



## MINUTES of the BOARD MEETING

18 May 2021, 1.00 p.m.

### Part A Public

Item	Subject	Action
	<p><b>Trustees present:</b></p> <p>Tom Briant-Evans (TBE) <i>attended via Zoom</i></p> <p>Karen Brokenshire (KB)</p> <p>Mike Hosking (MH) – Chair</p> <p>Nick Lake (NL)</p> <p>Keith Tipler (KT)</p> <p>John Whetter (JW)</p> <p><b>Also present:</b></p> <p>Jem Alder (JA) – Trust Secretary</p> <p>Cathryn Andrews (CA) – Head at Pennoweth <i>items 1-2 only</i></p> <p>Mike England (ME) – Finance Director</p> <p>Simon Hague (SE) – CEO <i>item 3 onwards</i></p> <p>Tamsin Lamb (TL) – Director of Education <i>item 3 onwards</i></p>	
<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies:</b> none	
<b>2</b>	<b>Cathryn Andrews – Head at Pennoweth</b>	
2.1	MH welcomed Cathryn to the meeting and reminded Trustees they had agreed it would be useful to have feedback from an experienced Headteacher joining the Trust having previously worked within a much larger national MAT (REach2).	
2.2	<p>CA shared a summary of both the similarities and differences between the two trusts.</p> <p>Positive aspects of Crofty included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School improvement partners are practising headteachers</li> <li>• Focus on improving school's offer rather than just meeting Ofsted requirements</li> <li>• SILC programme offered to all schools</li> <li>• CPD offer /pathways</li> <li>• Active use of development opportunities within the trust</li> <li>• Central team highly approachable – they are valued, known and seen</li> <li>• Consultative approach</li> <li>• Governance monitoring augmented by external programmes – eg SILC+, H&amp;S audits</li> </ul> <p>As a very large and older MAT REach2 have advantages with regard to capacity and economies of scale. Specific areas CA felt were noticeably different include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong inhouse leadership development programme</li> <li>• Shared Management Information System (MIS) – they use Arbor</li> <li>• Large central team with wide range of 'experts' eg Early Years, safeguarding</li> </ul>	

