

**OHC&AT SURREY & SUSSEX HUB [SASHUB]
Brantridge (BrS), Grafham Grange (GrG) & St Dominic's (StD) Schools**

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BODY (PART 1)
4pm Thursday 22nd March 2018
at Grafham Grange School**

1.	OPENING	
.1	Attendees/Apologies	
.1	Attendees were: <u>Governors:</u> Ken Cowdery (KC) Academy Governor, Chair [PF1/5] Angela Drayton (AD) Principal, St Dominic's School & Regional Lead, SASHUB Andrew Falk (AF) Academy Governor [PF4-StD] Martin Hartwell (MH) Academy Governor [PF6/3] Philip Knights (PK) Academy Governor, Vice-Chair [PF5/1] Alison Livesley (AL) Academy Governor [PF4-BrS] Sam Marshall (SM) Academy Governor [PF2] Dafydd Roberts (DR) Principal, Brantridge School Liz Simmons (LS) Academy Governor [PF3/6] Neil Sykes (NS) Interim Head Teacher, Grafham Grange Joanne Yarlett (JY) Academy Governor [PF4-GrG] <u>In attendance:</u> Sarah McCann (SM) Interim Deputy Head, Grafham Grange Brenda Scott (BS) OHC&AT Finance Manager <u>Officers:</u> Frank Curry (FC) Minute-taking Secretary	
.2	Apologies were received from: Corinne Morgan (CM) Staff Governor, St Dominic's School Steve Mitchell (SM) Head of Care, Grafham Grange	
.2	Chair's Remarks	
.1	KC welcomed new attendees to the meeting, particularly new governor Joanne Yarlett. Also, KC noted that AD, DR and NS had now become ex-officio Governors.	
.2	KC noted the change in status and ownership arrangements, with the three schools having converted to Academy status under the sponsorship/ownership of Orchard Hill College & Academy Trust (OHC&AT) on 1 st January 2018. The Governing Body is now a sub-committee of the OHC&AT Board. The Governing Body's remit is set out in a Scheme of Delegation that has been shared with Governors.	
.3	KC noted that, since 1 st January 2018, Governing Body's remit had been extended to incorporate Grafham Grange School and that collectively the three schools formed OHC&AT's regional hub for Surrey and Sussex, known as 'SASHUB'.	
.3	KC announced that AD had been formally appointed as the SASHUB Regional Lead, in addition to her responsibilities as Principal of St Dominic's. Governors congratulated AD on her appointment.	
.4	KC announced that DR had been formally appointed as Principal of Brantridge School. Governors congratulated DR on his appointment.	
.5	KC noted that paper number listed against agenda item 6.1 was incorrect. The actual paper number was SAS.18.1.08. KC added that there was no paper submitted for agenda Item 6.3 Residential Offer (Interim Measures) and that paper number SAS.18.1.06 had not been used.	
.3	Declarations of Interest(s):	

.1	There were no declarations of interest(s) in agenda items.	
.4	Review of minutes of Previous Meetings	
.1	The Part 1 Minutes of the previous St Dominic's/Brantridge Governing Body Meeting held on Tuesday 19 th December 2017 [SDB.17.4M.Pt1] having been circulated were taken as read and signed by KC as an accurate record of the meeting.	
.2	The Part 1 Minutes of the previous Grafham Grange Governing Body Meeting held on 7 th December 2017 [GG.17.4M.Pt1] having been circulated were taken as read and signed by KC as an accurate record of the meeting.	
.5	Matters Arising (Paper SAS.18.1.01)	
.1	Matters arising and an update on actions against those matters from both meetings was set out in paper SAS.18.1.01 provided.	
.2	In response to KC , NS confirmed that action on performance management reviews at Grafham Grange would take place early during the Summer Term.	
.3	All other actions were noted by Governors as either completed or on-going as stated.	
.7	Chair's Actions	
.1	KC noted that a summary of his own activities and actions since the last meeting is set out in Paper SAS.18.1.02.	
