

Merseyside Sports Partnership Board

MEETING DATE / HOST VENUE	Friday 6 th December 2013 – 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); Pauline Manning (Voluntary Sport Network); Julie Tierney (representing Primary Care Trust); Brian Boyle (Representing Local Sports Forum); David Boocock (representing Local Authority Heads of Sport); Suzanne Ramsey (representing Merseyside SGO's); Pam Jervis (FE advisor); John Bell (Vice Chair);
APOLOGIES	Leah Singleton (representing NGB's); Gerry Kinsella (Social Enterprises); Dave Southern (representing NGB's);
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
a. JB welcomed everyone and gave apologies for those who had sent them b. JS advised MSPB that DS & GK had concerns about not being able to attend meetings but were still keen to support the group. She will have further discussions with them. c. ST apologised for being late, he had been presenting a school with Kitemark and Healthy Schools award. d. JB asked MSPB to confirm action notes from previous meeting were a true representation.	AGREED AS TRUE REPRESENTATION		

AGENDA ITEM 2

TITLE: MATTERS ARISING / ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME / ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
1. Customer Satisfaction Survey KS provided MSPB with an update on the customer satisfaction survey having attended a review meeting to provide feedback. She highlighted the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Only 47 quality responses last year which was disappointing. b. Group agree the span was not long enough last time as it was at the same time as compliance for CSPs. c. We have looked at who could actually fill in the survey to avoid numerous 'don't knows'. This year 120 partners were identified, with Active Gloucestershire carrying out the survey for national partners to avoid duplication. d. At present there have been 66 responses from key stakeholders who have answered all questions. e. Have looked at how the survey was issued as blanket emails can be cold and telephone surveys may be nicer. f. JB carried out telephone surveys with MSPB members, Oaks Consultancy carried the rest out on behalf of MSP and hard copies were used at meetings etc. Email link was sent to those who expressed this as their preference. g. Raw data not available until January, what we have seen is good and confident the answers will have meaning. h. MSP have done customer satisfaction surveys for 7 years, CSPn have only being doing them for 3 so we are more experienced. MSP will need to add questions as we are a mature CSP. i. At next Board meeting in February KS will present results to the Board. j. We have names this year which is important if MSP are to follow up on comments be they positive or negative. k. DB – Surveyed as board member but not LA. KS, Damian and Terry were. l. JS – MSP acknowledge questions are generic but don't want to opt out as wouldn't be able to benchmark against other CSPs. m. DB – Suggested circulating the survey before the telephone survey takes place. n. JS – Generic questions won't change much but Board to consider what additional questions they would like to ask, what would they like to know? o. DB – Negative comments can be more constructive p. JT – What happens with the survey results? Are they published? KS, yes they are presented to MSPB, appear in MSP Annual Report and on the website. q. KS - Net Promoter Score taken out as CSPn didn't have a license to ask that question. MSPB agree this question doesn't fit well with CSPs anyway. 	<p style="text-align: center;">PRESENT CUSTOMER SATISFACTION RESULTS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PRESENT QUESTIONS FOR SURVEY</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">KS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MSPB</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">21ST FEB</p> <p style="text-align: center;">21ST FEB</p>
2. Merseyside MP Engagement and elected members JS has attended the last 2 Merseyside Cultural Forum meetings and has the support of the group who think it is a good idea to engage with all 21 Merseyside MPs.			

