



**Minutes of the Triathlon England Council Meeting held at MP East, Loughborough, on
21 May 2016 at 09:00 - 12.00**

Chair: Lawrence Green (LG)

Present: David Bellingham (DB), Richard Fuller (RF), Matt Honey (MH), Dave Rigby (DR), Francis Riley (FR), Tracey Sample (TS), Howard Vine (HV), Jane Wild (JW)

In Attendance: Bill James (BJ), Jack Buckner (JB) Dan Salcedo (DS), John Mills (JM)

Minutes: Emma Good (EG)

Referenced: Michael Buccheri (MB), Matt Divall (MD), Lisa Hollis (LH), Natalie Justice-Dearn (NJD), Garth Lewis (GL), Paul Moss (PM), Peter Pain (PP), Kay Simnett (KS)

Item	Minute	Owner and due date ¹
1	<p>Opening remarks & apologies</p> <p>LG had been asked to Chair the meeting as the President was unable to attend.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted the Agenda items and apologies were noted from the following members:</p> <p>Aimee Stocker (President) Paul Aubrey Derek Biggs Tom Chant</p> <p>David Bellingham and Jane Wild attended the meeting to represent the East Midlands and South West regions respectively in the absence of Paul Aubrey and Derek Biggs.</p> <p>It was noted that the minutes from the previous meeting had not yet been uploaded to the website.</p>	

¹ Unless otherwise specified all actions due by next meeting

	Action: EG/MB to upload these.	EG/MB
2	Declarations of Interest There were no declarations of interest.	
3	<p>Items for discussion from last meeting</p> <p><u>KPIs and Portfolio Updates</u></p> <p>There were no pressing issues to be discussed on KPIs / Portfolio updates.</p> <p><u>Issues arising from Board Report</u></p> <p>It was noted that the question of sharing the Regional Operation Plan(s) with the Regional Committees remained outstanding, however, there was confusion as to whether this was still in draft form or had been finalised.</p> <p>Action: LG to follow up with PP for it to be shared ahead of the next meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that royalty charges were due to increase in 2016 and amounts had not been agreed for central collection funding. There was due to be an increase in cost in Level 1 and Level 2 courses in 2016 and this had been discussed within the Operational Review Committee. NJD was facilitating a meeting with FR and Mike Green and this would be covered in this meeting. There was a discussion around the justification of current costs and the need for a Coach Education review. The administration costs for processing payments were queried, however, it was confirmed that they were accurate.</p>	LG/PP
3.1.	<p>Matters arising from Board Report</p> <p><u>Tri-Activator</u></p> <p>The Council thought it would be useful if there was a presentation about the Tri-Activator development at the next meeting as some of the Council members were unsure on this area.</p> <p>Action: FR to update the plan as it did not have a lot of detail at the time of the meeting.</p> <p>Efforts were being made to replace the Run Leader and Ride Leaders qualifications. These would be aimed at below Level 1, e.g., parent/helper, to help to market products at new people and novices. The qualifications would equip people to lead sessions. It</p>	FR

	<p>was noted that more information would be known once the pilot trial had taken place.</p> <p>Action: PM to submit a proposal to the TEMB for approval.</p> <p>The Run and Ride Leader courses were currently suspended pending the new qualifications being introduced. The Council wanted clarification that the current Run and Ride Leaders would be insured and what cost and type of Membership they would fall under.</p> <p>Action: The Council to address these queries with BJ.</p> <p><u>Membership Review</u></p> <p>The Council discussed the paper on the membership review that was included in the TEMB papers and requested that the Council representatives ensured that the points discussed by the Council were reflected in the TEMB discussion that afternoon. In particular, it was requested that consideration be given to the information to be shared with the Regional Committees both in terms of what information was appropriate and when would be the best time to share the information.</p> <p><u>Sport England governance requirements</u></p> <p>There was a brief discussion around the requirements for the Sport England Funding Consultation Exercise, however, it was decided that this would be covered in detail in agenda item 3.6 - Chairman's Report.</p> <p><u>Board Report</u></p> <p>It was felt that the quality of the Board report could be improved as there were weak areas with little information. It was felt that monthly reports had become much more relevant and there had been an improvement with these. It was noted that the Dropbox folder needed to be tidied for both the TEMB and the Council with a suggestion that there could be a combined folder for both to allow uniformity with the administration and the Board reports.</p> <p>Action: FR will liaise with the office staff to look at the organisation of the folders.</p>	<p>PM</p> <p>Council/BJ</p> <p>FR/EG/MB/KS</p>
3.2	<p>Council Matters and Regional Business</p> <p><u>Triathlon England Identity</u></p> <p>DR stated that it was felt that the Triathlon England identity was being diluted in the North West Region, e.g., the new Regional</p>	

