

SPORT ENGLAND BOARD - MINUTES

25 April 2018

Sport England, Rooms 11-13, Lower Ground Floor, 21 Bloomsbury Street, London, WC1B 3HF

Chairman: Nick Bitel

Members: Debbie Jevans (DJ)
Denise Barrett-Baxendale (DBB)
Ian Cumming (IC)
Wasim Khan (WK)
Andy Long (AL)
Karen Pickering (KP)
Charles Reed (CR)

Attendees: Jennie Price (JP)
Mike Diaper (MD)
Charles Johnston (CJ)
Lisa O'Keefe (LOK)
Chris Perks (CP)
Nick Pontefract (NP)
Phil Smith (PS)
Andrew Honeyman (AH)
Kate Dale (KD) (Item 2)
Simon Macqueen (SMac) (Items 2 & 3)
Dave Newton (DN) (Items 2-4)
Serena Jacobs (SJ) (Items 3 & 4)
Jon Fox (JF) (Item 6)
Caroline Fraser (CF) (Item 7)
Stuart Armstrong (SA) (Item 7)
Lizzie Hughes (LH) (Item 8)
Sarah Ruane (SR) (Item 9)

Secretariat: Tanya van Niekerk (TvN)

WELCOME

1. Apologies were received from Sport England Board members Chris Grant and Kate Bosomworth. Chris Grant had provided commentary to the Chairman on the items of business; the Chairman would relay these comments as appropriate during the course of the meeting. Board members, IC and AL would be arriving late and Board member CR would need to step out of the meeting for a short time at 11:00am. AH would need to leave the meeting early.

2. There were no declarations of interest.
3. The minutes of the Board meeting held on 28 March 2018 were **APPROVED** as a correct record.
4. The Board **NOTED** the Matters Arising from the Board meeting on 28 March 2018 and earlier meetings, all of which had been completed, carried forward or dealt with elsewhere on the Board's agenda.

CEO REPORT

5. JP introduced the report.

Update on Sport England's Diversity Work

6. JP summarised the equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) activities undertaken over the last few months and described Sport England's overall aspiration that in both its external and internal EDI work, the organisation should seek to be representative of the English population and where appropriate, the relevant city or region. A new approach to overseeing this work internally was proposed, with specific Board sponsorship; a new cross-organisational group, chaired by JP and attended by the Chairman; a refreshed internally focussed Equality Group, chaired by NP and attended by a member of the Workforce Committee.
7. The Board discussed the proposed principles for this area of work. Members welcomed the Chairman continuing to take the lead on Board sponsorship of this important work. DJ would discuss with the Workforce Committee who they felt was best placed to take up the Board position on the refreshed Equality Group. It was suggested that Sport England should look at the ways in which other organisations contribute to and oversee EDI work and draw on best practice.
8. JP said that one of the functions of the overarching group would be to look at EDI in every programme of work Sport England was delivering to ensure relevant aspects were delivering in line with both Sport England and 'Sporting Future' EDI objectives.
9. The Board **APPROVED** the overall aspiration for Sport England's work on equality, diversity and inclusion as outlined in the paper, and **NOTED** the remainder of the report.

KD joined the meeting.

This Girl Can Quarterly Update

10. JP introduced the report, highlighting the significant importance of the commercial strategy to the long-term sustainability of the This Girl Can (TGC) brand.

