

Merseyside Sports Partnership Board

MEETING DATE / HOST VENUE	Friday 23 rd May 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); John Bell (Vice Chair); Dave Southern (representing NGB's); Pam Jervis (FE advisor); Leah Singleton (representing NGB's); Julie Tierney (representing Primary Care Trust); Pauline Manning (Voluntary Sport Network);
APOLOGIES	Ben Williams (SE Regional Strategic Lead); Suzanne Ramsey (representing Merseyside SGO's); Gerry Kinsella (Social Enterprises);
DISTRIBUTION	Sue Drew (Primary Care Trust); 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. 2. ST gave indication of timescales of agenda 3. ST added additional item 6D L2 Competition to section 6 Reports 4. JS gave late apologies from Dave Southern			

AGENDA ITEM 2

TITLE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
1. Forms still outstanding for LS, GK, DS and JT 2. LS and JT completed theirs on the day			

AGENDA ITEM 3

TITLE: MATTERS ARISING / ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>School Games JB – School games in March was a wonderful event and was well attended by Mayors. MP attendance not quite as good but the feedback from those who did attend was positive. DB – His Mayor felt they spent too long sitting down and listening and not enough time with the young people. JS – This is because they arrived earlier to see the opening ceremony, the reception with case studies was actually the shortest it's ever been. This had already been raised and the operational group have taken these comments on board for the next event. JS – Going forward with MP engagement it is proposed that more regular meetings with MPs take place, with those that are keen to engage, be it breakfast meetings etc. PJ – Sensible to break it up into smaller more focused groups. ST – Discussed with JS about inviting MPs to a wider event but they will still be invited to events such as school games etc. JS – The VIP chaperones need to be well briefed and discussions need to be at a high level and seen as an opportunity to raise the profile of the event. DB – Would it work with case studies being spread around the site so that discussions can take place at each sport? JS this is a really good idea and should be suggested to the operational group. ST the MPs sometimes have their own ideas about what they want from the event. JS – The six case studies were amazing, so varied and inspirational. All comments have been positive.</p> <p>Sport England on site audit JS – has not circulated the report yet as it is not yet signed off. Still waiting for clarification on the rolling strategy, JS believes they actually mean a business plan.</p>	<p>SUGGESTIONS TO BE FEED INTO OPERATIONAL GROUP</p> <p>CIRCULATE REPORT</p>	<p>SR</p> <p>JS</p>	<p>ONGOING</p> <p>17/10/14</p>

