

**Attendees:** Chair: Shaun McCarthy (Action Sustainability), Ian Heptonstall (Action Sustainability), Hilary Hurrey (Action Sustainability), Dale Turner (Skanska), Martin Gettings (Canary Wharf Group), Julia Barrett (Willmott Dixon), Keith Chanter (EMCOR), Graham Edgell (Morgan Sindall), Dan Evans (Speedy Services), Aaron Reid (Balfour Beatty), Richard Bayliss (CITB), Anna Baker (Sir Robert McAlpine).

**Apologies:** Victoria Hughes (VINCI Facilities)

Anna announced that she is leaving Sir Robert McAlpine and therefore will be stepping down from the School Board. Anna has contributed fantastic value as a Board member over the last five years and will be sorely missed. It is an end of an era as Anna was part of the founding members cohort who started the School. Thank you, Anna for all your hard work and dedication.

### 1. Progress against actions

Hilary reported on progress against actions from the last meeting of which most related to conversations around future funding in the agenda.

Ian reported back on the CLC stakeholder mapping exercise that he undertook with Richard. There is not much representation currently from School Partners. However, within the skills group there is some Partner representation.

There has been low impact for the construction sector as the group is dominated more by manufacturers. The contractors influence as a group which then does give more impact.

#### Agreed:

- ✓ The Partner representatives that are on the skills group must be briefed about the School and asked to promote the School so that it is considered as part of the solution where relevant.

#### Actions:

1. IH and RB to draft a briefing paper that will go to Partners on the various groups of the CLC.

### 2. Learning & Engagement update

#### *Virtual delivery*

Hilary presented the most recent engagement figures (learner numbers, resource access, e-learning views) compared to last year and previous months. The School is continuing to maintain learning engagement and hugely increased the learning access on last year which is great news.

#### *Initiatives update*

Hilary gave an overview of what was happening in each of the new initiative groups since the last Board meeting.

### 3. Financial progress

Ian summarised progress against budget since the last Board meeting. Due to the focus on Partner retention and with additional new Partner income there is now £52k of additional income forecast for the year.

#### Agreed:

- ✓ Timing for recruitment of new Partners is key. The appetite is there however decisions are more likely to be made in January onwards due to the current unknown climate.
- ✓ Though the budget is in a better state than it was at the beginning of the financial year, it was agreed that the budget should be reviewed again in November before committing to any further costs.

**Actions:**

2. The current budget will be reviewed at the November Board meeting with any recommendations for spend if necessary.

**4. Alternative funding update**

Ian reported against the 5 key priorities the Board identified for new income streams and the income generation strategy.

The Highways England project funding proposal is progressing well with nine of the 13 contractors agreeing to date. This project equates to £300K over 5 years.

**Agreed:**

- ✓ Packaging in the Tool element to this proposal has been very successful due to the challenge around collecting shared data. There are significant drivers for JV's which are: learning pathways and reporting of data. This model has enabled both to be addressed and should prove fruitful for other similar projects.
- ✓ The Tool should be considered as part of the Partner fee. Whether this is an add on or as a 'basic reporting' function which can be upgraded for a further fee. This would be a big step towards understanding the link between learning and performance.
- ✓ FIR is embedded in the Skills workstream in the CLC. CITB are very supportive of this but cannot currently make any commitments to the £150K per year for this programme.
- ✓ For Regional Funding, work has just been won with GLA and a bid is with the South East LEP. Though the income attached is not large, it was important to establish relationships with regional bodies to enable this to be grown by proving the value of the School.
- ✓ Shaun had a positive conversation with the CEO of the LEP's who was very positive about the School. As a result, the School has an opportunity to be promoted in a newsletter to all LEP's as well as the opportunity to talk about the School. This should help to foster relationships with other LEP's being pursued.

**Actions:**

3. Ian and Aaron to catch up regarding taking forward D2N2 and the East Midlands LEP.
4. Ian and the relevant sponsors to continue to follow up the various bids and relationships.

**Bradwell B**

The Board went on to discuss the Bradwell B project and to discuss the potential sensitivities of School involvement/ bidding for the work. A summary of comment is below:

- ✓ The Government has selected nuclear and Chinese Investment not the School.
- ✓ It is incumbent for School to ensure that the project to upskill local businesses is delivered in the best possible way and the School represents this.
- ✓ To drive change, you need to participate in the situation. This project will happen with or without the School involvement.
- ✓ Some Partners explicitly don't source nuclear and money could be better spent on other renewable energy sources. Nuclear is not the correct solution.
- ✓ Consider what the 'do nothing' solution is. Who else would deliver the training? Likely to be the local FE network.
- ✓ If the School won the work it would be advised to ensure that regular reports were made back to the community and local people to present the value the School was giving.
- ✓ In terms of the Infrastructure market in the School, at least a third of the Partners are already working in nuclear. We should not therefore turn our back to this and need to be inclusive for that reason.
- ✓ It not necessary to have to be in support of nuclear as this project will happen anyway; but the School should be supporting via skills and training.

**Agreed:**

- ✓ It was agreed that it was beyond the School to make a judgement on the investment. The School is not political. Reverting to the mission and purpose of the School 'A world class collaboration to enable a sustainable built environment' there is an obligation to bid for the work to educate the supply chain.
- ✓ Therefore, the Board felt a bid should be submitted.

**5. Budgeting process for 2020/21**

Ian presented the current scenario for income for the next financial year along with costs. The scenario left the School with a £86,000 shortfall.

**Agreed:**

- ✓ The income outlined was on the more risk adverse side. Asked to quantify this risk in a scale 1 to 10. 1 being certain and 10 being very risky, Ian said the working budget was a 4 out of 10.
- ✓ A MoSCoW analysis (Must, Should, Could, Would) exercise should take place with each of the leadership and category groups when looking at the proposed cost budget. This would tease out priorities.
- ✓ Leadership groups should be asked to consider how the School might deliver more for less?
- ✓ The employee costs do not currently include the Directors packages (cut in the current FY due to COVID) and need to be put back in. This will increase the gap by £90k.
- ✓ Partners should be surveyed to as a whole to aid business planning. Leaving it to just the leadership groups is not reflective of the full complement of Partners as the business planning is influenced by who is in the room at the time.

- ✓ Clients within the industry could also be engaged with to understand the future challenges the School needs to engage with however, many clients look to the contractors on this.
- ✓ The CITB Insight team should work with the School to help understand future needs of the industry.

**Actions:**

5. Hilary to amend the cost budget on employee costs.
6. Ian and Hilary to go out to the groups to progress business planning based around the exercise of a MoSCoW analysis.
7. Survey to be developed for clients and all partners priorities.

## 6. Risk Register

Anna summarised the key changes made to the risk register. All agreed to the changes made.

Action Sustainability as delivery partner reported that, even with the income hit taken this FY due to the pandemic and economic climate, the business was still in a healthy place. The other products (consultancy and Tool) were still performing. A small profit would potentially be made this FY. In addition to this, the business holds a cash reserve larger than normal for a small business to protect its stability.

**Actions:**

7. Hilary will contact all Board members for a volunteer to support with the risk register.

## 7. AOB

It was suggested that the virtual Board meetings be considered to become shorter in length. This would likely mean that more meetings would be needed to ensure that all items were covered across the year. Board members are invited to consider this and respond to Hilary should they be in favour of this.

**Date of next meeting:**

24<sup>th</sup> November (10am – 1pm), Virtual session