

East Coast College Corporation

MINUTES of the meeting of the Governance Remuneration and Search Committee held at 9am 22 September 2020 Video Conference

Present:	Rob Evans (Chair RE) Albert Cadmore (AC) and for part of the meeting Tina Ellis (TE)	
In attendance: Wendy Stanger – (WS) Director of Governance		
G/20/09/1	Membership and Apologies	
Apologies were received from Stuart Rimmer (SR) and Alan Debenham (AD) Albert Cadmore was welcomed to his first meeting of the Committee		
G/20/09/2	Declarations of interest	
There were no declarations of interest from attendees		
G/20/09/3	To approve the minutes of the meeting and any other matters raised previously not otherwise included in the agenda	
The minutes of the meeting of 9 7 20 were agreed as a true record.		
G/20/09/4	To review the post meeting action log	
The action log was reviewed and it was noted that all were complete or were timetabled for completion.		
G/20/09/5	Governance Self-Assessment	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the overall self-assessment which concluded Governance was good and highlighted the reasons why and the improvements that required.</p> <p>Governors challenged that there was a need to ensure that student governors were full participants. The Director of Governance advised that the College was this year introducing a student sabbatical position whose remit would include the role of student governor. This could be supported by Student Associate Governors on Committees. It was noted that the L6FC Associate Governor on Standards had worked well.</p> <p>Governors challenged that reports needed clarity and brevity and noted that too much information can obscure key information.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further training session on the data dashboard to be held • Need for clarity and brevity of reports to be drawn to the Senior Teams attention, with training on report writing for Boards to be provided where appropriate. 		
		UR SR

Governors resolved to:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approve the governance self-assessment of good and recommend its inclusion in the College's overall SAR. 		
G/20/09/5.1	Code of Good Governance Review	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the review which set out how the College's Governance complied with the code of good governance. Areas that still required work were highlighted. An annual review of compliance was part of the code.</p> <p>Governors discussed the following areas for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>1.6 Board must be clear how performance will be measured. It should identify and adopt a set of key performance indicators (KPIs)...</i> There was still a need for governors to fully understand the data dashboard and for the information to be embedded into reporting. • <i>1.8 Board members should monitor and scrutinise the college's activities effectively, including using external benchmarks...</i> Reporting needed to include benchmarking, where available, so that performance could be measured against appropriate comparators. • <i>3.6 Students should be actively engaged in the college and ways should be found to ensure that the student voice is heard through both college and student led processes...</i> The student strategy consultation with Unloc had been positive and had been reflected in the Strategic Plan 2020-2030. There was a need to build on this to ensure that a sustainable plan for student governors was put in place and that the previously discussed role of Student Sabbatical should help with this. There was a need to ensure that this Sabbatical was supported to succeed. • <i>3.8 The board should ensure student complaints are effectively addressed and that summary reports are produced and considered (at least annually) on student complaints and appeals.</i> It was agreed that the annual complaints and complements report needed to be re-established and that this should include improvements made following complaints. • <i>4.1 The Board must foster exceptional teaching and learning.</i> It was agreed that the presentations to Standards by the Curriculum Managers and Students had been excellent and had helped Governors triangulate quality issues. When it was safe to do so there was a need to re-establish Governor Learning Walks as it was important that Governors were seen on site as well as taking part in walkthroughs of lessons and talking with staff and students. • <i>5.6 The Board should publish on the college website (at least annually) an account of the college's engagement with the main communities that it serves; the progress made towards meeting their needs for education and training and how it aims to meet future needs.</i> There was a need to complete the Community Strategy and to report its impact. • <i>9.28 The Search committee should produce an annual report which describes the work of the committee ...</i> An annual report from the Committee needed to be established akin to the Audit Committee report setting out how the Committee had fulfilled its remit. This should be produced after the current round of recruitment was complete and reported to the next GRS Committee. <p>The Director of Governance advised that the Governor's Council had asked the National Governance Professionals Special Interest Group, of which she was a member, assistance in reviewing the Code of Good Governance. This would pick up</p>		

