

Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee MINUTES

Date	13 th May 2024	Time	15:00-17:00
Venue	Room EC205 – ECAT House,	Eastbourne Campus	
Chair	Priscilla Kendall		
Membership: Priscilla	a Kendall (Committee Chair), I	an Mehrtens, Becky Cooke	
Attendance: Rebecca	a Conroy (CEO & Principal), Be	lle Howard (Director of Govern	ance – <i>minutes</i>)
Quorum: The meetin	g was quorate throughout.		

Apologies: None

#			Item		Action
1)	WELCOME	& APOLO	GIES	15:01	
			Performance & Reputation (GP&R) Committee Chair opened t elcome to colleagues.	he meeting at	
	1.2 There w	vere no ap	ologies as all participants were in attendance.		
2)	DECLARATI	ONS OF II	NTEREST	15:02	
	2.1 The Cha Board 360°		Board declared an interest in Item 6.2 of the agenda, related to	o the Chair of the	
3)	MINUTES O	OF LAST M	EETINGS	15:03	
	• Gov dise	vernors co vernors ag cussed.	onsidered the minutes from the meeting on 29 th January 2024. greed that the minutes were a true and accurate record of wl		
	3.2 Matters	s Arising			
			oted that all actions from the previous meeting had been comp the following item:	oleted, with the	
	Item	Owner	Action	Due Date	
	6.3.1	BH	Liaise with the Director of People regarding the ongoing redesign of the current mandatory training programme, with a view to explore which courses would be appropriate for Governors to complete moving forward.	In Progress	



	• The GP&R Committee Chair shared their experience having recently completed their mandatory training in the Smartlog System, reflecting that the courses were overly detailed and long.	
	• The CEO & Principal advised that working in collaboration with the Director of Governance, a new programme of Governor mandatory training for 2024-25 would be developed, wherever possible leveraging in person Board briefings to cover essential training for Governors.	
Boar	d & Committee Membership/Succession Planning	
4)	MEMBERSHIP & SUCCESSION PLANNING 15:05	
	4.1 Current Terms of Office & Succession Planning	
	The Director of Governance shared the following update:	
	• Membership & Recruitment:	
	 Following the recent round of recruitment the Board was now well resourced, with 13 of 15 Independent Governor positions now filled. This provided the Board with a good level of flexibility should a specific skills need subsequently arise. 	
	 All 3 Student Governors were expected to complete their current courses of study at the end of this academic year, though 1 was planning to commence a Higher Education course in the next academic year, so could remain in role. A Student Governor recruitment campaign would therefore be planned for Autumn 2024, targeting the Lewes and Eastbourne campuses. 	
	 The GP&R Committee was currently under resourced, so options for extending its membership needed to be explored. 	
	 A key priority would also be to identify new Committee Chairs for the CS&Q & ARaC Committees, Committee Vice Chairs for the ARaC & GP&R Committees and to appoint to various Governor Ambassador roles. Early succession planning was also recommended for the Chair of the Board role. 	
	• The following discussion then occurred:	
	 The Chair of the Board reflected that given the high level of Governor turnover in 2023-24 and several Governor appointments year-to-date, that it would be appropriate to carry two Independent Governor vacancies on the Board at present. 	
	 Governors noted an informal expression of interest had been received from an existing Student Governor to remain involved with governance activity moving forward, who's term of office was due to expire at the end of the current academic year. Governors noted that as they were also a member of staff, they would need to be nominated and elected in the usual way, should a Staff Governor vacancy subsequently arise. The CEO & Principal suggested that in the interim, it would be useful to retain their input, engagement and expertise in the existing Staff Think Tank forums. Governors agreed. 	



