We Nurture. We Thrive. We Achieve.

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

HELD VIRTUALLY MONDAY 5th MAY 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	✓		
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	KM to share SCC SATs Monitoring Checklist	KM
9.1	Typing corrections to the School Complaints policy be provided to SS for amendment before publishing	AL
10	DB to write to the LA regarding financial training for future governors.	DB
13a	Clerk to share link to National College Workplace Harassment training for DE & KM to complete.	Clerk
13b	GM to confirm an alternative date for the IEB to meet with the RISE advisor on their visit.	GM

	1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES & ABSENCES	Action
	The meeting opened at 7:29am. All members were present, no apologies had been received.	
	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.	

Signed _____ Date 02/06/2026

	4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS	
	The minutes from the previous IEB meeting on 23/03/2026 were agreed as true and accurate records. Following the meeting, the Chair's electronic signature was added to the minutes which were then filed.	
	5. MATTERS ARISING & ACTIONS	
	Matter arising from the previous meeting were discussed and the following noted: ● The safeguarding evaluation had been completed but not yet returned. The Safeguarding Governor (DB) had since visited and been through the policy and systems and written a visit report which had been shared. They highlighted a concern over the length of the policy and how accessible it was for non-specialists who may have to refer to and use it. Although it had been reviewed in September and reduced from over 100 to 53 pages, it was felt this could be tightened further. The board asked for feedback from the pupil survey and heard that the results indicated a more positive response to feeling safe in school. Results showed pupils mainly indicated that they 'always' felt safe in school but where 'sometimes' was selected this was related to transitions or break/lunchtimes. Monitoring also indicated behaviour spiking at these times and SLT had put things in place to address this. The school was recruiting more lunchtime supervisors to increase adult supervision and reviewing break/lunchtime provision with input from the student council. Governors were pleased that lunchtimes were being looked at as this was raised at a recent appeal panel hearing and was learning that the board and school had taken from it. **Decision :** It was AGREED that the IEB members were experts in their fields and that if a member with expertise provided advice or agreement then that was AGREED by the board. It was agreed that the SEND Governor (AL) would review the Governing Body section of the audit during their next visit and the audit would then be submitted. ● The Charging and Remissions policy was included in item 9.	
	6. SPRING DATA & BASELINE INFORMATION	
	The HT had shared documents with the board ahead of the meeting and explained what the data showed. ● For the Journey Data, the reading and maths data had been taken from assessments in the Spring term. These were done as the school was not confident in the teacher assessments. ● The EYFS data showed the difference between the teacher judgements and the testing. The school had held staff meetings around what was the expected level and undertook moderation looking at books against the national curriculum standards. The school felt it now had accurate information about starting points to be able to make action plans. It was explained that based on the external moderation from the Learning Federation, no pupils were at 'expected' in Year 1. This meant that the necessary adaptations and differentiation could be put in place. **Question**: Was the data showing that based on the Year 6 mock just over 20% would achieve the combined 'expected' result? **Response**: Yes, that was accurate when SPAG was removed.	

Signed  Date 02/06/2026

	Question: Was there quite a lot of absence for the testing? **Response**: Yes **Question**: The data showed a lot were working towards or just under the 'expected' - was there hope that they would achieve 'expected'? **Response**: Yes. The school was confident that those at 98-99 would get 'expected'. The evidence for writing this term had been crucial as it allowed teachers to plug the gaps. Many who were 'working towards' would still be 'working towards' but the results would be better than last year. **Question**: Was writing the main weakness? **Response**: Yes. Journey data showed how below expectations pupils were. Year 6 was in the worst position due to the gaps that had developed over a long period. Gaps were being plugged this year but they had not had enough time. It was also observed that this group had been impacted by Covid whilst they would have been learning phonics. **Question**: What would the progress look like for years 5 and 6? **Response**: That could be provided but concerns were expressed that given the over inflation of grades seen in Year R, then if judgements were similar then the progress data would not be correct. **Question**: How did teachers respond to these findings? What skills development/plans were in place to address it? **Response**: Teachers had not responded well and it had been a journey to help them understand the issues as they had been confident in their judgements. The learning curve was continuing as part of the PD Day - teachers would be able to understand their children better and what progress looked like. The teachers now had baselines and would develop the knowledge to be able to do it. There were some challenging conversations but the data couldn't be disputed. The issues had been identified and things put in place to mitigate. **Question**: Was there now enough robustness in place to know that the latest data was correct? The significance of benchmarking was acknowledged and given the lower starting point, could the board trust this data to be accurate? **Response**: The SLT and Partner were confident that there was no underinflation. The analysis had included reviewing every child's book. With the new data system assessment, the school was aware that there was a range within the pre-emerging and emerging categories and they would be able to show this. **Question**: The board asked for reassurance that this data could not be open to a criticism of underinflation? **Response**: The assessment used a consistent set of judgements and criteria standards to judge against. The key shift was in comparisons against actual criteria rather than comparing across children in the same class or cohort. For maths and reading, tests were completed that highlighted the gaps. The process had not been to highlight weaknesses but to get accurate starting points so that teachers could teach the right material at the right level of progress. The board was reassured that a high level of resources were put in reviewing all books, not just a data set. This had been extensive and comprehensive work. The Chair thanked everyone for the work done and the impact it would have. The HT thanks the Learning Federation Partner for their work on this and starting before the formal start of the role. See Confidential Part 2 minutes - A	
	7. RISE IMPROVEMENT PLAN	
	Documents were provided to the board ahead of the meeting. • The PD Day plans were up and running	

