

Minutes of the Meeting of the Active Partnerships National Board Held on Friday 17 Dec 2021 virtually by Teams

Members Present: Adam Walker (Chair), Dick Fedorcio, Ian Hacon, Adrian Leather, Amanda Pearce Higgins, Mike Sandys, Sue Storey, Eammon O'Rourke, Ali Shipway

In attendance: Nigel Harrison (Chief Executive), Nicki Couzens (Business Support and Communications Manager)

Apologies: Alison Shipway

Purpose of Meeting

4 items to be discussed during the meeting:

1. Discuss update on current situation of consultation
2. Feedback on SE meeting which NH and AW attended
3. Feedback from Active Partnership consultation
4. Outline points raised at staff meeting
5. Decide if Board are happy to approve to approve phase one

1. Update

Adam explained aim of meeting was to discuss the paper and achieve one of the following outcomes

1. Approve paper as written today
2. Approved but with some noted alternations
3. Not approved and think of alternatives

Board then agrees to phase 2 – which is implementation of staff structure

2. Feedback on Sport England Meeting

Mike Diaper, Tim Hollingsworth and Ed Sandham meeting with Adam Walker and Nigel Harrison.

Adam and Nigel reported

- SE very happy with direction of travel and how it fits with collaborative approach being pushed through UTM.
- Comfortable with report and progress being made
- Tim drew parallels with the Sport for Development Coalition where back-end staff support the collective group of organisations that collaborate and work together
- Tim led discussion with support from Ed and Mike
- Tim confirmed it provided a good opportunity to look at structure and staff and ensure it is right for the future
- Adam reported it was the best meeting they had had with SE, very aligned, supportive and collaborate. Tim appreciates the way network are going, was more than tick in box and can see our how we work within

new approach. Confirmed it is not just about Active Partnerships and network, needs SE to do work in this way as well.

- Tim pleased with level of consultation with Chairs and CEO.
- Nigel reported he had just received before Board meeting email to confirm that the Phase 1 submission has resulted in us submitting a more detailed bid for up to £300k per year. Positive to have funding confirmed but didn't get the uplift which would have helped membership fee issue. Also didn't get the second £50,000 CYP funding as this was treated as a one-off payment.

Board comments;

- Eammon- good to see that we have re-established personal relationships as we want to be aligned and embedded as part of SE review
- Amanda – seems at odds that Nigel and Adam had a great conversation but finances then lower than we hoped. Nigel confirmed it is a figure that is based on previous years, but Ed had indicated that the network may get more money.
- Adrian – did they stray into integration of network, core team, AP and SE. If SE are looking at structural reviews – will this open door in future?
- Nigel confirmed they supported blended team approach, 6 out of 7 Extended Workforce leads funding approved, they are taking a slightly different approach but are going to be employed. At Sport England, Ed's team, national team and local team are part of blended work but there is not structural employment integration. Teams still employed separately but developing way of working. More integrated than past
- Will need to look at governance to ensure streams of work are not conflicting

3 Feedback from Active Partnership consultation

All the feedback on recommendations presented in the report were sent to Board prior to meeting. General direction of travel is confirming the 43 Active Partnership working together with a core team behind them rather than a transactional service.

Twenty-four Active Partnerships replied with a further four sending verbal or email feedback. Disappointed that more surveys not completed but the ones that had were largely consistent and we're not hearing anything different from other conversations.

Adam confirmed the survey was to inform the high-level sense of direction and next stage is to look at the detail.

Board reported they were disappointed that more responses received but acknowledged that three reminders were sent and that it had been discussed at numerous meetings with CEO and Chairs.

Board asked to comment on feedback and if there were satisfied, they had enough feedback to support the recommendations.

Sue highlighted some responses mentioned the use of terminology and did not comment on what was trying to be achieved. Use of word Body mentioned a few times as not being appropriate.

Amanda acknowledged that the fees are always going to be the emotional part of discussions and was reassured that the Partnerships who replied represented a mixture of different sized partnerships.

Mike suggested it would be useful to know if the feedback was based on a CEO opinion, also if they were any 'gems' we needed to be aware of in comments.

Adrian L confirmed that Active Lancashire hadn't responded due to work load, time of year, no sinister reason for lack of response. Supported recommendations and highlighted comments would help open further dialogue. Has not read or heard anything that says this is a no go, helping bring skills and capacity across the team.

Board agreed that getting the right person for CEO was critical, need the right skills and influence at the national table.

Dick suggested that money discussion was focused on the past, need to look at what is being offered for the future. Nigel confirmed he felt too much energy had been spent on the membership discussion in the past. We need to consider the unfairness of if fees are applied and not all APs contribute. The response was largely, but not unanimously supportive of this.

Adam asked the Board if they felt that sufficient feedback had been received to move forward or if more was needed. The Board agreed there was enough information to progress.

Nigel reported that two members of the national team had completed the survey, and these were shown separately on the report. One member felt strongly that it was important to get more responses.

Board approved the report based on the consultation that has taken place to date and that it should continue to engage as many people as possible to form the detail for the next stage.

Further Discussion on Paper from Board perspective

The Board were asked if they had any further comments on the paper.

Areas raised were that the structural review will help form recommendations for what the national team will look like. Sport England should be present at Board meetings as a collaborative partner and the need to provide more understanding



around the structural relationship and contextual understanding with Active Partnership's and SE to aid transparency.

Board agreed it was important to echo back Tim's comments to Active Partnerships and how the approach is consistent with SE agenda.

Nigel suggested that terminology used should be Active Partnership Network not Body as suggested in comments and to keep it simple.

Decision

Board agreed to use terminology of network rather than body. Board agreed to invite Sport England to future meetings.

Resolution or Action	Detail	Responsibility	Action Update
Resolution	Board agreed to use the terminology of 'network' rather than 'Body'.		
Resolution	Board agreed the approval of all other recommendations in the paper.		
Action	Board agreed to invite Sport England to further meetings	AW	