



## ST MARY'S COLLEGE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BODY (PART A) HELD ON WEDNESDAY 25<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2019

- Present:** Mrs S. Beecroft  
Mr C Beesley  
Mrs E. Best (Interim Principal)  
Mr M. Conboy (18/19 Vice Chair – Voted in for 19/20)  
Mrs A. Francis  
Mr A Kherakar  
Ms P. Lightbown (Staff Governor)  
Mr N McNeil (18/19 Chair voted in for 19/20)  
Mr M. Vizzard  
Fthr N. Wynn (18/19 Vice Chair – Voted in for 19/20)
- In attendance:** Mrs L. Farnhill (Clerk to the Board)  
Mr S. Jones (Head of Intervention (ESFA))  
Mr F. Dowling (Provincial Education Deputy (Society of Mary))
- Staff:** Mr S D'Arcy (Head of RE and Chaplaincy)  
Mrs K. Hollern (Head of Finance)  
Mr J. Husselbee (assistant Principal)  
Mr S. Kirk (Assistant Principal)
- Apologies:** Mr M. Harkin (Student Governor)  
Mr M Wright
- Absent:** None
- Item 1: **OPENING PRAYER AND WELCOME****  
The 18/19 Chair opened the meeting by thanking member's for their attendance, welcoming new governors. AMF gave a brief introduction, outlining her extensive experience in the FE sector. Father Wynn then opened the meeting in prayer.
- Item 2: **APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR****  
NMN reiterated his intention to step down as Chair, reminding the Board that succession planning for the post was a specific action of the FEC. No new nominations were brought forward, therefore NMN agreed to continue on a short term basis whilst efforts to recruit a successor continued. This was proposed by MC and seconded by AK. NMN asked the Board to consider the benefits of continuing with two Vice Chairs, NMN proposed MC which was seconded by Fthr NW, MC proposed Fthr NW which was seconded by AK.

**Item 2**

**Resolved:** The Board approved Nick McNeil as Chair of the Board of Governors for the 19/20 year on a temporary basis. The Board approved the nominations of Father Noel Wynn and Mark Conboy as joint Vice Chair's for the 19/20 academic year.

**Item 3: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Details of apologies were given and accepted by the Board. The Chair stated that he looked forward to welcoming the Student Governor to the Board; he had come highly commended by staff and is the son of former Foundation Governor AH who had been an excellent Governor and valuable asset to the Board.

**Item 3**

**Resolved:** The Board accepted the apologies of MW and MH.

**Item 4: DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Interim Principal EB declared an interest in items relating to the Post of Principal, in particular, Item 21 in Part B.

**Item 4**

**Resolved:** The Board noted the interests declared by EB.

**Item 5: TRAINING**

The meeting was preceded by item 5, training. This was provided by GH from the external auditors and covered:

- Understanding Management Accounts
- Pensions schemes
- Insolvency regime

Additional literature regarding the insolvency regime would be distributed and governors were advised to read this.

**Item 5**

**Resolved:** Governors noted the details of the finance training.

**Action:** Clerk to distribute additional supporting documentation.

**Item 6: NOTIFICATION OF URGENT BUSINESS**

The clerk and Chair confirmed that they had not been notified of any urgent business after the issuing of the agenda.

**Item 7: APPROVAL OF THE BOARD MINUTES FROM THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE BOARD HELD ON 17<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2019**

The Chair asked the Board to consider if the minutes previously distributed were an accurate record of the meeting held on July 17<sup>th</sup> 2019. The Chair reminded the Board that this had been called as an extraordinary meeting after the collapse of the FoH and resignation of JS. The minutes of the meeting were accepted as a true record and signed by the Chair.

