

## **MINUTES of the BOARD MEETING**

## 19 July 2022, 1.00 p.m.

ltem	Subject		Action
	<b>Trustees present</b> : Nik Butcher (NB) Mike Hosking (MH) – Chair Nick Lake (NL) Peter Sheppard (PS) <i>items 1-9.3 only</i> Keith Tipler (KT) John Whetter (JW) <i>Also present:</i> Jem Alder (JA) – Trust Secretary Mike England (ME) – Finance Director Simon Hague (SE) – CEO Tamsin Lamb (TL) – Director of Education	<b>1. Apologies:</b> Tom Briant-Evans (TBE) Karen Brokenshire (KB)	
<b>2</b> 2.1	Conflicts of Interest         JW reported his daughter is now employed by the Trust.		
2.2 <b>3</b>	No additional interests were declared. <b>Previous minutes</b> of the 28 June 2022 were accepted as an accurate record.		
<u> </u>	Matters arising		
4.1	8.3 School Improvement. <i>Q: Has a mentor for the new Pencoys Head been identified yet?</i> Still to be agreed.		
5	Delegated Decisions		
5.1	LGC Chair appointments.         MH reported he had confirmed three new LGC Chair appointments where the previous incumbent had stepped down: Sarah Brough – Lanner, Lisette Harvey – Roskear, Jan Tressider – Illogan.		
5.2	Decisions taken by the Southerly Point Project Board are reported in agenda paper 6a - <i>see also</i> items 6.2/6.3 below.		
6	Strategic update		
6.1	Southerly Point. SH confirmed he is in regular contact with Sarah King at RDDSW ( <i>was RSC</i> ) office and had raised the issue of the poor physical condition of several of the schools. DfE Capital Directorate are sending someone for a site visit and will also be in touch with Cornwall Council.		

ltem	Subject	Action
6.2	Notes from SPPB 14 July. MH explained the decision to add TBE to this Board since membership was discussed at the last meeting. The new COO will be added from September too.	
6.3	<ul> <li>Trustees noted the delegated decisions taken and asked the following questions:</li> <li><i>Q Did they understand our SI model at all - eg more staff and more external validation?</i></li> <li>TL accepted we may not have made it clear enough for them.</li> <li><i>Q: We do not want to put more pressure on our schools regarding more external validations – is it changing?</i></li> <li>Justine Hocking is booked in for all 16 schools – but believe the RDDSW might like to see someone else review what we have in place.</li> <li>SH confirmed there are no plans to change our model – 'we know ours is more robust than some other trusts'.</li> <li><i>Q: How much of the identified costs might we be able to reclaim via TCAF?</i></li> <li>Expect to be able to claim more than previous funding streams – and we have upto 2.5 years to claim this back in future.</li> </ul>	
6.4	<ul> <li>CPR.</li> <li>Not moved forward. We and RSC continue to say we are committed to progress this.</li> <li>Last short meeting agreed all HTs can meet to allow them all to speak about their experiences of being in a MAT. Date not agreed – will be in autumn term.</li> <li>RDDSW will broker a meeting if people still wish to proceed.</li> <li>SH confirmed Heads are aware of this and he will brief them if it proceeds.</li> </ul>	
7	School Improvement	
7.1	Ofsted reports. Trustees noted the final published reports for Lanner and Pennoweth and that the outcomes had been discussed at previous meetings.	
7.2	<ul> <li>Director of Education's report - statutory data.</li> <li>Trustees noted the detailed report covering all 9 schools which compared 2022 data with pre-Covid 2019 data. TL confirmed this had been reviewed in detail at the last School Improvement meeting with KB and JW.</li> <li>TL highlighted the following: <ul> <li>Considerable variation remains between schools</li> <li>Y2/3 massively under-performing – but not well prepared to learn. Reflects influence of lack of cultural capital here – locked down during their formative years so limited exposure to non-school activity. Had a significant impact on vocabulary development and when combined with home learning impact has resulted in them finding it harder to deal with the rest of the curriculum</li> <li>Gap between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged has widened – but this is a national issue</li> <li>Y4 online multiplication data test is new this year but no indication from DfE of any pass mark / expected outcomes yet.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

