

Directors (ie trustees) meeting
Meeting held on 18th Sep 2025 at 5 pm,
at Brixington Primary Academy or via Teams,
Draft Minutes

Present: in person: P Walker (CEO), A Walmsley (chair), A Denner and C Bromfield
 virtually: R Warwick

In attendance in person: M Platten (Director of Finance - DoF) and I Candy (Lead Governance Professional - LGP)
 Virtually: N/A

Quorum: the meeting was quorate

Circulation: Directors and members (through GovernorHub), Dioceses (EDEN and SDBE via GovernorHub), schools & public (through Trust website)

Decision	Action due
----------	------------

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies	
Apologies were received from R Shaw (family commitment), M Williams (ill health) and P Wimsett (personal commitments).	
2. Prayer	
The board paused for self-reflection.	
3. Declaration of Conflict of Interests	
Declarations of conflict of interests were invited by the chair. None was made. Register of business interests and related party forms were circulated during the summer holidays. The LGP will chase any outstanding ones to ensure they are all returned and the register of interests is up to date.	LGP
4. Minutes of the last meeting	
4.1. To approve the minutes (Part I and Part II) of the last meeting (held on 17 July 2025)	
The draft minutes (Part I and Part II) of the previous meeting were circulated shortly before the meeting. These were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting and signed by the chair.	
4.2. To review matters arising not otherwise on the agenda	
The list of matters arising was circulated ahead of the meeting. The following matters arising were raised and discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R Warwick was appointed as foundation director with effect from 23rd July (not 23rd September as incorrectly listed in the matters arising list). • The finance policy update is in process. • Related to the matter of deficits from potential joiners; the CEO reported that a discussion had taken place at DSLS around Devon's handling of deficits for maintained schools converting to academy status, them not having a set policy and this resulting in differing outcomes on academisation. DSLS academy representatives have requested a consistent policy is adopted so that Devon children are treated fairly. (Some schools have had their deficit written off and some not in similar circumstances.) 	Appendix 1

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SDBE vacancy was discussed as part recruitment and succession planning discussed during the strategic session. • The LGP had not received any expression of interest for the role of foundation representatives following R Shaw informing DMAT staff about the role and vacancies. • The CEO was due to meet further with Devon (J Barnicott) around suspensions and exclusions following the IRP for the permanent exclusion at Blackpool. • The CEO confirmed he had met with PHP to discuss HR policies and make sure they were consistent. They will be updated at the same time, so they work well together. • It was confirmed that the University of St Mark and St John would no longer act as a corporate Member for MATs. Therefore, the current representative was invited to take the role of foundation representative on the West Hub and was considering this and whether there was a conflict with her role on Plymouth SACRE. • The date of the Ofsted training for governance volunteers was confirmed as 6th November. The LGP will send invitations for this. • The closing date to apply for the Director of Operations (DoO) vacant position was the week after this meeting. There was already a good range of applicants. Trustees were invited to be part of the short-listing panel by the CEO. The LGP was due to ask trustees for their availability for interviews on 29 and 30 September. • The chair reported that Bishop Fleming had written to explain audit services now needed to be under a separate audit company under new rules. Therefore, the Trust would get separate bills and separate contacts for audit services. The chair was asked to sign letter to confirm the Trust acceptance to enable Bishop Fleming to continue providing audit services, and this was agreed by the board. 	Trustees LGP
<p>5. To receive and discuss the CEO report, to include:</p> <p>Update on Education & Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes & priorities for next year including priority schools • Update on educational landscape including a brief update on Ofsted <p>Update on HR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on restructure and redundancies • Report on pay increments for staff below SLG <p>Update on Operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters agreed during the summer • Significant estate matters 	
<p>The CEO report, Sep 2025 accountability framework, standards meeting report, the 2025-26 '3 + 1' research-based plan for rapid improvement and the Ofsted report for the recent inspection at Membury were circulated ahead of the report.</p> <p><u>Pay increases:</u></p> <p>The CEO highlighted the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trust continued to follow the STPCD for teachers. As the DfE had announced teacher pay awards much earlier this year, the 4% 'cost of living' pay award was paid in Sep. • The non-teaching staff pay award was awarded in August, back paid to April 2025. • All staff that needed to move to next pay point had done so except the Trust Senior Leadership Group because their appraisal had not concluded yet. <p><u>Legal support:</u></p> <p>The CEO reminded the board that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHP provided legal and HR support to the Trust under a 'wrap' agreement as well as some operational support. The 'wrap' agreement was a unique offer: a fixed price for the legal and HR support that covered everything that the Trust felt they needed legal or HR support for. 	Appendices 2 – 6

