

Minutes of the Full Governing Board meeting

Monday 17 November 2025 at 6.00 pm

Membership

Name	Initials	Term Expiry Date	Governor Category
Leon Choueke	LC	N/A	Head Teacher, Ex-officio(1)
*Debby Kuypers (Chair)	DK	09-11-2025	Co-opted Governors (7)
Richard Holmes (Vice Chair)	RH	01-02-2026	
Nomi Tysman	NT	01-12-2028	
Jean-Michel Garcia-Alvarez	JGA	10-02-2029	
Becca Monahan	BM	17-11-2027	
*Michael Wang	CW	01-07-2028	
Andrena Emin	AE	04-02-2028	
Melian Mansfield	MM	19-01-2026	LA Governor (1)
Kirsten Schmidt	KS	04-02-2028	Staff (1)
Sarah Boffey	SB	05-01-2029	Parent Governors (2)
Ian Chapman	IC	05-01-2029	
Also in attendance:			
*Tim Ibbotson	TI	N/A	Asst HT
*Ben Strange	BS	N/A	Deputy HT
*Ben Miller	BMi	01-07-2028	Associate Governor
Eddie Webb	EW	01-12-2028	Associate Governor
Morinade Akinbobola	MA	01-12-2028	Associate Governor
*Sarah Ward	SW	28-10-2029	Associate Governor
*Corrina Phillips	CP	N/A	Asst HT and SENCO
*Louise Foulkes	LF	N/A	Deputy HT
Adam Crosier			Clerk

* Denotes absence

PART 1

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies for absence

RH opened the meeting at 6.05 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies had been received from DK for reasons of a prior commitment. These were accepted. JGA, MM and MA joined via Zoom. The meeting was quorate.

2. Declarations of interest, pecuniary or otherwise in respect of items on the agenda

None.

3. Developing and implementing the strategy

LC reminded governors that work had begun on the strategy at the FGB meeting in September with the support of the school improvement advisor (SIA). He now proposed that this session look at finalising the strategy and considering how it should be monitored and evaluated.

He said that it was important to consider how the strategy would be driven from the board and how to use the strategy to inform governor meetings and link visits. It was also important to think about how the strategy would be communicated to senior and middle leaders and to parents.

He said that there were several rather grand aspirations included in the strategic plan, but that also it was necessary to recognise that real life factors got in the way of achieving these. He pointed to the impact of school finances, broader economic pressures, the mental health of staff, students and parents and the changing role of technology, the high level of needs of children coming to the school, the demographic shift, falling birth rate and the needs of staff. It was important that staff were held in mind as key players in the delivery of the strategy, together with the various external services the school used, and also the reality of lengthening waiting lists for assessments etc of external services.

At the previous meeting governors had spent time considering strategic goals. They had agreed that each of the areas should link to the school's core values. From this, 5 statements, called strategic goals for 3-5 years, had been produced. LC said that while Ofsted regularly changed the details of its inspection framework, it was important that the school maintained consistency and that the strategy should link to broad Ofsted and DfE priorities.

Governors then discussed in small groups the strategic goals to ensure that nothing was missing and that nothing was included that was not relevant.

Following discussion governors fed back key points:

- AI appeared to fit in some areas (for example safeguarding) but there was nothing directly related to AI in the strategy.
- A separate financial strategy may be required, given the school's current financial position.
- Given the importance of inclusion in the Ofsted framework, the strategy should add more goals into this section.

Beyond these points, there was nothing obviously missing in relation to the Ofsted framework. LC said that it was early days for the new Ofsted framework, and that the school may need to review its approach and keep it in mind, as it was a potential risk.

MA said that she felt the goals in the strategy were vague and should be measurable. Aspirations should state by how much, for instance, provision to support SEND would increase. She also questioned the focus on creativity in the strategy, which currently addressed the creativity of teachers, but not of children. It was important to be clear about the goals: were they for the school or for the children? In terms of risks, MA said that some of the ambitions were in the school's control, and some were not. The financial position of the school was key. If the school's finances prevented it from achieving goals in some areas, then it should identify what was achievable financially, and what was not.

LC agreed that the language used in the strategy was important and that it was necessary to provide some form of measurement: he said that in relation to creativity, it was a mixture of staff and children, that adaptive teaching should be for both, but perhaps there was a need to adjust the language to reflect this.

He thanked governors for their contribution and said that the strategic goals should be further reviewed and then confirmed by the new year.

He then said that the meeting consider the mechanism to drive forward the strategy. He said that the board needed to consider how it organised itself, the systems and processes, to ensure that the strategy remained responsive and how it aligned with the SDP and SEF, and how it was used by governors in FGB meetings etc. And importantly, how there was a compelling story for parents to be told about the strategy.

In the past, he said that there had been a group of 3-4 governors to push forward the strategy. MA suggested that such a strategy group should engage with the link governor for each area and bring it back any learning from this to the strategy group.

LC said that every school should have the SEF alongside SDP and strategy. At Coleridge, the SEF had been a very lengthy prior to the most recent Ofsted visit. It had been set out under headings identified by the then Ofsted framework. Now, there was a need to develop a new SEF. He asked governors whether this should follow the strategy's goals or again follow the template of the now revised Ofsted framework. Either way, it was important that the strategy goals linked to the new Ofsted framework.

MA said that she felt the new Ofsted framework headings should be used for the SEF and should have the same broad headings for both the SEF and SDP. All the points in the values/goals document could be included under these headings.

LC said that there were more areas to be assessed against in the new and expanded Ofsted framework. He said that he felt that there was a need for more training on the framework and learning for other schools that had undergone inspection under the new framework. He said that the new strategy should be the 'shining star' and that this should filter to all other key documents.

LC invited thoughts about how to communicate the strategy to parents. It was proposed that overarching statements from the strategy be included in curriculum conversations with parents and via the school newsletter. It was also felt that the school website were clearly set out the school's values, but needed updating.

JGA left the meeting

LC invited nominations to the strategy group. The following were nominated: SB, MA, LC and DK. LC agreed to contact governors who were not present as well.

4. Any other business

Bake sale on behalf of the children of Gaza.

LC reported on a challenging development that related to Coleridge Families having agreed to a bake sale on school premises on the coming Friday 21 November. The sale was to be on behalf of a charity supporting children in Gaza, the Sameer Partnership. Unfortunately, an email relating to this event had been sent by Coleridge Families, but not seen by LC. He said that the event would be held on school premises but that

authorisation had not been granted by him or anyone at the school. However, he was reluctant to cancel/ban the sale from going ahead for fear of exacerbating a potentially sensitive issue.

LC said that the planned bake sale presented challenges for the school on several levels, because of the heightened sensitivity over any fundraising activity related to Gaza. As a Jewish Headteacher he felt that his own position was vulnerable, but there had been complaints raised by both Israeli parents and Jewish parents at the school relating to this event.

His desire was to avoid the matter 'blowing up' into something more than what he was sure was a well-intentioned and non-partisan proposal to support the children of Gaza, something that everyone would wish to support.

Governors discussed the matter, and a range of views were expressed, some in support of the bake sale going ahead, recognising that this was an initiative that came via parents and not the school. Others felt that the status of the Sameer Partnership should be reviewed, and due diligence done, to ensure that this was a legal and registered charity in the UK. LC was also advised to seek the view of the local authority on the matter, via the Haringey Education Partnership (HEP).

5. Date of next meeting

24 November 2025.

6. Confidential items

None.

Signed.....

Date..24.11.25.....

Chair of Governors

