

National Centre for Circus Arts

Minutes – Meeting of the Board of Trustees

Tuesday 20th October 2020

(by zoom)

In attendance:	Kate White (CEO) Froniga Lambert (COO) Glen Stewart (Director of Training) Adrian Porter (Director of Higher Education) Tony Bonnar (Head of Finance) Sharon Harble (EA to the CEO) Minutes
Deputy Chair:	Craig Calvert
Trustees:	Paul Steggall Sue James Betsy Lynch Tuikku Alaviitala William Underhill Rob West Jane Crowther Kate Cavelle Bill Morris Thomas Nowacki Lesley Strachan David Chinn
Observers:	Rachael Williams Cameron Brookhouse Alison King

1. Apologies

- 1.1 Tarun Napgal and Darshak Shah sent their apologies.
- 1.2 Craig Calvert reported that due notice of the meeting had been given and that a quorum was present.

2. Declaration of Interests

- 2.1 Pursuant to Article 7.1 of the National Centre for Circus Arts' Articles of Association, each Director present confirmed that they had no direct or indirect interest in any way in the proposed transaction to be considered at the meeting which they were required by section 177 of the Companies Act 2006 and the National Centre for Circus Arts Articles of Association to disclose.
- 2.2 It was noted that, pursuant to article 7 of the National Centre for Circus Arts' Articles of Association, a Director must absent himself or herself from any discussions in which it is possible that a conflict will arise between his or her duty to act solely in the interests of the charity and any personal interest. Any Director so interested would not vote and the vote would not count as part of a quorum on any of the matters in which he or she were interested.

3. Terms of Reference

- 3.1 Each committee has approved their own terms of reference. All 3 sets of terms were formally approved by the Board.

4. Minutes of the last meeting

4.1 The minutes of the last meeting (14 July 2020) were formally approved.

5. Action Tracker and Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

5.1 There were no outstanding actions from the previous meeting.

5.2 Craig congratulated the senior team on behalf of the trustees for their outstanding work over the past 7 months.

5.3 Craig thanked the trustees for giving up their time to attend additional meetings over the summer and during lockdown and for continuing to support Kate and the team through the ongoing challenges relating to C-19 and changes within CDD. With this in mind it is likely that there will be further meetings to attend in addition to the regular quarterly ones.

5.4 Craig thanked Jane Crowther for her contribution to the Board particularly as Chair of the RAN Committee. Jane has taken the difficult decision to step down as a trustee due to personal and work commitments.

5.5 Craig welcomed Ali King to the meeting. Craig will continue as Deputy Chair until January 2021. Ali, if formally appointed at the end of this meeting will take over from Craig as Chair to the Board of Trustees from the end of the meeting and will chair her first Board meeting in February 2021.

5.6 Kate reported on what has been an extraordinary quarter. She thanked Craig for his kind words but explained that keeping the building and the organization going through these exceptional times has been very much a wider team effort.

5.6.1 Delivery has continued, both in the building and in other spaces including Shoreditch Town Hall and some learning is still happening on line. There have of course been questions from the students but on the whole feedback has been positive. We have not been required to isolate any of our student bubbles nor have we had a single positive case of C-19 among staff or students. We have welcomed our CAT students and LYC students back into the building who train here 2 evenings during the week and on Sundays. Some of our professional circus artists are also back training in the building for Open Training, albeit for more limited periods.

5.6.2 Everybody across the various teams is responsible for the continuous cleaning regime that now happens within the building.

5.6.3 Things have been difficult at times particularly during the furlough period. The last group of people to return from furlough will be returning to work at the end of October. Thanks to the government's Job Retention Scheme we will be able to bring everyone back to full time hours albeit with some roles having changed slightly.

5.6.4 Additional facilities and protocols have been put in place to ensure everyone's safety throughout the building, from sinks in the courtyard to a one-way system inside the building as well as the additional cleaning. This has made things feel different but ultimately everyone feels safe and secure when they are in and around the building.

5.6.5 Kate confirmed that the ACE funding has been 'an absolute lifeline'. The Emergency Response Funding helped us through the initial period of lockdown and the Recovery Funding will allow us to continue into the long term with greater stability and financial resilience, to look at how we can create income and continue to teach in different and new ways.

5.6.6 Most people are continuing to work some of the time at home. This enables us to reduce the amount of footfall in the building and therefore reduce risk. We are also aware that we need to balance risk with people's mental health needs and wellbeing and so we understand that enabling people to spend some time in the office is equally important.

- 5.7 In answer to Rob's question Kate confirmed that our plans are in place for a second lockdown should this become necessary. Our plans have been submitted for approval to the Director of Public Health for our local region and to the Department of Education and explain how we intend to continue running our higher education programme and the building in the event of a further lockdown (local or otherwise).
- 5.8 In answer to Sue's question Kate confirmed that our student support programme is incredibly busy. Some students are living in shared accommodation and so receive a certain amount of mutual support however others live on their own and are therefore feeling more isolated and/or anxious. Counselling is available for students should they need it and we are also fully prepared for a situation in which a student might be required to self-isolate if tested positive for C-19 and for the support we would provide in that scenario.

6. RAN Committee

- 6.1 The RAN Committee met on 29th September. The main areas of focus at the meeting were Trustee recruitment and Chair recruitment (formal appointments to follow).
- 6.2 Jane reiterated that Craig will continue as Deputy Chair until January 2021. Ali King, if formerly appointed, will take over as Chair of the Board of Trustees post the meeting and will chair her first Board meeting in February 2021.
- 6.3 Jane introduced Cameron and Rachael and welcomed them to the meeting. Cameron and Rachael were formally voted on to the Board.
- 6.4 Jane explained that we will need to appoint a new Chair of the RAN Committee before the next RAN Committee meeting in January, also a new Chair of the Finance Committee when Craig steps down in January. We may also want to consider appointing a new Deputy Chair. Jane invited trustees to contact Ali and Kate if they would like to be considered for any of these roles.
 - 6.4.1 Froniga thanked the trustees who had completed the recent skills audit and reminded those who had not, to do so as soon as possible.
- 6.5 Jane noted she was stepping down formally as Trustee and Chair of the RAN Committee from the end of the meeting. Bill thanked Jane for her contribution to the organization and to the RAN Committee, for her diligence and her expertise.

7. Finance Committee

- 7.1 The Finance Committee met on 12th of October.
- 7.2 Craig confirmed that the year outturn is looking far better than we could have anticipated. In total, we will be receiving a total of close to £900k from ACE in support funding, the £413k in Emergency Response Funding (split over 2 years in the accounts) and the £466k in Recovery Funding. This puts us in a strong reserves position and is clearly an extremely positive outcome.
- 7.3 Craig suggested that the 2020/21 budget is reasonably conservative and that whilst further work to the budget should continue over the coming months as the wider situation changes, it was the decision of the Finance Committee that the budget be approved by the Board. The Board approved the budget.
- 7.4 Tony referred to his financial reports that accompanied the agenda and to our application for the CBILS loan and overdraft facilities with the Co-operative Bank. The Board was asked to approve the following two resolutions in respect of each of these facilities. Craig recommended that they be approved and passed.

Resolution (1) CBILS Overdraft Facility

1. *There being a quorum present the Chairman declared the meeting open and duly convened.*
2. *It was reported to the meeting that arrangements had been made for The Co-operative Bank plc. to provide an overdraft facility to the Company with a limit of £100,000 (One Hundred Thousand*

Pounds) on the terms notified in writing by The Co-operative Bank plc. to the Company in a facility letter (the "Facility Letter"), a copy of which was produced to the meeting.

3. The Facility Letter was considered and the board confirmed its full understanding of the effect and implications for the Company of the Facility Letter. It was resolved that the offer of the overdraft facility be accepted with all the Terms and Conditions as documented in the Facility Letter (including the Standard Terms and Conditions and any Special Conditions, and any requirement to give security for the overdraft facility, and that Kate White (CEO) and Tony Bonnar (Head of Finance) are authorised and instructed to accept and execute the Facility Letter in accordance with the bank mandate, together with any related documentation.

4. The directors confirmed and resolved that all banking facilities and arrangements documented in the Facility Letter are and will be conducted in accordance with the Company's memorandum and articles of association (its "Constitution"), together with all other relevant legislation and regulations. It was resolved that acceptance of the overdraft facility documented in the Facility Letter promotes the purposes and success of the Company for the benefit of its members as a whole and the directors have taken into consideration all of the factors listed in sections 171 to 177 of the Companies Act 2006.

5. Prior to passing the above resolutions all directors interested in the above transactions with the Company disclosed their interest (if any) and any conflict(s) of interest including potential conflict(s) of interest were approved where necessary in accordance with the Constitution of the Company and the Companies Act 2006 (in particular sections 177 and 182).

Resolution (2) CBILS Loan Facility

1. There being a quorum present the Chairman declared the meeting open and duly convened.

2. It was reported to the meeting that arrangements had been made for The Co-operative Bank plc. to provide a loan facility to the Company with a limit of £200,000 (Two Hundred Thousand Pounds) on the terms notified in writing by The Co-operative Bank plc. to the Company in a facility letter (the "Facility Letter"), a copy of which was produced to the meeting.

6. The Facility Letter was considered and the board confirmed its full understanding of the effect and implications for the Company of the Facility Letter. It was resolved that the offer of the loan facility be accepted with all the Terms and Conditions as documented in the Facility Letter (including the Standard Terms and Conditions and any Special Conditions, and any requirement to give security for the loan facility, and that Kate White (CEO) and Tony Bonnar (Head of Finance) are authorised and instructed to accept and execute the Facility Letter in accordance with the bank mandate, together with any related documentation.

3. The directors confirmed and resolved that all banking facilities and arrangements documented in the Facility Letter are and will be conducted in accordance with the Company's memorandum and articles of association (its "Constitution"), together with all other relevant legislation and regulations. It was resolved that acceptance of the loan facility documented in the Facility Letter promotes the purposes and success of the Company for the benefit of its members as a whole and the directors have taken into consideration all of the factors listed in sections 171 to 177 of the Companies Act 2006.

4. Prior to passing the above resolutions all directors interested in the above transactions with the Company disclosed their interest (if any) and any conflict(s) of interest including potential conflict(s) of interest were approved where necessary in accordance with the Constitution of the Company and the Companies Act 2006 (in particular sections 177 and 182).

7.4.1 The 2 resolutions were approved and passed by the Board.

7.5 Thomas and Craig both thanked Tony and his team for their hard work.

8. Audit Committee

8.1 The Audit Committee met on 13th October.

8.2 Thomas confirmed that our external audit had gone well and we received a clean audit report from Moore Kingston Smith with no issues raised. They commented that the process had been well run with far fewer post period adjustments than in previous years and that our management accounts now show more consistency with our financial statements (statutory accounts) which makes everything far clearer.

8.3 The one outstanding task which will complete the external audit is the going concern assessment which looks forward 12 months to 31st October 2021. However MKS expect to issue an unqualified audit opinion (once minor adjustments have been made and the going concern assessment is complete). Thomas felt satisfied that given the ACE funding and CBILS facility we will have capacity to continue delivering on our mandate and will be in a far stronger financial position than expected and therefore is happy to sign off on the going concern principles. The Board agreed.

8.4 It was agreed that the Board (Audit Committee and Finance Committee, per below) should have additional contact with Tony to stay up to date with issues relevant to the financial stability of the organization, such as changes to C-19 guidelines and government funding and strategy, considering the ever-changing situation with CDD. William proposed that, with the increase in discussions about the future of CDD and therefore our own future, there will need to be additional trustee focus on supporting the senior team as we enter a period of transition.

8.5 Craig suggested that members of the Audit and Finance Committees stay in contact with Tony and the senior team for updates on the new budget prior to 'year-end', rather than wait until the next round of quarterly meetings in the New Year. Kate reported that we will be required to produce a new draft strategic business plan for ACE before the end of the year. Trustees will be invited to participate in a discussion about the new strategy and to support decisions regarding the new strategy over the coming months. Kate and Ali will be setting up some conversations with the trustees to discuss strategy (including fundraising strategy) and how we plan to move forward with the work that has come out of the McKinsey project.

8.6 Thomas reported that our internal audit on schools based assurance also produced a clean audit report.

8.7 The new Safeguarding Policy received the Audit Committee's approval, following a small number of minor adjustments. The policy was formally approved by the Board.

8.8 The Audit Committee presented to the Board the Trustee Report and Financial Statements for approval. The Trustee Report and Financial Statements were formally approved.

8.9 It was agreed that the Letters of Representation and Letter of Comfort will be signed by Craig and Thomas directly after this meeting.

9. Departmental Reports

9.1 Froniga reported that she feels confident that all of the physical C-19 protocols we now have in place are safe and well researched. The final group of staff members on furlough will be returning to work after the half term break.

9.2 Glen and his team welcomed the positive interaction with the other departments to prepare for the new ways of teaching and learning at the start of the new term. He feels there is certainly still a need for investment in terms of online teaching, training and digital learning. The ACE funding will help us develop this work as we go forward into what will inevitably be a very different future. We have recognized that digital skills are

- definitely something that will become a permanent part of our new and ongoing teaching strategy and teacher support programme.
- 9.3 In answer to Rob's question Glen and Adrian confirmed that the notion of 'teaching without touch' is being embraced across the programme.
- 9.4 Adrian reported that our students' mental health and wellbeing continue to be high on the agenda and that we are constantly reviewing how we can address and improve our student support. We are in touch with schools in FEDEC and within CDD and continue to share information and experiences with them which is proving really helpful. Our Support through Studies Plan has a very structured approach which allows everyone to work within a well-managed framework both in terms of what we are able to deliver and what we expect from the students.
- 9.5 Adrian reminded the trustees that we are looking for mentors for the students' Business Plan module which starts in the spring term. A more formal email request has been circulated.
- 9.6 William followed up his written report with a verbal update on the current situation at CDD. Since the circulation of his report it has become clear that both the Chair and CEO of CDD have recognized that CDD as an organization is no longer viable. This means that the focus now will be on the transition to whatever future the remaining affiliates choose for their higher education provision, be that self-registration or new partnerships. We intend to meet with the Office for Students (OfS) on Friday (23/10) and assuming we want to continue as higher education providers (it was agreed that we do), to propose in principle that we, with the support of our trustees, continue to look at becoming a registered higher education provider.
- 9.7 Kate explained that we are also considering the option of partnering with another higher education provider, a larger university such as University of Kent or another specialist institution such as Northern School of Contemporary Dance or RADA, both of whom have expressed an interest in developing partnerships with us. Other non-CDD organisations such as Royal Central School of Speech and Drama and Guildhall School of Music and Drama are also interested in circus and have shown an interest in creating potential partnerships.
- 9.8 We are also considering working in partnership with another organization but within a shared services model. We need to consider all of these options and the potential restrictions and benefits of each. William assured the trustees that whilst we have no difficulty demonstrating that we can provide the right academic support to be a registered institution, what is critical is financial security and viability. We cannot rely on another institution to support us financially and the question of whether we are viable will be key for any potential partnering organization. We need to continue to explore each of the different options over the coming weeks but at this stage we require the support of the Board to begin to look at what it would mean to operate under our own registration.
- 9.8.1 It was agreed that every option should be carefully considered including that of self-registration.
- 9.8.2 Bill thanked Kate and William for their ongoing work and for the coverage they have provided on the situation.
- 9.8.3 William confirmed that the major change will take place in 2023 but that we need to have a clear solution in place by the first quarter of next year.
- 9.8.4 We are still awaiting a decision concerning the distribution of CDD reserves.
- 9.9 William proposed that a committee be created to be involved in email updates and telephone discussions 'around the knottier issues' when required. Rob, Bill, Craig, Cameron and Ali all formally voiced their support.

