

**Full Governing Board Meeting**  
**Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 28<sup>th</sup> April 2025**  
**at 6:00pm at the Sherwood Hill Campus and via Google Meet**



Fran Boto (FB)	Co-opted Governor	Present	
Penelope Fox (PF)	Parent Governor	Present	
Steve Cooper (SC)	Co-opted Governor	Present	
Gemma Davies (GD)	Co-opted Governor	Present	
Vajeha Haq (VH)	Parent Governor	Present	
Katerina Kelesidi (KK)	Co-opted Governor	Present	
David Murden (DM)	Ex-Officio Governor / Headteacher	Present	
Samata Razak-Oudirangou (SRO)	Foundation Governor ( <i>appointed at this meeting</i> )		Absent
Lindsay Sedola (LS)	Co-opted Governor	Present	
Fiona Taylor (FT)	Foundation Governor		Absent
Jack Cutler (JC)	Pupil Based Commissioning, L.B.Sutton	Present	
Beth Brookes (BB)	Head of School	Present	
Anna Robinson (AR)	Wellbeing; Trans-disciplinary Specialist	Present	
Riyaz Dayal (RD)	School Business Manager	Present	
Rosemary Viggiani (RV)	Clerk	Present	

	Item	Action
1.	<p><b>Welcome; Apologies for absence and quorum (5)</b></p> <p>GD opened the meeting at 6pm and welcomed all to the online meeting thanking Jack Cutler, the Pupil Based Commissioning Officer from the London Borough of Sutton. It was noted that Jack has been working very closely with the school on this proposal.</p> <p>Apologies were received and accepted from SRO and FT for personal reasons.</p> <p>The meeting was declared quorate. (8 /10)</p> <p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest regarding items on the agenda.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Minutes of the previous meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> March - Part A &amp; B</b></p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> Given that this is an extraordinary meeting to consider the opening of a third campus, the Board deferred approval of these Minutes (Part A and B) held on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2025 to the next full Board Meeting.</p> <p><b>Matters arising</b> (<i>see action list below</i>)</p> <p>The actions outstanding are noted in the table below.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Carew Manor Business Plan</b> (Jack Cutler, Schools Commissioning and Capital Lead to attend)</p> <p><b>Documents shared prior to the meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Draft 3-year Budget for Sherwood Park School (Hill and Park campus)</li> <li>– Financial Report and BMR for 2024/25 end of year</li> <li>– Draft Budget for the Carew Campus</li> <li>– The Manor Business Proposal</li> </ul> <p>Prior to the meeting the Governors had raised a number of questions regarding the proposal to open a third campus and the questions are set out in the table at the end of these minutes.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>These questions had been raised in advance of the meeting and the school had based its presentation on these questions with detailed answers. The presentation is available separately and the key points are noted in the table at the end of these Minutes.</p> <p>Key points arising from the presentation and accompanying discussion are summarised below.</p> <p><i>The most fundamental question raised was with regards to the background to this proposal, why it is being considered now and why the short timeframe for a September 2025 start?</i></p> <p>The need had arisen following the new government's decision to put a hold on the Free School programme meaning that the proposed new Angel Hill Free School would now not be ready for September 2025 resulting in a significant shortfall in special school places for children with SEND, particularly those with autism. Since no new schools can be opened, the only option is to increase capacity in existing provisions or send children to private provision, often at some distance from home. The LA had been working with the school with a proposal to open a satellite provision at the Carew Manor site.</p> <p>This building has recently been vacated by the Carew Academy who are a special school which has moved to new premises. The Carew Academy have used the building for many years now, accommodating 250 students with mild to moderate learning difficulties. As such the building clearly has the capacity for 25 children – subject, of course, to the children being assessed as having their needs met in this building in a new Sherwood provision.</p> <p>As regards the cohort, it was noted that AR has now met all the proposed cohort and her findings are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Sherwood Park School (SPS) can meet their needs on the new Manor Campus;</li> <li>– The needs of the children are less complex than the current SPS cohort and can be met through the mainstream school nursing service and similarly with therapies;</li> <li>– The children's needs will be met better at this school than they would be through any other provision that could be sourced for September; many children will also have their peers starting at the school in September;</li> <li>– The children are not new to the area and are known to, and have already been seen by, Health; Cognus have been consulted;</li> <li>– Only one child is coming from out of the area – and this is due to a strong parental preference;</li> <li>– Only one child has additional health needs that cannot be provided within the education provision and this has been factored into the budgeting with Cognus – wherever they are placed they would need that additional support.</li> <li>– The school have a strong working relationship with Cognus and the SLA can be expanded to encompass this cohort.</li> </ul> <p>The school has had weekly meetings with Jack and the timeline of the plan was shared and discussed; the following steps have already been taken / initiated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 10-12/24: Proposal discussed and agreed between LA &amp; Sherwood Heads</li> <li>– 16/12/24: Proposal discussed at governors meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Agreement in principle &amp; for LA to consult following local policies &amp; processes</li> <li>o Final decision to be based on the impact on the viability of the existing campuses</li> </ul> </li> <li>– LA Consultation process from Monday 27 January 2025 to Sunday 23 March 2025</li> <li>– 24/01/25 - Letter sent to parents &amp; staff of Sherwood Park school informing them of the consultation</li> <li>– 08/01/25 - 01/04/25 - Work with the LA agreeing proposal for building works</li> <li>– 10/01/25 ongoing - Work with the LA on financial planning in co-production with the LA</li> </ul>	

Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 25/02/25 - Consultation evening for interested parties held at Sherwood Hill Campus</li> <li>– 24/03/25 - Closing date of consultation</li> <li>– 24 &amp; 31/03/25 - SLT information sharing and questions session for staff</li> <li>– 18/03/25 &amp; 25/03/25 - Planned Finance committee &amp; FGB and meetings to provide further information and budget (<i>cancelled / reduced agenda</i>)</li> <li>– 13/04/25 - People’s committee Meeting - agreeing proposal</li> <li>– 01/04/25 - Naming of pupils through the admissions process</li> <li>– 04/04/25 - Commencing recruitment for the Manor Campus - prioritising leadership &amp; teaching roles</li> <li>– 15/04/25 - Liaison &amp; work with Cognus partners on communication and therapy offer</li> <li>– 23/04/25 - Commencing project management plan for set up of campus including (financial planning, recruitment, premises &amp; estates, design of the school offer &amp; pathways, curriculum &amp; timetable planning)</li> </ul> <p>It was noted that the recruitment of staff has started following agreement with the Chair – on the grounds that no appointments will have been made until the final decision is reached at this meeting.</p> <p>Leadership and teaching roles have been prioritised due to the national deadlines for resignation and appointment for a September start. The shortlisting took place today and interviews will be held next week.</p> <p>Work has also started on matters relating to finance and premises – again with no irrevocable decisions being made to date.</p> <p><u>Draft 3-year Budget for Sherwood Park School!</u> (Hill and Park campus)</p> <p>Jack confirmed that the LA would not expect the GB to sign off a budget that they do not feel is financially viable. Work is continuing to agree a level of dis-economy of scale and exceptional funding to support a sustainable financial position whilst the school is growing.</p> <p><i>Governors asked if the school can support the additional pupils at the Manor and still be viable?</i></p> <p>The Head noted that this is the first year we have achieved this and we want this to continue. In developing the budget proposals, he feels that the Manor will support us moving forwards. The proposals recognise the disproportionate costs in the early stages and, where necessary, efficiencies will be found. As regards the challenge of incremental drift, the Manor will help mitigate this through the top slice model.</p> <p>The LA have looked at it and believe that the financial model is viable – although there is still work to be done on some of the details.</p> <p>Jack confirmed that the Local Authority have agreed the principles, recognising that the core staffing structure and premises related costs will not be aligned with pupil numbers and will be disproportionately high in the early stages. Also, the nature of the building brings challenges and costs being mostly Grade 2 listed and some Grade 1 listed areas (e.g. the Hall). These elements are on top of the normal top up rates according to the needs of the pupils and there is still work needed to finalise these costs.</p> <p>It was emphasised that the process to date has been undertaken in partnership – it has been a fully transparent and co-produced process using the worst case scenarios and staffing.</p> <p>The UTS funding stream is confirmed for the cohort from special schools and there is £33k exceptional funding to account for an additional leader at the Manor that would otherwise not be justified with just 25 pupils.</p> <p>The principle is not to leave the school high and dry in the first two years with the break-even point in Year 3. The shortfall in funding is met by the £75k dis-economies of scale funding which is the maximum allowable.</p>	