2.	GOVERNANCE	
.1	Chair's Report (Paper SAS.18.1.02)	
.1	Introducing his report (SAS.18.1.02), KC drew Governors' attention to the need, for those who had not already done so, to complete annual Declarations of Interest by the end of term. ACTION: All Governors to complete return to OHC&AT their Declarations of Interests form.	Governors
.2	AL added that it was imperative that all Governors had read and understood Parts 1 and 2 of DfE's "Keeping Children Safe in Education". ACTION: All Governors to sign and return to OHC&AT their signed declaration that they had read and understood Parts 1 and 2 of DfE's "Keeping Children Safe in Education".	Governors
.3	LS asked, in respect of Para 3 of the Report, whether work in compliance with the new GDPR regulations (introduction due 25 th May 2018) was being done at School level, by OHC&AT or both. AD responded that the bulk of compliance work would be at school level, as that was where most personal data was held. AD added that, due to the nature of documentation records at special schools, the task was not as great as might be imagined. Both DR and NS confirmed that this was the case. AD stated that more training in this area would, however, be needed. AD clarified that the over-arching data management policy would be set by OHC&AT and a Data Controller nominated. KC clarified, the Governors' role was to look for assurance that the schools were in compliance with the policies. ACTION: Principals and Interim Head Teacher to ensure schools are GDPR ready by the date of its introduction on 25th May 2018.	AD, DR, NS
.4	LS also asked why it was intended to have only one Parent Governor on the Governing Body for the three schools (SM). KC responded that OHC&AT's preference was to have one designated Parent Governor on the GB but noted that there would actually be three parents on the GB, two with children at St Dominic's and one with a child at Brantridge. KC noted that there had been efforts made to introduce a Grafham Grange parent on the GB too but that no applications were received. LS asked for the Principals/Head Teacher's views on this issue. NS reflected that there were no applicants for the role at GrG, though he felt that it was vital for parents to be involved in schools where their children were studying. Parental involvement, however, need not necessarily be through being members of the Governing Body. AL pointed out that there were Parent Forums at the schools, which provided an opportunity for a degree of involvement and feedback. SM noted that she expected to visit all three schools and would be in a position to report, with a parent's perspective. KC concluded the discussion by reiterating that, at present, OHC&AT were seeking only intending to appoint one designated Parent Governor but added that he would be open to inviting a GrG parent to join GB, should someone apply.	
.5	Governors had no further comments on the Chair's report.	

.6	<p>POST MEETING NOTE REF. ITEM 2.1.4 ABOVE (KC): OHC&AT subsequently reviewed its position and decided that each school would have its own Parent Governor. Since then an application was received from a GrG parent who, subject to safer recruitment checks and formal ratification by OHC&AT board, will be appointed to Governing Body in Summer term. The three new parent governor appointees will each be designated as Parent Governors for their related schools. SM is now designated as an Academy Governor.</p>	
3.	PORTFOLIO GOVERNOR REPORTS	
.1	PF1 - Ethos, Vision, & Strategy (Paper SAS.18.1.PF1)	
.1	KC referred to his report and reported that he felt assured regarding progress in line with the business cycle. Key action items were highlighted in his report and these would be followed up at the next PF1 meeting.	
.2	KC noted substantive issues on Grafham Grange co-educational proposals and Brantridge Age Range proposals were stand-alone later agenda items.	
.3	LS asked if the Risk Register shared with PF1 could also be shared with PF3 (Finance & Resources), which was agreed.	
.2	PF2 - Teaching & Learning (Paper SAS.18.1.PF2)	
.1	SM referred to his report and reported that she considered that common practice across the schools needed to be introduced across the three schools.	
.2	SM noted the recruitment issues for educational staff had been highlighted to her. SM suggested that social media might be made use of more effectively. BS observed that OHC&AT would have no objection to this and was, itself, considering use of social media for recruitment. LS suggested Linked-In as another possible medium.	
.3	PF3 - Finance & Resources (Paper SAS.18.1.PF3)	
.1	LS referred to her report and reported that, as PF3 was a large portfolio, they had covered a lot of ground, including a review of the first set of management accounts for the current year, which were deemed satisfactory.	
.2	LS asked that BS attend future PF3 meetings and this BS agreed, in principle.	
.4	PF4 - Safeguarding and Child Protection	
.1	Brantridge (Paper SAS.18.1.PF4.BrS): AL referred to her report. AL emphasized that while the emphasis had to be on front line safety in the first term of the School Year, the focus of management effort was now moving on to embedding the good practice. The improvements at the school were evident and it was expected that improved behaviour would lead, in due course, to improved educational outcomes for pupils. AL congratulated staff and pupils on an excellent equality and diversity presentation on display at BrS .	
