

**Directors (ie trustees) meeting  
Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2025 at 5 pm,  
at Brixington Primary Academy,  
Draft Part I Minutes**

**Present:** in person: A Walmsley (chair), P Walker (CEO), A Denner, and C Bromfield  
virtually: P Wimsett and R Shaw

**In attendance** in person: M Platten (DoF), C Fegan (DSI), K Powell (DoI), A Jenkins (DPD  
and I Candy (C Sec)

**Quorum:** the meeting was quorate

**Circulation:** Directors and members (through GovernorHub), Dioceses (EDEN and SDBE via GovernorHub), schools & public (through Trust website)

|          |            |
|----------|------------|
| Decision | Action due |
|----------|------------|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>1. Welcome, introductions and apologies</b>   |   |
| Apologies were received from M Williams (holiday) and R Warwick (clash with a meeting for her trust). R Shaw was expected to join the meeting late.  |   |
| <b>2. Prayer</b>   |   |
| Led by P Wimsett   |   |
| <b>3. Declaration of Conflict of Interests</b>   |   |
| Declarations of conflict of interests were invited by the chair. None was made.  |   |
| <b>4. Minutes of the last meeting</b>  |   |
| <b>4.1. To approve the minutes (Part I and Part II) of the last meeting (held on 24 April 2025)</b>  |   |
| The draft minutes (Part I and Part II) of the previous meeting were circulated shortly before the meeting.<br>These were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting and signed by the chair.   |   |
| <b>4.2. To review matters arising not otherwise on the agenda</b>  |   |
| The list of matters arising was circulated ahead of the meeting, as were the consultation to extend the age range of Mary Dean's to take two-year-olds, the lead safeguarding trustee May 2025 visit report, and a summary of the approval process for the tender for Sidmouth project.<br>The following points were raised and discussed:<br><u>General matters arising:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The complaint workshop has taken place. The Trust complaints policy will be updated based on the workshop.</li> <li>• The appointment of R Warwick as foundation trustee is in process with Bath &amp; Wells.</li> <li>• The board continues to carry a SDBE appointed foundation trustee vacancy which needs to be filled.</li> <li>• The Bestic Trust (linked to Mrs Ethelston's) has appointed the head and one of the parent council members on their board of trustees, at the recommendation of the FFT.</li> </ul> | <b>Appendices<br/>1 – 3</b><br><br><b>I Candy</b> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendance trend / mobility: the Trust Senior Leadership Group (SLG) will be looking at ImpactEd and Arbor to see what information can be made available for trustees around this.</li> <li>IRP follow up: P Walker will speak to J Barnicott (Devon strategic lead for exclusions) and has already explained that the Trust will not be using the Devon IRP service in future</li> </ul> <p><u>Tender approval for Sidmouth project:</u><br/>A Walmsley reported that the tender had been approved in principle by the strategic &amp; finance committee based on summary information from Norse SouthWest. A full report was shared following the committee meeting. Strategic &amp; finance committee members then confirmed the approval by written resolution. The board endorsed the approval of the tender.</p> <p><u>Musbury preschool:</u><br/>A Walmsley confirmed that the transfer had taken place. The Trust was waiting to receive the final signed documents from the DfE.</p> <p><u>Proposal to extend the age range to include two year olds at Mary Dean's:</u><br/><b>The board queried whether most of the FFT schools that have nurseries now take children from the age of two.</b><br/>More and more of the Trust schools are, in order to secure pupil numbers. The Trust has been talking to all schools about it. The decision whether to extend the age range is made based on local demand identified by the LA and the space available in the schools. In the case of Mary Dean's, the FFT will be able to submit a grant application to extend the current nursery space.<br/>The proposal was approved by the board.</p> <p><u>Lead safeguarding trustee report:</u><br/>It was decided to wait to discuss this until R Shaw had joined the meeting to review this. This was therefore discussed under agenda item 5.</p>  | <p><b>SLG</b></p> <p><b>P Walker</b></p> |
| <p><b>5. To receive the verbal feedback from the committee chairs</b></p>  |  |
| <p><u>Education committee:</u><br/>A Denner (chair of the education committee) reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some items that had been discussed by the education committee were due to be discussed further in this meeting e.g. the Challenge Partners SI review.</li> <li>The committee had received useful information set out in the DfE attendance summary and reassurance that the Trust worked on improving pupil attendance in line with the priorities identified by the DfE.</li> <li>The committee had received an update on the work done using the WeSEND programme and its impact.</li> <li>The Spring term Year 6 Writing assessment data had been discussed as it had been lower than the Autumn term one and ten schools had been selected for moderation. The committee had received assurance on the work done by the Trust to support schools around this.</li> <li>The committee had discussed the need for it to monitor the quality of teaching, as the areas for improvement in several Ofsted inspections were around teaching &amp; learning and this would enable the committee to cross reference this with pupil outcomes.</li> <li>The committee had received positive information on the development opportunities offered to staff despite the cuts in funding (including the loss of TCAF).</li> <li>The committee has responded to the requests from hub boards about in particular having more information around safeguarding systems outside the trust, the focus on driving pupil outcomes and how these related to future life chances.</li> </ul> <p>[R Shaw joined the meeting at this point]</p> <p><u>Strategic &amp; finance committee:</u><br/>A Walmsley (chair of the S &amp; F committee) reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The significant issue discussed by the committee had been the in-year deficit which remained significant although it was lower than initially anticipated</li> </ul> |  |