10. AOB

- 10.1 There was no other business.

11. Formal appointment of Chair

11.1 Ali will continue to meet with Trustees over the coming weeks and plans to have met up with everyone before the end of the year. She is looking forward to supporting Kate in moving the organization forward and to the new challenges that lay ahead. Ali congratulated Kate and the team and thanked Craig for his ongoing support.

11.2 Ali was formally appointed as Chair of the Board of Trustees.

12. Trustee only session.

12.1 Kate and the senior team left the meeting.

Date of next meeting – Tuesday 9 February 2021

**National Centre for Circus Arts
Coronet Street, London N1 6HD**

**MINUTES – RAN
6.30pm Tuesday 12th January 2021**

(The meeting took place by zoom)

In attendance: Kate White, CEO
Froniga Lambert, COO
Sharon Harble, EA to the CEO (Minutes)

Trustees: Bill Morris (Chair)
Alison King
Lesley Strachan
Kate Cavelle
Paul Steggall

1. Apologies

1.1 Apologies were received from Betsy Lynch.

2. Minutes of the last meeting held – *for approval*

2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting (29th September '20) were approved.

3. Matter arising (not elsewhere on the agenda)

3.1 It was noted at the last meeting that we have always had representation from UBS on our board and it is hoped that our relationship with them will continue after Craig steps down. UBS have supported us in various ways over the years, from providing office space to mentoring students through their business planning. Kate W confirmed that she will be speaking with Craig about how we might be able to keep the connection going and also with Nick Wright, Managing Director for Corporate Responsibility & Community Affairs at UBS, about any recommendations he may have.

4. Subcommittee members to be ratified

4.1 Bill and Lesley welcomed the new members of the committee, Paul, Betsy (in absentia), Kate C and Ali to the meeting.

4.2 Paul asked Bill whether he (as the new RAN chair) could offer a sense of what his expectations of the committee are likely to be. Bill replied that he felt that the RAN agenda will certainly be affected by the wider COVID-19 situation and how it affects us directly, as well as the ongoing changes within CDD and our own organisational changes. Kate W suggested that in addition to the more general governance and senior staff recruitment she will also be looking to the committee for support in assuring we are able to meet the requirements for the Arts Council England's Creative Case for Diversity initiative, and with the organisational changes following on from the McKinsey work that was started back in 2019.

4.3 Kate W informed the committee that she is currently aware of and worried about the levels of stress and anxiety amongst the wider staff team, which are clearly higher now than they have been since the start of the pandemic and asked for any thoughts or practical advice from the committee on how best to support the staff. Kate explained that the decision to close the building, despite one of the government exemptions being to allow professional artists to train and rehearse, was taken due to the fact that most of our front line staff felt very uneasy about travelling in London and being in the building with others and that at the time we

simply did not have sufficient numbers of fully trained staff available to open the building to allow this relatively small group of users to train.

Kate is aware of the lobbying is currently taking place among performing arts students which may lead to us having to reopen the building and she is concerned about how we will be able to support and reassure staff when the time comes for us to ask them to come back into the building.

TO BE DISCUSSED FURTHER UNDER ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA.

- 4.4 Ali felt confident that having 'repopulated' the various committees, all of the committee meetings should now be well attended and work efficiently. She reminded the group that Kate C will be acting as vice chair of the RAN Committee to provide support for Bill when he is travelling. Ali will also be looking to introduce a vice chair to the board in due course (to be revisited in the spring).
- 4.5 Froniga reminded the new members of the committee that we retain an HR facility with employment law specialists LexLeyton, who have been supporting us over the past two years and proved a valuable asset.
- 4.6 Paul asked whether board effectiveness and the relationship with the executive committee sits within the RAN agenda. Froniga confirmed that in the formal governance structure board effectiveness sits within the Audit Committee's agenda and is reviewed annually. However this subject has in the past tended to be discussed from a different perspective and in greater detail by the RAN Committee and the feeling is that RAN will continue to address the people management and "soft skills" aspects of Board effectiveness whilst the Audit Committee will oversee constitutional and financial roles.
- 4.7 It was noted that Kate C will be happy to share her organisation's information on Diversity and Inclusion if needed.
- 4.8 Bill will be happy to have 1 – 1 meetings with fellow committee members outside of this meeting to discuss any issues, governance or otherwise.

5. COVID-19 Update

- 5.1 Kate W reported that we are seeing a lot more understanding and acceptance now from students about the reasons for online learning and have plans in place to continue 100% online learning until the February half term and if necessary until Easter.
- 5.2 Some staff members have been 're-furloughed', some full time and some part time.
- 5.3 By the time we reopen the building (whenever that may be) we will have reviewed all of our safety procedures to ensure that everyone is and feels safe in the building but the issue of how to help everyone feel safe travelling to and from the building remains an issue. The group agreed that if it is possible for staff to continue working from home then this should continue for as long as possible. Ali suggested looking at the cost implications of alternative travel arrangements for staff where possible. Kate C offered to put her organisation's office manager in touch with Kate W to talk about how we can ensure the building is safe. Kate W reiterated that we are confident about the way we run the building and interact with our participants and that the concern is more to do with how we ask staff to do something that clearly frightens them i.e. travel to work now that the risk has increased so severely. Kate C will look at and pass on the messaging her organisation used in the previous lockdowns. Bill agreed that he too has noticed an increased level of anxiety among his colleagues and connections.
- 5.4 In terms of the vaccination programme, things are still very unclear as to whether the lateral flow testing will be made mandatory, subsidised or even how useful it is. Questions around vaccinations continue to be raised with the DoFE and the debate continues about whether teachers and university staff should be moved up the priority list for vaccinations.
- 5.5 Kate W reiterated that she feels we were right in our decision to close the building in January. We received a fair amount of adverse feedback from many of our professional users who felt that their wellbeing was not being considered by us by

not allowing them to train however Kate felt able to respond that her decision was justified and reasonable.

- 5.6 We are aware that two other CDD schools are still open in order to provide access to studio or library facilities for a small number of specific students. We are not making this facility available but our degree team are happy with the levels of support we are providing.
- 5.7 Lesley suggested we wait and see how the situation changes over the coming weeks rather than try to plan for every eventuality. In the meantime she will forward any useful or relevant information or advice to Kate as and when she receives it. Ali suggested that hopefully the mood of the nation will change as things improve and infection rates come down and that in the meantime we ought to be thinking about increased testing as a form of support for staff when we start to think about asking them to return to work.
- 5.8 Ali reassured Kate that we are not alone in the difficulties and decisions we are facing, that the government have shifted the responsibility on to arts organisations by allowing them to open for training and rehearsals and by doing so have compounded the problem.
- 5.9 Bill asked whether the underlying financial position of the business is such that it can support us through the coming months and how measures such as the Cultural Recovery Fund and Job Retention Scheme will continue to support us through the current lockdown and beyond. Froniga confirmed that the ACE recovery funding has been a huge support and has enabled us to provide additional IT equipment for people to use at home. We are also continuing to access the JRS and still have some staff members on reduced hours or full furlough. Kate confirmed that there is also a second round of ACE recovery funding for which we intend to apply. We are able to apply for 50% of any funding we have already received. We are looking at the forecast and at the shortfall between deficit and expenditure beyond March and also at installing flooring and toilets in the courtyard and inside the combustion chamber and at increasing our broadband capacity, all of which will make us a more desirable prospect for hirers when that time comes later in the year (hopefully), and longer term. With all of this in mind, Kate praised the wider staff team who have shown a flexibility and keenness to adapt in the face of this adversity and to see the wider and longer picture in such a positive way. Kate added that by moving some people into new roles within the new structure, we have been able to deliver work in new and different (and better) ways. By doing this we are confident that we will not be facing the prospect of any redundancies for at least the next 6 months.
- 5.10 In response to Bill's question about whether there have been any particular incidents related to COVID-19 that the committee ought to be aware of, Kate confirmed that one of the biggest issues we are facing is that of some staff having to deliver home schooling for their own children. In terms of sickness, we have had only one case of COVID-19 among the staff team (Adrian). Bill wished Adrian a speedy recovery on behalf of the committee.
- 5.11 Bill thanked Kate on behalf of the committee and asked her to forward their good wishes and praise on to the wider staff team.

6. Update on organizational proposals

- 6.1 Kate reported that Glen took up the role of Director of Professional Development in November. The new Head of Professional Development (Beth King) is responsible for the degree productions and the oversight of the widening participation and outreach provision. Kate, Glen and Beth are currently working on the job descriptions for the two other widening participation and access roles and in due course will be looking at how best to staff the adult recreational provision, which is currently on hold. Ben Wallace who manages our Open Training professionals is still with us while he waits to be able to return to Australia. Rather than recruit someone into this role immediately, we intend to bring back existing members of staff who

are currently furloughed for an interim period while we create the structure of the new commercial directorate.

6.1.1 Paul asked whether the calibre of candidates applying for new roles recently had been noticeably higher with so many more people having been made redundant and whether we had considered taking a more ruthless approach towards our recruitment process in future. Kate replied that we hadn't been particularly inundated by qualified or overqualified applicants for the Development Manager role, although the individual we engaged was extremely impressive and we're looking forward to her joining us in February. However we did receive well over 200 applications for the CSA role partly due to the closure of so many box offices and similar arts organisations, although the fact that the majority of applicants were either hugely underqualified or overqualified, meant that they were nearly all completely unsuitable for the role. We may find that there is a larger pool of talent available when the time comes to fill the new roles within the commercial directorate in the spring.

6.2 Froniga confirmed that many of the savings identified by McKinsey as part of the organisational restructure have been realised through natural wastage and by not recruiting the third director role. Some of the changes originally suggested by McKinsey were too drastic to be practical or workable but we have now reached a more realistic point from which to move forward, with the right staff in place to be able to deliver the plan.

7. AOB

7.1 Kate C offered to meet with Kate W and Froniga to talk about Diversity and Inclusion, wellbeing and culture change.

7.2 Kate W thanked the trustees for their support, particularly in the decision to close the building.

7.3 Kate C asked whether there was anything the trustees could do to communicate their support to the wider staff team. Bill and Ali agreed that it would be useful and positive for the trustees to show their support either in a written communication or zoom. Conversations will continue outside of this meeting.

Next meeting: Tuesday 23rd March 2021

RAN ACTION TRACKER (AS OF JANUARY 2021)

Description	Action	Owner	Date raised	Date due	Status
Allocating trustees to sub committees.	Froniga to start to compile a skills audit before the board meeting so that an initial discussion can take place about the roles we need to fill.	Froniga	29.09.20	20.10.20	Complete. New committee members to be ratified at the beginning of each subcommittee meeting then acknowledged and formalised in the minutes at the next board meeting in Feb '21.
We have always had representation from UBS on our board. It is hoped that this will continue.	Craig will speak to UBS colleagues.	Craig/Kate	29.09.20	January '21	Ongoing. Kate will be speaking with Craig about this in due course, also with Nick Wright, Managing Director for Corporate Responsibility & Community Affairs at UBS.
Director of Professional Development interviews	Panel and dates to be agreed.	Kate	29.09.20	October '20	Complete. Glen Stewart took up the role of Director of Professional Development in November.

National Centre for Circus Arts
MINUTES – AUDIT COMMITTEE
NCCA, Coronet Street, London N1 6HD
6.30pm Tuesday 19th January 2021
(Meeting took place by zoom)

In attendance: Thomas Nowacki (Chair)
Tuikku Aviitala (Trustee)
Tarun Nagpal (Trustee)
Sue James (Trustee)
Kate White (CEO)
Froniga Lambert, COO
Sharon Harble, EA to the CEO (Minutes)

Thomas welcomed new committee members, Sue and Tarun to the meeting. The committee's official Terms of Reference were shared on screen. Thomas clarified that the general role of the Audit Committee is to identify potential risks and to help the senior management team to make effective decisions in order to mitigate them. More specifically the Audit Committee is responsible for reviewing the Financial Statements, monitoring any incidents of whistle blowing and interacting with the organisation's internal and external auditors. (See item 8 of the agenda).

1. Apologies

1.1 Apologies were received from William Underhill.

2. Minutes of the last meeting

2.1 The minutes of the Audit Committee meeting on 13th October 2020 were approved.

3. Action Log

3.1 Thomas had suggested that members of the Audit and Finance Committees should be maintaining a regular dialogue with Tony to stay up to date with issues relevant to the financial stability of the organization, such as changes to C-19 guidelines and government funding and the ever-changing situation with CDD. William suggested forming a separate 'trustee steering group' who would focus on movements and changes within CDD and report back on these to the trustees to ensure they are providing full and constant support to the Senior Management Team.

PREVIOUS ACTION REQUIRED (13/10/20) - For discussion at the Board meeting on 20th October.

UPDATE (19/1/21) – A Strategy Group has been created comprising Ali, Thomas, Sue and Cameron.

3.2 Loan Agreement - Both Tony and James thought that the loan agreement between NCCA and Circus Space Property dated April 1998 to fund the development of Coronet Street seemed very superficial and needed a review from both legal and tax perspectives. Froniga investigated the VAT status of the NCCA companies which requires an understanding of the original rationale for the corporate structure. A search for the original paperwork relating to the funding of the property development and the corporate structure took place so this can be understood and properly reviewed.

PREVIOUS ACTION (13/10/20) – The search will continue for the original paperwork relating to the funding of the property development and the corporate structure so that the loan agreement between NCCA and CSP can be understood and properly reviewed.

UPDATE (19/1/21) - The search for the original paperwork has so far proved inconclusive. Tony has instructed Slaughter & May to make adjustments to our current agreement.

- 3.3 Gift Aid – this year’s audit report (page 6) states “There is a risk that Gift Aid payment of Circus Space Events Ltd and Circus Space Property Ltd profits to National Centre for Circus Arts is made after the year end date”. MKS have confirmed that “the rules for Corporate Gift Aid were adhered to in relation to the distribution of 2018/19 profits from the trading subsidiaries to National Centre for Circus Arts”. However there remains a risk that the subsidiaries may not have the funds to make full payment before the HMRC deadline in the future. William will discuss with Tony outside of this meeting. The risk will be managed and monitored.

PREVIOUS ACTION (19/10.20) - Report back to committee on any required changes to mitigate the risk of not being able to transfer Gift Aid from CSR and CSP to NCCA.

UPDATE (19/01/21) – Tony is still in conversation with MKS.

