

## Board Notes

<b>Meeting</b>	Active Kent and Medway Partnership Board	<b>Date</b>	Tuesday 21 <sup>st</sup> January 2025
<b>Location</b>	Online meeting via Teams	<b>Time</b>	10.30am
<b>Board Members</b>	Graham Razey (Chair), Adam Lawrence, Liu Batchelor, Gurvinder Sandher, Derek Lewis, Chris Morgan, Kathryn Edwards, Luke McCarthy, Tom Marchant (Kent County Council – Host Representative), Liz Davidson (AP Director),		
<b>Board Members Present</b>	Graham Razey (GR), Tom Marchant (TM), Liz Davidson (LD), Derek Lewis (DL), Chris Morgan (CM), Luke McCarthy (LMC), Kathryn Edwards (KE), Liu Batchelor(LB)		
<b>Attendees Present</b>	Karen Bird (KB), Elise Rendall (ER), Andrea Murphy (AM), Louise Milne (LM), Chris Tinbergen (CT), Selina Baker (Active Kent & Medway Note Taker)		

Item No	Item	Comments		
1.	Welcome and Apologies for Absence	Apologies were received from Adam Lawrence and Gurvinder Sandher.		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		-	-	-
2.	Declarations of Interest	None received		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		-	-	-

3.	Minutes of the meeting held 21/10/24 including any confidential minutes	Members approved the notes for the meeting held in October 2024		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		-	-	-
4.	Matters arising not covered by this agenda	<p>DL raised a question about the smoking cessation work and whether it was outside our core activity and do we have the skill set for it. Additionally, should a separate paper have been included as it is similar in size to the postural stability work?</p> <p>LD advised that Public Health (PH) came to AKM before Christmas asking if we could support them with the administration of a programme. Agreeing with DL, LD added that normally, yes this does sit outside the realm of the partnership, however we had some capacity in the team. It was also done with the view of the relationship with PH and as a political decision / reactive as much as a strategic one.</p> <p>GR noted it was great that we had work being directed towards us, but we need to be mindful and have Board discussions around it to ensure that we continue to understand what our core purpose is.</p> <p>ER responded that capacity was carefully reviewed, and felt this was about reaching new audiences through our networks. AKM saw this as an opportunity on this occasion, by helping to link up sport / physical activity with health as well as mentoring and supporting teams to help themselves going forward.</p> <p>GR advised it was not the Board's place to stifle AKM's ability to make decisions, however this potentially does lie to one side of our core work. CM commented that he felt there was a natural synergy between the two areas of smoking cessation and healthy lives whereas GR said he felt this was normally seen as sitting within just health (typically GPs), and that PH were just managing their resources on a temporary basis.</p> <p>TM commented that we don't want to lose sight of future benefits that working with PH like this could bring, especially with the current environment, and noted that a wider piece warrants further exploration in terms of where we want to get to. GR commented that during the away day we should spend time better defining our five pillars to help with this.</p>		

		<p>With regards to linking up our work with health, KE questioned if there was the potential for better access to working collaboratively with GPs if working with PH. ER confirmed this was possible and that we were already with the One You Teams, although this was patchy, so could therefore be improved. KE followed up with the suggestion of getting more EDA videos in GP practices potentially.</p> <p>One final comment from ER with regards to smoking cessation was that we know that people have a tendency to gain weight when giving up smoking, which in turn links with encouraging people to be more active.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		Defining five pillars further	All	20/05/2025
5.	<b>Update Reports - <u>Chairman's Report</u></b>	<p>GR noted the significant current debate we should be having is around devolution. This is particularly important for us as a hosted organisation and we need to confirm what our position is regarding any communication we have around devolution by the end of the discussion.</p> <p>LD was asked to explain what was known to date by AKM. This consisted of the issue of a White Paper prior to Christmas by the government announcing the proposed way forward for local government would be strategic mayoral authorities as a bid to streamline the system.</p> <p>A submission of interest from KCC to be a priority place (i.e. application to be accelerated) was submitted on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2025 to government which will be heard on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2025. The new structure would comprise three levels of local authority, the first being who already are strategic mayoral authorities, then new mayoral authorities and finally foundation authorities (which KCC does not wish to be). Under this would be unitary authorities where Medway is currently already one. This would then mean the rest of the ~1.9 million Kent population being sectioned up into ones serving up approximately half a million people each, which is either going to be 3 or 4.</p> <p>KCC would likely no longer exist, and obviously as a hosted organisation this would have implications for us. This would affect the district relationships as we know them currently as well as place work and potentially funding from Public Health.</p> <p>LD concluded that we need to start having the conversation about how we communicate to staff and AKM should be exploring all the different options going forward for the partnership i.e. aligning with a unitary authority or becoming independent. LD noted that she had had calls with other APs to discuss their situation, looking at both sides to help evaluate the positives in each.</p>		

