

**Attendees:** Chair: Shaun McCarthy (Action Sustainability), Dale Turner (Skanska), Carol Williams (Laing O'Rourke), Graham Edgell (Morgan Sindall), Aaron Reid (Balfour Beatty), Marcus Bennett (CITB), Keith Chanter (EMCOR), Martin Gettings (Canary Wharf Group), Julia Barrett (Willmott Dixon), Victoria Hughes (VINCI Facilities), Ian Heptonstall (Action Sustainability), Hilary Hurrey (Action Sustainability)

**Apologies:** Dan Evans (Speedy Services)

## 1. Review of actions

Hilary ran through the review of the actions.

There are 22 Partners who currently hold the School's elearning on their own LMS. Out of those:

- 5 Partners have only just started using the modules so have not provided data yet
- 7 Partners provide data related to the usage
- 7 Partners have agreed to giving usage data but did not respond last time
- 3 Partners will not provide usage data

In terms of supply chain engagement, 31 Partners are reported to be actively promoting the School to their supply chains:

- 11 have set member level targets: active member, bronze, silver, gold
- 12 encourage their supply chain to join the School
- 7 are promoting learning pathways

Martin provided an update on the Worshipful Company Scholarships. This is progressing well and in September the Climate Action Group are aiming to launch their first scholar. Martin and James Cadman are working through who the scholars would be currently.

Ian fed back that the first meeting relating to the Technical Elearning has taken place and this is progressing, next meeting in Sept when we will have more of an idea on scope and resourcing.

Shaun fed back that there is a meeting with the Wellbeing sub-group on 14<sup>th</sup> July which he is attending to raise the concerns highlighted at the last board meeting. Once this has happened, he will pick up with Marcus regarding any related projects that would compliment what the group are considering.

## 2. Vision & Values

Ian presented the final Vision, Mission and Goal. The Board were asked for any further comment:

- Should the goal include the ambition to make the industry more attractive to work in?
- The purpose statements relating to contractors could be viewed as a bit of a tick box exercise and perhaps should include that contractors have their own drivers and also want to implement these irrespective of the pressure from clients.

### Actions

- ✓ Ian and Shaun will tweak the wording in the purpose statement, so it is more reflective of contractors' drivers and own purpose.

## 3. Strategy 2025 update

Ian talked through the progress against the 2025 Strategy and against each area which is going well. There has also been progress in the area of 'LMS for hire' where the School was going to remain 'reactive'. There have been two successful proposals:

- a) IPIECA (the global oil and gas association dedicated to advancing environmental and social performance across the energy transition) have received proposals to either join the School as a Partner or to have their own 'version' of the School as they have their own training materials. It is more likely that they will join as a Partner. They have a suite of elearning which is currently not in a format that can be hosted on an LMS. These are considering how best to change these to take this forward.
- b) SBCC (Scottish Business Climate Collaboration) have paid a one-off development fee of £120K for the development of a specific on lone learning platform focused on carbon and for a specific set of organisations (Scotland based, SME, supply chain), as well a suite of 12 elearning modules. Action Sustainability will then receive a Partnership fee of £36K annually for use of the underlying technology, there are some costs against this and there will be income stream to the School for the re-use of School content. Three Partners are engaged in this; Scottish Power, Scottish Water and Zero Waste Scotland. ZWS will run the platform in Scotland once developed and be funded by Scottish Government to do this. The School Scottish Group are very supportive and will be keen to be involved with this.

Two key areas were discussed with regards to the overall Strategy, incorporating the Technology Strategy:

#### *CIO/CTO role*

- The School should consider employing a CIO/ CTO role. As the business is technology based and there is a skills gap currently (in the Board and also within AS) there is a potential for risk by not having this role in place.
- Conversations have taken place, outside of the Board meetings, about when, if and how should this investment happen; what are the expectations around the role? It could be a two-step process with a part time advisor contracted at first.
- Currently Wendy Carwardine is responsible for the LMS and CMS side of the School and Charles Naud, Head of Product for the Tool.
- This role would also be linked to a data strategy for the School (also encompassing security, GDPR etc). This comment is linked to the conversation below about how Partners should engage their supply chains. However, it is a shared supply chain so how does the collaboration piece work with that.

