

MILLTHORPE SCHOOL

MINUTES OF THE EXTRA-ORDINARY  
FINANCE & STAFFING COMMITTEE MEETING



Held on Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2014 at 7.30pm

**Present:** Mr Trevor Burton (Headteacher) Mr Bill Schofield  
Mr Tim Hooper (Chair) Mr Bob Sydes  
Mr Tim Moat Ms Helen Thomas  
Ms Eileen Robertson

**In Attendance:** Mr Alex Collins (School Business Manager)  
Mr Don Henson (Community Governor)  
Ms Nicki Mitchell (Parent Governor)  
Mr Martyn Pysanczyn (Community Governor)  
Miss Amy White (Clerk)

		Action
1.	<p><b>Review of Cleaning Contract</b></p> <p>A 'Feasibility Report on Moving to an In-House Cleaning Service' had been produced by Alex Collins (School Business Manager) and distributed to governors prior to the meeting. Member of the Executive Committee had also received the report and were in attendance at the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the key considerations for moving to an in-house cleaning service were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Potential saving on cost</li> <li>· The quality of service – which was not currently of a consistent standard.</li> </ul> <p>Alex Collins presented his report and discussions took place as follows:</p> <p>Alex highlighted that the current contract was with the LA's Neighbourhood Services, who provided a cleaning services for most of the schools within the city. When the school had initially embarked on the evaluation of cleaning contracts a larger cost saving had been expected but there were still savings to be made.</p> <p>Alex explained that the Neighbourhood Service had been running for a long time but there was a clear sense that the future of the Service was under severe scrutiny and at risk from restructure or outsourcing. Governors were informed that the LA was supporting schools in bringing their cleaning service in-house in order to provide some stability for the cleaning staff. Alex clarified that the company was directly employed by the LA.</p> <p>A governor asked if it would be beneficial to speak to other secondary schools and Alex confirmed that this had been done. He outlined the information received as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Two had moved in-house three or more years ago with positive outcomes.</li> <li>· Two had a facilities management team.</li> <li>· One had given notice to the LA. The LA had been supportive and spoken to relevant members of staff.</li> <li>· One was in a similar position to Millthorpe but was looking more seriously at third party tender as they had capacity to manage such a contract.</li> </ul> <p>With reference to <i>Appendix 1: Timeline</i> and the notification of need for TUPE arrangements, a governor asked if TUPE was necessary if the cleaning staff would remain employed by the LA. Alex confirmed that TUPE was not necessary and explained that the change would be dealt with through a transfer of departments.</p> <p>A governor asked if the school currently had the same cleaning staff or if the staff rotated. Alex confirmed that the cleaning staff worked the same shifts but there was capacity for cover. If the contract was brought in-house the school would be required to build in additional flexibility and potentially employ casual staff to cover absence.</p> <p>Alex was asked if the school would have the flexibility to choose the cleaning staff. Alex replied that this was not possible, He explained that the current staff would be asked to decide if they wanted to transfer department and if all or most members of staff agreed, the school would need to accept most or all transfers. Alex stated that he felt it was not likely that all would agree to transfer department and that the level of scrutiny would be higher.</p> <p>A governor asked if the transfer of department would impact the ability of the staff to be</p>	

<p>contracted elsewhere. Alex replied that his understanding was that there could be some changes to the terms of their contract but the staff would not be greatly impacted.</p> <p>In response to a question, Alex explained that if no members of the current cleaning staff agreed to transfer the school would need to advertise. The LA would support the school through that transition period but there would be a charge. A governor stated that the opportunity to transfer was offering the staff some security. It was also acknowledged that the transfer would increase accountability.</p> <p>Governor asked if there was an anticipated management structure. Alex explained that a proportion of time would be allocated to Matt Chapman, Site Manager, to carry out onsite management. The current cleaning supervisor would continue to receive some supervisory time. The Headteacher further explained that the current cleaning supervisor was part of the on-site team of cleaners and in the same transfer position as the other members of staff. He clarified that this person would retain their supervisor role if they transferred. It would be difficult to determine the exact amount of time required for the current supervisor position as it was a very hands on and key role.</p> <p>The projected annual operating costs were reviewed in relation to management time and it was highlighted that the total was not £14,809 as stated within the report. After some consideration of the numbers governors noted that the amended figures suggested a more significant time management and net cost saving. Alex agreed to e-mail the updated tables to clearly identify the costs.</p> <p>In response to a question relating to the cost of equipment at £8,000, Alex explained that the figure was an initial outlay and annual cost. Alex further explained that if new equipment was purchased the initial cost would be higher but the future costs would be reduced. It was agreed that depreciation costs would need to be factored into the report but there would be no large equipment costs.</p> <p>Governors considered the training cost of £3,000 and noted that the Site Manager would receive training as he would be taking on different areas of responsibility. A governor asked if there would be generic training for all staff, for example, lifting and handling. Alex replied that there might be a requirement for some ladder training.</p> <p>Governors asked if the Site Manager's job description would be reassessed following the increase in responsibilities. Alex replied that it would be reasonable to look into reassessment. This would be carried out after a couple of terms to ensure that the management structure was effective. Following further questions it was noted that the implications on the budget would not be substantive.</p> <p>Pay rates were considered and governors asked if the school would be locked into the current LA pay rates. Alex explained that the school could not change the hourly rate as this was committed to the living wage. However, there would be more control over the number of weeks for each contract. Most contracts were based on 52 weeks but some could be moved to term time only if offered or if a vacancy arose.</p> <p>The Chair summarised that the report and recommendation had been driven by a better quality of service rather than cost. He also reiterated the potential future issues and challenges within the LA's Service. Governors expressed that they felt it was positive to be pro-active and they liked the quality of service approach. A governor stated that quality was being shown in every other element of the school and this should translate into how the school looked after the premises and the teaching and learning environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Governors approved the recommendation to move to an in-house cleaning service</li> </ul> <p>Proposed: Tim Hooper (Chair)    Seconded: Helen Thomas    Agreed: Unanimously</p>	<p><b>A.Collins</b></p>
--	-------------------------

**The meeting closed at 8.00pm**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Mr Tim Hooper**  
**Chair of Finance & Staffing Committee**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date Signed**