



OAKWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL MINUTES of the GOVERNING BODY MEETING

HELD VIRTUALLY

6th July 2026, 6:00-8:00pm

Name	Post	Attending	Apologies accepted	Apologies not received / accepted
Governors				
Maria Whitmarsh (HT)	Headteacher	✓		
Rachel Gander (RG)	Foundation Trust Gv/ Chair	✓		
Gemma Fawcitt (GF)	Staff Governor		✓	
Joe Crook (JC)	Co-opted Governor		✓	
Ben Hammond (BH)	Co-opted Governor		✓	
Jayanand Kumarguru (JK)	LA Governor	✓		
Laurence Harding (LH)	Foundation Trust Governor	✓		
Amy Ryan (AR)	Parent Gov / ViceChair	✓		
Foteini Stavroulia	Parent Governor	✓		
Other attendees				
Aaron Rattan (SBM)	School Business Manager	✓ (Items 1-5)		
Raylene Poppleton (RP)	Clerk	✓		
Quoracy - 50% of Governors (5)				

Actions arising from this meeting

Item		Action
3	MW to share the email from the solicitors and canvas governors for potential meeting dates	HT
5	SBM to follow up with LA about the School Resource Management Advisor	SBM
14.2	MW to contact people potentially interested in becoming Associate Members.	HT

Minutes

Item		Action
1.	Welcome, apologies and absences.	
	The Chair welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 6:00pm. Apologies had been received and accepted from JC, BH and GF. <i>*The clerk experienced intermittent technical difficulties during items 1-5. The content for those sections was subsequently agreed by those present.</i>	
2.	Declaration of Pecuniary/Business Interests	
	No changes to the declarations of interest were declared.	

	Governors had no pecuniary/business interests to declare in this agenda.	
3.	Items of Urgent Business	
	The HT advised governors that the Trust solicitors had provided information relating to the land transfer from SCC to the Trust. Governors were asked to take part in a call with them to get a clearer understanding of the information and issues. The Chair asked JC and JK to take part due to their experience in this area. Action: MW to share the email from the solicitors and canvas governors for potential meeting dates.	HT
4.	Reflection	
	The headteacher asked governors - <i>"Looking back at the key decisions we made this year, how did our challenges and discussions directly improve the outcomes and well-being of our pupils, and what does that tell us about our strategic priorities for September?"</i> Our challenge and oversight this year helped keep the school focused on improving outcomes and well-being for all pupils. By challenging leaders on attendance, attainment, safeguarding, inclusion, and resource allocation, we ensured that decisions remained centred on pupil needs. The impact of this challenge was evident and recognised feedback from the recent Ofsted inspection. Comments included: • As a governor it had taken time to move from tactical to strategic. • In September the focus for governor monitoring should be on attainment and attendance • Scrutiny focus should be on outcomes and wellbeing	
5.	Finance & Resources	
	A written report, income and expenditure report, email from the LA and cost saving scenarios were shared with governors ahead of the meeting. The school had looked at all purchasing, subscriptions, SLA's and utilities to make savings. It was not possible to cut back on those areas further without significantly impacting the school. The staffing demographic at Oakwood was towards the UPS (Upper Pay Scale) teaching staff. A potential need for restructuring was discussed. The school was in contact with the Trust HR about this. The LA had verbally advised that any school going through a restructure would be reimbursed the associated costs. MW felt this needed to be confirmed in writing. Question: Are there redeployment systems in place across the Trust?	

	Response: There used to be a system in place in the LA but it was not known if that was still in place. Governors were told that the Deficit Recovery Plan (DRP) looks for evidence of what had been done to reduce costs but did not consider the impact on the school or pupil outcomes. Governors discussed specific roles and whether removing roles was a false economy as the implications would be that the tasks associated with the role would still have to be done but by others, most likely someone on a higher pay scale. Question: Had the use of volunteers for some roles been considered? Response: That was a potential option, with the right oversight and training. Question: Could Southampton Services offered under the SLA support some of the roles under discussion? Response: The school would need to look into what services they could offer. Governors expressed additional concerns that the impact of losing roles would be wider, as it may affect additional activities that the children benefited from such as lunchtime clubs. The school would need to ensure that the necessary parts of any roles considered would continue to be done at the right level and the amount of hours the school needed staff to be available would be taken into account. The SBM and HT felt there was a good level of check and challenge between them meaning that they could reflect on issues and see the impact of decisions. An example of how the hours of a contract made recruiting into certain positions more difficult. Question: What is a School Resource Management Advisor? Response: They'll look at the resources, and do a top to bottom overview, going line-by line review of all contracts and purchases. It is a free service but the SBM had not received a follow up email about this. Governors discussed this and felt that it would be valuable to have an objective external review with a fresh set of eyes. It was acknowledged that the period up to submitting the DRP would require challenging conversations. The SBM advised that it had been agreed that from September they would be a shared resource by a 3rd school in the Trust. This would be trialled until the end of March 2027. The SBM advised that in their opinion the way to save money quickly was to reduce the number of higher paid staff - but there was a HR process required for that . There was an argument that the school had a teaching	
--	--	--

