



SCOTTISH FENCING LTD

Meeting of the BOARD of DIRECTORS of SCOTTISH FENCING LIMITED
17 JUNE 2021 BY MICROSOFT TEAMS

Present	George Liston Sheila Anderson Paul Vaughan Hugh Kernohan Adam Szymoszowskyj Mhairi McLaughlin Stan Stoodley	Chair (GDL) Director of Operations (SA) Director of Talent and Performance (PV) Director of Governance (HK) Director of Development (AS) Director (MMcL) President (SS)
In Attendance	Vincent Bryson Jacqui Dunlop	Chief Executive Officer (VB) Minute Taker

	Item	Action
1	<p>Introduction</p> <p>1.1 <u>Welcome and Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were intimated on behalf of David Carson (Finance Director) and Barry Cook, (sportscotland, Partnership Manager)</p> <p>1.2. <u>Declaration of conflicts of interest</u></p> <p>There were no new conflicts of interest declared.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising</p> <p>2.1 <u>Review of Minutes of 19 May 2021</u></p> <p>After two changes, it was agreed that the Minutes of the meeting of 19 May 2021 were a true record.</p> <p>2.2. <u>Matters Arising from Minutes of 19 May 2021 but not on the Agenda</u></p> <p>a) <u>KPMG Audit</u> – HK confirmed that the response to the Audit had been submitted to KPMG with the next step being the issuing of the final report.</p> <p>b) <u>Strategy Sub-Group</u>– VB noted that he had a chat with a couple of contacts regarding being part of the Strategy Sub-Group, however it was noted that there are people on the Sub-Group who also have the perspective of working from a different governing body. It was agreed that, as this was a refresh of the strategy, that the draft document would be shared with someone from another governing body or a presentation made. VB agreed to look into this when the document was ready for presentation.</p> <p>c) <u>Changing Lives</u> – SA and MM were still to meet to discuss the Changing Lives Action however as the Equality Framework was changing over the summer, SA had intended to do both at the same time</p> <p>d) <u>Volunteer Strategy</u> – SS noted that he was currently doing background reading and agreed to keep HK and PV in the loop.</p> <p>e) <u>Project Forte</u> – GDL noted he had still to contact Salle Ossian.</p> <p>f) <u>Strategy Session Actions</u> – SA noted that most of the actions relating to the Strategy Sessions were longer term ones so had not moved forward as yet.</p>	<p>VB</p> <p>SA/MM</p> <p>SS/HK/PV</p> <p>GDL</p>

