



## Argyle Primary School

### Minutes of the meeting of the Policy, Planning, Finance and Personnel Committee held on Tuesday 27 November 2018 at 9.00am

**Present:**

Mahad Sahal (*Chair*)  
 Jemima Wade - *Headteacher*  
 Nayem Chowdhury  
 Henry Fraser\*  
 Corinne Irving – *Bursar*

**Also in attendance:**

Mark Chesher – *Vice Chair*  
 Graham Watson - *Clerk*

\* Denotes Absence

| Item No  | Minute  | Action |
|----------|---|--------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Welcome/Apologies</b>  |        |
|          | The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received and accepted from Henry Fraser.   |        |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Declarations of interest</b>   |        |
|          | There were no declarations of interest.   |        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Minutes and Matters Arising from the meeting held on 24 May 2018<br/>(previously circulated)</b>   |        |
|          | <p>The minutes were agreed as an accurate record and were signed by the Chair.<br/>           There was one matter arising.</p> <p><b>Item 4: Breakfast Club</b> - The headteacher reported that the Breakfast Club started after the autumn half term. She had received positive feedback on the provision. Attendance was variable but averaged about 8 attendees. The current resources assigned could not be sustained if the numbers remained at their present level. This will be reviewed at the end of term. It was hoped numbers will increase at a more sustainable level over time as more parents became aware of the provision.</p> <p><b>Governor’s question: How typical is Argyle’s provision compared to other local schools?</b><br/>           Most schools provide a breakfast club However, they tend to have more working parents; and therefore the demand is greater.</p> |        |

|          |  |                      |
|----------|--|----------------------|
|          | <p><b>Item 13.2</b> – The headteacher reported that no governors were able to attend the recent INSET Day. However, staff enjoyed the lunch provided.</p>  |                      |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Updated School Improvement Plan 2018-2019</b> <i>(previously circulated)</i>  |                      |
|          | <p>The headteacher presented the SIP<br/>She had amended the wording in the School Priority 2 to place less emphasis on addressing behaviour. Behaviour in the school was generally outstanding with a few challenging children. There was greater emphasis on working to improve outcomes for challenging children. Actions to achieve this and success criteria had been added.</p> <p>The updated SIP would be submitted to the full governing body meeting on 11 December.</p>   | <b>JW/Clerk</b>      |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Updated SEF</b> <i>(previously circulated)</i>  |                      |
|          | <p>The headteacher presented the SEF Summary. The SEF had been amended to an evaluation of 'Outstanding'. The Challenge Partners were very positive about the school on their visit. They advised that this should be reflected in the SEF.</p> <p>The headteacher stressed that it was essential governors understood the SEF, as Ofsted inspectors would question them on the document. .</p>  | <b>All governors</b> |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Headteacher's update on teacher appraisal</b>   |                      |
|          | <p>The headteacher updated governors on teacher performance. All 5 teachers eligible for pay progression had achieved their targets and moved up the salary scale. The current teaching team were very experienced.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Corinne Irving joined the meeting at 9.15am</i></p>   |                      |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Finance Report</b> <i>(previously circulated)</i>   |                      |
|          | <p><b><u>Finance Report to 30 September 2018 and forecast</u></b></p> <p>Corinne Irving presented the Finance Report for the period up to 30 September 2018. The following points were highlighted, and governors' comments and questions invited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of filled nursery places had not met expectations. However, the loss of income had been partly offset by receiving enhanced placement funding from Camden.</li> <li>• Pupil Premium funding was £6,000 less than anticipated and there was a slight fall in the universal free school meals grant.</li> <li>• Overall total income was projected to be the same.</li> <li>• There were a substantial number of pupils requiring special needs support.</li> <li>• The number of directly employed support staff had decreased due to the return of staff on long term sic leave. However, due to the rise in the number of special needs pupils, the number of agency support staff had increased.</li> </ul> |                      |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school had decided to buy into part of Camden’s Building Maintenance SLA. It was unlikely the school would buy in next year. Consideration is being given to the school managing building projects directly; especially as the larger projects have now been completed, or are nearing completion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor’s question: Does the school need to provide this level of special needs support?</b><br/> Support for children with Education Health Welfare Plans (EHCPs) is a legal requirement. The school always had to make difficult decisions on the level of support provided to special needs pupils without EHCPs. Camden provided funding for pupils without EHCPs but this was reduced proportionately if a child received an EHCP.</p> <p><b>Q How does the school feel about the budget overall?</b><br/> Corinne replied that she was comfortable with the projected budget forecast. She had been prudent with the forecast. It was difficult to be precise with the forecast as there were several variables eg staff absences.</p> <p><b>Q How many spare places does the school have year on year; and what was the forecast of future pupil numbers?</b><br/> The school currently has 20 spare places. Falling rolls were reviewed in consultation with Camden. No major changes were anticipated and it was projected the school roll will be stable in the short term. If school funding did change there was a minimum funding guarantee if the budget reduced by more than 1.5%</p> <p><b>Q Could savings be made by reducing the number of teaching assistants, both directly employed and agency staff?</b><br/> This would be difficult. All teaching assistants not assigned to SEND were funded by the Pupil Premium Grant. This was ring fenced and it was difficult to see how reductions could be made in this area. There was no legal requirement for teaching assistants to give One to one support. It was possible to increase the number of special needs pupils for each teaching assistant. The headteacher would keep this under review.</p> <p><b>Q What were the legal implications of running a deficit budget?</b><br/> It was not possible to plan for a deficit budget. If a deficit budget was inevitable this required special approval from Camden and the production of a deficit recovery plan.</p> <p><b>Q What can be done to improve the marketing of the school?</b><br/> The headteacher replied that the school had already carried out some marketing eg flyers. However, she acknowledged more needed to be done. It was <b>agreed</b> that a major marketing campaign be undertaken when the school obtained ‘outstanding’ status. Governors also proposed that funds be allocated to market the school in January. The headteacher agreed to consider this.</p> <p>There followed a full discussion on the options available to the school to maintain a balanced budget.</p> | <p><b>Headteacher</b></p> <p><b>Headteacher</b></p> |
|--|--|---|

