D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

Maure Judith Jacqu Darre Tim F	ent: James - Community Governor (Chair) een Sims – Community Governor n Fisher – Community Governor uie Davies – Headteacher en King – Community Governor Pritchard – Community Governor ent: None	Apologies: None Duration of meeting: 6 – 7.48pm	
	endance:	MC members will be referred to as governors	
	n Price (KP) – School Business Manager lls (JH) - Clerk		
1.	Welcome & Apologies Declaration of Any Other Urgent Business Declaration of Business Interests		Action
1.1	Harry James welcomed those present.		
1.2	One item of any other business was raised in respect of the Heads Funding Group (HFG). There were no declarate		
2.	Minutes of the Meeting on 23 rd March 2021 & Matters agenda.	Arising where not elsewhere on the	
2.1	The minutes of the Finance Committee on 23 rd March 20 minutes were agreed as an accurate record and will be s reopen fully.		
2.2	Matters Arising (where not elsewhere on the agenda) There was one action to be carried forward from the minimplementation date had not yet been reached: 2.3 Book Maureen Sims onto Safer Recruitment training	•	SBM/Clerk AT 1
2.3	Governors were updated on the progress of the remainin meeting:- 2.12 Consider how best to feedback to policy holders approximature) and any queries which need to be addressed. The return the policies after meetings with confirmation of approximation of the policyholder. These are identified on the policy scheduler that the policy would be forwarded to Monica Romano who we forward it to Camelot to be added to the website.	proval of policies by Committees/MC (including The Headteacher proposed that the Clerk proval or details of any amendments needed to dule. Once the amendments had been agreed	
	2.15 Clerking Hours review – carried forward to Summer completed the review but would do so shortly.	Term 1. The Clerk advised that she had not	Clerk FC 29.06.21
	6.1 Include Internal Audit report on FC agenda as soon a second draft report had been received and further comm report is received it will be circulated to FC Governors.		Clerk FC 29.06.21
2.4	Governors were advised of the progress on a number of 2021:	matters arising from the minutes on 23rd March	
Signe	3.5 Headteacher to raise with LA how they arrived at the to HFG/Schools Forum. The Headteacher confirmed that had not received a response as yet. Action: Headteach	at she had emailed the LA on 31st March but	Headteacher FC 29.06.21

Signed:

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Actions
	4.3 Confirm how 2021/22 funding included in the HFG report compares to previous years. The Headteacher advised that in 2019/20 £270,000 had been received directly from schools. This had increased to £384,000 in 2020/21. In 2019/20 there would have been a higher number of permanent exclusions (PEX) meaning that the LA paid a larger proportion of icollege fees. Therapeutic Thinking had been introduced in 2020/21 and in some instances to avoid PEX the LA would fund schools who would in turn pay icollege.	
	4.5 Catch up information for website - "narrowing the gap" or "closing the gap". The Headteacher advised that the wording had not been amended as icollege closes the gap for its learners.	
	$5.3\ 2021/22\ \text{Budget}$ deadline. The SBM confirmed that the deadline for submission of 2021/22 budget to WBC is 1^{st} May 2021.	
3.	P12 Budget Monitoring Report	
3.1	The Headteacher thanked Governors for their questions in advance of the meeting on the P12 and the 2021/22 Budget and Three-year forecast, which the SBM had responded to and had been circulated shortly before this meeting. The SBM advised that whilst the P12 is the final month any residual adjustments will be processed in P13 which will be available shortly. The year end forecast is now a surplus of £352,180. The report included as Annex B details of every budget line with the actual and variance identified. This showed an underspend of £150,000 the majority of which was as a direct result of CV-19. Additional funding had been received due to Park House paying their aged debt. This was not received in time to be included in the 2020/21 accounts so has been provisioned. Governors asked if there was still some amounts outstanding from Park House. The SBM advised that there are still some invoices outstanding but all of the aged debt has been cleared. As the aged debt had not been accounted for previously, this had contributed to the increase in the year end surplus.	
3.2	Given that the Park House aged debt was c£17,000, Governors asked what else had contributed to the increase of £144,000 surplus between P11 and P12 and why if this was due to underspending had this not been apparent from earlier Budget Monitoring Reports. The SBM advised that in P11 there would still have been some purchase orders where invoicing had been anticipated, but this had not happened so they had now been closed down. As at that point icollege was still forecasting, there had been cautious budgeting in respect of late orders/emergency situations. There had been comittments in the forecast which are no longer on the system. The Headteacher added that P12 now included definite funding figures for SEN and the High Needs Block (HNB). Governors queried whether these had been significantly different and the Headteacher confirmed that they were.	
3.3	The Headteacher advised that this years budget monitoring had been especially challenging given CV-19. P13 had been received today which had confirmed that icollege was within £500 of agreeing the final year end surplus. Given that there is a 70% change in figures throughout the year it is challenging to be able to provide the answers Governors are rightly asking. Governors acknowledged the volatility of the budget which makes monitoring challenging for Governors, especially when within a month or two the surplus can vary by £144,000. This made it difficult to maintain confidence in the figures produced previously and whilst some element of variance is expected such a significant variance is concerning. The year end surplus had been forecast as being £208,000 in P11 which had risen to £352,000 by P12. Governors discussed whether it would be possible to include in the Budget Monitoring Reports a narrative within Table 1 as to the main reasons for the variances which occurred between one report and the next as a summary of the significant variances within the body of the report. Action: SBM to include narrative in Table 1 on key variances between budget monitoring reports.	SBM 2021/22 Budget Monitoring Reports
3.4	Accruals to be carried forward to 2021/22 were listed in Annex A. Many were already showing on the bank statements or remittance advices had been received, but too late for them to feature in the P12 report. There was only c£34,000 for which no payment information or update was available.	
Signod	. Date:	