		<p>GR addressed the fact that there was the third option of aligning ourselves with a combined authority. His view is to keep our options very open and agreed clear communication to staff was key. We need to be exploring all opportunities, and it was suggested that we write to leaders of KCC and Medway councils to suggest that we are very much engaged when they are looking at the options for which powers they wish to have. There is no suggestion at this stage nationally that APs would become any part of government administration however, and partnerships would be consumed back into local government arrangements. During our Board away day we need to confirm our position as a partnership regards this so that we can confirm to our stakeholders.</p> <p>TM has provided a paper which details a number of timescales. He believes KCC's application will be approved due to the amount of unified lobbying that has taken place. If approved there would be mayoral elections next May if on this programme, and things would move at pace if implemented. However he believes we need to wait until we hear the decision before we make any further comment / decision.</p> <p>In terms of responsibilities, GR recognised the Board's, and DR commented that as we go through the stages we need to be mindful of reassuring the staff, and what protection can we give them. DL also questioned potential legal fees and who would pay them. LD also added that we need to be careful about what we say regarding Devolution as we are hosted by KCC as well, as the fact that GS is involved with ICB setup, and it's likely the new Mayor would sit on the ICB Board.</p> <p>In conclusion GR noted there are number of organisations who have been through similar, and until we have a statement from KCC/Medway we have a bit of time. LD commented that there is also the positive in terms of this aligning with the SE funding cycle too and we do have the national network for support. GR concluded that change could be a positive outcome from this, as it could potentially be a new direction for the partnership.</p>		
		Action	Assigned To	Due Date
	Action Items	White Paper from TM – Circulate to All	SB	21/01/2025
		Write to KCC and Medway councils	LD/GR	21/03/2025

6.	Update Reports - Directors	<p>LD advised the changes within the structure of the AKM team with the appointment of four strategic leads – Health, Marketing, Insight and Strategy, Partnerships and Community, and Children and Young People. Within this restructure one of the original members of the SMT (Natalie Harris) has taken a role outside the SMT looking after events and safeguarding.</p> <p>LD concluded that significant progress had been made in this area. GR commented that the deputy nomination election was now the only outstanding item, for which a process is needed.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		From report - GR & LD to get in touch with Paralympians	LS & GR	28/02/25
7.	Place Work – Additional Place Decision	<p>LD explained that at the meeting in December with SE (AM also in attendance), they advised that in addition to Place Universal Offer (our funding being £740K) they were looking to invest in 27 No. further places, and a number of those on their long list were in Kent - Medway, Swale, Ashford, Dartford &amp; Tonbridge &amp; Malling. AKM were given 48 hours to consider the areas with the option of picking one or two. Swale had been encouraged by SE due to its rural and coastal deprivation.</p> <p>LD subsequently spoke to GR and the SMT and on 10<sup>th</sup> December our decision for Medway and Swale went back to the SE Board. On 12<sup>th</sup> December SE confirmed they would offer investment to Medway and Swale subject to our Board's approval.</p> <p>GR questioned whether taking on place work meant a bigger risk to the partnership as it would mean diverting capacity. Additionally it is potentially outside our normal remit, so do we have the capability to deliver it, is the talent/ resource out there? Place work as a whole is very new to APs generally so we need to ensure we have the right people out there to lead on this work.</p> <p>Responding to GRs comments, LD added that place making is not a new concept, it's been present in other sectors e.g. Arts. AKM just need to look outside normal recruitment pools as well as utilising the voluntary sector, where we're looking to build the steering groups. Considerably amount of learning from the 12 local delivery pilots that have already taken place. To close LD commented that we have this initial 12 month period of investment which is around the development award, which is where we need to prove ourselves in this space before taking the further 3-year award for the wider place work. This helps to understand the risk about capacity and getting the right individuals.</p>		

