

Minutes of a meeting of the LiFE Multi Academy Trust Board of Trustees
held at Bosworth Academy
on Monday 9 May 2022
commencing at 6.00 p.m.

Present

Liz Warren (Chair)

Hazel Cole
Hannah Cusworth
Iain Kinnis
Chris Parkinson (Chief Executive)
Andy Smith

In Attendance

Gareth Williams (Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Head, Countesthorpe Academy)

Stuart McDonough (Governance Adviser and Clerk to the Board)

	Procedural Items	
Min. No	Minute	Action
1	Welcome, introductions and apologies	All to note
1.1	The Chair (LW) welcomed all present to the meeting.	
1.2	Apologies for absence were received, noted and accepted from Sue Dunford (Other Governance commitment), Liam McDonough (Holiday) and Chris Tweedale (prior commitment).	
2	Declarations of Interest	All to note
	None.	
3	Minutes of the Previous Meeting : 7 March 2022	All to note
3.1	The following corrections were noted : <i>Minute 18 : Reports from Trustees : noted that Trustee reports received had been filed in the appropriate folder on Governor Hub.</i> <i>Minute 22 : Admission of <u>Dove Bank Primary School</u>.</i> <i>Minute 24 : Finance, Audit and Infrastructure Committee – next meeting – <u>20 June</u>.</i> Subject to the above, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a correct record for signature by the Chair.	LW
4	Storage of Confirmed Minutes	All to note
4.1	In response to a question from LW, the Clerk confirmed that arrangements were in place to store confirmed minutes on Governor Hub. The arrangements had been advised to the Chief Executive's PA.	

5	Matters arising from the previous minutes	All to note
5.1	<p><u>Minute 12 (Policies)</u></p> <p>At the previous meeting Trustees had discussed and approved three Policies subject to amendment to clarify certain matters. The Chair of the Finance, Audit and Infrastructure Committee (Andy Smith (AS)) confirmed that the amendments to each Policy had been made. The revised Policies had been posted on Governor Hub prior to the meeting and were before the Board for approval.</p>	
5.2	<p>Resolved that –</p> <p>i) subject to (ii) below, the following Policies be approved and adopted as now submitted, with immediate effect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finance Policy - Gifts and Hospitality Policy - Funds Policy <p>ii) the front cover of the above and all other Trust Policies be revised to refer to “Trustees” (not “Directors”).</p>	<p>SM</p> <p>CT</p>
5.3	<p><u>Minute 22 Proposed Admission of Dove Bank and Desford Primary Schools to the Trust</u></p> <p>In response to questions from Trustees, the Chief Executive (CP) confirmed that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - due diligence was proceeding for both schools. No major issues had arisen or were expected to arise from this. The DfE representatives dealing with the process had raised an issue related to the finances of one of the schools but this had been satisfactorily resolved; - the Headteacher Board was due to consider the applications for admission of the two schools to the Trust at their meeting scheduled for the end of May 2022; - a report on the outcome of due diligence would be brought to the Board. The target date for this was 4 September 2022. The final decision to admit the schools (or otherwise) would be for the Board to make at that meeting; - due diligence would take into account educational and related challenges at both schools. In that regard, the characteristics of the challenges at one of the two schools, related to pupil mobility, were recognised. Trustees were assured that the issues arising from this were well managed by the school, which was a well run, happy and good school with stable staffing. 	
5.4	<p><u>Minute 17 : Countesthorpe Academy : Proposed E-sports Development</u></p> <p>The Deputy Chief Executive (GW) reported that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Business Case for the proposed provision of the E-sports Arena was nearing completion, the intention being that the estimated cost (£300,000) would be met from school reserves (carry forwards) which were of the order of £1.4m; - a number of companies had confirmed their interest in sponsorship of the project. Discussions were continuing; 	