	 The Chair of the Board noted that the existing Instrument & Articles currently allowed for a fourth Staff Governor position, though reflected that this had not historically been utilised to ensure that the Board's ratio of Staff Governors to other Governor role types remained balanced. Moving forward, consideration should be given as to whether this additional role should be removed from the Instrument & Articles, as it was unusual for a Corporation Board to have as many as four Staff Governors in post. Governors agreed. Governors also noted that there was not currently a Support Staff Governor within the Board's membership, as all existing Staff Governors performed teaching roles. This circumstance had arisen following an earlier decision to prioritise 	
	representation from each of the three main campuses, rather than staff type.	
	 <u>Action 4.1.1</u> – At the next refresh of the Instrument & Articles of Government and Standing Orders, consider the feasibility of the following updates: An amendment to enable a mixture of both campus location and support/teaching staff representation in Staff Governor appointments. Validating that Staff Governors had terms of office that were harmonised with Independent Governors. Amending the maximum number of Staff Governors from 4 to 3. Governors also discussed the current committee leadership role vacancies and 	ВН
	identified potential candidates from the Board's existing membership.	
	 <u>Action 4.1.2</u> – Following the forthcoming Governor Induction session with the Director of Governance, explore whether any of the newly appointed Independent Governors scheduled to attend the session would be interested in performing a committee leadership role and/or join an additional committee. 	BH/IM
	• RESOLUTION – Subject to alignment and agreement with the individuals concerned, the Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the following appointments to the Board for 2024-25:	
	 CS&Q Committee Chair – Ann Potterton CS&Q Committee Vice Chair – Priscilla Kendall ARaC Committee Chair – Charles Dudley ARaC Committee Vice Chair – Shirley Watson GP&R Committee Vice Chair – Becky Cooke 	
5)	AMBASSADOR ROLE DESCRIPTIONS 15:20	
- 1	 5.1 Governors considered the draft role descriptions for the following Governor Ambassador roles: Safeguarding SEND 	
	Careers & Skills	
	Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	
	Health & Safety	



BH

BH/IM

5.2 The following discussion then occurred:

- Governors noted that following discussion at the last GP&R Committee meeting, it had been agreed that a Health & Safety Ambassador was not needed.
- Governors considered the Ambassador role descriptions and requested the following amendments:
 - 'Validate' or 'gain assurance' to replace instances of 'ensure' as the opening verb for several of the tasks listed, given the monitoring and oversight role of Governors.
 - Amend the Safeguarding Ambassador and SEND Ambassador role descriptions to remove any instances of combined safeguarding and SEND related tasks.
- <u>Action 5.2.1</u> Update the Ambassador role descriptions to reflect the agreed amendments, as detailed in Section 5.2 of the minutes.
- RESOLUTION The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the Safeguarding Ambassador, SEND Ambassador, Curriculum & Skills Ambassador and Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Ambassador role descriptions to the Board for approval.
- Governors considered both the output from the current Skills Audit Report and insights following the recent Governor Recruitment campaign and identified potential candidates for the vacant Ambassador roles from the Board's existing membership.
 - <u>Action 5.2.2</u> Contact the proposed Independent Governors to explore their willingness to perform an Ambassador role.
- RESOLUTION Subject to alignment and agreement with the individuals concerned, the Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the following appointments to the Board:
 - Safeguarding Ambassador Kerrith Etkin Bell
 - SEND Ambassador Ann Potterton
 - Curriculum & Skills Ambassador Kim Byford
 - Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Ambassador Derek Richardson

Board Effectiveness

6)	GOVERNANCE REVIEW & IMPROVEMENT15:29	
	6.1 Governance Improvement Plan	
	Governors considered the progress update detailed in the associated paper.	
	The following discussion then occurred:	
	 The Chair of the Board reflected on an earlier cross-committee referral action to identify Board priority KPIs for 2024-25. Governors considered potential priority 	

training completion and 'Membership: Skills Need & Recruitment'.

