

Minutes – Post 16 Academy Council Extraordinary Meeting - Redacted

Issue Date: 3rd April 2017

Meeting Date: 3rd April 2017

Location: JCA

Time: 4.30pm

Chair:	Guy Keith-Miller (GKM)	Chair
Attendees:	Kath Cooper (KC)	Principal
	Dan Nicholls (DN)	Executive Principal
	Mark Woodgate (MW)	Councillor
	Chris Millward (CM)	Councillor
	Marian Curran (MC) [by telephone]	Councillor
	Roger Dickinson	Councillor
In attendance:	Wendy Hellin (WH)	Clerk
Apologies:	Dereth Wood	Councillor

Minutes

Item	Description	Action
1	Introductions	
1.1	GKM welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending at short notice. Apologies have been received from DW; MC and DW have provided written feedback ahead of the meeting. GKM explained that due to the nature of the meeting staff and student councillors would not be in attendance.	
1.2	The meeting has been called in response to the post 16 restructure paper circulated 31/03/17	
2	Post 16 Re-structure paper	
2.1	A process has taken place to get to this point but it is clear that there is a need to review how the process for management of change happens in the future. GKM will take this action forward.	GKM
2.2	The first draft of this paper was carried out by KC and Marcus Gray. GKM has fed into the process. DN and Ian Payne have advised. The paper has been sent to two members of the board for approval.	
2.3	MW asked what is driving the tight time deadlines. KC reported that when the decision was made to reduce the provision to 2 centres the rationale for reducing the structure was postponed until after the Principal appointment. Following the appointment, the Post 16 team's expectations had been raised that they would hear within a week of the Principal appointment. Due to the nature of the information, the team are anxious and therefore the executive team wished for the news to be delivered before the Easter break.	



