We Nurture. We Thrive. We Achieve.

MINUTES OF THE INTERIM EXECUTIVE BOARD OF
SHIRLEY WARREN PRIMARY & NURSERY SCHOOL

HELD VIRTUALLY MONDAY 9TH MARCH 2026 AT 7:30AM

Name	Post	Attending	Apologies accepted	Absent
Board Members				
Dominic Boddington MBE (DB)	Chair	✓		
Silas Bingley (SB)	LA Representative	✓		
David Eager (DE)			✓	
Ann Langran (AL)		✓		
Karen Mellor (KM)	Bridge Education Trust	✓		
Other attendees				
Raylene Poppleton (Clerk)	Clerk	✓		
Sophia Ship (SS/HT)	Acting Headteacher			
Alison Philpott (AP)	Service Manager Education Standards, SCC	✓		
Gerida Montague MBE (GM)	Executive Headteacher, Learning Federation of Schools	✓		
Ian Prince (IP)	Co-Executive Headteacher, Learning Federation of Schools	✓		
Jo McNicholas (JM)	Chief Business, Finance and Compliance Officer, Learning Federation of Schools	✓		
Quorum - 3 Board Members				

Summary of actions arising at this meeting

Item	Action	Allocated
8.7A	Clerk to prepare revised delegated spending document for approval	Clerk
10A	SEND Governor to liaise with leaders on benchmarking/external advisors	AL
12A	The board asked AP to arrange that the school was included in the checks in the summer	AP

	1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES & ABSENCES	Action
	The meeting opened at 7:31am. Apologies were received and accepted from DE. The Chair advised that this meeting had a long agenda and confirmed that the board would meet as frequently as needed to get things done.	
	2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	
	The Register of Interests was shared with the board. There were no declarations of interest in this agenda.	
	3. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS	
	No items were presented.	
	4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS	

Signed ..…..

Date 23/03/2026

	The minutes from the previous IEB meeting on 02/03/2026 were agreed as true and accurate records. Following the meeting, the Chair's electronic signature was added to the minutes which were then filed. Minutes of the WGB on 20/01/2026, TLCS Committee on 26/01/2026 and Finance & Resources Committee on 12/01/2026 were shared with the board. On the basis that SS agreed they were a true record, the board approved the minutes. *Following the meeting the clerk confirmed with the Local Authority (LA) that this was the correct procedure in the circumstances.*	
	5. MATTERS ARISING & ACTIONS	
	Actions from the previous meeting were discussed and the following noted: ● The clerk had spoken with HC about the plans for previous governors ● The work to form the shadow board was added to the annual meeting plan for discussion in December. ● Staffing was to be discussed on this agenda. ● The signed TOR had not been received from the LA. ● Meeting with staff took place on 6th March 2026. ● Access arrangements had been made for the board members.	
	6. BRIDGE EDUCATION TRUST	
	Meeting dates were confirmed for the board and DB would attend the next meeting on 17/06/2026.	
	7. APPOINTMENT OF ROLES	
	The following appointments were made: ● Safeguarding - DB ● SEND - AL ● H&S - SB ● HT Performance Management - DB, DE, KM and AP as the external advisor. The board was informed that a standing Vice-Chair was not required and could be appointed at meetings on an ad-hoc basis.	
	8. FINANCE & RESOURCES	
8.1	<u>Budget reporting 2025-26</u> JM introduced themselves, explaining their role as part of the RISE team to support the HT. In addition the supporting organisation was providing an SBM support for 2 days per week. JM advised they had gone back through previous minutes to confirm the details of the budget that had been set. ● April 2025 - £256K deficit ● December 2025 - £249K deficit Statutory deadlines had not been met and going forwards the IEB should ensure that they were. The latest information showed that the deficit was circa £570K. This was due to an overspend on agency staff costs (£100K), settlement payments, high support staff costs, high ICT costs and £30K of unpaid invoices. The ICT contract was being exited.This would be confirmed at the next meeting as invoices etc needed to be thoroughly checked. **Question**: What impact will the measures that have been taken have? **Response**: The ICT contact had a 6 month notice period so this would have no change to the 2025-26 year end. The outstanding invoices had to be paid.	

