



**MINUTES of the BOARD MEETING**

**19 November 2018, 1.00 p.m. at Tolvaddon Business Park**

**Part A Public**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p><b>Trustees present:</b>            Karen Bond (KB) – Chair            Tom Briant-Evans (TBE)            Mike Hosking (MH)            Nick Lake (NL)            Keith Tipler (KT)            John Whetter (JW)</p> <p><i>Also present:</i>            Jeremy Alder (JA) – Trust Secretary            Mike England (ME) – Finance Director <i>items 9-11 only</i>            Simon Hague (SE) – CEO <i>items 1-12 only</i>            Tamsin Lamb (TL) – School Improvement Officer <i>items 1-12 only</i></p>	
<b>1</b>	<b>Appoint Chair</b>	
1.1	JA reminded Trustees of the process which had been used and confirmed that two Trustees had received and accepted nominations for the role of Chair. A secret ballot was conducted and JA announced that Mike Hosking had been elected as the new Chair of the Board of Trustees and would take office with immediate effect.	
1.2	MH thanked NL for his kind words in his submission document and thanked the outgoing Chair KB for all her hard work. He thanked the Board for their vote of confidence despite not having been a Trustee for very long and looked forward to continue working together to develop the Trust and maintain a strong focus on improving outcomes for all our children.	
1.3	JA to circulate the news of the change of Chair.	JA
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies:</b> none	
<b>3</b>	<b>Conflicts of Interest</b> – no additional interests were declared.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Previous minutes</b> of the 9 October 2018 were accepted as an accurate record.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Action Tracker / Matters arising</b>	
5.1	4.2 Email accounts. JA confirmed all Trustees were now using these.	
5.2	4.4 External Safeguarding review. SH reported that he had now received a second quote and will proceed with the supplier offering additional reporting.	

