

ROYAL SCOTTISH COUNTRY DANCE SOCIETY

MINUTES AND PAPERS OF THE

MANAGEMENT BOARD

2011

MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

Saturday 29 January 2011
King James Thistle Hotel, Edinburgh, 2.00-4.00pm

AGENDA

Enclosures/Papers

- 1 **Apologies**
- 2 **Notes of meeting of 20 November 2010** *Circulated on 2.12.10*
- 3 **Matters arising from Notes not listed elsewhere**
 - 3.1 Chairman's Remarks
 - 3.2 Executive Officer Update *Update attached*
- 4 **Management Board Strategic Plan**
 - 4.1 MB consideration of morning Table Discussion Topics
 - 4.1.1 Health - is going to be a major dimension in our Society
How (what strategies) might the Society develop to meet this challenge?
 - 4.1.2 Structural change – we changed our financial structure at the AGM
Is there a need for change in our other Committees? If so, what changes?
 - 4.1.3 Affiliated Groups – we have almost 400 affiliated groups and minimal contact
How might we engage them more in the Society?
 - 4.1.4 The wider SCD community – many more people enjoy SCD than are in the Society.
How might we engage them more with the RSCDS?
- 5 **Management Board Panels & Working Groups 2010-11**
 - 5.1 Panels
 - 5.1.1 Conferences
 1. England, NI & Wales Conference (Lorna)
 2. Regional Conferences (Ruth)
 3. Scottish Branches Conference 2011 (Lorna)
 - 5.1.2 Constitution (Keith Stacey) *Update attached*
 - 5.1.3 JMMF (Marjorie Hume) *Paper attached for information*
 - 5.2 Working Groups
 - 5.2.1 Engagement of Overseas Members (Lyn)
 - 5.2.2 External Events (Ruth)
- 6 **Any Other Competent Business**
- 7 **Date of Next full MB Meeting: 19 February 2011**

Please notify the Secretary/Executive Officer at HQ at least 5 days before the meeting, in writing, if you have any item you wish to be discussed under Any Other Competent Business.

**Notes of meeting of the Management Board
held on 29 January 2011 at 2.00pm
at King James Thistle Hotel, Edinburgh.**

Present: Ruth Beattie (Chairman and Convenor of meeting)
John Wilkinson (Chairman Elect)
Malcolm Brown, Lyn Bryce, Keith Evans, Jim Healy Marjorie Hume, Philip Whitley,
Elaine Wilde.

In attendance: Elizabeth Foster (Secretary/EO), Elspeth Gray (Notes)

Apologies: Di Rooney, Bill Austin (both in own committee meetings), Lorna Ogilvie, Jack Pressley, Ross Robertson, Keith Stacey.

	Decision/Action	Member/s responsible	Date to be completed
1	Notes of Meeting of 20 November 2010 and As there were no corrections, the notes were accepted as a true record.		
2	Matters Arising not listed elsewhere 1) RB circulated the agenda for the Convenors' meeting which had been held the previous day and would report on the items discussed as the current meeting progressed. 2) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 2 (4) Ian Muir (Ayr) tutoring on music course</i> – BA had followed up with George Meikle and “no problem”. 3) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 2 (11) ISTD and SNDC</i> – JTH had pulled back and AG had taken over the negotiations with SNDC. Colin Robertson was keen to give copyright to RSCDS for various books, including more or less all of Foss, and some other items: AG was awaiting a definitive list. Mervyn Short had talked to ISTD, who were happy for RSCDS to take over copyright of their books. The £500 previously approved by the Board was in case some interim payment was necessary, but it was assumed it would not be needed. It was agreed also to make £500 available for negotiations with Colin Robertson, eg for shipment or similar. JTH suggested that all the Imperial books could be reissued in 2 volumes: there were enough interesting dances to make it worthwhile. The Board agreed in principle to continue negotiations. Slipstop was part of the package. EF confirmed that, although she had not yet seen confirmation on paper, all remaining stock was being purchased, at 33% lower than normal price. AG would deliver it over time to save shipping costs. The patent and copyright for Slipstop was for separate negotiation, according to AG, and he had advised RB that he would pursue this. 4) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 3 (3) investment reports</i> – RR had confirmed that the reports were quarterly. 5) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 3 (5) bank signatories</i> – EF confirmed that the way the account was set up, trustees alone could not authorise		

