

Minutes - Board of Directors

Version: Draft
Meeting Date: Thursday 10 July 2025
Location: CLF Institute
Time: 4.00pm

Chairing this meeting Yvonne Beach (YB) Chair of the Board
Vice Chair: Georgina Gough (GG) Trustee
Trustees: Mark Davies (MD) Trustee
 Suzanne Carrie (SC) Trustee
 Adrian Coleman (AC) Trustee
 Tim Spratt (TS) Trustee
 Orville Lynch (OL) Trustee
 Bryony French (BF) Trustee
 Zarah Morwood (ZM) Trustee
 Nicky McAllister (NM) Trustee
 Jemma Griffiths (JG) Trustee

Attendees: Steve Taylor (ST) CEO
 Susie Weaver (SW) [part] Education Director
 Kate Richardson (KR) Education Director
 Alison Fletcher (AFL) Director of CLF Institute
 Rachel Mylrea (RMY) Director of HR
 Andy Ling (AL) Interim COO
 Martin Thomas (MT) Director of Estates and Facilities
 Tricia Brabham (TB) [part] Deputy Head of Governance (part)
 Helen Davies (HD) Finance Director
 Airlie Fife (AF) Member
 Peter Price (PP) Member
 Kyana Gitahi (KG) Observer
 Wendy Hellin (WH) Clerk

Apologies: Sarah Lovell (SL) COO
 Orville Lynch (OL) Trustee
 Sally Apps (SA) Deputy CEO
 Rachel Mortlock (RMO) Vice Chair of Trustees
 Liz Tincknell (LT) Head of Governance

Matters Arising

Action date and no	Item no	Action	Owner	Update
13.03.25 05	9.6.1	Cash flow will be discussed at the next Finance Executive Group meeting and a report will then be included in the Finance Report for the October board meeting.	SL	This has been discussed in the March FEG meeting and will be reported to the July board meeting. Included in Finance report – closed. Included in report - closed
19.06.25 01	5.1.15	Where attendance data is reported, it will include the CLF data and previous year's data for each of secondary, primary and special/AP phases.	SA/KR	Future reporting - ongoing

19.06.25 02	5.2.3	YB reminded all trustees to complete the annual safeguarding trainee if they have not already done so.	ALL	The new training courses will be available shortly in readiness for the new academic year. Trustees were reminded to complete those by the end of September 2025. Closed.
19.06.25 03	7.1.5	CST Review Report will be added to the July meeting agenda for further discussion and approval.	YB LT	On agenda - closed
19.06.25 04	11.2.3	LT will ensure the relevant Executive Group reviews the H & S policy ahead of it coming back to board for approval at the July meeting.	LT	On agenda - closed
19.06.25 05	13.4	LT will provide further information on Members' Review Day to JG and GG.	LT	Completed - Closed

Minutes

Item	Description	Action
1	Introductions, Administration, Apologies	
1.1	Following the pre-meeting where trustees meet without the Executive Team, YB welcomed everyone to the meeting. Peter Price and Airlie Fife (members of the trust) were introduced as observers for this meeting. Kyana Gitahi is currently shadowing ST's role as CEO and is an observer at this meeting.	
1.2	Apologies are recorded above and were accepted by the board.	
1.3	Tricia Brabham, Deputy Head of Governance, has joined to present the Governance item in LT's absence. The agenda will be re-ordered to allow that item to be heard before TB needs to leave the meeting at 5.15pm.	
2	Declarations of Interest	
2.1	No verbal declarations were made.	
3	Minutes of Previous Meetings	
3.1	Minutes of the meeting of 19 June 2025 were approved.	
4	Matters Arising	
4.1	The action table has been updated above.	
5	CST Review Report	
5.1	YB confirmed that at the last meeting discussions began about the recommendations from the CST external review of governance. At that meeting recommendations 1a, 1c, 1d and 4b were approved. Trustees are now asked to consider recommendation 1b and the remaining recommendations and approve if appropriate.	
5.2	Item 2a – consideration of refining reports that are submitted to board	
5.2.1	ST highlighted that the proposal is that instead of writing detailed reports to the board, reports will instead be provided by lead officers to sub-committees for review. A summary report will then be authored by the sub-committee chair / link trustee in a standardised template that will include a box to escalate any key issues to the board. Where this is authored by the lead officer, it will be signed off by the link trustee (as owner of that report) before it is submitted to the board.	
5.2.2	Following discussion and questions from the board, the proposal in response to recommendation 2a was approved. ACTION: It was agreed that a template to be used by lead officers / link trustees to provide a summary report to the board will be created and shared with the board for review.	ST LT
5.3	Item 7a – consideration of the sustainability of the current arrangements for education scrutiny.	