Item	Action
<p><i>Governors asked if this were agreed in principle?</i></p> <p>Jack confirmed that the budget is still being refined. Once the school is at full capacity there should be a surplus under the arrangements proposed. There is a balance between funding the school appropriately whilst ensuring that the mechanism is fair to all children across the Borough. The commitment made is to maintain the rates as the provision grows leaving the school with some surplus as it grows. This will be in the final commissioning agreement.</p> <p>The school will be moderated every three years to look at the top-up funding and this will act as a safety net if the assumptions agreed are wrong. In summary there will be the “Manor” funding rate and the three pathways on the other sites. There is also the potential for exceptional funding as the LA do not want the school to not meet the needs of the children because of money.</p> <p>It has been agreed to take out the central service costs in Years 1 and 2. The model used is that staffing forms 85% of the funding on each site and the remaining costs will be met by a 15% levy to cover all other costs – around £250k.</p> <p>Whilst staffing has been based on the assumption that all staff will be recruited on M6, in reality this will not be that case and the funding is therefore expected to be sufficient.</p> <p>Not all the assumptions have been agreed yet but it is believed that prudence is built in and the school will be in surplus by Year 2. A “reasonable” level of disproportionate funding will be agreed. The TUS additional £5k funding is yet to be agreed.</p> <p><i>Governors asked about the underlying assumptions. For instance, has it been assumed that all staff will progress by one grade?</i></p> <p>The Head replied no – but that was why all staff were put at the top of the grade initially.</p> <p>Jack noted that the utility costs are not known and the impact of different heating across the building is not clear. 15% feels like a reasonable assumption for the levy but the situation is quite unique and, within reason the LA will insure these costs.</p> <p><i>Governors asked what reasonable might be?</i></p> <p>Jack stated that 15% seems reasonable; 25 – 30% would not be reasonable 18% would be considered OK as the whole building has to be heated. The LA will commit to covering reasonable costs. The LA have committed to reviewing the funding six months after opening. Financial oversight has never been more stringent and any costs accumulating that have not been factored in will be picked up at an early point and not allowed to continue.</p> <p><i>Governors asked if the costs had been benchmarked against the school already in the building?</i></p> <p>Jack confirmed that information has been requested from the previous tenants but the pack has not yet been received back.</p> <p>The Head confirmed that it will also be informed by the schools current costs noting that the cohort will be different.</p> <p><i>Governors asked if the costing includes grounds costs?</i></p> <p>The Head confirmed that it does include 1.5 premises assistants for the Manor – well above what might normally be expected for 25 children. The disproportionate costs include the costs of the new Head of School, Assistant Head and admin staff. That said, there are some economies of scale e.g. the Manor will be covered by the existing contract with Action HR – at least initially.</p> <p><i>Governors asked about the capacity of the support team to manage and report on finances in a timely manner.</i></p> <p>The Head acknowledged the problems encountered with reporting over the past two years. This is largely explained through the capacity problems in the school business team. A new team is now in place and, with the feedback from the recent audit, the situation should now improve. Assurances were given by RD to this effect.</p>	

