



“Success for All”

# HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST

## Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

### Meeting 3 – Part 1 Minutes

Date/Time	Monday 3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2020 at 4.30 p.m.	Location	Meeting Room (HCC)
Attendees	Initials	Attendees	Initials
Matt Burrell (ELT)	MBU	Richmal Shorter (Governor)	RSH
Margaret Evans (Governor)	ME	Tony Smith (Governor)	TS
Jackie Rock (Governor)	JRo	Kate Smith (Governor/Chair)	KS

Apologies	Initials
Mark Gibbs (Governor/Vice-Chair)	MGi
Glenn Smith (Governor/Principal)	GSM

Absent without Apology	Initials

In Attendance	Initials	
Sarah Matthews	SM	Clerk

Minutes to
Attendees and Apologies
Governors
Website

	Agenda	Led by
1	<b>Apologies</b>	Chair
2	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	Chair
3	<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b> – 6 <sup>th</sup> November 2019	Chair
4	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p><b>Item 8a Management Accounts – (October 2019):</b> Student Numbers – MBU previously reported that the College had been contacted by Strategic Planning at DCC (Devon County Council) Children’s Services regarding the potential increase in admission/student numbers in future years. It was agreed MBU would bring a paper to the HT3 meeting which shows the DCC figures and the College figures. The DCC figures are higher but MBU wants to be sure before he changes the College’s figures to match these. Figures will be brought to meeting (not a paper).</p> <p><b>For HT4 Agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Should the College be requesting support from an SRMA?</b> – action from HT1 (for discussion at HT4) – to note.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> SMRA (Schools Management Resource Advisor)</p>	<p>MBU</p> <p>Chair</p>
5	<b>SRMSAT (School Resource Management Self-Assessment Toolkit)</b>	MBU
6	<b>Business case for new Software Package</b>	MBU
7	<b>Director of Finance and Resources Report</b>	MBU
8	<b>8a Management Accounts</b> <b>8b Data Dashboard</b>	MBU
9	<b>Five Year Budget</b>	MBU
10	<p><b>Pupil Premium</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the College making effective and efficient use of the Pupil Premium for its Children in Care? and</li> <li>• How are we measuring the impact of Pupil Premium Plus funding?</li> </ul>	TS
11	<b>Brexit Preparations</b>	MBU
12	<b>Future involvement of College in Community Use Building (CUB)</b>	MBU
13	<b>Health and Safety Committee update (note: accident update is included within the data dashboard)</b>	MBU



“Success for All”

## HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

14	<b>Review of Security Risk Assessment and Site Checklist</b>	MBU
15	<b>Review current staffing structure and staffing needs for the next financial year</b>	MBU
16	<b>Staffing Update (Clerk will update Pay Policy if there are any amendments to the Performance Management Tree)</b>	MBU
17	<b>Marketing and PR Working Party Update</b>	MBU
18	<b>Policy Review</b> • College Lettings Policy Statement	MBU
19	<b>Letters and correspondence from ESFA to academy trusts</b> <b>Note:</b> ESFA (Education and Skills Funding Agency)	MBU
20	<b>To note Resources Committee Governors have received monthly management accounts</b>	Chair
21	<b>Governor Audit Check</b>	ME
22	<b>Aged Debtor Report</b>	Chair
23	<b>Related Party Transactions/Employment of Trustees</b>	MBU
24	<b>Gifts and Hospitality, Connected and Related Party Transactions</b>	Chair
25	<b>Receive notification of any funding issues from Teaching and Learning Committee</b>	MBU for GSM
26	<b>Approval – Category B and C Trips</b>	MBU for GSM
27	<b>Review Induction Procedures for New Governors</b>	TS
28	<b>Review of Exit interviews, Staffing and Retention (to include review of Probationary Reviews e.g. ensure first meeting etc had taken place)</b>	KS
29	<b>Part 2 Minutes (inc. reminder of Part 2 Procedure and Confidentiality)</b>	Chair
30	<b>What impact has this meeting had on the outcome of pupils in our College?</b>	Chair
31	<b>Date and time of next meeting – Monday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2020 at 4.30 p.m.</b>	Chair