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

4.	Budget 2021/22 & Three-Year Forecast	Actions
4.1	The Chair asked the SBM to explain the background as to why this year, Governors had received three budget documents; POD+ Budget, Main School Budget and Main School Budget and POD+ combined. The SBM advised that the Main School Budget spreadsheet was the standard budget for a "normal" year and included all four units and the POD i.e. the current provision. The POD+ spreadsheet covers the additional Y7 provision icollege has been asked to provide for the 2021/22 academic year whilst the additional SEMH Provision being established by the LA is set up. The spreadsheet shows the costs/income involved in providing these additional places from September 2021 to March 2022 (the proportion of the financial year for which the budget is being set.) This had been prepared to demonstrate what the impact of adding POD+ was on the icollege budget. Within the three year forecast POD+ costs and income had been included within 2022/23 from April to August 2022 at which point the intention is that these students would move to the new SEMH provision. A revised POD+ budget had been circulated just before the meeting with corrected carry forward surplus figures for 2019/20 as these had been corrupted on the version circulated previously.	
4.2	The Chair advised Governors that their role is looking towards the future to ensure that the organisation is financially viable and sustainable. At the Strategy Day on 22^{nd} June Governors will be discussing the direction of travel for icollege and part of this will be how strong the financial position is. When reviewing budgets and forecasts and before looking in more detail at the budget focus is on the "bottom line" i.e. whether icollege is in surplus or deficit at year end. Whilst there is a healthy surplus to carry forward to $2021/22$, every year has an in year deficit and so is loosing money. Governors needed to understand why this was the case. It appeared from the figures presented that there was a significant increase in staffing costs year on year. The SBM advised that apart from those needed for POD+, there was no other planned expansion of staffing numbers within the budgets moving forward. They do however include incremental performance related pay increases and an assumed percentage increase (cost of living rise), except for $2021/22$ as the Government has already advised that there will not be an inflation increase for teachers this year.	
4.3	The Chair referred to the three year forecast and noted that total staffing costs in 2019/20 was £1.914m which by 2025/26 was forecast to have increased to £2.327m an increase of £412,000. Governors asked what percentage increase had been assumed within the three year forecast. The SBM advised that schools are given the percentage increases to include for budget setting purposes by WBC accountancy. Previously a 2.75% increase had been applied but for 2022/23 (as there was no increase planned for 2021/22), this had reduced to 2% across the board. The Chair advised that applying a 2% increase year on year from now until 2025/26 only accounted for £200,000 of the increase. The SBM advised that incremental increases are separate to the percentage increase. Support Staff have less of a pay range to progress e.g. Teaching Assistants only have three points within a band, whereas for a teacher it can take up to six years to reach the top of the Main Scale Range and then a further two years into the Upper Pay Range.	
4.4	Governors asked if based on the assumption that the increase in costs was due to cost of living increases, was there not additional income/funding to mitigate the increase. The SBM advised that whilst this should be the case, whilst in 2020/21 a 3% increase in funding had been agreed by the LA but there had been problems implementing this and for 2021/22 there had been no increase. The Headteacher refered back to a discussion at previous meetings whereby she had explained that for the first two years of icollege WBC Accountancy had applied a percentage increase, then the Chair of Governors requested an increase. Last year the Headteacher had requested an increase but did not hear back from the LA until August at which point they advised that funding could only increase by £3. The Headteacher advised that this was one of the reasons for the Any Other Business item raised at the start of the meeting. The Headteacher had requested a 3% increase from the LA for 2021/22 following agreement at an earlier Finance Committee. The Head of Education had advised that icollege would need to take a report/case to the HFG to support the request, which was something icollege had not been required to do previously. By the time this advise had been received the timescale for the HFG was too tight. However, icollege has since been advised that it can present a report to the meeting of the HFG in June 2021 supporting an increase for 2021/22 (for which the budget had been prepared without a percentage increase applied to funding.) The Headteacher asked Governors whether this was something they wished to do in light of the year end surplus of £350,000 or would it be better to	

