

Attendees: Chair: Julia Barrett (Willmott Dixon), Dale Turner (Skanska), Dan Evans (Speedy Services), Marcus Bennett (CITB), Ben Stone (Kier), Mandy Messenger (Advante), Andrew Spencer (Galliford Try), Graham Edgell (Morgan Sindall), Ian Heptonstall (Action Sustainability), Hilary Hurrey (Action Sustainability)

Apologies: Shaun McCarthy (Action Sustainability), Joanna Gilroy (Balfour Beatty)

1. Review of actions

Hilary reported that all actions were complete or being discussed as part of the agenda.

2. Financial Review

Andrew talked through the process he went through and gave an overview of the key elements of the financial review and the recommendations given.

Thank you to Andrew for taking on the exercise and producing a thorough financial review.

Agreed

- The 54% cost on labour needs to be reviewed and split out into the various delivery items.
- The labour costs should be listed alongside the achieved outputs. This also relates to the discussion around the groups and the cost to run them; how they are allocating costs and the outputs they achieve.
- It's important to understand which systems are allowing growth without affecting overhead. The School has done well over the past few years with decoupling growth vs costs but should continue in this way. A longer term (next 5 years) people and technology strategy needs to be in place. The technology strategy will include a technology roadmap as well as a product roadmap (as in those products that can help us deliver more for less) e.g. AI.
- AI should be added to the risk register and further discussion to take place to understand how AI could be used within the School.
- It was noted that ultimately all the financial risk is carried by the delivery partner.
- It would be a worthwhile exercise to benchmark vs competitors to understand what the KPI could be around financial performance and trained people.
- It would be helpful to include a line for context on each item of the cost budget, so it is easier to understand over/ under spends.

Actions

- Hilary to produce a financial review of last FY that includes people costs broken into activities and outputs.
- Hilary will include a description for each line item to provide context in the next financial update.
- A longer-term people and technology strategy will be produced (these will not be ready by the next meeting).
- Ian and Aled to discuss the benchmarking and setting a KPI around financial performance and trained people.

3. People Matter Charter

Hilary provided a summary of the recommendation to retire the People Matter Charter and instead replace it with a revised corporate capability assessment (with action plan) and training needs assessment.

Agreed

- It was agreed that if the School is going to have Charters, they cannot be a tick box exercise. They should not be for the badge hunters but about creating impact.
- The process around asking for the case studies does not appear to be being continued. However, what are we doing with the case studies? If there were 100 Partners providing them, that is 500 case studies which need to appear somewhere, that is a lot of work for very little viewing of these case studies.
- There are huge resource implications around the School providing an audit service for the Charters and the focus of the School should be about learning.
- The Board agree that the People Matter Charter in its current form should be retired and that the corporate capability assessment and training needs assessment should be developed. A task and finish group of Partners needs to be formed to look at these and how they link to FIR, Wellbeing, Modern Slavery etc.
- There are similar issues around the Plant Charter, though the process has been reviewed for this year. However, not all Partners agree with the current Charter. This leads onto the governance issues around groups. The Partners in the groups may agree the requirements of a charter or a set of outputs but if it has a wider industry impact or reputational risk for the School the Board should be approving.
- The Board should sign off any outputs generated by the groups which have resource or reputational implications.

Actions

- Hilary to speak to the internal team to create a task and finish group to review the People corporate and individual assessment and consider the overall strategy of the People group. **Board members who would like to be part of this group to let Hilary know by 31st July.**
- Hilary to speak to the Head of Marketing (and lead of the above group) about communications to those who are signed up to the People Matter Charter about it being retired. This will happen in due course once there is a concrete plan of what is replacing the Charter.
- The process around the Plant Charter should be discussed at the next Board meeting. Ian to engage with Plant group and report back.

4. Constructionline Collaboration Proposal

Ian talked through the outline of the proposal Constructionline has approached the School with.

Agreed

- There was a concern from around the room on the reputational risk of the School. This would need to be closely controlled. It would not be appropriate for the audit process to be badged as a School initiative.
- There should be options considered on how the proposal could be monetised, which is kept separate from the School.
- Audit or verification of reporting is something that will happen at some point, as it has in Europe. Being involved now will ensure that the School does maintain control on what will be produced now and going forward.
- It will be important that the audit must focus on what is most important – the supply chain won't be able to do everything.

Actions

- Ian to meet with Constructionline regarding the proposal to highlight the initial concerns and to ensure that parameters are built into the potential agreement around using the School name.
- A task group of Board members (Dale, Andrew, Graham, Mandy and Dan) will meet with Constructionline to have further discussion about the proposal and to understand the UK markets position better. This will take place once Ian has met with Constructionline again. **If any other Board members would like to be part of the task group please let Hilary know by 31st July.**

5. Strategy Morning Reflections

5.1 Impact

The Board agreed with the proposal of the 6 KPI's listed.