<p>Children and Young People strategic group – ST Group convened, meeting took place, some Head Teacher representatives were on a learning curve themselves. Aim is to have a Head Teacher representative from each borough with NGBs and MSPB members. Main aim is to identify 'what do we want children in Merseyside to benefit from?' Schools were supposed to publish how they are spending school sport premium on their website by 4th April 2014. They should spend the money in this academic year, how they spend is at their discretion but has to be linked to outcomes such as increasing participation in L2 competition against other schools. In a school yesterday, considered to be a sporting school, when the question was asked who took part in after school sport 90% put their hand up. However when asked who had represented their school in competitions against other schools only 10% put their hand up.</p> <p>Since the meeting things have moved on, Ofsted have been into three schools on the Wirral to look at PE and sport aspect. All schools should keep a detailed file on PE and Sport impact. It is concerning that across the region schools are spending money on bringing in outside deliverers rather than developing the skills of their staff. The quality of the outside deliverers is extremely varied. This route will impact on the results of the school when the professional development of staff aspect is reviewed.</p> <p>School Games website The school games portal is not working correctly, data entry is inconsistent. It is frustrating for everyone when data is added then disappears or is in the wrong place. Youth Sport Trust and Sport England are being encouraged to have one tool for all reporting. Feedback from Board Members:-</p> <p>DB - L2 competitions are not currently very inclusive, this is a growth area. Generally schools need to recognise that it cannot be the same 20 children who are selected for everything. It is not difficult to get bronze kitemark but to get silver or gold they have to engage in competitions. JS – The inclusive aspect has been discussed at operational group meetings, it needs to come up from L2 events. The challenge faced is around the capacity of SGOs. Although, there are only a couple of them who are 3 days a week, most are full time. DB – It would be useful to get the data out there so you can see what happens where and the differing numbers across the boroughs. ST – By September we should try and have a summary of all L2 events. JS - However this is very difficult as only the core competition data is mandatory on the school games website, plus as mentioned previously the website does not work correctly and the data entry is inconsistent. There is a need for the data as we need to be able to say these are some of the outcomes for this year. JS – Asked the group to address the L2 Competition report provided by SR. DB – Is this report correct, the competition figures have increased much more than the number of children taking part. PJ – due to the same children doing different sports. LS – not sure where stand alone events like theirs are counted. JT – What is the barrier in collecting the data? ST – Competitions are delivered by a variety of organisations. SGOs see their role as running L2 competitions to progress to L3. This doesn't account for large groups running cross country, athletics, football etc. ST is trying to pull it all together and get more schools wanting to enter the competitions. At present only about 50% will attend. JT – Is it the schools responsibility to provide the figures? ST no, they are obliged to report on their website the impact and involvement. The dilemma is does the SGO then collate all that information? DB – most of them are in a school setting and all procedures are different. JS we should just concentrate on what is organised by SGOs for now, and perhaps come back to trying to include other activities as a later stage. DB there is fourteen SGOs and he would like to see what they are doing in the different areas and what impact they are having. PM – How are they funded now? JS 3 days a week from Sport England, DB £45000 per role rather than 3 days. Some schools have reportedly been told that unless they buy in they will have no support. DB a letter went out last week to everyone who manages an SGO to say everything on their framework must be offered to all schools. BB – Are we collecting data on the same template? No, the challenge is at L1 it is not compulsory for schools to report. L2 is mandatory and linked to funding but only the core competitions. Maybe they can then include the stand alone events, however, some SGOs don't want to report on what they are doing outside of the framework because they get questioned by YST as to why? ST – Who pays their salary? Sport England, so they are the people they are accountable to so we need to be careful how we ask for the information. JS – For L3 it is MSP who are the accountable body so they can ask for the information. She has been very articulate in selling the benefits of collecting the data and sharing the information. MSP can work magic with the data if it exists.</p>	<p>MSP TO STANDARDISED FORM FOR SGOS TO COMPLETE. THIS WILL INCLUDE THE REASONS FOR ASKING TOGETHER WITH THE BENEFITS.</p>	<p>KS</p>	<p>ONGOING</p>
--	--	-----------	----------------

AGENDA ITEM 4

TITLE: TURNING INSIGHT INTO ACTION

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>Presentation by Calum Donnelly</p> <p>Presentation to MSPB report detailing how MSP use data and information to have an impact on the ground. Feedback from Board Members included:-</p> <p>BB – If someone, for instance a badminton club came along and asked for the information could be provide it? Yes, we haven't used a very sophisticated system so it would be a manual exercise. JS what we are struggling with is capacity to do more of it and broader hence the requirement for the additional posts.</p> <p>PJ – Report details 41 clubs, what is the borough split? CD currently working with Knowsley and Liverpool. Who is funding the coaches, and how will it be sustainable. MSP are funding at the moment, a resource for every sight. PJ sustainability is a massive issue.</p> <p>JS – we could have just taken the easy option and offered everyone a satellite club. What would be useful would be to add the St Helens pilot figures, although this only started 12 days ago.</p> <p>DB how many satellite clubs where physically up and running at the end of Y1? CD none</p> <p>JS – MSP are measured on offering 106. Offering is easy what we want is delivery.</p> <p>PJ – What about the ones that were not on school sites. CD – Halton looking at community sites but don't have capacity. Toxteth Fire Fit is being used for some school delivery.</p> <p>PJ – What FE are we working with? St Helens, Knowsley, Liverpool</p> <p>JS – We are strong on the occupancy questionnaire as it is important that we are making an impact. Switched on Head Teachers see it as a business opportunity for the school.</p> <p>CD – One of the best things is understanding the local community.</p> <p>DB – What is the target going to be? We have to deliver 106 by March 2016. JT do they have to be sustainable clubs? Yes, they can't of started and then died off. ST the approach used in getting to know the community and asking the questions is proving to be the sensible option so well done for those decisions.</p> <p>JS – They will be target for help with Awards for All etc to help with sustainability. PJ it will be interesting to see who is attending the clubs after 3 years, will the young people from the school still be attending. DB what are the times, is it between 5pm and 7pm? Varied times, they are all after the school day and community times. There is already a case when young people from 3 schools are attending.</p>	<p>To monitor progress through Sport England reporting framework</p>	<p>JS</p>	<p>17/10/14</p>

