

Cornwall Education Learning Trust

Board of Trustees Meeting

Date: Monday 8th December 2025
 Time: 10.30 am
 Venue: The Atlantic Centre, Newquay/ via MS Teams

Present:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Role</u>	<u>Present – P /Apologies – Ap /Absent - Ab</u>
Sally Foard (SF)	Trustee/Chair of the Board of Trustees	P
Seb Parker (SP)	Trustee/ Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees	P
Ashleigh Mann (AM)	Trustee	P
Helen Casson (HC)	Trustee	P (from 10.45 am)
Sarah Goswell (SG)	Trustee	P
Katie Chandler (KC)	Trustee	P
Hayley McKinstry (HM)	Trustee	P
John Simeons (JS)	Trustee	P
Jon Newnes (JN)	Trustee	P (from 10.45 am)
Rory Mason (RM)	Trustee	P
Stuart Radnedge (SR)	Trustee	P
Genna Bray (GB)	Trustee	P/ Ap for early departure
Dan Morrow (DM)	Trust Leader	P – not for part B
Amy Daniels (AD)	Director of Inclusion	P
Christie Saunders (CS)	Governance Coordinator/Observer	P
Stephanie Thomas (ST)	Governance Professional/ Minute taker	P

MINUTES

The meeting started at 10.40 am

Item		Lead
1.	<u>Welcome, Apologies & Declaration of Business Interests</u> There were no apologies for non-attendance. Apologies for early departure had been received from G Bray. There were no declarations of interest in addition to those already declared.	Chair

2

The Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising

2.1 Minutes of the previous meeting held on 16th September 2025.

IT WAS AGREED that the minutes of the previous extraordinary board meeting held on 16th September and the part B confidential session minutes of the meeting held on the same date be unanimously approved.

2.2 Matters arising and actions register.

It was noted that C Carter had resigned from her post as Governance Officer and Company Secretary ending on 30 November 2025. Trustees warmly thanked C Carter for her years of service in her role and wished her well in future.

ST briefly left the room for the appointment of the Company Secretary to be considered.

IT WAS AGREED unanimously that S Thomas be appointed the Company Secretary from 1 December 2025 and that Companies House be informed.

The Chair brought forward item 6.2 on the agenda:

Item 6.2 – Chair’s Update - Scheme of Delegation

SF outlined her work on the Scheme of Delegation. She referred to the membership of Trust panels that were required on behalf of the governing body. Headteachers and Executive Leaders would sit on panels under delegated authority. Those delegations were included in the Scheme of Delegation. Each panel had to be Chaired by a Trustee. There would be 2 or 3 trustees on each panel, depending on availability. It provided larger pool of people from which to get availability from.

DM had discussed the Scheme of Delegation in detail with leaders for clarity with mini schemes of delegation to sit underneath it for leaders who are school based. There was a real risk around school leaders not knowing the full contents of the Scheme of Delegation. This was being rectified. The document needed to be referred to consistently.

SF referred to the changes that had been made to the document. The updated version had been circulated with the papers for the meeting. She noted that the document should be under ongoing review. It was evolving and would be re-visited later in the academic year. It was a document that everybody should be using as a reference document.

Q JS was there a danger that a particular decision could need to be made and the provision is not included in the document?

DM there was ‘Chair’s action’ in place if the usual protocols couldn’t be gone through for which the trustees still had the ability to decide upon. Evaluating Chair’s actions is the role of trustees. They would be seeking further clarity about who could make certain decisions. It was being further refined.

