

MINUTES of the meeting of the People Committee 2pm 1st June 2023 Video Conference

Present:	Chair – Kirk Lower (KL) Alan Debenham (AD) Jude Owens (JO) Tina Ellis (TE) Liz Howard (LH)	
In Attendance:	Wendy Stanger – Director of Governance (WS) Ann Wall Director of People and Wellbeing (AW)	
L/23/06/1	Membership and Apologies	Action
Apologies Jose Bamonde (JB) and Stuart Rimmer (CEO/Principal SR)		
L/23/06/2	Declarations of Interest	
There were no declarations of interest		
L/23/06/3	To approve the minutes of the last meeting 24 1 23 and any other matters raised previously not otherwise included in the agenda	
The minutes of 24 2 23 were approved as a true record.		
L/23/06/4	To review the post meeting action log	
The action log was reviewed.		
24 12 23 L/23/01/5 comparative data – the Director of People and Wellbeing advised that comparative data had been difficult to source with National education data used as the nearest comparator. It was hoped that the DFE workforce data all Colleges had completed would provide better comparative data but this as yet had not been published.		
L/23/06/5	People Update	
<p>The Director of People and Wellbeing presented the update. The stability index was high as the College had a lot of long serving staff, vacancies were at a manageable level but will be inflated by recruitment for the Apollo project, absence was now trending down and not as high as predicted.</p> <p>Governors discussed the KPIs and questioned if the number of staff in capability was a useful KPI. If managers weren't having difficult conversations and managing poor performance this was a management issue that needed addressing and the target itself was not a useful tool to manage and monitor this. It was discussed if KPIs should be set for adherence to mandatory training and appraisals completed.</p> <p>Governors commented that appraisals need to be completed and completed well. This was important for managing and developing staff and was a fundamental management role. It was very disappointing that this was raised as an issue annually. The completion rate needed to improve and appropriate and consistent action taken where managers had not completed them and non-completion of appraisals reflected in the appraisal assessment of the manager. This was a cultural issue that needed to be addressed so that all received an effective appraisal.</p> <p>The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that it was disappointing that some managers still did not prioritise and prepare for the appraisals as it was a core management responsibility. Disciplinary action had been taken previously were appraisals hadn't been completed. The process was not complex and the window for completion was long and top down objectives were</p>		

	<p>introduced last year. As part of the appraisal the talent assessment needed to be discussed and explained. All managers were to be reminded of their appraisal responsibilities at an upcoming Wider Leadership Group meeting.</p> <p>Governors raised if those that were assessed as inadequate in the talent assessment should already be in or be moved into performance management. The Director of People and Wellbeing agreed that performance management should take place.</p> <p>Absence levels were discussed and the Director of People and Wellbeing advised that these had not been at the high level predicted and the level of absence was consistent with the national averages. Governors discussed if the public sector sick policy increased absence levels. In reporting there was a need to split reporting between long and short term sickness as short term sickness was where management action could make a difference. The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that this reporting would be available through the new HR system.</p> <p>Recruitment was discussed and the Director of People and Wellbeing advised that difficulty in recruiting was now being seen in support as well as in teaching roles. This was being seen across the sector with some colleges having to withdraw curriculum due to staff shortages. Lower graded administration posts were seeing few or no applicants and thought needed to be given to more innovative contracts and flexible/hybrid working as this was being offered by other employers.</p> <p>Governors commented that the average time to fill a vacancy of 35.7 days was good and queried how this had been achieved. The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that the decision had been taken to close and interview for vacancies where a suitable field of candidates had been achieved. This was required in the quickly moving employment market as was a smooth and quick process from offer acceptance to start as this mitigated the risk of successful candidates retracting their application or acceptance. Recruitment was difficult and had meant in some areas that people were recruited who didn't align fully to the College's values. Invigilators, who had a crucial role through the exam process, had been particularly hard to recruit and this had been seen at other schools and colleges. If other colleges awarded a pay increase and the College didn't there was a risk this would negatively affect the College's recruitment and retention.</p> <p>Governors discussed industrial action and the risk to the College of industrial action and the resultant disruption to the learner experience. It was important that if industrial action did occur that there was clear communication with learners and that the risk to retention was mitigated. This would be further considered at the joint People and Finance and General Purposes meeting on the pay review.</p> <p>The staff celebrations were discussed and a governor who had attended the celebrations advised that it had been a real positive event. The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that there had now been over 200 nominations for the staff annual awards with real uplifting reasons for nominations. These nomination reasons would be shared by post with the member of staff who had been nominated.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KPIs to be reviewed and revised for the next People Committee. • Appraisal update to the next People Committee 	<p>AW</p> <p>AW</p>
<p>L/23/06/6</p>	<p>Best Companies</p>	
	<p>The Director of People and Wellbeing presented the results of the latest Best Companies survey. The survey response was 77% which was the highest it has been in the past 6 years and 1% higher than the 2022 response rate. The response rate has been assisted by staff beginning to trust the anonymity of the survey, staff using it to express their views about issues such as pay and the work of the engagement ambassadors. The Q2 Best Companies awards saw the College move up to 65th best large employer nationally, 7th best education and training provider to work</p>	