		<p>Concerns were raised by KE that Place Work would be affected by Devolution, but LD advised it would still go ahead regardless as SE funding continues until 2027 – PH funding is more relevant to Devolution</p> <p>Recommendation on additional place decision for Medway and Swale in addition to anticipated successful application for Thanet and Gravesham was approved.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		-	-	-
8.	Public Health and Postural Stability Programme Decision	<p>ER advised her report focused on KCC service that is commissioned which is the Kent area and not Medway. The current services are provided by two organisations, one covering East Kent and one for West Kent. The sessions are for those over 65 and last 36 weeks.</p> <p>A review has taken place with workshops held by AKM with a view to implement changes due to a number of factors, namely: drop out rate, inability to join partway through, long waiting lists and not reaching target audiences (potentially due to location, age).</p> <p>Within the county we have an aging population, and the pressures are only going to get worse. Our proposal therefore is focused on prevention, with a 12-week programme open to those over 50, with a view to people using them remaining independent for longer, as well improving strength and balance. Included in the proposal is a 3-year grant programme with a budget of ~£125k for AKM to administer, including a grant pot of £103k, with AKM receiving £22k for management and delivery of the grant programme. Commencement date is April 2026.</p> <p>Public consultation has taken place in November and December, and we are awaiting the final report which is due at the end of this month, however we have received positive feedback so far. A number of risks were identified, one being that the PH grant is given on an annual basis. We have been working with PH team in terms of our MOU going beyond March at the moment. Capacity was also identified, and we are going out to recruit a Health Inclusion role to support this programme. SMT concluded that the opportunity the programme presents outweighs the risk.</p> <p>Comments from the Board included KE supporting the piece and noted it fits in well with the partnership's core aims. DL noted it was a good idea, particularly reducing it to 12 week which should make it more effective and help reach more people. He also had a question relating to capacity and ensuring that as it's a move away from just two suppliers to a larger number, does AKM have the skill set to deliver the course effectively and ensure standards are</p>		

		<p>maintained. In addition, GR questioned would be responsible for evaluating the success of the programme, as the AKM budget of 22K is not that large.</p> <p>ER confirmed that AKM would administer grants but the monitoring and evaluation would be a research proposal going out to university potentially. We have been in conversation with PH about training and upskilling organisations and how this would be presented e.g. in person or online, to ensure all are on equally competent. We have also proposed a set of pre application workshops for those applying for grants.</p> <p>DL questioned MOU being a priority for Q4 and what the status of it was. LD confirmed meeting with PH was next week and that AKM can provide an update thereafter.</p> <p>The Board supported the programme.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		AKM update after MOU	LD	31/01/2025
9.	Active Partnership Network Finance Update.	<p>CT presented a PowerPoint of his 2023/24 Finance Review of APs - only the second one that has been produced.</p> <p>It analyses the financial performance and the efficiency of the network, and all data within the report has been provided from the AP network. The focus is on income/expenditure, growth/shrinkage but it also helps to share income diversification and workforces across the network, as well as looking any recruitment challenges and environmental issues faced by the APs.</p> <p>CT continued to run through the report detailing the sections within it including: Expenditure Summary (which contained staffing costs, delivery costs and administration costs), investment strategies, efficiencies, workforce (which looked at staff benefits) and surplus/deficit which showed a huge variance across the APs.</p> <p>Slides included details about level of SE funding and how other APs have diversified their funding.</p> <p>Highlights and key figures included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SE funding remains the most significant income stream, but for the first time below 50%</li> </ul>		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salary costs increased by 11% during the year and remained the most significant cost to the network which is now a substantial employer with c. 1,000 employees</li> <li>• Reserves appear significant but are where they should be, ie equal to 6 months worth of expenditure</li> <li>• Income – £80.3 mil</li> <li>• Expenditure – £78.9 mil</li> <li>• Surplus – £2.4 mil</li> <li>• Non SE Funding – £43.6 mil</li> <li>• 843 FTE</li> <li>• Staffing costs - £37.4 mil</li> <li>• Reserves – £38.1 mil</li> </ul> <p>LM asked if he would be able to have the data sheet and what software do the other APs use and whether it is consistent across the APs. CT explained it was not consistent across the, a mix of Xero, Sage and some other less well-known packages.</p> <p>GR asked if there were any trends between hosted and non-hosted of importance, and whether there were any benefits to being either. CT advised that it's too early at this stage to comment with only two years' worth of data. However, one thing is apparent, diversity of income of the independent APs is greater than hosted.</p> <p>GR noted that Kent is a large population compared to the others and would like to see how this compared based on funding per head. CT agreed this was a good idea and noted for future analysis.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		Circulate copy of presentation	KB	21/01/25
		Share copy of data sheet to LM	CT	21/01/25
		Any questions on presentation to be sent to KB for compilation and the sent to CT	KB	28/01/25



