## THORNDOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL & THORNDOWN PRE-SCHOOL

## Finance and Premises Committee Meeting Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2023 (7:15pm.) Agenda

Finance and Premises Committee Membership			
Chris Snape	Head	Nick Drury	ND
Jade Strachan	JS	Rob Jagger	RJ
Frank Newton	FN	Jill Foster	JF
Helen Cooper	SBM	Mark Farr	MF
Lisa Johnson	IJ	Craig Laurence	CL
		Emily Bedford	EBed (associate)

Item		Action	Lead
1.	Welcome / Apologies / Declarations of Interest		
1.1	Governors present: Chris Snape, Frank Newton, Mark Farr,		
	Craig Laurence, Jill Foster, Nick Drury, Helen Cooper.		
1.2	Apologies for absence: Rob Jagger, Jade Strachan, Lisa		
	Johnson and Emily Bedford.		
	,		
1.3	Absent: None.		
1.4	Declaration of interest: ND spouse works in school.		
	, and the second		
1.5	In RJ absence, ND chaired the meeting.		
2.	Minutes and action points from the meeting held on 19 <sup>th</sup>		
	January 2023		
2.1	The minutes from the meeting held on 19 <sup>th</sup> January 2023 were		
	agreed as a true and accurate record.		
2.2 3.	There were no action points from this meeting.		
3.	Head's Report		
3.1	Budget for next year is being formulated. Headline is that		
	there will be a balanced budget, but this will be using the		
	carry forward to do this. There is still some work to be made		
	around the budget in regard to staffing, so this may change.		
3.2	Notes were sent to governors in regard to updates made to		
5.2	the premises. The update on the Tree report will be included		
	in the health and safety update in agenda item 8.		
	in the health and safety apaate in agenda item 6.		
4.	Chair's Report		
	Nothing to report.		
5.	EPM Judicium Review		
5.1	Judicium pay roll offer is still in its infancy. SBM confirmed		
	that the EPM pay roll has to be double checked but suggested		
	remaining with them whilst Judicium addressing any starting		
	issues. SBM suggesting running both companies alongside		
	each other for another year, which the committee were happy		
	to continue with.		
6.	SFVS and Benchmarking	Reference	
		Document	s 1 2
6.1	SFVS: SBM has completed this document on behalf of the		
	governors. The committee were reassured that they meet		

	good practice and receive and challenge detailed reports. SBM raised that with the falling roll and tightening budgets there is a need for 6 meetings to ensure the committee were fully aware of the budget. FN raised that there were no gaps that needed addressing and confirmed that this would not be required to go to FGB. FN will sign the document as Chair of the FGB, in the absence of RJ. SBM raised that the intention this year is to present the agreed budget to staff so they gain a better understanding of the school budget. SBM explained that as an action from last year SL are involved in the budget built to assist their understanding.	
6.2	Benchmarking: SBM has used different sources from previous years and explained where these were from and how they were benchmarked against different criteria. <b>CHALLENGE</b> : ND asked if the benchmarking data was focussed mostly on	CHALLENGE
	the budget, which SBM confirmed. <b>CHALLENGE:</b> ND asked if there is a benchmark for a stereotypical school, which CS stated that all the benchmarking data depends on the size of the school. SBM highlighted that the benchmarking shows that the school is broadly in line with other similar schools. The committee went through each chart, as broken down Per Pupil, and discussed each benchmarked section and how the	CHALLENGE
	school compared. <b>CHALLENGE:</b> ND asked if there were any numbers that the committee should be concerned about. Which SBM said there was none, the biggest area of expenditure was the full time equivalent staff, which was high in comparison, but SBM explained the reasons why.	CHALLENGE
3	<b>CHALLENGE</b> : CL raised that some benchmarked charts were not listed as per pupil. SBM said she would look at those charts and recirculate a per pupil costing. <b>CHALLENGE</b> : CL also asked that with the full time equivalent workforce being so high whether there was a group that was affecting this rating. SBM stated she would see if this could be broken down	CHALLENGE CHALLENGE
	into groups. <b>ACTION</b> : SBM to update the benchmarking data as the committees requests	ACTION
7.	Budget Monitor	Reference Documents 4 5 6 7
7.1	SBM had shared notes prior to the meeting and SBM ran through the highlights in the meeting. Changes to the curriculum will be built into the budget going forward.  CHALLENGE: FN asked if the backdated pay awards had affected the budget, which SBM confirmed it has but it was built in as it was expected.	CHALLENGE
7.2	Ukraine Support Funding: SBM highlighted that some financial support for Ukraine families in school had been received.  CHALLENGE: FN asked if this funding was expected, which SBM stated it was not and can be used on educational support. CHALLENGE: MF asked if the families were aware that this support was available, CS stated that through links with the rotary club they were aware. The committee were pleased to hear of the quantity of Ukraine families in school and that this fund was available to all. There was a robust discussion on how well this money could be used to support those families.	CHALLENGE