	<p>payments, they could do so only in conjunction with an authorised staff member. In the context of the new Development Fund, WW had suggested that up to £10k might be approved without Board approval, but RR thought this was high and would discuss with FGAG. It was important to consider the matter carefully and make a rational and informed decision. JTH noted that the issue may be whether or not the bank could manage more than one ceiling; there was already a ceiling of £250 for EF or EG to sign alone.</p> <p>6) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 4.2 (6) getting information to branches</i> – It was agreed that rather than discuss today, this should be carried forward to a future agenda as a discrete item.</p> <p>7) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 5.1.1 (2) cycle for regional conferences</i> – RB had considered a possible cycle and would present a proposal to the next Board meeting.</p> <p>8) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 5.1.2 (2) review of motions to AGM</i> – RB had spoken to KS, and some past chairmen who stated that ultimately it was a Board responsibility to decide on motions and a group to review motions should be constituted only if required. It was pointed out that the proposed group was to establish the validity and clarity of motions, not to decide on whether motions should be on the agenda. To discuss further.</p> <p>9) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 5.1.3 fundraising/diversification of income</i> – EF confirmed that the certificate for benefactors was in hand and would be produced in-house. Gift aid forms had been issued with the Kandahar Reel booklet. PW had provided useful information to help to determine an appropriate rate to hire out rooms to “friends” of the Society and EF would try to put some details together for the February meeting. EF noted that a meeting would shortly be arranged with the ABF to share information and reconcile income from the sales of Kandahar Reel booklets.</p> <p>10) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 5.1.5 Investment Panel</i> – will meet on 17 Feb 2011.</p> <p>11) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 6.1.1 (2) review of the Manual</i> – An electronic version of the Manual had been submitted by Keith Bark and Brian Charlton and passed to BA, who thought it had possibilities and was discussing it with his committee. It incorporated TAC notes, so there was some confusion regarding copyright, and it would need to go through due process. JTH was personally surprised at the previous meeting’s decision to not make an electronic Manual available to non-members, but accepted that it had been fully discussed and voted on.</p> <p>12) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 6.1.1 (3) proposal for discount to schools</i> – This suggestion had been discussed at the Convenors’ meeting. RB felt there was a need for CDs specifically for teaching children and young people in schools. BA was exploring this suggestion and DR was keen to take this forward. It was important to have appropriate materials to support teaching in schools. Parity in sales to different parties, however, also had to be considered.</p> <p>13) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 6.3.1 (2) policy on archive purchases</i> – A policy was not yet in place.</p> <p>14) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 11 (2) letter from Bournemouth Branch</i> – RB confirmed a reply had been sent.</p> <p>15) <i>20 Nov 2010, item 12.1 responding to Strathspey etc</i> – Strathspey had</p>	<p>RB/EF for agenda</p> <p>RB</p> <p>EG</p>	<p>19/02/11</p> <p>Beg/Mar</p>
--	---	---	--------------------------------

