

BOARD:	CELT Trust Board		
DATE:	30th March 2026		
TIME:	9.00am – 11.00am		
VENUE:	Brannel and via Teams		
TRUSTEES:	S Foard – Chair S Parker – Vice Chair J Simeons H McKinstry - <i>virtual</i>	S Goswell - <i>virtual</i> H Casson J Newnes	K Chandler - <i>virtual</i> G Bray - <i>virtual</i> S Radnedge
ATTENDING:	D Morrow – CEO	C Saunders (CS) – Governance Co-ord	M Aitken – Governance Professional (MA)

Questions and feedback from trustees are highlighted by the use of italics, actions and decisions in bold.

Item	Decisions from Trust Board – 30.03.26
30.03.26/D01	J Humphries was appointed as the Company Secretary and Mel Aitken as the Governance Professional.
30.03.26/D02	The minutes were approved from the previous meeting 8 th December 2025. Chair to sign.
30.03.26/D04	The TB is agreed to convene a virtual EGM if required, recognising potential implications and timescales for the TL's proposals
30.03.26/D05	The Trust Board approved the RPI policy subject to amendments, with delegated authority given to the Chair to provide final approval via Chair's action.

Item	Actions from Trust Board – 30.03.26	By whom	By when	Status
2.5(1)	GP to share information regarding Foundation Trustees	GP	ASAP	Completed
2.5(2)	Trustees to submit two nominations for Foundation Trustee roles to the Diocese.	All	ASAP	Live
4.	CS to check that a letter of thanks on behalf of the Board be issued to Penhaligon's Friends	CS	ASAP	Live
5.(1)	Safeguarding to be included as a standing agenda item across all committees.	GP	ASAP	Live
5.(2)	AD to report directly to the Trust Board (and cease attendance at QoE Primary and Secondary Committees).	Chair/AD	ASAP	Live
6.1(1)	TL to present the White Paper implications to the Board when further detail is available.	TL	When available	Live
6.1(2)	TL to develop and present a Trust Improvement Plan (TIP) supported by analysis.	TL	Strategy Day	Live
6.1(3)	TL to relaunch and strengthen the Trust risk register.	TL	Strategy Day	Live
6.1(4)	TL to provide clearer distinction between proposals and confirmed plans in future reports.	TL	Next meeting	Live
6.1(5)	TL to include RAG ratings and a standard outcomes framework for schools in future reports.	TL	Next meeting	Live
6.1(6)	TL to provide a detailed primary hub model proposal, including structure, roles, and implementation plan.	TL	ASAP	Live
6.1(7)	TL to present financial modelling scenarios, including short- and medium-term implications.	TL	ASAP	Live
6.1(8)	TL to develop and share a rolling 5-year medium-term financial plan for ARBs.	TL	ASAP	Live
6.1(9)	TL to clarify the proposed leadership structure (including ELT and school-level leadership).	TL	ASAP	Live

6.1(10)	TL to provide detailed business cases for: - ARB/AP expansion (including confirmation from the Local Authority where applicable) - Primary Hub model (including educational impact, costs, revenue, and 3–5 year projections)	TL	End April/ May	Live
6.1(11)	TL to ensure all future growth opportunities are presented to the Trust Board for consideration before progression.	TL	Ongoing	Live
6.1(12)	Review QoE agendas to ensure sharper focus on key priorities and reduce length.	GP	Next meetings	Live
6.1(13)	Align Primary committee timings more effectively with data collection cycles.	TL/GP	Next academic year	Live
8.1	HMCK to share a summary of the careers audit and pilot programme findings with the Trust Board once reviewed.	HMCK	ASAP	Live
8.2	Capacity within safeguarding to be reflected on the Trust risk register.	TL	ASAP	Live
8.3	Link trustee summary to be shared following the SEND meeting.	JS	ASAP	Live