**Item 7**

**Approved:** The minutes were approved and signed.

**Item 8: MATTERS ARISING**

The matters arising and associated actions detailed in the agenda were worked through with particular note to the following:

- 8.2: The revision of the I&A requires the support of the Trustees, Diocese and legal guidance with a need to address the Catholic numbers. NMN confirmed he had opened negotiations but progress was limited.
- 8.3: The marketing strategy had been deferred due to the cancellation of June Board. It was proposed that the strategy would be approved by the Resources Committee. **An objection was raised** - as a key element underpinning financial performance the Board needed to maintain oversight. This was accepted and the approval would maintain with the Board, with the Resources Committee reviewing and presenting it to the Board for approval.
- 8.6 AP JH confirmed that the amendments to the policy had been made ahead of implementation.
- 8.7 EB outlined actions undertaken to strengthen bonds with local providers. KH informed the Board that the intended new 6<sup>th</sup> Form had been highlighted as a risk within the financial plan.
- 8.10 Link Governor CB gave an overview of his link visit, looking at quality, HE and the EIF. CB detailed discussions and challenge held around the disappointing A Level results. A further action has been to diarise Learning Walks with LW.
- 8.11 EB and KH advised that the risk register was under review and would be presented to the Audit Committee in November
- 8.12 PL clarified the Board's understanding of the MA – that the statement needed to be published but the wording within the statement had needed amendment to reflect the College's position in terms of student reimbursement. The OfS had advised that the registration had been approved based on the original statement therefore this could not be amended without re-approval (from the OfS).  
Governors and staff discussed the possible options, with clarity from AMF and SB on the content and position within their institutions. It was agreed that this would be looked at in detail again and the action carried forward.

**Item 8**

**Resolved:** That details of MA are noted and where necessary further actions carried out as detailed.  
The Board approved the Resources Committee as the forum for detailed review of the Marketing Strategy but approval remains with the Board.  
The Board approved the Audit Committee as the forum for detailed review of the Risk Register but approval remains with the Board.

**Item 9: COMMITTEE MEETINGS MINUTES**

No meetings were held by the Audit or Resources Committees prior to the meeting of the Board of Governors.

A meeting of the Board Membership Advisory Committee had been held immediately prior to the meeting of the Board of Governors, a verbal report was presented by the Chair of the Committee, Fthr N. Wynn:

- Composition of the Committees – recommend to the Board that a Quality Committee is introduced – **Approved**
- Consideration for membership of this committee was discussed, the committee recommends AMF, CB, EB and another. AMF suggested that the parent governor would be well placed here. **Approved – membership to include the above**
- Indicative TOR for of the Quality committee to include termly meetings, membership of 4 with quoracy of 3, meeting termly ahead of full Board. To be drawn up by the Clerk, reflecting those of the previous committee and approved in November
- Remuneration Committee – recommendation to the Board that the BMAC includes the delegated authority to carry out the responsibilities that would otherwise be included in a separate remuneration committee – **Approved**
- Chair succession has been discussed under MA and Chair appointment
- Staff and Student Governor processes had been approved and followed up with the appointment of PL and MH
- The skills audit and Board SAR results were reviewed along with the Clerk’s report – with a recommendation that this is sent to all governors

**Item 9**

**Resolved:** The Board noted the details of the verbal report and approved:

- The introduction and membership of the Quality Committee
- The inclusion of remuneration of SPH to the BMAC Committee

**Action** **That the clerk distributes the SAR and skills audit information along with the Clerk’s report**

**Item 10** **CHAPLAINCY REPORTS**

SD’A gave a detailed account of the information contained within the report already distributed and tabled a document which provided more information on the Section 48 Inspection. SD’A provided background on the move from inspections integrated into Ofsted to a stand-alone inspection, providing insight into changes in drafts and reasons for delays, with political pressures and need for a national framework to be agreed by all stakeholders. Indicative timeframes were offered for the process.