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

Actions wait until after the Strategy Day and planned financial review, presenting a case for 2022/23 onwards. Governors discussed that whilst it would appear inappropriate to ask for an increase when there was £350,000 surplus at the end of 2020/21, looking at the three year forecast icollege was loosing between £190,000 and £270,000 per year and asked whether if a 3% increase in funding had been allowed for 2021/22, would this have negated the in year deficit. The Headteacher advised that whilst an increase would reduce the level of in year deficit, there was a risk that increasing fees could price icollege out of the market given how dependent icollege is on the LA for funding. The HFG may not agree an increase in light of the substantial year end surplus. The alternative would be to look at reducing the education offer currently provided by icollege. This is complicated by the uncertainty of the impact the new SEMH provision is likely to have on icollege provision moving forward in terms of student numbers and how many icollege may loose to the new provision. There does not appear to be a strategy within the LA outlining the ongoing relationship between icollege which has a high proportion of SEN learners and the new SEMH provision. 4.5 Governors discussed that based on a current income of c£3million per annum a 2% increase would equate to £60,000. Therefore even if this was applied it would not cover the predicted shortfall. The deficit would still need to be managed but it would be lower c£250,000. Based on current forecasts, icollege would go into an overall deficit position in two financial years time. At this point it would be incumbent on Governors to approve a Recovery Plan, but within the current circumstances it was not clear how this could be achieved. When considering the future of direction of icollege Governors need to understand its financial position and variables in order to be able to plan. It is therefore imperative, as discussed at previous meetings that icollege meet with the LA to discuss the way it is funded. The Headteacher advised that icollege is working with the LA to set up these meetings and Michelle Sancho is leading on the HFG review of icollege out of which a new funding model may be put forward. However, it suits the LA to fund icollege using the existing model based on individual pupil placements. icollege is symbiotically joined to the LA and therefore it is difficult to influence how it is funded because it is so dependent on its funding. It was agreed that this needs to be considered as part of the Strategy Day. 4.6 In relation to staffing costs the Headteacher sought clarification as to whether the WBC budgeting tool calculated increases automatically. The SBM advised that staff have to be entered individually and their performance related increases tracked year on year. With the annual pay award, the SBM adds the percentage increase and the effective date and the budgeting tool performs the calculation. 4.7 Governors agreed to run through the remaining questions asked in advance of the meeting and the responses from the SBM as not all Governors had been able to review these prior to the meeting. Q Are we able to set a deficit budget in 22/23 onwards? Usually there would need to be a plan to reduce this in place. Accepted that this may be an outcome of the strategic Review in June. A No a deficit budget can't be set. Having a forecast budget showing a deficit in the coming years means that there is time to make changes. This will form part of the review in June, could include school/LA charges, student charges (FSM/trips etc), staffing, etc 4.8 Governors queried whether a deficit budget could be set if there was a good reason for doing so and it was alongside a recovery plan. The SBM clarified that icollege could apply to the LA to set a deficit budget which would need to be accompanied with a five year Recovery Plan to bring icollege out of deficit, but this may not be accepted by the LA. Q The % spent on staffing 2021/22 is noted as £2103390 + OA £176455 = £2279855 v total exp £2716623 = 83.92%? (77% excluding OA) Is this accurate / sustainable? A This isn't accurate. The total staffing on the POD+ budget is £2,222,526, OA is £176,455. The percentages are 75% without OA and 80% including OA. This is an expected figure, but needs to form part of the strategic review because it adds to the forecast deficit.

