

Peterborough Diocese Education Trust
 Minutes of the Directors Meeting
 Tuesday 20th November 2018 at 6.00pm
 Held at the Business Exchange, Rockingham Road, Kettering, NN16 8JX

Attendees:	Margaret Holman (MH); Duncan Mills (CEO); Cathy Armstrong (CA); Greg Cracknell (GC); Gordon Temple (GT); Andrew Weatherill (AW); Peter Cantley (PC) – DDE; Kirstin Howarth (KH); Kevin Binley (JB);
In Attendance:	Ruth Walker-Green (RWG); Mike Cowland (MC); Helen Buckley (HB); Mike Behnke (Clerk – Syzygy Clerking Services);
Apologies:	

1. Opening Prayer

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MH welcomed Directors to the meeting GC led the opening prayer. 	

2. Declarations of pecuniary interest

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC and GC in relation to Item 11 (Members of the Diocesan Board of Education and relevant committees). 	

3. Apologies for absence.

Discussion	Action
There were no apologies.	

4. Any Other Business previously declared

Discussion	Action
There was none.	

5. Approval of Minutes of 18th September 2018

Discussion	Action
Amendments were recorded as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 34 – PC indicated that his question regarding other MAT cluster models should have indicated a need for some research to be done on other cluster models. Page 35 – Section 14 – Third and fourth bullet points were re-worded by RWG to provide more clarity. These now read: 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The green areas indicated that above 50% of the academies were in line with or above the national average. If more than 50% were <u>above</u> the national average, the subject was termed as <i>embedded</i>. If more than 50% of academies were <u>in line</u> with the national average, the subject was termed as <i>developing</i>. ○ End of KS1 Reading showed 42% of academies were above national average, which was a drop from last year. Maths at the end of KS2 (33% above national average) impacted on the combined figure. ● With no further amendments noted, the minutes were agreed to be a true record of the meeting and were signed by the Chair. 	
--	--

6. Matters Arising not on the action log or main agenda

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarity was required on two action points relating to SEND statement. This should go to the ESE Committee first for discussion and approval. It should then go to the Trust Board for final ratification. ● HT working towards her NPQEL would be meeting with the CEO and PC on Friday to discuss the matter further. ● Other actions were on the agenda. 	

7. CEO's Report

Discussion	Action
<p>Previously circulated. Questions were invited to the CEO:</p> <p>Q: On item 4, is there a long term solution regarding replacing the PDET Chaplain's post?</p> <p>A: I have raised this with Bishop John and it is hoped that when Members meet it can be an item for discussion.</p> <p>Q: They may be hard pressed to find someone to do it on a voluntary basis. Perhaps we could profile the role and circulate it to all the clergy in the Diocese? Maybe there is someone retiring who may wish to take it on? If not, then do we need to consider about funding the post?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It was added that maybe the Archdeacon could be approached as he might have a better grasp on clergy about to retire. <p>Q: In relation to Item 12 and the roll out of Office 365 and Group Call, do you have any more information about this?</p> <p>A: We contracted an organisation to scope what was involved in setting up 365. They are proceeding with it, but it is more complex than envisaged. There are three parts to the work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Migrating the central team to Office 365, including the Directors and Trust staff; ● Moving the academies, including governors, onto the system ● A tender specification for supporting the IT support for all of the academies, which is a big project. Stage 1 is the easiest. <p>Q: What is the complex part?</p> <p>A: Stages 2 and 3 become more complex as they involve more people. We know which academies already use 365 or other systems. The company contracted (EasiPC) has some of that information, already</p>	<p>AP1: CEO</p>