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
1	<b>Apologies</b> KS welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were accepted from MG. It was noted there was a quorum present.		
2	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> Staff members declared an interest in any discussions regarding staff.		
3	<b>Minutes of the last meeting (11<sup>th</sup> November 2019)</b> The minutes of the meeting held on the 11 <sup>th</sup> November 2019 had been circulated to all committee members in advance of the meeting.  <b>The minutes were then agreed (proposed KS, seconded RSH) as a true and accurate record of that meeting and signed accordingly by the Chair</b>	<b>Clerk - to file and website</b>	<b>Action Completed</b>
4	<b>Matters Arising</b> • <b>Item 8a Management Accounts – (October 2019):</b> Student Numbers – MBU previously reported that the College had been contacted by Strategic Planning at DCC Children's Services regarding the potential increase in admission/student numbers in future years. It was agreed MBU would bring a paper to the HT3 meeting which shows the DCC figures and the College figures. The DCC figures are higher but MBU wanted to be sure before he changes the College's figures to match these. <b>Update:</b> MBU stated that he had included a report in SharePoint as figures were more appropriate. Governors noted the document ' <b>Forecast Student Numbers Provided by Devon County Council</b> '. MBU suggested that the Committee review this later under item 9 'Five Year Budget' as this would tie in with this agenda item. All were in agreement.  <b>For HT4 Agenda</b> ➤ Should the College be requesting support from an SRMA? – action from HT1	<b>MBU/Clerk</b>	<b>Agenda</b>



“Success for All”

# HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST

## Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
	(for discussion at HT4). This was noted by the Governors.		Item HT4
5	<p><b><u>SRMSAT (School Resource Management Self-Assessment Toolkit)</u></b> Governors noted the following document in SharePoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>School Resources Management Assessment Toolkit</b></li> </ul> <p>KS said that she had had difficulty accessing the content. MBU showed the Governors how to do this by enabling the information. MBU then took the Governors through the document page by page. He explained that the College had been told to complete this (it was no longer voluntary but statutory). Governors must sign the information off before it is submitted.</p> <p>MBU reminded those present that they had requested time at this meeting to go through the document in more detail. MBU had updated the 2019 financial year information. The purpose of completing the toolkit is so that schools are provided with benchmarking information. MBU reminded the Governors that the difficulty is schools all include different information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Governor Question: How used?</b> - ME asked how this would be used. MBU said that the information included is not compulsory. A copy would be provided to the SMRA. The information is not audited. He re-iterated that all academy trusts are different. The information is taken into account with the Integrated Curriculum and Financial Planning (ICFP) tool with the purpose of looking at where schools get value for money</li> </ul> <p>Governors also noted the PowerPoint Presentation <b><i>'Introduction into Integration Curriculum and Financial Planning'</i></b> which MBU had included in SharePoint under item 7.</p> <p>MBU stated that any SMRA visiting the College would look at the SRMSAT and the ICFP. Governors would be asked about both. The information included is the same as the information MBU incorporates into the Data Dashboard which the Governors receive monthly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Governor Question: RAG (Red Amber Green) Assessed</b> – ME said it was her understanding that the ESFA RAG assessed the information. MBU confirmed they did.</li> <li><b>Governor Question: Follow-up</b> – ME asked if MBU would be contacted, after having submitted the SRMSAT, to discuss it further. MBU said that the SMRA would ask questions later. It was noted that one of the questions may be about SEN (Special Educational Needs) for which HCC is higher than the average similar school for costs. This is because of a higher number of Educational Healthcare Packages (EHCPs).</li> <li><b>Governor Comment: 5%</b> - TS felt that anything with less than a 5% spend was irrelevant due to the spread being so low. In his opinion there were only 4 areas which had been benchmarked to consider which made it much simpler. For example, he noted that the energy costs were higher but the buildings at HCC were older. MBU agreed.</li> <li><b>Governor Question: Bids</b> – ME asked if MBU could incorporate the information from the SMRSAT into the bid information. MBU said the bids were more about the condition of the buildings than the financial costs.</li> </ul>		



“Success for All”

# HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST

## Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
	<p>The Committee then discussed the need to contextualise the information. JRo pointed out that the information did not provide the whole picture. KS added that with larger class sizes and less staff this meant spending on teachers was less. MBU reminded the Committee that the comparisons were to similar schools and not schools in a particular area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Governor Question: London</b> – KS asked if London schools were included within the comparisons. MBU stated they were not.</li> <li>• <b>Governor Question: Names of Schools</b> – ME asked MBU if he knew the names of the other ‘similar’ schools. MBU said this information was not provided. The purpose of the exercise was so that schools could choose comparisons but detail was not provided.</li> </ul> <p>MBU stated that overall he did not feel that HCC compared too badly to others. KS agreed.</p> <p>MBU stated that in the past the College had used the DCC nominal codes. He added that the ESFA have codes as well but it is not possible for the schools to just switch to these. A mapping tool is being worked on by CAPITA to enable the College’s nominal codes to be linked to the new ESFA codes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Governor Comment: More Detail</b> – TS felt more detail was required for the information to be really useful. He felt the difference in (for example) class sizes could be 0.2 and this could have a huge impact on where HCC would sit in the table. MBU agreed. He said for the Sixth Form, HCC would show as being very good with regards to class sizes but on the other hand the small classes did not give value for money. ME agreed and pointed out that (as MBU has highlighted) this was just really a discussion document) MBU agreed. He felt that the information relating to the Reserves at HCC was very positive.</li> <li>• <b>Governor Question: Teacher Costs</b> – ME asked if this was the unit cost. MBU confirmed it was and included the pension costs etc. TS said he felt this information was very useful and noted that it was a significant figure.</li> </ul> <p>MBU advised the Committee that he would bring back this document for further discussion at the end of the year. However, he reminded the Governors that they received the Data Dashboard at every meeting which included a summary of this information.</p>	<p><b>MBU</b></p>	<p><b>HT6</b></p>
6	<p><b>Business Case for new Software Package</b></p> <p>Governors noted the 2 financial proposal documents in SharePoint. MBU stated that the College were not yet at the point of deciding which company to award the contract to and he would need to look further at the benefits of each.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Governor Question: Costs</b> – KS noted that there were significantly different costs between the 2 proposals. MBU said that one includes the costs for training staff. He added that the College had until April to make a decision (to enable a September start) so he did not see there was a huge rush to make a decision at the moment.</li> <li>• <b>Governor Question: Current Cost</b> – RSH asked how much the cost was for the current package used by the College. MBU said that the current package was part of the SIMS package (but was probably £2,500).</li> </ul>		



“Success for All”

# HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST

## Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
7	<p><b>Director of Finance and Resources Report</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the following document in SharePoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Director of Finance and Resources Report to Resources – January 2020</b></li> <li>• <b>ATP Project Plan for Honiton Community College</b></li> <li>• <b>HCC Purchases and Budgets Report – November 2019 (Griffin Chartered Accountants)</b></li> <li>• <b>ISBI ICFP Webinar (mentioned under item...)</b></li> <li>• <b>Teachers Pay Scale Proposals – September 2020</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> ATP (Artificial Turf Pitch)</p> <p>MBU highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Annual Accounts Return</b> – this was completed on time.</li> <li>• <b>ESFA Financial Returns</b> – details are included within report. These enable the ESFA to scrutinise the College. The ESFA hold a central risk assessment tracker and they do ‘name and shame’ any schools that do not complete the returns on time. There is no financial fines at present but failure to meet these deadline would indicate issues with leadership and management at a school.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Question: Ofsted</b> – RSH asked if Ofsted would take this information into account. MBU advised that they would not but there is a lot of debate at the moment as to whether they would start to look at financial decision making. The ELT are currently looking at the information within the IDSR (Inspection Data Summary Report) as the financial information they have included is incorrect.</p> <p><b>Governor Question: Decision Making</b> – KS asked if it was the case that Ofsted would look at the decision making processes regarding the finances rather than the actual budget. MBU stated that this was his understanding. For example, they would ask why the College had spent £X amount on a particular area or why the College had not invested in a particular area linked to the schools priorities and areas for development. The SMRA would challenge the information during a visit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Internal Audit Visit by Griffin Chartered Accountants</b> – the report has been included within SharePoint for Governors’ information.</li> <li>• <b>Rise to School Budgets as announced by the Government</b> – the College must be mindful and clear on what the Department for Education will expect the schools to fund out of any additional monies and what supplementary grants will continue or cease.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Comment: £5,000</b> – KS noted that this was the latest government model figure for each pupil. MBU agreed.</p> <p>MBU stated that the ESFA produce a spreadsheet as to what schools should receive, however the figure shown is very different from what the College actually receive as the Local Authority decides what will be allocated. He added that with the High Needs Funding Block there is a huge deficit for the local authority. He pointed out that the Local Authority could not keep taking the money from the schools DSG (Designated Schools Grant) budget. MBU stated that if there was a hard National Funding Formula the government would decide but with the soft National Funding Formula, which is currently in place, the Local Authority decides.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Teachers’ Pay</b> – there will be a change for all grades. The Government will expect schools to pay out of the additional monies awarded.</li> </ul>		



