



Nominations Committee of the Barbican Centre Board

Date: WEDNESDAY, 8 OCTOBER 2014

Time: At the rising of the Barbican Centre Board (approx. 3.30 pm)

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Deputy John Tomlinson (Chairman)
Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Deputy Chairman)
Tom Hoffman
Jeremy Mayhew
Trevor Phillips

Enquiries: Gregory Moore
tel. no.: 020 7332 1399
gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
To approve the public minutes and summary of the previous meeting held on 6 November 2013.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 2)
4. **SKILLS AND EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW 2013: REMINDER OF OUTCOMES**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 3 - 10)
5. **CURRENT BOARD MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 11 - 12)
6. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
8. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
MOTION – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.
9. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
To approve the non-public minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 November 2013.

For Decision
(Pages 13 - 14)
10. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE BARBICAN CENTRE BOARD
Wednesday, 6 November 2013

Minutes of the meeting of the Nominations Committee of the Barbican Centre Board held at Aldermen's Dining Room - 4th Floor West Wing on Wednesday, 6 November 2013 at 9.30 am

Present**Members:**

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chairman)
Deputy John Tomlinson (Deputy Chairman)
Tom Hoffman
Roly Keating

Officers:

Daniel Hooper	- Town Clerk's Department
Matthew Pitt	- Town Clerk's Department
Sir Nicholas Kenyon	- Managing Director Barbican Centre

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Jeremy Mayhew.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

The public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 15 May 2013 were approved.

4. SKILLS AND EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY 2013

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk highlighting key themes that came out of the Skills and Effectiveness Survey 2013.

The Chairman reported that in view of the concerns and queries raised about the presentation of financial information within committee reports, the Finance Team at the Centre had offered to talk through these issues with Members and, where appropriate, make adaptations.

Other issues raised in the feedback concerned the length of the meetings and the proportion of time spent on presentations rather than discussion. The Committee felt that in light of the feedback given on presentations, these set-pieces should be kept ideally to around 5 minutes presentation limit which should allow ample time afterwards for detailed discussion on the subject matter.

Discussion ensued around how the Board could best offer strategic input into the arts platforms at the Centre, particularly if less time was spent in the meetings hearing about artforms through the presentations. The Committee felt that an Arts Away Day, similar to the one held earlier in 2013 on the Centre's

vision, would be a good forum for such input.

In response to Member questions on the structure of the agenda, the Town Clerk undertook to investigate this but suspected this could not be changed given the Board currently sat within a Local Government framework.

Members felt that the Board would be better able to give the Centre a clear direction on matters if a set of clear options were presented within reports.

5. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There were no urgent items.

7. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

<u>Paragraph No.</u>	<u>Exemption Paragraph</u>
8	3
9	-
10	1 & 2

8. NON PUBLIC MINUTES

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2013 were approved.

9. NON PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There was one urgent item relating to nominations to the Board.

The meeting ended at 10.22 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Matthew Pitt
tel. no.: 020 7332 1425
matthew.pitt@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Nominations Committee of the Barbican Centre Board	8 October 2014
Subject: Skills and Effectiveness Review 2013: Reminder of Outcomes	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information

Summary

In Autumn of 2013 the Members of the Barbican Board undertook a skills and effectiveness review. This review asked Members to comment on various aspects around the work of the Board and the management of meetings. It explored Members' understanding of the Board's role, the input into and quality of meetings, the governance and clerking support received by the Board, and Member thoughts on communication from the Centre. It went on to assess personal attributes such as the level of training received by Board Members, the interaction of Board members with the Centre and its affiliates outside of formal meetings, and the skills that Members felt they brought to the Board.

With a year having passed since the review was conducted, it is timely to recirculate the findings to the Nominations Committee to remind Members of the outcomes and any gaps identified, with a view to informing future recruitment strategy.

The results of the survey are annexed to this report and Members will note that the data is split in to red, amber and green areas. The results demonstrated that Members were satisfied with the administration of the Board and that the role of the Board was understood. Concerns were raised over the type of decisions the Board were taking, with thoughts expressed on how strategic the Board was. Members also expressed concern around information coming from the Barbican Centre, with reports to the Board sometimes felt to be confusing and it thought that communication to and training for Members could be improved.

The results also demonstrated that the Board was strong in areas of governance and an interest and knowledge of the arts. It highlighted an interest from Members in creative learning and widening participation; however, there was a perception that there was a lack of identified skills in fundraising, property matters and equal opportunities.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the contents of this report.

Appendices

- Results and analysis – Barbican Centre Board Skills and Effectiveness Review 2013

Gregory Moore

Senior Committee & Member Services Officer
Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1399

E: gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Barbican Skills and Effectiveness Review Response Log

Question	No. of respondents	Results	Comments
Is the role of the Board clear?	10	90% = Yes 10% = Needs Improvement	<p>We should be less rubber stamping, more constructive</p> <p>There is some confusion as to the role of board members: is it a committee of management, or representatives of our largest donor? There is not enough "we" and "ys" and too much "you"</p>
Understand the Vision?	10	80% = Yes 20% = In Part	More information about comparators - other arts bodies
Clarity over decisions expected?	11	63% = Yes 36% In Part	<p>but care not to diminish the value and variety of board contributions by too much delegation to TC and chair/deputy chair unless true urgency</p> <p>Overall, governance is very strong...it is not clear whether the Board's role is to take decisions... strategic advisory capacity (more common). Both are valuable...sign-posting might help.</p> <p>Sometimes things seem to have been decided already rather than being open to input/discussion.</p> <p>We embark on conversations sometimes without clarity of whether we are just trying to assist with advice or are responsible. Good example: the change of name of Gin Joint!</p>
Sufficient skills on the Board?	10	90% = Yes 10% = No	<p>not sure we hear sufficiently from the elected members</p> <p>though would welcome more experience from the cultural sector; also more youth and diversity</p> <p>Areas of external expertise to consider adding for the future might include visual arts and digital media/marketing.</p>