The quote shared was for the legal and HR support contract. The Trust was also given the breakdown of the hours for each area. This confirmed that most of the hours were not linked to the transfer of the Acorn schools and Chickerell, but the Trust having sought more support during the last year in some areas e.g. around complaints, PEX/suspensions, age range changes for nurseries and SEND/equality act.

- Based on the cost per hour, the PAYGO model would cost significantly more than the 'wrap' cost.
- The service provided fell under the 'single supplier' provision within the Trust finance policy case because of the operation wrap which was a unique product.
- PHP was now clearer of where support was needed after working with the Trust and to reflect the new business team structure.
- There were some large contracts that needed to be procured in the next year, for which support would be needed. The operation wrap would benefit the Trust in terms of supporting the new DoO once they were in post.

The board discussed that:

- PHP offer a unique offer which meant that a lot of trusts were using them.
- The Trust would want to look at quotes and test the market next, for a three year period and once the support needs had been re-evaluated when the business team changes become embedded.
- When the Trust had last benchmarked the support, PHP were the lowest quote.
- The Trust had really benefitted from the additional PHP team which was now available, particularly for HR and procurement matters, and was happy with the support.

A trustee shared their Trust approach to the same supplier where they also found the support from PHP to be high quality but had re-tendered and decided to purchase a set amount of hours because that trust internal HR provision had increased.

The board agreed to renew the 'wrap' for legal and HR support and that procurement for this support would take place in time for a new contract to be put in place at the start of next year (2026-27).

School improvement (SI):

The CEO highlighted that:

- The Trust had developed a new system in response to low outcomes in order to challenge and support schools more precisely.
- The Educational Leadership Team (ELT) had met with eight schools the week before this meeting, to discuss their low outcomes and the reasons for those. Five schools had been asked to write a Rapid Improvement Plan (RIP), two schools had been asked to write a Raising Attainment Plan (this was a lighter touch approach, for example putting more focus on phonics without requiring a very different approach because progress made by children was very good). There was a bit of a theme around lower KS2 where there are no measures, therefore staff working there sometimes being less held accountable and less pupil progress being made. These RIPs and RAPs would be linked to visits from the linked director and the SI officers.
- The ELT may reduce interventions as the year goes, depending on assessment data.
- There were a few schools that were not invited to the standards panels because reasons for low attainment were better understood. This would however be kept under review following the next assessment data.

In response to a comment from the LGP, the CEO clarified that the standards panel was an operational panel, not a governance panel, attended by trustees to monitor the Trust school improvement approach and report to the board on the process.

The chair of the education committee confirmed from her attendance at the standards panels that:

CEO (DoO when in post)

- These had followed a very rigorous process and were quite difficult for some heads.
- The approach followed the 'no blame' culture but school leaders were asked to answer probing questions.
- The panels had emphasised that there were different issues in some schools although a common issue was leadership.
- The Trust expectations for disadvantaged and SEND pupils were made very clear.

The CEO further highlighted that:

- On some occasions, the leaders had made comments about their school having worked hard around inclusion (e.g. through resource bases) and/or increasing attendance which perhaps had been at the expense of raising outcomes. The ELT had made clear that attainment was part of inclusion and giving SEND and disadvantaged children a better start in life.
- Some schools had recognised they had not done enough monitoring.
- One of the themes was around the quality of teaching and the need to go back to pedagogy and what teachers did 'day in, day out' in their class, which was key to improving outcomes.

This was something that the Trust had started working on with teachers at the Trust non-pupil day and also during the central team development day, around accountability and validation, including the need for a clear purpose, to have credibility and to hold to account. This was being underpinned by the '3 + 1' rapid improvement framework.

- The 'keys to learning' programme was the way to implement this, through coaching.

The board queried if all teachers were using the same assessments at the same time, given that lower KS2 tended to be an issue.