11. DN provided the Board with an update on implementation of the commercial strategy, which consisted of three pillars - media, brand and merchandising. Sport England was working closely with Y Sport to ensure it could demonstrate significant progress by the time Sport England submitted the request for an amendment to the Section 27 permission to DCMS in May.
12. A number of meetings had taken place with agencies associated with potential commercial partners. Potential partners had been selected because of the alignment of their brands with the ambitions of the TGC brand and the opportunity they provided to reach Sport England's target audience. The creative would be refreshed to give it an even broader appeal, with the aim of reaching more of the younger and LSEG groups within the TGC audience. Consideration was being given to partnering with a youth brand(s) to complement the family of brands and help drive reach to the younger demographic.
13. The Board asked what success might look like for a commercial partnership. DN said that a successful partnership would be with a brand that could amplify TGC's message and reach those groups that Sport England was not able to reach itself. This wasn't solely about financial contribution, but encompassed other assets/contributions, for example a brand's reach into key areas of the workforce; advertising campaigns that aligned with TGC's brand values. It was about getting the right partners for the long term to engage with TGC's target audiences and maximise engagement. It was suggested that looking at opportunities to partner with online catalogues could be an interesting area to explore.
14. KD outlined recent campaign activity, which had focused on International Women's Day, an interview on Radio 4 Women's Hour, a partnership with Sport Relief and a collaboration with the Nursing Times. She also shared the timeline and approach to the Section 27 amendment application.
15. The Board **NOTED** the update.

KD left the meeting.

Transfer of Exchequer Funds to Ecorys

16. MD presented the item.
17. 'Sporting Future' mandates Sport England to on-going support of the School Games. The £11 million exchequer funding comes from both the DCMS and the DHSC and is ring-fenced to fund the network of School Games Organisers. The proposed grant was the mechanism by which Sport England transferred funds to the outsourced grant agent (Ecorys) for onward payment of the 450 individual grants.
18. In early 2017, a procurement process was undertaken via a Sport England framework and as a result of which Ecorys was reappointed as the grant agent for the SGO programme through to the end of the period of confirmed SGO funding (August 2020). Performance of the SGO network continued to be strong, with SGOs providing competition opportunities for almost 2.2 million school children in the previous academic year, and similar levels of

opportunity expected in the current academic year. MD described the safeguards that were in place to protect the sizable funds transferred to Ecorys.

19. The Board **APPROVED** to transfer the exchequer grant funds to Ecorys for the 2018/19 payments to the SGO hosts, which totalled £10,710,000.

Strategy Summary

20. JP introduced the report, highlighting some of the key areas of activity since the previous report to the Board in March.
21. Sport England had solicited the charity Mencap to help engage and increase activity levels with the 1.2 million people in England who have learning disabilities, and were helping Mencap to develop its capacity for data capture for evaluation purposes.
22. Following the launch of the Safeguarding Code for Martial Arts in March, 70 organisations had currently made a pledge to comply with the Code.
23. Data collection of the Active Lives Children and Young People Survey continued to progress, with over 1,400 schools responding to the Survey and over 72,000 questionnaires completed by children, young people and parents. The Board asked if Sport England officers had received any feedback from schools in respect of any concerns they might have in relation to the new General Data Protection Regulations, specifically, how schools capture the parental consent required for under-13's to complete the survey. Officers had ensured the Regulations informed the methodology of the survey and whilst no concerns had been raised to date, officers would continue to make it clear to schools that full account had been taken of the Regulations.
24. The Board noted that there were reported capacity and capability issues within the County Sports Partnerships (CSPs) and National Governing Bodies (NGBs) which were impacting on Clubmark delivery. Further analysis was being undertaken of the impacts of this, including any potential risks and solutions. An update would be provided at the next Board meeting.
25. JP updated the Board on progress towards opening up opportunity data which remained challenging, with required action from activity providers taking longer than expected. There were a number of large operators/groups that collected a significant volume of data and managed services for a lot of operators ('data aggregators'). The Board reflected on the importance of open data to achieving the stated outcomes of the Sport England and Sporting Future strategies and discussed what the best approach might be to induce the desired behaviors across the sports sector i.e. how best to drive engagement and take-up from activity providers and data aggregators.
26. The Board reflected on the performance of the England team at the recent Commonwealth Games, including the Gold medal won by the England Women's Netball team which represented a major achievement for Sport England's talent and elite funding. The Chairman paid tribute to CJ for the support he had provided to the England team throughout the Games. It was noted that Team England had performed less well than hoped in some areas, and that a number of factors could have contributed to this, including

the challenge for athletes about when in the sporting competition cycle they aimed to peak, and whether NGBs picked their best team for the Games, or if they were focused on other world events. This raised some questions for Sport England about how NGBs prioritised the Games that would need to be addressed when assessing investment for the 2022 Games. PS said that a thorough review by Commonwealth Games England of England's performance on and off the field was underway, and would also examine the administrative error made by the support team that had led to a female English cyclist not being able to compete.

