



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

Part 1

**Minutes of Resources Committee virtual meeting held on 29 September 2021 at 8am via Zoom**

<b>Governors Present:</b>	Firas Ali (FA) James Lane (JL) (Chair) Philippe Tapernoux (TP) Richard Rosewell (RW) Acting Head Teacher Alice McArdle (AMcA) Charlotte Axbey (CA)
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Svetlana Koksharova Business Manager (SK) Jackie Dutton (Clerk)
<b>Absent:</b>	None

Item	Action
<p>1. <b><u>Apologies for Absence</u></b></p> <p>None. The meeting was quorate throughout. Governors thanked SK for putting the meeting's documents together.</p>	
<p>2. <b><u>Governors' Declaration of Interests</u></b></p> <p>No direct or indirect pecuniary interests were declared.</p>	
<p>3. <b><u>Terms of Reference and Scheme of Delegation (Resources section)</u></b></p> <p>Governors reviewed these documents and it had been agreed to move the Data Protection governor to Resources - this would go to the full FGB meeting for approval.</p> <p>The curriculum section needed to include multi media – this would also be discussed at the next FGB meeting – it overlapped between Resources and Development and Pupils Committees. The Scheme of Delegation would be checked with the new Head.</p> <p>A governor noted that more actions were delegated to the Headteacher but a corresponding line said it could not be assigned – this should be checked.</p>	<p>Clerk-agenda</p> <p>Clerk -agenda</p> <p>JW</p> <p>SK</p>
<p>4. <b><u>Minutes of the last meeting - 26 May 2021</u></b></p>	

	<p>P 3 Item 6 SK had changed figures – the final balance was £82687 – the deficit figure on p3 was correct.</p> <p>With this amendment, Governors <b>agreed</b> the minutes from the last meeting were a true and accurate record. The Clerk would send amended minutes of the last meeting to JW for signing and to file at school when next possible. An electronic version would be filed online.</p> <p><i>Matters arising</i></p> <p>P4 Item 8 the Early Careers Policy would come to the November meeting.</p> <p>P3 Item 6 Chrome books – SK had discussed this with the IT lead teacher and the IT technician – it would be a big project to assess all the IT assets so there was a pause on leasing 60 Chromebooks. An immediate need to purchase a few laptops for teachers had been identified - once this was done a full audit would be carried out and a report prepared to come to Resources Committee.</p> <p><b>Q Is there any budget for this for the time being?</b> A This is still sitting in the budget as leased.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk – agenda</p> <p>SK</p>
5.	<p><b><u>Deficit recovery for 2022/23</u></b></p> <p>The final budget showed a deficit in Yrs 2 and 3 so AfC could not approve the budget until the figures for the next year were positive. This would be considered after the item on budget monitoring.</p> <p><b>Q Had this letter been expected?</b> A No – for the last financial year the 3 year budget was in deficit too but AfC did not send a letter.</p> <p><b>Q Would funding be reduced?</b> A No – the school needed to take steps to make savings this year in order to balance the budget for the next financial year.</p>	
6.	<p><b><u>Budget Monitoring</u></b></p> <p>The monitoring report to 22 September showed an in-year deficit of £280443. Taking the brought forward balance into account this gave a projected carry forward of £146291.</p> <p><i>Changes made/savings achieved</i></p> <p>The original budget included a teachers’ increase of 2% but this would not take place. Teachers earning less than £24K would receive £250 but there would be no rises for other teachers.</p> <p>Support staff – a pay increase of 2.75% was included in the initial budget but this was not confirmed yet. The unions and the LA were negotiating – a figure was in the budget for this.</p> <p>Additional appointments were made at lower scale points than budgeted. There were some other minor variances in staff costs.</p> <p>Insurance had a slight overspend – the qualifying period for the staff absence scheme had been decreased to 1 day for Teaching Assistants (was 5 days) – this would increase claims for the income side.</p> <p>There was an underspend of £1K in hygiene materials.</p> <p>For water and utilities, SK was projecting £2600 underspend - utility contracts had been renewed recently. There were concerns about the gas price increases..</p> <p>Rates – the council tax for the bungalow had increased (Special Resource Provision). At the 6 December FGB meeting there would be someone coming from AfC and the LA to talk about the Special Resource Provision. The</p>	