|  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <p>and the very draft budget for next year which would be further discussed during this meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The committee had also discussed proposed changes in staffing structure, who would be affected, and these were due to be discussed further at this meeting.</li> </ul> <p>The board noted that the audit &amp; risk committee had not met since the last meeting of the board.</p> <p><u>Lead safeguarding trustee report:</u><br/>R Shaw reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>She had selected the schools visited because they had joined the Trust in September 2024.</li> <li>School staff had been very open which showed the Trust had a sound culture.</li> <li>She had looked at a range of systems. It was clear from her visit that safeguarding systems were consistent and embedded across the Trust including the new schools.</li> <li>The schools and Trust safeguarding lead had acknowledged that there was some initial additional work to align systems. New schools said they had felt supported in adopting the systems and that those now helped with workload, particularly around staff training. They had given very positive feedback about the Trust safeguarding lead (T Winn) and officer (H Davies)</li> <li>The new schools had also brought new ideas to help further develop FFT systems, e.g. around induction processes.</li> <li>R Shaw was due to attend a Trust safeguarding forum to see the support given to DSLs during those.</li> </ul> <p>P Walker fed back that he was due to review HR related policies with the support from PHP and this would include reviewing induction processes.</p> <p>The meeting went into Part II to discuss how some current systems may be affected by proposed staff structure changes.<br/>The meeting went back into Part I.</p> | <p>P Walker</p>                    |
| <p><b>6. To receive and discuss the CEO report, to include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Update on staffing structures for next year</b></li> <li><b>Feedback from the Challenge Partners review</b></li> <li><b>ImpactEd reporting recommendations</b></li> </ul>  |                                    |
| <p>The CEO report was circulated ahead of the meeting, as was the report from the SI peer review undertaken by Challenge Partners.</p> <p><u>Salcombe Ofsted inspection:</u><br/>P Walker fed back that the inspector had understood the circumstances of the school and had been aware of the impact of the report. The outcome of the inspection had been as expected: there was not enough evidence that standards remain unchanged and therefore the next inspection would be a graded one. However, the framework was due to change next year and therefore the wording was likely to be different.</p> <p>The board concurred that the outcome of Salcombe's inspection had been the best possible given the school very specific circumstances. The board thanked A Jenkins, C Bennett and H Slater for their support of the inspection and leadership of the school.</p> <p><b><i>The board probed around the three Ofsted inspections that had taken place during the current school year where the quality of education has been considered not to be good. Whilst in all these cases, the board was aware that this was a likely outcome, should a strong trust like the FFT not have been able to react more quickly and mitigate the impact of weak leadership more strongly?</i></b></p> <p>The reasons for the two inspections where the quality of education was rated as requires improvement in the autumn term were discussed and outcomes were as anticipated by the Trust executive team.</p> <p>The meeting went into Part II to discuss actions taken by the Trust in these schools.<br/>The meeting went back into Part I.</p>   | <p><b>Appendices<br/>4 - 5</b></p> |

**Trustees probed further whether a good judgement could have been secured by the Trust SI team intervening more quickly.**

Had the executive team felt the school could attain a good judgement, that is what they would have reported to the board but that was not the case. The outcome of the inspections would have been worse if the Trust had not provided significant support. This was confirmed during the inspection of the school that had only been in the Trust for one year where inspectors were complimentary of the support of the Trust in their feedback.

