



## SPORT ENGLAND BOARD - MINUTES

10 December 2019

Sport England, Room 11-13, Lower Ground Floor, 21 Bloomsbury Street, London, WC1B 3HF

Chairman: Nick Bitel (NB)

Members: Natalie Ceeney (NC)  
Rashmi Becker (RB)  
Ian Cumming (IC)  
Chris Grant (CG)  
Sue James (SJ)  
Andy Long (AL)  
David Mahoney (DM)  
Tove Okunniwa (TO)  
Karen Pickering (KP)  
Azeem Akhtar (AA)

Attendees: Tim Hollingsworth (TH)  
Mike Diaper (MD)  
Alison Donnelly (ADo)  
Charles Johnston (CJ)  
Lisa O'Keefe (LOK)  
Chris Perks (CP)  
Nick Pontefract (NP)  
Phil Smith (PS)  
Anna Deignan, DCMS (AD)  
Joe Garrod, DCMS (JG)  
Jon Fox (JF) (Item 2)  
Naomi Shearon (NS) (Item 2)  
Steph Vidal-Hall (SVH) (Item 2)  
Greg Clements (GC) (Item 2)  
Luke Thomson (LT) (Item 2 & 3)  
Helen Price (HP) (Item 4)  
Amy Crees (AC) (Item 4)  
Serena Jacobs (SJa) (Item 6)  
Joel Brookfield (JB) (Item 7)  
Russell Turner (RT) (Item 7)

Apologies: Mohamad Elsarky

Secretariat: Hannah Kerly (HK)

*JF, NS, GC, SVH & LT joined the meeting.*

## **WELCOME**

1. The Chair welcomed JG from DCMS to the Board meeting, as well as SVH, GC and LT who would be assisting the internal strategy team with the facilitation of the discussion of the 21-25 Strategy.
2. Apologies were noted for Board Member, Mohamed Elsarky. KP had been delayed and would join the meeting from 10:30am.
3. There were no declarations of interest to be noted.
4. The Chair noted that, with the apologies and declarations completed, the minutes and matters arising would be discussed after the Strategy items.

## **NEW STRATEGY – FACILITATED SESSION**

5. In recent months the Executive Team, Investment Committee and Board had each discussed the overall approach to the development of the 2021-25 Sport England Strategy. The focus so far had been on shaping the principles and process (including consultation) that would guide the strategy development. A set of fundamental questions had also emerged, the answering of which would determine the scope and focus of Sport England's future strategy.
6. The Board and Executive participated in a facilitated discussion session, the purpose of which was to discuss these questions, understand the range of views that Board members and Executive held, find common ground and direction, and set the parameters for Sport England's approach to the continued 2021-25 strategy development and in particular its wider consultation and engagement.

*JF, GC, NS & SVH left the meeting*

## **2016-21 STRATEGY**

7. NP presented the paper, highlighting the key considerations as included on page 2 of the paper. The focus, in practical terms, had been hitting SE's three targets. SE is exceeding the overall target, yet there are still some challenges around the Women and Lower Socio-Economic Groups (LSEG) and reaching these targets by the end of next year would be a challenge.
8. The Board raised a question on the Capacity section around the support we were providing to individuals to help them meet this challenge through a period of change. It was noted that SE were providing additional training and support for line managers. It was highlighted that the leadership work should also be seen in the context of the new SE values that have recently been launched and that with the greater flexibility on admin spending from DCMS there is a new opportunity to resolve some of the capacity concerns in this area.

9. The Board had no further comments on the paper or information provided, however, did express interest in having a 'deep dive' on Women and LSEG in the new year [**ACTION**].

*LT left the meeting.*

### **WELCOME (CONTINUED)**

10. The minutes of the Board meeting held on 6 November 2019 were **APPROVED** as a correct record, subject to some amendments to the recording of the Transgender Facility Inclusion Guidelines discussion.
11. The Board noted the Matters Arising from the Board meeting on 6 November and earlier meetings, all of which had been completed.
12. The Chair requested an update on the timeline of the Transgender Guidance. The Board were informed that SE Colleagues were working on the Guidance to simplify and make more user friendly, this would be brought back for approval in the new year and that publication would be considered when a more appropriate draft had been finalised.
13. The Board were informed of the need (under the terms of the Code for Sports Governance) for an internal review to be undertaken on an annual basis to establish the effectiveness of the SE Board and Committees. Questionnaires would be emailed to all Board Members and Executive to be completed, with the deadline for return Thursday 9 January. Board Member 121s had been scheduled with the SE Chair for every member throughout January and February 2020.

