

Peterborough Diocese Education Trust
 Minutes of the Directors Meeting
 Tuesday 22nd January 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);
In Attendance:	Mike Cowland (MC); Helen Buckley (HB); Mike Behnke (Clerk – Syzygy Clerking Services).
Apologies:	Andrew Weatherill (AW); Kevin Binley (JB); Ruth Walker-Green (RWG);

1. Opening Prayer

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GC had led the opening prayer at the AGM, 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"> None. 	

5. Approval of Minutes of 18th December 2018

Discussion	Action
Amendments were recorded as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 47 – add ‘in that way’ to end of first bullet point. Page 48 – question on capitalisation of improvements – add ‘why’ to beginning of sentence i.e. ‘why has the value retained by the Trust....’ Page 52 – GDPR – amend to read ‘A further 140 queries had been logged....’ 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the above amendments noted, the minutes were agreed to be a true record of the meeting and were signed by the Chair. 	
---	--

6. Action Log

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This had been amended to reflect the actions carried out. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SofD had gone to Governance Committee for discussion/amendments before going to full Board for final agreement in March. Copies of the Academies Financial Handbook were circulated to Directors at the meeting by MC. 	AP1: HB

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

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A training and development session on SEND had been held the week prior to the meeting which had been well received by all attending. Feedback on the Condition Survey and the process undertaken had been positive from all academies. There was an understanding that Health and Safety issues had to be prioritised across the Trust. The CEO was to follow up with Richard Ormston the issue of a replacement for the PDET Chaplain post following the previous discussions with Richard and Bishop John. It was agreed that in the future, it would be useful for the Board to know more about Diocesan Chaplain appointments. During the discussion the potential of part funding of the post by PDET was raised. It was noted that currently the budget would not be able to bear this cost. The temporary support provided by Doug Spenceley was noted and appreciated by the Board. 	AP2: CEO

8. CEO's Report

Discussion	Action
<p><i>The previously circulated paper was taken as read.</i></p> <p>Q: On Office 365, when it has been rolled out to HTs, will it be part of the 5% or be funded separately? A: The plan is to roll it out under the 5%, so there will be no additional cost to academies.</p> <p>Q: If I already have a 365 account, do I require another? A: No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attention was drawn to Number 5 – Key Facts. The CEO was asked to include on future sheets, information on Pupil Premium and Sports Funding. 	AP3: CEO

<p>Q: Will this information be provided on each occasion? A: Yes, with different key facts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEO provided a further update on Item 4: the SLA and proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between PDET and the Diocesan Board of Education (DBE). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SLA had been discussed at the November Board meeting and since then, discussions had taken place between the CEO and PC with additional amendments. This would be presented to the DBE Strategy and Leadership Committee on 29/01/19. Further meetings between PC and CEO might be necessary following that meeting. ○ The aim was to bring a final draft to the PDET Board meeting in March. It would not be signed off before the Board had agreed it. ○ PC had circulated a draft MoU to all CofE stand-alone academies and MATs that included CofE schools. In discussions between the CEO and Chair, it was felt that this should be discussed first by Members before it came to the Board in order to recognise the special relationship between the Diocese and PDET. ○ Members had discussed it at their meeting on 19/12/18 and an amended version of the original ‘generic’ MoU had been further discussed with PC. Further amendments would be made and a draft document brought before the Board for discussion and approval. It would not be signed off until it had received the full approval of the Board. ○ <p>Q: Have there been any gender issues identified relating to performance in KS2? A: Nothing has been raised at ESE Committee. The issue is around the relative performance of disadvantaged pupils rather than gender. Once the Group Call data is fully functional, we can pull out the relevant information in more granular detail. A deadline is required for the completion of the Group call project. However, an issue revolves around one school and Capita. It has reinforced the need for an ICT strategy linked into the introduction of 365 across the Trust. It was agreed that MC and the CEO would bring a paper to the Board.</p> <p>Q: Three academies that came into the Trust and were formally outstanding, do you expect them to continue to be so? A: This will be for discussion in the Confidential part of the meeting.</p>	<p>AP4: MC/CEO</p>
--	------------------------

9. Trust-Wide Improvement Plan – Progress on Key Priorities

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEO reminded directors that the plan was updated at the end of the autumn term. Areas shaded out grey in the plan were for reporting later in the year. The remainder was colour coded Green (on schedule or achieved), Amber (behind schedule but achievable) and Red (behind schedule and at risk of not being achieved). • The majority of the plan was showing to be either green or amber. 	

<p>Q: In section D, you mention a focus on change in practice and improvement. What changes are being sought?</p> <p>A: The evidence is not “coloured” yet so this indicates that a formal evaluation will be done at the end of the year. We are undertaking the SPB programme, including peer challenge, and feedback from HTs is that it is proving useful. There will be a later report on the impact of this intervention at ESE.</p>	
--	--