<p>areas of repetition, out of date guidance and hopefully make the code more user friendly.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training session on the use of the data dashboard to be arranged. • Annual complaints and compliments to be reported to Standards Committee. • Community Strategy to be completed and annual report to be introduced. • Responses in Section 8 on equality and diversity to be strengthened • Annual Report on the work of the GRS Committee to be produced and reviewed at January's GRS Committee. 		<p>UR</p> <p>PP</p> <p>SR</p> <p>WS</p> <p>WS</p>
G/20/09/5.2	Governance Review	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the review which had been completed by 87% of Governors.</p> <p>Governors noted that the analysis provided positive feedback as well as raising areas where further work was required.</p> <p>Governors noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues such as all governors being aware of the quality and financial issues would hopefully be addressed by having the monthly Board meeting. • The current governor recruitment campaign aim was to address the skills mix, diversity and assist with succession planning. • Training of new governors would be key to successful appointments • Guidance on virtual meetings needed to be updated and encouragement given to all to fully participate 		
G/20/09/5.3	Governor Review	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the review which had been completed by 87% of Governors. This review had been introduced this year instead of the one to one annual appraisals due to Covid and a new Chair. It was suggested that this review should be carried out annually and used to inform the annual governor appraisal.</p> <p>Governors discussed Governor's ambassadorial role and noted that this could include simple sharing of College posts on social media, talking about the College to those in the community, attending events as well as more proactive action such as interviewing key staff on a Governor's radio show.</p> <p>Governors noted that the review highlighted the previously mentioned need for clarity and brevity in report writing so that relevant points were clear.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Review to be carried out annually to inform the SAR and the annual governor appraisal 		<p>WS</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on the use and content of the Governance Portal to be produced • Guidance on virtual meetings to be reviewed • Training policy to be produced including induction training • Guidance note on acting as an ambassador to be produced • Training on finance for non-finance governors to be sourced 	<p>WS</p> <p>WS</p> <p>WS</p> <p>WS</p>
G/20/09/5.4	Committee Reviews	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the reviews, a review hadn't been included for the People Committee as due to changes in memberships there was only 1 review completed.</p> <p>Governors noted that the committee reviews also needed to be reviewed by the committees. The Director of Governance advised that they would be added to the agendas and that this would include a review of terms of reference so that all Committees were clear of their remit and Governors could suggest changes. The Audit Review would be referenced in the Annual Audit Committee Report.</p> <p>Governors noted that the GRS Review raised issues re the Governor training programme and backed up the previously agreed item of producing a training policy.</p> <p>Governors challenged that the Standards Committee noted that all Governors needed to be involved in the SAR process. The Director of Governance advised that there had been good attendance at SAR meetings in 2019 with all validation meetings having as a minimum 1 governor in attendance. For 2020 the meetings would be held virtually with a maximum of 2 governors at each validation.</p> <p>Governors discussed the need for governance reports to be succinct, as was raised in all the reviews, but that they also needed to be in sufficient detail for external agencies. It was agreed that the use of the summary report should assist with highlighting key areas in a report.</p> <p>Governors discussed the need to ensure that commercial income was monitored both by ECETA and by F&GP. The College was the sole shareholder of ECETA and needed to take into account its income when reviewing finances. Consideration to be given to appointing a member of F&GP to the ECETA Board after the current round of recruitment was complete.</p> <p>Governors commented that the Audit Committee had now been strengthened through the recruitment of an associate governor and had a good mix of both financial and curriculum expertise.</p> <p>Governors noted that the Winning our Market Committee, now renamed the Curriculum Development Committee to reflect the new Strategic Plan's aims, had only been in place for a year. There was a need to ensure that they had full oversight over recruitment and the value for money and outcomes achieved through marketing.</p>		

<p>Governors noted that all the reviews raised the need to include benchmarking and competitor analysis where this was available so that performance could be assessed.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Reviews to be considered by each Committee. • Consideration to be given to appointing a member of F&GP to the ECETA Board, after the current round of recruitment was complete. • Governors to be reminded that they set the agenda for meetings and any items could be raised in the agenda planning section of meetings or through the Chair/Director of Governance outside meetings. • Audit Committee to consider how they could assure the Corporation that the college was deploying its resources to best effect and achieving value for money. • Curriculum Development Committee to review the value for money and recruitment outcomes of marketing campaigns. • Benchmarking and competitor analysis to be included in reports, where it is available and is relevant to assess performance. <p>The Committee concluded that the Committee’s performances were satisfactory and that they were complying with their terms of reference. There was a need to strengthen and succession plan for some of the Committees, such as Finance and General Purposes, and it was planned that this would be addressed by the current recruitment campaign.</p>	<p>WS</p> <p>WS/TE</p> <p>WS/ RE</p> <p>WS/Audit</p> <p>WS/CD Cttee</p> <p>Senior Team</p>	
<p>G/20/09/5.5</p>	<p>Annual Attendance Review</p>	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the annual attendance review. Attendance overall had increased from 75% in 18/19 to 80% in 19/20 with attendance improving since virtual meetings had been held. Included in the Governor’s annual commitment was a minimum individual attendance target of 80%.</p> <p>Governors discussed attendance and the highlighted cases of low attendance. It was noted that some of the lower attendees did make a valuable contribution due to their knowledge and experience when they did attend.</p> <p>Governors noted that attendance was monitored by the Director of Governance throughout the year and that issues were raised with the Governors as appropriate. Associate Governor positions could be utilised for those Governors that were unable to commit to full attendance. The Director of Governance confirmed that all committee’s terms of reference allowed for Associate Governors.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance to be a standing item on the GRS agenda. • Governors reminded through the annual commitment form that target for attendance was a minimum of 80% 	<p>WS</p> <p>WS</p>	