<p>a. JS – attended Merseyside Cultural Forum 2 and have support from group to engage with all 21 Merseyside MPs.</p> <p>b. Winter school games 21st March in Knowsley will be used as a backdrop, has had a walk through with sub group on what it could look like on the day. Invites to be issued before Christmas with confirmed format in the new year. They will be met, see the opening then move to a private area to showcase school sport, physical activity, case studies, trying to arrange for an LA to lead on case studies.</p> <p>c. Have updated MP database to identify what the MPs priorities are</p> <p>d. Asked at forum for their support in taking people round on the day</p> <p>e. Would like MSPB's thoughts on what people think should be included?</p> <p>f. JB – Would be nice for at least 10, would be good to get a cabinet member.</p> <p>g. DB – Target should be at least 1 from each LA.</p> <p>h. PM – Don't forget the School has changed its name.</p> <p>i. SR – Winter festival is taking part over the week at other venues so if can't make Friday 21st could do other days</p> <p>j. JS – Can be difficult to get MPs to represent Merseyside because they have their own constituencies</p> <p>k. JB – As long as there is a process to show how people are selected/asked.</p> <p>l. JS – There is no current communication process, need to ask them how best to communicate with them</p> <p>m. DB – Speak to Arts Council as there has been lots of lobbying within the community.</p> <p>n. ST – Brilliant idea but is not optimistic on those who will turn up. They constantly get pulled from one thing to another and if we get 3 or 4 MPs to turn up he will be happy.</p> <p>o. ST – have been successful getting Mayors etc to come to events in past and they will still be included.</p>	<p>CONSIDER WHAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED</p>	<p>MSPB</p>	<p>21ST FEB</p>
<p>3. Audits</p> <p>JS, following LCC audit we received a rating of 'very good' as apposed to satisfactory which in audit terms is great outcome. The 2nd audit was SE who pick 6 CSPs each year to audit. Initial report has been received by MSP who have now fed back on it. We were Green/Amber</p> <p>a. Areas of recommendation were good around good practise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify max number of board members • In MOU we have a detailed process for new Board members if they are from a network group, the process needs to be expanded. • Exec group have discussed how to respond regarding including an exit strategy into memo of understanding. It is in our risk register, SE have had CSPs (County Durham) issues with LA hosts over whose money it is. We challenged it because we flag it in risk register and in meetings with host. Feel raising something that isn't a problem and it could come back to bite us. <p>b. Rolling strategy, JS has asked for clarification for what this is. Think it is before you get to the end of current strategy you produce the next one so you never 'don't have' one. MSP do check and challenge regularly. They said it should be 13 to 17 then 14 to 18, this is costly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BW – If there is an annual plan that is feeding into the strategy then that is sufficient, as an organisation SE don't do new strategy each year. • DB – Could evidence the consideration of the strategy with an annual review. • ST – we do produce a strategy we review it every year and this should be sufficient. • BW – The host at Hull are saying the money is theirs and not CSP • JS – SE are tightening up the award letters to make it crystal clear who the money belongs to. If a CSP goes, then technically the money is SE and not the CSPs or host. The award letter is the contractual agreement. • JS – annually we identify the money that is ours so that the host don't take what hasn't been spent. • ST - Remarkable that MSP have got through 2 audits so successfully. • BB – Is there an arbitrator if there is a conflict, it would be the ombudsman. • ST – There is no problem with the host, it is a good, solid and long standing relationship. • JS – Has asked for the strong relationship with host to be acknowledge, we have been with Liverpool for 17 years. • JS – doesn't want to except it as it will end up in quarterly report. • DB – Will board receive the report, JS they will, it will be circulated • JS – we have our own dedicated Finance Officer who checks and challenges and understands our funds are ring fenced. <p>Acknowledgement: ST – MSPB are happy with the current process and note the audits have taken place. They would like to thank the Director for her work in obtaining good results.</p>			
<p>4. Skills audit</p> <p>Can those who haven't can you please complete and return the audit</p> <p>a. JS - Some Board members have contacted JS about their problems attending meetings. They still want to support the Board.</p> <p>b. DB – Both NGBs have different roles now with bigger areas.</p> <p>c. ST – attendance is being monitored, if 3 missed there will be a conversation.</p>	<p>SUBMIT SKILLS AUDIT</p>	<p>MSPB</p>	

