

Full Governing Board Meeting
Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 16th May 2022
at 6:00pm at the Sherwood Hill Campus and via Google Meet

PART A



Fran Boto (FB)	Co-opted Governor	Present	
Eileen Bone (EB)	Foundation Governor (Vice-Chair)	Present	
Robin Dear (RD)	Foundation Governor		Absent
Matthew Grew (MG)	Co-opted Governor	Present	
Claire Hadcocks (CH)	Co-opted Governor (Chair)	Present	
Brian Ikin (BI)	Co-opted Governor	Present	
David Murden (DM)	Ex-Officio Governor / Headteacher	Present	
Chris Williams (CW)	Local Authority Governor	Present	
Stephenie Shvern (SS)	Parent Governor		Absent
Tracey Townsend (TT)	Staff Governor	Present	
VajeHa Haq (VH)	Parent Governor		Absent
Barry Walder (BW)	Finance Consultant; SMS Ltd		Absent
Rosemary Viggiani (RV)	Clerk	Present	
Bethany Brookes (BB)	Assistant Head	Present	

	Item	Action
1.	<p>Welcome; Apologies for absence and quorum (3)</p> <p>CH opened the meeting at 6pm and welcomed all to the Sherwood Hill Campus. Apologies were received and accepted from SS for personal reasons; RD and BW for work related reasons. Apologies were not received from VH.</p> <p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest regarding items on the agenda.</p> <p>Appointment of Governors and welcome / introductions</p> <p><u>Co-opted Governor</u></p> <p>CH introduced and welcomed Matthew Grew (MG). MG was recommended for appointment as a co-opted Governor. MG introduced himself and gave details of his background and experience. <i>MG left the room.</i></p> <p>DECISION: MG was unanimously appointed as a co-opted governor and was invited back into the room.</p> <p><u>Associate Member:</u></p> <p>It was noted that Natalie Taylor (NT) wishes to apply for the role of Associate Member. She had applied for the role of Parent Governor but her application was received late by the Clerk and after the appointment of VH. The Chair had spoken with NT and suggested that the role of Associate Member may be appropriate given her experience as a parent and her passion to support the school.</p> <p>Governors debated the role description for an Associate Member. It was suggested that the role should be for a year and could be renewed after that time.</p> <p>DECISION: The role description for the Associate Member position was agreed.</p> <p>ACTION: RV to follow up with NT regarding her application form.</p>	43

