

Peterborough Diocese Education Trust
 Minutes of the Directors Meeting
 Tuesday 19th March 2019 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); Peter Cantley (PC) – DDE; Kirstin Howarth (KH); Kevin Binley (KB); Ruth Walker-Green (RWG);
In Attendance:	Mike Behnke (Clerk – Syzygy Clerking Services).
Apologies:	Andrew Weatherill (AW); Mike Cowland (MC); Helen Buckley (HB);

1. Opening Prayer

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GC had led the opening prayer prior to this meeting. 	

2. Declarations of pecuniary interest

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None declared. 	

3. Apologies for absence

Discussion	Action
As noted above.	

4. Any Other Business previously declared

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Register of Interests Policy SEND Policy 	

5. Approval of Minutes of 22nd January 2019

Discussion	Action
Amendments were recorded as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 57 – SPB should read SPP. Page 58 – Last bullet point – amend ‘classification’ to ‘identification’. 	

6. Action Log

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This had been amended to reflect the actions carried out. Points to note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA is attending catering provider monitoring meetings. GDPR training for Directors – Use of Spongy Elephant on the agenda of the meeting. Scheme of Delegation – on the agenda of the meeting. Review of Governance – on the agenda of the meeting. Safeguarding Training for Directors – This is likely to be in May, once a review of the approach to Safeguarding has been completed. PDET Chaplain post – No candidates have been identified. Archdeacon Richard recommends that this is raised with Bishop John on his return from sabbatical. Relationship between DSCs and AIOs – the matter is progressing. Arrangements have been made by PC for DM to attend the DDE's meetings with the DSCs. 	

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

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A previous action was omitted from Action Log: 'Officers should find an example of a MAT with an LGB structure which moved to a hub structure and report back with lessons learned by the MAT'. GT agreed to cover this in his Governance report. Memorandum of Understanding between the DDE and PDET – an amended version was presented to PC by DM. PC has asked for three clauses to be considered for inclusion. DM to consider and revise the draft MoU and bring to the Board meeting in May. <p><i>Q: The previous minutes identified the issue of variances in the Management Accounts relating to SLT salaries. Some of this was due to wrong coding. When will we have an established financial picture to consider?</i></p> <p><i>A: MC will bring a response to the next meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of Committee minutes being presented to this meeting was discussed. Some of these are confidential and there was a discussion about how they should be dealt with. The Chair and CEO will discuss and bring a proposal to the next meeting for roll out in the 2019-20 academic year. It was agreed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the meantime, Committee minutes would continue to be reported to the Board via verbal and summarised written reports. When Office 365 was functional and online, Committee minutes would be posted there for all Directors to view. 	<p>AP1: CEO</p> <p>AP2: MC</p> <p>AP3: CEO/Chair</p>

--	--

8. CEO's Report (Including Risk Register)

Discussion	Action
<p>Three papers had been circulated prior to this meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEO's report • The Risk Register • Report on the Christian distinctiveness that has been part of the CEO's visits to academies. <p>CEO Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 6: The SLA had been discussed with PC and agreement had been reached on the cost. It was going to the DBE meeting on 20/03/19 for further discussion and approval (or revision if required). • Item 10: Key Facts – Sports Funding has not been included in this report but will come to a future meeting. • Pupil Premium details have been included under Key Facts, indicating total funding received to the Trust, of £1,119,020, covering 753 pupils. • The total number of pupils in Trust academies exceeded 5,000 with 910 PDET employees. <p>Risk Register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The financial aspects would be discussed under the B&F committee report. <p>CEO Academy Visits:</p> <p><i>Q: The HTs of Milton and Barby: have they had, or will they have, exit interviews?</i></p> <p><i>A: Yes, DM and GT will be piloting a new template. DM will conduct the interview for Milton and GT at Barby.</i></p> <p><i>Q: Are the arrangements for the HT and DHT from Trinity supporting Barby agreed?</i></p> <p><i>A: There were questions from the Trinity governors, who only joined the Trust in February. However, they had previously discussed an Executive HT arrangement for their school. The Executive of the Trust believe it is a good option that will enable necessary school improvement to be driven forward at Barby. The Barby Chair would have preferred to be advertising a F/T replacement. DM has a meeting with her on Friday 22nd March to discuss this.</i></p> <p><i>Q: The Schemes of Delegation: where does the responsibility lie with regards to Pupil Premium?</i></p> <p><i>A: With the HT's and LGB's, monitored by the AIO's.</i></p> <p><i>Q: How is KS2 Maths performance and school improvement work progressing?</i></p> <p><i>A: Maths training for subject leaders and teachers of all year groups has been carried out with good feedback. Repeated sessions were delivered in Oundle (north) and Northampton (south) for ease of access. Maths consultancy is taking place, but there will not be any short term impact on the data. It will take time, although the short term feedback is positive.</i></p>	<p>AP4: CEO</p>

