**Cavendish Community Primary School**

**Resources Committee Meeting Minutes**

**School: Cavendish Community Primary School**

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

**Chair: Oliver Gibson**

**Clerk: Rob Merino**

**Date of meeting: 19 January 2022**

**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 |
| Helen Boanas | Parent | 22/01/22 | P |
| Oliver Gibson | Co-opted (Chair) | 01/07/23 | P |
|  |  |  |  |
| Vino Bromfield | Co-opted | 21/03/22 | Ap |
| Neil Todd | Co-opted | 22/11/22 | Ap |
| Suzannah Reeves | Co-opted | 01/07/23 | Ap |

**Others present**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
| Nicola Kennedy | School Business Manager (SBM) |
| Rob Merino | Clerk, One Education |

**Agenda Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Apologies and Welcome** |
| Apologies were received and accepted from Vino Bromfield, Neil Todd and Suzannah Reeves.  Oliver Gibson agreed to Chair this meeting. | |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising** | | |
| The governors approved the minutes of the meeting on 18th October 2021 as an accurate record of the meeting, subject to the following amendment:  Page 2, Item 5, Para 4: “before and after school activities” should be “before and after school tuition”.  A copy was signed for retention on file.  Matters Arising  Page 6 (Item 5) – The school will start to use the Department for Education (DfE) benchmarking website and data will be made available on the school’s website.  Page 7 (Item 6) – An update on the PE and Sports Grant with objectives for the use of the grant was presented and approved at the Curriculum committee.  Page 7 (Item 7) – A meeting has not taken place to complete the Schools Financial Value Statement (SFVS).  Page 8 (Item 9) – Staff training on General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) will take place this term.  *Q. Will the training be for all staff?*  Yes and it will be cascaded to the Lunch Time Organisers.  The School Business Manager (SBM) has recently completed GDPR training.  Page 9 (Item 12) – Capital projects – The office refurbishment is on hold, but the other capital works have been completed. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Previous minutes (18.10.21) approved | Res Cttee. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **Finance Report** | | |
| The School Business Manager (SBM) presented her report and supporting papers, which were circulated in advance of the meeting for review. The papers included:   1. Period 6 budget monitoring report 2. Period 9 budget monitoring report 3. Cost centre summary 4. Budget changes report 5. Cashflow report   2021-22 Period 9 Budget Monitoring  There have been some changes to the revenue budget to that reported and approved within the Period 6 monitoring report. The budget closedown from 2020/21 was higher than expected and the school has received more income than that originally budgeted. This has reduced the projected in year deficit and increased the projected surplus carry forward.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Income | £ 4,093,795 |  | | Expenditure | £ 4,242,801 |  | | In year surplus / deficit | £ 149,006 | Deficit | | B/F 2020/21 | £ 355,090 | Surplus | | C/F 2021/22 | £ 206,084 | Surplus |   *Q. Is there further clarity on the wage increase for support staff?*  No, the school budget still reflects a 1.75% increase, however this pay offer has been rejected by unions nationally and union members are being balloted for industrial action.  *Q. What is the impact for the expenditure if it is backdated?*  This is already included within the budget.  The change in the financial position was due to the following increased income:  The 2% pay increase for teachers has been removed.  There has been an increase in Nursery numbers with 12 new starters since September, of which 10 have Nursery codes which provides additional funding for working parents. There have been more Nursery top-ups.  New Educational Health Care Plans (EHCP’s).  An increase in lettings including for yoga and pilates classes.  An increase in after school activity clubs.  Actual government grants have now been received rather than the school using estimates.  Government grants, (Covid catch up, Recovery funding & School led tutoring) will be used to cover staffing and supply costs for the interventions taking place across the school to help children catch up.  *Q. How many children are now in nursery?*  There are 88 children. There are currently 2 spaces which are being accessed by Reception children.  The SBM advised that income and expenditure is being closely monitored to ensure that the school does not have to pay a claw back to the local authority (LA). Some building work will be able to take place with part of this funding.  *Q. What building work will take place?*  A library for Key Stage 1 (KS1) pupils.  A substantial amount has been spent on supply staff.  *Q. Does the monitoring cover costs to date?*  Yes it does and also a prediction of the spend until the end of the financial year.  *Q. Why has there been such an increase in supply costs?*  The increase is due to staff illness. Supply has been required to cover teaching assistant (TA) roles and this has not been needed in the past. The supply staff are from Trade Winds and are used for one to one support. Rather than offering contracts of employment at the school supply staff have been used as situations change within school and the regulations for pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) have changed and money needs to specifically used for a child.  