	<p>been very quiet. MB noted that there was a letter from John Mitchell in The Reel, but it was agreed not to respond. MB and JTH were thanked for agreeing to undertake this monitoring.</p>		
<p>3 3.1</p>	<p>Chairman's Remarks <i>New Zealand Branch</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) RB had circulated the remit raised at NZ AGM. It would be on the agenda for the next meeting, but helpful to initiate discussion now. PW attended NZ Summer School and had been very helpful in listening to debates and bringing back information. A group of NZ members were unhappy with the way their previous motion had been dealt with; their concern was not only about the analysis of the data, but also that they felt it had not been properly followed up or commented on at the following AGM. 2) PW had offered to meet Fiona Bullivant (Chairman), who invited him to attend a management committee meeting. PW reported that, in short, there were two separate issues. Firstly, grassroots members question what they get for their subscription fee; the fee is much higher than for any other branch he has come across. There was a small but vociferous minority who would be happy to break away from the Society completely. The second issue was that the Branch knows there are many dancers in NZ who have nothing to do with the Society (about 30% of all who dance in NZ are Society members). The motion was partly to quell dissent and to try to engage with these other dancers. A side issue was that Branch communications had not been as good as they might be, but this was expected to improve with the new branch secretary. 3) The remit to the NZ AGM was not passed; the overall feeling was that it was not explicitly worded and it was not clear what the benefits might be. It had gone back to the management committee and would be on the agenda at their next AGM in January 2012. PW felt that the committee – almost completely new – had no real desire to do anything that would harm the Society. 4) RB stated that what they really wanted was for the issue to be discussed again, which must be done. RB had committed to keeping in regular touch with the Branch and thought it would be useful if she and JW went to their next Summer School and held another Regional forum. The NZ committee confirmed they would be pleased if this takes place. RB thought there were some questions to be asked on the Branch accounts and had asked RR to review them; branches cannot be told what to do but we can comment. 		
3.2	<p><i>Regional forum in Europe</i></p> <p>RB had been in touch with Susi Mayr. The International Branch is happy for a regional forum to be part of the June Prague event. Ruth will attend with the Chairman Elect.</p>		
3.3	<p><i>Management Board numbers</i></p> <p>RB had no desire to co-opt members to fill gaps for the sake of it. This had been discussed at the Convenors' meeting and the strong feeling was to co-opt only if there were specific issues or topics to deal with where there was a skills gap.</p>		
3.4	<p><i>Number of Board meetings</i></p> <p>RB asked if members felt there should be an additional meeting,</p>		

	particularly if structure was to be considered, which needed time for discussion. It was agreed to set a provisional date of Sunday 15 May, to be confirmed asap, specifically to discuss structure.	EF	04/02/11
3.5	<i>Falkirk Branch</i> There had been some difficulties in the Branch, support was being given but it was a situation they had to resolve for themselves.		
3.6	<i>Scottish & N Irish Branches Conference</i> – scheduled for Sat. 5 February.		
4	Executive Officer Update EF highlighted two particular pieces of good news from the report circulated. Firstly, an additional year’s funding had been secured from Creative Scotland for the Young Dancer project. Secondly, John Archer (Hopscotch Films) had responded very positively to her letter regarding the film <i>Scotland Dances</i> and was keen to meet.		
5	Management Board Strategic Plan – consideration of am discussions		
5.1	RB noted that there had been good discussions in the morning, but not all ideas and suggestions could be taken forward. It was essential to select important strategic issues.		
5.2	Health 1) LB had prepared a handout to start the discussion, highlighting the triangle of health – physical, mental and social. SCD fitted into each of these aspects and the “fun, fitness & friendship” message encapsulated it. Ideas included short sessions of workplace training, and making SCD more widely known within the NHS, what we do and where it is available. The link with stress reduction was important and with obesity to a lesser degree, there was a need for short clear messages and information about how/where to access SCD. 2) This raised the question of who would actually do such work. For approval within NHS there was a need to go to the top, eg regional board, for their “rubber-stamp”, if it was felt to be a strategy worth pursuing. It was undecided whether what was being proposed was just leaflets, or working with health care professionals. 3) JTH felt it was similar to branches asking for materials. EF advised, however, that marketing materials were available for branches: the key issue was that a campaign such as this could not be embarked upon if branches were unable/ unwilling to “follow through” or deliver. EF believed that a partnership with branches, using a model with a dedicated resource such as the Young Dancer project provided the best way forward. 4) RB suggested consideration be given to offering basic training in SCD teaching to people who do not want to go on to the higher levels; there was Unit 0, but this might not be appropriate. 5) Following on from her earlier comments, EF reported that the Development Officer had had approaches from various people, including schools, who wanted SCD on their agenda, but had been unable to <u>ensure</u> delivery – we can approach branches, but if they do not have volunteers, capacity, and/or willingness to do it, it will not happen. 6) EW suggested setting up some pilots, targeting specific branches, and giving them support. Some branches were doing workshops in schools, or short sessions for people going to ceilidhs/		

