



FEBRUARY 2024 to JUNE 2024

**EXTERNAL REVIEW OF
GOVERNANCE
SOUTH BANK
COLLEGES**

CONTENTS

		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	Background to the External Review of Governance	2
1.2	Governance structure	4
	1.2.1 Group Governance and SBC legal and regulatory framework	4
	1.2.2 SBC Governance Structure	5
1.3	Composition and Membership of the Board	6
2	TRUSTEE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	
2.1	Overall compliance	6
2.2	Development of strategy	7
2.3	Quality of teaching, learning and the student experience	8
2.4	Ensuring the efficient and effective use of resources, the solvency of the Institution and safeguarding assets	10
	2.4.1 Finance and Resources	10
	2.4.2 Audit and Risk	11
	2.4.3 Staffing and senior postholders	12
	2.4.4 Other areas of trustee responsibility	13
3	MEMBERSHIP, RECRUITMENT AND SUCCESSION PLANNING	13
4	GOVERNANCE PROCESSES AND PRACTICES	15
5	GOVERNANCE CULTURE, WORKING RELATIONSHIPS AND DYNAMICS	17
6	THE IMPACT OF GOVERNANCE	19
7	THE ROLE AND INFLUENCE OF THE GOVERNANCE PROFESSIONAL	19
8	TRUSTEE INDUCTION, TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT	20
9	EQUALITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION (EDI)	20
10	SUMMARY OF KEY STRENGTHS OF SBC GOVERNANCE	21
11	RECOMMENDATIONS	21
	Appendices:	
	1. Scope and methodology of the External Governance Review	23
	2. About Rockborn Management Consultants	25

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the External Review of Governance

South Bank Colleges (SBC) was established in 2018 by London South Bank University (LSBU) to operate Further Education (FE) provision (16-19 years) in the LSBU Group of educational institutions. It came into operation in 2019 as part of the Section 28 (Further Education and Higher Education Act) pilot, concerning the designation of institutions. The formation of SBC followed the dissolution of the former Lambeth College corporation.

SBC operates from three campuses within the London Borough of Lambeth:

- Lambeth Gateway College operates from Clapham Common and Brixton.
- The London South Bank Technical College is situated in new state-of-the-art facilities in Nine Elms.

SBC serves a wide area of South London, with many pockets of low skills, disadvantage and deprivation. The College delivers vocational and technical education to approximately 1200 16-19-year-olds, and 6000 adult learners.

A key vision of the LSBU Group is that through its component organisations, which also includes the South Bank Academies MAT (South Bank University Academy and South Bank University Sixth Form), learners have access to 'step on, step off' educational pathways, from gateway qualifications through to T-Levels and the new Higher Technical Qualifications, and on to graduate and postgraduate level study for those who wish to progress. LSBU Group's Passmore Centre for Apprenticeships is the employer interface for its Group apprenticeship offer, enabling employers to access apprenticeship pathways from Level 2 through to Level 8.

The College received its last full Ofsted inspection in March 2022, achieving a 'Good' outcome for overall effectiveness, an improvement from the previous 'Requires Improvement' judgement. In the inspection report, governance was commended.

"Governors have a secure understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the college. Governors are well qualified and have a broad range of appropriate experience to ensure that they are well positioned to support and challenge leaders to improve upon any areas for development."

The College returned a deficit in 2022-23, although its cash position improved. Its financial health grade, assessed using ESFA measures, was therefore judged as 'Requires Improvement'. The financial outlook for 2023-24 is a planned deficit on operations of £1.2m, with 2024-25 planned as break even. In educational EBITDA terms, this translates to positive £1m for 2023-4 and positive £2.2m in 2024-5. This would have the College graded 'Good' for financial health according to ESFA financial metrics.

The Executive Principal was appointed to run SBC from 2018, previously occupying senior leadership positions in FE. She is supported by an experienced senior management team. The College has recently appointed a permanent Vice Principal Finance and Performance to replace the interim Chief Finance Officer, who was engaged on a consultancy basis.

The Board of Trustees was appointed to run the new SBC entity in 2019 and has enjoyed stable core membership since then, although some long-standing trustees will be reaching the end of their term of office in the near future.

The Board is supported by a designated Clerk who works as part of the LSBU governance team, and the LSBU Group Company Secretary, who has been appointed independently by the SBC Board as the SBC Company Secretary.

The Board last updated its governance self-assessment action plan in 2023. This External Governance Review, therefore, replaces the 2024 self-assessment. The Board is aware of the requirement in the DfE Conditions of Funding to undertake an annual self-assessment hereafter.

The Board agreed to commission an External Governance Review as part of its 2023-24 business calendar. The Review was undertaken between February and June 2024, with the final report delivered to the Board on 10 July 2024. It included a review of key documentation, an online survey, ongoing conversations with the Clerk, observation of key committee and Corporation meetings, individual meetings with the Chair, committee Chairs, and other key trustees, the Executive Principal, Accounting Officer, and other senior managers.

Survey outcomes are reported in the report. It should be noted, however, that the survey was mistakenly completed by a number of managers who did not have direct experience of the work of the Board of Trustees. Where their answers have affected the scores, we have reflected this in the report.

The review considered previous governance self-assessments, compliance with the sector Code of Governance, and other governance improvement activities as part of its work. Full details of the scope of the review and the activities undertaken are contained in Appendix 1. The scope meets the requirements of the Department for Education (DfE) Guide on External Governance Reviews in Further Education and the Post-16 Education and Skills Act.

In addition, in discussion with the Project Working Group, it was agreed that the review should advise on the clarity and effectiveness of the current governance arrangements within the Group structure, and areas where these might be strengthened.

Rockborn would like to thank the Clerk, Chair, Executive Principal, LSBU Vice-Chancellor, Committee Chairs, members of the wider Trustee Board and SLT, for their time and cooperation with the review.

1.2 Governance Structure

1.2.1 Group Governance and SBC legal and regulatory framework

SBC is one of four separate entities that comprise the LSBU Group: London South Bank University, South Bank Colleges, South Bank Academies and South Bank Innovation (SBUEL).

SBC was established as a charitable ‘company limited by guarantee’ and is an exempt charity, regulated by the DfE. London South Bank University is the sole ‘member’ of the Charity.