AGENDA ITEM 5

TITLE: EVALUATION SUMMARY

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>Customer Satisfaction Results presentation - KS</p> <p>KS presented comprehensive analysis of the past three years of MSP customer satisfaction results and created an improvement RAG rating system. The data at this point has not been benchmarked against the remaining 44 County Sports Partnerships as this information was not available at time of preparing presentation to Board Members, however, this will be included into the report. Board members thanked KS for the analysis and congratulated MSP team for great results. It should be noted that Kenny Chu has produced a professional looking report.</p>	<p>To include bench marking against 44 CSP's</p> <p>To re-adjust criteria for RAG rating i.e. above 80% = Green and use arrows to indicated trends if maintaining Gold but going down</p>	<p>KS</p>	<p>17/10/14</p>
<p>Primary Premium presentation – KS</p> <p>KS took Board Members through the findings of the recent primary schools website assessment as per the Sport England contract and funding linked to Primary sport premium. It is also noted that the assessment was of 9% of all the primary schools in Merseyside, equating to 42 schools which had been randomly selected, however, formula basis has been applied to cater for the various numbers of primary schools within each of the six local authority areas. The key finding were:-</p> <p>Merseyside Sports Partnership Area Web Site Review - How schools are utilising the Primary PE & School Sport Premium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published offer - 93% • Health Enhancing Activities - 77% • Published use of Premium – 69% • Additional Coaches - 62% 	<p>MSP to produce guidance documents</p> <p>1} directly to Primary Schools Re – NGB products and</p> <p>2} guide for organisations to support primary schools</p> <p>Findings and Quality issues to be referred to Children</p>	<p>KS</p> <p>ST/JS</p>	<p>17/10/14</p> <p>NOV 2014</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extending Competition - 62% • Professional Learning for teachers - 62% • PE Specialist or peripatetic teachers - 8% • Other - 0% <p>Other significant areas of investment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra-curricular clubs - 79% • Other - 74% • Swimming - 33% • Equipment - 31% • Transport - 15% • Inclusion - 5% <p>Highlights in our area include the high quality Liverpool School Sports Partnership programme being provided by Liverpool. We have noticed that a great deal of activity focuses upon KS2 as opposed to early years and KS1, as a number of schools within Merseyside now offer placements for 2 year olds. We have seen more schools linking with National Governing Bodies and ensuring here is a School to Club Links offer, which is very important. There appears to be a genuine desire to increase opportunities around health and well-being and many schools, who would have previously charged for activity, are now for the first time offering activities after school for free.</p> <p>This can only be measured upon gathering evidence from the school directly or witnessing a coaching session. Equally, many schools have detailed that they will be investing in CPS for their staff and adopting a 'Train the Trainer' type of approach but again this cannot be quantified in terms of quality unless the direct question was asked.</p> <p>Board members thanked KS for the comprehensive analysis and requested the information shared so locally they can support schools to ensure they are complying with funding conditions of displayed primary sport premium interventions on websites.</p> <p>Feedback from Board members concluded:-</p> <p>DB – As a borough he would like to have that information so they could provide the support. JS has had to sign a confidentiality agreement to not share the data. PJ – its public information as anyone can look at school websites so this should be able to be shared with anyone.</p> <p>DB – Understand that there are other aspects to the exercise but just the results of looking at the websites could be shared. ST – There is no point in any borough doing the website analysis again as it already exists.</p> <p>ST – There will be people out there who will want to know why it has been done and may not be happy about it. MSPB role is to protect the CSP and back MSP so they are not accused of breaching what they have signed.</p> <p>PM – What is the purpose of gathering the information? It is for ministers and information for ministers is excluded from freedom of information act.</p>	<p>and Young People Strategic Group.</p>		
---	--	--	--

