

**LIFE MULTI ACADEMY TRUST
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
HELD ON THE 31st March, 2025 AT 5.00PM**

**VIRTUAL MEETING
NON CONFIDENTIAL**

COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD

NAME		END DATE OF OFFICE	DESIGNATED ROLE	ATTENDANCE (TRUSTEES)
Liz Warren (LWA)	Trustee	09.02.2029	Vice Chair	Y
Chris Parkinson (CEO)	Trustee		CEO	Y
David Gordon (DGO)	Trustee	28.01.2028		N
David Maitland (DMA)	Trustee	09.02.2029		Y
Sue Dunford (SDU)	Trustee	05.09.2025		Y
Liam McDonagh (LMcD)	Trustee	09.02.2029		Y
Andy Smith (ASM)	Trustee	19.09.2026		Y
Anil Majithia (AKM)	Trustee	09.02.2029	Chair	Y
Ja Kim (JKI)	Trustee	09.02.2029		N
Rose Harvey (RHA)	Coopted Trustee	03.03.2028		Y - left at 7.00pm
IN ATTENDANCE				
Gareth Williams (GWI)			Coordinator of Education(LF)	
Nicola Koncarevic (NKO)			Director of Education (NFH)	
Chris Tweedale (CTW)			Executive Consultant	
Paul Maddox (PMA)			Executive CFO	
Sian Griffiths (SGR)			Director of Governance & Admissions	

1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed all present, apologies had been received from Ja Kim, David Gordon had also communicated to advise he was encountering problems joining the meeting.

RESOLVED: the apologies were accepted.

2. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

The Trustees were asked to declare any potential pecuniary interest or conflict of interest between an individual and the Trust Board as a whole with the business to be discussed during the meeting. Andy Smith and Chris Parkinson declared that they were Directors on the board of LiFE MAT Services. Trustees also noted that David Maitland would have an interest in agenda item 3a when Trustees considered his appointment onto the board of LiFE MAT Services.

RESOLVED: the additional declarations were noted.

3. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

The non-confidential minutes of the Board meeting held on the 9th December, 2024 and the 20th January, 2025 were approved and confirmed as an accurate record.

4. MATTERS ARISING

The Trustees reviewed and updated the action log from previous meetings, ongoing items highlighted in blue for ease of reference –

DATE	NO	ACTION	WHO	WHEN	UPDATES
23.09.2024	6e	Community Engagement – role of the executive CEO/LWA to agree who will lead on this item	CEO/LWA		ONGOING
Update – CEO confirmed Dave Bennett (DBE), Headteacher at Winstanley who was part of the newly formed Trust Leadership Group had agreed to lead on this action. The Trust was developing this area which was connected to the community engagement part of the strategic wheel. CEO and DBE had met to agree the KPIs to ensure they aligned with other areas of the trusts strategic planning, this piece of work would be finalised by the end of this term. Part of the work, which had been completed included re-engagement with Leicester and Leicestershire Citizens Group. AKM advised he was also in discussions with CTW about stakeholder management and felt it may be helpful to link the 2 pieces of work.					
09.12.2024	6d	NKO agreed to ask her PA to make contact with LWA/JKI to arrange a meeting at Ibstock.	NKO		COMPLETED
	8b	SMA to amend the Trustee Report/Annual Accounts with the correct narrative and send over the form of words to SGR for these minutes.	SMA		COMPLETED 10.12.2024
	8b	Amended accounts to be electronically signed by the Chair and CEO as Accounting Officer and submitted to the ESFA by the 31st December, 2024.	CEO/LWA/ PMA/SMA		COMPLETED
	10	LiFE MAT Services - SGR to arrange the meeting in the New Year between PWA & Trustees.	SGR		COMPLETED
	11c	LWA/SGR to review the process to receive assurance from the LGBs.	LWA/SGR		COMPLETED
Update – SGR confirmed this was an ongoing action which aligned with an ongoing action from the chairs group - to review the process to review the assurance from the LGB's to the Trust Board, both actions had been paused until the ERG (external review of governance) had been completed. The reviewer had been asked to include this as part of the review and provide some recommendations. The report would be available in early May.					
	12a	Parent code of conduct - SGR to ask Schools to include the link to the home school agreement in the code.	SGR		COMPLETED
	23a	SGR to move HTPR to Spring Term	SGR		COMPLETED see agenda item 17
	24	Trustee recruitment - LWA to make contact and confirm offer, SGR to start the appointment process.	LWA/SGR		CLOSED – see update below
Update – SGR reported that unfortunately despite multiple attempts to follow up/complete the process no progress has been made. Consequently, AKM had concluded that the applicant was withdrawing from the process and had asked SGR to advise them accordingly. SGR confirmed an email had been sent on the 21 st March, 2025.					
20.01.2025	6	Articles of Association move to the DFE model - SGR agreed to progress the process to change the Articles of Association.	SGR	ASAP	COMPLETED see update below
Update – SGR confirmed the approved draft articles had been sent to Anthony Collins solicitors who had submitted a copy to the Charities Commission and DFE. They anticipated the process could take about 6 months before we received approval.					

