



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



**Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> February 2022, following the AGM,  
in the Trust Conference Room**

<b>ATTENDING :</b> Carrie Gilmore Karen Harris Kristin Pryor Susan Reynolds		CGi KHa KPr SRe
<b>In Attendance</b> Guy Chappell [Interim Executive Lead] Sean Pinhay [CFO] Karen Teague [Trust Administrator / Clerk to Trust Board]		GCh SPi KTe
<b>APOLOGIES :</b> Donna Bryant		DBr
		<b>ACTION</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b><u>WELCOME AND DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS</u></b>	
	The Chair welcomed all those present. Under <b>Declarations of Pecuniary Interests</b> , no additional declarations were forthcoming at this time.	
<b>4.</b>	<b><u>MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING</u></b>	
	The minutes of the meeting of the Trust Board on Monday 14 <sup>th</sup> February 2022 were to be approved at the Trust Board meeting on Thursday 24 <sup>th</sup> March 2022. The minutes of the meeting of the Trust Board on Thursday 21 <sup>st</sup> October and the additional meeting of the Trust Board on Monday 31 <sup>st</sup> January had been approved at the additional meeting of the Trust Board on Monday 14 <sup>th</sup> February 2022.	
<b>5.</b>	<b><u>RATIFICATION OF FINANCE &amp; RESOURCES / STANDARDS / C-SAW COMMITTEE MINUTES</u></b>	
	The C-SAW Committee had met on 8 <sup>th</sup> February 2022, where the minutes of the meeting on 19 <sup>th</sup> April 2021 had been approved. No further meetings of the Standards Committee had taken place since the last scheduled Trust Board meeting. <b>Action: Reschedule meeting of Standards Committee postponed from 20<sup>th</sup> January 2022</b> The Finance and Resources Committee had met on 9 <sup>th</sup> December 2021, where the minutes of the meeting on 1 <sup>st</sup> July 2021 had been approved. Trustees <b>ratified</b> these minutes.	KPr
<b>6.</b>	<b><u>LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES</u></b>	
	<b>Matters Arising from LGB Meetings.</b> Not applicable on this occasion. <b>Governor Training Attendance.</b> An overview of Governor Training Attendance for the	

	<p>period September 2021 to February 2022 had been shared with Trustees prior to the meeting for their information. Upcoming training sessions for the Spring Term included Curriculum for Governors and Health and Safety for Governors.</p> <p><b>Trustee feedback from LGB Meetings.</b> Trustees were invited to talk through any pertinent feedback from recent LGB meetings.</p> <p><b>Forums / Forum Member.</b> Not applicable on this occasion.</p> <p><b>Pen Portraits of Prospective Governors.</b> The Pen Portraits of CAs [Halwin LGB], EBa [Parc Eglos], JFH [Parc Eglos LGB], JHa [Trannack LGB], RPa [Mullion Primary LGB], ARo [Trannack LGB], JSh [Grade Ruan LGB] and JWh [Mullion Primary LGB] had been <b>approved</b> by Trustees via email.</p> <p>KTe had sent / would send a letter to formally confirm these appointments.</p> <p>See also Confidential Notes SPCMAT 22 04 CON.</p>	<p>KTe</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b><u>EXECUTIVE LEADER REPORT AND UPDATES</u></b></p>	
	<p><b>Trust Statement of Intent</b></p> <p>A Trust Statement of Intent, with corresponding documentation, had been submitted to the RSC on 14<sup>th</sup> February following the meeting of the Trust Board on that evening. Members had received copies of the submission and had no further questions around it.</p> <p><b>Leadership Update</b></p> <p><b>HR.</b> See Confidential Notes SPCMAT 22 04 CON.</p> <p><b>School Improvement Strategy.</b> A draft School Improvement Strategy for the Trust had been shared with Chairs of Governors for the information of their LGBs to strengthen debate with Governors as well as Headteachers. TRi would lead the conversation around this with Headteachers.</p> <p><b>Standards Committee.</b> What had previously been produced for the Standards Committee had not been sufficiently robust so the remit of the Committee was being revised. Information would include an update and summary from the School Improvement Director, TRi, tied back with LGB reports. On the basis of this and his visits, an overview could be given that would enable triangulation. Information could be by school or around particular issues, as appropriate. Other pieces of work around the layers underneath could also be shared in order for Trustees to have a clearer understanding of the position of schools / the Trust. School improvement reports could include Key Performance Indicators, RAG ratings, quantitative data and narrative by school. This was to be discussed with TRi.</p> <p>An overview of curriculum, IT and any pertinent matters around estates could also be included.</p> <p><b>Support for Local Governing Bodies.</b> The Linked Trustee model was to be dropped. Trustees planned to reach out to Chairs of Governors from all the LGBs at an upcoming meeting - by sharing an overview of how things were developing, explaining why, fielding any questions, etc – and to show Trustees are still committed to supporting them but in a different way. Chairs could still call on them for any clarification, support and so on but in a shared capacity. The Chairs’ Network Group meetings were to be enhanced to improve communication.</p> <p><b>Membership of Committees.</b> There were still vacancies for governor representatives on the Standards and finance Committees so it was hoped more governors could be encouraged to put themselves forward for those roles.</p> <p><b>Overview of School Performance</b></p> <p>A draft overview of school performance produced by Tim Richards, Interim Primary School Improvement Director for the Trust, had been shared with Trustees prior to the meeting.</p> <p><b>Communication</b></p> <p>See SPCMATAGM/22/03.</p>	<p>GCh / KPr</p>