All year groups were using TestBase and their national moderation, so there would be a consistent approach to assessments. The ELT was looking at the appraisal system and the impact of this to ensure the right challenge was being applied. There were staff who were fairly new to accountability because they had joined during covid. Therefore, there needed to be clear expectations and these needed to be enforced through challenge.

The CEO further explained that:

- Priority schools (Brixington, Gatehouse, Mary Dean's, Salcombe, Westcliff and Willowbank) were identified because they had issues that were not just standards related.
- These schools were all allocated a link director who would meet with the school leader on a weekly basis to hold them to account. In addition, the CEO would go to five schools on a six weekly cycle to check what had been achieved and whether that matched expectations. The Director of Inclusion would be visiting the 6th school for which the CEO was the link. A different director from the link director would also visit in the middle of the cycle. This would enable the ELT to be able to have a collective view of the performance of the priority schools.
- In order to keep an oversight on the other schools, the SI officers would see the other schools once a fortnight to review set things e.g. quality of SIP, quality of targets, quality of phonics teaching and then report on this.
- Heads would mark 10% of tests as well as teachers, and the SI team would check a percentage of tests to ensure they were marked rigorously.

The board asked whether generous assessment marking may have contributed to an over optimistic view of pupil attainment last year.

That was likely to have played a role. For example, teachers thinking they knew the pupil could answer a question where an external marker would not have known this.

The board enquired whether schools were still categorised from A to D.

They were and that determined the level of support from the Trust. The SI team would continue to check and monitor all schools and use the same two weekly focus.

The board queried whether the six priority schools were aware of the new Trust approach for them.

They did and were given the dates of the CEO/link directors visits. Schools had seen this approach as positive, apart from one school leader who had found it difficult and was now on sick leave.

Assessment and targets:

The CEO highlighted that:

- Arbor was very useful for the SI team to be able to monitor data centrally.
- Targets for Year 6 would be based on the outcome of tests in Year 5.
- A whole day programme would take place around targets with Year 6 teachers and school heads the day after this meeting. The ELT had used conversion tables using the test scale scores and how they were expected to change from Year 5 to Year 6. They had done some retrospective checks in some schools on the progression from Year 5 to Year 6, which had showed that in some cases expectations were not high enough.
- Targets would be attached to children, not the class, and may therefore change during the year as a result of pupil mobility. For example, Brixington percentage of children expected to reach expected standards in Year 6 will be the average for 42 children in the class now, so this may change at the next data point if the pupils change.
- The Trust had also set some expectations of how scale scores should improve over the year ('the flight path').
- In addition, teachers were asked to bring an example of age-related Writing to help with consistency in this subject which is teacher not test assessed.

External partnership:

The CEO further explained that:

- The Trust would work with G Metcalfe, a Maths expert, to improve the Trust approach to Maths and use a programme that helps with rapid progress
- The Trust would be working with the Ted Wragg Trust at Brixington around STEM and this could involve pupils from other schools in Exmouth. Then the Trust may grow that model to Sidmouth.
- The Director of Inclusion (DoI) was due to meet with Ted Wragg Trust around disadvantaged pupils as their attainment is high.
- The Trust would also take part in a peer programme with Harbour schools initially, and also DMAT and ELAT to see practice in each other's schools.
- He had met with ACE to check approaches and confirmed there were no significant differences.
- He had also met with the CEO of Wave (a special schools Trust) around Alternative Provision panels and preventing the need for alternative provision / developing the FFT own provision.
- Trust leaders would also take part in groups from the Queen Street Group and CST, and the disadvantaged group in the South West through the DfE.
- Members of the executive team were going to be trained as Challenge Partners so they would go and visit other schools / trusts.
- The Trust would also look at some leaders joining a leadership training based on community and working with disadvantages families (from a London based organisation)
- He would do some reciprocal work with the CEO of a similar size trust based in Yorkshire, Ebor Academy Trust.
- Partnership meetings would take place regularly and would have a visit twice in a year to pick up issues that were general trends.

The board enquired about the four visits to other trusts that had been mentioned previously.

These would take place through Challenge Partners who offered four trusts to visit, which all education directors would aim to do. In addition, the DoI was due to work with the MEAD trust around their vulnerability index and criteria to help children succeed from having the right interventions in Early Years.