KPIs related to the GP&R Committee, such as related to Governor attendance,



	 <u>Action 6.1.1</u> – Propose possible priority KPIs specific to the GP&R Committee, with a view for the GP&R Committee to recommend these to the Board, via a written resolution. 	PMK/IM
0	The CEO & Principal advised that work remained underway to develop inhouse bite- sized modular training sessions for Governors, covering a range of key topic areas.	
0	The Chair of the Board reflected that a rationalised programme of mandatory training, would increase Governor capacity to take part in more value-add networking and training events. Governors agreed.	
0	The Chair of the Board suggested that following the recent Governor recruitment campaign, that Board diversity may no longer be a priority gap area at this time. Similarly, the Governance Improvement Plan currently referenced the College's anti- racism agenda and suggested that it would be more appropriate to reflect the College's broader diversity agenda in the plan. Governors agreed.	
	 <u>Action 6.1.2</u> – Update the Governance Improvement Plan to replace any references to 'anti-racism agenda' with 'diversity agenda'. 	вн
0	The CEO & Principal considered the 'Excellent College Reputation' focus area of the Governance Improvement Plan and advised that good progress had been made in developing a new Marketing Strategy. A further update would be shared later in the meeting.	
6.2 Annual Boo	ard Self Review	
• The Dir	rector of Governance summarised the following key themes arising from the review:	
0	Significant improvements in governance practice had been highlighted, particularly related to robust self-evaluation processes, more strategically focussed meeting agendas and Governors feeling confident in their ability to add value both collectively and individually.	
0	Contrastingly, the Board & Committee Effectiveness Surveys had identified some key focus areas, including the need for greater access to appropriate data to inform decision making, driving greater financial efficiency, ensuring robust risk management controls and the range of skills and expertise in Board membership.	
0	The Board was relatively diverse from an age, gender and sexual orientation perspective, though an ongoing area of opportunity for the Board's membership related to ethnic diversity.	
0	The Skills Audit had revealed a breadth of skills and experience on the Board with key training and development needs highlighted, related to college finances and funding, capital development projects, SEND and knowledge of the curriculum provision.	
0	The Chair's Annual Review had been highly positive across the board, evidenced both in Governor comments and survey ratings.	



	0	Given the high levels of Governor turnover in 2023-24, robust induction and development processes would be essential to ensure Board cohesiveness and impact moving forward. As such, the use of buddy/mentoring relationships to supplement access to training would be increasingly important moving forward.	
	0	Governor engagement in training remained inconsistent, though had improved overall. Further work was needed to enhance the mandatory training programme.	
	0	Coverage of the Governance Cycle of Business had been highly effective at 92% for 2023-24.	
•		rector of Governance outlined key recommendations for 2024-25 related to Decision g, Monitoring & Oversight, and Governor Development.	
•	The fol	lowing discussion then occurred:	l
	0	Governors reflected that the new single report format for the Annual Board Review was helpful, though suggested that there may be further opportunities to summarise the survey data.	
	0	The Chair of the Board considered the Board and Committee Effectiveness Survey results and asked – was it possible for the Board to drive financial efficiency at the College or was it instead responsible for oversight of robust risk management controls? Governors discussed in depth the level of influence the Board and its committees had over financial efficiency and reflected that a lack of clarity around this question may have detrimentally impacted the score in this area. Governors suggested that this question may need to be revisited for the next survey in 2024-25.	
		 <u>Action 6.2.1</u> – Amend the key recommendations detailed in the Annual Board Review Report to remove reference to 'financial efficiency'. 	вн
	0	Governors considered the Skills Audit Results Summary with regards to strengths and development opportunities. The Chair of the Board suggested that moving forward, it may be prudent to determine which skills were of particular priority for the Board, and whether there were key gaps in need of additional focus from a recruitment perspective. Governors agreed.	
	0	Governors noted that the current level of engagement with the ETF Learning Pathway Platform remained relatively low. The CEO & Principal asked – was the College currently being charged for this service? The Director of Governance committed to check this.	
		 <u>Action 6.2.2</u> – Confirm whether the College was currently being charged for the ETF Learning Pathway Platform. 	ВН
	0	Governors considered the current membership of the Curriculum, Skills & Quality (CS&Q) Committee and reflected that its membership was currently too large. The Chair of the Board noted that one Governor was currently a member of three committees, including CS&Q, and as such there may be an opportunity to rationalise	

Governors agreed.

the committee's membership by reducing their participation to just two committees.