<p>being an existing provider of IT services to some PDET academies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the main drivers for this change is GDPR. The Diocese, who service PDET's ICT requirements, have been reluctant to provide additional email addresses for Directors when requested. By disengaging from their system, PDET will have control of its own ICT. • With 365, the Trust will also be able to carry monitor the SCR's in the academies, as it will have direct access. <p>Q: Does this mean that we can lose Plumsun?</p> <p>A: No, but the some of that service will not be required as we will all be using 365. Some schools have converted to Office 365. Others may ask why it is being done, some will need support to do it. The third part of the process, needs to ensure that whatever is in place, is compatible. Training will be required to ensure that everyone understands the system.</p> <p>Q: If we are with Plumsun, can we have both?</p> <p>A: Yes, but that will be unnecessary and will duplicate provisions. We want everyone eventually on Office 365.</p> <p>Q: How long will it take?</p> <p>A: Stage 1 looks straightforward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group Call situation is more frustrating. They were chosen as a means of collecting the data across the Trust. The information is taken off SIMS into the central programme and processed . • The first issue has been difficulty in engaging with some ICT providers to academies. There have been significant problems with 3 schools who are serviced by Capita. They use Capita ICTs server, resulting in a hardware issue which is still unresolved. Alongside that, the information from SIMS, expected in September is still to be resolved. Group Call has been advised to go back to basics, examine all of the connections and then pilot three schools to see if all issues can be resolved and effectively piloted. • KB offered to assist in the discussions taking place between the Trust and Group Call to help resolve the issues. He agreed to discuss this with the CEO. <p>Q: Have we paid them anything?</p> <p>A: Only the first year of the contract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 12 – Monitoring of Headteacher Performance Management is behind schedule. <p>Q: Is it the target setting or the monitoring which is behind schedule?</p> <p>A: The target setting and the review is on target; the delay is in waiting for the governors to sign the documentation and then send it to the Trust central team. The target is to have this completed by Christmas.</p> <p>Q: Is it also to do with the Head Teacher's targets for the senior and middle leaders, hence a knock on effect?</p> <p>A: No, Headteachers know their targets and have that information already.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 8 – Towcester has had an Ofsted inspection with the outcome of 'Good'. • Item 10 – PDET has offered for one its academies to pilot the new inspection framework. • Item 11 – The CEO attended a round table exercise with the Schools Commissioner and other MATs on 16th November. This looked at 	<p>AP2: KB/CEO</p>
---	-------------------------------

<p>MAT accountability. It was felt to be a useful exercise, particularly hearing of the different models used by the Trusts for local governing bodies. The issue would be picked up at the Governance Committee meetings.</p> <p>Risk Register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDET's Risk register has been taken and adapted as a template for LGBs to use, if they did not have one. Currently it is only a draft template which the CEO will expand on at his visits to head teachers in the spring. As with the Board, it will be reported back on through the LGB minutes. • GT suggested that the Ofsted outcomes be changed to 'Ofsted and SIAMS outcomes' and that there was a blank box inserted which related to academy specific issues. <p>Q: The risk level of 9 is very striking. Would it therefore be useful to profile the staffing in schools, the Senior leadership and pay scales to work out if we have a cost effective structure? It would be useful for Directors.</p> <p>A: This is only an exemplar and the colours shown are only examples. Individual academies may not have that as red. We need to be aware that academy structures and staffing vary considerably due to their size, even those with a 2 form entry. It is difficult to pull it all together into one model. When looking at academy finances, we discuss staffing and RWG is involved when discussing each academy's staffing structure. We can also have better benchmark information. This extends to the pupil/teacher ratio and the affordable pupil/teacher ratio. We want to apply this to all of the reforecasts after Christmas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Reserves policy and the increase in risk with contracts in breach of the Academies handbook need to be included in the risk register. The B&F Committee asked that this be included until it had been resolved. • In terms of the Employer Responsibilities, the CEO stated that the scoring should be changed. By error, it appeared that a risk had been mitigated and the risk increased. <p>Q: In terms of the staffing quality, when are we aware that it becomes a serious issue?</p> <p>A: The Executive had discussed this and did not feel that one case was enough to change the overall risk register.</p>	<p>AP3:RWG?</p> <p>AP4: CEO</p>
---	---------------------------------

8. RSC Review Meeting

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of the letter from the RSC were circulated and the Chair reported that that the meeting had been very positive, the team being well prepared. All of the Executive attended and showed strength in depth and a team approach. • The RSC endorsed the MAT Strategic Plan, citing PDET as one of the region's strongest and best performing Diocesan? Trusts. 	

9. Updates from Committees

Discussion	Action
------------	--------

<p>Business and Finance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met on 16th October and discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the continued poor performance of Strictly Education as a payroll provider <p>Q: Has the decision been made to move to a single bank account for the Trust?</p> <p>A: It is a preference, an aspirational objective. There are a lot of benefits which have been discussed at Committee. We want to get there, but it will take time. The team has spoken to the Norwich MAT, who are about a year ahead of us and also moving towards a centralised service. They have cluster accounts, moving eventually towards a single account. It is easier to operate but does require more staff and control at the centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new contractor had been appointed for gas and electricity (CCS), with whom the majority of academies have a contract. There was a problem with salary expenditure not being coded consistently across the Trust which leads to issues. The message to academies to get this right is constantly being reinforced. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance Verbal update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GT reported that the Governance Committee holds its first meeting on Monday 26/11/18. Its brief will be to redefine, with a fresh clarity, governance for the MAT, ensuring that there is clear communication between the LGBs, the central team and the PDET committees. 	
--	--