The Articles were rigorously negotiated with the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) prior to the dissolution of the Lambeth College corporation, and retain some of the provisions of the Instruments and Articles of FE Government, including the requirement for staff and student trustees, and the specific responsibility of the trustees, "to have control of the Charity and its property and funds, in particular the efficient and effective use of resources, solvency and safeguarding of its asset".

The Articles are underpinned by a Governance Agreement between SBC and LSBU as its ‘parent’ which, among other matters, sets out:

- The joint commitment to achieving SBC’s educational objectives, including creating clear learning pathways between SBC and other educational institutions within the Group.
- The interrelationship between the Group Education Framework and Corporation Strategy and the SBC vision and academic strategy.
- Those matters subject to the prior written consent of LSBU.

The intention of the Governance Agreement is to provide for separate and independent governance in the ordinary course of business, and to set out the parameters beyond which SBC would need to gain the consent of the LSBU Board. A lot of work has been undertaken to clarify roles and responsibilities in a complex governance arrangement, and these are also expressed in a scheme of delegation and reserved matters within the Standing Orders.

The previous Lambeth College assets are protected by an asset deed that restricts the use of the land.

Service Level Agreements have been set up with LSBU for support with back-office functions and shared services with SBA for HR, finance, IT and estates, marketing and outreach.

During the review, we explored the benefits and risks of the governance arrangements through the survey and in individual conversations with trustees and staff.

The partnership is viewed as positive, characterised by a shared ambition to raise standards and make the vision of creating education pathways for South London work. It is acknowledged that ‘without the university, the College would be in a very difficult place.’ The high levels of support from LSBU have been welcomed and valued, particularly around the capital project, finance and governance support.

There is a desire, however, for SBC to move to a place to contribute to and to be involved earlier in Group decision making that will impact on the College. This is a theme that ran through many of our observations, which will be explored in more depth later in the report.

The survey contained several questions to specifically assess opinions and levels of understanding of the relationship between LSBU and SBC. The majority (80%) agreed (40% strongly) that the *'respective roles and responsibilities of the SBC trustee board and LSBU as parent are clear.'* 87% agreed (33% strongly) that they were *'comfortable that SBC trustees are able to act independently when it is necessary.'* Slightly fewer (73%), however, agreed that *'the level of communication between SBC and LSBU is appropriate.'* In the main, levels of 'disagreement' were higher in managers with less exposure to college governance.

The Accounting Officer is the LSBU Vice Chancellor, who is agreed by all to be central to how the relationships work. Many expressed concerns during the review about the potential risk that would result if he were to leave. The appointment of the SBC Chair to the LSBU Group Board, and the SBC Executive Principal to the Group Executive Team are recognised as positive safeguards. At one meeting, comments suggested that more could be done to explore synergies and develop communication between opposite numbers within the Group, to ensure greater mutual understanding at levels other than the leadership. There are already, however, a range of opportunities in place, including a Group senior management forum with college and university staff, joint strategy days, a regular newsletter, an annual review and joint teaching conference.

The LSBU Group are currently supported by a central governance team, which includes the SBC Clerk. This has many benefits in terms of coordinating Group governance and centralising some activities such as trustee recruitment. A recent review of the governance team concluded that there was too much vertical working within the team and recommended measures to strengthen the link between the College and Academy in particular. The need to balance efficiency with independent governance professional support, will be explored in more depth later in the report.

1.2.2 SBC Governance Structure

The SBC Trustee Board meets five times a year in September, November, February, May and July, and is supported by the following committees and working groups:

- Audit Committee (November, February and June).
- Quality and Improvement (QI) Committee (September, November, February and June).
- Remuneration Committee (November).
- Project Working Group (PWG, meeting as required). The PWG was established, and the Board agreed its Terms of Reference in June 2021. It was set up to advise the Board on the delivery of the estate strategy, the curriculum plan and a break-even financial model.

There is an annual Strategy Day, usually held in June of each year.

Unlike other college governing boards, there is no Search or Nominations Committee as this function is undertaken by the Group Nominations Committee.

Committees report to the Corporation via a written summary which is prepared by the Clerk. There is a review underway to increase transparency by making all minutes available to trustees via the online Board Portal, Convene.

1.3 Composition and Membership of the Board

The Board has a determined membership of no greater than ten and no fewer than five trustees, comprising:

- The Vice Chancellor of LSBU (ex officio)
- Up to four LSBU trustees
- Up to three independent trustees
- One student trustee
- One staff trustee

The Articles state that LSBU trustees should not exceed non-LSBU trustees, and the numbers seem to be equally balanced. This might need to be reviewed in the constitutional documents. The local authority (Lambeth Borough Council) has been invited to nominate a member to fill one of the non-LSBU trustee positions.

Board and committee membership, recruitment and succession planning are covered in more depth in Section 3.

2. TRUSTEE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In this section we will reflect on the similarities and differences between the statutory and regulatory framework for SBC and FE Corporations, and bring in good practice that applies to both.

2.1 Overall compliance

Summary of highlights

- Trustees have high awareness of their legal and regulatory duties: 94% of survey respondents agreed (47% strongly) with the statement that “SBC Trustees understand their legal and regulatory roles and responsibilities.”
- The constitutional and governance policy documents provide a robust framework that sets out the powers, duties and roles of the SBC Board and individual trustees, within the context of the wider LSBU Group.

Commentary

Governance at SBC is determined by a number of legal and regulatory frameworks including company law, charity law, Office for Students and FE funding body requirements arising from the conditions of funding contained within the ESFA’s Accountability Agreement, and the ESFA’s assurance and accountability requirements for post-16 providers.

As the recipient of public money from the ESFA and Greater London Authority, SBC is bound by the terms of ESFA funding agreements, regulatory guidance, and relevant financial handbooks. Because the legal entity is a private limited company and not public sector, however, HM Treasury's Managing Public Money requirements do not apply. The College has, however, adopted other sector guidance on a 'comply or explain' basis, including the new Financial Handbook, against which it will be reporting to the SBC Board. It would also be helpful to document which regulations have been adopted or not within the SBC governance policies.

Although SBC would appear to have to follow a more complicated compliance framework than a standard FE Corporation, there is a high level of overlap between the roles and responsibilities of SBC trustees and those of FE governors, especially as the latter are also de facto charity trustees. This has been recognised through the adoption of the Association of College's (AoC) Code of Governance by the SBC Board.

All new trustees are provided with an induction that covers the legal status of SBC, directors' duties under company and charity law, governance at SBC and the relationship with LSBU and FE governance.

