



The Vineyard School Governing Board
Friars Stile Road, Richmond TW10 6NE

Part 1

Minutes of Resources Committee meeting held on 9 March 2022 at 7.45am via Zoom

Governors Present: Firas Ali (FA)
James Lane (JL) (Chair)
Philippe Tapernoux (PT)
Frances Bracegirdle (FB) Head
Alice McArdle (AMcA)

In Attendance: Svetlana Koksharova Business Manager (SK)
Jackie Dutton (Clerk)

Item	Action
1. <u>Apologies for Absence</u> None	
2. <u>Governors' Declaration of Interests</u> None	
3. <u>Minutes of the last meeting - 16 November 2021</u> These were agreed as an accurate record and would be signed by JL	JL
4. <u>Matters arising not on the agenda</u> There were no matters arising not on the agenda	
5. <u>Budget Monitoring</u> Information had been sent out in advance of the meeting. The budget did reflect the staff changes - the Deputy Head leaving would impact in the following financial year. Q Were there any events on the horizon which would impact the budget? A No - there would only be small amounts relating to orders coming through in the second half of term, also a subscription for assessment. Q Does that include Covid Recovery and Catch up funding? A This was all in the budget. Q How does the school buy energy?	

	<p>A Via a broker from the Council for both gas and electric. There was a contract for 2 years ending September 2022. SK had taken variable rates and projected this forward for the next financial year. For the following year she had increased this by 50%. There was a predicted spend of £48K for 2021 -22 and projected £75K for the following year.</p> <p>In September 2023 there would be the new SEND provision and there was nothing in the budget for that building yet. SK would ask the LA team about what figure to put in. The school was now in a period of statutory consultation with residents and parents</p> <p>A governor requested that the LA be asked to be as carbon neutral as possible and asked what the council's take on moving to carbon neutral. Had solar panels on the roof been considered? The project was at a very early stage and this would be monitored. The school already had solar panels. At the last Resources meeting a discussion was held about having a ESG link governor (environmental/social and governance). JL would take this on if no-one else volunteered.</p> <p>PT was currently acting as a Finance Link Governor.</p>	<p>SK</p> <p>JL</p> <p>PT</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><u>Draft Budget 2022 - 23</u></p> <p>There was an additional grant for the NI increase and energy costs. Business managers were briefed about this the previous day - in following years this element would be part of the main funding.</p> <p>Staffing costs - SK had not put a pay increase in the budget for 2022- 23 - if she increased Teaching Staff by 2% there would be an additional £19K and £20.3K for support staff. Was there a 17K too as a possibility?</p> <p>A figure of £70K had been put in the budget for 21 - 22 - if an HR case had been pursued the school would have been notified by now. This would not be in 2022 -23 but would be borne in mind. A pay increase for Year 3 financial year had been included.</p> <p>PT had gone through the budget line by line with SK and thanked her for the time spent on this. FB had also gone through the staffing structure with SK.</p> <p>A second version included 1.75% in the budget and onwards. If the draft budget was agreed SK would use V 2 to go to FGB - that had not been sent to governors yet.</p> <p>Staff Absence Scheme (SAS) - the school had signed up to this for the next year. In 2020 -21 the school received reimbursement of £7658.72 for unspent funds. There had been a high level of absences due to Covid this year - due to high level of claims in 2021-22 the level of claims is reduced to 105% (from 150%) and no reimbursements for unspent funds are expected.</p> <p>Q Should we go ahead to renew this? A In previous years this has been agreed - SK had put this in and estimated the level of claims at 50% of what was paid into the scheme.</p> <p>Q 50% of claims- how did that compare? A In the draft budget the premium was covered because of Covid- £30K back plus 5%. If staff absences were low then it was a big cost - it was an insurance so there was some risk. SK had made a historical comparison - in the last 3 years there was one year where the school did not get claims equal to the premium.</p> <p>Q If £60K was lost but the school got back £31500 there was still a balance in this financial year? We could put £30K in an account to be used to offset costs? A SK had suggested that a couple of years previously but governors had decided to use the scheme. The scheme did cover maternity for teachers but not the on-costs. It was agreed to go ahead with the scheme this year and review it mid-financial year 2022-23 to inform the decision for the following financial year.</p> <p>Artis provision - the school was not using the advert for a music teacher.</p> <p>Clerking and finance officer costs were now included in staffing costs for 2022 -23 for this year they were in agency costs.</p> <p><i>Building and running costs for 2022 -23</i></p> <p>Cleaning contract costs increased (in line with agreement) due to increase in minimum wage increase in London.</p> <p><i>Curriculum costs for 2022 -23</i></p>	<p>SK</p>

These were broadly in line with the predicted outturn for 2021-22 with a slight increase in some areas. The school could not charge for day trips or swimming as these were voluntary contributions so income was not necessarily enough to cover costs. Expenditure for trips and swimming had been put at £15 - 20K higher than the income (I12)

Funding/income for 2022 -23

This was the second year the school was not full and £110K of funding was lost. The school had been given £10,418 to meet the minimum pupil funding level so there was an overall loss of £100K in funding for next year.

Q What can be done to increase pupil numbers?

A This was very difficult and all schools were having the same problem. There had been a lot of movement between schools, possibly because of Brexit/Covid. Yrs 3 and 4 had the lowest numbers but the school did not know reasons for this - there might be more movement to private schools.

Q Was there still demand for places in Reception?

