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WELCOME

1. Apologies were received from Sport England Board member Denise Barrett-Baxendale and from Sport England Officers Lisa O’Keefe and Charles Johnston.

2. The Board welcomed Nick Pontefract to his first Board meeting since his appointment as Chief Operating Officer, Sport England.

3. The Chairman declared an interest with respect to agenda item 4 – Parkrun Approval to Solicit by way of Kerman & CO LLP having provided legal advice to Parkrun and London
Marathon Events being a funder of Parkrun. DJ would chair the meeting for this item of business. WK declared an interest in agenda item 5 – National Governing Body (NGB) Investment - England and Wales Cricket Board by way of his position as Chief Executive at Leicestershire County Cricket Club. JP declared an interest in Streetdance by way of her partner’s position as Chair of Trustees of the organisation.

4. The minutes of the Board meeting held on 8 February 2018 were APPROVED as a correct record, subject to two minor amendments – an amendment to terminology under point 4 relating to NGB Diversity Plans such that these were deemed to be ‘compliant’, and a correction to the attendance record.

5. The Board NOTED the Matters Arising from the Board meeting on 8 February 2018 and earlier meetings, all of which had been completed, carried forward or dealt with elsewhere on the Board’s agenda. PS agreed to a target date of the 12 December 2018 Board meeting for presentation of the report on the review of the NGB Recognition Policy.

CEO REPORT

6. JP introduced the report.

StreetGames UK – Approval to Solicit

7. CP introduced this item. StreetGames’ key audience is young people from low socio-economic groups (LSEGs) facing significant barriers in becoming physically active. Working with a network of locally trusted ‘embedded’ organisations, StreetGames provides significant scale, reach and capacity for LSEGs in disadvantaged communities. Sport England has been discussing with StreetGames their potential contribution to our strategic priorities and targets and to understand their potential contribution to our targets on LSEGs.

8. The Board reflected on the significant amount of Sport England funding previously awarded to StreetGames (£20 million across the last strategy period and £3.5 million (transitional award) to date under the current strategy) and the importance of ensuring that delivery of the programme on the ground remained strong, and that StreetGames continued to demonstrate the positive impact of its interventions. It was noted that the organisation had good relations with corporates and had done well to leverage additional commercial funding, however, it was important that Sport England encourage StreetGames to continue to further develop effective partnerships, including with those organisations which had strong representation in the communities in which works.

9. The Board was satisfied that the proposal showed clear links to Sport England’s strategy, with a potential ability to reach 40,000 young people focussed in areas of high deprivation and low activity, and the potential for contributions to volunteering, core market, disability and children’s and young people strategic priorities. Given the proposed level of investment, it was agreed that, once solicited and assessed, the award should be brought to the Board for final approval.
10. The Board **APPROVED** the solicitation of an application from StreetGames for up to £7.1 million over three years. The Board **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** to the Investment Committee to consider the detailed investment proposal and to make a recommendation to the Board on the award.

**Football Foundation – Delegated Authority**

11. At its 4 October 2017 meeting, the Board approved an award of up to £8 million to the Parklife programme, delegating approval of the final award amount to the Chief Executive. Due to the Chief Executive’s appointment as a Trustee of the Football Foundation, she is now conflicted and cannot undertake this task.

12. The Board **APPROVED** delegation of authority on the final Parklife award and signing of the award agreement to Mike Diaper, Executive Director.

**Barclays Bank Mandate – Delegated Authority**

13. Barclays Bank requires that the Sport England Board formally approve the delegation of a number of actions relating to banking processes to any of the two individuals who hold the following positions: Chief Executive Officer, Chief Operating Officer, Executive Directors, Strategic Lead Finance / Director of Finance.

14. The Board **APPROVED** delegation of the actions (as listed in the report) to the individuals listed above.

**Active Lives – Survey Results**

15. JP took the Board through the latest set of Active Lives results, published on 22 March 2018 and reporting on activity levels in England from November 2016 to November 2017. Key headlines included overall levels of activity remaining stable, with 27.7m people being sufficiently active to benefit their health, and no change in the majority of key demographics or the gap in levels of activity between men and women (meaning the growth achieved through TGC remained) or in the activity levels amongst people with a disability. There had been some slight variation in levels of activity in different age groups, and in the types of activity with conventional sport slightly down and fitness classes and walking growing, which continued the trend seen before.

