

## Full Governors Meeting

4<sup>th</sup> February 2026 at Queen Elizabeth Grammar School

Item and Description	Notes
<p><b>1. Welcome, apologies and quorum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Introductions and welcome</li> <li>b. <b>Confirm</b> membership of the Full Academy Board</li> <li>c. <b>Receive and agree</b> whether to accept apologies</li> <li>d. <b>Confirm</b> whether the meeting is quorate</li> <li>e. <b>Confirm</b> resignations or term of office end</li> <li>f. <b>Consider and ratify</b> other changes</li> <li>g. <b>Declaration</b> of Interests and/or Conflict of Interests</li> </ul>	<p>Attendees: David Marchant, Sarah McGrath, Joe McGraw, Owen Price-Jones, Chris Pyle, Maggie Robson, Neil Ruddick.</p> <p>Additional attendees for certain sections of the meeting: Peter Croft, Colin Munro.</p> <p>Apologies: N/A full house.</p> <p>Quorate: Yes.</p> <p>Resignations: No.</p> <p>Declarations/conflicts of interest: No.</p>
<p><b>2. Approve</b> – Previous Full Academy Board Minutes</p>	<p><i>Approved, BJ to ensure this document is published on the school website.</i></p>
<p><b>3. Matters Arising</b></p>	<p><b>Entrance Testing</b></p> <p>DSM - Future Stories (Reading Grammar School) have explored consortium options for us. Our local consortia are not doing the same papers that we have selected. Other consortiums have schools which only have a single sex which would distort the data. They have now come up with an appropriate package for QEGS in line with our costings which is brilliant and will give us more freedom. I have a contract on my desk which I am ready to sign. I am just waiting for old provider to acknowledge our notice period. I am now working on a communication to local primaries and perspective parents before half-term. I will also be communicating this change in direction to staff.</p> <p><b>Updated Curriculum Model</b></p> <p>MR – How did the meeting go with staff following our last meeting?</p> <p>DSM – As well as it could have gone. There were some difficult messages to deliver. The biggest point of concern was around sixth form and the loss of games /how this impacts PE. However, we now have student choices in and we can sustain games next year. It is not perfect but this allows us to continue. We will be looking at ways to sustain this moving forwards. The updated proposal around GCSEs was supported and taken positively.</p> <p>OPJ – Staff were happy about reducing to 10 GCSEs due to the level of stress this can have on students. Broadly speaking they thought this was a good idea. There is a timetable concern around flexibility but it is appreciated that a lot of mapping takes place to secure things.</p> <p>DSM – Thank you OPJ. Yes, we may not have a lot of flexibility around teacher’s availability. Year 7 have half of their lessons with their form and then the other half is mixed. Year 8 have one form class and two mixed classes – which will naturally increase higher up</p>

	<p>in school. Not always being with the same people will lead to better behaviour and engagement in lessons. So, although there will be restrictions around the timetable creations our retainment needs to be prioritised.</p> <p>OPJ – It is a big job isn't it.</p> <p>DSM – There is a saying, you can do anything with a timetable but you can't do everything. Overall, I am hearing that the direction of travel is appreciated, thank you.</p>
<p><b>4. Policy Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Send Policy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Part 1- For information (Trust Policy)</li> <li>▪ Part 2 – For comment/approval</li> <li>▪ SEND information report – new for discussion/approval</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Exams</b> <p>For approval by governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Internal appeals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Internal assessment decisions</li> <li>○ Reviews of results and appeals</li> <li>○ access arrangements, special considerations and other administrative issues</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Exam access arrangements</li> <li>▪ Private candidates</li> </ul> <p>For information only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Feedback on Malpractice – PRC</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Pupil Premium</b> – Update - For Presentation at Easter</li> </ul>	<p><b>SEND Policies</b></p> <p>MR – <b>Part one</b> (CLLT policy) was circulated to all Governors to read alongside <b>part two</b> (QEGS policy), following the feedback from our last meeting. Myself and JM approved this policy via email however we need a third governor to approve this before it is published on the website.</p> <p>OPJ – A couple of things from me; 1) EHCP and EHC plan can we keep this consistent please. 2) Page 8 'We evaluate the effectiveness of provision ....' – this doesn't need to be a bullet point.</p> <p><i>Approved by everyone, BJ to ensure the documents are formatted and shared on the school website.</i></p> <p><b>SEND Information Report – CM joined this part of the meeting for discussion, feedback and questions.</b></p> <p>MR – The information report is new and for discussion.</p> <p>CM – The questions and answers have been created to support parents.</p> <p>MR – Point 13 asks what support is available and then point 14 goes on to other bodies e.g. occupational health. Things like this came up in complaints last year as some of these things didn't seem available. What exists and is there support there now?</p> <p>CM – The mental health support team meets every two weeks.</p> <p>SM – Is this Penrith based?</p> <p>CM – It is commissioned by the NHS - Barnardo's are in this area.</p> <p>DSM – There is some inequality of provision which is linked to how things are split between the councils. We need to look at the current position and take off anything that is not relevant.</p> <p>MR – Yes, it sets the expectation that we can't answer to as this is out of the school's control.</p> <p>OPJ – I understand "some of these agencies we work with include..."</p> <p>CP – Should there be a caveat in here about resources at the LA potentially being limited/not always available?</p>

DSM – Yes, this is a good suggestion as some are not consistent provisions.

