



MILLTHORPE SCHOOL

MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY FINANCE & STAFFING COMMITTEE MEETING

Held Wednesday 18 September 2013 at 6.00 pm in the School Library

Present: Trevor Burton (Headteacher) Tim Moat
Tim Hooper Bill Schofield
Glyn Jones Helen Thomas
Dave Merrett

Observers: Alex Collins (Business Manager)
Dave Randall (Head of PE)

Visitors: Brenda Grace and Steve Wells - Steve Wells Associates

	Action
<p>1 Major Sports Funding - Steve Wells Associates</p> <p>Steve Wells (SW) visited Millthorpe to assess the possibility of securing funding to improve Millthorpe's sporting facilities.</p> <p>SW is a school governor (not Millthorpe) with a background of sporting facilities management prior to becoming a consultant in funding of school sports. Steve Wells Associates (SWA) has been involved in bidding, writing contract specifications and project management of sporting facilities.</p> <p>At Millthorpe's current stage, SWA could support us in a feasibility study around the refresh of our facilities. The feasibility study cost would be in the region of £7,500. SW discussed several points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ the issue of floodlights on the hockey pitch;○ sizing of any pitches on various areas around Millthorpe's site;○ range of funding bodies we could apply to. <p>We need a strategic fit (our priorities, Governing Body priorities, YCC funding priorities) to enable a good bid for money. While student access is the prime priority, use by outside bodies will be the key to obtaining funding. SW said good preparation around this increases the potential to access funding. A plan setting out benefits, costs and mitigation of risks would be useful and SWA can help with this. SWA have six employees with a range of skills to support a feasibility study.</p> <p>Brenda Grace (BG) spoke about how community use would be necessary to unlock external funding. In addition, community use is beneficial to our relationships with the community and in linking school to clubs which will accept our students beyond school. A current high priority is the 14-25 age group.</p>	

SW suggested to us:

- what should we be doing and why;
- who else would agree (to unlock funding streams);
- why we cannot do it;
- what our plans should be;
- what the costs would be, including running costs;
- who might help fund it.

Tim Hooper (TH) explained that we felt we needed to refresh the school's premises, which had fallen behind in recent years. The PTA is keen to help raise money and a sporting facilities project would be likely to engage parents and students.

SW suggested that we aim high and think laterally to attract funding.

Glyn Jones (GJ) asked about SWA involvement in York High's sports development. How would Millthorpe fit into a CYC plan, as York High's development did?

BG said SWA had read the new CYC strategy on sport. Across the strategy there were elements we could develop which would fit in with this strategy, eg under-provision of 3G floodlit surfaces. We needed to look at how our priorities fit with this. SWA's feasibility study could fully explore this. For example, was our preferred option unlikely to attract funding? SW described a feasibility study he did in North Darlington for a sports college, which was used as a lever to open up conversations with a variety of people, eventually leading to a funding stream. The study was ready and waiting until a funding stream emerged. The study would also show commitment and a well thought through process.

Tim Hooper (TH) asked about timescales. SW said it would take three-four months but each site would be different. He spoke about mitigating risks by testing out our proposals early with decision makers, eg planning. It is important to remember that funding bodies will not fund statutory things, nor will they provide 100% funding, so we would have to part-fund. Any development costs (including the cost of a feasibility study) could be recognised.

Multiple bodies could fund, but the combination may be critical.

TB explained why we were discussing sport as opposed to other curriculum areas: high expense, need for expertise, shabby facilities at Millthorpe due to long-standing underfunding.

Dave Merrett (DM) explained that York is generally under-provided in sports facilities. BG said York had recognised that school sites are good ways of improving access to sporting facilities for the community. CYC note this in their strategy.

SW pointed out that sport is an easy point of consensus between school and community, more than any other curriculum area. 80% of footballers play on public facilities. 52% of these are school sites. SW outlined some easy funding streams which had existed in the past and may return in the future.

BG pointed out that this feasibility study would allow short, medium and long term planning.

Bob Sydes (BS) said he liked the idea of a menu of options but had a concern that the feasibility study might not be future-proof given the uncertainty of funding. SW said the feasibility study gave a plan which could take advantage of the right funding streams when they arrived. If NGB/LA strategies changed, we could adapt and most strategies have a four-five years life.

DM felt that having a strategy would help as most needs of students and community change slowly.

Debate followed around how new facilities might release funds no longer necessary for 'sticking plaster' solutions and also that we ought to be strongly aware of what developments are likely to succeed without being funding-led. TH also noted that the timescale needs to be short enough to engage parents (four-five years). SW said that the feasibility study allowed schools to jump in as soon as a funding stream emerged.

Tim Moat (TM) felt the commitment to plan for such improvement would excite both existing and prospective parents.

GJ asked what our priorities would be. DR wanted reliable facilities, with the ability to play outdoors for a full season and fulfil our fixture lists. DR also recognised the importance of being flexible about what facilities we would develop.

BS asked about gender issues. BG said this would be covered by the audit.

DM asked about the scope of the report. BG said it would include:

- audit;
- local content;
- what to do and why;
- who else thinks we should do it;
- identify the barriers and frustrations;
- propose development options;
- clarity of development outcomes;
- cost the developments;
- identification of funding streams.

BS asked if SWA would work with staff and governors. BG said they would work with people identified by the school.

Helen Thomas (HT) checked that we were still talking about the same feasibility discussed at FGB in July 2013. Alex Collins (AC) confirmed this was the case. HT asked about next steps. Governors needed to decide if they wanted to engage SWA.

SW and BG left the meeting at 7.08 pm.

Governors debated whether we should proceed with a feasibility study. Considerations included:

- degree of control;
- value of experts relieving senior leaders of unfamiliar development work;
- positive feedback from previous SWA customers.

	<p>BS proposed that the project be endorsed.</p> <p>TH seconded.</p> <p><u>Committee approved.</u></p> <p>DM offered to work as a responsible governor alongside AC.</p> <p>TM also offered to be involved.</p>	
2	<p>Pay Policy</p> <p>TB explained the background to the policy on Pay and Appraisal and asked governors to approve.</p> <p>Governors discussed the issue of double increments and how exceptional performance might be evidenced.</p> <p>Bill Schofield (BS) confirmed that the policy would have to be reviewed annually and the local authority would review it.</p> <p>TM proposed we accept the Pay and Appraisal policies.</p> <p>BS seconded.</p> <p><u>Committee approved unanimously.</u></p>	
3	<p>Meeting finished at 8.04 pm.</p>	