	staff surplus of 0.6 to 0.8FTE surplus but the HT and Governors need to look at the impact of this in Teaching and Learning. Question: Were there any retirements expected? Would that help? Response: Yes there were, but there were also additional maternity leaves that increased costs. In addition, in the past few years the school had experienced settlements and long term illnesses. The SBM shared a comparison with another Trust school in a different position. Governors discussed the information that had been shared and acknowledged the issues, but needed to see evidence of the impact. Question: The LA required the SRP but did they talk to the School Improvement Team? Response: The Director of Education was copied on the email included in the meeting pack. Governors expressed concern that they received congratulations on the school's outcomes and Ofsted result, but now were being required to make decisions that were likely to impact those outcomes. The current results for pupils were excellent but they were being asked to remove resources that introduced a risk to the children's education. Governors were also concerned at the timescale of October that had been set, due to the summer holidays. Any changes in teaching or structure wouldn't be able to take place within the year. Falling rolls also needed to be taken into account as reducing from 60 entry to 45 entry would not reduce the number of class teachers, but would reduce the income. The LA required a 3 year plan. Question: Do you have pupil population data for the next few years? Response: No. Governors felt concerned they were being asked to make decisions without access to the data they would need. They were told that next year the school was expecting 52 out of 60 for Year R entry. Other considerations were also the removal of Sports Premium funding and the changes to FSM eligibility which may cost the school more money than they receive. Question: Were the ECT contracts fixed term? Response: Yes. 1 fixed term and 1 maternity cover. Governors thanked the SBM and HT for their honesty and transparency. Action: SBM to follow up with LA about the School Resource Management Advisor	SBM
--	---	-----

	Governors appreciated the constructive challenge between the SBM and HT but were concerned about the push for schools to be treated as business whilst also being required to meet higher pupil needs. Governors thanked the SBM who then left the meeting.	
6.	Minutes of previous meetings	
	The draft minutes of the FGB on 18/05/2026 were reviewed. DECISION: The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record by those present. The Meeting Chair's electronic signature was used to sign the minutes after the meeting and the final version filed on the governor drive.	
7.	Matters Arising & Actions	
	The active actions were reviewed and the following was noted: • The clerk would set training for 2026-27 on National College from September. • The safeguarding visit had taken place • The TOR had been updated to take account of Associate Member appointments.	
8.	Bridge Education Trust	
	The Trust board had met on 17/06/2026. Trust Headteachers had put together a document (included with the meeting pack) explaining the joint working that took place within the Trust and highlighted the benefits.	
9.	Headteacher's Report	
9.1	It had been agreed with the Chair that due to workload and having received the Ofsted inspection report, this would be a verbal update based around the end of year data. The following items were taken out of agenda order. Some of the capital budget was being spent on toilet refurbishments and other small works over the summer holidays. The school closed for 1 day due to excessive heat (25th June). The HT kept governors informed. There had been a significant impact on attendance (reduced to 73%) with parents not sending their children into school even though the school had made a significant commitment to keep the school open. There had been an impact on the admin team who had to chase parents where children did not attend but the school had not been informed why. As the school was open, these were unauthorised absences as the school couldn't use the Y code (unavoidable absence). DECISION: The governors AGREED that the school should not be asked to open for an additional day at the end of term.	
9.3	End of Year Assessment Data	

