



**Minutes of the Southerly Point  
Co-operative Multi-Academy Trust  
Board Meeting**



**Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2017,  
at Helston Community College.**

<p><b><u>ATTENDING :</u></b> Catherine Bird Donna Bryant Sean Davis Alan Horne Kristin Pryor Susan Reynolds Kevin Thomas</p> <p><b>In Attendance</b> David Ellis [Estates Manager] Karen Teague</p>		<p><b>CBi DBr SDa AHo KPr SRe KTh</b></p> <p><b>DEI KTe</b></p>
<p><b><u>APOLOGIES :</u></b> None.</p>		
		<b><u>ACTION</u></b>
<b>3.</b>	<b><u>WELCOME AND DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS</u></b>	
	The Chair welcomed all those present.	
<b>4.</b>	<b><u>MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING</u></b>	
	<p>One minor alteration to the minutes of the previous meeting, SPCMAT/17/01, was requested but these were otherwise agreed to be an accurate record.</p> <p><b>Hub-wide Local Governing Body [LGB] meetings.</b> These meetings had been very positive. Dates for LGB meetings for the coming year were now being made.</p> <p><b>QA forms from 175 returns.</b> Those received had been very good overall and any actions were being acted on.</p> <p><b>BACs payments.</b> The CFO was still waiting for signatories to be added but Lloyds had responded and this was now in the process.</p> <p><b>Mullion School.</b> One member of staff had left and his / her hours backfilled internally. Another staff member had reduced their hours to part time so further cost savings had been made in each of these respects. It would still be necessary to monitor spending but these were definite moves in right direction.</p> <p><b>LGB Code of Conduct.</b> This had been amended in accordance with feedback from the recent hub-wide LGB meetings. Trustees suggested the phrase ‘in a rolling year’ be added to the newly included point on attendance.</p> <p><b>Action: KTe to add ‘in a rolling year’ to the point on attendance in the LGB Code of Conduct and forward to Clerks to Governors. Final version to be added to Trust online documents.</b></p> <p>A MAT version of the governor application form had been created by KTe and forwarded to clerks to governors.</p> <p><b>Financial SoDA.</b> DBr was to follow up on the auditors’ advice on the part of the Financial SoDA relating to limits around procurement to ensure this was comprehensively covered.</p>	<p><b>KTe</b></p>

	<p><b>Action: DBr to follow up on the auditors' advice on the part of the Financial SoDA relating to limits around procurement.</b></p> <p><b>Trust Plan.</b> The Trust Plan would have to be revisited in the autumn term in light of the risk register, budget plans and results.</p> <p><b>Action: DBr to revisit the Trust Plan in the autumn term in light of the above factors.</b></p>	<p>DBr</p> <p>DBr</p>
5.	<p><b><u>Estates Report</u></b></p>	
	<p>DEI introduced himself to Trustees and outlined his previous experience / skills base. He informed Trustees that his work would have four key foci:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance – all areas of compliance for each school</li> <li>• Scheduled maintenance and repairs [including backlog maintenance]</li> <li>• Unscheduled maintenance and repairs</li> <li>• How to grow schools / develop the estate</li> </ul> <p>Priorities would include areas such as legionella testing, as this was a monthly test and a large potential risk, and any projects related to safeguarding or health and safety concerns. Having now been out into all the schools, he had a much better understanding of the picture across the MAT and had been able to gather data in preparation for the upcoming asset reports for each of the schools.</p> <p>He was also looking at financial considerations. Eg. creating 'bundles' of work in order to get better value for money and looking at how existing employees could undertake work for other schools within the MAT so that these jobs were far more cost effective.</p> <p>Trustees thanked DEI for attending and he left the meeting.</p>	
6.	<p><b><u>Finance and Budgets</u></b></p>	
	<p>Discussion was had around the yearly budgets of individual schools against the various areas of expenditure. Trustees were reminded that the report was made up of broad brush strokes, as it had been based on headteachers' April discussions with the Business Managers, so there could have been some movement on figures since its preparation. The agreed support staff changes and potential uplifts had been allowed for.</p> <p>It was noted that there had been some decreases as well as increases. There were a small number of anomalies against individual schools but, overall, the position across the MAT was healthier.</p> <p>The amount left in the conversion pot also represented an improved situation on the last budget forecast.</p> <p>Trustees asked if an overview of the payroll process could be produced for formal sign off.</p> <p><b>Action: DBr to ask Finance Team to produce an outline of the payroll process so this could be formally signed off by Trustees.</b></p>	<p>DBr</p>
7.	<p><b><u>Governance</u></b></p>	
	<p><b>TRUSTEE COMMITTEES</b></p> <p>It was agreed that committees would comprise the following Trustees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Finance and Resources</b> CBi, AHo, KTh, DBr</li> <li>• <b>Standards</b> SDa, KPr, SRe, DBr</li> </ul> <p>However, Trustees would be happy to backfill for one another where necessary.</p> <p><b>LOCAL GOVERNING BODY APPOINTMENTS AND RESIGNATIONS</b></p> <p>DBr apprised Trustees of any changes to LGBs since the previous Trust Board meeting.</p> <p><b>SECTION 128 PROVISIONS</b></p> <p>DBr outlined the requirement to undertake an additional check for those in management roles in Multi-Academy Trusts to ensure they are not prohibited under Section 128 provisions. This was being discussed with the safeguarding team at Cornwall Council, for purposes of clarification, and further details were to follow.</p>	

