

**Search, Remuneration and Performance Committee
Wednesday 3 February 2021 18:00-20:00, Boardroom and Teams**

Draft minutes

Committee	Sue Kingman (Chair); Ian Valvona; Andy Chew; Mike Sutcliffe; Vincent Neate; Jim Marshall
In Attendance	Elaine McMahon (Interim Principal and CEO); Alison de Lord (Assistant Principal HR & OD); Sarah Connerty (interim governance advisor)
Apologies	

Item	Item Description	Action
1	Welcome and apologies The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that there are a large number of items on the agenda but items have clear summaries and actions to allow time for longer discussion around merger items.	
2	Declarations of interest SC and IV declared an interest for item 5-chair and governance appraisal. Governors noted they were content for IV to remain for the item. AdL declared an interest for item 12 – management and senior post holder structure. EM noted that the item is being discussed in general terms. All governors declared an interest for item 11 – appointment process for new governors.	
3	The minutes of the meeting of 22 September and 17 November 2020 were agreed as a true and accurate record. The electronic resolution of 4 December to recommend to approve the appointment of an independent governor was ratified.	
4	Actions and matters arising The majority of actions were agreed as completed. The following actions were considered as follows: Item 39 – date change from 2 June 2021. It was agreed to bring this date forward to the 10 May 2021. Item 32 – independent governors to be invited to share thoughts on SPH performance reviews. As this may not take place due to the proposed dissolution date the Chair suggested that colleagues contribute to the mid-year review in February. IV felt it made sense for Committee chairs to offer thoughts on their respective CLT members on questions of performance and welcomed this. He noted that the technicalities of timing and SPH status could be flexible to allow all CLT members to receive input from governors in an appropriate timescale. The Chair noted an action from Board meeting on the 9 December for the Committee to consider the College’s response the pay award for staff. EM reported that the College had set aside a 1% pay award for staff and were looking at cashflow and the ability to action this. The matter to be considered at item 14.	SC
5	Self-Assessment processes for 2020-21	

	<p>The Chair reported that the paper reflects the amount of assessment taking place. It was agreed that it is sensible to plan for business as usual and it is worthwhile to carry out the following self-assessments for the remainder of 2021. The proposed timetable for 2020-21 was agreed.</p> <p>Proposed self-assessment timetable for 2020-21</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="395 371 1316 600"> <tr> <td>Board self-assessment</td> <td>June 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Committee reviews of effectiveness</td> <td>June 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Review of governance</td> <td>Ongoing through year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meetings with the Chair, Principal and governance advisor</td> <td>Weekly</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meeting of Principal and Chairs</td> <td>Monthly as required</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Chair reported on the annual review of the Chair and interim governance advisor. The results are very positive. There is one example of somewhat disagree which has been followed up. This related to putting in place a more structured self-assessment through the year with the Board setting and monitoring KPIs for governors that are tested through the year with parents, staff, students and stakeholders. IV agreed that the principle is right and he would like to better understand the mechanism of getting parent and student views of the Board. Governors discussed how much parents would know about the Board and how the practicalities would work. The interim governance advisor noted that many college boards set KPIs and produce a governance SAR and this could usefully be implemented but timings would not be possible with the proposed dissolution. It was agreed it is a proposal that could go forward to HCUC as part of the governance work stream.</p> <p>The Chair noted that there were a number of don't know answers in the survey around such items as performance reviews and relationships and this could be addressed by being more transparent around these areas. It was noted that these are included in summary reports to the Board and could be highlighted further.</p>	Board self-assessment	June 2021	Committee reviews of effectiveness	June 2021	Review of governance	Ongoing through year	Meetings with the Chair, Principal and governance advisor	Weekly	Meeting of Principal and Chairs	Monthly as required	<p>SC</p> <p>SC</p>
Board self-assessment	June 2021											
Committee reviews of effectiveness	June 2021											
Review of governance	Ongoing through year											
Meetings with the Chair, Principal and governance advisor	Weekly											
Meeting of Principal and Chairs	Monthly as required											
<p>6</p>	<p>Membership and succession planning</p> <p>The Committee considered the current Board membership and the agreement at the last Committee meeting on the 17 November that it could manage the merger process and usual business and that a recruitment campaign at the current time would be time consuming and unsuitable. Following agreement to search for a time limited co-opted role on Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) Rosemary Scully was appointed on the 9 December to the Board and ARC. Points noted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two governors are approaching renewal to a second term of office in July 2021 (Mike Sutcliffe) and December 2021 (Sue Kingman) • John Poole has confirmed that he would like to remain a co-opted governor on ARC until dissolution <p>To ensure that there is consistency on the Board through the merger discussions the Committee recommended to approve that all terms of office due to expire this year are extended until dissolution as follows:</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee recommended to approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the term of office Ian Valvona as Chair of the RuTC Board until dissolution (currently this is until 31 July 2021) • the term of office of Mike Sutcliffe as an RuTC independent governor until dissolution (currently this is 4 July 2021) • the term of office of the RuTC staff governors until dissolution (currently this is 1 July 2021) 											
<p>7</p>	<p>Governor involvement and Board development programme for 2020-21</p>											