Ongoing support and advice are provided by the Clerk and Company Secretary, the Chair and the College and LSBU executive. Access is provided to FE Sector training and events, delivered by the AoC and other bodies.

Trustees' powers, roles and responsibilities are set out in the suite of constitutional documents and governance policies, including the Articles, Governance Agreement, the Standing Orders and Scheme of Delegation, and the Committee Terms of Reference. Together these provide a robust framework. During the review, some housekeeping points were picked up relating to version control and minor inconsistencies between different documents. These have been fed back to the Clerk.

It is recommended that the Board also adopts a Trustee Code of Conduct, which sets out the expectations in terms of individual and collective behaviour, and which all trustees are required to sign as a condition of service. The Eversheds model Code of Conduct can be tailored and has been adopted by many FE Boards.

Trustees undertake an annual review of their entries on the Register of Interests, confirm their eligibility to serve as trustees under the criteria of the 'fit and proper persons test' annually, and are asked to declare any new interests at each meeting.

2.2 Development of strategy

This is an area of strength for SBC trustees.

SBC operates within an overarching Group strategy. Trustees contribute towards the review and development of the Group strategy at cross-Group strategy days and find these extremely valuable.

The College has developed its own strategy/delivery plan for 2020-25 which aligns with the Group strategy. Trustees played a key role in the strategic planning process, devising the college vision and a set of linked strategic ambitions, values and behaviours. The five strategic ambitions are:

- Access to opportunity (for individuals, businesses and society).
- Student success.
- Real world impact (as an anchor institution in South London).
- Fit for the future (including a high quality physical and digital learning environment and financial sustainability).

The Board has also agreed a set of targets and KPIs that form the basis of the Executive Principal's and College Principal's report to each meeting. These provide an at-a-glance view of progress toward achieving key measures of success. It might be helpful to trustees, however, if it was clearer how these metrics cross reference back to the College's strategic ambitions.

The SBC Strategy Day in June provided an opportunity for trustees to spend more time exploring the various sub-strategies for estates, finance, curriculum and career pathways, as well as to receive updates on Ofsted and developments in FE policy.

In the survey, 93% of respondents agreed (60% strongly) that *'Trustees maintain a strong focus on strategy.'* 93% also agreed that the *'balance between strategy and oversight at meetings is appropriate'*, and this was borne out by our meeting observations.

The Corporation is aware of its statutory responsibilities under the Post-16 Education and Skills Act 2022, and trustees engaged in work to develop the first Accountability Statement, which was approved in May 2023.

The SBC curriculum is owned by the College. Governors have oversight of curriculum planning linked to local skills needs in accordance with the Skills Act 2022. The Curriculum Plan for 2024-25 was brought to the Board in May 2024 for approval. The QI Committee receives updates on developments in particular areas of provision, including Level 4, T-Levels and apprenticeships. All the 'external' trustees who responded to the survey agreed that *'trustees have strong oversight of the college curriculum and understand how this meets local skills needs.'*

It was noted, during the document review, that the 'duty to review' and the approval of the accountability statement is not currently included within terms of reference, workplans or the schedule of delegations in the Standing Orders. It is therefore recommended, that this should be incorporated in the next update of these documents.

2.3 Quality of teaching, learning and the student experience

The SBC Board has strong oversight of the quality of the academic provision. Learners are at the heart of discussions and decision making.

All the trustees surveyed and most of the management team agreed that *'trustees understand the strengths and weaknesses of teaching, learning and student experience.'* 87% of all survey respondents agreed that *'overall the balance between the focus on finance and resources and curriculum quality and students at meetings is appropriate.'*

The QI Committee meets termly to provide detailed scrutiny of standards and student-related matters. The committee is chaired by an experienced former FE College Chief Executive, and includes the staff and student trustees, and two further 'independent trustees' with appropriate skills and experience in diversity and inclusion, Higher

Education (HE), and community leadership. As with curriculum planning, quality is seen very much as the territory of the SBC Board. However, to maintain strong links with LSBU on these topics, the university Deputy Vice Chancellor also sits on the committee.

At the QI Committee meeting observed, papers were to the usual LSBC standard with most having excellent summary sheets backed up by comprehensive detail. Papers were 'taken as read' as a norm, with key elements reported or developed in questions. The areas covered were appropriate and covered in sufficient depth. Leaders were able to share concerns openly and trustees challenged appropriately, especially where they thought targets were too ambitious or not ambitious enough, but the working relationship was positive and respectful. While several trustees asked questions – including the staff and student trustees – the major load fell on the Chair, who used her background to good effect. Occasionally, however, the line of questioning sidetracked the discussion into an operational realm.

The QI Committee reports to the Board through a summary report which is prepared by the Clerk. Full minutes can be accessed by all trustees on Convene.

As with many colleges, trustees are involved with the validation of the College self-assessment report (SAR) before this is brought to the Board. The SAR validation meeting involved senior managers and an Ofsted inspector acting as an external consultant. The Chair, and Chair of the QI Committee, participate in this event with a particular role to 'sense check', and bring an additional layer of assurance about the rigour of the SAR process and its conclusions.

Outside the Board and committee structure, most colleges employ a range of approaches to provide trustees with firsthand experience of college life and opportunities to meet staff and students. Not only do these increase Board visibility, and develop trustees' knowledge of teaching, learning and the student experience, they also provide a valuable opportunity to triangulate information provided in management reports. These activities are also enjoyable for all involved.

The survey results suggest that trustee engagement is the main area for development, with fewer than half of respondents agreeing both that '*trustees engage regularly with students and stakeholders*', and '*trustees engage with staff and understand their experiences*.' Action has been taken to address this through the organisation of college engagement activities, including curriculum learning walks before Board meetings, a practice recently reintroduced following a hiatus during the pandemic, but there is an awareness that more could be done.

"I would like more opportunities to engage with front line staff other than the senior team, and with students on different courses and at the different campuses."

Other colleges have had success in offering trustees a menu of engagement options to choose from according to their availability and interests. These include trustee-initiated visits, curriculum link arrangements, other specialist link arrangements (e.g. health and safety, EDI), attendance at curriculum performance review meetings, attendance at student council or student forum meetings, student-led trustee training, attendance at staff forums and staff shadowing.

The benefits of strong trustee engagement and visibility within the College cannot be underestimated and it is recommended that this is a governance priority for 2024-25.