	<p><u>IT WAS AGREED</u> that the Scheme of Delegation be adopted and be re-visited later in the academic year.</p>	
	<p><u>The Chair brought forward item 8 – Policies for approval:</u></p> <p><u>Item 8 -Policies</u> The Chair asked trustees to consider the policies included on the agenda that had been raised for Chair’s action. All the relevant policy papers had been made available to trustees prior to the meeting.</p> <p>DM the policies were being put into the new Trust format. Behind each policy was a procedural ‘play book’. Previously, practice had lacked consistency. The statutory policies now needed to be ratified. They would be reviewed again in due course. He asked trustees to consider approval.</p> <p>DM each policy document was more concise with the procedural play book sitting underneath, a toolkit and exemplar letters. The way forward would be much clearer.</p> <p>SF going forward, policies would be considered and approved by the committees. JS the new policies format was a big improvement on the previous one.</p> <p>DM praised all the people involved who had worked hard to prepare the documents, including the Director of Reach, Governance Officer and PA to the Executive. They had done the deep thinking on the policies with involvement of headteachers and others as appropriate.</p> <p>KC trustees also needed to consider the play books as appropriate. JS the policy is the public facing bit. SF the policies and play books would be specific to committees.</p> <p>Q SR asked if a communications policy would be of benefit. DM it wouldn’t be statutory and would be progressed. SR there would be template newsletters and there should be uniformity across schools.</p> <p>It was proposed, seconded and unanimously,</p> <p><u>IT WAS APPROVED</u> that the following policies 1-26 be ratified by the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy 2025-26 2. Supporting Pupils with Medical Conditions policy 2025-26 3. Mental Health and Wellbeing 2025-26 4. Online Safety Policy 2025-26 5. Child On Child Abuse Policy 2025-26 6. Attendance Policy 2025-26 7. Code of Conduct 2025-26 8. Whistleblowing Policy 2025-26 9. Bereavement Policy 2025-26 10. CELT Young Carer Statement 2025-26 	<p>Chair</p>

	<p>11. Complaints Policy 2025 12. Designated Teacher Policy 2025-26 13. Disciplinary Policy 2025 14. Grievance Policy 2025 15. Intimate Care policy 2025-26 16. Managing Allegations Policy 2025-26 17. Parent Partnerships Policy 2026 18. Positive Handling and Physical Intervention Policy 2025-26 19. Primary Admissions Policy 2027-28 20. Primary Behaviour Policy 2025 21. Searching Screening and Confiscation Policy 2025-26 22. Secondary Admissions Policy 2027-28 23. Secondary Behaviour Policy 2025 24. SEND Policy 2025 25. Supporting Pupils with Medical Conditions Policy 2025-26 26. Suspension and Exclusion Policy</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p><u>CELT Safeguarding Report</u> <u>3.1 Presentation, questions and answers</u></p> <p>SF started by saying that safeguarding should be on every agenda because it is the golden thread throughout the organisation. However, the Director of Inclusion would not need to attend every trustees' meeting involving safeguarding.</p> <p>AD referred to the PowerPoint presentation. The data showed there were 65 Children in Need (CIN), 31 under child protection (CP) for neglect, 3 under CP for physical abuse, 14 under CP for emotional abuse and 1 under CP for sexual abuse and there were 51 children in care (CIC).</p> <p>AD Bodmin College and Pondhu Primary School had the highest proportion of CIC. Support from the central team was given to schools with personal plans and pastoral support. Interventions were both social and academic to support the cohorts. Each personal education plan (PEP) went to the LA and was graded. There had been a recent increase in number of gold PEPs. DM the most 'in need' children were being looked after and supported.</p> <p>AD there had been a number of racist incidents last half term, neither an increase nor decrease. They needed to address that. DM they looked for parent and carer support in addressing the use of racist language.</p> <p>Q SR how easy do you source the relevant training?</p> <p>AD there had been recent unconscious bias training for leaders. Training was bought in from out of county.</p> <p>GB left the meeting at 11.08 am</p> <p>AD there had been 542 safeguarding incidents recorded, 3 restrictive physical interventions (RPIs) last half term, of which, 2 were in primary and 1 in</p>	<p>AD</p>