The board queried whether the Yorkshire based trust was performing well.

<p>They had a strong year. All their schools were rated as 'good' by Ofsted but some of their schools were not at national average. However, they were more successful in Maths and had interesting ways of working.</p> <p>The board asked whether ACE was operating in a significantly different way from the FFT.</p> <p>Whilst their structures were different and they were using their heads more for supporting schools, their way of operating was similar and so were their expectations. Until recently, their schools were all convertors and not sponsored. The results of their more recent joiners that had more challenge were lower and they would be expected to improve over the next 3 years. The results that they reported publicly were based on the DfE performance table methods (so not including new joiners).</p> <p><u>Exeter Road:</u></p> <p>The CEO reported that the school had been allocated RISE advisors to help address standards, which was linked to additional funding for as long as they were a maintained school. This would need to be taken into account in the decision making as well who was appointed from the RISE team.</p> <p><u>Summer term requests around operations:</u></p> <p>The CEO clarified that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These had been necessary because of not having a Director of Operations (DoO) in post. It may be beneficial to have an early strategic & finance committee meeting to cover these in future. • SAM people had been purchased as agreed. The first part was for recruitment and would come into effect first. Then the second part, around HR management, would be put in place around Christmas time. • The business team redundancy process was now completed, and redundancy costs were as agreed during the summer holiday. Two Trust Business Managers had volunteered to take redundancy effective from 30 Nov 2025, C Haddy and S Cotton. The four others were appointed in the best position for their skill sets. E Dymond would become head of HR and was involved with the implementation of SAM people. S Brett would become the school support services lead. J Price would become head of estates and A Bremner would become head of procurement. All four would be reporting to the DoO and the new structure should help make the role of DoO easier. <p>The CEO reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a significant premises issue at Mrs Ethelston's linked to the building whose roof was blown off by the storm. As a result, two classes were accommodated at the local secondary school. The Trust had appointed a project manager as an emergency measure to help resolve this as quickly as possible. The Bestic Trust had offered to pay a third of costs. • The replacement of roof at Newton Ferrers which was a complex process looked like it would be even more expensive than initially anticipated because it was the whole roof structure that needed replacing and planning permission would therefore be required. 	<p>Board chair/ LGP</p>
<p>6. Feedback from the standards panel meeting (Chair of education committee, A Denner)</p>	
<p>This was discussed under the previous agenda item, item 5.</p>	
<p>7. To receive and discuss the update from the DoF (M Platten)</p> <p>To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation that the budget was filed as agreed • Update on estimated end-of-year position 	
<p>The DoF report was circulated ahead of the meeting as were the June 2025 management accounts. The July 2025 management accounts were circulated on the day of the meeting.</p> <p><u>Management accounts:</u></p> <p>The DoF highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the end of July 2025, the Trust had a surplus of just under £100K. 	<p>Appendices 7- 9</p>

- This improvement to the in-year position was due to some savings and delays in some work, vacancies (in particular the DoO one) and an upside in income. The Trust had also received some growth funding for Mrs Ethelston's which was related to a previous period and was verified with Devon before being released.
- The team had also reviewed the use of revenue funding for capital expenses. Because the capital revenue was higher than anticipated, the team was expecting to move about £150K from revenue to capital expenses, which would bring about £250K surplus.
- Therefore, the net in-year position at the end of August should be about break even or a small deficit, due to redundancy costs.

The board probed whether this was because the Trust cut costs, because there were recent joiner schools and new people in post, or because the Trust income was higher than expected.

It was a combination of several things. For example, income was higher than anticipated at Chickerell. Some expenses were deferred e.g. RM work. It was also because the team undertook forecasting more effectively and made better use of that, which the new business structure would help to drive this forward. In addition, a lot of work had taken place around cost control because the Trust had initially planned for a substantial deficit and were then further affected by the withdrawal of TCAF. For example, there had been very careful planning around staffing and how that linked to EHCPs to better match staffing to income, and tighter recruitment processes were developed. The Trust current position was a very positive outcome after a tough year and linked to a number of one-off factors.

