

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Meeting | 01/05/12 The Stadium/Terraces, Sport England, London WC1B 4SE |
| Chair Person | Richard Lewis (RL) |
| Members | Nick Bitel (NB), Mike Farrar (MF) (observer), Sadie Mason (SM) (min nos. 4 - 7), Peter Rowley (PR), Mich Stevenson (MS), James Stewart (JS), Peter Stybelski (PS), Martin Thomas (MT) |
| Chief Executive | Jennie Price (JP) |
| Officers | Hannah Bladen (min no.5), Rona Chester (RC), Mike Diaper (MD), Louise Griew (min no.4), Charles Johnston (CJ), Simon Macqueen (Simon M) (min no.7), Lisa O'Keefe (LOK), Phil Smith (Phil S), |
| DCMS | Frances MacLeod (FM) (min nos. 4 - 7) |
| Others in Attendance | Jane Ashworth, Kerry McDonald, Matthew Rivitt, Norman Turner (StreetGames) |
| Secretariat | Michelle Vassall (MV) |

| | Item | Action |
|----|---|--------|
| 1. | <p>Welcome</p> <p>a. Apologies Apologies had been received from Jill Ainscough (JA), Clare Connor (CC), Tanya Joseph (TJ) and Hanif Malik (HM).</p> <p>RL informed the meeting that MF was attending the meeting as an observer pending written confirmation of the extension of his appointment to the Sport England Board from DCMS.</p> <p>b. Declarations of Interest RL updated the Board on his appointment as Chief Executive Officer of the All England Lawn Tennis Club, Wimbledon. He advised that the nature of the organisation meant that there was a reduced risk of potential conflicts of interest. RL also advised that his time commitment to Sport England would also reduce from up to two days per week to up to one day per week.</p> <p>MS declared his interest in the Marylebone Cricket Club and advised that he would update his declarations of interest accordingly. NB also declared his interest in item 5 (Proposed Changes to the London Pro-</p> | |

| | | |
|------------------|---|------------------|
| | <p>actives), in light of being a member of the London Community Sports Board. The Board noted that for the purpose of the meeting, this would not give rise to a conflict of interest.</p> <p>c. Minutes of the Previous Meetings The minutes of the Meetings on 20 March 2012 were APPROVED as a correct record. The Board also NOTED and APPROVED the amendment to the minutes dated 21 February 2012.</p> <p>d. Matters Arising</p> <p>The Board NOTED the Matters Arising from the Board Meeting held on 20 March 2012. There were no other matters arising from the minutes of that meeting.</p> | |
| | | |
| <p>2.</p> | <p>Chief Executive's Report</p> <p>JP presented her CEO Report, as circulated with the papers for the meeting. The following was highlighted, in particular:</p> <p><u>Get On Track 2012-13 Award</u> The Board's concerns and queries (as discussed at the Board Meeting on 20 March 2012) had been discussed in detail with the Dame Kelly Holmes Legacy Trust (DKHLT) and the DKHLT had since worked very positively with Sport England to re-profile its work programme. It was NOTED that, in accordance with the delegated authority given to JP at the previous Board Meeting, JP had approved on 2 April 2012 an initial Lottery award of £432,534 to the DKHLT for Get On Track to cover the period April 2012 to September 2012 and an in-principle Lottery award of £369,365 to cover the period October 2012 to March 2013 – the 'in-principle' award would be given final sign off once Sport England was satisfied that the DKHLT had sufficiently demonstrated their ability to upscale, make the right local connections and had delivered two further projects funded by Sport England alongside their existing Get On Track schedule. A written report would be provided to the Board in October 2012 confirming that the DKHLT had met the KPIs set. The DKHLT would also be invited to present at the Board Meeting on 20 November 2012.</p> <p><u>NGB 13-17 Update</u> JP reported on the progress of the NGB 13-17 funding. The current cumulative funding request across the portfolio was forecast to be £430m against a distributable budget of £387m - a substantial reduction from the £601m cumulative total in March 2012, as a result of the NGB team having managed down expectations. There were some concerns regarding the strength of a number of plans and the ability of some sports to deliver increased participation. In these instances, the sports concerned had been challenged with demonstrating how they will achieve improved results, particularly those sports whose programmes had previously failed to deliver increased participation. However, the talent elements of the plans were generally very strong.</p> <p>In response to a query from the Board, LOK confirmed that funding decisions would be based on the information available to Sport England regarding each NGB, plus an analysis of the market, which had formed the basis of benchmarking the figures required by each sport. In response to a further query, JP confirmed that the funding available had been ring-fenced specifically for the NGBs (£470m) and that bids for use of these funds would only be solicited from third parties in the event that an NGB</p> | <p>MD MD</p> |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>was unable to put forward a credible plan for increasing participation in it sport, or funds were removed from a sport at a later date on the grounds of poor performance.</p> <p><u>Sports Participation Measurement - update</u></p> <p>JP provided an update on the work being undertaken with DCMS to harmonise the Active People and Taking Part (TP) surveys. The Office of National Statistics would have oversight of the process, as one survey was a national statistic whilst the other was an official statistic and, therefore, an open consultation was required. This would take place over 90 days, commencing in May 2012 and as a result, the baseline for the NGB 13-17 funding decisions would be based on the existing Active People Survey (APS) data, which would be updated to include data for 14 and 15 year olds. In response to a query from the Board, RC advised that the data would be reviewed by a team of statisticians within the Research and Development and NGB teams and that an additional individual would be recruited with the requisite technical skills into the research team. Discussions followed regarding the correlation between the APS data and other data, such as that published by the Fitness Industry Association. It was noted that there was some correlation, but that direct comparisons were not possible as other surveys were measuring different types of activity or defining participation in a different way.</p> <p><u>Business Partnerships</u></p> <p>JP reported that she had nothing further to add to the information detailed in her report. However, she drew the Board’s attention to the success of the Parliamentary exhibition which had taken place in March 2012.</p> <p>The Board NOTED the Chief Executive’s report and the updates contained therein.</p> | |
| <p>3.</p> | <p>Chief Operating Officer’s Report</p> <p>RC presented her COO Report, as circulated with the papers for the meeting. The following was highlighted, in particular:</p> <p><u>Year End Financial Update</u></p> <p>RC gave an update on the progress of the preparation of the financial accounts for the 2012/13 financial year. Early drafts indicated that the exchequer budget had been underspent by £1.1m (compared to £3.3m reported previously). It was noted that a contribution of £6.5m had been made to the LPFA defined benefit pension scheme (£2.6m Exchequer; £3.9m Lottery). In addition, Sport England was close to meeting the Lottery administration target of 5% (two years earlier than required) and Lottery gross costs were 10.5% against a budget of 11.8%, which was a significant improvement, albeit greater than the target of 8%; RC advised of her intention to discuss this target with the DCMS. It was also noted that the cash balance was £2.3m, which was lower than in previous years.</p> <p>The Board NOTED that the assets of Caversham Lakes Trust Limited had been transferred to and consolidated into the 2011/12 financial accounts of The Sports Council Trust Company.</p> <p><u>Strategic Risk Register</u></p> <p>The strategic risk register had been tabled to the Audit, Risk and Governance Committee (ARGC) Meeting on 3 April 2012. This was currently being reviewed, so as to align with the Sport England strategy, and would then be re-presented to the</p> | |