5.3.1	ST outlined that there are two types of Education Scrutiny. The Executive Scrutiny panel is chaired by RMO. There are no challenges in terms of membership for that meeting. The other is the Academy Scrutiny group. This comprises of three distinct panels for special, primary and secondary academy scrutiny. The recommendation made in the external review report is to consider a lighter touch scrutiny. ST highlighted the benefits of having the current model in place. It feeds the school improvement agenda and allows trustees to speak knowledgeably about each individual provision when meeting with external regulators; this has been extremely powerful. Therefore the proposal is that Executive Team colleagues continue to consider how to increase delegations to that committee by identifying further external experts so that the current model can continue.	
5.3.2	SC noted that as the trust has grown in size, it is helpful for the trustees to be able to visit academies during events such as the board away day. This allows trustees to see the school in action as well as allowing academies (particularly those newer to the trust, or geographically further from the centre) to feel included and connected to the board and wider trust.	
5.3.3	The board approved the proposal in response to item 7a.	
5.4	Item 7c – consideration of the balance of in person and remote meetings.	
5.4.1	The proposal is to maintain the current balance of 3 of the 7 meetings being in person, usually in October, December and July. The board approved the proposal in response to item 7c.	
5.5	Item 7e - keeping under review the reporting formats and how information from the committees is made available to the board	
5.5.1	This item has been covered within agenda item 7.2. The board approved the proposal that a template for summary reports is provided.	
5.6	Item 2f - how the management accounts are reported to trustees to ensure full compliance with the regulatory requirements	
5.6.1	ST confirmed that the regulatory requirements are that the board should receive management accounts each month. Currently the board receive accounts for 11/12 months. This is due to the July financials not being material. It is proposed that the current model of reporting continues, unless there is ever a significant difference to the budget in the July accounts. Where this is the case, the management accounts for that month will be reported, by exception, to the board.	
5.6.2	The board approved the proposal in response to item 2f.	
5.7	Remaining recommendations (with the exception of item 1b)	
5.7.1	YB asked if the board were happy to approve all remaining recommendations before moving to the discussion on item 1b.	
5.7.2	The board approved the proposal. For clarity these are recommendations numbered: 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4c, 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d, 7b, 7d.	
5.8	Item 1b - limiting the number of members of the executive team present for the full board meeting	
5.8.1	YB summarised the discussion from the last board meeting. There are three current options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limit the number of Executive colleagues at the board meeting to 3 (CEO, Deputy CEO, COO); 2. Maintain the current position; 3. Agree a middle ground by re-ordering the agenda so that where colleagues from the wider team are needed to present a report/answer questions on their particular area, those items are first on the agenda, to allow those colleagues to join the meeting at the start and leave once those items of business are concluded. For the remainder of the meeting, only the CEO, Deputy CEO and COO would be present. 	
5.8.2	A discussion took place about how the third option (re-ordering the agenda to allow Executive colleagues to join) would work.	

