

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE CPSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**Held at Edmonton House, Bisley Camp, Brookwood,
Woking, Surrey, GU24 0NP**

On Tuesday the 26th of May 2009 at 09:00am

PRESENT:

Mr TR Bobbett	Chairman
Mr WA Heeks	Vice Chairman / Regional Director - North
Mr PJ Boakes	Chief Executive Officer
Mr BD Curtis	Regional Director – East Midlands
Mr C Fielding	Regional Director – West Midlands
Ms N Heron	Regional Director – South East
Mr TWD Blaney	National Director
Mr G Walker	National Director

GUESTS: (attended part of the meeting)

Mr J McCormack	General Secretary, ICPSA
Mr C McVerry	Technical Manager, CPSA
Mr D Deeson	Deeson Group Publishing
Ms M Armstrong	Deeson Group Publishing

MINUTES SECRETARY:

Miss KJ Boazman

1. FORMALITIES

TRB opened the meeting at 09:00 and announced an apology from KJN.

Prior to discussion as per the Agenda, TRB asked TWDB to explain the statement he made at the recent AGM when asked if he would stand for Chairman, and invited him to apologise for his words, which apparently upset several members of the Board. TWDB explained that he did not wish to chair the Board with certain members still involved. TWDB has doubts as to some people's abilities as Directors, namely TRB and NH, and does not believe they have the best interests of the Association at heart. He highlighted the fact that this is, of course, his own personal view but added that he stands by what he said and would not apologise for it. NH asked him to expand with evidence to support this comment. TWDB refused.

a) Minutes of the previous meeting

A discussion took place re the accuracy of minutes taken and the need for confidential minutes in some cases. TRB drew the discussion to a close stating Board members always had copies of all relevant points, whether in the public domain or not.

CF then proposed the minutes of the previous meeting, and NH seconded them. It was unanimously agreed to pass the minutes.

b) Matters Arising

None.

2. JOHN MCCORMACK - ICPSA

a) The ICPSA are experiencing some problems with a small number of Irish shooters who are joining the CPSA (at a cheaper rate than the ICPSA) and then exploiting the system in Ireland, without joining ICPSA. A letter, from ICPSA, included in the Board Pack explained the problem in more detail and requested the Board's assistance in resolving the issue. At a previous meeting, neither TRB nor PJB could see how the CPSA could assist but out of courtesy to JM, TRB invited him to present the matter to the Board for consideration at today's meeting. It was agreed that JM would present and then the Board would discuss views privately. TRB will then respond on behalf of the Board.

ACTION: TRB

JM entered the meeting and presented the view of the ICPSA.

JM, having presented the case for the ICPSA, was thanked for his input and left the meeting.

The Board, having considered the ICPSA position, regrettably decided there was nothing it could do to assist the ICPSA in this instance.

3. CEO REPORT

a) Commercial Manager

Simon Barber will commence employment as Commercial Manager as of 1st June 2009. He has a background in marketing and his hobby is small bore rifle shooting.

b) Grounds Manager

Paul Rendell left the CPSA on Friday 22nd May. He was brought in to act as the first point of contact between Grounds and HQ but after a discussion with him and the HQ Team, it would seem that his time was mainly taken up dealing with incoming contact from people who weren't even necessarily CPSA members, for example, noise disruption complaints. He was also involved with smaller initiatives, such as working with Barry Gibb and the Scouts..

A discussion took place about training CPSA staff to deal with noise complaints.

A discussion took place as to why Paul Rendell had left the CPSA.

c) NATSS

TRB and PJB attended a meeting to find out exactly what the delay in progressing NATSS is. It would seem that the NRA are happy to work out a way forward although it will be a far more lengthy process than had been thought originally. It was suggested that by using the dormant GBTSF Ltd as a company, a model would be put on the table as a starting point and move on from there. In the interim, the Board will buy into the Sport England funding, which would imply collaborative projects, such as RDMs for all shooting. CF was concerned about losing control if RDMs were to be employed by GBTSF and said that he would not be interested in pursuing the recruitment of such roles if they were to be for other associations too. PJB explained the importance of considering 'the bigger picture'; he felt that if the CPSA was not willing to buy into GBTSF RDMs, they may as well walk away from NATSS altogether because sooner or later all the associations will have to start working together to fulfil the Sport England requirements. He then clarified that the suggestion is for two GBTSF RDMs (for the West Midlands and the North, where there are fewer CPSA members / grounds anyway) and, if it is decided to replace Paul Rendell's post with CPSA RDMs, that would be a separate matter. NH stated that PR's job should be advertised and was not happy with it being amalgamated with any SE structures for the regions. This is a CPSA appointment and necessary to our technical department.

