



never give up.

Trustee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday 7th February 2018

6pm-9.45pm

ACE Schools MAT, Martinsgate, Bretonside,
Plymouth, PL4 0AT

Trustees:

Dr Tim Searle	Chair
Mr Peter McDonnell	Vice Chair
Mr Alastair Wright	Vice Chair Elect
Mrs Sarah Gillett Plymouth	Trustee, CEO & Head Teacher of ACE Schools
Mrs Annette Benny	Trustee
Mrs Joan Watkins	Trustee & Chair of Governors ACE Schools Plymouth
Sue Bickle	Trustee & chair of Governors Courtlands

In Attendance

Mr Paul Turner	Director of Finance ACE MAT
Mr Chris Humphries	Director of School Performance ACE MAT
Mr Paul Winterton	Director of School Improvement ACE MAT
Mrs Cheryl Reuben	Clerk

1. **Chairman's introduction**

TS welcomed the Board. He requested to be allowed to juggle the agenda slightly as SG and PW were travelling back from Devon and there were some items which required their input/update. These would be deferred until they arrived. The Board agreed to this.

TS recounted a conversation he recently had with a friend who was a retired teacher. During last summer an incident occurred resulting in the death of a young man. The act was carried out by a former pupil of hers. She attended his trial at which he pleaded guilty and managed to forward a card on to him. The man was sentenced to 22 years in prison. Following this he wrote back to TS' friend and has given her updates on the progress he has made so far. TS advised he shared this conversation as he felt that it embodied the ethos of the MAT and reason the Trustees were part of the Trust and at the meeting- 'Never give up' .

2. **Apologies.**

None although SG & PW advised they would be arriving late due to having to travel from Central Devon. TS requested their arrival to be appropriately noted within the minutes.

3. **Verbal declarations of interest.**

AB advised that she has now retired from being a Director of Delt and CCG.

4. **Approve minutes of the previous meeting.**

In advance of the previous meeting which AB was unable to attend, she did forward some questions to TS. TS felt that these had been answered during the meeting and captured in the minutes but prior to signing them off sought AB' s confirmation that he had obtained the information desired. AB confirmed that she had providing AW felt there were no concerns relating to the ' going concern' raised by Bishop Fleming in their report. AW said he was satisfied that this was standard practice/wording. PM advised that he had also called PT after receiving the report and raised a similar query. PT explained that due to the nature of the Trust it would always be treading a fine line with regards to reserves.

With regards to the pension liability, ACE have to take on a long term liability under net assets. This affects anyone with a final salary scheme. The liability does fluctuate but it is indemnified by the DFE and Government. AB described how Delt was impacted during the first 2-3 years but felt it was imperative that Trustees were reminded that this was indemnified. PT advised that operationally, the input required could be increased from the employer. There are 3 years to make up the deficit which is what is being done and this is manageable. JW asked whether the pension funds were invested. PT advised that they were but that these investments were not in our control but chosen by actuaries/investment managers.

The Board discussed the KPI narrative and confirmed that they were happy with this.

With regards to the terms of reference, there was a query over the use of the word 'ensure'. AB impressed upon the Board that it is the duty of the Trustees to assure and the Mat Executives to ensure. PT advised that the wording in the Academies Financial Handbook states Trustees will 'ensure' which is why this wording had been used.

Following the above discussion, the Board approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

5. **Matters & Actions arising from previous meeting.**

None

6. **CEO Update- This was deferred to later in the meeting**

7. **Finance Reports**

The Board received a copy of the draft minutes from the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting. The Board were advised that these were only draft minutes as they would not be up for approval until the next Finance and Audit Committee Meeting and could be subject to amendments. As the full Trust meetings will always take place between Finance & Audit Committee meetings, it was agreed that any future draft minutes brought to the meeting would carry a draft watermark on them. The Board acknowledged the draft status of these minutes.

The work plan and terms of reference were reviewed.

The Board agreed that further conversation pertaining to PCC would be on hold until SG arrived at the meeting.