5.8.3	Trustees acknowledged that given the discussions at item 7.2 (above) regarding a change to the mechanism of submitting reports to the board, the discussions that take place at board meetings is likely to change and should be more strategic and less tactical.	
5.8.4	Q: How can the board be assured that all sub-committees are working to the same remit? The scheme of delegation and terms of reference are being reviewed in light of the change of designation of some of the current executive groups to sub-committees. Along with those documents, the standardisation of formal reporting and escalation processes should help to ensure that consistency and provide assurance to the board.	
5.8.5	Q: If there were 8 papers to be presented, would those Executive colleagues all stay in the meeting for the duration of those presentations? A separate piece of work is underway around governance planning and the cycle of work. This will ensure there are key items scheduled to come to each meeting and will avoid a high number of reports needing to come to a meeting. The summary reporting process that has been agreed should also reduce the number and length of reports coming to board.	
5.8.6	Q: In terms of the Executive colleagues present for the whole meeting, option 3 details the CEO, Deputy CEO and COO. Should the CFO (currently the Finance Director) also stay for the whole meeting? Everything discussed has a financial implication and this is a key mechanism for the person in that role to understand a top-level oversight of everything going on in the organisation. The CEO is the Accounting Officer for the trust and is present for the whole meeting. There is a rationale that the CFO only need be present for the finance items. It could be countered, for example, that the lead officer for safeguarding is a key role and should also be present for the whole meeting. It may be better to launch the next phase of governance with option 3 (only the CEO, Deputy CEO and COO present at the entire meeting) with other colleagues joining at the start if needed. This can then be kept under review.	
5.8.7	Q: How are the Maths Hub board and SCITT board chaired? If they are not chaired by a trustee, how do they report back into the board under the new system? The SCITT board is chaired by a trustee (Mark Davies). The Maths Hub board is chaired by Alf Coles who is not a trustee. The reporting mechanism is currently through the CLF Institute report, and that will continue. There is also a link trustee for the CLF Institute as a whole.	
5.8.8	Q: If there needs to be a majority of trustees on each sub-committee, are we sure we have enough trustees to fulfil those roles? It is envisaged that the total number of roles for trustees to fill will be approximately the same as this year. The increased requirement for trustees to sit on sub-committees will be counter-balanced by the reduced number of trustees needed to lead sub-strategies. This proposal can be revisited if it is found we do not have sufficient trustees to fill these roles; this will be determined at next week's members' review day.	
5.9	The board approved option 3 above (7.8.1) in response to recommendation 1b.	
6	Governance	
6.1	Proposed CLF Meeting Schedule 2025/26	
6.1.1	The board and sub-committee meeting schedule for 2025/26 was shared with trustees.	
6.2	CLF Strategic Briefing meeting– draft programme	
6.2.1	An update on the format and content for the Annual Strategic Briefing Meeting is included in the Governance report at Flag D.	
6.3	Training and Development for 2025/26	
6.3.1	ACTION: An update on training and development for trustees and Academy Councillors will be provided at the next meeting.	LT AFL
6.4	Dear Accounting Officer Letter	
6.4.1	The Dear Accounting Officer Letter is included in the papers for information.	