 Signed …..... Date 23/03/2026

	Question: How will the school get control of the deficit? **Response**: It was felt that realistically there was a crisis in Teaching and Learning (T&L) at the school and the Rise Improvement Plan (RIP) had not yet been completed. The deficit was built up over time. The school was committed to setting a trajectory to reduce the deficit over time and the supporting organisation was working with the HT on this, but not to the detriment of T&L. This could be addressed in future but not in the short term. It would be impossible, when there were other priorities in the short term. **Question**: Would it be enough to say that the IEB will ensure that the deficit would not be increased? **Response**: Yes **Question**: If the quality of T&L improved as a priority and the school could contain the deficit, how would the LA respond? The board discussed this point and felt that given this was a 2 year journey they had to ensure the school was not in the same position by the end of year 2, even if it had not decreased much by the end of year 1. **Response**: A deficit recovery plan was a legal requirement. If the school had not improved in 2 years then a structural change model would be enforced. The RIP was part of the plan. The LA confirmed that they may expect less recovery of the deficit in the first year but a staffing restructure may be part of the plan and a 3-5 year deficit recovery may be more suitable. If forced academisation was the outcome, the LA would have to clear the debt. The deficit increasing or not having a plan to reduce it would be seen as a risk by the LA finance team. The LA had been providing people support for the school improvement for free. See Confidential Part 2 Minutes A **Question**: Will the nursery be on the agenda today? **Response**: Not specifically, but it could be discussed. **Question**: Is the school currently working on a recovery plan? **Response**: At the moment the school was working to close out the 2025-26 budget, create a deficit recovery plan and set a new budget. This needed to be completed by April 30th and a board meeting should be scheduled before that. The board agreed. Some of the following items were taken out of agenda order	
8.4	<u>SFVS</u> **Question**: The SFVS was created under the previous board. Did this need amending as it did not include the current structure and deficit information?. **Response**: This was written by the previous SBM but it would be updated and sent out to board members. The board agreed to set another meeting before the end of the month to approve it.	
8.5	<u>SLA's</u> The SLA document was shared with governors. **Decision :** The board APPROVED the SLA submission	
8.6	<u>Hampshire Governor Services SLA</u> The previous board agreement with HGS would roll over at the end of March unless cancelled by the school. Documents were shared with the board. The board felt they did not require the services or training. **Decision :** The board AGREED to CANCEL the HGS subscription.	
8.7	<u>IEB Delegation of Spending</u> The LA confirmed that the IEB were required to set the delegated spending limits. The Governing Body TOR was shared with the board for information.	

Signed ....... Date 23/03/2026

	Concerns were expressed that there were a number of people who could authorise purchases and it had been previously found that when in deficit, having the HT being the only authoriser had worked as a control. This would also mean the board had a single line of challenge should the deficit increase. Additionally, the board was informed that no evidence had been found of probity, looking at best value or obtaining multiple quotes. Once the school was running more normally then leadership could be redistributed. The board considered the proposal and felt it was good advice. They raised concerns that this may increase HT workload but were reassured that having stronger management and office systems in place would pre-filter much of the work allowing the HT to maximise their time. For example orders would be pre-screened and others would follow the procurement rules. SS confirmed that the systems being put in place were not admin heavy and having oversight had been helpful. The new system should reduce workload over the previous system. **Decision :** The board AGREED that all spending should be authorised by the Headteacher up to a maximum value of £10,000. Above this level, decisions would be brought to the board for authorisation.	
A	Action: Clerk to prepare revised delegated spending document for approval	**Clerk**
8.3	<u>Staffing Structure</u> At present the focus of the Supporting Organisation (SO) was on completing the Rise Improvement Plan (RIP). Refer to Confidential Part 2 Minutes B	
	9. TLCS SPRING DATA	
	This data was not yet available as it was still being collected. Data was available from Autumn and Spring 1 but data was not deemed reliable due to teachers' lack of understanding and confidence in assessing and understanding of Age Related Expectations (ARE). Time had been spent this half term working on this and by the next meeting there should be data for a more accurate reflection of where the school was at.	
	10. HEADTEACHER'S REPORT	
	The board thanked the HT for the report commenting that it contained a lot of information. It was felt that for the benefit of the HT the board should look at the format and what was in the report which could come from other sources. This board was experienced and had more awareness so perhaps needed less detail. It was felt a report, at least termly from the HT, was important. **Question**: Could more information be shared about the referrals and incidents? Refer to Confidential Part 2 Minutes C **Question**: The quality of teaching information was written earlier this term - with the ongoing work was there evidence of 'green shoots'? **Response**: Yes. But it was felt that improvements had plateaued and now some teachers needed individualised support. In discussions with the SO, Professional Development (PD) Days had been developed for bespoke teaching, teachers pedagogy, the technicalities of teaching and learning, including coaching. To continue the metaphor, the green shoots needed water.	

