

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
----	-------------	---------	--------	----------------

The Diocese of Westminster Academy Trust

Approved Minutes of Board Meeting held on 11th February 2016

Present:

Mrs.K.Griffin(KGR),Mr.K.Rylett(KRY), Mr.P.Camoletto
(PCA),Mr.J.P.Morrison(JPM),Miss.N.Kane(NKA),Mr.C.Mathew(CMA),Dr.K.Sullivan(KSU),Mrs.L.Graham(LGR),
Mr.P.Quinn(PQU),Mrs.J.Pearce(JPE)

By invitation:

Mr.R.Anderson (RAN),Mr.A.J.Corish(TCO), Mrs.L.Graham(LGR),Mrs.T.Doyle(TDO)

Papers circulated: Spring Term Updates, Audit Tender draft with comments, Complaints Policy Template, MAT Loan Scheme, MAT Loan Scheme submissions from schools;NaCTSO guidance, School and College Security Manual;AET outcomes letter from OfSTED

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
		Prayer KGR Welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introduced Mr.R.Anderson Vice Chairman at NB; possible Foundation Director appointment for the Board and Mr.A.J.Corish Headteacher of TDMS.	Board members gave an overview of their roles	
1.	Apologies recorded and accepted	None. Noted the 5pm start and meeting in London had allowed everyone to be in attendance.	Monitor timings see which have higher attendance.	KGR/TDO
2.	Declaration of Business Interests	No interests declared in any items on the agenda. <u>Noted the following interests by Trust Board:</u> KGR Chairs Capital Strategy Committee of the Education Commission and holds directorships on other Diocesan academy trusts PCA is the Financial Secretary for The Diocese of Westminster, Director of Churchmarketplace and holds directorships on other Diocesan academy	Updated list of Academy Trusts PCA is on the Board	JPM

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
		trusts PQU Director Newham MAT Learning in Harmony Trust JPM is the Director of Education for The Diocese of Westminster NKA Director of a company linked to Education KRY IEB Member for Church of England School KSU Director of Rehydrogen and Property Development Company which is not involved in school works. RAN Chair of Board of Trustees Mediation in Health	of to be provided for file.	
3.	AOB not on the agenda	None declared.		
4.	Minutes of last meeting	The minutes of the last meeting were checked for factual accuracy.	Approved by Board	
5.	Matters arising from minutes	Foundation Director Application Form had been reviewed by the Bishop, following amendments by KGR and WWS. If no further amendments from Education Service recommend for approval.	Approved by Board	KGR/TDO
6.	Board Membership	Board membership RAN application for Foundation Director TCO take Principal Director vacancy on Board, which leaves one vacancy not filled. Documentation to be completed for Companies House	Approved by Board Approved by Board Paperwork to be filed	TDO TDO TDO
7.	Conditional Consent List	No further applications however Trust had been contact by St.Gregorys part of new AT created Jan 2016 support on information for COG's and Bursar/ Business Manager on post conversion information. KGR reported new HT at St.Pauls who may wish to revisit becoming part of AT.		
8.	Chairs Action	KGR reported had completed Raise online review of all Primary school data and had written to each of the Primary School Headteachers (HT) and Chair of Governors(COG) with a summary analysis.		

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
9.	Audit and Finance Meeting 19 th January 2016	<p>KGR noted the considerable knowledge held by the Board on the Academy journey and if there were to be changes in the organisation across the Diocese important to consider how can take advantage of what has been learned across DOWAT. Need to keep a weathered eye on developments and consider the impact on DOWAT. Already excellent examples of partnership and support across the Trust.</p> <p>CMA is a concern from the HT's that Trust is not part of the larger discussion on the Academies Model moving forward, feel detached from the process although it has been constantly raised by the Board that they are willing to be part of the discussion and to meet the other AT's to consider the way forward and have already recommended holding a meeting for AT's across the diocese.</p> <p>JPM advised is a small focus group of ten schools, five secondary, five primary which includes two HT's from DOWAT. It was very clear in discussion at the recent conference that those HT's in DOWAT had a far greater understanding of the Academy programme and the government's agenda to move it forward. Number of schools have kept discussion at a distance but it is a discussion we must have as a diocese currently have 19 schools in RI, 1 in special measures with an enforcement notice due in April. Need to have a strategy moving forward and structure that can support in both the short and long term. The consultation structure is for discussion on the possibility of looking at Regional groups across the Diocese. Want all schools to feel they have a voice in the consultation discussion.</p> <p>KGR added it was important in addition to HT's that Board members were included, as for those schools already within AT's it was the Board who were accountable. Originally the plan had been to invite the other AT's to the meeting on 19th January however with the Christmas break did not feel</p>		

