

Minutes of Network Club committee meeting
14th March 2016
University Of Bath

Attendees: Lindsay Dunn (LD), ASA
Jim Durrant (JD), Trowbridge ASC
Loren Roberts (LR), swim 21 Co-coordinator
Paul Sartain (PS), Bath Dolphins
Kay Wilcox (KW), Norton Radstock
Nicky Vause (NV), Norton Radstock
Susie Hann (SH), Frome
Fraser Thomason (FT), Frome
John Dougall (JD), Aquae Sulis
Rachel Ashworth (RA), membership Secretary
Dave Wordley (DW), Coach Liaison Officer
Stephen Pyne (SP), Westbury ASC
Barry Heywood (BH), Westbury ASC
Karen Bowen (KB), Workforce Coordinator
Tess Gibson (TG), Warminster
Sue Criddle (BOA) Bradford on Avon
Matt Lawman (ML), Communications Officer
Jamie, McNeil (JMcN), Chairman
Emil Taylor (ET), ASA
Wendy Hood (WH), Fundraising Manager
Dave Beament (DB), Keynsham
Christ Metcalfe (CM), Keynsham
Paul Nicol (PN), Melksham
Christine Lamb (CL), Calne Alpha /Secretary

Apologies: Mark Lawton,
Sean Grothier,
Suzanne Prichard.

1.0 Matters arising from previous meetings

A couple of amendments had been made to attendees and the distribution list from the last Minutes.

PS Wanted to know where the request for financial information from clubs was relevant. ET confirmed that discussions at the last meeting had taken place and this was around possible financial input into the club may be needed from network clubs. PS confirmed that he did not feel network club financial models were required by AS.

ACTION: Previous minutes approved

2.0 Aquae Sulis framework document (JMCN)

- Progress has been made on a number of points since the last meeting.
- Independent advice received on tax status and matter now resolved
- Welfare team have reviewed all outstanding issues around coaching and these have been addressed and resolved and there are no welfare issues outstanding from the club's welfare officer's point of view.

- At the parents meeting an apology was requested for JD. This will be discussed at the next committee meeting.
- Previous apology issued regarding communication of termination of the contract when announcing JD's return.
- DW has been working with the welfare team on the discipline log and policies and is continuing to be developed.
- Acknowledged by JMCN that the framework document is a working document that is fundamental to continuing to rebuild on the issues of the past and should be adopted by any new committee members as a priority

3.0 Future Committee Structure – JMCN

Good response received from the network clubs on the proposed structures. Discussion took place amongst all present with each club being given an opportunity to put their views forward.

ET gave an outline and confirmed that there were two main issues; the structure of the club and the desire of network clubs to be more involved in the decisions moving forward. Responses from the clubs would indicate that there is not the volunteer capacity for them to put someone to sit on the management committee. ET asked the clubs if this was correct. Confirmed.

The questions were asked how then the network clubs can be involved.

- JMCN confirmed that the management committee had discussed this and come up with a proposal.
- PS stated that they believed they should be two separate committee and meetings. Reasons were that the network clubs could come and go and felt that having them involved in the management of the club would be detrimental to its long term success. Also believed that the needs of network clubs would be different.
- DB believes it should be one committee as it was set up originally like that and believes that it is a partnership for the two parties and the best way to run it would be for some representation from network clubs on the committee. DB acknowledged that 12 network clubs could be difficult to manage and would suggest that 2 - 4 people who had the confidence of the network clubs for 12 month periods could be voted on. If not done in this way the committee is generally then made up of parents and this in his opinion does not always work well and in the best interests of the club.
- ML – agrees with PS – hard enough to get the network clubs to represent at the network clubs meetings.
- NV - swimming side and day to day operation need to be separated. They would prefer the existing model to stand.
- ET - confirmed that DB's version would be a compromise and this could be achieved by clustering the clubs. This would be the middle ground.
- SH - Whilst that would be good in an ideal world she feels that it would be difficult to get them into clusters.
- LD – raised the question; do you see that there are roles and responsibilities that need to be made day to day basis? and suggested that we could have an executive committee that deals with overarching issues on day to day management that then need to seek consultation with the other committee.
- JMCN – referred to ML's points and acknowledged that issues in the past have arisen from the last intake of swimmers and the issues relating to the termination of JD's contract. The management committee discussed these and came up with the idea of giving the network club more powers relating to swimming matters in particular. Other management issues. LD example – has attended network meetings in the past. recently took coaches into the

room to discuss the technical issues. Lack of attendance and entry and exit criteria was on the agenda. Current proposal is a way of giving more powers to the network clubs.