8.	<b><u>Standards Review</u></b>	
	<p>Trustees reviewed an analysis of Key Stage 2 data across the MAT and against local / national comparators. The overall picture was very positive, with improvements being identified in maths, reading, SPAG and writing in expected standard, greater depth or both. DBr was to go through this data more fully once greater detail had been obtained.</p> <p><b><u>Q. Can we be assured that standards are being watched and that any necessary action plans are being put in place?</u></b></p> <p><b>A. Yes. The role of the Trustee Standards Committee will be to regularly scrutinise standards and to report back to the CEO / Board on this. Hub Leaders and the CEO will be actively addressing this in their meetings with Heads</b></p> <p><b><u>Q. The biggest difference between average and expected is in writing. Is this being addressed?</u></b></p> <p><b>A. Yes. More meetings are scheduled to bench mark against all academic years to ensure schools get this right early and build on a secure foundation and trajectory.</b></p> <p><b>Action: DBr to go through the KS2 data more fully once greater detail obtained.</b></p>	DBr
9.	<b><u>CEO Report and Updates</u></b>	
	<p><b>Governor Allowances.</b> DBr outlined the proposed categories of eligible expenditure and the associated rates at which allowances would be payable. Trustees <b>approved</b> these particulars, subject to an annual summary to ensure a check was kept on claims.</p> <p><b>Policies.</b> DBr thanked Trustees for their feedback. She reported that the local union representatives were not prepared to give feedback but wanted to set up a joint consultation committee. A meeting had been arranged for 21<sup>st</sup> August 2017 to discuss the situation further. It was noted that, while unions were inevitably wary of any changes they feel might be detrimental to staff, no substantial changes in arrangements for staff had actually been made and many staff were already better off as a result of pay alignments by the MAT / increased wellbeing services for staff.</p> <p>If no significant amendments to the draft policies proved to be required, DBr was to make any minor amendments and publish the policies. These could then be in place as of September 2017 if all went well. Heads were to talk staff through policy changes in staff meetings etc to ensure all were fully informed.</p> <p>Additional policies, such as Equality, were to be done once those on HR and safeguarding were in place.</p> <p><b><u>Q. Is there a pot of money to cover Performance Management in each school?</u></b></p> <p><b>A. This should be done as part of the annual budgeting process.</b></p> <p><b>Action: DBr to check this is in place across all the MAT schools.</b></p> <p><b>Working with Unions.</b> Trustees looked at the Model Agreement for Joint Consultation and Negotiation Committees forwarded by unions as a starting point for discussion in this respect and agreed they would like to look carefully at any agreement with unions before going forward with it. Concern was raised over the Facilities Fund, as this did not appear to be fair or equitable. It was suggested it would be useful to learn how other MATs had dealt with this, in terms of any strategies developed or solutions found. They were happy for staff to be released for training or to support staff in schools and were keen to have a working relationship with unions if this did not impact negatively in any way. It was proposed that DBr explain this to the unions and discuss ways in which it might be possible to have a good working relationship without signing the model agreement or paying into the Facilities Fund. Trustees <b>approved</b> this proposal.</p> <p><b>Teachers' Pay Award.</b> Following publication of "The School Teachers' Review Body 27th Report: 2017" containing recommendations on how to apply the pay award for teachers from September 2017, there was now be a consultation period on this that would end on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2017. If accepted, this would represent a 1% pay award [2% for the minimum and maximum of the main pay range] but there would be no additional government funding for a pay increase. Schools / MATs would then be required to look at implementing these</p>	DBr