PT summarised the finance reports and provided updates on actions which had been taken following the finance and audit committee. Debtors- a large amount of the debt owed had now been recovered from Cornwall LA. Profit/loss - showed loss in December due to PCC. Devon & Cornwall LAs have both acknowledged their debts

and are currently being processed. This issue was not identified until Nov/Dec 17 and from the lessons learnt, additional processes and staff are being brought in to ACE to prevent this occurring again. The debt from PCC has not been acknowledged and agreed with them which is the key difference. The impact from the discrepancies in Banding allocations/payment are adversely impacting the Trust. The Trust are not currently in a financial position to appoint a new Head Teacher despite the fact this is necessary to allow SG to fully embrace her CEO role. The Finance and Audit Committee had discussed the viability of appointing an interim Head Teacher which could be funded by the additional income from the work with Schools Company as it linked in with the necessity of SG undertaking her CEO of ACE MAT role in order to support them. This would allow the Trust to better manage the risk of a Head teacher appointment which cannot be supported by the current finances.

PT advised that that his reports were a first attempt of incorporate the Finance and Audit Committee meetings and the new termly meeting structure. Through use, this will be further refined in its presentation and may include graphs/KPIs. PT advised that the key points were contained on page 3 and consisted of 4 points. PT also circulated copies of the most up to date aged debtors report and drew the Board's attention to page 4. He advised that this rated as green were due to come in tomorrow and that there had been an improvement in the older debt.

PW arrived at the meeting.

Currently in the bank there is £765k (The balance is £840k but Cornwall LA had made an over payment of £75k which is being refunded back to them). This presents a better picture than previously due to the debt recovery. There is currently £12k outstanding from Cornwall as we weren't aware that this was being paid by Cornwall College and not Cornwall LA. We have received confirmation that this will be paid during the half term.

Questions:

TS: With regards to the Outreach restructure and the decisions made by the Remuneration Committee, there was a £21k cost attached. What is the timescale on recovering these costs with the longer term savings which will be made?

PT: The restructure is similar to that at Primary so when drafting the Business Plan we considered staff costs being at the highest possible level. We are also looking to secure a better E-Learning deal. The funding levels at Dover Road are in line with PCC's exceptional banding.

SB: The appointment of Kirsty Thistlewaite in ACE Family, is this being paid for by Courtlands?

PT: The ACE Family appointment was not in place at the time of these management accounts. The costs will be partially for Rhoda and the safeguarding work undertaken. The rest will be split 50/50.

SB: So is this why there is a deficit?

PT: Yes, initially we allowed for the cost of 1 member of staff and no income. The fact ACE Family is generating income offsets the overspend of appointing additional staff.

JW: Are Devon LA paying the invoices due?

PT: Yes.

8. **ACE Family**

The Finance & Audit Committee forwarded to the full Board meeting. Wolferstans and Bishop Fleming advised setting up a trading subsidiary with ACE family being object of the charity. This would mean that they are not exactly the same as the MAT although they are related to education. The Key features are contained within page 2 and if the Board approve this it will be submitted to the DFE. TS asked PT if he was happy with the advice from Bishop Fleming? PT advised that the 2 partners and the audit manager specialises in MAT accountancy so was confident with the advice given. AB enquired as to whether with the trading subsidiary there would be shares and if so would the MAT be the only shareholder? PT advised that this was correct. There would be no loan from the MAT but it would be a shareholder with starting capital. The staff and funding would come from the MAT and then be recharged. JW asked if there was a known demand for the service from any LAs and were they able to fund this. PT advised that LAs were interested and schools would also be able to buy in. The risk is being managed by requiring a low input from the MAT. ACE Family will be staffed by 1.5 staff, have no premises costs and no assets. If not successful, staff can be relocated.

Questions:

AB: What assurance is there on the projected income/start up over 5 years? What is the period for review?

TS: Presumably this can't be moved on until to projections until it is agreed that it is an acceptable corporate structure with the DFE?

TS clarified that the Board were being asked to approve the proposed business structure (i.e. as a trading subsidiary) to be sent to the DFE and not for approval of the business itself. SB queried that ACE Family already existed and was trading. PT clarified that it was trading as part of ACE MAT in the same respect as the Bespoke services. This can continue and whilst the structure of a trading subsidiary is being explored further with costings being recharged.

SB informed the Board that a number of Special Schools had put together a similar offer which is now up and running. CH responded that the feedback on the uptake of this had not been great.

AB: Have the DFE agreed the Business Plan?

TS: Not yet as we are not at this stage yet.

PT: Directors need to be appointed, terms of reference need to be agreed and also agreed with RSC. The provision in Bournemouth may come under this as well.