<p>Q: Under the Funding and Liabilities section in the Risk Register, are we developing a policy on marketing and SLT salary ranges?</p> <p>A: The best marketing is excellent outcomes and Ofsted success. Cottingham and Pytchley are oversubscribed, whilst a number of other academies are seeing the impact of falling numbers of primary aged children. These two academies have been judged 'good' by Ofsted. Collingtree still carries an inadequate judgement, but we judge it better than this. However, parents will use the information they have access to. Individual academies do also use social media. With regard to HT salaries, the Trust has inherited an array of salaries of HTs, originating from pre academy conversion. They do not all fit into appropriate salary ranges. We have to let them work their way through the system. New appointments are made to an appropriate salary range.</p> <p>Q: With regards to marketing, PDET has developed a strong brand. Can this be used to assist marketing?</p> <p>A: We ensure that good news is published on Twitter and on the PDET website. Today for example, 3 HTs went to Northampton University to a recruitment event for NQTs. We had a stand there which was well supported and we have tweeted pictures of that. When there are so many academies spread across a large area, much depends on how well the individual academy can market itself. PDET is a strong brand which will help. In an ideal world, we would have a marketing person, however this is not possible due to budget limitations.</p> <p>Q: What about the apprenticeship levy?</p> <p>A: This can only be used that for training, not salaries. We are currently using it for a member of our Finance team.</p>	
---	--

9. The Role of Directors in the new Ofsted framework

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This paper has been prompted by questions raised by PC and lessons from the pilot inspection at Braunston. <p>Q: Will the inspectors look at Board minutes?</p> <p>A: The HMI leading the recent pilot wanted evidence of where the Trust was supporting and challenging the academy. We can show in the ESE minutes how we have discussed academies in depth. Braunston is one of our stronger academies. We often focus on the academies where there are concerns in discussions at Trust and committee level. We need to be more conscious of including discussion on all of our academies. We do of course consider a summary sheet of all of the schools under the confidential items.</p> <p>Q: We have experience from another small Trust where Ofsted pulled in one Director and asked questions about performance related data. Could this happen to PDET?</p> <p>A: Whilst the draft Ofsted handbook leaves open the possibility that any Director could be asked questions, PDET will delegate this responsibility to the Director of Learning and Achievement.</p> <p>Q: What would happen if we had an inspection at short notice?</p>	

A: The AIOs and RWG would be involved. It will usually be both, or one or the other in exceptional circumstances.

10. Academy Improvement update report

Discussion	Action
<p>Trustwide details of attendances and exclusions had been circulated.</p> <p>Exclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The previous years had been looked at by the ESE committee. • The data clearly shows the impact one academy can have and is itemised separately. One of those children has now had a permanent exclusion. • The data can now allow the Board to look at the trends. A clear difference was seen between boys and girls with few girls being excluded. All three of the boys excluded at one academy were Pupil Premium. We can now also more easily identify any pupils that are SEND. • This data is new to the Trust and can inform us going forward as to why children are being excluded. Some children have complex high needs. • This week, two schools are being advised about possible permanent exclusions that we obviously wish to avoid. The matters are complex and the level of challenge being faced by academies is increasing. • HT's do not permanently exclude without talking first to PDET. It is not something that is done lightly. One academy (St James) has provision for children who have been permanently excluded or at risk of exclusion from other schools so the Trust has experience in this area. • There has been an exclusion at one of our academies involving a LAC child who has been excluded from alternative provision. There is one child who has 2:1 supervision and PDET is waiting for a discussion about alternative provision. HT's are working hard to prevent exclusions, however in the current budgetary climate numbers are expected to increase. <p>Q: Can you reference a percentage against the national figures? A: It is difficult to get hold of national figures for exclusion. There are no DfE releases, but we will continue to see if we can get hold of the data.</p> <p>Attendance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only two terms from last year are available to view. • PDET is in line with national data. • PP data was thought to be low until compared with national PP attendance data, but, although needing to improve, is better than the national picture. • SEN attendance is in line with national, but SEN children with an EHC Plan are lower than national. <p>December data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes – Writing outcomes are presently low as shown by December data. However, it is expected that outcomes will rise throughout the year. Academies need to moderate over 6-8 genres over a range of pieces and they do not have that assessment data by 	

<p>December.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on disadvantaged pupils' outcomes, compared to non-disadvantaged, is available in the appendix. The PP Director's report explains measures presently being taken. <p>Q: Are all academies now included?</p> <p>A: We are missing data for Silverstone and Spratton in addition to the new academies, Blakesley, Trinity and Oundle. The picture is expected to improve once these academies' data is included.</p> <p>Q: Will this report go to all HT's?</p> <p>A: No. They have access to GroupCall, but not this summary. We would talk to them rather than send this detail out.</p>	
---	--

11. Pupil Premium Director report

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report from the February visit had been circulated. The statement at the bottom of Page 1 about the amount of RWG's time that was spent on installation of Groupcall was strong, but an accurate reflection of the situation. GroupCall is now installed and things are on the right track. The AIO reporting had also been looked at during the PP review meeting and was very detailed. <p>Q: On the second page, you state under Section3 that only 2/11 PP pupils are targeted to reach the expected standard?</p> <p>A: Yes, this was only an example of one academy and the targets were reset by the AIO.</p> <p>Q: In the section about the Towcester inspection and PP, you mention in the last sentence the need to 'consider the accountability structure as part of the Governance review'?</p> <p>A: That statement came as a result of a comment from the inspectors that it is ultimately the Trust's responsibility. These kinds of accountability are being included in the review of Governance, which is not yet complete.</p>	

12. Safeguarding Report and update

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report tabled for information. There were no questions from Directors. 	

