

Finance & Audit Committee Meeting
Thursday 12 MARCH 2020 at 5.30 pm

Chair: Kevin WARD

MINUTES

Present:

Kevin Ward (*Chair*)
Stuart Weatherall
Steven Mackay (*Headteacher*)
Tahir Darr
Tom Davies

In attendance:

Ishbel Tovey
Jeremy Kaye (*Clerk*)

	Item
1.	Welcome and Introductions The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance. JK was introduced to those who had not met him
2.	Procedural items 2.1 Apologies An apology was recorded from Martin Crook 2.2 Confirmation of Quorum It was agreed that the meeting was quorate, that being three members (<i>2 non staff</i>) 2.3 Declarations of Interests None were notified 2.4 Notification of Any Other Urgent Business Coronavirus update was agreed as the only AOB item to be discussed in item 13
3.	The minutes of the last meeting on 23 January 2020 3.1 Minutes: The minutes were approved, duly signed and passed to SMK for upload to GH 3.2 Matters Arising from the last Committee meeting <p style="text-align: right;">6.3 – COMPLETED</p> <p style="text-align: right;">11.0 – COMPLETED</p> Q: SWe asked how we are doing with catering options. He was advised it is on tonight's agenda
4.	Income & Expenditure Report

SMK ran through in detail and update on the income & expenditure report. What had been predicted back in November had been very accurate now that the grant figures were in. The only outstanding issue was Pupil Premium which had not yet been advised. He showed the full three year figures which had been based on assumptions, set funding for 20/21 and what was known about PP were accurate.

SMK was thanked for his work and accurate predictions

The three year commitments were based on +5% uplift in year 1 and +6% in year two (on top of PP). It was stated that staffing figures included increases plus the additional Deputy Head as per the proposed re-structure of the SLT.

The forecasts and potential surplus for next year (20/21) were discussed.

KW explained the variance in forecast to budget and a brief in depth discussion ensued which included the areas of inclusion, ICT, payments already made upfront for the LGPS, additional £11,000 staffing costs, admin and TA's.

It was agreed that this was still high and needs a 'top up' with allocations to Capital making the difference.

Q: KW: What are the chances that these figures are accurate?

A: SMK / SW: As we have discussed in detail we expect a higher level of inclusion next year. SMK explained that we need to spend all the SEND monies that come in and this was discussed.

Q: SW: How do we track that spend is on SEND?

A: SMK: That is not easy but we can see the spending is on SENCO & TA's but other than that is really difficult to do.

Q: SW: How do we know we are getting value for money?

A: IT: We see the new staff and the CPD overview

ACTION: SMK to sit with LUCY & unpick the detail

IT advised that Health & Safety was overspent and the various related issues were discussed.

IT & SW explained an example where the fire alarm had to be upgraded again as it was not in accordance with building regulations.

The outstanding repair list was discussed which included new furniture, a broken gate and the intruder alarm.

SW stated that much of needed to be done in the next school year and whether or not any of these items could be capital expenditure was also discussed. No final agreement was made on this.

SMK shared the most likely picture was we were quite close to the estimates which included a 3% pay rise although it was likely to be less and post 16 funding had been confirmed.

He said that he expects the figures to be accurate and this relies on the 2023/24 pupil numbers as the pupil funding figures are now known.

Q: SW: Asked if there was any other expected income?

A: SMK: Lettings, catering and rebates

	<p>It was agreed by ALL that there should be a healthy surplus overall and that as much as was prudent should be held.</p>
5.	<p>Capital projects 2020</p> <p>IT advised that she had been costing some target ideas.</p> <p>She advised that £63,000 had been spent on the CIF expansion bid with a further £1,000 for the window bid. The LA giving £250,000 should pay for this.</p> <p>Q: SWe: When do we expect the CIF result? A: SMK: March</p> <p>A discussion was had regarding the windows issue, the related bid and the H&S issues from this including asbestos, cold water tank, etc.</p> <p>Q: SWe: What if the bid is unsuccessful, do we need to act? A: IT: For sure the water tower needs doing</p> <p>The list for Capital Expenditure was discussed including the 4 classrooms that need renovation, a PE where a MUGA (Multi Use Games Area) with roof for £139,000. It was noted that this might not need planning. This could be used to increase income.</p> <p>It was discussed that there was a further £92,000 left to pay for the SEND project and that £70,000 more was required to deal with the windows issue.</p> <p>The discussion again turned to what if's around what if not bids were successful.</p> <p>Q: TD: Is there anything else that you are looking at? A: IT: The Duval building wooden cladding treatment & drainage</p> <p style="text-align: center;">It was AGREED that the windows bid was the key to making savings as it also included decorations.</p> <p>Q: TD: Do we have an estates condition report? A: SMK: Yes, the one done by the DfE</p> <p>IT mentioned that there is a report on water pipes outstanding.</p> <p>KW advised that there were therefore no decisions to be made or needed today. Everyone AGREED</p> <p>Q: SWe: Why is AstroTurf not on the list? A: SMK: Because to do it correctly it is £800,000 Q: SWe: Maybe it should at least be on the list. IT said maybe, but low on the list.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">ACTION: IT to get some quotes on Astro Turf</p> <p>The benefits of this including potential income of £100 per use were discussed as well as the trench cabling that was currently being done.</p>
6.	<p>SEND Base timeline & funding options</p>