5. Primary School Premium

- a. **JS** – we were in the process of provided ministers with a picture of primary schools in Merseyside.
 - Have now been asked to look at schools websites to see what is on there about what they are offering.
 - What is more important is the extension of the school sport support, announced yesterday, primary capital of £17 million. JS would like to see CSPs supporting, it's focused on those with no outside space, don't want primary schools to miss out.
 - **DB** – St Helens have already contacted their schools to say this funding exists and you may be eligible. They have offered their help with applications.
 - **ST** – Liverpool know their schools well as they have been working to improve outside space. This can be a catalyst to other funding and sometimes schools find match funding.
 - 2014 Ofsted changes, inspectors have been obliged to ask what is offered, they observe PE lessons, after school activity. Feedback from Head Teachers says its changing their results, in the past grade 3 was satisfactory and was achieved by many schools. However, 3 will now mean in need of improvement. Some schools who were grade 3 are now a 2 based on the schools sport provided. One such school is Gladys Street Primary School. The Head has presented to other heads to explain the impact.
 - **DB** – there is an excellent case study for MPs.
 - **DB** – They should be told to inspect PE, ST they are but not reporting accurately.
- b. **SR** – Schools welcome the extension, inspectors coming in and inspecting PE, they are increasing competition entries because they know the question will be asked. Kite mark asks questions about having A, B and C teams.

6. Core Funding

- a. JS – MSPB had agreed to a letter of response to the SE proposal for core funding regarding population size. Letter was tabled, 95% welcomed the change in formula, no surprise as nobody getting less, 2/3rds agreed with basing it on population.
 - Huge support for increased flexibility, eg if we are hitting targets and have a surplus then funds can be used elsewhere.
- b. Sportivate criteria has changed so if it's not spent it can be clawed back there are parts of the country where there are large under spends.
- c. Mike Diaper had operating costs in, lots of requests for clarification of what is meant by this. He needs to come up with accurate operating costs. JS has done this and we are fine both on SE budget and overall budget.
 - **DB** – Would be interesting to see cost of back office and each funding stream.
 - **BW** – Mike wants the figures so that he can clarify that CSPs are delivering value for money.
 - **JS** – asked at exec dire meeting what additional funding might look like.
 - **BW** – Have 6 new members and new chair, all from commercial background and want value for money and accountability.
 - **DB** – What are we doing with the addition money?
 - **JS** – Don't know if we will get additional measures to meet, are we doing as good as we can, or are we working people into and early grave. What we do but better.....or do more.
 - **DB** – what's the deadline, JS next board meeting
 - **BW** – it will be a top down and bottom up discussion

Acknowledgment: **ST** MSPB welcome the extension of school sports funding and primary capital.

7. Strategic Community Education group

ST – This will be a key group to influence education and community groups, competition work, links to clubs etc. Has been in structure for 9 months to give Operational group the opportunity to feel they are running the show. This has been achieved, and decisions such as having a Winter & Summer event using multiple venues

- a. The first meeting is scheduled for 24th January 2014, all 6 boroughs represented, could be a Head Teacher, SGO, comp man, aim is to review all issues, the whole range of opportunities. Will meet 4 times a year and will report back to board in February.
 - **ST** has already been given names of some people who should be included in the group
 - **JS** – make sure whoever they are they can feed back to the correct groups to communicate to the right groups. Don't want someone to focus on their school, it needs to be geographical area.
 - **DB** – what split of community/education are we looking for on the group, the actual community not the school community?
- b. **JS** – Do we need 2 groups, DB, no it should be 4 and 4 SGOs etc, then community.

