

Local Trust board meeting minutes, decisions, and actions

2 July 2021

Zoom, 9.30am - 12.45pm

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>Present</p> <p>Trustees</p> <p>David Warner (chair), Miatta Fahnbulleh, Jeannette Lichner, Caroline Macfarland, Karen Mellanby, Peter Mills, Nicola Pollock, Rich Wilson,</p> <p>Non-trustees</p> <p>Margaret Bolton, Rosie Chapman (Protector), James Goodman, Matt Leach, Rachel Rowney, Verity Soons (minutes).</p>	
<p>1. Welcome and Introduction and Apologies for absence</p> <p>The chair welcomed trustees and staff to the meeting.</p> <p>Caroline would need to leave the meeting at item at 10.15am and would return for item 7.2.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Sahil Khan.</p>	
<p>2. Declarations of interest</p> <p>Community Wealth Fund - Nicola Pollock sits on the board of the Oversight Trust which oversees the companies funded by dormant assets which report to the sponsoring department of DCMS.</p> <p>Caroline Macfarland – Common Vision had been commissioned by Local Trust to complete some work on resilience.</p> <p>Rich Wilson – Had been commissioned to write a long form blog on community power for Local Trust</p>	
<p>3. Minutes of last meetings and matters arising</p>	

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>3.1. Approve minutes of board on 24 March 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting of 24 March 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.</p> <p>3.2. Matters arising/action points not covered by the agenda</p> <p>The board noted the actions update paper and the following oral updates:</p> <p>Verity Soons would be going on maternity leave in November and work was underway to recruit a temporary senior governance officer who would support Local Trust’s governance work during that time.</p> <p>The Chair updated trustees on a recent meeting with Blondel Cluff, new Chair of TNLCF and Matt Leach noted that she had also been in attendance at an event at the Par Bay Big Local where she had met with the Chair of the partnership.</p> <p>The Chair also updated that following correspondence with TNLCF it had been agreed to extend Rosie Chapman’s tenure as protector for a further 3 years. TNLCF had also agreed to delay the date of the forthcoming deed review to 2022-23. In order to formalise the change of date there would need to be an amendment to the deed to require that the review should take place in the 11th year of the programme. Trustees could make this amendment by special resolution, after which a revised Deed would be lodged with the Charity Commission and TNLCF.</p>	<p>Special general meeting to be called in the autumn to make the amendment.</p>
<p>4. Committee proceedings</p> <p>4.1. Nominations and remuneration committee - 20 April 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting that took place on 20 April 2021 were noted.</p> <p>The chair had circulated an update on the governance review in advance of the meeting which had been noted.</p> <p>Jeannette Lichner and Nicola Pollock had been part of the shortlisting for new trustees and noted that a diverse range of applications had been received. Trustees on the committee remained confident that recruitment would result in the right skill sets for new trustees. However, if it was necessary, the committee would recommend re-opening the recruitment for further applications in the autumn.</p> <p>The board noted the update.</p> <p>Audit and risk committee – 28 April 2021</p> <p>Jeannette Lichner noted that feedback on the annual report and accounts had been received by the executive and invited Rachel to give an update.</p> <p>Rachel Rowney confirmed that an amended draft report would be sent to Jeannette Lichner as chair of the audit and risk committee, Nicola Pollock as chair of finance and investment and to Rosie Chapman for final comments. The report would be formally reviewed once more in full at the audit and risk committee meeting in October before being submitted to Board in November.</p>	

