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WELCOME

1. The Chair welcomed RB and SJ to their first meeting since their appointment to the Board. NH, the newly appointed Head of Sport, DCMS, would attend to observe the latter part of the meeting.

2. Apologies were received from Sport England Board members Kate Bosomworth, Natalie Ceeney and Debbie Jevans.

3. The Chair declared an interest in item 2 – update on the potential sale of Wembley National Stadium by way of his position as a former Trustee of the Wembley National Stadium Trust; and item 4 – Partnership with Parkrun. As the latter was a current interest, the Chair would step out for this item and AL would chair the meeting. CR also declared an interest in item 4, by way of his position on the Board of the London Marathon Charitable Trust.

4. The minutes of the Board meeting held on 19 June 2018 were APPROVED as a correct record, subject to two amendments to the attendance record.

5. The Board NOTED the Matters Arising from the Board meeting on 19 June 2018 and earlier meetings, all of which had been completed, carried forward or dealt with elsewhere on the Board’s agenda.

Committee and subsidiary Company membership

6. The Chair advised the Board that Natalie Ceeney would be taking over as Chair of the Investment Committee when CR’s term of service with the Sport England Board came to an end in late October.

7. The Chair thanked Board members for their service on the Committees and subsidiary company boards, recognising the additional time and commitment this service entailed.

8. The Board RATIFIED the changes to Committee membership and noted the changes to subsidiary company membership.

Induction of new Chief Executive

9. NP briefed the Board on the range of meetings, briefings and information sharing which formed part of Tim Hollingsworth’s induction programme. It was suggested that Tim meet with each of the Committee Chairs as part of the induction programme.

10. The Chair thanked relevant Board members for their help and support in what had been a robust selection process resulting in an excellent appointment.
CEO REPORT

**Wembley**

11. JP updated the Board on the ongoing discussions regarding the proposed sale of Wembley National Stadium. Sport England’s position remained consistent with the negotiating parameters as previously agreed by the Board. JP described the outstanding issues and said that discussions between the various parties about these areas were ongoing. The Board provided a steer with regards to some of these issues.

12. JP set out the anticipated timeline for decision making. The Board was happy for JP to continue to proceed with the negotiations as outlined, and in accordance with the negotiating parameters already agreed.

13. The Board **AGREED** it would consider the final recommendation for approval offline if needed (i.e. if timings did not align with scheduled board meetings).

*ES left the meeting.*

**Facilities Management Services**

14. As CJ needed to leave the meeting early, this item was brought up the agenda.

15. Sport England is seeking to enter into agreements for Estates Property Management Professional Services for the Sport England estate, and for Facilities Management Services for 21 Bloomsbury Street.

16. The Board discussed the potential options for relocating Sport England’s head office when the lease at 21 Bloomsbury Street came to an end in late 2022. Sport England officers had set a target of deciding on the location within the next two years, allowing a further two years thereafter to organise and implement the relocation.

17. In response to a question from the Board, CJ said the policy of the current facilities management service provider with respect to wages was competitive, and undertook to ensure that this resulted in the living wage being paid to all of their staff employed in the Sport England offices.


*CI left the meeting.*

**Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR)**

19. NP presented the item.
20. The Board had previously been updated on the upcoming CSR. Since then, Sport England had had its first formal commission from DCMS. At this stage, the work was internal to DCMS and was designed to aid their CSR preparation.

21. NP summarised the initial proposals Sport England had put forward, noting there was still plenty of time for these to be shaped and prioritised based on the Board’s feedback. NP reminded the Board that whilst the CSR process was focused solely on Exchequer funding, as two-thirds of Sport England’s income came from the National Lottery this was a material consideration in thinking about budget reductions.

22. The Board considered the saving and spending ideas set out in the paper. Members were assured that all the proposals had been fully costed and the phasing of money and risk considered. It was agreed that the detail of the costing exercise should be shared with the Board for information.

23. 

24. Sport England and UK Sport were liaising closely about their respective CSR proposals, but would not be making a joint submission.

25. 

