

# MINUTES



Noadswood

**BOARD:** General Purposes Committee

**SCHOOL:** Noadswood School

**DATE:** Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2021

**TIME:** 18:30hrs – 21:00hrs

**VENUE:** Remotely – via Teams

**ATTENDED:**

Tim Sunderland (TS)	Chair of Committee
Chris Blake (CB)	Vice Chair of Committee
Catherine Langdon (CL)	Chairman / Member – Appointed Governor
Kathryn Marshall (KM)	Head Teacher Governor
Elaine Huttly (EH)	Staff Governor
Sarah Staley (SS)	School Business Manager
Lisa Taylor (LT)	
Matt Hewett (MH) (left the meeting at 19:23hrs)	
Luke Wells (LW) (left the meeting at 19:23hrs)	

**ATTENDING:** Louise Instone *Clerk*

The Code of Conduct for Governors requires governors to be honest and open with regard to conflicts of interest (either real or perceived). Governors must not use their position for personal gain in business, political or social relationships. Therefore, a governor who has, or may be perceived to have, such a personal interest in a particular matter under consideration should declare that interest, withdraw from all discussions relating to it and take no part in any vote on such matter.

Items marked \* are those in which a majority of Governors may have an interest because of some shared attribute. When considering these items, Governors should aim to achieve a balanced view, paying particular attention to the sources of information and advice, and remind themselves of their duties as governors and to act in the public interest.

Item	
1	<b>Welcome and Apologies:</b> TS welcomed those present.
2	<b>Procedural items:</b> <b>2.1 Apologies for absence</b> No Apologies were received. The following were absent from the meeting, Neil Cotton & Phil Trevett <b>2.2 Confirmation of Quorum</b> (Three governors, to include two non-staff. The Headteacher or representative must be in attendance for a vote to take place) The meeting was quorate throughout the whole meeting. <b>2.3 Declarations of interest</b> No pecuniary or personal interests were advised for any agenda item for this meeting
3	<b>Any Other Business:</b> To consider any urgent items of business that need to be added as <b>AOB</b> for the end of the meeting.

# MINUTES



Noadswood

	First Aid Policy Head Bump Policy Premises Management Document
4	<b>Minutes:</b> The minutes of the previous meeting on 15 <sup>th</sup> October 2020 were approved by the Chair and other members
5	<b>Matters Arising from the Minutes:</b> See below, there were no other items discussed.
6	<b>Correspondence:</b> To note any correspondence received by the Trust /Chair. There was no correspondence to bring to the meeting.
7	<b>Safeguarding/Child Protection/Covid 19 Risk Management</b>  KM explained there were no safeguarding issues to bring to the meeting and no Covid 19 concerns or breaches to report to Governors.
8	<p><b>Proposal to update core infrastructure</b> MH &amp; LW attended the meeting to explain the options for updating the core infrastructure. This was to accompany the documents already supplied.</p> <p>CL met with MH and LW to discuss the IT core infrastructure. LW explained it is old and has been patched up and kept working but now seems to be the time to update it as we don't want to risk failure.</p> <p>LW: proposal</p> <p>LW shared a spreadsheet of dates indicating how old some of the IT items are: The server is 7 years old and the wireless infrastructure is 8 years old. LW explained the normal cycle of this equipment would be 4 years. Now struggling to get extended warranties on the SAN and Hosts.</p> <p>LW explained it is now expensive in money and time as they now have to spend more and more time maintaining and checking equipment as there is an increased risk of equipment going wrong. It could go on for 3 more years but the work on the items will increase and there is anxiety that it may go wrong. Updating the core infrastructure will also increase the speed of storage, SIMS, Frog, Teams, remote access.</p> <p>LW outlined the equipment we currently have had 3 hosts but when looking for new equipment we would probably only need 2 as they are so much better now.</p> <p>LW shared one example of pricing and explained he would obviously get 3 quotes if the proposal was agreed in principle by governors.</p> <p>LW explained that himself and his colleague could do a lot of the migration of services, thus reducing the cost.</p> <p>LW estimated the cost will be about £40,000</p> <p>LW asked for questions:</p> <p>CB agreed that whatever is purchased will run far more efficiently than the current equipment. However, was concerned that using in-house time to migrate the services would be costly and timely taking the cost to closer to £100,000.</p> <p>TS explained that we are already paying for the time so the time can be considered as free.</p>



CB felt if the initial build was contracted out and in-house resources were used to do the transfers we were looking at a minimum cost of £47,000.