**Trustees challenged the Trust executive team further whether the Trust could have reacted more quickly as the team had been aware of issues for a period of time. They felt that this was something that the DfE Regional Director could query too.**

Through the RISE programme, the DfE were clear that they would work on 12-to-24-month programmes to improve poor performing schools, therefore the idea that the Trust could 'turn around a school' in 12 months was not realistic. The Trust also suffered from the impact of funding on capacity. School performance can vary depending on the quality of leadership and sometimes, despite support and challenge, this does not improve.

**Trustees asked how that fitted with the focus on improving outcomes for children and what could be done to mitigate the impact on outcomes.**

The CEO concurred that the Trust executive team should aspire for more, pointed out the team does challenge schools but he felt that trustees also needed to recognise what the Trust was doing well.

**Trustees pointed out that their questions were about understanding the timings around when someone was not performing and how quickly the Trust responded to this.**

The CEO reminded the board that dashboards which include RAG ratings for each school and comments about what the Trust is doing in response are shared with a board every half-term. Trustees needed to be mindful that a dip in school performance was not always a sign of leader underperformance. In the dashboards, Westcliff, Mary Dean's and Salcombe were all mentioned as causing concern. New heads have now been appointed for these three schools. The CEO felt it was frustrating that the positive impact of the Trust on a lot of other schools was not mentioned when the Trust executive strives to share and be open with the board. For every single inspection, the view given by the Trust executive team was accurate.

**Trustees concurred that the view from the executive team had been accurate, however what they were querying was whether on reflection the Trust could have acted any sooner, given that the Trust Ofsted track record had been helpful in mitigating low pupil outcomes in terms of the Trust being seen as a strongly performing trust.**

The Trust could possibly have acted a few weeks earlier, but that needed to be balanced with the staff positive feedback on the Trust values and culture and being given the opportunity to improve. The CEO pointed out that the Trust reputation had improved in recent years around having a supportive culture and this had helped with staff recruitment and retention. Therefore, the executive team and board needed to weigh up these factors.

The director of inclusion added that, as a new SI team, executive directors had recognised that the Trust QA process needed to be improved and would be reviewing this again this year, reflecting on the impact of the first year of the new programme and growth.

The board agreed that having a robust QA process was really important to have certainty about expected outcomes and for trustees to be confident when talking to inspectors.

Changes made by the Trust SI leaders meant that they had met with schools two weeks into the autumn term to have challenging conversations around the need for improvement. Heads had reported that they found the regular scrutiny helpful and impactful.

#### Sidmouth building project:

P Walker reported that:

- M Platten and he had attended the pre-contract meeting.
- The work was due to start on 14th July and finish around May 2026.
- Progress meetings would be held monthly.
- Having a local company, Skinners, doing the work was helpful and may provide some opportunities for pupils. Skinners were excited by the project.
- The Trust would issue a press release to parents, and neighbours had been written to, so that they would be aware of the work starting.

#### Key operations update:

P Walker highlighted that the Trust would be receiving a higher School Capital Allocation (SCA) grant than expected which meant that more capital work could be completed, in particular:

- The complex replacement of Newton Ferrers roof would now be affordable over two years at a cost of about £600K.
- Fencing at Gatehouse to help prevent intruders coming into the school and further burglaries.
- Smaller items like decorating.

The Trust has been prioritising work, with advice from C Jay.

P Walker further highlighted that:

- At Rockbeare, the LA was funding a new classroom, with the Trust providing a small contribution (for example, to furnish the classroom).
- IT connections into schools were being upgraded. After that, the next steps would be to upgrade the connections within schools to meet the same quality of standards and then updating devices.
- Some 'bedding-in' issues with RM were being addressed via regular meetings with them.

#### Growth:

As Exeter Road were very keen to join the Trust, P Walker had spoken to the DfE RD and pointed out that the Trust had received TSI funding twice in the past, and again this year, to support the school and the school head was a FFT employee seconded to the role. Therefore it would make sense for the school to join the FFT and allow the school continuity in leadership.

