



MEETING OF THE RESOURCES COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 7TH 2023 AT 8.30AM IN THE SCHOOL

Present: Mike Waterson (MW), Ian Stewart (IS), Rob Hill (RH) Chair, Jenny Barker (JB), Hilary Priest (HP).

In attendance: Debbie Horton (Clerk), Sandie Lovell, Business Manager

Minutes

1	<p>Welcome & apologies for absence There were no apologies.</p>
2	<p>Attendance & declaration of interest The governors signed the attendance form. There were no declarations of interest.</p>
3	<p>Minutes of the last meeting 8.11.22 The Part 1 and 2 minutes were agreed as a correct record. The Chair signed the Part 1 minutes. The Part 2 minutes will be signed in GovernorHub.</p>
9	<p>Chefs in schools The meeting moved to Item 9, Chefs in Schools, in combination with the continuing inquiry into school meals and costing of ideas point in matters arising.</p> <p>HP reported that the new catering system is in its early stages and still settling into place. Feedback from parents has been very good, with 530 more meals ordered in the last three weeks in comparison to the same time last year. (It was pointed out that the comparator was a lock down period.) The new chef is settling in well, adjusting menus and finding out what works.</p> <p>Q: How was the decision to go ahead with the scheme made, since it did not come to a committee or the board? A: The working party, comprised of two governors, members of the SLT and 2 members of the kitchen staff, came to the decision. It was precipitated by the resignation of the school cook.</p> <p>Q: Could the governors have a breakdown of the costs involved in the scheme? A: SL tabled information about staffing costs and changes. There are now 3 people working in the kitchen, compared to 1 previously, so staffing costs had risen significantly. The new staffing structure comprises a Chef, Sous Chef, Assistant and a new MTA. Food costs had increased due to the rise in living costs, and the type of food bought, for example, organic flour with a high delivery cost attached.</p> <p>Q: Was the aim to continue to supply schools meals at 80p/£1 per head, despite the pressure of additional costs? A: At the moment, yes. The loss would be shouldered by the school initially, but the aim would be to break-even, once the scheme had become more embedded.</p> <p>HP reported that the chef is having conversations with local suppliers, and costs will settle once menus become more stable. She is currently applying for grants of £3000-£25, 000, and is in negotiation with the PTA over the £5000 match-funded cost of the Chefs in Schools annual consultancy fee. Fundraising is taking place, and she is confident that the initial set-up and running costs will be met from these initiatives, increased take-up of school meals and the budget. The school will be receiving an extra £36, 500 in April which will be used for the scheme and there is a healthy carry-forward. The aim is to break-even, and not to make a profit. She is confident that the scheme offers the best way of meeting the school's aim of providing popular nutritional meals, in a nurturing environment, and with strong links to the curriculum. The chef's role is also one of educator, so he will be involved in the classroom, in delivering experience and information which is integrated into the DT curriculum.</p> <p>One governor expressed concern about the high cost of the scheme and the changes involved, for</p>