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

	Thance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20 April 2021 at opin	Actions
.9	Governors queried the response provided and felt that there was still some discrepancy within the percentage staffing costs and that the status quo with OA is nearer 83%. It was agreed that the SBM would take another look at the staffing percentages and feedback to Governors after the meeting. Action: SBM to review staffing percentages with/without OA and report back to Governors.	SBM asap
	Post Meeting Note: Feedback from SBM - The question appears to mix information from the MSB and the POD+ budget when they need to be treated as two separate budgets. Because iCollege is expanding temporarily the POD+ budget is the one that should be discussed and approved.	
	POD+ year 21/22 staffing expenditure against total expenditure is 74% POD+ year 22/23 staffing expenditure against total expenditure is 82%	
	MSB year 21/22 staffing expenditure against total expenditure is 77% MSB year 22/23 staffing expenditure against total expenditure if 78%	
	These figures don't include OA	
	Expenditure POD+ 21/22 was a 10.6% increase from MSB in Year 1 POD+ 22/23 shows a reduction of 10% from POD+ year 1.	
	The 10% initial increase is set up costs, 7 months additional staffing, larger allocation for internal supply teachers paid for from Catch Up funding, 7 months charges cleaning, utilities, resources, lunch etc The 10% decrease would be no set up costs, 5 months staffing, no additional allocation for supply from catch up funding, 5 months costs on resources, cleaning, utilities, lunch etc,	
	The staffing costs overall in MSB increase by 3% year 1 to year 2 The staffing costs overall in POD+ increase by 2% year 1 to year 2	
	If the budgets aren't mixed and are compared year on year within the same budget the percentage increases on staffing/expenditure are consistent and can be explained where there is a large difference.	
	Q Going forward, iCollege appear to be anticipating an increase in expenditure of 4.7% from 2020/21 to 2021/22 to about £2.72 million, and there-after an average annual increase in expenditure of about 2.2% per annum to 2025/26. The budgeted income, however, only increases by 0.23% from 2020/21 to 2021/22 to £2.54 million, which is insufficient to cover the anticipated increase in expenditure, and thereafter the average proposed increase in budgeted income is 1.3% per annum to 2025/26; which is significantly below the projected average increase in expenditure (2.2% per annum) so any deficit will only increase. Consequently, the net deficit is projected to increase to be about £1,294,608 by the end of the 2025/26 year.	
	If that's correct, the following questions arise:	
	A SBM prepared and circulated a new document, the original one was corrupt and was showing a deficit of income which was incorrect.	
	Q Is there a way of retrospectively addressing the shortfall In income issue from 2019/20?	
	A All outstanding invoices for 19/20 have been paid.	
	Q How will the projected increase in expenditure from 2020/21 to 2021/22 of 4.7% be justified?	
	A POD+ as well as 2% increase on expenditure, staff increments where applicable, 1% for staff earning less than £25,000 (support and unqualified teachers)	
	Q How should the anticipated growing difference in budgeted income and expenditure be resolved?	