The meeting went into Part II to discuss recent approaches from schools.

The meeting went back into Part I.

#### Challenge Partners review:

P Walker reported that:

- The Trust had just received the review report from Challenge Partners and the report was generally very positive.
- The Trust executive team would be reviewing the report and suggestions for each key area.
- He had presented about growth at the Challenge Partners conference where positive feedback about the FFT was shared.

#### Staffing structures update:

P Walker highlighted that:

- School structures had been agreed as per his report, meaning that there would be 10 classes fewer across the Trust next year as anticipated.
- The Trust would be retaining some temporary teachers, mostly linked to maternity leave cover.
- The central team was now working on TA positions as these were funded by the PP allocation or EHCP top-up funding. There were 123 temporary TAs across the Trust because the Trust was aware of the funding decreasing. All temporary TAs had been notified that their contract was due to end. The team was looking at the PP and EHCP funding that would be received next year or was expected in the very short term in order to assess needs, and would then be working on finalising TA allocation with schools the week after this meeting.

|  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on current expected funding, the Trust was looking at an approximate £800K reduction in TA costs.</li> <li>• There were 6 schools where TA costs were above the funding received to pay for the staff in place. So the Trust may need to look at redundancies in these cases although it would aim to avoid doing this.</li> <li>• A fair and transparent process was being followed for all temporary staff which took time but was the right thing to do.</li> <li>• Based on projected pupil numbers, the Trust was likely to lose another 9 classes in 2026-27 and then 7 or 8 in 2027-28.</li> <li>• The changes in class structure meant a curriculum rewrite for some schools which had an impact on school improvement and workload.</li> </ul> <p><b>Trustees asked how significant an impact the reduction in class and TA numbers was going to be, even though it was done for sound reasons and the Trust had been able to mitigate some of it through recruiting temporary staff.</b></p> <p>Where schools are losing TAs, they will have fewer pupils on roll and also fewer pupils with EHCPs, particularly those currently in Year 6 who benefitted from bigger top-ups. To mitigate the impact, the SI team has been working on the deployment of TA and thinking more flexibly this year. Some schools have embraced this and are well placed to mitigate the impact on standards. Some will find it more difficult and will mention this when challenged about outcomes.</p> <p><b>The board queried whether there would any schools that would not have any TA at all next year.</b></p> <p>All schools will have a permanent core of TAs, but they will all have fewer TAs. The SI team has been aiming to give as much choice as possible to schools. The funding situation is such that support does not automatically mean a TA, so the team will have to be persistent in encouraging staff to think differently and use other ways of supporting pupils with additional needs. This is likely to be more difficult for some staff who trained when there were more differences between special and mainstream schools, but the current DfE policy is for children to be educated as close to home as possible. Schools outside the Trust are also doing things differently. The Trust will support schools by getting outreach and specialist support, and upskilling staff. The meeting went into Part II to discuss other staffing structure changes. There were no further questions from the board and the meeting went back into Part I.</p> |                                    |
| <p><b>7. To receive and discuss the updated draft budget for 2025-26</b></p>   |                                    |
| <p>The Director of Finance (DoF) report, and variance to forecast present at the S &amp; F committee meeting were circulated ahead of the meeting.</p> <p><u>Management accounts:</u></p> <p>M Platten highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The April management accounts were nearly ready to be shared with trustees.</li> <li>• The March management accounts showed the Trust in-year deficit was better than expected. However, from April the Trust would feel the impact of the increase in pay scale for support staff and the increase in NI contributions for all staff. Therefore, he wanted to make sure that the April management account figures were right; these currently showed a slightly better position possibly due to some delayed income in year.</li> <li>• The 2025 SCA grant for the Trust would be £1.05M because there was now a minimum funding guarantee which did not exist previously and was advantageous for small schools. Therefore, the team would review whether some relevant costs may now be paid through SCA rather than revenue as had been the case over the past few years because SCA had not covered the costs of all necessary work.</li> <li>• Being able to allocate more repair and maintenance costs to SCA should enable the Trust to reduce the in-year revenue deficit to about £400K (less than expected at the last S &amp; F committee meeting where the figure was circa £477). This would mean the Trust reserves decreasing to about £959K by the end of August 2025 from £1.3M in August 2024.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Appendices<br/>6 – 7</b></p> |