The Headteacher (HT) informed governors that using supply TAs creates a rotation of TAs which reduces the consistency of support for pupils. Also, the school can spend time training a supply TA who then moves on. Therefore, quality can be inconsistent, however with supply staff it is easier to ensure that there is always cover. The option is slightly more expensive than the school employing the staff.  The SBM’s report provided detail of the spend on supply staff.  *Q. Is the £127k spent on 1-2-1 support all for pupils with education and health care plans (EHCPs)?*  Yes, there are 25 pupils with EHCPs for different needs and therefore with different levels of funding.  *Q. Does an EHCP mandate the number of hours support required by the pupil?*  It used to in the past, but no longer does.  *Q. Are TAs at the TA3 skill level required?*  The TAs used for 1 to 1 support are usually at TA2 level. TA3 staff can do this and also deliver more interventions as it is a more skilled role. The school does not employ many TA3 staff.  *Q. Are there any TA2s that might want to be TA3s?*  Yes probably. This depends on whether the school decides it wants to employ staff at this level.  The HT has discussed potential models with the new assistant headteachers (AHTs) who had different practices in their previous schools such as sharing TAs across phases and the use of TA3s, so the use of TA3s needs to be reviewed. The school has started to include TAs in staff training with the SEND Co-ordinator (SENDCo) to build staff expertise.  *Q. Who are the supply TAs?*  They are capable but not necessarily experienced. Some are considering becoming teachers and are using the role to gain experience whilst others do not want a full time job and the role provides them with flexibility. The issue for the school is ensuring consistency.  *Q. When will the school need to get a structure in place?*  By the end of the academic year.  *Q. Has there been discussion with other staff about the issue?*  This has been discussed with the SENDCo as the arrangements would be very different to those currently in place. There would be a different way of working, for example if a teacher was attending training, the TA would cover the class rather than using supply.  *Q. Would this be better for pupils?*  Yes it would be better for all pupils, and especially for children with EHCPs as they would know the TA well and the TA would be able to better support these pupils than a supply teacher.  The HT advised that teachers would like to have a TA in each class with the potential to provide support over the academic year. The only issue with this model is that supply would be needed if there was any long term sickness absence. In Reception there is a teacher and TA3, but currently the TA3s do not cover sickness. In nursery the TA3s provide cover.  *Q. Does the school have high sickness rates?*  They are quite high and not solely due to COVID-19, there are short and long term absences.  The Chair noted that staff absence is a cultural rather than just a financial issue. By taking on staff, the school is making an investment in them. The school is looking at the best way to spend funding on pupils, and staff who know the pupils support this idea. Benchmarking shows that the supply expenditure is greater than in other schools.  The HT advised that currently there is a shortage of TAs and schools are finding it difficult to recruit.  *Q. Will there be TAs in every class?*  That is the idea. Potentially the school would roll out this model incrementally year group by year group.  Governors agreed for the HT to further investigate options around the TAs.  The SBM advised that the school has been told by the LA Energy Management Unit that utility costs may increase by up to 300% next year.  *Q. Will there be support from central government if there are large price increases?*  This is not known currently.  *Q. Are there any choices about energy providers?*  No, the current advice is not to move to change provider due to the rates on offer.  The HT advised that the resultant financial settlement from the National Funding Formula (NFF) will probably be negative for Manchester schools.  *Q. Would academisation improve this financially?*  No, not in terms of NFF funding.  *Q. Is there an expectation that Pupil Premium funding will continue?*  Yes.  Governors approved the Period 9 budget monitoring report and Period 9 budget.  Premises  The SBM outlined the planned preventative maintenance undertaken during the autumn term. There has been some small remedial works carried out to the Cavendish building. There was a leak from the one of the flat roofs where the toilet blocks are and a few small issues with the boilers.  Devolved Capital funding (DCF) of £11,493 has been supported by £87,073.00 from revenue to resurface the playground and refurbish the hall floors. This work is now complete, leaving the balance at zero. The school will receive further funding next financial year.  School meals  The uptake of school meals has continued to increase and the school will start a retender process for a provider to be in place by September 2022.  Supplementary grant  The SBM advised that the school will receive a one off payment of between £3k to £3500 and an additional amount per pupil and per free school meals (FSM) pupil.  *Q. What is the grant to cover?*  It is for increases in National insurance (NI) linked to the health and social care levy. The increase is already reflected in the budget and has not been ringfenced.  *Q. Will this be for one year only?*  It will be administrated similarly to the teachers’ pension and pay grant. There will be a one off payment and then it will be built into the overall funding that schools receive in future years.  