AGENDA ITEM 6

TITLE: TAKING PART

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>JS wants MSP to have their own 'Taking Part' participation target, so X amount of people have taken part in sport and physical activity. This would then be broken down into age groups etc.</p> <p>This would only include what MSP can have a direct impact and influence on.</p> <p>Will align it to strategy years and the proposed staffing changes so people's roles are aligned to specific work areas. MSP have started to work up some figures but they are not ready yet but should be for the next meeting.</p> <p>DB – Suggests adding visitor numbers to local authority leisure centres would be useful and is already gathered. JS would like to gather what we have a direct impact on first.</p> <p>JS – the definitions are very important to get right.</p>	<p>Agenda items for next meeting</p>	<p>JS</p>	<p>17/10/14</p>

AGENDA ITEM 7

TITLE: REPORTS

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>1. Workforce – see report distributed prior to Board Meeting. Feedback from Board Members concluded:- JB asked for people’s opinions as to the £600 cost of AfPE coaching course. DB – A coach has been heard to say that if you are a L1 coach you are liable if anything happens without any consideration of the venue it is taking place in and the presence of lifeguards etc.</p> <p>Executive Directors – See report distributed prior to Board Meeting.</p> <p>Key points highlighted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful meeting with Mike Diaper (Sport England) regarding business case for additional capacity, whereby the proposal was approved and urged external advertisement as soon as possible. • Existing core team are currently going through job evaluation, JS is working with JB, ST and Louise Gray on this and doesn’t have any concerns. <p>Feedback discussion included:-</p> <p>DB – What budget provision has been made, what is expectation regarding roles being downgraded? JS is confident that roles will be assimilated in where they are with a broader grade span.</p> <p>ST – By September meeting we should have the results of the job evaluation and who has been recruited into the new roles.</p> <p>JS – At end of financial year (31.03.14) we were green on all 14 contracts and were gold on one, even green on active people for the first time since 2006.</p> <p>ST on behalf of board well done, to hit those results is remarkable.</p> <p>Physical Activity - see report distributed prior to Board Meeting. Key highlighted for Boards Members to consider are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Going live with Work Place Challenge <p>Agenda items for next MSP Board Meeting 2014</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DB just completing Sport England funding application. How does it fit into the CSP Facilities Strategy? JS we don’t have one and it is not in any of the MSP contracts to have one. 2. JS we are not funded to do this so if it is required we would need to find capacity and funding. <p>Sharing Good Practice</p> <p>DB - Community Sport Activation Fund – all bids successful 1.3 million, Wirral will bid in the next round.</p>	<p>Coaching plan to be displayed on website Report accepted by Board Members</p> <p>Report accepted by Board Members</p> <p>Update at next meeting</p> <p>Report accepted by Board Members</p> <p>Workplace challenge presentation</p> <p>MSP board to explore implications</p> <p>For information</p>	<p>AW</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JL</p>	<p>17/10/14</p> <p>17/10/14</p> <p>17/10/14</p>

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 17th October 2014</p> <p>ST closed the meeting by offering thanks to all for a productive meeting.</p>	<p>DATE FOR DIARY</p>	<p>ALL</p>	