**MSP Board Meeting**

**Action Notes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date & Time** | **16th July - 09:30am – 12:30pm** |
| **Venue** | Virtual Meeting via Zoom |
| **Board Members (BM’s) Attendees** | Cameron Jones\* (**CJ**) (Chair); Mark Coups\* (**MC**) (Vice Chair); (Sport Expert); Sue Wilkinson (**SWK**) (Physical Education Expert); Tom Smith (**TS**) (Sport Expert); Liam Corcoran (**LC**) Co-opted Member (Youth & Community Expert); Liz Farrington (**LF**) (Public Health Expert); Sion Williams (**SW**) (Marketing Expert); Chris Lomas\* (**CL**) (Assistant Director – Liverpool City Council). |
| **MSP Team Members** | Tom Douglas (**TD**) (Director); Brendan McCrudden (**BMcC**) (Business Improvement Officer); Kerry Stewart (**KS**) (Strategic Lead for Business Improvement); Calum Donnelly (**CD**) (Strategic Lead for Sport and Physical Activity - CYP); Andrew Wileman (**AW**) (Strategic Lead for Adults); Holly Budgen (**HB)** (Marketing and Events Officer). |
| **Guests in Attendance** |  |
| **Apologies** | Cllr Wendy Simons (**WS**) (Political Expert). |
| **Compliance & Scrutiny Group** | \* Denotes the Compliance & Scrutiny Group. |
| **Distribution (internal & external)** | [www.merseysidesport.com](http://www.merseysidesport.com), MSP Team, Sport England; MSP Board. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Headlines from Discussion** | **Outcome / Actions** | **Who** | **Deadline** |
| 1 | **Introduction** | | | |
| **a. Welcome, apologies and introduction** | CJ welcomed the BMs, MSP Team and noted apologies.  Apologies noted: Wendy Simon.  CL introduced himself to the board. The board introduced themselves to CL. | **CJ**  **WS** |  |
|  | **b. Matters arising from last meeting – Action Log** | The Board acknowledged the action notes from the previous board meeting and reviewed actions which are still ongoing.  **Action:** TD to circulate diversity inclusion role specifications to board. | **CJ**  **TD** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Headlines from Discussion** | **Outcome / Actions** | **Who** | **Deadline** |
| 2 | **Declarations of interest** | | | |
|  | **Declarations of Interest** | **Outcome:** No declarations of interest made by BMs. TD notified the board that he is now an Ex-Officio of Merseyside Sports Foundation. | **All** | **N/A** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Headlines from Discussion** | **Outcome / Actions** | **Who** | **Deadline** |
| 3 | **Finances** | | | |
|  | 1. **2019/20 Finances for sign off** 2. **2020/21 Finances for sign off** | KS gave an overview of the 2019/20 & 2020/21 MSP Financial Reports to the board.    Notes of interest are;   * Secured a number of consultancy contracts in a short space of time. * Reduced premier service to one client with the hope to attain a service with one organisation. * Been effective and efficient in spending programme and operational costs. * Secured the Liverpool Active Workplace tender (34,000). * Purchased IT equipment to enable staff to work from home which is supported by Sport England. * Secured £110,000 from Sport England for the Inequalities Fund * Variance £80,844 forecasting to remain 2020/21 which has reduced from the previous financial year. * MSP’s core funding from Sport England is extended until March 2022. This includes Satellite Clubs, School Games, Active Lives, Active Workplaces, PE Spots Premium and our primary role. * The auditor’s report found no issues to challenge MSP. * The carryover budget for this financial year is £221,782 (based on income over expenditure).   **Challenge:** As it stands MSP has 2 months operating costs which is one on month short of 3 months operating costs. TS commented that the shortfall of operating costs should be reflected on the risk register. TS also asked what measures are being taken to mitigate this risk.  TS also commented the importance of striving to reach a variance of £100,000 and reach 3 months operating costs with the view to grow the operating costs to 6 months. Additionally, TS recommended European funding bids as an opportunity to secure additional funds.  The board extends it thanks and appreciation to Jo Schumann and Kerry Stewart for the production of the 2019/20 & 2020/21 financial report.  **Outcome:** The board approved 2019/20 financial report as true record.  **Outcome:** The board approved 2020/20 financial report as true record. | **BMs**  **BMs** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Headlines from Discussion** | **Outcome / Actions** | **Who** | **Deadline** |
| 4 | **Next Strategy Development** | | | |
|  | **a. Setting the scene** | TD gave a preamble of the motivation and aspiration for looking at our current & future strategy.  The keys points are;   * Currently undergoing the process of the external board evaluation and anticipate a report will be produced at the next board meeting. * Structural review is on hold due to current circumstances and also understanding what is Sport England’ future funding and landscape looks like. * There is an opportunity now to reflect to see what has and hasn’t worked well with the current strategy and then looking forward as a process to how do we progress together as a journey. The Leadership Team has already undertaken this process. * The landscape over the last four years has changed significantly and we have been flexible to adapt to these changes. * The theme of the next agenda item is ideas generation, input and development on how we develop the next strategy. Also, ideas and input for a short-term strategy.   5 questions for the board to prompt discussion;  *1.* Looking back at the creation of the last strategy, it is clear to see that we consciously went for a very internally focused approach. What is your view on this and should this stay the same / change stepping into the next one?  *2*. What other key learnings can we take forward from the last strategy creation    *3*. What great examples do you know of that we can explore to help us get the best process, including in the following areas:  o Data Collation and Analysis of Macro and Micro Trends  o Connecting into multiple related strategies  o Consultation, internally and externally  o Documentation and measurement  o Ownership from within the organisation and buy in from the system and key  stakeholders  *4*. How long do you think the process should take and who do you believe should be involved (both internally and externally)?  *5*. Whilst we develop the next strategy, due to COVID 19 there have been some  fundamental shifts that we can’t ignore. As such, we are currently ideating our 6-month priorities and would welcome your ideas on what we should include in these. |  |  |