LT explained her school has just gone through this, they have taken away SIMS and are using a web-based management system. She explained it had been exceptionally smooth to move to a fully cloud based system.

LW explained he had looked into web-based management system. However, SIMS is a very big part of the school and to change this would be a separate conversation, moving from SIMS would incur other costs ie. training for the new system etc.. His concern moving to all web-based is that it is very costly in annual subscriptions and it very quickly adds up. Our finance system is now based outside at a cost of £3,500 a year. It is obviously a lot cheaper if you are running it yourself for say 7/8 years.

LT agreed there is training, her school combined assessment and communication and have moved to Arbor. Bringing everything together has saved costs for her school. She advised it is worth exploring all options.

TS confirmed that remote storage is expensive and had concerns that if a school is relying on a broadband connection, should it be poor and is critical to the school you are leaving the school open to risk and didn't think it would be cheaper. TS agreed with the proposal and asked if there was an IT strategy?

LW confirmed there was an IT strategy.

TS asked why the equipment had got to 7 years old if there was a strategy? He expressed it is the wrong strategy not replacing this equipment over such a long period and asked to see the IT strategy. He felt a school with such large reserves should have spent them on this earlier.

CB supported LW on the basis of replacing the system but would like to see all options of how this could be achieved. CB felt that using a third party to do this for the school maybe wiser to ensure it is executed successfully and swiftly.

LW explained that he did have experience of migrating infrastructures and will look at what things could be better supported externally.

KM appreciated governors looking differently at how we spend the reserves.

TS stated reserves must be spent to get the best educational benefits for the children. School must invest now on the base infrastructure or the rest of the equipment/software won't work. I fully support this project. If you need some support, I am happy to put you in touch with Blackfield school who are going through their IT strategy, they have some experience. Need to ensure what is done now is a good fit for the future. IT is a fundamental part of the students' education.

LT asked have you looked at best case scenario, best value or just replaced like for like?

LW explained he is always very conscious about value and what we need, we are not just replacing what we have got. Going forward once the core infrastructure is updated we will look at updating the wireless infrastructure, then laptops and so on. We have run tools and analyzed our current storage to give us the idea of what we need.



	<p>LW summarized that now he knows the idea is supported he will put a proper proposal together and bring it back to governors.</p> <p>LT asked for a system that will benefit the students the most and not to cut corners.</p> <p>TS expressed that some strategy discussions were needed to discuss the way forward to see what students will be accessing and in what ways.</p> <p>TS suggested putting together a sub-team to take this forward.</p> <p>KM asked MH &amp; LW to create a couple of costings one with all bells and whistles and one more cost conscious.</p> <p>TS expressed concern that it might be difficult to evidence where this will be of benefit to the students.</p> <p>MH explained pupil outcomes are relatively straightforward to evidence at KS4 as IT is imperative for the vocational courses. At KS3 it is more difficult. The IT strategy doesn't reflect Covid. If you take that into account we may have to rethink but this is an unknown quantity. Laptops are going out the door to families who need them.</p>
9	<p><b>Data Protection</b> MH is the Data protection officer.</p> <p>MH explained there is a possibility that GDPR might change so we need to do a staff update. Staff that have been with us more than 6 months have had these updates before, so they are very aware. All potential data breaches and breaches must be recorded.</p> <p>How staff report a potential data breach</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fill out a form, online, in order for us to decide if it needs to be investigated.</li> <li>2. That generates an email to MH.</li> <li>3. This system stores all the breaches at the school. This keeps them logged on the spreadsheet.</li> </ol> <p>We have an SLA with Judicium as an external DPO; they like the form as it is very simple and easy for colleagues to use. 80% of breaches are people self-reporting and that is great as they are aware and there is a positive culture that colleagues will be treated kindly for human error mistakes and fairly in terms of process. Investigation log is a self-assessment tool to see if it needs to go to the ICO.</p> <p>A typical data breach is an email going to the wrong person.</p> <p>CB asked how many breaches have we reported to the ICO?</p> <p>We have very few serious breaches. MH and KM will provide an update of this to the next meeting and to each GPC moving forwards.</p> <p>There was an incident when an email went to a student instead of a colleague but it was retrieved by the IT department, so didn't breach.</p> <p>Using the Epraise system takes the possibility of using the wrong email away to parents.</p> <p>We have stopped staff leaving their machine logged on, just involved some training.</p>