2.4 Ensuring the efficient and effective use of resources, the solvency of the Institution and safeguarding assets

2.4.1 Finance and Resources

SBC trustees have fiduciary duties under company law, and charity law with regard to public money and the resources and assets of the College. This duty is set out in the Articles under paragraph 9.1:

“The trustees are charity trustees of the Charity and have control of the Charity and its property and funds, including in particular ensuring the effective and efficient use of resources, the solvency of the Charity and the safeguarding of its assets.”

In this area, the duties of the SBC trustees mirror those of FE governors closely.

Trustees are highly aware of their responsibilities, and 93% of survey respondents agreed (60% strongly) that ‘Trustees have strong oversight of finance and resources.’ However, the question arose several times during our review as to whether the current structure and reporting mechanisms are the most effective for trustees to fulfil their legal responsibilities.

The Group Executive reviews the financial position at the Group level every month and reports to the Group Finance and Investment Committee. The Vice Chancellor as the SBC Accounting Officer, and the Executive Principal, who attend these meetings, then provide a link back to the SBC Board, and the papers are presented by the College Chief Finance Officer to the Board.

At the SBC level, the full Board has oversight of finances and there is no separate Finance and Resources Committee. However, due to time constraints during Board meetings, the Project Working Group is often called upon to scrutinise detailed financial matters, and then report back to the Board. It is clear that the Project Working Group members have the necessary skills for this work, and the discussions and challenges we observed at this level were very thorough. Nevertheless, there are difficulties in scheduling last-minute meetings, which also tend to be reactive, rather than part of a planned approach to financial oversight.

Best governance practice means that there should be ‘no surprises’ when matters are brought to the SBC Board. At both Board meetings we observed however, trustees seemed unprepared for some financial messages, although we understand that this is not the norm. Nonetheless, trustees responded with strong governance by requiring that budgets be delivered as planned.

Comprehensive management accounts are brought to the SBC Board detailing financial KPIs, cash flow, and separate Capex reports. Sector guidance expects these to be shared with trustees and governors monthly, even between meetings. Many colleges fulfil this by sharing the accounts with Board members via email or their online portal, and inviting questions.

Trustees are keen to influence Group decisions that impact on the deployment of SBC resources. Several trustees and managers mentioned that the Board’s discussion of the Group procurement of a single supplier to deliver Integrated Facilities Management (IFM) was a key test of the boundaries of the governance agreement, and led to a better

understanding of where the Board needed to be involved in Group decisions impacting on College operations.

All these factors support a case for SBC trustees to have more regular, detailed oversight of financial matters in advance of Board meetings. The usual vehicle for this in a college would be to create a Finance and Resources Committee, and some expressed the view that the PWG already fulfils this purpose.

“I do feel that the Project Working Group should be reconstituted as a formal Finance and Capital Committee, and I don’t see any need to delay that happening.”

(There is also a perception among some trustees that the PWG operates as a ‘cabinet’, and this creates the risk of two-tier governance and a potential lack of transparency if PWG minutes are not provided to the Board, as seems to have been the case in the past.)

We therefore advise that the SBC Board considers its current arrangements for the oversight of finance, capital and other resources, in the context of the Group structure, to determine whether they offer the optimum mechanism for frequent, timely and proactive discussion and scrutiny before matters get to the Board meeting.

Trustees raised the idea of a combined Audit and Finance Committee. Whilst there is no rule in the Audit Code of Practice against this, separation is maintained by FE Corporations to preserve the independence of the Audit Committee. The Academy Financial Handbook allows combined committees in trusts with an annual income of less than £50 million. The Board and the Clerk are therefore advised to seek advice if considering this option.

The current Board membership includes two qualified accountants, one of whom is due to retire in July 2024. The need to maintain current levels of financial expertise has been identified as a matter for consideration by the Group Nominations Committee.

2.4.2 Audit and Risk

The College has set up a separate Audit Committee as required by Paragraph 22 of the Audit Code of Practice, which sets out the requirement as a Condition of Funding and states, *“for the avoidance of doubt, colleges that are subsidiaries of higher education institutions must have their own audit committee, separate to that of its parent.”*

80% of survey respondents agreed that *‘the Audit Committee provides effective oversight and assurance on internal controls, risk management and corporate governance.’* Notably, all of those who disagreed were management, who would not have had experience of the work of the committee.

The Audit Committee is comprised of three ‘external’ trustees with an appropriate mix of skills. The Chair of the committee, a qualified accountant, will be standing down in summer 2024. He is being succeeded by an experienced committee member with an accountancy background.

The business of the Audit Committee is set out in a comprehensive annual workplan. This covers all the necessary responsibilities of the committee. The committee has the opportunity to meet with auditors as required. Many colleges add a September Audit Committee meeting to their schedule, to review audit work from the previous year and take pressure from the November meeting. This has been discussed in the past, but is not considered necessary.

The February meeting that we observed was well organised and covered various required topics, including whistleblowing (reflected as a speak up report) and an excellent value for money report. The discussions and challenges were thorough. Trustees expressed on several occasions their preference for more involvement in Group level decision-making, with concerns about potential consequences if things don't go as planned. Additionally, members of the Audit Committee advocated for SBC representation on the Group level procurement panel for new internal auditors, to ensure that the new firm fully understands the needs of a FE college. It is noted that the Committee Terms of Reference currently imply that the SBC Board can appoint its own auditors and only needs to inform the LSBU Board if it chooses to do so. We suggest that the Terms of Reference are reviewed to ensure that they align with current practices.

2.4.3 Staffing and senior postholders

At present, staffing issues are reported to the whole Board as part of the Executive Principal report. At the meetings attended, this was comparatively light touch and tended to focus on recruitment challenges in particular, in curriculum areas. Trustees also receive information on matters such as health and safety, EDI and pay in different reports. A single, periodic 'HR' report, providing trustees with data and information on KPIs such as staff turnover, sickness absence, staff development and wellbeing, is recommended. Many colleges that have a Finance and Resources Committee include this responsibility within its Terms of Reference. One trustee commented:

"I have felt the lack of a Finance and HR Committee for scrutiny between Board meetings."

The Group and subsidiary structure translate into a different set of senior roles, responsibilities and accountabilities than would be found with an FE Corporation.