Signed _____ Date 02/06/2026

	• Quality of Teaching & Learning - behavior had been a challenge and this had been supported by the Bridge Education Trust (Southampton) in the Autumn terms which led to actions being taken and an improvement. The board was advised to expect behavior issues to increase as children began to be challenged to fill the learning gaps. The Chair observed that on their initial visit it was noted that the behaviour had impressed them, but children seemed placid and weren't being challenged. **Question**: Will the board have the opportunity to discuss SEND? There was no SENCO or Inclusion Manager in place and the partnership provision was 1 day per week. **Response**: The Partnership planned to add an additional 2 days/week of senior SENCO provision until a permanent SENCO could be appointed. **Question**: Can the school recruit a permanent SENCO for September? **Response**: The situation was in the process of being resolved. If it wasn't possible to appoint someone of the right caliber to the post then it would continue to be supported by the Partnership. The board was advised that the annual reviews had now taken place and the school now met its statutory compliance. The SENCO was now working on the list of EHCP applications and a tribunal. The partnership was hopeful that in 2 weeks this would increase from 3 days to 4 days a week in total. **Question**: The board agreed that it did not want to compromise on the quality of the appointment to the SENCO post - but did the Partnership have the capacity to continue this level of support next year? **Response**: Yes. There was flexibility available and staff would be deployed where most needed. The board were advised that the ordinarily available provision focus this half term was SEN. The PD Day would include adaptation and differentiation. The IEB could track this through the RIP. As a RIP target, SEN was on everyone's agenda such as those in EYFS, Nest provision, coaching and leadership. At the 'touch base' meeting with the RISE advisor, they were happy with the work that had been with the Partnership prior to the RIP starting and the work between the Partnership and SLT. The next IEB visit was set to coincide with the RISE advisor visit. AL had been present for the previous RISE advisor visit and felt it had been positive (notes had been shared with the board). The Chair advised board members that any reports can be shared with the rest of the board without approval of the Chair. A meeting was scheduled on 7th July 2026 to include the RISE advisor looking at the progress made so far. They understood how much there was to do and had been positive about the external support and monitoring. The IEB can use their evaluations and reports in addition to their own monitoring.	
	8. KS1 AND KS2 TESTING ARRANGEMENTS	
	It was confirmed that testing arrangements were in place and SS would share dates for IEB members to visit for monitoring. It was felt that due to the adjustments made to breaks and lunchtimes for SATs that it would not provide a typical view of the arrangements for governors to monitor on the same visit. **Action:** KM to share SCC SATs Monitoring Checklist	**KM**
	9. POLICIES	

Signed _____ Date 02/06/2026

9.1	School Complaints **Action:** Typing corrections to the School Complaints policy be provided to SS for amendment before publishing	**AL**
9.2	Premises Management The document was an SCC policy. From September 2026 a new Estate Management Strategy was being implemented and new documents would be issued - until that point this document was usable.	
9.3	Governor Allowances This policy had been reviewed and there were no questions	
9.4	Charging & Remissions Costings had been amended.	
	Decision : The board APPROVED all the statutory policies.	
	The Safe Touch and Positive Handling, Lettings and Fire Evacuation/Lockdown policies were postponed to the next meeting at the request of the HT.	
	10. FINANCE	
	Reports, budgets and deficit recovery plans were shared with the board in advance of the meeting. JM advised the board that several budget meetings and revisions had taken place and the overview report summarised this information. Today the board needed to agree the close-off for 2025-26, the budget set for 2026-27 and the deficit recovery plan.	
	2025-26 The End of Year deficit was £636,703 (Six hundred and thirty six thousand, seven hundred and three). This was higher than anticipated but had been gone through in great detail. DE had met with them to review the budget data. **Question**: What was the implication with the LA for closing off with a figure significantly higher than 2 months ago? **Response**: The majority of schools were in compromised financial positions. When the Partnership joined they were told the deficit was £190K-£200K. They had worked hard to uncover all the hidden debt and invoices that had not been paid,which were now all included. Additional items had been discovered since the last meeting. Last year there had been a water bill of £120K which compared to other schools averages of £7-12Kpa. It was known that there was a problem but it was not resolved correctly as the bill this year was £33K. The source of the leak was found to be in the boiler and remedial work was being done, but the bill still had to be paid. See Confidential Part 2 minutes - B **Question**: What are the implications of this deficit? **Response**: The LA requires a deficit recovery plan. The plan presented shows the school will be solvent in a few years time. This plan will go to the LA finance team for approval. **Question**: Had the LA agreed the end of year figures? **Response**: Yes, they had been spoken to about this last week.	