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

Actions A To be included in wider review. Budget assists in highlighting areas of concern. Q Budget at £720K / actual £660K (Assume 66 + Pod 6 '@ 10kea) Did we not receive £10k for Pod pupils? A The POD funding was received in 2 portions. SEN/HNB/LA pay differently to main funding, so it is coded in a different area on the LA Agresso (finance system), which has to be mirrored in FMS. P5 £42,094 received for 1.4.20 - 18.12.20 P10 £17,907 received for 1.1.21 - 31.3.21 Q 20/21 @ £720k - Does this now include Pod funding? A POD funding is included Q Formula Allocation: £702k is allocated for 21/22. Assuming this includes the additional £10k per pupil; how certain is this as we do not seem to have received this in the first year of the POD A Funding allocation is £720K for MSB, additional students in POD+ increases that figure to £790K for 21/22. Funding for POD was received 20/21, so it is expected that this funding will be received 21/22. **Q** Teachers Pay & Pension Grant: How is this paid to iCollege? Mainstream schools have this incorporated into their per pupil payment and from 21/22 into their main gov funding - but our fees are not increasing. A The LA receive funding for PRU/Special Schools/AP and pay an allocation to each eligible school. icollege would therefore expect to receive the Pay and Pensions Grant as a one off payment. Q HNB Top Up Funding: Budget from 22/23 increases by £25k pa. 19/20 to 20/21 has been constant. Why? A Increased because of additional student numbers for POD+, but had decreased in MSB initially to reflect less students – budgeting for 72, (20/21 budgeted for 74). Therefore whilst it looks as if the MSB has reduced overall including POD+ it has increased. A cautious approach has been taken for 2021/22 by setting the budget based on 72 instead of 74 students being on roll across the academic year. 4.10 Governors asked if the budget is set based on 72 students but icollege ends up with 76, where would the additional four students show in the budget. The SBM advised that icollege would receive additional income for the four pupils, however, icollege would not receive the base £10,000 for the additional four students. The £10,000 per student would only ever be received for the agreed base numbers of 72. Governors asked whether icollege would cover its costs for the additional four pupils. The Headteacher advised that in these circumstances, icollege would be technically loosing money as it would only receive top up funding. However, icollege may not need additional staffing or premises for the additional students other than any bespoke programme costs depending on their needs. Governors asked if this should be factored in to discussions with the LA around funding. The Headteacher advised that it could but that the LA has the same arrangement for Special Schools. Governors discussed that whilst it should not be aiming to make a "profit" it should not be expected to loose money. The Headteacher advised that as students are not necessarily with icollege for a full academic year, the only way to set a budget is to base it on an average number across the year. Q Misc income: What is this? Why is there no budget in years post 21 / 22? A This is for unexpected funding, and 20/21 included donations from YMCA for a gardening project at Intervention and the Good Exchange grants for the music project. No budget included, because this is not a firm funding stream. In medium/long term if any charity donations/grants could be managed by any 'Friends' groups if that progresses.

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

	Thance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20 April 2021 at opin	Actions
	Q Additional Grants: Does this include the Catch-Up Premium? Are we aware of any further catch-up grants in the future?	
	A Catch up for Summer Term 21 is included. There is no allocation of funding for academic year 21/22 at the moment, although the National Tutoring Programme has been extended, but this doesn't bring any funding and icollege has not signed up for this. SBM has review The Key and the Government website but found no new information.	
	Q Staffing General: comments note 1% for UNQ's under £25k pa – do we have any?	
	A There are 9 unqualified teachers 7 of which are earning less than £25,000 – these total 2.8 FTE.	
	Q Has a pay increase been included in the 21/22 budget, despite the Gov announcement of no increase for teachers this year?	
	A No pay increase has been included for September 21 for teachers or April 21 for support staff (other than the 1% uplift for staff on less than £25,000 and increment moves)	
	Q What is the AHT /LT contingency of 10hours per month to cover?	
	A Meetings, additional workload due to Child Protection concerns, exam, curriculum changes. Occasional cover for staff member with long term medical condition.	
4.11	Governors asked if the additional hours are utilised at a time when the member of staff is not usually employed. The SBM confirmed that Lead Teacher cover for medical condition would be at a time they were not usually employed for. Governors discussed that in accordance with Teaching Standards around the Leadership scales a degree of cover and attending additional meetings is an expected requirement of the role and would not therefore attract additional payment. The Headteacher advised that the Assistant Headteachers are 0.8fte each and so if they were required to work on a day they would not normally do so, or cannot take time in lieu for operational reasons then the payment of additional hours would be considered.	
	Q Apprenticeship levy: Any further thoughts as to how we might take on an apprentice?	
	A The possibility of a TA apprenticeship is being considered although this does tie up TA time on training away from the school. Action: Chair to provide the SBM with information about an apprenticeship scheme from another school, including the pro's and con's to aid discussion.	Finance Chair FC 29.06.21
	Q Notes include 'well-being missed' as part of supply insurance. What is the comparative cost of this versus the 'other' services implemented?	
	A The well being was initially missed by a small number of staff (maybe 5). Historically 1 GP appointment had been made, and 2 physio appointments. Counselling had been accessed 3 times. The cost of these outweighed the payments received from the supply insurance. AHT wellbeing had investigated a number of free of charge services for mental health. The in-house counsellor is able to work with staff and the LA provide 3 (chargeable) sessions for staff – no staff took up a chargeable session during financial year 20/21. The SBM was unable to comment on the number of staff the iCollege counsellor met due to confidentiallity.	
	Q Catering: Should we be charging non-FSM learners for meals - as a mainstream school would?	
	A This is a possibility. How would that be managed on each site and what happens if payments aren't made by parents? The SBM had been asked about this on a number of occassions by WBC Accountancy.	
4.12	Governors discussed the need for additional information to inform the discussion around how many	
Signed	: Date:	

