

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting

**Date of Meeting:** 07 February 2018

**Attendees:**

John Sheridan (JS - Chair)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM - minutes)	TNA
Paul Davies (PD)	TNA	Government Relations Manager (GRM)	TNA
Lucy Fletcher (LF)	TNA	Digital and Technology Research Lead (DTRL)	TNA
Val Johnson (VJ)	TNA	Julian Muller (JM)	TNA
Jeff James (JJ)	TNA	Information Manager (IM)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway-Searle (COS)	TNA		

**Apologies:** Neil Curtis (NC)

		Action
1.0	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	
1.1	The minutes of the previous meeting held on 31 January 2018 were reviewed and approved subject to minor amendments.	
1.2	There were no conflicts of interest declared.	
2.0	<b><u>Strategic Risk Register Review</u></b>	
2.1	The Executive Team was asked to review the Strategic Risk Register (SRR), current risk scores, and amendments to the text and mitigation measures.	
2.2	PD noted that discussion had not been possible with all directors due to a number of factors.	
2.3	Executive Team reviewed and discussed the SRR	
2.4	<u>Action:</u> PD to update the SRR as discussed ahead of review at the February Board. Due 17/02/18	PD
2.5	<b>Executive Team agreed the SRR subject to agreed changes being incorporated.</b>	

3.0	<b><u>Digital experimentation workshop programme</u></b>	
3.1	The Executive Team was asked to note and discuss the presentation on The National Archives' Digital experimentation workshop series.	
3.2	The DTRL took the Executive Team through the inspiration for the series, the current developments and the next steps.	
3.3	VJ noted that the DTRL had, since joining the organisation been very successful at bringing together the digital and historical strands of research. There was a great range of external partners in this series and a broad range of topics were covered.	
3.4	JS highlighted the usefulness of forming partnerships through programmes such as this.	
3.5	The DTRL explained that the proposed Public Facing Digital Experimentation Lab was imagined as a home for our Secondees, Phd students, Partners and Collaborators working with us on long-term projects and would not be aimed at a general public audience.	
3.6	JJ stated that we needed to consider how the space in the conference corridor was best utilised.	
3.7	PD noted that there would be start-up costs associated with converting an area into the Public Facing Digital Experimentation Lab, these needed to be considered and budgeted for.	
3.8	JS advised that the encouragement being given to staff to publish papers was commendable however we needed to be conscious of the amount of time and effort that was required from individuals in order to achieve this.	
3.9	VJ pointed out that the new Research Secondment scheme was designed specifically to address that issue.	
3.10	The DTRL said that we had and would continue to link papers to events that were being held, for example the recent 'Hackathon' event had led to the publication of 4 papers as much of the material for the papers had been produced in the preparation for the event and its outputs.	
3.11	JJ praised the linked themes and the prominence of the institutions that we had partnered with.	
3.12	JJ noted that it might be useful to remove abbreviations from the presentation to more easily understand which institutions were involved.	
3.13	JJ advised that what needed to be clearly signposted were the final, tangible, outcomes of the various workshops. We should aim to find real world issues that can be addressed and solved using research with partners.	
3.14	<b>Executive Team noted and fully supported the work being done and future plans.</b>	

<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.7</p>	<p><b><u>Document management system</u></b></p> <p>Executive Team was asked to consider options for the procurement of a corporate document management system. Two options were presented.</p> <p>JM advised that the SharePoint option would be in budget, we will need to move forward as we were at a decision point and Objective would soon be unsupported. The cost of continued use of Objective in the cloud would be around 50% more.</p> <p>The IM advised that there was a desire to share data and information with other organisation we collaborated or partnered with and currently this could only be done with email or through Google drive which was not viable in the long term. There was a demand for the ability to co-edit documents.</p> <p>JJ stated that we needed to consider our leadership duties and there was a balance to be made between the desire to collaborate and good record management practice. We needed to be aware of the risk to our reputation if we failed to meet the highest record management standards.</p> <p>JJ noted that it was a very positive move for both the KIM team and ICT to be working closely on this and presenting options together.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> JJ requested the KIM team to investigate if we have an extant action plan as a result of our previous IMA assessment, if not an IMA reassessment should be considered. Due 28/02/18</p> <p><b>Executive Team agreed an option to take forward.</b></p>	<p>PD / IM</p>
<p>5.0</p> <p>5.1</p>	<p><b><u>Any other business</u></b></p> <p><b>There being no other business the meeting was brought to a close.</b></p>	