<p>bungalow had been decorated with the intention of renting it out but the LA had not agreed to that. SK would talk to the Project Lead for the LA – the Council would not move on the council tax side.</p> <p><b>Q What is the rationale for not letting the bungalow? Could an external letting be agreed?</b></p> <p>A A short term letting could be agreed but the person who was interested wanted a letting for at least 18 months or more. The LA would want to implement a new proposal for the bungalow within that time frame. The boiler had broken down and needed replacing - this would be an additional cost which would not be feasible for a short term let. There were also safeguarding issues with other options such as B &amp; B. It had been advertised to staff for renting but no one was interested in this. A quote for a new boiler could be obtained. The FGB meeting would discuss this further...</p> <p>Curriculum costs – there was a residential trip (income from parental contributions would show in the income side). New exercise books and diaries had been purchased which were not in the budget.</p> <p>Some projects were funded by the PTA – expenditure would be in expenditure and donations from the PTA would balance this in the income side. The residential spending would be £10K with £1K paid as a deposit. When the budget was set the trip was planned for later on in the year - this had not been arranged when the budget was set. Some vulnerable families would receive a 25% reduction and the school would get a grant from Richmond Parish Land Charity towards that, Pupil Premium funding would also be used. As per the Charging and Remissions Policy vulnerable families could be asked for board and lodging costs in full. Payments would be made in 3 instalments – 2 this year and a third in the next financial year. The budgeted amount would be spent – SK noted that more families were asking for help – each claim was assessed.</p> <p>Catering and admin costs were as budgeted</p> <p>Agency and other professional services- there would be a slight overspend – a Finance Officer had resigned and recruitment was taking place. Clerking costs were also included in this. There would be an underspend on staffing costs to balance this.</p> <p>Income &amp; Funding – the top up funding for SEN had increased. There would be new recovery funding for pupil premium children from September (see link in the spreadsheet for more details)</p> <p>There was an increase in lettings – the number of clubs was growing.</p> <p>Debt recovery – a payment plan was now agreed and was being paid monthly – this would give about £3K extra this financial year.</p> <p>Staff absence scheme income - £16K had been received. There was a high staff absence currently (colds not Covid). One staff member is on long term sickness absence.</p> <p><b>Q Do we have insurance for this?</b></p> <p>A Yes – the staff absence scheme with the LA. If the LA had any surplus at the end of the year up to 150% could be claimed.</p> <p>There would also be a maternity claim.</p> <p><b>Q We don't bring in supply teachers – is that a net receipt?</b></p> <p>A No proof of agency cover was not needed - the school used existing staff whenever possible and only used supply cover when there was no other option.</p> <p>Parental contributions and donations - £17K so far</p> <p>Parents had been asked for the first instalment of the residential trip and would be chased for this the following week – this figure would increase for the next Resources meeting.</p>	<p>SK</p> <p>Clerk – agenda</p>
---	---------------------------------

	<p><b>Q How does the PTA contribution compare to previous years?</b></p> <p>A Last year there was not so much from the PTA – the PTA were now looking at outdoor provision with the idea for small equipment for the children outside as well as replacing an old gazebo.</p> <p>Additional grants – Universal Infant Free School Meals – this was slightly more than budgeted as it was an estimate when the budget was set (up £2800). The figure was based on the census figure for KS1 children and an average was taken.</p> <p><i>Deficit recovery</i></p> <p>SK shared the amended final budget sheet and the projected closing balance for 2021-22 was estimated at £146291. For 2022-23 there was a brought forward amount of £146291 and a projected closing balance of £29394. The deficit was now in 2023-24. Staffing costs were the highest element and it was not known yet what that would look like that far ahead. There was an increase in NI in the next financial year. The LA wanted the school to make savings in this financial year to improve the position for 2022-23 and take that year out of deficit – that had been achieved.</p> <p>SK had replaced the surplus figure and reported this to AfC – this now gave a positive budget for Yr 1. This would be monitored carefully and expenditure strictly controlled. There were further staff changes and SK would present a revised budget to Resources Committee and report back to the LA. The final budget had to be approved by this committee and the FGB before going to the LA.</p> <p><b>Q Should governors be looking at not having any deficits going forward?</b></p> <p>A Governors should set a balanced budget for the next financial year – reserves could be used to do this but the impact of this considered. Ideally a school would balance in year and governors might have some hard decisions to make. The new Head coming in might have ideas for staffing structure etc going forward – a working group might be formed to look at this.</p> <p>Expenditure would be monitored carefully especially for any unbudgeted items.</p> <p>Capital funds were about £11K.</p> <p>Governors <b>approved</b> the budget monitoring report and the current position of the budget for the next financial year. Governors noted that savings would be needed to prevent a future deficit. When the new Head was in post JL would have monthly meetings with her and they would look at the staffing structure.</p> <p>Governors agreed that SK monitored income and expenditure very effectively – the committee would look at this at every meeting . At the next meeting there would be a high focus on the Budget Monitoring Report to 16 November 2021 plus an update on the next financial year. JL, SK and the Clerk would prepare the agenda for that meeting. There would also be an update on the curriculum ICT plan.</p> <p>RR had spoken with ClickonIt London (IT technician) and meeting was to be held with SK, RR and the new Head in the first two weeks after half term.</p>	<p>SK Clerk - agenda</p> <p>Resources Comm JL, SK, Clerk</p>
7	<p><b><u>Capital funding review</u></b></p> <p>ICT was being reviewed.</p> <p>Yr 2 toilet refurbishment – this was hoped to be finished by the end of half term - there was a saving of £5K as there were no suitable portable loos available and the director of KS1 had said they could manage.</p> <p>Boundary wall repair – the capital bid was successful but progress was very slow. The wall was fenced off for H &amp; S reasons. All examinations and sampling had been carried out so the school was now waiting for the LA to take</p>	

