



F&A Committee Meeting
Thursday, 25 November 2021 at 5.30 pm
Via VIDEOCONFERENCE

Chair: Tom DAVIES

MINUTES

Present:

Tahir Darr – **TD**
Tom Davies - **Chair**
Steven Mackay (*Headteacher*) – **SMK**
Ishbel Tovey – **IT**
Steve Vickery - **SV**

In attendance:

Jeremy Kaye (*Judicium Governance Professional*)
James Gare **JG** (*Auditor*)

	Item
1.	Welcome and Introductions The chair offered a welcome to the meeting to all, especially James Gare who attended to present the draft accounts which had been distributed in advance, and to answer any questions.
1A.	Draft audited accounts James Gare had been asked to attend the meeting and the Chair allowed his presentation and acceptance of questions to take place before item 2. James thanked IT and her team for the excellent preparation for the audit. He shared his screen with the committee and ran through the balance sheet, explaining each item. He showed the movement of funds and explained the GAG, pots of reserve including average reserve figures for other SAT's. His outcome was that the school is in a healthier position than average. He confirmed that accounts are positive, both budget and reserves. He explained the audit recommendations noted in the audit and that all were low risk. These were: Website, related party transactions, declarations of interest, high bank balance, debtor monitoring, income posting during covid and VAT control differences. Q: SV: 5 Year projected balance is about £1m, is it worth looking at where to hold the balance? A: JG: There are products offering no risk with fixed rates which may work

	<p>James left the meeting at 17:55 and the Chair thanked IT, SMK and the team for their assistance with the audit</p> <p>Q: Chair: The chair asked IT and SMK how was the audit? A: IT: Apart from it being the wrong time of year it was fine. It would be better if the auditors could access the accounts system directly.</p> <p>There was then a discussion about an upcoming tender for auditors with SV offering to help with the tender template.</p>																																										
2.	<p>Procedural items</p> <p>2.1 Apologies Kevin Ward sent his apologies and Tom Davies had agreed to chair the meeting in advance.</p> <p>2.2 Confirmation of Quorum It was agreed that the meeting was quorate</p> <p>2.3 Declarations of Interests for this meeting None we advised</p> <p>2.4 Notification of Any Other Urgent Business There were no AOB items requested</p>																																										
3.	<p>The minutes of the last F&A meeting on 21 October</p> <p>3.1 The minutes were APPROVED 3.2 Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting on 21 October 2021</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th><th>Action</th><th>Actionee</th><th>Status</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5.</td><td>IAS report from One West - The committee acknowledged receipt of the report and it was discussed that the report should be aligned with areas for internal audit and the risk register.</td><td>Chair / SMK</td><td>ONGOING</td></tr> <tr> <td>5.</td><td>IAS report to be shared to all governors via GH</td><td>IT</td><td>COMPLETE</td></tr> <tr> <td>5.</td><td>Tom & SV to formally review the report & bring any comments to the next FGB</td><td>Tom / SV</td><td>COMPLETE</td></tr> <tr> <td>6.</td><td>Write offs – The wording of the policy for write offs to be changed</td><td>SMK / IT</td><td>ONGOING</td></tr> <tr> <td>6.</td><td>Bring listed items over £1000 to FGB for final decision to write off</td><td>Chair / Clerk</td><td>COMPLETE</td></tr> <tr> <td>7.</td><td>Capital schemes to be on November agenda</td><td>Chair / Clerk</td><td>TODAYS AGENDA</td></tr> <tr> <td>7.</td><td>CIF bids to be on November agenda</td><td>Chair / Clerk</td><td>TODAYS AGENDA</td></tr> <tr> <td>8.</td><td>Review of policies – Change financial regulations policy for review by PSW from this committee</td><td>SMK / IT</td><td>ONGOING</td></tr> <tr> <td>9.</td><td>Review of risk register – from November this item to be renamed 'review of risk register and flag any audit queries'</td><td>Chair / Clerk</td><td>COMPLETE</td></tr> </tbody> </table>			Item	Action	Actionee	Status	5.	IAS report from One West - The committee acknowledged receipt of the report and it was discussed that the report should be aligned with areas for internal audit and the risk register.	Chair / SMK	ONGOING	5.	IAS report to be shared to all governors via GH	IT	COMPLETE	5.	Tom & SV to formally review the report & bring any comments to the next FGB	Tom / SV	COMPLETE	6.	Write offs – The wording of the policy for write offs to be changed	SMK / IT	ONGOING	6.	Bring listed items over £1000 to FGB for final decision to write off	Chair / Clerk	COMPLETE	7.	Capital schemes to be on November agenda	Chair / Clerk	TODAYS AGENDA	7.	CIF bids to be on November agenda	Chair / Clerk	TODAYS AGENDA	8.	Review of policies – Change financial regulations policy for review by PSW from this committee	SMK / IT	ONGOING	9.	Review of risk register – from November this item to be renamed 'review of risk register and flag any audit queries'	Chair / Clerk	COMPLETE
Item	Action	Actionee	Status																																								
5.	IAS report from One West - The committee acknowledged receipt of the report and it was discussed that the report should be aligned with areas for internal audit and the risk register.	Chair / SMK	ONGOING																																								
5.	IAS report to be shared to all governors via GH	IT	COMPLETE																																								
5.	Tom & SV to formally review the report & bring any comments to the next FGB	Tom / SV	COMPLETE																																								
6.	Write offs – The wording of the policy for write offs to be changed	SMK / IT	ONGOING																																								
6.	Bring listed items over £1000 to FGB for final decision to write off	Chair / Clerk	COMPLETE																																								
7.	Capital schemes to be on November agenda	Chair / Clerk	TODAYS AGENDA																																								
7.	CIF bids to be on November agenda	Chair / Clerk	TODAYS AGENDA																																								
8.	Review of policies – Change financial regulations policy for review by PSW from this committee	SMK / IT	ONGOING																																								
9.	Review of risk register – from November this item to be renamed 'review of risk register and flag any audit queries'	Chair / Clerk	COMPLETE																																								
4	<p>Income and Expenditure</p>																																										

