

“Our Vision is a world where people with learning disabilities thrive”



The Blue Tangerine Federation

Governing Body Meeting

Held on Monday 22 January 2024 at 7pm at St Luke's School

MINUTES

Meeting Attendance 2023/24							
Name	Governor Category	25 Sept	27 Nov	22 Jan	18 Mar	23 May	17 Jun
Gareth Burger	Parent governor	P	A	P			
Chris Constant	Associate Member	P	P	P			
Poppy Choudhury	Co-opted governor	P	A	P			
Jo Dawson	LA Governor	P	P	A			
Ian Dignum	Partnership governor	P	P	P			
Julie Foster	Co-opted governor	A	P	A			
Nick Griffith	Co-opted governor	P	P	P			
Stephen Hault-Allen	Executive head	P	P	P			
Joshua Jayson	Co-opted governor	A	P	P			
Ebbah Kwambai	Co-opted governor	N	N	P			
Gemma Luke	Parent governor	P	P	P			
Chris Parsons	Partnership governor	P	P	P			
Christina Self	Staff governor	A	P	P			
In attendance							
Jamie Caple	Head of school: St Luke's	P	P	P			
Jenny Witter	Head of school: Collett	P	P	P			
Manda Sides	Head of Operations	P	P	P			
Philip McBeth	DSL	P	N	P			
Tracey Norris	Clerk, HLF Education	P	P	P			

P	Present
A	Apologies provided
N	Not present

	Item	Action
1.	<p>Welcome and apologies</p> <p>The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies for absence had been received and were approved for Jo Dawson (training) and Julie Foster (unwell). The meeting was quorate. The Chair expressed the governing body's condolences to the family of the Collett pupil who had died before Christmas, he recognised that this was a difficult period for staff and pupils and governors were available to support staff during this time if this was needed.</p>	
2.	<p>Declarations of conflicts of interest</p> <p>None relevant for this meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes and actions arising</p>	

	The minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2023 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.	
4.	<p>Actions arising</p> <p>a. JW to share staff survey results at January meeting: See agenda item 10.</p> <p>b. Safeguarding governor to look at nature and impact of interventions for FSM/Ever6 pupils in relation to reducing the number of suspensions issued over time: GL had requested a meeting with JC to review this at St Luke’s - update to next FGB meeting.</p> <p>c. ID to complete governor role descriptors for Property governor and IT governor: this had taken longer than anticipated, ID had been unable to find model descriptors for these roles and instead had created ones. ID felt that they would be useful given the proposed expansion plans at Collett and the longer-term project of the farm/cafe. The documents were with MS for review. CC had agreed to be the link governor for property and IT.</p> <p>d. SHA/CP to arrange meeting to review the risk register: outstanding. CP committed to completing this piece of work before the next meeting.</p> <p>e. PM to provide update at next meeting on online safeguarding issues: See agenda item 5.</p> <p>f. MS to ask the union representative for conflict resolution support: completed. This service was not offered by the unions. MS had secured the services of a private counsellor.</p> <p>g. HCC SEND report discussion at next meeting: See agenda item 7.</p> <p>h. Items to be carried forward to the spring term were noted and would be on the agenda of the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ID to create working party to consider academisation options ▪ Cafe/farm presentation – if appropriate – a meeting of the charity was schedule for w/c 29 January. ▪ Report on the level of need of new joiners at St Luke’s (compared to funding/designation). ▪ ID/MS to consider policy review process. 	<p>GL</p> <p>CP/SHA</p>
5.	<p>Any other business</p> <p>No items were raised.</p>	
6.	<p>Safeguarding, attendance and behaviour</p> <p>The following documents had been circulated in advance of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safeguarding report for governors ▪ Behaviour and attendance data report ▪ Online safeguarding issues: report for governors <p>The Chair thanked PM and SHA for the detailed reports. Questions and comments were invited:</p> <p>Safeguarding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Q Prevent incident and referral – what plans had been put in place to educate the pupil about his/her comments? Ans: The referral had not met the Prevent threshold, but the DSL had conducted a full investigation, talking to the pupil’s family to find out if the comments had been made at home as well as at school. The parents were very supportive and would reinforce the school’s position at home. When spoken to, the pupil had been reflective of his/her behaviour and realised that he/she had made a mistake thinking that this was a subject you could joke about. The pupil had received 1:1 support and the whole class had also had a session on this subject. ▪ Q Pupils expressing desire to self-harm/end life – what support was in place for staff to ensure they have the necessary resilience to continue to support pupils who make such disclosures? Ans: School leaders and the DSL were very aware of this. There were weekly reminders to staff of the counselling service available through Education Mutual. The DSL and other lead staff were always available to talk to. Feedback was always provided to the member of staff who reported a disclosure of this kind and there were various posters and 	