10.	Update on Active Lives CYP Survey 2022/23	<p>GR acknowledged that it's a really important piece of information and noted that coverage of the survey has huge bearing on outcome, but equally noted that it's frustrating that it's not completely representative as it depends on who has been surveyed. He then asked can we do more ourselves as an AP to ensure we know that we are doing more to make CYP more active in our geography.</p> <p>LM advised that in order to try and tackle this we have appointed a member of a staff in the team, and in the autumn term 8 more schools took part than in previous years. This is expected to increase further due to her approach and getting more school engaged, which in turn would give more representative data.</p> <p>In terms of doing our own survey, we are doing a lot of our own monitoring, but as for doing county wide, it's a big use of resource, and the recommendation would be for more schools taking part in the SE one. The SE one is randomly selected, but schools can opt in if they want. However, we're not currently really pushing schools to opt-in unless they're part of a project. One advantage is if a school completes enough SE survey entries they get a bespoke report.</p> <p>DL suggested that maybe could we maybe cut to just the areas we're focusing funding on? LM added we do already target these areas for monitoring already within our projects with our intervention. We could expand that, just a case of how far do you go.</p> <p>GR commented that the data says we've had a significant increase of approximately 6% activity in Kent &amp; Medway and questions why we weren't celebrating this/making news of it, as on the face of it, it's a huge increase. Our concerns, LM explains, would be that the figures could go the opposite way next year. Our continued approach is that we support those that need the most help e.g. less affluent areas. So if we target these the trends is likely to go the other way.</p> <p>In conclusion GR commented that if we can't rely on this data how can we be sure we are having an impact if it is a key measure? The Board needs to be assured that the goals of the partnership are being met, e.g. getting young people active. LD commented that it was less about the measure and more about the reach of the measure e.g. getting more schools to take part in the SE survey. GR concluded that he thought the idea of focusing our monitoring and evaluation on the four places with funding was a good idea but wondered how effective in the long term the proportion spent on evaluation was - something for the team to consider.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		-	-	-

11.	KPI Update	<p>DL questioned that a lot of the status is amber, and whether we had a feel for the timescale to get us to green? AM responded that it was the last quarter so there are some challenges in terms of the funding that distributed now. The capital grant historically has not been focused on those audiences whereas small grants are going towards clubs that may not survive without our help. This has brought the figures down slightly.</p> <p>In addition we're not capturing all the work we're doing in LSE areas; this is only picking up two of the key target audiences currently and something we are having internal discussions about. We made a conscious decision not collect post code level data. We have discussed with other APs, and perhaps something we try with the Place work.</p> <p>We're doing a session with the team in February and make it a quarterly update in terms of feeding back and pushing KPIs. We are also having a review and planning session in March to help understand how we use this data and making sure we are focusing on it more regularly so we can achieve the targets.</p> <p>GR confirmed it was the SMT who assigned the green/amber/red colour coding and that it was therefore the duty of the Board to challenge if it was felt they were not ambitious enough.</p> <p>GR concludes that when we get together for longer we need to think about the CYP KPIs are for the next year, for discussion at the next Board meeting.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		Add CYP KPIs as agenda item to next meeting	KB	20/05/25

12.	Finance Update	<p>GR noted that from the report all looks well financially and follows a similar pattern to previous years, but questioned reserves and how that's going to operate, and what the predictions are for this year. The management of incoming Place money and how that would cause our income to double very rapidly was questioned and GR asked if we have procedures in place for managing this high risk and robust reporting procedures. Perhaps something for DL committee to look into.</p> <p>KB advised that we have a history in managing projects well therefore there was no concern and was happy with monitoring and control of finances. There has been previous experience with employees being hosted externally which is of similar nature. SB to assist with day to day finance matters so KB can focus on this type of work.</p> <p>Additionally, we are utilising the KCC finance system who are upgrading this autumn from Oracle to Oracle Cloud, which should automate some processes and improve visibility.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		-	-	-
13.	Audit Governance and Risk Committee Update	<p>DR confirmed next meeting is scheduled for 20<sup>th</sup> February.</p> <p>The risks around structure and funding have increased due to Devolution and GR questioned whether a new risk around devolution should be included. DR agreed this was a good idea.</p>		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		Include devolution risk item on next audit and governance agenda	KB/SB	20/02/25
		Circulate Doodle poll with upcoming audit and governance date	KB/SB	28/02/25
14.	Nominations Committee	<p>LD commented that this is a critical point in terms of Board representation. We will be going out in earnest in the next 4-6 weeks to seek new members. We are looking for candidates within the Marketing and Communications, Health, Education and voluntary sectors. DR has been helpful with putting forward names which were followed up before Christmas. There is a rolling call for trustees on our website. Please also reach out to your networks and feedback any potential candidates to LD.</p>		
		<p>LD has also met with Adam and confirmed that the next Board meeting will be his last, so we need to refresh the nominations committee line up.</p>		

	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		Recruitment of new candidates for the Board – sharing of details	All	Ongoing
		Chair applications open	-	-
15.	AOB & Date of Next Meeting	Primary PE Conference 26 <sup>th</sup> March and Annual Conference 15 <sup>th</sup> October were confirmed. Next dates for Board meeting and away day (20 <sup>th</sup> May) were discussed – a poll will be sent out via Doodle.		
	Action Items	Action	Assigned To	Due Date
		Circulate poll for Board dates and away day for the upcoming year	SB	21/01/2025