A Yes it was oversubscribed. Yrs 6 and Yr R had 90 - 92 pupils and the mid years were not full - 86 or 87. A lot of pupils from Yr 4 went to private school - it may be that the threshold for entry dropped during lockdown so more pupils were able to get a place and there may have been more aggressive marketing from independent schools about joining junior departments in order to make it easier to get into senior schools.

Q Do we get more children into Yr 6 then to build numbers there?

A It was just the way it went - Yr 6 was full most years. There was a need to get the message out to parents that they could get into the school - there was a perception that it was impossible to get a place unless they lived close to the school. It was difficult to word the message without creating a negative image. Numbers had been lower in Yrs 3 and 4 for two years now - there were definitely year groups where less children were available.

Governors asked the SLT to review the opportunities to discreetly market places - this would be revisited at the next meeting.

SLT

The reduced class numbers had been costed in to the budget (600 across years not 630) so if they increased it would benefit the school.

Q Was there any way that the capacity could be increased in the Early Years?

A There were some circumstances in which more children could be taken but there was no guarantee they would not leave. That would impact class sizes and parents would not be happy.

Q Could there be another class?

A 3.5 classes would be difficult to manage. The wellbeing of teachers also had to be considered.

Capital - 2022 - 23

The wall repair has not happened this year - the capital bid for next year for the other wall has been successful so it was hoped to do both together. Both the 50% payment for the fire doors and the wiring are included in the capital programme for 2022 -23. Some wall art might be programmed.

There was £11K in capital funds, any expenditure over that would need to come from revenue funds.

Q Is there anything in for the music room?

A No, nothing. There would be a cost for building regulations and compliance with safeguarding needs/wifi/phone/fire alarms etc. SK would put together a budget for that. The planning application was not complete so SK had had to give priority to that paperwork. JL would be happy to help Svetlana with the work on the budget if she wished.

SK
JL

Year 2 draft budget for 2023 - 24

Supplementary grant will be a part of funding in future years and each year the school received 0.5% increase in funding. In April 2023 the school would get the first payment of £29934 for the specialist resource provision ready for September and there would be a further £73461 for staffing costs and some building maintenance. SK planned to visit a couple of schools with a specialist provision to look at their spend on building/staffing/admin etc. The figures were included in the main budget.

Staffing costs included a 2% pay raise and reflect the change in the specialist resource provision from April 2023 onwards.

Q Could inflation go over that percentage?

	<p>A 2% was used for staffing and other expenditure had some increases eg building costs, curriculum. The unions had proposed a 10% increase but this was not very likely. Governors noted that if it was at that level it would be hoped that funding would increase to cover this.</p> <p>This gave a £70K deficit but SK had been conservative with assumptions especially around income and had included risks.</p> <p>Q The comparables for general learning resources showed the school was at the lower end - in light of the budget position was there room for the SLT to invest in more learning resources eg new music concept which had a teacher for 3 days a week which could move to 5 days a week?</p> <p>A SK had gone through all the subscriptions and looked at costs of exercise books etc - it was agreed that SK and FB would discuss this further and bring this back to governors. It was agreed that the budget would be presented to FGB as it was but subject to potential additions. It would be helpful for the FGB to have a summary of the budget listing risks and opportunities.</p> <p>The budget was agreed.</p>	FGB
7.	<p><u>SFVS Schools Financial Value Standard</u></p> <p>The updated version had been sent to governors including comments. The deadline for submission was 31 March 2022. There were slightly more questions this year and normally it would show the schools data v schools nationally but this was not there this year. SK had sent out a powerpoint presentation on comparables.</p> <p>Q Was benchmarking used? - Q 17</p> <p>A Yes</p> <p>Q 27 - Fraud - SK had set out measures to prevent this and there had been no incidences over the last 12 month basis. Q 28 - Yes there was a Whistleblowing policy.</p> <p>The SFVS was discussed and agreed - it would go to FGB for final approval - AC would sign the form then.</p> <p>8.59 FA left</p>	FGB
8.	<p><u>Benchmarking</u></p> <p>Self assessment dashboard - this showed a comparison between two years, 2020 - 21 and 2021-22, based on the budget monitoring figures. Education support staff were in the highest 10%, teaching staff in the lowest 20%, average teacher costs were in the lowest 10%</p> <p>Q Did the School Development and Pupil Committee need to see this dashboard?</p> <p>A Yes it could.</p> <p>SK had gone through this with PT - the school was compared to schools with a similar number of pupils. Marshgate was not part of that voluntary group.</p> <p>Governors were asked to send any questions to SK. PT had been happy with this when he had gone through it with SK.</p>	S,D & P Govs
9.	<p><u>Update on bungalow</u> - already discussed</p>	
10.	<p><u>Policies to review</u></p> <p><i>Data Protection Policy and Data Retention.</i> There was a meeting with the DPO (Data Protection Officer) the following day and an update would be given - there were no significant changes to the policies. Governors queried if Simon Williams was the governor responsible for Data protection? It was agreed the policies would go to the FGB with a recommendation for approval.</p> <p><i>Bereavement</i> - this was a new policy and applied to pupils and staff, though bereavement of a family member was mentioned too. It mainly concerned what to do if this happened in school but did cover death at the weekend.</p> <p>Para 2.2. Was it worth setting out how the wellbeing team was made up?</p> <p>A it was agreed to do that.</p>	FGB FB

	With that change the policy was agreed and would go to the FGB	FGB
11.	<u>Date of next meeting - 18 May 2022</u> SK would email out dates for meetings. This committee would meet 6 times a year.	SK
12.	<u>AOB</u> - nothing to report The meeting closed at 9.17 pm with no Part 2 items.	