Item	Action
<p><u>Staffing, Curriculum and Risk</u></p> <p><i>Governors asked about staffing?</i></p> <p>The Head noted that there had been a recruitment freeze to allow RD to understand the situation. There had been a lack of HR support to push this forwards but there is now an HR Manager in post.</p> <p>Some long term sickness and maternity has been allowed for and there are some vacancies in the current schools. Recruitment is in hand with interviews being held next week.</p> <p>The school has very robust relationships with the key agencies. With this year being the first one not in deficit, the school are naturally being cautious in their recruitment.</p> <p><i>Governors asked if there will be any sharing of staff across the three campus?</i></p> <p>The school are not planning for this – it does not generally happen at the moment. That said, it may change with time. Moving to another campus can be good for staff development and help to retain and grow existing staff.</p> <p>AR noted that the applications for the Head of School and Assistant Head roles had brought some applicants who may not normally have applied. Overall she feels that there is a higher quality of staff applying. It was also noted that some of our best staff have come through agency roles initially.</p> <p>The Head noted that the senior leadership model at the Manor is currently top heavy and they are looking at how to make it more affordable. That said they are learning from the experience of setting up that Hill and it is important to recognise that this will adjust over time as the student numbers grow and it is important to set it up from the start so that it is sustainable in the medium to long term.</p> <p>It had already been noted that the leadership is stretched on the current two campus and there is a desire to build in more capacity – and the Manor will help in that regard. Getting the leadership right will make the whole school more viable.</p> <p>The 15% levy feels right but, in the short term, the LA have agrees additional admin support to cover the set-up phase. It was noted that some maternity cover will be needed next year and it is right that governors question the capacity. The past few years have been really tough and the Head noted that he would not suggest taking on the Manor if he did not feel that it was viable and would help.</p> <p>Jack noted that it is currently not possible to open a new maintained school; almost all new schools have been Free Schools / Academies. With SPS being so fabulous, this is the best way to grow the provision – the needs have to be met somehow.</p> <p>The Head noted that this is a safe improvement model and that the school’s roll is growing, noting that other maintained schools are reducing their roll. As such this is a unique opportunity at a serendipitous time.</p> <p><i>Governors asked if the school could grow even further?</i></p> <p>AR said yes – there are so many children looking to be placed through to Post-16 and there had been capacity issues at the Hill – this gives more options.</p> <p>Jack confirmed that there will be a commissioning need moving forwards.</p> <p>It was further noted that Ofsted had highlighted the need to develop a more formal curriculum and that the school has already been working towards this. This cohort is just an extension of the work we have been doing. The increased capacity at leadership level will allow them to drive the curriculum development. This will be helpful for all our pupils.</p> <p>AR noted that some children had had to move provision as they were too developed for that offered by the school – so this is helpful. A couple of the existing may move to the Manor to meet their changing needs and it allows more fluidity around the existing bottle neck at Year 7.</p> <p>The Head noted that, when the Hill opened it was lifechanging for the pupils and their families and this will be likewise.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>AR stated that the key focus of curriculum will be on science, maths and humanities.  <i>Governors asked, if we take on another site, will Ofsted come back quicker?</i>  The Head said no, not for an expanding provision. If the school federates then each school will have its own separate inspection.</p> <p>AR asked that the Governors approve the intention to change the name of the school to the Sherwood Foundation School – to alleviate the confusion around the Park Campus and avoid the current perception that the Park Campus is treated differently; to create the equity in both perception and reality.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> The Governors approved the new name for the School to be The Sherwood Foundation School and to follow the legal procedures through to facilitate this.</p> <p><i>Governors asked about the comment from the school as to how the cohort now being proposed is different from the original proposals?</i></p> <p>The school explained how that had developed after meeting with the proposed cohort. As matters have evolved and some changes have been made the school are now confident that they can meet the needs of the children on the Manor campus.</p> <p>The proposal regarding pathways within the funding model addresses the needs.  <i>Governors thanked the school and the Local Authority noting that it is remarkable that so much work has been done within the time available.</i></p> <p>Jack noted the difficult position created by the Government’s position leading to the need for more state funded provision. Jack thanked colleagues for their help.</p> <p><u>Premises and Risk</u></p> <p><i>Governors asked about the changes needed at the Manor site?</i>  It was explained that changes are required and some areas have been identified as needing upgrade before September. Some areas will be closed and not accessible on a daily basis as they will not be needed immediately on opening.</p> <p>The LA are project managing this (Darren) and the plans for the work have been drawn up and will start when Carew finally vacate the premises.</p> <p>Jack noted that substantial refurbishment is required to bring the rooms to be used to a higher standard. If pupil numbers grow into the building other rooms will be refurbished. That said the rooms have been used recently and are not in a terrible state but it is important to ensure that they have the most appropriate environment to learn in. It is a unique opportunity; it is an exciting building with great outdoor facilities and the potential for forest school provision that can be shared with other schools.</p> <p>The plan of the buildings was shared and it was noted that there are some Grade 1 listed buildings but most of it is Grade 2 listed.</p> <p>The challenges around the number and location of toilets was discussed but governors were given assurances that the proposals would be acceptable in practice.</p> <p><i>Governors asked about security?</i>  AR noted that the buildings open into a courtyard. The transport gates will be closed providing a secure loading and unloading area.</p> <p>The front of the school is not enclosed and this cannot be changed due to the listed nature of the building. However, the school have considered the risks and the external doors will be fobbed where possible / necessary and the front does open onto a minor road in the park and not onto a main road.</p> <p><i>Governors asked when the work will start and whether it can be completed in time?</i>  It was explained that contractors are lined up and works will start as soon as Carew are out of the building; the works will be completed for the site to be open to pupils by the end of September. The first week will be INSET then there will be a transition period where pupils will be in part time giving an opportunity for the staff to meet the children.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>It was noted that Tam, the Premises Manager been fully involved in the modelling. The work will be paid for through capital bids and the school are experienced in that. Jack noted that there is a contingency of £80k in one pot and more in another pot to be called upon if needed. The LA have no intention to commit that funding.</p> <p>Jack explained the prioritisation criteria for capital funding. SEND provision takes priority; it is possible to use other grants on specialist provision.</p> <p>Jack confirmed that this capital has already been approved and anything else would also be prioritised.</p> <p>It was also noted that Carew had to leave the building in a certain position and works are already being done to return it to an acceptable level; they have already replaced the boilers. £millions have already been spent and Jack is confident that the building work can be done supported by the substantial capital investment.</p> <p><i>Governors asked who owns the property and who will maintain the grounds?</i></p> <p>Jack stated that the Local authority will own it and the school will maintain the grounds. Costs have been built in recognition that they are higher than might normally be expected because of the disproportionate size of the grounds when compared to the number of children in the early cohorts.</p> <p><u>Support required from the Local Authority relating to the adoption of the Carew Manor Site</u></p> <p>The following statements were made in the presentation:</p> <p><i>The LA would not expect the Sherwood GB to sign off on a budget they do not feel is financially viable, and is continuing to work with Sherwood SLT to agree an appropriate level of diseconomy of scale and exceptional funding, to support a sustainable financial position whilst the school is growing.</i></p> <p><i>The GB should take reassurance that in year 2, the school reached a financially viable position (which when you add in additional grants such as PPG, TPECG etc, become more than sustainable and enters a surplus position). The LA is therefore confident that the model proposed by the school presents a viable one; the question is around appropriate diseconomy of scale and 'exceptional funding' across the first two years of opening, to ensure the school as a whole can remain financially sustainable whilst the Manor campus grows in capacity.</i></p> <p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <p><i>Governors asked what would happen if this proposal was not approved?</i></p> <p>Jack noted that it would be very difficult to meet the needs of this cohort in Sutton. It is likely that they would be placed out of Borough, a long way from home at great expense. It would not be good news for those children and their families.</p> <p>The families have already had a lot of uncertainty and a long wait for a decision.</p> <p>The families will be relieved that they have a school; the parents know that there is a lack of places nationally. The school has had nearly 200 consultations and have had to turn down from Sutton and other Boroughs. There is significant stress for families when the educational provision is not right for the child.</p> <p>Governors thanked the Local Authority for this assessment noting the extra costs from out of Borough placements and the value the school thus provides; it is important that this is taken into account when balanced against our costs.</p> <p>The Head said that the school always look to provide a service proportionate to what we can offer – he is not comfortable over stretching staff and other resources. This honesty and transparency has led to the development of a truly collaborative relationship with trust being developed between the school and the Local Authority, totally in line with the Nolan Principles.</p>	