10.	Summary of impact on standards and progress	
9.1	CHALLENGE: FN raised that there was a discussion regarding the telephone lines being disconnected in 2025. SBM has not received a letter regarding this but had been in conversations with BT regarding the move to internet phone lines.	CHALLENGE
9.	provided some resources to pass on to the Science Lead.  Any other business	
8.2	JF wanted to ensure that the committee were fully aware of what the County are asking the School to complete on their behalf but that without the appropriate training or clarification regarding the liability she has raised a concern to the LA on the GB's behalf. The committee were in agreement that JF was right to raise a concern. JF reassured the committee that other schools were also raising a concern regarding this suggested programme. <b>CHALLENGE</b> : FN asked if this concern could be escalated to the Director of Education, which CS stated that if they did not have a response from the LA then it could be. CS also suggested talking to the grounds maintenance company the school employs to see if they are qualified for this type of work.  JF has recently attended a H&S in teaching work shop and	CHALLENGE
8.1	Tree Survey: JF explained the recent County Council review of the trees on site in that the H&S team have asked the schools to complete their own tree surveys and explained the reasons behind this. JF, SBM and the Caretaker have raised concerns that they are not qualified to complete a tree risk assessment, nor have the available time to map, tag and report on over 200 tress on the premises. <b>CHALLENGE:</b> ND asked where the liability would be if the school were to complete a risk assessment. JF responded that she has asked this of the LA and they could not clarify. JF has raised a concern that the H&S advisor at County has asked them to complete this survey, without being able to confirm where the liability is. <b>CHALLENGE:</b> ND asked if the school was liable if they did not complete this survey, which JF responded that is why she has raised a concern to County.	CHALLENGE
8.	Review of Health and Safety	Refence Document 3
7.4	ITE: There are concerns across Cambridgeshire regarding a lack of pupils, which is being attributed to the cost of living crisis. The programme for next year currently has 4 pupils confirmed and following an advert in the Hunts Post and time of year there has been an increase in interest.	
7.3	Eco Project Funding: SBM highlighted that the school had received funding for Eco Projects, <b>CHALLENGE</b> : FN asked if this funding was ring fenced, which SBM confirmed but it was a broad criteria of how to could be spent. Therefore, the school are looking at using it for more energy efficient ICT equipment. <b>CHALLENGE</b> : ND raised that in the notes there had been an overspend on electricity and asked for further information. SBM confirmed that the invoices did not have the government scheme on it and explained what payments had been made. SBM is predicting an overspend on this but is monitoring the usage and explained how the heating is run on gas boilers and air source heat pumps and that the kitchen runs on both gas and electric.	CHALLENGE

10.1	The committee agreed that the impact of this meeting on	
	standards and to drive progress was:	
	<ul> <li>They were updating on the SFVS, which demonstrate</li> </ul>	
	that robust systems are in place to ensure the	
	committee are compliant on budgetary matters.	
	The committee looked in depth at the benchmarking	
	data and ensure the school was operating in the	
	parameters of similar schools.	

The meeting closed at 20:21

## **Finance and Premises Action Points**

		Lead	Outcome
AP1	6.2 SBM to update the benchmarking data as the committees requests	SBM	May 23

**6.2** SBM to update the benchmarking data as the committees requests

## Finance and Premises – Reference Documents

	Reference Documents
1.	SFVS
2.	Benchmarking Data 2021-2022
3.	Premises Notes March 23
4.	Budget Monitoring and Finances Feb 23
5.	Pre School BMR Feb 23
6.	Fund 01 BMR Feb 23
7.	DFC BMR Feb 23