Cost centre summary  The cost centre summary had been provided to governors.  The SBM advised that the school stops spending at the 31 January to ensure that there is a proper budget closedown.  *Q. Has delivering teaching and resources online reduced costs, for example for printing?*  Yes printing costs have been cheaper and have also reduced following a retender. The school is now much more paperless, for example parents receive letters via email rather than paper copies.  There were no issues and governors noted its contents.  Budget changes  The SBM provided an overview of the budget changes:  There were the following changes to income:  I01 - LA Funds - funding increase in 30 hour codes (increases by 10) has increased income by £42,543.  I03 - SEN Funding – actual funding for 23 EHCP's has increased income by £31,585.  I08a - Income from Lettings – Actual income has increased by £6000.  I08b - Income Facilities & Services - Budget for reception fund, nursery fund, after school activity clubs and nursery top ups accurately reflected resulting in an increase of £26,638.  I09 - Income Catering - Actual meal uptake reflected in a reduction of £1615.  I12 - Educational Visits - Accurate reflection to date resulting in a decrease of £6000.  I18c - Other COVID-19 related grants – the actual Recovery and School Led Tutoring funding has increased by £1500  Expenditure has changed in a few areas.  E01 - Teaching Staff – the actual costs have reduced by £44,275.  E12 - Building Maintenance and Improvement - Virement of £10k to cover costs to Year End, additional budget included to reflect the spend on the new office has increased expenditure by £18,000.  E15 - Water & Sewerage – reduction of £4000 to reflect that the school is in credit with Waste Water.  E19 - Learning Resources (not ICT) – increased expenditure to meet requirements in subject areas of £11,424.  E25 - Catering Supplies - Actual meal costs reflected and the expenditure on vouchers for the school holidays have increase expenditure by £37,115.  E26 - Agency Supply Teaching Staff – has increase by £21,380 as a reflection of actual costs and projected spend.  E27 - Bought in Professional Services – has reduced by £47,104 as a reflection of actual SLA costs. Also the cost of the supply being covered by the Catch up and Recovery funding has been moved.  The net impact of these budget changes was an increase to the budget of £94,142.  Governors approved the budget changes.  Staff changes  The staff changes were:  1 TA has returned from maternity leave  1 Assistant Head has left  2 Assistant Heads have started  1 Part time Administration Officer has started  3 TAs were on long term absence  Governors noted the staff changes.  3 Year Budget forecast  The revised 3 year budget forecast was circulated prior to the meeting.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2021-22** |  | **2022-23** |  | **2023-24** |  | | Income | £4,093,795 |  | £3,997,497 |  | £3,985,636 |  | | Expenditure | £4,242,801 |  | £4,155,675 |  | £4,231,972 |  | | In year | £ 149,006 | Deficit | £ 158,178 | Deficit | £ 246,336 | Deficit | | B/F | £ 355,090 | Surplus | £ 206,084 | Surplus | £ 47,906 | Surplus | | Cumulative | £ 206,084 | Surplus | £ 47,906 | Surplus | £ 198,430 | Deficit |   There were no questions and governors noted the 3 year budget forecast.    Cash flow forecast  The cash flow is in credit up to the end of the financial year. The cash flow is healthy and there are no concerns.  Governors approved the cash flow forecast.  Spending over £2,000  The spend over £2,000 was circulated in advance of the meeting for information. This spending was for:  Free School Meals vouchers from Wonde, costing £7460. The vouchers are funded by the LA and payment has been received.  There were no further questions and the Chair thanked the SBM for her report. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Further investigation of TA model approved * Period 9 monitoring approved * Period 9 budget approved * Budget changes approved * Cash flow approved | Res. Cttee.  Res. Cttee.  Res. Cttee.  Res. Cttee.  Res. Cttee. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **Schools Financial Value Statement (SFVS)** | | |
| The SFVS had been completed and circulated to governors prior to the meeting. The SBM advised that there were some new questions and the documents have changed from previous years. Previously there had been a data sheet linked to data from consistent financial reporting.  The SFVS also has 4 new questions. Governors reviewed the answers, particularly those answered “no” or “in part”.  Question 17: Does the school benchmark the size of its senior leadership team annually against that of similar schools?  The school is going to do this as part of a cluster with other schools as part of the benchmarking being undertaken.  Question 19: Has the school leadership team considered the results of the self-assessment dashboard or other DfE benchmarking?  This has been discussed at the school’s senior leadership team (SLT) meeting and then at the Resources committee. This answer will be amended.  Question 23: Do you compare your non-staff expenditure against the DfE recommended national deals to ensure you are achieving best value?  The school does not use DfE benchmarking as it considers that other benchmarking is better. Local clusters and networks are used to ensure best value.  Question 26. Are there adequate arrangements in place to manage related party transactions and has a complete list of related party transactions been appended to the checklist document?  Although this was completed as “in part”, declaration of interest forms are completed and the school has not completed the form as it has not been necessary to date.  *Q. In question 8, what is the group call system?*  It is a communication system used to contact parents.  *Q. In question 15, what is the professional independent advice?*  This is advice from the HR provider, the LA and a School Improvement Adviser who undertakes the HT’s and school’s quality assurance.  There were no further questions and governors approved the contents of the SFVS, subject to the changes noted previously. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * SFVS content approved | Res. Cttee. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **Pupil Premium (PP) Strategy Statement** | | |
