



## COMBINED CADET FORCE ASSOCIATION

### Minutes of the Open Board Meeting

Held on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017 at Holderness House London EC2A 4DW

<b>Trustees Present:</b>	<p>AVM NDA Maddox          Lt Col M Hampshire          Miss JYW Hodgson          Lt Col M Godfrey          Cdr (CCF) RK Gordon RNR          Lt Col S Law          Lt Col MZ Hamid          Wg Cdr DW Montgomery VRT          Cdr (CCF) MP Ripley RNR          Lt Cdr (CCF) GS Poulet-Bowden RNR          Maj AW Reynolds          Maj C Thompson          Capt JJ Bleakley          Capt S Heywood</p>	<p><b><u>Representing</u></b>          Chairman          Vice Chairman          Honorary Treasurer          East Anglia Schools          Northern Ireland Schools          West Midlands Schools          Lowland Schools          Highland Schools          North West and IoM Schools          West of England Schools          Tunbridge Wells Girls Grammar School          Thomas Deacon Academy          CEP Schools          North East Schools</p>
<b>Co-opted members:</b>	<p>Mrs J Taylor</p>	<p>ASCL and NAHT</p>
<b>Secretariat:</b>	<p>Col (Retd) MNS Urquhart          Mr R Walton          Ms V McBurney          Miss E Lynch</p>	<p>CE CCFA and Secretary          Finance Director (FD)          Hd of Vol Recruitment &amp; Comms          CCF Marketing &amp; Comms Officer</p>
<b>In attendance:</b>	<p>Cdre J Fry RN          Brig MP Lowe          Lt Col RI Armstrong RM          Sqn Ldr R Glendinning          Cdr (Retd) GR Bushell</p>	<p>MOD RF&amp;C Div          Army Regional Command          RN CCF, FOST          RAF HQ Air Command          CRFCA</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	<p>Mr M Mortimer          Wg Cdr MH Green VRT          Maj SW Emmerson</p>	<p>HMC and ISC          South East England Schools          Yorkshire and Humberside Schools</p>

Item No	Subject	Action
1.	<b>Conflict of Interest declarations.</b> The Chairman reminded those trustees present eligible to vote were required to declare any interests. There were no declarations.	

2.	<p><b>Minutes of the previous meeting.</b> The minutes of the Open Board meeting of 7 Mar 2017 were distributed prior to the meeting. No comments had been received and there were no matters arising. The Chairman signed the minutes as a true record.</p>	
3.	<p><b>CCFA report to MOD and single services.</b> The CE reported that CCFA is continuing to look at the Association as a charity and how it is structured, with a particular focus on governance because of new Charity Commission direction. Trustees had just agreed to adopt the Commission's new Governance Code, which will require trustees to become more involved than they did in the 'old' CCFA.</p> <p>Additionally, CCFA is looking to modernise the structure of the whole board of trustees. A substantial meeting had just happened and much work will ensue, in particular to work out how CCFA trustees can garner balanced representative views from their regions. A strong message was that CCF contingent commanders attend a large amount of regional meetings, therefore CE CCFA will engage with the s/services and the RFCAs to see if they can be slimmed down and made more focussed and productive.</p>	
4.	<p><b>CCFA Risk Register.</b> The Chairman reported that in the preceding meeting the trustees had spent some time examining the CCFA Risk Register. He asked if the Association could have sight of the MOD and s/service Cadet risk registers and best practice, as CCFA's register ought to mirror them. CCFA will circulate its risk register once complete. Cdre Fry responded that he was happy to provide the 3* Youth &amp; Cadet Steering Group risk register, which contains six top level risks. <b>[Afternote: Received.]</b></p>	CE
5.	<p><b>MOD report.</b> (The MOD Cadet Report was tabled prior to the meeting.)</p>	
a.	<p><u>Cadet Force 2020 Strategy.</u> Over the past two years the Strategy had served as a very good collective focus for the cadet forces. The intention now is to refresh it out to 2025. It has never been a top down strategy, rather it has been a top level umbrella that pulls together the strategies and intentions of the cadet forces to ensure they are going in roughly the same direction, with the MOD taking aspects on a tri-service basis where it makes sense.</p>	
b.	<p><u>Cross-Government Social Policy.</u> RF&amp;C Div is engaged with the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, which is leading for the Government on developing a cross-Government social policy for England, which will contain a youth policy chapter. Scotland and Wales have their own separate Youth policies and RF&amp;C Div engages with those administrations to ensure that MOD policies are coherent with them.</p>	
c.	<p><u>Cadet Forces Commission.</u> A number of final points of detail having been resolved, Cdre Fry expected the new Commission to receive Royal assent shortly. <b>[Afternote: On 26 Oct 17, MOD RF&amp;C Div confirmed that Her Majesty The Queen had approved and signed the Royal Warrant for the introduction and implementation of the Cadet Forces Commission.]</b></p>	