	<p>weddings etc, so the opportunity for teachers to do basic “getting people moving to music” was there. She felt it was about pulling together good practice and furthering initiatives.</p> <p>7) JTH felt that in summary, what everyone was saying was that it was about finding out what would work locally and finding local people to facilitate that. LB questioned whether the aim was to increase membership or to get more people dancing; the general feeling was that it was the latter.</p>		
5.3	<p><i>Affiliated Groups/Wider SCD Community</i></p> <p>JW felt there was a lot of overlap between groups 1, 3 and 4, that the underlying aims were similar, to get more people dancing. EF believed the question of affiliated groups was slightly different. RB suggested another group to look at this, involving some members from E&T and the MB. LB supported a short-term group to bring ideas together and develop a strategy. It would be important for the group to have a very clear “steer” – many groups promoted the health aspects of their dance form. RB and EF to work on remit.</p>	RB/EF	asap
5.4	<p><i>Structural change</i></p> <p>1) JTH felt the group had identified more questions than answers. There was a feeling that there were a lot of WGs and Panels, and two main committees whose remits had grown substantially since they started. He suggested it was time for a major re-think.</p> <p>2) There were issues such as where marketing fitted in, also music. Events (Schools and Conference Weekend) were organised by different committees although administratively similar. The group felt that E&T had too large a remit. It was pointed out that the Constitution Panel would be looking at a number of ideas, and comments from the group would be passed on to them.</p> <p>3) RB noted that Board members could not do everything, we are dependent on skills outwith the Board; people might commit to a WG or Panel if not to the Board.</p> <p>4) EF thought there was a need to look radically at the structure and, before that, at what the RSCDS as an organisation wished to be in the longer term. She felt there were some serious questions around the current structure’s fitness for purpose. The current structure has inherent weaknesses that will not go away. For example, the RSCDS is described as a “membership” organisation, but members come through the branch structure, where there is no mutuality in the Licence Agreement between the RSCDS and Branches. EF adheres to the architectural paradigm that “form follows function” – we cannot choose the best structure until we are clear on overall purpose, or we cannot design the most appropriate structure until we are clear on what it is designed to support/ deliver. We need first to agree what we want the Society to be in the longer term. JTH felt there was a real dichotomy – a teaching association on one hand and a members’ association on the other, with a huge gap. At the moment we were trying to be everything to everyone.</p> <p>5) EW noted that in looking at structure, it had to integrate with governance. KE acknowledged that the Panel was at a very early stage and communication so far had been by email; to properly address the issue and agree what they were going to consider a</p>		

	meeting now might be essential. Direction was needed. 6) Noted that if radical structural change was being considered, the legal structure also would have to come under consideration.		
6	Panels & Working Groups		
6.1	Panels		
6.1.1	<i>Conferences – Scottish Branches and Regional</i> 1) <i>England, N Ireland and Wales</i> – EW felt the lack of bookings was due not to branches not wanting a conference, but rather that there had been insufficient notice, it was the wrong time of year and wrong location. She felt it should be held in Feb/ March, with plenty of notice. RB suggested tying in with other events/ weekends where people were gathering anyway, but EW noted this would need negotiation. EF suggested a problem might be that “E&W” was not a coherent group, it may be better to separate, for example, into north, southeast and southwest. RB to look at different possibilities and discuss with various people. 2) <i>Regional Conferences</i> –RB has begun consideration of a cycle. 3) <i>Scotland</i> – All plans were in order for the 5 February conference.	RB	asap
6.1.2	<i>Constitution</i> 1) A report from KS had been circulated. KE felt that the group needed the Board to consider what they should be working towards and give the group direction. 2) MB noted that delegate representation was disproportionate; all branches were entitled to a minimum of two delegates but some had fewer than 50 members, while others had many more. KE confirmed the issue was for consideration.		
6.1.3	<i>JMMF</i> A draft project plan from MH had been circulated. It had gone to BA, DR and AG. MH felt it was fairly straightforward, but would probably not all be in place by the start of April. She felt it would be good to put a small piece in the next magazine advising members to watch the website. MH to write, EG to confirm date required. Formatting of the application form would be done at HQ. MH sought guidance on the three dates for submission of applications. MH will not be at the next Board meeting, but would provide a full report to the May meeting.	MH/EG	18/02/11
6.2	Working Groups		
6.2.1	<i>Engagement of overseas members</i> A few members had expressed interest, LB will report to next meeting.	LB	19/02/11
6.2.2	<i>External Events</i> RB had asked for suggestions for chairman of this group, none were received. In the meantime, RB, JW and EF will meet and try to make some decisions. However, RB was hoping to have an independent chairman and group of people to look out for opportunities.	RB/ JW/ EF	19/02/11
7	AOCB 1) There was discussion of the Society’s legal form, following Alastair Keatinge’s (AK) outline of the options in the morning. He seemed to say that the new legal form that was not yet in place, the SCIO (Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation), would be unsuitable for the Society but may suit branches. AK had advised that a limited company would be more appropriate for the Society. There was a feeling that this could cost a substantial amount and it was agreed that RB should get clarity	RB	19/02/11

	from AK about the two approaches. 2) RB thanked those who had facilitated the discussion groups in the morning.		
8	Date of Next Meeting 19 February 2011		