26. It was recognised that the nature of Exchequer versus Lottery funding (i.e. what can and cannot be funded from the two different budgets) added another layer of complexity.
27. Initial feedback from DCMS on the proposals was expected later in the week. NP would keep the Board and Investment Committee appraised of developments.

28. The Board noted the update and discussed key areas of interest in the CSR process, providing the Executive Team with a steer on those elements it felt were particularly important. The Board AGREED it would consider the final CSR Proposals for approval offline, if needed (i.e. if timings did not align with scheduled board meetings).

**Update on Local Delivery Pilots (LDPs)**

29. CP provided an update on the progress of the LDPs.

30. At its June meeting, the Board had approved an allocation of up to £10 million to the Greater Manchester (GM) local delivery pilot, subject to Investment Committee scrutiny and approval. The Committee considered the detail of the proposals at its 10 July meeting and approved these. The Committee also commented positively on the outcomes measurement approach to the LDPs.

31. The Board RATIFIED the delegation of the individual award approvals (totalling up to £10 million) to the GM pilot in line with the Sport England Delegated Authorities Policy (i.e. individual award approvals to be taken by Investment Committee or Sport England Directors as appropriate).

32. There was some reflection on the importance of maintaining a level of patience with respect to delivery of some of the outcomes across the LDPs i.e. where these were generational in nature and the pilots would need time to work towards being able to demonstrate progress.

33. Opportunities for embedding learning from relevant programmes and events taking place in some pilot places into the LDP programme should be harnessed. An example of this was the recent Get Out Get Active conference in Manchester, which had brought together a range of stakeholders including local authorities and individuals from the sport and fitness sector.

34. Every Board member had been paired with a pilot place with the purpose of acting as a Board ‘champion’. It was important to ensure that members had the opportunity to visit the place to which they were paired, and that their views and input about the development of the pilots were subsequently captured.

35. The Board considered how effectively Sport England was communicating with stakeholders about the progress of the LPD programme. Whilst the organisation was doing well at processing the learning coming out of the pilots, it was recognised that more could be done to share and communicate this learning across the pilots and with stakeholders. How this was communicated was also important, with the pilots being encouraged to chart their own progress and really tell their own story, which was supported by the local approach to measurement and evaluation.
36. PS presented the item.

37. The Board was invited to consider the recommendation to de-recognise the United Kingdom Dodgeball Association (UKDBA) as the NGB for the sport of dodgeball in the United Kingdom.

38. A recognition review of the UKDBA had been carried out by the UK Officer Recognition Panel which had made the recommendation. The Panel comprised officers from each of the five Sports Councils.

39. The Board considered the details of the review and the reasons for it, as set out in the paper.

40. The Board APPROVED the de-recognition of the United Kingdom Dodgeball Association as the NGB for dodgeball in the United Kingdom on the grounds it no longer met the Sports Councils’ criteria for recognising a national governing body of sport.

DN joined the meeting.

This Girl Can (TGC) Update

41. DN presented the item.

42. The third phase of the TGC campaign was due to launch on 15 October and work was progressing on the creative development of the content. Timelines were tight as Sport England had had to wait for formal expenditure approval from Government (received July 2018) before it could finalise the shape and structure of the campaign and start creative development. The campaign would be entirely digital, with the creative content tailored for the relevant platforms and outlets, ranging in duration from small gifs to normal advertising length. The Board suggested that thought be given to identifying opportunities for niche advertising, targeted at specific predominantly female groups, for example advertising to nurses through the Royal College of Nursing.

43. The Board noted there had been progress on activation, however, concern was expressed about the speed of this area of work and the progress in building commercial partnerships. Some of the challenge had been in progressing partnerships when the creative content was still being developed. The Board was assured that activation, including the activation of partners, was a priority for the marketing team, with dedicated resource now in place to help drive this work. Sport England was close to agreeing a MOU with its first commercial partner, and a number of conversations were ongoing with other potential partners. Some suggestions for further potential partners which could help reach the campaign’s target audience were suggested by the Board. DN would explore these further.

