

Local Trust board meeting minutes, decisions and actions

30 June 2016 at 2pm

Local Trust, Unit D, 15-18 White Lion Street, London, N1 9PD

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>Present</p> <p>Trustees</p> <p>Kevin Sugrue (chair), Penny Shepherd, Jonathan Taylor, John Whitton, Ben Lee, Daniel Goodwin, Kathryn Kane, Alice Casey, Peter Mills, Andrew Robinson (agenda items 1 to 10 and 12 to 19).</p> <p>Non-trustees</p> <p>Peter Thurston (Big Local Trust protector)</p> <p>Gemma Bull (Big Lottery Fund), Graham Finegold (Tank Consulting) (agenda items 1 to 6)</p> <p>Debbie Ladds (agenda items 1 to 5 and 8 to 19)</p> <p>Rachel Rowney, Nicola Hutcheson, Jayne Humm and Wendy Joynes (minutes) (Local Trust) (agenda items 8 to 19)</p>	
<p>1. Welcome and introductions</p> <p>Kevin welcomed to the meeting Gemma Bull, the development director for the England Portfolio at the Big Lottery Fund, who would be attending the board meeting in order to contribute to item 6 about the recruitment of the chief executive. Kevin advised the board that Tony Burton, vice-chair of the Big Lottery Fund Board, would be the BLF representative on the appointments panel.</p>	
<p>2. Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Karen Riches.</p>	
<p>3. Conflicts of interest</p> <p>Ben Lee: director, NANM (delivery partner, Big Local)</p> <p>Peter Mills, owner, Brand Ethos (commissioned by UnLtd, delivery partners for Big Local).</p> <p>Andrew Robinson: director, CCLA (investment manager, Big Local Trust)</p>	

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>4. Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising</p> <p>4.1 Minutes of previous meeting</p> <p>It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2016 be approved as a correct record.</p> <p>4.2 Matters arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jonathan stated that he was pleased to report that Daniel had agreed to join the finance and audit sub-committee. • Daniel agreed to liaise with Rachel over the "donations" policy 	<p>Daniel to liaise with Rachel over the donations policies</p>
<p>5. Appointment of chair of trustees</p> <p>Kevin vacated the chair. Debbie advised the board that eight nominations were received for the position of chair, which were all for Kevin and in the absence of any other nominations it was agreed that Kevin be appointed to serve a second three-year term of office as the chair of trustees until the October 2019 AGM.</p>	
<p>6. Recruitment of chief executive</p> <p>Debbie left the meeting at this point and took no part in the discussion of items 6 and 7.</p> <p>6.1 Overall process</p> <p>Agreed as recommended including the involvement of residents in the process but without responsibility for making the appointment.</p> <p>6.2 Executive search</p> <p>Agreed as recommended not to use traditional executive search.</p> <p>6.3 Timetable</p> <p>Agreed that the long list interviews should not take place in the August holiday period and the process should be pushed forward a week later from that point on, resulting in the panel interviews being held on 28 September and the appointment confirmed thereafter.</p> <p>6.4 Job description</p> <p>Agreed as recommended</p> <p>6.5 Person specification</p> <p>In order to reduce the length of the person spec, it was agreed to delete items 10 and 13 and that within the requirements the most important quality was leadership which was variously explained in items 1, 3, 4, 6, 12 and 14.</p> <p>6.5 Package</p> <p>Agreed that the benefits package should remain as is; the salary should be £90k and advertised as such; London based; and full time (5 days per week) at least to begin with.</p>	

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>6.7 Media, advertising fees</p> <p>Graham circulated details of options for advertising. It was agreed to use online advertising only, including the Guardian and Sunday Times online services and the minimal cost outlets in Graham's media options paper. It was also agreed that we should make full use of partners and contacts (including reps) to spread the word.</p> <p>6.8 Panel</p> <p>Agreed that the panel should comprise Kevin, Daniel, Ben, Alice and Tony Burton from the BLF, but that because of the concern that neither of the board's leads on communications were represented, Karen and Peter should be asked whether they have any particular advice to offer on requirements.</p> <p>6.9 Interim appointment</p> <p>Agreed that candidates for the position of interim CEO should be sought through partners, contacts and agencies but that it would be inappropriate for a delivery partner to provide the candidates because of the conflict of interest; that Graham recommend a shortlist of candidates for the panel to make the final appointment; and that where possible and appropriate senior managers take on additional responsibilities so that a part-time interim CEO can concentrate on maintaining staff morale and motivation and the positive face of Local Trust and Big Local to the outside world with strong leadership skills as a prime requirement.</p> <p>Gemma left the meeting at the conclusion of this item.</p>	
<p>7. Chief executive performance review for 2015-16</p> <p>Agreed that the board unanimously confirmed the panel's very positive assessment of the chief executive's performance in 2015/16 and records its congratulations to Debbie</p>	
<p>8. Programme delivery – Big Local Trust</p> <p>Debbie, Rachel, Jayne, Nicola and Wendy joined the meeting.</p> <p>The following questions and comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trustees felt that it was brilliant that we had now received plans from all 150 Big Local areas. • A question was raised about whether there was an analysis of what areas were doing and Jayne responded that we are completing some research with SPHR on this. In addition, the new Big Local booklet published shows the top 10 themes funding is being spent on. There is also some plan analysis being carried out by SPHR, which will be available at the end of the year. • In response to a question about what is different with Big Local, it was suggested that the difference is that residents own it and so there are deeper roots in the community and a high number of volunteers. 	