PJB went on to explain that the Board also needed to decide whether it would sign up to the Sport England contract that has been presented to all three governing bodies acting under GBTSF. CF was concerned that Sport England appear to have been given the impression that an amalgamation between CPSA, NSRA and NRA was more imminent than it actually is. PJB assured him, and the Board, that this was not the case. TRB added that GBTSF is simply a vehicle to manage the Sport England funding; NATSS is a project for a possible amalgamation that will not happen for a long time yet. There then appeared to be some confusion as to whether TRB and PJB are acting as Directors of GBTSF independently of, or as representatives of, the CPSA. CF felt that decisions made by Directors of GBTSF cannot and should not be incumbent upon the CPSA, as an independent organisation. TRB and PJB explained that this effectively is the case because they are representing the CPSA's voice at the NATSS Board meetings. They both then clarified that GBTSF / NATSS is not affecting CPSA members' money, it is dealing with the Sport England funding, which is for shooting as a whole. TRB then steered the Board back to the point that a decision about the Sport England contract was required today. Neither CF nor NH were prepared to make a decision about signing a contract that they have not yet read. PJB explained that the contract will be based on the Interventions, which the Board has already reviewed. Copies of the final contract can and will be circulated when available. BDC proposed that the Board agrees, in principal, to sign the contract for Sport England funding, which is to be administered by GBTSF, which is made up of the three NGBs. TWDB seconded the proposal and the Board agreed. However NH stated she wanted to see the final contract and wanted more details of the Confirmed Partnership Funding before the Board could actually sign.

Some discussion about the NRA's intentions then ensued. TWDB felt that there would be great merit in pursuing a relationship with the NSRA, while the NRA decides what they wish to do. NH and CF disagreed and felt it should be 'all or nothing' given that Sport England is only interested in all three NGBs as a whole. NH felt very strongly that moving forward with just the NSRA would be unwise. BDC totally disagreed with this concept. NH

pointed out that the first and main intervention set by SE was "to be further down the amalgamation road by the end of year one" and this was unlikely to be achieved now.

TRB reported that at the same meeting, it was suggested that the NATSS Steering Group is getting too big to manage and should therefore only comprise of CEOs and Chairmen. He asked the Board for their thoughts on this and it was generally agreed that this would not be a favourable set-up. The CPSA would therefore prefer to keep the same structure of four representatives: the CEO, the Chairman and two other Directors, on a rota basis.

PJB reported that there is to be a link between the CPSA website and that of NATSS. NH then queried the cost of domain names in the CPSA accounts, which seems to be quite high. PJB immediately raised the issue with Connie Pierre who explained that the £126 per month cost is for the CPSA website and all other domain names (e.g. futureofoursport.co.uk and cpsagb.co.uk) come in at around £1.50 per year. TWDB then questioned why NH should be 'checking up' on the accounts in such a way. NH stated that she would look at the accounts at any time she wished given she was a Director as it was her fiduciary duty to do so. GW responded that he had also looked at the accounts while at HQ because he wanted to get some clarification about the Academy costs.

d) World Skeet

PJB reported that there are currently 70 entries for the World Skeet. Australia has signed up and other countries are still to come. Four hundred entries are required to make up the amount of prize money initially suggested might be paid back. NH and CF stated that the Board were not involved in the decision to state a guaranteed prize fund of £12K and wanted it changed to 'subject to entries'. PJB was instructed to amend/update the website, any advertising and the entry forms to show that "the prize money is subject to entries". He was also asked to inform any relevant parties.

ACTION: PJB

Further ways to promote the event were then discussed, including an advert in Pull! and perhaps also in Clay Shooting.

4. REPORT FROM TECHNICAL MANAGER

(This was moved up the Agenda in preparation for the Academy discussion, scheduled for later on).

CMcV entered the meeting.

a) Disabled Shooters

Keith Shields has contacted CMcV about the Level 1 Instructors Course and is critical of its accessibility to disabled shooters. CMcV has found out, from the Disability Discrimination Act, that the CPSA has a duty to make "reasonable adjustments" and he is now exploring what exactly should be done. KS also alluded to a classification system that includes disabled categories. CMcV has spoken to several members in the West Midlands and they were not in favour of this. He has therefore asked KS to explore the matter in more depth and is awaiting his feedback.

b) County Sport Partnerships

CMcV has visited Warwick University to learn more about their County Sports Partnership contract. Sport England has given the CSP £200K to deliver a core offer, namely to support NGBs, under the Department of Health.

