Notre Dame
CATHOLIC SIXTH FORM COLLEGE

**FINANCE AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

NOTRE DAME SIXTH FORM CATHOLIC COLLEGE

Minutes of the Finance and Resources Committee meeting held on Microsoft Teams on

Thursday 16 June 2026 at 5.00pm

**Principles**: *Selflessness, Integrity, Objectivity, Accountability, Openness, Honesty, Leadership*
**Virtues:** *Trust, Wisdom, Kindness, Justice, Service, Courage, Optimism*

**PRESENT:** David Wright (Chair),
Matthew DiClemente,
Fr Michael Hall,
Richard Hall,
Alison Stuart and
Justine Barlow (Principal)

The quorum for a committee meeting is a minimum of two governors excluding the Principal.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Karen Petrillo – Director of Finance and Operations (DFO)
Rebecca Clacher – Clerk to Corporation

**The meeting opened with a prayer.**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **1.00**<br>**1.01** | **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND MEMBERSHIP MATTERS**<br>It was noted that at the Full Corporation meeting on 25th March 2026, Father Michael Hall had been approved as a member of Finance and Resources Committee. | |
| **2.00** | **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS** | |
| **2.01** | None declared. | |
| **3.00** | **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** | |
| **3.01** | The minutes of the last meeting of the Finance & Resources Committee held on 26 February 2026 had been circulated and were **approved.** | |
| | | |
| **4.00**<br>**4.01**<br><br>**4.02**<br>**4.03** | **REVIEW ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING**<br>There was an update on the following matters arising from the previous meeting:<br><br>6.03 – Wellbeing Time pilot – this would be taken as part of item 7. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 7.04 – Leave of absence guidance in relation to IVF. The Principal would look into this. | Principal |
| | *This item was brought forward to allow sufficient time to discuss this topic, including an item of AOB.* | |
| **10.00** | **CAPITAL & ESTATES UPDATE** | |
| **10.01** | **AOB**<br>An urgent item was raised by the Director of Finance and Operations about | |
| **10.02** | the development of the estate.<br><br>On 25th March 2026, Full Corporation had approved a project to convert the old library space into four classrooms, and extend the refectory space to improve student social space. The DFO explained that the works would need to be completed by the 28th August 2026 for the return of the students. This | |
| **10.03** | would allow a week to put necessary equipment into the classrooms.<br><br>The DFO presented a tender document which had been managed by the | |
| **10.04** | new Project Managers,Eddisons,and detailed three tenders. The tight timeline had also been factored into the tender process. | |
| **10.05** | The four classrooms were needed by the College to meet projections for enrolment and the budget. The Principal added that the College could not risk this project running over because of the impact on students and learning. | |
| **10.06** | Q. Why was there a significant variance between initial bid and price checked bid provided by companies on the tender document?<br>A. The DFO answered that this was because the project management | |
| **10.07** | company was able to offer further specifications to the College during the tender, which gave the companies more information.<br><br>Q. Why was there such a difference in project timelines? | |
| **10.08** | A. The DFO answered that this could be to do with the availability of the company, or the contractors they use. | |
| **10.09** | Q. Could the company that provided the shortest timescale have underestimated this to enhance competitiveness?<br>A. The DFO explained this was a concern, and a risk which needed to be | |
| **10.10** | explored with the company and the project management team.<br><br>Q. Would breaking the project up increase the price?<br>A. The DFO thought that it could possibly increase the price. If the project | |
| **10.11** | was broken up, there would need to be a re-tendering process.<br><br>Q. Why is the lead time significantly shorter for one of the companies?<br>A. The DFO highlighted that this company was the only one that came into College to do investigations before submitting the tender. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **10.12** | Q. What are the options for this situation?<br>A. The DFO and the Principal explained that the best case was that there was assurance the project could be entirely completed by the 28th August. If there could not be a cast-iron guarantee, it would be explored how the project could be broken up. | |
| **10.13** | Q. If it needed to be broken up, what then?<br>A. It may need to go out to tender again, which would likely mean that the work could not be completed in the summer. It was agreed this would be | |