Discussion and decision	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rachel agreed that it would be helpful to have trustees' involvement in reviewing the complaints procedure, looking at the proposed move towards a conflict resolution approach for some complaints. Trustees were asked to let Rachel or Wendy know if they could be involved. • Trustees also wished for their thanks to Debbie to be noted for the swift update following the EU referendum (Brexit) and the guidance to reps about our approach. • It was also felt that it would be good if future reports could pick up any issues following Brexit, including examples of good things happening in areas. <p>There were no further questions or comments and the report was noted by the board.</p>	<p>Trustees to contact Rachel or Wendy</p> <p>Rachel to report on any Brexit-related issues</p>
<p>9. Research, evaluation and learning report – Big Local Trust</p> <p>John and Jayne introduced the report. Since the report was written, the number of partnership surveys returned had risen from 490 to 582 returns, with no response yet from 9 areas.</p> <p>The following questions and comments were then raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of how we/SPHR will report on the analysis of content in Big Local plans, trustees were informed that this would be done in a number of ways including a report and blogs. • Trustees were interested in knowing what motivates people to get involved through Big Local and also what motivates them to stay involved. Trustees were informed that NCVO did some research on this in the Early Years evaluation and in Pathways to Participation, so there is already some knowledge but it can be looked into further. • Trustees also felt that when research partners do work for Local Trust then they should reference that it is Local Trust work to help promote our knowledge, which links to our communications plan. In response, trustees were informed that contracts for research providers include referencing Local Trust. Trustees felt that this was something to focus on and to keep revisiting so that Local Trust builds an academic research reputation. • In answer to a question about what makes Local Trust different and what will make people sit up a listen, Jayne responded that this was a key item from the research carried out last year by IVAR, but that the programme was still young and impacts cannot be concluded too early. <p>There were no further questions and the report was noted by the board.</p>	
<p>10. Finance and audit – Big Local Trust</p> <p>Jonathan and Nicola introduced the key issues in the report.</p> <p>Nicola informed the board that a temporary financial accountant had been recruited to help put together the accounts for 2015-16, following the recent IT issues, and that he would be with Local Trust for the next few weeks.</p>	

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>The trustees noted the accuracy of the predicted 2015-16 cashflow against the actuals.</p> <p>There were no further questions and the following recommendations were taken. The board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accepted the finance manager's report for the period ending 31 March 2016, including the revised monthly budget for 2016-17 • agreed that the annual reports and audited accounts will be agreed at the December 2016 board meeting • noted that the associated finance and audit sub-committee meeting will be moved from September 2016 to later in the year • agreed to move the AGM from October to December 2016 to take account of the delayed annual reports and audited accounts timeline. 	
<p>11. Investment – Big Local Trust</p> <p>Andrew left the meeting for this item.</p> <p>Minutes of the previous meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the investment sub-committee meeting on 13 June 2016 were received by the board.</p> <p>Investment update</p> <p>Penny introduced the report and advised trustees that CCLA had produced a short report on the EU referendum (Brexit) on 23 June, and this was tabled for information. She then highlighted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At 31 May 2016 the total value of the portfolio was £193.9m, but it was actually higher as of 29 June 2016 at £194.4m, after a further withdrawal of £2m. • The portfolio is designed to be robust. <p>The following comments and questions were then raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to the cost of the investment consultant, trustees were advised that it should be less than £10k. • It was felt that benchmarking of fees was essential in terms of ensuring value for money, and should be in the tender. • Trustees were advised that Local Trust had not asked CCLA to reduce their fee. CCLA had taken that decision independently. <p>There were no further questions or comments and the following recommendations were taken. The board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accepted the investment report including the proxy voting report for the quarter ended 31 March 2016 	<p>Amend tender to include benchmarking of fees</p>

