

Minutes for Lordship Hub Board Meeting- 15th June 2024

Attendees:

Ruth Keeling, Dave Morris, Joan Curtis, Sarah Hazlehurst, Roxanna Slavcheva, Yvonne Richards, Sandra Sutherland, Nora White, Nura Nur, Xime Silva, Nathan Otis

Apologies:

Sue Jameson, Issy Harvey, David Selby, Roland Chukuma Modu

Conflicts of interest:

No conflicts of interest

Minutes of the last meeting:

May meeting minutes Hub Board Minutes 17 May 2023.docx agreed by all.

1. Set Hub priorities for 2024/25

The board reviewed [2023 Hub objectives](#) and updated them based on more recent events & work including the May [user feedback workshop](#), outstanding [Board actions](#) and feedback from [recent staff exit letters](#).

- The fabric of the building - do we need to be more conscious about the space that we work and volunteer in. The building is now 10 years old and needs more care and maintenance as it gets older. The Hub [building type](#) has a minimum lifespan of 25 years.

A: Make the Hub a great place to work

- Add an objective about making sure the Hub is safe and attractive for people to work (and volunteer, and use), eg ongoing building maintenance.

B: Achieve financial stability

- Finance and fundraising for building work to be included in this group of objectives.
- Finance numbers – agreed to keep the same and stay ambitious.

C: Be a force for good in the local community

- With membership & volunteers, as well as growing numbers we want their active participation in the hub to grow (autonomy).
- Interest in park development could be increased (add a c6- to liaise more with the park)
Community engagement- what do we want to achieve in the park?

ACTION: Ruth to reshare how to add to maintenance projects with everyone.

2. Create working groups

The board discussed the creation of working groups:

- Do volunteers, membership and users get their own working groups- are these three too large to sit in a single group together? Counter-argument was that we don't want too many groups as many of the issues will overlap and we would end up with very small number of people in some groups.
- We need to be using this sub-group time well, if we are repurposing the board meeting time every other month.
- Each group could recruit staff members, the public and volunteers to support. Each area is not down to one person, it's about collective responsibility.
- Risk that there is a conflict of interest if staff sit in some groups eg personnel group - but this isn't always a bad thing, people just need to be transparent.
- Nathan has a basketball group suggestion to bring to the community engagement group.

DECISION: The board voted in favor of moving to six board meetings per year, and six subgroup meetings per year which would be made up of three groups (Community engagement, HR & personnel and Finance).

Ways of working:

- Each group to minute their own meetings, it won't be Nora or any other staff responsibility to lead this communication. A board member should be coordinating the working group.
- Suggestion to have a "top view" document that each group feeds into after the sub-group meetings. Also, a template for taking minutes, so there is consistency across the groups.
- Suggestion for a Hub bulletin to be circulated (maybe pulled from the template), to support communication between meetings.
- The board oversees strategy, and the working groups need to feed back to the board.
- Some board members suggested that all decisions should be coming back to board. Others were concerned that this would slow down decision making and suggested that working groups should have some trust and be able to make some decisions.

ACTION: Sarah to create templates for each group to use in sub-group meetings.

ACTION: see below re decision making and delegation breakdowns

Membership of each group:

Community engagement- Joan, Xima (with a focus on volunteers), Nathan, Yvonne.

HR and personnel- Nura Nur, Ruth, Dave

Finance- Nora White, Roxanna

Undecided/not at meeting: Sarah, Sue, Sandra, David, Issy, Roland.

ACTION: All to think about which group they would like to sit in by next week.

3. Delegation of priorities and actions

Ahead of the meeting, an example of how this delegation might look had been created to help the conversation: [Illustrative example - Sub-groups Delegation of priorities and actions.](#)

- Overall agreement from board of illustrative example. No feedback or disagreements noted.

ACTION: the chair and secretary will do a draft breakdown after the meeting and share with board members for agreement offline.

4. Elect board roles for 2024/25

The Hub's constitution requires that we elect a Chair and a Secretary.

DECISION: All voted in agreement for Ruth to continue as chair.

DECISION: All voted in agreement for Sarah to continue as secretary.

Other positions were also voted on.

DECISION: All voted in agreement for David Selby to continue as treasurer, while we look for a new treasurer; to note, David was not at the meeting.

DECISION: All voted in agreement for Sue to remain safeguarding lead for now; to note Sue was not at the meeting.

ACTION: Staff to discuss staff representative for the board at the next staff meeting.

Ruth did not want to continue as Personnel role as well as Chair of the Board and thought the two roles should be separated. No one else volunteered for the Personnel role.

DECISION: All agreed for Ruth to hold the Personnel role until an alternative person is identified.

ACTION: Personnel lead should be voted on at first HR & personnel subgroup meeting.

Last year we appointed some other roles (see the list in minutes from May 2023 meeting); we should discuss and decide whether we want to do the same again following the creation of working groups, or if working groups should decide on these roles at their first meeting.

ACTION: Board to revisit list of appointed roles in next board meeting.

5. AOB

Fundraising money discussion

- Discussion about how to use the money that has been crowdfunded. There is not a ringfence, but agreed we should communicate clearly to the public and the many people who donated what the amount has helped pay for.

ACTION: community engagement group to organise communications to thank donors and explain what the money has made possible.

Conflict resolution and safeguarding- next steps?

- A review of some recent internal conflicts and disagreements had recommended three things: Mediation between some individuals totaling £500; a review of safeguarding measures; a review of Hub complaints and grievance policy.

- Some board members questioned whether the spend would be good value for money. One said previous spend on non-violent communication training had not had an impact as people were still talking negatively to one another. How do we evaluate how well training has worked? Another board members suggested staff and volunteers could be trained to run mediate for themselves.

- There was previous agreement to support mediation as a principal and a way forward. Resolving issues is important. Commitment to mediation and communication as a board.

ACTION: personnel group to

- take note of the discussion and feedback of the board and
- action the feedback and original recommendations asap.