SD’A highlighted the key areas that SMC would need to comply with including the value of the Mission Statement as the ‘intent’ of SMC and requested that careful consideration is given by the Board to this after the inset in October. Regarding the Religious Education element, **there was considerable question and challenge** by governors on the content and inclusion within guided learning hours, including the late introduction and then closure of values and ethics in the 18/19 academic year. SD’A clarified that in terms of meeting the S48

requirements, the college was exceeding this, and the issues had been in relation to guided learning hours. SD'A highlighted how the programme supports with the EIF, S48 and guided learning hours and offered to go through the programme of RE in detail with the S48 governor outside of the meeting.

**Governors questions:**

**Q** - With over 80% Asian heritage students – will we still have to comply with Catholic education element?

**A** – Yes – as a Catholic College, we must comply

**Q** – Has anyone been inspected yet?

**A** – No

**Q** – What preparations are other colleges making?

**A** – All are working with the same draft framework and it is on the agenda for ACVIC so more information will be available after the conference

**Q** – What do you see as our biggest challenge?

**A** – Collective worship and how we provide and invite learners to attend this. The Asian heritage pupils engage well in Values and Ethics lessons but collective worship is a challenge.

**Q** – Could this be built into weekly assemblies?

**A** – As a SFC we do not hold weekly assemblies

**Q** – Are there assemblies to celebrate key points in the Christian calendar?

**A** – Yes, there are 4 throughout the year, welcome, Christmas, Easter and leaving assemblies.

Governors then discussed the changes in the EIF relating to student journey, the omission of moral and spiritual growth with a shift to British values, concluding that the strategy day would include detailed discussions around how SMC core values support the student journey and was vital for governors, with attendance required unless absence was unavoidable. NMN concluded that he could not attend but invited AMF to support him as S48 deputy, AMF agreed and this was approved by the Board.

SD'A went on to invite questions around the second report, that of the Chaplaincy role, including options regarding the imminent maternity leave.

**Questions and Comments**

**Q** – There is no iconography within this room – has the college been surveyed?

**A** – Fair trade and ethically sourced pieces have been bought and will be distributed next week

**C** – The links with LHu as an Ecumenical university need to be pointed out

**Q** – Are links with Stonyhurst developing?

**A** – Contact has been made and the strategy day will be held there

**Q** – What will be the cost implications of the maternity leave?

**A** – (KH) It will need to be part funded, leaving some funding available for cover, but not enough for a f/t post

**A – (SD'A)** – The open door support of the Chaplain is vital, the chapel in darkness for parts of the week will reduce the impact and students do not diarise times of need

**Q** – What is the proposed cover, could voluntary support be brought in?

**C** – Caution should be aired around the complexities and safeguarding implications of using volunteers in this capacity

Governors concluded that this would need to be reviewed in detail once the financial implications of the maternity leave were established, giving clear indications as to funding and options available with the Trustees included in the decision making process.

#### **Item 10**

**Resolved:** The Board noted the details of the reports

**Action:** 1 - Review of maternity cover options  
2 – Review of RE offer by S48 link governor

**SD'A left after this item**

#### **Item 11 ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE MISSION STATEMENT**

Governors noted the relevance of the forthcoming strategy day in underpinning the College ethos and review of the Mission Statement; therefore a review would be deferred. Governors held a brief discussion highlighting how the Marist ethos is central to the Statement but noting that there is still room for modernisation. **A governor commented** on the necessity to also make reference to the new EIF including the word 'resilience' which seemed to feature heavily. **A further question** was asked about student input into the statement, EB clarified that SD'A would be leading on it and this would be posed to him prior to the review.

#### **Item 11**

**Deferred:** The review of the Mission Statement would be deferred to take into account the content of the forthcoming strategy day.

#### **Item 12 CURRICULUM, QUALITY, TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT**

##### **Item 12a) Pass Rates, Retention Rates And Provisional ALPS Grades**

The Chair welcomed SK to the meeting, and asked him to deliver highlights from the results report, noting that the Board were aware that results were below expectations and understood that as new to the AP post, these results were not his but needed to be delivered and understood in detail and thanked him for the timely report.

