

Peterborough Diocese Education Trust
 Minutes of the Directors Meeting
 Tuesday 22nd May 2018 at 6.00pm
 Held at the Business Exchange, Rockingham Road, Kettering, NN16 8JX

Welcome and Opening Prayer

- The Chair welcomed Directors to the meeting and in particular, welcomed Gordon Temple (GT), Chair of Welford, Sibbertoft and Sulby Endowed School and Mike Behnke (Clerk) to their first meeting.
- GC led the opening prayer.

1. Apologies for absence & declarations of interest

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Attendees: | John Herrick (Chair); Duncan Mills (CEO); Cathy Armstrong (CA); Greg Cracknell (GC); Gordon Temple (GT); Kevin Binley (JB); Andrew Weatherill (AW); Mike Cowland (MC); Peter Cantley (PC) – DDE. |
| In Attendance: | Kirstin Howarth (KH) – Executive Headteacher representative from Isham; Ruth Walker-Green (RWG); Mike Behnke (Clerk); |
| Apologies: | Helen Buckley (HB); Margaret Holman (MH). |

2. Approval of Minutes of 20th March 2018 and Matters Arising

| Discussion | Action |
|---|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes from the previous meeting on 20th March 2018 were approved. • The Action Log has been updated to reflect those actions completed and those carried over. Further updates will be provided at the meeting under the appropriate agenda items. | |

3. CEO's Report

| Discussion | Action |
|---|-----------------|
| <p>The report had been previously circulated. The key points to note were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Management process for Central Team staff had started. • PDET had initiated a networking meeting with other Diocese MATs on 3rd May. As Ofsted MAT inspections were taking place, PDET were keen to get feedback from others as well as use the opportunity to share good practise and ideas. Three MATs attended with others having been invited but unable to make the date. • The Academies Show (25/04/18), held twice a year in London and Birmingham, was attended with Sir David Carter, the School Commissioner as the main speaker. A number of workshops were attended as listed in the report. Documents will be forwarded to Directors if required. • The Central Team is compiling folders on a range of areas to provide | AP1: CEO |

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>evidence in preparation for Ofsted inspecting the MAT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following the Chair’s audit of all of PDET school websites, to ensure they are compliant he stated that it was key for websites to be up to date as they are used by parents, prospective parents, Ofsted inspectors and were a marketing tool for PDET. • The PDET website is being revamped. • The CEO has visited all of the schools and met with the Chairs. A 2nd round of visits is now being conducted to meet with the HTs and to discuss and understand, both their and PDETs priorities. • Two new appointments are being made to the Central Team. Erica Holt was interviewed and appointed as an Academy Improvement Officer/Headteacher to support academies when required. She will start in September. • Applications for the 2nd post which will support Helen and Mel with admissions, governance, HR and act as the Data Protection Officer (DPO) have now closed and interviews will be held shortly. • The Trust has established regular contact with the RSC and has asked for a meeting in June/July to present the Strategic Plan 2018 -2021. • A Trust wide Improvement Plan will be presented to Directors at the July meeting. • Awaiting decision from the RSCs office on the proposed Easton Garford school closure. <p>Q: Regarding the MAT networking meeting, are there any MATs making overtures to work across borders?</p> <p>A: St Albans referred to 1 school in Northants. They are a smaller MAT but cover a large area. The meeting was useful to share information and although they couldn’t attend, Norwich were keen to be involved, being a similar sized MAT having just undergone an inspection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KH mentioned that the HTs meeting had been well received and that HTs now felt they had a voice and were moving forward together. | <p>AP2:CEO</p> |
|---|-----------------------|

4. Approval of the Strategic Plan and Trust evaluation

| Discussion | Action |
|--|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEO reported that a workshop for Directors had been held in April to review the previous plan. The evaluation document and a draft of the new plan had been shared. • Requests for changes had been accommodated in this new draft. It had also been shared with HTs at their Development Day. • It consists of a cord of 3 strands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Academy improvement and effectiveness ○ Good governance ○ Sound financial management. • Once approved by Directors, the plan will be circulated to schools and LGBs have been asked to discuss it at their first available meeting. Some have requested for Central Team members to present it. • Directors commented that the chart on page 5 (Item 7) looked good, showing the progress made, since Ofsted judgements on conversion. It was noted that 1 more school needed to be added which has recently | |

moved from Requires Improvement to Good. Two schools joined the Trust with an Outstanding judgment prior to conversion.