SM – There are SEN vs SEND inconsistencies.

DSM – Thank you, yes this will be picked up and changed to SEND as we talk about children with SEND normally.

SM – Section 4 - if a child has an EHCP already linked to the Year 6 review meeting... but what about those with needs that don't have an EHCP in place? There may not be the capacity to do this.

DSM – The processes are slightly different. Those children with an EHCP name us as a preferred school vs other children we know who have sat the test and named us on the form but we don't see which rank. The whole mechanism sees about 6 or 7 transitions alongside any potential SEND or barriers to learning. It is about triaging the system and doing follow ups with those that have complex needs.

SM – When is offers day?

DSM – 1<sup>st</sup> /2<sup>nd</sup> March. Sometimes when we are meeting with a primary teacher to discuss the transition of those with an EHCP we then find out about other children who may need more support which is great.

JM – What is the CAMHS waiting list like now, better or worse?

CM – Generally speaking there is a 12-hour response window if it is really needed but you can be waiting up to six months plus for other services.

DSM – It comes down to the level of severity. There are different steps for different challenges. It is a complex landscape that we are trying to navigate.

### **Exams**

DSM – We have split this section out into two areas;

- 1) For approval by governors
- 2) For information only

NR – Which exams are we talking about?

OPJ – External exams.

DSM – GCSE and A-level external exams. We need to look at the website and how this is structured next.

### **Exams – For Governors Approval**

#### **1. Internal Appeals (Internal Assessment Decisions)**

OPJ – There is mention of AI for marking / tools being used to assist, are we allowed to do this? What are staff allowed to use?

DSM - A really good question, this is direct from the JCQ guidelines. We will check this.

OPJ – Under deadlines and timescales – how soon will that be?

DSM – Within five working days, this should be “aim to within 5 working days” rather than “will be...”- the exams office are aware of the deadlines and priorities. PRC and JDH coordinate. We need to add in a flowchart/timeline and put together a guide on how this works.

## **2. Internal Appeals (Reviews of Results and Appeals)**

OPJ – The formatting needs looking at, at the bottom of page 5.

SM – There is a typo – at university or college. Also centre specific changes there is no content under this section on the last page, does this need to come out?

DSM – We will check this.

MR – Otherwise approved, taking into consideration these minor tweaks.

## **3. Internal Appeals (Access Arrangements, Special Considerations and Other Administrative Issues)**

*Approved, BJ to ensure this document is published on the school website.*

### **A separate note:**

OPJ – On one of the policies shared that was not for ratification it talks about a candidate who is late to an exam. This got me thinking, is this within an hour? Will they or won't they be allowed to sit the exam? This is mentioned in several areas. What do they mean by arrive? Physically in the building or sitting at the exam table?

DSM – This is exam board language. Definitions of timings will help here. It is important to get the language right.

## **4. Exam access arrangements**

*Approved, BJ to ensure this document is published on the school website.*

## **5. Candidate Identification Procedure (Includes Private Candidates)**

*Approved, BJ to ensure this document is published on the school website.*

SM – So you wouldn't charge an external candidate unless it is a cost to yourself?

DSM – Yes, only if there is a direct cost.