.2	St Dominic's (Paper SAS.18.1.PF4.StD): AF referred to his report (distributed after the meeting) and highlighted the short OFSTED s.5 inspection in December, which had awarded a 'Good' rating. A more recent residential OFSTED inspection in March (not yet published) had accrued excellent feedback and AF anticipated a very positive report. AF noted that he had undertaken PREVENT refresher training.	
.3	Grafham Grange (Paper SAS.18.1.PF4.GrG): JY referred to her report and reported that she had undertaken two visits. Assurance processes were now in place and it would be necessary in the future to look for trends based on data collated. NS reflected that a key issue was teaching pupils themselves how to be safe.	
.4	Generally: SM commented that Governor visibility in the schools was important and asked that Governors be invited to INSET days. AD welcomed this proposal and agreed to extend invitations to Governors.	
.5	PF5 - Admissions, Marketing and Business Development (Paper SAS.18.1.PF5)	
.1	PK referred to his report and reported that he felt assured regarding progress in line with the business cycle. PK highlighted two key areas. Firstly, StD was approaching capacity and needed, in consequence, to improve its infrastructure. Secondly, he felt that the three schools would benefit in the future if marketed as one entity.	
.2	LS asked about plans to improve StD infrastructure. BS confirmed that OHC&AT would be	

	looking into potential grants for additional capital funding to address the capacity issue.	
.6	PF6 - Human Resources (Paper SAS.18.1.PF6)	
.1	MH referred to his report and reported that there had been a review of induction procedures at both StD and GrG and also CPD opportunities. The question of staff exit interviews by Governors had also been discussed.	
.2	MH observed that at an exit interview he attended at StD, the leaving staff member had suggested that CPD opportunities could be improved. AD commented that she was aware of the comment and described the particular circumstances involved. KC commented that the sponsorship of OHC&AT should offer better opportunities for CPD in the future and this needed to be addressed in the future. MH agreed that greater opportunities for CPD would help retention.	
.3	Governors discussed in some detail whether Governors should be involved in exit interviews. Governors noted that, with three schools, the potential number of interviews could become burdensome on Governors. Governors also expressed lack of clarity as to the outcome of the interviews and whether feedback and comments were in fact used to improve future practise. MH felt that those he had conducted had been useful and enlightening and agreed with LS that they were in line with good practice, though caution was necessary in interpretation. Governors noted that, staff had other opportunities to put forward their views other than exit interviews. Governors agreed that exit interviews should not be perceived as the primary channel for ventilating staff grievances. KC concluded that the discussion showed the process was in need of review. ACTION: MH to review OHC&AT's current exit interview practice across the Trust.	MH
.4	<u>POST MEETING NOTE RE ITEM 3.6.3 ABOVE (KC):</u> OHC&AT has since confirmed that it does not have a requirement for staff exit interviews by Governors. Instead, leaving staff members are issued with a questionnaire and offered the opportunity for an interview.	
4.	PROCEDURE APPROVALS	
.1	Update on reconciliation of procedures and new policies	
.1	AD reported that she was working on bringing local school policies and procedures across the schools into harmony with OHC&AT's policies. AD added that this process would be discussed with staff at an INSET Day at St Dominic's later in March and that Brantridge and Grafham would follow in due course. AD cautioned that it would be an on-going task that she expected would be completed by the end of the current School Year. KC agreed that it was a big exercise and wondered whether AD had sufficient capacity at the present time. KC enquired whether OHC&AT could help. While AD would welcome assistance, she felt that the need for local school knowledge was essential. DF agreed and gave the Missing Pupil procedure at Brantridge as an example. ACTION: AD to aim local policies and procedures across all three schools to be line with OHC&AT policies by the end of the academic year, monitored by PF1.	AD /PF1
5.	SCHOOL PRINCIPAL / HEAD TEACHER REPORTS	
.1	St Dominic's Principal's Report & Dashboard (ref Papers SAS.18.1.03 and .03a)	
.1	AD highlighted the following key issues in her report: - Disappointment at the delay on the new Performing Arts Centre due to delays in the planning process. Completion was now forecast to be February 2019. - Two more staff resignations were expected but AD did not yet know the dates of their intended departure during the summer term. In response to KC , she confirmed that they were both staff involved with examination classes, which was an added complication that the school would address if the departures were prior to or during exams. - The position of SBM manager had been advertised at 5 days a week, which she felt was indispensable. AD invited comments/questions.	