Action 6.2.3 – Contact the identified Governor to confirm whether they IM would be willing to step down from the CS&Q Committee membership, with a view to reduce the total number of members in that committee. The CEO & Principal reflected on the need to evidence to Ofsted that there was a 0 clear line of sight from the Board to Student Council forums, thereby demonstrating that Student Voice remained at the heart of decision making. Governors agreed. The GP&R Committee Chair suggested that Governor attendance at Chairs Group 0 meetings should be excluded from the overall Governor attendance report, as this forum was not in fact a formal committee. Governors agreed. Subject to individual alignment, Governors proposed the following buddy/mentoring relationships to support the induction of new Governors moving forward: New Governor Committee Buddy/Mentor Kerrith Etkin Bell CS&Q Priscilla Kendall **Lionel Bunting** RC&I Andy Davy Kim Byford CS&Q Ian Mehrtens Geoff Munn ARaC **Charles Dudley** Ann Potterton CS&Q Ian Mehrtens Derek Richardson ARaC Graham Cook Shirley Watson ARaC TBC – leave of absence BH/IM Action 6.2.4 – Liaise with new and existing Independent Governors to confirm proposed buddy/mentoring relationships. The Chair of the Board also suggested that the Governor induction process could be 0 further enhanced through a follow up session after approximately 6 months in role, with the Director of Governance and buddy/mentor. This would enable new Governors to raise any additional questions, embed their learning and support ongoing development. Governors agreed. The Chair of the Board asked – as a result of the Annual Board Review process, 0 were any changes to the ESCG Board & Committee Structure proposed? The Director of Governance confirmed that there were not. BH Action 6.2.5 – Update the Annual Board Review Report to confirm that as output of the review process, no changes to the ESCG Board and Committee structure had been recommended. **RESOLUTION – The GP&R Committee agreed to recommend the Annual Board Review** Report to the Board for approval, subject to the agreed amendments.



BOARD & COMMITTEE STRUCTURE – 2024-25 16	5:36
7.1 GP&R Committee Terms of Reference	
• The Director of Governance outlined the following updates to the GP&R Committee Term Reference for 2024-25:	s of
 Minor grammatical amendments. An amendment to the list of Annual Reports in scope. 	
 An amendment (increase) in the number of policies delegated for GP&R Committe level approval. Amended review frequencies for some policies. 	ee
• The following discussion then occurred:	
 The Chair of the Board reflected that it may be prudent to revisit minimum quora- levels for the GP&R Committee in the Autumn Term if committee membership continued to be challenging. Governors agreed. 	¢y
• RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the GP&R Committee Terms of Reference for 2024-25 to the Board for approval.	
7.2 Special Committee Terms of Reference	
• The Director of Governance outlined the following updates to the Special Committee Terr of Reference for 2024-25:	ns
 Minor grammatical amendments throughout. The inclusion of additional related policies. 	
• There were no further comments or questions raised.	
• RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the Special Committee Terms of Reference for 2024-25 to the Board for approval.	
7.3 Draft Committee Membership – 2024-25	
Governors considered the associated paper, and the following amendments were identified	ed:
\circ 'Deputy Principal' role to be replaced with 'Executive Director of Curriculum & Ski	lls'.
 Kim Byford to be included within the membership of the Curriculum, Skills & Qual Committee. 	ity
• The GP&R Committee Chair reflected that there was currently a gender imbalance within membership of some committees, which should be monitored moving forward. Governo agreed.	

7)



•	<u>Action 7.3.1</u> – Update the Committee Membership (2024-25) paper to reflect the agreed amendments, as detailed in Section 7.3 of the minutes.	ВН
•	RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the proposed Committee Membership for 2024-25 to the Board for approval, subject to the agreed amendments.	
7.4 Dro	aft Cycle of Business – 2024-25	
•	The Director of Governance directed participants to the associated paper and outlined the following proposed changes for the next academic year:	
	 Meeting Schedule – now reflected the discontinuation of joint ARaC Committee and RC&I Committee meetings, as well as just one meeting each in the Autumn Term. Standing Items – new Staff & Student Governor reports. Annual Reports – several reports had been discontinued as they were no longer required, e.g. SPH & Governor Expenses Report, Compliance with the Remuneration Code, Compliance with ARaC Policies & Procedures etc. Policies – reduced frequency of review for several policies/key documents, e.g. Whistleblowing Policy, Recruitment & Succession Planning Policy etc. A New Cash Management Policy had been included. 	
•	RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the Cycle of Business for 2024-25 to the Board for approval.	
•	The Director of Governance directed participants to the associated paper and shared the following update:	
	 A broader range of meeting days and campus locations had been incorporated for both Board and committee meetings. Two Strategic Planning Days had been scheduled for the Autumn and Spring terms. The schedule reflected a reduced frequency of Capital Development Board (CDB) meetings. 1 virtual meeting per year, per committee had been retained (CDB to have 2 virtual meetings). 	
•	The Chair of the Board asked – would it be possible for the key to include a separate colour for the Newhaven – Marine Workshops site? The Director of Governance confirmed that this was feasible.	
	 <u>Action 7.5.1</u> – Update the Draft Schedule of Meetings to include a separate colour for the 'Newhaven – Marine Workshops' site. 	вн
•	RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the Schedule of Meetings for 2024-25 to the Board for approval, subject to the agreed amendment.	