5.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Leicester City Council, which was also considering a similar provision, had also expressed an interest in supporting the project. <p>In response to questions, CP and GW explained that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in addition to the educational benefit of the project, there would be potential opportunities for commercial and community use which would generate funds for the Trust; - the facility would be likely to attract additional students, notably at sixth form; - funding for any increase in pupils would be directed to and benefit the school. Income from any commercial or community use would be directed through LiFE Services for the overall benefit of the Trust; and - the project was an exciting innovative initiative and one of very few in England, such that it could be regarded at this stage as “cutting edge”. If approved, in addition to bringing educational and potentially commercial (income) benefits to the school, it would (in keeping with LiFE ethos) be transformative in establishing the reputation of the school in terms of school improvement and performance. 	
5.6	Following discussion Trustees agreed that a Working Party be established to consider the Business Case for the project and to make a recommendation to Trustees.	
5.7	<p>Resolved that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) a Working Party, comprising AS, Hannah Cusworth (HC) and Liam McDonagh (LMcD), be established to consider the Business Case for the project; and ii) the Working Party be authorised to make a recommendation, via Written Resolution, to approve (or otherwise) the project*. 	<p>AS/HC/ LMcD</p> <p>GW</p>
*Clerk's note	The decision on the Written Resolutionn to be reported to the next available meeting of the Trust Board.	Clerk/CT
6 6.1	<p>Management Information System</p> <p>Noted that –</p> <p>following consideration by a Working Party of staff from across the Trust, it had been agreed that the SIMS system be replaced. Competitive tenders had been invited for a replacement system. A decision on the replacement system was imminent. The costs of the new system would be of the order of £300,000 over three years. The decision was an operational matter and would be authorised by the Chief Executive on recommendation of the Working Party. Further reference to Trustees was not required.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>CP</p>
7 7.1	<p>Summary Actions List (7 March 2022)</p> <p>In addition to minute 5 above, Trustees received the Summary Action List from the previous meeting, noting as follows:</p> <p><u>Minute 13.1 – 13.2 Safeguarding (Staff) – Budget Provision</u></p> <p>CP advised that in light of experience in the current academic year, in particular the legacy and increased pressures on staff arising from school closures, Covid and related developments, having regard to the importance of staff wellbeing, the annual strategic review would review the extent of wellbeing and mental health provision and support</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>CP/SM</p>

	<p>available to staff. It was likely that the level of budget provision for this would be increased.</p> <p><u>Minute 13.8 Low Pay Concerns</u></p> <p>A Trustee referred to discussion at the previous meeting at which concern had been expressed around the increasingly uncompetitive nature of the salaries of lower paid staff and the impact of this on some staff recruitment.</p> <p>CP explained that the Pay Policy of the Trust included a commitment to the minimum wage (£9.50 per hour). This commitment was honoured and included with the nationally negotiated pay settlement for support staff (2021 / 22), reported to the previous meeting and which had been back dated to April 2021. Having regard to difficulties in recruiting lower paid staff, consideration was currently being given to payment of the non-statutory Living Wage (£9.90 an hour). Evaluation of the cost of this needed to take into account the impact on the differential of staff whose salary grades/point on their incremental scale were currently at or around that level.</p> <p>It was suggested that the report being prepared by the Trust Finance Manager be brought to an early meeting or considered by a Working Party authorised to make a decision on the issue. Trustees noted that a recommendation to pay the Living Wage would represent a change of Pay Policy and would therefore require the approval of the Trust Board, which was not scheduled to meet until 27 June.</p> <p>Resolved that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the remit of the Working Party appointed at Minute 5.7 above include consideration of the Policy of the Trust relating to the commitment to payment of the minimum wage; and ii) if, following consideration of the report of the Trust Finance Manager the Working Party conclude that the Pay Policy be amended to payment of the non-statutory Living Wage, it be authorised to make a recommendation to Trustees via Written Resolution*. <p><u>Minute 16.4 Kingsway recruitment</u></p> <p>HC confirmed she had received the Trust Recruitment Policy.</p>	AS/HC/LMcD
*Clerk's note	<p><i>If approved by Trustees, a recommendation to adopt the Living Wage will result in increased costs to the Trust. Good practice therefore requires that the deliberations of the Working Party be formally noted and submitted to all Trustees, together with the report of the Finance Manager and the proposed Written Resolution, the decision to be reported to the next available meeting of the Trust Board.</i></p>	SM/Clerk CT
8 8.1	<p>Trustee Resignations</p> <p>Noted that -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Hatle Mehta (HM) had resigned as a Trustee with effect from 4 March 2022. LW advised that HM had registered an interest in appointment as a Governor at Bosworth LGB; b) Consequent on this resignation there were now 2 Member appointed Trustee vacancies. This would increase to 3 on 31 August 2022 when Iain Kinnis (IK) would step down as a Trustee (remaining as a Member). <p><i>See also minute 20 below.</i></p>	All to note
9 9.1	<p>Finance, Audit and Infrastructure Committee : appointment of Trustee</p> <p>Resolved that –</p> <p>HC* be appointed a member of this Committee for the remainder of the current academic year.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>SM AS/HC</p>

