We Nurture. We Thrive. We Achieve.

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

HELD VIRTUALLY MONDAY 23RD MARCH 2026 AT 7:30AM

Name	Post	Attending	Apologies accepted	Absent
Board Members				
Dominic Boddington MBE (DB)	Chair	✓		
Silas Bingley (SB)	LA Representative	✓ (from 7:37am)		
David Eager (DE)		✓		
Ann Langran (AL)		✓		
Karen Mellor (KM)	Bridge Education Trust	✓		
Other attendees				
Raylene Poppleton (Clerk)	Clerk	✓		
Sophia Ship (SS/HT)	Acting Headteacher	✓		
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
6a	Clerk to share the skills audit with the IEB to complete by the next meeting.	Clerk/IEB
7a	HT to contact LA to arrange extension to the Safeguarding SEF submission and organise a pupil survey.	SS
7b	GM to organise dates for a working party during the first week of term to create a termly safeguarding audit.	GM
8.3a	Charging and Remissions policy rates to be checked and updated before finalising if found to be incorrect.	SS/JN
8.8a	Complaints and Premises Management policies to be reviewed by DE before the next meeting.	DE
9a	Clerk to share templates used by previous governing body for evaluation	Clerk
9b	HT to set up IEB email group for sharing information with the board	SS

	1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES & ABSENCES	Action
	The meeting opened at 7:31am. No apologies had been received. *SB had emailed to advise of technical difficulties joining the meeting.*	

Signed ……..

Date 05/05/2026

	2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	
	There were no declarations of interest in this agenda or changes to the Register of Business Interests.	
	3. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS	
	No items were presented.	
	4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS	
	The minutes from the previous IEB meeting on 09/03/2026 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 EGB meeting on 29/01/2026 were shared with the board. On the basis that SS agreed they were a true record, the board approved the minutes.	
	5. MATTERS ARISING & ACTIONS	
	Actions from the previous meeting were discussed and the following noted: ● The final version of the TOR had been received from the LA and was shared as part of the pack for this meeting. ● At the last meeting the delegated spending to the HT had been agreed by the board. A draft document confirming this was shared for the meeting. Following discussion it was agreed that this document was sufficient and that all financial controls were in place. **Decision :** The board APPROVED the Delegated Spending to HT document and following the meeting the Chair's electronic signature was added. SB joined the meeting.	
	6. FINANCE & RESOURCES	
a	The School Financial Value Standard (SFVS) was shared with the board ahead of the meeting. **Decision :** The board APPROVED the SFVS The SFVS question relating to an annual skills audit was discussed. This had been completed by the previous Governing Body and it was agreed that it should be completed again by the new board. **Action:** Clerk to share the skills audit with the IEB to complete by the next meeting.	**Clerk/ IEB**
	7. LA SAFEGUARDING EVALUATION	
	The LA Safeguarding Evaluation Form was shared with the board ahead of the meeting. The board had concerns about completing it due to how recently the board had been set up and the information they had. The board also expressed concern at the number of gaps and whether they should be comfortable in submitting it in its current form or whether the LA would have issues with it. The previous Ofsted had said safeguarding was okay but that was some time ago. The Safeguarding Governor (DB) would be the LADO referral and would complete a safeguarding audit to determine the status of the items that were either not met or not known.	

	The board was advised that to check children were feeling safe a survey could be put out. The board discussed whether the LA could be asked for an extension due to the timing. DB and AL were scheduled to be in school on 26/03/2026 for a Learning Walk and could start the conversations over safeguarding. A piece of work on safeguarding would be completed next term including the survey, and an extension to half way through next term would allow evidence to be collected and this work to be done. The board needed certainty to answer the questions. The questions were urgent but this required probity.	
a	**Action:** HT to contact LA to arrange extension and organise pupil survey.	**SS**
b	**Action:** GM to organise dates for a working party during the first week of term to create termly safeguarding audit.	**GM**
	Question: The December 2025 pupil survey indicated many felt unsafe. This was concerning. How did this compare to other schools? **Response**: This tended to be typical of schools in crisis and part of the work being done would mediate that. A new survey needed to go out. Board members raised concerns at the number that had responded that they felt picked on and that comparisons to other schools may not be helpful as they were at different points in their improvement journey. The board wanted to understand the details and specific issues which could be found through analysing the information and causes. **Question**: Were staff aware of who the children who felt unsafe were? 100% of children should feel safe **Response**: The school had used Google forms to collect the information so they were able to identify pupils. Following this they did a piece of work looking at what it meant to be bullied and how to report it, as prior to this the school had received no reports of bullying. There had now been reports and that was being addressed. Teachers were aware and were having conversations with pupils. The board agreed that this was a work in progress and that an update should be scheduled for the next meeting.	
	8. POLICIES	
8.1	<u>LA HR Policies</u> KM advised that their school had a standing agreement to adopt all LA HR policies. These policies were particularly relevant for this school, at this time. **Decision :** The board AGREED to adopt all LA HR policies going forward.	
8.2	<u>PSHE</u> This policy had been reviewed and there were no questions	
8.3	<u>Charging & Remissions</u> This policy had been reviewed and the board asked for confirmation that the rates shown in the policy were current and correct.	
a	**Action:** Rates to be checked and updated before finalising if found to be incorrect. Governors agreed that the policy could be approved on that basis.	**JN/SS**
8.4	<u>Annual PSED Equality Information Reporting</u> The board queried the use of the term “gay” instead of “LGBTQ” and whether it should include reference to Safer Recruitment. It was agreed to add the phrase “All staff that interviewed were Safer Recruitment trained”.	
8.5	<u>Data Protection</u>	