16. The Board queried whether there was any correlation between the gap in male/female participation rates and the difference in life expectancy rates for men and women. The Active Lives data is weighted by gender and age to ensure that the data and analysis is representative of the population. The weighting does not make allowance in the results for the fact that women have a slightly longer life expectancy than men as this would distort the actual picture of engagement. Analysis by gender and age reveals that the gender gap is present at every age group, with a lower proportion of women active than men regardless of age.
17. The Board asked if it was possible to provide a further level of detail in terms of types of activity i.e. was it possible to attribute increases in activity directly to some of the things which Sport England funded. JP explained that the data did not provide a causal link because it was drawn from a randomly selected sample, so it was not possible to track in the national data whether the activity had been done in an environment in which Sport England had invested or not. When considering increases or decreases in types of activity and how this aligned with the areas in which Sport England invested, it was important to remember that Sport England had consistently invested in local authority leisure facilities over the last ten years, so had made a contribution to levels of activity which take place in the gym environment.

18. The Board discussed the continuing decline in participation in cycling and swimming and considered what Sport England could do to challenge these sports further as to what action they were taking to address this. It was recognised that both sports had seen significant changes to their leadership structures in recent months, which was a positive start. Members agreed they would value a separate session at Board to consider the data and underlying trends in more depth.

19. The Board discussed the degree to which the governance changes required in relation to compliance with the Code for Sports Governance may have impacted organisations’ ability to focus on those aspects of the business that would drive sector-wide change, for example, innovation, new product formats, working with new partners, etc. Members noted that one of the most significant disruptor tactics in the strategy was investing in entrepreneurial organisations, and that a number of investments of that nature were already in train, or due to come to the Board for approval over the next two meetings.

20. The Board asked if the data could provide more granularity, for example, the correlation between activity levels in the LSEG demographic and how this mapped to specific locations. Such data would help Sport England to identify if there was something specific in particular localities that could be learnt from, for example, areas of deprivation where walking might be higher as people may spend less on transport. JP said that Sport England was building this understanding by mapping these types of reference points through the LPD investment programme, with some interesting learnings emerging.

Strategy Summary – RAG report

21. The Board noted that the report did not (currently) report against the impact on the strategic priorities and that comparing progress of planned, project level activity and national behavioural data would be particularly informative for the Board. The development of the report was an iterative process and this additional detail would be provided as comparative data became available from Active Lives.

22. It was agreed that every report should include an update on Safeguarding given the significance of this area of work.

23. The Board noted that Mass Markets remained rated ‘red’. As recruitment for key roles was nearing completion and the TGC procurement was progressing, it was anticipated that this rating would shift to ‘amber’ shortly.
24. The Board **NOTED** the contents of the RAG report.

*LH, SMac, SJ, NS joined the meeting.*

**INVESTMENT STRATEGY**

25. JP introduced the item.

26. The proposal was the culmination of a major piece of work over the last six months to provide a firm foundation for the implementation of the Sport England strategy, creating a clear organisational plan setting out what needs to be delivered to achieve success. The session at the Board meeting covered three specific areas of work: setting the financial envelope within which Sport England is aiming to deliver its strategy; setting the revised strategic priorities for the organisation; and reviewing and agreeing the adequacy and affordability of the proposed tactics to deliver the strategy.

**Lottery Income and Budget Implications**

27. JP reminded the Board that it had previously set a minimum requirement for savings over the current strategy period. Since then, lottery income had outperformed the original forecast, and was now set to be similar in 2017/18 to the income Sport England had received in 2016/17. The recommendation on future income assumptions for planning purposes was that lottery income would continue at the current level for the next year; thereafter Sport England would plan for a reduction from 2019-20 onwards in line with the Board’s original decision in October 2017.

28. 

29. The Board said that it was somewhat frustrating that, given the number of bodies receiving lottery income, a single forecasting model which all bodies could adopt, work to and review periodically was not in place. JP said that Sport England continued to work with DCMS and with the other lottery distributors to share as much information as possible amongst the distributors. Furthermore, the Gambling Commission would be taking over the operation of the NERA model in due course which should be helpful. It was however important for the Board to look at the different sources of information about the likely trends in lottery income in the future, and make its own judgement about commitments based on that information.