5. GOVERNANCE & COMPLIANCE

a. LiFE MAT Services

- i. Prior to the meeting, the Trustees were advised that David Maitland had agreed to join the board of directors for LiFE MAT Services.

RESOLVED: the Trustees approved David Maitland's appointment as a Director of LiFE MAT Services.

- ii. Recruitment of additional Directors, the Trustees were asked for their input on the approach to recruiting additional non-Trust Directors to the board, the recommendation from the solicitor was to recruit an additional 3, the composition would be – 3 Trustees, the Nursery Manager (Ofsted requirement) and 3 non Trust Directors. A question was raised as to who and how the Chair would be elected, SGR explained this was a matter for the board of the subsidiary company, ASM had been appointed as the Chair at the last meeting. A number of further questions were raised relating to the articles of association and the relationship between the Trust and the subsidiary company –

- a. Should the articles state that the Trust elects the Chair of the subsidiary company board.
- b. The articles state the quorum is 3 directors but does not clarify whether that relates to Trustees or non trust Directors, the Trustees may want to seek some clarity and amend the articles accordingly.
- c. A discussion needed to take place and a process put in place for the board of directors of the subsidiary company to report to the Trust Board.

The Trustees felt reassured that the appointment and termination of the directors lay with the Trust Board. The Trustees asked the board of Directors to meet and agree a process to recruit additional Directors, DMA also suggested undertaking a skills audit to identify gaps in experience and skills.

ACTION: SGR to convene a meeting of the board of directors for the subsidiary company.

b. Admissions

SGR provided an overview of the paper which had been shared prior to the meeting. The proposal was to bring the in-year admissions in-house, with SGR, Director of Governance & Admissions as the first point of contact who would then liaise with the LA and seek additional advice if required. This approach aimed to ensure consistency and uniformity across the Trust, providing all schools with clear and consistent guidance.

Discussions were taking place with Headteachers and staff who managed or administered admissions. The feedback so far has been overwhelmingly positive. Taking into account the additional cost of salaries for in-house management, this move to an in house service would ensure maximisation of census funding by increasing the number of children enrolled prior to the census deadline. The Trust Board as the admissions authority was requested to approve the recommendation to transition the in-year admissions function in-house, effective from the 2025–2026 academic year.

Q: (AKM) I'm concerned about capacity and workloads to take on this extra work, has this been considered as we've had issues with board papers and also about how much this would cost I understand that there would be a £20,000 saving, how will this be funded?

A: (SGR) As part of the change I would provide advice and support but the daily function e.g. administration and appeals panels would be undertaken by the governance team who work part time and had capacity. The report includes the current cost paid to the LA which were in the region of £20,000 per annum however the greatest impact was the loss of funding where children were not included in the census in October, which equated to £6,000 per child in secondaries and £5,000 in primaries. To streamline the process relating to board papers I've drawn up a working protocol this morning, with responsibilities so we can actually hold everybody, who is involved in the process, to account so all of the board papers and all of the actions will be addressed at least 2 Fridays before the meeting.

A: (NKO) I've undertaken a piece of work in the past and we probably miss funding for about 18 children across the National Forest hub before the census day which equates to 18 times £6,000. We also have a number of students that sit at home when they should be in school learning which also creates challenges.