- ET – identified that approx. about 40% of clubs want integrated and 60% want separate. PS stated that in this democracy the 60% prevails.
- LD -attendance at meetings is critical. LD had been at previous network club meetings with little representation from network clubs when entry and exit criteria had been discussed.
- PS- acknowledged the need for a non-executive role within the club. PS suggested someone independent from each of Wiltshire ASA and Somerset ASA should be encouraged.
- JD- stated that network clubs needed to be involved.
- JMCN - what are we trying to resolve is the committee structure and learn lessons from the past. This could possibly be achieved with a new role that provided an independent viewpoint and audit to ensure future committees were acting in best interest of the club and to try and remove conflicts of interest. Issues around parents on the committee with a conflict of interest have to be acknowledged but felt this could not be removed, likewise coaches from other clubs. To have someone on the committee who could audit the committee who was impartial is vital moving forward. It was generally agreed that someone with a financial interest i.e. someone who financial gains from an existing club i.e. earns a salary etc should not hold an executive committee role. DB confirmed that this was without question.
- CL acknowledged that the network clubs by having to put a representation on the committee are formally engaging in the network.
- JMCN. Highlighted that the new proposed structure would give the network club committee more control and leave the management separate.
- KB brought up the point of number of hours required to support.
- ET – Confirmed that the group in general support a two model committee moving forward and this was confirmed by members. The questions was now raised when and how often do they meet. What decisions will they have to make. Constitutional change – and whether this is required.
- CI confirmed that any change to responsibilities of the committees will require constitutional change but that this should not be a problem and will need to be voted on at the SGM.
- PS proposes 2 changes day to day management to meet monthly, network to meet quarterly to check strategic development workforce and network development. Proposal for the independents committee members to sit on the day to day management board to give guidance and advice. ET voting or non-voting. JMCN – always been supportive of an independent chair. What would be the advantage of 2 independent executive officers. PS – believes that county representation from both Somerset and Wiltshire would benefit the club. JMCN is investigating options for an independent chair at present. CL agrees that this would engage the counties.
- JMCN – stated that some clubs don't contribute swimmers, officials, money or volunteers and asked "Why should we listen if you don't help out. We do need your help."
- ET suggestion to stick with the network committee as it is. And trial for the year ahead. ET sees the problem that we have a problem with communication from the past. Agendas to be network led. Important to get someone independent. Work towards getting an independent chair. LD says that someone on the committee should be a non-parent. ET – difficult to find them.
- JMCN is very concerned about the possibility of a financial conflict between one or more of the clubs and AS especially where calendars on open meets

are concerned as this is one of AS's main income sources. JMCN explained that is why consultation with the clubs will of course continue the ultimate decision making should remain with the management committee and not the network committee. DB explains the conflict. If someone is an executive member of a network club who is paid by a network club, that there could be a conflict.

- ET supports independent chair and independent committee member that has no child in the squad. ML that is how the current committee is written and for the co-opting clause. LD must have voting rights to give transparency.
- CL confirmed there were some suggestions on amendments to the committee structure and voting rights and these would be circulated once agreed in first draft by the current committee.
- ET - Changing the constitution – the ASA recommends that one parent / guardian of a swimmer aged 15 or under becomes and ASA cat 3 member to ensure voting rights going forward
- JMCN structure agreed by management committee to remain as it is at the moment i.e. at two separate committees the management committee and the network club committee, maintaining the monthly/quarterly meeting structure. All Confirmed
- Additional officer with voting rights in a non-executive role. DB addendums should be as an independent officer and ensuring compliance to club rules and ASA guidelines. Suggestion that the role has the ability to call a network club meeting independently. DB this needs to be defined in the constitution
- FT – thinks that membership should be limited where parents were concerned. Discussion around how this could work. CL pointed out that clubs have the support of the local community whereas AS only has support of clubs and parents. This would be difficult to achieve and could isolate parents. DB highlighted that the club is still young a club and as such the committee is restricted by the current audience.
- LD – preference to have some parental representation and there needs to be a view to recruit from outside. ET put in 2 independent roles.

