Minutes of Regional Commission Meeting
Saturday 20 April 2013
National Volleyball Centre, Kettering

Meeting started at 10:45.

Reg/12-13/1 Present - Charlie Orton (President, London), Mike Turner (Yorkshire), Keith Sowden (North East), Sue Sowden (North East), Roy Pankhurst (South West), Alex Henderson (Minute taker)
Present for part of the meeting – Bryan Youlden (West Midlands), Janet Inman (Development Director, East Midlands), Stuart Johnson (Head of Development, Volleyball England), Lisa Wainwright (Chief Executive, Volleyball England), Geoff Allen (South West)
Apologies - Freda Bussey (South East), Ron Richards (South West), Richard Lee (North West)

Reg/12-13/2.1 Minutes of Last Meeting (5 January 2013)
The minutes were agreed to be a true and accurate representation.

Matters Arising

Reg/12-13/2.2 Minute Taking
Alex Henderson is present to take the minutes and will continue to do so, as outlined in her job description.

Reg/12-13/2.3 Unfulfilled/Outdated Action Points
Mike Turner pointed out that a number of long unfilled action points had become stale/redundant. Recent resignations of the Playing Director and President of the Performance Commission suggest there may be more serious issues over Talent Development and communication. The Regional Commission’s Terms of Reference states it should:- act as a facilitator in the delivery of Volleyball England’s Strategic Plan. But currently, it seems to just be ignored.
Action – Janet Inman to communicate concerns to the President.
As Janet was not present this was not resolved.

Reg/12-13/2.4 Communication
Lack of communication is still an issue but is getting better. Ron appears to receive everything he should now.
Action – Please forward any further issues or concerns to Stuart or Alex.

Reg/12-13/2.5 Regional Reports
Charlie advised he had noticed some trends in the regional reports and will produce a report on this.
Action – Charlie Orton to produce report on trends.

Reg/12-13/2.6 HEVOs
Action – James Abbott, National Higher and Further Education Development Officer to present an update at a future commission meeting

Reg/12-13/2.7 Membership Review
A discussion took place on the decision of the EGM on 10 November 2012 to reject the Individual Membership proposal. Concern was expressed that the proposal appeared to be a centrally imposed dictat, rather than addressing the needs of the members.
Next Steps - Janet Inman has taken on responsibility, working with Rob Harding, Head of Marketing for a bottom-up review - What do the members want to improve their volleyball experience.
Action – All to send members’ desires to Janet Inman
As Janet was not present this was not resolved.
Reg/12-13/2.7 Lack of Referees
Roy Pankhurst stated that there has been an increase of 1/3 in the number of referees in the south west, as reported by Ron Richards in his latest regional report. He asked if other regions have seen this sort of increase. Charlie Orton advised that he is mentoring referees in London and making them feel appreciated which may have contributed to the fact that there are currently 80 registered referees in London. Keith Sowden advised that Northumbria have been unable to sustain the number of officials. Sue added that scorers should be appointed in the same way referees are. Charlie advised that he is also trying to encourage new referees to have a go at scoring.
Action – Charlie to speak to Referee Commission about formally appointing scorers.

Reg/12-13/3 Regional Reports
Charlie advised that he had only received a report from Ron (south west) and he shared the contents with the group. The other regions had mostly sent in Regional reports for the Annual report, and it was not deemed necessary to duplicate those.

Janet arrived.

Reg/12-13/4 Inter-Regional Competition
Charlie asked what the demand for this competition was in each region as it is a heavy part of the Competitions review. The following comments were noted:
Roy – Regular, monthly training is taking place in the south west. We think it is important but realise we may end up funding it ourselves.
Keith – Last year it was a massive source of conflict in the north east. Sue added that the kids competing in this competition were not going through into the local or regional leagues which is why the north east do not compete anymore.
Charlie – Even if only 7 regions are competing there is still enough demand to continue but agreed that we may have to provide funding ourselves.
Roy – Teams previously have had to bring their own referee. Roy added that if it was a choice between the age groups that the younger age-group competition should stop.
Mike – the School Games Competition has taken over the target audience for this competition.
Action – Charlie to communicate the views to Competitions Commission.