	<p>The Chair noted the extensive list of governor involvement since the last meeting and colleagues agreed it was difficult to provide opportunities for governors in the pandemic. It was noted that chairs are committing a great deal of time to the College due to the SPA and the merger discussions and it is important to ensure that all governors are kept informed and be involved in the merger discussions. The Chair asked about Helen Litvak being involved in the marketing and comms workstream and AdL noted that it is very operational at this stage and EM agreed that when the process has moved further on it will be very helpful to involve Helen to review marketing and comms work. Alex Gallagher was agreed as a link to EDI at the College and SC agreed to follow up on this. SC reported that Japneet Kaur is being mentored by SK and Hamish Murray is considering whether a mentor would be helpful which SC will follow up.</p> <p>The Chair asked EM if there are any useful opportunities for governors to become more involved with staff and students. EM reported that a programme of lesson observations will commence after half term for governors and the schedule of activities is appended to the papers.</p> <p>AdL asked if CLT would have the opportunity to meet with Rosemary Scully as part of her induction and SC agreed to take forward.</p> <p>IV noted that awareness of the work Jason Jones is doing around quality improvement and quality assurance in particular is critical to how governors are brought into the life of the College. This will address the division in the Board around committee chairs and other governors which is naturally occurring due to the membership of the Joint Steering Group. He noted that the finance director has been in contact with Japneet Kaur to provide an opportunity to be involved in shadowing the financial aspects of the merger, and also Neal Hook is a member of the JSG. IV asked about where staff and student governors can most effectively engage and support through the merger discussions.</p>	<p>EM</p> <p>SC</p> <p>SC</p> <p>SC</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Schedule of Board and Committee meetings</p> <p>The Committee noted the schedule of Board and Committee meetings for 2020-21 that include the additional Board and Committee dates and Joint Steering Group meetings. It was noted that the SRP dates would be included when confirmed. A schedule for 2021-22 has been drafted in the event of delay or change to merger.</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p>Revised cycle of business for 2020-21</p> <p>The Chair reported that the cycle has been revised to take out non-essential items to allow Committees and the Board more time to focus on strategic discussion. AC asked about pre meetings for the JSG and it was agreed to schedule dates until dissolution, a couple of days before the JSG at 18.00. IV noted that he is having an informal meeting with the Chair of HCUC this Monday. The Chair noted the intention to expand the discussions going forward to get to know HCUC's Vice Chair.</p>	<p>SC</p> <p>IV</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Merger workstream plan for governance</p> <p>SC provided an overview of the governance workstream plan and the milestones (see plan for details).</p> <p>The Committee considered the public consultation timelines and agreed that it is a moment in the process when the merger discussions start to come together and there is the opportunity to underscore the benefits of merger to a wider audience. JM asked if there a list of people who receive the consultation and EM confirmed that there is. IV asked about the practicalities of engaging with staff and students and how governors can be engaged in all responses received. It was agreed that this needed careful handling. EM noted that MA has reiterated that he has</p>	