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>Discussions to merging the audit and risk and finance and investment committees were underway and the timeline was being revisited.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting that took place on 28 April 2021 were noted.</p> <p>4.2. Programme Delivery Committee – 7 June 2021</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting that took place on 7 June 2021 were noted.</p> <p>4.3. Finance and Investment Committee 26 May 2021</p> <p>a. Record of the meeting on 26 May 2021</p> <p>b. Record of decisions recommended for board approval</p> <p>The record of the meeting that took place on 26 May 2021 was noted.</p> <p>Nicola Pollock informed the board that the meeting had not been quorate but that trustees not in attendance had seen and endorsed the recommended decisions from the meeting by email. Trustees were asked to agree the recommendations for decisions that were summarised in the paper at item 4.4b.</p> <p>Nicola drew the attention of the board to the recommended decision following the annual review of the investment manager, noting that the committee had confirmed that they were very satisfied with the presentation and question responses from CCLA and CCLA’s response to ESG and responsible investing. Co-optees were also recorded as being confident to continue working with CCLA.</p> <p>The board agreed the decisions recommended by the committee for the finance and investment committee meeting held on 26 May 2021.</p>	
<p>5. CEO’s Report</p> <p>Matt introduced the CEO’s report with nothing further to bring to the attention of the board.</p> <p>The board noted the CEO’s report and the following key points were raised/noted/discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict management was raised as something evident throughout different areas of work and was suggested as a session to explore for Connects. • Youth engagement was raised as an important area for development and James Goodman gave an update on the partnership with Spirit of 2012. Local Trust had been invited into partnership to promote youth-led community bridging events throughout 2022-23. • Area visits for more challenged areas were being prioritised over the next 2 to 3 months for staff. Visits for trustees able to commit time to them were expected to resume more fully in the autumn. Trustees would also have the opportunity to visit a number of areas in Manchester as part of the September away day programme. Trustees were invited to contact Rachel Rowney and Verity Soons with details of their willingness to travel to visit areas, so that possible opportunities could be scoped out. 	

Discussion and decision	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the Dormant Assets Bill was now in Parliament. There had been no indication of movement on any public commitment to a Community Wealth Fund by government, however cross-party interest in the programme remained significant. Local Trust was contributing to a number of CSR bids, including for the Community Wealth Fund, Community Leadership Academy and (subject to trustee decisions later in this meeting) the proposed What Works Centre. Whilst it was hoped that one or more would be successful, but in any event the work done to date would help contribute to building the case for the next CSR. 	
<p>6. Performance, risk, finance and investment report</p> <p>6.1. Local Trust business plan monitoring to 30 June 2021</p> <p>Rachel Rowney introduced the paper noting that where items remained amber it was largely due to timing issues. As we were only reporting to the end of quarter one, the executive remained optimistic that all targets would be met but this could be challenged if another lockdown were to come into effect.</p> <p>The board noted the update and the report.</p> <p>6.2. Big Local Trust and Local Trust management accounts to 31 March 2021</p> <p>Rachel Rowney introduced the paper, bringing the following to the attention of the board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new format report was developed with a consultant following previous feedback from trustees on layout. Finance and investment committee now signed off the same version of the report that was seen in board meetings where previously board received an abridged version of that received at the committee. The report was still being developed and feedback received so far would be used to develop the next iteration of the report. The largest variance in the accounts was grant expenditure, accounting for 40% of the underspend for 2020-21 however this was mainly due to a timing issue and current reporting showed we had now caught up and were on track. <p>The board welcomed the new format of the report and noted and approved the Big Local Trust and Local Trust management accounts to 31 March 2021.</p> <p>6.3. Big Local Trust investment report to 31 March 2021</p> <p>6.4. Local Trust investment report to 31 March 2021</p> <p>Rachel Rowney introduced the papers together, noting that they were now shorter due to the near cash portfolio.</p> <p>The board noted and approved the Local Trust and Big Local Trust investment reports to 31 March 2021 and CCLA’s comments concerning the possible introduction of a negative interest rather in the future.</p>	

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>6.5. Risk register as at 30 June 2021</p> <p>Rachel Rowney introduced the paper, bringing the following to the attention of the board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was the detail that sat behind the high-level risks noted in the CEO report. • SMT reviewed a set of risks each month so all were reviewed in the quarter leading to each board meeting. <p>The board noted and approved the risk register as at 30 June 2021.</p> <p>The chair invited Rachel Rowney to update the board on The Day After Tomorrow initiative that some Big Local areas were now a part of.</p> <p>This was an initiative set up by few Big Local areas involved in the legacy cluster. It was to address the challenge of how to continue to share experience and learning between one another with other community groups after the end of Big Local. Support for this work was being provided via two reps who had knowledge in specific areas, such as incorporation, that may come up during this work. Currently around eight residents/workers were driving the initiative and looking for sign up from other areas.</p> <p>Messaging to the areas involved had been clear that all Big Local funds should be spent by March 2026, and that there should be not expectation they might be able to use ‘left over’ funds for this work. Should the areas raise their own funding, it would of course be for them to decide if they wished to allocate those funds to this initiative.</p> <p><i>Caroline Macfarland left the meeting</i></p>	
<p>7. What Works Centre</p> <p>7.1. Discussion – Part 1</p> <p>7.2. Discussion – Part 2</p> <p>Following a number of conversations, a policy sounding board discussion and a workshop with some trustees over the previous month, James Goodman invited trustees to consider the role that Local Trust might play in building or supporting a What Works Centre (WWC) for community/neighbourhood improvement, expected to emerge from the CSR process.</p> <p>Trustees were reminded that the timeframe for the CSR process was not within the control of Local Trust and so a positive decision would be required now to enable a clear way forward to be mapped out.</p> <p>Margaret gave a presentation which included an overview of the origins, successes and perceived shortcomings of WWC’s to date. She also presented an outline proposal of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what sort of WWC would best serve sector interests and contribute to achieving LT’s charitable purpose • what would be needed to implement a WWC 	