2.4	<p>CM asked if it is a decision from the board and is the Council just advisory. GKM noted the clarity is not there. He has been advised that recent practise has indicated that the board have delegated authority to PF and IJ (board members) to sign off restructures of this kind. CM reminded the council that all staff are ultimately board appointments. Gkm agreed to seek clarity and discuss with chair of COAC AF (action above)</p>	
2.5	<p>MC questioned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost effectiveness of the curriculum; - even though the offer is reduced, 9 is still shown as viable for a class; MC is not sure this is viable and said this sets a precedent going forward – this may need re-examining. <p>KC noted that the legacy groups are quite small. KC has asked a colleague to look at the AS formula and the impact of the A2 formula to see if this is bringing class size down and this will show differential between AS and A2. Moving forward the average class size will be 14 with some variation for breadth of curriculum. The forecast worked out with Sarah Lovell does not show this will be running at a loss. MC and KC discussed the formula calculation. Each A level on the curriculum costs £9k.</p>	
2.6	<p>MC further questioned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether these changes have been recorded in the risk register? <p>KC confirmed that they will be.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership and management for KC – who will deputise in Principal’s absence? <p>KC confirmed that there is currently no provision for a deputy in the structure and will discuss with DN about arrangements in KC absence.</p>	
2.7	<p>A number of Questions were raised by Councillors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is 9 per class too low? <p>KC confirmed that the average will be 14 or 15 with some exceptions. [DN joins meeting]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further concerns relating to slim leadership structure and lack of a Deputy Principal: If you have 2 sites, is the structure appropriate for 490 students and would you not be better with a deputy and then have 2 Pathway Leaders for each site? <p>KC said a leadership position is not affordable. KC said that the executive strategic leadership group will be made up of KC, Jon Jones and Simon White and Executive Principal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MC asked if Post 16 is projected to grow. <p>KC said if the figures reach 600 there will be more money. MC noted that the knowledge is all with KC. Structures need to be in place now in readiness for any free school. This structure allows for the current need and can be adapted following growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MC suggested there are 2 Pathway Leaders and someone slightly above that. <p>KC advised that as there is a growing transition curriculum there needs to be someone overseeing that. KC advised if Post 16 has a minimum of 14 students per class the curriculum would be cut by a further 50% and that will hurt recruitment. Different models were discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DN said there is wider support across the federation that could support KC in a crisis. A solution could be worked to provide a nominal deputy. MC asked what is happening with DSSB. DN reported there are no plans to merge the two at present. The curriculum of both complement each other. GKM said there is a need to have a document that shows the relationship between Post 16 and DSSB. It is also necessary to have a document showing the relationship between KC and the other two Principals. GKM said those Principals need to be involved as subjects are delivered there. Chairs will need to get together to discuss this. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DW raised the question around the infrastructure from the two academies and the buy in from those academies. KC said there are risks but strategic leadership between Principals is a focus for September. CM said a key issue is the Council having some assurance around succession planning There is only two years of finance planning shown – the Council need further assurances around this. KC said the five year model shown at Council didn't reflect these changes. KC will ask SL to review that document to reflect the changes. Where are the reporting lines in terms of line management? KC advised these were taken out for ease. Each PL will line manage associate staff; this will be set according to skillsets of those appointed. . This gives KC a role in performance management. GKM asked about the hierarchy of the structure. KC will revise this on the document; KC will also clarify the role of PA which will be to all the senior leadership team; not just to the Principal. How will the impact of the Pathway Leaders be measured? KC reported this will be by outcomes, attendance, value added and other KPIs as well as progress through teaching and learning monitoring. KC to include the EP role in the diagram as this adds strength to the model. <p>[MC left the meeting.]</p>	<p>KC</p> <p>KC</p>
2.8	<p>CM asked again, as DN was now present, his understanding of the decision making process. DN's understanding is that it is a board decision which has been delegated to two Directors (Pete Franklin and Iwan James). CM felt that it is appropriate for the Board to sign off as staff are employed by CLF. GKm said that he would clarify this as had no recollection of approval of this process. DN said that this process had been used in recent management of changes. DN confirmed that PF had provided a response with a number of questions and raised the question as to whether the Academy Council had given approval. He gave approval pending AC agreement. IJ had not responded.</p>	<p>GKm</p>
2.9	<p>KC reassured the Council about the finances, and accepted that there were costings in the document provided. KC said that the finances are secure and that the Financial Director would not allow this to go ahead if finances were at risk. MW observations are that it is not 100% watertight. It is signed off by FD – is this enough or does the Council have leverage for KC to go back and provide further challenge? MW noted that in his experience when there has been potential for redundancies, and when decisions can be challenged legally the rationale and process needs to be watertight. MW felt that a communication tomorrow feels too early. The Council provided suggestions of alternative communication plans.</p>	
2.10	<p>KC advised that during the process, her focus has been on limiting the impact on staff. If a further senior leader is appointed this would have a significant impact on potentially 4 posts. As stated, the structure can be reviewed again in line with growth of Post 16 and the free school bid.</p>	
2.11	<p>Any decisions from this Council are provided on the basis that the finances are being interrogated elsewhere as they are not included beyond 2 years.</p>	
2.12	<p>DN said he is reassured that the proposed plan is affordable.</p>	
2.13	<p>GKm noted that he would have expected a fully costed proposal to have come to the Academy Council and/or to the Board.</p>	
2.14	<p>GKm summarised the discussion and asked if the Council are still concerned about succession planning.</p>	
2.15	<p>CM said he is supportive subject to resolving the succession query. KC said the succession will come from the wider federation, not just the Post 16 team. DN noted that the focus is on student facing staff, not on leadership teams. KC works with two other Principals, and</p>	

	2 full SLTs and the EP. KC reminded the Council that the Post 16 does not sit in its own academy; it sits within 2 academies.	
2.16	DN said the Post 16 team can consider steps as part of the risk management of how it could fill the Principal post at short notice if needed.	
2.17	RD asked if three Pathway Leaders were needed. KC said they were, to be with only two would reduce the quality of course leadership. DN confirmed that there are 2 VPs at JCA and BBA that could step in. Some current staff may require further development/training to grow into their roles.	
2.18	KC felt the strategic leadership of Post 16 needs to be included in the paper, as well as professional growth and succession.	
2.19	GKM said that the risk relating to the light SLT should go in risk register. The Council supported the proposal with the recommendation that DN/KC provides further clarity around who will provide any immediate cover needs for KC.	KC DN/KC
2.20	The meeting closed at 5.45pm.	