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting

**Date of Meeting:** 14 February 2018

**Attendees:**

Neil Curtis (NC)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM - minutes)	TNA
Paul Davies (PD)	TNA	Sam Whaley (SW)	TNA
Lucy Fletcher (LF)	TNA	RSM Representative (RSMR)	RSM
Val Johnson (VJ)	TNA	Pauline Moore (PM)	TNA
Jeff James (JJ)	TNA	Corp Performance & Transparency Manager (CPTM)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway–Searle (COS)	TNA	Emma Markiewicz (EM)	TNA
John Sheridan (JS)	TNA	Darren Austin (DA)	TNA
		Marketing Manager (MM)	TNA
		Steve Burgess (SB)	TNA
		Senior Project and Business Change Manager (SPBCM)	TNA
		Anne Sexton (AS)	TNA

**Apologies:** None

		Action
1.0	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	
1.1	The minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 February 2018 were reviewed and approved subject to minor amendments.	
1.2	There were no conflicts of interest declared.	
2.0	<b><u>January Financials</u></b>	
2.1	The Executive Team was asked to note the January Management Accounts.	
2.2	PM took the Executive Team through the January Management Accounts.	
2.3	JJ advised that narrative needed to be included in the Board version to explain variances.	
2.4	<b>Executive Team noted the January Management Accounts.</b>	
3.0	<b><u>Dashboard</u></b>	

3.1	The Dashboard provides an easy reference of how the Performance Indicators for The National Archives have performed in the month and alerts the Executive Team to those areas where achievement is under threat and where some remedial action may be necessary.	
3.2	The Executive Team was asked to note the Corporate Dashboard for the month of January 2018.	
3.3	JJ noted the January Documents delivered onsite figure was approaching 65K, exceptionally high.	
3.4	COS advised that changes that had been introduced to the advance ordering system may have led to this particularly high figure.	
3.5	JJ stated that this was a good example of The National Archives delivering more to its users with less resource and this was encouraging.	
3.6	JJ highlighted that the expected increases in Born Digital material being accessioned had not yet occurred, we had originally expected the first large scale ingests in be 2016-2017, this had now been revised to 2020-2023 .	
3.7	<u>Action:</u> JJ requested JS provide an updated briefing paper for Board outlining the revised expectation around Born Digital material accessioning. Due 31/04/18	JS
3.8	NC suggested that we should consider how other organisations use infographics and possibly consider similar ways to display metrics in our Dashboard.	
3.9	<u>Action:</u> PD and his team to look at the RBG Kew report and consider if any infographics were suitable for our use	PD
3.10	<b>Executive Team noted January Dashboard.</b>	
4.0	<b><u>RSM update</u></b>	
4.1	The Executive Team were asked to note progress against the 2017-18 audit plan to date and suggest any amendments prior to this being presented to the Audit & Risk Committee on 26 February 2018.	
4.2	The RSM Tenon representative took the Executive Team through the report.	
4.3	PD explained the RSM contract was due to terminate on 31 March 2018, agreement had been reached to complete the Departmental Security Health Check Return) in April and Verification of Accounting Officer's Certificate (Pensions) in May, although it now seems likely that both of these audits will need to be completed in May if acceptable to RSM.	
4.4	<u>Action:</u> JJ requested PD discuss with HR arrangements around who would be liaising with him in preparing the completion of the Accounting Officer's Certificate as suitable resource needed to be allocated. Due 28/02/18	PD
4.5	<b>The Executive Team noted and approved the report.</b>	