TS reiterated that the Board were being asked to agree to proposing the corporate structure only. The next step would be the business model and growth plan. AB asked as to what the regulatory rules were on this. PT advised that the Academy Financial Handbook states that the MAT transfers the subsidiary as owned. It doesn't work the same as with a private limited company. AB asked if the model would be included in the business plan? JW enquired as to the fact ACE family was set up without a business plan/ model being in place? PT explained that ACE family wasn't set up overnight but had been through Trustees for approval. The risk was minimal due to utilising a member of staff who was already employed by ACE and providing Courtlands with Family Support. Conversation ensued as to at what stage the official model/business plan/what staff skill sets are required were to be approved by the Trust Board. TS advised that the time was now. It was down to the Board to agree whether or not to present the organisational structure to the DFE for consideration/approval. If approved the Trust Board would then decide on the business plan/model. TS asked the Board if they were happy for the proposed structure to be presented to the DFE for consideration/feedback/approval?

The Board agreed that they were happy for the proposed structured to be presented to the DFE for consideration/feedback/approval.

TS clarified that, subject to the DFE's approval, the future business plans/models would go through the Trust Board.

9. **Trust Dashboard**

PW summarised the KPI report. PW advised that the red areas in the Courtlands data had improved. ACE Schools Plymouth had shown improvements in Maths. English had not improved as fast so a deeper analysis is being conducted on this with Bretonside being of particular issue. The reading ability of the cohort is massively lower. Students with a standardised score of 95 are unable to access an English GCSE paper within the allotted time. However, we do not know the full impact of the results yet. JW asked as to whether this is an issue that stemmed from the English teaching the students received in mainstream? PW advised that there could be many contributory factors which may also include students refusing to engage or behaviour. He also advised that the rating for the teaching and learning is high so it may be that the curriculum is not meeting this cohorts needs.

Questions:

SB: Who make a judgement on the MAT quality Assurance?

CH: This will be covered fully under item 11.

PW informed the Board that the fixed term exclusions (FTE) had not improved in frequency but the length of them had. The Reflection base has been very successful but needed to embed further. The Board discussed where the base was situated

(William Sutton Hall, St Budeaux), who ran it (Monique Farrell, previously a TA at Bretonside) and the purpose of the Reflection Base.

SG arrived.

PW went on to explain that the PRAG rating parameters were based on National Data where comparable, historical data where available or against school standards such as 20% improvement in attendance.

The Board discussed the possibility of aligning the data collections of ACE Schools Plymouth and Courtlands. PW explained that due to the transient nature of the cohort of a PRU, 6 data collections were required per year whereas as only 3 were required with other types of schools. As the MAT grows, the new schools will align accordingly depending on whether they are PRUs or not.

10. **Governance**

The Board discussed the need to create additional LGB groups to cover the Devon/Cornwall sites as they all agreed that it was not feasible for ACE Schools Plymouth to effectively govern these outer laying sites. This was also a due diligence requirement from the RSC visit discussing growth. A written directive on Governance will be provided.

Questions:

AB: Are there any costs or issues associated with this?

JW: The biggest obstacle is recruitment.

PW: As the set-up is slightly different, it has been agreed that local people with an interest may volunteer.

SB: How will prospective Governors be brought to the Trust Board for approval?

PW: They will go through an application with the Chairs of the LGB who will then forward hen for approval.

TS asked the Board to vote on the recommendation of proceeding with recruiting additional LGB groups. The makeup and scheme of delegation will be directed by the RSC and the Trust Board will then appoint against this criteria.

The Board accepted this recommendation.

Education Committee- The Board discussed establishing an Education Committee. The Education Committee would meet at the same frequency as the Finance & Audit Committee and would review the levels of education and safeguarding. Their meetings would also have to be aligned with the LGB meetings. If the Board agreed to setting up an Education Committee, terms of reference will need to be written up.

The Board agreed to setting up an Education Committee and the terms of reference to be written up to support this.

11. **MAT Model of Delivery and Quality Assurance Model**

CH, PW & Bluesky have been working together over the last 9 months to recreate the SEF. There are currently 2 strands to the school SEF. This won't be replaced but will be able to draw down reports when required based on various input.

The focuses will be termly and will record ongoing work and wording. Senior and middle leaders will make judgements and this will build levels of reporting. This will be based on the notion of the ACE MAT Vision which will be broken down and evaluated.

The system is bespoke to ACE but contains similar aspects used by the RSC which they are happy with and gives credibility.

CH distributed handouts detailing 3 areas which will be subject to feedback. Once a statement has been made it will be fixed in the system. The information cannot be changed retrospectively. Where judgements are subjective they will also be open to challenge and backed by data/evidenced.