	Item	Action												
	<p><u>Summary:</u></p> <p>The school stated that, schools that are currently doing well are those that are adjusting to changing circumstances – they are opening hubs, federating etc.</p> <p>Because we will be bigger we will be better able to participate more widely across the Borough and nationally. This is inline with our Breaking the Mould ethos – allowing us to help others.</p> <p>We can do it educationally; we have thought it through.</p> <p>There are risks – financial risks – but, working collaboratively with the Local Authority we believe that we can make it happen as explained in this meeting to meet the needs of local SEND children.</p> <p>The discussion was closed and Governors given the opportunity to vote through an online link.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> Governors voted to adopt the proposal to open a third campus at Carew Manor.</p> <p><i>Governors thanked the school and the Local Authority for their time and efforts in making this proposal possible.</i></p>													
10.	<p><b>Correspondence to the Chair / Chair's Actions</b></p> <p>To note Chair's Actions and correspondence with the Chair</p> <p>There were no Chair's actions to report.</p>													
11.	<p><b>Confidential items</b></p> <p>To agree whether any items should be recorded in Part B Minutes as confidential.</p> <p>There were no confidential items.</p>													
12.	<p><b>Any other business / dates of future meetings / close</b></p> <p><u>Related Party Transactions</u></p> <p>The nature and importance of recording related party transactions was discussed and clarified.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> RD to identify the related party transactions for 2024/25 for approval by the Board at the Strategy Day on 20<sup>th</sup> May and establish procedures for identifying, managing and approving related party transactions moving forwards.</p> <p><u>Forthcoming Meetings:</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Finance, Audit &amp; Risk:</td> <td>29<sup>th</sup> April; 24<sup>th</sup> June 2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FGB</td> <td>20<sup>th</sup> May (Strategy Day); 8<sup>th</sup> July 2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strategy Day</td> <td>20<sup>th</sup> May 2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Premises Health &amp; Safety</td> <td>15<sup>th</sup> May 2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing &amp; Curriculum</td> <td>10<sup>th</sup> June 2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pay Committee</td> <td>17<sup>th</sup> June 2025</td> </tr> </table> <p>The meeting closed at 9:30pm</p>	Finance, Audit & Risk:	29 <sup>th</sup> April; 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2025	FGB	20 <sup>th</sup> May (Strategy Day); 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2025	Strategy Day	20 <sup>th</sup> May 2025	Premises Health & Safety	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2025	Staffing & Curriculum	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2025	Pay Committee	17 <sup>th</sup> June 2025	40
Finance, Audit & Risk:	29 <sup>th</sup> April; 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2025													
FGB	20 <sup>th</sup> May (Strategy Day); 8 <sup>th</sup> July 2025													
Strategy Day	20 <sup>th</sup> May 2025													
Premises Health & Safety	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2025													
Staffing & Curriculum	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2025													
Pay Committee	17 <sup>th</sup> June 2025													

Signed: <u></u>	Print Name: <u>GEMMA DAVIEL</u>
Chair	Date: <u>07.10.25</u>

## Questions re the Carew Proposal for FGB: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2025

(Responses are taken directly from the slides used in the meeting – additional comments are captured in the main meeting minutes above)

