

## Minutes

### OAT Board of Trustees

**Date:** Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> March

**Time:** 11.00am

**Location:** Guildhall Suite, Thistle City Barbican, Shoreditch, 120 Central Street, London, EC1V 8DS

**Present:**

<b>Paul Hann</b>	<b>PH</b>	<b>Chair</b>
<b>Frances Hall</b>	<b>FH</b>	<b>Trustee</b>
<b>Nick Hudson</b>	<b>NH</b>	<b>CEO and Trustee</b>
<b>Andrew Jones</b>	<b>AJ</b>	<b>Trustee</b>
<b>Bal Samra</b>	<b>BS</b>	<b>Trustee</b>
<b>Mark Stanyer</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>Executive Principal and Trustee</b>
<b>Ian Brookman</b>	<b>IB</b>	<b>Trustee</b>
<b>Peter Murray</b>	<b>PM</b>	<b>Trustee and Founding Chair</b>

**Apologies:**

<b>Jane Nolan</b>	<b>JN</b>	<b>Executive Principal and Trustee</b>
-------------------	-----------	--

**In Attendance:**

<b>Carmel Brown</b>	<b>CB</b>	<b>National Director of People and Operations</b>
<b>Sunita Yardley-Patel</b>	<b>SYP</b>	<b>Clerk to the Board</b>
<b>James Miller</b>	<b>JMi</b>	<b>National Director of Estates and Technology</b>
<b>James Murray</b>	<b>JMu</b>	<b>Ormiston Trust – CEO</b>
<b>Paul Nye</b>	<b>PN</b>	<b>National Director of Finance</b>
<b>Robert Pritchard</b>	<b>RP</b>	<b>Interim National Director of Education</b>
<b>Amelia Walker</b>	<b>AW</b>	<b>National Director of Strategy and Quality Improvement</b>

<b>Part</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome Introductions and Apologies</b>	
1.1	<p>Apologies were received from Jane Nolan.</p> <p>PH outlined that there were numerous key papers for this meeting and the role of the board is key in oversight at this point given the current position of the Trust. It was noted that OAT currently has a strong set of principals and Executive, which is reflected in the quality of the papers circulated.</p> <p>FOR Committee were thanked for their significant work on the Ops Model.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes</b>	
2.1	December minutes	

	<p>AJ commented that there was an inaccuracy in section 6.1, need to add that 'these have been corrected as part of the audit'</p> <p>Approved</p> <p>January minutes</p> <p>Approved.</p> <p>January confidential minutes</p> <p>Approved.</p> <p>Matters arising complete.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Target Operating Model</b>	
	<p>PH outlined that this would be to review and comment, high level costings, staffing structures and high level oversight for two areas.</p> <p>NH apologised for the weight of the papers crucial to see everything but will not happen again. Not being asked to approved structures but direction of travel – there is more work to be done – not at the point to sign this off at the moment as this is not the final version.</p> <p>PN added that future variations will be an improvement.</p> <p>CB – outlined the process for the collection of data from academies which has all been received. The data outlines who does what at the moment- some more work to be done on the intricacies of roles.</p> <p>259 staff will be affected cost of the current structure is £6.57mil saving will be £1.54mil.</p> <p>PN followed up that this was taken from current payroll. This was confirmed with Principals. Next step is to look at what the future state will be, PN outlined how this was researched and the continued consultation with principals in order to ensure that the model is workable and meets academy needs.</p> <p>Purchase Ledger Processing will be moved to centre (previous assumptions had been that this would stay in the academy), this is reflected in the current version of the model. It was further outlined that there is a longer term aim to remove cash on academy sites but this is not feasible at the moment.</p> <p>Next step is to look at all of the academies individually to ensure that there are not any gaps.</p> <p>NH – the other dimension of the plan is the size of the processing centre – DL is currently reviewing this. Considerations include staff numbers and contracts (FTC Etc)</p> <p>FH – Fixed term contracts will work well</p>	