	<p>g) <u>Dashboard for Objectives Tracking</u> – VB noted that he would redraft last year’s document and have available for the August meeting.</p> <p>h) <u>5 Nations</u> – VB noted that he had communicated with the other Home Nations and noted that the Performance Group had a discussion about this.</p>	VB
3	<p>Chair Update</p> <p>GDL reported that he had attended the sportscotland Chairs’ Meeting and highlighted the main points of the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the main issues affecting governing bodies was accessing local authority facilities. Sportscotland was starting to engage with local authorities with the input of an SGB CEO; all sports were asked to consider supporting this engagement with their CEOs. Local authorities and leisure trusts appeared to be moving in different ways and at different paces. • There were changes to anti-doping governance requirements with each SGB required to have a Board Lead for anti-doping. • The discussion regarding a strategic reset confirmed considerable overlap between SGBs, with increased focus on changing lives and sport’s role in public health, considering inequalities of access, including the affordability of participation. Some SGBs had reported that their relationship with their UK body had suffered, but GDL had noted that there had been improved engagement with British Fencing (BF) with this relationship looking stronger going forward. It was stressed that, if SGBs required it, sportscotland would consider flexibility in timing of strategic presentations. • A lot of sports had seen membership decrease, although some had increased membership such as Tennis Scotland with the pandemic affecting sports differently; it was noted that increased membership was accompanied by a different set of challenges. • A number of sports had indicated that the pandemic had improved their digital engagement and presence with all predicting that this was likely to continue. A number of sports indicated that a Digital Strategy was becoming increasingly important. • There was a discussion on Equality and Inclusion (E&I), addressing how different sports had sought to improve diversity at Board level. Some used E&I as a standing Board item; GDL noted that this may be something that Scottish Fencing (SF) may wish to explore but cautioned against it being tokenistic and suggested that it may be worth speaking to other SGBs to understand their approaches. SGBs employed different approaches to address Board composition with some appointing non-executive Directors, associate directors or directors representing different demographics. Boards were approaching this positively, but faced challenges when attempting to improve E&I at club level, and it may be worth the staff exploring this when meeting with clubs. • The LTA had developed an inclusion strategy; which GDL had uploaded the executive summary to the Equality folder on SharePoint. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of sports were facing issues with Selection for major events. • Sportscotland and Children 1st had developed safeguarding training for Board Members, and it was agreed that Directors would complete this within the next two months. <p>SA noted that she had noted that anti-doping needs to be added to a Director’s portfolio and she will build this into her work on the portfolios. VB reported that currently he was the contact for anti-doping on the sportscotland investment paper. SF was also a named body for UKAD and worked on a pilot scheme with them. Going forward, the governance of anti-doping would be similar to that for Safeguarding in that governing bodies would have to be 100% compliant.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>SA</p>
4	<p>CEO Flash Report</p> <p>VB submitted the CEO Report, the one-month summary was noted as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home-based was <i>status quo</i>: some in-person engagements were happening with clubs and key personnel. • Level 2/1/0 restrictions remained in place (mainland) nationwide • SF Membership: 589 (20 more than May 2021). • Performance Group met 5pm June 15th – verbal update. • Strategy Sessions beginning – CEO had had exploratory conversations with Chair, Dev Director and PM. • CEO and PM nominated one candidate for the Scottish Institute of Sport and sportscotland High-performance Coach Developer course (Masters level). • SF was in dialogue with BF regarding Scotland hosting a BRC qualifier (July 2022). • Nike kit prices had been agreed: store would be built and hosted by PSL. • Cash at Bank(From Xero/Paypal) at June 15th c.£99K. <p>VB reported that SF was losing adult complete memberships, so although there is a net gain of 20, it is the adult complete member who pay the most money.</p> <p>The candidate nominated for Scottish Institute of sport and sportscotland High-performance Coach Developer programme had been unsuccessful in gaining a place. As the frequency was changing to 12 months from 24 months there would be the opportunity to reapply in 9 months.</p> <p>VB reported that an Events Group had been held and support had been sought for an event in the Highlands. It was noted that any support which SF could provide would not be transformational but would be helpful; if the event could meet the objectives of getting people back into the sport it would be considered.</p> <p>BCr had been nominated for the sportscotland Leadership Programme, an 18-month course. He had completed the Changing Lives programme, which LA was engaged with currently.</p> <p>Work had started on the Scottish Coaching Certificate (SCC) mapping exercise with Active Advantage impressed with what had been done so far, and it was expected that it would not take as long as initially thought. There would be coach education running in the summer with Salle Ossian on the existing methodology but the SCC would be seen in its fullest form by the end of the calendar year.</p>	

	<p>SS, MM and VB attended the Board and CEO training on Equality.</p> <p>SA noted that, if SF was to run the BRC in July, there may be an issue with Scottish volunteers due to the school holidays.</p> <p>SA sought clarification of whether the Events Group was the same group as the Competition Group and VB confirmed that it was and comprised the same people.</p> <p>There was a discussion about event support and who would make that decision. VB noted that there is a headline figure of £10,000 in the development budget, but this has yet to be broken down. He had some generic thoughts around education, sponsorship or subsidising of events. Any funding to support events would be approximately £250-300 so would not be transformational.</p> <p>SA asked to receive an update at the August Board meeting on how the British Fencing project work was going and how it is impacting the staff. It was agreed that SA, VB and BCr would meet ahead of the Board to discuss staff impact with there being a full presentation to the Board by BCr.</p> <p>VB noted that the SFA had published the report into historic abuse and all CEOs would receive a briefing from the SFA on 5 July. The intention would be then to share this with the sportscotland Chairs' Group, and it was agreed that GDL would attend if he was available but if not another Director would attend.</p>	
5.	<p>Priority Areas Lockdown Activity</p> <p>The Board approved and issued updated COVID-19 Guidance on 17 May 2021.</p>	
6.	<p>Performance Sub-Group</p> <p>PV reported that the Performance Sub-Group had met and talked through the options for selection for the Commonwealth Championships. He noted that this was not a usual year as there were not the normal rankings or competitions. The membership had been informed that the Group would produce a Scheme of what the selection would look like for consultation by the end of June, however this will now be in July due to discussions with other Home Nations and British Fencing finishing off a consultation on the ranking scheme. 150 people attended the information session and had been notified that that there would be confirmation after the summer on what the scheme would be.</p> <p>A number of options were discussed, and none of these were cast in stone. One option was to hold a competition that would allow selection from the competitors who were going to the different Commonwealth Championships from Seniors down to Cadets and that competition might be staged alongside the Five Nations competition. Other options discussed were using BRCs which didn't have to take place in July, rankings, and there is also a discussion on arranging a Selection Panel between PV and the Coaches and Team Manager to select a team from those who have expressed an interest and those involved in the squad and pathways training.</p> <p>An important part of the process will be to have a robust and transparent appeals process, especially if there is a single competition from which the team is selected, and some fencers were able to compete at it.</p>	