Budget submissions:

The DoF confirmed that:

- The BFR return had been submitted by the summer deadline as agreed.
- Whilst redundancy costs were not included in the BFR, these had been balanced by other factors. Whilst it was sad to have to make redundancies there was the need to review structures due to financial constraints.
- The end-of-year position shown by the August management accounts and in the annual accounts would be discussed with the CEO and chair.

DoF

The chair queried whether the DoF was planning continue to undertake the management accounts himself, rather than delegate to the trust accountant as had been the case in the past.

This continued to be the plan for the future. The change in the business team structure would help around financial systems and management.

In response to queries from the board, the DoF and CEO confirmed that SAM people and/or Arbor would be able to produce reports, for example around staffing costs and staff absence (e.g. absence reasons and trends by role). This would help further inform decision making and people management. For example, if a lot of staff were off with flu, the cost of this could be compared with the cost of offering to pay for staff to have flu jabs. It would also help to have a higher quality staff recruitment approval system.

RM and connectivity:

The DoF reported that, when the Trust had signed the initial RM contracts, it had been agreed to have lease lines, but the costs of those differed depending on existing local infrastructure outside the school. In some cases that cost was expensive because of the school location, and this meant additional costs linked to six schools (Charmouth, Loders, Portesham, Sidmouth, St Andrews and Thorncombe). The Trust unsuccessfully tried to challenge this because it is Ofcom regulated. The new lines should improve connectivity for those six schools

This was noted by board who agreed that the lines were necessary for schools to be able to have a consistent service.

The DoF further reported that RM had now surveyed all the schools' internal infrastructure to establish the level of upgrades needed to have the same quality of connectivity within the schools as the connection coming to it. The costs linked to this would have to be discussed and prioritised.

Other procurements:

<p>The board noted the procurement undertaken during the summer holiday period, which was approved in writing by the strategic & finance committee: Zurich insurance cover, PPM contract with Sherwoods and SAM people. [Post meeting note: redundancy costs were also approved in writing by the strategic & finance committee].</p> <p>The DoF explained that the Trust had undertaken a value for money exercise previously to support the PPM contract with Sherwood but wanted to have some additional services relating to the former Acorn schools added to the initial contract and therefore had asked for a quote to that effect. As a result, the DoF recommended that Sherwoods be used for 2025-26 to cover additional PPM requirements not currently included in the contract, at a cost of around £10K in total, under the single supplier provision of the Trust finance policy. This was agreed by the board.</p> <p>The DoF reported that the Trust would be on the DfE intermediary rates for utilities until April 2026 when it would move to better rates, and that there had been no issues with the change in supplier.</p> <p><u>Finance policy:</u></p> <p>The DoF sought the approval of the board for a change to the current Trust finance policy, to reflect the new process around requisition and approval, which had been tested and were working well. The policy process was to approve requisitions but not the purchase order, whereas the new process involved approving the purchase order not the requisition as this was what the financial software allowed. This change was agreed by the board, pending the submission to the board of an updated finance policy.</p> <p>The DoF explained that the Trust was moving away from raising a purchase order in instances where expenditure was expected whose costs were not fully known, e.g. utilities, as this made it difficult to match the invoice to the purchase order. In response to a question, the DoF confirmed that internal auditors were supportive of this change.</p> <p>The DoF further explained that he had been asked to sign a letter of representation for FFT, Acorn and Chickerell, for teachers' pensions. However, whilst the Trust had received some information around Acorn and Chickerell to provide some reassurance, it did not have full control for the whole time period so there was a level of uncertainty. The board gave their approval for M Platten to sign the letter of representation for teachers pensions.</p>	DoF
8. Governance matters	
8.1. To elect the Chair and Vice-Chair for the remainder of the year	
<p>Elections took place as mandated by the articles of association. A Walmsley was elected as chair with thanks from the board. A Denner was elected as vice-chair, with thanks from the board chair for her support during the past year.</p>	
8.2. To receive an update on governance appointments and vacancies	
<p>The list of current governance appointments and vacancies was circulated ahead of the meeting. Succession planning had been discussed as part of the board strategic session held on the same day and it had been agreed to set up a working party to work on trust board succession planning and recruitment, using the outcome of the board self-assessment and skills audit. The working party would seek support from PHP as needed.</p>	Appendix 10 Board / LGP
8.3. To adopt the code of conduct	
<p>The proposed code of conduct was circulated ahead of the meeting. The LGP explained that the changes were aimed at better holding to account trust and hub board members around meeting attendance and training completion. The code of conduct was adopted as proposed.</p>	
8.4. To adopt the terms of reference for the Board of Directors committees (Strategic & Finance, Audit & Risk, Education, Admissions, First and Second committees, Executive Remuneration & Performance Management), Chair groups,	