#	Governors' questions raised in advance of the meeting	Response from the school
1	<p>Can you please provide more details on the background of this proposal.</p> <p>Why now? Why are we working on such a short time frame for a Sept 2025 start?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local Authority agreement with the Department for Education for the opening of a new Special Free School within Sutton (Angel Hill Free School) due to open in September 2025;</li> <li>- The DfE has put a hold on the Free School Program and has not yet confirmed whether the Angel Hill Free School will now go ahead and, if so, when;</li> <li>- Resulting in a significant shortfall for special school spaces for children with SEND (particularly those with Autism) requiring Secondary School places starting in September 2025;</li> <li>- Proposal for Sherwood Park School to open a satellite site for 24 pupils to alleviate the pressure on pupil places</li> </ul>
<b>Business Case</b>		
2	<p><i>If it is not working, we as a partnership will adopt and shift to make it work... It is a joint venture.</i> - what specific reassurances from the LA do we have around this?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We have worked in coproduction and with transparency with the LA throughout this process;</li> <li>- See new modelling and discussion.</li> </ul>
3	<p><i>'There will be more detail once we have the full SLA pack from Carew'</i> - when is this coming and what detail do we expect to see? It is difficult to approve such a big project without a full SLA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is not ideal however we have built in a significant increase in prudence using what we do know from Carew and our own budget - this will be reviewed in more detail when we receive the SLA pack from Carew</li> <li>- See new modelling</li> <li>- See RD's list of areas for consideration</li> </ul>
<b>Manor Draft Budget</b>		
4	<p>What is the funding model for new students? Is it based on current funding model for Hill/Park U/T/S, if not why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pupils from the Bases will receive a 'Manor' funding stream &amp; the existing Hill UTS funding stream is confirmed for the cohort from special schools.</li> </ul>
5	<p>What is 'top up', 'exceptional' and 'disproportionate funding'? Is there any exceptional/disproportionate funding available for year 2/3 if needed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exceptional funding is to allow for additional funding directly for additional staffing for pupils we think may need it. If they don't need it we will drop the agency TA - cost neutral.</li> <li>- Disproportionate funding is what the LA can give schools when setting up to support with small pupil numbers and large schools to run. LA have given us 75k - this is the maximum they are allowed to provide.</li> <li>- Each pupil has a 5k additional aspect to their funding also.</li> </ul>

#	Governors' questions raised in advance of the meeting	Response from the school
6	How confident are you that we are not underestimating central service costs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have drawn out the non-staff costs of the central services.</li> <li>With extra prudence as suggested by RD and governors, the contributions to the staff listed in version 1 cannot be covered.</li> <li>National benchmarking shows that MATs take 5-15% of the school's income each year as a top slice.</li> <li>The aim was to demonstrate it would benefit the whole school budget immediately, but with additional prudence in yr 1 now showing, this will not be the case. It won't negatively impact it but the positive impact comes later. We are not a MAT &amp; we have not got deep reserves, but if we are going to become stronger financially, we will need to make this compromise at the start.</li> <li>The business model works financially for the school over three years – LA agrees with this.</li> </ul>
7	Executive leadership 30% reducing over time to 20% has not been modelled into the spreadsheet?	
8	What are the Assumptions behind calculation D27 (v1)	
9	Is it reasonable to assume the central service costs c. 10-15% for SLT (ex head teacher)?	
10	At more conservative assumptions this central service cost is much higher and leads to a deficit. What conservatism has been modelled into the budget?	
11	Non-staff costs are lacking in some detail versus full school budget. What are we budgeting for: Training and development? Building & grounds maintenance? Cleaning /caretaking? Catering?	See RD's long list
<b>Staffing &amp; Curriculum</b>		
12	Considering we already have staffing issues in all areas at the current two sites we hold, with agency staff being deployed in key teaching areas and other posts, how likely is it that recruitment for all the posts needed at the Manor will be wholly successful. We already have many gaps where we can't recruit to existing roles and a lack of teachers is a national problem, let alone those with SEN experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing gaps in both campuses are recently due to a recruitment freeze, lack of HR support &amp; staff long term sickness</li> <li>Vacancies primarily in TA &amp; LSA roles, supported by robust relationships with key agencies</li> <li>Manor Campus will primarily attract professionals with different expertise &amp; experience</li> <li>Provide opportunities to retain and grow existing staff</li> <li>High quality applicants being shortlisted for existing vacancies</li> <li>We have always been a growing school due to our reputation and expertise, this will be an issue as long as we continue to grow - that is why we have expanded our HR team and Business Support team.</li> <li>Alongside the additional capacity in the Business team we are looking to grow capacity in our SLT in the Hill and Park - we have currently modelled for a SLT heavy model at the Manor.</li> <li>We have a very good track record of working with excellent agency staff and then onboarding - it is a good strategy.</li> <li>We have had a very good response so far in the recruitment for the Manor.</li> </ul>