4. COVID-19 operational impact & mitigations

- 4.1 Kate reported that we reopened the building after the Christmas break on 4th January but closed it again on the 5th January following the broadcast by the PM which warned of an increase in risk from the new strain of COVID-19 and advised people to work from home if possible. The government guidance does allow us to be open for the purpose of training and rehearsals, but with levels of anxiety among staff increasing and the increased risk from COVID-19 particularly in London, the decision was taken to keep the building closed, despite adverse feedback from many of our professional users who felt that their wellbeing was not being considered by not allowing them to train. Kate felt able to respond that to expect staff to travel into London with cases of COVID-19 rising at that time would be unreasonable however she assured them that we would keep the matter under review. These decisions were clearly supported by our Chair and our trustees.
- 4.2 The delivery of the degree programme continues online for the time being. We are seeing far more understanding and acceptance from students about the reasons for online learning and we have plans in place to continue 100% online learning until the February half term or if necessary until Easter.
- 4.3 We have rearranged our teaching schedule to enable creative work that is not discipline specific to take place sooner and have moved the majority of our discipline specific training to term 3. We hope to be able to return to the building after Easter so that more discipline training can continue.
- 4.4 With only a limited number of staff fully trained and equipped to open and run the building, we are hoping that with the gradual increase in the roll-out of the vaccine and decrease in new cases, by the time we can reopen staff will feel less anxious and more confident about travelling to and from the building. We may need to look at how we can provide support for those members of staff on whom we rely to run the building day to day so that they are not having to use public transport.
- 4.5 Kate confirmed that the majority of students are keen to get back into the building once it is safe for them to do so. If any student were to feel uneasy about coming in we would be obliged to provide online learning for them – for which we are fully prepared.
- 4.6 In terms of the vaccination programme, things are still very unclear as to whether lateral flow testing will be made mandatory, subsidised or even how useful it is. Questions around vaccinations and the cost implications involved continue to be raised with the

- DofE. The cost implication at the moment would be £40 per test. The Department of Health and Social Care is currently recommending that students are tested before they return after Easter but haven't yet committed to supporting this financially.
- 4.7 Froniga is in regular contact with the University of London and their partner institutions as we continue to await a firm decision and further information on costs and potential funding opportunities to support these costs.
- 4.8 There are a number of local authority testing sites in Hackney. When we reopen we may ask that our professional users provide negative test results before allowing them access to the building as an added layer of security.
- 4.9 We are currently anticipating a blended model of learning with some 'face to face' training and some online training after Easter. We hope to be able to use the courtyard as an additional outdoor training space and are currently putting together a funding application to support this.
- 4.10 How to keep individuals motivated who have been on furlough or flexi furlough since last March remains an issue. Likewise keeping our LYC students and young people engaged online will be a challenge the longer the need for it continues.
- 4.11 Kate confirmed that we have had only 2 positive cases of COVID-19 within our community but that thankfully these were not serious cases and the individuals have recovered fairly quickly.

5. Impact of Brexit

- 5.1 Kate reported that the main impact from Brexit so far has been from the government U turn on the Erasmus funding programme. We were the lead organization for an Erasmus funded project within the FEDEC however following the U turn we have now been withdrawn as one of the lead partners. We are still likely to see some benefit from the project, but we will lose out in terms of other Erasmus funded opportunities e.g. staff and student exchanges across Europe which have been hugely beneficial to us in the past.
- 5.2 Our student application numbers are currently at the same level as last year. Our audition process has been moved online which hopefully will not have a significant impact on numbers. However, EU students will now no longer be able to access the Students Loan Company support that was available in the UK through the Office for Students' so we will become a more expensive option. We have reflected this in our financial forecasting by reducing our expectation of EU and International students over the next 5 years, although numbers of US students could increase.
- 5.3 While there is likely to be an impact on the timing of larger scale touring shows and access to the EU, the main focus for the sector over the past year has been on COVID-19 rather than Brexit.

6. Update on CDD

- 6.1 We have created a working group, the HE Support Group, who are supporting the decisions and processes as we work towards self-registration. The group is chaired by William Underhill and comprises trustees Bill Morris, Ali King, Rob West and Cameron Brookhouse as well as our consultants Hugh and Anna (and Kate).
- 6.2 CDD's CEO is currently working notice. Their current Registrar has taken over the role of Accountable Officer and is now moving the transition project forward. The Chair of CDD's Board of trustees stepped down at the end of 2020 and one of their senior trustees has stepped into that role until CDD winds down.

- 6.3 All 6 remaining schools have created their exit plans and 5 year forecasts. The notional date for transition is 2023 by which time we will either have achieved self-registration status or be working in partnership with another HE provider. Ideally all the schools will leave CDD at the same time and this is the plan we are all currently working towards.
- 6.4 Our Plan A is to apply for self-registration. Our Plan B is to re-apply for self-registration and our Plan C is to partner with another HE provider. Our application for self-registration is likely to be ready for submission by April/May '21. William will provide an update on progress at the next Board meeting on 9th February.

7. Risk Register review

- 7.1 An up to date copy of the Risk Register was shared on screen.
- 7.2 The Risk Register is a useful management tool that we update and refer to regularly and which helps us to focus on particular areas of concern. It is important to note that it is a live document. It works well and the formatting makes it a useful device to refer to and check in with as we update it with actions and plans for the mitigation of key risks. The Risk Register is constantly evolving and the Audit Committee reviews the document annually.
- 7.3 Froniga confirmed that risks around COVID-19 and CDD have been added since the last review and mitigations such as the ACE Cultural Recovery Fund have been included.
- 7.4 IT systems – Froniga confirmed that since changing to our new outsource service provider SpirIT, some of our more aged applications have been identified as being incompatible with our server. We now have a plan in place to make incremental updates to our older systems and to replace our current finance system (Sage) with a newer more robust version of Sage or a better alternative if we feel this would be more beneficial. SpirIT have been extremely helpful, efficient and responsive, particularly with our move to remote working over the past year. It was noted that the impact from a potential cyber breach or data loss will remain a fairly key risk until all of the issues have been addressed fully.
- 7.5 Recruitment/Salaries - Thomas asked whether we have any key concerns about salary levels and our ability to attract a high enough calibre of candidate for new roles. Kate agreed that we do have concerns about salary levels, our salary levels are low. We are increasingly trying to ensure we are recruiting people on salaries that are appropriate for the work they are doing and to maintain equitable levels throughout the organization as we move forward with the McKinsey work.
- 7.6 Negative stories in the press – Thomas suggested we ought to think through our strategy to respond to a negative story. Kate confirmed that this is already covered in our Business Continuity Plan (previously the Disaster Recovery Plan). Our Business Continuity Plan is available to be viewed on our central shared hub along with our other procedures and strategies. Tarun suggested it would be useful to see some of the procedures and strategies. Trustees are welcome to ask to see copies of these and should contact Froniga should they wish to do so.
- 7.7 It was noted that GDPR and other laws around data protection were adopted and implemented into UK legislation before Brexit so are still relevant to us.

ACTION REQUIRED (19/01/21) - *Froniga to reassess post-mitigation impact scores for some risks e.g. physical accident, and update register accordingly.

8. New Committee members to be ratified

8.1 New members Sue, Tarun were welcomed again to the committee. New members will be formally ratified at the next Board meeting.

9. AOB

9.1 There have been no Whistle Blowing incidents since the last meeting of the committee.

10. Date of next meeting:

10.1 The next meeting of the Audit Committee will take place on 20 April 2021.

AUDIT ACTION TRACKER (AS OF JANUARY 2021)

<u>Description</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Date raised</u>	<u>Date due</u>	<u>Status</u>
How can the trustees support the Senior Management Team more effectively – more regular conversations with Tony, possibly forming a 'trustee steering group' to feed updates on strategy & finance back to the trustees on an ongoing basis.	For discussion at the Board meeting 20 October	Thomas / William	13.10.20	20.10.20	Complete. A Strategy Group has been created comprising Ali, Thomas, Sue and Cameron.
Loan Agreement - Both Tony and James thought the loan agreement between NCCA and Circus Space Property dated April 1998 to fund the development of Coronet Street seemed very superficial and needed a review from both legal and tax perspectives.	Update the loan agreement between NCCA and CSP	Tony/Froniga	13.10.20	For follow up at next Audit Committee meeting 19.01.21	The search for the original paperwork has so far proved inconclusive. Tony has instructed Slaughter & May to make adjustments to our current agreement. Ongoing.
Gift Aid - There remains a risk that the subsidiaries may not have the funds to make full payment before the HMRC deadline in the future. William will discuss with Tony outside of this meeting. The risk will be managed and monitored.	Report back to committee on any required changes to mitigate the risk of not being able to transfer Gift Aid from CSR and CSP to NCCA	Tony	13.10.20	For follow up at next Audit Committee meeting 19.01.21	Tony is still in conversation with MKS. Ongoing.
CDD Accountability Return	Kate and Thomas to sign and forward the CDD Accountability return to CDD	Kate/Thomas	13.10.20	Within the deadline 26.10.20	Complete.
Risk Register	Froniga to reassess post-mitigation impact scores for some risks e.g. physical accident, and update register accordingly.	Froniga	19.01.21	Immediately	This action was completed soon after the meeting.

National Centre for Circus Arts
NCCA, Coronet Street, London N1 6HD
MINUTES – FINANCE COMMITTEE
6.30pm Tuesday 26th January 2021
(By Zoom)

Chaired by: Craig Calvert
Attendees: Darshak Shah
David Chinn
Rob West
Rachael Williams
Kate White (CEO)
Froniga Lambert (COO)
Tony Bonnar (Head of Finance)
Sharon Harble (EA to the CEO) Minutes

It was noted that this would be Craig's last meeting as Chair of the Finance Committee. Craig welcomed the new members of the committee informally to the meeting (see item 9).

1. Apologies

1.1 Apologies were received from Cameron Brookhouse ahead of the meeting. Ali King was due to attend the meeting as an observer but also sent her apologies.

2. Minutes of the last meeting and outstanding actions

2.1 One small adjustment to the minutes (12th October '20) was noted. An adjustment will be made prior to the Board meeting on 9th February. The minutes were approved in principle.

3. Action log

3.1 Loan Agreement between NCCA and Circus Space Property - Both Tony and our external auditor, MKS, had felt that the loan agreement between NCCA and Circus Space Property dated April 1998 to fund the development of Coronet Street seemed very superficial and needed a review from both legal and tax perspectives. Froniga investigated the VAT status of the NCCA companies which requires an understanding of the original rationale for the corporate structure. A search for the original paperwork relating to the funding of the property development and the corporate structure took place so this can be understood and properly reviewed however this search has so far proved inconclusive. Tony has instructed Slaughter & May to make adjustments to our current agreement.

4. Preliminary Q1 Management Accounts

4.1 Craig thanked Tony for having worked so relentlessly on the numerous documents for the committee despite obvious challenges on his time. Tony assured the committee that a full finance report will be provided in time for the board meeting on 9th February and talked the committee through the preliminary version of the Q1 Management Accounts.
4.1.1 The reported surplus of £176k is £94k improved on the budgeted surplus of

£82k. The headline explanations for the variances were highlighted:

		£'000s
Major Q1 Variances	<i>Degree ISTA Grant: Windfall</i>	13
	<i>Degree Fee Income: Student Numbers higher than Budget</i>	10
	<i>Delayed CRF Spend (see below)</i>	58
	<i>Marketing Costs not incurred</i>	7
	Total	88

Tony explained that whilst recording the CRF grant income in this quarter (despite the delay in some of the expenditure it is funding) complies with SORP and CDD's requirement, in our final internal reporting the related grant would be deferred to match the timing of the expenditure, reducing the variation to the budget to nearer £30k.

- 4.1.2 Rachael asked whether we had included an assumption in our figures for a potential payback to ACE for staffing or project underspend. Kate explained that we have informed ACE that some of our project spending has been pushed back to the next quarter and the detail around this has been provided as part of our round 2 application. Staffing was not specifically included in our first CRF application so should not prove an issue.
- 4.1.3 In answer to Rob's question pertaining to aged debtors, in particular students' debts, Tony assured the committee that overall our debt failure is negligible.
- 4.1.4 In answer to Darshak's question about holiday pay accrual, Tony explained that in terms of core staff our holiday pay accrual is growing (as shown on the balance sheet) due to the fact that no holiday is being taken. Darshak reminded the committee that annual leave can be taken during furlough and suggested that this might be something we would want to consider asking our staff to do in order to ease costs for the organisation, providing the statutory notice period is applied (the general notice period for taking leave being twice the holiday period plus 1 day). Froniga confirmed that the current furlough period is due to finish at the end of April '21. We will be ensuring that line managers do not allow staff to carry over more holiday than is allowed in our policy going forwards, will actively encourage staff to take holiday and will be clear that the organisation will not pay off unused holiday and that it will be lost if not used.

5. Forecast and cash flow

- 5.1 Our liquidity position is healthy currently, in large part as a result of the ACE emergency funding.
- 5.2 Tony referred the committee to the latest forecast for 2020-21 which predicts a £110k increase in the budgeted deficit of £94k to circa £200k. He explained that the gain in Degree from a higher number of students (62v57) and the ISTA 'windfall' from CDD (£93k in total) is offset by the impact on non HE activities due to the second lockdown and the unbudgeted cost of consultancy support for our move towards self-registration.

Our application for the second round of ACE Culture Recovery Funding (£233k) includes £158k in deficit funding which would directly reduce the forecast deficit. Our application is strong and adds to the offer of support we are making to the sector. It is impossible to know whether we will be successful, although we have had a good track record to date.

- 5.3 We are rebuilding a fundraising strategy to enable us to make applications to Trusts and Foundations for support that will sit alongside our existing regular donor funding and multi-year payments from organisations such as The Leverhulme Trust. However, very little fundraising proceeds are expected in the current financial year.
- 5.4 David reminded the committee that the forecast shows us ending the year with a sizeable deficit, with further deficits in future years. Kate referred the committee to the 5 year projection (to be discussed further under item 6), our plans to grow our student cohort numbers and planned increases in commercial and corporate activity. A huge amount of work has gone into diversifying our income strands over the past 2 years and while it does feel ambitious at a time when we are faced by so many other difficult challenges, we remain confident that our plans are achievable.
- 5.5 The Energy Centre remains closed. We have offered a 25% reduction in rent to our tenants throughout this current national lockdown period. Once the lockdown is lifted this will revert to 100%. Feedback so far has been positive. Craig felt this was a positive result.
- 5.6 Darshak asked whether there was any scope to defer or stop any activity in the short term e.g. in relation to our new and improved corporate workshops. Kate explained that our new corporate offer will be a blended model including some online delivery, very different from the product we have delivered in the past. It will allow us to be *more* flexible in our approach and to reach a wider market than before. By piloting the new product over the summer we will be 'ahead of the game' when the market picks up.
- 5.7 We will hear from ACE whether our latest application has been successful at the end of March.
- 5.8 Tony confirmed that we currently have no COVID-related deferred liabilities.

6. 5 Year forecast

- 6.1 Tony referred the committee to the 2020-25 Five Year Projection that has been a work in progress in its many and varied forms since the start of December, which he and the SMT have been working on for our use and also for CDD's Annual Report and financial forecasts for submission to the Office for Students on 1st February.
- 6.2 Tony talked through the key financial variables and key assumptions -

- The projected loss of ISTA i.e. the last year is assumed to be 2021-22
- The increase in student numbers to 90 over three years commencing from 2021-22
- The phasing in of the McKinsey commercial initiatives impacting Corporate Events, Corporate Workshops and Recreational Courses & Classes commencing 2021-22

and accompanying narrative - HE & Commercial Income Strategy (Enclosure 3c) - which highlights smart scheduling to maximize space availability, the management of increased student numbers, reduction to registration fees and increased commercial activity.

- 6.3 Craig thanked Tony for providing such a detailed and thorough set of reports.
- 6.4 Rob wondered whether, in these uncertain times, we ought to look at gala income more in terms of a bi-annual fundraising target rather than as a particular event. Kate explained that our new fundraising strategy will address this. There is definitely the

potential for us to build on and increase our fundraising capacity within the new structure.