	<p>Manager was given a British rather than English email address. There was concern that the Federation would become an Association again. FR stated that the Triathlon England identity in Yorkshire had also been reduced and that there was confusion over where the boundaries lay. LG also stated that some members of the West Midlands Regional Committee also felt that the Triathlon England identity was getting submerged. RF stated that the Eastern Region had been provided with BTF logos for regional events without prior notice. There was a consensus that there was confusion around what was happening to the Triathlon England brand, however, there was positivity towards the alignment with BTF. The overarching concern was that BTF branding would become the default. There was also confusion around Welsh Triathlon and Triathlon Scotland as they were still using Welsh and Scottish branding, e.g., email addresses.</p> <p>Action: The Council asked for this to be raised at the TEMB meeting on 21 May.</p> <p><u>North West</u></p> <p>DR updated the Council that there was a complaint going through regarding a club. It was noted that PP had mentioned a new complaint procedure, however, there had been no notification of this from the TEMB and it had not been changed on the website.</p> <p>Action: The Council asked for this to be raised at the TEMB meeting on 21 May to clarify.</p> <p><u>South West</u></p> <p>JW updated the Council on the points that Derek Biggs had asked to be raised. It was asked if there could be clarification on the working group for unsanctioned events. It was noted that there was a group identified in the operational plan but this had not been put in place to date. It was asked if this could be followed up.</p> <p>Action: Council to follow up.</p> <p><u>Eastern</u></p> <p>The Chair was concerned over the quality of the communications that had been circulated as there had been poor English. It was felt that there needed to be a review on how messages were circulated and proofed.</p> <p>Action: To be raised in the TEMB meeting on 21 May and brought to the attention of the Director Marketing and Communications.</p> <p><u>East Midlands</u></p> <p>DB updated the Council that the region had put on their own event and that it had been very successful.</p>	<p>TEMB</p> <p>TEMB</p> <p>Council</p> <p>TEMB</p>
--	---	--

	<p><u>Yorkshire</u></p> <p>FR informed the Council that there had been confusion over the status of the welfare officer on the Regional Committee and whether this was mandatory. It was agreed that this will be reviewed.</p> <p><u>South East</u></p> <p>MH informed the Council that the volunteer offer of places at WTS Leeds had been good but had been too little notice before the event. It was agreed that this was a great principle and it would be nice to see more of this in the future, however, more notice would be required.</p>	
3.3	<p>Regional Ops Review Group progress report</p> <p>MH updated the Council on the review and there was a discussion around the issues and the areas to be worked on. It was noted that a paper had been produced by NJD that included the roles and responsibilities of regional committees and was consistent across the country. It was stated that Regional Managers had been communicating back up but not so well that Head Office objectives had come back to the Regions.</p> <p>It was agreed that members/clubs needed to be made aware of Regional Committees. It was asked if Head Office could provide job descriptions for Regional Committees and help with the recruitment and retention and the alignment of policies.</p> <p>There was a discussion around the Super Series and whether Regional Committees could help with the organisation of a Junior Super Series.</p> <p>The first review meeting had taken place and working group meetings were scheduled for June and July in order to be able to come back to the Council at the next meeting in September with a more defined approach. There was a view to launch in January/February 2017. The financials would be discussed at the September meeting.</p> <p>It was clarified that the document could be circulated to Regional Committees as there was scope to have them be more involved in the process before they see the final document to approve.</p> <p>It was questioned what the accountability of the Regional Academies would be and it was suggested that Head Office should confirm the best practice and then Regional Committees would adapt the right approach. It was questioned what guidance there was for new Committee members as to what was expected of</p>	

