April 2019

Prompt	What to look for	Notes
Was the committee chaired effectively?	Did the meeting run to time?	Yes
·	Did the committee devote the right amount of time	Yes
	to the items listed? (ie. More time for the more	
	significant issues)	
	Was the Chair well prepared for the meeting?	Yes
	Did everybody who wanted to participate get a	
	chance to do so? Note in particular if any member or	Yes, very inclusive for everyone
	attendee appears to have been ignored or sidelined.	
	At the conclusion of every item, was there	Yes
	appropriate summing up and was it clear what the	
	outcome of the discussion was?	
	Was there appropriate intervention? For example, if	Yes
	members strayed away from the topic or were	
	prolonging a discussion unnecessarily?	
Did the non-executive	Were the non-executive directors well prepared for	
directors participate	the meeting? How familiar did they appear to be	All were engaged
effectively?	with the detail in the papers or did they come across	
	as not having read the papers?	
	Did they ask insightful questions about the items	All involved were challenged appropriately
	under discussion?	
	Was there any non-participation/apparent disinterest	
	from a non-executive?	None

Prompt	What to look for	Notes
	Were the NED inputs to discussions balanced across all agenda items? [Some NEDs have a comfort zone and they will spend more time discussing favourite topics at the expense of issues that interest them less, even if they are a bigger issue for the organisation) Did any of the non-executive directors not challenge?	NED's were effective with a good chair
Was there effective challenge by the non-executives?	Did the non-executives challenge appropriately? In other words, did they challenge on suitably material and significant issues or were they overly concerned about trivial matters (eg. Spelling mistakes, immaterial issues)	There has been effective work by the NED's and there will be a meeting change in format with alternative sessions focussing more on a deep dive approach to topics.
	Were there any items discussed where you consider that there could have been more challenge by the non-executives? Was the nature of the challenge constructive, supportive, non-confrontational and respectful or did it come across negatively (adversarial,	One potential concern is there is no standardised reporting mechanisims in place. This means there is potential for some not delivering reports at the same standard as others. A standardised reporting system would be a benefit to all
In general, was it a good meeting	argumentative)? Was the debate constructive, positive and respectful? Was there a general atmosphere of mutual trust and candour? Was there any evidence of "group think"? This is a risky situation when groups become so collegiate and complacent that all members start behaving in the same way?	The new structure is a work in progress

Prompt sheet for Governors observing the Board of Directors and Board Committees

May 2019

This meeting was the first in the workshop style for which the topic was the 2018 Staff Survey.

There was a presentation on the work being done following the poor survey results. The workshop style was successful, there was good and open discussion. Everyone, including the Governors, were able and were encouraged to contribute.

There were aspects of this whole tranche of work that would be useful for all Governors to hear about, such as OAK (optimistic, appreciative and kind).

Again, a well chaired meeting. The chair let the workshop flow, only intervening to keep it to time.

Came away from the meeting feeling that the trust has the measures in place to improve the staff survey results over a period of time.