	<p>Trustees asked a number of questions about the transition arrangements and subsequent selection processes. These would be confirmed by each of the single services, but in response Cdre Fry made one broad point, which was that it would move the cadet forces outside some of the tortuous paperwork involved with personnel issues within the armed forces. In future Cadet Force Regulations will govern the processes and it will take time to reach that state.</p>	
<p>d.</p>	<p><u>Cadet Metrics.</u> MOD RF&amp;C Div staff were trying to prepare metrics which give the MOD and single services a view of what Cadets are giving Defence in terms of outcomes and trends. Staff capacity had prevented any progress on this over the past six months, but it was needed to inform the 3 Star Youth &amp; Cadet Steering Group's thinking on both Risk and Sustainability, therefore that work was beginning properly. It will draw upon information already held to provide a small dashboard showing how the cadet forces are doing and (using the word loosely) their health. It will also draw in part on the work of the University of Northampton into the benefits of the cadet forces, the first report having just been published in public.</p>	
<p>e.</p>	<p><u>Cadet Expansion Programme (CEP).</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The CEP was on track. The next round of schools approved in May had just (3 Oct 17) been announced publicly by the Secretary of State for Defence. 24 new units were parading this term. There are now over 400 units parading. There are about 70 approval places left with 105 schools fully engaged in preparing to apply for a place. The programme is therefore on track to meet the published target of 500 CCF units by 2020.</li> <li>2) Cdre Fry however acknowledged that there was still fragility in the new units for the same well known reasons, principally about CFAV continuity and school's funding their side of the partnership deal. He confirmed that his team was working closely with the Department for Education (DfE).</li> <li>3) This included DfE briefing the Regional School Commissioners on the role and benefits of the CCF. The Commissioners are now much more engaged and recognise that a cadet force in a school which is having problems is part of the solution and not the problem; this was a positive development already making a difference. There was however more to be done on briefing OFSTED.</li> <li>4) He also recognised that new contingents had failed and others will fail before 2020, but he emphasised that new units were not being approved if there was the slightest belief they would fail. The programme was not about meeting the 500 target, but instead about putting sustainable cadet forces into schools in order to provide long term benefit to the schools and young people in them. In response to trustees' questions he confirmed that 9 out of 181 had failed so far, with a further 9 on the risk register. The key was to identify the risk</li> </ol>	