| **10.14** | disappointing but the risk to the impact on students if the project overran was deemed to be too high. The Committee noted that this was the first time using the project management company. | |
| | Q. What penalties for failure to deliver on time could be written into this contract?<br>A. The DFO needed to discuss this with the company and understand what their contingency would be if it was not finished by the deadline. Financial | |
| **10.15** | penalties were felt to be important. | |
| **10.16** | The governors agreed that the DFO and the Principal should meet with the preferred company next week. This would be to ascertain a breakdown of | |
| **10.17** | the project and confirmation of timescales, as well as any penalties for not meeting the required date. The DFO would contact Committee members after this meeting with a recommendation of how to take this forward for approval. | |
| | **a)** To consider a report on current building work and planned | |
| **10.18** | building/maintenance work | |
| | A report from the Capital and Estates Manager had been circulated. The DFO provided a verbal update on the Mezzanine Project which had | |
| **10.19** | significantly overrun on the original project completion date. This was discussed at length. | |
| | *Alison Stuart left the meeting at 17.52.* | |
| | It was noted that a future item to be brought to the Committee was the | |
| **10.20** | refurbishment of the Art Department under the planned maintenance works. | |
| **10.21** | The DFO highlighted in the Estates report that there were no issues with the Chapel's air quality. | |
| | b) To consider the update on bids from recent CIF bidding round and action arising (point 3 in the Capital & Estates Update document). | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | The DFO reported that by the end of July the criteria for the post-16 Capacity Capital bid should have been released. The plans for different options were ready.<br><br>Q. Was there any other part of the country where we could learn from the bidding process?<br>A. The Principal explained that this process did happen in other parts of the country but was unique depending on authority.<br><br>Q. Has the College considered bringing on board expertise with bid funding applications? This takes place in some other colleges. The Chair of Committee was keen for future bids to score higher than the last bid.<br>A. The Principal agreed this was a good idea and would investigate this. The DFO reported that this was the last year where there would be a bidding process as the DfE moved to an FE model of an annual allocation of capital funds<br><br>Q. What was the picture like in the Catholic network for similar bids?<br>A. The Principal explained there was a large variation depending on area. The SFCA had provided some useful information.<br><br>c) To discuss the Estates Strategic Plan<br>A document had been circulated setting out the Estates Strategic Plan. This had been developed by the new Capital and Estates Manager. This was provided as information and every year would be reported against to the governing body. It was agreed that this document would go to the Full Corp. Governors commended the plan as clear and well presented.<br><br>The Committee requested an action plan for 2026/27 showing Estates priorities, proposed projects and spend. | DFO/ Principal<br><br>**Clerk**<br><br>**DFO** |
| **5.00**<br><br>**5.01**<br><br>**5.02**<br><br>**5.03** | **FINANCE REPORTS**<br>The following reports were considered:<br><br>a) May management accounts and commentary<br>The management accounts and accompanying commentary had been circulated. The Committee felt that the College was in a strong financial position currently.<br><br>Q. The previous budget had factored in the Mezzanine project with a depreciation of 50 years. Could that be explained?<br>A. The DFO explained that this project involved a building and equipment, which had different depreciation values. This value was not cashflow but was an accounting method for assessing the net book value.<br><br>b) CFFR Report and commentary<br>The report and commentary had been circulated. This was felt to be a strong report. The CFFR incorporated the three-year budget. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **5.04** | c) Financial benchmarking report from ACVIC<br>The ACVIC benchmarking report had been circulated along with a document from the DFO. | |
| **5.05** | d) Student number & budget update<br>The DFO went over the assumptions for the budget which included:<br>• The DFO had been prudent and had not predicted any increase in funding rates.<br>Q. What is funding for students as percentage of total income?<br>A. 97% of income, so this income was crucial.<br>• National insurance income was guaranteed until March 2027 but there was no guarantee that this would continue so it was not built into the budget.<br>• Not prediction for any in-year growth funding income.<br>• There was confidence about the planned maintenance spend. | |