|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The delay in allocating the contract for IT infrastructure may also help to move some of the funding towards reserves for next year.</li> </ul> <p><u>Updated draft 2025-26 budget:</u><br/>This was tabled at the meeting and uploaded in the meeting folder after the meeting.<br/>M Platten highlighted the key variations from the draft budget shared at the last meeting of the S &amp; F committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in funding due to the decrease in pupil number (including decrease in the number of PP pupils).</li> <li>Increase in funding because of the DfE grant paying for part of the NI contribution increase and staff pay increase.</li> <li>Increase in teacher pay costs going up offset by having fewer classes and therefore fewer teachers.</li> <li>About £800K reduction in TA costs as already discussed.</li> </ul> <p>M Platten further highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of one-off reserves and transitions costs linked to the former Acorn schools and Chickerell joining the Trust last September.</li> <li>The team was looking at energy costs as the Trust was about to finish fixed contracts which were fixed at relatively high rates.</li> <li>The team was also reviewing non-educational contracts and hoping to save some costs there.</li> <li>The key changes were summarised in the 'headline movements bridge', showing the projected in-year deficit for 2025-26 decreasing from £806K to £495K.</li> <li>The budget included a potential one-off increase due to projected redundancy costs linked to the proposed staffing structure changes discussed under agenda item 6. The proposed changes would lead to lower staff costs in the following years.</li> </ul> <p>A Walmsley pointed out that, taking into account the projected reserves at the end of 2024-25 and the projected in-year deficit for 2025-26, the Trust would be looking at having reserves of circa £500K at the end of 2025-26 and would therefore be asked to show how reserves would be rebuilt in subsequent years, which supported the need for staffing structure changes.</p> <p><b>The board queried whether the further year decrease in class numbers would mean redundancies which would have a cost impact.</b></p> <p>The Trust should have enough temporary staff next year to be able to manage class reductions without the need for redundancies.<br/>The board was reminded that the submission date for the budget was mid August. This may be more challenging than usual this year due to proposed staffing structure changes.</p> | <p><b>Appendix 8</b></p> |
| <p><b>8. Governance matters</b></p>  |                          |
| <p><b>8.1. To note the re-appointment of A Walmsley as a foundation director appointed by EDEN and the process for R Warwick to be appointed as foundation director by BWDBE has started</b></p>   |                          |
| <p>These were noted by the board.</p>  |                          |
| <p><b>8.2. To re-appoint C Bromfield as co-opted director with effect from the end of her current term of office (17/07/2025)</b></p>  |                          |
| <p>C Bromfield was re-appointed as a co-opted director by the foundation directors present at the meeting, with effect from the end of her current term of office.<br/>A Walmsley reported that P Wimsett was wishing to step down from his role as trustee, which he had been considering for a period of time and wished to continue supporting a smaller number of church schools in a foundation role.<br/>The board thanked P Wimsett for his significant contribution and for being a perfect example for trustees around values and culture.<br/>P Wimsett explained that he would be happy to be flexible in order to help fit with new trustees being appointed, and that he had really enjoyed his role as trustee and his work with schools.</p>  |                          |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| The board will have to look carefully at its recruitment process to replace the Church school knowledge and expertise held by P Wimsett.   | Trust board                            |
| <b>8.3. To review and discuss the outcome of the board self-assessment</b>   |  |
| A summary of the outcome of the replies received to date was circulated ahead of the meeting, although not all trustees had been able to complete the assessment which had been circulated at relatively short notice.<br>A Walmsley explained that he had asked the executive team to complete the same self-assessment to see if their perception was different from the board, and therefore it would be more effective to discuss this when everyone had completed the assessment. A separate strategic session will be organised at the very beginning of the next school year.<br>The board noted that there were no significant findings to report linked to the assessments already completed.   | Appendix 9<br><br>A Walmsley / I Candy |
| <b>8.4. To agree governance support services for 2025-26</b>   |  |
| A recommendation for governance support services for 2025-26 was circulated ahead of the meeting, including a content and cost comparison.<br>I Candy outlined that the aim was to maintain a good level of services (resources, storage and sharing platform, and training) whilst maintaining value for money and aiming to reduce overall costs.<br>The board agreed the recommended services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGA membership for the Trust board</li> <li>• GovernorHub Knowledge for the Trust and hub boards</li> <li>• TGP subscription as a key MAT governance resource for the lead governance professional</li> </ul>   | Appendix 10                            |