13. Committee Reports

Discussion	Action
<p>Governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work on the Scheme of Delegation (SoD) at Board level was progressing. It had radically changed and was not quite ready yet. 	

- Two policies, Complaints and Register of Business Interests have been considered by the Governance Committee. They were both considered satisfactory and are recommended for approval.
- A copy of the Business Interests Policy was circulated to the Board for taking away and commenting on back to HB.
- The SoD documents will be circulated as soon as possible, once they have been finalised as a complete package.
- GT reported that the review of the Local Governance Model is a large undertaking. To that end, a consultation event had been held with HTs and Chairs to begin the journey

An open exercise was held on 'what is governance' and looked at the strengths and weaknesses of the current model.

- A group exercise was held (3 groups) looking at where they felt responsibilities lay between 'central' and local governance. This was consolidated into a table with 80 items. The results of this have now gone to the Governance Committee for their views.
- As a result of this and discussions, the Committee was starting to form some clear opinions, boundaries and components.
- Examples from 9 other MAT's, e.g. Lincolnshire, were looked at online.
- In total, there 738 Trusts nationally, 13 of them having 26 plus schools. Some of these have marginalised local governance, referring to groups as Advisory Councils.
- Maxine Ward, a governance expert, attended the meeting and provided some insight into how other MATs were operating.
- The challenge now was for GT and the Committee to distil that information down, pull everything together and identify what can be done locally and what is better done centrally.
- It was recognised that we have many committed and skilled people in local governance and they need to be supported.
- Other MATs are going through this same process. Each is different due to size, geography and ethos and therefore it is difficult to find someone identical.
- The scope of governance has been reduced locally, there is no need for large LGBs and multiple layers of committees. The size of an ideal LGB was discussed, the Committee currently favouring 6 members.
- In a separate matter, it was reported that a governor at Ryhall, whose term of office had ended, was questioning the need to sign the paperwork required for a new term of office. **This was discussed and it was agreed that there was a process in place for a reason, which had to be adhered to.**

ESE:

- Much of what was debated at the ESE Committee had already been covered earlier in this meeting, Information on individual schools and those causing concern would be covered in the confidential part of the meeting.
- Hilary Spenceley had reviewed the draft SEND Policy. Her comments had gone to GT, as SEND Director.
- The Board needed to see the final copy of the policy before ratifying it. It was agreed that RWG would circulate it to members via email for completion by 25/03/19.

AP6:
RWG/All

<p>B&F:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A written summary had been provided by KB. Areas covered were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review and approval of the projected overspend in the central school improvement budget. The Committee were not happy with the variances in the budget reforecasts. Since then, DM and MC have been meeting with academies to discuss the reasons for the variances in the reforecasts. There will be an additional meeting to receive feedback ahead of the next B&F Committee on 16/04/19. Three tenders had been received for project managing the capital works which had been identified following the site condition survey. These tenders had been looked at by CA and MC, with a preferred company being selected. <p>Q: Why is there so much salary overspend shown on the budget variances?</p> <p>A: It is different to each school. The concern was covered in the discussions with the academies by DM and MC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KH reported that she and her SBM did not recognise the figures presented for her school. Further meetings with other academies had drawn explanations and raised a number of issues. An additional meeting of the Business and Finance Committee will consider these. It was noted that it was not just the level of overspend that was concerning, but also some academies not understanding the level and status of carry forwards. The Reserves Policy is clearly not fully understood by all. There is a need for clearer messages about the levels of in year budgets and support for managing within them. Overspends will need to be approved by the Business and Finance Committee going forward. The Board asked that future budget re-forecasts came with a clear explanatory narrative. It is acknowledged that schools funding is presenting a growing challenge. Costs were rising, (for example pension costs), and income was remaining static at best. The demographics had changed and the Primary School population was falling. Some schools were therefore, going to have to address some difficult issues and the Executive would need to support them in doing so. 	<p>AP7: CEO</p> <p>AP8: MC</p>
--	--

14. Any Other Business

Discussion	Action
There was no other business. The previously declared AOB was covered under the above agenda items.	

15. Dates of next meetings

Tuesday	21 st May 2019	18.00	Kettering Business Exchange
Tuesday	23 rd July 2019	18.00	Kettering Business Exchange
Tuesday	17 th September 2019	18.00	Kettering Business Exchange
Tuesday	19 th November 2019	18.00	Kettering Business Exchange

With no further business, the Chair brought the non-confidential meeting to a conclusion at 7.28pm.

Chair Signature for approval of minutes: _____

Date: _____