



Merseyside Sports Partnership Board

MEETING DATE / HOST VENUE	Friday 21 st February 2014 – Merseyside Sports Partnership Office, Unit 1 Dakota Business Park, Skyhawk Avenue, Liverpool L19 2QR
NOTE TAKER	Jo Schumann
ATTENDEES	Jean Stephens (Merseyside Sports Partnership); Stephen Tiffany (Chair); Brian Boyle (Representing Local Sports Forum); David Boocock (representing Local Authority Heads of Sport); Suzanne Ramsey (representing Merseyside SGO's); John Bell (Vice Chair); Dave Southern (representing NGB's);
APOLOGIES	Pam Jervis (FE advisor); Leah Singleton (representing NGB's); Gerry Kinsella (Social Enterprises); Julie Tierney (representing Primary Care Trust); Pauline Manning (Voluntary Sport Network);
DISTRIBUTION	Sue Drew (Primary Care Trust); Ben Williams (SE Regional Strategic Lead); www.merseysidesport.com , Core Team Development Managers & Senior Officers

AGENDA ITEM 1

TITLE: WELCOME, APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME / ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
1. ST welcomed everyone and gave apologies for those who had sent them.			

AGENDA ITEM 2

TITLE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME / ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
1. Forms still outstanding for LS, GK, DS and JT			

AGENDA ITEM 3

TITLE: MATTERS ARISING / ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME / ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>1. Customer Satisfaction Results and Recommendations – KS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same format and questions as usual, 5th survey and have pulled out local results, 66 Responses this year, targeted 94 local partners 74% response rate which is excellent. • 46% response rate from regional & national partners. • Highest number of responders were from school sport; this is due to being more targeted. • Quality of responses was a lot better, best results since we have been doing it. • DB – would be good to see the 5 years results all together • Usefulness of CSP website has come down so needs looking at. JS frustrating as a lot of effort went into the relaunch of the site and the working group looked at it said it had improved. • DB – Is the problem with the navigation or the content. Those who have added their name will be contacted. • DB – figure for supporting the L2 event is low. JS this question was challenged but some CSPs who are small do support L2 events although it isn't an SE requirement. • SR – they do need support because of the increase in numbers eg. They had 17 schools come forward for hockey when they had 5 last year. • DB – Concerned about the club figure as he anticipates this won't be picked up by anyone but the NGBs in the future. JS CSPs were never set up to directly work with clubs, they are to help and support with clubs wanting to achieve Club Mark etc. ST maybe this is an opportunity for us to work in this area. JS we can help with Awards for All bids etc. • KS – Still lots of anonymous comments which are difficult as those comments can't be addressed. If there are names it can be resolved as was done with Keith Hackett. DB don't get hung up on comments with no names just take it on board. KS we do but it is better if we can address any negatives. • JB – figures are low for NGB, KS this is because there are less local officers now. Most of them will be regional/national responses which are not included in this document. JS we have had better NGB responses in the past but it was decided by CSPn to target differently as some NGBs were being asked 49 times. • SR – Private coaching companies is on list with 0% nobody knows who they are or works with them. KS they are everywhere, they even applied for Sportivate funding. JS again, that is a national question and some CSPs do work with them. They are simplifying coach web to make it easier to get people to sign up, this will help towards ensuring minimum standards. BB the process is very complicated, and you have to be aware you can be seen as endorsing the company. The important thing is a big 	<p>COMPARISON</p> <p>FOLLOW UP WITH MSIDE GROUP</p>	<p>KS</p> <p>SR</p>	<p>23RD MAY</p> <p>23RD MAY</p>

