

Minutes of CAST Board meeting to discuss strategic goal monitoring held on Friday 21st January 2022 remotely via Zoom from 10.30am

Attendees:	Andy Nicholls (AN)	-	Foundation Director (Chair)
	Sandy Anderson (SA)	-	Foundation Director
	Ruth O'Donovan (RO)	-	Foundation Director
	Graham Briscoe (GB)	-	Co-opted Director
	Les Robins (LR)	-	Co-opted Director
In Attendance:	Zoe Batten (ZB)	-	CEO
	Rose Colpus-Fricker (RCF)	-	COO
	Kevin Butlin (KB)	-	Director of Education and Standards
	Leah Paiano (LP)	-	Clerk

1. Welcome and Opening Prayer	Decision/Action
Opening prayer by AN.	
2. Apologies and Confirmation of Quorum	
Apologies received from Dan Rogerson, Jacqui Vaughan, Ann Harris and Laura Fox. Quorum met.	
3. Declaration of Interest	
None declared.	
4. Questions received in advance of the meeting	
Looking at the standards ranges for a large number of goals, if any one school is NE then the whole Trust is NE. I believe this is too harsh as we could have an extreme position where 33 schools are M and one school is NE then the whole Trust would be NE. Remember this reflects a point in time (current Trust position) to assess how we are progressing against the 5 year goal end point. If these ranges are used, we will always see little in the "progressing towards" column and a lot in the NE column. This will make it difficult to focus on the most significant issues.	
2. Line 1 (canonical inspection grade) shows a Trust position of NE. However, there are no schools shown as NE and greater than 90% are M or better?	
3. Pupil wellbeing - there are 74% of schools at M and none at NE, so the Trust should be at least Progressing Towards.	
4. Premises and Estates - surprised to see every school NE.	
5. When we use this heat map in Board meetings I believe there will need to be a short commentary to highlight key issues.	
Reviewing Sandy`s comments - and looking at the paperwork again last evening - I see that you too have picked up the point	

I was going to make = "Premises & Estate = H & S % ranking for each School.

I presume the reference to **RED "Not established"** is because of the workload setting up the Heat Map - (rather than having nothing to base on) because I believe all CAST Schools have now had some form of H & S inspection by the Devon County Council – CAST's out-sourced Responsible Person.

Looking at our current position how realistic is the achievement of the strategy in 5 years? Are there elements in red which can be achieved?

Has any insight analysis been undertaken?

Comment: I believe that we had agreed that the Finance measures were to be at Trust level - is this the case?

ZB explained the school level sheet of the Heat Map is a point in time but makes projections on reaching the standards, how we are assessing ourselves against the 5-year goals. This has been discussed at SELT and is has been decided the school level data aggregates the data into a Trust view and this can show a judgment which is too harsh or too positive. The school level sheets will continue and be reviewed by the Board three times a year, school level will be kept as a point in time. Link Directors will be able to have meaningful conversations with the LGB about judgements. SELT and the School Improvement Team will drill down further. The top sheet is a judgement based on progress towards the goals, recognising they cover a 5-year period. The school level sheet is the here and now. AN felt the top sheet is also a point in time and not a forecast of where schools will be in 5 years' time.

KB stated the terminology is critical. The top sheet is an accurately positive view of the Trust position (projection) within the life of the TIP, at the moment it would reflect our judgement of each standard of 2025. AN disagreed with this. Current Trust position is where we are today, progressing towards the 5-year end point. ZB agreed that terminology is key, the top sheet is a point in time and going forward there will be two things – point in time at school level and the Trust position which more favourably reflects where we are on the 5-year journey. AN felt the Board should be reviewing a Trust level document and delving deeper when needed, a report that shows us today where we are on achieving the 5-year goals.

KB talked through monitoring in schools and how this is reflected in the Heat Map. Projections will change over time positively and negatively with progress being tracked by version history. AN issue is looking at projection of where you think you will be means you can't focus on where the problems are. How to hold SELT to account using this report, all reports have to line up. SA felt need to know where individual schools stand today based on ESM judgements, and where schools will be in 5 years time in the view of SELT. AN likened it to financial reports – where we are today and forecast reports. GB confirmed he

was happy with the school level data (current position) and Trust data (overall position).

The Board discussed the goals and whether they were realistic. ZB confirmed some goals were highlight aspirational, for example, Net Zero by 2030 – more likely 2050. Some goals could be 'quick wins' if finances are being directed, e.g. capital, but diverts money from school improvement.

AN felt the Board should be looking at two sheets; current position and forecast position and asked how much work it would take to generate both. ZB explained it is important to have the time to get it right and the target would be the May Board meeting. AN confirmed asking SELT to produce two reports, current and forecast position. RO asked if the Board would need the forecast position at each Heat Map review or only the annual review. AB confirmed for each review (three times per year). ZB highlighted that the school level data drop is carried out three times a year but admissions is an annual process so some measures would not change until the end of the annual cycle.

