

**MINUTES of the BOARD MEETING**
**1 October 2015, 5.00 at Carclaze**

Item	Subject	Action
	<p><b>Present:</b>            Claire Bunting (CB)            Kevin Johns (KJ)            Emma Knowles (EK)            Peter Marshall (PM) – Chair            Shaun Netherton (SN)            David Parker (DP) - CEO            Kevin Pearce (KP)            Simon Pollard (SP)            Mark Rudge (MR)            Julie Seyler(JS) <i>items 1-11.3 only</i>            Paul Towe (PT)</p> <p><i>Also in attendance:</i>            Jeremy Alder (JA) – Trust Secretary            Chris Price (CP) – new Director <i>items 2.2 –6.2 only</i>            Natalie Simmonds (NS) – HT, Lostwithiel            Ramon van de Velde (RV) – new Director <i>item 2.2 onwards</i>            Chris Wathern (CW) – HT, Fowey            Ellie Willcocks (EW) – CFO</p>	
	<b>Apologies:</b> Jeremy Barnard	
1	<b>Conflicts of Interest:</b> no additional interests declared.	
2	<b>New Director appointments</b>	
2.1	PM explained the process followed and summarised the background of our two candidates – one each proposed by Fowey and Lostwithiel. He confirmed that they are both a good ‘fit’ with our current skills matrix. The selection panel recommends both candidates to the Board – and also feel that even if neither had been linked to one of our schools they believe they will be an asset to the Board. Directors approved the recommendation that both CP and RV be invited to join the Board with immediate effect.	<b>JA</b>
2.2	CP, NS, RV and CW all gave the meeting a brief introduction about their background.	
3	<b>Previous minutes</b> of the 16 July were accepted subject to the following amendment: Part A, item 5.2, line 8 - amend to read “ <i>who does not have the required skills.</i> ”	<b>JA</b>
4	<b>Matters arising</b>	
4.1	7.3 Budget surplus issue – still outstanding.	<b>DP/EW</b>
4.2	9.3 Data Protection training. EW is looking at options for online training.	<b>EW</b>
4.3	11.1 PM still to speak to Chair of Penrice LGB.	<b>PM</b>

4.4	17.1 Safeguarding. Kay Adams is coming to speak to ELT next month and get feedback from the HTs.	
<b>5</b>	<b>New school presentations</b>	
5.1	<p>Directors received presentations from each Head of the two new schools. Fowey.</p> <p>CW highlighted the following in his presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roll increasing – catchment now wider than just Fowey</li> <li>• Class sizes range from 21-30</li> <li>• Pupil Premium pupils are 21% of roll – this reflects a mixed catchment area and not the common perception of Fowey the town</li> <li>• Wednesday Workshops – enriched curriculum, mixed age groups of 8-16 pupils</li> <li>• School runs their own catering – both a financial risk and an income generation opportunity</li> <li>• PP students get good results – so why not the same with our non-PP pupils?</li> <li>• Work with other partners - eg Fowey Festival</li> </ul>	
5.2	<p>Lostwithiel.</p> <p>NS explained she had been in post for just one month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outdoor Learning at the heart of what the school is all about</li> <li>• One of 2 schools in the town (<i>other is the small CoE St Winnow</i>) – slight dip in roll to 154</li> <li>• Good Ofsted in late 2014</li> <li>• New 7th class introduced this September</li> <li>• PP above 20% too – like Fowey not the common perception of Lostwithiel</li> <li>• Challenging site but great for the children due to the outside area / Forest School</li> <li>• KS2 good, KS1 needs to improve along with PP children</li> <li>• Attendance also needs to improve</li> </ul> <p>She stressed how helpful it has been to start as part of PLT and have the support of the other heads. Wants to look at having a more inspiring curriculum.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>CEO's report</b>	
6.1	<p>DP highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No new data available yet</li> <li>• Focus has been on Performance Management – using our new external advisor who is very good and 'very sharp'. Next year will invite the LGB Chair to be in from the beginning rather than join us only at the end.</li> <li>• Clear focus on where do we want to be at year end with progress and attainment</li> <li>• Plans for second part of the year are to inspect each other's schools - stressed that this isn't a 'Mocksted'</li> <li>• Review targets this time next year</li> <li>• Anticipate we will review and make changes / improvements to the process</li> </ul>	
6.2	<p>SN asked about the involvement of LGB Chair – could they be part of the walkaround? DP pointed out the need to distinguish between a professional conversation and governance – but happy to discuss this with the heads.</p> <p>Directors discussed the benefits of greater training for governors on what to look for in assessing performance of their school. PM queried if this was a subject for MAT-wide training? Yes. PT mentioned that a session around the new Ofsted framework is already being planned.</p>	
6.3	<p>KP noted the meeting with Poltair and asked if we would be receiving any more feedback on results? DP confirmed that the LGBs had been looking at these already.</p> <p>Discussion took place over the link between the Board and the LGBs and the need to strike a balance between avoiding duplication but also being reassured that analysis and challenge has happened.</p>	

