

Kirklees Directorate for Children and Adults

Company no: 07729878

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF SHARE MULTI ACADEMY TRUST

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors of SHARE Multi Academy Trust held via Microsoft Teams at 6pm Thursday 1 July 2021.

Present

Mr A Kent (Chair), Mr M Day, Mr M Dunkley, Mr N Javaid, Prof J Keay, Mr J McNally, Mrs L Rawlinson

In Attendance

 Ms R Hesmondhalgh, Executive Headteacher (for item 479)
 Ms D Howard, Director of Operations
 Mrs J Newson, Executive PA, SHARE Multi Academy Trust
 Mrs C Potterton, Director of Finance
 Ms A Walker, Minute Clerk

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
478.	Apologies, Consent and Declarations of LAAPS and Interests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. • There were apologies for absence from Mr D Quinn. • Mr J Glazzard was absent. • The following declaration of interest was made <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The wife of Mr M Dunkley works for SHARE Multi-Academy Trust. 	
479.	Sustainable Growth Plan <p>All attendees agreed to this item being filmed.</p> <p>As part of her NPQEL qualification, Ms Hesmondhalgh was undertaking a project to look at a sustainable growth plan within the school improvement provision and presented her findings and key priorities to date, opening up any questions from Directors.</p> <p>Ms Hesmondhalgh explained that the project proposed to look at needs and development needs of the Trust to provide value. The Trust had the potential for growth. Feedback was being gathered in terms of the needs of the schools, and this could be subject specific, staffing or succession</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>planning and the findings would be used to identify key school improvement priorities, particularly in the context of Trust growth. Feedback was being gathered to look at how well staff were used, capacity in schools and external support. There was a need to focus on the implications, for example, finance and HR, and the wider expectations of the Trust.</p> <p>Q. What level is the project aimed at. There sounds to be a lot of detail and this is fantastic. It appears to be at the practical level. To what degree is the project strategic and forward looking and what is the balance between this and more immediate things which might crop up?</p> <p>A. There are always things which need to be actioned early in the academic year. The project is also looking forward, for example, if Whitcliffe was to join the Trust and what might be needed. When speaking to headteachers, we are looking at capacity and how we might need to support staff with development and growth going forward to maintain strong staffing. There is a balance between what needs to be done now and the plan to go forward, and whether these are a one off or a project.</p> <p>Q. How will value, beliefs and outcomes inform the future strategy?</p> <p>A. I would hope this is included in the process and in the work we currently undertake in school improvement. Value for money will be looked at. We do not know what growth will look like. We will see what is likely to be needed and act on guidance from the CEO and the wider team and there will sometimes be a need to prioritise. The intention is always to get best outcomes for students. We cannot always do everything and sometimes the answers are in the school, utilising strong staff elsewhere and continuing to develop staff.</p> <p>Q. You mentioned business development at the beginning and, to a certain extent, this means selling. Is a spin off to this work to ‘sell’ the Trust to facilitate growth?</p> <p>A. I am not best placed to answer this, but in terms of ‘selling’, we do this on a daily basis and it is very important to sell what a MAT can do. You do not need to say much as by its actions the Trust ‘sells’ itself. If you get the job right and are seen to be valuable, it sells itself. If it is right to grow, we could be in a situation where this could happen.</p> <p>Q. What does success look like – is it to grow or to improve what we do, or are the two linked?</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>A. From my perspective, it is important to get the support right for the schools we have. Within the current model, we can look at growth. We look at whether we grow and consider if we are in a position to do so effectively. If we take on schools without the right support, it will not work. It is about what we are doing now and what we could offer going forward.</p>	
480.	<p>Matters for any Other Urgent Business</p> <p>The following items were raised as Any Other Business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millbridge Change to the School Day • Queen’s Platinum Jubilee Bank Holiday 2022 	
481.	<p>Representation</p> <p>The following matters of representation were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christopher Evans and Tom Kitching had resigned from Millbridge and Heaton Avenue school governing bodies, respectively. <p>Mrs Newson would draft a letter of thanks on behalf of the Trustees.</p>	
