

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE NOBEL SCHOOL
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
HELD REMOTELY VIA TEAMS ON WEDNESDAY 29 APRIL 2026 AT 5.45PM**

Governors Present: Matt Reah (Chair), Samuel Appiah, Chris Crawley, Samuel Dwamena, Jamie Kellett, Mark Laws, Richa Nair, Rose Odudu, Shannon Parr, Rav Phagura (Headteacher) and Helen Sparks.

Also in Attendance: Jacquie Watts (Clerk)

(NB: Governor Challenge, Questions and Monitoring are highlighted in bold) Action By:

1.	<p>To receive any apologies for absence and decide whether to consent to the same</p> <p>NOTED: the meeting was quorate. Apologies for absence had been received from specific governors, but given the short notice for the meeting, and that some governors had previously identified in advance that they could not attend on the date and time chosen, it was agreed that apologies for absence should be recorded for all governors who were not present.</p> <p>AGREED: to accept apologies on behalf of Sophie Cowan, Callum Green and Jackie Mordaunt.</p>	
2.	<p>AOB</p> <p>NOTED: no AOB was identified.</p>	
3.	<p>For governors to declare any potential conflicts of interest re. items on the agenda</p> <p>NOTED: Matt Reah declared he had recently been subject to two complaints, though one was now being reviewed as a grievance. Rav Phagura had similarly been involved in ongoing complaints. A governor asked if the declared interests were such that they should withdraw from the meeting? The Clerk felt they did not constitute a direct conflict of interest with the policy to be considered for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the complaint referred to by the Chair had been disallowed as a complaint, in keeping with DfE guidelines; • the policy to be considered was based on the recommended HCC model policy and publicly available DfE guidelines; • the policy to be considered, if approved, would only apply to fresh complaints. Any complaints already raised and under ongoing consideration would continue to be addressed under the terms of the School's current Complaints Policy, on the grounds that it was the applicable policy at the time the complaint was raised. • existing policies, as currently being used, and as would continue to be used for previously raised issues, were not being discussed or reviewed by the meeting. 	
4.	<p>Minutes of Previous Meetings - Foundation Committee and Governing Board.</p> <p>NOTED: the minutes of previous meetings would be considered at the next scheduled Board meeting on 1 June 2026.</p>	
5.	<p>Approval of Policies</p> <p>NOTED: the proposed new Complaints Policy as circulated by email. The Head introduced the document, highlighting the national increase in school-based complaints and the increased use of AI, which had resulted in lengthy, pseudo-legal and combative complaints being raised. The school had experienced the same directly. Regular use of</p>	

the school's existing Complaints Policy had highlighted its weaknesses and it had been pointed out, both internally and externally, that it was no longer compatible with the recommended HCC and DfE model policies. Aspects of this had already been discussed during the 23 March 2026 Board meeting, but recent developments in terms of complaints and related procedures had placed vastly increased pressure on staff time and resources, increasing school costs and preventing staff from focusing on the priorities of pupils, teaching and learning. In some instances, staff well being was at risk. Complaint documents being submitted covered multiple pages and complex, sometimes spurious arguments that needed analysis before the actual complaint could be addressed.

NOTED: the meeting discussed the proposed document. **A governor highlighted that there were typos, and elements of the document had yet to be completed. Governors asked if there had been any changes to the HCC model policy?** The section on AI had been added to the HCC model by the school. The HCC policy, excluding the AI section, was aligned to the DfE model policy. **Governors discussed the use of AI and why it might not automatically be a negative thing, and asked the school how it intended to identify and approach the use of AI within the parameters of the added AI section of the policy?** The Head felt that AI use could be identified by tone and style and by use of AI identifying software. The school would not ban the use of AI but would caution complainants about its use, if suspected, and ask them to summarise their complaint more succinctly. **Some governors expressed their reservations about the viability of the AI section.**

Chris Crawley left the meeting at this point, but indicated her support for the proposed policy

NOTED: governors discussed methods by which complaints could be raised. If a complaint was initially raised orally, it would have to be followed up by a written complaint. **A governor felt this was not clear from potentially contradictory sections of the policy.**

NOTED: the policy was scheduled for two-yearly review. **Governors recommended that it should be reviewed within six months to a year given the new approach proposed.**

AGREED: if approved, the policy should be further reviewed within six months to a year from the date of approval and ideally in time for the start of the academic year 2026/27.

NOTED: in response to a question from governors, it was reiterated that current, ongoing complaints would continue to be addressed via the Complaints Policy in place at the time of the complaint first being raised.

Shannon Parr left the meeting at this point, but indicated her support for the proposed policy

NOTED: approval of the proposed Complaints Policy was put to the vote.

AGREED: by a majority of governors present, the new Complaints Policy as proposed

NOTED: a governor commented that, while he was content with most of the new policy, he continued to have reservations about the added section on AI because he was not sure that use of AI could be managed and the policy would not prevent the use of AI. He wanted to understand the situation better and the school needed to give consideration as to how it would respond to the perceived use of AI. The Head stated that the AI section had been drafted by the legal team of a MAT and it was

	believed it would provide legal protection. A governor asked if the school had a separate policy on the use of AI? It was being drafted and would be brought forward for the 26/27 academic year.	
6.	AOB NOTED: no urgent matters were raised.	
7.	Date of Next Meeting NOTED: the date of the next scheduled meeting of the Board of Governors was Monday, 1 June 2026 at 6.30pm via TEAMS. <i>The meeting ended at approximately 18:28</i>	

Drafted by: Jacquie Watts
Clerk To The Governors
2 May 2026

Approved by The Board of Governors on:

Date:1 June 2026.....

Signature (Chair):