10. Academy Improvement Update

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This had been reported on at the ESE Committee meeting. Key points to note were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13 out of 15 academies are now judged as good following Ofsted inspections in the Trust. The 2 judged as being RI, had previous RI judgements as predecessor schools. The present position (November 2018) of the Trust academies has 21 out of the 26 being either good or outstanding. The report included a number of Ofsted quotations citing the positive role of the Trust. The report also included a summary of the Headteachers' development day in October, a successful day when Trust-wide data and key priorities were shared. An update on the situation with Groupcall Analytics and a date of 14th December set as the first trust-wide data drop. Cluster working and 'School to School' support with the identification of Improvement Champions and training sessions scheduled for their cluster academies. <p>Q: Is there funding available for the academies?</p> <p>A: The funding is built into the bid for Improvement Champions. This amounts to 3 days per school, 97 days across the trust, totalling £540.</p> <p>Q: Does it cover for when Head teachers and/or their Deputies are out?</p> <p>A: No.</p>	

11. The Diocesan SLA

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board's attention was drawn to the paper previously circulated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC in his response, stated that the paper, in his opinion, was contextually incomplete and put forward the view that it was an unnecessary recommendation for Directors to consider because the Officers did not need the Directors' permission 'to work with the Board of Education to identify services that could be provided to the MAT under the SLA'. He added that the DBE was always open to tailor the SLA to meet the Trust's needs. He went on to outline how schools use the SLA in varying degrees within each band, with the option to negotiate additional services. The CEO's paper stated that whilst recognising the benefits from subscribing to the SLA, the Trust had to be mindful of good governance and value for money of a service that would cost in excess of £20,000. The Academies Financial Handbook has made trusts aware of the need to ensure that all procurement decisions withstood public scrutiny, particularly, as in this case, of a service that is deemed as a 'related party transaction'. <p>Q: Do all of the Church schools take up the SLA? A: Yes, all are included at least at the Bronze level. Approximately 75% take up the Gold level but there is a lot of trading around it, flexibility. To get the best value, you need a bespoke model. The DBF grant to the DBE already heavily subsidises the SLA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CEO reiterated that the agreement, crossed the £20,000 threshold and as the Board wanted to be transparent, conducting its business properly, that was the reason for bringing this paper to the Board meeting for a full discussion. He would like to see an agreement that is bespoke to the MAT, clearly outlining what the Trust was receiving, what it was paying and who was accountable for each part. He added that this was not just a business transaction, but a partnership with everyone working together to ensure that all the academies maintained and developed the Church School ethos and could be at least, SIAMS 'Good'. KH added that the SLA had been discussed at the Head Teachers' meeting where concerns were raised about the need to raise the 5%, what was needed in schools and the need to know how to get the best value for money. It was felt that the SIAMS training and related work was valuable, but there was also a feeling that academies were paying for things duplicated by PDET. There was a need to have a better streamlined service with fewer priorities and without provisions being paid for that were not required. The issue of governor training was brought up. Not all governors were taking up what was being offered due to time constraints. HB reported that the NGA online service (Learning Link), was being introduced to governors, where they could access training in their own time. Training currently took up a number of forms, some being delivered by HB, some online and some through the Diocese, HB also being involved 	

<p>with the latter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a feeling that the pricing and services did not match up and these needed to be redefined. This could include some discretionary spend. • HB stated that currently, work was taking place on a model SLA for the Trust, eventually aiming to have all SLAs on the same footing, ensuring greater consistency. • MC informed the Board that from April 2019, there would be a new ruling in place, requiring all Trusts to obtain consent for all related party transactions over £20,000. • Following a full discussion, it was left for the CEO and DDE to meet in order to progress an SLA, as outlined in the recommendation. 	AP5: CEO
---	-----------------

12. Scheme of Delegation

Discussion	Action
HB briefly reported on the Scheme of Delegation for the committees and the LGBs. She reiterated the need for transparency and where responsibility lay. This would be part of the work of the new Governance Committee.	

13. Safeguarding

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some adjustments need to be carried out to the Single Central Records (SCR) following the latest Keeping Children Safe in Education documentation. As Lesley Pollard is currently overstretched, a new resource has been found to carry out those checks and a report will come back to the board in due course. <p>Q: When we get the new changes, will you be sending those out? A: There will be a briefing note about the changes and a new model document to cover it.</p>	AP6: HB

14. Any Other Business

Discussion	Action
There was no other business.	

15. Date of next meeting

Tuesday	18 th December 2018	18.00	Kettering Business Exchange
---------	--------------------------------	-------	-----------------------------

With no further business, the non-confidential meeting concluded at 7.35pm.

Chair Signature for approval of minutes: _____

Date: _____