

## EEGT SEND EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the virtual meeting held on 27 November 2025 at 3.00pm

**Present physically:** -

**Present virtually:** A Friend, Committee member  
A Miti, Committee member  
G Abbott, Parent member – Chalk Hill (part)  
J Finch, Committee member  
J Wakelam, EEGT Trustee  
K Points, EEGT Trustee and Trustee Lead for People (part)  
M Cadman, Committee member  
N Kellett, EEGT Trustee and Trustee Lead for Safeguarding – **Vice Chair**  
R Inman, EEGT Trustee  
S Snowdon, EEGT Trustee and Trustee Lead for SEND – **Chair**

**In attendance:** E Barneveld, Head of School – Duke of Lancaster School  
G Huntington, Group Head of SEND services  
J McDonnell, Trainee Clerk and EA to the Governance Professional  
L Chapman, interim Head of School – Stone Lodge Academy  
N Jennings, Head of School – Chalk Hill  
N Savvas, CEO  
P Hamilton, Head of School – Sunrise Academy  
R Bamford, Group Vice Principal Quality  
R King, Group Head of Supported Learning  
S Chesterton, Head of Welfare and Safeguarding (SEND Cluster)  
S Gales, Governance Professional  
S Hopkins, Head of SEND Services  
S-L Neesam, Group Head of Welfare and Safeguarding  
S White, Head of School – Priory School

**Apologies:** C Shaw, Group Sixth Form Principal  
E Newport, Parent member – Stone Lodge Academy  
E O'Hara, Head of Welfare and Safeguarding (SEMH)  
L Sutherland, Parent member – Priory School  
S Daley, EEGT Trustee and Trustee Lead for Careers

**Absent:**

#### 1. Declaration of Interests and Apologies for absence

S Daley and S Snowdon declared their roles as Governors of West Suffolk College.

Members recognised the standing declarations. No other conflicts of interest in relation to the items of the agenda were declared.

Apologies were accepted from E Newport, L Sutherland and S Daley.

[K Points joined the meeting at 3.06pm](#)

The Chair commended the Executive for the improved quality, presentation and analysis of the reports provided to the Committee.

The Chair explained that the papers will be taken as 'read' to allow more time for the Committee to question the reports to provide appropriate support and challenge. The Chair noted that a significant proportion of time would be spent on the school self-evaluation frameworks and the associated development plans, to support their preparations for Ofsted.

#### Action

The Chair noted that Sue Daley has sent through questions relating to the papers, which the Chair would raise these during discussions so that they are incorporated in absentia.

2. **Minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2025**

Members reviewed and **agreed** the minutes of meeting on 9 October 2025 as an accurate record.

The Chair commended the thoroughness and accuracy of the minutes.

3. **Matters arising from the meeting on 9 October 2025**

Members **noted** that three of the six matters arising were complete, with three were noted and closed.

i. **Update on RISE for Stone Lodge Academy**

Members received and **noted** the report which updated on the progress being made with the Department for Education's Regional Improvement for Standards and Excellence (RISE) programme.

R Bamford gave a verbal update on progress since the report was written and informed that we are developing a two-year development plan which includes a significant focus on training, coaching, curriculum developments and implementing/embedding new systems and processes at the school to continue to the rapid improvement journey.

R Bamford explained the next steps, which include submitting the two-year development plan to the DfE for them to review on 2 December 2025, with the view to getting formal sign-off from the RISE team for the planned works, so that these can commence from January 2026.

Members queried whether, when we were discussing our proposed two-year development plan with our RISE lead, the RISE team had identified any additional or suggested that we should prioritise any specific actions. R Bamford confirmed that they hadn't suggested a change of priority areas however they had suggested the inclusion of actions to support the new Head of School, which have since been added.

Members queried when the new Head of School is due to start. The CEO confirmed that the Head of School will start after the easter break.

4. **First Hand Feedback**

Members received and considered the feedback resulting from members visits to the SEND schools.

The Chair noted that this term, she and several governance members, participated in the validation and final review of the school self-evaluation frameworks and the associated development plans, and commended the transparency of the process.

A Friend informed that she has visited Sunrise, Duke of Lancaster and Priory this term, and is due to visit Chalk Hill and Stone Lodge before Christmas.

A Friend reflected that, as an experienced member of the Primary Educational Excellence Committee she is used to visiting schools and using them as an opportunity to strengthen the Committee's relationship with and understanding of the schools e.g. support available for disadvantaged children, staff wellbeing, training and workload, etc.