- **Directors unanimously approved the Strategic Plan 2018-2021.**
- The Trust Evaluation plan (PDET Self-Assessment April 2018) hasn't been shared with HTs. It will be for Directors use and will form part of the evidence for Ofsted. Its purpose is to take an honest view on where the Trust is. The areas identified have largely been developed from Sir David Carter's guidance.
- The evidence column shows where the Trust thinks it is, in relation to the Strategic Plan and vision. This will lead to the MAT Improvement Plan. Some of the wording has been changed since the April meeting.
- The Chair highlighted some issues regarding use of terminology which may be familiar to Directors, but not to others outside e.g. use of 'Academy Principals' and not HTs, use of 'School to School' support, Academy instead of school, terms that were interchangeable.

Q: In the PDET Self-Assessment, under B2, what does the sentence, "the SIP having been shared with Directors." mean?

A: This relates to the MAT improvement plan. However, the Self-Assessment reads 'School Improvement Plan' when it should read 'MAT improvement plan'. This will be shared with, and discussed by, Directors and be evidence that they are engaged in the strategy for improving standards.

Q: Are academies evaluated in terms of the Strategic Direction of the MAT?

A: The MAT Improvement Plan is structured in keeping with advice from Sir David Carter about what good MATs should be doing. This is also reflected in strategic objectives in the Strategic Plan. The academies will be expected to relate their own plans to these, as appropriate. The plans are being shared with the LGB's and Heads will have a trust-wide target in their Performance Management.

• The CEO stated that PDET didn't want the plan to be a document that is written, shared and then forgotten. It needs to be referred to throughout the three years of its life and reviewed at least annually. The self-assessment document reflects where PDET considers itself to currently be placed against the vision and aims. Some areas of the previous plan have been changed, for example, the reference to the well-being of students has been included.

Q: Has consideration been given to how the MAT will change and how will this be identified, if the strategy is successfully delivered?

A: This is about the vision and direction. It also relates to the quality of what is delivered. It depends on the LGB's understanding what they are working to and also a changed mind-set. We need to see academies considering 'our Trust' and not just 'our school'.

Q: From now, will everything relate to the Strategic Plan?

A: Yes. At the next HT's day, we will refer to and discuss a target / objective for Headteachers that ties in with the plan.

5. Finance Matters

| Discussion | Action |
|---|--|
| <p>MC updated Directors on progress in a number of areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insurance: Following the decision by the Business and Finance Committee in April, PDET has opted into the government's Risk Protection Arrangements (RPA) plus a small number of commercial add ons that were recommended by Arthur J Gallagher (the previous insurers). This will save the Trust, approximately £20,000 over the next 12 months. • Site Condition surveys: Following a tender process preceding the decision by the April Business and Finance committee, PDET appointed John Burke Associates to carry out site condition and statutory non-compliance surveys on the converted schools. The initiation meeting has been completed and academies are now being contacted to arrange the visits. A single surveyor is to be used across all the academies to ensure consistency across the trust wide priority plan. All visits are expected to be completed by September 2018. • Catering Contract: Directors were reminded that PDET was working with the Litmus Partnership to conduct an OJEU compliant tender process for a 3 year contract worth approximately £3,000,000. Interested parties have been shortlisted down to 5 and the academy visits are complete. Proposals are now being developed by the parties who will then be shortlisted further and invited to a bidders' day at Bouverie Court on 28th June. All academies involved in the contract are invited to send 1 representative to the day. The decision will need to be taken soon after the 28th and before the next Directors meeting in July. Therefore, any Directors interested in attending the Bidders day were asked to let MC know. • Asbestos Management Assurance Process (AMAP): All academies have now completed the ESFA self-assessment. As PDET is the Responsible Body, MC is following up with those who appear to be partially compliant to ensure they are fully compliant before the submission date of 15th June. • Budget Forecast Return Outturn (BFRO): The finance team has worked hard to ensure that the deadline date for submission was met. This is a crucial report and if not submitted on time, can result in PDET being listed by the DfE as a MAT that has not complied with their financial obligations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The target dates in the Finance Action plan have been updated. • The aim is for the mid-year mini report, (outcome is awaited) to indicate that the Trust is in a better position than this time last year. <p>Q: Are target dates being achieved? A: There has been some slippage and the revised dates are shown in the report. The mid-year audit took place on time.</p> <p>Q: Is everything reconciled back to April? A: Not yet.</p> <p>Q: Are there any concerns about inflation? A: No.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">AP3: ALL</p> |