6.5	Academy Trust Handbook briefing document	
6.5.1	The Academy Trust Handbook board briefing document is included for information at Flag F.	
6.6	Policies for Approval – Health and Safety Policy (Trust wide and Academy)	
6.6.1	Following some revisions made by ZM as Chair of the People and Wellbeing Executive Group, the board approved the Trust level Health and Safety Policy and the Academy Health and Safety Policy.	
7	Finance and Operations	
7.1	Finance Report	
7.1.1	<p>The finance report is included at Flag B. It was proposed that the board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approve the 2025/26 budget • approve the 3-year submission to the Department for Education • note the Trust’s management accounts position as at May 2025 and subsequent mitigation • note the Cashflow update <p>HD advised that the information has been reviewed by the Finance Executive Group, however, the budget presented to board is an improved position, with the forecast surplus now at £365k vs the original budget presented to FEG of £225k. The improved position is due to updated information on income streams and the ongoing internal work on contract review and costs savings.</p> <p>The board approved the proposal as detailed in the four bullet points above.</p>	
7.2	IT Procurement	
7.2.1	AL spoke to the procurement paper at Flag C. The current cost of the internet line service across the trust is £196k per year; the proposed new contract would reduce this to £116k per year. It was proposed that the board approve the appointment of Gradwell Communications. The board approved the proposal.	
7.2.2	ACO noted his congratulations and thanks to AL and all those responsible for putting the new contract in place; significant cost savings have been made, and these funds can be used elsewhere to support the pupils across the trust.	
8	Education Updates – Primary Outcomes	
8.1	<p>KR advised that the data is still fresh; particularly the KS2 outcomes that were received this week. It has undergone some initial analysis and been shared with leaders but there is further review needed. In the presentation of the data, KR has taken on board the information provided by TS on the usefulness of providing trends over time and context, and also the need to consider the data for White British pupils. As well as trends over time, the national averages and trust standards have been used as comparators. Where ‘DfE reporting cohort’ is referred to this is the group of 10 primary academies that have been in the trust over 3 years. The DfE do not require trusts to report data for academies that have been in the trust for under 3 years; all 8 of the new primary academies fall into that category. The ‘CLF cohort’ refers to all 18 primary academies. KR provided headline information for EYFS, Phonics, Year 4 Multiplication Check and KS2 SATs outcomes. The slides are shared in the meeting folder in Governor Hub.</p>	
8.2	EYFS	
8.2.1	<p>CLF cohort - 71% of pupils achieving Good Levels of Development (GLD) DfE reporting cohort – 74% of pupils achieved GLD</p> <p>Overall, the data is broadly in line with last year’s data set, but there have been gains in the figures for students experiencing disadvantage. KR highlighted HVA where all children achieved GLD, and CPS where 4 out of the 5 pupils in the cohort achieved GLD.</p>	
8.3	Phonics	

8.3.1	There is a slightly wider gap between PP pupil's vs all pupils, however, there is a consistent picture in that all schools are above the national average for phonics. KR highlighted KOA that met the aspirational trust standard of 95% for phonics. MPS had weaker results for phonics with just 58% of the cohort passing the assessment and support will be provided to ensure improvements there.	
8.4	Year 4 Multiplication Check (MTC)	
8.4.1	DfE reporting cohort – pupils scored an average of 23.5 out of a total of 25 questions. The national average is just above 21. CLF cohort- there is a gap seen between PP and all students. There is a cultural piece of work to do over time around privileging children experiencing disadvantage and embedding the culture in the new academies. There is no trust standard set for the Y4 MTC. KR highlighted Priorswood who have seen a 6-point improvement, and some good gains at HMA, BPA and WLA.	
8.5	KS2 SATs outcomes	
8.5.1	KR advised that overall, the KS2 outcomes were strong. The trust has maintained outcomes above national average at 66% for combined outcomes this year (CLF cohort) despite 8 primary academies joining the trust. The DfE reporting cohort has seen a very slight dip at 71% compared to 72% last year. However, this figure may yet increase to 72% due to some appeals that might yet change the results. KR highlighted the strong results at EPA, SA and MPA. UVA has also seen an increased after a dip in last year's results due to some students not achieving all three (reading, writing, maths).	
8.5.2	The trust standard for PP greater depth combined is 3%, which is also the national figure. Overall, the trust is not near that figure but there were 3 individual schools that hit that target and that represents a move in the right direction.	
8.5.3	The CLF cohort for children experiencing disadvantage (PP) has seen an increase in data, despite the period of growth with 61% achieving combined at KS2. This is almost in line with the national average which has gone up by 1% this year to 62%. Outcomes for the DfE reporting cohort for PP pupils has been maintained compared to last year's data. For the 8 newer primary academies, much resource has been put into supporting them, and the KS2 combined figure for those schools has increased from 32% to 40% over the year.	
8.6	Questions from trustees	
8.7	<p>Are you following cohorts to track the gap over time to see if it is reducing? Did you compare the PP gap in Year 1 to the gap for the same cohort when they were in EYFS? There will be some influx of new students to the cohort and some leaving – are you able to look at the original group of children and check they are improving, and the gap closing, as they move up through the year groups?</p> <p>Yes, we do track the cohorts. Some provisions will close the gap quicker depending on the context of their cohort. EPA have narrowed the gap for their cohort since EY, but it will be a seven-year journey. UVA could close the gap much quicker due to less mobility and less disadvantage in the cohort. We try not to draw a direct line between GLD and phonics as they are completely different measures but there is a correlation, and we need to ensure the improvements start from the bottom up so that it is not a Year 6 Raising Attainment issue.</p>	
8.8	<p>The KS2 combined outcomes for WFA have gone down by 16%. What is the reason for that decrease?</p> <p>Staff were disappointed that the outcomes were not in the 70s as expected, however, there is a high proportion of SEND in the cohort and a couple of students just missed it. We track the mock assessments and were expecting a lower figure for combined. Similarly, FVA missed out on combined whilst being above national for each of the individual subjects. There is further analysis to take place.</p>	

