

**Beaminster School**  
**Minutes of the Full Governing Body meeting held on**  
**Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2026, 9.15am**

Governors (13):	N Chalkley (NC), L Donaldson (LD), D Ennals (DE), P Fleming (PF), K Hales (KH) <b>Headteacher</b> , B Millwood (BM) <b>Chair</b> , G Montague (GM), C Moss (CM), S A Palmer (SAP), K Patten (KP), S Rollick (SR), A Taylor (AT) <i>via video-conferencing</i> .
In Attendance:	R Barnes (RB) <b>Associate member</b> , T Harley (TH) <b>Clerk</b> , J See (JS) <b>KS4 DOLA from 9.15-9.55 only</b> , Head Boy and Head Girl <i>from 9.15 – 9.25am only</i> , K Poole (KP) <b>Finance Manager from 10.15-10.50am only</b>

Item	Detail	Actions
73.1.	<p><b>Welcome &amp; Apologies:</b></p> <p><b>Apologies:</b> C Shead-Jones (CSJ), P Tanner (PT), R Tanner (RT) <b>Vice-Chair</b>, K Quigley (KG) <b>Associate member</b>, all accepted.</p> <p><b>Absent:</b> None.</p> <p><b>The meeting was quorate.</b></p>	
73.2.	<b>Declaration of Beneficial Interest:</b> None declared.	
73.5.	<p><b>Student Voice – meet Head Boy and Head Girl:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current Head Boy and Head Girl were introduced, noting they had been in post since May 2025, and their tenure was about to finish.</li> <li>• The process for electing the next Head students had recently launched, with good feedback and applications received.</li> <li>• JS noted the current Heads had been invaluable assets and governors were invited to ask questions.</li> <li>• Questions ranged from what aspects of the role had been difficult, things they had achieved, what had been most rewarding and advice for the new incumbents were answered. The students felt they were a positive role model for all students, that students had a strong voice at BS, especially through the School Council and that their issues were heard.</li> <li>• The students were thanked for their service and commitment.</li> </ul> <p><i>The students left the meeting at 9.25am</i></p> <p><b>KS4 Director of Learning and Achievement report – J See</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JS updated governors on current Y11; they had just finished mock exams and finals began on 9<sup>th</sup> May. A programme of revision with prizes was in place, most students were ready and confidence for results was good. There were a small number of ghost students (non-attenders and those in alternative provisions) that may affect the overall results, but this was an able year group.</li> <li>• Y10 attendance was good, but a small group of about 10 students (7-8% of cohort) were presenting challenging behaviour, which was having an impact on the whole year group and amongst staff. Interventions were in place and supported by the parents. Individually, when supported with invested time the students were doing better but the issues arose when they were together. Behaviour was better in mixed ability classes where the students were more able to be separated but issues were amplified in set ability classes where the students were more often in the same class.</li> <li>• <b>GQ: Under the new Ofsted framework, was the school expected to have a greater responsibility on students needing to access alternative provisions?</b> The school systems in place were good and as long as this was demonstrated to Ofsted, responsibility was shown. Frustrations arose with diminished and slow responses from the LA, once need was established.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>GQ: Are interventions not working?</b> There was a limited array of sanctions available, and students were motivated in different ways but they all needed investment and time.</li> <li>• <b>GQ: Were earlier years, specifically Y8 and Y9, issues picked up and able to be addressed before the students reached Y10?</b> There was a good programme of intervention and attendance for the whole school and patterns of behaviour amongst siblings were also being reviewed to help support and break patterns. Greater consistency on data input and behaviour incidents in ClassCharts also would aid intervention work.</li> <li>• <b>GQ: How were the Head Boy and Girl selected, was there provision to allow more challenging students to participate, and do prefects get privileges?</b> It was open to all students, they had to answer 5 questions to filter, with staff feedback and data used to inform, followed by an interview. The main privilege was access to the town during lunch break.</li> <li>• <b>GQ: What was Y11's attitude to the 6<sup>th</sup> form?</b> The KS5 DOLA was better placed to answer this question but 54 students had applied (KPI target 51), which was consistent with the need for 5 grade 5's at GCSE to enable access to A-levels, being 60-65% of the cohort.</li> </ul> <p><i>JS left the meeting at 9.55am.</i></p>	
73.3.	<p><b>Minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2026</b> (<i>CONFIDENTIAL</i> and non-confidential minutes, previously circulated):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The non-confidential minutes were approved as a true and accurate record and the governors agreed for them to be published on the school website. They were signed by BM.</li> <li>• The confidential part 2 minutes were approved as a true and accurate record and signed by BM.</li> </ul>	TH /NC – publish non-confidential minutes
73.4.	<p><b>Matters arising and action list update from the minutes:</b> The governors reviewed the minutes and actions <b>NOTING:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 72.5; Student survey results; KH agreed to circulate a summary of the results with the draft minutes of this meeting.</li> <li>• 72.8: Governors were reminded of their invitation to the Social Mobility talk by Lee Elliot Major at 11am on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2026.</li> <li>• All other actions were either complete, in hand or on the agenda and there were no other matters arising.</li> </ul>	Update action plan
73.5.	<p><b>Headteachers Report:</b> (Spring term KPI report, tabled). <b>Spring Term KPI Report:</b> KH introduced the report <b>NOTING:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance was above national, although there had been a dip in December, due to influenza. Absence rates for all years was below national and the few persistent absences were being monitored and supported.</li> <li>• Suspensions had been up recently, but still very low compared to national, with students being tracked and supported through the SSGC, isolation and reparation programme. A specialist school was being sought for one YR7 specialist in mainstream student, whose needs could not be met. <b>GQ: Is this still an option following the SEND reforms?</b> Yes.</li> <li>• Behaviour summary; 5.8% negative points across the whole school was a key indicator. Certificates for significant achievements and postcards home were a powerful tool. Staff quotas and issuing of points was monitored and the minor inconsistencies in ClassCharts did not affect or skew the overall picture.</li> <li>• Expected attainment; Y11 had just completed their final mock exams, with the final snapshot and areas for focus ready after the Easter holidays. Y13 were a good year group, although some students were struggling with mental health wellbeing. 25 of the 33 students had applied for university/ higher level apprenticeships.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffing; currently fully staffed with one very strong candidate for the Humanities post interview being held on 26<sup>th</sup> March.</li> </ul> <p><b>Strategy and KPI workshop feedback:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The workshops had been well led and informative. The strategic cycle was on track to be implemented from September 2026.</li> <li>Due to technical issues AT was unable to update the board on this item and asked for any questions and feedback to be forwarded to her.</li> </ul> <p><i>KP entered the meeting at 10.15am</i></p>	
73.9.	<p><b>Resources Committee – Finance Manager report</b> (SLA purchases, SFVS 2026, 5-year Budget plan papers, previously circulated).  KP introduced the reports <b>NOTING:</b></p> <p><b>SLA Purchases;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 3-4% increase had been expected, but many were significantly higher than this and above inflation. DC had published the costs very late, which had not allowed time for much alternative research. Core insurance with RPA had come in slightly higher than the LA and it had been known BMIS would be significantly more expensive.</li> <li>KP recommended accepting the agreements and confirmed that alternative providers would be investigated earlier next year to mitigate.</li> <li><b>With a show of hands, a majority of the governors present approved the SLA purchases as circulated.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>SFVS 2026;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AT, with support from KP had populated the checklist. The governors reviewed the answers, being a full response with many comments.</li> <li>There were no areas for concern and with <b>a show of hands the governors unanimously approved the SFVS checklist</b>, as circulated, to be submitted to the LA.</li> </ul> <p><b>5-year Budget Plan;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two versions had been circulated to governors for review with the recommendation that version one be approved and submitted to the LA for approval, including the licensed deficit application.</li> <li>In version one all fixed term contracts extended throughout the 5-year plan, but in version two they ended at the end of the first academic year. Version two demonstrated flexibility and the possibility to move into a surplus by the end of the 5-year plan but without version one the school would not be able to meet the current level of need. Fixed term contracts were linked to students and the LA needed to be aware of the challenges faced.</li> <li>Improvements in funding were anticipated; 16-19 allocation higher due to high value courses and a greater share of the joint sixth form budget.</li> <li>The ICFP RAG ratings highlighted issues, as discussed at Resources had been revised to include TLR's and showed there was an element of flexibility on Fte. teaching staff requirements.</li> <li>Grants received last year to cover NI and pay increases had been rolled into the NFF, with an overall increase in NFF of just under 2.2% in the first year and predicted 2.01% thereafter. Wage increases advised at 3.2% in the first year and 2% thereafter. It was hoped extra grant funding may be available to support extra costs.</li> <li>Raising pupil numbers was the most effective way to improve the situation.</li> <li>SEND funding through the LA was the most unpredictable and challenging area.</li> <li>Governors asked questions on the funding statement, assumptions, licenced deficit application and approval checklist and asked KP to provide a funding priorities list for any surplus income and an interim budget report to the FGB in the Autumn term to monitor. KP agreed and</li> </ul>	<p>SLA purchases approved</p> <p>SFVS checklist approved for submission to LA</p> <p>Provide funding priorities list and interim budget report to FGB in October</p>