30. The Board **AGREED** to adopt the recommended assumptions on lottery income described in the paper for the purposes of investment planning, subject to quarterly reviews against
actual income by the Executive, and regular reports to the Investment and Audit Committees and the Board.

31. JP set out the available funding based on the agreed lottery assumptions (levels of available funding, available but ring-fenced funding, and committed and spent funding) for the period April 2016 to March 2021.

Outcomes and Strategic Priorities

32. SMac reminded the Board that the starting point for the organisational plan had been to establish Sport England’s strategic priorities and how these would be measured. The Board had already considered the priorities, the rationale behind each and how Sport England will judge the success of its work against them, but had questioned whether there were too many priorities and stressed the need to avoid a long ‘to do’ list.

33. Sport England Officers had reviewed the list of priorities to identify any opportunities to consolidate. It was recommended that two of the Sector Change priorities be consolidated into a single priority - 'Ensuring that the physical environment provides the conditions for people to be more active ('Active Environments'). This would still encompass the relevant Government priorities, but better reflected insight that facilities and the wider environment where people choose to be active (including parks and streets) is a critical enabler for Sport England’s strategy delivery and extends far beyond traditional sports facilities.

34. LH described the Active Environments priority in detail. The Board asked about the impact of the change on previous and future investment decisions. LH explained that this change of approach would be about transitioning existing programmes, for example, ensuring that Sport England asks the right questions when it is considering co-located facilities. More broadly, it was about how Sport England worked with its partners to identify opportunities and influence change, for example through initiatives like active travel.

35. The Board reflected that one of the challenges with active travel investments was that they were often dominated by issues relating to the design standards of the physical infrastructure. Sport England investment could add value in order to help drive the behaviour change needed to ensure the opportunities to walk or cycle were taken up.

36. The Board asked about the expectations around funding these programmes (who will pay for what). JP said that most of the Local Delivery Pilots (LDP) had sources of capital investment identified, the Manchester LDP for example. Sport England investment would be positioned towards activation, and providing insight on the behavioural barriers to help during the design process.

37. The Board reflected on the complex set of factors involved in delivering this priority and how finding simple but effective ways of communicating the interconnectedness of the various aspects of active environments would be a critical success factor. It was suggested that it would be helpful to map opportunities where other budgets could be contributing to active environment programmes.
38. The Board noted the crucial role of the LDPs in terms of developing insight in this area. Sport England would utilise the expertise of its facilities capital team and the knowledge of its specialist planners, but would seek to broaden how that knowledge was used and placed.

39. The Board AGREED to replace the Sector Change priorities with a single priority on 'Ensuring that the physical environment provides the conditions for people to be more active ('Active Environments').

Portfolio of Tactics

40. The Board moved on to discuss the proposed range of tactics for each priority (presented at Appendix 3 of the paper), which gave a high-level summary of the priority, insight into the major challenges and opportunities that Sport England needs to address, and the major tactics the organisation will be adopting to achieve the success measures.

41. The tactics had been analysed through three lenses – evolving and refocusing the existing system; testing and learning for the future; and major disruption tactics, and ranged in size and scale from small and self-contained to major investment programmes. The Board considered that the method and decision-making process that had led to the range of tactics outlined had been rigorous, and also highlighted the clear relationship between the tactics and the insight.

42. In response to a question from the Board, NS said that the number of tactics and percentage of investment was broadly matched. In terms of the amount of effort required some tactics, for example the major disruption tactics, were likely to take more effort and to be more innovative and therefore higher risk.

43. The Board welcomed the emphasise on major disruption tactics and particularly the focus on innovation. For these tactics to become really transformative, Sport England would need to prioritise internally to ensure the organisation had the capability to drive the sort of disruption required. There was some reflection on the challenge for the organisation of evolving in this way at the same time as delivering a big and complex programme.

44. The Board discussed the anticipated timeframe for delivery of these changes. NS said that each tactic had been considered and the anticipated length of time within which significant change could realistically be expected to happen categorised as short, medium or long term. Overall, cumulatively 70% of the tactics were anticipated to demonstrate impact within this strategy period, and remaining tactics were necessary to underpin larger scale change over the longer term.