27. Discussions were ongoing with British Cycling and Swim England following disappointing participation results for these sports in the recent Active Lives Survey. A report would be provided at the next Board meeting.
28. A full review of the Leisure Contracts and Procurement Toolkit was underway with consultation workshops held with a range of organisations across the sector. There was a significantly greater emphasis on helping Local Authorities (LAs) to develop service delivery which was outcome focused and delivered against local strategic outcomes.
29. Work continued with The Football Association and Premier League on the implementation of the shared priorities of the National Football Facilities Strategy. Sport England continued to emphasise the importance of getting the provision right, ensuring it was run in a way that was generally attractive and inclusive, and helped reach the LSEG demographic. CJ outlined the likely timetable for delivering the programme.
30. JP said that this would be the last time the report was presented in this format. From June 2018 onwards, the report would reflect both impact and actions and would be organised by Sport England's priorities and tactics rather than by individual investment programmes. This approach was outlined further within the COO report section of the agenda.
31. The Board **NOTED** the contents of the report.

SJ joined the meeting. IC arrived. CR stepped out of the meeting.

COO REPORT

Delivery of the Strategy

32. NP presented the item.
33. Officers had been reflecting on how best to scope the priorities and tactics work quickly, and in a coordinated way. There were two elements to this: structures and structural changes in how Sport England does business, and the behaviours in the organisation and how we approach this in our teams.
34. The structural element focused on coordination. An Executive Director had been allocated to each of the cross-directorate teams and more detailed scoping of tactics would now take place. The approach to this work would be key as it needed to be done without overloading the organisation or becoming too bureaucratic in nature.

35. The second area of work was focused on how to support the organisation to move to a culture of working in a more flexible, cooperative way. This included for example, looking at the level at which decisions are made in the organisation to inject a bit more pace into decision making, supporting flexible working, and how to make it easier for teams to work collaboratively.
36. Going forward, the reporting to the Board would report against priorities and tactics, addressing key issues such as those described above. More information on this approach would be provided at the next Board meeting.
37. A number of Board members reflected on their learning from working in organisations which had adopted matrix working and some of the challenges this had presented. Giving teams the opportunity to set out their own structures and ways of working from the start, allowing them to bring suggestions about contributions at a team level and take collective responsibility for success and failure, were all felt to be essential.

2017-18 Management Accounts

38. SJ presented the accounts.
39. The report provided the Board with an overview of the Management Accounts for the full year ended March 2018 and would become the figures in the Annual Report and Accounts (subject to final lottery income adjustments, and the valuation of the National Sports Centres and the defined benefit pension scheme).
40. SJ explained that, applying the recently agreed methodology (which uses a three-year rolling average for income and excludes irrecoverable VAT) the target for non-grant costs would have been achieved for 2017-18 (7.4% against a maximum of 8%). However, the revised methodology would only come into effect from the 2018-19 accounting period. The Audit Committee had discussed this performance against the income targets, noting that Sport England's rate of spending had stayed relatively stable since 2016-17. The 15% reduction in Lottery income from 2015-16 was the main contributor to exceeding the 8% cost target in 17-18 under the current methodology, and the Board noted that actual costs had reduced from 2015-16 to 2016-17 by 5% and had remained stable in 2017/18.

SMac left the meeting. CR re-joined the meeting.