A Friend queried how the Committee would like its members to utilise their First-Hand visits. The Chair explained that members should use First-Hand visits to strengthen oversight of the schools e.g. by discussing progress against the school development plans, speak to staff and students, etc. Members reflected that it would be helpful to

have more guidance to support the effectiveness of their First-Hand visits to schools e.g. knowing who visited last, any areas of concern/development identified, etc. The CEO agreed and suggested that the Governance Professional is best placed to provide this guidance and explained that the intention of the First-Hand visits is for governance member to visit the schools to see what the culture is and to understand what its like in the school and how the school is developing. The Governance Professional agreed and confirmed that the intention is to give governance members the opportunity to triangulate the information they receive at this Committee with what they see is happening within the school to know whether the strategies are having the intended impact, and to pick up on any emerging concerns.

A Miti fed back that following his visit to Priory he reached out to the Governance Professional to seek guidance when filling out the feedback form and agreed that more structure would be helpful.

The Governance Professional reflected that, now that the Committee is more established and all governance members have visited at least one of the SEND schools, it would now be appropriate for First-Hand visits to be more structured and guided, and agreed to work with the Executive to implement this. The Governance Professional assured that there is no expectation of governance members being formally part of quality assurance reviews.

Gov. Prof.

A Friend queried, given the frequency and severity of assaults on staff at the SEND schools, what support is provided for staff who are victims of assault. S-L Neesam explained that if staff are victims of assault, we ask them to formally notify us using our medical tracking system, which is reviewed daily by the Head of School and HR, so that we can provide appropriate support. S-L Neesam summarised the types of support HR typically provide and informed that to reduce the likelihood of assaults we are exploring implementing new staff training to support them to de-escalate dysregulated students. Members queried whether all staff are aware of and use the medical tracking system as intended. S-L Neesam confirmed that they do. S White gave examples of how the system works at Priory School and the multiple ways in which staff can disclose other wellbeing issues to leaders, so they can receive support. Members commended this approach and queried whether leaders are able to access sufficient support and feel empowered to disclose their wellbeing issues. S White confirmed that there is and gave examples of the support available to her and other Heads of School. L Chapman informed that the health and safety team are auditing the SEND school information in the medical tracker system, across the with a view of strengthening them where needed.

K Points, as Trustee lead for People, fed back following her visit to a joint HR and H&S team meeting and informed that this was a topic of discussion. K Points explained that all staff can access specialist counselling and other wellbeing support through the Employee Assistance Programme and summarised how assaults on staff are being tracked and addressed. K Points reflected that, through the recent exclusion panels, she has heard about the serious and lasting impact that assaults can have on staff and the importance of a whole-school approach to addressing negative behaviours in supporting the necessary culture change to reduce assaults.

Members reflected that our ongoing work with the Local Authorities around more closely reviewing admissions to the schools, should help create more stable school environments (as students correctly placed are more likely to be regulated and, with the right funding for their SEN needs, will receive impactful support interventions). The Chair reflected that, further to the recent exclusion panels, these assaults on staff also have a significant impact on other students – of those who witness the assault and those whose learning is impacted by the absence of staff following assaults.

N Kellett, as Trustee lead for residential, fed back on his visits to the residential provisions at Chalk Hill and Priory, and to Sunrise; and commended the d enthusiasm from students and staff. N Kellett reflected that the leadership about admissions and

behaviour management across the schools is having a significant and impact and reflected that the school environments felt very different compared to his previous visits and commended the positive culture.

5. **Risk Register Extract**

Members received and considered Risk Register extract which included **0 Red, 8 Amber** and **4 Yellow** risks, and proposed a new risk (EEG00X relating to capacity to implement planned improvements).

The Governance Professional informed that the Audit and Risk Management Committee discussed the recent Standard 3 visit to Chalk Hill's residential provision identified areas for improvement which, when considered in the context of its previous Ofsted in January 2025, could represent an emerging risk (linked to agenda item 8). Members discussed the concerns raised and reflected that while an action plan is in place to address the concerns, it has not been fully implemented yet and therefore there is an emerging risk. Members discussed whether this warrants a standalone risk or falls under EEG004 (relating to Ofsted). R Bamford advised that they are inspected under different frameworks so should be considered separately.