01189 416636

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

	2131.00.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20 April 2021 at 6pm	Actions
	pupils there are, how many are eligible for free school meals, how much income would be generated if those not on FSM paid for their lunches, as an organisation is this a route icollege wants to go down, is it in accordance with icollege values. Action: SBM to provide additional information relating to FSM and implications around charging other students.	SBM FC 29.06.21
	Post meeting note: The SBM advised that as of 25.05.21, icollege has icollege has 82 students on roll. 47 of these students are registered as FSM. 57%. FY 20/21 icollege received £0 FSM Supplementary Grant. The FSM grant was based on the number of FSM on roll during the October 19 and 20 census. October 19 = 18 students. October 20 = 17 students. The difference between the two if higher would attract £450 per student. However as icollege had less students there was no additional funding. There is no indication that this supplementary grant will be offered FY 21/22. We did receive £182 Infant Free School Meals Funding FY 20/21.	
	Q Governor Support: As WBC provides access to The Key – do we need to pay for this separately; if indeed we are?	
	A The LA provide Governor support which includes Governor Hub, some training and LA support for the Clerk and Governors. The LA does not provide The Key, iCollege has an annual subscription to this for Governors and School Leaders. Action: Clerk to clarify with Governor Services and to send invites to new Governors so they can access The Key.	Clerk FC 29.06.21
	Post meeting note : Governor Services have confirmed that the subscription icollege has with them does not include access to The Key.	
	Q Top up: Are we safe to assume that this is accurate as pupils & their needs are known? (Accepting in-year changes to needs)	
	A The top up funding is based on 72 students and the current student banding, that is realistic. POD+ additional 10 students from September increasing to 12 in January 22 – all Band 2. This is realistic. Bands are known for those students who are staying with icollege and averages have been used to budget for the remaining places. icollege cannot predict what the needs of new students will be and therefore cannot determine for budgeting purposes which funding band is appropriate. In 2020/21 there were more higher band students than anticipated.	
4.13	The Headteacher advised that it would make budgeting easier if the LA paid based on places rather than students, say at Band 1 and then icollege would only need to invoice for top up funding where student needs were higher. Governors discussed that evidence is available to support the average number of students per year which could form the basis of a case to the LA.	
	Q Staffing total from MSB £2103k to POD+£2222k = £119k Total Exp MSB £2716k v POD+ £2979k = £263k = 45% staffing costs.	
	Is this due to first year set up costs skewing the %? If not, why is it 45% when MSB is in the 80's?	
	A Set up costs are skewing 21/22. Action: SBM to look into this further.	SBM FC 29.06.21
	Q The forecast surplus from POD+ IS £51K in its first year (MSB £179k surplus v POD+ £230k surplus).	
	This seems high given the last year surplus for iCollege was originally £81k. In year 2 – 2021 / 22 there is an overall POD+ surplus of £85k. Is this based on a one year academic provision in POD+? If so, learners would only be in POD+ for April to July in 22/23.	
	A POD+ students included in budget as follows 71 days Sept – December 10 students 62 days Jan 22 – March 22 12 students also for 22/23 April to July 59 days 12 students)	
Signed		

INSPIRATIONKS1& 2 Foxglove Way . Thatcham Berks . RG18 4DH 01635 877114

INTEGRATIONKS3&4 22 Highview . Calcot Reading . Berks . RG31 4XD 01189 416636

INTERVENTIONY9&10 88 Newtown Road . Newbury Berks . RG14 7BT 01635 49397

INDEPENDENCEY11&K\$5 Richmond House . Bath Road Newbury . Berks . RG14 1QY 01635 48872