DRAFT 2017-18 ANNUAL REPORT

41. JP introduced the item.
42. DN provided feedback on the Audit Committee's consideration of the Annual Report at its April meeting, and reflected on the excellent job Zjan Shirinian, Head of Editorial Content, had done to draw together the narrative.
43. The Board was invited to provide feedback on the style and content of Report, and discussed each section turn.

44. The Board noted that the Strategic Priorities would be updated to include a summary of the key activities in 2017-18 (as per FReM requirements). The Board agreed that the ‘customer focus’ needed to be better emphasized in section 2 of the priorities. The Report needed to better reflect the impact and influence of Sport England in the sports sector (i.e. inclusion of a clear statement about the difference Sport England is making); this could either be included in this section or the opening statements.
45. The Board discussed the Financial Overview and agreed that further market and strategic context was needed to better describe the decline in Lottery income, how challenging it was to predict this, and what this meant for Sport England in terms of the impact to financial forecasting and planning. Although Lottery income over the past two years had been consistent, there was now a lower Lottery income base (as a result of decline in previous years) and this should be made clearer.
46. The Board discussed the main narrative. Member considered the ‘accessibility’ of some of the language used in the Report, which was very sector-specific. The language needed to be comprehensible to a non-sporting audience, thereby reflecting Sport England’s strategy of engaging with a much broader audience and working with new organisations outside of the sports sector.
47. The Board noted that the majority of quotes contained in the Report were generated by Sport England; it would be helpful to include quotes from third parties, for example the Office of National Statistics endorsement of Active Lives.
48. The Board felt that the description of the work done on the Workforce Strategy did not fully reflect the breadth of work in this area, and as a point of accuracy, the correct terminology was ‘Paid’ workforce.
49. The Board discussed the Accountability Report, agreeing that some explanatory text was needed to describe what was meant by ‘assets gifted to subsidiaries’.
50. JP noted that there were a few minor corrections to be made to the staff section of the Remuneration and Staff Report, including explaining where there were dashes for Board members this was because they chose to forgo the day rate payment.
51. The Board reviewed the Governance Statement, in particular the section setting out the work the Board had focused on over the year and the risk areas.
52. The Board noted the Senior Information Risk Officer (SIRO) Report, a supplementary document which provided the SIRO’s annual assessment of information risk performance to the Accounting Officer.
53. The Board reviewed the Related Party information, noting an inaccuracy for the disclosure in relation to one Board member, and a need to check the consistency of reporting across the two accounts (Lottery and Grant-in-Aid accounts). The information would be updated and circulated offline to Board members.

SJ and DN left the meeting. AL arrived.

LOCAL DELIVERY

54. CP presented the item, reminding the Board that the Local Delivery Pilots (LDPs) are based on the principle that Sport England's current and future customers are part of communities across England, each with their own unique structure, relationships and geography. The pilots were working through the key steps towards system change including building a shared vision amongst other leaders locally and an understanding of what needs to be achieved, and engaging with communities in the right way, with Sport England seeing some quite different approaches which were challenging our views about what good community engagement looks like.
55. Significant interest had been shown in the test and learn approach ('start somewhere, follow anywhere and learn fast') and Sport England was looking to learn quickly on things that worked well. A key building block of system change was putting communities at the heart of the thinking. The Board discussed the importance of spending time alongside the communities, having honest face-to-face conversations about the challenges and opportunities at the very local level ('shoe leather and trust building').
56. The Board recognised that the pilots were moving at different speeds and in different ways. CP gave some examples of the range of progress across the portfolio, some of the varying challenges the pilots faced, and how Sport England was responding to those challenges. As a direct result of relationships forming, opportunities were arising with discussions on some small capital investment in Active Travel in Greater Manchester being just one example of where a pilot could start to deliver results quickly. If this resulted in an increase in activity levels, Sport England would look to see how this could be replicated and scaled up rapidly across more than just the LDP programme (i.e. across other relevant projects and programmes).
57. The Board was reassured that every pilot was very engaged, and was doing what was being asked of them by Sport England at the right pace and with the right level of seniority engaged. It was anticipated that communities in some of the pilot places would start to see some change on the ground over the next 6-9 months. Further detail about the pace of delivery and when the Board could expect to start to see system change beginning and impacting on delivery was requested, and should be included in future reports to the Board. Reporting would also cover how much of the LDP budget had been spent, and where possible, what impact it was anticipated to have in the current strategy cycle (noting that it would not be possible to provide this level of detail at the outset for the full budget given the varied stages which the pilots were at).
58. The Board reflected on some of the significant early learning, including Sport England being able to change the dialogue with some of the NGBs who were interested in understanding the opportunities for them.
59. There were some interesting examples of local engagement. In Calderdale, a daily journey with a local mum with a double-buggy had been tracked, to test practical aspects like whether she could get onto and off pavements with the buggy. Interestingly, this had