*Clerk's note	HC may require remote access to the next meeting (20 June 2022).	
	Reports and Assurance reports	
10	Report of the Chair	All to note
	<u>External Review of Governance</u>	
10.1	Noted that	
	Further to Minute 16.1 & 16.2 of the previous meeting, David Werry, National Leader in Governance (accredited by DfE to undertake Governance Effectiveness Reviews) had been appointed to undertake the Review requested by Members.	
10.2	CP advised that following a meeting with Mr Werry, at which the scope of the exercise had been agreed, Mr Werry had confirmed that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - his review would take into account and acknowledge that the Trust was in a governance transition phase and, as far as practically possible, seek to recognise the benefits of the impacts of governance developments that had already taken place and include recommended priorities for remaining governance actions; - attend the next scheduled meeting of the Board (27 June); and - aim to present the Review Report to the 4 September meeting of the Board. 	CT
	<u>Safeguarding</u>	
10.3	Noted that	
	further to Minute 7(b) of the previous meeting, LW had spoken with the Trust Board Safeguarding Lead (Sue Dunford) who had confirmed that she was content with the support available to her in that role, in which she would continue.	SD
11	Trust Risk Register (confidential minute)	All to note
11.1	<u>Risks raised by Trustees.</u>	
	Following questions from Trustees , a detailed discussion took place in which CP explained that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>admission of two new Primary schools</u> to the Trust would support development of primary provision within the Trust. In his view there was no risk to standards or to school improvement : conversely, the two schools, with whom there had been long standing collaboration arrangements, would strengthen primary standards; - workloads relating to admission of the two schools would fall principally to CT and also the Finance Team and would not place additional strain on school improvement; - <u>in practice, data outcomes</u>/Progress 8 results from 2022 would not be comparable to those of 2019. Outcomes from 2022 would provide an indication of the progress and recovery from two years of lockdown and disrupted education and the impact of remote learning. They could not therefore be used as a meaningful comparator to 2019; - additionally, 2022 outcomes would almost certainly include anomalies that would mitigate against meaningful comparison with 2019 outcomes and between student groups, locally and nationally. This was because some groups had responded well to e.g. remote learning, whilst others had not. Some areas had suffered severely from Covid infections whilst others had been less affected. Further, in recognition of difficulties faced by students due to take examinations this year, the curriculum/syllabus of 	