The information will predominantly be input by middle leaders including lesson observations, and can be done on departments or on the whole school. So far this has proved quick and easy to use and contributes to a culture of positive challenge. TS asked how staff had adapted to the new system? CH replied that they had found it easy to use and it had now become second nature. It allowed staff to be held to account. SB asked how it would fit in with the KPIs to which CH replied that these indicators would be identified and responded to.

Questions:

SB: Who makes the judgement on the MAT areas?

CH: These are currently made by CH and PW referring to the parameters set by OFSTED. Parts of the SEF will also be completed by SLT.

CH provided the Trustees with a SEF questionnaire which he requested they completed and returned to him to be input before the next Trust Board meeting. The Trustees were asked to focus on where they see the Trust is now compared to September 17.

The Board agreed to role this out to Courtlands with training.

12. **Policies.**

Courtlands Referral and Admissions Policy- The feedback from the lawyers is that Courtlands have 75 places commissioned by PCC but have a capacity of 100. This does mean that 25 places can be offered out beyond Plymouth LA. A very small number of Devon/Cornwall referrals do go through the Plymouth SMAP panel. However, the need has been identified from the commissions from these LAs for Bespoke WRAP places with ACE Schools Plymouth.

Questions:

JW: How would the students travel to Courtlands from out of area placements?

CH: The LA would cover the transportation costs. For each student Courtlands would receive the SEN banding funding plus £10k base funding. The students would need to fit around the existing cohort. The increase in number would reduce the risks.

SB: If Courtlands offered out the additional 25 places and PCC decided they wanted a further 10, would this be a problem?

SG: The places are allocated on a first come first served basis to which ever LA required them which could include PCC but they would not be ring fenced for them. The students would have to have an EHCP or be in progress of assessment for one. The placements at Courtlands would not be PRU placements. Courtlands would have to be the school named/being named on the EHCP. If the EHCP is not granted or Courtlands does not end up being the named school, the student's place would be terminated within 10 days.

The Board agreed to adopt the Courtlands Referral and Admissions Policy.

ACE Schools Plymouth Marking, Assessment and Tracking Policy- The Board discussed the importance of ensuring consistency across all of the policies - using the correct logo, page numbering, version control and including the job title of authors. CH advised that the authors needed to be amended to Sam Morahan & Kirsty Lambert.

The Board agreed to the content of the ACE Schools Plymouth Marking, Assessment and Tracking Policy subject to the above administrative changes.

Policy Review- CH distributed the Policy review document. All of the current policies are indexed on a spreadsheet. CH, Becky Woods, Joanne Warne and Cheryl Reuben are due to attend a policy writing course to facilitate the group to be able to confidently and competently write policies in-house. Whilst Policy templates can be purchased, these tend to be very generic. The intention is to strengthen the existing policies and not re-write them from scratch.

Questions:

SB: Will the LGBs have any input?

CH: This would depend on the Scheme of Delegation and the level of authority required. Currently Lee Earnshaw and Carolyn Kearney are consulted on policies for Courtlands where appropriate.

The Board acknowledged and agreed the content of the Policy Review paper.

The E-Safety policy will be reviewed in-line with GDPR. A consultant from the Sapphire Consulting Group will be conducting an audit, reviewing current practices and providing training on what needs to be changed/implemented.

6. CEO Update

RSC Visit-The content of the RSC visit was rigorous and valuable. It was similar to an OFSTED inspection. The feedback given at the end of the day was very positive. A report and directive will be issued following the visit but the indication is that ACE MAT is in an 'Outstanding' position to support other Trusts/Schools.

An application for significant change is being completed. The note was given after pursuing work in Bournemouth to create a satellite academy. This would require a Local LGB. The application will go via the Trustees, Education Committee (when formed) and the Finance & Audit Committee. A business plan will need to be created. We will be working with the DFE and RSC over a 4-6 week period to use the venture as a research development tool. The venture was acknowledged by Lord Agnew during a recent conversation. The advice we have received with Bournemouth is to pursue with caution when setting up the provision around costings, identifying premises and recruiting. The intention is to be able to offer the provision from Summer/Autumn 18. SG advised she has kept all the LAs up to date with the progress.

