Beenham Primary School, Full Governing Body meeting

Tuesday 21th April 2026 7pm-9pm

Held Virtually

Minutes

Present	• James Tobin (JT) - Chair of Governors, Finance Governor, IT link Governor • Sophie McBean (SM) – Headteacher • Bev Sharp (BS) – Staff Governor and SBM • Vicky Thirkell (VT) (Remote) – Vice Chair, Safeguarding Governor and link Governor for wellbeing • Jennifer Campbell (JC) – Parent and SEND Governor • Georgina Grey (GG) - Co-Opted Governor Governors at the meeting met the quorate

Item no		
1	Apologies for Absence Tanya Galliara was absent	Chair
2	Declarations of Other Business None	Chair
3	Declaration of Interests None	Chair
4	Policy for Review – Behaviour Comments had already been submitted by GG before the meeting. Governors commented on how cohesive and comprehensive the policy was. The policy was approved by all Governors.	All
5	Budget Review BS started with taking the FGB through the staff structure at the school. There is a PPA teacher who works one day at week who will	All

	finish at the school in July 2026. VT queried what the cover would look like after the teacher leaves, SM explained that 0.5 of the 1 day is used to cover ECT released time, and next year we won't have any ECT's at the school. In addition, the teacher also covers 0.5 day SENCO cover, and this will be picked up by SM and the class TA next year. VT questioned whether SM could manage the additional workload, SM confirmed this was fine. JT asked whether the teaching structure is the same as last year and stated that there had been discussions at the FGB in the past around whether an additional TA was required to support the workload. SM confirmed that the budget does not include an additional TA, but this situation would be reviewed again mid-year along with a budget update. JT queried why the TA's had such varying hours of employment. SM informed the team that each TA was hired by a different head teacher over time, with different agreements on hours. VT asked whether this model worked. SM confirmed it did work, and if anything TA's would always like more hours. BF then covered pay increase percentages and the school has used recommended amounts for worst-case scenarios on percentages, which everyone agreed with. The buy-backs were discussed with the FGB, and these were all the recommended packages. In particular, the buyback of a Data Protection Officer was brought up in having considerable value. VT questioned whether increases had been put on buy-back costs from last year, or whether the exact same amount has been used. The school has added a percentage increase onto any buy-back costs that the final figure hasn't been provided for, based on previous years' experience. JT asked why the MIS Support had reduced in cost by around £800, because it was unusual to see a cost reduction. BT confirmed this was because there was an additional cost to move MIS to the cloud for the previous year, and now the cost had returned to normal. Pupil number forecasts were then reviewed by the FGB. Predicted reception numbers from WBC show declining reception numbers after 2027, but these are estimates which can change over time. BS showed a slide of data regarding Beenham Primary School from WBC. The data showed good data around reception and school context, inward/outward movement, and reception & capacity. JT queried why WBC are providing this information, and what are schools meant to do with data such as inward and outward movement. There was a discussion around the use of this data, and for example how it showed that more children come to Beenham out	

	of catchment. JT suggested that we should advertise more out of catchment to increase our numbers even further. BS confirmed that the budget assumed an intake of four children for 2026, and 8 for 2027. The school budget therefore used four children for 2026, and conservatively went for 5 in 2027. Action – to discuss at the next FGB how the school is marketing itself to gain more children in and out of catchment. BS presented a new Funding Overview slide which explained where all the income comes into the school for the year. JT asked about the new Inclusive Mainstream Fund (IMF grant), and whether the amount was for the whole three years or per year. BS confirmed that this amount £5800 was per year. JT asked how the funds can be spent, SM stated that guidance had not been given on this yet. JT asked when the school receives this funding, BS believes it would be in May. BS then took the FGB through some points to note about costs. Electricity costs have not been confirmed from WBC, and this had been followed up The SLA cost for School Improvement was not confirmed but BS had allowed a cost for £4000 as an estimate. VT then led a discussion on costs to allow for a consultant and outsourcing as an option. JT also raised that if an outsourced consultant was used, they should be checked on their experience understanding the new Ofsted framework because this would add value to the school. Disproportionate funding had not been confirmed yet from WBC, so the school has not included this in the budget. The oil budget was in for 3x the amount of the previous year due to the current state of the world. Four weeks of supply cover was budgeted for, and the school was expecting a potential increased cost for alternative provision, although this was not confirmed. JC questioned whether the school is responsible for this cost directly, and it was confirmed that the school was responsible for it. The budget confirmed that the school would be in credit for the next two years, with a longer-term concern with decreasing pupil numbers nationally. However, from experience the school has seen these numbers vary a lot, so this will need to be adjusted closer to the time. VT asked whether any surplus would be taken back by WBC, and BS confirmed that this was not the case. Pupil Premium – BS took the FGB through the PPG pupil numbers and overall revenue from Pupil Premium grant, which is an increase over last year due to increasing numbers of children on census day. VT queried whether the rate had increased this, BS confirmed it was	