	<p>many subjects had been narrowed or constrained. This inevitably would mean that some brighter students were likely to obtain very good results because they had less on which to focus. In that regard the outcomes from 2022 could not be compared with those of 2019 when the full curriculum/syllabus had applied; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - he remained confident that overall outcomes for the Trust would be good but adhered to the amber risk rating that suggested huge uncertainty about the extent to which 2022 data could be regarded as a reliability indicator. 	
11.2	<p>A Governor commented on the confidence expressed by CP and asked</p> <p>What makes you so sure that LiFE outcomes will be good?</p> <p>CP advised that his confidence was based on a range of evidence, including</p>	
11.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Challenge Partner reviews which for Countesthorpe, Bosworth, Winstanley and Braunstone Frith had been very positive; - the robust nature of Trust subject based reviews; - his detailed reviews and discussion with school leaders and the positive developments taking place in schools, examples of which he described including coaching and mentoring and targeted interventions etc; and - SEND reviews. 	
11.4	<p>However, CP cautioned that whilst these and other actions being taken in all schools were positive and encouraging, they could not control the impacts that the experience of Covid and school closures had on individual students.</p> <p><u>Energy Costs (Non Confidential Risk 2 (White))</u></p>	
11.5	<p>A Trustee referred to the significant increases in energy costs, examples of which she gave. She suggested that the provision for a 50% increase in costs included in the 2022 / 23 budget would not be sufficient and that consequently, the sharp rise in costs, forecast to continue beyond Autumn, should warrant a higher rated risk than that currently identified in the Register.</p> <p>CP assured the Board that the level of provision for increased energy costs to be made in the 2022 / 23 budgets was under review by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and would be considered at the next meeting of the Finance, Audit and Infrastructure Committee. The need or otherwise to increase the risk rating would be considered by that Committee.</p>	CP
11.16	<p>The Board noted the report.</p>	CP/LW
12	<p>Trust HR Provision</p>	All to note
12.1	<p>Noted that –</p> <p>a review of current Trust HR resource, including the option of buying-in additional HR advice services in preference to the current arrangement with the County Council Traded Services (HR Unit), was currently underway.</p>	
12.2	<p>In response to questions, CP explained that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the review was an operational matter that had arisen because existing HR support arrangements, including internal HR capacity, could not meet the increasing HR requirements of the Trust; 	

12.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in addition to making alternative arrangements for buying-in HR expertise and advice from a legal Provider, the level of expertise and resource available internally was also under review with a view to ensuring that an appropriate level of timely advice was available to all Headteachers. Examples of the need for this were given; - confirmed that the review would include development of a Vision for the future of centralised internal HR, which he agreed should eventually ideally include support for staff Training and Talent Management; and - the cost of any additional HR resource had to be considered in the context of the increasing demand for HR advice and support, the commitment to maintenance of the 4.5% top slice and the impact on Trust Reserves, which he reminded Trustees were owned by the Trust but held at individual school level. <p>The Board noted the position.</p>	
13 13.1 13.2 13.3	<p>Central Service Provision</p> <p>Arising from discussion at Minute 12 above, a Trustee asked if a document was available that set out the services provided by the Centre and the cost of these in relation to the top slice.</p> <p>CP advised that a compendium of the services provided from the Centre was maintained by GW but there was currently no formal Service Level Agreement. To date, his view had been that issue of such a document would not be helpful because of potential or perceived inequities in receipt of services by individual schools.</p> <p>During the brief discussion that followed it was</p> <p>AGREED that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) development of any Service Level Agreement or similar document would require approval of Trustees and if agreed would require consideration over a number of meetings; b) consideration be given to the matter at the forthcoming Board Strategy Day, this to include principles governing central or local provision of services; c) any such document should reflect the principle that the role of the Trust Board was to create the capacity for school improvement and the role of the LGB in delivering that. 	<p>All to note</p> <p>LW/CP</p>
14 14.1 14.2	<p>Reports from Trustees</p> <p><u>CEO Performance Management</u></p> <p>AS reported that the process for the current academic year had been completed by the Performance Management Committee, the next meeting of which would be November 2022. He suggested that given that he had chaired the Committee for three years, it may now be time to step aside and allow another Trustee to join the Committee in his place.</p> <p>Following a brief discussion the Board</p> <p>AGREED that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) AS remain as a member of the Committee with a view to arranging an orderly handover to another Trustee, later in the year; b) Sue Dunford* and, subject to his being willing and available to serve, Liam McDonagh be appointed to the Committee; and 	<p>All to note</p> <p>SD/AS/ LMcD</p>