surfaced other barriers (for example taking a longer route to avoid an area she did not feel comfortable walking through) which illustrated the importance of this type of testing. The Board agreed that Sport England should encourage every pilot to consider what their version of this type of local insight was.

60. A concern was expressed about the lack of diversity on the leadership and steering groups for the Hackney pilot. The Board was reassured that Sport England was monitoring diversity of the groups leading the pilots (across the whole LDP portfolio) to ensure they were representative of their local communities, however, CP would check on the specific concern raised regarding the makeup of the Hackney groups.

Secretary's Note: Following the concern raised about the potential lack of diversity on the steering groups for the Hackney pilot Chris Perks, Executive Director Local Delivery, attended the Hackney steering group workshop in July. A positive range of partners and community interests were actively engaged throughout. The workshop identified some excellent key principles that further support the diversity of community engagement as the pilot develops. The concern therefore was investigated and found categorically not to be the case.

61. The Board recognised the scale of the task of servicing these high level and complex relationships. Each pilot would have an Executive Director sponsor and the Board agreed to the proposal that each pilot should also have a dedicated Board 'champion'. A proposal had been prepared which, as far as was practicable, mapped members to a pilot place nearest to their locality. The list of proposed places for members to 'adopt' would be circulated in due course.
62. The Board reflected on the communication strategy and approach, suggesting that Sport England officers consider engaging with Faith and Community group audiences to find out what worked in their own parts of the pilot areas (i.e. at a hyper-local level). It was also important to engage with local MPs in each place. Demand for community support from within communities was increasing and engaging with large sports organisations in the communities, for example football clubs, may result in some interesting opportunities.
63. The Board highlighted the importance of working collaboratively across the organisation. Sport England would need to ensure the cross-departmental approach was fully embedded and integrated. The Beat the Street investment proposal (which featured later on the agenda) was an example of where Sport England should be cross-referencing investment proposals and identifying opportunities to build some of these investments into pilot places.
64. AH said that there was significant interest in government about the programme, for example how it could help to deliver the objectives of the Office for Civil Society. Sport England would continue to make these links and engage with these departments.
65. In response to a question from the Board, CP said that a whole 'community of learning' was growing, with Sport England maintaining active discussion with the non-successful

applicants (to the pilot programme) from the short list as well as being in touch with some of those who hadn't made the short list.

66. The Board **NOTED** the nature and pace of progress being made and **DISCUSSED** the early challenges emerging.

AH left the meeting. JF joined the meeting.

