



MSP Advisory Board Meeting Joint with MSF Trustees

Action Notes

Date & Time	21 st April - 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); Tom Pedersen Smith (TPS) (Sport Expert); Chris Lomas* (CL) (Assistant Director – Liverpool City Council); Sion Williams (SW) (Marketing Expert); Liam Corcoran (LC) Co-opted Member (Youth & Community Expert).
MSP Team Members	Tom Douglas (TD) (Director); Brendan McCrudden (BMcC) (Business Improvement Officer); Andrew Wileman (AW) (Strategic Lead for Adults).
MSF Trustee Attendees	Pat Shenton (PS) (MSF Trustee); John Bell (JB) (MSF Chair/Trustee)
Apologies	Cllr Wendy Simons (WS) (Political Expert); Sue Wilkinson (SWK) (Physical Education Expert); Alan Cooper (AC) (MSF Trustee); Adam Walker (AWK) (MSF Trustee)
Compliance & Scrutiny Group	* Denotes the Compliance & Scrutiny Group.
Distribution (internal & external)	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, MSF Trustees and noted apologies. Apologies noted: Wendy Simon, Sue Wilkinson, Alan Cooper and Adam Walker	CJ	
	b. Introductions	All BMs and Trustees introduced themselves including their background, skills, reason for joining respective boards and a fun fact about themselves.	ALL	

	Headlines from Discussion	Outcome / Actions	Who	Deadline
2	MSF Past and Present			
	a. MSF Creation and Early Stages and how MSF has supported MSP in the past b. Recent Journey	Outcome: JB summarised this agenda point and these are the key items; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report undertaken by Oaks Consultancy to investigate what form of entity could support MSP and the findings concluded an establishment of an incorporated charity. • It was identified the charity could undertake work in which MSP as a city council organisation could not. 	All	N/A



c. Future Business Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose was the charitable arm was to assist MSP in its remit of Advocating sport and physical activity in Merseyside. • TD comments about the recent journey and the key items are; • Has been confusing amongst the relationship of the organisations but the recent 18 months have undergone a journey to separate the organisations but to bring them together in a inter dependant way. • Its about recognising the differences of the organisations but leveraging the strengths of each organisation that supports our overall vision and aims. • Undergone a governance project to unpack the policies and ensure both organisations are meeting governing compliance. • Recently undertaken a business plan with help from Oaks Consultancy which will help deliver the aims and objectives of the Foundation with a view to generate income whilst supporting sport and physical activity. 		
--------------------------------	---	--	--

	Headlines from Discussion	Outcome / Actions	Who	Deadline
3	MSP Past and Present			
	a. Previous Strategy b. Recent Journey c. Future Strategy Development, LCC Relationship and Sport England Relationship	Outcome: CJ summarised this agenda point and these are the key items; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He was brought on in 2015 and developed the current strategy with Jean Stephens. • With TD’s appointment, a new direction with a more closer working relationship with Sport England has been the focus and part of the new journey. • As MSP looking to lead in piloting programmes and initiatives with Sport England to further establish a closer working relationship. 		



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Going forward the direction is aligning MSP closer with Sport England and their strategy and looking to give back more to the region and build stronger relationships, creating system leadership and movement. 		
--	---	--	--

	Headlines from Discussion	Outcome / Actions	Who	Deadline
4	Our Relationship Together			
	<p>a. The benefits of MSP and MSF working together and the barriers to overcome</p> <p>b. Document(s) needed to support this – MOU?</p> <p>c. What should be in the document(s)</p> <p>d. Board collaboration – joint membership / frequency of joint meetings</p>	<p>Outcome: All BM's and Trustees discussed agenda points 4a. to 4b. Below are the key points from this discussion;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JB commented about how the events in which transpired last year due to the pandemic allows a fresh approach to how we traditionally approach and advocate sport and physical activity going forward. CL built on JB's comment about Liverpool City Council's Leisure and Improvement Board (LCC) and its lessons learnings from last year from behavioural change, harnessing the energy from community uptake in sport and physical activity. There are communities that have significantly reduced in physical activity and need help to reach them in a meaningful way. CL commented that we shouldn't be wedded to an asset-based model (leisure centres) as the stats show they don't work. Instead must look at the needs of the community and look to find sport and physical activity alternatives that give greater impact. PS expressed as both boards the questions that needs to be asked are who are, how to both organisations come together and a recognition of what everyone does with skills and expertise in which we can use to better effect. 		

- JB summarised MSF’s position as the implementation arm of the MSP strategy. Agile in recruitment of staff and others areas whereas with LCC it may take longer due to bureaucracy.
- Amongst many in the discussion there is an agreement in working differently with affected communities to address their barrier and needs. The Sport England Strategy and MSF Business Plan both support this point.
- TPS asked the question to the group about the identity of both organisations and whether branding them together would make it easier for partners and community groups to understand who we are.
- Do both organisations need to be separate entities or can they look and feel like one entity? The outputs, objectives and principles of both organisations are very similar which go back to this question.
- Partnership hosted by local authority working with the Foundation. The liability and decision-making lie with the Trustees and the Board Members have a purely advisory capacity.
- CJ identified where the two organisations can work in different places is with the relationships developed to make it happen. We should use the relationships from the board to diversify and to build going forward.
- Everything we do should always go back to the big picture, how do we serve our communities better.
- TPS raised a question about whether it’s possible to amalgamate both board meetings together due to the similar objectives and programmes currently working. TD explained from a decision-making view, board members can only make decisions on their own organisations not vice versa.
- CJ sees value in both meetings 95% of the meeting can be discussed amongst both board and 5% where decisions need to be made can be actioned by appropriate boards.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SW commented on reviewing the positives and negatives of amalgamating both groups in a meeting before any action is taken. <p>Action: To trial a joint board meeting for both MSP and MSF in July 2021</p> <p>Action: To check the legal requirements of independent decision making for both boards, to share at July meeting</p>	<p>TD</p> <p>TD</p>	<p>July 2021</p> <p>July 2021</p>
--	--	---------------------	-----------------------------------