	<p>c) as regards the protocol for sharing reports of the deliberations of the Committee, these be available to the members of that Committee only, the Board to be advised by the Chair of the Committee of the outcome, not the detail, of those meetings.</p> <p><i>*LW confirmed that Sue Dunford had confirmed her willingness to serve on the Committee.</i></p>	
Governance		
15	Trust Governance Improvement Programme : Project Plan	All to note
15.1	Further to Minute 14 of the previous meeting, the Board considered and noted the report of the Director of Governance (CT). This included target timescales for the further actions to be taken within the scope of the Programme.	
15.2	LW advised that she would discuss the report, including the target timescales, in further detail with CT.	LW/CT
	<u>Head of Governance and Clerk recruitment</u>	
15.3	<p>A number of encouraging applications had been received for the Head of Governance post.</p> <p>AGREED that –</p> <p>the interview Panel for the post include LW, CT and a Governor to be nominated by Ivanhoe LGB</p> <p><u>Governor Hub</u></p>	CT/LW
15.4	<p>In response to questions from Trustees, the Clerk (SAMcD) advised that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the initial establishment of the system had been completed within the timescale he had set; - currently there were around 15 individuals who had not activated their registration on the system. This was an increase in the number previously reported and appeared to be due to a number of newly appointed governors and/or the way in which their registration details had been entered onto the system, about which he had not been consulted; - it was the case that the system had yet to be fully developed. In his view, as he had recommended at the outset, in order to maximise use and management of the system a User Group, common protocols and training was required. He drew the attention of Trustees to the section of the Governance Programme Progress Report, which itemised the actions that he considered were required fully to utilise the system and which he had originally recommended in November 2021. To date these actions had not been taken. He agreed with the suggestion of a Trustee that until these actions were implemented, the system would not, and could not be 100% complete/effective. He suggested that the Trust Governance Officer should be responsible for the overall management of the system and implementation of the actions recommended in the report; and - confirmed that he had requested Governor Hub for a quotation for staff and governor/Trustee training on the system. <p><u>Governor Training Review and NGA/CST Subscriptions</u></p>	
15.5	Arrangements made for these, as set out in the Governance Programme Progress report, were noted.	
16	Trust Scheme of Delegation (Proposed)	All to note
16.1	This report was discussed in detail. SAMcD explained that	