5.0	<b><u>Internal Audit progress report</u></b>	
5.1	The Executive Team was asked to review the status of outstanding recommendations from completed internal audits, and suggest any amendments prior to these being presented to the Audit & Risk Committee on the 26 February 2018.	
5.2	The Executive Team reviewed and discussed the report.	
5.3	<b>Executive Team approved the report ahead of it being reviewed at Audit and Risk Committee.</b>	
6.0	<b><u>Prize Papers</u></b>	
6.1	Executive Team was asked to consider and approve a proposal to support the Prize Papers project, for a period of up to twelve years.	
6.2	EM advised that surveys had shown that in the first few years of the project there should be no unforeseen circumstances that would slow progress.	
6.3	NC noted that there would be a requirement on the Digitisation team and it was important to track all attributable work being done on the project. The project would be formally reviewed after 6 months and we needed to capture all workflows involved.	
6.4	NC sought clarity around plans regarding internet access for the project, there needed to be certainty that there would be no impact on access to public Wi-Fi.	
6.5	<u>Action:</u> EM to seek clarification around plans and add this to the paper. Due 21/02/18	EM
6.6	<u>Action:</u> DA to increase the clarity of the break points in the contract in the paper and show clearly how duplicate requests will be dealt with during the arrangement. Due 21/02/18	DA
6.7	<u>Action:</u> DA to provide a table with costs clearly laid out in paper. Due 21/02/18	DA
6.8	<u>Action:</u> EA to provide regular 6 month project updates to Executive Team. Due 01/09/18	EA
6.9	<u>Action:</u> Paper to be re-distributed to Executive Team for write round agreement after updating. Due 21/02/18	EA
7.0	<b><u>HLF bid Archives Inspire; Communities Count</u></b>	
7.1	Agreement was sought from Executive Team for the financial commitment that comes with a successful HLF application at both round 1 and round 2; the organisational support needed in terms of internal resource and focus; and the potential disruption to staff and customers from building works.	
7.2	Executive Team was also asked for views on what to present to the Board in February 2018.	

7.3	COS advised that this bid addressed points made in the feedback of our original bid around why now, phasing and why if digital was our key challenge was the original bid focused on the physical.	COS
7.4	MM said that we had designed a package that we hoped would appeal to other funding sources.	
7.5	The team presented on the different aspects of the bid, including the activities, partnerships, volunteering opportunities and the capital elements of the Public Space master plan.	
7.6	SB outlined a number of commercial opportunities.	
7.7	MM advised that going into Stage 2 was reliant on us raising the necessary funding.	
7.8	JS advised that the concept was strong and there was every chance that it could be a brilliant success.	
7.9	<u>Action:</u> COS to bring this item, HLF bid - Archives Inspire; Communities Count back to Executive Team for further discussion ahead of decision. Due 21/02/18	
7.10	JJ noted the importance of detailing potential risks when this was looked at by Board on 28 February 2018.	
8.0	<b><u>Any other business</u></b>	
8.1	<u>ATRs:</u> Executive Team approved LF bringing 3 ATR to Executive Team meeting on 21/02/18 for approval.	
8.2	<u>Policies:</u> COS advised the TUS had sought assurance around our readiness to deal with any potential instances of inappropriate behaviour in the work place or allegations of sexual harassment in response to much recent media coverage of related issues.	
8.3	COS stated that HR systematically review all of our policies but would put all related policies at the top of the pile to review first.	
8.4	<u>School lunch overflow:</u> PD and COS outlined plans for an overflow area for school children.	
8.5	Executive Team did not support the proposals and requested that plans were reconsidered.	
8.6	<u>Catering:</u> PD updated on issues relating to our catering concession	
8.7	<u>DoFW:</u> PD updated on progress.	
8.8	<b>There being no other business the meeting was brought to a close</b>	

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting  
**Date of Meeting:** 21 February 2018 – morning meeting  
**Attendees:**