	<p>notice boards around the school which provided staff with signposting to organisations offering support. The Mental Health practitioner had offered to run drop-in sessions for staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some successes have been achieved, for example, a pupil at Collett who had regularly stated a desire to harm themselves, were no longer doing so as they were now better able to articulate their feelings. Support for pupils was extensive. ▪ Q Did the DSL receive supervision? Ans: Yes. ▪ The DSL had left a question mark in the termly safeguarding report regarding governor safeguarding training. This was available from a report on GH which could be provided by the Clerk or Chair. Governors were required to update their safeguarding training every two years. ▪ Q Domestic violence reporting, how did staff know what information to share with family members/other organisations when requests were made? Ans: All staff followed data checking protocols. They would ask for an email confirmation from an external agency first before providing any information. For requests from a family member, the member of staff would first refer to ARBOR to see who had parental rights. ▪ All child protection and safeguarding information was stored on the S-Drive – Q How secure was this? Ans: All confidential information was kept on CPOMs which had restricted access rights. ▪ Q Did the school have a protocol for an emergency lock down – was this practiced? Ans: Yes. At Collett the notification of a lock down was via an alarm and at St Luke’s this was communicated via walkie talkie. Blinds and doors would be shut, and pupils and staff would move to a safe space. ▪ Q Vouchers for additional educational resources for CLA pupils – how were these allocated? Ans: The LA funded these vouchers which were spend following consultation with social workers and/or guardian/carer. An example was provided of the type of therapeutic resource this was used for. Q Did the school track the impact of these resources? Ans: Yes, in that, each item was selected on the grounds that it would support pro-social behaviour. Behaviour was tracked and reviewed in each CLA’s termly PEP review meeting. ▪ Governors clarified the date of the termly safeguarding report – it was using a 2021 HCC template but referred to safeguarding matters and training in the second half term of the autumn. <p>Online safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Q What steps do staff take to enforce age limits when accessing social media? Ans: Both schools provided a constant flow of information/guidance and reminders to pupils and parents about age limits on social media platforms. Pupils were not allowed to use their phones at school but the enforcement of parental controls was not in the school’s remit even though the consequences of social media/online activities often spilled over into school. ▪ JW noted that education was the best defence, pupils would always have social media/smart phones in their life, they needed the tools to manage these and the confidence to say no when needed. ▪ Q What support did the DfE provide schools to support this process? Ans: There was a lot of material available from the DfE, NSPCC and other sources. JW had recently shared a video by the Mayor of London at an assembly at Collett which had been impactful, safer internet day was coming up in February. ▪ Q Did DSL have enough tools/resources to support/promote online safety adequately? Ans: More staff to support pupils would be welcome. The federation was moving internet/IT support to a company which could provide greater filters and monitoring services. 	
--	---	--

- **Q How could parental engagement in this area be improved?** Ans: Parental engagement was always monitored, and certain families would be targeted with additional support, for example, some parents were unaware of the social interactions that took place across gaming platforms. The schools provided a constant stream of information, updates and links to parents on this subject.
- **Q Did DSL direct parents to online workshops/websites that provide support?** Ans: Yes. This was done all the time in school newsletters, in safeguarding updates etc.
- Police-led after school basketball club – **Q how did pupils attend this?** This relied on parental support for transport.