	<p>CB asked if staff are aware what data is sensitive.</p> <p>MH explained staff have been trained of what is sensitive information. We have got the culture right, people are referring themselves for their own breaches. This is a healthy situation to be in.</p> <p>MH offered to go through an investigation from beginning to end if a governor was interested.</p> <p>LW confirmed he also gets notification if anyone sets up an email to forward information out, if there is an attempt to move data we get an alert. This is security in case someone gets their account hacked.</p> <p>TS commented that there seems to be a good culture and a good set up for reporting and asked how would Trustees know if there was a breach?</p> <p>MH confirmed although it isn't part of the policy if a breach went to the ICO we would let governors know.</p> <p>KM agreed it would be brought to this committee.</p> <p>CL asked if a summary could be brought to this committee or it could slip through the net?</p> <p>KM agreed they will do a summary.</p> <p>MH suggested everything serious that involved an internal investigation would be reported.</p> <p>TS agreed trustees only need to know about the serious breaches.</p> <p>MH agreed to report anything of significance. He explained that colleagues have also spoken to staff about pupil data being taken around school and taken home and LW has stopped staff moving data around school with data sticks, staff use 365 rather than risking a breach with a data stick.</p>
10	<p><b>Maintenance, Catering &amp; Buildings including CIF</b></p> <p>SS confirmed she had created a document called GPC update BM Premises which gave a full update of where we are at the moment. SS confirmed there was nothing specifically to agree, this is just to let governors know where we are with projects.</p> <p><b>CIF Funding</b></p> <p>We have put the 2 CIF bids in, one for fire safety and compliances, fire doors and surrounds. There are voids above the ceilings, fire could progress very quickly. There is also a bid in for putting a 6ft barrier around the whole school. We do have intruders in the evenings which is a risk.</p> <p>SS explained the team have used a project management company and have gone out to tender and they are for projects that are often high on the CIF agenda.</p> <p>CB asked what is the value of those 2 bids?</p> <p>£628,000 fire safety £218,000 fence</p>