	<p>for and 31st employer to work for in the East of England, an improvement in rankings in all the categories.</p> <p>Governors congratulated the College on the Best Companies results and asked how they would be used to promote the College. The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that the results would be used in marketing, on email signatures, across social media and celebrated in the Annual Review.</p> <p>Governors challenged what issues were identified that needed improving. The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that leadership visibility, especially that of the CEO, was again raised as an issue. Work has been ongoing to improve this such as assigning an Assistant Principal to each campus and listening groups but there needed to be a concerted effort by the senior leadership group to make themselves visible this could be by simple actions such as eating lunch in the canteen or walking the corridors. Curriculum Managers were visible as based in curriculum areas but there can be issues if they are managing cross campus.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target to be set to improve all of the Senior Management Group’s visibility assessment in future staff surveys 	SMG
L/23/06/7	Wider Leadership Succession Planning Heatmap	
	<p>The Director of People and Wellbeing presented the succession planning heatmap which included all managers apart from Senior Post Holders as their succession planning was the remit of Governance Remuneration and Search Committee. This had been completed by the CEO and Director of People and Wellbeing and identified that in the majority of cases there wasn’t an internal successor which wasn’t consistent with the number of future leaders identified on the talent assessment.</p> <p>Governors commented that this identified a clear risk for the organisation and there needed to be further work to identify key priority area’s risks and mitigation by the Senior Management Group. This was an operational issue but could have strategic implications. The Director of Governance advised that a similar process had been carried out for the Senior Post Holders by Governance Remuneration and Search and risk mitigation identified and action taken.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following action:</p> <p>Senior Management Group to review the Wider Leadership Succession Planning Heatmap risks and put in place the appropriate mitigation.</p>	SMG
L/23/06/8	To review the Risk Register	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the risk register been reviewed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, May 2023 2. Is the Committee content that the risks are relevant and are being updated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, and discussed as part of the agenda items. 3. Is the Committee content that the risks are being mitigated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, and discussed as part of the agenda items. 4. Where a red risk is the Committee assured that appropriate action is being taken <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The red risks were discussed as part of the agenda items including recruitment and retention. It was noted that the absence risk had reduced. 5. Where does the Committee have significant concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks of industrial action and recruitment and retention were the main concerns and this risk was likely to increase if there was no pay review. 	

	Policies for Approval	
L/23/06/9	QD022 Capability Policy and Procedure	
L/23/06/10	QD077 Discrimination, Bullying and Harassment Policy and Procedure	
L/23/06/11	QD132 Recruitment of Ex-Offenders Policy	
<p>The Director of People and Wellbeing presented the policy updates, advised of changes and confirmed they had been reviewed by the Unions.</p> <p>The Committee resolved to approve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability Policy and Procedure QD022 • Discrimination, Bullying and Harassment Policy and Procedure QD077 • Recruitment of Ex-Offenders Policy QD132 		
L/23/06/12	Agenda Planning	
<p>The planned joint meeting with Finance and General Purposes and its governance was discussed. Establishment Review summary to be circulated by email.</p>		
L/23/06/13	Review of Meeting	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confidential Items – reports with named staff 2. Risk Management: any issues discussed which may require an additional Assessment – industrial action, recruitment and retention 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 – pay review 5. Sustainability: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment - None 6. Media: any issues discussed to inform local media – Best Companies 7. How did the meeting go – a good meeting with detailed discussions 		