BA	Bill Austin	MH	Marjorie Hume	SC	Shona Coyle
RB	Ruth Beattie	LO	Lorna Ogilvie	MCH	Marilyn Healy
MB	Malcolm Brown	JP	Jack Pressley	HR	Helen Russell
LB	Lyn Bryce	DR	Di Rooney	WW	William Whyte
KE	Keith Evans	RR	Ross Robertson		
EF	Elizabeth Foster	KS	Keith Stacey		
LF	Liz Fraser	PW	Philip Whitley		
EG	Elsbeth Gray	EW	Elaine Wilde		
JTH	Jim Healy	JW	John Wilkinson		

MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

Saturday 19 February 2011

RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.30am

AGENDA (v1)

Enclosures/Papers

1 Apologies

Short strategic planning exercise

2 Notes of Meeting of 29 January 2010

3 Matters arising from Notes not listed elsewhere

- 3.1 Chairman's Remarks
 - 3.1.1 Health Working Group Proposal
 - 3.1.2 RSCDS President
 - 3.1.3 Training day on 29 January 2011
- 3.2 ISTD/SNDC (2.9 Update)

4 Finance

- 4.1 Management Accounts to end of December 2010

attached

5 Management Board Strategic Plan

- 5.1 Executive Officer
 - 5.1.1 Report – report to follow
 - 5.1.2 SP Review and Update – verbal update

6 Management Board Panels & Working Groups 2010-11

- 6.1 Panels
 - 6.1.1 Conferences
 - 1. Regional Conferences (O/seas, Europe, England, Wales) (Ruth)
 - 2. Scottish and NI Branches Conference 2011 (Lorna) – report to follow
 - 6.1.2 Constitution (Keith Stacey) – no further update
 - 6.1.2.1 New Zealand Branch (Ruth)
 - 6.1.2.2 RSCDS as Company limited by Guarantee Proposal (Ruth)
 - 6.1.3 HR (Ruth) – Group has not met
 - 6.1.4 Investment (Ross) – verbal update
 - 6.1.5 JMMF (Marjorie) – no further update
 - 6.1.6 Magazine Editorial Board (Andrew K)

attached

6.2 Working Groups

- 6.2.1 Engagement of Overseas Members (Lyn)
- 6.2.3 External Events (chair to be selected) – verbal update

attached

- 6.3 Finance and Governance Advisory Group (Liz/Ross) – verbal update

- 7 Management Committees**
- 7.1 Education and Training Committee (Di Rooney)
 - 7.1.1 Minute of Meeting of 29 January 2011
 - 7.1.2 Strategic Plan Update, including Schools, Spring Fling, RSCDS Manual and Curriculum for Excellence updates *attached*
 - 7.2 Membership Services Committee (Bill Austin)
 - 7.2.1 Minutes of Meetings of 22, and 29 January 2011
 - 7.2.2 Strategic Plan Update, including AGM Conference Weekends (2011, 2012) DSW and Digital Downloading updates *DSW Review Report attached*
- 8 Appointed Posts**
- 8.1 Nothing to date
- 9 Branches**
- 9.1 Nothing to date
- 10 Affiliated Groups**
- 10.1 Nothing to report
- 11 Board Member/Trustee Issues**
- 11.1 Nothing to date
- 12 Correspondence**
- 12.1 Nothing to date
- 13 Any Other Competent Business**
- 13.1 Nothing to date
- 14 Date of Next MB Meeting**
- 14 May 2011
 - Date of Meeting to discuss RSCDS strategic direction and structure
 - 15 May 2011 (am)

Please notify the Secretary/Executive Officer at HQ at least 5 days before the meeting, in writing, if you have any item you wish to be discussed under Any Other Competent Business.