	<p>The income and expenditure report which had been distributed in advance was reviewed in details.</p> <p>SMK gave an update on each variance; these were discussed but there were few. SMK reminded the committee that the carry forward was from the CIF bid and explained the detail which all accepted. He explained that £930k is projected reserve.</p> <p>SMK uploaded live the update as of today with adjustments and explained that these now show an accurate position.</p> <p>Q: SV: What about exam fees? A: SMK: SMK explained the refunds for fees which were not what they should be as the school did all the work</p> <p>SMK then ran through the 5-year forecast which was distributed in advance and explained the details.</p> <p>Q: Chair: Are pupil numbers staying constant? A: SMK: Yes, pupil numbers are currently pretty flat and we are being conservative on 6th form numbers</p> <p>SMK explained the modelling in A, B, and C was of unfunded pay increases.</p> <p>There was then a short discussion about the models with the SMK saying that model C was most likely in his opinion at this time.</p> <p>Q:SV: If the government issues a pay rise are you obliged to pay it? A: SMK: I suppose not really, but we would have to do so</p> <p>Q: SV: How is the effect of pay rises on staff morale? A: SMK: It depends on the pay rise next year, maybe 2-2.5% then absorbed funding</p>
5.	<p>Update on Capital scheme projects & feasibility study</p> <p>The Chair confirmed with SMK that the requirement tonight was to agree in principle the feasibility but not to make any decisions.</p> <p>SMK had distributed the reports in advance and everyone acknowledged having read them.</p> <p>SMK advised that there would only be one CIF bid for windows with the roof repair in Penn. The estimate is £180k and we would need to contribute £28k from current capital so we would need to allocate this £28k.</p> <p>There was a discussion on the types of projects to do this and it was AGREED that there was no risk to the school as if the £28k was not needed (CIF bid failure) then it could be used on windows.</p> <p>A show of hands was taken and it was AGREED to set aside this £28k for the CIF bid.</p>