44. The nature of the campaign as being solely digitally-driven presented opportunities in terms of agility and fluidity, however, one of the challenges of not having above-the-line advertising was that some leisure operators found it more difficult to see how the campaign would have the same level of impact as the previous campaign. The marketing team was mindful of this and of the need to ensure the new phase had plenty of opportunities for user engagement.
45. The matter of activation raised a broader issue for Sport England which was about relationship management with leisure centre operators and whether Sport England was approaching these operators in the right way. This matter had been discussed at the TGC Project Board.

46. The Board **NOTED** the update.

   *JM joined the meeting.*

   *Safeguarding – Children & Young People plus Adults at Risk*

47. JM presented the item.

48. The Board formally considers safeguarding of Children and Young People plus Adults at Risk twice a year. JM summarised the work with DCMS, other Government departments and other organisations since the last update to the Board. Sport England officers continue to support officials with the ongoing work, including consideration of potential changes to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 to change the law on positions of trust to include sports coaches (at present the Act only applies to professions such as teaching or the care services). JM noted that parental engagement, i.e. raising parental awareness and providing appropriate support, continued to be a priority area. JM provided a short verbal update on the types of safeguarding cases Sport England receives and deals with.

49. The Board was reassured that whilst the emphasis of the report to Board was focused on sexual abuse and exploitation, other types of abuse, such as mental abuse and bullying, were also being addressed.

50. The Board **NOTED** the report and the progress made on safeguarding of Children and Young People plus Adults at Risk.

   *JM and DN left the meeting. LT joined the meeting.*

   *Corporate Risk Register*

51. LT presented the item.

52. The report provided an update on Sport England's corporate and directorate/operational risk profile. LT summarised the changes to the register since it was last considered by the Board, noting an error in the RAG colour for Risk 3, such that the residual risk score indicated a RED rating and not AMBER (as was currently recorded).

53. The Board discussed whether there were any further planned mitigations it should consider in relation to Risk 7: *Uncertainty in the broader political and operating environment (e.g. Government, Brexit, Comprehensive Spending Review) has a detrimental impact on confidence and therefore on delivery of the strategy.* This risk was in recognition of the unique status of the current funding landscape and the potential impact this could have on some of our partners. Sport England had also looked at the potential direct impact of Brexit on Sport England as an organisation. Whilst this was relatively limited, secondary impacts, for example
on workforce and the movement of staff, and wider impacts to Sport England’s partners, the local environment and society as a whole, were potentially significant.

54. The Board was assured that whilst diversity and inclusivity measures did not feature on the Corporate Register, they were included in and managed at directorate level, in their risk registers.

55. The Board **REVIEWED** the Corporate Risk Register.

*LT left the meeting. SMac and SB joined the meeting.*

**COO REPORT**

*Strategy and Budget Report*

56. NP presented the item, providing a summary of progress on the implementation of the strategy and an update on the approach to budgeting for the period of the strategy. The report itself had been evolving to align to Sport England’s strategic priorities and to provide information that allowed an assessment of the collective impact of the organisation’s work, showing progress and impact against delivery, targets and the Government Outcomes.

57. Each Priority Owner had completed a one-page report highlighting the progress, issues, risks and opportunities against each priority. These one-page reports included a RAG rating for each specific tactic within that priority. It was proposed that the Board would receive a report such as this on a quarterly basis and would be invited to request further, more detailed information on specific areas of interest for subsequent meetings.

58. The Board welcomed the overall style of the report and said the narrative was pitched at the right level of relevance for the Board. Members said that where scoping work was still taking place, target completion dates should be provided so they could be sighted on any areas where timings might slip. As reporting currently entailed 12 one-page Priority Performance Reports (increasing to 18 one-pagers once reporting on the six Major Disruptor Tactics was added), Members asked that significant changes to the information from one report to the next be highlighted so that they could quickly see any areas of concern.

59. The intention going forward was for Members to identify from the quarterly reports those areas of delivery of the strategy which they felt required more in-depth discussion at subsequent meetings. The Board welcomed this collaborative approach and asked that, as a starting point, Sport England officers identify those areas they felt required more discussion by Board. The Board would then consider and agree the areas for discussion.