<p>CB – need to be careful about current staff members on permanent contracts.</p> <p>IB – outlined the context for those not at FOR Committee; internal audit reports have been completed recently and it is clear that there are issues with some academies doing basic finance transactions correctly. Moving these functions to sit under head office supervision means that it is more likely that correct processes will be followed.</p> <p>From an audit point of view, there needs to be an awareness that there have to be more than one person involved in counting petty cash and thus at least two staff members will need to be involved.</p> <p>NH the Ops manager role has changed significantly. This was being paid for out of the admin line on the chart – now moved to finance – this is sensitive because at the moment business managers and fds are paid £20-£70k – if you strip this out to create central processing – it's unlikely that the ops manager role will get a salary in the top half of this range. Sensitive because there will be almost no opportunity for current business managers to be engaged because there's a bit salary difference. Exec are of the view that given the central function for finance in the new model, there does not need to be anyone in the academy with financial expertise.</p> <p>PM – are we going to be able to accommodate central staff at head office?</p> <p>NH – lease at Newhall Street due for renewal Sept 2020. Exec to look at this in more detail on Monday.</p> <p>AJ – General discussion about finance – if we look at revised overall savings – balance of savings has switched – now got a case where 80% or more of savings in Finance – this model halves the expenditure in finance dept. Surprised to not see any comment in feedback from heads about how radical a change it is for the realms of Finance.</p> <p>If you lose the ability to report, difficulties can arise. Formerly note that this is high risk and any indication of the model going off-track needs to be tracked carefully.</p> <p>FH – understand that people in roles doing things like this – start with the premise with ops manager– what is it that is needed to be done in the school – includes supporting principal. There are a significant number of non-teaching staff in schools and somebody has to line manage them – needs to be a GM role rather than a specialist role. Backs up the view is that these roles are in place to allow teachers to teach – need to clarify exactly what it is that this role will do.</p> <p>MS – met with principals regionally and the role was given £40-50k – principals were comforted by this because the role was high profile – a lower salary will change the dynamic. OSSMA – Finance and Ops directors. Got to manage it very very carefully.</p> <p>AJ – slight fear that no one takes notice until it goes wrong – then they ask how it was allowed to happen.</p>	
--	--

	<p>NH – the scaled would be £25k-50something. But the role has changed since then and the principals need to be revisited with a revised message. Not convinced that principals have completely internalised the message. One -to-one conversations have been different.</p> <p>A balance of the savings has changed since December – December it was- 28% finance 13.1% estates 21% ICT.</p> <p>ICT now lower and Finance is much higher. Need to go back and look at the roles, in particular for ICT</p> <p>FH not surprised that principals have not engaged with this. As well as a restructure this is a cultural shift and the message will have to be continually reiterated for people to take it on board. This is why the theme in the model around continued communication is crucial.</p> <p>JM – what are the feedback mechanisms from heads throughout this process?</p> <p>CM – in terms of the project team – we have two heads on that, and then a plan will be developed. Not yet entirely formalised.</p> <p>FH – consultants mention it in the papers.</p> <p>JM – looking at this throughout the year – to get feedback en masse at several points.</p> <p>NH – once we've implemented the Ops Model, we should then continually review – our aim is to become more efficient – we need to check that this is what happens.</p> <p>PN – makes sense to see what the levels of satisfaction are now before we change so that we have something to measure against.</p> <p>MS – principal feedback in the North session - don't want it but understand the reason for it.</p> <p>NH – best conversation recently with Norton – he said I heard everything that was said but it makes sense and it's much harder on your own. Intent on doing the heavy lifting to join OAT so that they have the protection of a MAT.</p> <p>AW – really important that whatever we put in place, doesn't fundamentally affect the support they're getting from us. Mechanisms for us that we need to put in place to get feedback but also to demonstrate commitment to school levels throughout the trust.</p> <p>JM – do you think that the in year assessment/survey will be ready to go forward this year in the next couple of months?</p> <p>AW – it's part of our plans.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>FH – not quite understanding what the challenge is in schools in terms of what is being taken away from them and what the new model gives. Job role meets the needs to deliver what they need in those areas – however</p> <p>MS – if you take primary schools – smaller – people doing multi-tasks – need reassurance that multi tasks and reaction to things in academies are fast as that is the current situation. Human element – principals have to look after staff – emotional connections.</p> <p>When you look at bigger academies – the vast majority (north) to some extent, all have similar model where heads don't get too involved in Finance or ops. From that point of view there is an individualised model in each of those schools. Saving will give us something better in the long run. Danger is speed of reaction.</p> <p>RP – bursar did finance, line management of all operational departments. If that person disappears – need someone to run this. If you take away all that stuff need someone to do it.</p> <p>NH – salary was lower than we're paying ours.</p> <p>RP - £32</p> <p>FH – muddled between people in roles on salaries and what we actually need. Need to reassure that everything will be completed as they want.</p> <p>MS – NH has communicated that the services cannot get worse.</p> <p>FH – need to write down what the role then is.</p> <p>NH – everything FH says is correct – next stage is how we have that conversation with academies – need to have some bespoke conversations. Academies might say that they don't need this role because they already have someone that does it – but we need to have personalised conversations to ensure that it is fair and equitable. Think it will land better if we consider current state.</p> <p>IB – roles – finance at head office is still based around individuals – not roles. Why do you need trust accounting – need central services to reflect head office so that it's consistent.</p> <p>PM – response times are going to get worse – there's a high change that because employee will not be on site that some of the response times might get worse – is that possible?</p> <p>PH – whole process is high risk as mentioned – key role is the non-finance bit – concerns from principals – what about my right hand person that oversees everything. Getting that role right is going to be the trick to getting the model and implementation right. Need to get the finance bit sorted and then understand how that role will work. It will vary school to school.</p> <p>Agree the right direction of travel – happy with the way that it's being explored.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>MS – principals need re-educating to think longer-term and strategically. Issues do arise but they do not need to be responded to straight away – that's okay.</p> <p>PM – focus on the benefit of this programme in our communication.</p> <p>SECTION 2</p> <p>PH – staffing structures – changes from what has been previously proposed – regions have changed.</p> <p>FH – common structure – consistency about business partners.</p> <p>Feedback – finance – double reporting line for management account – line needs to be removed.</p> <p>Bulleted list doesn't match org chart – finance 1 and finance 2 – finance processing centre.</p> <p>FBP – and everything underneath but above that – it does not seem to work. With Finance Processing Centre – you would not have people then at head office.</p> <p>IB – someone needs to check the paperwork to ensure that all of the information is correct.</p> <p>Estates and ICT – are they all full time? Workloads look very different. Need to be honest if they're not full time – need to consider how we cover gaps if they are not full time.</p> <p>JMi – estates lead might be somebody who's based in an academy with an active role in that academy and then is able to support more than one academy. Discussion with principals about whether to have a person in an academy.</p> <p>Some academies are not on the list because they're on an ICT managed service.</p> <p>IB – still need someone to oversee that.</p> <p>FH – note needs to be added at the bottom.</p> <p>PH – beware of who manages whom?</p> <p>AJ - possible for us to get together before the May FOR in order to discuss this further. (CB, AJ, FH, IB).</p> <p>PH – things that need to be continued to develop before it goes any further.</p> <p>SECTION 3</p> <p>PH - Project initiation documents</p>	
---	--