	<p>Regional Head Coaches and it was stated that key principles are required and good practice varied between the regions. It was suggested that the Council could start to help with the key principles and leave room for Committees to add their own values. It was noted that there needed to be uniformity between the Academies' and Skills Schools' accounting.</p> <p>Action: MH to take these points to the working group.</p> <p>It was questioned whether issues should go through the Committees or Regional Managers rather than the Head Office. It was noted that the SW Region had been receiving an increase in issues and were unsure of how these should be dealt with. It was suggested that an increase in issues meant that more people were getting involved with the sport so this could be taken as a positive.</p> <p>Action: MH to take this point to the working group.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the welfare officer role should be a qualified role.</p> <p>Action: MH to raise this with the working group.</p>	<p>MH</p> <p>MH</p> <p>MH</p>
3.4	<p>Council Contribution to the Sport</p> <p>This subject was not discussed in the meeting.</p>	
3.5	<p>Website update</p> <p><i>BJ and JB joined the meeting.</i></p> <p>The Council were updated that the new website would go live the week commencing 20 June 2016 (<i>update - this had been pushed back to later in the year</i>). There would be an initial 'soft' launch and mock pages were available to view the website in advance of this. It was noted that the website could be viewed on desktops, tablets and phones.</p>	
3.6	<p>Chairman's Report</p> <p><u>Governance</u></p> <p>BJ updated the Council around the tactical improvements that had taken place around how the organisation was run at a governance level. It was noted that there was a change of emphasis with Sport England and UK Sport now expected to collaborate under one governance code. It was thought that Sport England's perception</p>	

	<p>was that BTF was a well-run national governing body and there was no urgent requirement to do anything different.</p> <p>It was felt that there could be a challenge in getting everyday members to think they were involved in a rigorous and healthy internal democracy so mechanisms would need to be put into place to satisfy this requirement. BJ wanted to review this once the Sport England governance code had been made available and the Council agreed with that approach. The use of electronic voting was discussed, however, it was noted that this would require IT resource. It was felt that a tool such as Survey Monkey would not be robust and that an electoral reform society would be unaffordable. It was felt that the costs versus benefits and the knowledge of what the average Triathlon England Member wanted was not clear enough to address this with the TEMB at that moment in time.</p> <p>It was noted that minority groups were starting to be targeted and female Board and Council members had been appointed; these were steps taken that showed the BTF was improving.</p> <p>Moore Stephens had recently completed an audit and BTF were awaiting their report, however, verbal feedback had been provided and KS had started to work on the tactics to respond.</p> <p>It was noted that all TEMB members had been formally and properly appraised and their objectives had been published.</p> <p>Action: BJ to republish these in an accessible format to be held in HR files at Head Office.</p> <p>It was stated that the appraisal process was much more vigorous and had gone in the right direction, making a big difference.</p> <p>There was now a formalised President, however, the Chair was accountable to the Council with no appraisal or set of objectives. BJ asked the Council to think about what to do going forward. A suggestion was that the President and one of the Council Appointed Directors could be responsible for the Chair's appraisal.</p> <p>Action: BJ to put this forward to the TEMB.</p> <p>It was noted that KS had been working on the induction process; this would be available in the summer for BTF and Triathlon England Board members. It was suggested that this would be useful for the Council to have along with a Head Office induction.</p> <p>Action: BJ to recommend this to KS.</p>	<p>BJ</p> <p>BJ</p> <p>BJ</p>
--	--	-------------------------------