	<p>early, which had not been good earlier in the programme but was now much better. The challenge then was working out how to intervene, because whilst if the cause was military it was easy to allocate resources, it was more difficult if the cause was school related. There were two common reasons for failure. The first was pressure on school funding. The second and by far main reason was succession planning and continuity of CFAVs; it is a school responsibility to find CFAVs and get them away on training and not the MOD's responsibility, although the MOD will help as much as it can, for example by making more courses available at school friendly times. Cdre Fry repeated the point that he made in the previous board meeting, which was that if CCFA felt strongly about the risk posed by insufficient education funding, then the Association could write to the Department for Education.</p>	
	<p>f. <u>The MOD RF&amp;C Div team</u>. Cdre Fry's team at the end of 2016 consisted of seven staff but will reduce to 3½ by the end of 2017 (with him being the half). The team's capacity to take on big projects will reduce accordingly.</p>	
	<p>g. <u>Connected magazine</u>. Cdre Fry complimented CCFA's Marketing &amp; Comms team on the development of Connected magazine. He had just read the latest edition and was impressed how it had grown into something full of useful information that people want to read.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Army report.</b> (Tabled prior to the meeting were two documents: Regional Command's report and Regional Command's staff answers to a list of questions and issues submitted in advance by trustee contingent commanders.) Brig Lowe made two points from an Army CCF point of view: Assurance and Funding post 2020.</p>	
	<p>a. <b>Assurance.</b> Regional Command knew that it was consciously taking risk with the assurance of school CCFs prior to CEP 100, because as there were no trained adult volunteers and no trained senior cadets in CEP 500 contingents, greater attention and effort had to be given to help them get up and running. Consequently a lighter touch approach had to be given to the established CCFs.</p>	
	<p>b. <b>Funding post 2020.</b> When the LIBOR funding ends in 2020, the single services have been directed to absorb the costs of the now expanded CCF. For the Army that represents about £8.5m in annual running costs plus about 60 employees. Regional Command would of course continue to support CCFs, but in future struggling CCFs cannot take it for granted that extraordinary additional effort and resources, for example CTTs and their time, would be forthcoming to support them.</p>	
	<p>c. <b>JSP 313.</b> Myles Ripley confirmed that he had volunteered to assist with the re-write of JSP 313 and was wondering when this would happen. Brig Lowe responded that Dr Richard Crawford SO1 Cadets Policy and Plans was leading on the work. It was agreed to discuss it further out of committee.</p>	

	<p><b>d. FMT 600.</b> One of the questions submitted in advance of the board meeting concerned the regulations for using school mini buses when driving cadets to CCF activity. The Regional Command staff response was that drivers of any vehicle being used to support cadet activity are to hold D1 licences and FMT 600s, which was a s/Service wide policy affecting RN and Army sections and which had been unsuccessfully challenged in the past. Myles Ripley challenged this response, pointing out that considerable safety related requirements had to be met to drive a school mini bus and that adding the FMT 600 requirement was a little ludicrous.</p> <p>Brig Lowe responded describing his understanding of this matter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Army Logistic branch interpretation of policy was that the MOD’s rules applied when a school mini bus was taking cadets to a cadet activity.</li> <li>• He acknowledged that this was not the view of his counterparts in the Air Cadet Organisation.</li> <li>• He also wondered whether the Army had the authority to overrule what he understood to be a perfectly lawful construct that schools have for the safe driving of their minibuses (a school member of staff driving a school minibus under school insurance and carrying a Section 19 permit).</li> <li>• The issue was being raised again within the Army and he hoped that his assessment about the Army’s authority would be confirmed.</li> </ul> <p>[<b>Afternote:</b> Brig Lowe wrote to all regional commanders on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2017 confirming his decision regarding HQ Regional Command Policy: it was that schools are entitled to transport their cadets to and from CCF activity in school-provided minibuses, driven by the school’s own drivers under a Section 19 exemption permit, if they wish, and that school-owned transport should not be subjected to any form of MOD motor transport management audit by Logistic Support staff or the CTTs.]</p>	
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Royal Navy report.</b> (Lt Col Armstrong tabled a RN CCF report prior to the meeting.) Lt Col Armstrong gave a wide ranging update. key points were:</p>	
<p><b>a.</b></p>	<p><b>CCF modernisation.</b> RN CCF staff were working closely with Regional Command on CCF modernisation.</p>	
<p><b>b.</b></p>	<p><b>Transformation Planning.</b> Transformation Planning was a new main workstream starting now. He referred back to Brig Lowe’s earlier point about LIBOR funding ceasing and the effect it would have on the Army’s budget. His team was anticipating the same challenge by working out a model for delivering cadet activity and its costs, the intent being that there will not be a drop off in business continuity across the 2019-2021 period. Volunteers would be sent surveys and asked to participate in working groups.</p>	
<p><b>c.</b></p>	<p><b>Courses and Camps attendance statistics.</b> Lt Col Armstrong referred to a slide in his tabled report showing the real output of training. Although RN CCF is providing a range of camps and courses for CFAVs and cadets, experience this year is showing that there is an average of an 18%</p>	