PROPOSAL

JS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. PJ – it’s about what the group does and at what level, people who can make decisions. The remit of the group needs to be clear. d. ST – All comments taken on board, will take the lead and canvas people to attend. He will ask for commitment to attend 4 meetings a year for 2 years. ToR will be reported to board. e. Key outcome of group to involve people in community sport permanently if children have a negative experience you won’t engaged them, education needs to engage them into community sport they continue for life. f. ST mentioned the Select Community Olympic Legacy document that hasn’t worked how it was hoped. There needs to be a desire, if a child has been let down in an education environment they won’t engage. g. PJ – supports what ST says, the link between education and community is where we fail. Need to keep people engaged in the sport permanently. 			
<p>8. Access to Schools Programme</p> <p>PJ, Working on behalf of SE in Liverpool on new build schools. The next stage is looking at the other schools as there is lots of good work going on there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Knowsley is something different, they have Bluebell Park School, JS has done lots of work with them. Cardinal Heenan excellent case study. b. BW – Jackie Bryson working on this, want to develop tools that can be shared to a wider group rather than reinvent the wheel. c. ST – Space for Schools was a programme that invested lots. d. St Margaret’s will be case study and how they run their leisure centre is excellent e. DB – Space for Sport and Arts was not as successful as primary programme. money was wasted on insisting that some facilities where built to leisure centre spec and now stand unused. Must do what we can to make sure facilities are uses. f. PJ – FE role she is interested in what’s going on in FE in each area. g. DB - area of concern in one, PJ will meet with him. h. JS - MSP have good relationship with college makers who are enthusiastic and want to work with us as a collective group. They have been very active on providing information about their facilities. i. ST – concerns about 5000 young people and the opportunities are not as good as they would be if they were at school. j. JS – all but Wirral have had additional people to work on this. Wirral didn’t apply for capacity or FE activation fund but MSP are now working with them on this. 	<p>DISCUSS CONCERNS</p>	<p>PJ / DB</p>	
<p>9. Sportivate</p> <p>ST welcomed JL who addressed MSPB, additional funding available to deliver to end of March 2014. 3 LAs had the money offered to them as they had submitted their plans. The money that didn’t go to LAs, went to other partners who did submit plans. Majority of plans were from FE as we had identified groups where there were gaps, older ages, disability etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yearly plans in September show 14-16 age group had gone down 3% with the 19-21 age group going up 4%. b. Plans were better quality than previous, could be because they were more targeted. c. JB – How much money is it worth, JL Year 3 additional £45,000. Year 4 additional is approx £40,000. Original funding for year 3 £101000. Have been offered the innovation fund, currently looking at this, 5th Feb is when the plans need to be in for this. d. DB – What is the gender split, JL, Year 2 52% female 48% male, JL has looked at individual LAs and what funding is already there, Liverpool had lots for females. e. BW – thinks there will be a dedicated women’s programme coming from SE so anything that helps identify genders will be useful. f. ST – can JL identify any particular areas of success. Best plans and delivery has been from other partners, not LAs. Clubs, YMCA, etc YMCA plan is excellent, very targeted, high cost but results will be brilliant. College sport makers have produce great plans g. JS – Common problem is the same people are leading so the plans are the same old same old. h. JL – There is saturation in some areas, money from other programmes. i. DB – What can we do as a Board? Some working as a group some not, what can be done to up skill. j. JS – It’s not just Sportivate, Knowsley for example need to resurrect their strategy, strategic group, Paula Williams and Andrew McCormick recognise this. PJ – a bit like the SPAA they used to have. k. BB – Is it the number of partners involved or the type of partners. JL it’s the type of partners. l. JS – JL wants people to be up front about what they want to do and be honest about what they want to do. m. ST – Will we meet our targets? JL yes, we are going to hit targets so can be more risky. n. BW – Happy we will hit targets and therefore happy to encourage risk taking with different age groups etc. 			
<p>10. Coachmark</p> <p>ST welcomed AW who presented his paper to MSPB. Children’s Activity Physicals, are not using terminology such as coach but that is who is being targeted. CSPn have created a working group to produce a framework for coaches. Supported by Sports Coach UK and Bing, who support the databases used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AW – Recommends waiting to see what happens with development of register and what 			

DISCUSSION	OUTCOME /ACTION	WHO	DEADLINE
<p>1. ST - Sporting Champions Dinner This years was the best one for a couple of years. Went very smoothly and finished 10 minutes early which was nice as it gave people time to chat at the end which doesn't usually happen.</p>			

AGENDA ITEM 7

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 21st February 2014</p> <p>ST closed the meeting by offering thanks to all for a productive meeting.</p>			