	<p>SS explained that whilst we do have reserves as an academy, as discussed earlier, this money would mean we could do the whole project at once.</p> <p>CB enquired regarding fire doors, is there a British Standard we are not meeting and asked whether it was on the risk register and asked if we don't get the funding should we fund it?</p> <p>SS explained we will work with the project management company if we don't win it and we will see what is very urgent and we will do that work. We have had a fire RA and we will work with that and see what we can afford to spend in the meantime.</p> <p>KM confirmed that if we didn't get the CIF money we would analyse any issues that require addressing because we are non-compliant as opposed to what is ideal as we would need to fund ourselves.</p> <p>SS confirmed this type of project is exactly what the CIF money is there to be bid for. We get £20,000 for capital yearly – academies are supposed then to bid for this type of job.</p> <p>CB commented that is where we must use the risk register - we have identified an issue, are we comfortable to wait until we get funding or should we use the funds we do have.</p> <p>SS explained identifying the issue re fire safety is what has led to this being a CIF bid. What is important is that our procedures for getting people out of the building are robust. The risk is to the building. We are not putting children or staff at risk.</p> <p>CB agreed that is reassuring.</p> <p>TS acknowledged that is the right way to use CIF money. He felt there needs to be a strategy for reserves.</p> <p>TS asked if these will be project managed?</p> <p>SS explained the project management company did this on a no win no fee basis. The project management company would come in and get the ball rolling as soon as we got the go ahead for the funding.</p>
11	<p><b>Health &amp; Safety Incl. Security/Cleaning</b></p> <p><b>Maintenance</b></p> <p>SS reiterated, as mentioned in her report, she needs to get back on track with the health and safety checks on a weekly/fortnightly/termly basis. The evidencing of the checking and recording needs to be reinstated as per pre-lockdown 1 and as per our previous much improved audit. SS and the team will have the programme written prior to her departure on M Leave.</p> <p>TS agreed that we need to demonstrate Trustee involvement in health and safety and governors needs to be involved and record what checks have been done.</p> <p>TS thought the policy was good but was not sure how you do it all. It relies on there being lots of trained experts in house and he wondered whether it is worth simplifying and buying them in. Just have basic health and safety checks carried out by premises team, but use third parties' expertise and buy it in when we need it?</p>



SS stated that some of the checks need to be done weekly. Legionella, fire safety checks, asbestos is all done in house. These are done so frequently so would be costly to outsource to third parties.

LT agreed it is part of a premises manager's and team's role to do those checks.

KM agreed it would be possible to explore each layer of checks to establish where outsourcing may be of advantage to us and provide good value with SS, CMCK, DCR.

CB suggested regarding legionella we can check weekly but maybe get an annual expert in. Due to lockdown for the last few months the legionella concern goes up as sections of pipe work not being used increases.

SS confirmed the flushing is being done, the schoolhouse is empty but we still do that flushing every week. The site has not been closed.

EH agreed site staff are very used to flushing through the water system when we are shut to students during the summer.

TS asked whether we should we be doing our next Health & Safety Audit and bring Ray West, our external consultant/auditor in.

KM agreed with TS, it would be valuable to get Ray in, the way he conducts the audit is rigorous, supportive and helpful as a process.

SS agreed it would be sensible to get a Health & Safety Audit booked in. If this is timed correctly it would be useful to Carys to re-embed the processes following the lockdowns..

KM felt a Health and Safety Audit in the autumn term would definitely feel right.

## Property Services

The school is still on a pay as you go agreement with Hampshire County Council, we are in tender at the moment with Deals for Schools to replace this. Carys is working very hard on getting a tender together. We are not getting all the responses back at the usual pace due to lockdown. It is the reason we delayed the last one, because of lockdown, companies can't come onto site.

CB asked whether there is an option to extend for a short period?

SS didn't think so, we are the only Academy left with them. We normally do 3 years with an option to extend.

TS outlined that price is one thing but service is another – does Deals for Schools provide the information we need?

CB asked if the website gives you a list to evaluation/select from.

SS advised there is a template we can change, we don't look at price alone.

CB explained it is all about how you set up the criteria and evaluation process.