<p>managed 17 mergers and knows the pitfalls and the things that work. EM and IV have already met with a number of key stakeholders and have insight into areas where further communications and work is needed, i.e. council members. These are already being revisited. Key stakeholders have been identified and a plan is being rolled out which is in part an opportunity to promote the College.</p> <p>Governors asked if there is formal engagement with the Unions when the consultation is published. AdL reported that more union meetings and joint union meetings are being diarised and there will be a staff consultation. A few staff meetings have taken place already and it has been raised with the unions and staff in general to remind them of the process. Regular online and verbal communications are taking place with Q&As. Not being able to see people face to face causes issues but online opportunities are being taken. EM reported that the amount of feedback and questions is minimal and unusually quiet with staff around the merger. This could be to do with Covid and everyone working so hard to keep the learning going and dealing with the issues of home working. AdL agreed and noted that at the last union meeting there was very little questioning or discussion on merger apart from wanting to know the type of merger and clarification that terms and conditions would be looked at post merger. AC noted that at no stage can the College be accused of under communicating and suggested that around the time of publication of the consultation governors produce an informal video with the rationale of merger and what will be achieved going forward. Alongside this a FAQs which includes questions from individual stakeholders and more general questions could be included. AdL noted that a video from the governors would be very welcome and an FAQ on merger is already in train. MS suggested that a governor(s) could attend the all-staff sessions and EM welcomed this and noted that they are a very well attended forum for staff. It was agreed that providing an opportunity now to encourage views that will be useful for the consultation document would enrich the publication. EM and AdL agreed to think about a vehicle for that as the all-staff meetings can be intimidating for staff. Planting questions to encourage dialogue was suggested and EM reported that during the first staff Q&A session CLT went around classrooms spending time with colleagues which resulted in a lot of questions and discussion. AdL noted that the Staff Forum is another vehicle but it is not representative of all staff.</p> <p>IV agreed that to get some granular meaningful input the College should go more widely and be candid around where all the answers are not there and ask for thoughts.</p> <p>EM noted that she speaks to DDS on weekly basis and communications is a regular agenda item. DDS has shared his all staff address which focused on the West London arc and process of merger. Feedback will be shared so the FAQs can encompass HCUCs. AC asked if the FAQs are published on the internet and intranet and EM explained that it is just being shared with staff now but will start to be share more widely including on the intranet.</p> <p>IV noted that being joined up with HCUC in an external facing way will be helped by having a joint position on the signed off set of FAQs. The merger won't have a microsite but the College needs to ensure that they are aligned and consistent in their messaging.</p> <p>Governors asked if the staff are aware of the process for consultation. EM reported that she keeps staff updated on all discussions through the weekly all staff email. Last week the Chair sent out an update to staff. Governors noted that there needs to be an awareness from staff that now is the time to speak as it is still</p>	<p>EM/IV</p> <p>EM/IV</p> <p>EM/ AdL</p>
--	--

	<p>internal but will be evolving from this point and there needs to be the opportunity for staff to interact. EM agreed and noted that over the next few weeks the workstreams will be coming together more to interact with staff and there will be more of a cascade of messages which will help the cycle of questioning. The unions are in dialogue with both colleges but there are no unanswerable questions coming out to date. AdL noted that the support staff are so emersed in the due diligence and they also feel there is an inevitability to the merger. There was a desire to be standalone but now that is not an option they are expecting the senior team to manage this in the best way to support the staff and students.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>Appointment process for new governors</p> <p>At the Chairs catch up this week the following questions had been raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the strategy for the new college and what should the governance structure be to support the strategy? • Will the new Board have the skills and experience to serve the best interests of the students? The same applies for the management structure. • How will the RuTC Board get comfort that both the governance and management structure are appropriate for the merged college? • What are the skills and experience gaps on the merged college Board? • What is the governor recruitment process? Skills audit and expressions of interest discussed to date. Will there be informal discussions with the Chair? • Will it be a new Board whose skills and experience are reviewed as a whole, or will RuTC governors be bolted on to the existing Board? • Will there be opportunities for the RuTC committee chairs to have roles on the new Board? <p>SC provided an update on questions raised as follows:</p> <p>Determination of numbers –RuTC governors will be appointed on top of the current membership number of 11 independent governors (16 in total) which would mean a membership of between 20-22 plus a staff and student governor from RuTC if one is taken from each college. There may be at least one governor stepping down but this is not yet part of discussions.</p> <p>Current skills – an annual skills audit and self-assessment process takes place at HCUC. The immediate vacancy is for a finance/audit governor with strengthening of education/curriculum.</p> <p>Committee chairs at HCUC are well established but there may be some opportunity.</p> <p>Terms of office – the Board operates on two terms of four years but this is not formalised in the standing orders. [confidential item].</p> <p>IV noted that he was not completely cited on terms of office but that adding 4-6 to a Board of 16 is overly large and alongside a number of governors who have served more than long enough in terms of good governance requires further work. In a classic relationship management space it would be around trying to work towards something in between RuTC’s reluctance to simply passport over and the lack of competitive process. It is about finding something in between and asking what does this merged entity need in relation to a governing body in terms of size and skills. He noted that there is work to be done still before signing up to a process.</p> <p>SK agreed and noted the sensitivity of the discussion as ND was appointed to Harrow in 2010. IV noted that bringing governors in from RuTC and from outside and keeping a manageable sized board would require running a process and it</p>	