RESOLVED: the Trustees approved the recommendation to transition the in-year admissions function in-house, effective from the 2025–2026 academic year.

ACTION: SGR to notify the Leicestershire County Council and Leicester City Council.

The Significant change report had been shared with Trustees prior to the meeting, Trustees were invited to make comments/ask questions.

Q: (AKM) What will the impact be if we increase the pupil numbers at Winstanley, what would be the impact on other schools e.g. Bosworth?

A: (CEO) The proposal doesn't impact negatively on any other schools and in fact highlights a great success story where Winstanley is oversubscribed and Bosworth continues to be significantly oversubscribed for year 7 as well. So actually, it shows more parents and families in the community want their children to come to schools within our trust.

RESOLVED: the Trustees approved the request from Winstanley and Ibstock School to submit a significant change application.

- c. Committee Chairs/Membership – AKM provide an overview of the proposed changes listed below

COMMITTEE	CURRENT POSITION	PROPOSED CHANGE
Pay & People	Chair – Anil Majithia	Chair – Liz Warren
School Improvement	Committee member - Anil Majithia	Committee member – Liz Warren
Audit & Risk	Committee member – Liz Warren	Committee member – Anil Majithia until the end of the Summer Term.

RESOLVED: the Trustees approved the changes listed above.

- d. To review and agree the proposed agenda template.

A copy of a proposed template was shared with Trustees. AKM provided an explanation of the rationale for changing the format. Previously, with fewer Trustees on the board, just three or four, most Trustees were heavily involved in committees, providing visibility across all areas. Now, with 12 Trustees, only a few will be attending each committee, which may leave others with less insight into what was happening elsewhere. AKM felt the only way to ensure full visibility was through clear reporting structures within the board, the revised agenda was designed to achieve this objective. The proposal included asking the specific leads to provide updates from the executive perspective, detailing what was happening in their areas. Chairs of committees would play a crucial role in providing assurance that the information presented to the board was accurate, had been scrutinised, and met the necessary standards. The heavy lifting would be undertaken at the committees, but Trustees must ensure that they were able to make informed decisions. To do so, Trustees must have a comprehensive understanding of what was happening across all areas. The purpose of this revised agenda was to ensure that the board was fully informed, able to ask questions, triangulate information, and feel confident that they were fulfilling their responsibilities. AKM invited Trustees to ask questions and/or share their views.

DMA felt LiFE Services should be included in this process as a quasi committee of the Trust. SDU commented that 3 individuals involved in the School Improvement Committee addressed a lot of complex and detailed questions during the meetings and suggested that this would create additional work or a duplication of effort if they were asked similar questions by other members of the Board of Trustees, rather than by those Trustees who were members of the committee. Changing the process may also result in considerably longer board meetings, given the increased number of people involved in those discussions. SDU was keen to avoid duplication of effort or ask the executive team to go through the same process twice, however, there might be a workable solution if there was a way to avoid repetition.

AKM expressed concern that relying solely on meeting minutes to understand what was happening was not the best way for Trustees to gain assurance, Trustees need to have a clear understanding of the wider picture, and this could only be achieved through reports presented by executives at Trust Board meetings. This piece of work was not an optional extra for executives but should be an integral part of their role to provide Trustees with the assurance needed to carry out oversight of the Trustee role responsibilities effectively.

This process was not about duplicating the work of the committees who would continue to do the heavy lifting, but the board needed a holistic view. There were 9 Trustees who at any point in time may not have attended the committee meetings, so this broader perspective was crucial. All areas were interdependent, and having a comprehensive view was vital for effective governance.

Q: (RHA) Can you provide some clarity around what is required for the focus Trustee update so I have a better understanding of my role, we're all linked with individual schools. But at the minute is it just a general point for anyone who's done a visit to provide an update, or should we check in with the local governing board before each meeting. How are you envisaging this piece of work to be carried out, shall we put something in the diary to speak to them before the board meetings?