			Too many people round the table makes for not a very good discussion.
Is the Chairman effective?	8	100% = Yes	
Structure of agenda?	10	60% = Good 30% = Adequate 10% = Needs Improvement	Suggest use "starred items" system as for Guildhall School. Would prefer fewer presentations The relative formality of agenda structure....more discursive matters are arrived at later in the meeting than would be ideal...discussion can be curtailed. It takes us a long time to get to the meat of a meeting. There seems (to this outsider) to be too much bureaucratic stuff during the first hour
Paper content?	10	50% = Good 30% = Adequate 20% = Needs Improvement	Financial information difficult to understand, with questions like "Did event X break-even" unable to be answered. Treatment of overheads mystifying! Much improved Generally good....more concise language is always welcome! Vary - but have improved steadily in recent years I am not used to the format of the papers. Not a lot you can do about it but they don't make for good discussion.
Clarity of Minutes?	10	70% = Good 30% Adequate	
Agenda Timeliness?	10	70% = Good 30% Adequate	Could really do with longer to review the papers before they are circulated Late Papers

			At times, too many late papers but again improved
Clerking arrangements?	9	100% = Good	
Own meeting attendance rating?	10	70% = Good 30% = Adequate	I do my best not to miss meetings...there have been unavoidable clashes.
Own input at meetings	9	55% = Good 33% = Adequate 11% = Needs Improvement	When we do genuinely discuss I am sure I am not perfect!
Own outside interaction with Centre?	10	40% = Good 60% = Adequate	My interactions with the team, while always positive, are relatively limited. Partly...diary pressure...keen and ready to engage with all aspects of the arts, digital and communication agendas. Not sure management does enough to invite Board to events
Did you receive an induction?	11	63% Did 37% Didn't	
Did you get an induction pack?	11	46% Did 54% Didn't	
Centre Communications helpful/good?	10	30% = Good 60% = Adequate 10% = Needs Improvement	Getting much better but the board would benefit for a better flow of information about what is happening, as it happens Probably Improved but more [something] than strategic
Other Centre Communications	9	55% = Good 33% = Adequate 12% = Needs Improvement	Press briefings have improve but cannot be enjoyed much between meetings
General Effectiveness Comments			finance committee is more focused than the board meeting; we must always bear down on overlong presentations and repetition of material already circulated to read It functions, but are we having enough time to debate the "big issues"? We are a large diverse and well skilled Board but we are not having those skills utilised - it is a bit of [something] show!

			<p>The Board provides stable and strong governance of an exceptional creative and management team. It would benefit from growing the number and diversity of external members ...creative, cultural and business sectors.</p> <p>Pretty good - currently well chaired and with enthusiastic members. Meetings are very long and work could be more efficiently dealt with.</p> <p>Insufficient engagement between Board and artistic activities.</p> <p>A "normal" board would have fund raising at its heart - and we don't do that</p>

Least Skilled = high aggregate score

Most Skilled = low aggregate score

Member Indicated Skills = skills recorded to demonstrate Board skills in this area but form not filled out correctly.

Skills Area	Expertise		General Interest	
	High	Moderate	High	Moderate
Arts Administration	5			
Charity Organisation	2			4
Creative Learning		3	10	5
Equal Opportunities				
Facilities Management		Member indicated skills		
Film	5		8	7
Finance	4			
Fundraising	Member indicated skills	Member indicated skills		
Governance/Trusteeship	2			
Health & Safety		Member Indicated Skills		
Legal	6			
Local Authorities	3	4		
Marketing	4			
Music	4	5	7	

Other Business expertise (please state below)	1 (Media) 4 (General Company Management)			
Personnel Matters		Member Indicated Skills		
Project Management		Member Indicated Skills		
Public Relations			6	
Public Sector Organisations	5		1	
Quality Systems				
Risk and Audit	5			
Theatre	2		7	
Visual Arts			11	
Widening Participation	4		1	

Board Membership

Members' Name	Expiry of current term	Length of current term & date of appointment	Complete years' service as of May 2014	Eligible for reappointment when term expires**?
Court of Common Council Members				
Catherine McGuinness	2015	3 years - 2012	6	Yes - 2018
Richard Regan	2015	3 years – 2012	2	Yes - 2018
Jeremy Simons	2015	3 years – 2012	2	Yes - 2018
Jeremy Mayhew	2016	3 years - 2013	8	Yes - 2016
John Tomlinson	2016	3 years – 2013	3	Yes - 2016
Tom Hoffman	2017	3 years – 2014	3	Yes - 2017
Giles Shilson	2017	3 years – 2014	3	Yes - 2017
Judith Pleasance	2017	3 years – 2014	0	Yes - 2017
Co-opted Members				
Roly Keating	March 2015	3 Years - 2012	2	Yes
Sir Brian McMaster	March 2017	3 Years - 2014	2	Yes
Cllr Guy Nicholson	March 2016	3 years - 2013	4	Yes, third term would expire 2019
Trevor Phillips	March 2016	3 years - 2013	1	Yes
Keith Salway	March 2017	3 years - 2014	4**	The expiry of Mr Salway's third term in March 2017 brings him to 8 years reckonable service

** In accordance with the revised constitution agreed by the Court of Common Council in September 2008 viz:-

if an existing Member's current term would take him/her beyond the maximum nine years of reckonable service, then he/she would be permitted to complete their full current term, retiring at the end of the Committee/Board year in March;

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank