



# **SOUTHGATE COLLEGE GOVERNING CORPORATION**

## **Finance and Staffing Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2008**

#### **Attendance**

##### Members

Andrew Nicholas (In the chair)  
Michael Blagden (Principal)  
Paul Camp  
Ron Lis

.

##### In attendance

Shah Alam (Director of Finance)  
Angélique Gainza (Vice Principal Curriculum)  
David Chaplin (Chaplin Frobisher Welling, Clerks to the Corporation)  
Jonathan Key (GVA Grimley) *for item 1*

#### **1 (Agenda item 8) Accommodation Strategy**

*Received: Timetable for the planning and construction of the new build (Gantt chart)*

- 1.1** 1.1.1. This item was taken early to allow Jonathan Key, of GVA Grimley (the Building Project managers) to make a presentation. In future he would be producing a monthly update paper, and attending F&S meetings to answer questions.
- 1.1.2 The outline timetable (see also 3.1 below) was provided for all members.
- 1.1.3 Jonathan Key confirmed that the design team was now almost complete with the appointment of Savills as planning consultants – only specialist consultants for arboriculture and Highways remained to be appointed. Enquiries into availability of basic utilities and ground conditions were being pursued.
- 1.1.4 The design team were still at a familiarisation stage, reviewing the earlier feasibility study that had envisaged accommodating the College on the main sites, retaining and refurbishing the main building and replacing the old buildings with an iconic building with visual impact on the High Street.
- 1.1.5 Certain assumptions needed to be clearly defined.
- 1.1.6. The Library site was included in the site capacity, on the assumption that the existing Public Library could be re-located (see also 1.1.14 below).
- 1.1.7 Use of the Grovelands Park site was less certain and the assumption was that the sports studies associated classrooms would be accommodated on the main site (see also 1.1.13 below).

1.1.8 The potential inclusion of the (public) Southgate swimming pool site was close to being ruled out. There was no urgency for the authority to renew the facility which still had a ten year life; any inclusion on the main site would stretch the redevelopment capability of the site beyond reasonable expectations. The Application in Principle (AiP) would require the inclusion of at least some binding third party commitment and this was judged unlikely within the required timescale (see also 1.1.15 below).

1.1.9. In respect of Planning, a very positive meeting had been held with Enfield BC planners. No major obstacles had been identified, and the planners were not seeking undue restrictions.

1.1.10 In so far as the programme was concerned; the main driver was the need to submit an AiP to the LSC in April, for decision by July 2009. He hoped that the LSC would be content with a letter of comfort from the planners at the AiP stage. Andrew Nicholas queried this. Ron Lis sought clarification that if AiP was granted, then Application in Detail (AiD) and availability of funding would follow in turn.

1.1.11 GVA Grimley and the Design Team had no illusions about the tightness of the schedule. There was a huge amount to be agreed; it was essential that the College had given a design brief (in terms of quantity and type of accommodation) to the architect by end October, and that the Education case had been agreed by the College with the LSC (unofficially – it was an iterative process) before the AiP (of which it was officially part, along with the Financial Case) was presented.

1.1.12 RL asked if the College had sufficient management resource to achieve these deadlines. Michael Blagden explained the David Byrne was taking up post as Principal - designate in November to play a leading role, and that a College Co-ordinator would also be appointed.

1.1.13 Returning to the assumptions that required to be defined; Grovelands was becoming a “can of worms”. It was an important Metropolitan Open Space, and any intrusion would have to be minimal . In order to get momentum, two key issues were being tackled as a matter of urgency. There were important (original Humphry Repton planting) trees that could not be impacted upon and it was necessary to ascertain if this precluded any useful development. If the site was to accommodate two pitches it would be necessary to acquire a small (and redundant) portion of land owned by Thames Water, but Thames Water seemed to be in no hurry to talk about selling it.

1.1.14 In respect of the Library site, there was general agreement that the most satisfactory relocation would be to the former Police Station site. However, the police authority were in no hurry, and unlikely to make the necessary commitment in time. The Police authority would also probably wish to maximise redevelopment value of the site, which could embroil the College in a major Town Centre re-development for which LSC support was at best unpredictable.

Every alternative relocation site was being explored (including the College site, possibly on shared use basis, although the Library were not keen on this); a better prospect for the Library to be relocated to a newly built development opposite the Police Station site.

1.1.15 RL asked if the Swimming Pool was a “red herring”. MB felt the whole idea should be “knocked on the head” JK felt that it was important to keep talking for the sake of good relations with the local authority.

1.1.16 MB urged members to pay careful attention to the timetable (Gantt chart) which clearly showed the pinch points at lines 11, 15.

## **1.2** *Received: notes of the Design Team meetings of College staff with Architects and other consultants held on 17<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> September and 14<sup>th</sup> October 2008*

The Design Team minutes of the three meetings were reviewed.

**2. Minutes of the meeting of 25<sup>th</sup> September 2008**

*Received: Minutes of the Meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2008*

The minutes were amended in small detail, in particular to confirm the Committee's endorsement of the Education Case (minute 9), then confirmed as true and accurate record and signed by the Chairman

**3. Matters arising**

3.1 Construction Timetable (Para 9) This had now been received.

3.2 Pay award (Para 10) The AoC recommended settlement (3.2% from October 2008, equivalent to 2.66 % on all year salary) had been agreed with the unions nationally and locally and the committee would recommend it to the Corporation for implementation

**4. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Ann Zinkin and Nigel Levey

**5. Declaration of Governor interest**

No declarations had been notified.

**6. Notification of any other urgent business**

There was no other business

**Management accounts for the period ending 30<sup>th</sup> September 2008**

**7.**

*Received: the management accounts for the period ending 30<sup>th</sup> September 2008, including the Balance sheet at that date and cash flow forecast to August 2009.*

The Committee reviewed the accounts and noted:

- Overall financial performance. The operating surplus for the year to date was marginally below previous year but ahead of profiled target
- Income for the month was on target.
- Pay costs overall remained on target for both the month and the year to date; enhanced FR17 (Pension fund liabilities) provision might be required in response to the economic downturn

Non-pay costs were marginally above target due to IT, Administration, Planned maintenance and ICT departments advancing spending plans. The departments concerned have been reminded of the importance of carefully maintaining spend at profile levels .

All performance indicators – year-to-date- compared well with LSC recommended range (shown in brackets).

Cash days in hand	62.1	(5- 30)
Current ratio	1.5	(0 – 2.5)
Pay Costs as % of income	63.4%	(65 – 72)

## 8.. Enrolment 2008/9

*Received: Cumulative enrolment numbers up to the previous day*

Broadly speaking enrolments were at or ahead of target, except for apprenticeships.

### **Learner responsive:**

16-18 funded	1745	vs all year target of	1720
Adult funded	3053		3150
16-18 apprenticeships	4		22 (2 per month)

### **Employer responsive**

19+ apprenticeships	2		20
Train to Gain	271		968 { all-year recruitment;
FE workplace NVQs	491		884 { on or ahead of profile

## 9. HR issues

9.1 The resignation of John Spindler with effect from 30<sup>th</sup> September 2008 was noted.

9.2 Michael Blagden reported that order for costs against the plaintiff in the recent Employment Tribunal had been made. These had now been assessed at £50k; the plaintiff had not contested this and formal judgement was awaited.

## 10. Other urgent business

There was no other business.

## 11. Date and time of future meetings

Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> December 2008 (at Governors Review Day)

Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> January 2009 1700 hours

**The meeting finished at 6.05 p.m.**