*HP joined the meeting.*

### **CEO REPORT**

#### Active Lives Children Survey

14. Following the circulation of the initial highlights of the Active Lives Children survey results, LOK and HP took the Board through a presentation, diving deeper into the results. They noted that, with only two years of data, it was too early to talk about meaningful trends at this stage.
15. LOK informed the Board the number of children and young people meeting the CMO Guidelines had increased by 279,600 (3.6%) with growth coming from activity outside of school and in particular walking, active play, informal activities and team sports. LOK took the Board through some of the positive changes observed in walking, running and football and discussed some of the factors likely to be behind these.
16. It was acknowledged that the CMO Guidelines for Children had changed since the last results were published, and these changes were reflected in the published results. LOK confirmed that the numbers were up on both the previous and new CMO guidelines.

### Main Political Party Manifestos and Sport

17. There was a brief discussion on the recent Conservative Party election announcement relating to substantial increased investment in football facilities, and also to additional funds that would be administered by SE extending both CAF and our teacher training programmes.

### BAME research and event update

18. The CEO thanked CG as the Board Member who had been driving this and updated on the plans for the event to be held in January 2020 to present the new research.
19. It was noted that this piece of work had allowed SE to segment in more detail than before the activity levels of the BAME community and to establish the extent to which they are driven by motivation. The point was made that it cannot be assumed that people don't want to do a certain activity, rather it is more important that they feel they have the opportunity to do so.

### Sport England Brand Partnership Policy

20. AC joined for the SE Brand Partnership Policy item, noting the policy had previously been through the Exec, opening the room up for any questions or feedback.
21. The Board complemented the policy, noting it was an excellent paper and raising a few considerations.
22. It was asked whether company ownership of control by key individuals needed to be incorporated into the policy. The Board discussed some recent cases highlighted in the media, and whether it would be worth considering going beyond the organisation and looking at the owners and the critical individuals as well, when considering a partnership.
23. Clarity around co-branding; recognising when and where SE would and wouldn't want to co-brand. The Board discussed mechanisms in place to ensure good decisions, and enforce these with partners, recognising the instances partners may work with brands that SE would not choose to work with.
24. It was noted that the policy does not cover the sex industry, pornography, sex toys or contraception brands and suggested that these areas should be included as a restricted category.
25. The Board discussed that in addition to considering sectors, it was important to consider the behaviours demonstrated by brands, for example their policies and behaviours on topics like animal welfare and human rights. It was noted that often there is a trade off with brand partnerships and that it may be that whilst a brand is not a perfect fit for Sport England, if it has significant reach to our target audience, we may consider that the benefits outweigh the potential negatives.
26. SE Colleagues noted that partnerships would be assessed on a case by case basis, however, did take on board the comments and considerations as noted above.

27. The Sport England Board **NOTED** all items under the CEO Report.

Safeguarding Children and Young People plus adults at risk: six monthly report

28. MD presented the paper, noting there were three points to draw out: the focus on the embedding of the safeguarding policy across the National Governing Bodies (NGBs), Active Partnerships and National Partnerships; enhancing customer care around safeguarding; and the independent review of the Child Protection in Sport Unit (CPSU).
29. The Board discussed the need for the risk review to incorporate both SE and broader society.
30. The Board AGREED a more detailed risk analysis, outlining where we saw the risks, should be provide within the next six-monthly report [**ACTION**].
31. The Sport England Board **NOTED** the Safeguarding Children and Young People plus Adults at risk: six monthly report.

*SJa joined the meeting.*

**FINANCE**

Management Accounts

32. SJa presented the paper, noting there was no additional information or updates to be provided to the Board since the paper had been distributed.
33. AL, in his position of Chair of the Audit, Risk and Governance Committee, had no additional concerns to add.
34. The Chair asked for a brief background on the Gambling Commission Lottery income estimates to highlight the range in figures that could be reported. It was confirmed the Gambling Commission gave SE three estimates, in which SE report against the median. There was an expectation that income is likely to exceed the median/central estimate for 2019/20.