TE left the meeting due to internet outage.		
G/20/09/6	Recruitment Update	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the recruitment update from the campaign with AOC. This has been very positive and it was hoped that applications would be high. She reminded the Committee that if additional governors were recruited on top of that agreed with AOC there would be an additional cost.</p> <p>Governors noted that there had been a pleasing amount of interest and it was hoped that this would be reflected in the applications.</p> <p>The Director of Governance advised that the closing date was 27/9 with the Committee shortlisting on 1/10. All applications would be added to the portal when received from AOC.</p>		
G/20/09/7	College Fellows	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the report and advised the Committee how the College Fellow nomination process worked.</p> <p>Governors discussed the suggested nominees and agreed to proceed with nominating Mike Burrows given his work in the successful establishment of East Coast College which included 2 mergers, Ofsted Good and Financial Health Good. The Committee didn't feel at that stage that they could agree to the external nominated candidate as they weren't aware of his work in the community or any links to the College.</p> <p>The Director of Governance advised that it was hoped, when it was safe to do so, to hold a fellows lunch in the College restaurant.</p> <p>Governors discussed the Honorary Degree nominee and agreed that this was a good candidate and supported their award.</p> <p>The Committee resolved to propose to Corporation that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Burrows <p>be appointed a College Fellow</p>		
G/20/09/8	Annual Remuneration Report	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the report that was required to comply with the Code of Good Governance and College's Senior Staff Remuneration Code. The figures included would be confirmed following the annual audit and once formally approved by the Corporation would be published on the College website.</p> <p>Governors agreed some minor editing and noted that it was an excellent and informative report.</p>		

<p>The Committee resolved to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approve the Annual Remuneration Report, subject to any changes identified during the annual audit <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recommend it to December's Corporation to be read alongside the Annual Accounts. 		
G/20/09/9	Risk Register	
<p>The Director of Governance presented the risk register.</p> <p>1. Has the risk register been reviewed</p> <p>The Director of Governance advised that the register had been reviewed and would be further reviewed following recruitment.</p> <p>2. Is the Committee content that the risks are relevant and are being updated</p> <p>The Committee agreed that they were relevant and that the reports included on the agenda included updates on the risks.</p> <p>3. Is the Committee content that the risks are being mitigated</p> <p>The Committee agreed that the risks were being mitigated and that this included items discussed at the meeting such as the Governance SAR and recruitment.</p> <p>4. Where a red risk is the Committee assured that appropriate action is being taken</p> <p>There were no red risks when considering variance from risk appetite.</p> <p>5. Where does the Committee have significant concerns</p> <p>The Committee's main concern was in ensuring the wellbeing of the senior team. This was being supported through one to one meetings with the Chair.</p>		
G/20/09/10	Confidential Independent Governors Only	
	Senior Post Holder Appraisals	
<p>The Chair presented the CEO/Principal's appraisal which all agreed was a thorough and detailed assessment of performance.</p> <p>The Committee noted that performance had again been excellent and agreed to recommend the appraisal to the Corporation for final sign off.</p>		
G/20/09/11	Agenda Planning	
<p>Director of Governance to update TE on the remainder of the items that she was not able to participate in.</p>		

Consideration of appointing a Senior Independent Director – Director of Governance to research and present a paper to the next meeting.		WS
Cost of governance – Director of Governance to research and ascertain the cost of governance to include Governor’s time with the aim that a statement be included in that annual accounts governance statement.		WS
G/20/09/12	Review of Meeting	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confidential Items – Senior Post Holder Appraisals agenda item 10 2. Risk Management: any issues discussed which may require an additional Assessment – impact of governor recruitment and change of chair 3. Health & Safety: any issues discussed which may require an additional Assessment – none 4. Equality & Diversity: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment – recruitment 5. Media: any issues discussed to inform local media – none 6. How did the meeting go: excellent meeting 		