N Kellett, as Trustee lead for residential, confirmed that he and N Jennings have discussed the Standard 3 action plan (see agenda item 8).

Members reviewed the risks and **felt assured** by the mitigations proposed, though recommend that a risk relating to Chalk Hill's residential provision be added to the Risk Register.

A&RMC

6. **School Evaluation Framework and School Development Plan**

Members received and considered the papers provided which included each SEND school's annual 2024/25 self-evaluation and their proposed development plans for 2025/26.

The Chair thanked the Executive for the overview paper which helped the Committee understand the individual school reports.

R Bamford explained that these assess against the old Ofsted framework (as this was in place for the 2024/25 academic year) and that in spring, in preparation for any future inspection, we will consider the school's self-assessment against the new Ofsted framework while reviewing progress against the development plan.

Members queried how the judgements have been scrutinised, challenged and validated, to give the Committee confidence in them. R Bamford explained the validation process and noted the process included governance members and the highly experienced quality team.

Members noted that the reports used undefined acronyms and asked that in future years they can be defined.

Heads

Members discussed **Chalk Hill's** self-evaluation and their proposed development plans.

Members queried why Chalk Hill's residential provision wasn't covered by the reports. R Bamford explained that the residential provision is inspected under a different Ofsted framework linked to the National Minimum Standards, and so these reports focus on the quality of Chalk Hill's day-school.

Members asked how many students Chalk Hill has on roll vs capacity. N Jennings informed there are 20 students on roll and capacity (PAN) for 24 students and explained that when the school relocates to its new site the PAN will increase to 48 students.

Members reflected that when the school relocates and expands its PAN, this will have a significant impact on the number of staff needed and their training; and queried how the Executive are planning for this. N Jennings and L Chapman informed that growth will be phased, so that recruitment of new staff is in line with the increased students on roll. L Chapman noted that, as the date of relocation is still being negotiated with the Local Authority, planning is challenging and noted that we are working with current staff to keep them informed.

Members commended the focus on reading and queried how the school is measuring the impact of their focus. N Jennings informed that staff use a national testing structure to track student's reading age to evaluate improvements each term.

Members queried how the school engages parents to support the school's plans to improve reading. N Jennings explained that, given the SEN needs of its students, the school typically doesn't utilise homework however the school communicates home weekly via ClassDojo to families to inform them about what the children are studying with an 'ask' that families have conversations with their child about the books they've read.

Members queried whether Earwig software will be used across all the SEND schools to track and report on student progress. R Bamford confirmed that it will be.

Members queried how the Executive know if the learning walks are robust and impactful. K Points noted that, as part of her First-Hand visit, this was discussed and the Heads are providing peer-to-peer support to share best practice and discuss any challenges, and that the central quality team is being expanded to bring in additional skills and capacity.

Members queried how the school is supporting students and their families to understand their next steps and destinations, linked to 'preparing for adulthood'. N Jennings reflected that in 2024/25 the school did not have any Key Stage 4 students, so these preparations started in Key Stage 3; though informed that the central careers team are working with the school to prepare for future Key Stage 4 students. J Finch offered to support the school's review their preparations for careers and preparing for adulthood delivery.

J Finch  
N Jennings

Members queried if there is sufficient evidence to underpin the self-assessment of 'good' for quality of education and the rationale. N Jennings explained that she feels overall the quality of education is good and reflected that while there are subject which are less strong (e.g. maths, science and PE) she has plans underway to address these (e.g. recruiting new teachers). N Jennings explained that the new assessment tool will help measure the impact of these.

Members queried whether there are any limiting judgements in the new Ofsted framework. R Bamford confirmed that there are no limiting judgements.

Members discussed **Duke of Lancaster School's** self-evaluation and their proposed development plans.

Members queried whether the main issue consistency. E Barneveld confirmed that consistency is a core challenge and gave examples of how leaders are evaluating areas of strength and areas requiring development to implement training, support and share best practice.

Members queried the colour coding in the development plan. E Barneveld explained their meaning and noted that on areas where they are behind schedule, they are due to staff absence.

Members queried the rationale for the longer completion date for actions relating to reading. E Barneveld explained that the school is working with students and their families to promote a love of reading through engaging activities, introducing reading

diaries, suggesting age-/ability- appropriate books, and working to build core vocabulary; though noted that this needs time to embed fully. E Barneveld informed that some further staff training is also needed (e.g. to support delivery of phonics in Primary), which requires time to implement. E Barneveld noted that best-practice is being shared with the Trust's Primary schools and informed that the school has invested in its selection of books to nurture a love of reading.