- 6.5 It was noted that the 2% inflationary increase on ACE funding may not in fact come through given the backdrop.
- 6.6 David asked, if the Board does not approve the 2020-25 Business Plan, what our alternative will be to enable us to reach a zero deficit whilst still being able to deliver our core activities. Kate replied that we would need to start from scratch by deciding what our core activities are. Kate felt that it would be a huge ask for the team, having already worked so hard for so long, looking so far into the future to try and see how we can make things work long term, to expect them to revert back to looking at a shorter term plan. This would challenge our ability to remain a HE institution and result in us looking at the fundamental purpose of the organization. David felt that, whilst our current situation has largely been imposed upon us by COVID-19, in some ways signing off on a 5 year budget serves no purpose since we manage year to year. He suggested that we would be wise to consider putting some additional contingency plans in place and pending the decision by the Arts Council, that a conversation should take place to discuss what our priorities are and what our purpose is.
- 6.7 Kate reminded the committee that we have managed to not lose any members of staff from what is an extremely stretched team (notwithstanding the small amount of 'natural wastage' that has taken place). Were we to reshape our activity in such a severe way, we would need to reshape the organization accordingly.
- 6.8 Operating solely as a higher education provider would not be a viable option since this area of the organisation does not generate sufficient income by itself to cover the delivery of the programme. There have to be other activities to support the HE programme. An alternative would be to stop delivering higher education and become something altogether very different.
- 6.9 David asked where responsibility for the development or redevelopment of the HE programme sits. Kate explained that it sits with the Academic Board which in turn reports into our Board of Trustees via our quarterly board meetings. Any reshaping of HE activity would need to go through (currently) CDD and our validating body, University of Kent. Whilst we don't have an education sub-committee as such, we do have the HE Support Group, chaired by William Underhill and comprising trustees Bill Morris, Ali King, Rob West and Cameron Brookhouse as well as our consultants Hugh and Anna (and Kate), whose main focus at the moment is to support the decisions and processes as we work towards self-registration. The group in turn provides our board with a clear oversight of the changes that are happening within CDD and more widely, within Higher Education.
- 6.10 Rachael asked how the fundraising target in our projection and staff levels compare with targets achieved in previous years. Kate replied that the staff levels are similar but that her main concern is more with the changes in the fundraising landscape. Our new Development Manager will be joining us in February and we will also be bringing in someone to provide higher level support on a consultancy basis. That person will focus on strategy which in turn will be delivered by the Development Manager with support from specific members of the wider team. We have struggled in the past to find someone with quite the right level of experience to deliver our fundraising strategy successfully. Rachael agreed that finding the right level of experience is often tricky. The funding bodies themselves are also very unsure about what type of organisations and activity they want to support amid the current uncertain climate and beyond.

- 6.11 Darshak (referring back to the projection V8) felt that the growth gradient for our recreational and commercial activity (and possibly the start point) were potentially too aggressive and suggested creating an additional more tempered version. He would also be interested to see a version of the projection showing the downside scenario of an HE only organization against a pragmatic or realistic view of commercial and recreational activity, in order to provide the Board with more than one view of the 5 year plan.
- 6.12 Craig noted that one of the reasons the plan looked so aggressive is that the first year was hit by COVID and therefore the future should in part be looked at against a full pre-COVID year.
- 6.13 Craig suggested that the existing forecast be submitted to the Board on 9th February with a supporting narrative and that our plans and expectations for the next 5 years should be debated further, either at an away day or at committee, once the decision from ACE about the CRF is known and there was additional visibility more generally.
- 6.14 In answer to Rachael's question Kate confirmed that, were we to become an HE only organization we would no longer be in a position to hold NPO (National Portfolio Organisation) status and would therefore no longer be eligible to apply for the levels of ACE funding we currently receive.

7. COVID-19 update & mitigations

- 7.1 Kate reported that we reopened the building after the Christmas break on 4th January but closed it again on the 5th January following the broadcast by the PM which warned of an increase in risk from the new strain of COVID-19 and advised people to work from home if possible.
- 7.2 With only a limited number of staff fully trained and equipped to open and run the building, we are hoping that with the gradual increase in the roll-out of the vaccine and decrease in new cases, by the time we can reopen staff will feel less anxious and more confident about travelling to and from the building. We may look at how we can provide support for those members of staff on whom we rely to run the building day to day so that they are not having to use public transport, when the time comes.
- 7.3 The government guidance does allow us to be open for the purpose of training and rehearsals, but with levels of anxiety among staff increasing and the increased risk from COVID-19 particularly in London, the decision was taken to keep the building closed, despite adverse feedback from many of our professional users who felt that their wellbeing was not being considered by not allowing them to train. Kate felt able to respond that to expect staff to travel into London with cases of COVID-19 rising at that time would be unreasonable however she assured them that we would keep the matter under review.
- 7.4 The delivery of the degree programme continues online for the time being. We are seeing far more understanding and acceptance from students about the reasons for online learning and we have plans in place to continue 100% online learning until the February half term or if necessary until Easter. We have rearranged our teaching schedule to enable creative work that is not discipline specific to take place sooner and have moved the majority of our discipline specific training to term 3. We hope to be able to return to the building after Easter so that more discipline training can continue.
- 7.5 The delivery of our CAT and LYC programmes are continuing online.

7.6 Our Sensory Circus initiative has been launched online and will go live in a week's time. We are about to start selling our online juggling classes designed for parents with children at home.

7.7 Some staff members are back on flexi-furlough, only one individual is still on full furlough (and has been since last March). Everyone is extremely busy. Staff are continuing to show incredible resilience.

8. Cash management strategy (including CBILS loan facility)

8.1 CBILS facility - having hit various a number of obstacles Tony is continuing to work with Slaughter & May and Pinders to reach a favourable outcome. The search for key documentation required by Pinders to move forward continues.

8.2 We have activated our accounts with Scottish Widows and CAF Bank Ltd (Charities Aid Foundation) but are still holding circa £640k with the Cooperative Bank. In order to mitigate further risk (or at least spread the risk) we are considering engaging Flagstone Investment Management to act as our deposit aggregator as recommended by MKS. It was agreed that having our funds in a systemically important institution with an implicit government guarantee would be sensible. David was concerned from a due diligence perspective that research into Flagstone has not been sufficiently rigorous.

ACTIONS REQUIRED - *Darshak to make an informal enquiry to his friend at the Bank of England; *Tony to ask Flagstone for client references; *Craig to speak to the CFO at Money Supermarket (a shareholder in Flagstone). *All findings to be fed back to Tony and the committee.

8.3 Management Information System – our ACE Culture Recovery Funding includes £30k for the replacement/upgrade of our SAGE financial system. Tony is proposing that we move forward with plans for a replacement by the end of March. David suggested we speak to some organisations who have made similar transitions and wait until the completion of year end to make our transition to a new system.

ACTIONS REQUIRED - *Kate to double check the limits of the funding. *An update on progress will be prepared for the board meeting on 9th February.

9. New Committee members to be ratified

9.1 New members Rob West, Rachael Williams and Cameron Brookhouse (in absentia) were welcomed formally to the committee. New members will be formally ratified at the next Board meeting.

9.2 Kate thanked Craig for his support over the past 9 years.

9.3 Craig will step down formally as Chair of the Finance Committee at the Board meeting on 9th February.

10. AOB

10.1 There was no other business.

11. Date of next meeting

Next quarterly meeting – Tuesday 27th April 2021 (To be chaired by new committee chair, Darshak Shah).

FINANCE ACTION TRACKER (AS OF JANUARY 2021)

<u>Description</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Date raised</u>	<u>Date due</u>	<u>Status</u>
<p>Management Information System replacement/upgrade.</p> <p>Our ACE Culture Recovery Funding includes £30k for the replacement (and upgrade) of our SAGE financial system.</p>	<p>Kate to double check the limits of the funding.</p> <p>An update on progress will be prepared for the board meeting on 9th February.</p>	<p>Kate</p> <p>Tony</p>	<p>26.01.21</p> <p>26.01.21</p>	<p>09.02.21</p>	<p>For follow up at the board meeting on 9th February</p>
<p>Financial Services Compensation Scheme – need to determine whether deposits by our two trading subsidiaries would be covered by the scheme if the depositor failed.</p> <p>We have activated our accounts with Scottish Widows and CAF Bank Ltd (Charities Aid Foundation) but are still holding circa £640k with the Cooperative Bank. In order to mitigate further risk we are considering Flagstone’s deposit aggregator service.</p>	<p>Continue to seek clarification on this point.</p> <p>Darshak to make an informal enquiry to his friend at the Bank of England.</p> <p>Tony to ask Flagstone for client references.</p> <p>Craig to speak to the CFO at Money Supermarket.</p> <p>All findings to be fed back to Tony and the committee.</p>	<p>Tony</p> <p>Darshak</p> <p>Tony</p> <p>Craig</p>	<p>14.01.20</p> <p>26.01.21</p> <p>26.01.21</p> <p>26.01.21</p>	<p>In process</p>	<p>For follow up in due course</p>
<p>General reserves target</p>	<p>Determine the most effective way to calculate our target and to carry out a benchmarking exercise with other schools so that we can ensure that the target we are reporting is realistic.</p>	<p>Tony</p>	<p>14.01.20</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>For follow up at a later date</p>
<p>Reserves Policy position to be reported to the Finance Committee as part of each quarter’s Finance Report</p>	<p>Present the final draft of the policy at the next Finance Committee meeting (31 March ’20).</p>	<p>Tony</p>	<p>14.01.20</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>For follow up at a later date</p>
<p>Loan agreement between NCCA and Circus Space Property</p>	<p>Tony to create a flow diagram showing the quantum of money that flows between the 3 entities and to circulate it to the committee, showing where the VAT is triggered.</p> <p>Narrative to be provided for MKS’s Post Audit Management Report, linking this to the loan between NCCA and Circus Space Property as shown in the Trustees’ Report & Financial Statements</p>	<p>Tony</p>	<p>12.10.20</p>	<p>In process</p>	<p>The search for the original paperwork relating to the funding of the property development and the corporate structure has so far proved inconclusive. Tony has instructed Slaughter & May to make adjustments to our current agreement.</p>

Finance Update: Board Meeting 9th February 2021

Author: Tony Bonnar

Purpose: Information & discussion

1. Actual Results for Q1 and Forecast for the Year

The Q1 Finance Report is enclosed

2. 2020-25 Five Year Projection

At the beginning of December, we started working on this Projection based on two scenarios i.e. that NCCA is independently registered with the OfS:

- from August 2023...our lead assumption
- from August 2022...a fall back if working through CDD for a further year was not in our interest

Attached is a “Key Financials” schedule which summaries the headlines of our lead assumption, i.e. self-registration from August 2023, for easy reading. The full model has been shared and discussed with FSC Trustees and obviously am happy to send it to any other Trustee that has a more detailed interest.

In reality there is no huge difference (£35k) in the cumulative financial outcome from either self-registration date; the key financial variables are not so much about the move to self-registration but much more about common assumptions:

- The projected loss of ISTA i.e. the last year is assumed to be 2021-22 (next year)
- The increase in student numbers to 90 over three years commencing from 2021-22
- The phasing in of the McKinsey commercial initiatives impacting Corporate Events, Corporate Workshops and Recreational Courses & Classes commencing 2021-22

Both scenarios project two years of significant Deficits in 2021-22 and 2022-23 (combined range £300k to £350k), resulting in a low point year-end point in Liquidity and Free Reserves in the range £200k to £250k at July 2023. However, this is followed by two years of smaller Surpluses resulting in a cumulative Deficit of circa £100k over the next four years.

Whilst no year-end point at which we will need to draw on our CBILS facilities is projected, there may be in-year low point(s) that do and further modelling will be needed to determine this.

Having generated a base model, we have now started to “What If” and stress test.

We also used our lead model as the basis of three differing “Five Year Forecast” scenarios required by CDD for the Annual Report and Financial Forecasts they submitted to the OfS on 1st February.

3. CBILS Banking Facilities

Finalising our CBILS facilities hasn't gone anything like as well as expected because:

- Slaughters are having issues engaging Hackney on a legal agreement to waive their charge over Coronet Street in favour of the Co-operative Bank.
- We are having issues locating key legal documentation relating to the development of the Coronet Street site from the mid-1990s and physical searching is not helped by restricted building access. This documentation is required by the valuers (Pinders) appointed by the Bank.

The offers from the Co-operative Bank of CBILS facilities expired earlier in January although this shouldn't be an issue as the CBILS scheme has now been extended to 31st March 2021 and the Bank seem very onside with us. So, unless this date moves on again we have just less than 2 months to get this over the line.

4. Risk Management of "Free Funds"

We acted last year to spread our risk by moving £200k to Scottish Widows and £100k to CAF Bank; however, that still leaves us currently with substantial funds with the Co-operative Bank.

We are in the process of opening an account with "Flagstone", a deposit aggregator that MKS, our auditors, recommended. Conceptually this service is administratively attractive as a one Flagstone account provides a gateway to a wide range of finance institutions with whom we can then deposit our funds.

<https://www.flagstoneim.com/about-us/>

In terms of due diligence, apart from MKS, Craig has obtained very positive feedback from one of Flagstone's corporate shareholders in the financial services sector. Flagstone is not covered by the FSCS but our funds should be "in transit" only for a very short period and are routed through a Barclays trust account.

A Flagstone account should ensure that it is administratively feasible for us to place a maximum of £85k (FSCS limit) with multiple financial institutions; we clearly need to confirm the ultimate institution is covered by the scheme before we transfer deposit funds.

In terms of costs, my understanding is that any interest earned would be matched by Flagstone's charges in our current low rate economy; we do not earn any interest on free funds from the Co-operative.

To: **Trustees**

Update on the Conservatoire for Dance and Drama

This is an update for the Board on developments in relation to CDD and progress on our own direction of travel.

The Board is asked to decide whether we should continue to progress an application for self-registration or pursue another option for our HE activities.

Overview

CDD has a new Chair and its CEO has resigned. CDD accepts that it does not have a long term future and its efforts will now be concentrated on (a) achieving a smooth transition of its students to the Schools operating independently or (in the case of BOVTS) in partnership with another UWE and (b) ensuring that it remains in compliance with its regulatory obligations and protects the interests of its students during that process. This is an important and positive development that has given CDD and the Schools a clear objective with interests that are aligned.

CDD has established a Transition Project to develop and implement a Transition Plan.

The OfS has been kept informed of developments and remains supportive. It has not taken any steps to intervene although it is monitoring the situation closely and it is expecting to see progress on a transition plan shortly.

CDD Governance

The Chair of CDD, Caragh Merrick, has resigned. Julian Roskill, the Senior Independent Governor, has been appointed Chair and Louise Verrill, the Governor nominated by Rambert School of Ballet has been appointed Deputy Chair (a new role, designed to provide support for Julian during the transition process). Both have agreed to serve until the transition process is complete.

The CEO of CDD, David Reubain, has resigned as CEO and Accountable Officer, and will formally have ceased employment in March. He is no longer to play an active part in the running of CDD. Jill Leigh, the Academic Registrar, has been made Accountable Officer and Joseph Lowe, the FD, has been made Director of Finance and Operations. The CEO's functions are being undertaken by a combination of Jill, Joseph and Julian.

Transition Project

A proposal for the governance of the Transition Project has been produced. This is set out in the attached draft Project Initiation Document (this has not been formally adopted but the arrangements set out appear to be generally agreed). The essential elements are:

- Julian Roskill is Project Sponsor on behalf of CDD.
- Jill Leigh is Project Manager.
- A CDD Board Transition Committee (Independent Governors) will take decisions on behalf of CDD.
- A Transition Co-ordination Committee (CDD SMT and Principals and one member of the Board Transition Committee) will be the forum for Schools and CDD to discuss and agree transition issues.
- A Transition Planning Group (three School representatives) will have oversight on behalf of the Schools.

This structure is intended to give the Schools a strong voice in the management of the Project. The Transition Planning Group has indicated that it will keep Schools informed about the Project and

seek views from Schools through regular meetings (currently weekly) with the Principals and Nominated Governors.

OfS

KW and WU have attended two meetings with OfS, a roundtable with CDD and the other Schools on 23 October 2020 and a bilateral meeting, attended by KW and WU on 13 November 2020.

The OfS team has been cooperative and positive. They have confirmed that although we would be among the smallest registered HE providers that is not a bar to our registration.