8.9	<p>You mentioned you have focused your resources on the newer academies (represented as the green lines in the graph). What would you need to be in place in order to focus on improving both the newer and longer-standing academies.</p> <p>We have put a lot of time and energy into improving our DfE reporting cohort of the ten existing academies as well as the newer provisions. We need to lift the newer academies to lift the whole cohort of 18 academies. Some of the newer academies will need more time to change mindsets and shift culture whilst still being new to CLF systems and processes.</p>	
8.10	<p>Over time, will you be able to decrease the support and resource going into those 8 newer schools?</p> <p>Yes, that is right. We have worked intensively this year with 6 of the 8 newer academies. It has been school improvement work. Going forwards, as those academies have been in the trust longer, and start to improve the resource will be directed on more of a risk approach. It is anticipated that the newer schools will need less support as the curriculum becomes fully embedded. MPS is a strong example of a positive story of an academy joining a trust. It went from 0% combined at KS2 to 20% within a year of joining, to 47% last year and this year they are above national average at 68%.</p>	
8.11	<p>Do you have the ethnicity data in the graph available as a table?</p> <p>Yes, it is included in the slides. There are 750 children in the Year 6 cohort across the trust. 250 of them are children experiencing disadvantage and there is an ethnicity crossover and this needs to be further analysed. Further work needs to be done with white and black Caribbean pupils and with White British pupils.</p>	
8.12	Trustees congratulated the Executive Team on the very positive set of primary outcomes.	
9	Strategic Review and Reports	
9.1	Points of Escalation from sub-committees or Executive Groups	
9.1.1	No points of escalation were raised at this meeting.	
9.2	Strategy Review 2024-2025	
9.2.1	AL spoke to Flag I which provides an overview of the professional services Streamline plan and a summary of progress to the 7 sub strategies.	
9.3	Professional Services Streamline plan	
9.3.1	<p>AL highlighted the following 3 areas:</p> <p>Recruitment processes</p> <p>The process for recruiting staff and volunteers has been reviewed end-to-end. Efficiencies were identified and the processes updated. This included implementing a new dedicated recruitment system, meeting success measures of increasing the number of applications and reducing complexity when engaging in the process.</p> <p>Bromcom (Management Information System [MIS])</p> <p>This year the trust will be seeking to implement further modules of the new Bromcom system, and it is estimated that annual savings of circa £100k will be made by using this system to its full extent.</p> <p>Governor Hub</p> <p>The roll out of Governor Hub has been completed and will provide an enhanced user experience for trustees and Academy Councillors whilst ensuring enhanced security processes are in place.</p>	
9.4	Sub-strategy review	
9.4.1	AL advised that a trustee has been linked to each of the 7 sub-strategies. Each link trustee has met with the lead officer 3 times to review progress in each of the areas. A summary report is provided in Flag I. Trustees are asked to approve these reports as an accurate reflection of the work through the year. PP noted that he was a link for the Exceptional Trust Leadership sub-strategy, linking with AFL. PP described the work of the team at the CLF Institute as	