45. The Board considered the challenge for the organisation of thinking laterally about what the range of priorities looked like as a collective picture i.e. thinking about the adequacy of the portfolio as a whole, and whether the collection adds up to the scale of change required.

46. The Board moved on to consider the range of proposed tactics against priorities.
Strategic Priority – More resilient habits

47. The Board supported the proposed tactics underpinning this priority, but acknowledged the importance for Sport England of continuing to prioritise support to the 27 million people who are already active to stay active, at the same time as evolving and focusing investment towards growing this figure.

48. There was some reflection on the complexity of the major tactics and whether, as a result, the tactics could feel somewhat fragmented. The Board discussed how the adequacy of the tactics would be assessed, reflecting that some tactics would potentially be more challenging to deliver than others, for example, the ‘influencing the traditional sport sector’ tactic where historically it had been difficult to persuade leisure providers that it was in their own best interests to make changes. JP said that the tactics would be constantly and closely monitored and if a tactic was not delivering as anticipated, Sport England would be flexible and able to adapt its approach to address this.

49. The Board recognised that there were some major tactics that would be absolutely critical to success and without which the other tactics would fail to deliver against the success measures, for example the opening up of opportunity data and the Local Delivery Pilots. The Board said that Sport England officers may find it helpful to ‘weight’ the tactics (across all priorities) to show this distinction.

Strategic Priority – Increasing the levels of sport and physical activity within lower socio-economic groups

50. The Board supported the proposed tactics underpinning this priority, however, this was an area of particular focus for the organisation and the Board felt that there was an opportunity to identify more disruptor tactics, in particular entrepreneurial disruptors. Given the level of change needed in this area, Sport England should be looking at innovative ways in which to increase the pace of change.

51. The Board reflected that Sport England could also better articulate its overall approach to engaging with this demographic through its local delivery work.

Strategic Priority – Increasing the levels of sport and physical activity amongst women

52. The Board reflected on the significant practical barrier to activity which childcare issues could have amongst this group – if leisure facilities don’t have good quality, affordable childcare facilities this can be a significant barrier to women becoming more active. Members agreed there should be an added tactic covering this aspect. JP said that the provision of creche/child care facilities could be captured as part of what we were prepared to fund where it was currently a barrier, if the Board was happy to agree to this. Members agreed this would be a sensible approach.

53. The Board had previously discussed the potential of developing a kite mark where leisure facilities or the activity could be This Girl Can approved. It was potentially a significant
undertaking (in terms of the practicalities around costing, auditing etc.) however, the Board agreed it would like this to be presented at the appropriate future point for its consideration.

54. The Board noted the opportunity that the LDPs presented to build understanding of and insight into increasing the levels of activity amongst women, for example, South Asian women walking around parks. There was a real opportunity to engage at grassroots level and drive the sense of ‘legitimacy’ of the activity.

**Strategic Priority – More positive habits amongst young people towards sport and physical activity**

55. More clarity was sought as to what was meant by ‘stimulating public debate around young people’s experiences. NS explained that the insight that underpins this is that children and young people are the only group who don’t get too choose what they do and how they do it - it’s largely school or parent choice and is shaped by the people who provide the activity. For a large proportion of this audience this approach doesn’t work. Foundational experiences are key and the children and young people tactics require the system to recognise that this approach is not working for some. This is about finding trusted voices to talk to the public and create the environment in which the stories about positive and negative experiences come out naturally to help encourage this change.

56. The Board supported this approach, but suggested that rather than relying on commentators, Sport England could give young people the chance to speak for themselves, including through social media, and encourage them to propose solutions directly. There was a real opportunity for Sport England to be more innovative in this area, and it was agreed this should be pursued.

**Strategic Priority – Increase the number and diversity of Volunteers**

57. The Board noted whilst there was good activity and progress in this area, more disruptive interventions were needed. The Board discussed the positive impact that good prevolunteering programmes, for example programmes like Personal Best, could have on stimulating the system.

58. There were a number of large-scale sporting events coming up, for example, Commonwealth Games and Rugby League World Cup, which provided an excellent platform for driving the volunteering agenda. More could be done in the way in which volunteers were recruited and it was important that Sport England clearly communicate the value proposition for volunteering - defining what the roles are and the value people can gain from volunteering as well as the value of retaining and using volunteers after the particular games/events for which they had volunteered had ended.