Item	Meeting started at: 11.05am
1.	Welcome and introductions: Those present were welcomed by the Chair to the meeting.
2.	Administration matters
2.1	Apologies for absence Apologies were received and accepted from R Mason.
2.2	Confirmation of quorum The meeting was confirmed quorate at the start of the meeting.
2.3	Declarations of interest No pecuniary or personal interests were advised for any agenda item for this meeting. One trustee raised in the papers
2.4	Appointment of Governance Professional and Company Secretary The Chair advised that Stephanie has stepped down from the role and will continue to support panels. ST remains in post as a Governance Professional, with this recognised as an additional position. MA is providing support to CELT under a Service Level Agreement (SLA); this arrangement was ratified and approved. It was also confirmed that Jodie Humphries has been appointed as Company Secretary, which was approved by the Board.
2.5	Foundation trustees The Chair advised that, as the Trust is part of the Diocese, Foundation representation is required under the Trust's mixed Articles. The CEO explained that this arrangement reflects earlier academisation structures, although the system has evolved as more trusts have formed. It was clarified that individuals do not need to be practising Christians to become Foundation Trustees; however, the role includes upholding and supporting the teaching of religious education. The process now requires self-nomination from the Trust Board to the Diocese. Further information will be shared following the meeting, and two nominations are to be sought as soon as possible.
3.	Minutes
	The minutes of the meeting of 8 th December 2025 were approved (subject to amendments) as an accurate record of the meeting. The Chair will sign them on GovernorHub.

4.	Matters arising – the actions from the last meeting were reviewed and any actions not on the agenda discussed.														
	<table><tr><td>Item</td><td>Action from BoT 8.12.25</td><td>By who</td><td>By when</td><td>Status</td></tr><tr><td>3.</td><td>A letter of thanks on behalf of the Board be issued to Penhaligon’s Friends</td><td></td><td></td><td>CS to check position</td></tr></table>					Item	Action from BoT 8.12.25	By who	By when	Status	3.	A letter of thanks on behalf of the Board be issued to Penhaligon’s Friends			CS to check position
Item	Action from BoT 8.12.25	By who	By when	Status											
3.	A letter of thanks on behalf of the Board be issued to Penhaligon’s Friends			CS to check position											
5.	Safeguarding report														
	The Chair noted that AD has previously presented at both Primary and Secondary Quality of Education (QoE) Committees, combining safeguarding and inclusion reports. HC suggested that, due to capacity, AD should attend the Trust Board (TB) rather than QoE Committees. TL advised that AD had been scheduled to attend the Ethos Committee, and in the interim has been attending TB. Following discussion, Trustees agreed that, given the importance of safeguarding, AD should report directly to the Trust Board. <i>Can a mechanism be established to flag safeguarding concerns between Trust Board meetings?</i> TL confirmed that any urgent concerns would be escalated to him and, where appropriate, to the Trust Chair. It was also agreed that safeguarding should be a standing item across all committees to allow concerns to be raised promptly, with formal updates reported to the Trust Board. AD will no longer attend QoE Primary or Secondary Committees.														
6.	Trust Leader report														
6.1	TL report														
	The Chair noted that one hour had been allocated for this item. Discussion to include ARB/AP within the context of Trust growth. TL advised that the forthcoming White Paper is expected to bring some of the most significant changes in recent years, including SEND reforms. Once further detail is available, this will be presented to the Board. A strategy document is in development, with a renewed focus on vision and values. Two key strategic priorities were identified: • People • Pedagogical alignment and structures It was noted that since September, two members of the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) have been absent. The report represents a “moment in time,” with a focus on planning for the next academic year. A Trust Improvement Plan (TIP) will be developed, supported by detailed analysis. There will also be a review of ELT capacity and a relaunch of the risk register to better reflect current risks. Work is underway to introduce standardised metrics to strengthen organisational health by September. <i>Trustees queried that, as written, the report could be interpreted as confirming ARB expansion and primary hubs. Clarification was sought.</i> TL clarified that: • The primary hub work is internal planning and initial thinking for September. • ARB expansion proposals will require Board approval before proceeding. <i>Is there a formal partnership with SPT?</i> TL confirmed that an existing partnership is being expanded. Trustees requested clearer proposals and greater clarity in future reports regarding what is proposed versus what is confirmed. TL reiterated that the paper reflects strategic direction, noting that the sector is evolving rapidly, particularly in relation to inclusion. <i>Trustees emphasised the importance of clearly understanding current school positions and associated risks. It was agreed that future reports should include RAG ratings for schools.</i>														