8)	ANNUAL COMPLIANCE WITH THE AOC CODE OF GOOD GOVERNANCE 16:51	
	8.1 The Director of Governance directed the participants to the associated paper and shared the following update:	
	 Leveraging the new AoC Good Governance template resource, no areas of non-compliance had been identified for 2023-24. 	
	 Almost all areas of opportunity that were identified were directly aligned to the existing Governance Improvement Plan, with the exception of one item related to environmental sustainability objectives. However, this was already being addressed through the development of the new ESCG Strategic Plan. 	
	8.2 The following discussion then occurred:	
	• The Chair of the Board suggested that updates and evidence associated with the Self Assessment Report and Quality Improvement Plan should ideally be included within another section of the report. Furthermore, other moderate amendments were also suggested.	
	 <u>Action 8.2.1</u> – Update the AoC Code of Good Governance Report to incorporate suggested amendments from the Chair of the Board. 	BH/IM
	• RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the Annual Compliance with the AoC Code of Good Governance Report to the Board for approval, subject to the agreed amendments.	
Strat	tegic Items	
9)	REPUTATION & BRAND UPDATE 15:56	
	9.1 The CEO & Principal advised that extensive work was currently underway, led by the Marketing & Communications Team to develop a new Marketing Strategy and a further update would be shared at the next meeting. The draft Marketing Strategy was also currently under review with Internal Audit.	
	9.2 The Chair of the Board suggested that it may be helpful to encourage Governors to leverage their social media channels to act as ambassadors for the college. Governors agreed.	
10)	ESCG STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE 16:57	
	10.1 The CEO & Principal shared the following update:	
	• The Curriculum Strategy was currently being drafted, which would inform the development of the broader ESCG Strategic Plan.	
	 The Strategic Plan would also incorporate strategic priorities related to 'Sustainability', 'Diversity, Equity & Inclusion', 'Digital (infrastructure and provision)', 'Ambition', 'Partnership' and 'Social Impact'. 	



	Key milestone dates were as follows:	l
	 An initial draft would be shared at the Full Board meeting on 8th July 2024. An updated plan would be presented for approval at the 18th October 2024 Strategy Day & Board meeting, and subsequently launched later in the Autumn Term, 2024. 	
Poli	cies & Key Documents	
11)	POLICIES 16:56	
	11.1 Code of Conduct for Corporation Members	l
	• Governors noted the key changes to this policy, as detailed in the associated Policy Change Summary Sheet.	l
	• The Chair of the Board reflected that it would also be timely for summary information on the purpose of the 'Code of Conduct for Corporation Members' to be shared with the Board, given the high number of new Governors in its membership. Governors agreed.	
	• RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend that the Code of Conduct for Corporation Members be adopted by the Board.	l
	11.2 Scheme of Delegation	l
	• Governors noted the key changes to this policy, as detailed in the associated Policy Change Summary Sheet.	l
	• RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the Scheme of Delegation to the Board for approval.	I
	11.3 Standing Orders	l
	• Governors noted the key changes to this policy, as detailed in the associated Policy Change Summary Sheet.	l
	• RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee agreed to recommend the Standing Orders to the Board for approval.	L
	11.4 SPH Disciplinary Procedure	l
	• The Director of Governance advised that following careful review of the latest guidance and legislation by the Director of People, there had been no significant changes to this policy.	l
	• The Chair of the Board reflected that the current suite of SPH policies needed to reference the latest guidance, related to approval thresholds for staff severance payments, as detailed in the <u>College Financial Handbook</u> and <u>Managing Public Money</u> . Governors agreed.	
	 <u>Action 11.4.1</u> – Ensure that the current suite of policies for senior post holders (particularly the SPH Remuneration Guidance) appropriately references the guidance detailed in the <u>College Financial Handbook</u> and <u>Managing Public Money</u>, related to approval thresholds for staff severance payments. 	LC