Item	Subject	Action
2.3	<p><i>Q: How enfranchised do schools feel in a large MAT?</i> It changed over time. As the MAT grew there was a 'massive disconnect' and more of a 'them and us' mentality. Became more important everyone was doing the same.</p> <p><i>Q: How effective was their centralised procurement?</i> Not a strongpoint as some decisions seemed counter-productive and we lost some local relationships.</p> <p><i>Q: Did they have a top down or bottom up approach to planning, budgets, targets?</i> Definitely top down – strict 5 year plans to meet whole trust targets.</p> <p><i>Q: What impact did your arrival have on your peers?</i> Felt very different at first from the school's teachers – mix of my background and experience.</p> <p><i>Q: Any suggestions as to what Crofty can do to attract more schools to join us?</i> REAch2 were good at stressing their school improvement package and opportunities within the trust – less clear the latter were different for struggling schools. Yes potential schools and parents may be swayed by Ofsted ratings – but feel it is 'brilliant' Crofty look beyond this.</p> <p><i>Q: If there is one thing we should take from them what would it be (and vice versa)?</i> A shared MIS system – and give them our school-based SIP approach.</p>	. .
<b>3</b>	<b>Conflicts of Interest:</b> no additional conflicts were declared.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Previous minutes</b> of the 30 March 2021 were accepted as an accurate record.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Matters arising / Tracker</b>	
5.1	<p>Matters arising: 8.1 Catering contract savings. ME reported there have been no savings made so far but a more accurate projection will be available after next month's meeting with the contractor.</p>	
5.2	<p>Tracker: 20.35 Budget reporting – ME confirmed he expected SMART reports to be available from the autumn term. 20.36 DeCarbonisation programme bid – confirmed that no additional resources have been committed as part of the bid.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>CPR MAT meeting feedback</b>	
6.1	<p>SH and MH accepted invitation to join a roundtable discussion on a potential new Camborne / Pool / Redruth MAT on 6 May. This was organised by the RSC's office and was chaired by an experienced MAT CEO from outside of Cornwall to provide both independence and be able to explain the benefits of MATs. Along with Crofty and the three secondary schools there was representation from Rainbow MAT and Trewirgie Juniors.</p>	
6.2	Confidential item	
6.3	<p><i>Q: Any sense of a timetable from the RSC?</i> SH had the impression they are happy for a medium-term solution if there is an opportunity to make this work. This fits well with the government / RSC's current policy direction – eg recent guidance on merging trusts and 'try before you buy' approach. <i>Q: There is a rumour the two secondaries will form a MAT?</i></p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>SH reported this was not his understanding and they were more likely to start with a collaborative federation.</p> <p>Trustees noted that the region can move further and faster than elsewhere due to high proportion of schools who have already academised - but those who haven't will be more of a challenge? However Cornwall Council will continue to struggle to support who is left behind and standalone academies will come under more pressure.</p> <p>Trustees confirmed they still fully supported the Trust being involved in this project.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Director of Education's update</b>	
7.1	<p>TL highlighted the following from her curriculum report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have asked Headteachers to go beyond the statutory minimum requirements for reporting and publishing how Catch Up funding will be used</li> <li>• School improvement work continue - SILC programme has a slightly lighter touch and SILC+ has been relaunched but due to Covid we are restricting this to a shorter halfday visit</li> <li>• Schools are consulting with parents over the new SRHE policy</li> <li>• New EYFS framework from September has big changes in areas including vocabulary and reading</li> </ul> <p>Trustees noted the example web review example and JW confirmed the website he looked at was very easy to navigate.</p> <p>TL confirmed this was a high 'Ofsted ready' quality example. She pointed out that the use of websites has changed over the last year. Parents are no longer the prime audience as they are accessing information via different channels. More emphasis is being given to other audiences - prospective parents, Ofsted, people who know what to look for.</p>	
7.2	<p>Ofsted.</p> <p><i>Q: Is there a link between some of the work being reported and the likely arrival of Ofsted at some schools by the end of the calendar year?</i></p> <p>Yes. TL explained that currently only the shorter section 8 inspections are planned for summer term so Lanner is being prioritised.</p> <p>Our risk assessments have identified 5 schools who would or are likely to receive the fuller section 5 inspections which are anticipated from September onwards: Illogan, Pencoys, Pennoweth, Rosemellin, Weeth.</p> <p>TL added that it is difficult to know what criteria Ofsted may use to identify priority schools when they don't have results or attendance data.</p>	
7.3	<p>HR update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Career Teachers (ECTs) replaces NQT terminology from September – and has a two year framework. Various options the Trust can choose but financial benefit to follow a DfE-approved scheme</li> <li>• Drafting a new CPPD strategy – both KB and JW have seen the draft</li> <li>• Stable and affordable staffing structure in place for Pencoys – confirmed there have been no redundancies</li> </ul> <p>Trust is not expecting to recruit any new teachers for next year which is unusual. TL suggested this was due to a combination of factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covid uncertainties impacted individual decisions</li> <li>• Programme of internal movements</li> </ul>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of several temporary staff originally recruited for maternity cover to fill vacancies</li> </ul> <p>Trustees commented that although this was a positive sign for the Trust in terms of staff retention and desire to work for Crofty – it did mean no new / different experience coming in.</p>	
7.4	Confidential item	