	<p>would take the position into a very tricky space quickly and requires absolute careful handling.</p> <p>VN noted that he could see a process that looks at understanding what the governance change programme is into the future. RuTC will be handing over the reins of RuTC and the students to this new entity and if there are perceived governance flaws in the current set up then a lot of focus needs to go into it before RuTC are comfortable to say yes. This would look at retiring governors, a programme on terms of office and ensuring the needs of the Board are matched into the group. He suggested quite a lot of focus is required before coming back to SRP and reporting back on how the iterative dialogue goes so the Committee can consider whether this is the governance change programme RuTC want to sign up to. IV agreed that the concerns are legitimate and will require a response and consideration. He noted that ESFA are in the conversations with the JSG and governance is something they would take an interest in.</p> <p>AC suggested stressing to ND and HCUC that RuTC governors see this as part of the opportunity of the merged entity. The further work on the vision and strategy as a new organisation would also take a step back and look at what a best in class model of governance looks like and there is the opportunity to review part of that in the run up to the new entity.</p> <p>It was agreed that because of what RuTC has gone through there are more sensitivities to good governance. It was also noted that RuTC had only tightened up on some of the I&As and byelaws over the last year.</p>	
<p>12</p>	<p>Management and Senior Post holder structure</p> <p>AdL reported on the HR timeline. The JSG on the 25 February will be talking about what the structure may look like and the consultation with staff will commence on the 19 April closing on 3 May and posts advertised. Interviews will take place week commencing 10 May with HCUC Board approving designate appointments on the 18 May.</p> <p>AdL noted that it is a very tight timetable and half term is week commencing 31 May. TUPE closes on 7 June and further work on the HR operating programme needs to be done by 24 May.</p> <p>EM noted that she is meeting with DDS and Matt Atkinson tomorrow and will have more knowledge of the initial thoughts on the structure. DDS is taking the opportunity to review the whole structure for the college, with the departure of the Deputy CEO and Principal of Harrow College. The structure, which has elements of a matrix, will be reviewed to see how it is working. There needs to be a skills review to align with the changing strategic direction and this has to take RuTC into account. It is early in the process and the vision and strategic direction has to be clearer and that impacts on structure. CLT have been sharing thoughts on where RuTC are with the structure and EM welcomed the opportunity for colleagues' views.</p> <p>The Committee shared their thoughts as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talking about the principles of merger, what are the drivers? What are we learning from one another coming out of the workstreams and due diligence to get a feel for each other's college and how it is operating, what are the perspectives coming through and what are the challenges? • Don't forget that culture is going to be one of the key workstreams, we are looking at very different cultures. How are we going to synergise, how will we understand processes and systems? • Are we understanding the resource numbers? 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to define the integrated operating business model? • EM noted that the need to maintain stability has been discussed at length at CLT. RuTC has moved from turmoil to stability and has traction on its improving performance. In the structure are we recognising enough that turmoil and making sure HCUC understands. Maintaining the stability and the upward growth trend needs to be sustained and it should be noted that CLT have played a significant part in leading the improvements • EM noted the importance of building continuity into the new structure. CLT do feel HCUC are talking about a partnership of equals. Questions to be addressed include: What will the application process be for posts in tier 2 and tier 3? It is important to enable fair and equitable processes • EM noted that she is hoping HCUC will take forward the three CLT members of staff because they are instrumental to keeping that upwards projectory • Maximising talents, maintaining institutional knowledge, putting in place a skills set that will deliver the new college strategy and outcomes are all vital • EM noted that two of the CLT members are SPHs – SFW and JJ, one is interim – IR. Last year AdL was given the responsibility for estates alongside her HR & OD role. EM is proposing formally to the SRP and the Board that a designation of SPH is given to this role to ensure equity when benchmarked. It was noted that this would come forward to a future meeting for discussion • Because there is a matrix element like most large groups RuTC would want to be sure that RuTC would have a Principal/senior person who leads from a cross college role • EM noted that the new college will need to deliver economies of scale over the first year but it will need staff to deliver the integration and it will need to TUPE people across from RuTC. CLT have spent a lot of time considering what the new college will look like and what it needs to deliver the strategies and outcomes • AC asked for more detail about the matrix elements in the structure. He understood that one of the top tier is leaving and asked how DDS is looking at that. There are talented people at RuTC in estates and HR and projects could be managed from RuTC. SFW could not be let go because she is key to delivering RuTC projects but that does not fit neatly into any current role. There is a need to really understand the thinking to be able to contribute and governors are ready to give ideas. AC asked if there is a matrix structure in place. EM reported that the Deputy Principal Quality (DMc) and the FD operate across both colleges. AdL clarified that there are three curriculum directors at Uxbridge and two at Harrow, and the Harrow directors are managed by the existing principle with a dotted line reporting into DMc. AdL agreed to share the organisational chart when available • EM reported that JJ had noted that he would like three directors if he were Principal because he oversees student support as well as the curriculum and would need people to delegate to • AC noted that it would be useful to know what HCUC see as the advantages of that matrix against the Principals having their own team and reporting into DDS. Is it economies of scale? What is the logic and what 	AdL
--	--	-----