Agreed

- There needs to be a KPI around the productivity piece (see action above around establishing a KPI) which looks at revenue; activity; volume. E.g. £1 spent per xx no. of learners or learners per employee.
- When gaining the NPS score from Partners it would be important to reach out to the budget holder but also other employees e.g. those attending meetings; those learning through the School.
- There should be a target response rate established.
- There should be the potential to look at the type of Partners responding to be able to gain more information around type of Partner as well as qualitative feedback.
- There should be questions on the below which were the lowest scoring in the report produced by the management consultants who gained the NPS score for the School:
 - Ability to manage CPD
 - Learner experience
 - Administrator user experience
 - Reporting/ Management Information
- NPS for both Partners and Members is important.
- ROI for Partners should also be considered as a KPI.
- The star rating applied on resources should be considered to also allow a text response.

Actions

- Hilary will consider how best to integrate NPS into the annual impact survey. Also to investigate the 4 items noted above in the annual survey to members.
- Hilary will agree a target response rate with the Head of Marketing (benchmark from last year is 1,200 responses from Partners and Members).
- The annual survey will be sent to all Partner contacts (response to this part of the survey is not anonymous).
- A complete set of KPI's will be presented at the next Board meeting to include the additional ones suggested.
- Hilary will discuss the adding of text to the rating of resources with the technical team and add this to the development pipeline.

5.2 Governance

Role of Chair

As Shaun is exiting Action Sustainability and not working full time with the School going forward, the Board were asked to consider various options regarding the Chair role.

Agreed

- The next Chair must be from a Partner organisation.
- The person must have a passion and be an ambassador for the School.
- The constitution needs to be updated to reflect the process and timeline for selecting the Chair.
- The comment was made in general that the Board need to be more forward looking. It should be taken as given that the pre-read has been read and considered. The meeting should take the format so that there is more space for discussion and the ability to consider 'what next' (as well as holding to account).

Actions

- Ben will share the process he has undergone for a Chair role in another organisation.
- Shaun will draft a job description for the Chair role and form a subgroup which will review this, the process and put forward the necessary changes to the constitution. These will be agreed at the AGM 2025.

Governance clarity relating to School growth

Agreed

- The Board agreed with the statements presented to give clarity on the various growth items and actions.
- There needs to be more sharing of best practice and updates to the Board on progress and plans with the other Schools.
- The licence agreements need wording to reflect the governance over brand and the embedding of the guiding principles. If an iteration of the School does not adhere to the guiding principles, the licence is revoked.
- It was agreed that any licence fees that Action Sustainability charge for the use of their learning platform should reflect the work done by the UK School. It was agreed that a fee of 10% of revenue up to £26k be paid by any other versions of the Supply Chain Sustainability School. The £26k reflects the top rate partner fee. Once 10% of revenue equals the £26k Partner level that overseas School will become a Partner to the UK School, fees are then capped at this Partnership level.
 - This is already done by SBCC, Australia and Ipieca (who use the platform in a lightly different way).
 - The French School's licence finishes this autumn so no change will be made to their current agreement.
 - A key consideration is the two-way sharing of knowledge. For example; Ireland sharing their new module on Sustainability reporting once it is produced.
- If there needs to be a quicker decision on a sponsorship deal, then defaulting to email correspondence with the Board is acceptable.

Actions

- Ian will write governance on brand and adhering to the guiding principles into any future licence agreement for the School.

- Action Sustainability will apply the fee arrangement to Ireland in this FY and to nay future School as Action Sustainability develops these.
- The items on the agenda which were not covered below will be covered in the September Board meeting:
 - Board members in post for 5 years re-election
 - Collaboration: Leadership groups
 - Learning: who and how are we trying to reach

6. AOB

Ian gave a brief overview of the CITB grant funded programme around FIR and onsite training delivery which is being produced and submitted to CITB. This could have huge potential to open a new type of training and audience if the bid is accepted. This could then be utilised in the rest of the School.

There are also wider discussions with CITB which are ongoing about a more long-term strategic relationship, potentially to increase reach to 100K+ members of the School.

Actions

- Hilary to check that all Board members are registered for the Summit and to check if there are any actions for Board members on the day.

Next Board meeting:

Tuesday 24th September: 10am – 1pm at Balfour Beatty's offices, 5 Churchill Place, Canary Wharf, E14 5HU