<b>8</b>	<b>Culture survey feedback</b>	
8.1	<p>SH explained how this survey was part of his MBA project and specifically comparing co-creation of values between CEO and a trust's staff compared to other approaches. SH highlighted the significant rise in understanding of the Trust's aims, vision and values over a 16 month period.</p> <p>Aspects of the project were put on hold due to Covid but he plans to return to work directly with TAs and also follow up on those activities teachers had identified as making a difference to how they responded.</p>	
8.2	<p>Trustees noted this was a very positive response and further evidence of the work SH and colleagues had carried out.</p> <p><i>Q: What was the return %?</i></p> <p>Around 90% of teachers responded.</p> <p><i>Q: Have you analysed results school by school?</i></p> <p>No – partly due to methodology agreed in advance. However SH had made a comparison of the returns from the 3 schools he had worked closely with compared to the remainder – and there was a positive difference.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<b>Budget monitoring</b>	
9.1	<p>20.21 Budget monitoring.</p> <p>ME highlighted the following from his report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ahead of income target – helped by one-off extras eg EHCP support and expect year end position to be the same</li> <li>Staffing slightly overspent – project £150K over at year end. New payroll system providing very accurate forecasts for us. Stronger recruitment decisions are also helping with this</li> <li>Overheads currently overspent but some of this is Covid-related</li> <li>Anticipate some repairs expenditure will move to capital expenditure</li> <li>ICT now excludes capital expenditure eg new hardware</li> <li>Catering – not expecting a profit due to Covid but FSM numbers are improving so expect a return to agreed funding model later this term</li> <li>Expect a significant underspend on maintenance budget due to problems accessing sites during lockdown</li> </ul> <p>Cautious projection for final outturn position is a minimum of £250K surplus.</p> <p>TL reported that the new LED lighting at Weeth has 'transformed' the building / environment. ME confirmed the Trust is looking to target more reserves to specific projects like these.</p>	
9.2	<p>Budgeting for 21.22.</p> <p>SH reported that all Headteachers agree with our equitable funding principles – but there is a short time scale to implement for next year.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	Trust will contact ESFA regarding changing the Funding Agreement so we can report whole trust data in future accounts.	
<b>10</b>	<b>Governance Scheme of Delegation (GSoD)</b>	
10.1	<p>JA summarised the approach taken in drafting an updated version of the scheme – in particular to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflect latest learning and understanding</li> <li>• Align with move to being a 'single organisation'</li> <li>• Ensure content and format allows for it to be used for a range of purposes and audiences</li> </ul> <p>He highlighted the key changes including separating out decision making from monitoring and compliance tasks, and the outline proposal for a different approach to urgent decision making.</p>	
10.2	<p>Following discussion of the Delegated Decisions list (3.2) the following was agreed:</p> <p>4.3 Approve KPIs – remove</p> <p>5.2 Permanent exclusion – change to Governance being responsible</p> <p><i>Q: How will the scheme make it unambiguous to third parties what responsibilities are delegated to LGBs?</i></p> <p>Their Terms of Reference (5.3) will be completely rewritten to reflect content in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p><i>Q: Will there need to be any new policies written?</i></p> <p>No – aim is just to incorporate what exists and avoid duplication or additional work.</p>	
10.3	Trustees confirmed their approval of the proposed scope and format of the scheme.	
<b>11</b>	<b>Audit committee 22 April</b>	
11.1	<p>KT fed back from the meeting including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• summary of the approach taken to agree an internal audit plan</li> <li>• providing formal feedback to internal auditor which will be incorporated into their final report</li> </ul> <p>KT highlighted the successful completion of the credit card audit including the reclaiming of all VAT for the current year.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<b>Policies for approval</b>	
12.1	<p>Following six policies have been updated and Trustees were asked to approve them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capability / Disciplinary / Grievance / Redundancy</li> <li>• Family Friendly</li> <li>• Critical Incident</li> </ul> <p>TL confirmed all the necessary consultation with staff and unions had been completed. Subsequent to issuing board papers minor amendments to the terminology and governance references had been made to Capability and Redundancy policies and clarification added they applied to staff employed centrally.</p>	
12.2	<p><i>Q: Trustees asked if these policies are now applied consistently across the Trust?</i></p> <p>TL confirmed there are some minor legacy issues being addressed (eg old documentation) but explained as part of the introduction of the new payroll system all</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	staff now have full access to all policies which will ensure they are consistently implemented across all our schools.	
12.3	Q: <i>Do we have a parental behaviour policy?</i> Not currently but SH confirmed introducing one would be beneficial to help manage some current issues.	SH
<b>13</b>	<b>Trustee re-appointment</b>	
13.1	Trustees agreed to recommend MH be re-appointed for a new 4 year term of office.	JA
<b>14</b>	<b>Investment update</b>	
14.1	NL reported that following discussion it has been agreed to invite Flagstone back as it is 18 months since the original meeting and much has changed. Following this meeting a proposal will be brought to the Board.	NL
<b>15</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
15.1	Trustees reported back to SH and TL that they were very impressed by CA's earlier presentation and her responses to their questions.	
<b>16</b>	<b>Items for next agenda</b>	
16.1	Progress data. Budget approval. Agreed decision needed as to whether an additional meeting would be required.	MH/SH
	Meeting finished at 3.36	
	<i>Dates of next meetings:</i> 16 June Clerks 25 June Members 29 June Chairs 13 July Board	