier was to help with immersion in a love of reading and a love of English, and to avoid anything too dry. JC acknowledged the need to cover the basics in a systematic way, however.

2.6 Q: Linked with ReadWriteInk, would an adjusted approach have impacted the difference seen in phonics and reading results in Year 1?

A: Reading was about understanding the text. Phonologically, ReadWriteInk was a great resource, but was not necessarily fit for purpose for teaching reading comprehension or writing. That was the reason for having moved to a new progression of skills approach together with a whole class English approach. This had been happening already for a little while now.

2.7 Q: It appeared that there was a dip in maths at Year 2 and possibly Year 3?

A: Year 3 data was the same. At Year 2, the data revealed a challenge with two children – which was not a theme or a worry. This was related to the legacy of two ECTs in Year 1. It had taken a while for one of those teachers to understand the school’s high expectations and that teacher was not with the school anymore.

2.8 Q: For pupil premium with SEND and pupil premium with no SEND outcomes, did the school do its own analysis?

A: It did, but it was important to note that the groups were small which impacted the significance of the data. Of the Year 3-4 pupils who were pupil premium and SEND, two were achieving in reading and writing, and all of them were achieving in maths.

2.9 Q: Noting that the school had put a strategy in place this year to help with writing outcomes, and having seen the data and reflected on this, would AA have done anything differently? Could the Trust have helped or supported more?

A: CL acknowledged that his unexpected period of long-term sickness absence had not helped. Possibly more support should have been in place as the school was an extremely busy environment for all staff. The January figures had been disappointing, but AA had been pretty sure that a difference would be observed by April based on strategies in place. So much time had been invested into this. The planning had now changed with support, including from CD. The deep dive AA had discussed, into the reading, writing and phonics in the lower years, had produced some extremely helpful information which was being acted upon. The teachers could not have worked any harder.

2.10 Q: AA had talked about how the Reception year group’s GLD assessment had been moderated. Had the same happened with reading, writing, and maths results?

A: The school was part of the Didcot Partnership, which provided a maths consultant. So, moderation was partly via that method, and partly via internal systems. Internal reading and maths assessments were done via tests which were chosen by the school. It might be valuable for the Principals to collaborate and agree on a standard choice of tests, to help with standardisation across all Trust schools.

2.11 Q: In the school’s submitted EHCP application forms, was the box for selecting a recommended provision left blank?

A: The council chose to leave this blank, explaining that this was parental choice. The earlier children were able to get into a special provision the better, as places later on were hard to come by.

3. Review progress against SEF/SDP 2022-2023

3.1 AA shared her SDP in summary form and confirmed that writing would form a big part of development plan for the following year.

3.2 JC asked that Committee to note the hard work done by staff in 2022-2023 and the wonderful cultural and pastoral experience the pupils had had, as well as the strong culture for learning. There were tweaks to be made, but JC offered her thanks from the Trust for everyone's hard work.

4. Pupil Survey Results 2023

4.1 All headteachers had received their feedback from the pupil survey, held annually in the summer term. A standard set of questions was used each year

4.2 The DPA pupil survey report needed a small amount of further work and would be sent to AA shortly after the meeting. AA's thoughts on the findings could be discussed at the next meeting. **ACTION – AA/SBM**

Meeting Closed: 12.34

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 17th October 2023 starting at 10am

Actions from QES Committee Meeting of 04.07.2023

Section A	Action 1	Minute 3.1	SBM to request signature of the approved previous minutes and publish items on the website as needed
	Action 2	Minute 3.2	CD to send the Principals his streamlined SEF template
	Action 3	Minute 4.2	LB to bring her safeguarding audit report to the next QES meeting
Section B - TPA	Action 4	Minute 1.2	EM to organise the election/appointment of a new TPA parent governor for the autumn term
	Action 5	Minute 2.4	EM to adjust the Year 2 phonics figure in her dashboard to show the data for the whole year group
	Action 6	Minute 2.13	EM to send JC the outcomes of the Year 4 multiplication check
Section D - DPA	Action 7	Minute 4.2	At next QES meeting, SBM include short agenda item to ask for AA's thoughts on DPA pupil survey findings

Excerpt from OLT Governance Handbook:

Voting and Quorum

Every resolution to be passed at a full Board meeting, or any item requiring approval at a meeting of the Operations Committee or of the Quality of Education and Safeguarding Committee, must be determined by a majority of votes of the voting members of the Board or of the committee, who are present (or represented by proxy) at the meeting. This is also the case if only a quorum is present.

The 'quorum' means the minimum number of voting Board or voting Committee members required to be present at the meeting, which in all cases is three. At the Quality of Education and Safeguarding Committee, and in relation to items requiring approval which are specific to a school, the quorum cannot comprise voting governors who are allocated to a different school.

If there is an equal number of votes, the chair (or the person acting as chair) - provided that he or she holds voting rights - has a second (or casting) vote.

Where there is a conflict between the interests of any voting Board or committee member and the interests of the Board or Committee, that person will withdraw from the meeting and will not vote. In a situation where the principles of natural justice require a fair hearing and there is any reasonable doubt as to a person's ability to act impartially, he/she will also withdraw from the meeting and not vote.

Directors should withdraw from any meeting in which they have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest. These matters will be recorded in the minutes.