SK agreed that the A level results were concerning and would be the focus of discussion as BTEC grades were where they needed to be.

SK noted that at just over 50% of the cohort, low A-level results had impacted the overall ALPs with concerns that SMC pass rates were

below the national average. The biggest concern was the low levels of high grades at 22% below the national average of 29.3%.

SK noted that the impact on small cohorts were understandable, the main concern were subjects with large cohorts and poor results. SK gave additional information to governors regarding chemistry and physics, noting the increase in retention for Physics potentially impacting on grades. SK reminded governors of the Alps scoring system, with the SMC grade of 8 placing them in the bottom 10%. Although this had been close to a 7, there had not been enough in the remarks to push this into a 7. SK gave detailed information on the number of students in Alps red, black and blue versus the previous year.

**Q** – Were the outcomes pass rates not been foreseen from Alps

**A** – The prediction was a 5

**C** – top grades are the issue, lower grades compared well

**C** – From the brightest to the less able, SMC is not serving any students well with underachievement across the Board

**A** – we have had positives throughout the year, a good Ofsted as well as positive feedback during the support and monitoring visits on the work undertaken to improve quality. The new systems are in place, it is the culture of learning and the effort outside of college which we are working on with the new DILA process

**Q** – Are you saying that the students work well in college but this is not reflected outside of the classroom?

**A** – There have been considerable improvements in teaching and learning, we need to improve the ethos and engrain a culture of independent learning

**Q** – at what point was this recognised?

**A** – With the results and the analysis, we expected better and the initiatives put into place indicated that this would be the case

**Q** Is the internal assessment process that far adrift?

**A** – Not necessarily

**C** – The results indicate that this is the case. It could be a blip or the start of a downward trend. We were lured in by the positive Ofsted.

**C** – Ofsted was in February, a large proportion of the academic year had already passed by this point. Concern must be raised that in the previous year our understanding was that the quality had improved and there was a good expectation of results that didn't transpire. We have gone backwards.

**A** – there was two years of Ofsted monitoring visits prior to the inspection and all demonstrated that progress had been made.

**Q** - So are you saying that this result is better than it could have been had the interventions not been in place?

**C** – it is possible that they could have been worse

**Q** – Are we doing the best we can? Is it the quality of the education we provide or the students?

**C** – Data is clear and detailed but needs to include comparative trend data for outcomes and retention

**A** – This will be included in the next paper

**C** – As governors we need this information straight after results. An action was taken for this to be addressed and submitted to the Quality Committee and governors acknowledged the SLT's interpretation that the internal assessment programme was too prescriptive and frequent, described as 'assessment for monitoring not assessment for learning', with lost teaching time as a result. Details were given of the proposed internal assessment calendar for 19/20, with a governor commenting that they had raised concerns the previous year about the intensity of the assessments and impact on the wellbeing of the students. EB added that curriculum support had been available but not well attended and proposed improvements to the timetable to rectify this.

**Q** – Was the poor support attendance not picked up in year?

**A** – Yes, it was

**Q** – What was done about it?

**A** – the sessions were reallocated, some students then attended, some still did not which is why we have addressed this through the new time table structure

**C** – Some outstanding colleges do not allow a choice, parents are informed and they have to attend, in the holidays, it is an expectation, not just for those failing to meet expectations but for all learners

**Q** – recognition of this was alluded to in the culture of learning, how are you going to go from a culture of intervention to independence? The Differentiation needs to be embedded

**C** – Those outstanding colleges will be attracting a better cohort of learner

**C** – That would be reflected in their predictions and ALPs

**C** – but attitude to learning is not measured and likely higher in those attending colleges graded as 'outstanding'

**A** – CPD at inset is focusing on this issue. Ofsted note the improvements in teaching and learning and commented that this is not being extended beyond the classroom

**C** – You need robust parental contact and discipline.

**C** – you need to focus on performance. Performance, measures need to be reviewed and it is not possible to performance manage all staff, you need to prioritise.

