



**Whitchurch Primary School and Nursery**  
**Finance and Resources Committee Meeting, 7<sup>th</sup> July 2023**

**Meeting Attendees:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
Matt Bradley (MB)	Headteacher
Martin Thompson-Lawrie (MTL)	Deputy Headteacher / Contributor
Rupen Shah (RS)	Governor and Chair
Seema Supeda (SS)	SBM
Peter Tenconi (PT)	Governor
Paul Smith (PS) - Apologised	Governor
Rickesh Samani (RSa) - Absent	Governor
Cat (PP Lead)	Contributor

Clerked by Deepti Bal, Clerk to Governors

## Meeting Record:

	Item	Action
1.	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b> RS welcomed Governors.	
2.	<b>Apologies</b> Apologies from Paul Smith (PS) were received. Rickesh Samani (RSa) was absent.	
3.	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> None	
4.	<b>Minutes of the Previous Meeting and Matters Arising</b>  Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record.  <u>Governors to review the VFMI for areas of investigation to lines of enquiry</u>  MTL has spoken with Joseph who has offered to meet with leaving staff. Governor involvement in potential exit interviews was considered with Joseph and the FGB. MB felt that this would provide valuable feedback but also accepted that it could be operational. <b>ACTION: To be discussed further with Joseph.</b>	<b>Exit interviews to be discussed further with Joseph.</b>
5.	<b>Pupil Premium (PP)</b> MB explained that this is an agenda item requested by RS.	

	<p>Cat is responsible for looking after PP pupils - current plans for this academic year are still underway (typically this is reported by the end of December). RS felt it would be useful to understand the previous period in terms of targets. MTL indicated that the end of year data would be presented at the FGB where the impact of the funding can be reviewed more closely.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Cat to share the presentation on PP.</b></p> <p>From May, 12% of pupils are eligible for PP or FSM. In Y5/6 there are higher numbers of eligible pupils and wider gaps between PP and non-PP attainment. PT asked why. Cat explained that it has always been higher in higher years. SS noted that before Y2, all pupils receive free school meals so there is no incentive to register. This changes after Y2.</p> <p>There is work to do in ensuring that families are aware of 'Ever 6' and sign up earlier.</p> <p>PP funding is increasing to £1,455 per pupil.</p> <p>Strategies are focused on developing oral skills, reasoning, providing target interventions, wellbeing and visits/enrichment experiences. Funding has been used to subsidise instruments, one to one support SALTs, social and emotional support workers, breakfast club provision, etc.</p> <p>Stakeholders have been surveyed to inform next year's offer This may include smaller trips (for example a visit to Park High and the high street). Clubs and boosters will continue but there is a challenge with take-up. Pastoral care (therapists and 'Motional' package) will continue.</p> <p>A lot of work is being done on parental engagement, including translating messages on School Spider, a Food Bank.</p> <p>The survey results were noted. The main issue reporting is that staff feel less comfortable than they should in signposting parents to sign up for PP. MB suggested grouping by ethnicity.</p>	<p><b>Cat to share the presentation on PP.</b></p>
--	---	--

	<p>MB asked if there are any areas which Governors would like to understand more about, next time? <b>PT indicated that he would like to understand the aims and impact.</b></p> <p>For the three years prior to the pandemic, Cat was on a 50% timetable to focus on Y5 and Y6 and gaps were starting to narrow. Pupils were provided opportunities for leadership experiences, sporting activities, etc. Cat highlighted the buy in and impact of the one term boosters and that pupils were very well prepared to transition to secondary.</p> <p>MTL noted that targets for impact are for a 3yr period. PT and RS requested that despite this they would like to see how this is tracking to target on an annual basis.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Finance Reporting</b></p> <p><u>Budget Monitoring and identification of variance</u></p> <p>The budget monitoring was noted – this is the end of month 3.</p> <p>The only major variance is the kitchen cost, and this was anticipated. Additional EP sessions have also been published.</p> <p><u>VFMI lines of inquiry</u> Rolled over. <b>ACTION: VFMI to be an ongoing item.</b></p> <p><u>Extended services financial report</u> SS indicated that this is going well. For September, there has been a price increase of £2 for some clubs.</p> <p><b>PT asked about the percentage increase.</b> SS explained that £2 is equivalent to a 20% increase. The increase has been consulted upon and only one parent provided feedback. SS noted the need to increase staffing capacity, food costs, etc. SS noted that the new price should prevent running on a loss.</p>	<p><b>VFMI lines of inquiry to be an ongoing item.</b></p>