## **Exams – For Information Only**

### **1. Malpractice**

	<p>PRC – Following on from the feedback at the last governor’s meeting, this policy has been tweaked to include the content under centre malpractice.</p> <p>OPJ – I like how we can see the changes made at the back of the document.</p> <p>PRC – JCQ are making life easier to review.</p> <p>DSM – We are also trying hard to track changes on other policies.</p> <p><b>Pupil Premium</b></p> <p>DSM – There is a link in the new Ofsted framework so we are working on this now. We want to get this policy right alongside our long-term objectives. We can present this at our next meeting. The inclusion inspector will look at the PP policy and the impact to see if money being used effectively.</p> <p>SM – Absolutely it is important to get right and then monitor/gather feedback.</p>
<p><b>5. Reporting by Exception - HT report updates</b></p>	<p>DSM – I felt this was hard to complete this time as we are not in a position to change the colours from last time as we don’t have external results. It made me question what the evidence was based off if I changed this. We know there are a lot of activities going on within these subjects. For governors’ awareness one of the biggest changes to the SDP was the identified issue with extended writing from learning walks – we are seeing variation. We got subject leads together to plan out the half term and share the plans with teams. Review meetings are booked in before half-term and we aim to discuss the impact this has made and the quality of work. This is a big driver for improvement.</p> <p>Areas flagged in amber:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ‘Identifying, assessing, meeting needs, barriers’ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Looking at CAT tests, reading and low scores. Some screening we do isn’t as targeted as it could be. We could do early screening for children that we know are good at masking. Some children may be ok for the entrance test but may be dyslexic and have no support. Vulnerable areas we need to strengthen.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2) ‘Achievement’ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This comes back to the external data. We are consistently above national average but we are not hitting the top grades that we really want and we should be doing better.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3) ‘Curriculum and teaching’ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This has been identified previously and we have done 100 plus lesson drop-ins already. We are building a picture of strong practice and developing as well.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>OPJ – If things have changed it would be good to see what this was to avoid flicking between reports for subject information.</p>

SM – Yes, the format is horrible. The risk here is that safeguarding is amber, but what is the issue?

OPJ – How are we getting the overall ratings? Surely the overall rating should at least be the minimum rating? E.g. under HR, there is red and green but then the overall rating is green, which isn't a true reflection of the full line?

DSM – The best fit.

MR – Yes, I had the same question for T&L, some reds but then overall green. It doesn't fit with the other page.

DSM – Please disregard that additional section, that should not have been included.

SM – How has RAG been generated?

DSM – It is subjective, we have been given no guidance beyond this. Maybe this is something we need to feedback to the Trust.

SM – Yes, it is hard to look at the likelihood and impact matrix with this.

DSM – Indeed. We take this all on board and will develop as we move forwards.

JM – It isn't easy to follow.

DSM – The primary heads found the previous reports much more challenging. Last time I thought the new style had legs but this time it was not meaningful. The old-style report provided more descriptive information which enabled more helpful questions. Let me have a think about this.

SM – It is missing a lot of the detail.

JM – We can't really challenge in the new format.

SM – The new style also misses all the positive messaging.

OPJ – For the overview on the second page, who is deciding the colours/where is the evidence behind this? When it is green, why is it green? There is a place for this but with more detail added in.

DSM – We could look at a RAG rating column linked to the Ofsted toolkit and map this against last year. This could be a starting point.

NR – So how are we moving forwards?

DSM – Let me look at a hybrid approach.

MR – How long has this been in place for now?

DSM – For this year.

MR – I think it is good to be prepared to be challenged.

	<p>DSM – I have already shared feedback with JS – I shared that there were no changes since the last report due to no results. It would be disingenuous to change the colours without this data.</p>
<p><b>6. INCLUSION / SEND update</b></p>	<p><i>CM joined the meeting to share a full update with all governors.</i></p> <p>CM – There are three levels of our SEN register:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) SEN support - K</li> <li>2) EHCPs - E</li> <li>3) Non-compulsory monitoring code (which don't show up on national records) - N</li> </ol> <p><i>CM shared specific details/numbers with the group and confirmed that these were reviewed on a regular basis.</i></p> <p>CM – The trust had its first Trust SENCO meeting and the biggest concern was around more high need children.</p> <p>CP – How do the teachers know if a child has SEN? What detail do they know? Is there a process and how well does this work?</p> <p>CM – Everyone can see a summary for each child. If the needs are more advanced, then the individual will have a profile. A lot is about wider staff training – good SEND training and sharing information. We share information in staff briefings and can share specifics in the staff bulletin.</p> <p>DSM – We need to be mindful with the new Ofsted toolkit. There is a big emphasis on inclusion and T&amp;L with adaptations for pupils. We need to evidence this/clearly document our strategies. This is also linked to the quality of education which should be our driver.</p> <p>OPJ - The way this information is presented on the register is significantly better/makes things easier. Individual codes are shown and documents are linked , it is good.</p> <p>CP – We may need to review the process, e.g. the EHCP is built in but how does that work for the K code?</p> <p>CM – We meet every half-term and trial new things.</p> <p>DSM – We will be tightening up further with this new Ofsted approach. Parents evening is an obvious point, end of year around study leave is another. We need to be clear on what systems are and make the right adaptations for people, ensuring staff have this information.</p> <p>OPJ - How does that work with N?</p> <p>CM – If something is not working for them, we move. It is important we keep these individuals on our radar.</p> <p>DSM – We look at attainment data and attendance vs peers. Can change (up) and discuss next steps depending. We consider tracking needs and interventions and social/pastoral routines etc.</p>