	<p>are they trying to drive? It is important that matrix models are thought through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EM noted that in the bigger college groups she had worked with there were more simplistic models of 3 principals who report into the group CEO • AdL noted that the HCUC structures don't align with RuTC structure which is much flatter. RuTC have a discreet dedicated safeguarding and student services team and are not sure where it is located at HCUC but this may be in the supported learning area. She noted that some of the roles might be happenstance rather than deliberate from the previous merger • It was agreed that now is the opportunity to look at the complete structure, taking people out of it. AdL noted that CLT would like a Principal at RuTC and thought that was part of the SPA. It was agreed that it is not RuTC's role to define what the structure would be, but looking at the underlying principles to ensure the structures is not losing the stability and institutional memory is an important part of the discussions • AdL noted that HCUC are an Outstanding college but they haven't been inspected for a long time and some areas, e.g. corporate services which not as modern in thinking as RUTC. There are things RuTC can offer in terms of development and improvement as they have had to review and be more agile as a result of the FEC intervention. • JM noted that in the same way as for the appointment of governors whatever structure is suggested governors need to feel comfortable that it is appropriate for RuTC and that the management and staff and students will be looked after appropriately • AC agreed and noted that digging into the structure follows the strategy. It is about what RuTC is able to achieve in the future that it wouldn't otherwise be able to achieve and ensuring that governance and management is fit for that • IV noted that the finer points of this are going to be worked out in considerable detail as part of the merger discussions. He had envisaged a centre Principal at RuTC with a focus on curriculum and the student experience and relationships with local stakeholders but with less emphasis on finances and estates. This may not be practical or corporately responsible and IV noted that he was amenable to looking at different options but is more fixed on a centre Principal for RuTC directly reporting to the group Principal and attending group Board meetings. EM agreed this is exactly how it has worked in large groups structures she has worked at with headquarters being a very tight senior team and a Principal at each of the campuses with a financial management accountant and an overarching COO for the group. This is very familiar model and also exists in business and does work. The strategic direction needs to be clear to determine who the right people are for the roles. This is such a critical part of the merger and these discussions have just started. <p>EM's presentation is appended to the minutes.</p>	
13	<p>Process for review of SPHs performance for 2020-21</p> <p>EM reported that the mid-year review takes place in February and there is a clear policy and process for staff to work to. The CLT's objectives and CPD development was reviewed in October 2020 alongside developing the one-year strategic plan and those changes were encompassed into the earlier agreements from the previous Principal and CEO. Recent reflections on CPD have resulted in some additional development including Jason Jones attending the Principals</p>	