Paul Davies (PD)	TNA	Kristen Dilworth (KD - minutes)	TNA
Neil Curtis (NC)	TNA	Head of Academic Engagement (HAE)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway–Searle (COS)	TNA	Lee Oliver (LMO)	TNA
Lucy Fletcher (LF)	TNA	Steve Burgess (SB)	TNA
Val Johnson (VJ)	TNA	Principal Records Specialist - Diverse Histories (PRSDH)	TNA
John Sheridan (JS)	TNA	Juergen Vervoort (JV)	TNA
		Jane Craigie – Payne (JCP)	TNA
		HR Manager – Organisational Development (HRMOD)	TNA
		Pauline Moore (PM)	TNA

**Apologies:** Jeff James (JJ)

		Action
1.0	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	
1.1	The minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 February 2018 were reviewed and approved subject to minor amendments.	
1.2	There were no conflicts of interest declared.	
2.0	<b><u>Professional Fellowship Scheme</u></b>	
2.1	The Executive Team was asked to approve the creation of a Professional Fellowship Scheme for staff, in partnership with Research Libraries UK, in accordance with our Memorandum of Understanding 2017 – 2020.	
2.2	The HAE explained that the scheme would allow staff from both organisations to undertake a one-year fellowship exploring a research theme or professional practice question pertinent to their role.	
2.3	The HAE said the scheme would enable colleagues to place their work in a wider professional context, engage in peer mentoring and knowledge exchange and strengthen the relationship between TNA and RLUK.	
2.4	The HAE acknowledged Deanna Clements advice and support throughout the scheme’s design. The scheme has been approved by GASP and will be presented to the RLUK board.	
2.5	The HAE explained the intention is to offer up to a maximum of four Professional	



	Fellows each year (two from The National Archives, two from RLUK).	
2.6	COS asked how would staff balance a <b>Professional Fellowship with their substantive role.</b>	
2.7	The HAE declared that Professional Fellowships are not secondments and Fellows will be expected to continue in their substantive role throughout the period of the Fellowship. It will be essential, therefore, that applicants talk with their line manager or head of department at the earliest possible moment about how the Professional Fellowship will help them in their substantive role. Suitable adjustments should be made to an individual's performance objectives and responsibilities depending on the size and scope of the proposed Fellowship activities. These adjustments are to be decided between the line manager and applicant.	
2.8	JS expressed the importance of how we present the offer to staff and the need to clarify that it is an inclusive scheme and applicants can apply from any of The National Archives' departments or directorates.	
2.9	The HAE stated a communication plan is being developed with the Internal and Stakeholder Communications Officer to encourage a wide interest from staff.	
2.10	<b>The Executive Team approved the creation of the Professional Fellowship scheme for staff.</b>	
3.0	<b><u>Late Night Opening Trial</u></b>	
3.1	The Executive Team was asked to take note of the objectives of this trial and approve the associated expenditure, which is included in the Venue Management Services budget bid for the next financial year.	
3.2	LMO explained that the trial is based on a variety of feedback that has been received over the last few years which stated that 19:00 is too early to close for a meaningful research visit after a day at work in London and the that evening What's On events start too early (18:00).	
3.3	LMO stated the trial would initially last for 8 weeks on Thursdays during May & June, What's On events would run on the same night, with later start times than current. If it is going well after four weeks, we will extend the trial period for a 12-week period.	
3.4	JS asked if we are going to actively promote the trial	
3.5	LMO replied both Marketing & Comms and Academic Engagement would be involved in promoting the trial.	
3.6	VJ offered her support to speak to individuals in the academic audience to explain the trial.	
3.7	LMO stated that we intend to measure and evaluate the trial by using barrier data to examine entry and exit times for the reading rooms, and compare them to a pre- trial baseline. We will also seek feedback from those who stay late.	