Attendance

- **Q What benefits did staff receive from the attendance officer training?** Ans: This has given staff confidence to positively challenge parents and provided DSL with better understanding of the attendance landscape and the interactions between parents/school and the local authority. Aim: to improve attendance for all pupils.
- Trends and patterns would be identified by the front facing staff who have regular conversations with parents.
- Parents were reminded of the number of school sessions their child has missed (this was considered more impactful than a percentage).
- **Q How quickly were parents called?** Ans: When a pupil was absent with no prior warning, the family was called as soon as possible after registers have closed. DSL were keeping written record of telephone calls and emails to support the school’s attendance strategy. There was excellent communication between heads of school/DSL and the attendance team.
- **Q Did staff know pupils/families well enough to know which were genuine reasons for absence and which were not?** Ans: Yes. The school would send a warning letter when unauthorised absences reached a certain threshold. It was hoped that for most families the threat of a fine would be enough to improve attendance.
- **Q How do staff differentiate between families who intentionally take unauthorised absences and those families who genuinely struggle to get their child to school?** Ans: School leaders were very mindful of the context of each individual family. Help and support was available to families depending on their level of need. 20% of parents (of Federation pupils) have learning difficulties of their own and there were increasing numbers of pupils who were categorised as CIN (child in need) which increased their vulnerabilities and need.
- **Q Was there a link between FSM and levels of absence?** Ans: Attendance rates for FSM pupils were slightly lower than non-FSM but not significantly. County arranged transport for pupils to attend specialist provision meant the pupil was less dependent on their parents to get to school.
- **Q Why were authorised absences at Collett so much higher than St Luke’s?** Ans: 9.2% of absences had been authorised at Collett, these were mostly for medical reasons or hospital appointments; there were more pupils with medical need at Collett than St Luke’s.
- **Q What was the Federation’s vision for attendance?** Ans: To reduce absences by making the schools a place where pupils wanted to attend (because of the engaging and exciting curriculum offer). When pupils on reduced timetables were discounted, both school’s attendance data improved to above 90%

Behaviour

- The permanent exclusion of a pupil at St Luke’s School in December was noted.
- **Q What could the school do to address the disparity in behaviour incidents between boys and girls – what was the cause of this?** Ans: There were fewer girls than boys on roll at both schools which skewed the data. Generally, girls were less likely to respond to a situation with physical behaviour and were more able to respond to reasoning and abide

	<p>by the behaviour expectations compared to boys. However, there were some high-profile girls at St Luke’s in the upper school. Staff were focused not on narrowing the gap between behaviour incidents but on ensuring everyone was treated equally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Governors thanked SHA for including a summary of positive rewards on pages 3 and 4, it was lovely to read about pro-social behaviours as well as negative behaviour reporting. ▪ Q What SEMH resources did Collett School lack? – governors noted the high number of level 2 and 4 incidents at Collett. Ans: JW explained that SEMH schools would often provide climbing walls, trampolines, gyms etc which pupils could use to channel emotions, in general SEMH pupils were more neurotypical. The profile of Collett pupils was more complex than those at SEMH schools; Collett pupils with SEMH needs also had LD (autism). Collett pupils also had a vast range of interest and obsessions, and its biggest issue was the lack of space for breakout rooms and a lack of resources to fund outreach. ▪ Q What accounted for the higher number of level 4 incidents at Collett compared to St Luke’s? Ans: The majority of level 4 incidents were attributable to a small cohort of pupils who either had highly complex needs or were in the wrong provision. ▪ Q How many pupils were close to being permanently excluded, acknowledging that this was a last resort which school leaders were always loathed to take? Ans: Approximately six pupils were currently at risk of permanent exclusion across the Federation. ▪ Governors were keen to ensure that school leaders were having open and honest conversations with parents about their child’s behaviour – they should be made aware (in writing) of the escalating behaviour issues and that a permanent exclusion was a possibility. Governors noted that there was a delicate balance between accommodating dysregulated behaviour as part of a pupils’ SEN and providing a safe working environment for staff; staff should not have to tolerate physical assaults and other dangerous behaviour and if adaptations and strategies were not working, school leaders should not be afraid to admit this. ▪ Head of school noted how each pupil was unique, some arrived with extreme behaviour but responded well to strategies and adaptations, others did not. Staff were very mindful and aware of the difference between dangerous/violent behaviour with intent and dysregulated behaviour arising from SEN. ▪ Q Governors noted that each school was often “forced” to take a pupil whose needs could not be met but that a pupil who had permanently excluded from St Luke’s had spent a considerable amount of time out of education before being placed at alternative provision – was this fair? Ans: SHA noted that both heads of schools had been refusing to take pupils whose needs could not be met. ▪ Governors highlighted the success of pupils on reduced timetables at Collett School; all had increased their timetable by varying degrees. This was good progress. ▪ Q Would the school consider an App for parents to share negative behaviour reporting? Ans: This had previously been explored and heads of school had not wanted to pursue this method of comms. ▪ JW noted that Collett had drafted a flow chart with triggers for comms with parents when discussing pupil behaviour, so the school could evidence when information had been shared with parents. ▪ Q Did parents sign a home/school agreement re behaviour expectations? Ans: Yes, this was part of the schools’ induction pack. This had been repeated on an annual basis, but the response rate was low. Consideration was being given to how best re-iterate behaviour expectations at the start of each term for pupils and parents. ▪ Q When would DofE Award be available for Collett pupils? Ans: Shortly, a new member of staff had been employed who would work between both schools. ▪ Action: GB and SHA to meet to discuss DofE support from St Albans Boys School. <p style="text-align: center;">PM left the meeting.</p>	
--	--	--