	<p>Governors felt that this was a fair price / balance as it should not cost the school and there should be contingency. SS explained that the school was broadly in middle compared to other schools.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Lettings</b></p> <p>Governors were assured that lettings have increased over the year, with new providers being engaged.</p> <p>RS asked about summer income. SS explained this was limited as works were undertaken. There is a plan for October and Easter next year for STEAM sessions to be run.</p>	
8.	<p><b>National Tutoring Programme</b></p> <p>21 pupils have accessed online tutoring and the school is looking at the impact.</p> <p>The tutoring company operates a one to one model, currently, but MTL would like to increase this to one to two or more. This is a new initiative and so needs to be reviewed. MTL explained that the funding may not roll over into future years and so there is a need to consider timelines and achievable impact. Governors were supportive of it continuing, provided it is having an impact.</p> <p>Reporting on impact should be submitted next week. MB suggested that this should be reviewed by the Finance Committee.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Impact of NTP to be reviewed in September.</b></p>	<p><b>ACTION: Impact of NTP to be reviewed in September.</b></p>
9.	<p><b>Premises and Resources</b></p> <p><u>Health and Safety Update</u></p> <p>The audit has been completed. Training has been booked with Harrow Council. There have been no accidents or incidents.</p>	

	<p>MB asked whether incidents are logged on HSE. MTL explained that incidents are logged on the Health and Safety provider software can then be used to generate reports. MB noted that the current system of carbon copy is less easy to navigate. The school reports RIDDOR injuries with the support of the Health and Safety provider.</p> <p><u>Capital Works</u></p> <p>Work has been completed to support the kitchen extension project. MB is satisfied that everything that should have taken place, has taken place. There has been architectural work, quality surveys and a structural engineer visit. The steel work will escalate the costs, however. £40k was budgeted but this has almost doubled to £75k. The actual ideas about what needed to happen have not changed.</p> <p>MB noted the reasons for the increase in costs. This includes the existence of a hatch and allowing access to water tanks, etc, which will need to continue to be accessible once building works are completed. This was not picked up initially. He noted the importance of holding builders to account for their work against a building works plan.</p> <p><b>Governors noted the cost breakdown.</b> MB strongly recommended that the project progress, suggesting the additional £35k is not an increase but only represents the true cost of the project. There is a significant health and safety risk as it stands. The project will not fix every element of this, however.</p> <p>The cooking unit may need to be moved and this may be reviewed. Next year, around 90% of pupils are expected to take a school meal.</p> <p>MB explained that the works will be committed to for September, if approved. However, there is also a back up plan for providing meals if the kitchen is not available.</p> <p><b>DECISION: Governors approved the works.</b></p> <p><u>Cleaning</u></p> <p>A direct award is recommended for the current cleaners. The school is very happy with the service.</p>	
--	--	--

**RS asked about costs.** There is a small cost increase. but this is considered negligible and to reflect an increase in London living wage.

**DECISION: Governors approved recommendation.**

#### Catering

Catering has gone to full tender. The Tender Assessment Report from Everything FM was reviewed, as were the assessment reports and commercial offers.

**RS asked about the commercial assessment figures.** SS explained that this refers to the profits they will look to make.

Coombs offered a 50% guaranteed position, as previously. They put forward a very good technical offer, scoring top marks in the service and social value section. They also scored well in their contract management section. They have proposed to increase the staffing level to ten (from eight) in response to the free KS2 lunch initiative and current uptake, and proposed the highest sales figure with the lowest total core costs. They provided the highest, positive, guaranteed commercial position so when this commercial result is coupled with their high technical bid score, they came out as the preferred bidder.

Based on the evaluation and moderation meeting with the school's team, the school recommended awarding the contract to Coombs.

**RS noted the changes in the London Living Wage. It was noted that this may not be covered in the tender and may need to be considered for next year. How this affects the overall price vs guaranteed position should also be understood.**

MB noted that any guaranteed position funds will be put back into the kitchen.

