



THE GOVERNING BODY OF ST. JOHN FISHER CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Minutes of the Governing Body meeting held at 6.00pm at the School on Wednesday, 10 March 2010.

PRESENT

Dr J D Cortis (Chair), Miss C Anchor, Mr. P Booth, Mr. M Collins, Mr. N Dalzell, Mrs. M Day, Rev P F Fisher, Mr. K Higgins (Headteacher), Mr. T Hinchliffe, Mrs. G Lowe, Miss L Newton, Rev A Wilson, Mrs. F Wilson, Mr. B F Poulter

In Attendance

Mrs. G M Denison (Minute Clerk)
Fr M Hall (Deputy Headteacher)
Mr. D Martin (Head ChYPS Asset Management) for agenda item 3.
Ms N Hargrave (BSF Programme Manager) for agenda item 3.

Opening prayer was led by Fr Hall. Chair asked that the families of Mrs. Julie Holland and Miss Laura Maguire, who died recently, be remembered in our prayers.

Dr Cortis welcomed the LA Officers to the meeting and introductions were made.

1. APLOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE, CONSENT AND DECLARATION OF INTEREST

09/111 RESOLVED: to note apologies for absence were received from Fr P Smith (consent) and Mrs. G Lowe's declaration of interest in the item 3 on the agenda.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT UP UNDER ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chair notified the following as additional business:

- Update on meetings regarding re-modelling plans for the School through BSF which will be addressed under agenda item 3
- Marking Outcomes from Section 5 and Section 48 Inspections which will be taken under Any Other Business

3. ISSUES REGARDING BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE(BSF)

Chair referred to the paperwork which was produced by the BSF team and circulated via the School. Item will be managed under two separate issues.

Chair reminded that Governors **resolved** at the September 2009 meeting under minute 09/05: to confirm governors' agreement in principle to the proposed BSF ICT Managed Service and for the Chair to sign the relevant paper work and submit to Mr. Williams. Such paper work was submitted by the due date.

I) ICT Managed Service

2 documents had been circulated by the School and Ms N Hargrave (BSF Programme Manager) spoke to this item.

Governors noted that the next step in the process was for the LA to produce and Outline Business Case (OBC) and therefore the School was being asked to make a set of formal commitments in order for the OBC to progress.

Issues discussed included:

- The cost per pupil – Governors were advised that the current spend is expected to be around £173 per pupil with a guaranteed cost of between £150 and £200 per pupil.
 - Cost would be index linked (noted in the letter circulated)
- The LA would be seeking partners to build the new schools but, unlike PPI, these partners would have no further input into the running of the School.

Governors raised a number of issues including:

- Voluntary Aided Schools and the 10% liability for Governors – how does that fit into the scheme?
- What about VAT? VA Schools had been informed that they could not reclaim their VAT so the School would potentially be paying 10% Governor Contribution on top of 17.5% VAT which other Schools would not have to pay.
 - Mr. Martin advised Governors that VAT that is non-recoverable had been written into the scheme guidance and the LA would clarify this in writing for the School.
- Governors asked about the length of commitment when Schools sign up for the ICT Managed Service. What was the expectation of the LA regarding this issue?
 - Governors were advised that the requirement was for a minimum of 5 years from the time that the site has been handed over to the School post-construction /re-modelling etc. It was accepted that, in theory,

some Schools could be coming out of the Managed Service Scheme as others are just coming on line.

- Re ICT sign-up – in terms of ICT had there been any examples of any schools in the BSF Scheme who had opted out of the ICT Managed Service?
- LA informed that there had been no schools opting out as this was not a model PSF would accept – no sign up, no money.
- Another area of concern was staffing as Governors of VA schools are the employers. It was accepted that technical staff with no links to curriculum delivery would move over to work for the company who provided the Managed ICT Service, their 'Terms and Conditions' of service would remain the same. Governors asked if, after the 5 years the school wanted to manage their own service would they be able to take their staff back into their employment.
- Governors were advised that once the staff have moved over (under TUPE) to the Managed Service Provider they would not be able to return to the employment of the school. This issue however needs checking out because this is not the understanding of one Governor, with a legal background.

II) Options for the provision of Hard Facilities Management (FM) Services under BSF

Documents had been circulated and Mr. Martin, spoke to this agenda item. Governors were advised that extensive consultation between the LA and the Diocese had taken place around the provision of Hard FM services.

Chair tabled copy of an email sent by Mr. Anderson, Diocesan Surveyor, to Mr. Martin on Monday 8th. March 2010.

There were two options available at the moment:

- A Local Education Partner (LEP) provides the Hard Facilities Management.
- The Local Authority would provide the Hard Facilities Management.