Item	Subject	Action
5.3	<p>4.5 Parental election process.</p> <p>JA explained that based on further research and a conversation with TBE it is clear that the DfE have effectively reverted to requiring parent governors to be elected only (rather than including the option to appoint), and he advised Trustees against a formal request to the DfE to amend the articles as previously discussed.</p> <p>Following discussion of the options available and the guidance in the current DfE Governance Handbook to hold 'informed elections' Trustees agreed not to pursue amending the articles.</p> <p>JA to draft updated election procedures for all LGBs to follow.</p>	JA
5.4	<p>5.4 Responding to workforce engagement.</p> <p>SH reported this is an outstanding piece of work as he has been concentrating on the support staff pay review.</p>	
5.5	<p>8.1 Policies.</p> <p>SH gave a brief update on work to improve how policies are managed across the Trust. This includes ensuring each have both a named executive and trustee lead; and developing a calendar of expiry / review / ratification dates.</p> <p>Suggestion to use term rather than exact dates was discussed and agreed, along with the principle of approving outside of meetings when appropriate.</p>	
5.6	<p>Part B Confidential minutes.</p> <p>6. Staffing update.</p> <p>SH reported that the consultation period for staff had been extended into the new year so there would be no formal report to the December Board.</p> <p>Extra funding from the government for the teacher's pay award has now been confirmed by the DfE and the Trust has started to receive it.</p>	JA
5.7	<p>13.1 Confidential HR item.</p> <p>KB reported she had shared additional notes and evidence with the external auditors in response to their checking on how the Board came to a decision.</p>	
5.8	<p>Part C Confidential minutes.</p> <p>14. CEO's Performance Management.</p> <p>Advice has been received that there is no reason to delay making the award.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Data update from Lead Trustee</b>	
6.1	<p>JW took Trustees through his report which had been prepared following his meeting with TL and access to extensive performance data.</p> <p>The following points were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to make direct year on year comparison due to new schools joining</li> <li>• Data for FSM and SEN shows the Trust serves a deprived area compared to national figures</li> <li>• KS2 attainment was just below national</li> <li>• KS2 progress can be helped by a low base at the end of KS1</li> <li>• Treloweth and Roskear regularly appear in higher performing list</li> <li>• Outcomes for summer born children are a reverse of the national picture</li> <li>• Higher attainers and SEN children regularly show in the data as performing less well than other cohorts – they are being prioritised</li> <li>• Gap between Crofty and national figure is growing in certain areas– eg higher achievers and again addressing this is a priority in latest plans</li> </ul> <p>SH explained that it is very difficult to know how we are doing compared with other trusts / schools as national statistics used different methodology for different groups eg gender and disadvantaged.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
6.2	<p>Trustees asked a series of questions.</p> <p><i>Qn: Do we know why the gap is growing for higher achievers?</i></p> <p>SILC programme has picked up we focus on getting children to expected standards but have probably taken our eye off this cohort so the level of challenge needs to improve.</p> <p><i>Qn: Do staff need more training in this area?</i></p> <p>TL felt it is more about expectations and teacher's having a greater awareness of who to track.</p> <p><i>Qn: Is there any correlation with attendance levels and outcomes?</i></p> <p>Only one school demonstrates a statistical correlation.</p> <p><i>Qn: Is benchmarking data readily available for this?</i></p> <p>No – but SH confirmed there will be local MATs he expects would share data.</p> <p><i>Qn: Why the notable variation between reading and writing at Lanner?</i></p> <p>Very specific teacher moderation issue which will not repeat.</p> <p><i>Qn: Trustees noted that the two schools who are performing better overall are also our largest – is there a direct correlation?</i></p> <p>SH suggested the main correlation was with a consistency of leadership.</p>	
6.3	<p>Trustees asked SH to pass on their thanks for the outcomes achieved to all the Headteachers at their next meeting.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Draft SEF</b>	
7.1	<p>TL explained that this is the first attempt at a trust wide SEF and partly reflects her new fulltime role. The document shared with Trustees is a work in progress and there are sections where data still needs to be added.</p> <p>TL took Trustees through the document and the areas highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Years data suggests we are not always focusing on most important areas</li> <li>• SEND 20%. This is a cohort containing students who are in the lowest 20% nationally. Tracking this group should be a good indicator of the impact the school /Trust is having.</li> <li>• Y1 phonics – significant reduction in the P.D (Pupil Difference) figure reflects the emphasis we put on this area last year and improvements at specific schools</li> <li>• KS2 - really mixed picture</li> <li>• Higher attainers not doing well for both attainment and progress.</li> <li>• Maths is a focus this year.</li> </ul> <p>SH suggested that Trustees should take confidence that the Trust addressed an area of underachievement last year - and by working together and embracing external support we made a significant improvement in a single year.</p>	
7.2	<p><i>Trustees asked if the apparent positive impact of EY provision on EYFS outcomes was a challenge for the Board to respond to? Should the Trust be looking to increase provision?</i></p> <p>TL pointed out that there is lots of competition locally and felt the priority was finding ways to work more closely with these existing providers be they on our own site (eg Pencoy) or in the area.</p>	
7.3	<p>TL explained she is yet to dig into progress data. She is developing three year trend data which will be reviewed termly to look at progress against individual school targets.</p> <p>Teacher assessments are now moderated across the trust with schools working in triads.</p> <p>TL leads Y1 moderation and we have countywide moderators who contribute to this as well.</p> <p><i>Trustees asked if outcomes and performance is compared back to projections?</i></p> <p>TL confirmed there had been limited moderation last year but the three schools we have identified as high priority all had quality of teaching issues.</p>	
7.4	<p>TL stressed she would welcome any comment on the format and content of this SEF.</p>	ALL

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Trustees welcomed the document and approach and felt it would be a really valuable tool. A range of comments and suggestions were made including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context section, final bullet point – suggest refine the wording</li> <li>• Table format for progress data was welcomed along with RAG rating as overall summary</li> <li>• Risk rating to be moved to start of the document and a summary narrative added</li> </ul>	TL
<b>8</b>	<b>Individual school data /SILC programme update</b>	
8.1	<p>Individual school data sheets.</p> <p>Trustees commented they found the format of these very helpful. <i>They asked where the current SEF grades came from and did TL agree with them?</i></p> <p>TL explained most had been set prior to the start of the SILC visits. She added that recent training with an Ofsted inspector suggested that the local judgement ought to take into account whether the school was expecting a 1 or 2 day inspection and how ‘imminent’ this was.</p> <p>SH shared a data sheet from another (larger) Trust as another example of board-level monitoring information, and reminded Trustees that when there are more than 9 schools to monitor we will need to review what we have in place</p>	
8.2	<p>SILC programme.</p> <p>TL confirmed each school will receive a visit and a 6-7 page report.</p> <p>Trustees asked TL to produce a summary report for the February Board meeting. They confirmed they would like to be able to access individual reports as and when required and it was agreed that in due course the governance portal would be the obvious solution for this.</p>	TL/JA
<b>9</b>	<b>Update on audited accounts</b>	
9.1	<p>ME provided a brief update to accompany his report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues with financial management system which Bishop Fleming have confirmed other Trusts have experienced too.</li> <li>• Capital receipts have not been dealt with correctly upto now and we have relied on the auditors to do this work for us. Income from successful CIF bids needs to be shown in advance of receipt of funds.</li> <li>• £100K of adjustments agreed with Bishop Fleming, which means some funds will be returned to schools’ reserves. Final numbers will be presented on 11 December.</li> </ul> <p>ME confirmed he does not expect there to be any additional items added to the management letter.</p>	
9.2	<p>ME queried whether the pension liability of a school should be part of any future Due Diligence process?</p> <p>TBE felt there was potential for this to be a negotiating factor if another school wants to join us – especially if the RSC want this to happen.</p> <p>ME also suggested the Trust may want to review the reserves policy so the accounts show a closer match between balances and recommended levels.</p>	
9.3	<p>Trustees asked ME if he had an update on Action A18.02 from the Tracker – Related Party Transactions above 20K?</p> <p>ME confirmed that as this relies on self-declaration by the individuals there is work to be done for all contracts with our main suppliers.</p> <p>Trustees were reminded that the requirements in the AFH become stricter from next April.</p> <p>Trustees requested ME look at this in more detail and reports back.</p>	ME
<b>10</b>	<b>Update on trading arm</b>	
10.1	<p>ME and MH gave a brief verbal report from the first meeting of the Crofty Support Services company on 9<sup>th</sup> November.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Advice was being sought on whether other Trust income (eg schools lettings) needed to be considered.</p> <p>It is too early to assess time spent by staff against original projections and current thinking is there will be a report after the first 6 months.</p> <p>ME confirmed we are charging for any additional work.</p> <p>MH queried whether he can still be a Director now he is Chair? TBE thought it would be OK and having a non-Trustee Director was helpful.</p> <p>Trustees asked ME to obtain advice as to whether there needed to be any form of internal contract between the trading arm company and the Trust.</p>	ME
<b>11</b>	<b>Budget monitoring – Lead Trustee update</b>	
11.1	<p>NL confirmed he is due to meet with ME later this week but has already seen the figures for September which he is happy with.</p> <p>These have not yet been shared as the central team expressed a concern about them being distributed via email, so other options are being considered.</p> <p>SH reiterated the need to have a strong review process in place before releasing figures, and how this will be more important in the future as budget pressures increase.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<b>LGBs – update</b>	
12.1	<p>KB reported on Chair appointment requests: Roskear agreed, Lanner have deferred, Treloweth in process of appointing.</p>	
12.2	Confidential item	
<b>13</b>	<b>Governance Development Plan</b>	
13.1	<p>Lead Trustee roles.</p> <p>NL, JW and TBE to continue in their respective Finance, School Improvement and GDPR roles.</p> <p>KT to take Safeguarding and KB Governance.</p> <p>KB was asked to prepare a plan for governance.</p> <p>Trustees also discussed a wider concern about the current capacity of the centre of the Trust for areas such as Safeguarding, IT/ GDPR and HR. They agreed there needed to be clarity on the strategic direction of the Trust before any decisions were made.</p>	KB
13.2	<p>Recruitment.</p> <p>MH asked that all Trustees give thought as to how and where to identify potential new Trustees.</p> <p>It was accepted that current LGB members could be considered but that they could not remain as local governors if they joined the Board.</p>	ALL
13.3	<p>Chair of Chairs.</p> <p>Trustees noted a decision was needed for their meeting on the 27 November. After discussion it was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KT will chair the next meeting but announce he</li> <li>• Current Chairs to be asked for their views on the future of the group</li> <li>• New Chair to be appointed by January meeting to serve until summer 2020</li> </ul>	
13.4	<p>Strategy Day.</p> <p>MH reported back from the meeting held with KB, NL and JA to look at the governance section of the Trust Improvement Plan.</p> <p>It was proposed that the Board and senior leaders have a joint strategy day early in the new year. Trustees agreed an early start with a mid-afternoon finish was preferable.</p>	MH
13.5	<p>Chair / Vice Chair terms of office.</p> <p>JA outlined the options for coming to a decision. Trustees noted that the current articles appear to offer more flexibility than previous versions.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
	Trustees agreed that MH should serve through till summer 2020, and NL would retain his current role of Vice Chair (subject to JA checking and confirm the articles).	<b>JA</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Trustee induction feedback</b>	
14.1	TBE had found his visit to 8 schools very helpful and suggested it should be part of formal induction for new Trustees. It had helped highlight the differences between schools in terms of their geographical location and space for expansion.	
<b>15</b>	<b>Items for next agenda</b>	
15.1	Bishop Fleming / approve audited accounts. Finance update.	
	<b>Dates of next Board meetings:</b> 11 December 5 February 2019 26 March	
	<i>Meeting finished at 4.58</i>	

<b>Signed</b>	<b>Date</b>
---------------	-------------