482.	<p>Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 13 May and Any Matters Arising from the Minutes</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2021 be approved and can be signed by the chair as a correct record of the meeting.</p> <p>There was one matter arising:</p> <p><u>CEO Report - Operations Report (Minute 468 (I) refers)</u></p> <p>Mrs Newson confirmed that the National Governance Association had stated that face to face meetings should be held from September 2021 unless there were exceptional reasons to revert to video conference. Members asked Mrs Newson to seek clarity on this rationale. Members would prefer a hybrid model where they could choose the most appropriate method.</p> <p>ACTION: Mrs Newson to seek a rationale from the NGA on their guidance for all meetings to be face to face.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
483.	<p>CEO Report for Directors</p> <p>The Chief Executive’s Report July 2021 had been circulated before the meeting.</p> <p>The CEO updated the meeting on key areas in the report.</p> <p>(a) DELETED – Minute 492 refers</p> <p>(b) <u>Royds Hall Restructure Plans</u></p> <p>The CEO explained that the consultation had been completed. This included four face to face meetings, an online questionnaire and email responses. The Local Authority was included in the consultation. Responses had been shared with Trustees. An update was given on the response from the LA.</p> <p>An equality impact assessment will be submitted with the application and this had not previously been shared with Trustees. The CEO explained that the impact on SEND and disadvantaged pupils would need to be mitigated through the provision of free and supervised transport. The full equality impact assessment would be shared with Trustees.</p> <p>Q. The correspondence included a solicitor’s letter which asked for the consultation to be extended by four weeks. Given that there is not overwhelming support for the proposals, would it be sensible to do this?</p> <p>A. The purpose of a consultation is to gather views, which it has done. In another four weeks, there will be the same views. Stakeholders have had the opportunity to tell the Trust what they think and it is unlikely we would get any new information by extending the consultation. There have been responses which are against the proposal but none have put forward an alternative option. If there had been apathy, this would be a reason to consider an extension. The consultation has successfully reached people.</p> <p>Q. Have the legal consultation timescales been adhered to?</p> <p>A. Yes, exactly in line with the guidance.</p> <p>Q. I read all the responses and most are driven by emotion, which is understandable. However, one practical issue raised is the need to transport children from one location to the other and there will be</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>environmental impacts. What impact is transport likely to have?</p> <p>A. There are 113 children at Lilly Park and 60 live within the priority area and the rest are outside. In the short term, the transport may be an issue but there are children who currently come from outside the admission area. Over a period of 5/7 years, it is expected that intake will transition to those living closer and there will again be the opportunity for families to walk to the school.</p> <p>Q. How many objections were received from the families of the 113 current pupils?</p> <p>A. There was some overlap in the consultation, with some families responding more than once. The face to face consultations were attended by 31 parents (this represents about 50% of families), although some were accompanied by additional family members. The wording of the emails and questionnaires has highlighted duplication of responses.</p> <p>Q. The LA response expressed some opposition, what impact will this have?</p> <p>A. We have built good relationships with officers. The guidance on consultations requires the Trust to be able to say how it engaged with LA. There LA does make some concession in their response, for example, they accept that there is reduced pupil demand.</p> <p>Q. If the Trust does go ahead with the proposal, the communications will be critical and the implantation plan will be important. Do we have policy on communications? There is the potential for individual Trustees to be contacted about this.</p> <p>A. The CEO will be the central contact for all enquiries.</p> <p>Q. How many pupils are expected to require transport to Luck Lane and over what timeframe? What will the costs be?</p> <p>A. This will be based on individual circumstances. There are four pupils with an educational health care plan but these are not mobility related. Parent disability might be a consideration for one family. A standard 50 seater coach could cost over £30,000 per year. In the context of the school budget position and the financial impact of the school remaining open, the transport costs are not prohibitive to the proposal.