**C** – The length and depth of this discussion is evidence that the quality committee needs reinstating, not to replace this debate but to ensure time to scrutinise this in detail and report back to the Board for final comments and questions. We have been embarrassed in the past by poor results that were unexpected; we cannot let this happen again and must be seen to be taking action.

**C** – There are two critical windows of opportunity for analysis, results and SAR, there was a change in process under the previous Principal, how will we manage it this year.

**A** – It will go tot the quality committee initially but will be presented for approval to the whole Board in January.

**C** – As long as the data presented within it is accurate, do we have assurances of this now

**Q** – There are comments indicating that governors were mislead in the past, is it not that there were insufficient governors with educational experience and it was not understood rather than mislead?

**C** – No, we were misled, this is why it I have challenged it, looking at and focusing on the positives, we were misled, it was not a whole picture.

Governors agree to move on following lengthy discussion, concluding that data and outcomes needed more detailed scrutiny by Governors with educational experience but emphasising that outcomes still needed to be covered at Board.

SK went on to outline the detail of the BTEC information, which is for just over half of the cohort. Governors questioned the rationale for the improvement in BTEC whilst there was a decline in the outcomes for A-Level provision.

#### **Item 12a**

**Resolved:** The Board noted the details of the report and reiterated the previous action to reinstate a quality committee

**Action:** **That the outcomes report is rewritten to include comparative data for outcomes and retention**

#### **Item 12b PRINCIPAL'S REPORT PART A**

EB outlined the rationale behind the reduced target agreed with the ESFA of 650, noting that enrolment stood at 670 with 393 in year 12 which was vital for progression figures for the following years budget. EB added that the other target set was for improved conversion which was at 49% ahead of the previous year at 43%. EB gave a detailed breakdown of the school by school and ethnicity data.

EB provided additional details of activities undertaken at enrolment to ensure that the destinations of applicants and reasons for non-enrolment were understood. EB advised that 28 new starters had since withdrawn, with most leaving to take up apprenticeship opportunities or full time work.

Governors noted their formal appreciation to the marketing and enrolment team for their efforts in exceeding the target.

EB went on to provide details of the second part of her report, which included detail of the ESFA assurance audit undertaken at the start of the academic year. This had seen a thorough interrogation of data led by the MIS consultant and the inspector had praised staff, commenting on the files as being some of the best that she had seen. The three recommendations within the report had all been picked up by the MIS consultant, adding further reassurance.

Governors asked for further details regarding the succession planning with regards to the new MIS post with EB adding that whilst it had been expensive, the work of the consultant had saved a considerable amount and a decision had been made to extend the contract to ensure sufficient handover with the new to post employee starting in October.

#### **Item 12b**

**Resolved:** The Board noted the details of the report including the outcome of the ESFA assurance review

**Item 12c**      **HE ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT**

The chair asked for PL to highlight key points of her report, asking if any problems needed to be raised.

PL asked the Board to note that this was the AMR for UCLAN and that LHu would be embedded in the next academic year. PL noted that the actions regarding staff development had not been met and this was to be picked up departmentally by line managers. PL also drew governors attention to the low retention due to the type of course, with courses amalgamating in year 2 and data being skewed due to low numbers. PL detailed supportive interventions implemented for those repeating the year and added that the external examiner recommendations were for the whole provision and not SMC specific. Governors discussed the potential for other courses that would provide increased pathways internally and PL advised that these had been explored and the justifications for their refusal.

**Item 12c**

**Approved:** The Board noted and approved the AMR

**Item 12d**      **HE RECRUITMENT AND PROGRESSION REPORT**

Upon introduction to the item, the Chair noted that the figures were not in line with expectations. PL stated that it could be argued that they were in line with previous years but based on less staffing and with an increased target it had been challenging. PL added that conversion had been a key focus with efforts focused on business, with the need to fill ten places by Friday and IT had eight with two in the pipeline. It was clarified that it would not be cost effective to run with eight and that high level conversations had taken place with LHu, who were supportive but would not run a course at a financial loss. PL added that the recruitment figures were in line with previous years and that applicants can be accepted onto courses up to three or four weeks into the course.