| <b>8.5. To discuss the suggestion to re-establish an academy committee for Portesham</b>   |  |
| A proposal to re-establish an academy committee for Portesham, based on local feedback, was circulated ahead of the meeting.<br>This was proposed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen the link between the school and the community</li> <li>• Act as a 'critical friend' for teachers</li> </ul> The board discussed that the first purpose listed had not been achieved by the academy committee in place previously and the committee had been seen as additional workload and not being helpful to the school. Whilst the board supported the aim to reconnect with community, an academy committee was not the right conduit for it.<br>With regards to the second aim, the board felt that the current governance and SI model had been successful with supporting the school to improve, as evidenced by the recent Ofsted inspection, and had therefore had the intended impact.<br>The board therefore agreed not to re-establish an academy committee for Portesham. | Appendix 11                            |
| <b>8.6. To receive an update about the appointment of an additional Member</b>   |  |
| I Candy reported that this was initially going to require updating the latest Trust articles. However, it had recently been announced that MarJon were intending to withdraw from Trust membership. Therefore, it had been decided to wait until this was confirmed and a new member would be appointed once MarJon had formally resigned from the role.<br>It was suggested that the current MarJon representative, who had been a governor for St Budeaux previously, would be approached around remaining a governance volunteer, possibly as a foundation representative within the West Hub.  | I Candy<br><br>I Candy                 |
| <b>9. Policies and compliance, to include a review of the risk register</b>  |  |
| The policies and compliance report was circulated ahead of the meeting, as were the proposed policies.<br>The following policies were approved as proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data protection policy</li> <li>• Social media policy</li> <li>• Neonatal care leave policy (the approval was subject to final feedback from the unions, who the policy had been discussed with)</li> </ul>   | Appendix 12                            |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Nursery charging policy for Brixington</b></li> </ul> <p>The latest version of the Trust risk register (May 2025) was circulated ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>The board discussed that it felt like a high-risk time because of financial pressures and staffing structure changes. However, finance was already identified as a high risk within the Trust risk register. <b>The board therefore agreed not to amend the Trust risk register.</b></p>  |  |
| <p><b>10. ImpactEd</b></p> <p>An Impact Ed mock-up dashboard, filled with partial data from the Trust (because not all data had yet been entered in the system, as it came from different sources, including Arbor which some schools had only recently moved to), was shared on screen.</p> <p>Trustees were reminded that the dashboard was reporting on the Trust three-year strategic plan and elements within that.</p> <p>The dashboard showed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key milestones for each strategic theme, with a set of KPIs underneath.</li> <li>• How the KPIs are broken down.</li> <li>• Benchmarks, some of which were DfE data (e.g. statutory test national averages), and some FFT data, based on what was most relevant for each KPI.</li> <li>• How the whole Trust and each school compared to the benchmarks. For example, the percentage of SEND pupils attaining age related expectations in Reading in Early Years for each school, and for the Trust overall.</li> </ul> <p>As some of the elements had been amended in response to previous suggestions from the board, A Jenkins asked for feedback on this updated version.</p> <p>The board liked the ability to easily access key information and to 'drill down' to see individual school data. It would be useful for trustees to be able to see data at different date points to help identify trends. Trustees felt that the dashboard would be more suitable for the trust board and education committee than the hub boards.</p> <p>[R Shaw left the meeting at this stage]</p> <p>A Jenkins explained that the next steps would be to import the rest of the data.</p> <p><b>The board queried whether it would be possible to add other KPIs to the dashboard should trustees wish to do this.</b></p> <p>That would not be possible, the current format was static because it was based on the Trust three-year strategic plan.</p> <p>The board thanked staff for the work done, around staffing and Ofsted inspections in particular, recognising that the impact of these on workload.</p> |  |

Meeting start: 5 pm; meeting close: 7.35 pm

Date of the next meetings: SFC – 26 June 2025, ARC – 26 June 2025, EC – 3 July 2025, trust board: 17 July 2025

**These minutes are agreed by those present as being a true record.**

Signed:.....  
Chair of Directors

Date:.....

-