| The PP strategy statement had been circulated prior to the meeting.  The HT advised that the DfE has developed a new standardised template document for the Pupil Premium (PP) strategy statement. The new document has an increased requirement to provide a rationale for the actions being taken based on evidence based practice.  The HT advised that within all the evidence high quality teaching has the greatest impact on disadvantaged pupil outcomes. Therefore, a key focus at the school for the strategy and funding has been identified as monitoring, training and improving the quality of teaching.  The budget for the academic year is £135,915 covering targeted academic support and wider strategies. The school also provides funding to support the strategy from other budgets.  *Q. So this is supplemented by the school?*  Yes.  *Q. What is the total budgeted cost?*  The total cost is £271k.  *Q. The rationale seems strong, but can the grant be used for teacher training?*  Yes, there needs to be an impact and the quality of teaching can have this impact. Outstanding teachers have the greatest impact on disadvantaged pupils. Providing an array of many different interventions are not necessarily effective, the quality of teaching is more of an issue.  *Q. So the school is investing in teachers rather than initiatives?*  Yes.  The Chair agreed that reducing the number of different interventions and providing more of a focus seemed a good idea.  *Q. What is the evidence around the use of play therapy?*  There is no evidence of academic impact from the Education Endowment Fund (EEF), but the school is clear that the therapy can support the emotional needs of pupils which enables better learning.  Governors approved the Pupil Premium Strategy Statement. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Pupil Premium Strategy Statement approved | Res. Cttee. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) update** | | |
| The update was provided as part of matters arising during item 3. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **Staffing update** | | |
| The SBM provided a report on staff absence which was available due to the new system in use. The report also provided information on the costs of absences. There have been some glitches in the system, but they are being resolved. The provided data was for the last 9 months, but there was also comparative data in the system for previous years.  The absence days for the last 9 months were:  Teachers / leadership 188.5 days  Support staff 796 days  Administration / site staff 67 days  *Q. What benchmarking has been used to calculate average days per employee comparisons?*  The benchmarking is for education, particularly the schools that use the system.  *Q. Are staff aware that their absence is high in comparison to other schools?*  This has not been communicated to staff due to the individual circumstances of staff members. The school will look at how it will introduce the system to staff. Staff will see their own personal data.  The SBM noted that the school is preparing to do a trial and then phase in the use of the system in the summer term. The system can be used to hold a variety of HR data as well as staff being able to use it to make leave requests and to complete return to work forms.  Governors proposed that the system goes live for all staff from summer term and believed that it would be positive for staff to see their absence and the financial impact, as well as broader anonymised data for the school. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **Any Other Business** | | |
| Attendance policy  The HT presented the Attendance policy.  The return to work form has been updated to ensure that absences are reported correctly.  *Q. Who completes the form?*  The staff member who has been absent with their line manager.  *Q. What is an AMR?*  An attendance monitoring review meeting, which is more formal than a return to work meeting and the policy lists the triggers when this is needed in line with the policy in place provided by the school’s HR provider.  The only other change to the policy is the contact names. A reference to COVID-19 is included which indicates that staff need to follow the latest government guidelines.  *Q. Can it also have a link to the latest government guidance?*  Yes, the school will look into this.  The SBM indicated that there is currently an issue with self-certification of illness which has increased to up to 28 days, and staff do not need to provide a sick note after 5 days as happened previously. This has an impact for the school when organising statutory sick pay.  Governors approved the Attendance policy. | | | |
|  | **Actions or decisions** | **Owner** | **Timescale** |
|  | * Attendance policy approved | Res. Cttee. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of next meeting:** | **15th June 2022 @ 5.30pm** |