The sports course had not drawn in enough interest and governors urged PL to make a decision sooner rather than later if that was to be pulled as students would need to find alternative provision with PL agreeing that the decision would be confirmed the following day. It was noted that this provided considerable financial challenges in the region of £60,000. Intense discussion regarding the advertising of the provision and stretch of the targets was held with governors concluding that the provision could be offered for 2020 entry but must be advertised properly throughout the year utilising the expertise of the marketing team. It was noted that the loss of the opportunities presented through the FoH and utilising access to CMC learners had also impacted the availability to meet the targets set. Governors commented on the impact of local celebrity endorsement at local competitors as well as free transport offered.

Final comments and questions regarding the figures presented were financial, asking if this was the final figure with PL stating that this was the 'worst case scenario' and that further opportunities were available

with the masters which had a start date of January. No further questions or comments were received

**Item 12d**

**Approved:** The Board noted the details of the report

**Actions:** **Governors should be notified of the outcome of the Business, IT and sports courses and the budget impact of this**

**PL left after this item as per previous notification to the Clerk**

**Item 13a-f FINANCE AND RESOURCES**

KH advised the Board that financial KPI's were included within the management accounts and other aspects were reviewed as part of the weekly exec meeting and a written format for this would be in place by the next meeting of the Board. KH gave a detailed account of all discrepancies, advising that the covenant had been breached but that there was no plan for this to be repriced although the right to is reserved and invited questions and comments from the Board.

Governors clarified that the auditors had been notified and a copy of the letter had been issued to them, this was confirmed, adding that the technically no breach had happened yet as it had been reconciled to December. Governors noted that the letter had not been dated and it was requested that this was notified to the bank.

KH confirmed some cost saving was built in and that there had been a balance between quality and budget with costs associated with the collapse or combining of some classes and some transport savings having been built in and that a 1% staff rise was not included and could be removed saving £36000. KH added that the failure to improve HE numbers had left the budget vulnerable only £10,000 variance pushing the college into an inadequate position.

KH and EN added that they were being transparent with the ESFA and would inform them immediately if this was to happen, noting that John Boyle was aware of both the financial position and issues relating to quality. KH confirmed the announcement of the ESF to fund the TPS for this year and next along with a rise per student giving a further £124,000 along with a potential increase of £43,000 or £44,000 base don the additional recruitment. Governors noted that they were aware that there were risks associated with increased HE targets.

Discussions were held regarding the financial position, with governors noting the support already offered by the ESFA with this likely to be more favourable if improvements are imminent and demonstrable. It was noted with clarity provided by SJ (ESFA) that the previous intervention was still in place along with the previous notice to improve, therefore, reputational risk as a result of further intervention was minimal.

Governors attention was drawn to the risk of being technically insolvent with SJ (ESFA) confirming that if the issue was very short term, it was possible that re-phasing would be possible.

Governors discussed the 1% pay rise including the impact of not awarding it and agreed to defer the decision until Dec Board when more information regarding the final HE figures would be available.

It as concluded by the Chair that the finances remained too tight not to consider a structural solution, with it being agreed that the offer to stand alone was only ever temporary to give the time and opportunity to work through the figures and options but it was now evident that this needed to be accelerated.

EB distributed a list of classes due to combined or collapsed as a result of enrolment as part of a curriculum plan update. Governors commended staff for their swift and decisive action that continued to support students via innovative solutions including exploring hourly rate agency work to cover low uptake subjects.

KH returned to the financial implications of the proposed budget, again highlighting the cash flow issues in March and April, asking governors for consideration and approval.

Governors approved the budget without the inclusion of a pay rise and subject to further revisions as a result of final HE figures.