	<p>exceptional and acknowledged that while the report details the strategy as complete, it is ever ongoing. Trustees approved the sub-strategy review reports.</p>	
10	CEO Report including Draft Strategic Planning 2025/26	
10.1	CEO Updates	
10.1.1	<p>ST and AFL provided an update on the highly successful CLF Summer Conference that took place last week. Over 2000 staff members attended WHA; everyone was at the one site. A graduation ceremony was held for the cohort of SCITT trainees that had completed their training. Staff nominated for a Heart award were presented with their Heart badges and had a photo opportunity. There were a variety of key-note speakers as well as a huge number of CLF staff that led workshops. ST thanked Alison Fletcher, Rhian Skinner and all colleagues that contributed to the success of the conference.</p>	
10.2	Strategic Planning 2025/26	
10.2.1	<p>ST introduced Flag J, which includes the final version of the proposed CLF Strategy, as well as a narrative to explain the process. This has been produced following the Board briefing on May 8th, at which Simon Day facilitated a discussion between Trustees and Executive Leaders. Since that briefing, work has continued with Executive and Academy leaders to further develop and secure the strategic priorities for 2025-2026 and the period up to 2030.</p>	
10.2.2	<p>ST gave a presentation on the journey of the strategic planning for 2025/26 and beyond and shared templates with trustees, including the top sheet that will be used in each academy AIP. This year's strategy has a focus on People. There will be 3 core enablers in place of the current 7 sub-strategies. These core enablers will be Diversity, Equality, Inclusion and Belonging (DEIB), Environment, Operational Sustainability. There will also be a number of team plans in place, and each will also have a top sheet. The slides are included in the meeting folder on Governor Hub. ST invited questions and comments from trustees about the strategy as a whole, and about the elements highlighted in blue on the top sheet shared with trustees.</p>	
10.2.3	<p>There is a reference to PD on the top sheet. It will be essential to match PD to people's needs. Who will judge what those needs are? Will it be the staff member themselves or is there a mechanism in place to determine that?</p> <p>There is a tension between giving people choice in their PD and in helping them to understand better both what they need, and what PD looks like. Part of that conversation takes place during the annual professional development appraisal process.</p>	
10.2.4	<p>If the intention is to create a diverse team, it would be useful to think about the mechanisms in place to deliver that, and whether or not the metrics planned are the right metrics to measure that. It is quite common for the trust to recruit staff from within. If there is not a diverse team to begin with, that will provide an ongoing challenge in terms of lack of diversity. Additionally, when thinking about the role shadowing and coaching opportunities in place for global majority staff, this might be what those members of staff are looking for, but it might not.</p> <p>In the example top sheet shared, the wining aspirations are detailed in the box on the left and we will take those into the various sub-committees for discussion. We definitely are seeking to do some work around supporting existing colleagues into leadership roles. With recruitment, there is an aim to recruit more global majority SCITT trainees that we can then employ in our academies on completion of their course. This is more focused than relying on the general recruitment market where we can put in place processes to encourage applications from global majority staff but cannot guarantee they are competitive enough to secure the role.</p>	
10.2.5	<p>There is a metric included with some wording that includes the attendance rate of students being empowered by inclusive, high-quality education. Can this wording be tweaked?</p>	

