



## CLIFTON GREEN PRIMARY SCHOOL

### Minutes of the meeting of the Resources Committee

Held at the school on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017 at 6.00pm

**Present:** Peter Warry (Chair) Alison Dewhirst  
Kathleen Wood Lynn Comer  
Martyn Stoakes Fraser Forsyth

**In Attendance:** Jackie Holmes (School Business Manager)  
Claire Neal (Bursar)  
Lisa Green (Catering Manager) [to 7.15pm]  
Sara Goyea (Deputy Headteacher)  
Jess Swarbrick (Clerk – Governor Support Officer)

	<u>Executive Summary</u>
1.	<b>Welcome, Apologies and Declarations</b> Apologies were received, with consent, from Dave Brown. There were no declarations of interest.
2.	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017</b> Previously distributed. The minutes were agreed and signed by the Chair.
3.	<b>Action Plan / Matters Arising</b> Progress against each action point was noted (please see main minutes for details). There were no matters arising.
4.	<b>Staffing Update</b> The Deputy Headteacher provided an update on staffing, including the appointment of a new Site Manager and restructure of the Office Team for September 2017.
6.	<b>Apprenticeship Levy</b> Lisa Green provided an update on the apprenticeship levy. It was noted that further updates would be provided once a response had been given by CYC on Expression of Interest applications.
7.	<b>Salix Fund</b> Lisa Green presented a proposal to apply for a CYC loan for energy saving investment in LED light fittings. Governors discussed the quotes received, noting that further information was required before a decision could be made.
8.	<b>School Dog Proposal</b> Lisa Green presented a breakdown of costings relating to the proposal for a school dog. Governors agreed that they were happy to support the proposal and had no objections on the basis of cost. However, a number of questions were raised regarding the procedure and management of any safety concerns, and it was agreed that further research was needed on these before going ahead.
5.	<b>Period 3 Monitoring Report</b> The Bursar presented the monitoring report for Period 3, and a number of points were noted (see main minutes for details).
9.	<b>Review of Progress against Information Governance Audit Actions</b> The Office Manager provided an update on the Information Governance Audit report recommendations.
10.	<b>E-Safety Policy</b> Previously distributed. Governors raised a number of questions regarding the policy, and it was agreed that further work was needed on this before it could be approved.
11.	<b>Staff Code of Conduct</b> Previously distributed. Governors raised a number of questions regarding the policy, and it was agreed that further work was needed on this before it could be approved.
12.	<b>Any Other Business</b> There was no other business to report.
13.	<b>Date and Time of Next Meeting</b> TBC. It was noted that proposed meeting dates for 2017/18 would be discussed at the full governing body meeting on 4 <sup>th</sup> July.

1.	<b><u>Welcome, Apologies and Declarations of Interest</u></b> Apologies were received, with consent, from Dave Brown.  There were no declarations of interest.	
2.	<b><u>Minutes of the meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017</u></b> Previously distributed. The minutes were agreed to be a true and accurate record and were signed by the Chair.	
3.	<b><u>Action Plan and Matters Arising</u></b> With reference to the Action Plan: 1. Alison Dewhirst reported that she had not circulated the National Funding Formula summary, as the recent general election had meant a hold on any further policy development. It was agreed that the changing political landscape meant it was unclear at this point whether this would be going ahead in its current format. Alison advised that she would circulate the information to governors, with the caveat that this could be subject to change.	