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

	Thianoc committee (virtual incesting) raceday 20 April 2021 at opin	Actions
	Q It would be better to show a separate budget for POD+ from the MSB, in order to monitor that this provision is not running at a loss / is to the detriment of the rest of iCollege.	Actions
	A The funding will come in on MSB for iCollege. POD students are joining the POD+ students on the same site. It would be difficult to split out the income and expenditure for those current POD students and POD+ students. There will be a breakdown on FMS for the POD. The SBM confirmed that POD+ student funding will be on the same basis as other students.	
4.14	Governors discussed that as POD+ is a temporary provision, their concern was that the permanent 72 student places are not subsidising POD+ students and thus skewing the budget position. FMS can record POD costs separately, not utilities etc but general costs. This could be monitored. The Headteacher clarified that POD+ students would consist of current POD students who would normally move on to Year 7 provision but this is not available until the new SEMH provision planned by the LA is in place. There are also some additional mainstream pupils who have EHCP's who need additional support who will be joining POD+. It is anticipated that both sets of learners will move to the new SEMH provision once this is up and running.	
	Q What is the proposed staffing structure for POD+?	
	A 4 x TA's 30 hours Grade C 1 x Admin Support 20 hours Grade D 2 x Teachers 1 FTE Up to UPS3 + 1SEN Lead Teacher already employed	
	There is no increase in any leadership costs etc.	
4.15	Governors unanimously agreed that the 2021/22 budget and three-year forecast should be recommended to the Management Committee on 27th April 2021 for approval with the caveat that discussions need to take place around the management of future years resources. Action: SBM to update the budget document to reflect P13 final figures, draft a high level summary of the budget strategy to explain key assumptions, then forward to the Clerk to issue to the MC along with the budget sign off sheet. Action: Include Governors questions and answers discussed at this meeting along with MC budget	SBM/Headteacher 24.04.21 Clerk 24.04.21
4.40	papers.	
4.16	Governors thanked the SBM for her hard work in constructing the budget.	
5.	Schools Financial Values Statement (SFVS) 2020/21	
5.1	The Chair had gone through the SFVS with the SBM. The document is designed to be a tool to assist schools rather than an inspection/audit document. The majority of areas are satisfactory. Those where there are actions are around discussions of pupil numbers/funding etc and therefore relate to arranging meetings with the LA to discuss the way forward. Actions also include the Finance Chair meeting with the SBM once a month but definitely prior to a meeting to discuss/clarify budget monitoring information.	
5.2	Question 20 – Collaboration with other schools/shared purchasing. The Headteacher noted that the response was "In part" and that icollege would explore collaborating with other schools where it is feasible and productive. The Headteacher expressed concern that whilst idealistically collaboration as a way to reduce costs is desireable when it has been explored in the past, the organisation involved has outweighed any benefits. It was agreed that the statement would remain but should collaboration be impractical then it wouldn't be adopted.	
5.3	Question 22 – The LA own the buildings and are responsible for any upgrades – The SBM queried this as icollege would need to apply to the LA for capital funding if work was required. Ongoing maintenance is undertaken by the caretaker. Action: Reword response to Q22.	Finance Chair MC 27.04.21
	: Date:	

01189 416636

INTERVENTIONY9&10

D1 31.05.21 Finance Committee (virtual meeting) Tuesday 20th April 2021 at 6pm

		Actions
5.4	Governors unanimously agreed to recommend to the MC on 27.04.21 that they approve the SFVS for 2021/22 subject to the amendments agreed above.	
6.	Any Other Urgent Business.	
	Covered in part under 4.4 above.	
6.1	Governors discussed that it would be good to have the timings in writing in order for icollege to submit a case for a percentage increase of fees. The Headteacher advised that any changes would need to be agreed at the March 2022 HFG at the latest. The Clerk advised that this would make it difficult to include any changes agreed to funding within the 2022/23 budget as there was only one working week after the Easter Holidays for the budget to be reviewed by the Finance Committee and approved by the Management Committee ready for submission to the LA by 1st May 2022. Action: Headteacher to request that the LA provide a definitive timetable for icollege to report to the HFG requesting an increase to its fees etc.	Headteacher FC 29.06.21
7.	Date and Focus of Next Meeting – The next meeting is 29th June 2021 at 6pm. The focus will be:- P2 Budget Monitoring Report Immerging issues since budget setting Feedback from HFG 9.06.21 and Schools Forum 21.06.21 Capital/Building Projects Health and Safety Policies – Accessibility/Access Audit (MR) Meeting Schedule for 2021/22P12 Budget Monitoring Report and Year-end Outturn, Final 2021/22, Debtors – provisions/write offs, SFVS approval.	
8.	Part II minutes. Approval of the Part II minutes of the Extraordinary Finance Committee on 16th March 2021 was carried forward to the June meeting.	

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7.48pm.