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| | <p>ARGC and then Board for approval.</p> <p><u>Project Committee</u> MS provided the Board with an update on the discussions that had taken place at the Project Committee Meeting on 19 March 2012. In response to a query regarding the award to the Fitness Industry Association, it was noted that any future award would exceed the Project Committee's delegated authority limit of £2m and would, therefore, be re-presented to the Board for approval.</p> <p><u>Audit, Risk and Governance Committee</u> PR provided the Board with an update on the discussions that had taken place at the ARGC meeting on 3 April 2012. It was noted that a private meeting, attended by committee members and the internal and external audit teams had taken place before the meeting and that this would take place at least two times per year, going forward. No issues of concern had been raised at that meeting. PR advised that the internal audit plan remained a work in progress, although the plan for Q1 2012/13 had now been approved. PR reported that a long-standing member of the ARGC would retire in June 2012 and that he and RC were considering co-opting an additional member, so as to ensure the committee continued to have the right balance of knowledge and skills. JS reported that the ARGC had also discussed the risk to Sport England should Lottery funding cease or be reduced in future years.</p> <p>Following further discussions, it was noted that the DCMS were keen for Sport England to utilise its Lottery budget in full. However, there were concerns regarding the potential impact of the Health Lottery on the level of National Lottery income. JP suggested that the Board devise a clear strategy as to how to respond in the event that funding was reduced. It was NOTED that further discussions would take place at the Finance Committee meeting and an update would be provided to the Board following that meeting. In response to a query regarding the results of the internal audit on Board and committee effectiveness, it was noted that the findings of the audit were awaited and would be reported to the Board at a future meeting.</p> <p>The Board NOTED the Chief Operating Officers Report and the updates therein, together with the updates on the Project Committee and ARGC meetings.</p> | JS |
| 4. | <p>Merger with UK Sport</p> <p>Louise Griew attended the meeting for this item and JP presented an update on the progress of the proposed merger with UK Sport.</p> | |
| 5. | <p>Proposed Changes to the London Pro-Actives</p> <p>RL welcomed HB to her first Board Meeting.</p> <p>MD provided the Board with an update on the work being carried out with the five London Pro-Actives. In addition to the slides presented at the meeting, it was noted that discussions had taken place with the Greater London Authority (GLA) regarding how they and Sport England could work closer together to best utilise the funds invested by the GLA and Sport England to drive sports participation.</p> <p>It was noted that Sport England will invest £2.7m into the London Pro-Actives in the 2012/13 financial year, with the core funding of £1m split equally, in line with the</p> | |