A: (AKM) As the focus Trustee at Bosworth I've attended an LGB meeting and report back, this can be a verbal update to Trustees on any points of what's happening at LGB level. We have to trust each other's judgment, if you don't have anything to report, you can simply say I've got nothing to report this time.

LMCD raised concerns that whilst he was not against this idea, could this change in board reporting lead to duplication of effort, could the board end up having detailed conversations about every committee's meetings discussion and decision during the board session. In his experience this could happen and could lead to a position where the board challenged and/or unintentionally undermined the committees. It may create an unnecessary overlap and might not be the most efficient use of everyone's time. The committees have been established for a reason and the Trust board had entrusted them to do the work, and Trustees should have confidence that they would bring matters requiring board attention to the board. A general opportunity for updates was fine, but going through every committee and asking individual Trustees for updates feels redundant and not the best use of time.

AKM explained the proposal where executives responsible for specific areas provided direct reports to the board members ensured that all Trustees have a shared understanding and were fully aligned on the matters at hand.

CTW agreed that the proposal may create duplication. The executive team members who support each committee already invested significant time and effort into these meetings, asking them to attend a full board meeting to address potential additional questions, beyond what had already been covered in the committee, felt duplicative and unnecessary. Moreover, the scheme of delegation (SOD) in the MAT clearly stated that the Board's role was to hold the Chief Executive to account, and this was CTW's experience where he had worked in other MAT's as a CEO. The exception was where a member of the executive team was invited to the meeting by the CEO to contribute to a particular agenda item. While this has worked well for specific situations, expecting multiple executives, potentially six or more to attend every board meeting was in his view, a significant ask and may also be in contradiction to the SOD which would blur the lines between the Boards responsibility to hold the Chief Executive to account and the role of the executive team. Any new practices should align clearly with governance principles and should not compromise efficiency or accountability.

DMA agreed that the reports should only be a brief summary to cover the key facts that trustees needed to know and it was up to the CEO who he chose to invite to support with the delivery of those reports.

RHA suggested that it may be helpful to link this process to the external review of governance as the reviewer would have insights into how other trusts operate at the board level and might have findings that could help reflect on this matter.

Q: (LMCD) Are we looking at making changes as we have identified a problem or is this something we're doing for the sake of it, does it actually need further consideration, do we have an understanding of what the problem is that we're trying to solve?

A: (AKM) Essentially, the issue is that 9 out of 12 trustees are not fully informed about what's happening, we need to have a holistic view. If we're sitting here without knowing the details and just reading the minutes of the meeting, I don't see how we, as trustees, can confidently say we're making informed decisions. That's the problem I'm trying to address. This has become more relevant due to the changing circumstances and the fact that we now have a full board.

LWA Having discussed this last Tuesday at the committee chairs meeting, I have since reflected on it as it was a concern for me too. I have reviewed the NGA suggestions for how board reporting works and believe there was a format that could be very helpful in informing this process. Therefore, each committee would ensure that the entire report was accurate and well-understood. The whole report would then come to the board, ensuring that each

section has been quality assured by a committee. This way, Trustees would receive a comprehensive report that was minimal yet informative, including graphics to help understand the content.

CTW commented that having listened to all the comments from the various trustees and directors, it seems that several people are a bit unsure about this, one valid point made was that the Trustees were about to receive an external review of governance report. Perhaps Trustees ought to wait until that report was published and then consider this issue as part of the action plan which would need to be produced based on the recommendations. This would ensure that Trustees would be able to take a measured view on the whole of those things together rather than making this individual decision now.

AKM confirmed he was content to include this as part of the ERG report action plan and ensure there was no duplication, but Trustees were reassured that they were able to hold the CEO to account through a triangulation process. CEO suggested implementing a process where single-page summaries were considered as a trial for the July meeting, particularly covering the COO, HR and School Improvement summary. The CEO specifically did not attend all committee meetings which enabled Trustees to triangulate the information presented by staff with responses from the CEO at Trust Board meetings. This triangulation process was important.

RESOLVED: the Trustees agreed to defer a decision until such time as the ERG report had been received.

ACTION: CEO to ensure there were 3 additional summary reports available for the July board meeting.

ACTION: SGR to place the summary reports as an item on the July agenda.