	<p><b>Cleaning staff</b></p> <p>SS asked if letters of gratitude have been going out to staff through the Chair?</p> <p>KM confirmed CL has begun to do that, and asked CL if this could be done for the cleaners.</p> <p>SS voiced that Carys has asked if someone from SLT could sit down and thank the site team in person? SS reflected that she felt like we do let them know our support for their efforts.</p> <p>KM confirmed this could be done but that also Chair will write to site/cleaner staff.</p>
12	<p><b>Policy Updates: Health &amp; Safety</b></p> <p>Governors approved the policy.</p>
13	<p><b>Risk Register: key risks for committee monitoring</b></p> <p>SS advised there was nothing specific to mention: she just wants to get those health and safety spot checks back in place. Supporting pupils with a medical condition policy needs to be updated. Nothing else urgent to be done.</p> <p>Governors expressed concern that the Covid risk assessment is indicated as being partially met, they didn't feel this was right.</p> <p>SS explained it is a constantly changing risk assessment being dynamically reviewed, rather than that there is anything we are not meeting or complying with.</p> <p>KM confirmed we need to capture the dynamic review of it and it is changed each time the school guidance changes. Maybe we need to amend the wording to reflect the emphasis is dynamic review and not omissions.</p> <p>CB asked as you start to use the risk register you will get to a point where you have achieved a specific piece of work such that the risk is no longer present, or not?</p> <p>SS explained the previous risk register had 150 risks on it and they were just possible risks not actual risks whereas we believe these are an accurate reflection of risks right now.</p> <p>CB asked whether the current risk register is used when making management decisions?</p> <p>KM confirmed we are using it exactly in the right way now, we use it every week in our SLT discussions and it is reviewed every week making sure the risks are being addressed. It is done regularly and dynamically.</p> <p>TS noted they are strategic level risks. He suggested maybe the fire doors should be on the risk register. We are worried about the big-ticket items not just the day to day. If there is a fire safety problem, we have got an issue.</p> <p>CL suggested the Risk Register could have hyperlinks to more information and documents.</p> <p>SS agreed that could be done.</p>
14	<p><b>Any Other Urgent Business (AOB):</b></p> <p><b>14.1 First Aid Policy</b>, this was approved by governors.</p>



# MINUTES



Noadswood

	<p><b>14.2 Head Bump Policy</b>, this was approved by governors.</p> <p><b>14.3 Premises Management Document</b>, SS explained this was an statutory document required by the DFE. This was approved by governors.</p> <p><b>14.4 Union concerns</b> - LT asked whether Noadswood had been hit by the union action at the beginning of the week and has it impacted staffing particularly support staff?</p> <p>KM confirmed there was no action from staff and they have been working closely with the local UNISON rep as a significant number of key learning support staff are with UNISON.</p> <p><b>14.5 Covid Testing</b> - LT asked how Covid testing was going with pupils in school?</p> <p>KM confirmed Lateral Flow Testing is up and running for staff and students this week and we will continue to do weekly tests. We are also part of the saliva testing programme with Southampton Uni, more to follow.</p>
	<p><b>Meeting Dates</b> It was agreed that the next meeting will be on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021</p>
	<b>The meeting was adjourned by the Chair at 20:08 hrs</b>

## Matters arising from the minutes of the -General Purposes Committee held on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2021

Item	Action	Actionee	Status
8	MH to supply TS with the IT Strategy	MH	
8	MH & LW to put a proposal together for the new IT Core Infrastructure and bring it back to Governors	MH	
9	MH to report any significant data breaches to this committee in future	MH	
11	SS to book a H&S Audit with Ray for the Autumn Term	SS	
11	CL to write letters of gratitude to cleaners/site staff	CL	
11	KM to arrange for a member of SLT to meet with the site team.	KM	
13	SS to set up hyperlinks to relevant documents, when applicable, on the Risk Register.	SS	

## Matters arising from the minutes of the -General Purposes Committee held on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Item	Action	Actionee	Status
8	Creation of new draft ToR's for the Audit & GPC to be emailed round to Governors for comment	TS/CL	Complete
10.3	KM to speak to Victoria Blake re the legality of publishing staffs' salaries	KM	Complete
10.4	LI to ensure all declarations of interest are on the Governor Hub asap	LI	Complete
11	KM & LI to discuss the calendar of events for each committee	KM/LI	LI has spoken to ex-clerk regarding calendar of events

# MINUTES



Noadswood

## Outstanding items:

Item	Responsible	Status
No outstanding items		

<b>SIGNED BY:</b>	
<b>DATED:</b>	