The OfS wrote to us (and the other Schools) on 15 December 2020. The key points in the letter were:

- Schools may register without students, while they continue to rely on CDD's registration. The implications of this are not yet fully understood and we will be seeking clarification from OfS.
- In order to continue to charge fees at the higher level (above £6,000) an approved Access and Participation Plan will be required.
- A Quality and Standards Review will be required, although this may be on a streamlined basis given the track record of the Schools.
- It will be necessary to demonstrate that Condition B3 (successful outcomes for students) can be met.
- Fees will be capped at £9,000 unless and until we obtain a TEF award (the existing TEF award cannot be passported). As a new provider we will have to apply in our own right for a TEF award..

HE Support Group

The Committee constituted at the Board meeting on 20 October 2020, now known as the HE Support Group, has met three times.

Key decisions taken were:

- To appoint consultants Anna Verhamme and Hugh Jones (subject to approval of the financial terms by the Chairs of Finance and Audit Committees, which was subsequently obtained).
- To approve the CDD Compliance Manual

The cost of advice from Anna Verhamme and Hugh Jones will be a fixed fee of £28,902 plus VAT (£34,682). This fixed fee covers three phases: (1) Strategic options appraisal and OfS preparedness assessment (2) preparing and supporting application to the OfS, (3) support for quality and standards review and continued OfS registration.

The CDD Compliance Manual sets out the steps taken by the Schools and CDD to ensure compliance with the conditions of registration with OfS. It replaces the Operating and Finance Agreement that was intended to be entered into but was not agreed between CDD and the Schools. The Compliance Manual documents the existing procedures and is uncontroversial save for two new requirements: (a) each School to provide monthly financial information, and (b) each School to provide a letter of representation that confirms that it owes a duty of care to CDD to supply it with up to date, complete and accurate information. TB has agreed with CDD that we will commence providing the monthly financial information in March 2021. The letter of representation has been signed by AK. The HE Support Group met on 15 December 2020 to receive a presentation from Anna Verhamme and Hugh Jones on the options open to NCCA and the timeline to self-registration. The HE Support Group agreed that proceeding with our own registration was probably the best option at this stage. Doing so will not commit us for all time to remaining independent but would give us control over our

immediate future and would provide a sound basis for us to explore the possibility of a franchising or merger solution for the long term. However, the HE Support Group asked for an analysis of the options to be presented to the Board. A paper on the options prepared by Hugh Jones is included in the board pack.

The Board is asked to decide whether we should continue to progress an application for self-registration or pursue another option for our HE activities.

Exit Plan

We have submitted a draft Exit Plan to CDD. This is a work in progress and will be progressed in the coming weeks.

Annexures

Minutes of meetings of the HE Support Group on 12 November 2020 and 9 December 2020
Letter of representation provided to CDD in accordance with the CDD Compliance Manual
Strategic Options paper from Hugh Jones

Kate White
William Underhill
27 January 2021

Strategic options for HE: National Centre for Circus Arts

Introduction

The paper describes and appraises the strategic options open to the National Centre for Circus Arts (**NCCA** or **the Centre**) as it decides upon and implements its arrangements for continuing to provide higher education programmes after leaving the Conservatoire for Dance and Drama (**CDD**).

My analysis will consider the Centre's options using a range of models of partnership and collaborative provision, based upon established approaches within higher education, and including options identified in the discussion with some NCCA governors on 15 December 2020.

Established models: Validation; Franchising; Merger; Articulation

There are four standard models for collaboration within higher education.

- a. **Validation** is where a provider which has the power to award degrees – the validator – accredits another provider's programme(s) so that successful students are awarded a degree from the validating institution. Students are primarily registered, for funding purposes, with the teaching institution. Typically, this is used by specialist, new or alternative providers to access degree awards for their students whilst retaining autonomy. The validated institution must be registered with the Office for Students (**OfS**) if it wishes to enable its students to access Student Loans Company (**SLC**) funding for tuition fees and living costs.
- b. **Franchising** is where a provider pays another to deliver its courses on its behalf. Students are primarily registered, for funding purposes, with the franchising institution, not with the teaching institution. Typically, this is a mechanism used by universities to work with FE colleges to provide pre-university study: by creating a year 0 of a degree programme, students can access loans for costs and fees; and FE colleges can provide a good transition from school to university.
- c. **Merger** is where two providers become, legally, one body. Often this is a larger provider which incorporates a smaller one, enabling the activity at the smaller to continue, albeit sometimes under a different name. Examples include the Royal Welsh School of Music and Drama becoming legally part of the University of South Wales; or the Institute of Education becoming part of University College London.
- d. **Articulation** is where study at one provider is judged as equivalent to study at another. This is most often used in transnational education, for example where study at a university in another country can be articulated as the equivalent of year 1 at a UK university. This is sometimes referred to as 2+2 arrangements, and enables students to study in the UK more economically

than it would cost to do a full three-year undergraduate programme at a UK university.

In discussion another possible future was identified: a merger with one or more complementary bodies, which may or may not be in the HE sector, for reasons of cultural or geographical affinity.

Articulation is not relevant for the situation in which the Centre finds itself, so I will limit the analysis to the first three options, and the extra-HE-sector merger possibility. I will also include 'do nothing' as an option: it is clearly untenable, but provides a useful base from which to understand the costs and benefits of the other options.

The options under consideration are therefore:

- e. Do nothing
- f. Validation with OfS registration
- g. A franchise agreement with an established university
- h. Merger with a large university
- i. Merger with complementary organisations

For each option I will provide an analysis of the option and its impact on the Centre, including an analysis against the five criteria identified in discussion with the governors: autonomy, revenue, cost, funding/capital and time.

Do nothing

Under this option, the Centre would cease to be a member of CDD when CDD winds up – currently July 2023. At that point, the Centre would cease to be part of an organisation registered with the OfS, and accordingly its students would no longer be eligible to receive loans from the SLC to pay tuition fees or contribute to their living costs. The provisions of the CDD Student Protection Plan would be triggered, potentially resulting in students leaving the Centre to complete their studies elsewhere, and/or refunds and compensation being paid by the Centre to students who were registered at that time. The Centre's programmes would still be validated by University of Kent. The Centre would be able to charge fees to students but these would need to be privately funded by the students. The Centre would not be eligible to recruit through UCAS.

This is very unlikely to be a viable business model for the school. Providers outside the established HE sector find that there is only a very small and shrinking pool of students who do not prefer to enrol at an institution which enables them to access SLC funding.

Analysing the option against the five criteria:

Autonomy	-	In the strictest sense, the Centre will be autonomous, but it will be a powerless autonomy which gives the Centre no positive choices.
Revenue	-	The only revenue sources would be privately funded students: experience elsewhere suggests that this is not a viable option.
Cost	-	The option would entail the costs of closure
Funding/Capital	-	The option would not open up any new sources of capital funding
Time	-	On current plans, the CDD will be wound up in July 2023

In summary:

Benefits of doing nothing	Costs of doing nothing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of business model • Inability to deliver programmes to registered students • Likely institutional closure

Validation

Under this option:

- j. The Centre would seek independent registration with the Office for Students (**OfS**) as an approved (fee cap) provider
- k. The Centre would continue to have its programmes validated by the University of Kent as leading to the award of a University of Kent degree
- l. Students registered at the Centre would be able to access SLC loans for tuition fees and a contribution towards their living costs
- m. The Centre would bear the ongoing costs of compliance with the OfS's conditions of registration, including subscription costs for the OfS, the Quality Assurance Agency (**QAA**), the Higher Education Statistics Agency (**HESA**), and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (**OIA**)
- n. Without a Teaching Excellence Framework (**TEF**) award, which would not be automatic, the maximum fee chargeable would be £9,000 per annum, not £9,250
- o. The Centre may be eligible to apply for any successor to Institution-Specific Teaching Allocation (**ISTA**) funding, which is currently under review by OfS. (This is the top-up funding for conservatoire-level education)

This option is most like the current arrangements, with the Centre taking on the responsibilities currently carried out by CDD on its (and the other CDD member schools') behalf. It gives the Centre the most autonomy and freedom to act of the

options being considered, and similarly gives it the most control over its day-to-day activities.

It is also an option which creates vulnerabilities. Although the OfS is a principles-based regulator rather than a rules-based regulator, there is no doubt that the burden of regulation falls more heavily on smaller institutions. There are two elements to this.

Firstly, there are direct costs of managing compliance. These comprise subscriptions to agencies; the costs of staff time to manage compliance; and systems investment.

- p. For a school of about 150 students, compulsory annual subscriptions would be as follows:

OFS	£30,100
HESA	£4,195
QAA	£1,950
OIA	<£1,000
Total	Approx. £37,000

- q. It would be reasonable also to budget for £10k-£15k for other subscriptions/memberships (eg UUK, GuildHE etc); and a further £10k per annum for internal audit costs.
- r. There would be a need for staff to support compliance – in relation to the Access and Participation Plan; data and returns; and in relation to managing other elements of compliance, including keeping track of OFS requirements and ensuring that they are addressed within the Centre. It would be prudent to budget about £100k per annum for this; It may be possible to share some of these costs with other CDD schools, which could reduce the cost to about £75k.
- s. There may be a need for investment in data systems - and specifically in a student record system – to facilitate data returns and tracking performance on access and participation. If so, an annual budget of £30k is reasonable; there may be possibilities for cost sharing.

The total direct annual cost would therefore be of the order of £140k - £160k. Much of this could be offset because the Centre would no longer bear the costs of CDD's operations, but this is dependent upon ISTA funding continuing to be available, which is uncertain.

Secondly, there are indirect costs relating to capacity. OfS can be a demanding regulator, and leaders and managers in a small institution will find themselves stretched by the need to manage compliance and respond to OfS requirements, and the need to play a full role in the delivery of the day-to-day activities of the school. This is a more intangible cost, but must nevertheless be borne in mind.

Analysing the option against the five criteria:

Autonomy	+	This option gives the Centre short-term autonomy.
Revenue	=/-	The option enables the Centre to continue to charge fees, albeit at £9,000 not immediately at £9,250. ISTA funding would be subject to any new arrangements the OfS put in place.
Cost	=/-	There are costs of staff time and consultancy support in preparing an application; once registered there are ongoing costs, probably slightly higher than those currently paid to CDD.
Funding/Capital	+	As an approved provider, the Centre would be eligible to apply for any capital funding available from OfS
Time	+	It should be possible to apply to OfS in Spring 2021. If successful, this should enable registration from 2022 or 2023.

In summary:

Benefits of validation	Costs of validation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued ability to charge higher fee level Potential continued ability to gain ISTA funding Retention of institutional autonomy Continuation of patterns of working Maximum scope for future development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased net costs of £20-30k (taking into account the current costs of CDD membership) Reduced net income of £35k (because of £9,000 tuition fees, not £9,250) Increased demands on leadership and management

Franchising

Under this option:

- t. The Centre would operate as a sub-contractor of the University of Kent (I assume the University of Kent as the franchiser, because of your current relationship with it as validator. The same points would apply were you to choose, for example, University of the Arts London.)
- u. Students would be the University of Kent students and would access SLC funds via the University of Kent's OfS registration
- v. the University of Kent would receive students' tuition fees, and would pass on to the Centre a proportion of this in line with your agreement with them. It is very likely that you would no longer be eligible to receive ISTA funding.
- w. The extent to which you were able to develop your curriculum would depend upon your agreement with the University of Kent. Normally, a franchise arrangement is based upon the franchisee teaching a curriculum designed and owned by the franchiser.

A franchise where the curriculum is not owned by the franchiser is very unusual. Normally, a franchise is a good idea for the franchiser because they can recruit more students at a lower unit cost than if they were teaching themselves; and often these students come from backgrounds which do not participate so readily in higher education. The motivation is therefore clear – it can help widen access; it can bring in a surplus-making revenue stream.

This option would reduce the Centre’s autonomy and capacity to innovate. Although the Centre would in the last analysis be able to end the relationship, it would operationally be able to grow or shrink student numbers only by agreement with the University of Kent (and, of course, in line with market demands). Curriculum development would have to be agreed with the University of Kent, although this may not be very onerous, building as it does on the existing validation relationship. The loss of ISTA funding would require changes to your delivery model, which would need to be reflected in changes to teaching.

The specific benefits and costs depend upon the extent of your agreement with the University of Kent. It may be possible as part of the agreement for students on the Centre’s courses to access services provided by the University of Kent – for instance counselling, financial advice, residences and so on. As a large university the University of Kent will have better services than the Centre would be able to provide; but, of course, all of this would be reflected in the share of tuition fee income that the University of Kent took. Physical distance would also be a factor: a London-based provider may offer more options.

The school would not have to deal with the OfS, but would be obliged – subject to the details of the agreement reached with the University of Kent – to follow the University of Kent policies, procedures and strategies. This would include in relation to access and participation, where the school’s targets would be subsumed within the University of Kent’s overall Access and Participation Plan.

Analysing the option against the five criteria:

Autonomy	=/-	This option reduces the Centre’s autonomy a little.
Revenue	=/-	The option enables the Centre to continue to gain a share of £9,250 fee income. There would be no future ISTA funding.
Cost	-	There would be costs in reaching an agreement with the franchising university, and costs per student paid to the franchising university.
Funding/Capital	-	The Centre would not be eligible to apply for any capital funding available from OfS
Time	+	It should be possible to identify and complete an agreement with a franchising partner by summer 2023, and possibly by summer 2022.

In summary:

Benefits of franchising	Costs of franchising
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Greater long-term security• Potential to access better services to support students and staff• Reduced burden of OfS regulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decreased per-student income• Changes to teaching model• Reduced autonomy• Increased dependency on an external organisation (eg the University of Kent)

Merger with a university

In this option:

- x. The Centre would become part of a larger university, disestablishing itself as a separate organisation. The Centre's property and assets would transfer to ownership by the university.
- y. Staff would be employed by the university; students would be registered only with the university.
- z. The terms on which the merger took place would determine whether the Centre retained a brand identity and a distinct identity within the university; there may also be provision for an ongoing external advisory board

A merger is clearly a one-time decision. There are many examples of mergers within higher education; typically, mergers aim to create scale, and therefore economies; or remove duplication, and thereby gain economies; or occasionally to bring together different types of providers to create a breadth of provision (eg merging further and higher education institutions).

A merger between the Centre and another university would, in practice, be a takeover by that university. The Centre would need to identify what it hoped to preserve through the merger process (which might simply be the programmes; or might involve brand identity, some governance and a degree of autonomy).

The benefits would be the continuation of the provision, with a quicker process and greater certainty.

The downside would be the loss of autonomy; and the likely loss of any future guarantee of identity and distinctiveness (see, for example, the merger of Royal Holloway and Bedford Colleges, where Bedford's identity and location have gone; and Queen Mary and Westfield College, where Westfield's identity and location are no more, despite in both cases the names being preserved in formal legal form.)

Takeovers in HE typically happen only when it is clear to the governors of the smaller institution that there is no viable future, and that the end of the road is in sight. Management and operational staff from the smaller institution are at risk, at the

very least of changes to their roles, for some of redundancy. There is also often a great deal of unhappiness amongst staff, students and stakeholders of the smaller institution.

Analysing the option against the five criteria:

Autonomy	-	This option removes any possibility of future autonomy.
Revenue	=/-	The option enables the Centre's activities to be funded by £9,250 fee income. There would be no possibility of future ISTA funding
Cost	-	There would be costs in reaching an agreement with the partner university, and costs resulting from subsequent restructuring
Funding/Capital	+	The Centre's work could be supported by capital funding from the partner university
Time	+	It should be possible to identify and complete a merger by summer 2023, and possibly by summer 2022.