<p>campaign to promote minimum standards. JB the best process is to have the minimum standards and invite people to endorse themselves as following them. ST ultimately the responsibility still lies with the school.</p> <p>ST What he is seeing is a high level of customer satisfaction. Don't get hung up on negative comments, you can't please everyone or address every negative comment.</p> <p>2. School Games / Dash Board update KS there isn't anything to update at this time. Bev Whiteside is working closely with MSP and is helping with trying to extract the L1 & L2 data. However, the dashboard is not working correctly. SR They updated the dashboard and deleted some data and now schools are reluctant to re-enter the data.</p> <p>3. MP Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPs have been invited to the School Games on the 21st March. There is a list of invitees and responses so far at the back of the papers. The presentation will be 30-40 minutes maximum so case studies need to be short and sharp. DB what came out of the Cultural Forum group is they would like to see the case studies by the 1st March to be able to review them and be knowledgeable about them. JS we can take some case studies from last year's annual report but we do need to make sure there is a mix of health, schools, volunteers, make sure the positives are high-lighted and the 'so what' is prioritised. DB Sammy Scotland who spoke at last year's games was great and if you could get more young people like that. ST 1st March is only 1 week tomorrow, is this achievable? JS yes, Gladys Street School would be a great example to use. <p>ACTION: JS will identify where there are gaps and get back to people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DB/SR has concerns about who is accompanying the Mayor/Mayress. There will be a nominated person, probably the SGO. We can add a column to identify who is the escort. JS this is just the start of engaging with MPs, Luciana Berger for example wants to do a personal sport related challenge. SR There is an SGO regional meeting on the 18th March which could be used to do a briefing on the role of the escort on the day. JS or perhaps a paper prior to the event. <p>4. Sport England on site audit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JS following last meeting there were 2 recommendations, 1 exit strategy and 2 rolling strategy. JS fed back thoughts to Head of Governance at SE, they are reviewing their offer letter to make it clear who the money belongs to should things go wrong. Regarding rolling strategy, think its terminology they are getting confused with. It's more a business plan, so you are never without a plan. JS is waiting to see an example. <p>ACTION: JS to circulate report.</p> <p>5. Primary Premium update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JS everyone is aware of £150 million going into Primary Schools. The spreadsheet that was pulled together by CPSs doesn't show how they are spending their money. Data was presented to Ministers by Jenny Price and was well received. Nobody knows if this had any impact on the additional funding being agreed. There is an exercise to look at school websites to see how they are spending their money. By the 4th April all schools should be displaying what they are spending their money on. JS wants to know where they are spending their £9000. They won't list exactly what they have spent the money on it will be more a case of what they did before and look at what we are doing now with the extra £9000. JS has been told that there is a template that has been sent out to schools to use on the website to show how it's been spent. She has asked for sight of this but then was told it was still being drafted! Would be great to know their top 2/3 priorities now so she could talk about it at the high level Strategic Group. SR has seen a change in the last couple of weeks, schools who have just had OFSTED thought they were ok for now but are realising they will be reviewed again and are hearing that OFSTED are reviewing websites etc before they go in. The data could be interpreted incorrectly and the Head Teachers are the best people to give the information. JS we can only complete what we know, if we don't know we won't complete it. It would be great to go directly to schools and ask the questions but CSPs have been told they can't. However, nobody has said JS can't ask the schools what their needs and priorities are. ST need to consider the local landscape and the roles of SGOs etc already in the areas. ST September is a key date for schools. JS the NGB aspect could be added to the local offer, some NGBs are going directly to schools with offers. JS MSP have an intern in looking at school websites now so we can judge the impact of the money. SR would be useful to track this against OFSTED dates so you can see the changes. DB could this data be shared on a weekly basis with SGOs so they can target those who don't have anything on. 	<p>ONGOING DIALOG WITH YST</p> <p>UPDATE AT NEXT MEETING</p> <p>IDENTIFY GAPS IN CASE STUDIES</p> <p>UPDATE IN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT</p> <p>CIRCULATE REPORT SIGNED OFF BY SE</p> <p>PRESENTATION OF SUMMARY FINDINGS</p>	<p>KS</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JS</p> <p>KS</p>	<p>ONGOING</p> <p>23RD MAY</p> <p>25TH FEB</p> <p>23RD MAY</p> <p>TBC</p> <p>TBC</p>
--	---	---	---

<p>ACTION: JS will establish progress on this work and report back to the group.</p>	<p>ESTABLISH PROGRESS REPORT BACK</p>	<p>JS</p>	<p>23RD MAY</p>
<p>6. Children and Young People Strategic Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First meeting is scheduled for the 28th February. DS we have been talking about the £9000 money, when is it MSPB being strategic and when is it this group. ST the idea is this group will include people who are not MSPB but ultimately they will feed back to MSPB who will make final decision. • DB need to be careful that it does not turn into a PE group again. JS Do not want to end up having the same conversations at both meetings. DS cannot get his head around who does what, is MSP role to support, influence and to say we expect that there will always be a certain % to be great, some good and some will always be rubbish? Should we be saying a realistic goal is to have this happen? Look at the Liverpool model, other models and leaving well alone were volunteers, clubs etc are working well already. Have meetings with NGBs to tell them where there is need; ask them what they can offer. ST took group through the ToR for the Strategic Group. • DB not sure what is listed can be measured. JS there is no reason why a system cannot be put in to measure if it is agreed that is what is needed. There must be a way to measure the impact as the government are not going to keep giving money if there are no measures to show improvement. • DS could be naive but schools are supposed to be giving 2 hrs of PE, ST/DB this is not happening, SR Kitemark have changed the wording to 'aspire to 2 hrs'. • DB looking at the membership there is a glaring hole in the group, there should be Public Health. JS should the public health representative be part of Strategic Group or MSPB? 	<p>&</p>	<p></p>	<p></p>
<p>ST to summarise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ DS has issues about point 1 of the document ➢ DB about public health ➢ DB also has issues about the resource required to measure some aspects and the value added to having this information. ➢ Instead of saying once a term it should say 4 times a year between MSPB meetings. Once a term implies it is an educational group. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DB thinks SPORTIVATE should go through this group as well. JS will go over proposed MPS staff changes and these points to having Children & Young People and one Adults. This may help to make the functional groups work better. We get funding to work with those up to age 24 and there are massive opportunities to work with adults. • DS there are at least 3 possibly 4 members of MSPB is this too much. JS this may be needed to get the groups up and running. DS think the group needs to be the group from the start. • ST asked DB if he wanted to be on the group, yes as he is on the Young People group wearing dual hats so it makes sense that he is on part of it. DS is keen to be on the group and probably need to have Alice Watson as this covers the 2 big sports. JS the Chair of the group should be someone other than her or ST. • DB why not leave JS as ex officio to dip in and out of all groups. DS should do this with ST as well. They need to step away from the groups when they are up and running. JB knowing head teachers the way he does he doesn't think ST or JS being there would make them hold back on their comments. Schools are going to be playing a bigger role in sport. Need to just give it a go as we are not satisfied with the groups we have and things need to change. • ST is trying to get members to represent special schools and secondary schools. <p>ST all comments have been taken on board and will be raised at the meeting on the 28th Feb.</p>	<p>UPDATE</p>	<p>ST</p>	<p>23RD MAY</p>
<p>7. Access to Schools In the absence of PJ this item was not discussed</p>			
<p>8. Coach Mark update Postponed until future meeting</p>			

