**Cavendish Community Primary School**

**Resources Committee Meeting Minutes**

**School: Cavendish Community Primary School**

**Quorum: 3 (met at this meeting)**

**Chair: Thomas Johnson**

**Clerk: Jan Haslam**

**Date of meeting: 18 January 2023**

**Venue: Cavendish Community Primary School**

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Governor type** | **‘End of Term of Office’ date** | **(P)resent /**  **(Ap)ologies /**  **(A)bsent** |
| Jo Taylor | Headteacher (HT) | N/A | P |
| Sami Khan | Parent | 09/12/25 | P |
| Neil Todd | Co-opted | 22/11/26 | P |
| Tim Whitworth | Co-opted | 09/12/25 | P |
| Oliver Gibson | Co-opted | 01/07/23 | P |
| Thomas Johnson | Co-opted | 25/01/26 | P |
| Nicola Kennedy | Associate | 20/09/26 | P |

**Others present**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
| Jan Haslam | Clerk, One Education |

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Apologies and Welcome** |
| The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. There were no apologies. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2** | **Declaration of interests** |
| No declarations of interest were received with regard to any items on the agenda. | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **Minutes of the last meeting (19.10.22) and matters arising** | | |
| The governors approved the minutes of the meeting on 19.10.22 as an accurate record of the meeting. A copy was signed for retention on file.  Matters arising  Page 3. Item 5 – The spending over £2,000 document was sent to the Resources Committee. See Item 4.6.  Page 3. Item 6 - The HT amended the error in the PE and Sports Premium document.  Page 3. Item 7 – The school meals provider, Aspens, has prepared a letter to go out to the parents once it has been finalised with the HT and SBM.  *Q: Was there negative feedback on the questionnaire sent by Aspens?*  There was a mixed response. However, the uptake of school meals has increased.  Page 4. Item 9 - GDPR training and Retention schedule have not yet been completed.  Page 5. Item 10 – The Pay Policy was approved at the FGB meeting on 11.1.23.  Page 6. Item 11 - Discuss SFVS with the Chair of the Resources Committee and bring to the next meeting for ratification. See Item 5. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
| D | * Previous minutes (19.10.22) approved | Res Cttee. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **Finance Report** | | |
| 4.1 School Business Manager report  The SBM presented her report, which was circulated in advance of the meeting for review.  It was noted that the financial position has changed since the report was circulated.  The SBM outlined the actions that took place to address the proposed Period 6 deficit balance. This resulted in the school moving from a deficit of £82,194 to a surplus of £40,218.  *Q: Have these measures had a negative impact on the children?*  They have had a mixed impact but some of the measures have been positive and have benefitted the school and the children. Some of the decisions were difficult and some of the staff found them difficult to understand.  4.2 Period 9 Budget Monitoring  The SBM presented the Period Budget Monitoring, which was circulated in advance of the meeting, for review.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Income | £ 4,198,759 |  | | Expenditure | £ 4,405,986 |  | | In year surplus / deficit | £ 35,774 | Deficit | | B/F 2021/22 | £ 247,455 | Surplus | | C/F 2022/23 | £ 40,218 | Surplus |   The SBM brought the governors’ attention to the footnote that was in the letter that the school received from Manchester City Council (MCC) regarding period 9 budget monitoring. This is as follows:  Please note governing bodies cannot plan for or authorise a cumulative deficit budget in year without first agreeing a ‘Licensed Deficit’ arrangement with the Authority.  Please refer to [Schools Financial Regulations (3.20)](https://www.manchester.gov.uk/schoolhub/info/65/finance/444/schools_financial_regulations_and_schemes_for_financing_schools)  If in 22/23 the school is projecting a low cumulative revenue balance, less than 25k, please can you also submit the following information:   * The latest school’s cash flow statement * Information explaining the school’s budget pressures and what measures/actions are planned for returning the school’s budget to a better financial position   *Q: Was the budget monitoring that the school received from the Local Authority (LA) useful?*  For Cavendish, it did not prove to be useful as the HT and SBM knew what actions to take that were right for the school.  The Governing Body approved the 9-month budget monitoring.  4.3 Budget Changes  These were presented on an itemised document including a commentary, sent to governors prior to the meeting.  The original budget was set from predicted figures that were advised by the LA. There is now greater accuracy as bills have been received.  Energy consumption has reduced. The budget planning for the upcoming year will be more accurate.  The budget changes were approved by the Resources Committee.  4.4 3-year budget  The 3-year budget shows that the school with end this year with a surplus of £40,218. The end of 2023-24 shows a surplus of £42,654 and the end of 2024-25 shows a small deficit of £13,529.  *Q: Have any senior members of staff indicated that they will be leaving the school?*  No.  There were no matters arising and the 3-year budget forecast was approved by the Resources Committee.  4.5 Cash flow forecast  The cash flow forecast to period ending January 2023 is in credit.  The cash flow forecast was approved by the Resources Committee.  4.6 Spending over £2,000  The spending over £2,000 for periods 6 and 9 were presented by the SBM.  