Discussion and decision	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agreed that there is no change to the arrangement with HSBC as the custodian for Big Local Trust until the next review • agreed the revised investment management agreement from CCLA, subject to the wording being checked • agreed to retain CCLA as the fund manager for Big Local Trust for a further year, with a fee of 0.25% per annum <p>agreed the appointment of an independent investment consultant.</p>	
<p>12. Communications – Big Local Trust</p> <p>Andrew re-joined the meeting.</p> <p>The board received the update on communications and the following questions and comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbie gave a verbal update on the perception audit by BritainThinks and advised that following a meeting held this morning information would be shared when available. It was felt that work being done on communications so far was very good and it would be interesting to hear these outcomes and results. <p>There were no further questions or comments raised and the board noted the report.</p>	<p>Information on perception audit to be shared with trustees when available</p>
<p>13. System development and knowledge management – Big Local Trust</p> <p>Jayne introduced the report and the following questions and comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trustees thanked Jayne for taking on this project and for the progress made. • In answer to a question about how Microsoft SharePoint with Office 365 had been chosen as the new IT package, trustees were informed that it was because it was good value, Local Trust had received a good deal as a charity and it is secure. It had also been recommended by consultants some time before the ransomware attack and had a substantial amount of storage. • A question was also raised about whether there would be a chance to try it first, and if it could be customised. In response, trustees were informed that there wouldn't be the chance to try it before buying, but it can be customised once purchased to match our structure of data. Our sub-contractors, Co-operative Systems can help tweak the system if needed. <p>Trustees then asked if it was all within budget and were advised that it was and that the move to the cloud had been planned beforehand, but was brought forward following the ransomware attack. Jayne and Nicola said that they would let trustees have the cost details.</p>	<p>Jayne/Nicola to supply costs to trustees</p>

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>14. Chief executive report – Big Local Trust</p> <p>Debbie tabled a paper on the results of the Brexit and our approach. It was agreed to return to this topic in October.</p> <p>Debbie introduced the report and highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Big Lottery Fund England Committee meeting, which will include a presentation from us, had been moved to 14 September at the request of Local Trust. They have not asked for a Big Local area to attend this meeting. • The team workplan is similar to previous plans, but shorter and the team can deliver on this whilst a new chief executive is being appointed. <p>The following questions and comments were then raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trustees felt that under objective three of the workplan there should be a line about cohesion within communities where someone keeps an eye following Brexit and it was agreed that Rachel R would take this on, and a target would be added. • There was a query about objective two in relation to research and learning. Debbie responded that this had not changed but she would double-check and change it if necessary. • Review of the investment manager needs to be added. <p>There were no further questions or comments and the board agreed the workplan for 2016-17</p>	<p>Have discussion about impact of Brexit in October</p> <p>Add target on cohesion</p> <p>Check objective two</p> <p>Add target on the investment manager review</p>
<p>15. The community development legacy project – Local Trust</p> <p>The following questions and comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to possible conflict of interest for Andrew as he is still officially the chair of CDF, it was felt that there was no conflict of interest as Andrew will not be chair of CDF when the money is spent as CDF will not exist. • In answer to a question raised about separating the cost of staff working on the legacy project from Big Local, trustees were advised that the hours spent working on the legacy project would be recorded and paid for using some of the legacy funds. • There was then a discussion about the timetable for spending the money and it was felt that there needed to be some decision making about when the bulk of the money would be spent, so that an appropriate investment strategy can be put in place. At the moment, it is thought to be 2018 and beyond, but as yet it is not known what it will be spent on. It was also felt that it would be more helpful to say what the plan will be and what proportion might be left in five years' time. • Trustees then suggested that this question be brought back to the next meeting or the one after that to progress to an expenditure plan. <p>There were no further questions and the report was noted by the board.</p>	

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>16. Finance and audit – the legacy – Local Trust</p> <p>There were no questions or comments on the finance and audit report for the legacy and the report was therefore noted by the board.</p>	
<p>17. Investment – the legacy – Local Trust</p> <p>Minutes of the previous investment sub-committee meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the investment sub-committee meeting on 13 June 2016 were received by the board.</p> <p>Update on current investment of funds from CDF</p> <p>The board noted the update of the current investment of funds from CDF.</p> <p>Review of banking options for CDF donation to Local Trust</p> <p>Debbie informed trustees that the funds received were £596k rather than the £500k stated in the report.</p> <p>There were no questions or comments and the board noted the report.</p>	
<p>18. Chief executive report: legacy funding</p> <p>There were no questions or comments on the report.</p>	
<p>19. Any other business</p> <p>There was no other urgent business and the meeting closed at 4.45pm.</p>	
<p>Full board meetings 2-5pm</p> <p>13 October 2016, 8 December 2016 (including AGM)</p> <p>Finance and audit sub-committee 2-5pm</p> <p>Date to be rearranged in autumn 2016</p> <p>Investment sub-committee</p> <p>19 September 2016, 10am to 12 noon, 22 November 2016, 2.30pm to 4.30pm</p>	

Kevin Angone

28/10/2016