8.	<b><u>REASONS TO CELEBRATE AND AREAS OF CHALLENGE</u></b>	
	Covered in Item 7.	
9.	<b><u>POLICIES</u></b>	
	<p>Approval by the Trust Board was sought for the following updated and new policies, shared with Trustees prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admissions – 2023 / 2024</li> <li>• Non-Resident Parents</li> <li>• Pupil Attendance</li> <li>• Safeguarding and Child Protection</li> <li>• Self-Harm – Primary and Secondary</li> <li>• Staff Social Media</li> <li>• Whistleblowing</li> </ul> <p>Trustees <b>ratified</b> the policies / policy changes for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pupil Attendance</li> <li>• Safeguarding and Child Protection</li> <li>• Self-Harm – Primary and Secondary</li> <li>• Staff Social Media</li> <li>• Whistleblowing</li> </ul> <p><b>Admissions.</b> Trustees considered a request pertaining to the over-subscription criteria that had arisen from the consultation around this policy but decided that, as the current policy was in line with other admissions policies and the change had only been requested by one individual, the change would not be made. The version previously approved by Trustees at the October Trust Board meeting would be adopted. KTe was to ensure the parent had been thanked for their feedback.</p> <p><b>Non-Resident Parents.</b> This was to be reviewed further. KTe was to forward the policy and feedback to SRe for her consideration on behalf of the Trustees.</p>	<p>KTe</p> <p>KTe</p>
10.	<b><u>CODES OF CONDUCT FOR TRUSTEES / LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES</u></b>	
	<p><b>Code of Conduct for Trustees</b></p> <p>A copy of the proposed new Code of Conduct for Trustees had been shared with Trustees prior to the meeting. This incorporated the NGA model Code of Conduct and a section on Church Schools that had been added by the Diocese.</p> <p><b>Code of Conduct for LGBs</b></p> <p>A copy of the revised Code of Conduct for LGBs had been shared with Trustees prior to the meeting. While the NGA model Code worked for Trustees, it would have required a great deal of nuancing for the Trust’s LGBs. Therefore, the LGB Code of Conduct had been left as it was previously so it better reflected the role of the governor within the Trust but the section to cover off the Church School element had been added to it.</p> <p>There were two additional proposed changes to the SPCMAT Code of Conduct for LGBs around adhering to Trust / school policies and undertaking regular monitoring activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We agree to adhere to Trust / school policies and procedures as set out by the relevant governing documents and law.</li> <li>• We accept that not undertaking the regular monitoring activities required by the role will result in disqualification.</li> </ul> <p>Trustees <b>approved</b> and agreed to adopt the Code of Conduct for Trustees.</p> <p>Trustees <b>approved</b> the addition of the Church School element to the LGB Code of Conduct for the use of Church Schools within the Trust and the addition of the points detailed above for all schools within the Trust.</p>	