SMALL GRANTS FUND

67. CP introduced the item. Sport England's small grants programme was launched in 2009, and had awarded over £50 million of lottery and exchequer funding to more than 7000 organisations in grants of £10,000 or less since then. The paper set out proposals to improve the alignment between small grants and Sport England's strategic priorities. There was a significant opportunity to refresh and reposition the role that small awards can play in supporting communities to lead action delivering on Sport England's strategy and priorities.
68. JF described the customer-focused delivery model, set out in Appendix 1 of the paper, which suggested how partnership, capacity building and marketing could be flexibly deployed within a core approach. Given the potential impact of the new approach, Sport England officers would deliver the first set of improvements by the end of May. The changes were significant and it was therefore proposed that a continued and intensive period of further development, testing and improvement take place over the next 12 months.
69. The Board broadly welcomed the proposals. They discussed the potential risk that the delivery model could stimulate new demand that may result in lower success rates for applications for small grants funding. Whilst this would be mitigated by the proposed increase in budget, and more upfront messages on priorities, Sport England would also need to work proactively with key sectors likely to be affected. Officers would closely monitor and report on the types of investment and the types of audiences reached through those investments, thus ensuring a diverse small grants portfolio. Members considered the impact for some sports and types of projects that had benefited significantly from the current programme and the importance of ensuring a balanced portfolio of investment across a range of partners/projects going forward.
70. The Board discussed the proposed changes to the fund criteria/eligibility. Members considered whether £300 as the bottom of the funding threshold might be too low. It was noted that Sport England received relatively few applications at this lower end. Furthermore, recent experience of inviting applications for Tackling Inactivity and Economic Disadvantage funding had provided helpful learning which had informed the approach outlined in the paper, including the significant difference to projects that awards of £1,000 or less could make. Officers would need to closely monitor awards at this end of the scale to ensure the cost of managing the grants did not outweigh the value of the grants themselves.

71. The Board discussed the proposal to remove the £50,000 total project costs limit, the rationale being that while less than a 20% contribution to a project would be a rare occurrence, projects should be commended rather than penalised for having a diverse funding portfolio. Members considered to what extent financial need was shown where Sport England's contribution to the cost of a project may be less than 5% of the total costs (for example), and whether this represented a good return on investment. Members were reassured that contributions at this level were important, as even a small funding contribution could make a big difference to wider fundraising by creating confidence in the project, and could mean the difference between whether a project went ahead or not.
72. The Board reflected on the change to the criteria pertaining to 'items for individual benefit'. Members supported the change to allow for reasonable expenditure on personal items, but agreed that the use of funds in this way would need to be closely monitored.
73. The Board reviewed the proposed approach to the Small Grants Fund (including immediate improvements) and **APPROVED** the allocation of an annual budget of £5 million to small grants for 2018-21.

The Board **AGREED** that Sport England officers would need to closely monitor the impact of the changes to the award criteria, in particular the criteria relating to less than a 20% contribution to a project; and items for individual benefit. Officers would also need to closely monitor awards at the lower end of the scale to ensure the cost of managing these grants did not outweigh the value of the grants themselves.

JF left the meeting. CF & SA joined the meeting.

WORKFORCE STRATEGY

74. CF introduced the item, setting out the background to the development of the Professional Workforce Strategy, which had been drafted following wide-ranging consultation and engagement with stakeholders. The consultation had helped to shape the strategy by providing a focus on the key strategic approaches and tactics required. CF described the vision of the strategy; its two main objectives, to develop a more customer focussed workforce and for the workforce to be recognised as a profession; and the approach to how these objectives would be achieved. The TGC Swim Pilot was an example of how the strategy would work in practice, as the role of the workforce had been central to its success.
75. The Board was invited to consider the strategic approach relating to diversity and inclusion (in terms of the tactics and the ambition), noting that there was a need to gather a more in depth understanding of the issues and challenges that hinder specific groups from entering the professional workforce.
76. The Board discussed the definition of success for building a diverse and inclusive working environment, with the strategy aiming to have 'established aspirations' for improving gender, BAME, Disability and LGBT representation in the workforce by 2020, and the proposed tactics for achieving that ambition. The sports sector's workforce was significantly behind the national workforce in this area and Sport England had an important

role to play in helping to address this imbalance. The Board agreed that the organisation should be seeking to drive change sooner through this strategy, and that establishing an ‘aspiration’ was not challenging enough. Furthermore, members were unclear how the tactics would achieve the stated ambition.