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>RESOLVED: That the application for a significant change be submitted to the Regional Schools Commissioner before the end of the academic year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transfer pupils from the Lily Park site to Luck Lane; 2. De-amalgamate the secondary and primary school. <p>One director abstained from the vote due to their operational involvement in the consultation.</p> <p>Q. Can these be decided as a single vote?</p> <p>A. Our trust advisor from the RSC has said that the Trust might have to consult again but they thought this was unlikely.</p> <p><i>Mr Dunkley the meeting at 7.25pm</i></p> <p>(c) <u>Teacher Assessed Grades</u></p> <p>The CEO provided an update and noted that a summary was appended to the report. Assessment samples had been sent to exam boards, as per their request.</p> <p>Q. Are schools still required to pay exam board fees this year?</p> <p>A. A proportion of the fees will be payable. The Welsh Exam Board has indicated that schools will pay 43 per cent of the fees and a response is awaited from AQA. Trust school budgets assume that 100 per cent of fees will be payable and therefore this could represent up to £100,000 savings across the Trust.</p> <p>(d) <u>MAT Assurance Framework</u></p> <p>The CEO presented the self-evaluation framework, which had been completed in draft and appended to the report.</p> <p>Q. The frameworks asks whether the Trustee Board collects feedback from staff, pupils and parents. Where do we ask for this?</p> <p>A. This has not been done this year due to Covid. We tend to use the Ofsted questionnaire. We have said we will do it in September. There is more work to do to engage parents on our priorities.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>Q. Should we be considering governance succession planning?</p> <p>A. The Trust has established a governor network. Succession planning is something to focus on more next year.</p> <p>Q. Should the areas rated red and amber be built into a plan for next year?</p> <p>A. I need to reflect on this. We have a Trust Implementation Plan, which is based on the individual academy targets but this should also have a Trust wide focus within it. However, the Trust Implementation Plan is a way to help head teachers focus on the SIP and maybe it is not the right approach and the focus of the centre should be on the MAT assurance framework. Trustees will be kept informed on the thinking around this.</p> <p>Q. Will this be tied in with the results of the Ambition Institute review?</p> <p>A. Yes. The Ambition Institute review was booked in before the DfE brought out the assurance framework. The Ambition Institute will provide analysis and objectives, and it makes sense to pull all this together.</p> <p>(e) <u>Teaching Hub School</u></p> <p>The CEO commented on the positive recruitment and noted thanks to the team. He thanked Ms Keay and Mr Dunkley for agreeing to be part of the teaching hub governing body.</p> <p>(f) <u>Trust Leadership Structures</u></p> <p>The CEO commented that all head teachers had reacted positively to the rotation of two primary heads.</p> <p>(g) <u>OFSTED Report on Sexual Abuse</u></p> <p>The CEO provided an update on the actions taken to address this. He said this was fully supported and there was a need to address these issues before they start. The actions included reviews of policy and the personal development programme for next year.</p> <p>(h) <u>Finance – Director of Finance report</u></p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>The DoF provided an update. It was noted that the narrative in the report had been reviewed in May, along with the draft budget. The budget reviewed by the Audit and Risk Committee forecasted a £77,000 in-year deficit and the updated version presented today showed a £42,000 in year deficit. Detail was given about the improved forecast being as a result of recent extensive forecast checks completed by central finance in consultation with academy headteachers. An overview of the three-year budget was also provided.</p> <p>Q. We were not expecting salary increases, why has a two per cent pay increase been budgeted?</p> <p>A. This is for support staff salary increases. The current offer is 1.5 per cent and this is unlikely to go down. A 1 per cent pay rise has been budgeted for teaching staff in future years on the assumption this will be funded centrally.</p> <p>Q. Without the salary increases, would there be a balanced in year budget?</p> <p>A. Yes.</p> <p>Q. Are there any implications for the Trust in agreeing an in-year deficit?</p> <p>A. There is a requirement for trusts to work within a balanced budget but this does include the reserves. As a trust, Share, receives an allocation of capital funding. Some of this funding is allocated to staffing costs for premises staff. There will be further consideration to the way this is reported and this will be raised with the external auditors.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the 2021-22 SHARE MAT Draft Budget be approved.