	<p>It is aimed to have the consultation out and back in time for the Board to make a decision at either the August or September Board meeting and issue the decision to the membership with some communication about what is then known about the Commonwealths.</p> <p>VB noted that if the competition was weapons specific then it would be held in 3 different locations, due to group sizes. U20s will require a bit of notice to be organized for India with these not until later in 2022 so any selection competition would be in late January/February.</p> <p>MM sought clarification on the idea to have one selection competition as there may be problems with fencers having a bad day, or not able to attend. VB explained that this approach would mean that fencers and their families would not need to put themselves at risk by trying to achieve ranking points and travelling across Britain to do this. Some competitions also may not be able to go ahead with large numbers due to covid restrictions, eg the national competitions. There has to be some consideration given to the potential restrictions which may be in place when the decision is made on the best approach for selection.</p> <p>MM asked if one of the options was more holistic, using discretion and looking at people's training plans and what their commitment and PV confirmed that is being considered as part of the squad and training approach. VB noted that restrictions may dictate that competitions can't take place so a holistic approach would have to be taken.</p> <p>HK noted that he agreed with MM's concerns and felt that it was something on which the membership should be consulted.</p> <p>SA explained that Veterans have used the single competition approach for a while. PV noted that it is a clear selection policy which the vets have it is not something which Scottish Fencing have been involved in. SA noted that the vets are involved with the Pathway training and Scottish Fencing may need to recognize that they get the opportunity to comment on the vet's selection. SA also suggested that there is a point of contact for the Vets so that they are aware of the information and suggested that both a vet, senior and junior representative is on the Performance Group.</p> <p>SS suggested that the information relating to selection is uploaded to the website so that the membership are fully aware of the process and when they can expect information, and this was agreed. SA felt it important that it was explained that the lack of movement into Level 0 is influencing when Scottish Fencing will be able to run competitions and what the selection process will be, also explaining that the organization does not want to put fencers and their families at risk by making selection reliant upon attending competitions across the UK to get rankings.</p> <p>It was agreed that the members would be consulted on the selection, and this would be issued by the end of July.</p>	
<p>7. Financial Review</p>	<p>DC had submitted a report in his absence. The cash figure was noted as healthy, £74,698, which is double what was in the bank account a year ago. The projection for the year is for there to be a cash surplus of £12,000 but this may be reduced if some expenditure comes in such as Project Forte, Storage etc. When the Strategy is presented to sportscotland it is likely that an increase in investment will be asked for and this can be justified as there will be Changing Lives work to be undertaken.</p>	

	<p>The finances over the short and medium term, to the end of this year are fine, but there may be a choice to be made if restriction remove quickly. The second tranche of the sportscotland investment will be due in September and the British Fencing payment of £7,500 should be received in November. It is important that the Project Forte funding is spent, but this can't be done at the moment due to restrictions, but this will start up again when restrictions allow.</p> <p>GDL asked about the COVID funding and VB reported that what was shown was the Edinburgh City Council grant and noted that there will be a couple of funding opportunities in relation to Changing Lives which can be applied for near the end of the year.</p> <p>GDL noted that there had been a lot of good work done by the staff to minimise expenditure, and the cash position was then helped by the covid related income. When the time is right BCr will restart Club visits and operational expenses will increase then.</p> <p>VB agreed to do a more detailed breakdown of the £10,000 development budget.</p>	VB
8.	Sportscotland Update	
	As he was unable to attend the meeting BC agreed to provide a written update.	BC
9.	Record of Decisions made Outside a Board meeting	
	The Board approved the issuing of version 18 of the COVID-19 Guidance on 17 May 2021.	
10.	Submitted Papers and Areas for Discussion	
	a) <u>Board Portfolios</u> – SA noted that she has not progressed the Board Portfolios. She has sent HK adverts for a potential additional director and independent director. When they join there may be a further change to portfolios, hence the reason for the delay in dealing with the portfolios. HK noted that the Board had agreed at the first meeting after the Election to produce a complete list of Directors' roles, portfolios and code of conduct on the website. It was agreed that the current portfolios would be published, and notification given to the members that the Board are looking to recruit two new Directors and that the portfolios will likely be revised when they are appointed. It was noted that both Safeguarding and Anti-Doping need to be added to the current portfolios and SA agreed to look at this.	SA
11	Any Other Business	
	a) <u>Strategy Timetable</u> – SA asked if the timetable which GDL had issued meant that the Board were seeing the draft strategy at the same time as the membership. GDL noted that not all milestones were included, only the key ones. It was agreed that there would be an update from the Strategy Group at the next Board meeting. HK felt that the Board should see the same draft the membership would see otherwise there would be the same conversation two or three times. GDL agreed to update the timetable and work with VB on the dates. He noted that the dates were based on the sportscotland panel meeting being late September/October and he will find out if there has been an update on these dates.	GDL/VB
	Date of Next Meeting – 14 July 2021	