<p>CB – only worked here 4/5 days – she will project manage</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Scope out high level project and speak to every member of exec to ascertain direction of travel.</li> <li>2) Scope out financial processes.</li> </ol> <p>First attempt at PID</p> <p>CB – proper plan being put in place – assurance for the board that this is happening. Are there any concerns or feedback on content?</p> <p>AJ – Finance processing centre – having suggested it does purchased pay cycle in addition to everything else – that's all it's doing – need to identify all processes that are going to go in it. Not yet complete and not all joined up in terms of different workstreams.</p> <p>PH – board endorses the process and we'll look at it in more detail in FOR.</p> <p>SECTION 4</p> <p>PH – would like us to have an understanding of what is said at the Principals' Forum next week.</p> <p>CB – engaged with external consultants to produce a work plan – identified key phases in terms of planning – timing and plans – 5 stage process. More detail to be added but this is yet to be populated. Until decision informed by structures, difficult to do anymore work on this – job descriptions can be done – something that we're working on.</p> <p>How are we going to manage implementation of consultation. Conversation about upskilling principals – need to give principals documentation in July so that there is time to upskill principals. Might have to use people from EPM, HR consultants and people from head office go out. Unclear on how each academy will be affected at this point.</p> <p>FH – I had a couple of comments – training for Principals – not just logistics but also something about understanding change generally (operational and people). Important to train them – something that they've never done before and probably will never do again.</p> <p>How big is the team of consultants that will support – do we have 38 people that could go out and do this individually. Plenty of time after session to answer questions.</p> <p>IB – planning phase 2 listed as 14<sup>th</sup> July – board meeting is July 11<sup>th</sup> – either an interim board meeting or an extraordinary meeting. As a board, we want to have more input into the proposals before that phase goes live. Extraordinary meeting early June/late May</p> <p>Principals Forum will be end of June.</p> <p>FH – this would be picked up in workstream around stakeholder planning.</p> <p>PH - Where are we with next weeks' Principals' Forum</p>	
---	--