It was noted that the purchase of the Scrubber Dryer, which is used to clean and dry the dining room floor has been a good investment.  4.7 Premises, Health and Safety Update  The SBM presented the update as part of her report.  The school’s initial Devolved Funding Capital (DFC) of £11,824.00 has been used to support the costs of the refurbishments in the Reception classrooms. The school have been given a further amount from the DFE of £23,950.00, to be spent on improvements to energy efficiency or other building improvements if no energy efficiency improvements are needed. A new boiler will be fitted and a divider in the Reception classrooms, which will keep the rooms warmer.  All Planned Preventative Maintenance (PPM) has taken place.  4.8 2023-24 Budget planning  The SBM informed the governors that, last week, the government allocated an additional £2 billion to address the cost issues in schools for this academic year.  Cavendish will receive £94,282 as a one-off grant for this year, which will be rolled over into the next financial year. This has been reflected in the budget planning for the next 2 years. It is called the Maintained Schools Additional Grant (MSAG). The amount the school will receive is based on pupil numbers.  The position of the budget is still unsure due to the unpredictable pay rises for teachers and support staff. If the percentage increases that are being asked for by the unions are accepted, the budget for future years would be deficit.  Some temporary contract staff will be able to stay at the school until the end of the summer term.  *Q: Do the SLT think that, because the school staff have had a shock in terms of the budget, it will have a knock-on effect for staff attendance?*  See Item 9, staffing update.  *Q: If the teachers received a pay rise of 7% and support staff received a pay rise of 14.1%, would the school employ more teachers rather than TAs?*  No, because the gap in pay will still be large.  Lunchtime Organisers (LTOs) are being paid at grade 1 and the lowest paid TAs at the school are being paid at grade 2. In April, grade 1 is being discontinued which will mean that LTOs and some TAs will be paid at the same grade, even though their work expectations are very different and not comparable. This will need further discussion. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
| D  D  D  D | * 9 month budget monitoring approved * Budget Changes approved * 3-year forecast approved * Cash flow forecast approved | Resources Committee  Resources Committee  Resources Committee  Resources Committee |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **Schools Financial Value Statement (SFVS)** | | |
| The SBM presented the SFVS.  There have been no changes since last year. Two actions from last year are not yet complete. They are:  Does the school benchmark the size of its senior leadership team annually against that of similar schools? And  Do you compare your non-staff expenditure against the DfE recommended national deals to ensure you are achieving best value? This action has been completed in part.  Training for one of these (?) will take place.  The SFVS was approved by the Resources Committee. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
| D | * SFVS approved | Resources Committee |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **Benchmarking** | | |
| The SBM presented the Benchmarking report.  The Benchmarking information is completed on the DfE website. The school has two reports; one, which compares the school to the local cluster schools, and one which compares certain criteria from schools in the North West. Only 9 schools can be selected for comparison in the latter report, and they are all three-form entry schools. The report is based on information from 2021-22.  The SBM provided a commentary on the results of these reports. The main points from the Benchmarking reports are as follows:  The school has the highest number of children with Education Health Care Plans (EHCPs).  From the first report, it can be seen that the school’s absolute total, per pupil and per teacher expenditure is high, with the total expenditure as a percentage of total income being the highest. Staff total expenditure is also the highest. The supply staff table demonstrates the excess amount the school spends on supply compared to other schools. Staff absence remains an ongoing issue for the school. Although it looks like the school are at the lower end of the spending on support staff, the figures do not include the cost of supply support staff as this cost is recorded in a different cost area.  From the second report, it can be seen that, E26, the use of supply for teachers, is very high compared to the cluster average but the school has started to address this.  *Q: Does the school have insurance for supply?*  No, because the premium quoted is based on the previous 3-year records and the schools record meant that the quote was between £40,000-£50,000 a year for teachers only, after 3 days absence. This premium is unaffordable. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **School Development Plan (SDP)** | | |
| The HT presented the SDP and the following points were raised in the discussion:  The attainment and progress targets for Reception are ambitious. The targets for Pupil Premium children are also ambitious.  In phonics, the school is confident that the phonics scheme is working and that the children are making good progress. The phonics interim assessment report will be discussed at the next FGB meeting.  The 2021-22 end of KS1 results were in-line with the national results. However, they were lower than the usual expectation so the targets are also ambitious.  The 2021-22 end of KS2 results were good but the targets have been set so that results are maintained and improved in places. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