.2	LS asked about the teacher on a support plan, following monitoring of performance. AD confirmed that the support plan was working and rapid improvement was being achieved.	
.3	PK asked, in view of the water damage to the drive, whether the school was insured for	

	these events. AD confirmed that insurance was in place but repairs to the Lodge, where there was also water damage, had been delayed owing to uncertainty about the Lodge's future.	
.4	AF asked whether there were girls on roll. AD confirmed that there is one girl on roll at present and that the school is keen for more girls but placement enquiries remained low.	
.5	MH asked about fire containment measures across the three schools. AD confirmed that the recommendations of OHC&AT's Fire Officer would be prioritised. In respect of Brantridge, DR indicated that there had been a report in October and the Fire Officer would be returning in April but outcomes were positive. NS confirmed that the OHC&AT Fire Officer had visited and found no significant issues. The latter was preparing a risk assessment.	
.6	LS asked whether the school had plans to develop the unused Lodge at the school entrance. AD responded that it was a major cost issue, which was being considered. AD added that the disuse had attracted the interest of the local Parish Council, which was concerned about unoccupied housing in the area.	
.7	LS also asked about the number of slips, trips and falls listed in Para 4 (Health and Safety) of her report and whether this seemed excessive. AD felt no particular concern as most of these were very minor. AD noted that the school had closed during the snow in March but the staff had been tasked to undertake many outstanding non-teaching jobs.	
.8	KC noted that AD was now acting as Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) and asked whether this was a permanent arrangement. AD explained that this was a temporary measure and was highly necessary but she expected to delegate the assignment as soon as possible.	
.9	In response to KC , BS confirmed that the budget process for FY 2018/19 was in hand and would be finalised during the Summer Term, in time for presentation to the Governing Body in June. Upon enquiry, BS confirmed that the figures would include the OHC&AT fee.	
.10	Governors thanked AD for her report.	
.2	Brantridge School's Principal's Report and Dashboard (ref Papers SAS.18.1.04 and 04a)	
.1	DR highlighted the following key issues in his report: - The school's key management control documents are now substantially in place. - DR 's self-evaluation is that the school remains at an OfSTED Requires Improvement standard (as per the most recent Ofsted judgement), but with many areas progressing toward 'Good'. - Since the change in leadership, the main management emphasis had been on improved behaviour. The result had been a very significant decline in reportable incidents. - The focus for the future needed to be on academic improvement. Progress was being made but key weaknesses, such as maths, needed addressing. - DR highlighted the Teacher Assessment Schedule. While the lesson observations indicated real progress, DR felt there was still some way to go to reach a "Good" assessment. - As at St Dominic's, the school was closed during the snow in early March but staff were tasked with alternative work. DR invited comments/questions.	
.2	AL commented that the residential side had been considered now to be "Good" by an external school improvement advisor, which was a validation of the progress being made in this area.	
.3	In response to a Governor query, DR confirmed that he would be relinquishing the DSL role in April and that Rob Chowns would be taking over.	
.4	KC asked about plans to improve outcomes in maths. DR responded that a new IT programme had been installed but it was too early to identify significant results.	
.5	KC noted that pupil attendance fell below the national average and asked what steps the school was taking to address the issue. DR agreed that this was the case and stated that steps were being taken by the school in this regard. There had been engagement with parents on the matters and school practices were being reviewed. DR also noted, as an example of the school's efforts, that some parents had had transport issues and so the school had implemented arrangements for the children to be collected itself.	