Members queried the impact of staff champions. E Barneveld fed back that these have been positive in helping to culture change at the school by encouraging other staff to try new strategies, and through their modelling and coaching to peers.

Members reflected that, at previous meetings, there has been discussions about the mixed SEN needs of students at the school, which does not always align to its formal SEN designation. Members queried whether this has been resolved through closer oversight of admissions or whether the mixed SEN needs of students present an ongoing issue impacting curriculum planning. E Barneveld informed that improved admissions processes are starting to improve the situation however noted that there are still students on roll who are working significantly below their age and peer group and informed how the school adapts the curriculum to support their SEN needs.

The CEO commended E Barneveld's leadership and resilience.

#### G Abbott joined the meeting at 4.04pm

Members discussed **Priory School's** self-evaluation and their proposed development plans.

Members reflected that, in the past, Priory had an 'independence' flat to support residential students to prepare for adulthood and queried if the school still used this model. S White confirmed that it no longer offers this.

Members commended the plans for a sustainability project.

Members reflected that many of the maths actions were due to be completed by this point and queried if they had been. S White gave an update on these actions and informed that many of them have been implemented.

Members discussed the school's plan to rationalise the number of accreditations it offers for maths and English. Members queried whether this is likely to improve the quality of education. S White explained that it will help leaders to analyse outcome trends.

A Miti, fed back on his First-Hand visit, and commended the support given to students at the start of the day to transition from their taxis into school. A Miti reflected that the diversity of SEN needs within the student cohort as well as EDI diversity and queried how staff support students. S White explained how the school uses curriculum pathways to tailor learning to different needs and supports students to connect with others in small groups.

Members commended the use of the new Ofsted framework within the report to help the Committee understand its performance in that context.

Members discussed **Stone Lodge Academy's** self-evaluation and their proposed development plans.

Members reflected that significant improvement works are needed at the school and queried how these will be prioritised, and if some are more challenging than others to implement. L Chapman advised that the RISE action plan will show significantly more detail about the planned improvement actions, and reflected that the biggest challenges are upskilling staff, setting high expectations, and a full curriculum review. L Chapman explained the intention is to ensure the curriculum content is suitable for

the needs of students and is delivered well, while achieving a culture change while bringing staff with us, and strengthening leadership to lead and sustain the culture change.

Members asked if staff are supportive of the changes. L Chapman explained that there has been a mixed reaction and reflected that the recent Ofsted monitoring report is helping staff to see the positive impact of the extensive changes.

Members queried how leaders will work with the RISE team. L Chapman explained how leaders are building relationships with the RISE team and with other outstanding SEND schools to share best practice.

Members queried the response from parents and carers to the school's new approaches. L Chapman informed that on the whole parents have been supportive of the school and have appreciated the improved communication from the school. L Chapman gave examples of how the school has worked with families such as improved attendance at the schools 'moving to adulthood' evening with post-16 providers and engagement in the parent forum.

Members queried why girls attendance in Year 5 was less strong than boys. L Chapman advised that, given the very small number of students, the percentage analysis is less meaningful.

Members queried when the RISE action plan will be shared with the Committee. L Chapman confirmed that it will be shared at the next meeting.

Members discussed **Sunrise Academy's** self-evaluation and their proposed development plans.

N Kellett reflected that during his First-Hand visit to Sunrise leaders spoke of using AI and queried the intended use of AI to support students and to reduce staff workload. P Hamilton informed that EEG's AI lead provided training to SLT about potential uses and informed of plans to survey staff to help inform training needs and gave examples of how he has used AI tools. R Bamford informed that staff skills evaluation is central to our AI strategy.

Members queried what baseline assessment tool the school uses. P Hamilton informed that the school uses WRAT5 (wide-ranging assessment tests). Members queried the reason for the long implementation time proposed with improving baselining. P Hamilton explained that staff need time to understand how to use the data from WRAT5 to inform teaching and learning.

Members discussed the proposal to modify the school day and queried the reasons for this and the intended impact. P Hamilton informed that the idea is based on best practice observed at an outstanding SEMH school, with the intention of a later start time allowing the student to be more engaged when they arrive at school and gives more time to staff in the morning to plan and prepare. P Hamilton informed that it is still an idea and outlined plans to consult with staff and families. Member reflected that later start times are better for older children, according to scientific studies.