	<p>attendance gap; i.e. despite what RN CCF lay on and cadets committing to attend, within the final two weeks up until report time the average gap between capacity and cadets turning up is 18%. Reasons vary: parents not agreeing to attendance at the last minute; parents not informed by cadets; sickness; failure to complete compulsory medical info (Diving); cadets did not feel like attending at the last minute etc. The late drop-outs by cadets are such that it is too late to offer the places elsewhere. This will be analysed during the Transformation Planning work to see if this wastage can be reduced. Thought was given to charging the cadets, but it was thought that this was not possible.</p> <p>Myles Ripley asked whether it was worth considering the issue on a tri-service basis. He wondered if young people now have so much going on in their lives and many other opportunities, therefore it could be useful to see if there are common trends between the services and whether there are any obvious reasons for low attendance.</p> <p>Brig Lowe responded that in the case of the CCF (Army) that did not appear to be the case. Attendance by cadets at annual camps in 2017 was up by 600 to 700. Attendance by adult volunteers was however down by about 12%, but this was not uniform, being strongly down in the South West, London and the East Midlands/East Anglia areas, and was strongly up in Wales. He was therefore not sure that there were common factors.</p> <p>Brig Lowe did identify a related trend, which was the clear increase in pressure on adult volunteers as a result of modern working practices. Sensitive thought would therefore have to be given to how to adapt the model, because a 'one size fits all' approach was potentially ruling out some adult volunteers who want to attend a camp but cannot attend the whole period.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>RAF report.</b> Sqn Ldr Glenddining presented a verbal report. His main points were:</p>	
	<p><b>a. CEP update.</b> The CEP programme was healthy. 27 schools were going through the CEP process and were at different stages within it. Additionally two requests had just been received from business as usual schools.</p>	
	<p><b>b. Support to RAF sections.</b> Realise need to be more agile and responsive in supporting new schools. Recruiting new staff Training and Evaluation staff. A number of Corporal support staff to do day-to-day administration. Struggling to recruit, which is disappointing. Currently 50% light on TEST officers. Acknowledge means reduced support to schools. Actively recruiting.</p>	
	<p><b>c. Focus on STEM.</b> Focussing on STEM. In some schools, e.g. in Birmingham, Military not a career way forward in the eyes of some parents, but engineering, medical, science related careers are attractive. Looking to build a cohort of STEM specialist CFAVs.</p>	

9.	<b>Assurance.</b> A general discussion about assurance matters ensued.	
a.	<p><b>Westminster / Bader.</b> Trustees noted that the new assurance process was being done through Westminster and asked for an update on steps move Bader closer to Westminster.</p> <p>Cdre Fry responded. The short term intention was to try to develop a common front-end for both Bader and Westminster, for which funding will be required. That would be short term progress and it might be the only progress, but he confirmed that it remained part of the 2020 strategy.</p>	
b.	<p><b>Duplication – the Red Book Test.</b> Maj Reynolds followed on with another example of duplication, questioning the value of the Red Book Test. The ten questions never changed and it would be easy to provide the answers to achieve compliance. Additionally CFAVs do other training, e.g. First Aid training, which duplicates aspects of the Red Book Test. Brig Lowe agreed to take the matter away to check that there is no unnecessary duplication. Lt Col Armstrong defended the Red Book, considering it to be an important and useful aide memoire. He reminded trustees that its widespread adoption across the cadet forces was brought in after Cadet Kaylee McIntosh was killed in 2007. He personally found it useful and commended the occasional review, for example to remind oneself what to do in an emergency.</p>	
10.	<b>CRFCA report.</b> Cdr Bushell mentioned three matters.	
a.	<p><b>RFCAs engagement with CCFs.</b> He observed that, historically, the RFCAs had not had as much to do with CCF contingents compared to the community cadet forces. The Cadet Expansion Programme had however changed that situation. Using LIBOR funding around 50 additional members of staff were employed by the RFCAs, working in a variety of organisations, to support the CEP. In particular he emphasised the key role played by the School Cadet Expansion Officers (SCEOs).</p>	
b.	<p><b>Cadet Training facilities.</b> He reminded contingents that, generally, in every county there is a community cadet force county training centre which CCFs can book. There would be a cost because the RFCAs are not funded for facilities beyond the community cadet forces, however CCFs would only be charged the no loss costs.</p>	
c.	<p><b>Cadet Health Check Team.</b> As part of the annual programme the Cadet Health Check team has actively visited CCF camps and CEP schools. It particularly looked to visit CCF contingents at the extremes of the CEP programme, i.e. that had been stood up but were struggling and those which had been stood up and thriving. The finding will be presented to the Chief of Defence Personnel in the annual report.</p>	
11.	<p><b>Best Practice Forum.</b> Valerie McBurney reminded that an action coming out of the 2017 conference for CCF Headteachers, which was set by GOC Regional Command, was to set up an online forum for schools to exchange best practice and ideas, particularly for new and potential CEP schools.</p>	