<p>Governance Hub Boards, and Academy Committees (Brixington, Chickerell, General)</p>	
<p>The proposed terms of reference for the above committees were circulated ahead of the meeting, together with a summary of proposed changes from the LGP.</p> <p>The terms of reference for the Strategic & Finance, Audit & Risk, Education, Admissions, First and Second committees, Chair groups, and Governance Hub Boards were adopted as proposed.</p> <p>The board discussed the need to follow up hub board members' attendance, in particular where there was also an academy committee in place and to ensure that parent council members in particular understood the difference in remit. This would be followed up with individuals and the committee by the LGP.</p> <p>The LGP explained the reasons for the proposed changes to the Executive Remuneration and Performance Management committee, which were linked to the change in the Academy Trust Handbook around the approval of the pay for the CEO. As a result of the LGP recommendation (based on the advice from TGP/CST), the chair had taken HR advice to confirm that the proposed process was appropriate and to discuss mechanisms for appeals. TGP had indicated that they would not be expecting to have a completely independent panel which was not what the initial HR advice was, so the chair would follow this through with HR support.</p> <p>The chair explained that the previous independent advisor to the CEO performance management committee had retired. He had therefore approached two potential replacements, a retired CEO who was recommended by PHP and the CST CEO performance management service. He had then taken further HR advice and had chosen the CST service because it provided enhanced scrutiny and evidence. The adviser providing the service was a recently retired CEO from a Church MAT from outside the local area.</p> <p>The board adopted the terms of reference for the Executive Remuneration & Performance Management, subject to further review once the committee had started to work with CST.</p>	<p>Appendix 11</p> <p>LGP</p> <p>Trust chair</p> <p>Trust chair</p> <p>Trust chair / LGP</p>
<p>8.5. To adopt the scheme of delegation</p>	
<p>The proposed governance scheme of delegation was circulated ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>The LGP highlighted that the changes were made to ensure that all areas listed in the TGP scheme of checklist were included.</p> <p>The scheme of delegation was adopted as proposed.</p>	
<p>8.6 To note the requirement to have read KCSiE 2025 Part 1 and Part 2.</p>	
<p>This was noted by the board, as well as the requirement to confirm this on GovernorHub.</p>	
<p>8.7. To remind trustees to complete their Companies House ID verification</p>	
<p>Trustees were reminded to complete this and share their personal code with the LGP as this would be needed for future filings with Companies House.</p>	
<p>9. Policies and compliance, to include a review of the risk register</p>	
<p>The policies and compliance report and the proposed policies were circulated ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>Pay policy: The CEO confirmed that this met the requirement of the STPCD. The pay policy was approved by the board.</p> <p>Nursery policies: The nursery admissions and charging policies for Bere Alston, Charmouth, Chickerell, Hawkchurch, Musbury, Newton Ferrers, Sidmouth and St Budeaux were approved by the board.</p> <p>It was agreed that policies that were based on the same template and had not been ready in time for the meeting would be approved by written resolution once available.</p> <p>School admissions policies: Minor changes in the policy templates were explained.</p>	<p>Appendix 10</p> <p>LGP</p>

<p>The recommendation to increase the PAN at Rockbeare from 15 to 20, based on request from LA which was linked to additional funding, was approved by the board. The board noted a potential issue with Exeter Diocese communicated on the day of the meeting around their involvement in the premises change linked to this.</p> <p>Having reviewed the Trust risk register, the board decided not to amend any of the risks listed but will consider adding some elements around priority schools.</p>	Board
---	--------------

Meeting start: 5 pm; meeting close: 7.30 pm

Date of the next meetings: SFC – 9 Oct, ARC – 9 Oct, EC – 23 Oct, SFC 20 Nov, EC – 4 Dec, ARC – 11 Dec, board – 18 Dec, all at 5 pm

These minutes are agreed by those present as being a true record.

Signed:.....
 Chair of Directors

Date:.....

-