77. The Board agreed that if the aim of becoming ‘the sector with the most diverse leadership’ was to be achieved by 2025, more emphasis was needed on the practical things that the sector should be doing by 2019 (for example blind recruitment) to start to drive the required change, as well as setting out further concrete steps through the timeline to 2025. The strategy rightly talked about being customer focused (‘best possible experiences’), however, the Board was interested to know what the measure(s) was that would indicate whether this had changed as a result of the stated tactics.
78. The Board considered Sport England’s role in stimulating the education market and whether the organisation should be working to define specific apprenticeships in the future. CF said that a lot of work was being done to understand and respond to opportunities in growing apprenticeships, however, this was a challenging area for all sectors. Sport England was already engaging with Universities through its partnership with the Chartered Institute for the Management of Sport and Physical Activity. Engagement with the education market was also being addressed through Sport England’s Children & Young People work, for example through the Secondary Teachers Training Programme and working with training schools and Universities that train teachers to ensure the curriculums are underpinned by our research. Training in good governance practices, including issues of safeguarding, also featured. The Board felt that this area of work could be further emphasised in the strategy document.
79. The Board discussed the changing workforce, specifically how the younger workforce value and want far greater flexibility in their working patterns, for example, career breaks and different ways of working with the ability to prioritise family, noting that the impact of this change was already being seen in the Health Sector. Members were reassured that the strategy took account of this. Sport England had been looking at organisations like Google to better understand how they attract millennials and how they are adapting their employment practices in response.
80. The Board agreed that the strategy document would benefit from a ‘sharpening’ of some of the language used to better reflect the more aspirational definition of success as discussed above. The document could also be worded to better highlight the bold and innovative approach being proposed. Furthermore, the audience for the strategy was a broad range of people employed in sport and physical activity, including for example sports physiotherapists and teachers teaching physical exercise, and the strategy document should reflect this.
81. There was some reflection on the importance of engaging directly with communities. As was the case with the Local Pilots programme, hearing directly from local people was vital and would form a central part of the development of a clear and coherent picture of the sport and physical activity workforce.

82. This was a significant and ambitious piece of work which was seeking to drive sector-wide change and the Board recognised the significant amount of work that had gone into developing the strategy. The Board was supportive of the vision and approach, however, members agreed that Sport England officers should reframe the proposal, taking the ideas and comments raised by the Board and relating them to aspirations and targets, and setting some measures and outcomes that would contribute further to the customer focus.
83. The Professional Workforce Strategy would be updated to take account of this feedback and would be brought back to the Board for approval in due course.

CF & SA left the meeting.

LEGACY CAPITAL FUNDING

84. CJ presented the item.
85. The Government has granted in-principle £25 million of capital exchequer funding to support the delivery of a grassroots facility legacy associated with hosting two major sporting events. The funding benefiting the Rugby Football League Ltd (RFL) and the British Cycling Federation (BC) will be routed through Sport England and is therefore subject to due process. CJ updated the Board on the progress of negotiations between the relevant bodies and outlined the proposal to adopt a partnership approach to delivery. The proposal had been discussed by the Sport England Investment Committee (10 April), who were supportive.
86. The Board reflected on the various challenges with respect to the RFL's governance structures from a legacy perspective. Members were reassured that this had been taken into consideration, with the principle of effective and appropriate governance structures to support joint decision-making having been a key focus of the negotiations.
87. The Board asked for further clarification in relation to accountability for the management of the funds, giving the example if the RFL or BC made a small grant award of circa. £10,000 and there was fraud involved, who would be accountable? It was explained that the RFL and BC had similar processes to Sport England for managing and monitoring grants. Sport England would require both organisations to adhere to the control mechanisms, to monitor all grants and to report back to Sport England.
88. The Board noted that BC and RFL were being encouraged to take a broad approach to engaging with delivery partners outside of their usual sphere of engagement.
89. The Board **ENDORSED** the recommendations agreed by Investment Committee to:
 - **APPROVE** a recommendation that a Partnership Agreement should be executed between DCMS, SE, RFL Ltd and RLWC 2021 Ltd for the delivery of the Rugby League World Cup 2021 Facilities Legacy Programme based on a joint delivery model.