A paper tabled at the meeting by the LA officers indicated that the cost for the school of Hard FM through a LEP would be in the region of £171,183 per annum whilst the cost of the provision through the LA would be around £96,806. This would be payable from construction handover (2015/16) for 10 years (subject to ongoing satisfaction regarding performance).

Governors were asked to sign up in principle by 31 March 2010.

Governors noted that the LA would offer a service to cover statutory maintenance then other services would be on offer as a buy-back service. The current model was based on a 5 year rolling maintenance plan at the same cost as the School is currently charged.

Governors expressed concerns that there had, in the past, been issues regarding the service provided by the LA with regards to statutory maintenance services. What guarantees would be written into any scheme to ensure that the LA fulfils its commitments? What if the LA fails to fulfill its statutory requirements on timescales? What comeback would the School have?

Governors expressed concern that there were only two models on offer – either LEP or LA, what about other options? It was suggested that Bradford Authority and Leeds had found another model which had proved to be effective. The Bradford Model was discussed.

The LA representatives advised that the LA just required a general commitment that the School would agree to the LA Model for Hard FM at this stage. Whether the Bradford Model could be incorporated into that would be discussed when the detail was finalised.

Fr. Fisher left the meeting (7 pm)

Mr. Martin confirmed he had permission from Mr. Anderson to forward his email to PFS for consideration. A response is awaited.

Governors asked what underwriting would be provided should the LA be unable to fulfill their obligations to provide the service at an acceptable level? Should the LEP fail to fulfill its commitments then there would be penalties, how would this apply to the LA?

Governors were advised that there could be no underwriting commitment by the LA as all funding (both LA's and school's) was provided by central Government.

It was accepted that the LA was keen to avoid a LEP provision.

VA Lifecycle costs (post construction) would be jointly funded from:

- Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) contribution 2011-2017 then at an agreed % of DFC thereafter
- Contribution from LCVAP

Again Governors were asked to sign up in principle by 31 March 2010

Governors were concerned that the school was being asked to forego the DFC funding for 6 financial years which would then be put into the building works

along with a percentage thereafter without any notion of what would be spent on the school through BSF. How would other buildings not involved in BSF be maintained?

Mr. Collins left meeting at 7.40

- Would the programme be value for money? What guarantee would there be for the school that their DFC funding would be spent on St John Fisher facilities?
- Governors were advised that once a LEP is approved they would work on the plan taking into account the parameters including the school's requirements as expressed in the Strategy for Change. It was reported that the amount would change for a variety of reasons including inflation; where the work would take place; the cost of materials; how certain issues were addressed.
- What all Schools could be assured of was that they would get a multi-million pound investment on their site which would deal with the condition issues raised by both the School and the Diocese.
- Governors' liability of 10%, how did that fit in?
- There would be no 10% liability on the BSF works as it would be funded through the project.
- As the Governing Body is responsible for the DFC returns to the Department for Schools, Children and Families, which the Diocese currently administers on behalf of the school, how would the LA deal with the VAT issues?
- Is it legal for VA DFC to be spent on non-VA schools?
- In terms of the 10% contribution required for any LCVAP project, this was provided by parents and Governors suggested that should this funding be required up-front this could be problematic if it was seen that these funds are used for works on another School and not St John Fisher.
- Currently the School is required to find 10% under DFC for the School building and this would continue to be the case under the new project.
- Governors asked if the costs of building works escalated early on in the scheme would this have a knock-on effect for funding works in schools who were scheduled to have works carried out at the end of the scheme?
- Governors were advised that there were sections written into the contracts to try to cover as many contingencies as possible.

- There was concerns re LCVAP and cluster funding.
- Mr. Martin confirmed that he would send copies of the PSF Guidance to the School for information.
- Governors asked if PFI Schools would receive guaranteed funding under the BSF scheme?
- They were advised: No, absolutely not!

Governors thanked the LA Officers for their presentation.

Mr. Martin and Ms Hargrave left the meeting (7:45pm)

There was still concern that should a LEP be employed there would be significant need for monitoring that all works were done on time, would the LA version include significant monitoring and if so what form would that take?

09/112 RESOLVED: that Governors agreed that no decision could be made at the meeting and it was agreed to bring the matter to the next meeting scheduled to take place on 23 March when a decision would be made.

09/113 RESOLVED: for the Chair to invite, Mr. K Anderson, Diocesan Surveyor, to attend the next meeting.

Other related issues:

Chair pointed out that aligned to these discussions was a proposal for expansion of Westborough High School and the Chair tabled a letter for information registering an objection on behalf of St John Fisher to the proposed application plan. Planning Committee has deferred item to a future meeting.

09/114 RESOLVED: to receive Chair's letter submitted to the Planning Committee regarding the proposed expansion to Westborough High School.