c) Cadets

Further conversations have taken place based on the success of the work with RAF cadets, which reached approximately 40,000 cadets. Major Simon Fraser, from the Army, has expressed concern about potential differences between RAF standards, as a result of their CPSA training, and standard Army levels. He wants all cadets to follow the same training programme. A common ground has therefore been reached, which will give the CPSA access to around 150,000 people whose first experience of shooting will come via the Association. It could also provide a way in to Sport England's Innovation Fund. NH commented on emails being circulated to the army stating that the CPSA will be a sponsor and provide discounted courses. CMcV was due to attend and present at one that week. NH requested that CMcV make it very clear to the Army that the CPSA was not a sponsor and no money would come from CPSA member's funds.

CF raised a concern about an apparent discrepancy between the costs of Safety Officer courses for the Army and for CPSA members, making reference to a recent meeting in the West Midlands. CMcV clarified that he did not mean to give the impression that the Association is offering cheaper courses to the Army than to its own

members. NH, CF and WAH all felt that despite any intentions, this was the impression that has been given. In answer to a question raised by NH, CMcV clarified that different prices are offered to the Army only when they provide their own tutors (who have qualified through the CPSA) for example at Pirbright, then the Academy sells manuals but does not provide tutors, therefore the cost is different. NH continued to query the costs mentioned on CMcV's report and so he will respond in detail via email in due course.

NH asked why we were paying coaches from other organisations to take our assessment course when we already have assessors. If these outside coaches wish to work for the CPSA Academy as assessors they should be prepared to pay for this training or assist on the courses for free in order to gain CPD points.

ACTION: CMcV

d) UK Coaching Framework and UKCC

CMcV attended a meeting about the rolling out process for sports not yet involved in the UK Coaching Framework. Such sports, which includes CPSA, need to complete a Progress Review Form (an example of which was circulated to the Board) by 19th June 2009. The form will be used to identify what resource would be needed should a sport decide to follow the UK Coaching Framework. CMcV has made it clear to the relevant parties that the CPSA has yet to decide if it does indeed want to sign up to the Framework. He did state that if the Association is not part of the Framework, there is a chance that Sport England will be reluctant to release funding for future projects.

e) BASC

CMcV attended a meeting with the Standards Director, Dr Peter Marshall, and his team to discuss accredited prior learning on CPSA courses. During that meeting, it seemed like BASC were keen to get involved in the NATSS process. NH interjected that she had raised this point at a NATSS meeting in the past asking for BASC and CA to be involved but was told that this would not happen as NATSS was not going to be linked to live quarry shooting. NH stated that at that NATSS meeting PJB was one of the people who stated it could not happen. CMcV concluded that BASC are keen to be involved in any way that they can if it helps identify shooters and progress the sport as a whole.

f) QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

i) Jewish Olympics: TWDB previously suggested that CMcV might wish to explore the possibility of getting involved with the Jewish Olympics, which are held in Israel. TWDB is currently trying to make contact with the organising group and CMcV felt this may be worth further exploration in the future.

ii) Corporate Training Certificate: GW questioned the validity of the Corporate Training Certificate. CMcV explained that it was designed to respond to a clear gap in the market and acts as a participation pathway (which will factor in the UK Coaching Framework project) and is based on the IDW, with some corporate modifications. He further pointed out that they need to practice under insurance cover. GW pointed out that the IDW serves as a filter mechanism and questioned whether the Corporate Training Certificate is therefore sufficient, suggesting it is simply a cheaper version of a Level 1 course. NH agreed, she did not feel it was of a good enough standard and was not safe. GW felt that the Certificate devalued the Academy and meant there were fewer people completing a Level One. GW continued that in his opinion, Level 1 courses are too expensive and therefore prohibitive. He felt the Association should decentralise the process, which would lessen expenses (e.g. coaches) and therefore make the course cheaper. Safety Officer courses are the most profitable and should be offered at regional level and not centralised. NH explained that her concern was more in relation to the 'corporate' element; she had a great problem with offering a low-level entry into the coaching system and stated that it was unwise and unsafe for such a low qualification to be able to supervise on a corporate event. CMcV pointed out that the CPSA course is currently the most comprehensive on the market. NH refuted that referring to BASC courses and our own L1. BDC added that it is surely better to have some training than none at all.