ACTION: AKM/CEO to agree attendance for the next meeting.

6. CEO REPORT

The CEO provided a brief overview, the full report had been shared prior to the meeting. The majority of the report was undertaken by other colleagues, the CEO provided a single page summary, Trustees were encouraged to read the full report in particular the part of the report which pertained to the school within their area of focus.

Ofsted - since the report was made available for Trustees the Ofsted inspection at Dove Bank has taken place. The CEO thanked all the Trustees who were involved in that visit. The inspection was really successful, and the Chair of Governors commented that it highlighted and supported the decision to join a Trust. When Dove Bank joined the Trust, there were some risks to the Trust as the school had significant issues. Seeing the work that colleagues associated with Dove Bank and the wider trust have managed to realise validated the decision to academise. The support covered financial as well as school improvement, the Trust had provided additional short term funding to cover the additional support required.

At the start of the year there were 5 inspections due to take place this had now reduced to 3 and the Trust needed to recognise how that impacts leaders at the moment. Whilst inspections should not be the only focus the Trust must ensure that outcomes were as good as they could be in that process, which has been the priority this academic year.

Attendance - was a national issue and an issue for the Trust and was on the increase in every school, but it had to be nuanced and recognised that it was more difficult to raise attendance in some contexts, communities, and groups within communities than others. One point of note in the inspection last week was the improvement in Dove Bank's attendance, the attendance had increased by a percentage point on last year, which was really good.

Countesthorpe post-inspection – the executive recognised that there were still significant gains to be made in terms of learning and teaching in particular areas. It was understood that things would get harder before they get easier, and there would be some challenges with results e.g. occasions where supply had been used to cover staff absences made it harder to achieve the desired outcomes.

GWJ provided a further overview, he was now based at the school 5 days per week increased from 1 day last year. Other trust colleagues had also increased their time and input. One of the significant challenges, which was a national problem, was teacher recruitment. To address this issue the trust had been creative and incentivise moves from experienced members of staff within other schools in the trust to support less experienced staff with their development. As well as a specific focus on maths and science there was also a focus on attendance which whilst it was looking more positive, the school was undertaking a higher number of interventions than in previous years.

Challenge Partners were also visiting the school this week, this would be part of a new and improved whole school trust wide peer review in May at some point.

Recruitment – shortlisting would take place for the Headteacher vacancy at Ivanhoe, with the interviews scheduled for the end of next week.

Q: (AKM) How will we know we've got to good, do we have a dashboard?

A: (CEO) We're really clear on what good looks like in terms of the Ofsted framework and our own self-evaluation tool. We have a strong peer review and self-evaluation tool, we also have external reviews coming in, such as the challenge partners this week. However, these reviews haven't always provided the feedback we needed because significant leadership input was making things seem better at the time. When that input was removed, the improvements couldn't be sustained. It's crucial that the leaders in the school have the skills to sustain improvement and share the same clarity on what good looks like that we have as a trust.

Q: (AKM) Thank you. The other point is assuming that the colleagues here agree with me. Could we ask you to send a formal note of thanks to Andrea and Amelia and the team on the wonderful outcome, and all the hard work they did for Dove Bank. We're really grateful for all the work they've done, and pleased with the outcome.

ACTION: SGR to ensure a letter on behalf of the Trustees is sent to the staff at Dove Bank and all staff who supported the school during the recent Ofsted.

7. FINANCE

a. CFOs Report & Management Accounts

PMA provided a brief summary and update; he pointed out that during the same period last year there was a deficit of £702,000 and the trust hoping to hit the annual budget deficit of over £1,500,000. Looking at these management accounts now, working as a trust and getting those synergies between the schools has led to more efficient ways of working and whilst the budget was still in a deficit of £354,000, but looking at the year-to-date position, helped by the funding for the pay rises, which was also included in the budget, there was a forecasted year-to-date surplus of £1,400,000, this was really positive. One caveat for Trustees to note was the bulk of the spend comes in curriculum spend, exam fees, and a lot of those purchase orders and commitments come through in February, March, and April. So, although at the moment the forecast was positive Trustees needed to be aware that the majority of expenditure comes in from now until the end of the financial year. Sometimes the job was managing that position, but the Trust had a healthy cash return from the Flagstone investment portal, a return of circa £67,000 so far this financial year.