|            |   |   |
|------------|---|---|
|            | <p>It was <b>agreed</b> that the headteacher produce an options plan for submission to the full governing body.</p> <p><b><u>School fund – income and expenditure report</u></b><br/> CI presented the School Fund income and expenditure report. There was a surplus in 2017-18 of £17,741.17. Expenditure from the Fund could be carried out at the school’s discretion.</p> <p><b><u>Camden Benchmarking</u></b><br/> Corinne presented for the information of governors the Consistent Financial Reporting (CFR) document for 2017-18.</p> <p><b><u>School Financial Value Standard (SFVS)</u></b><br/> Corinne presented the SFVS document. It was <b>agreed</b> that the SFVS would be submitted to the full governing body meeting on 11 December.</p> | <p><b>Headteacher/CI</b></p> <p><b>Headteacher/CI</b></p> |
| <b>8</b>   | <b>Premises Development Plan</b> ( <i>previously circulated</i> )   |   |
|            | <p>The headteacher reported that the Premises Development Plan was discussed and approved at the Buildings, Environment and Community Committee on 22 November. She added that the school had always received excellent feedback on the physical environment provided to children.</p> <p>The Family Learning Room and STEM project were due to be handed over to the school this week.</p> <p>The school programme of redecoration was being maintained at reduced costs.<br/> The small playground will require work in the future.</p>   |   |
| <b>9</b>   | <b>Policy Review</b> ( <i>documents previously circulated</i> )   |   |
| <b>9.1</b> | <p>The headteacher presented the following policies,</p> <p><b><u>Appraisal Procedure for Teachers</u></b><br/> This was a Camden model. She carried out the teacher appraisals together with the two deputy headteachers. The Appraisal Policy will be submitted to the full governing body meeting on 11 December.</p>  | <b>Headteacher</b>  |
| <b>9.2</b> | <p><b><u>Credit Card Policy</u></b><br/> This was a Camden model and there were no changes.</p>   |   |
| <b>9.3</b> | <p><b><u>Data Protection Policy</u></b><br/> This was a new policy which had been produced as a consequence of GDPR. The school had a service level agreement with Camden to provide a Data Protection Officer Service. The cost was £4,000 per annum and the school also received advice, training and model procedures. Camden were coming to the school shortly to carry out an audit.</p>   |   |

|            |   |                    |
|------------|---|--------------------|
|            | The headteacher noted that she was not sure if the school were receiving value for money; but will keep the SLA under review.   | <b>Headteacher</b> |
| <b>9.4</b> | <b><u>Freedom of Information Policy</u></b><br>This was also a Camden model and there were no changes.  |                    |
| <b>9.5</b> | <b><u>School Pay Policy</u></b><br>This was a Camden model and the only change was the addition of the 2018 Teachers' Pay Award.<br><br>The policies were <b>approved</b> . |                    |
| <b>10</b>  | <b>Review of Terms of Reference</b> ( <i>previously circulated</i> )  |                    |
|            | Governors had discussed the following items in the committee remit:<br>Items 1,2,3,5,10, 11,13,14,.21,22,28 and 29.   |                    |
| <b>11</b>  | <b>Any other Business</b>   |                    |
|            | There was no other business.  |                    |
| <b>12</b>  | <b>Confidential Items</b>   |                    |
|            | There were no confidential items.   |                    |

The Chair thanked all for attending and closed the meeting at 10.15a m.

Signed ..... Date .....

Committee Chair