“Success for All”

# HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST

## Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Collapse of Boundary Wall</b> – this continues to be an on-going issue. The Committee noted that the car park and cattle market were being sold. A brief discussion took place regarding the impact this could have on the College particularly if housing was built and pupil numbers increased. TS said the Committee must be mindful of what benefit the College could get from this change of use.</li> <li>• <b>ATP Project Plan</b> – MBU reported that funding is available as a result of the housing development at Gittisham (Baker Estates). This is known as Section 106 money. MBU stated that Honiton as a town in need of an ATP. It would benefit the College and the local community who could use it out of hours. A bid will need to be submitted for the Section 106 money if the College wish to progress the ATP Project Plan. Planning Permission must be in place.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Question: Amount</b> – KS asked if MBU knew the amount of Section 106 funding available. MBU said he did not know the exact amount, however the money would not cover the full cost of the ATP and the College would have to seek additional funding from Sport England or the Football Association. He hoped both would be positive in their support for the College but stated that planning permission would have to be in place as part of the local plan. MBU stated he would not want to use the College reserves to fund the ATP. MBU would look at the costs.</p> <p><b>Governor Question: Cost of Planning Permission</b> – KS asked how much MBU expected this to be. He advised about £20,000 but there would be other costs (as per the proposal). KS said she could therefore see this figure being in the region of £50,000. MBU said he will be talking to the Council to see if they would be prepared to fund some of the cost up front. He reiterated that he would be very reluctant to use any of the money from the Reserves. MBU said he would also look at what other parties could be involved and what they would be willing to contribute financially.</p> <p><b>Governor Question: Local Authority</b> – ME asked if they would provide planning permission at a more competitive rate. MBU said there would be other elements involved and did not think so.</p> <p><b>Governor Question: Outline Planning Permission</b> – KS asked if this was a possible option. MBU said he did not think this would provide enough reassurance. TS felt it may be helpful though to include this.</p> <p>MBU pointed out to the Governors that 2 of the big issues would be lighting and noise. Consultants have advised that lighting today is much better, however there is still the concern that residents may not want floodlights at the front/back of their houses. In addition, the area would be much busier with traffic if a ATP was built.</p> <p><b>Governor Question: Funding</b> – ME asked if MBU had thought to approach local sports teams such as the Exeter Chiefs. MBU confirmed he had.</p> <p><b>Governor Question: Lighting</b> – ME asked if lighting proved to be an issue whether there was the possibility that the hours of opening be reduced to times when lighting would not be needed. MBU stated it could be but this would be a major loss of revenue if the pitch was not available after say 4 p.m. in the winter months.</p> <p><b>Governor Comment: Noise</b> – The Committee hoped that noise would not be an issue given the noise generated by the A30 which ran directly behind the College.</p> <p><b>Governor Question: Deadline</b> – JRo asked if there was one. MBU said he did know at present but the College would need to be ready to apply for any Section 106 funding.</p>		



“Success for All”

# HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST

## Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Teachers Pay</b> – MBU referred the Committee to his paper included within SharePoint. In particular he pointed out the increase for Newly Qualified Teachers from £24,000 to £30,000. This will have an impact on what MBU has budgeted for. MBU took the Governors through the options in his paper.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Comment: Staffing</b> – KS said the figures did appear to show that HCC was a bit top heavy with regards to staffing costs. MBU pointed out that the College did not get the turnaround that other schools may.</p> <p><b>Governor Question: Percentage adopted</b> – TS asked MBU to confirm that the College do not get a say in what % is agreed. MBU confirmed this was the case and that the additional costs come out of the money provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Pension Costs and National Insurance</b> – MBU stated that the correct costs are included within the figures. He has made some assumptions regarding the leadership grades as these are not included.</li> </ul> <p>KS thanked MBU for his update.</p>		
8	<p><b>8a Management Accounts and 8b Data Dashboard</b> Governors noted the following documents in SharePoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Management Accounts – December 2019</b></li> <li><b>Data Dashboard - December 2019</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Management Accounts</b> MBU highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The top line figures</li> <li>The in-year balance of approximately £18,000</li> <li>The end of year reserves (approximately £242,000) – he expected that some of this would be spent to did not expect this to be as high as currently shown.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Comment: Figures</b> – ME commented that these were good at this stage.</p> <p><b>Data Dashboard</b> MBU highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student Numbers (and the difference between what is shown on the Data Dashboard and what has been funded) i.e. 743 on Data Dashboard and 734 funded.</li> </ul> <p><b>Governor Comment: Student Numbers</b> – TS suggested amending the scale to start at 700. MBU agreed to do this.</p>	MBU	Before next meeting
9	<p><b>Five Year Budget</b> Governors noted the following document in SharePoint:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Five Year Budget Update – ‘2020-21 and beyond’ January 2020 - HT3</b></li> </ul> <p>MBU reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>He has done further work on this prior to the meeting so the data is already out of date.</li> <li>If the grants are removed there would be a severe impact on the budget.</li> <li>Higher numbers are expected in the Sixth Form next year than originally estimated.</li> <li>Rates for KS3/4 remain unchanged, although new rates had been confirmed on the day of the meeting.</li> <li>Funding for Sixth Form students will rise.</li> <li>Funding is based on the October census for the 2020-21 academic year which</li> </ul>		





“Success for All”

## HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
	Governors noted the document in SharePoint: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>RAA24B Security Risk Assessment</b></li> </ul> <p>MBU reported that this was an operational risk assessment and was included for the Governors' information. It was noted 'yes' was the response to all questions.</p>		
15	<b><u>Review current staffing structure and staffing needs for the next financial year</u></b> MBU reported that no changes were being recommended.		
16	<b><u>Staffing Update (Clerk will update Pay Policy if there are any amendments to the Performance Management Tree)</u></b> It was noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a new Deputy Designated Officer for Child Protection.</li> <li>The Attendance Officer post will be advertised in due course (but is currently being covered by a temporary contract).</li> <li>The Receptionist is in post until the end of the College year (when the post will be advertised).</li> <li>Interviews are due to take place for 2 temporary Teaching Assistant Posts.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Performance Management Tree</u></b> It was noted that the Clerk will ensure any changes to the Pay Policy (Appendix 1) are made.</p>	<b>Clerk</b>	<b>After FGB 12.02.20</b>
17	<b><u>Marketing Working Party Update</u></b> Governors noted the following documents in SharePoint: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Marketing Plan (version7)</b></li> </ul> <p>MBU reported that this had been updated. RSH noted that it was a lengthy plan. MBU said that there was an issue with regards to capacity (i.e. everyone at the College had very busy roles so there was limited time for marketing) therefore the Working Party had chosen to focus on 3 aspects (1. Newsletter (and frequency), 2. Brand Management, 3 Corridors and Displays). MBU reminded the Governors that administrative staff at the College had been stripped to the bone and therefore there was no additional capacity. He added that the plan was a work in progress.</p>		
18	<b><u>Policy Review</u></b> Governors noted the following document in SharePoint: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>College Lettings Policy Statement</b></li> </ul> <p>RSH said she had read through the document and was content with the policy. She pointed out one minor amendment regarding the scale of charge date in the policy which MBU amended. It was noted the correct date was on the College website. All were content. As there were no questions, <b><u>it was therefore agreed that the College Lettings Policy Statement had been approved by the Resources Committee. Proposed: RSH, Seconded: KS.</u></b></p>	<b>Chair</b>	<b>To FGB to note 12.02.20</b>
19	<b><u>Letters and correspondence from ESFA to academy trusts</u></b> MBU reported that there were no letters or correspondence to note.		
20	<b><u>To note Resources Committee Governors have received monthly management accounts</u></b> It was noted that Governors have received these (MBU has put a folder in SharePoint for the Management Accounts). The Chair of Governors is emailed by MBU on a monthly basis informing him they are available.		
21	<b><u>Governor Audit Check</u></b> ME reported that she had conducted a check (4 <sup>th</sup> December 2019) and all was in order.		