 Signed …..... Date 23/03/2026

	Question: Does that call into question some of the coaching programme? **Response**: The quality of coaching was good but there were systems behind that which needed addressing. This term there had been a focus on pedagogy and ARE. The PD days would address this. The curriculum also required review. The LA advised that from their perspective on visits so far, the coaching programme was quite new and so far had focussed on generic issues. Honest discussions were taking place about the school being inadequate with scaffold and structure being put in place. The RIP contained a lot about quality of teaching required beyond RI. Professional Development was important. There were 3 prongs to the improvement required: 1. Developing teachers 2. Pedagogy 3. Progress of Children Data would be driving discussions about impact and the system would be clear and streamlined. Curriculum was being discussed to get clarity on the school's approach around each curriculum area. Once the coaching was completed then everything could be fully assessed. The board stated that pedagogy was key. **Question**: How was the school moving with SEND? **Response**: The school had a register but it was found that it was not accurate. Refer to Confidential Part 2 Minutes D. The school and SO were talking with the LA and eternal advisors to get a team to benchmark, check progress and give the board external triangulation. This would provide key evidence for a baseline and the board should feel they could take part in that. **Action:** SEND Governor to liaise with leaders The LA advised that the recent SIP review included information that may be useful. The Strategic Lead for SEND at the LA had done work on this too. Refer to Confidential Part 2 Minutes E. The current Year 1/Year 2 structure was set up before the current HT was in post. A member of SLT had to go into Year 6 to support teaching but that was impacting the pace at which the SLT could work. The next item was taken out of agenda order.	A **AL**
	13. POLICIES	
	Question: Was there anything urgent for policies to be addressed at this meeting? **Response**: The policies would be updated and sent to governors via email. *Following the meeting it was clarified that the policies presented were already updated and these versions could be approved by governors. They were scheduled for the next meeting.*	
	11. RISE ANALYSIS OF NEED	

Signed ....... Date 23/03/2026

	The process required the school and SO to work closely together. Paperwork was sent to RISE and the feedback was that the targets were strong. The RIP has clearly identified issues and smart targets created - again the feedback was that they were strong. The school and SO will meet again to discuss the RIP and then it will be sent to RISE, copying the board. The board felt it was a really good document and had been confirmed by everything they had seen and talked about when visiting last week.	
	12. LA SAFEGUARDING EVALUATION	
	A copy of the evaluation was shared with the board. **Question**: Has this been completed? **Response**: It was completed and actions identified. The board has to ensure that it is completed. **Question**: Should this board review the 'Governor' section again as this group differs from the previous board? **Response**: Yes **Question**: How high a priority is safeguarding for the school? Can board members come in to look at safeguarding? **Response**: It was the school's number 1 priority and board members could visit at any time. The LA explained that the evaluation was due in before Easter and the LA would dip sample some of the schools in the summer. It was likely this school would be checked but the board could request that they are checked. The Safeguarding governor advised they would arrange a visit. The board was told that the annual audit was a good baseline and would give board members a clear outline of where they were. **Question**: Has CPOMS recently been introduced? **Response**: CPOMS was already being used but the school now also used the Staff Safe element.	
A	**Action:** The board asked AP to arrange that the school included in the checks in the summer	**AP**
	14. BOARD PLANS & VISITS	
	• AL to make a SEND visit • DB to make a Safeguarding visit • Learning Walk requested to take place before Easter The SO advised a schedule would be put together to populate with dates for the baseline team visit. The next meeting was scheduled for 7:30am, Monday 23rd March 2026. The main focus for the meeting was finance. GM left the meeting KM asked the board to consider avoiding Monday meetings in future.	

 Signed …..... Date 23/03/2026

	AP would attend in future when invited. The Chair thanked them for attending today as their input had been helpful.	
	There being no other business the meeting closed at 9:00am	

Future IEB Meeting Dates 2025-26	
	Monday 23rd March 2026 at 7:30am

Signed …….. Date 23/03/2026