Discussion and decision	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> two potential strategies for Local Trust emerging from previous discussions – lead/follow <p>Trustees noted the presentation and made the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That if Local Trust were to proceed with leading the development of a WWC it would need to be with a view to delivering a non-traditional model which was dynamic and challenged traditional evaluation techniques. It would focus on developing knowledge and practice on community development and champion new ways of working. Partnership discussions and development are still at an early stage. A skills and attributes audit would help to identify skills gaps and potential other partners. WWCs operate on a UK basis and partners in other constituent parts of the UK would need to be approached. The WWC would be an independent organisation, likely with charity status. Funds could be made available from the strategic contingency to fund the initial set up of the WWC. Trustees discussed what might happen if the lead role was not taken by Local Trust, noting that a small amount of fundraising had been done by other partners and that a bid was likely still be put forward for the spending review with or without Local Trust’s involvement. Traditionally, WWCs have struggled more to secure start-up funding than ongoing funding. It was expected this would be the same for the proposed WWC and that once it was established it would likely attract additional funding beyond the initial three years. <p>Following Margaret’s presentation, the board used breakout rooms to consider the two potential strategies presented and the implications of each.</p> <p><i>Caroline Macfarland re-joined the meeting</i></p> <p>The chair summarised the outcome of the trustees discussions noting:</p> <p>There was a strong consensus to commit to Local Trust playing a leading role in driving forward the case for a community focused WWC for communities and neighbourhoods so long as it was of a significantly different and more dynamic model to the traditional WWCs seen before.</p> <p>Trustees agreed this outcome and agreed in principle to the level of investment identified to develop a proposal for a WWC for communities.</p> <p>Margaret and James would circulate a summary note to trustees for comment after the meeting to clarify the terms on which trustees were happy to proceed.</p> <p>A business case would be finalised towards the end of July and financial scenarios would be revisited later in the year.</p>	<p>MB/JG - Summary note to trustees after the meeting to refine and finalise conditions for</p>

Discussion and decision	Action
<p>Trustees agreed that the work could be taken forward by Margaret Bolton and James Goodman through the policy sounding board for trustee support ahead of the CSR.</p>	<p>supporting a lead strategy.</p>
<p>8. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion update</p> <p>Rachel Rowney introduced the paper which gave an update on Local Trust’s EDI work to date with recommendations on next steps and brought the following to the attention of the board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper focused on both internal work and work with Big Local areas. • The BRAP report was attached for reference – it was not highly detailed but covered the most salient and important points. Fleshing out the report was discussed with BRAP but had agreed to build on it as we progressed with recommendations. • An initial recommendation to work with trustees to develop a strategy for Local Trust was to use time at the Board’s strategy discussion in January to progress this. <p>The board noted the paper and the key points raised by Rachel. Key comments noted/raised in discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report was welcomed, as was the opportunity to work on this as a board. • Felt some of the issues were synthesised well in the BRAP report and need more attention as a board. • Local Trust were looking to expand their networks in this area. The Equality and Inclusion coalition of funders might be helpful here. However, it was challenging to find similar organisations to Local Trust in terms of scale, grant making practice and lifespan. • A number of trustees offered to provide Rachel Rowney with information on actions of other organisations and available research and training to help progress the work ahead. <p>Trustees would welcome a summary on what training and discussion opportunities might be available to them in the autumn to better prepare for the strategy day in January 2022.</p> <p>The board agreed to commit some of the time at the January 2022 strategy discussion to a further discussion EDI issues. The board also agreed to explore opportunities for training/engagement that might be useful ahead of January and noted the review work taking place in Big Local areas and the intention to integrate recommendations and findings into the support review.</p>	<p>RR to send a summary to trustees of training and engagement opportunities.</p>
<p>9. Any other business</p> <p>There was none</p>	