Chair confirmed that three meetings have taken place recently to consider proposals drawn up by Capita Symonds in terms of new build, remodeled, refurbish areas in the School as part of the BSF project. The Headteacher tabled the latest version of the designs and clarified key changes and developments. He explained that the plans formed the basis of the control option for the school. When a LEP is appointed these plans would form the basis of the programme.

The proposed Site Layout Plans were discussed and concerns were raised regarding the inclusion of Crow Nest Park, a site for the school to deliver

elements of its physical education curriculum. The boundary between St John Fisher and Westborough High was also discussed with particular reference to the sports fields and how this affects the Football Foundation funding.

09/115 RESOLVED: to receive headteacher's update from meetings held to progress with developments under BSF in order to produce a control option.

09/116 RESOLVED: for the control option plans considered at the meeting to remain confidential.

4. SECTION 5 INSPECTION REPORT (FEBRUARY 2010)

Document had been circulated from the school. Chair stressed that the grades and the report is not up for discussion as it can not be changed and that Governors' responsibility was to discuss the action plan aimed to address the areas for improvement identified in the report. There was an area of concern regarding page 3 and a comment that *"the levels of social disadvantage are a little above average"*. The school could challenge this fact as the school draws from what are seen as highly disadvantaged areas but we need to acknowledge that this is how this variable is being recorded in the report.

Three Key Areas had been highlighted for improvement, these would be discussed further when looking at the Action Plan.

The Head Teacher advised that although the School had received a number of grades at Levels 1 and 2, the grade 3 judgments were limiting factors when arriving at the final grades.

09/117 RESOLVED: to receive and note the content of the OFSTED inspection report which took place in February 2010.

5. ACTION PLAN FOLLOWING SECTION 5 INSPECTION

A Draft Action Plan was circulated and discussed – the Action Plan was addressing the 3 Key Areas highlighted by Ofsted as areas for improvement.

Governors discussed in detail the sections of the Action Plan highlighting areas where there could be minor adjustments and more clarity in terms of presentation and performance indicators.

Governors analysed the plan in detail and questioned the head/deputy headteacher about the monitoring systems and how they would work. Governors asked what the targets were in Section 1.1 a and how they would be monitored and evaluated.

Governors asked how they would monitor the plan? It was suggested that there would be a report provided by the School outlining the levels and progress made against FFT Grade D to the Curriculum Committee.

Miss C Anchor left the meeting (8:40 pm)

Governors asked for the addition of the quality assurance postholder in SLT to be added to the monitoring column within the maths plan as it was for English.

There was an issue raised around the symmetry of the plan for English and Maths and the headteacher confirmed that this would be rectified.

All three Key Issues were covered in the Action Plan and Governors felt that there was a need to look at costings at the next Finance Committee meeting scheduled for 15th. March 2010.

Mrs. G Lowe left the meeting (8:55 pm)

A Governor suggested that there could be a column added to the Action Plan document for timescales. The headteacher invited Governors to provide any templates they felt would provide exemplar for amending school plans in the future.

09/118 RESOLVED: to approve the Action Plan following the Section 5 Inspection subject to inclusion of points raised at the meeting.

09/119 RESOLVED: for the Governors' Curriculum Committee to decide how this action plan will be monitored.

09/120 RESOLVED: to thank the Senior Leadership Team and others involved in producing the post Section 5 Inspection action plan

6. OUTCOME OF SECTION 48 INSPECTION

Chair confirmed that the Section 48 Inspection was carried out by a team of two appointed by the Diocese over the 1st and 2nd. March 2010. The draft Section 48 Inspection document was tabled. Governors were given time to scan this document especially the outcome scores. Chair indicated that the outcomes were extremely encouraging.

Governors raised a couple of observations but generally found that the report affirms the excellent provision which the School, provides for its pupils. The headteacher wished to thank all those who had been involved in this process.

09/121 RESOLVED: to receive and note the content of the draft Section 48 inspection report.

09/122 RESOLVED: that the Key Issues identified on pages 2-3 would be integrated into the School Development Plan.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

i) Marking Outcomes from Section 5 and Section 48 Inspections

09/123 RESOLVED: for the Governors to pay for a buffet for staff and governors to be held at St Paulinus Club Dewsbury on Friday 12th. March at 7.30

8. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

09/124 RESOLVED: That the next meetings of the Governing Body be held:
(I) Tuesday, 23 March 2010
(II) Tuesday, 22 June 2010

9. Agenda, Minutes and Related Papers – School Copy

09/125 RESOLVED: That no part of these minutes, agendas, or related papers be excluded from the copy to be made available at the school with the exception of the plans for control options under BSF as minuted under 09/116.