		GB/SHA
7.	<p>Chair’s update ID shared the following summary of his activities as chair since the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weekly calls with SHA. ▪ Email correspondence with other chairs of governors to explore academisation options. ▪ Exclusions training. ▪ Liaison meeting with chairs of governors from other special schools; these chairs had confirmed that they had a budget line for staff wellbeing, and this would be explored further at the next F&R committee meeting. 	
8.	<p>Federation-wide strategic matters The following documents had been circulated in advance of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risk register: updated January 2024 ▪ Collett expansion: proposal ▪ Equality objectives <p>Questions and comments were invited:</p> <p>a. <u>Risk register:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Q Were the schools still at risk from strike action by staff? Ans: The Federation supported staffs’ right to strike and it was likely that instances might occur when the 2024 pay negotiations commenced between the government and the unions in the summer. SHA noted that the government were consulting about minimum staffing levels which might prevent all staff who wanted to from participating in strike action. ▪ Q What was the difference between outreach and in-reach services? Ans: The school provide outreach support to mainstream settings (members of staff would visit the mainstream school and share strategies), in-reach would be having mainstream staff visiting Collett School and seeing strategies in practice. ▪ Both schools had been too hot in the summer (air conditioning had been installed) - Q Were there any issues with classrooms being too cold? Ans: No but MS was aware that St Luke’s would need to upgrade the boilers in the lower school and the bungalow in coming years. CS noted the positive impact in the classroom (from a teacher’s perspective) from the air conditioning installation. ▪ Q Cost of replacement of fibre optic cables within St Luke’s? This was a new entry in the risk register. MS reported how this had now become an urgent issue. There had been two occasions in recent weeks when the wi-fi had crashed due to faults in the fibre optic cable connections and switches. Q Was this due to end of life or damage? Ans: End of life. ▪ Q Would a similar project of upgrade be required at Collett? Ans: No, St Luke’s had been an early adopter of fibre technology and was now faced with obsolete equipment, Collett had introduced fibre optic cables much later. <p>b. <u>Expansion at Collett</u></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Q Why was the risk rating of the proposed expansion at Collett so high (25)? Ans: There were many and varied risks associated with the expansion as well as many unknowns. For example, HCC had now indicated that they wanted Collett to take on 60 new pupils not 40 (with no increase in footprint). The land would need to be transferred to the Federation, issues might arise from the communal use of the car park by neighbouring schools which would need to cease on transfer, the school’s existing middle block required upgrading to house more primary-aged pupils (if older pupils were moved to the new building), more sensory spaces were required – would HCC pay for these additions, etc. ▪ Q Was there any risk of RAAC in the new building? Ans: No, but some major R&M works were required, eg new roof, new reception area, accessibility adaptations. ▪ Q Was there any asbestos? Ans: Yes, but this was located in the roof and would be removed as part of the roof replacement. ▪ Q How would pupils access the new building? Ans: Transition between the existing Collett site and the new building would be to cross Warners End Road and walk along Gadebridge Road. The new site was located between Gade Valley Primary School and St Cuthbert Mayne School. ▪ Having two sites would duplicate some staff roles eg receptionist and impact the school’s benchmarking data. ▪ The school would aim to secure as much improvement to the existing site from HCC as possible as part of the negotiations re the expansion. <p>c. <u>HCC SEND Inspection outcome</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Q What immediate impact had been experienced by the Federation following the SEND inspection report which had identified HCC’s systematic failure of SEN provision? Ans: HCC were required to demonstrate progress within 17 months and SHA was aware of a number of initiatives being considered. Some of which might impact the Federation, these were captured in the risk register, eg rapid expansion of SEN school spaces. ▪ As yet, nothing had been announced that would positively impact pupils or families with SEN. 	
9.	<p>Disadvantaged pupils: deep dive</p> <p>A report on disadvantaged pupils at St Luke’s and the Collett Schools had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Comment and questions were invited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action: School leaders to upload their “Onwards and Upwards” assessment data from the autumn term when finalised. ▪ Going forward the report would include progress data for vulnerable pupils. ▪ Q Why were “girls” a vulnerable group? Ans: They were a minority (there were more boys than girls on roll) so were tracked like any other minority group. ▪ Action: JD to review disadvantaged groups as part of her next school visit. ▪ The timing of the report would coincide with progress data reports and would be added to the annual planner for Easter and July. ▪ The Federation had been supported in the creation of this report from the CSV (commissioned school visit) by Rachel McFarlane on disadvantaged pupils. 	<p>JW/JC</p> <p>JD</p>
10.	<p>Staff Survey Results: Collett</p> <p>The survey results had been circulated in advance of the meeting. For context, JW reminded governors that the survey had been completed in June 2023, during a period of industrial action. The following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highlights: 100% of respondents said they were proud to work at the school. 	