60. The Board asked how the RAG ratings for the performance reports had been calibrated. The importance of ensuring consistency across the reporting framework was recognised, and whilst a moderation exercise hadn’t been undertaken, NP said the reports would be shared in a single forum with all Priority Owners and Tactic Leads to help ensure balance across the status ratings. Simple RAG rating was a relatively blunt tool and it was suggested that further categorisation of the RED and AMBER ratings, for example identifying whether the causal issue was one of timing/scaling or a genuine block, could be helpful.
61. The Board was assured that scoping the approximately 30% of tactics which were still outstanding was a primary focus for the Tactic Leads and Priority Owners. NP would provide the Board with a timescale for completing this work when the report was next presented to the Board in December.

62. SMac summarised the work to identify those areas of investment which were likely to have the greatest impact i.e. ability to impact at large scale, across large parts of the population, and contribute to significant social change. Six specific areas had been identified (within the existing tactics) which were likely to amount to macro-level interventions - the Major Disruptor Tactics. As mentioned earlier, future reports would provide information on these tactics.

63. The Board moved on to discuss the budget for the period 2016-17 to 2019-20 (the 4 Year Plan) which had been revised in line with the strategic priorities and tactics.

64. SB provided the Board with context as to how the proposed Lottery award budget for the period had been arrived at, and the award cashflow. Lottery award commitment profiling was expected to be fluid as award programmes developed over the coming months. The annual profile of the award cashflow had been reviewed, balancing the optimism of how quickly Sport England anticipates recipients will claim the grants, with its experience of how long this can take in reality.

65. 

66. The Board NOTED the progress made to date on the delivery of the strategy and APPROVED the 2018-19 Lottery award budget, as set out in the paper.

Management Accounts

67. SB presented the item, summarising the key messages in relation to the Lottery cost target and the Exchequer underspend. Sport England officers were closely monitoring the Lottery cost target.
SMac and SB left the meeting. DN and JC joined the meeting.

PARTNERSHIP WITH PARKRUN

69. The Chair stepped out of the meeting for this item of business. AL chaired the discussion.

70. DN introduced the item. At its 28 March 2018 meeting, the Board had approved the solicitation of an application from Parkrun Ltd and delegated authority to the Investment Committee to consider the detailed proposal. The Committee discussed the proposal at its meeting on 6 September 2018, agreeing to recommend to the Board that the grant should be approved.

71. The Investment Committee had discussed the potential issue of the investment creating the perception of a competitive advantage in what can be a fragmented running market. The Board reiterated the need to be clear that Sport England was not subsiding Parkrun, and must clearly articulate that the investment would be into areas that would help Parkrun broaden the demographic of its participants, particularly to increase participation by females and people from LSEG backgrounds, and that this growth would be beneficial to clubs and other providers in the running market. Parkrun would need to work collaboratively with existing local operators and be mindful of not displacing people already active with those organisations.

72. The Board discussed the nature and extent of Sport England’s potential involvement in the project, noting that Parkrun was already well-managed. It was clarified that the intention for Sport England’s involvement was to focus on building the relationship between the two organisations, ensuring the right touchpoints were in place and supporting and helping Parkrun with the implementation of the project, for example, sharing areas of digital expertise which would help them reach audiences in harder to reach communities.

73. Parkrun’s proposal was based on three main initiatives, one of which was starting 200 new parkrun events in England over three years, a third of which would be in areas of high social deprivation. LSEG participation would account for 14% of new events compared to their current participation rate of 13%. Whilst this increase was not significant in percentage terms, the Board was assured that in terms of the actual number of participants, the increase was considerable.

74. The Board was assured as to the underlying financial sustainability of Parkrun Ltd - the organisation’s operating model was sustainable and Parkrun was looking at opportunities for longer-term investment to support costs beyond Sport England’s investment.