| | | |
|------------------|---|---------------|
| | <p>national funding formula for CSPs, across the Pro-Actives irrespective of size. MD reported that the London Pro-Actives had, generally, a good relationship with the local authorities, and the School Games was an example of the work being done across London. However, he advised that there were a number of issues with the current structure, which were being addressed as part of this Transformation Project.</p> <p>A number of changes were being proposed and a London wide consultation, undertaken in partnership with the Mayor’s office and the five Pro-actives, had recently closed. A good number of responses had been received (approximately 100) and MD provided the Board with an overview of the proposed new structure and the consultation responses.</p> <p>It was noted that consideration was being given to providing transitional funding to assist with the creation of the new structure, which will include a strategic hub and any funding decisions relating to this would be tabled to the Project Committee. It was further noted that the approach, which was already being considered by some other CSPs, was likely to lead to back of house costs savings and that the model could be adopted in other parts of the country.</p> <p>The Board NOTED the update on the London Pro-Actives Transformation Programme and confirmed their support of the proposed changes and way ahead.</p> | |
| <p>6.</p> | <p>NGB and Sport – Door Step Clubs and StreetGames</p> <p>Simon M attended the meeting for this item, together with representatives from StreetGames, namely Norman Turner (Chair), Jane Ashworth (CEO), Kerry McDonald and Matthew Rivitt.</p> <p>Phil S provided the Board with an outline of the work undertaken by StreetGames and advised that Sport England was considering investing in StreetGames’ Doorstep Clubs initiative. It was noted that the Board were not required to make a decision at that meeting; however, a full funding submission would be presented for decision at the Board Meeting on 20 June 2012. The StreetGames representatives then provided an overview of the organisation and, in particular, the work being undertaken to develop the Doorstep Club initiative. In addition to the presentation slides which were shown at the meeting, the following was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the StreetGames charity was started using lottery funding, with the objective of increasing sports participation in disadvantaged areas, by working with bodies that were able to deliver sports at a local level. the Doorstep Clubs initiative was aligned to the Sport England strategy, in terms of its age remit, and focused on closing the gap between young people in poverty who had access to sport. market research had been a very useful way of identifying the needs of young people and the research conducted to date suggested that they wanted a sports club with a coach from the local area who was able to keep the sessions safe. Further research had been commission to look at the characteristics of adults in disadvantage areas who played sports and this would be used to inform the curriculum of the Doorstep Clubs. the Doorstep Clubs will incorporate elements of StreetGames’ other initiatives, such as training, volunteering, Us Girls and 2012 Inspired events. it was intended to create 1,000 new Doorstep Sports Clubs by the end 2017. | <p>Phil S</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <p>In response to a query from the Board regarding the development and characteristics of the Doorstep Sports Clubs, it was noted that each club was developed based on the requirements of the local community it served; it was also important to be able to host a club which could be used as a multi-sport and single sport club throughout the week. In response to a further question regarding the length of StreetGames' involvement in clubs, it was reported that StreetGames had regional managers who worked with the clubs, but that good project workers from existing Door Step Clubs were also identified who could 'buddy' with the project workers at the newer clubs.</p> <p>Following discussions, it was noted that the relationship with the NGBs was improving and for the target group concerned, it was recognised that a multisport offering was more attractive than a single sport offering from a governing body; local authorities also believed that the outreach method was a useful means of solving problems with youth engagement, including areas such as public health and it was, therefore, necessary to ensure that a good level of communication was maintained with the local authorities.</p> <p>Following further discussions regarding the number of Doorstep Sports Clubs that would be developed over the next five years and how it was intended to ensure that these were sustainable, it was noted that StreetGames' local partners were very keen on the initiative and there was considerable interest in Doorstep Sports Clubs generally. However, planning had been conducted on a short term basis only, due to the uncertainty regarding future funding; contingency planning would also be carried out for future years, although it was hoped that help would come from corporate organisations, which were being approached to provide support by "adopting a club".</p> <p>It was noted that the majority of Sport England's funding would be used for grassroots delivery, training of coaches and facility hire (particularly in winter). Following further discussion, Phil S confirmed to the Board that StreetGames had received funding as a National Partner and for their women themed initiative, but had not received any funding thus far for the Doorstep Clubs initiative. [POST MEETING NOTE: Board Members are invited to contact Simon Macqueen, should they wish to attend a StreetGames session].</p> <p>The Board THANKED StreetGames for their presentation and commended them on their success of achieving increased participation amongst hard to reach groups.</p> | |
| 7. | <p>Any Other Business</p> <p><u>School Games</u> RL reminded Board Members wishing to attend the School Games to respond as soon as possible.</p> | |
| | <p>The Meeting finished at 14.27pm</p> | |