	The Codes of Conduct would be looked at again in due course as part of the wider conversations taking place around the Trust.	
<b>11.</b>	<b><u>HEALTH AND SAFETY UPDATE</u></b>	
	<p>There were no additional updates pertaining to Health and Safety concerns at this time.</p> <p>Discussion was briefly had around recent work on improving reporting by Local Governing Bodies. It was suggested Health &amp; Safety Governor reports might go to the Finance Committee / Audit subgroup so critical points could be minuted, action points set, etc. Health and Safety monitoring visits would be conducted with one of the trust's Estates Managers, with any necessary additional support from the Health and Safety representative from Cornwall Council. This would need to be driven centrally and, if this was a responsibility Local Governing Bodies were struggling to meet, an interim mechanism would need to be found. It would be helpful if Health and Safety Governors were available but, if not, monitoring visits would need to take place anyway.</p>	
<b>12.</b>	<b><u>SAFEGUARDING UPDATE</u></b>	
	<p>CGi had offered to step into the role of Safeguarding Trustee at the additional Trust Board meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022 and this had been unanimously agreed by Trustees.</p> <p>Due to a prior commitment, CGi had not been able to attend a meeting of the DSLs' Network Group on 9<sup>th</sup> February so KTe reported back on some of the matters discussed. Notes of the DSLs' Network Group meetings – along with monthly Safeguarding Updates, training opportunities and so on – would continue to be routinely shared with the safeguarding Trustee.</p> <p><b>Paired Termly DSL Visits.</b> There were still some visits to schedule and DSLs were reminded it was important these were undertaken before the end of term if they were not carried out in the Autumn term. The visits should be on site and not virtual if at all possible at this point.</p> <p><b>Low Level Concerns Policy.</b> As the Cornwall Association of Primary Heads [CAPH] did not have a model policy for Low Level Concerns, LWa had sourced other examples and put together a draft policy for the Trust. In principle, DSLs' were happy with the content of this policy and for it to be taken further so this was to be shared with the Trust's HR legal adviser before Trustee approval was sought.</p> <p><b>Ofsted Handbook Updates.</b> DSLs had been advised the Ofsted Handbook and Framework [Section 5] had been updated. Changes included paragraphs 67, 236, 252 and 315 to 317 – updated to clarify Ofsted's approach to harmful sexual behaviour so DSLs were asked to familiarise themselves with these sections.</p> <p><b>Ofsted Reports: Safeguarding.</b> Safeguarding had come out as good in every school inspection to date so DSLs had been thanked for all the hard work being done in this area across the Trust.</p> <p>Trustees were advised of one safeguarding concern that had recently been raised and were assured this was being dealt with by internal and external parties as appropriate to the nature of the concern.</p>	
<b>13.</b>	<b><u>RISK REGISTER REVIEW</u></b>	
	Covered in Item 7 and the March meeting of the Trust Board.	
<b>14.</b>	<b><u>FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS / RESOURCES</u></b>	
	<p><b>Update to Bank Signatories / Online Bank Access.</b> Due to various staff and Trustee changes, it was necessary to change a number of the bank signatories on the Trust's bank account and to change those with online bank access so the proposed changes were shared with Trustees for discussion and authorisation.</p> <p>Trustees <b>approved</b> the following:</p>	

