

PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES

Meeting of:	Resources Committee
Date/Time:	19 th November 2019 3pm
Location:	Patcham High School
Distribution:	Governing Body Website Di Bonner
Present:	Governors (voting) Richard Evea (RE) Chair of Committee Sarah Fitzjohn-Scott (SFS) Rebecca Ouassa (RO) Andrew Saunders (ASD) J McKee (JM) Headteacher from 15.53 Other (non-voting) Di Bonner (DB) School Business Manager, in attendance Janet Johnson (JJ) Clerk to Governors
Quorum:	3 governors (excluding headteacher). The meeting was quorate throughout.

	DISCUSSION AND DECISION	ACTION
1	<p>WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTERESTS RE opened the meeting and thanked all for amending their schedule to enable attendance. JM was expected to arrive late. No new interests were declared upon request. All governors could take full part throughout. Note: This meeting took place following 'governor day' when governors had visited the school.</p>	
2	<p>ORGANISATION OF COMMITTEE Papers: current terms of reference</p> <p>2.1 Chairing of Committee: RE was nominated for and agreed to chair the committee for the year.</p> <p>2.2 Terms Of Reference Review In discussion it was agreed to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new name of the committee • Health and Safety • SFVS. It was suggested 'ensure financial probity of the school and complete SFVS by due date'. <p>2.3 Annual Agenda Plan This would be drawn up and take into account the annual work plan recommended to school business managers. DB would provide a copy and liaise with RE.</p>	<p>SFS RE</p> <p>DB RE</p>

PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES

3	<p>MINUTES This item was not required.</p>	
4	<p>MATTERS ARISING not referred to elsewhere on agenda Papers: Action from full governing body meetings 14.5.19 and 19.9.19 This item was not taken.</p>	RE
5	<p>FINANCE REPORT Papers: End of month 7 projected outturn for year including chart of review cost centres. The paper was signed by RE.</p> <p>5.1 Budget monitoring The projected surplus was currently £2k.</p> <p>DB gave further information and took questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing levels in finance/admin had reduced unexpectedly increasing pressure of work. • Agency and supply were being used to cover sickness so these heads were overspent, only partially set off by underspending on teachers' pay. • Difficulties had been encountered recruiting teaching assistants. • The water bill was expected to rise as there had been difficulties with the pool. • 90% + of pupil premium funds are spent on staffing. <p>Governors enquired about the educational standards requested for teaching assistants and the impact of not having the required complement. DB informed recruitment was usually from a pool expecting to later complete the Post Graduate Certificate in Education but there was a current shortage. Governors expressed concern that pupil needs may not be met.</p> <p>Is there still no confirmation of the cost of compensation for the local authority's term time only contract error? No but the estimate could be £23k per annum for 10 years. In discussion governors suggested DB pursued with the local authority to find out the actual liability, bearing in mind the local authority had contacted those affected. DB would take this forward.</p> <p>Re staff welfare, flu jabs: when did this take place? Did you pay for those entitled to them free? It was on 5th November and entitlement was taken into account.</p> <p>Do you have a 3% vacancy factor built in? No but I have included in the budget how many teaching assistants we needed.</p> <p>A governor confirmed having visited the school and working through the current budgetary situation with DB and informed there was nothing to report.</p>	

PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil to teacher ratio was noted to be about middle of local schools but according to the dashboard we are higher. It was though this could be as a result of staffing the Bridge and ‘double employing’ due to covering those on long term sick or maternity. There was a difference between the compare school site and the dashboard rating. <p>Does it include anyone with qualified teacher status? No, just employed as teachers.</p> <p>Governors acknowledged this was where they had chosen to invest our funds, so that was expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re Question 16, size of leadership team, benchmarking against other schools it was ascertained there was scope for schools recordings not to enable like for like comparisons. A governor had carried out a benchmarking exercise and had ascertained the school was in the middle. <p>If you have extra people coming on to the leadership team do they have a teaching commitment? It is rare – we think about the balance.</p> <p>Are there any areas you saw as high or risk? No. Premises are high. DB added that she thought PFI had not been included so maintenance would be low.</p> <p>A governor had noticed a classroom which was not up to the standard of the rest and DB would check on this. She confirmed they did an accommodation standards walk around with the LA monthly, covering a section at a time but all the school over the course of one year.</p> <p>Premises to staff ratio still looks high. DB informed that was because they school had in-house cleaning and catering.</p> <p>Will you have more income from lettings following the canteen change? Yes. JM added we want to try and have children eating in the canteen. Governors agreed there were benefits to this and added they had not seen one phone during their lunchtime visit and lots of chatter and discussion. DB displayed the proposed layout of the new dining hall extension.</p> <p>7.3 Contract register DB informed there were no contracts due. The 3G pitch was out to tender, to be finished in April and this was handled by the local authority. There was a need to allow for depreciation of that asset and to obtain funds for the sports hall. It was recalled the PFI agreement still had several years to run.</p> <p>7.4 School Fund DB informed the school fund auditor had attended. The certificate would be available for the full governing body meeting. The fund continued to be used for school trips.</p> <p>7.5 SFVS forms</p>	DB
--	----

PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES

10	<p>POLICY REVIEWS DUE (other than on matters arising)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website check – RO’s offer to do this was accepted with thanks. • DB will look at the biometric information and include it with the data protection policy if it is not already. • The Staff code of conduct was received. • RO would review the policy process/schedule. 	<p>RO</p> <p>DB</p> <p>#</p> <p>RO JJ</p>
11	<p>HEALTH and SAFETY</p> <p>Although the main report would be to the full governing body, governors had some queries surrounding the cost of the system put in place to track staff feelings as they felt that with notice and use of IT expertise in the school a ‘free’ system may have been possible. JM thought it was a good investment and was getting valuable feedback.</p> <p>How long has it been in place? Just after start of term and we are now getting comments.</p> <p>It was agreed SFS would discuss the system and outcomes with JM once it had been in place 6 months. It would also be discussed at the school health and safety committee.</p> <p>Governors noted the wellbeing committee met weekly.</p>	SFS
12	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>JM and DB leave 17.00</p> <p>The representative of the headteacher performance management group reported back. There had been at least 3 review points, with differing members of the group. A lot of evidence had been considered. The final meeting had been with the school improvement partner and objectives had been suggested for the forthcoming year. These were shared and in discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Governors confirmed the recommendation re pay and supported the objectives. <p>In the forthcoming year there would be 3 review points. The headteacher performance management group would comprise SFS RE ASD RO(Chair) NM. RO would liaise with the school improvement partner, Sue Childs re dates.</p> <p>JM would be informed of the outcome directly after the meeting.</p> <p>There being no further business the meeting closed 17.18</p>	RO

..... signed Dated
Signature noted in minutes 26.2.20

PATCHAM HIGH SCHOOL
GOVERNING BODY
MINUTES

Item	Owner	Action	Due by
2.2	SFS RE	Amend and take TOR to FGB	Latest, 5.12.19
2.3	DB RE	Send SBM annual work plan Draw up plan, liaise DB JJ	29.11.19 EOT
4	RE	Take forward if any relevant outstanding actions	
5.1	DB	Ascertain liability – liaise LA and update committee	ASAP
7.1	RE	Take forward if required re papers not provided.	
7.2	DB	Note re optional comment suggestion And follow up re the below par classroom	
7.5	DB	Provide completed SFVS	Latest 28.11.19
8.2	DB	Provide Pay policy for FGB approval	28.11.19
8.2	JJ RO/AS D/JM	Signpost re information re equality stats Agree a useful, workable format	19.12.19
9	DB	Provide Charging and remissions policy for FGB	28.11.19
10	DB	Biometric information statutory policy/document requirements – include with Data protection policy – update committee	19.12.19
10	RO	Carry out website check and move forward on general policy review/process? – (JJ can signpost)	Next meeting
11	SFS	Review wellbeing system with Jm	March 20
12	RO SFS	Set up HTPM 19/20 group Assist	