	<p>JS commented that we don't need a lot of information but it is good to see the highlights and a link back to what we were told before. CB felt that the MAT improvement plan will cover much of this.</p> <p>EK asked if the proposed summary sheets for each school are available yet? DP confirmed they should be created very shortly.</p> <p>JS mentioned that being part of a Head's PM was very helpful but she was conscious that we've set targets without yet knowing the result of life without levels? DP accepted that the trust may well need to re-visit these mid-year.</p> <p>PT added we may need to rely on comparison with national data because not possible to compare with our own previous year's data.</p> <p>DP pointed out that there will be greater clarity as we approach next September; and we were setting 'goals not targets'.</p>	<b>DP</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Meeting with the Regional Schools Commissioner - update</b>	
7.1	<p>DP and PM met with him in Bristol. He made it very clear he holds DP accountable for outcomes, then the individual heads, but the Board needs to hold DP to account as well.</p> <p>PM added we got a sense of where they want schools to be going in Cornwall – expectation that 75% of primaries to become academies by 2020.</p>	
7.2	<p>Self-evaluation process – DP confirmed we are at the 'setting-up' stage - not yet reached 'embedding'. However he still feels we are ahead of some other MATs. We have been given a 'green light' to grow and we came away with the feeling the RSC may push schools towards us to help us achieve this.</p> <p>PM added he seemed to endorse where we have got to in our first 6 months.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>CEO's Performance Management</b>	
8.1	<p>KP gave the following update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Clare Emory who has agreed to support us and provided a quote</li> <li>• She has proposed some dates – 3 days in total spread across the year</li> <li>• Outlined the PM process – initial 121 with DP who then meets with the panel</li> </ul> <p>PM commented this is not a cheap process but feels we need this level of expertise and challenge. EW confirmed not included in the budget but does not present a problem.</p> <p>Board agreed that the panel will comprise the Chair and the two Vice Chairs, with another director in reserve.</p>	<b>PM</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Admissions</b>	
9.1	<p>Board discussed the briefing paper and recommendations, focusing on the desirability of a standard approach and the degree of delegation to LGBs. Following was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no working party needed</li> <li>• each school's draft arrangements to be ratified by the Board by email before formal public consultation</li> </ul>	<b>JA</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Academies Financial Handbook 2015 – update</b>	
10.1	<p>JA highlighted the requirements for greater transparency over governance arrangements and individual director / governor information published on websites. EW pointed out that the simplified budget monitoring arrangements (2.3.3) will mean less work for her team.</p>	
10.2	<p>Directors agreed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• publish information only on the Trust website</li> <li>• retain a separate Audit committee</li> </ul>	<b>JA</b>