	<p>NH – half an hour for ops model, not planned what to say until after this meeting. Feels important to share the change in the emphasis around the processing centre. Giving a reflection of the discussions that have happened here. Something about the establishment of the project group and decide when it's going to launch and who the reps will be. Challenge of geography – would want more engagement but difficult with geography. Do we put something else in before next forum – maybe regional in smaller groups to explain where we're getting to.</p> <p>FH- periodic dial ins. Opportunity to ask questions when they come up rather than waiting till next meeting. Forum in June/July time.</p> <p>PM – bespoke approach will be 1-2-1 with individual academies.</p> <p>PH – helpful to have this mapped out – particularly around who needs to be the person that you speak to with feedback – ensure that EVERYONE is fully involved and picked up.</p> <p>Something next week which outlines range of engagement will be helpful and give them reassurance. Several individuals who are very worried and are turning to other principals to talk to when they should be speaking to Exec/project team etc.</p> <p>Thanks to NH and CB and everyone that has been involved so far.</p> <p>SECTION 4</p> <p>Risk register any comments</p> <p>FH– risks in PID and risks on register – need to be ties up.</p> <p>IB – needs to be tidied up.</p> <p>SECTION 5</p> <p>Future project reporting template</p> <p>Trustees happy.</p> <p>IB – on the timing of these – is the intention that these will be updated after the project boards. Would be good to see these at the end of each month so that we get an update.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>SI Update</b>	
	<p>RP - SIS 28<sup>th</sup> Feb – have seen this in some detail.</p> <p>Consistency key to the SI strategy.</p> <p>lofE</p> <p>Lead practitioners</p>	



<p>High-risk academies</p> <p>JN appointed as primary and SEN lead as of Sept.</p> <p>Regions set to change 7 East, 8 South, 8 West 8 North 8 Primaries. Principals not aware.</p> <p>FH that move – is that reflected in the TOM – not but it doesn't impact anything – it does tie up with the new regions.</p> <p>RP – clear view in terms of what we offer young people. Good discussion in SIS about the strands of the SI strategy.</p> <p>OAT model of improvement in each region needs to be looked at now.</p> <p>Non-negotiables – elective home education, what should we do when this happens? Setting out trust wide expectations to standard incidents.</p> <p>Currently have 4 lead practitioners who are doing very well. Increasing this to 8 in sept – still not a large number. Having an impact on high risk and other academies.</p> <p>FH – are these requested by regions or from the centre?</p> <p>RP- both – regions are aware of where they're needed – specific needs in each area. Some scepticism about recruitment.</p> <p>AJ – 8 is not many – what's the constraint?</p> <p>RP – funding. Good opportunity for teachers that wants to work across more than one academy. Good stepping stone for CV and very interesting.</p> <p>CB – good talent management.</p> <p>AJ – can we afford any more than 8?</p> <p>PN – budgets being worked on right now – we can find the budget for 8 – if there's more money, that's where it will be spent.</p> <p>NH – depends how much we manage to achieve in budget setting round and CLFP.</p> <p>FH – funded from the centre?</p> <p>MS- worked in an LA that had 52 consultants but they weren't effective – quality over quantity. Rob's model looks at high quality.</p> <p>AJ – isn't this part of the whole hearts and minds link to TOM – totally commit through releasing savings into Lead practitioners.</p> <p>NH – explicitly communicated at the roadshows. Rebalance resources so that more is being spent on education. It's been made clear – establishing 8 puts us in good stead. Has been part of the message.</p>	
---	--