“Our Vision is a world where people with learning disabilities thrive”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The same questions will be asked each year to ensure progress against each metric could be tracked. ▪ School leaders had reflected on all feedback and had created an action plan of “you said....we did....” which was shared with staff. ▪ Q How has staff workload been managed? Ans: This was always a contentious issue. A presentation on directive time was shared with staff in September and where possible, administrative tasks have been reduced. JW had reviewed the DfE recommendations on reducing workload (announced last week) and would explore those that were practical. Staff were allowed to complete their PPA time at home. ▪ Q Were all possible steps taken to increase/promote participation in the survey? Ans: yes. The timeframe was extended, and regular reminders were made. 45/60 members of staff had responded. ▪ Question 16: Governors make a positive contribution to the school: 36.5% of staff disagreed with this comment. The Chair expressed his disappointment given the efforts that had been made to engage with staff. Governors considered how best they could share information about their role and what they were/were not responsible for with staff. It was agreed that a myth-buster/factsheet about governors might be appropriate. ▪ Meet the governor sessions had been held at Collett and one was planned at St Luke’s. Governors were not responsible for the day-to-day operations of each school and could not get involved in staff complaints about working conditions unless staff were prepared to follow the appropriate procedures (ie the complaints policy, the whistleblowing policy etc). This needed to be a consolidated message from governors to staff during any governor visit/event. ▪ “Have you meet....” articles about governors were in school newsletters which were also sent to staff. ▪ Action: NG would draft a FAQ/fact sheet about the governors’ role within the Federation and share with ID for review. 	NG
11.	<p>Policies for ratification None due at this time.</p>	
12.	<p>Finance and Resources Committee: matters to escalate The minutes of the F&R committee meeting held on 11 December 2023 had been circulated in advance. NG summarised the discussions held:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capital projects were being planned at Collett which were in the process of being costed (eg development of the cookery room). ▪ Deep dive focus: school trips. ▪ Staff wellbeing: further discussions were required on this, the SBM had been told by HCC that a budget line for staff wellbeing was not allowed, but governors were aware of other local schools with an allocation for this. ▪ The SVFS would be drafted using the data from the revised January forecast. ▪ ID had redrafted the terms of reference and these were approved. (References to St Luke’s deficit position had been removed). 	
13.	<p>Governor matters</p> <p>a. <u>Composition</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The school’s application to increase the number of co-opted governors from five to six had been approved. ▪ Chris Constant was moved to the role of co-opted governor (previously associate member). ▪ There were no vacancies. 	