Signed ……..

Date 05/05/2026

	Question: Was the school registered with the ICO? **Response**: Yes **Question**: A section relating to CCTV was highlighted - did the school comply with relevant legislation? **Response**: The CCTV system wasn't previously working but was now coming back online. There had been a query as to whether the signage was prominent enough but was being addressed and names were amended to reference the Acting SBM.	
	Decision : The board APPROVED all the statutory policies.	
8.6	Freedom of Information (Trust) The Trust policy had been amended to include school information.	
8.7	Safe Touch and Positive Handling **Question**: The policy stated that data was analysed and reported termly - was this done? **Response**: That was done internally but wasn't previously reported to governors. This information would be included in the termly HT report going forwards. **Question**: Can Positive Handling Plans (PHP) be seen by governors as part of safeguarding checks? **Response**: Yes. They were stored in the child's SEN folder. Some schools called them Individual Behaviour plans. They were shared with parents so that they know the school may use restraint. **Question**: Have staff and SLT undergone relevant training/Securicare training? **Response**: Yes. The board discussed DfE updates to guidance on the use of physical restraint. **Question**: Does this policy reflect the changes/updates? **Response**: It may need to be reviewed in light of those changes. Following discussion it was agreed that support would be given by the Supporting Organisation and the Trust DSL's. The policy would be updated before being brought to the next meeting.	
8.8	Walking To and From School The policy was reviewed and a minor change to wording agreed.	
	Decision : The board APPROVED the Freedom of Information and Walking To and From School policies.	
a	The policies from the schedule due for the end of May were reviewed. **Action:** Complaints and Premises Management policies to be reviewed by DE before the next meeting.	**DE**
	9. BOARD MONITORING	
a	The board agreed that progress needed to be captured and templates for visit reports and logs were discussed. **Action:** Clerk to share templates used by previous governing body for evaluation **Question**: Was the SENCO available to meet with? **Response**: No. The SEND governor asked to meet with the HT to agree on the next steps so there was no delay. This was agreed. Dates would be planned for safeguarding visits. It was agreed the board would share dates for visits and set up methods for sharing information to include Whatsapp.	**Clerk**

Signed ……

Date 05/05/2026

b	**Action:** HT to set up IEB email group for sharing information with the board. SB confirmed they had resolved their access issues.	**SS**
	10. AOB	
	A draft annual meeting plan had been shared with the board. It was restated that the board would meet as often as necessary. It was agreed that the next meeting should concentrate on school data and the baseline information. GM updated the board on work that had taken place. The RISE Improvement Plan (RIP) and Expenditure Plan (EP) had been approved on Friday and that may now form a structure for the board's work. **Question**: Who was it approved by? **Response**: The DfE. It was now in its final stages. The supporting organisation, along with the HT and SLT, had been through a large piece of work to give an accurate current picture/baseline. All the writing books and writing grades and targets set. 80% of previous judgements were found to be incorrect. Tests had also been completed for reading and maths. The first data drop would contain the historic information and the new baseline information from this exercise. There would also be journey information for year 6 pupils showing their progress each year through the school. The nursery had been closed for 2 days and a team from the supporting organisation worked alongside staff to transform the nursery. The next piece of work would be on curriculum and learning, and testing the leadership of Early Years. Three (3) resignations had been received. See Confidential Part 2 minutes A The Supporting Organisation (SO) had commissioned 2 external inspectors to work with the school and give a robust challenge. They had been booked for dates over the next 2 years to give a baseline and report to the IEB, giving triangulation and challenge. The board agreed on the need for external scrutiny. **Question**: Following on from the resignations, would there be recruitment challenges? **Response**: Strong responses had been received to advertisements that had been placed. They had been clear about the school's position and journey. **Question**: Will the recruitment be looking for experience or ECT's? **Response**: The recruitment was looking for both. The school needed teachers with the energy to join the journey the school was on. When looking at the data to identify where pupils were at and the projections, it did not match what was seen looking at the books. A baseline allowed for the setting of clear objectives to meet end of year targets. The source of gaps had also been identified to ensure that was being addressed. Professional Development (PD) days for next term would take place while pupils were getting enrichment such as PE, Computing, Forest School, and teachers could meet with leaders to develop their expertise, raise subject knowledge and knowledge of the children. The SO had met with the SLT to set action plans. **Question**: What had been the staff's initial response to the PD approach?	