TL acknowledged this and confirmed that a standard outcomes framework, including **RAG ratings, will be implemented in future reporting.**

Trustees queried the reference to primary hub leaders being led by TL and sought clarity on the role of the Director of Primary?

TL advised that the Director of Primary would become one of the hub leads. This would not represent a significant change in role, as the position is on a fixed-term contract with a known retirement date. TL will meet with the Primary Board to help shape the strategy. It was noted that declining pupil numbers present both financial and reputational risks, and careful management of communication with communities will be essential.

Is this an additional role or a release from existing responsibilities?

TL confirmed that this is not an additional role but an evolution of existing responsibilities within current capacity.

What are the financial implications of moving to a hub model?

TL advised that the Trust is currently partway through budgeting, exploring different scenarios. While the model is unlikely to generate immediate savings, it is expected to reduce leadership costs over a three-year period, particularly across smaller schools. The current leadership structure is considered expensive, with around one-third of Headteachers paid above the appropriate range. Historic pay decisions present challenges for review.

Trustees noted that while the model may be sensible in the long term, in the short term the Trust remains committed to a costly leadership structure, potentially with additional layers of management. TL acknowledged this and **confirmed that scenarios will be presented.**

Is the reported reduction in GAG funding (approx. £0.5m) accurate?

TL advised that this is difficult to confirm at present due to other funding streams, but current estimates suggest a reduction of approximately £380k.

Will a more detailed primary hub model be presented?

TL confirmed that further detail is in development. The model is driven by both research evidence supporting hub structures and practical challenges around staffing. It aims to increase flexibility, for example by sharing PPA provision across schools. It was noted that inefficiencies in current staffing arrangements equate to approximately £240k across the Trust.

The hub model is also intended to strengthen collaboration, with Primary Headteachers expressing a preference for local cluster working rather than a single line management structure. A locality-based approach would allow for more tailored responses to community needs.

Trustees noted significant variation in leadership costs and that the proposed hub model appears to be based on an indicative size of around 400 pupils. TL acknowledged this as a starting point for modelling.

Trustees expressed concern that, beyond ELT, there is currently a lack of clarity regarding the proposed leadership structure. There was particular concern about whether all schools would continue to have a Headteacher?

The TL confirmed that the model is still in development and that alternative structures (e.g. Executive Headteachers or hub leadership models) are being considered, as seen in other trusts and local authorities.

Trustees requested a rolling five-year medium-term financial plan to support oversight and operational planning.

Further discussion highlighted concerns regarding:

- Lack of clarity around ELT and wider leadership structures
- Perception that decisions are being presented as final rather than consultative
- Potential impact on staff morale and organisational culture
- Geographic challenges across schools
- Risk that accelerated timelines (e.g. implementation by September) may be unrealistic
- The need to balance financial efficiencies with maintaining educational quality and staffing capacity

Trustees emphasised that “no learner left behind” must remain central and that reductions in staffing should not undermine this principle.