In summary:

Benefits of merger with a university	Costs of merger with a university
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuation of provision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of autonomy Potential loss of identity Loss of jobs Opposition from stakeholders

Merger with complementary organisations

In this option:

- aa. The Centre would become part of a new organisation, joining one or more complementary organisations, and disestablishing itself as a separate organisation. The Centre's property and assets would transfer to ownership by the new organisation.
- bb. Staff would be employed by the new organisation; students would be registered with the new organisation.
- cc. The terms on which the merger took place would determine whether the Centre retained a brand identity and a distinct identity within the new organisation.
- dd. Unless the other organisations involved included one with OfS registration and the power to award degrees, the new organisation would still need to register with the OfS and enter into a validation relationship to enable it to continue to offer HE programmes

To avoid complications if this discussion paper is made public, I have deliberately not identified the organisations mentioned in the informal discussion with governors.

As in the previous option, this is a one-time decision. A merger involving partners outside of HE could enable different types of activities, or better linkages between existing activities. There may be benefits of scale, but these would be offset by the greater range of activities which the new organisation would undertake. The business case for any such merger would clearly need to identify how the merger would benefit each organisation.

If at least one of the partner organisations was connected to a wealthier body (for example, in some way connected to the City of London corporation) then there could be significant long-term benefits of financial stability.

Such a merger would require more work to identify benefits and understand the impact of cross-sector merger. It would therefore need to take place on a longer timescale than the other options.

Analysing the option against the five criteria:

Autonomy	-	This option removes any possibility of future autonomy.
Revenue	=/-	The option in principle enables the Centre's activities to be funded by £9,000 fee income. It may be possible to gain ISTA funding in the future
Cost	-	There would be costs in reaching an agreement with the partner university, and costs resulting from subsequent restructuring. There would possibly be costs involved in gaining OfS registration and ongoing validation.
Funding/Capital	+	The Centre's could continue to be eligible for capital funding from the OfS
Time	-	Such a merger would take longer than the other options above. It would be hard to complete such a merger before July 2023.

In summary:

Benefits of a complementary merger	Costs of complementary merger
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of provision • Future potential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of autonomy • Potential loss of identity • Loss of jobs • Opposition from stakeholders • Uncertain benefits

Discussion of options

The choice facing the Centre is difficult. Each option has its downsides; and the Centre's limited scale means that resources to implement any choice are stretched.

The following table sets out each of the options against the five criteria identified by the informal group of governors in December 2020:

	Do nothing	Validation	Franchising	Merger with a university	Merger with complementary organisations
Autonomy	-	+	=/-	-	-
Revenue	-	=/-	=/-	=/-	=/-
Cost	-	=/-	-	-	-
Funding/Capital	-	+	-	+	+
Time	-	+	+	+	-
Overall	-	+	?	?	?

Of the five options, *do nothing* is clearly unviable.

Validation is, at least in the short term, the most attractive option. It retains the Centre's autonomy, enabling it to make different choices in the future. It is the option which is closest to the current operating model of the Centre, and can be delivered within the time available to the Centre.

Franchising is a plausible model. There is some loss of autonomy and a lower income compared to the validation model income, but if the Centre could adapt to operating on a lower fee income per student (that is, with the share of fee income taken by the franchising institution, and the certain loss of ISTA), it provides a route to continue to deliver higher education. It would not be an irrevocable step; and with the right university partner it could be accomplished relatively quickly, and with less immediate spend than the validation approach.

Both merger models (with a university and with complementary organisations) are one-off decisions.

ee. Merger with a university tends to be a decision of last resort, when there are no other options. This does not represent the Centre's position.

ff. Merger with complementary organisations contains many unknowns. It may well create new possibilities for creative, educational and organisational synergy, but these will need to be teased out in discussions with potential partners, and it is a sensitive topic.

This suggests the following approach:

gg. Proceed to seek registration with the Office for Students, to enable the Centre to operate under the validation model. The sooner this is done, the

sooner the Centre can adapt to a new way of operating, and gain some stability.

- hh. Consider, over the next 6-12 months, possible organisational futures – this is to identify whether there is any scope for a merger with complementary organisations.
- ii. If OfS registration cannot be obtained, seek a franchise relationship with an existing university. Considerations here include the current relationships that the Centre has (eg with the University of Kent as validator) and questions of location (a London-based provider would be in a better position to offer services to the Centre's students).

Hugh Jones
27 January 2021

Letter of representation from the Board of CDD Members Schools to the Board of CDD

Background:

While CDD does receive each member school's auditors' management letter, which gives CDD significant assurance, these don't create a duty of care between the schools and CDD. The letter below is designed to create this duty. It has been discussed with, and incorporates the comments of, BDO. Its best seen as an accompaniment to the AAR and could potentially replace it.

To the Directors of the Conservatoire for Dance and Drama (CDD):

We authorise this letter to the Board of CDD, in the context of the information that we have supplied to CDD, and in the knowledge that CDD will be submitting the 'Annual Financial Return' to the OfS on 1 February 2021.

The information that we have supplied to CDD is:

- Annual Report and Accounts (2019/20)
- Auditors Management Letter (2019/20)
- CDD Annual Accountability Return (2020)
- Financial forecast tables and commentary (2019-2025)
- Exit Plan [draft]

We acknowledge that this information is supplied to CDD in good faith and we confirm an explicit obligation to CDD in relation to this information. In so doing we acknowledge that the information that we have provided will be used by CDD as part of its own assessment of going concern, viability and sustainability.

Whilst CDD may conduct its own due-diligence, we understand that should any of the above information that we have supplied be incorrect, misleading, or incomplete, CDD could make an incorrect judgment as to its own assessment of going concern, viability and sustainability. In this context, we confirm to the Board of CDD that the information supplied to CDD has been appropriately reviewed by our Board, in the knowledge that it will be relied upon by CDD, and therefore that we have a duty of care to CDD to supply up to date, complete and accurate information. We acknowledge that this obligation is complementary to our obligations under the Members Agreement of 18 October 2017.

We confirm that the above information is complete and that we are not aware of any further information of which we should make CDD aware, before it makes its own assessment of going concern, viability, and sustainability.

Specifically, we confirm that we have made an assessment of our school's ability to continue as a going concern for a period of at least twelve months from the date on which the financial statements were approved by our Board. As a result of our assessment we considered that we would be able to continue to operate as a going concern and that it was appropriate to prepare our financial statements and financial forecasts on a going concern basis.

Yours faithfully



Chair of Trustees

School -National Centre of Circus Arts..... Name – Alison King

Date - 8/01/21

**9th December 2020 HE SUPPORT GROUP
MEETING**

Meeting to approve the CDD Operating Manual and general update on our transition with CDD.

Attendees: William Underhill (Chair), Kate White, Bill Morris, Ali King, Rob West, Cameron Brookhouse

The CDD Board of Governors report *Transition and Timeline*, separate timeline document and the final draft of the CDD Compliance Manual were circulated to the group prior to the meeting.

Kate confirmed that whilst we have signalled our intention we have not yet given formal notice to resign from CDD. Neither have Rambert School of Ballet, Central School of Ballet nor London Contemporary Dance School. William explained that we will not give formal notice until the time is right for us to do so.

The departure of David Ruebain as CEO of CDD should not speed up the process of CDD winding down but it will make the regulator and the independent governors focus on bringing things to a conclusion earlier rather than later. It is likely that we and the other schools will work towards a transition in 2022, with 2023 available as a fall-back. It appears to be accepted that if any school is not ready for 2022 all schools will continue with CDD until 2023. The OfS are supportive of this approach.

With the post of CDD CEO becoming redundant, there will need to be an Accountable Officer to fulfil the regulatory obligations to OfS. This role could be taken on by one of the schools' principals or shared by more than one of the principals on a rotation basis. The other schools are keen to employ a consultant/project manager to manage the wind down. Such a person could be the Accountable Officer. The process to appoint such a project manager is currently being led by the Senior Independent Governor, Julian Roskill supported by the Chair of Rambert School of Ballet, Louise Verrill.

In answer to Rob's question about the option of us partnering with University of Kent, Kate explained that we have not yet made an approach to them but that this is one of the things that our consultants Hugh and Anna will be doing on our behalf. It is likely that a partnering arrangement will be our Plan B, if we are unable to self register.

For the purposes of its accountability return to OfS, CDD requires that we provide a 5 year forecast showing our financial stability. A similar forecast is required as part of our application for registration and will be needed early in the new year.

The 5 year forecast is a major challenge for us, particularly as we factor in the loss of ISTA [from 2021/2022]. The question around ISTA is a factor in all the schools' plans. The feeling is that it will be replaced by an alternative. If this were not to happen, losing ISTA funding may make it uneconomic for us to continue to provide Higher Education unless that funding can be replaced from another source. Kate explained how, as part of CDD we have been required to teach in a particular way, with 35 hours each week of contact time, large amounts of one to one teaching and very small classes. We are now starting to think about different ways of teaching and of using our spaces which will enable us to make cost savings and increase our student numbers. As part of our own financial planning we are looking at how the HE provision could be supported in new ways by other income generating activity and use of resources within the organisation and/or by the changes we make to the way in which we deliver HE. While we could look at entering a partnership arrangement (for example with University of Kent) it is unlikely any partner would be willing to subsidise our course to the extent required to maintain the current level of contact time and intensity of teaching. Kate explained that this is a problem shared with other schools although Rambert have some historic

support from various benefactors and Bristol Old Vic Theatre School have significant assets in property. Bristol are entering into a partnership with UWE (University of the West of England) so will not be applying for self-registration.

Although some of the discussion has now been opened up to the wider staff team the fact remains that working on the restructure of the organisation and the transition with CDD simultaneously is taking up a lot of time and resource. Our consultants Anna and Hugh will be meeting with the group next week and with the staff team who will be immediately impacted this week. From these discussions Anna and Hugh should be able to identify what external assistance we might need to support us through the process and what additional resource we may need post CDD.

In answer to Cam's question 'why is self-registration our Plan A rather than a partnership with Kent', Kate explained that our own registration would allow us our own autonomy and as a small, specialist school it would potentially give us more access to government funding if small specialist support remains in any form. William added that it will be easier to go from the self-registration option to a partnership than it would vice versa. We still need to keep in mind that a partnership might be the better option for us in the longer term.

Our students have very little engagement with CDD or with University of Kent. We have told them that it is our intention to apply for self-registration and they seem fairly unphased. We will be communicating with them regularly as the process continues. The matter will become more relevant to future cohorts.

Ali reminded Kate that she should ask for help from the trustees if it is needed. Kate thanked Ali and thanked William for his continued support.

The CDD compliance manual has not yet been agreed by all the schools. William explained that some other schools had raised objections to the monthly financial information required and a letter of representation that CDD was requiring. We did not see these as problems. Tony had agreed to provide the monthly information from February and William explained that in his view the letter of representation did not in reality change the position of the schools. The group gave their approval of the CDD Compliance Manual, with any changes agreed between the schools collectively and CDD.

The group will be meeting with Anna and Hugh on 15th December when the options will be presented and the timeline to self-registration outlined. Anna and Hugh will be setting the agenda for the meeting.

Kate and William will inform the group of any other urgent CDD updates by email as they occur. A further meeting of the group can be arranged if necessary.

ACTION – Kate to circulate the 5 year forecast and narrative as soon as it is ready before it goes to CDD. Anna and Hugh will be assisting us with the narrative. It is unlikely to be complete before Christmas.

Operations & Admin board report, January 2021

Froniga Lambert, Chief Operating Officer

Building and Facilities

- COVID-19 site management going well with a range of protocols around both general building use, and specifics around how training takes place.
- We have had no reported positive cases to date amongst students, staff or other users.
- We continue to hold weekly cross-departmental meetings to discuss COVID measures and challenges. These continue to be very well attended and bring high expertise into a very difficult period.
- Plans to improve Library and GC store following student feedback – this is funded from a CDD capital grant.
 - Library – create a larger ‘lecture’ space by moving central bookshelf and creating a partial glass partition. This will enable a larger, brighter main space/meeting room/study space as well as creating a smaller private meeting area.
 - GC store – adjust the heating equipment in the space and reconfigure the layout. Enables more efficient and effective heating for studios and library (west side of building), more eco-friendly and also enables better use of the store. Funding for an energy efficient electrical heating system may be an option.
- Energy Centre – currently is at 100% occupancy and will shortly lose (mid-Jan) one tenant due to moving to Europe for work. During the current lockdown we have reduced rents by 25% as a gesture of goodwill.

Venue hire & workshops

- The venue hire and corporate workshop market remain non-existent, with very few even very tentative enquiries coming through.
- Petra is looking into a number of initiatives to help get us back up and running swiftly once venue hires do restart, including:
 - Provision of dedicated broadband for hirers (assuming there will be a move to more hybrid events, with fewer physical attendees but more streaming to a virtual audience).
 - Updating our premises licence to consolidate our hours for licensable activity and in particular extend the hours for use of the courtyard.
 - Exploitation of the courtyard, assuming there will be a quicker return to outdoor events than indoor.
- We have appointed Kay Scolah as the consultant to work with us on developing the new style corporate workshops, which will provide more of an executive education experience than our current ‘team building’ events.
- We have also appointed Magdalen Fisher as consultant to review our fundraising and commercial strategies, putting the work previously done by McKinsey into a post-COVID context and building on the work previously done by Rob around fundraising. She will be working between January and March.

Technical

- Over the autumn term we worked closely with both the HE and Participation teams to facilitate their return to delivering programmes on site in a COVID-safe manner. We have spent much time developing, implementing and revising equipment management systems as programmes changed over the term. We have adjusted our work schedules to be more on hand to support teachers, students and professional members in working safely.
- Before the Christmas break we undertook another round of improvements and additions to our standard rigging to enable more LYC aerial class to take place. We are also investing in

more equipment to facilitate these. This is funded by the ACE Cultural Recovery Fund money.

Finance & Admin

Finance

The Finance team are well on the way to procuring a new/updated Management Information System, to replace the rather old version of Sage we currently use. It is hoped that the new system will provide a lot of efficiencies for both the Finance team and wider staff team, by having more self-service capabilities. This is being funded from the ACE Cultural Recovery Fund grant.

Staffing

We have pressed ahead with the appointment of the Director of Professional Development and were delighted to confirm Glen in post in November. Since then, about two-thirds of the other structural changes within the Professional Development Directorate have been made. There will be an interim structure in the rest of the organisation until we are in a position to appoint the Director of Commercial Activity role.

Following the extension of the Job Retention Scheme at the end of October, we continued to have a small number of office staff on furlough or flexi-furlough, and are using flexi-furlough to reduce staff hours when on-site activity has to be reduced due to external circumstances. We have also put P&O teachers back onto the Job Retention Scheme.

Since the most recent lockdown, we have re-furloughed much of the Buildings and Technical teams.

We have run the first tranche of a number of Equality, Diversity & Inclusion training sessions, run by external trainers Equaliteach. These will be rolled out to all office staff, teachers and trustees over the next couple of months.

We have appointed Raluca Moraru as Development Manager. Raluca currently works for the WCIT Charity and is due to start at NCCA in mid-February.

Froniga Lambert

Board Report – Marketing and Communications, January 2021

Digital & Social Media

	Following	Activity
Facebook	16kk 0%	https://www.facebook.com/NationalCentreforCircusArts/
Twitter	11.1k 0%	https://twitter.com/nationalcircus
YouTube	2,296,000 (views) + 3%	https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=national+centre+for+circus+arts
Instagram	54.5k -1%	https://www.instagram.com/p/Bg1GXpaH4n_/?hl=en&taken-at=1739127

We have seen a downturn in growth on our social media channels over the last few weeks. It is often a quiet period but is also attributable to a lack of new content creation in the current lockdown.