<p>secondary. There was RPI training in place for a minimum of 2 members of staff per school. Some additional support was needed for specific SEND learners with challenging behaviours.</p> <p>AD domestic abuse remained the highest concern in schools. Despite the number of bereavements being higher, the number of incidents were broadly in line with last year. There were a number of tragic losses. Support for the schools in such circumstances had been important.</p> <p>DM Penhaligon’s Friends had been supportive in the cases of tragic losses. It would be appropriate for thanks to be sent on behalf of the Board would be appropriate due to the exceptional level of support.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u> – a letter of thanks on behalf of the Board be issued to Penhaligon’s Friends</p> <p>AD there had been 37 cases of missing children. there was further training needed around the issues.</p> <p>Q JN could the Board be given an idea of the type of incidents when children needed to be physically restrained?</p> <p>AD a restrictive physical intervention (RPI) was required when the child had put themselves or others at significant risk. A coregulation plan identified the triggers, and the methods of restraint. The parents and child were informed and debriefs took place.</p> <p>DM the procedures were in line with the DfE best practice around those actions.</p> <p>Q JN regarding the 5 incidents listed, were there any weapons found in school?</p> <p>AD all incidents referred to were external situations. No weapons had been found in school.</p> <p>AD there were several learners accessing alternative provision (AP). A high proportion were in Year 11. Of whom, pupil premium (PP) and SEND pupils were disproportionately represented. From early 2026, there would be AP based in at the Atlantic Centre, Newquay. Those pupils would receive intensive interventions in reading and Maths. Significant gaps in learning were being addressed. Such gaps may correlate with dysregulated behaviour.</p> <p>Q HC how many AP providers were used and how many were registered?</p> <p>AD registered AP providers were preferred. She would share the AP tracker with HC, as Safeguarding Trustee, at a meeting soon.</p> <p>AD they were seeking to reduce the number of pupils on AP. Some pupils required specialist provision or additional funding. For some the benefits of education in forest schools and outdoor pursuits was recognised. There were 4 learners accessing flexi schooling to meet their medical needs. Some learners were accessing CHES.</p>	<p>DM/SF</p>
--	--------------

Q JS were the gaps in learning for English and Maths recognised early enough?

AD the learners who had been identified to work in the Newquay AP were all in Year 7. They were working with local feeder schools to ensure that children could start successfully in Year 7. They were given access to fluent reading and number skills, screened and checked from the earliest point possible, working with educational psychologists (EPs) and, speech and language therapists.

Q SF how are we working with local primary schools?

AD they didn't just work with CELT schools, they worked with all feeder schools.

DM there was also work with Aspire and other Trusts.

AD by February there would be a robust plan in place for those learners needing intervention. Regarding safeguarding training, school staff were compliant, trustees were due to update their training. 4 trustees had already completed their knowledge check. Trustees were reminded to complete their training if they had not already done so.

AD safeguarding auditors had conducted a safeguarding audit. The critical incidents process was robust and had improved. The local authority had asked CELT to share their good practice too. There was reflective practice in place with learning experiences. Supervision had further improved the offer. There were strong multi agency working relationships. Areas for development had been the single central record (SCR) compliance as a result of multiple individuals moving around. The SCR had been updated, was compliant and there was a document guide to support those new to their role or requiring a refresher. Teams within HR teams re-arranged their work. There were also checkers checking the work done.

DM there had previously been some non-compliance in HR that had been rectified. There had been significant work to address that.

AD there would be a future yearlong DSL and DDSL training course. The training programme added capacity within the safeguarding team. They were looking at making it accredited which would take a year to do and they would achieve a level 3 qualification out of it.

AD there had been 3 recent significant safeguarding cases, involving the police, social care and other agencies.

Q SR was intrigued about the processes of that? What were the next steps with such cases?

AD with such cases, different professionals challenge each other from their perspectives. They work with local networks to ask for a child practice review (CPR), if failings have happened, and where to go next. Through that process they get a greater understanding what could have been done better.

SF thanked AD and everyone on the team. She asked for a message of support to be sent to the safeguarding team.