	around and additional £50. BS then explained the how this funding is going to be used, including the LGPS pension deficit. VT asked whether PPG funding can be used against the pension deficit, BS confirmed that you have to fund the LGPS deficit from every fund code, and that the school in total loses around £12,000 towards this deficit. Sports premium was discussed, but it was raised by VT that every year we don't know whether we are going to receive this funding. BS stated that we have assumed that the sports premium funding will be delivered this year, and every school is assuming this. Breakfast and after school fund were then discussed. The funding for this was due to make a loss of £3486.08 for the year, and there is a line in the main school budget to allow for this deficit. BS explained the numbers of children that use the service and the income received by having those children at the school and asked the FGB to decide whether they would advise keeping the wrap-around care. JT challenged whether the school could put prices up. BS stated that the prices can't be increased because they were already increased last year. JT asked whether it should be increased again this year. BS spoke to other school business managers, and the school is on-par to what other schools charge. SM agreed, and that more can be done to improve the numbers at after-school club. SM was concerned about increasing charges on our school community. BS stated that the local authority lead for wraparound care is coming to see her the week after. Action - SM asked whether BS could get some clarification from this person regarding the free breakfast club offering. VT asked whether the regular children using the wraparound care are living inside or outside of catchment area. SM confirmed 60% of the children are outside of catchment. VT stated that those outside of catchment may need the service to come and collect the children, and if the school is looking to gain more children outside of catchment, then this service should remain. BS stated that when potential parents call the school they usually ask about the wraparound care. VT also stated that since parents are being asked to return to the office, the service is as important as ever. JT said that the school could look at ways to encourage people to use the service, for example a "use four days get a fifth free" offer, and this would then reduce the deficit because at this number of children the staff cost is fixed until numbers become a lot greater. BS responded that the school also has some after school clubs which takes the numbers away from the after-school club. VT asked whether the school receives a payment from the clubs being run at	

	school and BS stated that the school did not. BS stated that it didn't feel right to ask some of the parents who run clubs for funding, but it could be something to ask the businesses who use the grounds. JT suggested that the school could start by asking for a voluntary donation from the business that use the school grounds, for example £100 a term which could then be used to put against the after-school club costs, because the organisations use (as an example) the water and electricity services at the school. Action – BS to ask any school club businesses for a termly donation to contribute towards school use costs. The FGB decided to keep the breakfast club and after school club provision in place, even though it does currently run at a loss. Finally, the capital budget was reviewed. The cracks in the staff room will be mainly covered by the capital maintenance programme, so school's contribution will be around £750. 50% of the CCTV funding was allocated (the remaining to come from the Parish Council if approved due to using the community room on the school grounds). Funding was also allocated to health and safety, an ICT upgrade and new lighting. The lighting funding may not proceed because the fire risk assessors visited the school and stated that new roofing tiles are required for fire safety. This funding may need to be used towards that. JT was surprised that the tiles were not picked up on the original fire risk assessment review which was not long ago. BS will receive a new report shortly from the assessor. BS stated that she would upload the final budgets on Friday for the approval meeting, which is happening the week after this meeting. VT thanked BS and said that the new slide approach was very helpful in order to understand everything in the budget. The FGB thanked BS for all her work in preparing the content for the meeting, and for organising the budget itself. VT commented that it felt good not submitting a deficit budget since the school is in credit.	
6	**EICR checks quote discussion** BS asked the FGB to check MS Teams, where three quotes for a five-year fixed electrical check, and in the next meeting one of them would need to be selected. The FGB agreed to this. Action – FGB members to review the quotes on MS Teams before the budget approval meeting.	All
7	**Chair's notices/AOB**	Chair

	None	

Actions

Action – to discuss at the next FGB how the school is marketing itself to gain more children in and out of catchment.	JT
Action - SM asked whether BS could get some clarification from this person regarding the free breakfast club offering.	BS
Action – BS to ask any school club businesses for a termly donation to contribute towards school use costs.	BS
Action – FGB members to review the quotes on MS Teams before the budget approval meeting.	All