	<p>the next step. A survey had been arranged with residents but this was likely to be a lengthy project. An update would be given at the next FGB meeting. SK noted that the LA person for capital funding was the same as for the Special Resource Provision so she would check on this too. SK would also check with JL for a suitable date to come in to walk the boundary.</p> <p>Some small capital projects had been carried out:          Heating in Yr 1 classrooms          Wall art was on hold and a final decision was needed on designs          Big hall external doors had been replaced          Small hall decoration was starting at half term          On line classroom management for ICT          Fire doors and corridors – the cost in the budget was for replacing the doors but not connecting them to the fire alarm system. The Site Manager was getting quotes for connecting to the fire system but it was proving difficult to get quotes currently. The doors with the heaviest traffic pattern would be replaced – SK would report the full costs to this committee and JL when available.</p> <p><b>Q What did the fire risk assessment say? Q Is this a serious H &amp; S issue that should be done even if expensive?</b>          A SK said it was flagged as should be done or highly recommended          Replacing two sets would be an improvement and another set of doors could be replaced in the second year. Doing two sets of doors was a short term solution. The doors were always on the H &amp; S visit and highlighted as a hazard. The school could budget over 2 -3 years to replace all the doors in the corridor</p> <p><b>Q Governors should be aware of the full costs involved?</b>  <b>Q What does linking doors to the fire system mean? Is it every door?</b>          A The Site Manager was getting the full costs – this would come back to this committee to consider how much and when. Doors in the corridor were kept open in the school day- if there was a fire it would trigger automatic closure of those doors. There were only a few doors now with automatic closers – other doors were propped open and would not close so did need replacing – it was not every door.</p> <p><b>Q Why are they propped open?</b>          A It is a high traffic area with people and pupils in the corridors - they did need to be open all the time as they were heavy and there was a risk of fingers getting trapped.</p> <p>JL proposed getting the doors done first and also to consider how to budget for the wider cost – replacement doors would be needed not just the closing mechanism. Fire doors are more solid than normal doors – the current doors were not fire doors and had no closing mechanism.</p> <p><b>Q When can this be done?</b>          A SK would chase the Site Manager about this and the quote for connecting to the fire system and get this prioritised. Once a quote was received a decision could be taken about how many to replace and connect to the fire system, hopefully at the same time. This would be brought to this committee for a decision after cross checking with the fire risk assessment. SK would check this with the H &amp; S Officer and explain the potential plan for replacement.</p> <p><b>Q Is the school still compliant?</b>          A Replacing the doors was a priority.</p>	<p>Clerk – agenda          SK, JL</p> <p>SS</p> <p>SK</p>
9.	<p><b><u>Policies</u></b></p> <p>Lettings – The policy had not changed but SK had looked at all the charges and had increased them slightly – see the Appendix. The last increase was in 2008. All clubs were asked to provide a free space for a PP child for every 10 places – this was already happening.</p> <p><b>Q Were the hirers happy with this?</b>          A Yes it was expected but SK needed governor approval before she could tell hirers. SK had checked the charges with other schools and they were well in line. The PE Coach also hired other venues and she was happy with the</p>	

	<p>charges. The areas highlighted in yellow would be tidied up. This was all <b>agreed</b> and the policy and appendix would go to the next FGB meeting for approval.</p> <p><b>Q A governor queried the deposit of £100 and asked if it should be increased?</b></p> <p>A JL asked if there had been any issues over this and SK reported it had never proved a problem – the school mainly had one-off lettings. One football club bought new nets when needed though some damage might be from foxes. This was discussed and it was <b>agreed</b> that SK would check with other schools to see what they were charging. Governors also discussed if full payment should be requested at the time of booking – this might cause issues with cancellations/administration (currently 50% of hire charge for regular hirers if cancelled with less than one week notice) – it was <b>agreed</b> that JL FA and SK would discuss this further outside the meeting. The next Resources meeting was on 16 November 2021 and the FGB on 6 December 2021.</p> <p>Terms of reference – <b>agreed</b> with no changes</p> <p>Governors' expenditure policy - A governor queried that only mileage was covered for cost of travel. SK confirmed that governors had not submitted any expense claims for a few years, other than for planning applications etc connected to a project. The cost of public transport was included in the policy. This was discussed and it was <b>agreed</b> that expenditure had to be authorised in advance of it being made and would need the approval of the Chair of Resources. SK would amend this policy. She also needed advance notice to include in the budgeting.</p> <p>9.40 am CA left the meeting.</p>	<p>Clerk – agenda</p> <p>SK</p> <p>JL, FA, SK</p> <p>SK</p>
10	<p><b><u>AOB see Part 2</u></b></p> <p>Following Part 2 items the meeting closed at 9.46 am</p>	