	<i>Questions were also raised about central spending, including the Director of Communications role?</i> The TL clarified that this sits within Strategy and Insights, is operational in nature, and falls within agreed spending limits. <i>Trustees queried the future of school improvement (SI) capacity?</i> The TL advised that current SI roles are largely fixed-term and that the longer-term aim is to move towards a more school-led improvement model, with hub leaders playing a key role. This approach is intended to reduce central costs while maintaining strong support for schools. Trustees expressed concern about the level of consultation to date, noting that some changes appear to have been communicated externally before full Board discussion. They requested greater involvement and clarity moving forward. There was also concern about introducing additional leadership layers at a time when primary school improvement remains a priority. Trustees highlighted the importance of maintaining a positive organisational culture and ensuring that change is implemented <i>with</i> staff rather than <i>to</i> them. It was suggested that the Trust engage with other trusts that have implemented similar models to understand risks and lessons learned, and that contingency planning should be included to manage potential financial and operational risks.
6.2	<i>Risk register – update, questions and next steps</i> A query was raised regarding risks associated with Ofsted and safeguarding complaints. TL advised that these risks are currently captured within individual school-based risk registers.
6.3	<i>Growth appetite discussion</i> The Chair noted that the Board should review its growth appetite annually. While TL is responsible for presenting recommendations, decisions regarding growth sit with the Trust Board (TB), with final approval resting with the Regional Director. The TL outlined the opportunities and risks within the local system, particularly in light of the forthcoming White Paper. Cornwall is already highly academised, which presents challenges for growth. It was noted that SATs are likely to be removed as a performance driver, and that Cornwall LA is not planning to establish a local trust. As a result, consolidation across maintained schools and SATs is expected. The TL highlighted that system-wide direction is moving towards consolidation and increased civic responsibility. Change across the sector is anticipated within the next two years. Trustees discussed the balance between ensuring CELT's own schools are secure ("getting our own house in order") and not missing strategic growth opportunities. It was emphasised that any future growth approach would require robust due diligence and a more cautious risk-based approach than previously. The White Paper is expected to mandate at least one inclusion base within the next 18 months. Cornwall LA is prioritising this, with proposals emerging from the Mid Cornwall initiative to increase ARB provision across primary and secondary phases. This would create 75 additional places from September and 178 over three years. <i>Which year groups are proposed from September?</i> TL advised this would initially focus on KS1 and KS3, although final approval from the Regional Group is still pending. <i>Are capital and revenue costs understood?</i> Capital costs would be covered by the Local Authority. Revenue funding per place is known but staffing costs remain uncertain until final numbers and ratios are confirmed. Financial viability is expected in Years 1–2, though longer-term modelling is more complex due to pupil movement between ARB and mainstream provision. <i>Is there sufficient expertise to staff ARBs?</i> The TL advised that recruitment has begun, with experienced staff already appointed in Bodmin. Support from SPT will include secondments and co-developed training programmes. Internal capacity is growing, though this remains a recognised challenge.

	Trustees noted previous difficulties in staffing ARBs (e.g. Mount Charles) and emphasised that upskilling staff takes time. <i>A trustee asked whether the DfE will begin directing trust growth?</i> The TL advised that currently the DfE has limited formal powers to direct growth, except in cases of failure. However, future policy changes may strengthen this position, with funding levers (e.g. CIF) likely to influence trust behaviour. Trustees stressed the importance of ensuring CELT's current schools are secure before pursuing growth, particularly given upcoming Ofsted inspections. The TL acknowledged this, noting that any adverse Ofsted judgement could halt growth plans. However, improvements in leadership and a clearer understanding of school performance were highlighted as positive developments. Trustees requested: • Earlier visibility of business cases (particularly for ARBs) • Greater clarity on implementation ("how") as well as strategic intent ("what") Clear articulation of risks and benefits of growth • Consideration of the appropriate balance between internal capacity and external support Concerns were raised that the paper focused more on growth intent than on risk analysis and operational delivery. Trustees suggested that a workshop-style session could strengthen understanding of growth implications. The TL confirmed that some support may come through partnerships rather than paid consultancy. It was reiterated that while growth is important, CELT must ensure its current provision is secure and sustainable. Trustees noted that some schools, including Brannel, are not yet where they need to be, despite improvements in leadership and clarity of position. <i>Trustees noted that, regardless of the outcome of the Ofsted inspection at Brannel, the school is not currently at the standard they expect.</i> The TL advised that capacity to improve is as important as current or historic outcomes. Leadership has been strengthened in the schools where concerns were greatest, and there is now a much clearer and more accurate understanding of each school's position across the Trust. <i>TL left the meeting at 10:15am to allow Trustees to discuss the matter further.</i> See confidential minutes.
7.	Committee Chair updates (including draft minutes if available)
7.1	Quality of Education (Primary & Secondary) SG provided feedback on the Quality of Education Committees. For Secondary, strengths were noted as: • Strong and knowledgeable Board members • Good attendance at meetings • A well-established meeting calendar • High-quality data and useful executive summaries, which can be cross-referenced Areas for development included: • Volume of paperwork remains high, though improving in precision • Data is extensive and sometimes difficult to interpret • Agendas are too long, limiting focus on key school issues • Limited insight into staff experience, ethos, and culture beyond attainment data For Primary, similar themes were identified: • Timing of meetings does not always align well with data collection points • Greater focus is needed on priority areas • Feedback on data can lack clarity and be overly detailed without clear conclusions