The SBC Accounting Officer role is held by the Vice Chancellor of LSBU. This strengthens the accountability for the College and ensures that this continues, were the Vice Chancellor to leave.

The SBC Executive Principal is appointed by, and line managed by, the Accounting Officer. The SBC Board does, however, have a Remuneration Committee which considers any pay recommendations by the Vice Chancellor before they are made to the LSBU Remuneration Committee. The Vice Chancellor consults the SBC Chair as part of the Executive Principal's appraisal and reports to the SBC Remuneration Committee.

The Terms of Reference for the Remuneration Committee follow sector guidance with regard to chairing and membership. The committee also allows the Executive Principal to bring reports on the performance and objectives of the two College Principals and the Chief Finance Officer to trustees, thus enhancing transparency and accountability.

We raised the question about whether there was any element of performance review of the Vice Chancellor in his capacity as SBC Accounting Officer, given that, in this role, he is responsible to the Chair of the SBC Board and to its members. A set of specific objectives is set for SBC which are reviewed by the Chair of LSBU and Chair of SBC, who is able to represent the views of the wider group.

We noted that all senior appointments across the LSBU Group are dealt with as cross-Group appointments as part of the drive to instil 'common DNA' across the Executive. The SBC Executive Principal is the Accounting Officer for the South Bank Academies, which supports this objective further.

2.4.4 Other areas of trustee responsibility

- **Safeguarding and Prevent** is an area of strength. Trustees recognise the particular challenges faced by many of the students outside College. The Safeguarding Link Trustee is highly experienced and ensures that safeguarding is a key consideration in all Board discussions. At the QI Committee, there was a thorough appraisal of a very detailed safeguarding report which analysed incidents in significant detail as well as providing an overview of action being taken. All trustees that completed the survey agreed (the majority strongly) that *‘Trustees have strong oversight of safeguarding and understand their role.’*
- **Health and Safety.** Trustees receive an annual health and safety report at the May meeting, reporting on the previous academic year. As this is ten months after the period it is reporting on, it is recommended that the report is brought to the Board earlier in the year, preferably in the first term of the subsequent academic year. Any issues that occur during the year are reported in the Accounting Officer Report. As the College delivers a curriculum with areas of high health and safety risk, and is in the middle of a major capital development, a mechanism for systematic in-year monitoring of accidents, incidents, compliance and risks, might also be considered. Many colleges bring such a report to their Audit Committee.
- **Equality, Diversity and Inclusion.** EDI is considered a whole-Board responsibility and is covered in detail in Section 10.
- **Sustainability.** 90% of survey respondents agreed that *‘the Board is committed to sustainability.’* There is evidence in Board reports of the work that is being undertaken in this area, both at the College and Group level, and the SBC Board was presented with a draft LSBU Group Environmental Sustainability Policy in December 2023, from which KPIs and targets would be developed for monitoring at Group executive level. The SBC Board asked that student engagement on the sustainability agenda should be emphasised in the policy, and might wish to keep this under review.

3. MEMBERSHIP, RECRUITMENT AND SUCCESSION PLANNING

Summary of highlights

The breadth of skills and diversity of the Board is a key strength. Trustees bring experience from different education sectors, industry, local community, and EDI and inclusion, which add value and enable constructive support and challenge.

“A strength is the wealth of experience among the members of the Board, their probity and their commitment to the profile of learners at SBC and to equality, diversity and inclusion. Their experience enables them to challenge as appropriate.”

- The Chair is experienced, committed and highly regarded – she conducts meetings effectively and shows robust leadership between meetings.

- The role and contribution of the Vice Chair and Chairs of committees is also recognised and valued.

Commentary

The former LSBU trustees have been valuable in bringing their institutional knowledge, which has helped to broker and strengthen positive relationships between the two entities. Several people mentioned that former LSBU trustees were now firmly ‘team SBC’ and championed the best interests of the College. This was backed up by our meeting observations.

The Board is small compared to a FE Corporation, making it even more important that each trustee brings the skills and expertise needed to support the achievement of the College’s strategic ambitions. The Board should review its skills needs on an ongoing basis, in the light of changing internal and external priorities.

The Group Appointment Procedures state that trustee skill matrices are updated annually in the spring, and we suggest that they should be maintained as a ‘live’ document to capture changes throughout the year. The procedures also reflect the need to ensure diversity in Board membership.

Appointment of trustees is undertaken by the Group Nominations Committee, a sub-committee of the LSBU, SBA and SBC Boards. The SBC Chair is a committee member, along with another independent trustee, and this should help to ensure that the committee considers the current skills needs of the Board when making appointments.

The SBC Board has the final decision on the appointment of trustees recommended by the Group Nominations Committee. However, Article 9.4 states that “*the Board must not unreasonably refuse to appoint a person nominated by the Member (unless they are not eligible to serve).*”

An exception to this process seems to be that one ‘independent’ trustee position is currently reserved for a nominee of Lambeth Council. Comments were made to suggest that the Board has no say in who is put forward. This is an unusual arrangement that has not been in place in other FE Boards since incorporation, although the rationale to maintain strong links with the local authority and the communities it serves, is clear. This arrangement does not, however, seem to be reflected in the Appointment Procedures or Standing Orders, so this is recommended.

The staff trustee has served on the Board since merger and was previously a staff governor on the Lambeth College Board, so brings considerable organisational knowledge and confidence in raising questions in meetings. Staff trustees are recruited through a selection, rather than an election, process.

The SBC Student Union President is automatically the student trustee. The student trustee is invited to provide a report to each Board meeting, which tends to focus on SU activities. Many Boards have experienced challenges with recruiting, re-engaging and retaining student governors since the pandemic, and several comments were made in the survey that there was scope to engage the student trustee further.

Examples from other colleges visited of active student governor support include:

- Scheduled KIT (Keep in Touch meetings) between student governor/s, the Principal, governance professional and Chair.
- Where there is one student governor, the option to co-opt a second student to attend meetings for support.
- Student trustee written reports, based on student voice feedback.
- Linking with a ‘buddy’ from the established membership.
- Chairs to actively encourage student governor contributions and invite opinions at meetings.
- A proactive commitment by trustees to getting to know, and supporting, the student governors.

The Chair of the SBC Board is a former university Vice Chancellor, and now acts as an education consultant. She has a particular interest in the role of education in enhancing the work-related skills of young people. She has strong previous experience of FE, school governance and chairing. Two-thirds of survey respondents (67%) agreed strongly that ‘the Chair conducts meetings effectively and shows robust leadership between meetings.’