Devon & Cornwall Satellite bases- Payment issued are being resolved and referrals are still coming in. There is currently an issue with capacity as we are receiving more referrals than we do places. However, LAs are holding out until the capacity is available which is a testament to our communication and service is. With regards to researching an alternative Devon venue, we are waiting to see what the instruction is regarding the Devon AP.

Bath- The decision has been made not to commit to tendering due to our capacity and timings. The contract is for 3 years so we will flag up a review for in 2 ½ years. We will continue to monitor quality and assurance.

ACE Schools Plymouth- With regards to PCC funding, PCC refused to meet with TS, PM & Ruth Westwood, which suggests that there is a personal issue pertaining to SG.

This meeting will be rearranged and the issue needs to be raised to future proof against other issues. At the modified SPP, 16 of the 24 requests were agreed which is the best rate so far. As the situation should be around the process/transaction, this is the area in which Ruth specialises.

Questions:

AB: How far do we let this situation go when it is clear that there is no longer a relationship to save?

TS: When I spoke to Judith Harwood, it seemed clear to him that she did not get what the issues were. We had agreed to meet again as the meeting was cancelled by PCC due to SG unable to attend. When we met on 4th January 2018 it felt that we were on the same page. It was agreed that ACE Schools Plymouth could attend the panel meeting to make comment which they did. We do have a full audit trail of correspondence which supports our position and the action we have taken to resolve the issues. PCC have requested another date to meet.

TS proposed that the Board wrote to PCC again, reiterate the financial implications to ACE Schools Plymouth if PCC continue. He suggested this was sent to the RSC first and the RSC brought in if necessary.

AB: What is to be gained by repeating the financial implications when we have already been clear on this?

JW: We should be informing the leader of the Council and the CEO. I don't believe they are aware of the decisions being made by the Officers of the Council.

AB: During the meeting of the Finance and Audit Committee, discussed the very real risk of ACE Schools Plymouth becoming insolvent. As a Board we need to take the view of if we were questioned on our decisions, how we would justify that we tried being 'nice' in order to preserve a relationship which is now non-existent and by doing so risked being able to offer an education and support to all of the other students on roll? Following our Director Training it is very clear that we have a duty of care to ensure the business remains solvent.

SG: At the panel meeting this week, 16 requested were accepted. As we speak I have received an email from PCC advising that 3 of the places accepted are now being rejected. These are places at Dover Road and the reason being given is that students can only be placed here by the S19 panel. This is not the case.

The Board discussed what has changed since concerting to a MAT? They determined that the offer was the same, the paperwork was the same and the costs remained the same. The only difference was that ACE was now a MAT and not a maintained school.

The Board then discussed the precedent ACE Schools Plymouth had set with Somerset LA. This involved writing to parents advising that Somerset LA were

unwilling to pay the amount due for the provisions offered and therefore their child would no longer be able to access this provision. The Board discussed taking the same action in writing to parents of the students for which PCC refuse to pay.

CH raised that as a customer, PCC cannot to reduce their payment and expect to receive the same product. When the banding changes came in, it was only the AP banding which were changed and not the SEN bandings.

The Board discussed various options which included referring the issue to the DFE, collating the evidence and writing further correspondence to the CEO and leader of the Council, writing to the parents to advise them that the provision will be withdrawn or involving the ESFA.

SG provided some narrative to the Board around one of the students who would be effected to provide the Board with some real life context.

AB raised a concern over the PR that could surround writing to the parents before informing the CEO of PCC, especially considering half term is about to start so ACE staff may not be in a position to respond immediately.

SG advised that some of the application had been submitted at the panel meeting last summer. Now they have been agreed SG is waiting for confirmation as to whether these will be back dated to when they were first requested. As the provisions have been necessary for the welfare of the students, ACE have funded the difference in cost/funding whilst the process was being agreed. This decision was based on the risk of not providing the students with the right provisions for their need and faith in the system providing the appropriate outcome.

The Board agreed that TS would draft a letter to the CEO of PCC and Leader of the Council explaining the chain of events, action taken to resolve and the implications to the students and ACE Schools Plymouth if an appropriate resolution is not found. It was agreed that whilst prompt action was imperative, it was equally important to ensure all matters raised were accurate and watertight, that the relevant people who needed to receive the correspondence were in the office to receive it and were allowed a reasonable amount of time to respond. The Board agreed a timescale to draft a letter to the CEO of PCC and the Leader of the Council and also furnish them with a draft letter which will be sent to parents with a set deadline to receive a response.

PM and AB both offered their support and assistance to read and review any proposed correspondence during the half term.