Members discussed the proposal to create outside outdoor learning and queried if this is a safeguarding risk given the SEMH needs of the students. P Hamilton agreed that it is but the potential benefits to the students makes it worth exploring and confirmed that suitable safeguards and mitigations would be put in place. P Hamilton gave examples of the impact of a pilot at Carlton Marshes.

Members commended the specific improvement objectives and success criteria especially for improving behaviours, and queried whether working with the Local Authority to secure more suitable placements for some students should be considered alongside fair use of suspensions as an action this Committee to monitor. P Hamilton agreed though reflected that there can be an unhelpful delay in response

time from the Local Authority relating to requests for alternative placements, which can result in the decision to permanently exclude.

Members queried how progress against the School Development Plans will be monitored. R Bamford confirmed that progress will be reported to this Committee. Members requested that progress is RAG rated against the completion date. The Governance Professional added that, where another report to this Committee may link to an action within a school development plan, we will look to add this to the cover report to help the Committee monitor progress and keep oversight.

Members **approved** the School Evaluation Framework and School Development Plan and **agreed to recommend to the board**.

**i. Student and Parent Voice**

Members received and noted the Student and Parent Voice paper provided.

Members commended the engagement with families.

The Governance Professional informed that there has been an applicant for the Duke of Lancaster parent member role.

Members asked if complaints and compliments will be reported to this Committee. The Governance Professional informed that are due to be reported at the next meeting.

**7. Alternative Provision**

Members received and considered the paper provided which reported on the alternative provisions used at Duke of Lancaster School, Stone Lodge Academy and Sunrise Academy.

Members queried how leaders decide which student should access alternative provision. P Hamilton explained that alternative provision is typically used at Sunrise for students who are not engaging within the school environment and for those with SEND needs which make the school environment less suitable (e.g. needing a more sensory environment or to address behaviours which in school would adversely impact other students). L Chapman added that the student on alternative provision at Stone Lodge uses it to address more therapeutic needs.

Members reflected that Sunrise Academy has a very high proportion of students accessing alternative provision compared to the students on roll and queried if this is typical for an SEMH school. P Hamilton explained that SEMH students have challenging behaviours and do sometimes require

Members queried how we ensure students accessing alternative provision access a full curriculum offer including careers guidance and prepare for adulthood, especially given post-16 they may no longer be able to access alternative provision so will need support to transition to their next steps. R Bamford and S-L Neesam explained that we have a specialist board to consider requests for students to access alternative provision, the intended benefits, the support offer, etc. S Hopkins gave examples of how the SEND services team support transitioning students and liaise with the Local Authority, student and family to support and agree next steps.

**8. Residential Provision Update (inc. Standard 3)**

**i. Chalk Hill**

**ii. Priory School**

Members received and considered the paper provided which summarised developments at Chalk Hill and Priory School's residential provision and included the report from their most recent Standard 3 visit. Members also received the action plan associated with Chalk Hill's Standard 3 report.

Members commended the successful outcome of Priory School's residential Ofsted inspection, and queried what factors impacted the outcome. S White explained how the residential team had prepared for the inspection and learned lessons from the last inspection to improve the outcome this time.

N Kellett, as Trustee lead for residential, informed that from his visits to the provision he does not have concerns about the wellbeing of the residential students at Chalk Hill.

L Chapman informed that a Group Head of Residential post is currently being recruited which will help strengthen leadership of Chalk Hill and R Bamford confirmed that Priory colleagues are sharing best practice and lessons learned from their Ofsted inspection to support Chalk Hill to strengthen their residential provision.

Members **noted** the Committee's responses to the Standard 3 reports and the action plan relating to Chalk Hill.

## 9. **Attendance**

Members received and considered the paper provided which analysed the attendance and persistent absence data of each SEND school compared to relevant benchmarks, to identify emerging trends and concerns. The report also summarised the actions taken by school staff to work with the student and their family to improve attendance, and how the school monitors, tracks and supports attendance in line with the DfE guidance. The report also evaluated the effectiveness and/or limitations of the strategies/actions used during the previous half term and discuss plans to adapt/change approaches for the next half term.

Members queried why the student numbers in this report did not match with those in the reports in agenda item 6. The Governance Professional informed that the figures in this item relate to 2025/26, whereas the figures in agenda item 6 relate to 2024/25.