5. PULL! MAGAZINE

a) Dominic Deeson and Melanie Armstrong were invited to attend the meeting to discuss Pull! magazine. Prior to their arrival, the Board shared their thoughts on the magazine, as follows:

i) Jenny Andrews had been asked to inform Deesons of the need to report on all major shoots. It would seem that this message has somehow been confused to the point where they think they do not need to report on any other event including international events.

ii) NH felt it was essential that sponsored events are covered..

iii) CF thought that more coverage should be given to grass-roots shooters.

iv) NH suggested that the magazine should report on selection shoots, GB caps and so on.

v) PJB suggested that it may be more efficient to put organisations such as BITCSF, sponsors and so on, directly in touch with the Commercial Manager (and therefore Deesons) to take the subject away from the Board.

DD and MA joined the meeting.

b) DD began by giving an overview of the situation from their point of view. He highlighted the difficulties in deciding what should and should not be included in the magazine:

- paging allowance is limited
- it is a diverse sport, with many varying views
- the magazine was dominated by competition reports last year, which did not seem popular, but is this what people want now?

He mentioned the success of the recent readers' survey and explained that advertising revenue is up, which is indicative of the success of the magazine. He explained that Clay Shooting is a very different kind of magazine in that it is a commercial publication whereas Pull! is a members' magazine. He sees this difference as a positive point in that it means less competition; people can and do read both.

c) MA circulated a list of events that she has been told must be covered and asked the Board to review it and amend where necessary, suggesting that somebody more appropriate than herself should be accountable for such a decision. DD added that Deesons are keen to have the Board's input. The Board will discuss the list and return a 'wish list' of events to cover to MA, who will then establish what realistically can be included and what cannot. PJB will collate the information and send it to MA.

ACTION: All

d) BDC reported that his County Secretary is very pleased with the job Deesons are doing.

e) TRB raised the issue of the poor content of the recent cartridge test reports and DD took this on board and will review it.

f) DD reported that they are also doing their best to allow more coverage for grass-roots shooters wherever possible.

g) PJB asked about increasing the number of pages. DD explained that the next size up from 84 pages is 92 pages, which would obviously increase printing and postage costs. BDC suggested that the pagination is increased in summer and decreased in winter and DD felt this was worth considering. DD talked about the possibility of going to 12 issues per year and smaller issues. NH stated that there is insufficient space now without reducing the size. Everyone generally agreed that there would be no benefit in increasing from 10 to 12 issues per year. DD will explore the costs of increasing the number of pages and send the information to PJB.

ACTION: DD

h) CF and NH raised a concern about Regional and County news. Members complain because their submissions are cut and there are silhouette pictures where there could be photographs. MA clarified that she does not cut anything from members' submissions but what generally happens is that photographs are not submitted, even though space has been allowed for them, and they are obliged to use the silhouette images. NH felt that any picture from any county would be fine to include in the space as long as it was displayed under the right region. The majority of people disagreed with this but in any case it was agreed that the point was moot given that the format of that section is due to change in the near future. MA is putting together a series of templates that will show very clearly to members how much space there really is to fit submissions in to, depending on the number of pictures, and hopes this may resolve the issue. MA highlighted how keen she is for people to contact her directly and encouraged the Board to pass that message on to their various regions.

i) DD provided an update on advertising: May is up 18% on last year and June is up 12%. TRB asked, and was informed, this is mainly due to additional, new advertisers. Advertisers seem to like the magazine because it has a high degree of credibility and generally a good response rate. DD reported that the idea for private adverts did not work as there was little or no interest from readers. DD has been approached by a company wishing to add free scratch-cards to the magazine. He showed an example to the Board and explained that he felt this was a reputable company. Everyone, including DD, ultimately felt it would not be appropriate to include such advertising in Pull!

6. REQUESTED ITEMS

a) The Academy / Role of the Technical Manager

GW handed out a paper describing his views on the Academy and Chris McVerry's consultancy role. PJB stated

that due to the lack of time no one had had the opportunity to read the paper and debate the content and that the paper should have been circulated in advance of the meeting for people to absorb.

GW explained the detail of his paper covering the Academy and its involvement and support in the Regions as a mechanism to grow the sport. It is a wholly encompassing idea from developing clubs, providing education, helping the regions, and have a go days, and is not just coaching.

A discussion also took place between Board members about the necessity for continued use of the consultant CMcV rather than an employee of the CPSA working from HQ. TRB commented our auditors were becoming less comfortable with the situation from a tax standpoint.

The Board voted 5-2 that CMcV's contract will be terminated according to the notice period stated therein. The post will be advertised as an employee of the CPSA. CMcV will, of course, be welcome to apply. The Board confirmed that the role would be based at HQ.