	• Heavy reliance on ELT reporting, with concern this may present a partial view • A need for deeper discussion and increased challenge within meetings The Board expressed its thanks to AD for her significant contribution and hard work. <i>GB left the meeting at 10.56am</i>
7.2	Resources & Infrastructure Minutes were shared for information.
7.3	Remuneration (verbal) TL reported that Executive Leadership Team (ELT) pay awards have been reviewed, and all pay has been considered as part of this process. A further meeting is scheduled in May to agree the updated Pay Policy and overall pay structure.
7.4	Audit & Risk (no update as meeting has moved) Meeting was postponed due to quoracy and will take place after Easter.
8.	Link Trustee update
8.1	Careers HMCK reported that she has met with James on several occasions. A careers audit is currently underway to assess the impact of the careers programme. It was noted that Bodmin and Brannel did not have a fully developed plan at the time of the review. Pay, support, and conditions for the Careers Lead role have been reviewed, and HMCK will follow up on this. The new curriculum is being mapped against the Gatsby Benchmarks, led by James. This provision is expected to be particularly important in supporting disadvantaged pupils and those at risk of becoming NEET. It was also noted that, from 2027, there will be a statutory increase in work experience requirements from 10 days to two weeks. A pilot programme has already begun. HMCK confirmed that she will share a summary of findings once the audit review is complete.
8.2	Safeguarding HC reported that she met with AD on Friday. A key issue identified was capacity within safeguarding, and it was agreed that this should be reflected on the Trust risk register. A Local Authority review is taking place at Brannel and Newquay due to an increase in safeguarding-related complaints and concerns around outcomes. Consideration is being given to appointing an additional full-time Safeguarding Lead from September to strengthen capacity. It was noted that there is a strong training programme in place across the Trust for aspiring DSLs. AD has also been involved in a child death review (2024), which has been challenging. Lessons have been identified, particularly in relation to managing and verifying information. The Board recognised AD's significant contribution and raised concern regarding her wellbeing.
8.3	SEND John is meeting AD on Thursday – summary to be shared following the meeting.

9.	Any other business
	It was noted that the policy could not be approved at the Quality of Education Committee due to quoracy. Trustees raised concerns regarding the definition of <i>seclusion</i>. It was clarified that this terminology is taken directly from statutory guidance and applies only in very specific circumstances. TL confirmed that seclusion is not used within the Trust and that “Ready to Learn” is a distinct strategy and not a form of seclusion. The policy statement regarding physical intervention was discussed. TL advised that, following findings from a serious case review, pinning a child to the floor is now prohibited due to the physical and psychological risks involved. Any such action would be considered gross misconduct and could result in dismissal and potential prosecution. Trustees agreed that the definition of seclusion should be clarified within the policy to ensure alignment with guidance and avoid ambiguity. The Trust Board approved the policy subject to amendments, with delegated authority given to the Chair to provide final approval via Chair’s action.
10.	Future meeting dates all starting at 11.00am:
	• End of April – online EGM - TBC • 23rd June 2026 – Strategy Day • 13th July 2026 – Brannel School or via Teams

Meeting ended at 11.08am