ltem	Subject	Action
	TL commented that other MATs do not seem to have recognised the current Y3 issue but is confident our early intervention work should have an impact over next 3 years. Current Y3 project will continue into next year – focus on reading fluency.	
7.3	<ul> <li>Q: Is the high number of EHCP and Record of Need children at Illogan an anomaly or a trend?</li> <li>Quirky cohort – they have 6 of 19 EHCPs in whole trust.</li> <li>Q: Post Covid will all children get back 'on track'?</li> <li>No general answer. Lanner and Pennoweth responded really quickly and it shows – in contrast Rosemellin took a different approach. Some of this year's data reflects specific cohorts – current Y5 looking different.</li> <li>JW reminded Trustees not all schools are the same so variations are to be expected.</li> </ul>	
7.4	Q: Trustees asked if allocating additional resources from reserves would make a difference – including to short term staff turnover? TL confirmed the next School Improvement plan is being drafted and some actions will have a cost – eg bringing in cover, TLRs for more specialist responsibilities. Staffing issues at Treloweth were quite specific and it is difficult to predict all scenarios which arise. SH added he did not feel lack of resources had been an issue to date. Trustees noted the new budget model requires schools to ask for what they think they need.	
7.5	<ul> <li>Attendance data.</li> <li>Trustees noted the whole trust report, the summary of changes required by new statutory guidance, and the Trust's proposed response to these.</li> <li>TL confirmed that attendance is a significant issue for all schools – although we are still above the national figure. Persistent Absence rates and those for SEND/PP children are of particular concern. The new guidance effectively is a 'reset' process – the DfE will not look at data from the last two years.</li> <li><i>Q: Are some schools better than others?</i></li> <li>Traditionally some schools have had better systems but also individual personalities can make a difference.</li> <li><i>Q: Can we see which day of the week?</i></li> <li>Yes. Fridays are worse – reflects national picture too. Full attendance in the first week of term is really key too.</li> <li><i>Q: Do we know about SP schools?</i></li> <li>Don't know yet. Informally understand it is 'hugely variable' between schools.</li> <li>TL confirmed attendance will be a priority for local governor training next year.</li> <li>Two decisions were taken:</li> <li>JW will be lead / link Trustee for attendance.</li> <li>Make attendance a standing agenda item for LGC Chairs' meetings.</li> </ul>	
7.6	Exclusions. Trustees noted the data comparing all 9 schools with national data. TL explained the context of some individual school's data and the wider picture: • Just one permanent exclusion in last 7 years	

ltem	Subject	Action
	<ul> <li>Currently two children are at high risk of permanent exclusion and on reduced timetables. New guidance however, does not recommend the use of reduced timetables.</li> <li>Five children at high risk of further exclusion, the trust is working with the LA, parents and other agencies to better meet their needs, whilst recognising that the county has limited available alternative provision</li> <li>No correlation between poor attendance and exclusion</li> <li>TL confirmed the issue for county is a lack resources. The LA is looking at a new form of provision with a private partnership.</li> <li><i>Q: Is any form of an internal solution an option?</i></li> <li>We would want to specialise in early intervention – we have no expertise for full provision.</li> </ul>	
8	Finance	
8.1	Energy supply. Trustees noted the report on the recent procurement process for a new energy supply contract and the increased budgetary requirements. Awarding new contract was taken as a Delegated Decision by the Finance group and reflects current market position and price fluctuations. ME confirmed chosen supplier will link directly to our own systems and so provide accurate estimates / bills. Recent investments into LED lighting and smart meters should both help the Trust manage the additional costs. Trust has chosen to set a deficit budget to highlight the impact of price rises.	
8.2	<ul> <li>Budget monitoring.</li> <li>Revenue ahead of projections and currently £200K increase is forecast.</li> <li>Significant savings made on FSM costs and our supplier has challenged us on the lack of take-up in some schools. Next year's budget will need to reflect food price increases and the supplier recovering what they lost.</li> <li>Supplier has raised the issue of switching to pre-cooked meals which we would not want.</li> <li><i>Q: Any alternative if we stepped away?</i></li> <li>Other bidder less experience. Entering final year of contract so next contract will reflect expanded number of schools.</li> <li><i>Q: Any correlation between attendance and FSM takeup?</i></li> <li>Unknown.</li> <li>TL agreed that schools could probably do more to encourage take up of FSM.</li> <li>A further meeting is planned and the Trust will look at contingency arrangements should the supplier decide to introduce pre-cooked meals.</li> </ul>	
8.3	Budget 2022.23 update. Changes made reflect the energy increases discussed earlier and decision to set deficit budget.	
8.4	Finance Team feedback 23/6 and 14/7. NL summarised areas discussed including:	