SMK then gave an update on the sports pitch (£120k) as well as £16k – CIF windows left over and £35k – balance of the SEND building

and then how the £180k fund might be allocated, which is as follows:

£28k – Penn windows

£35k – fire doors

£5k – furniture

£25k – tarmac roadway

£10k – reserve

This comes to £103k of the £180k with the balance to be agreed further, possibly on the following: Basketball hoops, fitness suite, lighting and sound in hall, digital developments required, cricket nets

Q: SV: If the boilers were to break down (for example) where would the money come to replace or repair?

A: SMK: In the main building or Penn this would cost about £250k which we would request an emergency bid, however with our healthy balance this may not be easy to get.

SMK then moved on to discuss the science lab project for which the documentation had been distributed in advance. SMK gave an update on the project plan and ran through the requirements, being: More teaching space is required, more science lab space is required with our 8-form entry, the DT offer is currently restricted, we have tried 4 years to get a CIF bid but each time this failed.

The chair reminded the committee that the PAN can go to 1320, it is currently 1270

It was **AGREED** that education is compromised with the shortage of both labs and teaching rooms.

Q: Chair: With 9 labs are we ok 90% of the time for space?

A: SMK: We may still be short for the odd lesson

Q: Chair: We are talking general science labs, right?

A: SMK: Yes, correct

SMK then ran through each option in detail to show the extra rooms that would be achieved, discussed options that would most likely get planning and which offered best value.

Each option was summarised during the discussion including with regard to cost, value for money, suitability, footprint, space achieved, time to build, cost of temporary buildings, final build location on site, etc.

It was **AGREED** that only one option really ticked most boxes at this time and that the final option, option 5 (not yet delivered) may be the best all round. SMK advised that on receipt he would distribute that option.

	<p>The chair noted that in reality this is a £1.5m project with potentially an additional £100k required for temporary space.</p> <p>SMK reminded the committee members that the LA had agreed to put £500k into the project. It was then discussed asking for more, which he will do at the appropriate time.</p> <p>SMK explained that leaves £1m to find, £700 from reserves including finding £300k. The suggestion was to use £150k from each of the next two years capital, making £300k. In addition to apply for a Wolfson grant for £100k, and other grants.</p> <p>There was then a discussion on other costs expected over this period and that there were no other big projects planned except the potential CIF bid for the canteen.</p> <p>Q: TD: I am happy with (just) £500k reserves, I like option 5 (if it comes out as explained) and building on spare ground would save the temporary costs, is that correct?</p> <p>A:IT: Yes, correct. Also, there would be less effect on teaching and learning.</p> <p>The chair commented that he was just a little nervous of two years of capital spend so we need to tie the project (KK) down to a maximum all in limit of £1.5m. There was then a discussion around professional fees, if they are included and what is included.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ACTION: SMK to check professional fees, what is included?</p> <p>SMK asked for a recommendation to proceed with the project and to continue to move ahead without commitment.</p> <p>It was AGREED for SMK to proceed with the project and to look to move ahead.</p> <p>The chair suggested outsourcing any grant applications.</p>
6.	<p>Reviews of policies Investment policy</p> <p>It was AGREED to move this item to the next meeting</p>
7.	<p>Review of risk register and flag any audit queries</p> <p>The risk register was reviewed item by item live in the meeting and no changes were required at this time.</p>
8.	<p>Any other URGENT Business (as previously agreed in item 2.4 above)</p> <p>There was no AOB</p>
9.	<p>The date of the next meeting was CONFIRMED as Thursday 27 January 2022</p>

Minutes will now be 'signed' online on GovernorHub. For instructions, please contact the clerk.