	Item	Action
2.	<p>Minutes of the previous meeting held on 30th March 2022</p> <p>As this is an extraordinary meeting for the purpose of agreeing the three-year budget and the deficit recovery plan (DRP), approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 30th March 2022 was deferred to the next meeting.</p> <p>Matters arising (see action list below)</p> <p>The actions outstanding are noted in the table below.</p>	
3.	<p>Finance:</p> <p><u>Approval of the 3-year plan and the Deficit Recovery Plan</u></p> <p><i>Papers were circulated prior to the meeting.</i></p> <p>It was noted that the school has ended 2021-22 with an in-year balance of -£15k. This is a creditable result – although it was noted that there are still some risks to this figure. The final outturn should be clarified by the next Finance Committee meeting although the VAT related risk may take a bit longer to finalise; the school is still trying to locate the receipts for the capital expenditure to close that item.</p> <p>This 21/22 outturn means that the carry-forward deficit is £-448k and a deficit recovery plan (DRP) has been developed to allow this to be repaid over a reasonable and achievable timescale; The DRP has been agreed in principle with the Finance Committee and with the LA at a meeting on 3rd March; it is presented for formal approval by the full Board tonight.</p> <p>It was noted that the LA are supportive of our 22/3 budget our 3 year plan and the DRP and are encouraged by the school limiting the in-year deficit to £15k this year. At the meeting they had asked incisive questions; they clearly understood what the school wants to do and are very supportive of it. However, no-one underestimates the challenge of delivering against the proposed budget.</p> <p>The LA had asked if the proposals had been approved by the Board; the school confirmed that the Board had seen the proposals but had not yet approved them – the Board wished to wait until the LA had confirmed that they were acceptable.</p> <p>The DRP is based on four repayments of: £50k, £146k, £96k and a final £150k in 2025/26</p> <p>Key points to note are that the contingency this year is very small and the risks include the soaring costs of utilities and the uncertainties around staff cover; income from lettings is also uncertain – it was noted that it will be very tough to deliver against this plan.</p> <p>It was noted that managing the finances and deficit recovery is a work in progress; it is suggested that there should be more GB finance meetings in 2022/23 to scrutinise and support the Headteacher in delivering the budget.</p> <p>Some of the key assumptions are that the school will be full to capacity with a bulge class – a total of 170 places with 18 out of Borough students. £50k has been allowed for in terms of income from a third site in future years although run costs of the third site have not yet been included. If this does not happen then there will need to be alternative means to find the £50k either through alternative sources of income or through reducing costs. .</p> <p>Staffing cost as % of income is planned to be at 87% - which is down on previous levels and more in line with other special schools.</p> <p>Governors asked a range of questions including:</p> <p><i>Which are the other Boroughs who fund students at Sherwood Park?</i></p> <p><i>Are we charging the correct amount to other Boroughs – should we charge more to reflect the fact that costs have increased and our charges have not?</i></p> <p><i>Can we increase our out-of-Borough charges during the year? Are there legal or other restrictions?</i></p> <p>It was noted that most out-of-Borough children come from Croydon, Merton and Surrey.</p> <p>The schools charges have remained static for many years; there is some scope to increase the charges. The fees are now invoiced termly whereas they used to be billed annually in arrears.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>There are also additional costs for Out of Borough children associated with the different paperwork and more difficult processes for accessing support services which the school need to be able to recoup.</p> <p>In terms of calculating the costs for out of borough children some assumptions can be made from other Out of Borough children and the school can also cost the support required.. There is no intention to 'profit' from out of borough children just to ensure that the charges fully cover the costs of the provision.</p> <p>Any increase over current has not been built into the budget so would be a benefit to the school. What will help is moving away from a negotiated basis for each individual child to an agreed fee structure. On the question of legal limitations it is understood that there is no legal cap on costs but charges should be transparent and justifiable. Local Authorities are under massive pressure and are doing all they can to not send children out of borough; they are looking to review costs and there is always a risk that they may not agree to any increase in charges – equally we believe that the school's charges, even if marginally increased, would be far less than those in the private sector.</p> <p><i>Some of the discussions held in this part of the meeting are recorded in the Part B Minutes.</i></p> <p><i>Governors emphasised the need for robust and regular reporting and the need to work within the agreed budget.</i></p> <p>DM affirmed that, whilst the exact plans in some areas have yet to be finalised, the middle rows of the budget may flex, but DM understands that the top and bottom lines will be set.</p> <p><i>Governors asked whether the factors driving the historic over-spend have now been identified and addressed in the proposed budget?</i></p> <p>DM noted that one key factor was the overspending on staff. The current plans are now funded for all pupils at what DM believes is a reasonable amount and DM feels confident that he can manage resources within the recommended budget. .</p> <p>Other significant past variants have been the number of agency staff and the lack of tight control over cover expenditure. . More controls have now been put in place to manage this. The Deputy Heads are now accountable for managing cover within the budget available and DH is monitoring and managing the use of agency staff cover on a daily basis. There are more controls, clearer expectations and greater understanding from the staff – DM has spoken to all staff to say that we cannot overspend. We have golden rules and will monitor to see what works. However, it is also recognised that the school has to deliver an excellent education. Timetabling has improved and the school is tightening up on synchronicity. DM is now more confident that the school will be able to stick to the budget for this large variable.</p> <p>Governors noted that the school has come a huge distance in a short time. Back in January the school was nowhere near this level of understanding and control. Governors asked DM to pass on their thanks and congratulations to everyone involved.</p> <p><i>DM stepped out of the meeting at 6:35pm.</i></p> <p>Governors noted that the improved situation is in large part due to DM finding a way to control expenditure better and build the proposed budget and three year plan in a an open and transparent process with the LA so that all parties have a clear and shared view of the plans, the risks and the opportunities. Governors noted the significant amount of work undertaken by DM, BW and the finance governors in getting us to this point. The process is now much more rigorous; the top line has improved and there is greater visibility over the cost lines. Governors remain concerned at the challenge associated with delivering the plan and agreed that the Board will work closely with David and team to scrutinise progress.</p> <p><i>Governors wished to formally note their thanks to everyone involved in creating this improved situation.</i></p> <p>DECISION: The Board approved the three-year plan and the deficit recovery plan.</p>	