AGENDA ITEM 4

TITLE: FORWARD OPPORTUNITIES & CHALLENGES

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
1. No items raised.			

AGENDA ITEM 5

TITLE: REPORTS

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>1. Executive Directors - JS Presented report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSPs have capacity funding until 2017 which is going to be allocated on population of 14-25 year olds plus a flat rate amount that everyone will get. The increased funding is about doing what we do better. • Management Development days held to dissect what we do, how we do it, what could we do better. JS set up the structure many years ago and development managers were outward facing, this is no longer the case. • Merseyside lead the way with data and information but don't have the capacity. • MSP lost 35 years experience in Business Support which was replaced by two 17 year old apprentices. <p>ST thanked JS and highlighted the Budget Income over Expenditure and asked the group to consider the new appointments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DB would have liked to see JS's comments about the capacity issues within the team included in the document. • JB is happy to go with the knowledge and experience of the MSP Team to establish their needs and trusts their judgement. They have held 2 development days deciding on these proposals. • JS they will free up the Development Managers to do what they should be doing. JS at the moment MSP cannot do things like show economic impact of school games etc to MPs. • DB has concerns that because of redeployment with LCC we may not get the right person from the limited pool. JS and ST have met with Louise Gray at LCC to discuss the redeployment issue. Louise Gray has asked SE to produce a document confirming that the roles are subject to strict SE guidelines. The plan B is there are 3rd party organisations who could recruit but this isn't the preferred method. • People need to be in post as soon as possible. • DB is there a possibility to offer Local Authorities a redeployment offer? Yes, the group agree to the idea of this but it has to go to market. This would need further investigation but potentially someone could apply and request secondment. <p>AGREED: Following a comprehensive discussion MSPB signed off the proposed changes and additional roles.</p> <p>ACTION: Business case to be produced to demonstrate how additional capacity will impact on front line delivery</p>	<p>PRODUCE BUSINESS CASE</p>	<p>JS</p>	<p>23RD MAY</p>
<p>2. School Games Operational Group - SR Conscious the funding is coming to an end, the visioning group will be discussing this. Liverpool have tapped into some of the Wirral funding for new age curling and SGOs are looking at including this as a sport in the L3 competition in the future.</p> <p>ACTION: SR to speak to GW regarding identifying the individual who will accompany the VIPs</p>	<p>RAISE VIP CHAPERONE ISSUE</p>	<p>SR</p>	<p>4TH MARCH</p>
<p>3. Physical Activity – JT/JL Report included in papers</p>			
<p>4. Workforce - JB Report included in papers</p>			

AGENDA ITEM 6

TITLE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DB asked that action notes from MSPB meetings be put on the MSP website as they were in the past. Group agreed this was fine but there must be acceptance of the fact that there will always be confidential issues that should not be published. <p>ACTION: JSch will produce action notes and publish on website</p> <p>ACTION: ST & JS to identify confidential information not to be included on website</p>	<p>PUBLISH ON WEBSITE</p> <p>IDENTIFY CONFIDENTIAL DATA</p>	<p>JSCH</p> <p>JS/ST</p>	<p>22ND MAY</p> <p>7TH MARCH</p>

AGENDA ITEM 7

TITLE: SHARING GOOD PRACTICE

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>1. DB St Helens have submitted Defibrillators guidance documents to all schools.</p>	FOR INFORMATION		

AGENDA ITEM 8

TITLE: FUTURE DATES FOR DIARY

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>1. Events for diary</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Future date and venue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Date and Venue of next meetings: Friday 23rd May 2014</p> <p>ST closed the meeting by offering thanks to all for a productive meeting.</p>			