|  | **b. Discussion on the process moving forward inc short term priorities (6 months)** | The board discussed their thoughts about moving forward including short term priorities.  **TS** – Going out wider to external stakeholders make sense because we want to serve them and the wider public. We don’t have to take on all feedback from stakeholders but should listen to what they have to say. I would estimate in the next six months to have a robust strategy to be sent out publicly. It was important to undergo the brand and identity change and we should be weary changing the brand again like other Active Partnerships.  **SW** – We don’t really look at our competitors are doing or our Active Partnership network. I see value in collaborating with competitors or in our case other Active Partnerships and reaching out on projects to collaborate. This process may help us in knowing what others are going and striving for and bring that back to our understanding. By looking externally, it may reaffirm what we are doing is correct.  From 3 and half years on our priorities have changed as has the strategy. When looking at new priorities, should finances be part of the strategy due to the previous mentioned shortfall of operating costs? We should be wary of overcomplicating the strategy with various documents and should be simplified to state our objective and a supporting document which could be a tick list which makes it very clear what is needed to meet the strategy. As a board we need to ensure that the strategy is regularly reviewed to in order that we don’t go mission drift.  **LF** – Echoes the same comments from **TS** and **SW** about going out to colleagues and stakeholders to work collaboratively. We are in a different environment now with COVID19. We need to be mindful of how stakeholders in the network are recovering at different rates. This is a key early piece of work to do and will influence the strategy.  **LC** – I noticed in my workplace that the sector has come together nationally. Industry bodies of various organisations are coming together like leisure trusts and Community Active UK. I have noticed Active Partnerships are starting to come on board in a big way alongside leisure trusts and the private sector. Being a leader in publishing and sharing data and insight on physical activity could be a good opportunity for MSP to have a voice in that space and data and insight could be part of the strategy.  **SWK** – Also echoes previous comments about going out wider to stakeholders but also conscious not to be too inward focused. We need to be proactive and reach out to our local network as everyone is in a different place and we should gather insight of our partner’s needs. Can all Active Partnerships Insight teams collaborate and work together to share data and insight across the network? Additionally, can MSP be a leader in this space? It is better to provide a service model rather than a sales model when delivering data and insight to customers and clients.  **MC** – There is a need to work through the tension existing within the organisation about reflection outwards and need for an ever increasing wider group of stakeholders to assist, work and inform us, versus the services we coordinate for Liverpool area. That tension therefore needs to be played out in the strategy and to work out the aforementioned two points which conflict amongst each other.  5 years is a long time and is there a challenge for the board to reform the strategy sooner than later. As board we need to reflect is that the right thing to do? With the changing landscape happening currently, the next six months is imperative whilst we have identified new priorities like the finances (operating costs) to address and action. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Headlines from Discussion** | **Outcome / Actions** | **Who** | **Deadline** |
| 6 | **Governance** | | | |
|  | **a. Risk Register** | TD updated the Board on the risk register.  Key points of note;   * First change to the risk register was the relationship with LCC. Chris Lomas (CL) is the new local authority representative and TD & CL have started a good working relationship. MSP is seen as an integral part of LCC. The risk has been downgraded as the likelihood of separating is less likely. * Renewal of IT equipment - laptops have been purchased for team members at the start of lockdown which has helped downgrade the risk. * COVID19 measures - KS has been leading on guidance for returning to the office and connecting protocols with LCC. KS also undertook a risk assessment of the office. Measures have been put in place to the best of our ability.   **Challenge:** MC commented that the score for our finances in the risk register needs to be reviewed due to the earlier discussions about the concern of our shortfall of operating costs.  TS suggested adding a specific line item about the 3 month operating costs into the risk register and also set the aspiration to 6 months operating costs.  **Action:** TD to amend risk register by board recommendations and to send out with action notes.  **Outcome:** BMs reviewed and approved risk register. | **TD**  **BMs** | XXX (no date specified) |