.6	SM asked about implementation of parental fines for pupil absence. DR explained that	

	<p>this was a Local Authority responsibility but that absences of three days or more were reported to the Educational Welfare Officer (EWO). NS added that Head Teachers could not sanction holidays in term time. DR also pointed out that the absence figures were presented for a small cohort and this tended to magnify the percentages.</p>	
.7	<p>KC noted that staff absence seemed high and asked if this was being addressed. DR agreed that this did need addressing, as his report indicated, and that measured would be taken accordingly.</p>	
.8	<p>Governors thanked DR for his report.</p>	
.3	<p>Grafham Grange School's Interim Head Teacher's Report and Dashboard (ref Papers SAS.18.1.05 and .05a)</p>	
.1	<p>NS expressed regret that his report had had to be tabled on this occasion. NS reported as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The findings of the OFSTED inspection demonstrate there is a great deal of work to be done, requiring, in NS's view, at least five terms of sustained collective effort with a high level of personal accountability by the staff. - The residential and co-educational issues were important but would be discussed as separate items on the agenda. - The Statement of Purpose, criticised by OFSTED for being too long and a 'work of fiction' was in the process of being updated. - NS emphasized the need to develop a range of therapies to support pupils, including music and animal care sessions. - On teaching and learning, the imperative was to upskill teachers and to ensure that they met professional standards. A programme of lesson observations and learning walks were planned for the Summer Term. - In terms of other staff development, use of on-line EduCare resources had proved productive. - Two staff resignations had been received, of which the Art teacher was particularly unfortunate, given pupils taking GCSE Art in the summer. Remedial arrangements had been put in place. - Sarah McCann had been appointed as Interim Deputy Head Teacher, on secondment, to cover the resignation of the Assistant Head Teacher from Easter. - The financial position had been carefully reviewed in conjunction with OHC&AT and it had proved possible to turn the current financial year forecast out-turn from deficit to surplus. - On Child Protection, the SENCO was receiving DSL training and thus adding capacity. - Pupil attendance at 89% was unsatisfactory but was to some extent a cohort issue. It needed addressing, however. - Behaviour had improved and although the level of serious incidents was up, fixed term exclusions had fallen dramatically. - On admissions, NS praised the work of Sarah Kennedy, which had greatly improved the number of students on roll. - Staff absence and resignations remained a concern but arrangements had been put in place to provide sufficient teaching and other capacity during the Summer Term. <p>NS invited questions.</p>	
.2	<p>SM asked whether NS was confident that sufficient safeguarding capacity was in place. NS confirmed that he was satisfied in this regard.</p>	
.3	<p>LS asked about the absence of the School Business Manager. NS responded that the absence was due to a short-term illness.</p>	
.4	<p>KC asked about the status of the budget. Both NS and LS confirmed that regular financial monitoring reports were now being received from OHC&AT and all three schools were currently projecting an end of year surplus.</p>	
.5	<p>In response to PK, NS agreed that financial losses on the boarding element were an issue that needed to be addressed.</p>	
.6	<p>KC questioned the reported rise in serious incidents. NS felt that many behaviour incidents in class could be ascribed to the quality of teaching and ability to engage pupils in the learning process. NS explained that it was a question of looking for solutions rather than highlighting problems. NS added that there was a shift in culture at the school but the process needed more time and staff effort.</p>	

.7	In response to SM , NS confirmed that the school's welcome statement on the website was under review.	
.8	Governors thanked NS for his report.	
6.	STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR REVIEW / DISCUSSION	
.1	Brantridge Age Range Proposal (ref Paper SAS.18.1.08)	
.1	The case for reducing the age range of Brantridge pupils from Years 6-13 to Years 6-11 had been set out by DR in his paper and in a Business Case drafted for DfE, as Portfolio PF1 meetings and at the previous Governing Board meeting. DR 's paper invited Governors to approve the change in age range with effect from academic year 2019/2020, subject to approval and comments from the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC), which is due to review the proposal on 19 th April 2018. KC invited Governors to discuss the proposal.	
.2	AL noted that the forecasts presented suggested that the change could potentially push the school from a financial surplus to a deficit in the third year. BS confirmed that, depending on the assumptions used, such a deficit could occur and, on further questioning, confirmed to Governors that setting a deficit budget was prohibited. LS commented that the budget shortfall could most likely be managed over time.	
.3	KC added that, based on the numbers presented, the proposed change would see the school accruing a deficit of £70k in 2020/21 - the point at which the forecasts suggest the school would have reached stabilisation in terms of age range change and school capacity. The forecasts presented therefore suggested the proposal would not be sustainable. AL cautioned that, with Local Authorities looking to cut funding, such an outcome would be hard to justify. LS thought that these figures were likely based on worst-case analysis and with different budgetary assumptions, a better scenario could emerge.	