	<p>MS – NH did make this clear to all the heads. There may be more we can do – in relation to AW's work around curriculum. Secondary all putting curriculums together for their students – is there something in standardisation of curriculum in order to save money and standardise practices – something that we should be looking to do in the near future.</p> <p>PH – can you outline</p> <p>AW – to be discussed and principals' forum next week - curriculum programme underway – senior leaders have come together to look at greater alignment across academies. We will bring a paper on this to the next meeting.</p> <p>Curriculum aims that link to the strategy. Breaking curriculum into 2 streams – eng, mat, sci – stream 1 – subjects are all similar, need to standardise this curriculum. Rest of curriculum, develop a toolkit so there won't be uniformity but there will be alignment.</p> <p>NH – KS3 with the aim of engaging academies for lead practitioners to develop resources for Sept 2020 start. Further conversations to be had with JN about what will be done for primary. Non-negotiables in terms of the curriculum: Must be an ebacc track Must be an opportunity for students to do individual sciences (in the core)</p> <p>Should not be that controversial.</p> <p>AW – feedback from academies that 19-20 is a developmental year because schools are already looking at their curriculums – looking for implementation 2020.</p> <p>NH – Ofsted framework from Sept with focus on curriculum – academies present OAT wide curriculum as part of a MAT and this is their key presentation at Ofsted.– might be helpful for the board to get a briefing on the new Ofsted framework in July.</p> <p>IB – science eng maths -mention of ebacc. No mention of arts or MFL – no move towards standard approach in GCSE till 2023? Wait for the 2020 year 7s to get up to GCSEs? One exam board etc?</p> <p>RP – content of all exam boards in the same anyway – quality of provision more important than exam boards.</p> <p>NH – MfL covered by Ebacc. Has to be the opportunity for students to study a MfL. Breadth will still be there – will be an Ofsted criteria in framework. Present framework in terms of breadth is clearer than it's ever been.</p> <p>Things like iWill and extra curriculums will be looked at in consideration of final decision on quality of education.</p> <p>AW – on the point about quals – the area that needs focus isn't exam boards but the variety of qualifications – we currently offer hundreds of different</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>kinds – need to reassure ourselves that the right qualifications are being offered.</p> <p>NH - RDs need to sign this off.</p> <p>RP – quality of teachers is our next development – IoE – training, developing and retaining our staff. SCITT trainees doubled for September. Hub in Birmingham – this will grow as we move forward.</p> <p>17% of teaching school numbers left last year. 7-11% is acceptable – 17% is high – 50% of the leavers left OAT and the rest were promoted in their academy so the actual number is closer to 8%.</p> <p>BS – missing thing is the talent development – if you want to change the message from we're doing it to you....our biggest asset is our people – people need to be at the centre of the TOM – journey that we're going on. Framework for career progression.</p> <p>RP – yes – not just about training staff – full career progression.</p> <p>BS – that should have been in the centre of the TOM conversation. Get a better balance of centralisation so that people aren't having something done to them, it's an investment in people. Needs to be a key message in the communications of the TOM.</p> <p>CB – not only investing in lead practitioners and trainee teachers.</p> <p>BS – let people know that they can move within the framework of the whole organisation.</p> <p>RP – need to train our own and invest in people. Recent trip to Canada was successful – not a long term solution but good short term measure. The quality of candidates was incredible.</p> <p>FH – interesting to see what their experiences are when they come over and start.</p> <p>RP – when they come over- they'll be in accommodation together so that they're not isolated.</p> <p>Not many inspections this year. But really good outcomes so far.</p> <p>Safeguarding – DSLs have been trained – change of practice to the way we review SG – increased emphasis on students electively home educated.</p> <p>Closer look at the definition of restraint. Need to be careful about where youngsters that leave, go. Data available on CPOMS.</p> <p>New MAT evaluation framework – some elements on sg compliance for MATs – if and when we're looked at as a MAT – SG support is in place.</p> <p>IB – spent time looking at lessons learned from Stoke High in FOR.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>PM – Permanent Exclusions – harsh approach towards students.</p> <p>RP – consistency around behaviour across the trust – AP offer differs massively. Norfolk no AP – Stoke, good local provision. Sometimes when you look at LAs there are different support in place. Need an improvement on consistency.</p> <p>PM – too extreme a zero-tolerance approach.</p> <p>MS – AP approach – <b>look at the amount of money that we spend on AP and how that is spent. Do we set up our own AP – we can provide them with our own education system – they still stay on our role. Stops gaming. Financial thing around this. £250k from 3 schools in stoke.</b></p> <p>PH – important issue – with new evaluation framework next year – Cliff Park asked if they were interested in running AP in Suffolk. RP to have a view on permexs and then where</p> <p>BS – have a conversation about what we think our standard is- we're in the most challenging areas – standards need to be set.</p> <p>PH – need to have a view of what's happening across academies in permex and what should we do about it?</p> <p>NH – extracting budgets spent on AP – needs to be done on the basis of clusters of academies.</p> <p>PH – schools do set up managed moves. Drugs not tolerated.</p> <p>MS – inconsistencies in how we as an organisation would deal with situation. I involved police and wouldn't exclude necessarily. Clarifying it in order to ensure consistency. Bigger picture is what we're doing support children.</p> <p>PM – cost implication – all processes involved amount to £50k</p> <p>NH – MAT review process – have a briefing for MAT review process and Ofsted Framework training.</p> <p>FH – question on appendix –</p> <p>PH – looks glossy and nice.</p> <p>RP – looks different</p> <p>FH – looks good.</p> <p>PH – circulate to trustees.</p> <p>BS – comments on TOM – observation – simple RAG status of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) ambition,</li> <li>2) project timeline,</li> <li>3) staff feedback</li> </ol>	
--	--