**Item 13**

**Approved:** Governors noted the information presented and approved 3 year Financial Plan and draft budget for 19/20.

**Actions:**

- **Request for the bank to date all letters**
- **Defer decision to award 1% pay rise to December (after consideration by the Resources Committee in November)**
- **Continue to explore opportunities for structural solutions**

**Item 14**

**CORRESPONDENCE FOR INFORMATION**

Governors were asked to note the content of the documents distributed within the pack. The Clerk confirmed that these were to assist in governors understanding of the sector and their role and were recommended and in some cases essential reading. The Chair asked for questions and comments, none were raised.

The Clerked asked all governors present to sign to confirm that they had read and understood the KSIE updated guidance as part of their annual safeguarding commitment.

**Item 14**

**Resolved:** Governors noted the information presented and confirmed their understanding of KSIE.

**Item 15**

**15a**

**POLICIES FOR APPROVAL**

**16-19 Safeguarding Policy**

Governors were asked to approve the fully revised Safeguarding policy. Governors were advised of the updates to the team since KR retirement. It was asked if MV, the link governor for safeguarding had been in to review the policy and procedures under the new team. It was confirmed that he had been in and the meeting between MV, JH, KS and IL had been productive and consideration should be given as to whether he would have the capacity to be the link for E&D/ SEND as this was also with in the remit of the DSL, KS. There were some queries raised regarding the policy only having reference to BwD and not PanLancashire, however they were assured by JH that this was sufficient.

No further questions or comments were raised. As no staff or student governors were present, the Chair agreed to move onto item 16 – The safeguarding report (this is documented in Board meeting minutes Part ii).

**Item 15a**

**Approved:** The Board approved the new policy for immediate implementation  
**Action:** **MV would be approached regarding taking on responsibilities for E&D and SEND**

**Item 15b GOVERNORS CODE OF CONDUCT**

The clerk advised that only minor grammatical alterations had been made as there had been a complete overhaul the previous year. Governors were reminded that in approving the code, they were agreeing to follow the principals within it.

**Item 15b**

**Approved:** The Board approved the code of conduct

**Item 15c CHAIR'S JOB DESCRIPTION**

The clerk had previously circulated the job description as part of the request for members to consider their ability to take on this responsibility. The clerk detailed feedback from the Trustees which were discussed and whilst it was agreed the ability communicate with the Trustees was an essential element, it was not to be included within the description as official communications should be channelled through the Clerk and Company Secretary to ensure it is documented and cascaded to members or other stakeholders where necessary. Governors decided that the only amendment should be to the handling of the press, which would now be overseen by the Chair but conducted by the marketing team. A full review would take place upon the election of a new Chair

**Item 15c**

**Approved:** The Board approved the job description of the Chair subject to the amendment of point 11

Part One of the Meeting concluded and all other items are detailed within Part two.

**Actions/MA:**

- Chair recruitment
- Additional insolvency materials to be distributed
- I&A revision – ongoing
- Marketing strategy to be reviewed by resources then approved by the Board
- Learning walks to be completed by CB
- Risk register to be reviewed by Audit then approved by the Board
- Review of student protection plan including further clarity from OfS
- SAR, skills audit and clerk report results to be distributed to all governors
- Quality TOR to be drafted for approval

- RE programme detail to be reviewed with S48 governor
- S48 deputy – AMF – role description to be distributed
- Chaplain maternity options to be reviewed and Trustees notified
- Clarity to be sought from SD'A regarding student input into the Mission Statement and strategy day.
- Outcomes report needs to include comparative trend data for outcomes and retention
- Governors should be notified of the outcome of the Business, IT and sports courses and the budget impact of this
- Request for the bank to date all letters
- Defer decision to award 1% pay rise to December (after consideration by the Resources Committee in November)
- Continue to explore opportunities for structural solutions
- MV would be approached regarding taking on responsibilities for E&D and SEND
- **An annual safeguarding report for the nurseries should be presented to the Board with termly updates to resources. (Part B)**