



Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol  
**MERTHYR TUDFUL**  
**MERTHYR TYDFIL**  
County Borough Council

---

**SCHOOL BUDGET FORUM**  
**Working Group**  
**Tuesday, 14<sup>th</sup> October 2025**  
**(Ynysowen Community Primary School)**

---

**NOTES**

**PRESENT:** Stuart James (Afon Taf)  
Owen Morgan (Cyfarthfa Park Primary)  
Simone Roden (Ynysowen Community Primary) - Chair  
James Voros (Gellifaelog Primary)  
Sarah Hopkins (Blessed Carlo Acutis)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Joanna Lewis (LMS Manager)  
Stacey Green (LMS Resources Senior Officer)  
Chris Jones (Building & Property Services Group Manager)

No	Discussion/Action
1.	<b><u>Apologies</u></b> Apologies for absence were received from Alwen Bowen, Anthony Lewis, Louise Ballinger and Emma France.
2.	<b><u>Property Services SLA</u></b>  <b><u>O/S queries from prior SLA review (Responsive repairs)</u></b>  <b>1. Evidence re: 10% sample checks on responsive repair works</b> CJ: SB has provided evidence of inspected invoices; this data will need to be summarised before distributing to Headteachers.  <b>SR: Has SB found any anomalies?</b> CJ: Yes, he has visited schools to inspect unsatisfactory work. The vast majority sampled have been satisfactory.  SR: Cost of current contract are high compared to other local contractors.  <b>OM: Are we confident that ACE are best value for money?</b> CJ: Responsive repairs contract is on national schedule of rates; contract has to be meet procurement regulations.  <b>SR: Could schools have a list of contract requirements that they could refer to if they were to procure their own contractor?</b> CJ: The risk is then that the school would be liable for all works carried out should anything go wrong.

No	Discussion/Action
	<p><b>OM: Currently schools are seeing issues where jobs a fixed temporarily meaning further call outs needed with extra cost to schools.</b></p> <p>CJ: Some jobs may need to be made safe with a temporary repair initially with further work needed to repair permanently.</p> <p><b>SR: Are the 10% spot checks being carried out regularly?</b></p> <p>CJ: Yes, SB carries out checks on a monthly basis.</p> <p>It was noted that no schools within the WG have ever been sampled. However, the sample checks carried out was actually over the 10%. Any more than this would require extra staff within the property services team. If extra staff were employed, there would not be any cost implications to schools via the SLA</p> <p>Summary – CJ to summarise the sample data and distribute to working group.</p> <p><b>2. Online form for feedback on responsive repair work</b></p> <p>CJ: Form has been created, this will be completed for all works, satisfactory and unsatisfactory, will include scores and comments.</p> <p><b>SR: Could this form be generated automatically to be issued to schools after a job is complete, this will prompt heads to complete and submit form.</b></p> <p>CJ: Not sure but will speak to IT to hopefully set up.</p> <p><b>SR: This form could be linked with approval of invoices, if the cost was included on the feedback form. Once the form is submitted, this could be used as authorisation for payment if the work was completed to a satisfactory level.</b></p> <p>CJ: Will look into if this can be included in the trial.</p> <p>Summary: CJ to liaise with IT to see if the feedback form can be issued to headteachers via email once works are complete and see if this form can be linked into current invoice process trial.</p> <p><b>3. Feedback on invoice trial and next steps</b></p> <p>Currently all invoices relating to works carried out in schools are being sent to schools for approval, it was noted that schools don't really need to see all invoices, servicing charges are standard charges that have to be paid, no need for schools to authorise these. It was agreed to hold a meeting with all schools involved in the trial to review any issues – including the possibility of adding in the new feedback form.</p> <p><b><u>Responsive Repair Contract Tender</u></b></p> <p><b>1. Timeline</b></p> <p>CJ: The new contract is due to start in February 2026. The tender process closes on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2025. The new contract will be awarded by the end of the Autumn term.</p> <p><b>2. Tender evaluation criteria</b></p> <p>CJ: As like the current contract, we are working with RCT to acquire a new 3 year contract</p>

No	Discussion/Action
	<p>with the option of a 12 month extension.</p> <p><b>3. Job Prioritisation</b></p> <p><b>Priority 0: Out of Hours call out:</b> The contractor will attend site within 1 hour and complete work within 24 hours, works include boarding up of windows, stopping leaks etc. This priority is only to make safe and will probably require a follow up job to be raised to affect a complete repair.</p> <p><b>Priority 1: Emergency Calls during working hours:</b> The contractor will attend site within 2 hour and complete work within 24 hours. This priority is only to make safe and will probably require a follow up job to be raised to affect a complete repair.</p> <p><b>Priority 2:</b> The contractor will attend site within 24hours, and works will be completed complete within 5 working days. An extension to timescales may be required for specialist works or specialist parts need to be ordered.</p> <p><b>Priority 3:</b> The contractor will attend site within 48 hrs and complete within 10 working days. This is the normal priority for most works which do not require an immediate response.</p> <p><b>Priority 4:</b> Planned works with a value less than £5,000.00 which requires completing to a set timescale or during school breaks, this option does not get tendered and is let to the responsive repair's contractor. This option can also be used for weather dependant works i.e., roofing repairs during bad weather.</p> <p>These can be found in the Property Services SLA</p> <p><b>JV: Do the priorities affect the cost of the works carried out?</b> CJ: No, all works are based on national schedule of rates.</p> <p><b>SR: Please can the out of hours contact details be shared with schools?</b> CJ: Yes, will arrange for the numbers to be shared with schools.</p> <p><b>SR: Is there an electronic copy of the schedule of works?</b> CJ: Not currently.</p> <p>JL: We will look into the possibility of purchasing one online subscription do be shared with schools.</p> <p><b>4. Performance Management arrangements</b></p> <p><b>SR: Will there be a cooling off period for the new contract? i.e. if they are not meeting the required standards?</b></p>

No	Discussion/Action
	<p>CJ: There will be a clause in the contract. Performance will be monitored via monthly meetings. The feedback forms will be important for these meetings.</p> <p><b>SR: Currently jobs are being signed off by whoever is on site, this just means that someone has been on site, the job is not being inspected, this signature does not mean that the work is complete. Jobs need to be signed off by the caretaker or headteacher.</b></p> <p>CJ: This will need to be looked into; this could affect the performance targets. Maybe there could be a follow up with caretaker to inspect the work. This is when it will be important for the feedback forms to be completed.</p> <p><b><u>Modernising responsibility framework for R&amp;M</u></b></p> <p><b>1. Review of funding for servicing contacts</b></p> <p>CJ: This mainly affects newer schools. Newer builds tend to have more maintenance costs due to modern technology used. Schools are currently funded based on square meterage; this no longer seems viable as maintenance costs in schools varies.</p> <p>JL: We have started analysing how schools are funding and comparing with actual costs.</p> <p><b>SR: If the conclusion that schools need to be funded differently, will this be done by next financial year.</b></p> <p>JL: Hopefully, that's the timeline that we are currently working towards.</p> <p><b>SR: Does this mean some schools will lose funding if the pot is being redistributed?</b></p> <p>JL: No, we're looking at keeping the square meterage funding but adding on an additional rate based on maintenance costs in schools. Schools need to be fairly funded. The results of this analysis works will be brought the next meeting.</p> <p>CJ: The current responsibilities for repairs document will also be updated to include modern works not currently included in document.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b><u>Any other business</u></b></p> <p><b>SR: We'd like to discuss our concerns on the Catering SLA.</b></p> <p>JL: This will be addressed in the next meeting.</p>