	<p>reassured governors that the termly outturn reviews discussed at Resources enabled conversations and checks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>With no further questions and a show of hands the governors unanimously approved the version one 5-budget plan and licensed deficit application for submission to the LA.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>KP left the meeting at 10.50am</i></p>	Budget approved for submission to LA
73.6.	<p><b>Safeguarding</b> (DSL update report, tabled): KH introduced the report prepared by KQ <b>NOTING:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report highlighted local and external links and meetings held, training sessions completed, concerns, themes and interventions, development of the safeguarding curriculum and current work on misogyny and online misinformation.</li> </ul>	
73.7.	<p><b>SEND</b> (summary report on SEND reforms, previously circulated): KH updated governors <b>NOTING:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LA support was being given, with alternative placements being sought for two challenging Y7 students linked to the inclusion hub.</li> <li>• BM had prepared a summary on the SEND reforms (White paper under consultation) for governor information and awareness.</li> </ul>	
73.8.	<p><b>Standards Committee:</b> <i>no meeting held since the last FGB meeting:</i> No urgent matters raised for discussion.</p>	
73.9.	<p><b>Resources Committee</b> (draft minutes of the meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2026, previously circulated):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Minutes;</b> received for information only, with no further matters raised for discussion.</li> </ul>	
73.10.	<p><b>Governance Committee</b> (draft minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2026, previously circulated): SAP introduced the minutes <b>NOTING:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The committee had agreed that the Governors review survey be conducted bi-annually and ask that all governors complete the skills audit this year, to be circulated early May, for review at the July FGB meeting.</li> <li>• Governors were encouraged to complete Safer recruitment and Exclusions training to enable them to sit on interview and exclusion panels. RT had recently completed exclusion and panels training through the NGA and DE had volunteered for both.</li> <li>• A new governor had asked for the protocol for tabling questions prior to the meetings and governors were reminded that questions could be directed to the relevant lead (C.C TH) once papers were circulated to aid discussion.</li> <li>• Non-statutory policy review; the committee recommended that review and approval of all non-statutory policies be delegated to KH, with only major key changes being brought to the GB for discussion. Awareness of and responsibility of the review cycle would remain with governors. <b>With a show of hands governors unanimously approved the delegation of all non-statutory policy reviews to KH.</b></li> </ul>	<p>Send out skills audit questionnaire to GB in May – review July FGB</p> <p>Complete training</p> <p>Table questions prior to meetings to aid discussion</p> <p>Non-statutory policy delegation approved</p>
73.11.	<p><b>Link Scheme</b> (Six reports (Careers, Computer Science, Science, PE, PP, SEND, previously circulated):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governors asked questions on the SEND, PE and Pupil Premium reports and were assured systems were in place to capture data and support teachers in identifying PP and inclusion needs of all students.</li> </ul>	
73.12.	<p><b>Chairs Report</b> (Chairs report and Ofsted guidance document, previously circulated through SharePoint): BM introduced the report <b>NOTING:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEND reforms and new Ofsted framework outlined significant changes with a huge focus on inclusion and governors were advised to include questions on inclusion at all link meetings. A guidance document</li> </ul>	