“The great chairing means people feel comfortable to challenge and give alternative views.”

The Board’s annual self-assessment allows for an element of self-reflection by trustees, which then informs one-to-one meetings with the Chair. The outcomes of this process help to drive continuous improvement and trustee development. During the one-to-one meeting, the Chair asks the member to reflect on the Chair’s performance and make any comments, as well as reflecting on the member’s own performance. In case there are matters the member does not want to discuss openly with the Chair, the Deputy Chair invites members to have a meeting with them to discuss the Chair’s performance. The Group Chair also meets with the SBC Chair to discuss feedback and performance.

The Governor Competency Frameworks produced by the DfE through the Education and Training Foundation (ETF) might provide helpful structures for both activities.

<https://www.et-foundation.co.uk/professional-development/leadership-and-governance-programmes/governance/>

4. GOVERNANCE PROCESSES AND PRACTICES

Summary of highlights

- Governance processes are robust and consistent and are managed effectively by the Clerk and wider governance team. A standard approach to many processes is applied across the Group.

- There are effective working relationships and communication between the Chair, Executive Principal, Accounting Officer, other senior staff and the governance professional, which ensure efficient planning and preparation for meetings.
- Meetings run smoothly and are considered to be productive.

Commentary

No significant procedural issues were identified in the review. Some suggestions are made below based on good practice, to enhance processes further.

Meetings take place according to a group calendar. SBC, therefore, faces the dual challenge of scheduling meetings to both reflect the cycle of business and returns deadlines for a FE college, and to synchronise with the LSBU Board. Generally, this works, although a later Board meeting in the latter part of the autumn term would allow more time for management to prepare the annual report and financial statements. The gap between the Board meeting at the end of February and that at the beginning of May also feels to be long, especially with no other trustee meetings in between, and this represents a potential risk that trustees will not have an opportunity to discuss key issues as they arise. The meetings schedule is being reviewed by the governance team.

Agendas are well constructed and concise and reflect an annual workplan. Board agendas generally follow a standard format, following preliminary items, of:

- *Items to discuss and approve where relevant.* These include a verbal report from the SU President, the Executive Principal's report, the Accounting Officer's report, and the CFO's report.
- *Items to note* (presumably without discussion). These include reports from committees.

The positioning of the student trustee report and the Executive Principal's report at the top of the agenda help to ensure that quality, curriculum and student experience, and other items of key strategic significance or risk, are most prominent at meetings.

Agendas do not currently include timings against items, but this can be a helpful tool to guide the Chair and others, and ensure that adequate time is given to all items. We noted however, that meetings, particularly Board meetings, generally ran to time.

The Clerk works with the Executive and Chairs on the development of agendas. In line with good practice, regular meetings of the 'triumvirate' take place.

Agendas and papers are circulated electronically via the Convene board pack system. Convene is also used as a repository for some key governance documents and its use could be developed further as a one-stop-shop for trustees to access key documents relating to the Group and the College. The survey, resolution and announcement functions would also have useful applications.

Minutes are well written and detailed, summarise discussions and challenge, and identify actions and decisions. It is suggested that actions might be more clearly identifiable to readers if highlighted in bold font.

A matters arising/action log allows trustees to track progress on completing previous actions. In response to a request from trustees in February, this was streamlined and

improved for the May meeting. A further enhancement would be to RAG-rate the status column, to allow trustees to identify overdue actions easily.

Papers are of a high quality, well-structured and contain an appropriate level of information. 93% of survey respondents agreed that *'papers are of a good quality and enable trustees to do their job.'* This compares well with other colleges, where the volume of papers can be a source of frustration for governors to the extent that it can sometimes thwart good governance.

Most papers are prefaced by an executive summary sheet that advises trustees on the background to the item, main issues from the detailed report/data, recommendations, and any other action required of them. In some cases, however, the information provided in the executive summary was scant. All managers should be encouraged to produce them to the same high standard using the LSBU Group standard guidance. Some further helpful guidance is available online on producing executive summaries. An example is provided below:

<https://www.boardintelligence.com/blog/the-definitive-guide-to-writing-an-executive-summary>

At the meetings observed, trustees made a plea for report authors to avoid sector jargon and acronyms. The Clerk has a role in communicating this message when papers are being prepared.

Meetings run very smoothly and are well managed by the Chairs. 93% of survey respondents agreed (53% strongly) that *'meetings run smoothly and are productive.'* Papers are generally taken as read, which maximises the time for trustee discussion.

Committees report to the Board via a written summary that is prepared by the Clerk. Trustees should also be able to access the full minutes to ensure a complete full line of sight. Trustees requested at the February meeting that the minutes of the PWG should be provided to the full Board. Given the importance of some of its discussions, this is vital to ensure transparency and accountability in decision making.

The governance webpages are comprehensive, containing trustee bios and most key governance information. They should, however, be reviewed regularly to ensure that the most up-to-date minutes and versions of other key documents are published.

5. GOVERNANCE CULTURE, WORKING RELATIONSHIPS AND DYNAMICS

Summary of highlights

- There is a positive governance culture, based on a shared vision, openness, trust and mutual respect between the Board and the Executive. Trustees and senior managers understand each other's roles and work effectively together.
- The culture of openness and trust also applies to the relationships between the Board and the LSBU Vice Chancellor, and this support is highly valued by trustees.
- Trustees are highly committed to the College and give their time willingly.

- The Chairs promotes an inclusive Board culture to encourage contributions from all.

Commentary

Trustees and senior leaders define the governance culture at SBC as supportive and challenging. At all the meetings that we observed, discussion was robust but respectful. All trustees seemed to be comfortable raising questions and expressing opinions, and these were well received by management. Trustees stated that they felt ‘listened to’, even though their points were not always acted upon. The Chair is careful to encourage contributions from everyone, including newer and quieter members.

“Board members always hold senior managers to account, which whilst sometimes challenging, is reassuring. I feel that this support and challenge is extremely helpful in my role, and this was in evidence at our most recent meeting.”

“There were some great discussions in the room, and I felt able to participate where I had something to add.”

The boardroom culture, coupled with the breadth and diversity of trustee skills and knowledge, ensures that there is no ‘group think’.

Although the lively boardroom environment can sometimes result in questions and discussion veering into a more operational space, Chairs are adept at bringing business back on track.