We have received tender application for the redevelopment of the national centre's primary website. The successful application will be selected in the next couple of weeks.

We are currently editing video content for the HE Open Day and planning online degree shows.

Philip Nichols

Head of Marketing and Communications

Glen Stewart, Director of Training/Professional Development Board Report Jan 2021

On the back of both the Cultural Recovery Fund money and the HEIF funding, we are in a fortunate position to be able to develop many of the projects we started earlier in the year. The projects such as learning resources for primary school teachers and the development of an enhanced corporate workshop offer are now supported financially via these pots of money.

Unfortunately, while we are unable to access our building, the filming that is required for the primary school teachers is on hold. However, we are ready to pick this up again once we return to Coronet Street. The Participation and Outreach team have had their own ideas to engage with primary schools which the training team has been able to support. They trialled running juggling sessions to various age groups via zoom. The kids we give instructions and set a task to make their own juggling balls prior to the online session. The trials were a success so they are now looking at developing this work and see it as a potential offer for families while kids are home schooling. The P&O and Training Teams will come together in the new organisational structure and which will create an exciting and productive team.

We have now contracted Kay Scolah as the consultant who will support us with the development of the new corporate workshop. She has put together a skeleton working plan that will take us (Covid permitting) to a proposed launch date for September this year. She has started the process of interviewing our staff and soon will gather feedback from participants of workshops in the past.

This is the last board report that I will write as the Director of Training. I am very excited to be now in the new role as Director of Professional Development.

We continue to make changes to various roles that sit under the Professional Development umbrella. Beth King has accepted the role of Head of Professional Development and has hit the ground running with the production of the Degree shows.

Beth and I will work together over the next coming weeks to reorganise the staff from the Participation and Outreach team into the new roles that will be focusing on youth development and pathways for young people into circus.

James and Alice have moved into their new roles as Teacher Education Leads and are doing a great job hosting the weekly Teachers' Virtual Staff Room. This is one of the initiatives we created as part of a teacher support programme. For a long time, we have recognised the need to work more closely with our teaching staff. We typically run into barriers due to teacher availability and the limitations of our restricted budget. With a heavy reduction of classes in the building, the use of Zoom and the funding to now pay teachers to attend, the Virtual Staff Room is working really well and has great potential to achieve the connection with teachers that we have always wished for. With the direct impact social distancing has had on teaching, the need to support and develop our approach to teaching is more evident than ever. The concept of 'teaching without touch' has been the source of many discussions and will continue to be over the next few months.

I have been spending more time learning from the Degree Team and getting a better understanding of the changes that are being proposed as part of the programme re-write. Both this work and the initiatives that need to happen for independent registration and creating financial stability of the Degree programme thankfully complement each other, and will guide a lot of our work in the next 6 months.

Circus Development Board Report – January 20

Ben Wallace, Circus Development Manager

Open Training

Since reopening in September we have been able to run Open Training sessions consistently for our professional members, including during November's lockdown. I mentioned in October's board report that demand had been lower than expected in the initial couple weeks after reopening, but this soon picked up and most sessions were in fact oversubscribed, at least for aerialists.

Artists have certainly appreciated the opportunities they've had to train, though there are understandably grumblings about the limited amount of training (with only 2 sessions running a week most of the time, aerialists were often assigned only 1 session). During the October half-term and following the premature end to the degree term we were able to offer significantly more sessions, and this was gratefully received. Our plan for the spring term was to move to 5-6 sessions a week, albeit a couple of those sessions would be shorter than usual. This, of course, is on hold.

The decision to close in January received a mixed response, with some members expressing sympathy, understanding and gratitude for the efforts the organisation had made to remain open thus far. Unsurprisingly though, there was a significant number of members expressing frustration or requesting clarification for the rationale behind the decision given training and rehearsals for professional artists is explicitly listed by government as an exempt activity. We have reiterated that the reasons for closing were first and foremost centred on H&S grounds in the interests of both staff and users, with financial considerations being secondary. I suspect we will hear more from members around 29th January, when we said we would review the situation.

Creation Studio Hires

Demand for the Creation Studio has been greater than I expected, with 5 hires taking place of varying lengths, and a number of enquiries for the purposes of funding applications. From my anecdotal observations, it seems like the success rate for applications to ACE for R&D is higher than usual, I suppose with less money going to touring due to the pandemic.

Jerwood Circus Residencies

Since my last report, we have had two of the five recipients undertake some or all of their residencies on-site in the Creation Studio. Another two have undertaken their residencies overseas where they are currently based; one at a venue in Spain and another on a rooftop in Athens! The second half of one of the residencies is being rescheduled to spring or summer, and the final recipient will be doing her residency in the summer too.

We were due to run a second iteration of the programme in 2021 (subject to approval of our evaluation of the first iteration) though we might choose to delay this to 2022 given the delays in delivering the first cycle.

Staffing Update

I mentioned in October's report that I was due to leave in November but alas, I am loitering with intent due to difficulties getting home to Australia. Hopefully I will have made it back by the next report!

I am in the process of preparing for a handover of my duties to existing staff as we will not be recruiting a replacement at this stage.

I wish all board members the very best as you help the organisation navigate these extraordinary times, and I look forward to staying in touch and watching the organisation's success for years to come. It has been a pleasure to meet and work with a number of you over the years.

London Youth Circus were able to return to the building at the start of the new academic year.

Due to the restrictions in place, we had to adapt our usual (pre-covid) offer to skills that allowed us to ensure the safety of the participants and staff. This meant focusing on floor-based skills, such as juggling, tightwire, acrobatics, handstands as the equipment is easily cleaned after use and the class could be spread out to ensure social distancing.

Unfortunately, some of our more popular skills like aerial (rope, silks, static) could not be offered as there was no way to effectively clean the equipment (due to the material) after each use to ensure it was covid safe.

This had a both positive and negative reaction as some participants didn't want to continue unless these classes were offered, whereas others took on the challenge to learn new skills and surprised themselves. We had some wonderful feedback from families and participants saying the change in programme allowed them to explore their training to different avenues.

After November, we were able to purchase some extra aerial equipment that meant our students could have their own equipment to train on and had no issues with cleaning them to make them covid safe. This meant we were able to return aerial back into the programme in limited use. This was welcomed with much excitement!

In December we put plans in place to partially return the Adult and youth recreational programme back from January, unfortunately the lockdown put a stop to that.

Since January, the P&O team have still been providing online activities to our LYC and CAT students, and are now in the process of starting online classes to our Sensory Circus community (those with Autism) and offering paid juggling classes for young people and families (open to the public)

Beth King, Head of Professional Development

Higher Education Board report January 2021

Adrian Porter Head of Higher Education Delivery

Current numbers

Despite the mixed/blended delivery the HE programme has not suffered from attrition.

Many of the students are at their term time addresses. We have two students who remain internationally based and provision is being made to ensure that their experience mirrors that of the UK based student experience.

Delivery

We continued to deliver a blended model of provision over the Autumn term. Though with the current government advice and recommendations the HE team has begun the spring term delivering the entire program on line. In an attempt to protect the students discipline classes, the HE team have looked at the modules over the remainder of the year and moved them around so that the circus discipline element of the program is now beginning later in the term. This will hopefully coincide with a relaxation of the current tier 4 restrictions.

The HE team are also preparing and are ready for a continuation of full online delivery for the spring term. However if the current restrictions continue into the summer term we are very concerned with our ability to make fair assessments of the students around their discipline learning. With any relaxation of the restrictions the HE team will prioritise the circus discipline learning in the building and teacher facing.

Stevie Taylor and myself with the support of SMT continue to look at how the difference in delivery this term has affected the teaching costs for the circus delivery. We will also be looking at the overall delivery costs for the next academic year and moving forward in preparation for a dramatic drop in funding.

Initial student responses around the blended delivery are good.

HE staff remain in close contact with students supporting them through the blended learning delivery. There is a certain level of uncertainty, however the students do have a pragmatic.

A piece of work needs to be undertaken around ensuring that the teaching staff have the correct resources and teaching support while we are online with the students. Streaming equipment, teaching environment, access to adequate software and internet access all play into the quality of what we are delivering as does planning for online learning. Who will undertake this work however is not clear as the HE team are somewhat overwhelmed with work.

Teaching

The HE budget has been somewhat difficult to pin down, in part because the need to hire external space. Student capacity restrictions of those spaces prompts a smaller student/teacher ratio which in turn affects the number of hours for a given module. Theatre and movement are most affected by this.

Productions

As mentioned above, some modules have been moved in response to the lockdown. All three ensemble productions have been moved from the summer term to the beginning of this term and will be online. The move has put a lot of pressure on Beth King who is producing the productions but she is dealing with this challenge in an exemplary fashion.

FEDEC

FEDEC has had their first Erasmus+ Lab (COSMIC). A very interesting platform called MemoRekall was introduced. It is an open source digital documentation platform that is not only timely in the current situation, but has some considerable potential in many areas of the HE delivery, in particular around creative process and assessment. Alice Jackson and I will be presenting the platform and soliciting interest from peers who wish to look at applications of MemoRekall.

Healthy Conservatoires Network

Michael Durant from HCN has asked if they can use the NCCA to create a case study that looks at the work that we do as a small institution to support our HE students. This would form their next round of case studies aimed at sharing best practice throughout the network.

Staffing

HE staff continue to work from home.

Self registration/programme re-write

Is underway. Glen, Stevie and myself have had initial meetings. Stevie is outlining the process, with the support of Hugh and Anna consulting. A timeline will be available for the next board.

National Centre for Circus Arts Academic Board

Wednesday 2nd December 2020
Microsoft Teams Online Meeting

Unconfirmed Minutes

In Attendance

Chair: Kate White (KW) – Chief Executive & Principal

Minutes: Joanna Gray (JG) – Admissions and Registry Manager

Stevie Taylor (ST) - Head of Academic Administration and Student Support

Adrian Porter (AP) – Head of Degree Delivery

Glen Stewart (GS) – Director of Professional Development

Michaela O'Connor (MO) – HE Year Manager

Amy Welbourne (AW) - HE Year Manager

Martha Harrison (MH) – HE Year Manager

Nikita Shergill (NS) – Higher Education Records Officer

Antigone Exton-White (AEW) – Student Support Manager

Lucy Gilroy (LG) - FD1 Student Rep

Ellie Pearson (EP) – FD1 Student Rep

Harry Latham (HL) – FD1 Student Rep

Felix Sudbery (FS) – FD1 Student Rep

James Gill (JaG) – FD1 Student Rep

1. Welcome and Apologies

Apologies were received from: Beth King – Head of Participation and Outreach

2. Minutes from the last meeting, 16th October 2019

The minutes were reviewed and confirmed as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. Matters Arising

The actions from the previous meeting were reviewed and commented on.

Action (AP1): JG to add prospectus review to the SSLT agenda and for students to bring their feedback to the meeting. COMPLETE

It was noted that this action has now been completed and our online prospectus is now in place.

Action (AP2): GS, AP and RH to work together across departments and share information on industry partners coming into the organisation. IN PROGRESS

AP commented that there have been initial conversations with private drama events and Ali King around students being allowed to sit in on set ups and the production process. In particular, the production process is something we are missing quite a lot of at the moment with regards to the students' experience.

KW checked that these plans fit in line with the recently developed CDD policy (B10) around working with external partners and AP confirmed this.

Action (AP3): ST to speak to the Marketing and Communications team about working with student reps on their social media coverage. IN PROGRESS

LT added that a meeting to address this has happened with good conversations and students are feeling a lot happier about it.

AP also spoke with Hazel in marketing about this recently and it was suggested that we need to help students to promote themselves. Some are already good at this but other students need more encouragement to engage with the notion of social media and feel comfortable with it.

ST expressed that it is still evolving and that there is a student takeover coming up on Instagram, however, it was felt that there is still more work to be done. It was agreed that this matter should stay in progress. **Action (AP1): Keep working with students and marketing on improving students' social media coverage and support.**

JG added that the takeover was due to go ahead on the run up to the virtual open day (end of January) and applications closing (beginning of March).

LT commented that the takeover was a great idea and also great that NCCA is recognising how much of an influence social media has on young people and those applying to higher education. It is was a good way to engage people who might not think to look into this school.

Action (AP4): JG to set up a meeting/working group to review our current audition process in relation to bigger piece disciplines, and improve clarity in what we are offering to successful applicants. CONTINUING

JG expressed that conversations around this have been ongoing and this was particularly to do with how we audition applicants for big space pieces of equipment. So far, we have made improvements to the website to try and make it as clear as possible around what students are signing up to in regards to the specialisation process, and clarity around the fact that students might not be able to specialise in things like CYR wheel. It was expressed that this is something that does keep reoccurring but some improvements have been made.

AP added that the main issue we do face is due to the specialisation process, as it sets up an expectation for FD1 students coming in that they can try and do everything, when in fact some disciplines are very much restricted in terms of numbers.

KW questioned whether we need to be clearer about this at the point of audition?

MO opened this question to FD1 student reps to comment on.

FS expressed that it was clear once the course started, however, coming into the first year he came in with the perception that he would be able to try a lot more things. This was not made clear enough during the audition and it was noted that others in FD1 agreed with that.

MH raised that we (MH and JG) had planned to do a presentation during the audition process which explained the specialisation process in detail, however, because auditions had to go online, we unfortunately didn't manage to do this. Additionally, because of the COVID-19 protocols in place this year it was noted that it has been a slightly different year for FD1 students, in that they have not been able to try as many disciplines as previous years.

It was noted that covid has put the school in a non-ideal situation this year but that we are aware of this and will continue to review and address this issue, especially by working towards making things as clear and available as possible for applicants' pre-entry to the course. **Action (AP2): Continue to review and improve clarity around the specialisation process at audition point and pre-entry to the course.**

Action (AP5): NS to discuss with PE about a final essay submission deadline for CA109 Performance in Theory & Practice and send to students, along with relevant support. COMPLETE

NS confirmed this action as completed.

Action (AP6): NS to email student regarding assessment for completion of course – COMPLETE

NS confirmed this action as completed.

4. Updates and Reports

- 4.1. Update from CEO about structural changes in the organisation and introduction of new roles within the Higher Education Team.

KW reported that the organisation has been going through a period of change to make sure that it can be as resilient as possible going forward. The graduate world is very different than what it was 20 years ago when our degree course first started and so we want to be really clear and sure that what we are doing is responding to the world around us in the best way possible. Therefore, we undertook some strategic review work, which led us to slimming down the top end of our organisation and reorganising ourselves into 3 distinct divisions. This has allowed us to bring Higher Education together with everything else that we deliver in terms of education, such as access and participation, the support we give to teachers and the work we do with professional artists.

KW continued to update on how this has become increasingly important for us as we recently made the decision to move towards being a registered independent Higher Education Provider. It was noted that this would not make much difference to our current students as this is a process that takes a long time. However, it does mean that we will no longer be part of the Conservatoire for Dance and Drama, although we will still be validated by the University of Kent for our degree awarding powers. This will mean that there will be no third party that information has to go through. In some ways this puts us a bit more in control of our own destiny which will be useful for us. It was reported that we are working with a consultancy company at the moment to support us on this transition.

KW invited questions at this point in the meeting. No questions were raised.

5. CDD Updates from Head of Academic Administration

5.1 Revisions to Course Summary Documentation – To Note (attached as paper AB1220A)

ST informed the meeting that there were a few amendments to the course summary document to be noted, which all students signed up to when applying for the course. These amendments will be communicated through a guidance note which JG will send out to all students via Teams. It was noted that there is nothing that students need to be concerned about; these are minor changes but we must comply with CMA guidance to make sure students have all the information.