	<p>There is a piece of work we need to do with pupils with a 5 – 15% absence band (those pupils with 85% - 95% attendance). Whilst we work with a smaller number of pupils with much higher absence, there is a large number of students within that band and supporting them could significantly impact the overall attendance data and ensure those pupils are in school more and ready to engage with the high-quality provision. The metric is one of the measures of how they far they feel they belong and can see purpose in the education they receive. As a trust, if more secondary phase children felt purposeful and that they belonged, they would be in school more often. We can look at the phrasing around that.</p>	
10.2.6	<p>Is the plan that, in a years' time, you will come back to the board and give us the numbers you have achieved against the targets you have set?</p> <p>We have been careful to deliberately set winning aspirations, not targets.</p>	
10.2.7	<p>The board will need to assess if you have objectively achieved what the strategy sets out. Are all the areas measurable?</p> <p>Yes. We have set winning aspirations to get to certain points over time and in a year's time our aim is to come back to the board and report on the progress we have made towards that aspiration; we are not saying that everything will be achieved within a year.</p>	
10.2.8	<p>How will you assess that you have a positive workplace culture and improved staff engagement?</p> <p>We have baseline data for this year from the Edurio staff survey. We will repeat the survey to measure improvements. We are encouraging academies to personalise their AIP and will choose a range of areas to focus on and a variety of winning aspirations, depending on their context.</p>	
10.2.9	<p>In the third box on the AIP template shared, do you think it is aspirational enough to come up just below the national benchmark?</p> <p>Yes. With the period of growth we have had there will be different levels in each academy and some work to do around the culture of collaboration. Some newer colleagues may not yet fully understand the collaborative approach of the trust and so it may take longer to achieve. We want colleagues to understand all the networks available to them and to be able to access all the resources we offer.</p>	
10.2.10	<p>In terms of the core enabler for Environment, shared by MT, whereabouts in the plan, or elsewhere, do you provide details about how much it costs to deliver the plan?</p> <p>It comes from the schools' condition allocation.</p>	
10.2.11	<p>If considering partnerships in more detail next year, it would be worth considering how you can include parents and families in that strand, potentially as a reference group.</p>	
10.2.12	<p>How do the three core enablers (DEIB, Environment and Operational Sustainability) relate to the core strategy of CLF People?</p> <p>Stakeholder voice has told us that having a focus on the environment, for example, enables us to deliver the core strategy. Operational sustainability is about finance (to ensure we remain sustainable as a trust and so can deliver all parts of the strategy) but it is also about looking at the processes and systems we use to see if they can be refined and provide capacity that can be directed to support the core strategy, particularly in the continually changing context and environment in which we work.</p>	
10.2.13	<p>How would the environment core enabler and how we deal with emissions, for example, have a bearing on investing in CLF People? Do the core enablers provide a distraction from the core strategy?</p> <p>A couple of examples would be that the decarbonisation project will add to the overall environment, and therefore experience, that the pupils have. The trust has a morale responsibility to ensure staff and pupils have a healthy environment to work in. This</p>	

	contributes to retention. Anecdotally, it has been found that younger applicants place more emphasis on working for companies that take seriously their approach to sustainability.	
10.2.14	NM advised that she requested the trust consider the environmental sustainability approach some years ago and that the Environment core enabler is very much valued and welcomed.	
10.2.15	Trustees are asked to approve the strategic headlines as set out for 2025-2026 with the acknowledgement that the Executive Team notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed amendment to the wording around pupil attendance, • the perspective shared regarding including parents in the partnership working next year • the consideration around benchmarking, and ensuring winning aspirations are measurable. 	
10.2.16	Trustees approved the strategic headlines for 2025/26.	
11	Any Other Business	
11.1	The draft agenda for the October board meeting is included in the papers for information; it will be reviewed in considerations of the proposals agreed in this meeting.	
11.2	The meeting closed at 7.37pm.	

Actions to take forward

Action date and no	Item no	Action	Owner	Update
19.06.25 01	5.1.15	Where attendance data is reported, it will include the CLF data and previous year's data for each of secondary, primary and special/AP phases.	SA/KR	Future reporting - ongoing
10.07.25 01	6.3.1	An update on training and development for trustees and Academy Councillors will be provided at the next meeting.	AFL LT	