<b>5</b>	<b>Estates Update</b>	
	<p>Progress made on ensuring ICT compliance, capital works and Pathfinders – early adopters of the new bellrock service.</p> <p>New staff member in H&amp;S part time on FTC in order to assist with ongoing work and risk assessments.</p> <p>FH – accidents and incidents reporting piece – saw it at FOR in terms of what it might look like – what is now happening with this data.</p> <p>JMi – within my team, we review H&amp;S incidents on a daily basis and action accordingly.</p> <p>FH – looking at individual instances – but in terms of patterns – why are we collecting the trust data?</p> <p>JMi – unions like to see the data to ensure that we're keeping everyone safe. Could use the data to be more tactical.</p> <p>AW – data project- number of priorities – drawing in data from lots of sources.</p> <p>FH – fear of collection data for no reason</p> <p>JMi – replaces accident books.</p> <p>PH – why is everyone else doing compliance and not CNS?</p> <p>JMi – short staffed – action plan in place to deal with it. Needs to be addressed asap – support and coaching package been put into place to support staff member that needs to do the work.</p> <p>IB – are they falling below a floor standard? Or are the fire service being picky</p> <p>JMi – bit of both.</p> <p>IB – who does our fire safety risk assessments in other schools,</p> <p>JMi outsourced – flagged because actions from outsourced assessments were not completed.</p> <p>AJ – Why are they not doing food hygiene certification, confined spaces etc. Understand there might be a lead time but they should not keep coming up as red on the risk assessments.</p> <p>JMi – there is detail in the report about why but potentially could be stronger.</p> <p>PH – Feedback for next board meeting that CNS are now compliant.</p> <p>NH – I wouldn't want us to be sent any FOI requests on this for all of our academies as this would be difficult.</p>	

	<p>JMi - shall take a stronger stance.</p> <p>IB – longer established academies – Bushfield, shouldn't have big blocks of red – they need to sort it out.</p> <p>JMi – capital programmes panel met last week in making awards directly to academies. Larger blocks of improvements works allocated and awarded – allocated £2.6m. sent out early next week to Exec and RDs and then sent out to all academies to ensure transparency.</p> <p>Good year for capital programmes – phillip Hammond award, GSA extension, COWES joint pitch award. Good year for capital investment.</p> <p>FH – where has the phillip Hammond money gone?</p> <p>JMi – came to us but has now gone directly on to each academy – must be spent on capital at each academy.</p> <p>PN – has to be accounted for at some point.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Data Project</b>	
	<p>AW -focussed on the strategy – data strategy about unpacking our analytical skills.</p> <p>Data team now working on (developmental – fully fledged by summer) – level of iteration that is required.</p> <p>Initial thoughts about a data strategy – sounding board at first stage – what is it that we want to achieve, where are we now and what does that look like?</p> <p>Think about the people that we have and the behaviours that we're seeing. Level of risk in some of the practices and level of risk in the data that we hold (large quantities).</p> <p>Management information systems (MIS) all schools have an MIS – looking to migrate everyone to the same one. We will move to SIMS – 36/38 Those not included will have to continue with manual input.</p> <p>Currently putting a script into MIS to extract all the data. In terms of culture there has been barriers in terms of academy employee cooperation.</p> <p>Currently at 5 schools that have no yet implemented script (2 are those that haven't moved across yet)</p> <p>Production of a production tool – have been using EVA – taken the decision to build our own tool. The market for MAT tools is not mature and the tools are not great.</p> <p>Risk is that we have to have something for the start of September. We have good progress and there is an interim tool in place – feedback on this has been better. Excel based currently, moving to a powerBI tool by Sept.</p>	