	<p>on what was meant by inclusion, specifically for Beaminster School was being produced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A governor noted that the suggested link governor questions focussed on teaching staff and was not so relevant for the support staff link. The support staff link leads agreed to research their foci.</li> <li>• One extra governor was needed to apply and sit on the HTPM panel, which consisted of 3 governors meeting with the HT and LA partner three times a year. The role was well supported and training was available.</li> <li>• A summary of the Ofsted framework changes had been compiled for reference and a checklist would be written to support governors with inspection.</li> </ul>	<p>Review non-teaching staff link questions</p> <p>Consider joining HTPM panel</p>
73.13.	<p><b>Clerk's Report</b> (Clerks Report, previously circulated): TH introduced the report for information <b>NOTING:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main link to the Governors SharePoint on Office 365 was currently broken, but governors were still able to access the SharePoint documents through OneDrive. TH would inform governors once the issue was resolved.</li> </ul>	<p>Resolve SharePoint issue</p>
73.14.	<p><b>Any other business:</b> BM asked governors if they had any other business to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governors were invited to attend the school concert on 26<sup>th</sup> March and reminded to contact NC to reserve seats.</li> <li>• A social media post had commended a Y8 student field day visit to Lyme Regis.</li> </ul>	<p>Reverse seats &amp; attend school event</p>
73.15.	<p><b>2025/26 Meetings,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next meeting dates <b>NOTED:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Standards 15<sup>th</sup> April, 5.30pm</li> <li>○ Resources 27<sup>th</sup> April, 3.45pm</li> <li>○ <b>FGB 11<sup>th</sup> May, 6.30pm</b></li> <li>○ Governance 15<sup>th</sup> June, 5.00pm - new meeting confirmed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	With no further business the meeting ended at 11.15am	

Chair.....Dated.....

Item	Action	Owner	By when /report
73.3	Publish approved minutes	TH / NC	Completed
73.4	Circulate student survey summary results to GB Attend PD Day on Social Mobility led by Lee Elliot Major	KH All	Asap 11am 3/7/26
73.9	SLA purchases approved SFVS checklist approved and submitted to LA 5-Yr Budget plan and licenced deficit application approved and submitted to LA Provide funding priorities list for GB review Interim Budget update to FGB each October (update year planner)	KP KP KP KP TH	Completed Completed Completed 27/4/26 Completed
73.10	Circulate skills audit questionnaire, complete, review at July FGB Complete Safer recruitment / Exclusions training Table questions prior to meetings Non-statutory policy review delegated to KH	All All All TH / KH	1/5 - 3/7/26 ASAP Ongoing Completed
73.12	Review non-teaching staff link questions Consider joining HTPM panel	NC / LD All	Ongoing ASAP
73.13	Resolve SharePoint issue	TH / BM	ASAP
73.14	Attend school events	ALL	Ongoing