<p>3.8</p> <p>3.9</p> <p>3.10</p> <p>3.11</p> <p>3.12</p> <p>3.13</p> <p>3.14</p> <p>3.15</p> <p>3.16</p>	<p>LMO said for reading rooms and events, transactions and takings in the Coffee bar and shop will be analysed to see if late night opening generates sufficient business to make opening them worthwhile.</p> <p>NC asked about document productions.</p> <p>LMO advised that wherever possible we will extend existing services by 2 hours on a late night but this will not include document ordering, which will remain as normal.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team were supportive of the trial.</b></p> <p>The Executive Team was asked to approve the renaming of the hireable spaces, and a staff competition to help generate suitable names.</p> <p>LMO explained that the Venue Management team are currently working with Estates, Marketing &amp; Comms and BaxterStorey to market our spaces for corporate and other hire.</p> <p>LMO said BaxterStorey has strongly advised us to rename our hireable spaces to make them more marketable. LMO proposed the rooms are named after some of our iconic documents in the collection.</p> <p>LMO stated that we intend to run a staff competition to encourage suitable suggestions. A selection panel will be established to choose the winners. Once the names have been chosen and linked to the spaces, final approval will be sought from the Operations Director and the Director of Public Engagement.</p> <p><b>The Executive Team approved the renaming of the hireable spaces as outlined above.</b></p>	
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p>	<p><b><u>Suffrage Season / Exhibition</u></b></p> <p>The Executive Team were ask to give feedback and comments on our Suffrage 100 season.</p> <p>The PRSDH explained that this year is 100 years since some women gained the vote and a series of national commemorative programmes are taking place.</p> <p>The PRSDH stated that this anniversary gives us an excellent opportunity to build on our existing work around diverse histories, and to mainstream this into our public programming, for our first ever events and exhibitions season.</p> <p>The PRSDH explained that the season was kicked off with a ‘pop up’ dance performance at Victoria Station on 6<sup>th</sup> February to commemorate Emily Wilding Davison taking the train to Epsom racecourse in June 1913. The performance was in collaboration with Combination Dance, the local Richmond based dance company that used our records about Emily to inspire their performance. The dance was featured on Channel 4 news.</p> <p>SB stated our onsite events was launched by a film screening of Suffragette in our new events space, the first screening of this type that we have hosted. This was</p>	

	<p>accompanied by an introductory talk with a chance to explore original suffrage records.</p> <p>4.6 The PRSDH said this week we announced Suffragette City, which builds on last year's collaboration with the National Trust. Suffragette City runs at the London Pavilion in Piccadilly Circus from 8 to 25 March.</p> <p>4.7 SB noted that the next Archives at Night would be a celebration of suffrage. Jessica Hynes will be in conversation in our events space talking about her research and writing process for the BBC Suffragist comedy Up the Women.</p> <p>4.8 SB stated the centre of our season would be a temporary exhibition; Suffragettes vs the State in the Keepers Gallery, which will run from 8, May – 29 October 2018.</p> <p>4.9 LF acknowledged the efforts of the Digital and Marketing Officer and the Partnerships &amp; Engagement Assistant on Jessica Hynes's participation.</p> <p>4.10 JS asked if there would be an opportunity for women to discuss what the vote means to them.</p> <p>4.11 SB suggested we could use social media or they could be an opportunity at Archives at Night.</p> <p>4.12 <b>The Executive Team expressed their support for the season</b></p>	
5.0	<p><b><u>CCD's Civil Service Staff Engagement Survey</u></b></p> <p>5.1 JV wrote a paper for Executive Team to reflect on changes within the Collection Care Department over the last year, where the increased staff engagement as shown in the engagement survey has been significant.</p> <p>5.2 VJ congratulated JV on creating a new structure which supported positive engagement, and was a significant factor in the positive results.</p> <p>5.3 VJ explained that the new structure and career progression scheme in Collection Care presented several career opportunities for staff in a variety of forms.</p> <p>5.4 PD asked for the views of JCP and the HRMOD.</p> <p>5.5 The HRMOD noted that the managers had been through the Management Development programme, which reflected the positive response relating to the 'My Manager' questions.</p> <p>5.6 JV stated that although Collection Care had a good year, that does not make it immune to negative impact in the future.</p> <p>5.7 JV noted that there is plenty more work to do in 2018 to keep up the engagement level.</p> <p>5.8 COS suggested having a Senior Leadership Team meeting to discuss the ways in which teams are working to improve the engagement within their teams and share some of the issues that they have or are encountering.</p>	