	<p>Bank Signatories – SPi, SRe, KHa, LWa.</p> <p>Online Bank Access - SPi, MCo, SRe and KHa.</p> <p><b>Central Trust Authorities.</b> Due to various staff and Trustee changes, it was necessary to change a number of the Trust Authorities so the proposed changes were shared with Trustees for discussion and authorisation.</p> <p>Trustees <b>approved</b> the following:</p> <p>Payroll Authorisation - GCh, SPi</p> <p>Supplier Invoices [Creditors] – GCh [Certify for Payment], SPi [Orders] and MCo [Goods Received]</p>	
<p><b>15.</b></p>	<p><b><u>PAY AWARDS</u></b></p>	
	<p><b>Request for Additional Payment for Member of Leadership Team.</b> A request for a one off payment for works undertaken by a Senior Leader on behalf of another body outside of school time which was linked to mentoring across a number of schools had been received and details shared. Under the Trust’s Teacher Pay Policy [16.3], a payment of this nature had to be agreed by Trustees so their approval had been sought prior to the payment being made.</p> <p>Following a query around possible further implications, Trustees were assured this would be a lump sum payment with no implications for pension and so on.</p> <p>While Trustees were minded to approve the payment, they felt prior information from the Headteacher around hours worked, when, etc should have been shared with Trustees so SPi was to go back to the Headteacher on this matter.</p> <p><b>Action: SPi to go back to the Headteacher.</b></p> <p><b>Support Staff Price of Living Rise</b></p> <p>The support staff price of living rise was due to be applied from April 2022. Normally this was a relatively straight forward process, as the Trusts principle was to award support staff the same price of living increase as teachers received the previous September. However, in September 2021 teachers did not receive a price of living rise - in line with the national pay freeze that was in force for public sector staff. This freeze would end on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022, which coincided with the date that support staff become entitled to their annual price of living rise. So, without the teachers’ annual pay rise, there was no guide and therefore Trustees would need to consider options for support staff. A number of options were shared with Trustees for their consideration.</p> <p>Trustees were reminded one element of the rise that was already determined for them was Scale 1, which as always would be the new National Living Wage. That would be £9.50 per hour from April 2022, which equated to a 6.6% increase for that group of staff. Such a large increase also required the two/three scales above to receive a pay increase to ensure at least some differential was maintained between the lower grades.</p> <p>The options presented ranged from paying everyone the same increase as those on Scale 1 through to adjusting the bottom few grades only and applying no increase to all the other grades, plus a series of other options in between.</p> <p>Trustees were advised of some other points they should be aware of, including: the current CPI / RPI rates; the NEU pushing for a 8% settlement for their members from September 2022; the NJC (National Joint Council) advising that just the bottom few scales be adjusted now to allow for the new National Living Wage but, until an agreement / guidance nationally was agreed, all other grades remain unaltered.</p> <p>Trustees acknowledged that adhering to strict policy and awarding nothing would be hard in the current climate, and it was necessary to deal with the implications of the national living wage rise / price of living rise. Discussion was had around the various models and how percentage increases related to other public sector pay.</p> <p>Trustees proposed: a 3.5% increase across the scales; an additional bottom load for the lowest categories, with a starting point for the lowest scale at 10p more than the National Living Wage and then tapering.</p>	<p><b>SPI</b></p>

