

The RGSW and AOS Foundation Meeting
4pm – 5.30pm Tuesday 10 January 2017
AR Wheeler Boardroom

Attendees:

Foundation Trustees - Andrew Greenway (AG) Nick Fairlie (NF), Mike Ridout (MR),
RGS staff: John Pitt (JDP), Ian Roberts (ITR), Scott MacDonald (SCM), John Ralph (JWR)
Minute Secretary: Joanna Weaver

Introduction

Welcome from **AG**, outlining the purpose of the working group meeting and the four areas to be covered: the provision of funds from the Foundation to the School to support bursaries; the transfer of restricted gifts from the Foundation to the School; the Foundation's input into fundraising for Capital projects; the naming of bursaries funded through the Foundation.

No attended declared any conflict of interest

1 Proposed Timeline for Decision Making relating to Foundation Bursary Awards.

To support the discussion **SCM** had produced a document that outlines the existing process used by the School for awarding of bursaries. All participants had received a copy prior to the meeting (*See appendix for background note*).

Discussion points around bursaries:

AG sought clarification as to the current level of school-funded bursary awards and whether this was likely to remain for the foreseeable future. **JWR** confirmed that the School's operating budget provides funding the equivalent of 4 full fee new bursaries each academic year. He further advised that The AR Wheeler Bursary Fund provides one virtually full fee bursary while the AOS Bursary Fund provides a partial bursary place. Both of these are one pupil going through the School rather than a new place each year. In the case of these named funds it is annual income generated from the capital that is used for the bursary payments. The capital is not spent and is actually added to each year through ongoing donations secured by the Development Office. There are also some other bursaries funded directly by donors through direct contact with the Headmaster's office.

JDP emphasised that all funds raised through the Foundation for bursaries would be in addition to the School funded awards and not in place of them. **JDP** also suggested some donors may want to sponsor an individual pupil and to do this through the School as opposed to adding donations to a collective bursary fund. He observed that it would be incumbent upon the Foundation and the School to be as flexible as possible to ensure the best result for pupils and donors. He added that he was encouraged by former RGS pupils who described their 'free' education as a huge benefit in their life and that they may be encouraged to 'give back to help others receive what they got from the School.'

MR queried the availability of bursaries in the Prep schools. **ITR** confirmed that this is currently not standard practice but that the School did not preclude such a thing in exceptional circumstances. However, the School does on occasion currently help in individual cases of financial hardship on a temporary basis.

MR sought clarification as to whether The AR Wheeler Bursary Fund and The Alice Ottley Bursary Fund would definitely transfer to the Foundation. **ITR** confirmed that this was still the intention but that the transfer was subject to a final legal check. When that was satisfied the Board of Governors would approve the transfer and this would be documented with the Boards of the respective charities.

SCM advised that existing sponsors could move to the giving through the Foundation for onward transmission to the School but that at the moment in the case of David Owen who provides funding for full bursary place it was not a priority to seek his agreement. However, this could be revisited at a future date.

NF questioned the allocation of future Foundation bursaries to specific pupils. **JDP and ITR** confirmed to the meeting that the selection of candidates for bursary support had to remain with them and their respective teams to ensure transparency, consistency and fairness in allocation of means-tested support. It was likely that Foundation funds could be used to top up School funds so the process had to be seamless in determining need and priority.

All participants agreed that the School needed to have the freedom to decide which pupils should receive a bursary even if it was funded from Foundation donations (in line with how it works for third party sponsors). However, the Foundation would benefit from the positive PR of supporting the School and the pupils. The Headmaster would be able to provide high-level progress update to the Foundation Board relating to pupils who are in receipt of Foundation generated support in a way that protects anonymity.

Both **JDP and ITR** reiterated their need for strict pupil anonymity in relation to bursary recipients irrespective of who funds the award. **MR** added that he had never known which pupils received financial support and had valued this approach as a teacher and was grateful for this approach.

ITR confirmed that from 2017 onwards bursary agreements will include a reference to the School's right to ask recipients to endorse the value of bursaries once they have become alumni. Such publicity will be through mutual agreement only.

ITR confirmed that all current bursary awards are annually reviewed by means-testing and academic results. There needs to be a term's notice for withdrawal of funds if the pupil does not meet the criteria for an awarded bursary (behaviour, academic attainment) but this was not a regular occurrence since bursaries were so highly valued by pupils and their families.