Member commended the strong reports and analysis, though reflected that student case studies may help to evidence impact. The Governance Professional suggested that these case studies could be part of the item's members review as part of their First-Hand visits. Members supported this approach.

Members queried if high levels of absence and persistent absence are discussed at the safeguarding 'top 10' meetings. S-L Neesam confirmed that they are.

S White fed back on issuing a fixed penalty notice linked to unauthorised absence and the lessons learned, S-L Neesam fed back on the response from families to greater follow up from the schools with families to work to improve attendance and R Bamford informed that a group is being set up for the attendance leads at each school to share best practice.

Members discussed our attendance/absence data in the context of national absence data, and commended the support and interventions used to improve attendance.

## 10. **Behaviour Report (inc. Suspensions and Exclusions)**

Members received and considered the report provided which analysed how each SEND school implements its behaviour policy and sets high expectations for all students' attendance, behaviour and attitudes; how the school rewards and praises positive behaviours and addresses negative behaviours through consequences and sanctions to support students to understand how to manage their behaviour and emotional regulation. The paper also evaluated what is working well and where improvement is needed, and the school's plan to prioritise improvement, as well as reported on the number of suspensions and exclusions.

members commended the strong and improved report.

Heads

Members queried if greater, yet appropriate use of suspensions is helping to address negative behaviours to both improve the safety of the school environment and help staff to feel supported. E Barneveld and P Hamilton agreed that it is having this impact and confirmed that suspensions were used appropriately and that students were supported to reintegrate into school.

**11. Work Experience, Work-Related Projects and Gatsby Benchmark Progress**

Members received and considered report provided which reported on the Gatsby Benchmarks and updated on the strategic leadership and direction for careers, work experience and work-related projects across the SEND schools.

Members reflected that EEG's colleges are well connected to employers and have a very established and experienced team overseeing careers and work experience and queried if the SEND schools are benefitting from this. R Bamford confirmed that they are, and that that team is now leading the provision at the SEND schools.

P Hamilton added that East Coast College is local to Sunrise and informed of work with them to support students to transition to further education and training.

**12. Therapies Update**

Members received and considered the report provided which evaluated the effectiveness of the therapeutic arrangements in place at each SEND school, in ensuring that students can access the curriculum fully and make sustained progress.

Members queried if Sunrise offers therapies. P Hamilton apologised for the omission and informed that Sunrise offers music therapy. S Hopkins added that we also have an inhouse occupational therapist.

Members queried when they will receive a further report on therapies. The Governance Professional informed that it will be reported in March and in June.

**13. Annual Safeguarding Report**

Members received and considered the report provided which reviewed each SEND school's safeguarding data to identify any trends compared to the previous academic year and any shared issues or patterns.

Members commended the thorough reports.

N Kellett, as Trustee lead for Safeguarding, fed back that the newly established SEND student services board was highly effective in reviewing the safeguarding data and the policies (see agenda item 16), and commended the safeguarding teams for their hard work.

**14. Pupil Premium Report**

Members received and considered the paper provided which summarised the Pupil Premium allocation, utilisation and impact at each SEND school for the 2025/26 academic year.

Members **approved** the Pupil Premium Report and **agreed to recommend to the board**.

**15. Staffing Compliance (inc. SCR and mandatory training)**

Members received and considered the report provided which updated on staff mandatory training completion and single central record checks, at each SEND school.

Members challenged why mandatory training completion was not higher. L Chapman explained that some support staff (e.g. cleaners and catering team) don't have laptops or other devices or time within the day near a device to complete online training, so we are finding solutions (e.g. making training more bitesize, providing access to devices, etc.) to improve completion. L Chapman informed that the

deadline for completion is the end of January and advised that Heads receive weekly updates on compliance to aid tracking.

**16. Policies**

- i. **EEG – DSL Job Description**
- ii. **EEG – Online Safety and Social Media Policy**
- iii. **EEG – Relationships and Sex Education and PSHE Policy**
- iv. **EEG – Transferrable Risk Policy**
- v. **EEGT – Transgender Policy**

The Chair noted that these policies had been scrutinised and recommended by the SEND Curriculum and Quality Board.

N Kellett, as Trustee lead for Safeguarding, noted that these policies had been scrutinised at the SEND student services board.

Members received, considered and **approved** these policies and recommend them to the Trust Board

**17. Any Other Business**

None.

The meeting closed at 6.04pm