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Q: What's the scope of the asbestos issue? A: There is a DfE document that outlines what is required to be compliant. It is a checklist questions and every school has to do it. The consolidated report then goes to the DfE.</p> <p>Q: Overall, have the issues reduced in comparison with last year? A: We are in a better position than we were before. The end of year audit started earlier to be able to identify any issues sooner. The finance team has worked hard but as yet, we haven't seen the final report.</p> <p>Q: Were there issues with getting information back from the academies? A: Yes, but we are now getting this and it is more accurate. Training with the Central Team and bursars has been good and has helped.</p> <p>Q: Are the error rates typical of schools finance, or worse because of the conversion to academies? A: We are asking bursars to do things that they haven't done before. There is an increased level of accounting and there is work to do to develop the role of the bursar.</p> <p>Q: Are all of the reports from all of the schools checked each month? A: No, due to staff absence this has not been possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accounts: - the detail shows 2 areas in red relating to specific schools which, due to pupil numbers. This is leading to challenging budgets <p>Q: Can you indicate the relative scale of the schools? There is nothing to indicate pupil numbers in relation to the deficit. A: Future reports will include an additional column next time showing pupil numbers to help put the figures into context.</p> <p>Q: Can you explain the figures for St James? A:-The school has invested a lot in energy lighting, play equipment etc.</p> <p>MC was thanked for his report.</p> | <p>AP4: MC</p> |
|--|-----------------------|

6. School Effectiveness Matters

| Discussion | Action |
|--|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESE Committee: - GC fed back to Directors on that morning's ESE Committee meeting. Matters covered included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A look at the schools causing concern (confidential) and overall, the committee were pleased with the actions being undertaken ○ View of the recent Ofsted reports which included 3 'good' ratings | |

and 1'requiring improvement'.

- Discussed the revised RE syllabus and noted that Lesley Pollard had expressed concerns about it. RWG was asked to follow this up with her and report back to the Committee.
- Discussed the DSC visits to PDET schools.
- **SEND/Pupil Premium/LAC:** - RWG reported that there was a need for a more consistent approach for these groups across PDET. There was no MAT overview on those children's performance nor how much funding as a whole, was being received. The new Trust wide data system being proposed will address those issues.

Q: Longer term, will data sharing be effectively underpinned by shared curriculum and assessment models to provide data that can be easily compared?

A: We don't wish to dictate the curriculum to academies, although they all follow the national curriculum. In terms of assessments, we have had meetings with the HTs at the Development Day to discuss standardised tests which are more reliable. This will provide us with the summative data which we need, the teacher assessments can still happen, but they are not used for the summative data.

Q: What are the timescales for introducing the new system?

A: We hope that Directors will agree tonight for us to appoint Groupcall Analytics who we feel provide the best solution to enable us to extract the information we would require. The timescales involve a 2 stage process – the summer will see us have the statutory data returns including Behaviour and Attendance from SIMS, then Phase 2 will be in December when we will have the first data drop from the standardised tests.

- **HTs Development Day:** - MC led a session on Central Services, an analysis of the responses were attached. HTs had the opportunity to say what their priorities were and what else they'd like included in the 5% as part of the management charge. The 2nd paper provided a background of Groupcall Analytics, together with a cost breakdown of the service they provide. Schools have been asked if they currently use MS Office 365. It is hoped to eventually move all schools onto that system. Directors will in future have a PDET email address with information being stored in the Cloud. Currently, £100,000 is spent across the Trust on SIMS and other alternatives were being explored.

Q: Are you looking at bespoke developments?

A Yes

Q: Is there a challenge on HTs and staff to collect and provide additional data?

A: We have talked about it with the introduction of standardised tests There is an issue about workload that we need to look at.

- All schools use SIMS and PDET has talked to alternative providers but would need to drop SIMS and buy their complete packages which would be a risk, requiring a major change to the system.
- PDET has spoken to GCA who are able to pull information from any

system, just need to define the outputs required.

Q: Will it provide what is required and what is the cost?

A: We have £60,000 from the RSC to implement it. Costed out, it will enable Office 365 and provide cover for 3 years. We will look at the savings after that period.

- It was felt that this system seemed to be the only one that provided the results needed by PDET and the schools. In terms of a target date, there will be periodic tests at regular intervals to give a Trust wide picture and it makes sense to introduce this for the new academic year in September.

Q: Did you have a face to face meeting with Scholarpack?

A: Yes, they are proud of their management system and have tied teacher assessments to it. All the systems we have looked at have had their strengths but can't deliver. Group Call Analytics, have educationalists behind their set up and have the inside knowledge that others don't in terms of primary school data.

- RWG added that she had seen the system in use in 1 school and felt that all the necessary research had been done.