	Item	Action
	<p>DM returned to the meeting at 6:40pm.</p> <p><u>Extension at The Hill to accommodate the bulge class</u></p> <p>Documents were circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The following questions had been asked and responded to prior to the meeting:</p> <p>1) <i>Costs relating to the build:</i></p> <p>Our understanding is that all costs for the build above are coming from LA capital funding. The school is not required to make any contribution.</p> <p>2) <i>Project management:</i></p> <p>Our understanding is that the LA are project managing this plan therefore there are no costs for the school to approve.</p> <p>3) <i>Work in Progress insurance:</i></p> <p>We can confirm this but I presume this is covered in 2 above.</p> <p>ACTION: DM to check with the LA that Works in Progress insurance is included in their plans for the extension at The Hill and that the school needs no further insurance cover for this.</p> <p>4) <i>Additional running costs relating to the larger building in the budget (heating, electric, cleaning etc):</i></p> <p>The additional running costs would be for the three storey extension and cooking in the kitchen on site from September 2023. These need to be factored in to the three year budget but are not relevant for the 22/23 plan.</p> <p>5) <i>Do we need any permissions regarding the land and buildings e.g. from the SET, LA Planning etc?</i></p> <p>The local authority are managing this, including obtaining any required planning permission.</p> <p>It was NOTED that this project had been allowed for in the budget and through the agreed LA funding for the project subject to confirmation regarding any additional running costs.</p> <p>ACTION: DM to check with BW as to whether the additional infrastructure and running costs will be provided by the LA as a part of the budget for the build at The Hill campus.</p> <p><u>Robin Hood Lane site:</u></p> <p>It was agreed that this project required a business case and that it had not yet been agreed and was not yet in the budget. However, it had been agreed with the LA that there would need to be a net benefit to the school and £50k <u>has</u> been built in to the 3 year plan but the additional running costs had <u>not</u> yet been included. If this project does not happen then there must be an alternative plan to cover the £50k so far included.</p> <p>ACTION: DM to present an update re the third site at the Strategy Day in July.</p>	<p>44</p> <p>45</p> <p>46</p>
4.	<p>Policies for approval</p> <p>It was noted that a number of policies are reaching, or have passed, their planned review date.</p> <p>DECISION: Governors confirmed that policies that have not been reviewed by their target date will remain in force until an updated policy is approved.</p>	
5.	<p>Confidential items</p> <p>This is recorded in the Part B Minutes.</p>	
	<p>Any other business / Dates of future meetings</p> <p>The Head informed the Governors that the interviews for two Deputy Head positions had been held on the previous Wednesday. Three shortlisted candidates had been interviewed. Jess Baldwin and Simon Gale had been offered the positions and had accepted them.</p> <p>There was no other business.</p>	

Item	Action
<p><u>Forthcoming Meetings:</u></p> <p>Premises, Health & Safety: tbc</p> <p>Curriculum and Staffing: 17th May 2022</p> <p>Finance: 12th July 2022</p> <p>FGB: 20th July 2022</p>	
<p>The meeting closed at 6:50pm.</p>	