	<p><b>Action: Models to be shared for approval. Take to Finance and Resources Committee meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> March and then agree by email before next meeting of Trust Board.</b></p> <p>SPI pointed out that, in due course, it would be necessary to look at the scales just above the lower band – Scales 6, 7, 8, etc – as these had lost out most in terms of the differential.</p> <p><b><u>Q. Can we look at salaries in other MATs at a future review?</u></b></p> <p><b>A. These would not be very dissimilar but can be shared for comparison.</b></p> <p><b>Teaching Assistant Increase from Scale 2 to Scale 3</b></p> <p>Trustees are also asked to consider moving Teaching Assistants / Nursery Assistants from Scale 2 to Scale 3. This request was linked to recruitment issues, which in turn were linked to the fact that staff attracted to the Teaching Assistant role were able to secure higher paid roles in other industries. The impact of that decision financially had been included within the six price of living options shared with Trustees. Rates of pay in other industries that Teaching Assistants may be attracted to were also shared for comparison.</p> <p>Trustees agreed it would be untenable to not do this. The increase would bring the Trust more in line with other Trusts without crippling school budgets and would demonstrate to staff their contribution was valued.</p> <p>Trustees unanimously <b>approved</b> the increase from Scale 2 to Scale 3.</p>	SPI
16.	<p><b><u>PAY PROTECTION</u></b></p>	
	<p>Trustees were advised support staff went on to a new pay structure in April 2019 and, as part of the process, any staff that received a reduction to their pay received pay protection. In practice, this had meant that - until protected pay came into line with other staff on the same scale - those individuals had not received a price of living rise. As part of the process of moving to the new scales, staff were made aware that the protected element of their pay would be reviewed after three years and that anniversary was March 2022. A table was shared showing all the staff still in receipt of protected pay, the amount they currently received and how this could be impacted by the potential price of living rise in April 2022 / price of living rise from April 2022 to be agreed. It was noted that, when applicable, teachers only received protection for three years in a similar situation.</p> <p>Options to be discussed included: doing nothing; stopping protection from April 2022; stopping protection and offering those with the greatest reduction extra hours to offset loss of income, with a cut off to be agreed.</p> <p>Trustees noted there would have to be a point at which this ended and, if not now, the matter would have to be revisited in the next 12 months. While it may be necessary to justify a decision to withdraw the pay protection to a very small number of staff, this decision would be equitable in terms of the staff overall and would ensure Trustees were adhering to the Trust's protocols / procedures in this respect.</p> <p>Trustees unanimously <b>approved</b> the removal of the pay protection from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022.</p> <p><b>Action: SPI to liaise with Headteachers where staff losing significant amounts of money.</b></p>	SPI
17.	<p><b><u>APPROVAL OF ILL HEALTH RETIREMENT</u></b></p>	
	<p>SPI requested Trustees consider / approve the early ill health retirement of a member of the Trust support staff. The request followed a recommendation from Occupational Health.</p> <p>CGi stated that, in her experience, very few organisations were still doing this and sought reassurance around the following areas:</p> <p>Will the Trust need to pay a lump sum figure to up the member of staff's pension as they are going early?</p> <p>Will there be implications for future pension charges due to this decision?</p> <p>Would the member of staff be better off if they were to die in employment rather than have ill health retirement?</p>	SPI

	<b>Action: SPi to seek additional reassurances and report back to the Trust Board.</b>	<b>SPi</b>
<b>18.</b>	<b><u>SIMS LICENCES</u></b>	
	<p>It had been necessary to amend the figures previously taken to the Finance and Resources Committee for their consideration so the amended figures had been shared with Trustees prior to the meeting for their consideration.</p> <p>Trustees were advised their approval was being sought as it would be necessary to sign up for a period of three years. It was pointed out that, while a shorter term might have been preferable in some ways, systems could not be changed overnight and it would be necessary to look at this again going forward as part of a potential merger so it would be more costly to move from the current provider at the present time.</p> <p>Trustees <b>approved</b> the purchase of SIMS licences for a three year period.</p>	
<b>19.</b>	<b><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></b>	
	<p><b>Feedback from Helston Community College Headteacher Interviews</b></p> <p>Mr. Alex Lingard, currently Headteacher at Liskeard School and Community College, had been offered and had accepted the post of Headteacher at Helston Community College with effect from September 2022.</p> <p>See also Confidential Notes SPCMAT 22 04 CON.</p> <p>There were no further matters for consideration so the meeting was brought to a close at 9.40pm.</p>	
<b>20.</b>	<b><u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u></b>	
	<p>The next meeting of the Trust Board was to take place on <b>Thursday 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022</b>, from 6.00pm, in the Trust Conference Room.</p> <p>Thereafter, meetings were to take place on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> May 2022</li> <li>• Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2022</li> </ul>	

Chair's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_