	<p>2. The Office Manager advised that an update on this would be provided under item 12.</p> <p>3. The Office Manager advised that an update on this would be provided under item 12.</p> <p>4. Completed. Martyn Stoakes reported that he had met with the Office Manager to look at the quotation for the photocopier contract. He advised that following a comparison with the supplier at his own place of work, the figures were very competitive and seemed to show a good deal for the school. The Office Manager confirmed that on this basis, the school had gone ahead with the contract with United Carlton.</p> <p>5. It was noted that the Pupil Premium report should be carried forward to the full governing body meeting in July. Governors agreed the importance of an in-depth review of the use of the funding and its impact. The Deputy Headteacher advised that Mark Benson, Pupil Premium governor, had visited the school and looked at an overview of the current position. She added that he was planning to re-visit once the 2017 outcomes were available. Governors requested a written report from this visit,</p> <p>There were no matters arising.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><b><u>Staffing Update</u></b></p> <p>The Deputy Headteacher presented an update on staffing for governors. She reported that one of the current Year 5 teachers, who was working on a job-share basis, would be leaving on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2017. A new 0.5 FTE teacher had been appointed to work in Year 5 from September. The Deputy Headteacher advised that the individual appointed was an experienced teacher, and would be in school on the transition days before the end of the summer term. It was noted that there were no other anticipated changes to the current teaching profile for September 2017.</p> <p>The Deputy Headteacher reported that a new Site Manager had now been appointed, and would be working 20 hours per week starting on 1<sup>st</sup> July.</p> <p>It was noted that changes to the Admin Team were being finalised, with some additional hours and changes to current grades. The Deputy Headteacher reported that Lisa Green would be taking on the role of Business Manager, with Claire Neal working as Office Manager. It was noted that the intention was to run with this structure for the first half of the autumn term, before a review to assess whether any further recruitment was needed.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p><b><u>Apprenticeship Levy</u></b></p> <p>Lisa Green presented an update on the apprenticeship levy. She advised that the levy was charged at 0.5% of the annual pay bill, and the school had budgeted £6,362 for this for the coming year. Lisa reported that the school had submitted a number of Expression of Interest forms for the two new apprentices starting in September, as well as for developing existing staff. It was noted that a panel from the LA would meet on 21<sup>st</sup> June to discuss all Expressions of Interest, and to make a decision on which would be granted. Lisa advised that she would be part of this panel.</p> <p>Governors noted that the levy was in place to cover training costs, with the employer meeting the first 10% of this. A question was raised as to whether this had been factored into the budget. In response to a question about the cost of the two new apprentices, the Bursar confirmed that these had already been included in the start budget, and had been approved at the previous Resources Committee meeting. The Bursar also confirmed that the school had included approximately £6,000 in the budget for the cost of the levy. Lisa advised that it was not yet known how many Expressions of Interest would be accepted, though if all went through, the overall contribution of 10% of each would be around £5,000.</p> <p>Governors requested a breakdown of all costs and the impact this would have on the budget once it was known how many Expressions of Interest had been accepted. Governors agreed it would also be helpful to have a list of all approved training and investment for information.</p>	<p>LG</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b><u>Salix Fund</u></b></p> <p>Lisa Green presented a proposal on the installation of LED light fittings throughout school. A summary of this proposal, along with two quotations from contractors to carry out the work had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Lisa explained that the LA held a pot of Salix funding, available to schools for use in improving energy efficiency, which could be accessed for this project.</p> <p>Lisa advised that she had consulted with Gary Christie from the LA, who had recommended three companies who would be able to carry out the work. Lisa further advised that she had also spoken to another local primary school who had recently completed a similar project. It was noted that the loan repayments would take between five and seven years.</p> <p>Lisa reported that she had received quotes from two of the three recommended companies. It had arisen that the third named company actually carried out work for one of the first two, and was therefore not a stand-alone quote.</p>	

	<p>The summary costs as included within the quotes was noted as follows:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Martin Dixons (bulb change)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£17,276.28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Martin Dixons (unit change)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£31,042.48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Luxbright Solutions (unit change)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£32,440.80</td> </tr> </table> <p>Lisa advised that Martin Dixons had initially only quoted for a bulb change, but had provided a figure for unit change on request, so that this could be compared with the quote from Luxbright. Lisa noted, however, that this second figure had been provided without a full assessment of the site.</p> <p>Governors noted that the quotes were not like for like in a number of ways, for example one included VAT and the other did not. In addition to this, both companies were quoting for a different number of units to change/replace and were therefore not directly comparable. Lisa advised that the Luxbright quote had been provided following a robust site survey, which included an analysis of the use of light in the classroom.</p> <p>Governors agreed that there was still more investigation needed into the best contractor to carry out the work, but there was a need for agreement on whether it was worth investing in the work in the first place. It was agreed that LED lights were much more energy efficient, though a question was raised as to whether it would be necessary to refit all units, rather than just replacing the bulbs.</p> <p>A question was raised regarding the terms of the loan. Lisa advised that this was interest free, and would be repaid on the proviso of a notional saving predicted on the electrical unit cost plus the cost of installation. In response to a question about predicted energy costs for the next five years, Lisa confirmed that the school had just fixed their unit costs for five years, though the total predicted saving was a calculated estimate.</p> <p>Governors agreed that there was not currently enough information to be able to make an informed decision on contractors, as the details provided in each quotation were not comparable. Lisa agreed to go back to Luxbright and request a quote for bulb replacement only, so this could be compared with Martin Dixons. In addition, governors asked for further information on whether the fittings would be sufficient for emergency lighting, and if not would this hold an additional cost to factor in. Governors also asked whether the LA could help with the process, and provide advice on which units may or may not need replacing.</p> <p>Martyn Stoakes agreed to work with Lisa Green to collate these questions and request further information from the contractors.</p>	Martin Dixons (bulb change)	£17,276.28	Martin Dixons (unit change)	£31,042.48	Luxbright Solutions (unit change)	£32,440.80	LG / MS
Martin Dixons (bulb change)	£17,276.28							
Martin Dixons (unit change)	£31,042.48							
Luxbright Solutions (unit change)	£32,440.80							
8.	<p><b><u>School Dog Proposal</u></b></p> <p>Lisa Green presented a costed proposal for a school dog. It was noted that this had been raised and discussed with the Senior Leadership Team and the School Council, as well as with the Teaching, Learning &amp; Curriculum Committee. Lisa outlined the benefits of a school dog, which included those from a nurture perspective, as well as for development of literacy in school. Lisa advised that she had contacted another local school who had a dog, and had carried out some background research on the costs and preparation involved in the process.</p> <p>Lisa advised that the dog would need to be owned by a member of staff, who would meet the cost of the dog and any vets bills. Training costs would be met by the school, through the charity Dogs Helping Kids, with six assessments within the first three years, and then an annual assessment until retirement. It was noted that the total cost to the school would be £765 for training, plus annual costs of up to £100 for insurance.</p> <p>Governors agreed that they were happy to support the proposal, and had no objections on the basis of cost. However, it was also agreed that there was further work to be done on how this would be managed, particularly in terms of those children in school who were afraid of dogs, and the risk of biting or allergies. The Deputy Headteacher advised that there would be clear guidelines in place regarding the dog’s role in school. She explained that the initial training would be as much about managing the owner’s expectations and handling skills. In addition, there would be careful controls around the amount of contact the children had with the dog, and it would be important for staff to manage this appropriately.</p> <p>Governors agreed that there should be a full consultation with both parents/carers and children on the proposal, to ensure that any further concerns were addressed. In principle, governors agreed they were happy to support the proposal if the school wished to go ahead, on the proviso that any concerns regarding fears etc were managed appropriately.</p> <p><i>[Lisa Green left the meeting at 7.15pm]</i></p>							
5.	<p><b><u>Monitoring Report</u></b></p> <p>The Bursar tabled the monitoring report for Period 3. The Chair remarked that the profiling had not changed since the start budget, meaning that variances in the report were due to changes which had arisen since then.</p>							