Q: (AKM) What are the potential risks, what is the level of uncertainty, to get to say the £1,400,000 surplus, we should be able to predict the expenditure until the end of the financial year.

A: (PMA) That figure is the year to date position, we have a £352,000 deficit, and at the time of the January accounts the forecast was a deficit of £166,000. To a large extent they are known costs e.g. curriculum budgets, we can assume that the schools will spend the curriculum budgets, and we know the pupil numbers for exam fees. So in terms of that forecast, I'm quite comfortable that we should land the right side of the annual budget come the end of August.

Q: (DMA) Why did we miss out on funding for one year group at Bosworth?

A: (CEO) There are 2 censuses which are completed during the year. One is in October and the other in January, they both collect different types of information. The problem has arisen due to an administrative error where the correct box (denoting that they had met the level 2 threshold) wasn't ticked. So we have to put a business case in, in order to get that funding back, I would expect that we would get it back. The issue that we're trying to interrogate at the moment is that the document that Headteachers look at and that we look at as a trust doesn't highlight that there's a potential error. So we need to look at implementing a system to check individual schools and highlight any admin errors. We also pay a significant amount to the LA for them to check the information but failed to pick up on the error.

Q: (RHA) The catering costs which are £150,000 under budget from the commentary is as a result of students spending more. From what you've said just now, perhaps this isn't actually the right time to consider this, but given that the forecast is £150,000 under, and that the Trust's overall position is better than budgeted at the start of the year. I wondered if you'd considered passing that catering saving on to students, I just wondered whether they'd considered, making healthier food options slightly cheaper or in the current economic situations for everyone, whether they've considered targeting some of that spend?

A: (PMA) We introduced chip and PIN systems in a lot of the schools, and that had a real positive impact, especially at those secondary schools that had 6th forms and had had an impact on uptake. There are some additional costs relating to the employment of an assistant catering manager, so there are some salary costs which need to be allocated to that line. It won't impact the bottom overall surplus, it will just pull them out of other support in the management accounts, and it will tag it against the catering surplus. So there is a little bit of work to tighten up that figure, but even if we call it £100,000 I think that will be a conversation for the catering manager. We don't want to make surplus on trips, on utilities or catering. So if there is a way to pass that to students, I'm sure that will be considered.

A: (CEO) Last year there was a significant overspend on catering and this is a part correction to that. I'm not sure that I would want to reduce prices, but we've still got the opportunity to increase quality, and that's where I would want to direct that. But let's see where we are at the end of the year, and that will give the catering manager the opportunity to make some decisions around quality, provenance of ingredients, and so on.

8. TRUSTEE WORK IN ADDITION TO COMMITTEES & COMMUNICATION WITH THE LGB'S

The Trustees noted the following visits had been undertaken since the last meeting –

- a. DMA attended the meeting of the LGB at Ashby on the 24th March, 2025.
- b. AKM attended the LGB at Bosworth on the 27th March, 2025 and felt the LGB were very engaged.
- c. RHA attended Kingsway LGB on the 24th March, 2025 and reported it was really positive and included the bespoke training session from the NGA which was really good and engaging. One question for the CEO, the Headteacher was overwhelmingly positive about the trust and the trust support. At the moment there were lots of discussions about a big push on quality of teaching and trying to expose a lot of the staff to high quality teaching. Quite a lot of that modelling came from the Headteacher who was obviously under pressure, would it be possible to look at additional opportunities for the trust to support with that modeling perhaps look at linking teachers from the school with teachers in other schools across the Trust to share best practice. The CEO explained the Headteacher received support from the Director of Primary Education and the Primary Senior Leader, there was also subject communities, and primaries get together for that linking up, working together, observing each other, developing model lessons, looking at them in each of the schools.
- d. LWA explained that at the start of the year she had spent some time with Anne Melville, who was both chair at Dove Bank and at Countesthorpe, LWA felt it was helpful to flag up that whilst Anne was happy to stay on for another term the LGB at Countesthorpe would be without a Chair from the start of the next academic year. SGR explained that there may be some options in the pipeline, and she would provide an update after the Easter break.
- e. ASM confirmed he would be attending the LGB at Winstanley on the 7th April, 2025 and shared with other Trustees that he had found the Headteachers report from each school helpful to be able to benchmark between the schools.