| **5.06** | For the next year, the Chair wanted a clear steer from the DFO on priorities, oversight and risk assurance on the areas for financial performance which could be monitored by the committee. | |
| **5.07** | Q. Is the College part of a procurement group for utilities?<br>A. The DFO explained that The College was not eligible for a DfE procurement group this was only for schools. The College did use a broker. There was provision built in for expected higher costs next year, around a | **DFO** |
| **5.08** | 33% increase.<br><br>Q. Could there be any energy efficient improvements as part of the Estate?<br>A. The DFO reported that the sustainability group would explore this. There were limitations current options for the existing estate. Any new builds would focus on temperature efficiencies. | |
| **5.09** | *Fr Michael Hall left the meeting at 18.19.* | |
| **5.10** | The DFO offered verbal headlines from the budget, and governors agreed it was a strong forecast with prudent assumptions. | |
| **5.11** | The DFO highlighted sensitivity analysis conducted:<br>• There were funds of £724,500 for students on high-value courses. This would have a significant impact if changed but this would affect the whole sector.<br>• Inflation increases – staff pay rises by 5%. | |
| **5.12** | A governor highlighted that some sensitivity analysis showed that the College's financial position could significantly change depending on external events. However, it was felt that the Committee and the Corporation were monitoring this closely. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **5.13** | Q. Was any curriculum reform expected to have an impact on student numbers?<br>A. The Principal said that no, this was not expected.<br><br>**Approved**: The budget was **agreed** by the Committee and would be submitted to Full Corporation for approval. | |
| **6.00**<br>**6.01**<br><br>**6.02**<br><br><br><br>**6.03**<br><br><br><br><br>**6.04**<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>**6.05** | **BURSARY FUND MANAGEMENT**<br>A dashboard report showing spend against available funds had been circulated.<br><br>The DFO explained that there was total underspend on the bursary every year. There was an overspend on Free School Meals to subsidise government to ensure all students could access a meal.<br><br>This year the forecast showed spend of just over 50% of the available bursary. It was noted that the bursary was not included in the College's cashflow because it was in a separate bank account. The new financial system would incorporate that and so the bursary would need to be monitored separately.<br><br>Q. Is the issue that the students aren't making themselves known?<br>A. The DFO explained that the students are made aware of this bursary at different times in the year. It was felt that the threshold for household eligibility needed to be widened. The associated risk was the increase of the household income threshold having too high a demand on available funds. The DFO explained that the change in threshold would be done piecemeal to mitigate this risk.<br><br>Q. Does it need a staff member to be responsible for advertising the bursary?<br>A. The DFO set out the process, and it was felt that advertising the fund to students was well sufficient. | |
| **7.00**<br>**7.01**<br><br>**7.02**<br><br><br><br><br><br>**7.03** | **HUMAN RESOURCES**<br>A report on staffing from June 2026 had been circulated.<br><br>The Principal gave an update on the Wellbeing Time pilot. Verbal feedback had been positive so far, and a survey was due to be sent to staff on Friday. The results of the survey would impact the decision about whether the scheme would be implemented longer-term. Survey results could be brought to Full Corporation.<br><br>Q. How do you measure the value and impact of this pilot?<br>A. The Principal responded that it was hard to measure this directly. The SLT would monitoring any negative impacts shown in student surveys, e.g. access to staff when needed. Exam results were already closely monitored and this would be considered. If there was a change to timetable, offering | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | the scheme could be more difficult, so it was likely it would be offered for the next academic year subject to any timetable difficulties. | |
| **7.04** | Q. What has been the take up from staff?<br>A. The Principal answered that this information was not available now, though it was felt that most staff had used wellbeing time. The Principal had asked senior staff about barriers to the scheme but nothing had been raised. The SLT was also trying to model using the scheme for wellbeing. | |
| **7.05** | Q. In reference to recruitment and retentions, are we doing all we can in terms of a people strategy?<br>A. The Principal explained that staff development work had been discussed at Curriculum and Standards Committee. Staff wellbeing time was unique to Notre Dame and in addition to supporting wellbeing was a retention strategy. Recruitment of new staff in certain subject areas was the biggest challenge at present. Other Colleges were in the same situation. | |