|  | **b. Governance Framework** | TD updated the board on the governance framework.  Key points of note:   * Organisational chart has been updated. * Thematic groups (CYP and Adults) have been removed from the governance framework. * CYP – reasoning is the members of the group became more involved and evolved into advisors which helped shape the good work in CYP programmes and activities. * Adults – the reasoning for the removal of the adults group is because it was never assembled however MSP does connect with local stakeholders and also build upon relationships within local sitting groups and stakeholders.   **Challenge:** SWK suggested an amendment to the governance framework with regards to mentioning the impact of COVID and how MSP will lead and support with its partners.  MC questioned where is the relationship with The Foundation specified within the governance framework? Moving forward MC anticipates a section identifying how The Foundation relates to MSP.  SWK suggests within the recruitment of the board there should be a statement (specifically the terms of reference) about diversity and MSP’s commitment to recruit a diverse community.  **Outcome:** BMs reviewed and approved governance framework. | **BMs** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Headlines from Discussion** | **Outcome / Actions** | **Who** | **Deadline** |
| 7 | **Impact 365** | | | |
|  | **a. An insight into our new externally facing and fluid annual reporting** | HB shared to the board a virtual tour of the new MSP website (work in progress).  HB informed the learnings and journey from the current website to making the new website;   * The current website has strong strategic focus for our partners but the public visitor doesn’t find it as accessible. * Consistent feedback from partners was the website can be difficult to access and also the language which internally is familiar doesn’t resonate to the website. * There has been a focus to make the headings on the new website easier to understand to be accessible to a broader audience. * MSP has grown into its brand identity in which we use Professor Brian Cox’s personality as model for MSP’s brand identity. * The new website is a hybrid which takes the best parts of the current website and is modernised. * The new website is more visual with inclusion of videos and colours and gives feeling of motion. * The traditional annual report has been replaced with a new living document on the website called Impact 365. This will give a real time view of the impact from MSP to a broader audience. * Impact 365 can be used a marketing tool to promote MSP and the Foundation to new potential partners in our network.   **Challenge:** CJ asked whether the website will have enough images and videos to be inclusive of different gender and ethnicities in which HB assured that this is a focus and a capacity to ensure that the website will have an inclusive feel.  CJ asked whether the website will be compatible with all devices and software especially older software. To which HB confirmed that working along with the web developers, she can say with confidence that the website will be very accessible. | **TD** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Headlines from Discussion** | **Outcome / Actions** | **Who** | **Deadline** |
| 8 | **AOB** | | | |
|  | **a. Update on VRP Funding** | CD updated the board about MSP’s new Violence Reduction Partnership (VRP) Funding.  The VRP is a collection of partners such as; Merseyside Police, Merseyside Fire and Rescue, local government, local youth service, public health partners, education partners and community leads.  They come together every Wednesday as a strategic partnership to tackle violent crimes across our communities. Started relationship building in August 2019 and by December invited to bid for funding through The Foundation and deliver with England Boxing (via local boxing clubs) to get young people of the streets into boxing clubs. This was successfully delivered.  Won another bid for £125,000 in which MSP will coordinate the delivery across the city region and lead the sports sector. MSP will be working with a range of partners to ensure the right projects are being delivered to ensure young people are directed away from violent crime. £12,500 of the funding will be a management fee and the remaining monies will be allocated to local community organisations delivering on the outcomes. |  |  |
|  | **b. Update on Sport England Inequalities Fund** | AW updated the board about Sport England’s Inequalities Fund.  Sport England tasked the Active Partnership network with taking forward a fund called The Inequalities Fund. It’s an emergency grant fund for charities, local community groups to focus on priority audiences who have been identified for additional help due to COVID. These audiences are suffering from low participation in physical activity who come from low socio-economic backgrounds, BAME communities, disabilities and people with long term health conditions.  Sport England have awarded MSP £110,000 pounds to allocate funds to community groups who are important to developed projects which adapt or new offers for priority groups or allow the organisation to continue its current programmes during COVID.  This is separate and different to the Community Emergency Fund as it won’t be an open fund. We will have a targeted approach to reach identified local community organisations who we have worked with and also reached out to local authorities.  The team has drawn up a short list of organisations and in the process of reaching out to them to discuss their projects. Sport England have awarded us the money but the money goes straight to the organisations as there is no allocation for capacity. Sport England also requires to sign off every project before money is awarded. |  |  |