59. The Board agreed more thought was needed around the disruptor tactic and what was needed to drive change at scale. It was suggested that the Parkrun model of microvolunteering could be the sort of thing that could make a difference to the nature of what volunteering is, who does it, and how they do it.
60. The Board REVIEWED and AGREED the revised strategic priorities, noting that there was some more work to do on some of the priorities to demonstrate that Sport England has sufficient tactics, for example for LSEG and Women, and some further development in relation to Volunteering.

**Affordability and Manageability**

61. SMac described how the affordability of the proposed plan had been assessed using ranges of investment to establish a headline cost of carrying out all of the necessary tactics. Where available, exact costs had been used. The capacity and capability of colleagues to carry out the selected tactics had been reviewed and work had started on sequencing, looking at all the tactics and when they will be delivered across the next four-year period.

62. The Board AGREED the available award budget (discussed at the start of the item) and AGREED the adequacy and affordability of the organisational plan.

*LH, Smac, SJ and NS left the meeting. JC and DN joined the meeting.*

**PARKRUN – APPROVAL TO SOLICIT**

63. The Chairman stepped out of the meeting. DJ chaired the meeting for this item.

64. DN introduced the item. Sport England and Parkrun had been in discussions since March 2017 regarding a future partnership aligned to Sport England’s strategy. It was explained that Parkrun had the ability, through its reach and delivery model, to contribute to a number of Sport England’s strategic priorities: sustaining and increasing levels of regular sport and physical activity; increasing the levels of sport and physical activity within LSEG groups; and increasing the levels of sport and physical activity amongst women.

65. The Board reflected on the merit of investing with Parkrun given its position as one of the country’s largest mass participation organisations. The Board asked if it was possible to provide any details pertaining to operating costs at this stage. This level of detail would be explored through the solicitation; however, the Board was reassured that Sport England funding would be directed towards improving long-term sustainability rather than underpinning operating costs over a prolonged period. Sport England investment into the organisation would be sharply focused on activity that supported Sport England’s priorities.

66. Members discussed the statistics for the share of runs in the most deprived areas, noting that these had been steady since 2014. There was a real opportunity for Parkrun to be ambitious in the growth of the events being driven in parks and areas that are socially deprived, thereby increasing the levels of sport and activity within LSEG groups. The Board reflected on how the Parkrun model would work in those areas that were more socially deprived, as these often had less parks and green spaces. Parkrun would need to work positively and collaboratively with local partners and be innovative in how it sought to engage with this demographic in these areas of deprivation.
67. The Board noted that Parkrun sees participation as a two-step process - first, registration and second, attending the event. Parkrun’s aims were to increase registrations but also to ensure this translated into sustained participation and the Board would anticipate their application would clearly articulate how they planned to convert even more registrations into participation.

68. In summary, the Board agreed that a successful investment proposal would demonstrate innovation in how Parkrun planned to engage further with LSEG groups and women; clearly articulate how they plan to work positively and collaboratively with local partners and embrace community groups; and recognise the importance of open data, which would be a fundamental part of a successful approach.

69. The Board APPROVED the solicitation of an application from Parkrun Ltd of up to £3 million over three years.

70. The Chairman returned to the meeting and resumed chairmanship of the proceedings.

DN and JC left the meeting. GC and DT joined the meeting.

NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY INVESTMENT (NGB)

71. GC introduced the item. Awards to three NGBs - Basketball England, British Triathlon, and England & Wales Cricket Board - were presented for consideration following submission of updated applications for previously ring-fenced investment for the 2018-21 period. The conversion of years 2-4 funding for the Lawn Tennis Association’s women and girls programme, which was awarded 1 year of investment with future years conditional upon the development of a high-quality Women and Girls Strategy, was also presented for consideration.

Basketball England (BE)

72. DT summarised the investment case which set out BE’s talent submission for the remaining three years of the funding cycle, 2018-21. The proposal described BE’s newly revised talent system which had five stages of progression and incorporated other sources of funding.

73. The Chairman reported on the outcomes of a recent meeting which the Minister of Sport had called between the various Basketball governing bodies.

74. The Board discussed the importance of ensuring clearly defined roles of responsibility between BE and GB Basketball. PS confirmed that the two organisations had agreed and signed a Service Level Agreement, and Sport England would require BE to appoint a dedicated person to manage Sport England talent investment into BE.