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
		<p>sufficient time for them to be able to provide the information, know the Cardinal Hume Trust also want to have a meeting. As Chair of DOWAT will be looking in discussion with the Board on how our Trust could fit into a new model.</p> <p>KRY raised his concerns following the meeting of 19th January 2016 that documentation had been circulated to schools within the Trust for comment which the Board was not aware of. Serious concern over the potential infrastructure needed to deliver the proposal which has had no discussion at Board level and the proposed timings for delivery. Currently limited capacity from a team of volunteers and as raised by CMA this has been on our agenda as a Trust for a significant period of time to progress the Trust. Feedback from own school concern over how it would be delivered and if services would be consolidated, what discussion would there be at local level.</p> <p>Board discussed the issues of originally wanting a 'light touch' structure but with the changing emphasis on MATs from the government and the OfSTED inspections, Board role was constantly evolving but now difficult to move forward as may need to amend structure again in order to link into the diocesan consultation. Concern that difficult to make strategic plans for the Trust with number of unknown variables.</p> <p>JPM clarified that the discussion on 19th January was brainstorming opportunity as there were a number of schools present to gain ideas and suggestions, it was not a consultation and as discussed earlier would welcome input from DOWAT directors moving forward as part of the consultation on the diocese academy structure and programme, important use experiences of DOWAT to help shape new structure.</p> <p>Key points to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of the Diocese to be able to deliver a model across the schools • Creditability of the service offer for back office 		

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision that schools will want to buy into • Quality Assurance • Develop further the collaborative working arrangements and good practice already in place across the diocese <p>Helpful to get all the Trusts communicating, currently work in isolation.</p> <p>TCO suggested in the current financial constraints need to market this as a credible solution that will help to build capacity and a collaborative approach, show schools it is a solution to meet their needs. The Diocese will be held accountable for Standards in a similar way to an authority and will need to be able to broker support such as School Improvement.</p> <p>KGR Key concern raised on behalf of Trust HT's by St. Marks was the consolidated debt and the shared responsibility for it. A separate Sponsorship 'Holding' Trust would allow schools with both Standards and Financial concerns to address these before moving into a group protecting all parties. For standards the Diocese under Canon Law section 806 should already be holding schools to account.</p> <p>The Board then reviewed the findings from OfSTED on the Focused Inspection of the AET MAT, comments can be quite sharp, noted do contact Local Governing Bodies and schools for feedback. Discussed importance of keeping link with LGB's.</p> <p>NKA raised the issue of Primary schools and need to ensure they feel part of the discussion, their set up and needs very different to a secondary school and need to be taken into consideration in a consultation.</p> <p>KGR noted topic had generated a lot of discussion need as a Trust to consider the potential for DOWAT in the proposals and the impact for our schools, need to be clear on the options available so can give full consideration.</p>		

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
		<p>JPM suggested if helpful will provide a copy of the documentation to the Board and provide a regular monthly briefing paper of the progress on the consultation discussions and timeline.</p> <p>KSU meeting on 19th January 2016 produced some good ideas around collaborative working and sharing good practice.</p> <p>Board agreed key focus was to look at developing collaborative and network opportunities across the Trust schools look at sharing skills and expertise as budgets continued to get tighter, see how can work to support each other and the students within the Trust schools.</p> <p>CMA asked if a diocesan wide meeting for all the Academy Trusts to meet had been arranged. KGR suggested looking at an invitation from DOWAT and to combine with a Board Meeting.</p>	<p>Monthly Briefing Paper to be provided for Board on how consultation is progressing</p> <p>Review of work stream focuses for 15/16</p> <p>Invitation to join end of next Board Meeting at 4.00pm. Invitation to be sent out to Trusts.</p>	<p>JPM</p> <p>Board</p> <p>JPM/KGR/TDO</p>
10	MAT Capital Pilot Loan Scheme	<p>The Board considered the documentation circulated from the EFA on a Pilot Loan Scheme for MATs, currently seeking expression of interest on projects from MATs.</p> <p>PCA raised a concern that there was limited information on the scheme and the financing which would need to be clarified before approval from the Trustees.</p> <p>KGR advised each LGB had been emailed and asked if had a project to be considered under the categories specified:</p> <p>CMA proposal from JHN to replace a satellite boiler £10k, provide efficiency savings, security fencing replacement around Astro Turf and New Performing Arts block , site currently very open, costings of £120k, replace a 30 foot single glazed wall. Aim to recoup savings against the projects over ten year period.</p>		