	<p>Through TOM – the process that will need to go through school accounts and look at licence fees for various tools. Strategy is that we centralise costs and invest in better capability nationally.</p> <p>iWill – how to look at social and emotional data.</p> <p>IB – appendix listed all the different bits of software – assuming that this is an account of schools – worrying that nearly all our schools are on Hoge. But only 27 listed – do we have the correct amount of licences?</p> <p>AW – licences is an indication but not clear exactly correct as a number of schools did not respond.</p> <p>FH – a lot of our strategies we started to develop before agreement of overall strategy. Need to see clear link between overarching strategy and individual plans/strategies – need to make sure that this happens in every document.</p> <p>AW – helpful point need to use it for checks and challenging ourselves.</p> <p>BS – breadth of the purpose of this piece of work. Compliance data, information to run the business, data and information to build knowledge – what's the data story of information</p> <p>AW – the compliance bit is the bit that we have focussed least on – we have things that are holding the organisation together – the focus at the moment is about building the information to run the business. Strategy perspective is to fill that business need and build a cultural piece about how they view students and consider and assess needs being met.</p> <p>Need to replace tool used now that isn't fit for purpose.</p> <p>BS – will you use the same systems for knowledge building ?</p> <p>AW – infrastructure we're trying to build – you can harvest large numbers of data sets and build analysis out of that. Use the same tool to do the basic and complex things.</p> <p>BS – you'd want to be confident to be doing it in house – big piece of work.</p> <p>AW – won't do it all inhouse – looking to develop a collection of tools to use but at the moment there isn't coherence between systems.</p> <p>BS – do we have that expertise in house?</p> <p>AJ – difficult to accept that none of the other MATs has done this already? Can we make sure that we definitively know that there isn't something we could piggy back on.</p> <p>AW – had frank conversations with various people – Arber will do it for you but then you're locked in. Or you do the whole things yourself. Or you fit various market items together which is what we want to do.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The vision for what we want to do – there isn't anything on the market that does that. We wouldn't necessarily do it ourselves – we would have to get someone external to do that but we do have the expertise to link programmes together.</p> <p>AJ – who is leading on the development and what expertise is there internally? Do we need more resource on this?</p> <p>AW – tight group AW, JMi, LL, DJ. Small team both have the technical ability. DJ built a whole school system at OCA – all staff love it.</p> <p>JMi – reality – capita at the heart and then half a dozen bits of software with some knitting around the edges. Will need to pilot then roll out to other academies.</p> <p>AW – capability bit is very important – need to understand what we don't know. We know when we haven't got a skill.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Management Accounts</b>	
	<p>Positive variance but half of it is sitting in head office – funding of teachers pay awards given to academies. One third of it returned. Staff vacancies this year which has led to some savings. Head office variance will decline throughout the year. Also lots of costs incurred on TOM.</p> <p>End of year forecast – aim is to ensure that every academy comes in on budget. A few negative academies – Bushfield, NEW, WOA, Meridian. More money come in this week for FSM – NEW – had to pay an unexpected £70k to leaving principal. FSM funding will help rectify this.</p> <p>IB – went through the accounts at FOR – particularly the red ones. Whilst we're looking at these as forecast results – potential accountings costs in that we might have to recognise next years' restructuring costs in this years' accounts – but consultation with accountant has concluded that as haven't started consultation we don't need to include them in this financial year.</p> <p>PN – budgets – well into budget cycle – now getting funding through from ESFA – Chairs invited to attend meetings – will bring draft budgets to next FOR committee in May.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Strategy Implementation</b>	
	<p>AW – focused on corporate planning – if we want to deliver on actions we need threads to run throughout the organisation. Currently running on an incomplete golden thread. Needed a corporate plan at head office and links between strategy and ADP.</p> <p>Should be a link between strategy and budget planning.</p> <p>Need to get people to think about the strategy in everything they do. Moving towards a collaborative discussion is welcome but needs a shift in culture.</p> <p>Templates being worked on at the moment. The link missing is the to make sure that actions in strategy are outlined clearly and that they are asked to think about what they need to do to deliver that action. Evident challenge</p>	



	<p>about balance of activity in order to make them think about how local activity links to central strategy.</p> <p>View from the board about corporate plan – is there a view about reporting back to the board at a higher level?</p> <p>FH – will it be RAG rated</p> <p>AW – yes –</p> <p>IB – the bit that needs to come to us is the head office bit to either FOR or the BOARD.</p> <p>AW – helpful thank you.</p> <p>AJ – If I'm a head and thinking of a 'done to' culture – is this another thing that you're making me do? What's the perception of the level of centralisation?</p> <p>MS – they understand the need for change, particularly in terms of trust performance – like anything else, when it's in practice, they see it's being 'done to' us. AW looking at important strategy – we need that consistency of approach and clear understanding. Still will have some people thinking that it's from the top. Considerations of is this right time with SATs coming up etc. Organisational restructure current focus – Strategy will be seen as an easier thing to follow.</p> <p>AJ – necessary but it needs to be light touch. Worried about the perception – win the hearts and minds. Don't want it to be seen as a layer of bureaucracy</p> <p>BS – important of balance compliance and controlling nature of things that we do, my sense, and making sure that there's innovation otherwise it'll just feel like another corporate initiative. Compliance and innovation should always be considered. How you do it – not what you do.</p> <p>AW – culture – the intention is not that it be hard edged/compliance focussed – use the mechanism of the annual planning cycle which they do anyway to facilitate a different lens to look at our work. Some of our ADPs are not where they need to do – some of them are not very good. Strategy priority to motivate staff to stay with us and relish teaching. Some things we expect them to do well. It's a liberating message- just do a small number of things well.</p> <p>FH – important that they see value in what we ask them to do – length of time and workload – need to give them things that are shorter quicker faster better.</p> <p>PH – some ADPs online where they're too long and inaccessible.</p> <p>NH – the guidance is that ADP shouldn't be longer than 4 pages</p> <p>PH – it this in your strategy? Do we say it should be 4 sides.</p>	
--	--	--