The Board summarised that whilst the action they are required to take may be difficult, the children ACE Schools Plymouth served remained at the centre of what needed to be achieved.

Courtlands- Doing well. Staff are doing well. SLT are strong and are holding the Head Teacher to account. We are looking at reinvigorating the LGB.

ACE Family- The launch went well and was well publicised. ACE Family are engaging parents with various classes. The next step is to create a business model and a plan for growth.

Schools Company- The Trust have appointed an interim CEO- Angela Barrie. SG has been given full delegate autonomy as CEO over CDA, NDA & SDA. The MAT Execs are conducting a 3 day visit, spending 1 day at each site. A date has been set for re-brokerage of 31st May 2018. There is a vast amount of work to be done but if we work together we should be able to effect change quickly. The process is transparent and we can now prove our abilities in working practice through our colleagues and strategic leadership. We are instilling capability measures and accountability. Lord Agnew' s committee and ESFA are mooting the notion of disbanding the governance and create an interim executive committee under the Trust. This would include some Trustee and others. This was brought about by the RSC visit, with Lord Agnew, the ESFA, SG, Angela Barrie and the Trustees to establish what this will look and feel like. The extraordinary meeting has been called which we will receive feedback from. We should receive an update on this tomorrow.

Questions:

SB: What are the financial implications?

SG: There are none as yet. We are able to draw down funding of £170k for consultancy work and support to CDA, predominantly by Clare Martin and to allow ACE to back fill her position. There is an investigation taking place as to the content of the debt. This should not be an issue during the re-brokerage. One of the largest spends was SLT which has been dealt with. PT is acting at the interim CFO. The DFE have an emergency improvement fund and we are also looking at employing legal expertise, although we feel a company working at a national level is required for this.

AB: Regarding the significant change, what is the timetable for the decision on re-brokering? Will there be an opportunity to pre-read material and to meet to discuss?

SG: The detail will be in the narrative. The correspondence will be around the commercial elements and HR. A head teacher/interim head teacher will be required at ACE Schools Plymouth. We will need to draw down funding for this line of work.

13. AOB.

*(Items should be generally lodged with the clerk at least **48 hours before the meeting**).*

CH informed the Board that he was undertaking a NPQEL in business development strategy. He requested approval from the Board to write up and give a presentation on what this will entail.

The Board approved this request.

JW raised the date of the next meeting for Plymouth LGB which was due to take place on Thursday 29th March 2018. JW would be unable to attend this so will be requesting the LGB to meet on an alternative date during this week.

Note: Due to the extensive length of the meeting and the running order being altered, TS sent out an email after the meeting raising the following points to the Trust Board:

1. The Finance Report Item 7.ii. We did not accept this as there were comments needed from Sarah about the LA and the ACE Plymouth Head. She made these comments, and we have the discussion. So if you are happy please can you indicate by email to me that we accept this report. We will reflect this in the mins.

PM, SB & JW all responded confirming their acceptance of the report. These emails will be printed and stored with the signed copy of the minutes.

2. Under AOB Trustee' s need to sign the ICT Acceptable use policy - Cheryl can you send this out by email and we will all sign it. **This was emailed out to all Trustees after the meeting to be signed and returned to the Clerk.**
3. Lastly, when life has slowed down slightly, it would be great if we could have a meal together - Cheryl and I will send some dates out.

14. Reserved Business

Pending Items:

Item	Date Added (meeting date)	Review Date
Terms of Office – length of service		
Policy review		
Trustees meeting dates		
Trustee Work plan		

Dates of Future Meetings:

Wednesday 28th March 2018 18:00-20:00

Wednesday 23rd May 2018 18:00-20:00

Wednesday 11th July 2018 18:00-20:00

Board of Trustees:

Dr Tim Searle	tim.searle@acemat.uk	Chair
Mr Peter McDonnell	peter.mcdonnell@acemat.uk	Vice Chair
Mr Alastair Wright	alastair.wright@acemat.uk	Vice Chair Elect
Mrs Annette Benny	annette.benny@acemat.uk	Trustee
Mrs Joan Watkins	joan.watkins@acemat.uk Plymouth LGB	Trustee & Chair of ACE Schools
Mrs Sue Bickle	sue.bickle@acemat.uk LGB	Trustee & Chair of Courtlands
Sarah Gillett	sarah.gillett@aceschools.net	CEO of ACE Schools Trust