<b>11</b>	<b>Role of the Board in determining strategy</b>	
11.1	<p>PM summarised the focus of the last 2 terms as a huge amount of work in bringing four individual schools together into a MAT with a clear ethos, goals for the future, and a variety of procedures and policies established. The next step is for the Board to become more strategic – it needs to lead not manage.</p> <p>PM pointed out that this would require change to our meetings – agendas, issuing of papers etc.</p> <p>Possible solutions include more meetings, strategy-only agendas, more delegation to committees, expanded roles for individual directors.</p> <p>PM also referred to the RSC’s document as a potential framework to aid the Board in developing this approach – monitoring our progress against the 9 characteristics.</p>	
11.2	<p>PM expanded on his thinking including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• want to avoid a deluge of paperwork</li> <li>• need to be clear what we are trying to achieve and how to monitor this</li> <li>• define what our Outstanding and Good looks like</li> <li>• judge ourselves on impact on the children</li> <li>• budget summary at every board meeting</li> <li>• monitor KPIs covering HR, IT and other areas at each meeting – these are our ‘way markers’ to measure progress</li> </ul>	
11.3	<p>The meeting discussed this approach in depth – questions, suggestions and PM’s responses included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EW – shouldn’t Finance be monitoring the budget? <i>They look at the detail – we just need a top level summary</i></li> <li>• DP – with no HR director this would give us some capacity issues. <i>Yes I accept this – but bring proposals to the board to address this and we can then make a decision</i></li> <li>• RV / EK – we also need data and estates’ KPIs</li> <li>• DP – some will be harder to create and we will not always have termly data</li> <li>• DP – we need to ensure we focus on what does make a difference, and impacts on educational outcomes</li> <li>• RV – a dashboard approach allows us to initially start with priority areas</li> <li>• CB – limited capacity of current central team – eg premises. <i>Perfect example of what the board needs to know</i></li> <li>• DP - to implement this now we will need to stop doing some things. <i>This is where PLT is different from a single school. PM accepted that to start with there is a lot of extra work for managers – but after this you are just updating and the workload reduces significantly</i></li> <li>• DP - value of the board is in the debate and challenge. <i>Dont want us to spend 2 hours looking at KPIs either – do want time for debate / discussion</i></li> </ul>	
11.4	<p>Further discussion identified the following actions to progress this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. DP arranges a direct link up between individual directors and key staff members.</li> <li>b. Develop RAG-based monitoring system of agreed KPIs.</li> <li>c. Consider devolving more responsibility to both committee and LGB Chairs.</li> <li>d. Review CEO’s capacity (only 2 days per week) at December Board meeting.</li> </ol>	<p><b>DP</b> <b>DP/PM</b> <b>DP/PM</b> <b>PM/JA</b></p>
<b>12</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
12.1	<p>JA reported that the first joint training session for all MAT Directors and Governors will be on the new Ofsted framework. Date to be confirmed.</p>	<b>JA</b>
12.2	<p>RV asked DP why earlier in the meeting he had mentioned that many larger MATs had dropped their LGBs?</p>	

	DP explained that it was purely to illustrate that using them effectively is much harder as it requires more work – he believes they have taken the easy route by removing them. He confirmed he is not suggesting at all that PLT would ever consider this.	
12.3	PM reminded the Board that the MAT had been created because the 4 Heads had starting talking to each other about collaboration and working together. CB, SP and PT are standing down as Directors after today – so he asked that the minutes record his and the Board’s thanks for their contributions.	
	Dates of next meetings: <b>22 October - Finance 5.00</b> <b>20 November - Members 1.30</b> <b>26 November - Audit 5.00</b> <b>10 December - BOARD 5.00 @ Fowey.</b>	
	Meeting finished at 7.35	

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

### **ACTION TRACKER – updated 7.11.15**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Status</b>
Oct 15	PM	Clarify DP’s PM arrangements with Penrice LGB	
Oct 15	PM	CEO’s Performance Management	
Oct 15	PM/JA	Agenda item for December – CEO’s capacity / days per week	
Oct 15	DP/PM	Develop KPI monitoring system	
Oct 15	DP/PM	Consider devolving more responsibility to Committee / LGB	
Oct 15	DP	Individual summary sheets for each school	
Oct 15	DP	Arrange links between directors and key staff	
Oct 15	DP/EW	Budget surpluses proposal	
Oct 15	EW	Data Protection training	
Oct 15	JA	Draft Admission Arrangements circulated	
Oct 15	JA	New Directors – induction etc	
Oct 15	JA	Amend previous minutes	done
Oct 15	JA	Circulate details of Ofsted training	