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
		<p>TCO projects from TDMS health and safety concern with Sports Hall flooring which requires replacing with the under floor heating, new materials and heating system will be more energy efficient, cheaper in longer term than patch repairing sections of the floor. Generation income stream in longer term, recoup over twenty year period £232,000 estimated cost. Second project is the fire door replacement highlighted on health and safety report, heat loss through fitting and current glazing, improved materials and insulation will generate savings. Buying doors in bulk will provide procurement savings, solid doors significant life expectancy. KGR asked if any update on the major capital rebuild project? TCO advised representation made to the Local Plan, meeting with the Local authority and planning, project would be of zero cost to the authority but is on Green Belt land and planners raised concerns. School working with the planning consultants to see if can move forward, would provide excellent provision for the school community and facilities for the local community for the future.</p> <p>KRY reported the proposal from St. Michaels was for a first floor extension for the Sixthform Block, currently due to capacity unable to increase numbers despite the local demand for places by Catholic children, would allow school to offer and provide additional Post 16 funding of £240k per annum. Year on year seeing a significant increase on children unable to be offered a place at the school. The sixth form has increased significantly from around 120 to currently 220 and is projected to increase further in future years. Estimated cost £2.3million which would be recouped over a ten year period.</p> <p>JPE asked if some of the projects could go Trust wide as St. Marys had also been identified for replacement of fire doors.</p> <p>Board reviewed the proposals and it was agreed to merge the projects to create three project proposals from the Trust:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Safety works • Security / Safeguarding • Post 16 provision 	<p>Details from St. Marys to be added into Health and Safety Project.</p>	<p>JPE/TDO</p>

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility
		<p>KGR projects will be submitted but we will take a view on whether Trust goes forward once we have full details of the proposed scheme and PCA has had the opportunity to review the financing of the scheme.</p>	<p>Proposals to be submitted by deadline to EFA as expressions of interest only at this stage.</p>	<p>KGR/TDO</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Complaints Policy Template for Trust</p>	<p>TDO advised the template policy had been circulated to all schools, some feedback on wording. Template had been drafted by Winckworth Sherwood following the revised guidance issued by the DfE to maintained schools, expecting updated guidance for academies to follow. Policy revision incorporated within School Support agreement.</p> <p>RAN suggested review of the wording on the publication and review of the policy it refers to the Local Governing Board but if Trust wide should be reviewed by the Board.</p> <p>Board noted need to check each school publishes the policy once ratified by LGB's.</p> <p>Board approved the template policy subject to the revision suggested by RAN.</p>	<p>Amend wording to reflect Trust role.</p>	<p>TDO</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>OfSTED MAT Review AET Trust</p>	<p>Board reviewed the letter of outcomes issued to the AET Trust following the OfSTED review of the MAT processes and procedures.</p> <p>KRY suggested following his work with schools and OfSTED Governance reviews were very important, governors need to be involved in the vision and strategic planning for their schools need to look at the future of their schools in the changing education landscape. Importance of taking a step back and reviewing what went well, what needs to be improved, holding school to account and understanding the terminology.</p>		

No	Agenda Item	Details	Action	Responsibility								
		<p>KGR advised a focus on Governance training needs across LGB's looking at key skills and where LGB's would value support in specific areas.</p> <p>JPE important to remember the different roles of Primary and Secondary Headship, needs of both and roles with governors are different.</p> <p>CMA raised a concern impact of an OfSTED for this Trust.</p> <p>KGR clearly documented the formation and set up of this Trust, role of Trust has moved with the statutory processes placed on it by the government, overall Trust has a lot of Good schools and governance.</p>	<p>Review of Strategic Development of the Board and plan to be OfSTED prepared as a MAT not just at school level. Nxt agenda.</p>	<p>KGR/TDO</p>								
<p>13.</p>	<p>Audit Tender 2016</p>	<p>The Audit and Finance Committee had reviewed the Audit Tender for circulation, copy circulated to Board. Timetable as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="524 900 1254 1292"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="524 900 875 946"><u>Stage</u></th> <th data-bbox="875 900 1254 946"><u>Date and Time</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="524 946 875 1070">Issue of Invitation to Tender [this document]</td> <td data-bbox="875 946 1254 1070">23 February 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="524 1070 875 1158">Visit to academies by audit firms, if required</td> <td data-bbox="875 1070 1254 1158">10 am - 3 pm, Tues 8 March 2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="524 1158 875 1292">Deadline for questions [in writing], if any, from audit firms</td> <td data-bbox="875 1158 1254 1292">Thurs 10 March 2016</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Stage</u>	<u>Date and Time</u>	Issue of Invitation to Tender [this document]	23 February 2016	Visit to academies by audit firms, if required	10 am - 3 pm, Tues 8 March 2016	Deadline for questions [in writing], if any, from audit firms	Thurs 10 March 2016	<p>Tenders to go to four Audit Firms with experience of working with MATs.</p>	<p>Audit and Finance</p>
<u>Stage</u>	<u>Date and Time</u>											
Issue of Invitation to Tender [this document]	23 February 2016											
Visit to academies by audit firms, if required	10 am - 3 pm, Tues 8 March 2016											
Deadline for questions [in writing], if any, from audit firms	Thurs 10 March 2016											

