

Governing Board Diversity Indicators Evaluation Report

Mylor Bridge School

Based on 5 completed board responses

Prepared in line with National Governance Association diversity indicators guidance (2025)

Purpose and confidentiality

This report collates board responses question by question and presents only aggregated information. Individual responses are not linked across categories. This approach is intended to protect confidentiality and reduce the risk that individual governors could be identified from combinations of personal characteristics.

The findings are intended to support board reflection, recruitment and succession planning, inclusive participation, training and the identification of potential gaps in lived experience. The figures should be considered alongside the demographic profile and needs of the school and its wider community.

Important note: questions 9 and 11 allowed respondents to select more than one applicable option. Totals for those questions therefore exceed the number of respondents.

1. Gender

Response	Number of board responses
Female	3
Male	2
Other gender identity	0
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: The responses show a reasonably balanced gender profile, with three female and two male respondents. No respondent selected another gender identity or chose not to say.

2. Age group

Response	Number of board responses
18 to 40	2
41 to 60	3
61 or over	0
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: There is representation across the 18 to 40 and 41 to 60 age groups. No respondents are aged 61 or over, so this age group is not represented within the returned forms.

3. Disability

Response	Number of board responses
Disability requiring additional support and/or adjustments	0
Disability requiring no additional support and/or adjustments	1
No disability	4
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: One respondent identified as having a disability but requiring no additional support or adjustments. Four respondents reported no disability. No respondent indicated that adjustments are currently required for participation in governance.

4. Sexual orientation

Response	Number of board responses
Bisexual	0
Gay or Lesbian	0
Straight/Heterosexual	5
Other sexual orientation	0
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: All five respondents identified as straight/heterosexual. No other sexual orientation was represented within the returned forms.

5. Ethnic group

Response	Number of board responses
Asian or Asian British	0
Black, Black British, Caribbean or African	0
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	0
White: English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British	4
White: any other White background (Cornish)	1
Other ethnic group	0
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: All respondents identified within a White ethnic group. Four identified as English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British and one described their White background as Cornish. No minoritised ethnic groups were represented within the returned forms.

6. Religion

Response	Number of board responses
Buddhist	0
Christian	2
Hindu	0
Jewish	0
Muslim	0
Sikh	0
No religion	3
Any other religion	0
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: The responses show some diversity of religious and non-religious belief, with two Christian respondents and three respondents reporting no religion.

7. Proximity to the school

Response	Number of board responses
Less than 1 mile	2
2 to 5 miles	2
6 to 15 miles	1
16 to 40 miles	0
More than 40 miles	0
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: All respondents live within 15 miles of the school, and four of the five live within five miles. This suggests a strong degree of local connection to the school and surrounding community.

8. Experience of school as a parent or carer

Response	Number of board responses
Parent/carers of child or children currently of school age	3
Parent/carers of child or children who have completed education	0
Not a parent or carer	1
Chose not to say	1

Evaluation comments: Current parental experience is well represented, with three respondents parenting or caring for school-age children. One respondent is not a parent or carer and one chose not to say.

9. Type of school attended

Response	Number of board responses
State-run or state-funded school	4
Independent or fee-paying school	2
Attended school outside the UK	0
Chose not to say	0
Other type of education setting	0

Evaluation comments: Educational background is predominantly state-school based, with four selections for state-run or state-funded schooling. Independent or fee-paying education was selected twice. As respondents could select more than one applicable option, the total number of selections exceeds five.

10. Experience of the care system

Response	Number of board responses
Looked after/in the care of the local authority during all or some of school education	0
Not looked after/in the care of the local authority	5
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: None of the respondents reported lived experience of being looked after or in the care of the local authority during their school education.

11. Continued education after leaving school

Response	Number of board responses
Further education (sixth form/college)	2
Higher education (university)	4
Apprenticeship route	0
Did not continue education	0
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: The board responses show substantial experience of continued education. Four selections were for higher education and two for further education. No apprenticeship route was reported. As respondents could select more than one applicable option, the total number of selections exceeds five.

12. Eligibility for free school meals

Response	Number of board responses
Eligible	0
Not eligible	5
Don't know	0
Not applicable	0
Chose not to say	0

Evaluation comments: None of the respondents reported having been eligible for free school meals. This indicates that lived experience of this indicator of educational disadvantage is not represented within the returned forms.

Summary of strengths, gaps and opportunities

Strengths indicated by the responses

- A reasonably balanced gender profile within the five returned forms.
- Representation across two age bands, including two respondents aged 18 to 40.

- Strong local connection, with all respondents living within 15 miles of the school and most within five miles.
- Substantial current parental experience within the board.
- Some diversity of religious and non-religious belief.
- A range of educational pathways represented through state and some independent schooling, and through further and higher education.

Gaps or areas for reflection

- No respondents from minoritised ethnic groups are represented in the returned data.
- No diversity of sexual orientation is represented in the returned data.
- No respondent reported lived experience of the care system.
- No respondent reported having been eligible for free school meals, so this indicator of socioeconomic disadvantage is not represented through lived experience.
- No respondents aged 61 or over are represented.
- No apprenticeship route was reported among respondents who continued education.

Proposed actions for board discussion

- Compare the board profile with available school, local community and pupil demographic information before determining recruitment priorities.
- Consider future recruitment and succession planning with a view to broadening ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic representation where this would better reflect the community served.
- Where lived experience is not present on the board, seek wider perspectives through pupil voice, parent and carer engagement, community organisations and other appropriate external sources.
- Ensure board decision making routinely considers the experiences of pupils and families affected by disadvantage, SEND, care experience and other forms of underrepresentation, rather than relying solely on personal experience within the board.
- Continue to make governance participation accessible and invite members to raise any support or adjustment needs confidentially if these arise.
- Review the diversity profile and agreed actions periodically, including as part of recruitment and succession planning.

Publication and confidentiality

Because this analysis is based on only five responses, some categories contain a single respondent. Publishing the full numerical breakdown could therefore create a risk of identifying individuals. A safer public approach would be to publish a short statement confirming that the board collects diversity information confidentially, reviews the findings, and uses them to inform inclusive governance, recruitment and development.

Suggested statement for the school website

The governing board collects diversity information from members on a voluntary and confidential basis. The information is reviewed in aggregate to help the board understand how well its membership reflects the school and wider community, identify gaps in representation and lived experience, and inform recruitment, succession

planning and inclusive governance practices. Because the number of respondents is small, detailed data is not published where this could risk identifying individual members.

Review record

Date considered by governing board	
Actions agreed	
Lead / responsible person	
Review date	