<p>16.2</p>	<p>a) the narrative format of the Scheme would complement the Accountability Framework and in his view was necessary, in accordance with best practice, to support Trustees in holding the Executive to account. In that respect, the Framework provided a useful reference point but was not sufficiently explicit in terms of meaningful interpretation of delegated responsibilities; and</p> <p>b) the proposed Scheme and the report before the Board was in a several parts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Covering Report – which explained the rationale, best practice and principles of the Scheme and invited Trustees to consider the extent to which they were satisfied with current arrangements for assurance reporting; - Part 1 of the Scheme : the Principles on which the Scheme of Delegation was based including the arrangements for annual review, the scope and limits of delegations and those matters which would be reserved to the Board for decision. The purpose of this Part of the Scheme was to underpin the “rules” of the Scheme and thus provide assurance to the Board regarding the arrangements for future review and management of the Scheme; - Part 2 of the Scheme : delegations to Board Committees. With the exception of the revised Scheme of Delegation for LGBs, these had been agreed at the previous meeting (Minute 12.10 refers). <p>LW reported that discussions with LGB Chairs regarding the revised LGB Scheme of Delegation were proceeding well. Trustees noted that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the expectation was that this element of the Scheme would be brought to the 27 June 2022 meeting of the Board for approval; and • the single LGB Scheme would replace the need for eight/ten individual Schemes for each LGB. The ability of the Board to apply a differentiated Scheme where in their view the circumstances or performance of individuals LGBs required this, would remain; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Part 3 of the Scheme : delegations to the Chief Executive. This included the delegated arrangements that the Chief Executive would make to the Trust Management Team, Chief Financial Officer and Headteachers and other colleagues. In this regard, SAMcD drew attention to the covering report which acknowledged that this element of the Scheme required further refinement. <p>The focus of the detailed discussion that ensued related to Part 3 of the Scheme. Key points emerging from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SAMcD advised that, in his view approval of delegations from the Trust Board to the Chief Executive was essential in determining the scope of the authority of the Chief Executive. Once approved, the Chief Executive was free, within the overall scope of the Scheme, to delegate to colleagues. The terms of the Scheme required any major changes in the delegation arrangements made by the Chief Executive to be reported to and approved by the Board. This might occur where, for example, additional management posts were established and/or the role of individual management colleagues may change. The Board determined all delegation arrangements and could withdraw or change these at their discretion. However, subject to this, Trustees would not normally oversee or review the delegation arrangements made by the Chief Executive but it was important that they maintained an awareness of this; 	<p>CT</p>
-------------	---	-----------

16.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delegation arrangements in the sector differed significantly from those in the Private and other parts of the Public Sector. Whilst there was no Model Scheme, delegations were determined by reference to DfE and ESFA Regulation and included the statutory position of the Chief Executive as Accounting Officer; - it was not the practice within the sector to develop a Scheme whereby senior staff (e.g. the Chief Financial Officer) were responsible directly to the Board and therefore were subject to their own Scheme of Delegation. Delegations to colleagues was an operational issue for the Chief Executive; - delegations to and from the Chief Executive should be viewed in the context of the Scheme as a whole. Part 1 of the Scheme set the underpinning overall principles of the Scheme. Part 2 set delegations to Committees. Taken together, these provided appropriate detailed checks and balances. An example of this was explained in relation to a concern expressed around the scope for internal fraud. In that regard, the duty of the Finance and Audit Committee was to ensure that, as far as reasonably possible, the annual internal audit programme set by the Committee on behalf of the Board reviewed those areas and activities that might be vulnerable to unauthorised activity. Similar considerations applied to all activities delegated by the Chief Executive to the management team and senior colleagues; - recognition that, as suggested in the covering report, Part 3 of the Scheme required further discussion and refinement. Trustees agreed with the suggestion of a Trustee that this should take place after the Board Strategic Awayday at which priorities and actions might be agreed that would affect the scope of delegations to senior staff; - in response to a question, SAMcD confirmed that, subject to approval of Part 1 and 2 of the scheme, as now submitted (and which he reminded Trustees was subject to annual review and could be adjusted by the Board at any time), this timescale would enable the Board to approve Part 3 of the Scheme, together with the LGB Delegations, at their June meeting. In his view this would be major step forward for the Trust. <p>Resolved that -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Part 1 of the proposed Scheme of Delegation, as now submitted be approved; ii) the position in relation to Part 2 of the Scheme (Committee including LGB delegations) be noted, a report to be brought to the June meeting of the Board; and iii) further consideration be given to Part 3 of the Scheme for which purpose a Working Party comprising LW, CP, CT and SAMcD be established. (SAMcD stated that he would advise all Trustees of the date of the meeting of the Working Party so that they would have the option to attend). 	<p>CT</p> <p>LW/CP CT/SAMcD</p>
17 17.1	Trust Contribution Record	All to note