The bringing together of former LSBU and ‘independent’ trustees could have been challenging in terms of harmonising the two sets of interests. Many commented, however, that the shared vision and commitment of all trustees mean that it is impossible to distinguish between the different constituencies. This was particularly seen at the Audit Committee, where all the members were LSBU nominated trustees.

The role and influence of the LSBU Vice Chancellor in supporting the vision for SBC and developing positive relationships is recognised by all. He and the SBC Chair meet regularly. The question was raised during the review whether the LSBU Board shared the vision for SBC and what measures were in place to ‘futureproof’ the current strong relationships and culture if he were to leave.

This is a concern for other trustees. However, they recognise that the involvement of the SBC Chair and Executive Principal at Group level have helped to strengthen the link. Assurance was also given that any new Vice Chancellor would have the SBC Accounting Officer role ‘hard baked’ into the role description.

The Vice Chancellor, supported by the Chair, Vice Chair and Executive Principal have worked hard to design and implement integrating architecture, so that the vision is sustained beyond individuals. Trustees at the SBC Board challenging, for example, a projected financial deficit, were clear that financial performance had to be maintained as part of the College’s compact with the university rather than through any contractual responsibility. The sense of partnership is strong, as is the understanding that the university brings resource, and heft, and allows the College access to much greater opportunities than would be available if it were to stand alone. That said, the Board also made clear that it must have a say in services provided to it, such as the recent decision regarding building maintenance.

Ultimately, however, the relationship between SBC and LSBU will be secured through the success of the College in achieving strong educational outcomes, financial stability, and developing vocational and professional pathways for its students into the university.

6. THE IMPACT OF GOVERNANCE

Answering the 'so what' question is often a key challenge for Boards. Trustees bring a range of skills and expertise to the boardroom, but how are these utilised to add value to discussions and decision making?

The impact of governance at SBC was explored through the survey and conversations. Trustees and managers were able to provide a significant number of examples of where trustees had contributed their expertise to hold leaders to account and to add value:

- The completion of Phase One of the capital project during a pandemic.
- The achievement of Ofsted 'Good'.
- Improving financial stability and maintaining a laser focus on achieving independent financial sustainability.
- Developing the relationship with LSBU and advocating the interests of the College.
- Improved staff and union relationships.

“There would certainly be a gap if governance at SBC were not as effective as it is. The SBC Board has been effective in its role brokering the relationship between LSBU and SBC ensuring that the College's needs are served while also recognising the importance of being part of the LSBU group to SBC's continuing existence. Examples include the IFM contract negotiations and the decant strategy for Clapham.”

7. THE ROLE AND INFLUENCE OF THE GOVERNANCE PROFESSIONAL

The Board is supported by a Clerk and a Group Company Secretary, both of whom have been appointed under Article 14. The governance support and Clerk responsibilities have been delegated to a dedicated member of the Group Governance Team, who holds a Company Secretary qualification and has experience of governance in a range of other organisations, including housing and charities. She participates in FE Sector governance networks to maintain her knowledge and professional development.

This arrangement has practical advantages in terms of Group-level efficiency, although the wording of the SBC Articles outlines the need to preserve the independence of the clerking arrangements. FE sector guidance also stresses the need for the independence of the governance professional and requires that evidence is provided of this through the regularity audit. The current arrangements, with a dedicated Clerk, help to preserve this independence.

The Governance Department is currently being reviewed. Care should be taken to ensure that the ability of the SBC governance professionals to advise independently, is preserved in any changes.

8. TRUSTEE INDUCTION, TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

New trustees are provided with an induction covering the legal and regulatory status of SBC, the role and responsibilities of its trustees, and its relationship with LSBU as the 'parent'. In many colleges, new trustees are provided with the opportunity to meet the Chair and committee Chairs, observe all of the committees, meet staff and students, and to participate in learning walks and other college activities as part of their induction. A 'buddy' system can also be an effective way to help new trustees get up to speed with the role and learn about the college.

The Clerk maintains a record of trustee training during the current year, along with a training programme for the year ahead which is monitored by the Board. The training programme includes mandatory training on equality and diversity, safeguarding, Prevent, health and safety, and GDPR. Other elements include board development sessions before the main board meeting, annual strategic days, the Trustee Link Scheme, and external events. In addition, the Board is encouraged to make full use of the extensive materials available to FE governors through the ETF, most of which apply to them in their role as SBC trustees.

9. EQUALITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION (EDI)

SBC has a strong commitment to the principles of EDI, and these are considered integral to achieving the College's mission, vision, values and strategic ambitions. The College has also benefited from the LSBU group approach to EDI and has engaged the services of the Black Leadership Group. One trustee is an EDI specialist and the Executive Principal updates the Board on EDI issues at each meeting. All papers are accompanied by an EDI impact assessment where relevant.

In the survey, 80% of respondents agreed (47% strongly) that *'trustees lead a positive culture of equality, diversity and inclusion.'* One trustee commented that *'more could always be done to champion EDI as I don't think there has been much of a discussion around this.'*

The Board is encouraged to establish the reasons why 20% disagreed with the statement and agree on any actions required to promote EDI more proactively at Board level. This could form the basis of a useful workshop at a future development session.

10. SUMMARY OF KEY STRENGTHS OF SOUTH BANK COLLEGES GOVERNANCE

- Trustees are committed to the vision, values and strategic ambitions of the College and the wider Group, and to providing the best possible student experience.
- The relationship between SBC and LSBU as parent is positive and supportive, led by the Vice Chancellor and supported by the Chair and Executive Principal.
- The broad and diverse set of skills and backgrounds on the Board enable a range of perspectives to be applied to oversight, support, challenge, and decision making. Committees comprise of trustees with a range of appropriate knowledge and expertise. There is a good mix of long-standing and new trustees, and a balance of male and female trustees.
- There is a positive culture, based on openness and respect and strong relationships, that enables open discussion and constructive challenge and means that governance has an impact.
- Strong oversight of teaching, learning and the student experience especially through the QI Committee.
- Board oversight of safeguarding and Prevent is strong, and the Board benefits from the contributions of a highly experienced safeguarding lead trustee.
- Strong and independent Audit Committee that helps to ensure adequacy of internal controls. Oversight of risk is strong.
- Trustees are prepared to challenge the Group to advocate for independence and influence in group decision making where appropriate.
- There are rigorous and effective governance policies and processes, which are well managed by the Clerk and governance team.
- Trustees are aware of their legal and regulatory roles and responsibilities, and the governance/management divide is well observed.
- Board and committee meetings are effectively chaired, and meetings well planned and run.