	<p>changes to the national pay framework “in accordance with their pay policies and within the funding available”. Trustees were therefore asked to consider the best way forward in respect of implementing the pay award.</p> <p><b>Q. What will this amount to overall?</b></p> <p><b>A. The Finance Team have costed this into the budget but an overall figure has not been included here.</b></p> <p><b>Action: DBr to ascertain the overall amount from the Business Managers.</b></p> <p>To ensure due consideration had been given to all factors, it was proposed that DBr ask Neopeople what other MATs, Cornwall Council and so on were talking about doing. A formal decision could then be made once a clearer view of the local / national picture had been gleaned and the award backdated accordingly. Trustees <b>approved</b> this proposal.</p> <p><b>Action: DBr to ask Neopeople what other MATs, Cornwall Council, etc were talking about doing.</b></p> <p><b>Pay Reviews.</b> Trustees acknowledged it was important to ensure consistency and due scrutiny in the review of pay awards now that all staff had a shared employer. Various suggestions as to how a system for this might look were considered and discussed. It was subsequently proposed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviews be undertaken by a Hub Council panel, in line with the SoDA. At a later date, this panel might include or be made up of Trustees so that one group of people is undertaking all reviews for the purposes of continuity.</li> <li>• Hub Leaders be asked to produce a suggested framework for the presentation of information [documentation / evidence] to the panel so that everything could go to Hub Councils in the same format. This framework could then be considered at the Heads’ Group meeting in September 2017.</li> <li>• The CEO / Hub Leaders act as moderators.</li> <li>• Allowances still be made for mitigating circumstances.</li> </ul> <p>Trustees <b>approved</b> these proposals.</p> <p>At the end of the first year, which would serve as a benchmarking exercise, Trustees would be able to determine what was or was not working. It would then be possible to gain greater standardisation through agreed criteria for future years.</p> <p><b>Action: DBr to ask Hub Leaders to produce a standard framework for the presentation of information to pay review panels.</b></p> <p>AHo left the meeting at 8.30pm.</p>	<p>DBr</p> <p>DBr</p>
10.	<b><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></b>	
	<p><b>Keskowethyans.</b> The possibility of DBr / the new CFO working with the Keskowethyans MAT through an SLA was further discussed.</p> <p><b>Trustee Recruitment.</b> KTh advised Trustees that Rev Dr Peter Johnson could potentially be able to return to the role of Trustee due to a change of circumstances and offered to approach him on this, with the approval of other Trustees. Trustees stated his educational experience would be invaluable to the Board and unanimously <b>approved</b> the proposal.</p> <p>There were no further matters to be raised at this time so KTh thanked everyone for attending and drew the meeting to a close at 8.40pm.</p>	KTh
11.	<b><u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u></b>	
	<p>The next meeting of the Trust Board will be taking place on <b>Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2017</b>, from 6.00pm, in the MAT Conference Room. Thereafter, meetings will take place on:</p> <p><b>14<sup>th</sup> December 2017</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> February 2018</b> - AGM</p> <p><b>15<sup>th</sup> March 2018</b></p> <p><b>17<sup>th</sup> May 2018</b></p> <p><b>12<sup>th</sup> July 2018</b></p>	