Signed: <u>cewadrotr</u>	Print Name: <u>HADCOCKS / C E</u>
Chair	Date: <u>20/7/22</u>



Action list

Item	Action point	Who	By when	Up
Actions arising from the Meeting of the 29 th September 2021				
1	DM to contact Ms Prieto Arbor	DM	Dec 2021	Ev
3	DM to report back to the GB regarding the monitoring and control of access controls (both system and people related) and to look further into the availability of funding.	DM	Dec 2021	Act for
7.	To request Governor Support to provide a whole governor training session on Ofsted readiness to be held in school. <i>Note: request emailed to Governor Support 6/10/21</i>	CH	Dec 2021	Arr Act
8.	EB to create an Induction Guide for new governors	EB	Mar 22	In l
Actions arising from the meeting of the 8 th December 2021				
13.	EB to work with the school to review the monitoring needs of the Board in relation to Safeguarding and Behaviour Management and the schedule for review both at Committee and Full Board level.	EB	Feb 22	EB
15.	DM to invite Jean to a meeting in the Spring to recognise her contribution to the school over many years. DM will invite Mavis to the meeting to mark Jean's departure.	DM	July 22	Mo
16.	DM to follow up to find out the situation regarding the ownership of the school's land.	DM	FGB T2	DM bec Bro Fin:
24.	RV to work with DM and CH to review the website and ensure compliance with statutory requirements. Also to include governor biographies.	RV, DM, CH	Feb 22	RV anc rev
28.	BI/CH to clarify the role and responsibilities of the Responsible Officer and consider other potential options for carrying out the role e.g. through peer review.	BI, CH	Feb 22	Act
Actions arising from the meeting of 31 st January 2022				
33.	BW to manage the requirement to borrow from the LA to manage our cash flow and to provide a cash statement for Governors to review	BW		Cas key the

Item	Action point	Who	By when	Up
Actions arising from the meeting of 23 rd February 2022				
35	DM and BW to progress discussions with the LA regarding the 3 year plan and deficit recovery and to arrange the admission of the additional 7 students as soon as possible.	DM/BW		Due
Actions arising from the meeting of 23 rd February 2022				
36	RV to update GIAS re Vajeha Haq and Robin Dear and notify the SET regarding Robin Dear's appointment.	RV	May 22	Act
37	RV to follow up SS and new Governors to ensure that all documents including the Register of Business Interests and KCSIE are completed.	RV	May 22	In t
38	BW, BI and DM to agree a revised reporting regime for the Board re finances	BI, BW, DM	July 22	
39	DM and BW to update the budget and deficit recovery plan (DRP) after Easter to include an accurate and detailed 3-year plan with a narrative.	DM, BW	May 22	On
40	To put a discussion on the agenda for the next C&S meeting to review and triangulate the data regarding target setting and assessments to ensure that governors understand the processes and achievements. Anonymous case studies will be helpful.	RV	May 22	On
41	DM to confirm Inset dates for 2022-23 for approval at the next FGB.	DM	July FGB	
42 (Part B)	DM to liaise with the LA regarding the budgets and ensure that they are aware of the leadership structure decision and that the school will commit to delivering the budget as agreed.	DM	May 22	DM stru (wh
-	EB to circulate her Safeguarding Link Governor Report to the Board.	EB	May 22	
Actions arising from the Meeting of the 16 th May 2022				
43	RV to follow up with Natalie Taylor regarding her application form.	RV	July 22	
44	DM to check with the LA that Works in Progress insurance is included in their plans for the extension at The Hill and that the school needs no further insurance cover for this.	DM	July 22	

Item	Action point	Who	By when	
45	DM to check with BW as to whether the additional infrastructure and running costs will be provided by the LA as a part of the budget for the build at The Hill campus.	DM	June 22	
46	DM to present an update re the third site at the Strategy Day in July	DM	July 22	