Outcome: Agreed to progress with 2 separate committees. Areas of responsibilities to be redefined and agreed. The creation of an additional independent role to sense check and advise on compliance and ASA guidelines. Independent chair, where possible. Parent of a young member on the management committee.

Action: CL to draft additional changes to constitution and forward to current committee for perusal and agreement and then circulate to network clubs for comments.

CI to liaise with AW and ET re proposed changes w.c 21.03.16
SGM to be called for 21.4.16

Proposed club management structure to be circulated by JMCN to network clubs for comment.

4.0 Draft squad structure. – JMCN keeping involved.

JMCN confirmed that there was a unanimous decision from the current committee to support the new club structure submitted by JD. Feedback from the network clubs was invited.

- BOA – structure in line with club thoughts. A few queries – had no time to review in depth and will feed back comments in due course.
- Warminster - can't comment at this stage as not had time to consult
- Westbury– believes that there need to be a balance. Would like to see non-members of AS for the academy.
- LD agreed that this acts as a good stepping stone into clubs. LD wanted us to not to get hung up on LC training. Would recommend that we do not appease parental desire for LC training. Do not lead long course training between the ages of 9 and 11.
- KB Development camps. When would they be running? JD – usually held them in half terms. Group acknowledge that this may be difficult due to geographical area. CI confirmed that local authorities had given powers to schools to independently choose their holiday from January 2016. To fill a course on a 5 year running. Looking at running them at half terms; though concern that £6k profit will be hard to attain.
- JMCN are happy with the structure but the financial plan needs to be ratified.
- Keynsham – happy with the financial plan but the criteria needs to be worked on a little.
- Westbury – happy
- LD stated we need support of the university start time that could be impacted on training time. Land training will supplement the swimming. Performance club on swim 21 now have to have a history of international success and history of international swimmers. Working towards it in the future.
- JMCN – confirmed that the management would need to financially review the club quarterly. And will need support of the network clubs especially for the provision of volunteers to run the open meets due to reduced numbers.
- KB confirmed that the MOU will provide officials and helpers from the swimming club.
- ET has concerns on basing the model on 4 open meets per year.
- CL suggested that financial model can be ratified and agreed at a later date.
- JMCN is liaising with SG the current open meet manager and Sylvia Sinclair regarding future meets as unclear who would be open meet manager going forward and will try to resolve this.
- ET - Maybe this could be an appointment role and be paid.
- CL – structure good, criteria needs work – comments already submitted to JMCN and JD
- PN – Structure good, criteria needs ratifying
- Norton Radstock – Structure is good.
- SH – Frome – we need to trust in JD at some point with the criteria. CL confirmed this was not an issue of trust more of how it fits in with the agreement with the clubs e.g. releasing swimmers for county's club and school. This is not in current criteria. LD confirmed that the MOU with clubs is the overriding agreement here and the criteria should only be read in conjunction with that. JD confirmed that it was agreed that the MOU would be changed with all clubs. CL and PS not aware of this. JD confirmed it was agreed at last meeting. JMCN confirmed that all documentation policies and procedures were under review and not necessarily changed and full consultation would take place with all clubs on MOU's. PS – MOU for entry criteria needs to be agreed as presently there are only exist criteria.

Outcome : Vote on JD model – squad structure fine but financial model needs more work. Entry criteria to be ratified.

Action: All clubs to feedback comments on Criteria to JMCN by 08.04.16 to give time to ratify and agree before SGM.

5.0 Financial Model

Discussions around the financial model took place. PS reiterated that the income from Somerset ASA was “up to” £2500, for pre designated purposes and should not be used as a guaranteed income. KB confirmed that this had been mentioned and that all Somerset ASA money was spent on development. Next decision on funding from Somerset ASA is in April

6.0 AOB

KB – 8 places available on Safeguarding course being run. Please email her. This is from Somerset ASA funding.

Meeting Closed 20.35 Next date to be confirmed