	<p>It was asked if democracy was visible to the Members. It was suggested that electronic voting could be used for the Regional AGMs in 2017 as a soft launch.</p> <p>Action: BJ to discuss this with KS and determine if voting would occur before or during AGMs.</p> <p>JB stated that BTF would need to acquire funding for the cost of implementation but KS had done some groundwork on this. It was noted that it would need to be consistent across all Regions.</p> <p><u>Membership</u></p> <p>BJ reported on the Membership review and it was clear that he agreed with most of the comments that had been made in the earlier discussion on that subject.</p> <p><u>WTS Leeds</u></p> <p>It was noted that there would be good participation numbers for the Saturday activities and there had previously been little participation numbers with the Hyde Park event. It was noted that Leeds as a city was fully behind the event.</p> <p>2017 registration would be opened up to Home Nation Members first as a membership benefit.</p> <p><u>Sport England</u></p> <p>The Council were informed that the Sport England Strategy Paper had been released and that pages 9 and 17 were of particular note for the summary and the funding shift of investment.</p> <p>The expression of interest and formal bidding phases would take place in the summer; these were expected to be mid-June and mid-July respectively.</p> <p>It was noted that the core funding market in the future would be national governing bodies at 29% and 17% of funding would be directed at children and young people. The mass market funding would be represented by 6% of the funding with inactivity and local pilot schemes receiving 13% and 16% of funding respectively.</p> <p>It was suggested that the participation work around WTS Leeds showed a practical example of what BTF is doing as a national governing body.</p>	BJ
--	--	----

3.7	<p>TEMB Report</p> <p>This had been discussed earlier in the meeting.</p>	
3.8	<p>Skills School</p> <p><i>DS and JM joined the meeting.</i></p> <p>DS explained that Lead Coaches had been appointed for all of the Regions except Yorkshire and that Coaches had already attended a development weekend with future dates for further development planned. Individual development plans had been created with Tony Jolly. DS explained that the Lead Coaches would soon be introduced to their respective Regional Committees. MD had already met with the North West and London Committees and was due to meet with West Midlands.</p> <p>It was discussed that Skills School would look slightly different in each region depending on the set up of the region.</p> <p>It was stated that the Yorkshire Lead Coach role was being re-advertised and that 13 people had already got in touch from the advert. It was noted that somebody was performing the responsibilities of the role in the interim before a Lead Coach was appointed.</p> <p>DS stated that the process of producing a marketing pack had begun. DS circulated an example of the flyer that will be used. It was discussed that the World Class Performance Programme athletes would be involved with promoting Skills School and that this would be included on the website.</p> <p>There was a debate around the assessment process. It was stated that there would be a general framework of skills, however, how those skills would be assessed was still under discussion.</p> <p>It was noted that Chris Volley would speak to key members of the team about the curriculum over the next few weeks.</p> <p>The Council had confidence in how the project had been managed.</p> <p>There was a discussion around encouraging Regional Coaches to help with the promotion of the project; e.g., they could be around at events to hand out flyers, etc.</p> <p>The Regional Committees' financial commitment was discussed and it was noted that NJD had been involved in discussions with the</p>	

	<p>Committees on this subject. There was no current detail, however, it was felt that an agreement would be reached in the near future.</p> <p>There was concern that differential pricing could create issues with children that live on the borders between Regions. There was a discussion around the option to have a national price.</p> <p>It was noted that BTF would seek funding for Skills School through the Sport England bid.</p> <p>It was noted that the steering group had not been fully operational since the early stages of the project. This had not been a problem due the excellent process followed in the project and there was a discussion around maintaining or abandoning the group and it was felt that the group should be kept as a forum to address any issues that might arise.</p> <p>There was concern that there had been a fall in the number of athletes expected to join Skills School, however, DS and JM explained that the initial aim was to increase awareness of the project and then follow that up in the following year to increase participation.</p>	
4.	<p>Matters arising from minutes not dealt with in the meeting</p> <p>There were no other matters arising to discuss.</p>	
5.	<p>Date of next meeting:</p> <p>24 September 2016 at MP East, Loughborough.</p>	