| A | * Phonics interim assessment report on the agenda for the FGB meeting | Clerk | 29.3.23 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **General Data Protection Requirements (GDPR) update** | | |
| There have been no GDPR breaches. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
| A  A | * Complete GDPR training * Complete retention schedule | All staff  HT/SBM |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **Staffing update to include staff absence** | | | |
| The SBM presented the staffing update as part of her report. The SBM also presented an absence summary report and teacher and support staff absence costs.  There continues to be an issue with both long and short-term teacher absence. The SBM completes Attendance Management Reviews (AMRs) for absences. Currently, 16 members of staff have hit triggers. In Manchester schools, triggers are 3 absences (of a day or more) in a 3-month rolling period or an absence of 4 days or more. Academies can decide on their own staff attendance policy.  *Q: If the staff knew that that the staff absence was so high, would this affect their behaviour in terms of absence?*  The staff may perceive that they are being targeted if they have been ill. The school uses the systems available rigorously and has to be careful to remain within these systems.  *Q: Is there a demographic of teachers who have more absence?*  This is not known.  *Q: Can the governors offer any support to the school regarding this issue?*  The school are already using all systems and procedures available.  *Q: Do any other local schools have similar issues?*  This information is not shared between schools.  The school used to cover staff absence with supply but, due to restructuring, the school now uses TAs who are grade 3 or 4. This has had an impact on supply costs in one term. Hopefully, further impact will be noted in future finance reports.  *Q: Could the school seek external advice on this issue?*  The school could appoint One Education or another provider to talk to staff but now is not the right time.  The governors agreed that staff absence would be reviewed at the next Resources Committee meeting. | | | | |
|  | | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
| A | | * Staff absence to be an item on the next Resources Committee agenda | Clerk | 14.6.23 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **AOB** | | |
| The HT provided the governors with an update on the upcoming industrial action for teachers. One of the teaching unions has announced a number of dates for strike action, with the first one being on 1 February. The HT believes that most of the teachers at Cavendish will strike. It is unsustainable to open the school without asking TAs to cover classes and this may cause conflict. Therefore, the HT presented the governors with three options that she has considered.  The first option would be to open the school for just the two classes where the teachers are not striking. This approach was used last time and caused some difficulties between staff. It is also arbitrary for parents as it is a small group of children so they may have children in school and children not in school.  The second option would be to close the school completely.  The third option would be to open the school for children who are on free school meals (FSM), children with EHCPs and other children who the school deem to be vulnerable.  The HT supports the third option. This is a new consideration since the last teachers strike. The school feels that they have a responsibility to provide this group of children with a meal and a warm, safe environment. The school would not offer formal education on this day and the children would be supervised by all the TAs and the EHCP support staff.  *Q: Would the children of critical and key worker children be considered?*  This is very difficult to organise and, when this was put into place during Covid, the school has approximately 300 children in this group which would not be workable on this day.  A governor commented that the strike on 1 February would not be the last strike and asked what the school would for future strike action.  The HT said that some teachers had indicated that they would take part in the first strike but not subsequent ones. Each industrial action day would have be considered on a case-by-case basis.  A governor stated their support for the HTs decision, as they believe that the school is embedded in the community and it is compassionately and morally justified.  *Q: Would the provision for certain groups of children only, cause a rift between parents?*  The school would make it clear that it will not be a day of education but childcare.  *Q: How many children would be involved?*  The school has 25% of children on FSM so it is workable. In addition, it is likely that some children will not attend. The parents of the children with EHCPs will be approached separately.  *Q: Will some parents question the decision?*  Some parents may. A letter will go out to all parents and some vulnerable children will be approached separately.  *Q: Will there be enough statutory staff in on that day, for example, Designated Safeguarding Lead and First Aiders?*  Yes and the kitchen staff will also be in.  The governors agreed to support the HTs decision.  The HT invited the governors to the unveiling of the Margaret Ashton memorial. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
| D | * The governors support the decision of the HT for the organisation of the teachers’ industrial action day. | Resources Committee |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of next meeting:** | **Wednesday 14th June 2023 @ 5.00pm** |