75. The Board highlighted the importance of BE paying due attention to diversity, not only to player pathways but also to coaching and other team support pathways to make sure the organisation was truly reflective of its participants. It was suggested that thought be given to conditioning the award to ensure BE addressed this.
76. The Board **APPROVED** an investment of £895,000 to Basketball England for funding its Talent Programme.

*WK stepped out of the meeting.*

**England & Wales Cricket Board (ECB)**

77. GC summarised the investment case. Although the ECB were solicited for a particular programme (the Super 8 programme), there were a number of other elements within their disability strategy that they were self-funding that have not been included in the application or budget breakdown. The ECB was requesting £400,000 though this submission with a sole focus on disabled participants within the Core Market.

78. The Board noted that the ECB had completed an extensive evaluation of previous disability provision, and had generated in depth insight of their disability market. Sport England’s disability team had worked closely with the ECB on the plan and the strategy placed the ECB as one of the most insight-led NGBs in the delivery of programmes to disabled people.

79. The Board **APPROVED** an investment of £400,000 to the England & Wales Cricket Board to fund its disability plan.

*WK returned to the meeting.*

**Lawn Tennis Association (LTA)**

80. PS summarised the investment case. The LTA’s strategy would focus on two specific segments: Girls aged 5-11 and Women aged 25-39, with Sport England’s investment focused on the This Girl Can Coach (£527,000), Inspire the Next Generation (£360,000) and Tennis for Me (£319,000) programmes. The investment would allow the LTA to deliver at much greater pace and scale over the next three years, in particular with the workforce elements of their plan.

81. The Board reflected on the importance of the LTA seeking to better understand the attitudes and perceptions of women towards the game of tennis. Whilst the award was conditioned to help ensure this, with the LTA required to establish a regular survey and to modify their plans in response to this information, it would be important for Sport England to continue to monitor this.

82. There was a broader challenge from the Board as to the ‘innovative’ quality of the LTA’s insight. The Board agreed that it was important for Sport England to challenge all NGBs, including the LTA, to continually develop and evolve their insight as they sought to deliver their strategies. Insight needed to be valuable and meaningful. Opportunities for aligning insight should also be taken advantage of, for example, how insight gathered in relation to coaching aligned with insight in other areas.

83. The Board noted the opportunity for Sport England to encourage the LTA to fully exploit the opportunities for working with the Tennis Foundation and drive cohesion between the
two organisations, for example, by supporting each other on programmes like Serves, which offered an excellent way into the game for disadvantaged people.

84. The Board **APPROVED** the conversion of years 2-4 funding of £1,206,664 for the Lawn Tennis Association’s women and girls programme for the remaining three years of this cycle (2018 – 2021).

**British Triathlon (BT)**

85. GC summarised the investment case. BT split its request for funding for its Mass Market GoTri programme over two years (2018-20) to provide more stability and allow further time to develop its insight base. This request remained within the scoping range. A range of different GoTri options would be available through the development of the programme and a series of campaigns and partnerships with service and leisure providers, NGBs and digital companies, were planned to build momentum.

86. In response to a question from the Board, JP confirmed that she had recently met with the CEO of BT who had identified this initiative as one of his top priorities, particularly in terms of creating a sustainable funding model for GoTri and that this model seemed realistic given some of the commercial partnerships in place.

87. The Board **APPROVED** a 2-year award of £1,059,000 British Triathlon (£650,000 in 2018-19 and £409,000 in 2019-20) to fund its Mass Market GoTri programme.

**MINUTES FROM COMMITTEE AND SUBSIDIARY COMPANY MEETINGS**

88. The Board **NOTED** the minutes from the Committee and Subsidiary Company meetings.

**AOB**

89. The Chairman updated the Board on the progress of the Board member recruitment. The interviews had concluded, with the panel proposing to Ministers for their consideration a number of appointable individuals with a good gender and ethnicity mix and a diverse set of skills.

90. The Chair thanked Rona Chester for her outstanding contribution to Sport England and support to the Board during her eight years of service with the organisation, and wished her all the very best for her retirement.

The meeting closed at 2:45pm.

**PRIVATE SESSION**

91. A private session for the Board members and CEO was held.