Recommendation to the Foundation Trustees

***AG** received formal confirmation that everyone had read and understood this process and the timeline. Agreement was received from all participants for the working group to recommend to the trustees that the Foundation works to School's bursary award process in its entirety. To do this it also recommends that trustees follow the documented timeline by arranging the necessary finance subcommittee meeting for the Michaelmas Term.*

2 **Restricted Gifts** (See appendix for background note)

AG sought agreement as to how gifts made to the Foundation with restrictions on their use should be handled because the Foundation's trustees have an obligation to ensure restrictions are met when a gift is allocated to the School.

SM confirmed that in recent years the Development Office had secured funding through restricted gifts for the Music Department and a Physics Prize. **ITR** confirmed that the School has added to the value of such gifts to enable the purchase of items of greater value than the initial donation such as the oboe donated by David Packman and the AOOE Association.

AG queried how the Foundation could ensure it worked in conjunction with the AOOEs to avoid any duplication of effort. **JDP** advised that he attended AOOE Committee meetings each term and that funding requests from any part of the School to the association now go through his office for prior vetting. He also has agreement from the AOOEs that any form of fundraising message it wishes to promote to its members will be shared with the Development Office for prior agreement. **JDP** wished to acknowledge the good relationship the School enjoys with the AOOE committee and its valued support for RGSW.

Recommendation to the Foundation Trustees

***AG** noted all participants were content for the Foundation Chairman to write to the Headmaster and Bursar to inform them of any such gifts, detailing the restrictions, and inviting them to confirm how the School would use the gift in accordance with the donor's wishes. Upon receipt of this confirmation the Foundation would pass the gift to the School. Therefore, the working group recommends this to the Foundation Trustees.*

3 **Capital Projects** (See appendix for background note)

AG sought clarification as to whether the Foundation should be used to help the School raise funds for Capital projects given its remit to secure additional funding for bursaries. He invited contributions from all participants.

SCM confirmed the main purpose of the Development Office since its creation is to raise funds for bursaries and that it would continue to promote the 20/20 Bursary Campaign as a priority. However, the co-incidence in timing of the Foundation launch and the GBT refurbishment meant that the trustees and the Development Office should now examine how this Capital project could be supported by the Foundation. He emphasised that the actual strategy and tactics to be deployed would require further detailed consideration but that he needed prompt confirmation as to whether the trustees would agree to the Foundation's inclusion in fundraising for it.

MR made the point that the last major fundraising request to the RGS community (parents and alumni) was in 1981 for the Independence Appeal. The consensus amongst the group was that there would be interest and support for this project from parents and alumni.

JDP explained that prep school parents in particular may see the merit in supporting a facility that will benefit their children when they join the Senior School. **ITR** added that the use of the Pullinger Legacy, as recently agreed by the Board of Governors, would add to

the legitimacy of having the Foundation front the fundraising since it would be able to demonstrate success in its first project.

ITR confirmed planning permission is in the process of being sought and the proposed building works would commence during the Summer 2017 if all goes to plan. **NF** urged caution until the final permission is granted and acceptable quotations have been formally received. Delays with either could hinder a Foundation launch that includes an appeal to raise funds for the GBT. Participants noted **NF's** caution along with **SCM's** concern to avoid any dilution of the 20/20 Bursary Campaign when corresponding with donor groups.

Recommendation to the Foundation Trustees

***AG** gathered a consensus that, notwithstanding the concerns recorded, the working group should recommend to trustees that the Foundation takes the lead role in fronting fund raising activities for the GBT project.*

4 Naming of the Foundation Bursary Awards

The meeting discussed the merit of identifying bursary awards made from the Foundation in order to publicise the work of the Foundation. **JDP** suggested that the names of awards (bursary / scholarship) should remain unchanged at this moment in time but further discussion needed as the scale of awards grows.

Recommendation to the Foundation Trustees

***AG** noted all participants agreed to defer discussions to a future point in time when the Foundation is in a position to fund full fee equivalent bursaries.*

Future Foundation Board Meetings:

Lent Term

Tuesday 28 Feb

4-6pm

Spurling Meeting Room

Britannia House

Trinity Term

Tuesday 6 June

4-6pm

Spurling Meeting Room

Britannia House

RGS Governors Meetings

Lent Term

F&GP – 15 February

Board – 16 March

Trinity Term -

F&GP – 24 May

Board – 15 June