.4	AF asked if the future of residential accommodation had been considered in the analysis. BS explained that the figures assumed that the current losses incurred in providing the residential offer still incorporated within the figures. AD added that all three schools had all seen a fall in demand of residential education but the situation and Brantridge and Grafham Grange was particularly acute as pupil numbers were so low and projected to be even lower next academic year.	
.5	PK observed that he could see at least four scenarios to be considered i.e. with and without residential, with or without the age range change, all of which should be really have been costed before a balanced financial judgement could be made by Governing Body.	
.6	KC summarised the discussion: - Governors present had made no challenge to the educational case for the proposed change in age range. - Governors required further assurance about the financial analysis before Governing Body could fully endorse the proposal. ACTION: DR/BS to revisit the financial forecasts and report back to the Governing Body as soon as possible.	DR/BS
.7	<u>POST MEETING NOTE REF. ITEM 6.1.6 ABOVE (KC):</u> Since the meeting, DR and BS have revisited the budget forecasts and, with some realistic adjustments, were able to present revised forecasts that showed the school making a small surplus of £28k in 2020/21 rather than a deficit. KC shared that revised forecast with Governors and asked those Governors who had been present at the meeting to confirm support or otherwise based on the revised forecasts. KC had proposed that, if there was unanimous support from Governors who attended the meeting, then Governing Body approval would be deemed to have been given. Replies were subsequently received from all Governors who attended the meeting. Whilst various observations were received from Governors, support for the proposal was unanimous and therefore Governing Body is deemed to have given its approval. ACTION: DR to proceed to implement the age range change, subject to DfE/RSC feedback and confirmation of OHC&AT final board approval, if required.	
.2	Grafham Grange: Co-educational Proposal (ref Paper SAS.18.1.07)	
.1	The case for the proposal to change Grafham Grange's current boys only provision to a co-	

	educational provision, was set out in the paper SAS.18.1.07 prepared by Rama Venchard (RV) of Silica Associates, consultant to OHC&AT, and also in a Business Plan prepared by RV for the DfE/RSC that had also been shared with Governors. The paper invited the Governing Body to review and approve the proposal, subject to approval and comments from the DfE and RSC, which is due to review the proposal on 19 th April 2019. KC invited Governors to discuss the proposal.	
.2	NS pointed out that, although the proposal had not been made by himself, he commented on the DfE's strong encouragement for co-education, particularly in the secondary sector. NS himself considered that a co-educational framework encouraged social skills and made for a more balanced introduction into adult life. NS added there was also a good business opportunity as Surrey were having to place girls, eligible for special education, outside the County which was not their preference.	
.3	LS and SM agreed with this view and JY felt that a balance between the sexes provided a healthier educational environment, with the proviso that school selection must identify the right school for the individual pupil.	
.4	NS felt that the demand would be more from day pupils, rather than for boarding provision.	
.5	KC noted consultation feedback that suggested there was a need for an all-boys SEMH provision as there was other SEMH co-educational provision in the county. However, Governors agreed that, on balance, the case for a co-educational setting was stronger.	
.6	In conclusion, Governing Body confirmed its support for the proposed change. ACTION: NS to proceed to implement the change to co-educational provision, subject to DfE/RSC feedback and confirmation of OHC&AT final board approval, if required.	
.3	Residential Offer – Interim Measures	
.1	KC introduced the item by explaining that projected residential placements in all three schools next academic year were down and Principals and Interim Head Teacher had been considering how to address the issues faced. KC invited AD to set out the current thinking.	
.2	AD expanded on the background by explaining that, with the lack of enquiries for residential placement for next academic year and the number of residential leavers, the residential placements at each school is very likely to reduce. The issue is particularly acute at Grafham Grange and Brantridge where the projected residential placements is anticipated to fall to be just two at Brantridge and five at Grafham Grange. With such low numbers the schools would neither be able to offer a good quality provision for the residential pupils nor be able to do so in a financially sustainable way.	
.3	Governors agreed that the proposal would be discussed further in Part 2 of the meeting.	
7.	CALENDAR	
.1	School Calendars	
.1	Governors noted key dates in the schools' calendars.	
.2	Dates of next Governing Body Meeting.	
.1	The next full GB meeting is at 4pm Thursday 19 th July 2018 at Brantridge School	
8.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
.1	There being no other business Part 1 of the meeting closed at 7.15pm	