*SJa and AD left the meeting. JB & RT joined the meeting*

**INVESTMENT DECISIONS**

LDP Investment – Calderdale

35. As its Board Champion, CG introduced the item, noting that he and LOK had recently been up to Calderdale to meet the leadership team and see the pilot in action.
36. CP reminded the Board Members SE was working with 12 very different places, each LDP was working in a different way, with each one having their own stories to share.

37. For Board Members' awareness, it was noted parts of the Calderdale area were in the 10% most deprived communities nationally. The vision and mission of the Calderdale LDP was to ensure everyone in Calderdale could be more independent and have a better quality of life – 'Helping people to live a larger life'.
38. This LDP was facilitating change within Calderdale's Health and Social Care Transformation Programme (Calderdale Cares), so that the audience and prevention was at the heart of the process. One example of this would be establishing how GPs could incorporate discussions on physical activity into their general consultations with patients.
39. The Board discussed the upcoming change in leadership with the Director of Public Health retiring and whether this would have any notable impact on the LDP and its progress. Both CG and CP had spoken recently to the CEO of the Council and both were reassured that physical activity remains an important priority locally and the new DPH would be an integral part of the Senior Management Team at the Council. SE Officers discussed the opportunities this could provide the LDP, noting the impact the LDP had been having in the Community had attracted high quality interest.
40. SE Officers confirmed significantly less funding had been included in this investment for evaluation. It was noted, in the previous award, that significant resources had been allocated to evaluation and that Calderdale had secured an evaluation partner. This additional allocation will ensure that they can continue to work with the LDP through to March 2021.
41. The Board were interested in establishing how the learnings from each pilot and indeed from other place-based approaches could be used more widely. The Board were informed a paper was going to the Investment Committee in 2020 that brought all the LDP's and learnings together. This paper would be circulated to all Board Members for information.
42. The Sport England Board **APPROVED** an award extension of up to £2,655,000 of Pathfinder Investment Investments to Calderdale Council for the delivery of the Active Calderdale Local Delivery Pilot, of which £2,655,000 revenue funding is confirmed.

#### LDP Investment – South Tees

43. CP and JB presented the paper, noting this request was for Pathfinder and Accelerator funding.
44. South Tees is comprised of two neighbouring unitary authorities, Middlesbrough and Redcar & Cleveland. There are significant social and economic issues which contribute to inequality and these inequalities are typified by small physical barriers and massive cultural barriers across a range of issues.
45. The area had already made key strides to tackle systemic barriers e.g. the establishment of a Joint Health & Well-being Board. The LDP reflects a collective commitment and a shared vision for the South Tees with the aim of getting '*more people, more active, more often*' in recognition of its contribution to the broader outcomes needed to transform the quality of life for local people and communities.

46. The Board discussed what characterised the South Tees community, noting they had been affected and demoralised by previous unsustainable investments and failed initiatives across the public sector. The pilot was moving at a considered pace in comparison to the other pilots in order to build the trust with very marginalised communities and form relationships through the limited organisations operating in the pilot area, utilising existing employees and individuals. Those leading had striven to approach the pilot in a collaborative way, employing a range of partners to do things differently.
47. The SE Officers confirmed there was significant potential in South Tees, hence, the application for accelerator funding for pre-habilitation. The Board noted there was additional NHS related funding available outside of SE, that could help this LDP progress quicker on this strand.
48. The issue of senior leadership buy-in as a feature of the risk register was raised. It was confirmed that this reflected some turbulence earlier this year due to the impact of the local elections but was less of a concern as efforts to engage new place-based leaders were proving successful.
49. The Board discussed the 16% that had been allocated specifically for monitoring and evaluation and asked whether this was excessive. It was acknowledged that there had been very limited evaluation costs included within the development award compared to other pilots, and it would be using a slightly more costly form of comparative evaluation to monitor the impact of the LDP. It was noted this LDP did utilise rigorous NHS standards which incorporated a good measurement system.
50. The Sport England Board **APPROVED** an award extension of up to £3,056,207 of investment into Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council for the delivery of South Tees Local Delivery Pilot. £2,510,000 is Pathfinder Investment comprising £2,210,00 revenue funding and £300,000 capital funding, and £546,207 is Accelerator Investment, all of which is revenue funding.

*JB & RT left the meeting*

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There were no further areas of business.

The meeting closed at 2.30pm.

*All Guests and Exec left the meeting.*

#### **PRIVATE SESSION**