	<p>example, staffing costs. Expenditure so far had been more than expected and had added to the loss already accrued to the catering cost centre. It had also come at a time of significant budgetary pressure. He questioned the decision to make school meals a priority over other areas, such as curriculum needs for children.</p> <p>He noted that the school had committed to the scheme, not least because new kitchen staff had been given permanent contracts, which he thought unwise in the circumstances.</p> <p>Another governor was comfortable with the decision to go ahead with what he thought was a fantastic initiative. He was glad to see school meals prioritised after many years of other initiatives and needs taking precedence. Governors were being asked to agree to a loss, but this cost centre had been operating at a loss for years, and the difference now is that this loss is planned, and countered with an ambitious strategy to break even.</p> <p>The committee asked for a detailed breakdown of costings for the next meeting plus clear aims for the scheme. So far, the committee understood aims to include keeping the cost of a meal to its present figure, breaking even, and the integration of the chef's role into the classroom and the school community through workshops, and events, for example. They would also like to see objectives for the chef-educator.</p> <p>ACTION: Detailed costings for schools meals, aims, and chef's objectives - HP</p>
4	<p>Matters arising from the last meeting The meeting returned to item 4, matters arising.</p> <p>Online payments: SL had obtained two quotes for the online payments proposal. She had spoken to other schools and DCC about their experiences and wanted to gather more information before coming up with a clear recommendation. HP asked for a quote from E-schools, since the school had bought-in to its service.</p> <p>The committee agreed that the online payments proposal was the right direction of travel, ideally from September 2023. They agreed that the costs involved, of approximately £1000-£1500 were acceptable. It was agreed that £1000 would be ringfenced for the scheme in the budget.</p> <p>SL would be asked to come up with a recommendation for the next/May meeting.</p> <p>Outstanding visit notes and planned facilities visit - IS, RH & JB RH and JB to do, IS done. JB arrived at 9.30am.</p> <p>ACTION: Online payments recommendation - SL</p>
5	<p>Budget The governors had received the FRS and an explanatory note from SL. The carry-forward had reduced considerably (from £170,000 - £113,000) meaning that the budget will go into deficit in Year 2 rather than Year 3, as predicted. This is a result of a large cohort of Year 6 children leaving at the end of the year, and other reductions in numbers of children due to families moving out of the area. On census day, there were 42/45 children on roll.</p> <p>Q: Is the reduction in numbers of children a trend? A: DCC had informed schools of a downward trend, but the school has always maintained numbers in the face of previous downward predictions.</p> <p>DCC had not produced information about the school's budget share, so the 2023/24 budget was not discussed. Agreement of bought-in services was likewise postponed to the next meeting.</p> <p>Q: Did the school buy in the support of an Educational Psychiatrist and a school counsellor? A: The school now pays for a play therapist, previously she had been funded. The Educational Psychiatrist service is used on a needs basis, but there is a long waiting list. The SENDcos are currently looking into alternatives.</p>
6	<p>SFVS The governors had received a draft SFVS. RH and SL agreed to meet in the week after half-term to do the</p>

	benchmarking exercise and complete the form. ACTION: Benchmarking and completion of SFVS - RH and SL SL left at 9.35am
7	Benchmarking See above, item 6.
8	Monitoring criteria for Governors' strategic plan The committee decided that this was more suited to an FGB meeting. ACTION: Monitoring criteria for strategic plan to go to FGB
10	Policies for review School Emergency and Continuity plan. Q: Does the school have a fireproof cabinet for papers? A: Yes, in the school office. Q: Whereabouts in the Mansion House is the assembly room, in case of an emergency? A: In the hall opposite the library. The Emergency Plan was reviewed and agreed, with the proviso that dates (p14), contact details (p31) children/ staff numbers (p16) and buddy school information (p28) were updated. Governor expenses – reviewed and agreed. Lettings Q: Should the per hour rental figure be reviewed, to include higher energy costs? A: The committee agreed to ask SL to review the amount to ensure it meets costs. Rentals currently generate about £7000. In the meantime, the Lettings policy was reviewed and agreed. The 2021-22 PE/Sports Premium report is currently on the website. ACTION: Amendments to Emergency Plan - HP
12	Governors' monitoring visits from this committee A benchmarking and SFVS visit will take place after half-term – RH. A facilities visit took place on February 6 th 2023 – IS. No new problems were found. The front door plans are still ongoing. More quotes are needed. A health and safety visit, to include the kitchen, will take place after half-term – IS. RH will sample a school dinner after half-term.
13	Training (governor and school workforce) School workforce training review (excluding teacher training). Safeguarding training is up-to-date and likewise health and safety training. Feedback from governor training undertaken – none from this committee.
14	Business brought forward by the Chair There was none.
15	Date & time of next meeting Resources meeting 7 th March 2023

The meeting ended at 9.45am

Summary of Actions

9	Detailed costings for schools meals, aims, and chef's objectives - HP	HP	March 7 th 2023
4	Online payments recommendation for committee	SL	March 7 th 2023
6	Benchmarking and completion of SFVS for recommendation to FGB on March 21 st 2023	RH & SL	March 7 th 2023
8	Monitoring criteria for strategic plan to go to FGB	Clerk	March 21 st 2023