		the SPH Disciplinary Procedure.		
11	1.4 \$	PH Grievance Procedure		
	•	The Director of Governance advised that following careful review of the legislation by the Director of People, there had been no significant chan	-	
	•	RESOLUTION – The Governance, Performance & Reputation Committee the SPH Disciplinary Procedure.	e agreed to approve	
lose				
2) A I	NYC	OTHER BUSINESS	17:01	
12	2.1 7	here were no further items raised for discussion.		
3) D/	ΑΤΕ	OF NEXT MEETING	17:02	
		Governors noted that the next meeting had been tentatively scheduled for -17:00.	or 23 [™] October 2024,	
.) LI'	VE C	COMMITTEE SELF-ASSESSMENT	17:03	
	14.1 Two survey reasons were reasined from Covernors, calling during the mosting.			
14	4.1 T	wo survey responses were received from Governors, online during the me	eting:	
14	4.1 T	wo survey responses were received from Governors, online during the me	eeting:	
	#	ASSESSMENT QUESTION	RESULT	
		ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance	-	
	# 1.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities?	RESULT 100%	
1	#	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being	RESULT 100% 50% – Yes	
1	# 1.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities?	RESULT 100%	
1	# 1. 2.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions?	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100%	
1 2 3 4	# 1. 2. 3. 4.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions? Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth?	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100%	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions? Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth? Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner?	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100%	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions? Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth? Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner? Was the student experience at the heart of decision making?	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100% 100% 100%	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	ASSESSMENT QUESTIONWas the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities?Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors?Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions?Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth?Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner?Was the student experience at the heart of decision making?Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100% 100% 50% - Partially	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	ASSESSMENT QUESTIONWas the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities?Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors?Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions?Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth?Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner?Was the student experience at the heart of decision making?Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100% 100% 100%	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions? Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth? Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner? Was the student experience at the heart of decision making? Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of perspectives were considered?	RESULT 100% 50% – Yes 50% – Partially 100% 100% 100% 50% – Partially 50% – N/A	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	ASSESSMENT QUESTIONWas the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities?Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors?Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions?Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth?Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner?Was the student experience at the heart of decision making?Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of perspectives were considered?Were opportunities created to invite input from Student and Staff	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100% 100% 50% - Partially 50% - Yes 50% - Yes 50% - Yes 50% - Yes	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8.	ASSESSMENT QUESTIONWas the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities?Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors?Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions?Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth?Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner?Was the student experience at the heart of decision making?Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of perspectives were considered?Were opportunities created to invite input from Student and Staff Governors?	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100% 100% 100% 50% - Partially 50% - Yes 50% - N/A	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.	ASSESSMENT QUESTIONWas the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities?Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors?Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions?Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth?Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner?Was the student experience at the heart of decision making?Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of perspectives were considered?Were opportunities created to invite input from Student and Staff	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100% 100% 50% - Partially 50% - Yes 50% - Yes 50% - Yes 50% - Yes	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions? Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth? Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner? Was the student experience at the heart of decision making? Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of perspectives were considered? Were opportunities created to invite input from Student and Staff Governors? Any comments or suggestions?	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100% 100% 100% 50% - Partially 50% - Yes 50% - N/A Yes*	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions? Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth? Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner? Was the student experience at the heart of decision making? Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of perspectives were considered? Were opportunities created to invite input from Student and Staff Governors? Any comments or suggestions? Ments: I know that this Committee is about Governance, and that we all firmly backet.	RESULT 100% 50% - Yes 50% - Partially 100% 100% 100% 100% 50% - Partially 50% - Yes 50% - N/A Yes*	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions? Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth? Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner? Was the student experience at the heart of decision making? Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of perspectives were considered? Were opportunities created to invite input from Student and Staff Governors? Any comments or suggestions? Mark this Committee is about Governance, and that we all firmly b are and should be at the centre of what we do, but feel we should find a	RESULT100%50% - Yes50% - Partially100%100%100% - Partially50% - Yes50% - Yes50% - Yes50% - N/A50% - N/AYes*	
	# 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	ASSESSMENT QUESTION Was the agenda sufficiently balanced between core governance business and strategic priorities? Where the papers succinct, with clarity in the information being communicated and the action required by Governors? Did you have all the information you needed to fully participate in discussion and decisions? Was there sufficient time to debate priority items in depth? Were you satisfied that decisions were arrived at in a proper manner? Was the student experience at the heart of decision making? Did the Chair facilitate the meeting effectively, enabling adequate focus on strategic priorities and creating an environment where a range of perspectives were considered? Were opportunities created to invite input from Student and Staff Governors? Any comments or suggestions? Ments: I know that this Committee is about Governance, and that we all firmly backet.	RESULT100%50% - Yes50% - Partially100%100%100% - Partially50% - Yes50% - Yes50% - Yes50% - N/A50% - N/AYes*	