	RP – it says what should be in the ADP but doesn't outline 4 sides.	
<b>9</b>	<b>Conversions</b>	
	<p>NH - Sandymoor – near OBA – successful associations. Recent ofsted visit has been positive for OAT. Process has become inverted because the RSC usually see the proposal after it's been to the trust board but the RSC has already given approval. We need to have a long hard look at it.</p> <p>Everything good apart from the finances – ongoing deficit of £250k+ - cannot continue with this unless forecast numbers will continue. Need further assurances before the next board.</p> <p>PN – important that things happen in the right order. Currently on LAG funding. If they remain as they are they would put forward a business case for forecast numbers. As soon as they convert they will become our problem. Need confirmation from the right people that it will be funded. We will then propose what the case is when we have more detail.</p> <p>PM is there a conflict with OBA?</p> <p>NH – makes more sense for both academies to be in one trust in order to plan pupil numbers across both schools. Difficulty with catchments in both areas.</p> <p>Hopefully they will have voted themselves to continue down the conversion route.</p> <p>Brownhills.</p> <p>PH – has this been to FOR?</p> <p>IB – Yes</p> <p>PH – are they content?</p> <p>AJ – we had some questions.</p> <p>NH – easy to see the red – our view is that it's not difficult to put these things right.</p> <p>Key case for proceeding is that it's close to other academies. Particularly shelfield, looking to strengthen links between schools. Lots of capacity in region in terms of working with the school. One NLE has already been contracted to work with Brownhills – would be able to continue should they join. He probably won't be needed for the work he's been doing with Tenbury – they're in a good place and the appointment there wasn't intended to be long term.</p> <p>Key opportunity about leadership – head is leaving – we are supporting. Another vacancy for VP. Give us the chance to put the right leadership in place. We believe it would be appropriate to continue forward with Brownhills.</p>	

	<p>AJ – prior to final sign off, can we see the financial turnaround plan?</p> <p>PN – page 143</p> <p>AJ – Are these their forecasts or our forecast?</p> <p>PN – theirs but we have checked and they make sense.</p> <p>Board happy for Brownhills conversion to continue.</p> <p>FH – monitor what happens between now and conversion – make sure that there's a transition plan.</p> <p>NH – will put the memorandum of understanding in place tomorrow.</p> <p>Need to look at Safeguarding in more detail.</p> <p>IB – finance more important because we know the head and deputy are going and could spend lots of money.</p>	
<b>10</b>	<b>Decision Papers</b>	
	<p>PH - All presented to lawyers and Exec – is there anything contentious.</p> <p>BS – if it was a complaint against OAT management.</p> <p>CB – any complaint about Head Office would come through the OAT policies.</p> <p>All approved.</p>	
<b>11</b>	<b>For info</b>	
	All approved.	
<b>12</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	<p>AJ – Training programme for MAT trustees tomorrow and Saturday – continuing on-boarding process. Whole board and individual thing – will follow up on what happens.</p> <p>Skills audit will be sent out to trustees.</p> <p>Jane becoming national director of primary and send. Will be coming to SIS in her new capacity. Thus she cannot continue as a principal trustee. PH will talk to JN about this next week. Asked MS to speak to JN about the process for appointed a new principal onto the academy. Process was not good last time. Needs to be a better process this time. MS and JN to discuss and come back with a better process in order to start in Sept,</p> <p>PM – meeting with education endowment fund. Would AW brief us on iWill.</p> <p>AW – development work evaluation it is ready to go out – integrated assessment model, early intervention foundation – better to use a single provider. Going back to big lottery to test the ground.</p>	

	<p>PM – tender will go out soon?</p> <p>AW – waiting for Amanda to come back. Document sitting and waiting to go.</p> <p>PH – Amanda Taylor (AT) CEO of a learning Trust and NLE – recommended by Robin Boshier – NH met with her – she wishes to join the board. Sensible for her to come to next SIS – which will be in May.</p> <p>Another appointment as national director for teaching and training and we have 1 candidate – 1 strong candidate. There will be a process involving exec and trustee interviews.</p> <p>NH – can we find a date – Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> March? Panel of Principals and RDs – PH will attend. May consider alternative dates to for FH to attend aswell.</p>	
<b>13</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	
	Extraordinary meeting in Late May – next meetings confirmed.	