“Success for All”

## HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
22	<b><u>Aged Debtor Report</u></b> KS reported that that apart from one entry over 2 months there were no concerns. She had discussed this with MBU who is monitoring the situation. <b>All felt that it may be better to write-off the debt. Proposed: TS, Seconded: ME.</b> MBU said he would arrange this.	MBU	After Meeting
23	<b><u>Related Party Transactions/Employment of Trustees</u></b> MBU stated that there was nothing to report.		
24	<b><u>Gifts and Hospitality, Connected and Related Party Transactions</u></b> KS stated that she had checked the book and there were no new entries.		
25	<b><u>Receive notification of any funding issues from Teaching and Learning</u></b> The Committee discussed the request from the Teaching and Learning Committee with regards to increasing the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Budget. Governors questioned MBU as to what the budget had been spent on to date. It was noted that a high percentage of the budget had been spent at the start of the term on 2 days of 'attachment based' training for teachers. This had meant less money was available for the remainder of the academic year. The Committee felt that if statutory training was required money would be found, but at this stage they would not agree to an increase in the CPD budget. KS to feedback to the Full Governing Body.	KS	Feedback to FGB 12.02.20
26	<b><u>Approval – Category B and C Trips</u></b> Governors noted the document in SharePoint regarding the proposed eSwatini Trip: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Honiton Community College Reservation Form 2021 eSwatini</b></li> </ul> <p>However, as this trip has been postponed due to numbers they noted there was no need to discuss further.</p>		
27	<b><u>Review induction procedures for new governors</u></b> TS reported that he had reviewed the procedures, in particular the Checklist maintained by the Clerk for each new governor. He reported that the induction was tailored to the needs of each individual new governor. He was involved in one-to-one meetings where he could discuss any concerns with new governors. Overall he was more than satisfied with the current induction package and had emailed KS (as Chair of Resources) to confirm this. JRo, as a new governor, said she was more than satisfied with the induction process and the support from the Chair/Clerk.	KS	Feedback to FGB 12.02.20
28	<b><u>Review of Exit interviews, Staffing and Retention (to include review of Probationary Reviews e.g. ensure first meeting etc had taken place)</u></b> KS stated that she had met with JBI (Jenny Bigmore – PA to Principal) who is responsible for ensuring Exit Interviews and Probationary Reviews are conducted. They had agreed that an annual review would be done at the end of each academic year.		
29	<b><u>Part 2 Minutes</u></b> <b>The meeting went into Part 2 at 6.25 p.m. Proposed: KS, Seconded: RSH.</b> <b>The meeting came out of Part 2 at 6.30 p.m. Proposed: KS, Seconded: JRo.</b>		
30	<b><u>What impact has this meeting had on the outcomes of pupils in our College?</u></b> It was noted that the Governors have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looked at how the facilities could be better improved in the future (e.g. the ATP).</li> <li>• Ensured that the budget is financially sensible and therefore provides excellent support to the students.</li> <li>• Reviewed what impact any additional funding may have on the College.</li> <li>• Been reassured that all is in place with regards to Health and Safety.</li> <li>• Looked at the work of the Marketing Working Party in particular how to attract additional students.</li> </ul>		



"Success for All"

# HONITON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMY TRUST

## Resources Committee

**POLICIES ADOPTED:** College Lettings Policy Statement

**POLICIES TO RECOMMEND TO FULL GOVERNING BODY:** None

Ref	Action or Decision	Action	Date Due
31	<b><u>Date and time of next meeting</u></b> Monday 16 <sup>th</sup> March 2020 at 4.30 p.m. HCC Meeting Room. <i>Meeting ended at 6.32 p.m.</i>		