6.0	<b><u>Authority to recruit (ATR) discussion</u></b>
6.1	The Executive Team considered a number of ATRs for 'business critical' roles presented for discussion.
6.2	CORE 1-4 - Senior Legal Editors - Approved
6.3	CORE 5-6 - Arabian Gulf Digital Archive Project Cataloguers - Approved
6.4	CORE 7 - Head of Archive Sector Development - Approved
6.5	CORE 8 - Digital Selection and Transfer Service Owner - Approved
6.6	CORE 9 - Head of Cross-Government Engagement and Projects - Approved
6.7	CORE 10 – Head of Strategy Development - Approved
6.8	DOFW 1 - Partnership and Programming Manager - Approved
6.9	DOFW 2 - Development Manager Fundraising - Approved
7.0	<b><u>AoB / Diary Review</u></b>
7.1	COS shared the Update on Safeguarding paper that will be reviewed at the Audit and Risk Committee on an Annual basis.
7.2	COS highlighted the launch of Suffragette City on Monday 26 <sup>th</sup> February at the London Pavilion, Piccadilly.
7.3	LF advised of the visit by Lord Ashton on Thursday 22 February.
7.4	PD stated he will attend User Forum to talk about Car Parking
7.5	<b>There being no other business the meeting was brought to a close.</b>

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting  
**Date of Meeting:** 21 February 2018 – afternoon meeting  
**Attendees:**

Jeff James (JJ - Chair)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM - minutes)	TNA
Paul Davies (PD)	TNA	Sam Whaley (SW)	TNA
Lucy Fletcher (LF)	TNA	Marketing Manager (MM)	TNA
Val Johnson (VJ)	TNA	Senior Project and Business Change Manager (SPBCM)	TNA
Neil Curtis (NC)	TNA	Pauline Moore (PM)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway-Searle (COS)	TNA	Jane Craigie-Payne (JCP)	TNA

John Sheridan (JS)	TNA		

**Apologies:** None

		Action
1.0	<b><u>Conflicts of interest</u></b>	
1.1	There were no conflicts of interest declared.	
2.0	<b><u>Funding bid</u></b>	
2.1	Executive Team was asked to support proposals for a funding bid. Executive Team had previously discussed plans on 14 February and asked this item be brought back for further discussion ahead of a decision being reached.	
2.2	The MM presented further details on the proposed budgets and how the spend would be split.	
2.3	JS suggested that we needed to make assumptions on what we expected the financial landscape to be over the duration of the project and what the key areas of capital spend we would be required to make, we could then assess if this was an affordable proposal.	
2.4	JS noted the duty on the Keeper to take all practical steps to preserve the records, set out in the Public Records Act 1958, alongside the more nebulous duty to provide reasonable facilities for public access	
2.5	JJ stated that the Board should be advised of potential different scenarios we could face in order to give an idea of the potential risks and unknowns that we faced.	
2.6	<b>The Executive Team approved proposals, noted potential risks and plans to update Board.</b>	
3.0	<b><u>Budget 2018-19</u></b>	
3.1	Executive Team was asked to note and discuss the Early Budget Review summary and to consider plans for reaching a balanced budget.	
3.2	JJ said that we needed to thoroughly interrogate our non-staff costs and challenge our spending plans.	
3.3	JJ stated that the other key area to consider was income generation, we needed to firmly challenge our expectations and forecasts and ascertain if more income could be generated.	