| **7.06** | Q. Where did the national benchmark for public sector sickness days of 2.9% come from?<br>A. This was from the Office for National Statistics. The College was closely managing this. | |
| **8.00** | **HEALTH AND SAFETY** | |
| **8.01** | The health and safety annual report had been circulated. | |
| **8.02** | The Estates Manager had asked whether this report could be part of the wider Capital and Estates report. It was agreed it could be, if it was presented as a significant item within the report. | |
| **8.03** | Q. What is the work recommended from the fire safety report, and what is the impact on planned maintenance?<br>A. The DFO confirmed that fire safety improvements had not been factored into planned maintenance and that these reports had only just been received. A plan for this work would be submitted to the Committee in September. The Committee wanted oversight of this as part of a wider planned maintenance and spend on Estates. | **DFO/ Clerk** |
| **9.00** | **MARKETING REPORT** | |
| **9.01** | The marketing report had been circulated. The Chair highlighted it was helpful to have the cover sheet which should be included with all papers. | **Clerk** |
| **9.02** | Q. In terms of further investment in marketing, was there an area that needed monitoring going forward?<br>A. The Marketing Manager answered not specifically in terms of marketing spend. | |
| **9.03** | The Committee thanked the marketing team for the report, and all the work done over the year. | |
| **11.0011.01** | **POLICY REVIEW** | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **11.02**<br><br>**11.03**<br><br>**11.04**<br><br><br><br>**11.05**<br><br><br><br><br>**11.06** | The following policies had all been circulated:<br><br>a) Staff Code of Conduct Policy Statement<br>This was approved.<br><br>b) Flexible Working Policy and Procedure<br>This was approved. Governors requested a summary document about changes to Employment Law and the impact on the College.<br><br>c) Financial Regulations<br>This was approved for recommendation to Full Corporation until October 2026 when it would be reviewed after the introduction of the new financial system. The Regulations would be reviewed by this Committee in February 2027.<br><br>d) Sexual Harassment Policy<br>This was a new policy and had been written by the HR Manager and based on a template by the SFCA. The content was largely statutory content. The Committee approved this policy for recommendation to Full Corporation as a new policy.<br><br>Q. How do we make this policy known to staff and students?<br>A. The Principal explained that for staff this would be in the staff code of conduct and would be highlighted in the return to work pack in September. Students would be informed in tutorials. | <br><br><br><br><br><br>**Clerk**<br><br><br><br>**Clerk** |
| **12.0012.01**<br><br>**12.02** | **RISK MATTERS**<br>The Committee had discussed risks associated with items 10 (Capital Estates) and 5.b (the budget).<br><br>The risks identified in item 10 should be brought to the attention of the Full Corporation at the next meeting on 1 July. | <br><br><br><br>**DFO** |
| **13.0013.01** | **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**<br>This had been addressed under item 10. As a time-sensitive item, all agreed it had required discussion. | |
| **14.00**<br>**14.01** | **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**<br>The date of the next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday 30th September, 5pm. To be confirmed on agreement of the governance calendar at Full Corporation on 1st July. The Committee Chair would meet with the DFO in the coming weeks about what to report to the Board on 1st July. | <br><br><br><br>**DFO/ Chair** |

**The meeting finished at 7.10pm**

Appendix 1

**Additional requests to Bermar for the Mezzanine Project**

These requests were all additional to the original contracted work.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bermar work to accommodate the media wall in hall | Bermar | £5,314.32 | £1,062.86 | £6,377.18 |
| Painting the hall stone | Bermar | £1,192.40 | £238.48 | £1,430.88 |
| Knock wall down in undercroft for future project | Bermar | £3,640.00 | £728.00 | £4,368.00 |
| Glass wall for quiet room | Bermar | £5,302.00 | £1,060.40 | £6,362.40 |
| Works for external signage | Bermar | £961.40 | £192.28 | £1,153.68 |
| 3no. Additional double sockets for lockdown equipment in basement | Bermar | £550.94 | £110.19 | 661.128 |
| **Total costs** | | | | **£20,353.27** |

Additional costs that were incurred as part of the planning condition

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tree Protection Measures | Bermar | £13,975.50 | £2,795.10 | £16,770.60 |
| Tree Removal | Bermar | £3,421.00 | £684.20 | £4,105.20 |
| Additional Planting for BNG | Bermar | £1,792.37 | £358.47 | £2,150.84 |
| | | | | |
| **Total Costs** | | | | **£23,026.64** |