Reg/12-13/4 Regional Champions Trophy
Charlie asked if we wanted to continue with this competition. A discussion into the value of this competition took place and the following comments were noted:
Roy – Teams will be ready to compete in September.
Keith – Having won it last year the North East would like to continue to compete.
Charlie – London teams are not interested in competing in this competition.
Mike – There was an incident in the past where a Yorkshire team felt the competition was being used as a referee training weekend. It seemed to fit in to the 2009-13 plan but Yorkshire would not be upset if it no longer took place.

Stuart, Lisa and Bryan arrived.

Bryan – West Midlands support the competition and would like to keep it.
Janet – It is a pathway and should be a way up to the national league. We need to look into the costs of the competition, what the function is and what the outcomes are. What happens to the team that wins?
Sue – The team who won last year used it as a stepping stone to the national league.

Lisa stated that the Regional Commission should be advising the Competitions Commission of what they want this competition to look like and the Competitions Commission will deliver it. In the room it sounds like 3 of 9 regions want it to go ahead, South West, North East and West Midlands. Lisa added that we need to ask Clubs what their views are.

There was a discussion around whether there are enough regions interested to continue.

Janet stated that as the regions were not clearly for or against the competition they should go back and carry out a serious consultation with their clubs.
LW suggested that as only three regions felt strongly about continuing why did the commission not take the decision to cancel it.

Bryan replied that the West Midlands would not be up in arms about this decision but they would be disappointed.

Roy added that although the South West would like to continue, he accepted the general picture.

The following was assumed of the regions who were not represented at the meeting:
North West – would not send a team
East – would not send a team
London – would not send a team

The decision was made not to continue with the Regional Champions Trophy. The majority agreed and Bryan added that he felt the resource could be deployed better elsewhere.

Roy added that he will go back and explain the general feeling to the South West and if the three regions who wanted to continue want to get together to run this competition – they could!

Action – Charlie to communicate the decision to Competitions Commission

Reg/12-13/5 2013-17 Strategic Plan - Discussion
Lisa and Stuart went through the presentation that is being used at the engagement events. Portas Consulting have now completed the infrastructure review and their recommendations will be agreed at the next Board meeting on 11th May.

Charlie noted that the Insight Pack for East London and Essex may contain some inaccurate figures. Lisa replied that the insight information is only in draft format and asked the Commission to note any inaccuracies and send them to Alex or Stuart.

Action – All to send any inaccuracies in insight packs to Alex/ Stuart.

Lisa left the meeting. Geoff Allen arrived.

Stuart continued to go through the presentation and a discussion followed about each programme.

Geoff asked if we are doing anything to get equipment out on to grass. Stuart replied that we have £109k for capital spend but it has not yet been agreed what it will be spent on. At the moment everything spent will be on the five investment zones but we are using those areas as catalysts to accelerate growth whilst not forgetting other areas. We will support areas with small grants bids. Janet added that the Go Spike Campaign is an outdoor opportunity.

Geoff asked if we are considering changing our regions as some of the areas visited as part of the engagement events are part of more than one region. A discussion followed about regional boundaries. Geoff added that it may be better if we had a regional association for Dorset and Hampshire.

Action – Charlie to add this to the next agenda.

Stuart concluded by stating that 7 of 9 events have taken place. The next steps will be pulling together the expressions of interest. They will then be assimilated and a decision will be taken as to where the five areas will be.

Reg/12-13/6 Any Other Business
JSIC – Charlie is unable to attend the JSIC on 11th May.

Post-Meeting Note – The JSIC was cancelled but Commission Presidents were invited to attend the Infrastructure Review item on the Executive Board agenda.

Action – Janet will represent the Regional Commission.

Investment Zones – It was noted that the Regional Commission are concerned about the administrative structure of these zones.

Action – Janet to ask the Board where the five selected zones will be.
Date of Next Meeting – TBC (mid to late June)

Meeting closed at 13:40