Actions Summary

ltem	Owner	Action	Due Date
4.1.1	BH	When next refreshing of the Instrument & Articles of Government and Standing	Autumn Term
		Orders, consider the feasibility of the following updates:	2024
		 An amendment to enable a mixture of both campus location and 	
		support/teaching staff representation in Staff Governor appointments.	
		 Validating that Staff Governors had terms of office that were 	
		harmonised with Independent Governors.	
		 Amending the maximum number of Staff Governors from 4 to 3. 	
4.1.2	BH/IM	Following the forthcoming Governor induction session with the Director of	8 th July 2024
		Governance, explore whether any of the newly appointed Independent	
		Governors scheduled to attend the session would be interested in performing a	
		committee leadership role and/or join an additional committee.	
5.2.1	BH	Update the Ambassador role descriptions to reflect the agreed amendments, as	Complete
		detailed in Section 5.2 of the minutes.	
5.2.2	BH/IM	Contact the proposed Independent Governors to explore their willingness to	8 th July 2024
		perform an Ambassador role.	
6.1.1	PMK/IM	Propose priority KPIs specific to the GP&R Committee, with a view for the GP&R	8 th July 2024
		Committee to recommend these to the Board, via a written resolution.	
6.1.2	BH	Update the Governance Improvement Plan to replace the reference to 'anti-	Complete
		racism agenda' with 'diversity agenda'.	
6.2.1	BH	Amend the key recommendations detailed in the Annual Board Review Report	Complete
		to remove reference to 'financial efficiency'.	
6.2.2	BH	Confirm whether the College was currently being charged for the ETF Learning	23 rd October
		Pathway Platform.	2024
6.2.3	IM	Contact the identified Governor to confirm whether they would be willing to	8 th July 2024
		step down from the CS&Q Committee membership, with a view to reduce the	
		total number of members in that committee.	ath i la ann i
6.2.4	BH/IM	Liaise with new and existing Independent Governors to confirm proposed	8 th July 2024
		buddy/mentoring relationships.	
6.2.5	BH	Update the Annual Board Review Report to confirm that as output of the review	Complete
		process, no changes to the ESCG Board and Committee structure had been	
724	DU	recommended.	
7.3.1	BH	Update the Committee Membership (2024-25) paper to reflect the agreed	Complete
754	DU	amendments, as detailed in Section 7.3 of the minutes.	
7.5.1	BH	Update the Draft Schedule of Meetings to include a separate colour for the	Complete
0 7 1		'Newhaven – Marine Workshops' site.	oth unby 2024
8.2.1	BH/IM	Update the AoC Code of Good Governance Report to incorporate suggested amendments from the Chair of the Board.	8 th July 2024
11 / 1	LC	Ensure that the current suite of policies for senior post holders (particularly the	23 rd October
11.4.1		SPH Remuneration Guidance) appropriately references the guidance detailed in	23 rd October 2024
		the <u>College Financial Handbook</u> and <u>Managing Public Money</u> , related to approval	2024
		thresholds for staff severance payments.	