Signed _____ Date 02/06/2026

The board were told that what had been uncovered was that there had been no clear financial management or governance in place. There were still things to be unpicked and nothing yet showed fraudulence, it was more likely mis-management.
Question: What was the position of the Governing Body in this? Was there insufficient information or were they not asking the right questions? Does this show incompetence?
Response: The Chair of the IEB should write to the LA regarding the financial mis-management advising that any governors re-joining the board take significant financial training.
The previous Governing Body set a deficit budget of £223K and that had increased by over £400K.
Action: DB to write to the LA regarding financial training for future governors.

Decision : The board APPROVED the 2025-26 close-off deficit of £636,703 (Six hundred and thirty six thousand, seven hundred and three).

DB

2026-2027 Budget and Deficit Recovery Plan

JM shared the journey of the budget process through to the final budget presented at the meeting. The plan showed how the school would get to a positive position by year 3. The budget process had included looking at extra income from the nursery and changes in staff.

DE had reviewed the budget and recommended the board approved them.
The board comments on the impressive work that had been done.

Question: The written report showed the school moving from a £376K deficit to a £66K surplus by year 5 - was this based on actual pupil numbers? What assumptions had been made over the 5 years?
Response: This was based on the census returns from October 2025 and the numbers starting in Year R in September 2026. Additional work was being done to increase the numbers in the nursery. Assumptions made were generally on the conservative side.
Question: At a recent meeting the LA advised that the birth rate was not increasing and there were surplus places across the city - had this been factored in?
Response: Yes
Question: Was there any prospect of the LA closing schools?
Response: The LA had been forward planning for these numbers and had been looking at reducing PAN's rather than closing schools. Other cities such as London were in crisis and there were concerns.
The board discussed their concerns.

For 2026-27:

Income	£ 2,874,819
Expenditure	£ 2,614,565
In Year Surplus (Deficit)	£ 260,255
Brought Forwards (Deficit)	£ (636,704)
Cumulative C/fwd (Deficit)	£ (376,449)

Decision : The board approved the budget for 2026-27 with a cumulative deficit of £376,449 (Three hundred and seventy six thousands, four hundred and forty nine).

Decision : The board approved the proposed deficit recovery plan to be submitted to the Local Authority.

Signed _____ Date 02/06/2026

	11. BOARD MONITORING	
	Visit reports and the monitoring log were shared in advance of the meeting. The board discussed the best way to monitor and report on the monitoring. It was suggested that monitoring visits should include 10 minutes at the end to reflect and talk about the visit and have a collective view in the report. It was agreed that a written record of what monitoring was done in school was needed but reports did not need to be discussed at IEB meetings unless members wanted to raise issues from them.	
	12. SKILLS AUDIT	
	The skills audit had been completed and all areas scored at least 4 out of 5, with the exception of Estate Management. It was agreed that this fell into the remit of SB as H&S Governor. JM was confident that they could support SB in that role with the changes to Estate Management coming in the autumn term. KM was the most experienced board member for that skill and as they would be going through that process with their school, felt they could support in this role too.	
	13. AOB	
a	The board were advised that Trust HR had recommended at least one board member complete Workplace Harassment training in advance to changes to employment legislation in October. Future members of HR panels should include someone trained. DE and KM agreed to complete the training. **Action:** Clerk to share link to National College Workplace Harassment training for DE & KM to complete. <u>Date setting for future meetings</u>: The board discussed priorities for the rest of the term, the requirements for future meetings and how the meetings could best allow the board to focus on the objectives of the RIP. Combining the IEB meetings with monitoring visits to school was discussed. It was agreed that for the next meeting on 2nd June, the board would meet in person at 7:30am at the school for the board meeting, to be followed by monitoring visits and ending with the IEB members meeting to discuss the outcomes of the monitoring related to the RIP.	**Clerk**
b	The dates of other meetings in the summer term were discussed. The SIO would be reporting on 6th July. **Action:** GM to confirm an alternative date for the IEB to meet with the RISE advisor on their visit.	
	There being no other business the meeting closed at 9:08am	

Future IEB Meeting Dates 2025-26	
	Tuesday 2nd June 2026 at 7:30am, in person at Shirley Warren Primary & Nursery School.

Signed _____ Date 02/06/2026