75. The Board APPROVED an award to Parkrun Ltd of £3 million for the period 2018-2021.

76. The Chair returned to the meeting and resumed the chair.

DN and JC left the meeting. JM joined the meeting.
PORTFOLIO OF AWARDS TO COUNTY SPORTS PARTNERSHIPS (CSPs) AND LONDON YOUTH GAMES (LYG)

77. JM presented the item.

78. The portfolio of awards, totalling £11,702,850 to 43 CSPs and LYG, were for programmes for the academic years 2018/19 and 2019/20, these being the School Games, Volunteer Leaders and Coaches, Primary School Support, and Active Lives Children and Young People Survey. The Investment Committee discussed the proposals at its meeting on 6 September 2018, agreeing to recommend to the Board that the awards should be approved.

79. The Board discussed the investment into LYG and the ability of the organisation to continue to deliver its programme of activities, which included the School Games (Level 3) London event given the lack of a title sponsor.

80. The Board considered to what extent the Level 3 Games could help get children who are not active into sport. LYG had run a number of specific girls-only programmes which had had a different makeup to the types of children traditionally participating in sport, and the CSPs and LYG were developing county festivals of sport which resulted in a broadening of the participant base.

81. The Board APPROVED a portfolio of Lottery and Exchequer awards to County Sports Partnerships and London Youth Games totalling £11,702,850; with £6,126,100 awarded in full for the academic year 1 September 2018 to 31 August 2019 and £5,576,750 is in principle funding for the academic year 1 September 2019 to 31 August 2020 subject to satisfactory progress.

The Board DELEGATED to the Investment Committee the conversion of the in-principle awards for the academic year 2019/20.

JM left the meeting. SR and NH joined the meeting.

MOVING HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMME (MHPP)

82. MD introduced the item.

83. Healthcare professionals are able to reach a large percentage of the population - more than 1 in 10 people visit their GP every two weeks and there are 1.2 million health-related visits to a community pharmacy every day. The MHPP provided an opportunity to make these contact points count. Phase One of the programme was due to end in March 2019 and permission was being sought to solicit a funding application from Public Health England (PHE) for Phase Two.

84. This investment would continue to seek to influence existing health care professionals (HCPs) through peer-to-peer training; upskilling the next generation of HCPs by visiting all the medical schools and updating resources; developing dedicated HCP-facing resources - e-learning and Moving Medicine digital resource; and testing and evaluating some new ideas, for example, the pilot of an Active Hospital model.
85. In response to a question from the Board, SR said that PHE was committed to the agenda and as the application is developed, Sport England would explore the level of co-funding they could contribute. It was suggested that involving other public health organisations (NHS England, Health Education England) should also be explored and SR confirmed this was happening.

86. The Board considered the Moving Medicine resource, specifically, who owned the Intellectual Property. The IP was currently owned by PHE and the Faculty of Exercise and Sport Medicine, but they required Sport England agreement to commercially exploit the rights. The Board asked that Sport England nevertheless explore co-ownership of the IP with PHE and the Faculty.

87. In response to a question from the Board, SR said opportunities to link to or develop social prescribing would be explored as the application develops.

88. The Board considered how the programme would seek to stimulate action and clearly connect to the sport and physical activity sector, for example, providing the social support that signposted people to local activities. There was clear evidence that patients do act on advice from GPs and Nurses encouraging them to be more active. The next phase of the partnership would provide further patient behavioural change evidence.

89. There was some reflection on the benefits of engaging with a wider range of healthcare professionals i.e. including specialists/consultants. Whilst this was not being done at scale, it was being explored through the piloting of the Active Hospital model, which was exploring how to embed physical activity across a hospital into five clinical pathways (e.g. maternity, cardiology, etc.).

90. The Board APPROVED the solicitation of an application from Public Health England of up to £4.5 million over three years for a significant expansion of the training of healthcare professionals to offer advice on physical activity. It was agreed that the proposal would be brought to the Board, via the Investment Committee, in February 2019.

SB left the meeting. PB joined the meeting.

CONVERSION OF IN-PRINCIPLE FUNDING FOR 2018/19

Football Facilities Investment

91. PB presented the item, updating the Board on developments regarding Sport England’s investment into football facilities, specifically in relation to delivery of the National Football Facilities Strategy; governance of the Football Foundation; and the Funders Partnership Agreement.