Q: Have you looked at the impact on staff? Have HTs bought into it?

A: They have bought into the fact that a Trust wide system is needed with cold hard data. It won't generate more work and is needed for the longer term.

Q: Is it a 3 year contract?

A: Yes, however it doesn't stop us moving from SIMS for management information.

Q: Is there an additional cost for this?

A: Yes, but there is a 25% reduction if we use PIRA tests.

Q: How will it be rolled out to schools?

A: All Academies will be involved in Phase 1 in the summer and then Phase 2 in December.

Q: One of the key issues has been that not all governors are au fait with the data. Will this help them?

A: Yes Governor involvement in the process is key and this system will help them understand better, the way in which the data is collected and used.

- With no further questions, **Directors voted and unanimously agreed to purchase the Groupcall Analytics system.**

7. Governance Matters

| Discussion | Action |
|---|--------|
| <p>HB had given her apologies for this meeting. However, an update had been provided that the CEO gave verbally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An external review of PDET governance and the scheme of delegation had taken place • Clerks training and briefing session for PDET schools had taken place. | |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support provided for LGBs prior to Ofsted, one in particular, required intensive support. • Admissions and Appeals training for governors had taken place. • A revised Scheme of Delegation will be brought to the Director's September meeting. | AP5: HB |
|--|----------------|

8. GDPR

| Discussion | Action |
|--|--------|
| <p>DM reported that the Central Team had been working on this since January with our solicitors Stone King, using DfE available guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two options were identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To contract out, at an annual cost of approx. £600 or ○ To do the work in house. • The latter option was preferred and therefore, all schools have been audited and a high level map created. • A DPO will be appointed (reported earlier in the meeting) with an interim person in post until the appointment is made. • The central team have shared all of the guidance on the new policies with HTs • Privacy notices have been provided to schools for issuing to all parents and staff. • There is a new data collection sheet. • There is information on the website on PDET's role as the Data Controller. • A list of suppliers has been created. Stone King will develop a contract variation to send to all providers. • Not everything has been completed, yet but good progress is being made. | |

9. Risk Register

| Discussion | Action |
|---|--------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy had been circulated with the papers for this meeting. • DM explained that the right hand column. • Changes to the level of risk were discussed. These were all related to pupil numbers. <p><i>Q: In the summary of control procedures, have you thought about the marketing of PDET and the benefit to schools? It's a strong brand.</i> <i>A: Two working groups of HT's has been held. These have discussed how we market all the good things PDET is achieving.</i></p> | |

10. Membership of the Board of Directors

| Discussion | Action |
|--|--------|
| <p>The Chair reminded Directors about the membership process of PDET:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directors were appointed by the Members. | |

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members have recently had concerns about the balance of Executive and non-Executive members on the Board. • From mid-April, 4 Directors came to the end of their 4 year of office: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Margaret Holman (MH) ○ Helen Buckley (HB) ○ Mike Cowland (MC) ○ The Chair (JH) • Members felt that this was an appropriate time to move towards a Board of non-Executive members. It has therefore been agreed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MC would cease to be a Director but could continue to come to meetings in his capacity-as Director of Business and Finance ○ HB. It was felt that HB’s legal experience continues to be required and has therefore been invited to extend her term of office for a further year, which she has accepted. ○ MH indicated she was happy to continue and Members approved this appointment. ○ The Chair has decided to take this opportunity to step down from his role as Chair and as a Director but has agreed to stay until 31/08/18 to enable a smooth handover to the new chair. Therefore, the July Board meeting will appoint a new chair. ○ The Clerk to now seek nominations for a new Chair via email from the members of the Board. These will need to be received two weeks prior to the next Board meeting in July. <p>Q: Will officers in an ex-officio capacity, be invited to future meetings? A: That is the intention but the new Chair may have a view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM responded to the Chair’s announcement, thanking him for the work he had put into the foundation of an Academy Trust of now, over 26 schools. He had led that development and all of the detail which underpinned it. In addition, he had provided help to DM for quickly settling in as the new CEO. | AP6: Clerk |
|--|-----------------------|

11. Matters of urgency

| Discussion | Action |
|------------------|--------|
| There were none. | |

12. Dates of next meetings

| | | | |
|---------|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| Tuesday | 24 th July 2018 | 18.00 | Kettering Business Exchange |
| | 18 th September 2018 | | |
| | 20 th November 2018 | | |
| | 18 th December 2018 | | |

With no further business, the non-confidential meeting concluded at 7.56pm.

Chair Signature for approval of minutes: _____

Date: _____