3.4	NC stated that while he could review Director's budgets and flag up areas and assumptions that could be challenged it was for Executive Team to collectively decide.	
3.5	NC noted that we had a hard deadline of the 15 March which is when the Budget needed to be distributed to Board, much work was required to reach that point.	
3.6	JJ advised that we needed to stay focused on getting as close as possible to achieving the aim of DoFW in this CSR period.	
3.7	JJ suggested NC seek input from the Head of Procurement on what savings could potentially be made from renegotiating contracts over the three year period.	
3.8	<u>Action:</u> PM and NC to investigate potential non staff cost savings and income assumptions and aspirations. Due 27/02/18	PM / NC
3.9	<u>Communications:</u>	
3.10	SLT to be advised:	
3.11	Good progress made and year 1 looks manageable, now looking out to how we deliver DoFW in the next 3 to 4 years.	
3.12	We will thoroughly examine income to see if more could be raised and examine non-staff costs to check if savings can be found.	
3.13	<u>Action:</u> PD to draft an update for SLT, agree with Directors via write round and send out to SLT. Due 23/02/18	PD
4.0	<b><u>Any other business</u></b>	
4.1	JJ updated on a recent meeting with the Director General of Imperial War Museums, useful guidance had been received relating to fundraising.	
4.2	There being no other business the meeting was closed	

**Title:** Executive Team Meeting

**Date of Meeting:** 28 February 2018

**Attendees:**

Paul Davies (PD)	TNA	Patrick Mallett (PJM – minutes)	TNA
Neil Curtis (NC)	TNA	Pauline Moore (PM)	TNA
Caroline Ottaway–Searle (COS)	TNA	Jane Craigie – Payne (JCP)	TNA
Lucy Fletcher (LF)	TNA		
Val Johnson (VJ)	TNA		
John Sheridan (JS)	TNA		
Jeff James (JJ – from item 2)			


**Apologies:** none

		Action
1.0	<b><u>Minutes and Matters Arising</u></b>	
1.1	The minutes of the previous two meetings held on 21 February 2018 were reviewed and approved subject to minor amendments.	
1.2	There were no conflicts of interest declared.	
2.0	<b><u>Draft Budget 2018-19</u></b>	
2.1	The Executive Team was asked to discuss the Draft Budget 2018-19.	
2.2	NC stated that we will need to thoroughly explore areas where non-staff costs might be reduced and areas where projected income streams could be revised upwards.	
2.3	NC advised that the outputs from this session would feed into a number of scenarios that would be looked at next week and an approach agreed	
2.4	Executive Team reviewed the main variances in Non-staff costs by Directorate. A number of suggestions were made to trim down the Non-staff costs.	
2.5	<u>Action:</u> COS to invite our Customer Insight Officer to Executive Team to update on work being done on analysing the impact of events and the metrics used. Due 31/03/18	COS
2.6	JJ noted that as we are now were in a position where there would be no in year surplus to fund projects, we needed ask what we could stop and difficult decisions would have to be made.	
2.7	Executive Team discussed Income levels.	
2.8	<u>Action:</u> COS / PD to review potential to raise income through subletting space and the monetising of the Event Space and update NC. Due 07/03/18	COS / PD
2.9	<u>Action:</u> NC and PM to feed outputs of the discussion into the proposed scenarios to be discussed at Executive Team. Due 06/03/18	NC / PM
2.10	<u>DoFW – update</u>	
2.11	JCP updated on the current VE exercise.	
3.0	<b><u>Draft Business priorities</u></b>	

3.1	The Executive Team was asked to review draft Business Priorities for 2018-19 ahead of planned review and agreement at the March Board.	
3.2	PD asked Directors to prepare their Business Priorities ready for discussion at Executive Team next week.	
4.0	<b><u>AOB / Diary Review</u></b>	
4.1	JJ noted the importance of assessing and agreeing the most appropriate metrics to measure when the item is discussed next week. A detailed understanding of what we measure and why will be required ahead of the planned Tailored Review.	
4.2	JJ requested thorough briefing of our social media strategy for events he would be attending in the future.	
4.3	VJ discussed issues around recruitment.	
4.4	PD outlined the refined charging levels for the car park and explained that signage would be going up this week advising the public of plans.	
4.5	<i>Post meeting note 07/03/18 – signage delayed until w/c 07/03/18 due to sudden return of wintry weather.</i>	
4.6	<b>There being no other business the meeting was brought to a close.</b>	