92. The Board reflected on the time it had taken to progress this area of work. It was recognised that the pace of change had been slower than Sport England would have liked, however, the scale of change at the Football Foundation had been significant, with the implementation of
the requirements of the Code for Sports Governance having been particularly challenging for the Foundation given its unique set up and Sport England and DCMS’ role as Trustees.

93. Whilst progress had been made on the Parklife Football Hubs programme, here again the pace of delivery was relatively slow. This programme of work had been particularly challenging as some Local Authorities (LAs) had found it difficult to align their strategies and resources to adopt the Parklife ownership model. Parklife was central to the success of the facilities delivery model and the Board agreed it would welcome a review of the programme to better understand the reasons for the lag in take up amongst LAs and other operators, the reasons for the slow pace of delivery and what might need to change as a result.

94. The Board noted the issues in relation to investment into multi-sport environments.

95. The Board was assured the Foundation would put in place a meaningful and credible plan to ensure continued compliance in relation to gender diversity of its Board.

96. The Board:
   - **NOTED** the progress made with delivery of the National Football Facilities Strategy
   - **NOTED** the position regarding sign-off of the Funders Partnership Agreement
   - **NOTED** the future development of a Single Facilities Fund (which will require further development and discussion both with the Funding Partners and with DCMS)
   - **APPROVED** the appointment of new CEO, Tim Hollingsworth, as Sport England’s Trustee on the Football Foundation from 19 November 2018.
   - **APPROVED** the conversion to full award of the in-principle 2018-19 Exchequer awards to the Football Foundation of:
     - £10 million towards the single site programme
     - £8 million towards the Parklife programme
   - **NOTED** the remaining in-principle Exchequer award to the Football Foundation for 2019-20, comprising:
     - £10 million towards the single site programme
     - £8 million towards the Parklife programme
   - **DELEGATED** the review of performance and detailed plans to the Sport England Investment Committee.

*PB left the meeting. NR joined the meeting.*

**Talented Athlete Scholarship Scheme**

97. NR presented the item.

98. At its 21 June 2017 meeting, the Board approved an award of £6,000,000 to SportsAid for delivery of the TASS programme, comprising a hard commitment of £2,000,000 for 2017-18; and in principle commitments of £2,000,000 for both 2018-19 and 2019-20. Conversion of
the in-principle funding for 2018-19 and 2019-20 was stated to be subject to successful delivery against agreed performance measures.

99. The Board discussed the measures of success for the scheme, with both sporting and academic achievements being tracked and reported back to Sport England, and the evidence giving a ‘pulse check’ on areas like inclusion, for example.

100. The Board reflected on the duty of care process for individuals who dropped off the pathway, whether through injury or circumstance, and was assured that TASS actively managed exit strategies.

101. The Board considered how to ensure the provision of awards was diverse enough. Whilst some sports had chosen not to nominate athletes for the programme and/or had chosen to run TASS-like models of their own, the Board encouraged Sport England officers to work with TASS with a view to seeing what more could be done to encourage greater diversity of participants in the programme.

102. The Board **APPROVED** the conversion of the ‘in-principle’ funding of £2,000,000 to the SportsAid Trust for the delivery of the Talented Athletes Scholarship Scheme (TASS) for the 2018-2019 financial year, based on their successfully delivery, year to date, against agreed performance measures.

**MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

103. The Board noted the minutes of the Sport England Committees and the subsidiary company. CR noted that KB would be taking over as Chair of the ESDTL Board when his term of office came to an end on 1 October 2018.

**AOB**

104. The Chair reminded Board members and the Executive Team that the deadline for submitting their responses to the Board Evaluation exercise was 5 October 2018.

105. The Chair thanked CR for his service to Sport England. He had been an outstanding Board Member; had chaired the Investment Committee for a number of years and helped through that to transform Sport England’s approach to investing, monitoring and evaluation; and had served as Chair of the ESDTL Board.

106. There were no further areas of business.

The meeting closed at 1:30pm.

**PRIVATE SESSION**

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