	<p>It was noted that the budget was mainly on track, and that work would be done for the revised budget in the autumn to ensure that the profile fits the model more closely.</p> <p>The Bursar presented the report, and highlighted a number of points for information:</p> <p><b>INCOME</b></p> <p>I01 – Infant Class Size funding had been received in part, with the second payment expected in period 10.  I03 – SEN funding was expected to reduce due to pupil movement from the school.  I18 – Funding for Universal Infant Free School Meals and the Sports Grant were on track.  I06 – Teacher training grants would be coming in to the budget throughout the year.  I07 – Relating to the invoice for the playground development, which had now been received.  I08 – The figure for facilities and services was slightly higher due to debts for Breakfast and After School Club and lunches. The Bursar reported that these were being actively pursued, with figures much improved on the previous year.  I09 – Catering income was currently inline with expected figures.</p> <p><b>EXPENDITURE</b></p> <p>E01-E02 – Teaching costs were inline with the budget, with expenditure on supply being kept at a minimum.  E08 – It was noted that the monthly apprenticeship levy cost was included within Indirect Employee Expenses  E12-E13 – The Bursar highlighted a one off cost of approximately £1,000 for treework. In addition, it was noted that £1,000 had been included for work done by the relief site manager, though this would be recoded to sit within salary costs.  E16 – The Bursar advised that energy costs were higher than predicted, though recharges to the Children's Centre would come in the next Powersolve and would offset this in part.  E15, E17 – The Bursar advised that she would be investigating the water and sewerage charges, as well as the charges for rates as these were higher than expected.  E25 – Catering supplies costs had increased, due to the higher price of resources, as discussed at previous meetings.</p> <p>Governors thanked the Bursar for her update.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p><b><u>Review of Progress against Information Governance Audit Actions</u></b></p> <p>The Office Manager presented an update on the LA Information Governance Audit, which had taken place earlier in the year. She advised that the school's completion of the self-assessment tool had identified that a lot of recommendations were already in place.</p> <p>The Office Manager reported that the main action from the audit had been the need for data protection training for all staff involved in the handling of data and with specific duties such as marketing and information security. The Office Manager advised that this training would now be provided at induction and updated at regular intervals.</p> <p>In response to a question from governors, the Office Manager confirmed that the data policy was reviewed annually. Governors requested that a regular update be provided to the committee as part of this review, to provide assurance to governors of the school's compliance with regulations.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p><b><u>E-Safety Policy</u></b></p> <p>Previously distributed. A number of queries were raised:</p> <p><b>3.9</b> Governors asked whether there was a clear procedure in place for reporting incidents, and if so, could governors have sight of this.</p> <p><b>3.2</b> The policy stated that the governing body were responsible for ensuring appropriate filtering procedures were in place. Governors asked what these filters were – it was suggested that this query be raised with the LA and Vital as IT providers, with a report being brought back to a future meeting.</p> <p><b>3.13</b> Reference to regular meetings between governors and the e-safety officer. It was suggested that this be carried out by way of a termly review under health and safety updates.</p> <p><b>3.14/3.15</b> Governors asked for clarification, as the first clause states a termly review by governors of the E-Safety policy, whilst the second refers to the Headteacher evaluating and reviewing the policy.</p> <p><b>5.5</b> Governors requested clarification on the use of smart phones in school by staff. Clarification was also requested on the use of mobiles to take photographs, ie by parents at events.</p> <p>Governors noted that it was not possible to approve the policy at present, due to the queries outlined above, which required clarification. The Deputy Headteacher agreed to liaise with staff to further review the policy before bringing it back to the committee for approval.</p>	