NKO reported that the current Chair at Ibstock was planning not to renew his term as a Governor during the Summer break. LWA mentioned that during previous conversations he had indicated he may be willing to become a Trustee, or possibly a Member. AKM suggested it maybe be useful to consider a swap with a current Trustee to provide different experiences.

9. BOARD PRIORITIES AND INPUT INTO STRATEGIC PLAN

The CEO advised tomorrow was the Headteachers collaboration meeting where the next stage of the strategic wheel would be discussed to look at the KPI's for years 1, 2 and 3 for each of the quadrants. This was part of the piece of work that trustees were involved in, in its inception in the autumn term, Trustees would be updated on progress and asked to approve at the July meeting.

ACTION: SGR to add onto the July agenda.

10. COMMITTEES MINUTES & LGB ASSURANCES

- a. The Trustees receive the following committee minutes and brief summary from the relevant Committee Chair -
 - i. School Improvement 22.01.2025 & 19.03.2025 –

SDU/LWA provided an update, the meeting on the 22nd January included very full discussions, masses of data, and we were wondering about how we were best going to be using that data. In the subsequent meeting, on the 19th

March a discussion took place as to how best to use the data but ensure there was no duplication of the work undertaken by the governing body or the executive staff either, this was an ongoing piece of work. The work of the committee would move to a focus on a more strategic view of the schools, holding staff to account and using the information provided as the basis for discussion. The committee needed to ensure the work cycle of the committee aligned with the data drops and other reporting cycles during the academic year so the staff could provide meaningful analysis. The review would also include agreeing the dates of the committee meetings.

ACTION: SGR agreed to put meeting dates as an agenda item on the next SI agenda in May.

NKO suggested as there was an element of the work in the Headteacher reports where a significant amount of effort goes in. Could we perhaps focus more on analysing these reports, the Headteachers put in so much effort for the board, and it might be beneficial to look at these documents at a committee level to draw out key indicators, such as those mentioned by ASM regarding operation encompass. It seemed that a lot of valuable information in these reports was lost. Given the importance of demonstrating what was happening in the schools, perhaps this analysis should be completed by a group or committee. LWA agreed that it could be possible to use the NGA template in conjunction with the Headteacher report and then provide assurance within a board report for Trustees.

ACTION: LWA/SDU to progress the reporting process and timing of meetings etc in relation to the School Improvement Committee.

ii. Infrastructure 04.02.2025

ASM provided an overview; one of the actions was to review whether the trust was receiving value for money. ASM had met with SWI and her team and now understood that it was not just about value for money with the schools but also included utilisation and obtaining grants. One of the key points that emerged was how the schools supported vulnerable members of the community, including both students and adults by running clubs for people who were struggling in life, whether with physical disabilities, mental health issues, or other challenges. So, there was much more to it than just the monetary value; it was about the value of the things included in the vision and values of the trust as well as community engagement. A further meeting would be arranged in the next couple of weeks to track progress, with a report available for the next infrastructure committee to view and discuss

iii. Finance 11.02.2025

ASM confirmed the committee had reviewed Period 4 budget reports, PMA advised Period 5 and Period 6 would be available tomorrow. The meeting also reviewed the ICFP and the SRMSAC (School resource management self-assessment checklist).

The minutes of the Audit & Risk Committee on the 5th March, 2025 were considered under the confidential business and listed on the confidential agenda.

- b. The Trustees noted a piece of work was ongoing to agree a process to provide assurances from the LGB's, this subject area was also included in the current ERG. AKM asked for those reports to be available for the July Board.

ACTION: SGR to ensure LGB reports are available for the Trust Board in July.

- c. Trust Board reporting to LGB's – not covered/discussed.