	<p>SMK advised that the Bat survey will delay this to November which had implications on space but no impact on places as this was not till January. This gives us more time for tenders and so the tender report was no rush. The money from the LA would affect the final figures.</p> <p>Q: SWe: What happens if there are bats? A: SMK: I have no idea.</p> <p>It was suggested that we start looking for a potential bat haven to take them.</p> <p>The committee then ran through in fine detail the tenders received from the 5 companies and compared the costings.</p> <p>Spec errors on the reports were noted and discussed.</p> <p>Professional fees were discussed as a set % of the agreed cost. It was not known at what stage this amount would be known.</p> <p>The committee were advised that the schools advisors would now advise on the next stage.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">It was AGREED that the ADDITIONAL (Bat) time was a good thing.</p> <p>Q: KW: It is now up to our experts to engineer the price down so that it is still commercial and workable but becomes the best, final offer. The estimated start date is still June 2020.</p> <p>IT advised that so far £73,000 had been spent on the project.</p> <p>Q: KW: Are we still looking at £850,000 including professional fees? A: SMK: Yes Q: KW: So its tender price phase first? A: SMK: Yes, then quality at next phase.</p> <p>It was discussed about how to select a final bid.</p>
7.	<p>SLT restructure decision</p> <p>SMK said that the additional Deputy Head was in all the figures. He presented details of similar sized schools and their SLT structures.</p> <p>It was AGREED that the proposal fitted in well with the other school SLT team sizes and make ups and that this was an investment in the school. It was agreed to advertise immediately.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">The restructure was APPROVED</p>
8.	<p>Staffing update</p> <p>IT gave a brief update on staffing, mentioned the May 31 deadline and gave a recruitment update.</p> <p>SWe asked why there was so little movement. IT replied she had no real idea, mainly support staff.</p>

9.	<p>Support staff liability update</p> <p>The support staff update was discussed following the Brazel judgement. IT advised that the school's exposure over 6 years was a maximum of £70,000</p>
10.	<p>Audit West report</p> <p>Thanks were given to IT as a report of grade 5 was achieved. The only comment was counter signing of credit card reconciliation reports. The system has now been amended to include this</p>
11.	<p>Review of risk register</p> <p>The risk register items were listed and checked. The pandemic Covid-19 was discussed in detail including the HT's contingency plan.</p> <p>Q: KW: What if cleaners cannot come in? A: IT: There are already only 4 instead of 8 so we are already using site staff to support.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">It was AGREED that amendments should be made to the following items:</p> <p>R90 – Proximity R02 – To be updated with regard to Covid-19 R04 – Mitigation to be updated R08 – to be updated</p> <p style="text-align: right;">ACTION: SMK</p>
12.	<p>Policy review</p> <p>It was agreed that there were no policies requiring review at this time</p>
13.	<p>Any other URGENT Business <i>(as previously agreed in item 2.4)</i></p> <p>The only AOB item having been agreed being Coronavirus, this was discussed in great detail with reference to the contingencies the school was preparing.</p> <p>SMK explained his forthcoming letter to parents, the response to offsite learning and prioritising years 11 & 13.</p> <p>Exams and the effect this would have was discussed.</p> <p>Plans to meet with parents and carers of vulnerable pupils were explained with ongoing communication protocols and plans.</p> <p>Q: SWe: Will there be skype lessons? A: SMK: No. We feel that gives us an issue with the use of personal devices but staff are planning additional lessons which can be done online and via show your homework.</p> <p>It was discussed that preparation for any pupils who may be out of school early (earlier than a close down) due to medical conditions, was discussed.</p> <p>Q: TD: Can the payroll be run offsite? A: IT: Not all of it but I have backup personnel with appropriate access.</p>

	<p>There was a discussion that if it was necessary just run last month's figures and sort out later.</p> <p>The numbers of staff to run the school (skeleton) were discussed.</p> <p>The lone worker policy was discussed.</p> <p>It was AGREED to share information with local schools</p> <p style="text-align: right;">ACTION: SMK / IT</p> <p>There was a brief conversation regarding pay for staff who were ill</p> <p style="text-align: right;">It was AGREED to support staff with self-isolation if required.</p>
14.1	<p>Items for next meeting</p> <p>14.1 It was agreed that Capital Expenditure should be on the next agenda</p> <p>14.2 The next meeting will be on 7 May at 17:30</p>
15.	There being no other matters to discuss the meeting was closed by the Chair at 19:40

Signed by the chair..... Date.....