	<p>Children tend to come from SEMH e.g. bereavement and suffering for a couple of years or a traumatic injury.</p> <p>DSM – We are looking at a number of individual situations with doctors. Some children are not in school regularly and are not sitting a full suite of subjects. Tracking is done by the SEN register. We know this cohort is unique and not accessing school as much as we would like. I will pick up here with MR separately around some case studies.</p> <p>SM – It would be good for us to see some of these case studies. As governors, we need real reassurance that this is being enabled and can be done.</p> <p>DSM – I think we should have the link governor meetings next time you are in school so we can look at case studies. I suggest MR/SM/CM, not the full group. This is a good idea as it will show some great successes and some areas of concern/frustration. The nature of some of these issues is constantly challenging.</p> <p>NR – So you can see the codes on the register, but you can search for the codes/information in another way?</p> <p>DSM – Yes, this was a key piece of work, thanks to CM.</p> <p><i>OPJ demonstrated on his computer. All thanked CM.</i></p>
<p><b>7. LGB skills Audit / training – feedback and actions to address outcomes</b></p>	<p>DSM – Looking at the audit and the scores as a whole I think we are a very strong governing board.</p> <p>OPJ – What was the aim of this?</p> <p>DSM – The LGB skills audit is a process that is encouraged.</p> <p>NR – Generally, it is meant to indicate skillsets across the governing body but it also allows us to see if there are any weaker areas/gaps so we can target/recruit others to join the board to bring up our strengths. But this is all dependant on how we score ourselves and this looks to be high.</p> <p>DSM – This task would highlight a skill gap, should there be any. I am conscious we are a small unit so it would be good to have a couple of additional people on the board. This is a challenge.</p> <p>MR – Did you have any response from the Chamber of Commerce?</p> <p>DSM – MR and I drafted a letter to see if anyone would be willing to join.</p> <p>SM – From their businesses not from the chamber themselves?</p> <p>DSM – Yes, we reached out to members of the Penrith Chamber of Trade and Commerce to consider becoming a school governor at QEGS and this got extended for Kirby Thore School, who are also part of CLLT.</p> <p>SM - I haven't seen anything come out and I am part of the Cumbria one.</p>

	<p>DSM – I will ask about this, but it was Penrith specific. We could also look to parents again.</p> <p>SM – Yes as a parent governor, my daughter is going to university now.</p> <p>DSM – The makeup of the board needs to be balanced and we need to keep it this way for the dynamics.</p> <p>NR – Do the Trust have a view on this?</p> <p>DSM – It is set out as 2 parents, 1 staff member, and other governors are invited to join with particular skills.</p> <p>NR – Is there any guidance on the size?</p> <p>DSM – You still need a certain number of individuals for the meeting to be quorate. The volume/mix of knowledge and skills offered is also important.</p> <p>JM – Is there anything we, as Governors, can do here? What about promotion e.g. on LinkedIn?</p> <p>DSM – We can look into options. This is a conversation for MR and I to take away and look at how we can bring in new skills.</p> <p>NR – Unconscious biased training. Adverts schools have made for positions in the school. We have talked about moving names.</p> <p>DSM – Yes, it does happen.</p> <p>NR – Good but positive advertising has not been seen.</p> <p>DSM – This all goes through my new term now, which goes through various systems and is checked by HR for compliance reasons.</p> <p>NR – We don't see these things as a governing board.</p> <p>DSM – We may need to consider recruitment in general, but I am mindful of the financial balance. It would make a difference if our efforts were tied to the community.</p> <p>OPJ – We could do this for recruiting more governors e.g. a newspaper advert?</p> <p>DSM – I will speak to MR out of this meeting and raise something with JS.</p>
<p><b>8. Chair's Advisory Meeting – feedback</b></p>	<p>MR – There have been no further meetings, therefore there is nothing to report back.</p>
<p><b>9. Ratify</b> actions taken since the last meeting</p>	<p>MR – This has been covered in the matters arising discussion.</p>
<p><b>10. Note</b> – correspondence to The Chair</p>	<p>No.</p>

<p><b>11. Confirm</b> – actions/information from this meeting</p>	<p>MR – There are two actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Publishing the policies on the school website once tweaked and formatted.</li> <li>2) Sharing feedback with the Trust around the Headteacher’s report.</li> </ol>
<p><b>12. Dates</b></p> <p>a. <b>Next LGB meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18<sup>th</sup> March – Teams meeting, time tbc</li> <li>• 20<sup>th</sup> May – In person at QEGS, 12.30pm</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> July – Teams meeting, time tbc</li> </ul>	<p>DSM – For our next meeting I will bring the updated school development plan for discussion. The next meeting is in the diary for 18<sup>th</sup> March on Teams, does 6-8pm work for everyone?</p> <p><i>All agreed.</i></p>