The Board discussed school level data affecting the Trust level data and questioned whether the links between the two sets of data were working correctly. The links are to be looked at. ZB asked the Board for what they consider an appropriate range to use, a clear steer was needed today to bring back to the May Board meeting.

KB shared his screen and talked the Board through his suggested data set definitions explaining how it recognises the school's journey in the improvement plan and how it feeds into the Board's 5-year plan. SA suggested looking at the CAST standards and agree what the percentage of schools need to achieve for the Trust to be considered "meeting" that standard. AN thanked KB for his work on this and asked KB to share his definitions for the Board to comment on.

AN recapped on the actions –
KB to share his definitions for comment and agreement.
SELT to create a forecast and current report.

AN confirmed all questions had been answered during this discussion and by these actions.

The Board discussed being able to interrogate the spreadsheet which they were unable to do when shared as read-only. Sharing as a forced copy in Google Sheets was a suggested alternative.

RCF asked for approval of the Heat Map paper regarding KPIs for Premises and Net Zero. SA agreed with RCF that schools have very little control and should be tracked at Trust level. The Board thanked RCF for the work on this paper and approved the KPIs.

GB asked if there was any link between the Heat Map and the appetite for risk, believing there should be a link of aspirations

KB to share suggested data set for comment and agreement.

SELT to create a forecast and current report.

Heat Map paper approved.

and appetite for risk. ZB felt there was an indirect link which is the Risk Register, focussing on areas of mitigation and strengthening activities to mitigate risk. The Risk Register encapsulates all, the SEF pulls out areas, the TIP recognises all of that information and shows the actions required to move the Trust forward and the Heat Map is the data showing where we are today. RCF confirmed the Risk Register arrows show the movement of risk and reflects the areas being worked upon in the Heat Map. GB was happy with the assurances of information in the Heat Map taking account of the appetite of risk in the Risk Register.

The Board discussed the arrows contained in the Heat Map and which column was the most recent data. ZB explained there would be three columns which would be Autumn, Spring and Summer, the plan would then be controlled by version history when a new version was produced. AN felt this needed to address trends and should be a rolling plan and not an in-year report. ZB's understanding was that it would be a new report each year. AN's understanding was that it would be a rolling report with progression across five years. ZB clarified the Board's expectation for having two reports: one projection towards 5 year goal and one point in time report, and should the point in time report be an in-year report and the projection report be a rolling report. The Board agreed that both reports should be rolling reports.

SA highlighted the PAN report as being worrying and how it is key to everything the Trust wants to do and asked what can the Board do to improve the PAN. AN confirmed this will be brought to the Board meeting. ZB has a list of items that are being carried out. AN asked ZB to share.

AN highlighted a concern that the Board was not yet looking at these reports. LR asked how the Board would be using the Heat Map. AN confirmed the two reports with a high-level commentary would guide Directors to any key issues. LR asked who would be providing this commentary. ZB confirmed that SELT would provide the commentary. It would be a standing agenda item, in line with the cycle of business, data and reports will be available, pulling out areas of concern and highlighting progress and then any questions. AN confirmed that Committees will ask questions relevant to their particular area. LR felt Committees were useful but work in isolation, where does that discussion combine all areas. AN confirmed that was Board level and the commentary would lead Directors into that discussion. ZB explained Committees would be doing their work, not in isolation and the Heat Map needs to reflect all areas and school level. Holistically, the whole of the Trust and its schools can lead the discussion on areas of focus and impact. GB works on a philosophy of no surprises, talk about red areas and perhaps amber areas, CEO report would reflect this. Early warning system required of amber areas moving to red. AN felt this would be the purpose of the commentary.

AN asked regarding timeframes for sharing the ranges and giving comments to the May Board meeting. ZB confirmed it takes time to ensure it is done properly. AN asked ZB if the

Two reports (point in time and projection reports) to be rolling reports.

ZB to share list to address PAN.

Current position report – March meeting.

current position report could be provided to the March Board meeting and the projection report for the May Board meeting. ZB agreed. RCF and KB felt once the school positions were updated and the aggregation links were checked it was possible.

AN provided feedback on recent Governor training. It was well attended and positively received. One point was regarding contact between CoGs and Lead Directors. KB to ask ESM to prompt contact with Chairs and Link Directors.

Future Meeting Dates:

Audit and Risk 11th February 2022
Finance and Resources 18th February 2022
Board Meeting 11th March 2022

Meeting closed at 3.06pm

Projection report -
May meeting.

KB to ask ESMs to
prompt contact
with Link Directors.