	<p>AD the level of work being done was significant.</p> <p>Q SR do we have provisions in place to support the members of staff?</p> <p>AD the current levels of supervision and checking, with external supervision and team time were all important.</p>	
4	<p>CELT Finance Report - this item was deferred to the Resource and Infrastructure Committee in January 2026.</p>	
5	<p>Trust Leader's Report</p> <p><u>5.1 The Trust Leader's report - horizon scanning, the new Ofsted framework and the 3 strategic priorities</u></p> <p>DM the report had been made available with the papers for the meeting. He recommended 3 Board level strategic priorities around proactive policy engagement and the actions that would stem from the report. He asked for trustees' agreement with the 3 strategic Board priorities and the proposed targets.</p> <p>It was noted that, within the report, Poltair and Fowey should read Bodmin and Fowey.</p> <p>DM inclusion was a high priority for Ofsted and would be important for the future of the Trust. The Trust's centres of excellence would become local leaders for SEND and inclusion. Reputationally, the Trust was developing consistent practice in its structure and approach this year. He was working closely with AD on this to take it forward. The mainstream sector would be asked to do more with SEND and inclusion without necessarily more resources. Those barriers were to be addressed for children in nursery, Yr 1 and Yr2. They were making sure that those children who hadn't previously had good provision were supported to address the gaps in learning and meet their educational needs. They were looking at where they could make the most difference.</p> <p>Q SF asked about commissioning AP?</p> <p>DM there would be 6 pupils at the Atlantic Centre who would be part funded by the local authority. The budgets were already approved to work with AP experts such as Wave MAT. There's not necessarily a financial cost to the Trust where funding is available.</p> <p>Q JN commended the very thorough report. How were the SEND changes being experienced and received by those teams in school. It seemed a positive direction of travel?</p> <p>DM the changes were being received differently in different schools. There was some departure from the previous norms. There were changes in classes. One third of people were exceptionally supportive, one third recognised the change curve and one third were quite negative on the impacts on class teachers. On the expectations and improvements expected of teachers, there</p>	DM

was a cultural change and a strategic change. There would be some forthcoming metrics about how that had landed within the schools. He was reflective about how the speech and language had been improved.

Q JS were the top performing learners in danger of being disenchanted and was the pace of learning not fast enough for them?

DM higher attaining children continued to do exceptionally well. They remain an important part of the overall provision. They needed to become even better around extracurricular activities and enrichment. The Trust had been measured above the national average for middle learners. However, the Trust measured below the national average on SEND needs. SEND is a barrier but not a ceiling. There needed to be focus on an equitable provision.

KC it was important to get the right impacts on all learners.

DM SEND is a wicked problem locally, regionally and nationally.

SF agreed with DM. Appropriate strategies were being used, such as curate and narrate, Ofsted would be looking at how teachers worked with those strategies.

JS was with a group chatting with the Ofsted inspector at a school. They were keen to see that the higher performers were being stretched.

DM the Trust has an area resource base (ARB) at Bodmin College with plans to open more and centres of excellence. Getting this right would enhance the Trust. If we are strategically getting it right, then we ensure we have the intentionality when we talk about exclusions and SEND.

HC some of SEND pupils are high performers.

DM was aware of the risk of pigeonholing and was seeking to change perceptions of SEND children and the narrative about what SEND child are capable of. There needed to be a genuine sense of inclusion. It hadn't been the case previously.

SR there are those who are above and ahead of where they should be. We should not be losing sight of obligations to meet educational needs of those learners too.

DM when the Trust prioritised, a greater focus would go on SEND pupils. The skilled and gifted learners would still be driven whilst maintaining the fundamentals. The Trust must become more aspirational for SEND learners because they face bigger barriers to learning.

SF asked trustees if they were in agreement with the strategic priorities and the targets the Trust will be working on.

Q HM asked about the available budgets and forward planning in place for meeting the strategic priorities?

DM historically, the budgetary approach had been year to year. In framing the horizon, Year 3 would show a budget deficit. In Year 2, there shouldn't be a deficit. The biggest cost was staffing. He was considering the core business and important decisions. He would be open and honest in the choices being made as part of the 3-year planning process.