<p>17.2</p> <p>17.3</p>	<p>The Board welcomed, received and noted the pro-forma report developed and presented by LW, the purpose of which (i.e. enabling Trustees to assess the contributions to the work of LGBs and schools by the Trust and vice-versa) she explained, emphasising that a pre requisite to completion of the form was a discussion between the Chair and the Headteacher of the school to which individual Trustees were allocated.</p> <p>LW agreed to advise those Trustees not present at the meeting of the process. CP to advise Heads</p> <p>Resolved that –</p> <p>the approach proposed by the Chair of the Trust Board be approved.</p>	<p>LW</p> <p>All Trustees</p>
<p>18</p> <p>18.1</p> <p>18.2</p>	<p>Towards a Trust Board Plan</p> <p>Trustees noted the Plan, posted on Governor Hub and which LW emphasised was a “Live” document to be updated as agreed targets and actions progressed and other issues emerged.</p> <p>In response to a suggestion from a Trustee, LW agreed to consider the possibility of developing the Plan into a Trustee Handbook.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>LW</p>
<p>19</p> <p>19.1</p> <p>19.2</p> <p>19.3</p>	<p>Trust Board Work Plan and Dates</p> <p>This document was received and noted.</p> <p>LW agreed to review the dates of meetings included within the Plan and to advise Trustees of any adjustments. The date of the AGM is waiting upon Members availability.</p> <p>Resolved that –</p> <p>the recommendations of the Chair relating to the future Programme of work for the Board include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoidance of the CEO report and Finance Committee reports at the same meeting; b) ensuring Committee meeting dates were held sufficiently in advance of Trust Board meetings to accommodate the needs of a non-quorate meeting; c) future AGM meetings to be held independently of and on separate days to other Trustee meetings; d) ensuring that a Trustee Planning session be held in advance of the Strategic Awayday; and e) greater use of Working Parties to reduce Trust Board meeting times. 	<p>All to note</p> <p>LW</p>
<p>20</p> <p>20.1</p> <p>20.2</p>	<p>Trustee Recruitment</p> <p>Pursuant to Minute 7 of the previous meeting, the Board considered a Paper prepared by LW (which included an analyses of the most recent Trustee skills audit (September 2021)) and which presented recommendations for future Trustee recruitment . LW explained that for a number of reasons it had not been possible to convene a meeting of the Working Party appointed at the previous meeting to consider the recommendations.</p> <p>During a detailed discussion Trustees welcomed the document and AGREED that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) further consideration be given to the diversity and skills of the Board including the required balance between existing/former educationalists and individuals from outside the education sector; 	<p>All to note</p> <p>Trustees</p>

	<p>b) consideration be given to development of criteria that would provide opportunities for LGB governors to become eligible for consideration of appointment as a Trustee;</p> <p>c) the recruitment and appointment process should have regard to the respective roles of the Board (creating capacity for school improvement) and LGBs (delivery of school improvement);</p> <p>d) the Trustee Recruitment pack may be reviewed: it was suggested that this could be improved notwithstanding the comments of HC who stated that, in her view as a new recruit to the Board, the existing pack had served it's purpose well;</p> <p>e) all trustees be requested to consider whether or not their personal/professional contacts might be interested in serving on the Board and, if they were, to put them in contact with LW; and</p> <p>f) the current (two) (Member appointed) Trustee vacancies be advertised, the nature of the advert and advertising media to be agreed by LW in consultation with the newly appointed Trust Media Officer. (This to include consideration of recruitment support from the Agency previously identified by CP or other agencies that might be appropriate).</p>	LW
Concluding Items		
23	Trustee Working Afternoon	All to note
23.1	<p>Noted – Wednesday 26 May 2.30 p.m.</p> <p>HC requested arrangements be made to enable her to attend remotely.</p>	LW
24	<p>Dates of Future Meetings</p> <p>Trust Strategic Planning Day : 7 June</p> <p>Finance, Audit and Infrastructure Committee : 20 June</p> <p>Trust Board - 27 June</p>	All to note
samcd draft 15.05.22	<i>The meeting concluded at 21.02 p.m.</i>	



(Signed)

27th June 2022 (Date)

L. Warren (Chair)