ltem	Subject	Action
	<ul> <li>Plan is to submit split budgets for the two trusts then re-submit once sp schools have formally joined.</li> <li>Awaiting SP budget information.</li> <li>We will re-create a Trading Company to reflect potential new income streams – eg swimming pool at Parc Eglos – as this allows us to claim Gift Aid and avoid corporation tax.</li> <li>Noted poor physical state of the 7 schools and agreed funds for detailed condition surveys.</li> </ul>	
8.5	Accommodation update. SH reported that the Trust needs additional office space so will need to take some of the conference room over for this. Option to expand into adjacent building was explored but significantly more expensive than previously indicated to us. Premises Manager continuing to look at other options.	
8.6	Sponsorship update. Trustees received details of a potential scheme to add new / replacement solar panel installations to 3 schools – providing 65% of current consumption and repaid within 5 years. ME confirmed there are funds identified in current budget for this sort of investment but Finance group would need to receive and review a more detailed bid. He explained that as Rosemellin is a PFI school this might lead to some contract issues as to who receives any income.	
9	Governance	
9.1	NL was re-appointed as Vice Chair.	
9.2	Agree Register of Interests. Trustees confirmed they were happy to include all entries in published version. JA to re-circulate when PS's interests added.	
9.3	<ul> <li>Committees proposal.</li> <li>MH summarised the previous discussion about introducing formal committees in response to expansion in the new year, including extending membership to non-Trustees.</li> <li>Trustees agreed with his suggestion that the earliest they are introduced is the spring term when there will be the option of recruiting from SP schools / boards.</li> <li>Trustees agreed with the proposal that JA produces draft Terms of Reference in advance of any recruitment.</li> <li>MH stressed that regardless of future committee structures / membership he wants all Trustees to remain upto date with all areas of the Board's responsibilities.</li> </ul>	
9.4	LGC report summary. The meeting reviewed the latest summary report covering the end of the spring term upto previous week. JA confirmed there would be further reports from some very recent meetings and some individual responses to LGCs would be required. Discussion noted the following: • Variations in style and content	

ltem	Subject			Action	
	Some items should be dealt with via Head / shared services team				
	• Following expansion may need to re-assess how reported to the Board?				
	Opportunity to incorporate some of the content into training materials				
	The query over the current restriction of excluding SLT from being the nominated staff governor was discussed and it was agreed to amend the current LGC Terms of Reference to say governors should <i>seek</i> to elect a non-SLT staff governor but if				
				JA	
	unsuccess	sful could appoint a member of SLT.			
10	AOB				
10.1	JA reporte	ed that there is a new email distribution list	available to communicate with		
	all current Board attendees (Trustees, Officers, Trust Secretary):				
	MAT-Trust Board ( <u>trust-board@croftymat.org</u> )				
	To only contact Trustees you will need to manually remove other members.				
10.2 Q: NL asked if the Trust has any links with the Spaceport as			oort as he can share some contact		
	details?				
	No. NL to	o share contact details.		NL	
11	Dates of next meetings				
11.1	SH confirmed that some meetings can still be accommodated at Tolvaddon from				
	next term	<ul> <li>maximum size would be 8 people.</li> </ul>			
	Date	Meeting	<b>Venue</b> ( <i>V</i> = <i>virtual</i> )		
	7/9	Governance Support team	V		
	12/9		Tolvaddon		
	19/9	SIP	Tolvaddon		
	20/9	Board	Roskear		
	26/9	SPPB	Tolvaddon		
	27/9		Tolvaddon (tbc)		
		LGC Chairs	tba		
	_	Board	Lanner		
	Tbc		Tolvaddon		
	Meeting finished at 3.33				