	The HT presented data that had not yet gone through checking or LA comparison. The DFE had written to Headteachers advising that KS2 data was delayed due to Pearson, who the marking had been outsourced to. This was now delayed until 16th July. As school reports were due to go out on the 17th, parents had not been informed of the delay as it was expected these could still be gotten out on time if the results arrived on the 16th. The deadline for schools to check the results data had been extended into the school holidays, 24th July. Question: What is the checking deadline? Response: Schools can check the scripts to check for marking errors and have them reviewed. Question: Do you check all the papers? Response: No - just borderline ones. Question: Do appeals happen often? Response: There were 2 last year and none the year before, so no the school didn't make many appeals. Question: When would secondary schools receive the data? Would this now be delayed? Did they use this data for streaming? Response: There is a longer, 6 week, checking window after which the results would be issued. LH advised that secondary schools do not use the SATs results for streaming. <u>EYFS</u> This year 76.7% achieved GLD <u>Phonics</u> 86.4% of Year 1 passed the phonics test, an increase of 14.7% over 2025. 80% of Year 2 retakes passed, an increase of 56.9% since 2025 These results showed the impact of the interventions <u>MTC</u> The school was 11th centile nationally.	
9.2	Annual Safeguarding Report This statutory report was a summary of the safeguarding reports that had been shared at meetings through the year.	
10.	Policies	
	The HT explained that the school was still trying to find the best way of communicating during a lockdown and was trialling a roll-out of walkie talkies and the use of code words. Cases of inappropriate use of mobile phones by staff had been noted and most other schools had stopped all mobile phone use. The rolling out of the walkie talkies from September 1st would coincide with a change that mobile phones would not be allowed and calls should go via the school office.	

	Governors were advised that this was reflected in the ICT policy which had been made tighter. Question: Was that a staff code of conduct issue? Response: The code of conduct was being updated Question: How would the change be communicated? Response: The change timeline would be communicated by email and the new ICT Policy and Code of Conduct would be shared before the end of term. It would then be shared again at the start of term. Question: Do staff sign to say they've read it? Response: That is done within National College Question: Would that extend to volunteers as well? Response: Yes Governors discussed the letter that was sent to parents about pupils use of mobile phones in school from September. No responses had been received from parents yet.	
10.1	Accessibility Plan Question: Where it indicates things that need to be done, are those still to be done? Response: Those were things that the school was already doing/had done. Some were in the process of being done. It was explained that the school had a plan in the past but this was simplified.	
	The policies presented were for governor information and approval had previously been delegated to the headteacher.	
11.	Equality Objectives & Policy	
	This had been looked at and a policy was not required, just the objectives. Documents from a range of schools had been compared and this was now inline with the format of other Trust schools. The HT took governors through some of the objectives and actions.	
12.	Governor Visits	
	Governors raised issues with the visit report form. Governors gave feedback on their visits during Governors in School Week: • Saw good teaching practice at a difficult time of year • One governor had watched the first part of the heart monitoring practical life lab session, but was sad to miss the results of the exercise as children were engaged and excited to find out what their heart rate would be after exercise. Teachers had been positive about the life lab and the equipment. • A governor met with IT support and discussed a range of issues including the support for computer literacy and issues with older laptops. The school had received some technology funding and had	

	bought chromebooks, iPads and boards on wheels. The governor had been impressed with the firewalls and alerts. Governors were advised that the move to OneCom for IT had been smooth and positive.	
13.	Governor Training & Skills	
	Training had been covered under Actions. Governors were reminded of the statutory training that would come out in September.	
14.	Governor Reflection and Planning	
14.1	Reflections on 2025-26 - Governors felt there were improved monitoring visits. Governors were a regular presence in school, with more focus - looking at SIP priorities or their governor focus. - Staff were used to governors being in school - JK and FS were invited to take part in visits next year. Visit times could be flexible to fit around other commitments.	
14.2	Plans for 2026-27 - Potential Associate Members to be approached as a way of supporting governors joining the board for board succession. Action: MW to contact potentially interested parties. - Governors discussed the proposed Monitoring Plan that had been developed for other Trust schools and agreed to look at it to agree to visits at the next meeting.	
14.3	Meeting Dates 2026-27 - The proposed meeting dates were agreed (see table at the end of these minutes). - It was agreed that all future FGB meetings would take place online. - AR would like to see more frequent F&R meetings with a strict focus from September. It was agreed that a September meeting date would be set once the LA provided a reply about the advisor.	
15.	Governor Correspondence & Clerking Matters	
	No items to raise.	
16.	AOB	
	The Chair would arrange for retirement cards from the governors to be given to those staff leaving and would circulate details if governors wish to contribute to collections for those staff. Governors congratulated the HT again for the Ofsted. Governors were proud to be governors of this school. There being no other business the meeting closed at 7:45pm.	

Dates of Meetings 2026 - 2027

Full Governing Body 6:00-8:00pm	Finance Committee 12:30-1:30pm [Hybrid]	Governors In School Days <i>(visit during the week)</i>
05/10/26	09/10/26	
23/11/26	05/03/27	
01/02/27	07/05/27	
15/03/27		
17/05/27		
05/07/27		