10. Updates from Committees

Discussion	Action
<p>Business and Finance Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report had been circulated prior to the meeting and was taken as read. The Financial statements and a clean audit report were filed on time before the ESFA’s deadline of 31/12/18. <p>Q: Is this the actual total?</p> <p>A: The figures are up to the end of December (Period 4). It needs to be read with the Management Accounts paper.</p> <p>Q: What is FRS?</p> <p>A: It relates to the pension deficit. It applies to last year but is paid in the current year, thus leaving a negative actual spend.</p> <p>Q: There are big variances seen in the Management Accounts pages. The biggest relates to Support staff and SLT?</p> <p>A: We are looking at that as a whole and need to delve further into the figures to find out why. Some are due to academies getting the budget coding wrong. The underspend in teaching staff partly compensates for the SLT costs.</p> <p>Q: The Educational Supplies and Services figures look worrying?</p> <p>A: It is largely a profiling issue. Some overspends are down to people commitments which are appearing as funds spent.</p> <p>Q: The supply costs seem high.</p> <p>A: Agreed. PDET has formed a Procurement Forum made up of the Business Director and willing Business Managers and Bursars. The government has launched a Supply Agency deal and the forum will look into it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deadline for the Academies Accounts Return was 21/01/19 and PDETs were submitted on time. <p>Q: SLT staff costs (B6) – is there a concern about the variance, the actual and the budgeted costs?</p> <p>A: Yes, we need to understand it more. Some of the variance is due to academies coding teaching staff to SLT, but there are other variances. These will be discussed in further detail at the B&F Committee. We are confident that the picture will be improved when the reforecasts are uploaded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MC was asked to provide an underlying narrative to all significant variance figures for future reports to help Board members understand them. • MC reported that the academies with overspends were known and 	<p style="text-align: right; margin-top: 100px;">AP5: MC</p> <p style="text-align: right; margin-top: 100px;">AP6: MC</p>

<p>meetings were taking place with them. A list of those where there were concerns went to the B&F Committee for consideration.</p> <p>The Summary Report provided was for the Central Team. MC was asked to produce one for the Trust, including the commentary on the major variances.</p> <p>ESE Committee:</p> <p>In the absence of minutes, GC was asked to give a verbal report. The minutes would be circulated to directors as soon as they had been completed. The committee had discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools causing concern (detail on this would be discussed in the Confidential section of the meeting). • The Ofsted report for Towcester • SIAMS reports ensuring that, as a Trust, the focus on SIAMS was not lost. The Framework was changing but no inspections had been held; they were starting this term. • The role of the DSCs and how their roles could be better personalised for PDET, avoiding duplication in content. To that end, Hilary Spenceley (HS) would be meeting with the CEO to look at this further. • The Risk Register as it related to the ESE Committee. <p>Governance Committee:</p> <p>A detailed report from the Chair (GT) had been circulated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first Governance workshop had been held with the second, being held on 23/01/19 in Towcester. • As had been reported earlier, the revised Board SofD was not yet ready. It would have to go to each Sub-Committee before a final board decision was made in March. 	
---	--

11. Evaluation of Data Drop 1

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data was not yet available. <p><i>NB: This data to be circulated to directors in February by RWG together with executive analysis,</i></p>	

12. SEND Update

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report had been circulated from GT (SEND Director). • He reported on the MAT SEND Review meeting which he had attended with relevant PDET leaders and two headteachers HTs who had been invited to attend and give their perspectives. • Data was presented and very much helped to inform the questions. • Other areas connected to this, that require more attention, include Behaviour and Pupil Premium. • Whilst the data received was good, there was an issue around QA of school to school classification. There appeared to be a lack of consistency in coding students to SEND and that whole strand needed 	

<p>to be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A question identified at the session was whether academies were identifying and categorising SEND consistently. Further consideration of this would drive good practice. 	
---	--

13. Safeguarding

Discussion	Action
<p>A summary of work to date was presented by HB. She added that LP would be submitting her detailed report in the Spring 2 term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support and advice had been given to a number of HTs who had safeguarding issues • Three staff queries had been received regarding concerns about pupils • Training had been delivered in a wide range of areas, including an update training for the central team. • Training had been undertaken on the Single Central Record (SCR) for the central team and academies to help clarify confusion about what records academies could keep in relation to GDPR. • Two full safeguarding reviews had been carried out with a further 3 planned for Spring 1 term. Ofsted readiness checks were being prepared for those due for inspection for in Spring 2 term. 	

14. Risk Register

Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEO referred to the updated risk register which had been circulated prior to the meeting and identified a number of areas where there were upward arrows, indicating an increased risk. These were still being worked on and related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funding and liabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contracts in breach of the Academies Financial Handbook ▪ Trust reserves being below an acceptable level ○ Educational Performance and results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction and implementation of the new SIAMS schedule ○ Governance and compliance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Governance structures and support being in place ○ Employer responsibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All employer responsibilities were carried out. The issue related specifically to the recent issue with HMRC and Strictly Education regarding employees working at more than one academy. This would stay on the risk Register and would be monitored until it was fully resolved. <p>Q: With regards to teaching, can you identify the key CPD measures being pursued to review teaching? A: This will be further discussed in the Confidential part of the meeting, with regards to interventions.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC added that it would be more helpful if the summary of control procedures covered not just the measuring but also more of the detail. DM replied that his point regarding detail on impact was well made, but there was a danger of using the Risk Register as a quasi-development plan. DM will consider if and how impact measures and monitoring would appear on the Trust's Improvement Plan. 	AP7: CEO
<p>Schedule of Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An updated version of the Schedule of Work for Directors was provided which sets out the content of meetings planned. Directors were asked to let the CEO know if they wanted anything additional agenda items included in any of the meetings. 	AP8: ALL

15. Date of next meeting

Tuesday	19 th March 2019	18.00	Kettering Business Exchange
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, Grace was said and the Chair brought the non-confidential meeting to a conclusion at 7.42pm.

Chair Signature for approval of minutes: _____

Date: _____