**PT noted that the meal price has previously been reduced because of the larger profits expected.**

**DECISION: Approval on the basis of revisiting the London Living Wage when next possible.**

**ACTION: Audit contractors to see who is not paying the London living wage.**

	<p>RS asked how much the Government is giving for FSM. All eligible pupils are funded at £.2.53, or £2.62 if in London.</p> <p>MB explained that the Government provides a UFSM offer for pupils up to Y2, with PP pupils receiving additional funding.</p>	<p><b>Audit contractors to see who is not paying the London living wage.</b></p>
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Management</b></p> <p>Performance management runs on a 12 month cycle. Generally there are three targets (a whole school target, a year group/leadership target and a personal/professional development target). There is also discussion of additional training – each member of staff has a skills audit indicating their training needs.</p> <p>MTL confirmed that targets will next be reviewed in Autumn 1. Additional future review dates are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Autumn 2 – educational support staff</li> <li>● Spring 1 – all other staff</li> <li>● Spring 2 – mid-review for educational support staff.</li> <li>● Summer 1 – all other staff.</li> </ul> <p>One member of staff is on a support plan.</p> <p>Historically, the headteacher’s pay committee is formed by the Chair, Committee Chairs and educational advisor.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Line management and performance management structures to be reviewed with Joseph Pine.</b></p> <p>Governors reviewed the structure of performance management, starting with agreeing the School Development and Strategic Priorities early in the Autumn Term. Following from this are the Headteacher targets and then the Staff targets are structured to support this.</p> <p><b>ACTION: MTL to share the training on SS4E.</b></p>	<p><b>Line management and performance management structures to be reviewed with Joseph Pine.</b></p> <p><b>MTL to share the training on SS4E.</b></p>



11.	<p><b>Exit Interview Arrangements</b>                  Covered previously in the agenda.</p>	
12.	<p><b>Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Data retention policy – approved with no major changes.</li> <li>● Child care policy – approved with no major changes</li> <li>● Lettings policy – approved. Changes are around KCSIE 23.</li> </ul> <p><b>DECISION: Policies were approved.</b></p>	
13.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><u>Financial delegations for new Headteacher.</u>                  MB confirmed that the only change was the name to the new Headteacher.</p> <p><b>DECISION: Revised delegation was approved.</b></p> <p><u>GEMS - <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/good-estate-management-for-schools">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/good-estate-management-for-schools</a></u></p> <p>MB explained that information on state management should be read for Governor information.</p> <p><b>AOB: Trips</b>                  SS explained that the aim is to cap the cost of trips at £30, paid for in advance. Previously individual trip costs were put on Parent Pay. The previous way, there was around 95% uptake. This move has proved less popular.</p> <p>SS provided annual cost of all trips provided by year Group and this showed a cost range of £18 to £29 per pupil. However this includes only external costs and not any internal admin costs. Adding in a reasonable per trip admin cost would bring the amount near or above £30 for every year group. However, as previously discussed the upfront donation request approach to parents has led to lower proportion of parents paying than the previous PAYG model and also removed the admin benefit of one payment from the school as SS now spends time chasing for payment. This also meant the contributions actually made to date have not covered even the</p>	

	<p>external costs. MB asked Deepti of her experience of schools using PAYG vs pay upfront. She noted that c20% use pay up front. Governors agreed to revert to the previous PAYG model and on balance agreed it is not necessary to make any refunds to parents especially noting the payments are donations.</p> <p>MTL explained that trips and experiences have been new and what the £30 paid for was not made clear before payment was required. A parent survey on the model introduced has been completed. There is now a planned schedule of trips across the year. MTL has had a few queries about this from parents. MB was concerned about possible rigidity if all trips must be planned a year ahead.</p> <p>RS asked about the impact in terms of administration. SS explained previously it was relatively more time consuming from an operational perspective. MB suggested that no parents have substantially missed out (and some have benefited).</p> <p>PT noted that payments should be considered donations.</p> <p><b>DECISION: It was agreed by Governors that the school will return to a 'pay as you go' model and will not refund the £30 cost where pupils failed to take up all trip offers - the school has not unduly profited and the sum was considered a donation.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Trip costs/charging to be covered at the FGB via Committee Chair's Reporting</b></p>	<p><b>Trip costs/charging to be covered at the FGB via Chair's Reporting</b></p>
14.	<p><b>PART TWO CONFIDENTIAL</b></p> <p>None</p>	

#### Post Meeting Action Log:

No	Item
1.	Exit interviews to be discussed further with Joseph.
2.	Cat to circulate the presentation on PP.
3.	VFMI lines of inquiry to be a standing item.

4.	Impact of NTP to be reviewed in September.
5.	Audit contractors to see who is not paying the London living wage.
6.	Line management and performance management structures to be reviewed with Joseph Pine.
7.	MTL to share the training on SS4E.
8.	Trip costs/charging to be covered at the FGB via Chair's Reporting

Accepted as a true and accurate record by the Chair \_\_\_\_\_