<b>11.</b>	<p><b><u>Staff Code of Conduct</u></b> Previously distributed. A number of queries were raised:</p> <p>It was agreed that clarification was needed on the member of staff responsible for the Code of Conduct. A question was raised as to whether this should be the Headteacher, rather than the Office Manager.</p> <p>With reference to item 16, it was noted that this should simply state that staff would adhere to the procedures within the E-Safety Policy.</p> <p>With reference to item 18, it was suggested that re-wording was required to reflect the school's use of social media for marketing and promotion purposes.</p> <p>Governors noted that it was not possible to approve the policy at present, due to the queries outlined above, which required clarification. The Deputy Headteacher agreed to liaise with staff to further review the code of conduct before bringing it back to the committee for approval.</p>	
<b>12.</b>	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b> <b>12.1 IT Provision</b></p> <p>The Office Manager provided a brief summary, outlining the rationale for remaining with Vital for IT provision, as requested by governors at the previous meeting. She advised that the school had completed a robust tender process in 2014, which resulted in Vital being awarded the contract. It was noted that the service in the three years since this process had been consistently good, and the school had a good relationship with the provider. The Office Manager advised that other options had been explored but there had been no other alternative identified in the area that would provide the same level of service. In addition, in consideration of the possibility of conversion, the Office Manager advised that a number of other schools within the Pathfinder MAT were also with Vital. It was noted that the school had taken a three year contract, which offered a loyalty discount of 25%, with a saving of £10,702 per year.</p> <p>Governors thanked the Office Manager for her update. It was noted that the decision to remain with Vital had been agreed at the previous meeting, but it was helpful to have evidence of a clear rationale for this.</p> <p><b>12.2 Cleaning Contract Wage Levels</b></p> <p>A query had been raised at the previous meeting as to whether the cleaning contractors were paying staff the Real Living Wage. The Office Manager reported that the contract showed cleaners would be paid at £7.65 per hour, above the National Living Wage of £6.50 but below the Real Living Wage of £8.45. The Office Manager advised that the contractors had said they would only pay the Real Living Wage at the school's request, and cost the contract accordingly.</p> <p>It was noted that the school had previously made a commitment to being a Living Wage Employer, which was no longer the case in light of the hourly rate being paid by the cleaning contractors. Governors expressed their disappointment that the contractor had not factored this into the new contract. Governors agreed that this issue needed to be rectified, to ensure that all staff were paid the Real Living Wage as a minimum. Governors asked the Office Manager to raise this with the Headteacher and the contractors, and to calculate the additional cost of raising the hourly rate to £8.45. It was agreed that this should then be raised at the next full governing body meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> July.</p>	<b>JH</b>
<b>13.</b>	<p><b><u>Date and time of next meeting</u></b></p> <p>It was noted that proposed meeting dates for 2017/18 would be discussed at the full governing body meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> July.</p>	

The meeting closed at 7.55pm

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr Peter Warry  
Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Clifton Green Primary School  
Action Plan following the meeting of the Resources Committee  
held on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017**

	<b>Action</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
<b>1.</b>	Breakdown of apprenticeship levy costs and impact on the budget	6	Lisa Green	September 2017
<b>2.</b>	Request further information and a like for like quote for LED fittings, raise governor questions for response from contractors	7	Lisa Green / Martyn Stoakes	July 2017
<b>3.</b>	Cost up amendment of cleaning staff wages to reflect the Real Living Wage	12	Jackie Holmes	04/07/17

Items for next agenda

- Apprenticeship Levy update
- Pupil Premium Report (FGB?)
- E-Safety Policy
- Staff Code of Conduct

Future agenda items

- Minibus update (Autumn 2017)
- Benchmarking: identification of areas for focus (Autumn 2017)