	<p>She and her team had been investigating options and consequently had a number of questions that needed answering before taking ideas further forward, such as: who it should be aimed at, how it should be run, what platform should be used, how to get it off to a good start etc. The questions would be circulated to trustees who were asked to comment and respond to Valerie.</p>	<b>Trustees</b>
<b>12.</b>	<p><b>Armouries and access to weapons for training.</b> Johnathan Bleakley had submitted a comment in advance pointing out the difficulty faced by CEP schools in building armouries and gaining access to weapons for training, particularly live firing. Although he presented it as an individual problem affecting his contingent, he predicted that the problem will increase as more CEP school contingents are established. The Regional Command staff response highlighted the current high threat security situation and predicted that it was unlikely that security precautions and controls applied to Cadets weapons and ammunition would be relaxed. Johnathan Bleakley nevertheless described the practical consequences of the existing ad hoc arrangements to ‘beg and borrow’ weapons, which was running on goodwill and staff in contingents going out of their way to make special arrangements to help, which he felt was not sustainable. The particular problem is live firing, when additional weapons are needed and he pointed out that the shooting does not take place outside military ranges. He therefore asked if regional centralised pools of weapons could be established, similar to the Northern Ireland model, where each school has its own weapons but they are held at either the main training areas of security force bases. In his case the logical place to store the weapons in a central armoury would be at Colchester.</p> <p>Brig Lowe responded that took the point, noting that it was the first time the issue had been raised. The suggestion was feasible, but with it there would be a huge resource bill for doing this in each regional across the UK (building new armouries, making people responsible for storing and accounting). There was now a need to understand shared resources taking geography, time and space into account. It was agreed that the matter would have to be taken away for deeper consideration.</p>	
<b>13.</b>	<p><b>Dates of next meetings.</b> Dates of next meetings were confirmed as:</p>	
<b>a.</b>	<p><b>Monday 11<sup>th</sup> December 2017 – AGM and Dinner</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TBC late morning – extraordinary Trustees’ reserved business meeting to discuss the makeup of the board.</li> <li>• 1400 hours – AGM</li> <li>• 1900 hours – annual dinner</li> </ul>	
<b>b.</b>	<p><b>Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2018 – Board meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1130 to 1300 hours – Trustees reserved business</li> <li>• 1300 to 1355 hours – Lunch</li> <li>• 1400 hours – Open board meeting</li> </ul>	

c.	<b>Monday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2018 – Board meetings, AGM and Dinner</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1045 to 1200 hours – Trustees reserved business</li> <li>• 1200 to 1245 hours – Lunch</li> <li>• 1245 to 1345 hours – Open board meeting</li> <li>• 1400 hours – AGM</li> </ul>	
<b>14.</b>	There was no other business. The meeting closed at 1610 hours.	