</p> <p>(i) <u>Operations Report</u></p> <p>The report presented the School Condition Allocation (SCA) capital grant plan for 2021/22 for approval. Allocation of funding was based on condition surveys, which were commissioned by the DfE. The full spreadsheet version of the plans had been shared with Trustees, which outlined historic and future plans. Some projects in the plan were still at estimate stage and the costs were based on previous condition improvement bids.</p> <p>Q. There is a lot of activity and it looks like the Trust made the right decision to employ in house</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>technicians. What governance is in place to ensure the quality of work?</p> <p>A. The staff employed are specialist technicians. For the larger schemes of work, external companies are engaged to project manage and sign off the work.</p> <p>Q. There is some work in the capital plans which represents catch up. In the longer term, does the Trust need to be more innovative and cost effective, for example, taking a step back on heating and considering new technologies, for example, solar and heat pumps.</p> <p>A. The Trust is in the second year of SCA allocation, and therefore this is only the second year that the Trust has had the funds to spend as it sees fit. The priorities are driven by the condition surveys. Where external consultants are engaged, we are having these conversations about future proofing, rather than like for like replacement. There was a recent push on green initiatives from Government and there was a small window to apply for grants.</p> <p>Q. The gardens at Shelley College are overgrown, does this lead to vermin?</p> <p>A. There have been some caretaking capacity issues that have now been resolved. Schools occasionally get vermin, particularly those surrounded by fields. This can be affected by issues such as how classrooms are left.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the SCA spend plan for 21/22 be approved.</p>	
484.	<p>Teacher Assessed Grades</p> <p>This item was covered under the CEO's Report.</p>	
485.	<p>Whitcliffe Mount</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Diligence <p>This item was covered under the CEO's Report.</p>	
486.	<p>OFSTED Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Sexual Abuse in Schools and Colleges <p>This item was covered under the CEO's Report.</p>	
487.	<p>Finance, Operations and HR Reports</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>•SCA Expenditure Review 2020/21 and Plans for 2021/22</p> <p>This item was covered under the CEO’s Report.</p>	
488.	<p>Budget Approval, including Capital Expenditure Plans</p> <p>This item was covered under the CEO’s Report.</p>	
489.	<p>Verbal Updates from NE Directors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director of Training & Curriculum • Director of Behaviour & Attendance • Director of Employee Matters • Director of IT, H&S & Operational Matters • Director of Safeguarding • Director of LAC & Disadvantaged • Director of Equality & SEND • Audit & Risk Assurance Committee update • Feedback from the Governance Group <p>There were no further updates in addition to those provided within the CEO’s Report.</p>	
490.	<p>Correspondence</p> <p>There had been no items of correspondence.</p>	
491.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>(a) <u>Queen’s Platinum Jubilee Bank Holiday 2022</u></p> <p>The CEO explained the proposal to follow the Kirklees’ calendar. The additional bank holiday may be taken at any other time of the year. The CEO recommended this decision is delegated to local academies.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the Queen’s Platinum Jubilee Bank Holiday 2022 arrangements be arranged by local governors and headteachers</p> <p>(b) <u>Millbridge Change to the School Day</u></p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions	Action – who/by
	<p>The proposal was to change from at 8.55am start to an 8.40am start (previously pupils had arrived on site from 8.30am for an 8.55am start) The change would result in additional learning time and parents were happy with the proposal. The change would not require a formal consultation.</p> <p>Q. Does the change in school day have support from staff and trade unions?</p> <p>A. Yes.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That a change in school day at Millbridge be approved to allow an 8:55am start to the school day.</p> <p>(c) <u>Acknowledgement</u></p> <p>The CEO noted that this was Mrs Newson’s last Board meeting. He expressed his gratitude for the support she had provided to him and the Trustees and he commented on the wonderful job she had done. The Chair echoed this and expressed his thanks for the support Mrs Newson had provided to him and others. The Board passed on their best wishes for Mrs Newson’s new career.</p> <p>Mrs Newson thanked the board for their kind words and expressed how much she had enjoyed the role.</p>	
492.	<p>Agenda, minutes and related papers – school copy</p> <p>RESOLVED: That minute 483(a) be excluded from the copy to be made available at the Trust, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.</p>	

The Chair closed the meeting at 20:15.