	<p>development programme at the Said Business School and all managers in the College having mentoring and coaching this year. The College already had a good CPD programme in place for its staff and it has been strengthened this year. This will be reflected in the mid-year review which will take into account the benefits of the additional support. At the review meeting targets and objectives will be revisited and CLT will provide their views. The meetings are scheduled over the next fortnight and will be reported back to SRP [after note: CLT reviews will be followed by the Principal and CEO and governance advisors’ review meetings with the Chair in the first week of March].</p> <p>EM and IV have discussed involving governors in the process and had suggested 360 evaluation. CLT felt it would not be helpful at this time. IV reported that CLT members have pre meetings with their respective chairs as well as informal discussions through the year and taking those views into account before sharing the outcome of mid-year reviews would be helpful. JM noted that he was happy to have that informal conversation and that he has regular catch ups with Ian Rule which started as part of the induction and have kept going because they are useful. He noted that he would extend that and feedback. EM noted that IR has a detailed contract which encompasses his objectives and targets which can be used. VN and MS both confirmed that would be happy to take forward and asked about the timeline. EM noted that the timeline for receiving feedback is by the end of February and she would like the process to be as transparent as possible. AdL explained that CLT reluctance to move to a 360 feedback approach at this time could be skewed because of Covid and the stress that everyone is under and CLT didn’t want further work for people to do which may give a distorted response at this time. CLT’s view had been in response to staff rather than governor feedback and she welcomed a governor view as a lot of the work done is for the Board and the input from governors would be welcomed.</p> <p>Chairs questioned how they would review and EM noted that objectives are currently being updated and would be shared [Strategic priorities and targets will be available on 11 February]. It was agreed that the governor input is around development rather than judgement and could be usefully extended to all independent Board members. SC to take forward with CLT.</p>	<p>Chairs</p> <p>SC</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>Pay award</p> <p>AdL reported that the College has done work on the affordability of offering a pay award to staff and this is progressing. The real piece of work is looking at the terms and conditions for staffing at HCUC to ensure any decisions around a pay award do not create a bigger gap. More time is needed to carry out this work and a report will come to the full Board when further details are available.</p>	<p>AdL</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>Freedom of Information report</p> <p>SC reported that the paper includes details of FOI requests since April 2020 that were all responded to within the 20 working days requirement.</p> <p>The policy has been updated to clarify the scope of the policy, owners of FOI at the College, clear guidance on how to request information and costs, a summary of the FOI and Environmental Regulations and updated contact details for the Information Commissioners Office.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The Committee considered and approved the revised Freedom of Information Policy</p>	
<p>16</p>	<p>Attendance 2020-21</p> <p>The Committee noted the attendance report and the positive attendance figure of 92% for overall attendance compared to 77% from 2019-20. All Committee attendance is high. SC reported that there are two instances of membership below</p>	

	<p>80% but results at this stage of the year are not reflective of governor commitment and there are no areas of concern to report.</p> <p>SC reported that the two instances of concern raised at the September meeting had been followed up with governors and have been resolved.</p> <p>VN asked to resign from CRPG and it was agreed this Committee has a full membership and would not cause any issues for the effective functioning of CRPG.</p> <p>It was noted that VN provides a great deal of time to the Board as Chair of Audit and Risk Committee, member of SRP, attendee on CQS and safeguarding and mental health and wellbeing governor.</p>	SC
17	<p>Use of the College Seal</p> <p>The Committee noted that the Seal was used twice since the last meeting on the: Emergency Recovery Support Funds contract with the GLA and on Deed of Variation and Escrow Agreement between RuTC and Clarion Housing Association Ltd on the 17 December 2020</p>	
18	<p>Any other business [confidential item]</p>	
19	<p>Meeting dates for 2020-21:</p> <p>It was agreed that further discussions are required around governor and senior post holder appointments. SC to work with the Chair to set appropriate dates. 2 June 2021 date moved to the 10 May 2021.</p>	

Meeting closed: 20.22