#### *Incentivising Partners and Supply Chain Engagement*

- As part of the 25K active individuals target, Partners need to be incentivised. Putting together league tables have been suggested in the past but are viewed as divisive and not collaborative (against the values of the School.) Though they could be anonymised.
- More should be done to re-enforce the minimum expectations around Partners.
- There could be a list of 10 / 20 'influencers' who are using and engaging with the School. Though there could be an issue with small vs larger contractors as the comparison is not like for like for elements such as e.g., size of supply chain.
- Important to consider how to reward those who have done well but not making those who haven't feel inadequate/ cause upset.
- Those who are top could be rewarded annually with an award.
- Focus should be given on levels of engagement. There could be e.g., Platinum Partner. This level could have elements in it such as 'have reached a minimum of 300 active members form the supply chain'. There would need to be other elements wrapped up in this as not all Partners want to / are focused yet on engaging their supply chains. These will include various elements so that the levels are inclusive.
- Also, important to not make the SME's within the supply chain feel like this is a 'tick box' exercise and yet another ask from their client.

#### *Actions*

- ✓ Ian and Shaun to consider further the CTO/ CIO role further and report back to the Board.

- ✓ Hilary to circulate the current Partner maturity matrix with the Board notes.
- ✓ School team to work up some 'Partner levels' for the next Board meeting.

#### 4. School Constitution: Review

Shaun ran through the areas of the Constitution that needed some updating.

##### *Comments:*

- There were questions over the IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) and how this works.
- The content produced that is funded by CITB, the foreground IPR is owned by CITB. CITB give the School the licence to use the content (royalty free) as this benefits the wider industry.
- The general (Partner) funding of the School means that anything created, refreshed/ updated is owned by the School.
- There needs to be more clarity in the constitution around IPR.
- IPR is also linked to a data strategy, discussed earlier in the meeting.
- All agree with the Board recommending the re-election of the Chair instead of the using the AGM to do this. However, there needs to be a clearer process around how this works.
- Is it worth considering having the AGM take place after the end of the close of the financial year which is typically what happens in other organisations?
- There needs more detail around a significant change in structure or ownership to Action Sustainability as the delivery partner. A separate legal opinion should be sought to get a view on this.

##### *Actions:*

- Keith, Ian and Shaun will work together to produce an updated draft of the Constitution for review by the Board at the next meeting.

#### 5. 10-year summit: Feedback & Reflections

The Board discussed whether the School should have an annual face to face event on a similar scale to the Summit.

##### *Comments:*

- The School should run face to face events as they are very much in line with the Schools values of 'inspire' and 'collaborate' which happens when face to face.
- It would be important to ensure that the content and theme was progressed.
- Allow other to speak such as members of the School (not just the Board).
- Was the summit so successful because it had not met face to face for a couple of years? The agenda and speakers would need careful thought to replicate the similar success.
- Having Government appear on the agenda to also encourage C-level attendees.
- Consider not having the same format and audience each year but focus on a particular audience each year?

##### *Agreed*

- There should be an annual event and thought will need to go into the format and content to ensure success.

##### *Actions:*

- ✓ Hilary to distribute link to the sum up video for the summit.

#### 6. FIR Programme: Impact & Future

Ian gave an overview of the current FIR programme; what it is delivering to the end of its funding cycle (December 2022); the top-level results of the impact survey. CITB will be going to competitive tender later this year.

*Agreed:*

- ✓ The School will bid for the new FIR contract.
- ✓ The School will continue to contribute towards the FIR programme annually (£50K).
- ✓ If the School is not successful in the bidding process, we will work with the winning organisation.
- ✓ A reduced programme of work will continue should we not be successful.

*Actions:*

- ✓ Ian will go through the bidding process as the School, with support from CECA.

**8. AOB**

It was raised that the Board should consider having at least one meeting per year face to face. All agreed.

**Next Board meeting:**

Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> September, 10am – 1pm