“Our Vision is a world where people with learning disabilities thrive”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poppy Choudhury confirmed (after the meeting) that she would renew her term of office as a co-opted governor. <p>b. <u>Governor visits</u>: the following visits had been undertaken and visit reports uploaded to governor hub:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Julie Foster: H&S - December 2023 ▪ Gareth Burger: SDP impact – December 2023 ▪ Poppy Choudhury: Behaviour at Collett: December 2023 ▪ Governors were reminded to use the new visit form – available in the governor visit folder on Governor Hub. <p>c. <u>Governor training</u>: the following training had been undertaken since the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In-house training on exclusions for all governors: 15 January 2024 ▪ Knowing your school and Ofsted: Jo Dawson – 22 January 2024 ▪ Governors were asked to complete at least one training session per half term (either live training from HFL Education or Modern Governor training). <p>Action: All governors to complete a visit and undertake training in the spring term.</p>	All
14.	<p>Any other business</p> <p>None raised.</p>	
15.	<p>New risks identified during the meeting:</p> <p>Expansion at Collett – already added to the risk register</p> <p>Upgrade/replacement of fibre-optic cables at St Lukes – cost and disruption – already added to risk register.</p>	
16.	<p>Items for further discussion</p> <p>For the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gender guidance from the DfE ▪ Impact of HCC SEND inspection: standing agenda item 	
17.	<p>Meeting dates for 2023/24</p> <p>Monday 18 March 2024 new date</p> <p>Thursday 23 May 2024 new date</p> <p>Monday 17 June 2024</p>	

Meeting closed at 9.20pm

Actions from meeting			
1	CP to arrange meeting with SHA to review risk register	CP/SHA	
2	GL to report back on meeting with JC re nature and impact of interventions on vulnerable pupils and whether these reduced the number of suspensions issued over time.	GL	
3	GB and SHA to meet to discuss DofE support from St Albans Boys School.	GB/SHA	
4	School leaders to upload their “Onwards and Upwards” assessment data from the autumn term when finalised.	JW/JC	
5	JD to review disadvantaged groups as part of her next school visit.	JD	
6	All governors to complete a visit and undertake training in the spring term.	All	
Items planned for the spring/summer term			

“Our Vision is a world where people with learning disabilities thrive”

1	ID to arrange working party to consider academisation options/direction of travel	ID	Update at next meeting
2	SLT to prepare report detailing the need of the new joiners (at St Luke’s) compared to banding level.	JC/SHA	On agenda for March meeting
3	ID/MS to discuss policy review process, double checking which policies could be delegated to a sub-set of governors/link governor for review and the review period (1-3 years).	ID/MS	c/f to spring term
4	Presentation of Farm/cafe	SHA	As and when appropriate: update on timeline at next meeting

KEY DATES 2023/24

SCHOOL COUNCIL MEETINGS			
Collett School: meetings to start at 9.30am		St Luke’s School: meetings to start at 10am	
Date	Governor to attend	Date	Governor to attend
15 September		30 November	
17 November		8 February	
11 January		21 March	
8 March		16 May	
26 April		11 July	
14 June			
PARENT COFFEE MORNINGS/AFTERNOONS			
Collett School: session to start at 9.30am		St Luke’s School: session to start at 1.45pm	
Date	Governor to attend	Date	Governor to attend
29 September		29 September	
8 December		20 October	
26 January	Ian Dignum	24 November	
22 March		26 January	
24 May	Ian Dignum	22 March	
		24 May	
		21 June	
HIP VISITS			
Collett School: morning slot		St Luke’s: afternoon slot	
Date	Governor to attend	Date	Governor to attend
Monday 13 November		Monday 13 November	