

Minutes of the Extraordinary Full Governing Board meeting

Wednesday 30 April 2025 at 8.00 am via MS Teams

Membership

Name	Initials	Term Expiry Date	Governor Category
Leon Choueke	LC	N/A	Head Teacher, Ex-officio(1)
Debby Kuypers (Chair)	DK	09-11-2025	Co-opted Governors (7)
Richard Holmes (Vice Chair)	RH	01-02-2026	
*Nomi Tysman	NT	01-12-2028	
*Jean-Michel Garcia-Alvarez	JGA	10-02-2029	
*Becca Monahan	BM	17-11-2027	
*Michael Wang	CW	01-07-2028	
*Andrena Emin	AE	04-02-2028	
*Melian Mansfield	MM	19-01-2026	LA Governor (1)
*Kirsten Schmidt	KS	04-02-2028	Staff (1)
Sarah Boffey	SB	05-01-2029	Parent Governors (2)
*Ian Chapman	IC	05-01-2029	
Also in attendance:			
*Tim Ibbotson	TI	N/A	Asst HT
*Ben Strange	BS	N/A	Deputy HT
*Ben Miller	BMi	01-07-2028	Associate Governor
Eddie Webb	EW	01-12-2028	Associate Governor
*Morinade Akinbobola	MA	01-12-2028	Associate Governor
*Claudia Simms Abrahm	CSA	04-02-2028	Associate Governor
*Corrina Phillips	CP	N/A	Asst HT and SENCO
*Louise Foulkes	LF	N/A	Deputy HT
Harriet Weedon	HW	N/A	Finance Manager
Adam Crosier			Clerk

* Denotes absence

PART 1

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies for absence

DK opened the meeting at 8.15 am and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The meeting was not quorate.

2. Declarations of interest, pecuniary or otherwise in respect of items on the agenda

None.

3. Budget

HW reported that the school had ended the 2024/25 financial year with a deficit of around £307,000. This was £54,000 greater than budgeted and the main reasons were as follows:

- Staff pay increases that had not been funded
 - Unforeseen agency costs for individual support provided by TAs
 - Professional services that were higher than forecast
 - Water and energy costs that were higher than predicted by the local authority
 - Building and maintenance costs to an aging structure that were very challenging.
- These challenges were likely to continue over the next few years.

She reported that the reality was that the school's income no longer covered its expenditure, which was spent mainly on staff costs.

In the next budget, the school was predicting the deficit to decline over the 3-year period, but not to be returned to a balanced budget within that timescale. In year 3 of the plan, the school was forecasting an in-year deficit of £109,000. The main reasons for the improvements were due to the following:

- Prediction of an increase in income from After School Clubs and Breakfast Club, and Youth Club provision
- Reduction in the cost of the cleaning contract
- Reduction in the cost of agency staff as children in early years moved up the school and would hopefully require less individual support.

The changes in After School Clubs/Care were forecast to lead to an increase in expected income from £25,000 to £120,000 over the 3-year period.

Q SB asked whether there was an intention to renegotiate the contract for After School provision with the current provider.

A. LC confirmed that there was this intention and that the figures presented were from the existing provider.

HW reported that for the Youth Club, there was a predicted profit of around £26,000 for the current year.

Cleaning contract: there would be a new outsourced cleaning contract from July 2025. This was forecast to lead to savings of around £38,000 in the current year compared with 2024/25. The forecast was for a similar level of saving plus inflation over the next few years. This would also reduce staffing costs and avoid supervision costs by school staff.

Agency costs for TAs: In the current school year there had been 3 children who had joined the school with a high level of need that demanded one to one support, something that had not been anticipated in the budget for 2024/25.

HW reported that in the previous years, agency spend had been around £20,000 compared with the £80,000 in the current year.

LC said that it was not possible to be precise about staffing requirements in the budget because the deadline for teachers' resignations was not due until 31 May. He reported that there were fixed term contracts for some TAs that would conclude at the end of the

current school year. However, what was not known was the level of need of pupils who would join the school in September 2025.

Q. DK asked whether the repayment of loans that had been provided to the school by the local authority, was included in budget.

A. HW said that these costs were not included in the budget and that they amounted to around £8,000 per month.

She reported that overall, the school's income was likely to decrease by about £45,000 because of the reduction in the number of pupils (by 8) at the October census. For most of the other areas of the budget the 'actuals' from the previous year had been retained. The only significant changes to income were for the After School Clubs provision. Existing grants were maintained and expected income from donations was predicted to increase by 5%.

Staff: the proposed budget assumed a 3% annual increase for teachers pay and 2.5% increase for support staff pay, plus the requirement to increase national insurance costs by 1.5%.

LC added that he was working to reduce the costs of the SENCO role and that the budget included provision for possible changes to the senior leadership team in year 2 of the budget, although this was just a possibility at this stage. He reported that teachers' pay and conditions had changed, with annual increases for all staff now a requirement that schools had to meet.

For the Counselling team, the allocated expenditure had been reduced by £10,000 from £50,000 to £40,000 per year.

He said that there may be some small savings on staffing: 1 x teacher was likely to resign following maternity leave.

HW reported that inflation was built into the main points of the budget and that estimates of energy and utility costs had been advised by LB Haringey.

Capital expenditure: the school's wifi contract and system were due to expire and were in need of an upgrade. The school had obtained quotes. It was likely to cost in the region of £20,000 for a new provider.

Capital income: LC reported that he was in the process of challenging the LB Haringey formula for capital funding allocation. He said that there was an unfairness in the method that disadvantaged Coleridge, even though it had more children and a more challenging estate of buildings to maintain than other schools in the borough.

LC reminded governors that the school had reduced the number of various staff members in response to the SMRA report, but that this action had not had the desired impact on reducing the school's deficit.

In relation to pupil numbers, the outlook was positive for the coming year. At a time when other schools were seeing their numbers reducing, it had been vitally important

that Coleridge had received the Outstanding judgement by Ofsted. This was important as parents used this assessment to decide where to send their children.

4. Any other business

None.

5. Date of next meeting

FGB: 12 May 2025 at 6.00 pm

6. Confidential items

None.



Signed.....Date...12.5.25.....
Chair of Governors