Action AP3: JG to circulate guidance note to students which communicates the amendments to the Course Summary Document.

5.2 CDD Student Voice Forum

ST raised that there had not been much uptake from any of the schools for the CDD Student Voice Forum. It was questioned whether this was due to timing, communication and/or a lack of information about it? Additionally, CDD recently had to cancel an inclusivity workshop which was set up with Equaliteach which we informed students about. Unfortunately, only 2 students signed up to it meaning it had to be cancelled. This matter was opened to student reps to comment on.

LT went to the first forum and although it was a little clunky, as it was the first one, LT expressed that it was really nice to hear from other students and highly recommended it. She informed that she couldn't make the 2nd one but would have loved to go. It was raised that the degree team had communicated these workshops well and with plenty of notice, but that unfortunately the issue may be that students don't like engaging with Teams.

FS commented that he enjoyed the first one but didn't go to the 2nd one because he struggles with and doesn't engage well with reading information online. FS also added that no one knew what it was and that reminders in person would be helpful.

JaG also raised confusion over what the student voice forum was.

ST suggested that video notifications could be an alternative option if reading online is an issue for students. ST will bring this feedback to CDD to see if other schools are having similar issues.

KW added that it may be useful to take back to CDD the fact that communications are often too word heavy for students to digest online. It was also noted that as currently face to face briefs are not happening in the same way due to COVID, this may also be making communication much more problematic for us.

Action (AP4): ST to feed back to CDD students' comments about communication and uptake of CDD events and trial using video notifications as an alternative way of communicating with students.

AP addressed whether it would be useful to bring student reps together at the beginning of the year to talk about what it means to be a student rep and discuss in more depth things like the student voice forum. This information can also be then communicated from student reps to their year groups. KW agreed that this would be a great way for information to be passed through the student reps and not solely down to degree staff to disseminate.

Student reps agreed this would be a good idea.

Action (AP5): Degree team to set up student rep meeting at the beginning of the year to talk about what it means to be a student rep, the meeting structure and forums.

6. Quality Assurance & Monitoring

6.1. Annual Programme Monitoring Report – To note (attached as paper AB1220A)

KW advised that the External examiner report is a useful document for students to read, which comes from Kent and looks at what it is that the external examiner is seeing within the school.

ST suggested that there could be a moment where student reps could input into the APMR document, which would be really useful to send to the Office for Students to ensure that we are meeting our quality assurance obligations. It was noted that this

year's report was a little rushed through but it is something we strive to update on every year by including students' termly feedback, however, direct input from the reps themselves could be really useful.

LT commented on the glowing report from the external examiner and questioned what exactly students would input on.

ST advised that it would be dependent on what questions we get next year, but we would send the questions to the students to then respond to. e.g. asking students to comment on our student support provision, thoughts on assessment and so on.

KW agreed that having the student voice within the APMR would be really useful and a good way to gather information in one place and use it effectively.

6.2. External Examiner report -To note (attached as AB1220C) and Response to External Examiner (attached as AB1220D)

A huge thank you to the higher education team was noted by KW for an extraordinary year's work in what has been an extraordinary year. Students and staff should be incredibly proud of themselves.

No other comments were raised on either items 6.1 or 6.2.

6.3. Monitoring of External Requirements – PPR

No minutes were recorded for this agenda item.

7. Annual Student Cycle

7.1. Admissions

JG updated the meeting on current student numbers, intermissions and withdrawals, registration, applications, open day and audition plans:

Student numbers: 62

- 24 new FD1's
- 21 continuing FD2's
- 17 continuing BA students
- 2 students due to return into FD2 in term 2 and 3 next year
- No withdrawals

Registration

Registration was completed online this year through CDD. There were a few teething issues as it was a new system for all but all students did manage to successfully register in the end.

Applications for September 2021 entry

Applications are now open and live on our website and close on 15th March 2021. We have had 20 applications so far which is good for this time of year and slightly up from last year.

Degree Open Day

This year we are going virtual and launching our Virtual Open Day on 28th January 2021.

Filming is well under way and we will be broadcasting footage which covers: degree classes, student and teacher interviews, day in the life vlogs and graduate stories. It was noted that students and teachers have contributed to this massively. The student Instagram takeover is also planned on the run up to this day to drive interest.

We are also hosting a live Q&A through zoom on the day where prospective applicants can hear more about the audition process, ask questions live and speak to current students, teachers and degree staff.

JG asked if student reps could attend this after their classes at 4pm. Thumbs were raised in agreement.

Auditions

Auditions are taking place between 29th March – 1st April 2021. We are planning to run these live in the building this year (Covid dependent), with a video back up in place.

Video Auditions

It was noted that last year we were very much thrown in the deep end, whereby we had to audition a whole cohort via video, something we have not had to do before.

JG informed the meeting that a review of that process has taken place internally with our degree team, to help shape our video audition back up for next year, however, feedback from our current FD1 reps would be welcomed as they are the ones that actually went through this process.

Student reps were invited to comment on this.

EP said that she didn't find the video audition too bad, adding that she had to do a lot of video auditions last year and actually found NCCA's the easiest. EP found the format really clear and mentioned that it gave them freedom to show off their own personality and skills; it was a smooth process.

HL added that the only issue he found was with editing as he didn't know much about that but otherwise he found it quite easy.

JaG found the switch from thinking the audition would be in person, to going online, quite difficult, and a little confusing in terms of working out what to include in the video and exactly how the panel would want it. However, so long as applicants know the expectations for the video audition he felt it would run nicely if we had to do it again.

FS added that the mix of quite straight forward tasks to more challenging tasks was good. He also found it good in terms of having time to prepare and practice sections of the video. However, he did find the explanation of the dish rock quite confusing.

AP expressed that although the whole process was challenging for the degree team and we really didn't know whether it was going to work out, we have been extremely happy with our first-year cohort. It was noted that a lot of work went in to making video auditions work and it did end up being a positive process.

KW emphasised that like many other things this year, this really was an unknown process but all of the feedback received so far has been really positive in regards to the first-year cohort's progression and achievement.

Thanks, were again noted to the whole team.

7.2. Progressions and Completion

ST reported on the below progression and completion data:

- BA year – 4 students achieved First class (honours) degrees and 6 students achieved second class degrees; no third class or fails.
- All 1st and 2nd year students passed, with 2 FD1's leaving with an exit award.

COVID impact on BA's Journey

It was noted that the final term went completely online. AP expressed that this was amazing considering the impact covid had on the BA students. As part of our support to them we are currently arranging for them to come back into the building next year to film their devised pieces, with lighting.

KW added that although there are scheduling considerations, it is important that we do our best to try and make this happen for them.

7.3. Prospectus Review

JG reported that it was great that we now have an online prospectus in place, but there was definitely need to review this annually and keep it updated. JG requested for student reps to feedback on our current version.

KW welcomed comments from student reps, particularly around things they would like to see in a prospectus that doesn't currently exist in ours, and that they think would be useful to prospective applicants.

Action (AP6): JG to share prospectus link with student reps to feed back on.

8. Policy Review/revisions

No policy updates were reported in the meeting. However, it was noted that there were likely to be some revisions coming up as we go through working towards independent registration, which will be pertinent for the next academic board.

9. AOB

KW welcomed any other business from students reps.

LT expressed a huge thank you to the degree team for all of their work this term, under the circumstances.

FS raised on behalf of the FD1 cohort that students are struggling with the structure of the online sessions on Tuesdays, whereby the morning is physically quite intense but the afternoons are much lighter, making the sessions mentally difficult as they are scheduled back to back.

MO agreed that the format of the day was not ideal and that the year managers would like to change it. MO advised that the order of the day can be changed no problem but ideally, we would like to break up the day completely, so it is not all online. However, in the meantime students should feedback to the delivery team directly on how the current structure can be rearranged.

Action (AP7): FD1 student reps and Year Mangers to review and rearrange FD1 Tuesday online schedule.

No further AOB's were raised from the students and they were thanked for their input before leaving.

10. Date of next meeting – Wednesday 10th March 2021 3-5pm

Part 2: Closed Business (Student Representatives not present)

11. Matters Arising:

No matters arising were noted.

12. Disciplinary Issues

ST raised that there have not been any disciplinary issues as yet, however, there may be down the line. It was reported that there has been some unhappiness with FD2s around the covid protocols, as well as issues they have with a member of staff. A solution is needed

where we can say to the students that although you are not happy with this staff member, if you do not follow the protocols, consequences will be put in place.

A discussion was had about whether we should look at putting these students through the non-academic misconduct policy, however, it was felt that more clarity around what the protocols are was needed before going down this route. Additionally, concerns were raised that this policy would be too admin heavy for what could be small and individual breaks of our covid protocols. Although we are aware a communication needs to go out to students, confusion still remains around exactly how to move forward with this.

It was noted that although other schools have used the non-academic misconduct policy this has been in response to serious breaches. It is felt that our 2nd year students are reacting internally to their disgruntlement with a staff member, with minor but nonetheless unacceptable breaches of the protocols.

ST expressed that whereby the students need to adhere to our code of conduct, the issues with this staff member also need addressing, otherwise we will find ourselves going around in circles.

KW confirmed that conversations have already been happening around tone and how we approach students and that this staff member has been asked to take a step back, but now other people now also need to take a step forward. The importance of advocacy within the student body was emphasised and that they are key in advocating our code of conduct to the rest of their cohorts. It was also noted that we have not yet had a covid case. This should be celebrated and communicated to the students in a way that highlights the good work that has been done so far by all, but needs to carry on.

AP raised that when we talk about consequences to students, there needs to be a clear distinction between those that accidentally forget to put a mask on and those that respond negatively to complying with covid protocol.

ST added that it is important that we work out individually who these students are, so that we are not penalising all.

MH suggested that we take covid out of this, as actually it is rude and inappropriate responses that are the issue. Additionally, this has been inflamed by the way a staff member as spoken to the students, which in turn makes them feel it is appropriate to respond in a negative way.

AP added that we are all in agreement that we must step forward and deal with the students, however, there is another side to this.

GS agreed that this is actually a global principle around respect, rather than being solely covid focused; student reps also commented on this in a meeting earlier this week. It was noted that there have been direct conversations with this staff member as a consequence. GS suggested that non- academic misconduct should be used as a bottom line but that the degree team is already doing enough, especially around asking the student reps to step up and also around communicating respect.

ST suggested that this message be shared with the rest of the organisation, as sometimes it comes across to us that other departments don't think we are doing enough, or taking it seriously.

KW reported that she has not heard that the degree team are not taking this seriously. It was questioned specifically what problem the FD2 students were having?

ST reported that the main problem they had was with the member of staff and that although some students have been problematic with adhering to the covid protocols, the majority have been on board; there are just a few students that are pushing boundaries.

AP added that part of it could be to do with where they are in the programme as 2nd year students. There is an element of over confidence or over familiarity which historically comes with this.

It was agreed that students do respond in different ways at different times and that compliance can be more of an issue in the 2nd year.

MH reiterated the fact that initially the students got it wrong a bit and then they have felt that a particular staff member has come down on them too hard, leading to a push and pull in the space. A sense of 'whatever I do I'm going to get grief' has been felt from the students. MH reported that there are definitely some key players in the year group and that it was not the entire year pushing this. Ultimately, we will not win this battle, if we do not calm it down on both sides.

MO reported that there have also been some rigging issues with the FD1 students, which led to the technical team being more involved with the FD2 students, particularly during theatre classes. This meant that they were being told off from different angles.

GS stressed the importance of keeping this conversation visible. It is clear that staff are continually looking for the right way to approach this and are ahead of the curve, rather than responding to it. AP's email was noted as particularly good at keeping this conversation visible to other staff members.

AP added that MH has also been exemplary in making sure that this is happening.

MH expressed that the problem is that although we are trying different approaches of dealing with this issue, the loudest voice is being heard all of the time. We need to calm things down and make sure that the softer voices who are more used to getting compliance from students can be heard.

It was questioned, how are we going to communicate what consequences there are to students?

ST shared the plan of firstly sending an encouraging communication out to students, congratulating them on this term and our successes with covid. As part of this, we will reiterate to the students what the protocols have been this term and then let them know that these have been reviewed and any changes to them will be communicated in the new year. It will be stressed that we expect students to comply with these new protocols and that if they don't, there will be consequences. It was highlighted though that we are still unsure what those consequences should be.

Further discussion was had around the appropriateness of the non-academic misconduct policy and it was agreed that it was negative behaviour we should be doing something about, and continued breaches of health and safety. In these scenarios, student behavioral issues would normally be escalated to a teacher's line manager. It was agreed that we should treat this in the same way we would treat any health and safety breach.

GS raised that the student representatives themselves have expressed feelings of frustration towards some of their peers that are not following protocols correctly. They recognise the work we are doing to keep the building safe and would like non-compliance dealt with.

ST suggested that perhaps we should send out a reminder of the code of conduct, stating that if students breach any health and safety of any kind then they will go through a process that could lead to non-academic misconduct disciplinary. This will be dependent on continual breaches and students' responses to protocol.

AP reported that during the student rep meeting, students had commented on how much they respect and respond to the way that MH speaks to them.

KW confirmed again that there has already been a conversation with the staff member in question, and therefore as that process was underway, we should move forward with the students but in the way that has been discussed in terms of taking the heat out of this situation.

Action (AP8): ST to send communication out to students before the end of term with a reminder of the code of conduct and non-academic disciplinary process, as well as congratulating the successes of the term.

13. Appeals and Complaints

No appeals or complaints were reported.

14. Student Support (see appendix 1)

AEW spoke through and updated the meeting on a breakdown of student support concerns for term 1 2020/21 (attached as appendix 1).

In addition to the report, AEW informed the meeting that the student support team had been working hard on getting students to access help from the NHS as much as possible. Connections have also been set up with a new service called 'Problem Shared', which provides low cost therapy online. This has turned out to be a great relationship and we are referring students we are particularly concerned about to them, as although we have a good deal, it is still not cheap enough. Students are able to get 6 sessions of therapy from this, which is a great start for us (although they may need more) and provides us extra security, especially in crisis situations.

Following the report, no questions were raised in regards to student support.

15. AOB

GS informed the meeting that MO had completed her PGCHE and everybody congratulated her.

KW thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

No further business was recorded.

Action Plan Summary

Action (AP1): Keep working with students and marketing on improving students' social media coverage and support.

Action (AP2): Continue to review and improve clarity around the specialisation process at audition point and pre-entry to the course.

Action AP3: JG to circulate guidance note to students which communicates the amendments to the Course Summary Document.

Action (AP4): ST to feed back to CDD students' comments about communication and uptake of CDD events and trial using video notifications as an alternative way of communicating with students.

Action (AP5): Degree team to set up student rep meeting at the beginning of the year to talk about what it means to be a student rep, the meeting structure and forums.

Action (AP6): JG to share prospectus link with student reps to feed back on.

Action (AP7): FD1 student reps and Year Mangers to review and rearrange FD1 Tuesday online schedule.

Action (AP8): ST to send communication out to students before the end of term with a reminder of the code of conduct and non-academic disciplinary process, as well as congratulating the successes of the term.

APPENDIX 1

Breakdown of student support concerns Term 1 20/21

	Anxiety/ Depression (moderate to severe)	Disordered Eating	Self-Harm	One or more SpLD	Medication for mental health condition	Therapy/ Counselling NHS (usually 6 sessions) Or through a specific charity	Therapy through Problem Shared	Waiting list for NHS	Seeing SST on weekly basis for mental health related issues
FD1	12	3	3	11	5	4	2	3	8
FD2	10	1	3	7	4	3	2	4	7
BA	6	0	2	5	2	1	1	2	5

NB Two students receive therapy privately that they pay for.