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Develop and implement a flexible range of regular trustee engagement activities to increase trustee visibility and provide trustees with the opportunity to gain firsthand knowledge of College life and the experience of College students and staff.
- Develop and flex the induction programme to meet the individual needs of new trustees, to provide information about College life as well as the legal framework and group structure.

- Gain whole-Board buy-in to involve, engage and support the student trustee.
- Explore how to further develop meaningful Board engagement with the EDI agenda.
- Review arrangements to enhance the frequency and rigour of financial oversight, scrutiny and planning, including the potential development of a committee for this purpose.
- Introduce an HR report, providing trustees with oversight of staffing across a range of metrics and areas including turnover, sickness absence, staff development and wellbeing.
- Reflect the statutory 'Duty to Review' local skills needs and the requirement for the Accountability Statement within workplans, Terms of Reference, and the Scheme of Delegations.
- Draw up a written schedule to clarify which DfE and other government regulation SBC is required to comply with.
- Ensure that current levels of financial expertise are maintained as part of the recruitment of new trustees.
- Further formalise trustee one-to-one meetings and the Chair's appraisal process.
- Ensure that committee and working group minutes are made available to all trustees on a timely basis, to ensure transparency and regular information flow.
- Bring forward the timing of the Health and Safety Annual Report and review the need for more frequent in-year reporting, over and above current arrangements.
- Ensure consistent completion of executive summaries, and that jargon and acronyms in papers are reduced.
- Preserve the independence of the SBC governance professional in any reviews of the Group governance team.

APPENDIX 1

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW

The following scope was agreed upon with the South Bank Colleges Project Working Group. It takes full account of the DfE guidance on External Reviews of Further Education Governance, published in May 2022.

Scope

- Discharge of roles and duties as charity trustees.
- Board culture.
- Impact of governance.
- Strategy.
- Equality and Diversity.
- Trustee membership, recruitment, and induction.
- Governance professional experience, and interaction between Board and the Executive Team.
- Review the Corporation's interaction with students and other stakeholders.

The Chair, Trustees, and Principal and Chief Executive expressed a particular interest in examining the working relationship and effectiveness of the intra-Group governance arrangements.

Methodology and timeline

The review comprised the following activities:

Month	Task
January 24	Initial scoping meeting with Project Working Group
February 24	Observation of Audit Committee
	Initial meeting with Clerk
	Observation of Board development session and Board meeting
	Survey issued
	Desk based review
	Meeting with Company Secretary and Clerk
March 24	Project Working Group observation

April 2024	One-to-one meetings with Chair, Executive Principal, Accounting Officer, Interim CFO, Chair of QI Committee
May 2024	Board meeting
June 2024	QI Committee observation
	Draft report circulated to Director of Governance and Project Working Group
July 2024	Presentation of findings.

ABOUT ROCKBORN MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

Rockborn Management Consultants (RMC) are experienced education management consultants who tailor-make services to your organisation's needs.

We offer specialist, professional and pragmatic management solutions that range from helping you develop your strategic options, to providing expert advice and guidance on a wide range of organisational HR and change issues.

We have extensive experience of the sector and have an exceptional track record with regard to supporting boards and senior teams.

We take a personal approach to working with you and undertaking governance reviews. We do not have a 'one size fits all' approach and offer a bespoke review that meets your requirements and ensures sustainable improvement. This involves:

- Getting to know the organisation so we understand your values and culture to ensure proposed solutions will work in your context.
- Building relationships and providing a high-quality, personal, and reliable service
- Being available when you need us.
- Ensuring we use our extensive expertise and knowledge, and those of our associates, to provide you with the very best advice and guidance.
- Ensuring we add value - we will not replicate your existing governance self-assessment activities but will aim to complement them.
- Ensuring that qualified and personable experts work alongside you, not 'inspecting' you.
- And a real belief that, if you get the fundamentals right, the rest will follow.

THE REVIEW TEAM

Lead Reviewer: Melissa Drayson

Melissa is a seasoned governance professional with a strong sense of what a good board looks like. Her governance experience has been gained primarily within the FE sector, where she has supported ten different college boards of governors over 20 years. She also has a working knowledge of academy, charity, and corporate governance. She has supported three separate FE colleges through merger and has undertaken several board reviews in her capacity as clerk.

As a consultant and trainer, Melissa has advised a range of educational institutions on their governance, from primary schools to universities. She currently works with the AoC delivering induction training and mentoring to new governance professionals as part of the ETF Governance Professionals Development Programme.

Melissa holds the ICSA (Chartered Governance Institute) Professional Diploma in Corporate Governance and is a part-qualified Chartered Company Secretary.

For 11 years, Melissa ran the induction training service for new governors in Sussex colleges. She also runs courses in minute writing and other committee skills for public sector workers.

In her spare time, Melissa is the Chair of the Trustee Board of an established charity in her hometown of Brighton.

Company Director: Peter Ryder

A highly respected and successful former college Principal (Leeds College of Technology and Tameside College) and previous Chair and then Chief Executive of the Greater Manchester Colleges Group (a partnership of 10 Further Education colleges covering all boroughs across Greater Manchester), Chair of West Yorkshire Consortium of Colleges and member of the AoC's Board, representing all colleges in the North West of England.

Now an independent FE consultant, Peter has been supporting and advising colleges since the announcement of the Area Based Review process in 2015.

Peter has extensive expertise in many areas including strategic reviews/option appraisals, working with boards, merger project management, college turnarounds and change management.

Peter has experience across a broad range of strategic assignments including the support of five colleges with strategic option appraisals, advising boards on their options, holding workshops with governors to evaluate future strategy, directly involved in two college mergers in an executive role, project-managed a further six college merger processes, and most recently provided post-merger project management support to a college which merged with a college group, doubling the size of the organisation overnight and making it the third largest college in England.

Working with education providers to improve strategic and operational performance



Rockborn
Mynshull House
78 Churchgate
Stockport SK1 1YJ

Peter Ryder
Company Director
pryder@rockborn.co.uk

Nicola Tomlinson
Company Director
ntomlinson@rockborn.co.uk

General enquiries
support@rockborn.co.uk