#	Governors' questions raised in advance of the meeting	Response from the school
13	Capacity issues have been raised on numerous occasions around our existing staff and more so now with the audit raising areas of concern. With an already stretched workforce, especially in the support/business roles at the school, what further impact will a new site bring and what contingency is in place to not overstretch further the staff we currently have?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We are 1 term in to having a full business support team.</li> <li>- This support team is essential but are expensive and the Manor will dilute this expense over time.</li> <li>- Additional administration support has been modelled in the Manor</li> <li>- Performance Reviews and JD's will be reviewed each year to ensure colleagues who have expanding teams will be compensated.</li> <li>- For leadership roles (like EHT / HS&amp;S) - we have modelled for a Head of School and an AHT with just four classes / 25 pupils to enable them to fully develop the school offer once the school is open.</li> </ul>
14	How will those staff that work across all three sites efficiently split their time? It has already been raised that the senior team are stretched and if one person is off this has significant impact on all areas. The proposal was to increase senior staffing on the two existing sites, but I can see no additional capacity for this at the proposed Manor site in terms of the budget.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For business support this will be covered as per Q14 above;</li> <li>- The whole school budget shows a significant cumulative surplus (NB but only small in year for this year);</li> <li>- Additional capacity is required within our current campuses which needs to be found from within our whole school budget - This impacts EHT and HoSP;</li> <li>- This is not a new problem but the money for this capacity needs to be found within our current two sites / whole school budget. This will be shown in our three year budget before the final submission date. (This is where we are with our current draft 3 yr - it is much more detail driven than previous budgets so we are now in a position for EHT to scrutinise for savings / changes);</li> <li>- The capacity may be found through different types of roles relevant to each campus and head's may need different things;</li> <li>- HoSP post change / not change to be decided;</li> <li>- We have strong staff who are ready to step up;</li> <li>- The 'top slice' from the Manor will support this moving forward.</li> </ul>
15	A national curriculum will be needed for the proposed pupils (from memory) which would require a completely different approach/lesson plans/assessment etc with a brand new workforce. How is this achievable by September?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not all of the curriculum needs to be ready for September;</li> <li>- As a whole school we are currently working on one Sherwood Curriculum that moves seamlessly from our lowest level to our highest level ability;</li> <li>- This cohort will be using some of the existing curriculum and a level above;</li> <li>- Additional AAT capacity in the coming term will support the development of the curriculum which will then be picked up by the new Manor leadership &amp; developed over time.</li> </ul>

#	Governors' questions raised in advance of the meeting	Response from the school
16	<i>'The assessment of the children for the Manor flagging up different (but still very much in our wheelhouse) pupils than initially communicate'</i> - can you please provide more details about this? How will we provide for these differences? What does this mean practically speaking?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 of the pupils come from specialist schools, not bases with a higher level of need, requiring more support</li> <li>- We have agreed UTS model for the Hill type pupils</li> <li>- The differences do not make it inappropriate for them to use the Manor</li> <li>- We are confident we can meet all the needs of all the pupils.</li> </ul>
17	<i>'Diversifying our curriculum offer to a more formal cohort supports us to develop our expertise in a key area that Ofsted have suggested and is already underway'</i> - can you provide more details?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Our only area for development from Ofsted was to further develop our formal curriculum, this is already underway using the existing subject specific teaching teams (currently the focus is on key areas such as Maths, Science &amp; Humanities)</li> <li>- The curriculum for the Manor Campus is an extension in the top end of these curriculum areas</li> </ul>
18	What capacity does the SLT have to take on this project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- £50k given towards this by LA;</li> <li>- This project will ultimately allow for more capacity and strength - it is the answer not the problem. See earlier responses;</li> <li>- Right thing for our school and community;</li> <li>- Increasing overtime and better than it has been for many years re Business support;</li> <li>- We do need additional capacity within our current 2 schools - this is a focus for the 3 yr budget moving forward and discussions re structure, surplus, shape and provision.</li> </ul>
<b>Premises, Health &amp; Safety</b>		
19	Is there any plan for what work will be needed at the Manor to make the site workable for the number and type of cohort being suggested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes - building works will happen in phases: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stage 1 - Required building work for the first year opening</li> <li>- Stage 2 - additional work to develop other areas as needed when required</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Please see the separate plans as provided</li> </ul>
20	What facilities exist now? What changes to facilities would need to happen between now and September to facilitate the students & staff?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Manor has been a special school for a number of years but not for our cohort</li> <li>- We have identified areas of the school for an upgrade between now and September. This includes the front of school, key office areas, classrooms, areas for specialist rooms, toilets &amp; changing facilities</li> <li>- We have been working closely with the LA, the designated project lead &amp; plans for this work have been drawn up &amp; due to begin as soon as Carew have handed back the building</li> </ul>

#	Governors' questions raised in advance of the meeting	Response from the school
21	Has a risk assessment of the site been done and areas identified that may not be fit for purpose or could cause harm?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes - This was completed in the Autumn term with the LA, EHT, HoSP &amp; Premises manager.</li> <li>- Any identified risks have been identified and are part of the refurbishment plan</li> <li>- Two pupils were turned down for the Manor as it was felt the risk in supporting them was too high given the building &amp; facilities</li> </ul>
22	Are there already contractors lined up to undertake all the work and assurances in place that everything will be finished by the September start?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project manager is in place &amp; currently tendering the work</li> <li>- Whilst there are tight timeframes, phase 1 of the work is anticipated to be completed by September</li> <li>- The school will open to pupils at the end of September so there is some extension time for minor completion of works if required</li> </ul>
23	Only a small part of the site is going to be utilised initially, but the whole site will come under our remit to maintain. This site is very large, with many buildings/grounds etc. Has the cost of upkeep for all of this been factored in effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Premises manager has been fully involved in the project and has advised on the needs from his team</li> <li>- This will be factored into the modelling once the full pack has been received from Carew</li> </ul>
<b>Finance, Audit &amp; Risk</b>		
24	We have had issues with receiving accurate and punctual financial data for the current 2 sites of the school, and staff have been overstretched trying to produce this data for the governors as well as using an external advisor to aid with this. Adding another site is only going to make this more complex and add to the load. What mitigation will be put in to ensure timely and accurate data without causing a hike in workload.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Our new business team is 1 term old.</li> <li>- We haven't had this before.</li> <li>- We now have a much more detailed budget to view.</li> <li>- The overstretching is about the bottleneck from historical issues not business capacity moving forward.</li> <li>- The structure of our budget needed to change to a two site model already.</li> <li>- It would be great to do this in two years time but the opportunity is now &amp; won't come again</li> </ul>
25	What are the risks to the school if we go ahead?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financials risks unseen – mitigated and measured</li> <li>- Capacity – SLT / Business</li> </ul>