Signed ..…..

Date 05/05/2026

Response: This was introduced last week. Staff were excited and 1 member of staff had experience of this and had been positive about it. There was some uncertainty the school was ensuring the communication was clear. It had been a challenge to get staff on board with the journey but once they had seen the impact the response was positive.
Question: Would the content of the PD days be bespoke?
Response: Yes. The content would be based on the gaps. Work had been done on phonics including reading assessments based on Pip and PAP. It was necessary to ensure gaps affecting comprehension were filled. Based on Year 1 data, 70% were at GLD but from the testing there was a lot of work to be done to get children to Age Related Expectations (ARE).
Question: If initial progress looks minimal due to the change of the data set - how would that look for those outside of the school looking for rapid progress?
Response: An education consultant had been arranged to come and look at the quality of education in order to triangulate the baseline. They will also look at how the school can make rapid progress. The baseline assessment had not only looked at every child's grades but also their gaps and the PD days would use that to target what was required to make progress.

The issue of gaps in learning impacting pupils progress was discussed.

Question: What would be the response to the challenge from organisations outside of the school to the situation the school faced?
Response: That would be provided by the body of evidence produced by those brought in. as well as that from the school. There would be more than one set of evidence. The aim was for progress seen in the books as well as from the baseline. As governors it was important to know how the evidence was being compiled, so that the school could be challenged.

The amount of work that had been completed in a short time was acknowledged by the board.
Question: Given how much was done in a short time, how can accuracy be assured?
Response: A lot of discussion had taken place. It was necessary to be at the required starting point for the summer term. There had been cross referencing, working together on the assessment of books alongside the statutory information on grades.

Those staff supporting pupils on the Enrichment Days, such as those for computing, had been meeting with colleagues in Federation schools for development.
Question: How would Enrichment Days be staffed?
Response: The HT and SLT have been very positive about this and a lot of progress had been made. They would be staffed by organisations the Federation already used as it was important to know that the curriculum was strong. The HT nominated a strong team to be able to support this.
Question: Won't staff taking part miss out on the Professional Development?
Response: No. The staff supporting the Enrichment Days would be Teaching Assistants not teachers.
Question: Was the progress sustainable?
Response: The RIP was shared with the clerk to forward to the board members. During the first year it would continue to be this intense but in year 2 there would be a shift to employing people to train up and continue. There would be a step change. From experience the intensity helped develop the energy needed to sustain the progress. The HT needed to know they had partners in this and that in 2 years there won;t need to be an enforced structural change with that progress. An example was shared of there being a Family Inclusion Officer incorporated in Year 2 of the plan.
Question: How was the HT managing all of the additional work alongside the regular role of being a headteacher?

Signed ……… Date 05/05/2026

	Response: It was felt to be being managed well and nothing operationally had been dropped. Prioritisation was important. There was some evening work required but that wasn't uncommon. The board was reassured by the HT that they were okay and enjoying the experience. The current phase was supporting activities in staff support and development and it would then kick-off after Easter. A rhythm would develop through knowing the school and the school year. It may not be less intense, but more known, settled and confident with it. The board members were invited to come in when the education consultant was visiting. KM advised they would try to attend. The next meeting was set for 5th May at 7:30am. The focus was to be the school data drop, baseline information and pupil journey history information. Progress would then be able to be seen for the end of summer data drop. Following discussions it was agreed that DE would meet with JM in advance to review the budget and deficit recovery plan. A report would be submitted for governors so that the budget could be approved at that meeting.	
	There being no other business the meeting closed at 9:07am	

Future IEB Meeting Dates 2025-26	
	Tuesday 5th May 2026 at 7:30am

Signed ……… Date 05/05/2026