A discussion then followed on the need for a technical writer. It was felt that the CPSA did not need an ongoing technical writer and that this work as and when needed could be contracted out on a job by job basis. The Board after some discussion voted again 5-2 to terminate the contract of Stewart Meinert, the Technical Writer. Both these decisions were supported by TRB, WAH, CF, NH and GW with TWDB and BC against.

b) ESK Selection Shoot (East Yorkshire)

Many letters were received complaining about the ESK Selection Shoot in East Yorkshire. Following lengthy discussion it was decided that the Chairman would respond to those who had sent letters in complaining. It was also decided to remove EYGC from the rota to hold the second England Team selection shoot next year. When asked what requirements were in the contract with the ground, PJB advised that beside the usual requirement to host the event and take the entries etc., there was the option of imposing a financial penalty of £3-00 per shooter. The Board did not believe there was merit in imposing this penalty on EYGC on this occasion.

c) DTL Selection Shoot

A letter of complaint has been received from a shooter who had three points removed by a Jury for late arrival at the recent England Team selection DTL event. The letter did not say if the Jury deducted the points because they were late. It was queried if the Jury were actually called. PJB stated that it was deducted by the Jury. It was generally agreed that a Jury decision cannot be changed and the same rules should apply here as to any other shoot. PJB felt it would be wrong to award the points back and the moment you overruled a jury the ramifications would be unmanageable. It was decided that PJB will write to the Ground concerned and remind the owner of the rules in relation to squadding following a second complaint from a competitor about allowing those not competing for an England team place being allowed to shoot with those that were.

ACTION: PJB

d) Prize Money

BDC reported that sporting shooters in his Region want prize money taken in classes to stay in the classes and not to go towards a high-gun prize. BDC added that, in his personal view, if a club wishes to put on a high-gun prize, this should be sponsored by an individual party or the ground itself, not funded by the shooters. Shooters in BDC's region also felt that unclaimed prize money should stay at the clubs for at least 12 months. Anything that happens to it after that time should be made clear at the entry desk, even if it is to be donated to charity. They felt that this should all be reflected in the CPSA Rules. NH put forward an idea from a SE member Mr Cox. TRB believed that the Board cannot impose rules concerning prize money on a Ground. The leaflet already recommends what the shooters are suggesting and this is as far as the Board can take it. PJB will draft an official response for BDC to take back and TRB will sign it.

ACTION: PJB

7. MANAGEMENT TEAM UPDATES

Time did not allow for the Management Team to present their updates to the Board. This will be deferred to the next meeting.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

a) Coniston

The Ground has applied for Premier Plus status. Two Board members need to visit the Ground and report back for the Board to make a decision.

ACTION: BDC and CF

b) Elena Little

PJB informed the Board that until 2007, EL has always shot for England. She has now married a Welshman and has Welsh residency. A letter has been written to Peter Underhill, Chairman of ETSF to release her from shooting for England at CSF and CG level and allow her to shoot for Wales instead. This will be fine for both the CSF and Commonwealth Games in Delhi in 2010 but she will not be allowed to compete for Wales in the home internationals until 2011.

c) JD Marshall

PB has responded to the letter in the Board Pack.

d) Ground Audits (Mike Williams)

PJB has included the relevant information in the Board Pack, as requested at the previous meeting. NH queried the charges. PJB stated that a new ground pays £150 for its ground audit. Every 5 years it is due to be reaudited. An existing ground does not pay any audit fees after the first one. If however they introduce a new layout it is £25 per layout.

e) Lancashire Constabulary

A letter has been received praising Clare from the HQ Team.

f) Army

A letter has been received complimenting CMcV for his work.

g) Martin Chapman

MC has written to say he feels that the cost of coaching courses were too expensive. PJB stated that nothing could really be done about the pricing structure and all prices were justified. NH and GW stated that this issue could be addressed by putting the courses back to the regions to control therefore eliminating the need for hotels and expensive travel costs.

h) Mr. Smith

Mr Smith's letter regarding an England Team for the World Sporting was discussed. It was generally agreed that nothing could be added to the response already provided by Trudy Williamson. PJB will however draft a letter and forward it to TRB for him to respond.

ACTION: PJB/TRB

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

b) Approval of February's Minutes

Approval of the minutes from February's meeting was deferred until the next meeting, in July.

c) Change of meeting dates

NH requested that the meeting scheduled for the 29th September be rescheduled to 22nd September, everyone agreed to the new date.

d) Feedback for HQ Staff

WAH felt that the English Open Sporting ran brilliantly and that the staff did an outstanding job; he was very proud of them all. CF agreed and felt the same stood for the English Skeet.

The meeting closed at 17:30.