11. POLICIES

The Trustees considered the following policies, policies a. to e. had been available for comment by the Trustees prior to the meeting. SGR provided a brief summary as follows -

- ECT Induction Policy – new policy, reason for Trust Board approval - the SI meeting on the 19th March was initially canceled and then reinstated but the notice of the reinstatement was too late to include the policy.
- Accessibility Policy – new policy, reason for Trust Board approval - this policy covered more than one committee area and therefore requires Trust Board approval.
- Equality Policy - new policy, reason for Trust Board approval - this policy covered more than one committee area and therefore requires Trust Board approval.

- d. GDPR – no change, review date to be extended, reason for Trust Board approval - this policy had not been reviewed by the DPO by the time the committee met, the Trust was required to have an in date/in review policy on the website.
- e. Pay Policy – new policy, reason for Trust Board approval - both policies were on the agenda for Pay & People on the 24th March and had been shared with Trustees for comment on the 29th January unfortunately the meeting was cancelled.

RESOLVED: the Trustees approved the policies listed above.

- f. Professional Development & Appraisal Policy – new policy, reason for Trust Board approval - both policies were on the agenda for P & P on the 24th March and had been shared with Trustees for comment on the 29th January unfortunately the meeting was cancelled.

LWA queried the wording in relation to targets following a discussion the Trustees approved the policy (point f. above) subject to a review of that particular area of the wording.

RESOLVED: The Trustees agreed to approve the policy subject to LWA/CEO agreeing a form of words, the Trustees delegated the approval of the final wording to LWA.

ACTION: Professional Development & Appraisal Policy - LWA/CEO to agree a form of words and notify HR Business Partner.

A discussion took place regarding how the policy approval process should operate, CTW suggested that SGR/CTW could undertake a piece of work to address these issues. ^{Note 1}

Note 1 - added for clarity to confirm the current position –

A significant amount of work has been undertaken around policies. As part of the process a number of policies were identified which could be delegated to committees and which should be considered by the Trust Board. In September, 2024 the Trust Board agreed to trial using the committees to review and approve policies - this has been implemented. So wherever possible the Trust Board are asked to consider a small number of policies either because -

a. there is a requirement to do so and this task cannot be delegated or because they cover more than one committee area i.e. Accessibility and Equality which covers all stakeholder

b. where a committee meeting has to be postponed and the approval is urgent.

There may also be occasions where approval is required via Governor Hub to meet specific deadlines e.g. any changes to our Safeguarding policy are determined by the publication of KCSIE during the Summer with a requirement to reflect these changes by the start of the academic year.

12. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETINGS

- a. The Trustees approved the meeting schedule for 2025 – 2026 and noted the School Improvement committee would start at 5.00pm and the dates for next year would be agreed at the committee meeting on the 20th May, 2025.
- b. The Trustees noted the date and time of the next Board meeting on the 7th July, 2025. Trustees were also asked to note the Strategy Day on the 4th June, 2025 at De Montfort University.

ACTION: SGR send to send calendar invites to Trustees re: Strategy Day

MEETING DATES 2024 – 2025

DATE	MEETING	START TIME	ONLINE/IN PERSON
EASTER - 14.04.2025 - 25.04.2025			
Wed 30 Apr 2025	CEO call with Trustees	5.30pm	Online - googlemeet
Tues 6 May 2025	Infrastructure	5.00pm	Online - zoom
Wed 7 May 2025	Audit & Risk (extra)	4.00pm	Online - zoom

Thu 8 May 2025	Chairs Group	6.00 pm	Online - zoom
Tue 20 May 2025	School Improvement	5.00 pm	Online - zoom
HALF TERM 26.05.2025 - 30.05.2025			
Wed 4 June 2025	Trust Strategy Day	All Day	In person
Wed 11 Jun 2025	Audit & Risk	4.00 pm	Online - zoom
Wed 18 Jun 2025	School Improvement	4.00 pm	Online - zoom
Mon 30 Jun 2025	Pay & People	3.00pm	Online - zoom
Tues 1 Jul 2025	Finance	5.00pm	Online - zoom
Mon 7 Jul 2025	Trust Board	5.00 pm	In person
SUMMER - 11.07.2025			

The meeting closed at 7.44pm following the conclusion of the confidential business.