- **APPROVE** a recommendation that a Partnership Agreement should be executed between DCMS, SE and British Cycling for the delivery of the British Cycling World Road Cycling Championships 2019 Facilities Legacy Programme based on a joint delivery model.
- **APPROVE** a recommendation that decision-making for the subsequent Exchequer Funding Agreements in accordance with the Partnership Agreements should be delegated to the Sport England Investment Committee.

SR joined the meeting.

INTELLIGENT HEALTH – BEAT THE STREET PROGRAMME

90. MD presented the item.
91. Beat the Street (BTS) is an innovative mass participation physical activity intervention, delivered by Intelligent Health (IH), which empowers communities to increase their activity levels and improve health through an incentivised community game. Using smartcard and online technology, residents record their distance walked or cycled by tapping their BTS cards on 'Beat Boxes' installed in streets and parks where people live. Board support was being sought to solicit an application from IH that would deliver the roll out of BTS over a three-year period engaging 655,000 participants overall (327,000 adults) focussed on the groups where we have specific engagement targets – adult women and participants from the most deprived areas in the country.
92. The Board noted IH was a private limited company but was eligible to receive lottery grant, and had a separate account through which they managed the Sport England pilot transactions. IH would need to continue to work on a not for profit basis and without taking a management fee. This would be further tested during the application process. IH would need to do some work to comply with the Code for Sports Governance. Sport England would work with them on this during the application process, including a focus on their future business plan as long-term sustainability was currently dependent on securing external funding, including commercial support. The Board noted the range of potential partnership opportunities, including commercial and health and wellbeing partnerships.
93. The Board considered the participant breakdown and whether the lift of 7% of adult participants in the programme into activity was a good enough result for the investment. MD said that the figures had been drawn from the pilot, which was at a small scale. Sport England would encourage IH to be ambitious, but it was recognised that there were challenges to engaging these target audiences. Sport England had undertaken some benchmarking which considered this percentage a good result. It was important to note that the programme was about overall impact and the lift of 17% of children into activity was highlighted. It was confirmed that Sport England would interrogate the cost per-outcome with IH as part of the solicitation process.
94. The Board considered the long-term sustainability of the programme and how it would fund itself going forward. Sustainability beyond Sport England funding would be focused

on Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) as the programme would be very attractive to CCGs (and Local Authorities) if it could prove, at scale, that in an area with appropriate support the programme could raise activity levels.

95. The Board **APPROVED** the solicitation of Intelligent Health to deliver the 'Beat the Street' programme, totalling £3.322 million from 2018-2021, contributing to a total of £5.822 million project costs, subject to Intelligent Health addressing the issues relating to compliance with the Code for Sports Governance and continuing to work on a not for profit basis and without taking a management fee. The Board **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** to the Investment Committee, for the approval of the award following receipt of application and Sport England officer assessment and peer review.

SR left the meeting.

MINUTES FROM COMMITTEE AND SUBSIDIARY COMPANY MEETINGS

96. The Board **NOTED** the minutes from the Committee and Subsidiary Company meetings.

AOB

97. The Chairman updated the Board on the progress of the Board member recruitment. It was anticipated that DCMS would be in a position to announce the appointment of three new Board members – Sue James, Natalie Ceeney and Mohamed Elsarky - in due course. Appointment dates would be somewhat staggered, with all three Board members serving an initial three-year term. The Board noted that it was anticipated that Sue James would serve on the Workforce Committee (of which she was already a co-opted member), Natalie Ceeney on the Investment Committee, and Mohamed Elsarky on the Audit, Risk and Governance Committee.

The meeting closed at 2.20pm

PRIVATE SESSION

98. A private session for the Board members and CEO was held.