	<p>It was proposed, seconded and unanimously,</p> <p><u>5.1 APPROVED</u> that the 3 strategic recommendations be adopted as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen Medium-Term Financial Resilience Through Proactive Operational Planning 2. Position CELT as Leader in Inclusive Practice and SEND Excellence Ahead of Ofsted Reforms and White Paper Emphasis 3. Engage Proactively With Policy Development and Position CELT's Expertise in System Leadership <p><u>5.2 Risk Register – update, methodology – discussion, questions and answers, next steps</u></p> <p>DM there was more work to do on the Risk Register at Committee level. Each policy would be reviewed.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Chair's Update/ Agenda notes</u></p> <p>The remaining items under Item 6, Chair's update were moved to item 10, AOB, and Item 7, Committee Chairs' updates and minutes, were moved to follow Part B/ item 9 on the agenda.</p> <p>At 12.10 pm the Part A meeting adjourned, when DM and AD left the meeting, and immediately re-convened in Part B confidential session for item 9 on the agenda.</p> <p>After the Part B confidential session closed, HC, HM and KC left the meeting and DM re-joined.</p> <p>At 12.41 pm the meeting reconvened for the Part A meeting.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p><u>Committees – Chairs' updates and draft minutes</u></p> <p>The following Committee Chairs' update reports and draft minutes were received and noted:</p> <p>7.1 Secondary Quality of Education Committee – 16.10.25</p> <p>7.2 Resources and Infrastructure Committee – 17.11.25</p> <p>7.3 Audit and Risk Committee – draft minutes of the meeting held on 01.12.25 were not yet available</p> <p><u>Committee Chairs' updates.</u></p> <p><u>7.2</u> SP the recent change to Resources and Infrastructure from Finance and Estates had doubled the length of the meeting. He referred to his update of the meeting that had been circulated with the papers.</p> <p><u>7.3</u> JS updated the Board on Audit and Risk. He had found the form useful in providing a written update. He referred to his report.</p> <p>The Committee had been re-assured that the Trust was using as much data as possible. They had reviewed the Trust as a going concern and were happy with that. There would be a review of internal audit during the Spring/Summer. They would continue with the most likely pupil numbers</p>	

	<p>forecasts, which in future would be supplemented by the best case and worst case scenarios.</p> <p>DM in future there would be greater focus on cyber security standards, procurement and internal controls, and risks.</p> <p>JS some aspects may require us to look again at the Risk Registers. Some areas that look as if they are under control may need further review. The use of Trust assets is being looked at. They would keep an eye on marginally viable schools. It was recognised that in terms of financial risk, nurseries may be a bit of a loss leader because they encourage the feeding in of children to primary settings. GDPR was compliant.</p> <p>DM the Executive Assistant was doing the GDPR course. The organisation was currently compliant with GDPR but the processes could be tighter.</p> <p><u>7.1</u> SG talked through her previously circulated update on the Secondary Quality of Education Committee. There had been much improved communication regarding agenda setting. She had talked through the agenda with Executive Leaders in advance. There needed to be greater clarity regarding the agenda. It needed to be more specific to avoid covering too much in one meeting. Safeguarding is the golden thread in every meeting. There needed to be greater involvement on trustees in getting to know our schools. In future, they would approve the minutes via email.</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>AOB and date of the next meeting</p> <p><u>6.3 Terms of Reference for all Committees</u> The Terms of Reference had been received by trustees and were noted.</p> <p><u>6.4 Link Trustees for schools</u> SF the link trustees would be considered at a future meeting.</p> <p><u>6.5 Diocese Trustee</u> SF nominations were invited to the Chair via email for the role of Diocese Trustee.</p> <p>SF thanked everyone.</p> <p>The next meeting of Full Board would be held on Monday 30th March 2026.</p>	
	<p>Signed by the Chair:</p>	