#	Governors' questions raised in advance of the meeting	Response from the school
26	What are the risks to the school if we do not go ahead?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial risk of standing still means we will never properly manage the incremental drift, it will have to be done through staffing reduction, which in turn means less complex pupils. (Expansion will dilute central and executive costs over time).</li> <li>- Risk of academies taking this opportunity and then taking over our school - we have something unique and our community deserves this school and its values.</li> <li>- We run an expensive model through necessity as two campuses - EHT, Business team etc. Restructure may be necessary moving forward to ensure the incremental drift is managed effectively and support leadership capacity.</li> <li>- Good staff will leave if we do not provide opportunities for growth and development and new ventures to be excited about.</li> <li>- Children this year and increasingly so in years moving forward, will not have a local school like ours as we are completely full - opportunity to reduce capacity at the Hill / Park Campus - moving pupils to the Manor as and if appropriate.</li> <li>- Standing still in education is a risk - look at primary schools.</li> <li>- This is a once in a lifetime opportunity for the school.</li> <li>- Reputational damage.</li> <li>- Opportunity to influence others with our strategies and way of supporting children will be diminished.</li> </ul>

## Action list

Item	Action point	Who	By when	Update
Actions arising from the meeting of the 5 <sup>th</sup> October 2022				
62	BB to explore how the monies can be transferred from the School Fund account to the main school account.	DM	Aut 24	This is in hand with the aim of completing it shortly after Easter; action remains open.
Actions arising from the meeting of the 26 <sup>th</sup> March 2024				
09	RV to arrange training for new Governors including a tour of the school arranged through DM / Rachael.	RV	April 24	FT would welcome a tour of the school; action remains open.
Actions arising from the meeting of the 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2024				
20	Governors to review the parent survey before it goes out in the Summer Term.	GD / AR	Mar 25	The FGB felt that this is still required for the strategy day; action remains open.
24	All governors to do Safeguarding training on Learning Link and the Home Office Prevent Training and to record this on Governor Hub, uploading the relevant certificates of completion.	All	Nov 24	Governors' training has been audited and governors encouraged to undertake training according to their roles. All should do Safeguarding and Prevent training; action remains open
Actions arising from the meeting of the 16 <sup>th</sup> December 2024				
29	All Governors to fill in the ethnicity and diversity data on Governor Hub.	All	Jan 25	Six governors have responded; report produced; all still encouraged to respond; action remains open
30	The Risk Register should note the risks around the delays in the review of some key school policies.	RD	Jan 25	Risk Register in the process of being re-shaped; work in progress. Action remains open.
Actions arising from the meeting of the 26 <sup>th</sup> March 2025				
33	Risks relating to the unfenced cottages at Carew to be assessed in relation to the potential opening of a new site.	DM / RD	April 25	
34	VH, PF, RD and DH to meet to consider potential funding bids for new mini-buses.	VH, PF, DM, RD	Sept 25	
35	RD to liaise with SC to confirm the on-costs on the VOIP contract.	RD	April 25	

Item	Action point	Who	By when	Update
36	RD and DM to ensure that the procurement and signature of all contracts that require the Head's approval follow the requirements as set out in the scheme of delegation; that they are signed by the Head and not the Business Leader and all contracts over £10,000 are signed by both the Head and Chair. All contracts over £5,000 also have to be noted in the Full Board Minutes.	RD/DM	Ongoing	
37	Chair to clearly set out the expectations the Board has of the school with regards to preparation for meetings.	GD	April 25	
38	RD / DM to provide a business model for the Carew Campus to the next meeting.	RD/DM	April 25	
39	Carry approval of Term Dates for 2025-26 forward to the next FGB meeting.	DM	May 25	
Actions arising from the meeting of the 28 <sup>th</sup> April 2025 – Carew Manor extra-ordinary meeting				
40	RD to identify the related party transactions for 2024/25 for approval by the Board at the Strategy Day on 20 <sup>th</sup> May and establish procedures for identifying, managing and approving related party transactions moving forwards.	RD	May 20 <sup>th</sup> 2025	