**Notes of meeting of the Management Board
held on 19 February 2011
at RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.30am**

Present: Ruth Beattie (Chairman and Convenor of meeting)
John Wilkinson (Chairman Elect)
Bill Austin (Convenor, Membership Services Committee)
Di Rooney (Convenor, Education & Training Committee)
Ross Robertson (Treasurer)
Malcolm Brown, Lyn Bryce, Keith Evans, Jim Healy, Lorna Ogilvie, Jack Pressley,
Keith Stacey, Philip Whitley, Elaine Wilde.

In attendance: Elizabeth Foster (Secretary/EO), Elspeth Gray (Notes)

Apologies: Marjorie Hume

	Decision/Action	Member/s responsible	Date to be completed
1	Strategic Planning (“Vision”) Exercise EF led the Board in an exercise to begin to identify key aspects of what type of organisation Board members feel the Society should be in 5 years’ time: she would analyse the results and feed back .		
2	Notes of Meeting of 29 January 2010 1) <i>Item 2 (5) re authorisation</i> – The notes did not reflect what RR intended, the issue was about the Development Fund and authorisation to approve expenditure. 2) <i>3.1 (3) re New Zealand Branch</i> – Amend final sentence to begin “PW was advised that the committee...” 3) With above amendments, Notes were accepted as a true record.		
3	Matters Arising not listed elsewhere 1) <i>29 Jan 2011, item 2(6) getting information to branches</i> – EW had raised the question of an information highway last September. She was concerned it kept being put off and was again not on the agenda. RB assured the Board that the issue was being addressed and would be on a future agenda. 2) <i>29 Jan 2011, item 3 .5 Falkirk Branch</i> – KS asked what support had been given to the branch. JW had been in touch and offered to help but they were aware they had to make decisions themselves. EF confirmed that some branch members were requesting a SGM; she and EG had been giving interpretations of constitution to help them to take matters forward constructively.	RB/EF for agenda	
4 4.1	Chairman’s Remarks RB was sorry to inform the Board that Alastair MacFadyen had bone marrow cancer. He had started a 2-year programme of treatment and was very positive. He hoped to continue a little longer as President, but discussion about his successor would have to be re-opened. JTH asked if the WG had considered whether a President was required; it had not been, but could now be considered: EF to re-circulate the final paper from the WG. RB to send the Board’s best wishes to Alastair.	EF RB	28/02/11 28/02/11

4.2	<p>Training day</p> <p>Not all forms had been returned, so no concrete evaluation as yet. However, comments so far were generally positive. It was clear there should be a health working group, and something on structure: an additional meeting had been arranged to discuss the latter. RB and EF had drafted a proposed remit (tabled) for a Health Strategy WG. LB had agreed to convene the group, and would step down from the Overseas Members WG, as it had completed its initial remit: PW to become convenor of the O M WG on a slightly changed remit.</p>		
4.3	<p>ISTD and SNDC</p> <p>AG was handling the patent and copyright issues. JTH reported that the only development was ISTD had pulled together all the unpublished Jack McConnachie Sword Dances and was happy for us to print those as well. JTH envisaged publishing all the Imperial books, probably in 2 volumes (1-3, and 4, 5 + new). If AG was successful in acquiring the rights to the Foss dances, that would accelerate discussion on how best to handle future publication.</p>		
5	Finance		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Budget and risk management to be dealt with under item 6. 2) Two main things to report: success of Summer School, which made more than was anticipated, and excellent sales this year. RR predicted being well under budget at the year end. 3) A future Treasurer might consider separating Summer School from the General Fund (where it sits at the moment) and treating it as a "Division", which might make it easier to juggle over/under spends on Summer School. The important thing is not to be seen to be using subscription income to subsidise Summer School. It would not be advisable to run Schools as a separate company, because of the VAT position. 4) JP queried the process for pursuing subscription payments from branches. EF confirmed there were 22 outstanding at end December, but last year almost 100% were received by end March. It seemed effective last year for MB members to contact "their" outstanding branches with a gentle reminder, and it was agreed that this should be done again. 5) LO questioned why there was a figure in next year's budget for irrecoverable VAT but nothing in the current year figures. RR explained that this may change by the end of the year. EF noted that WW had been keen to reach a point where there was no VAT to pay at all, but this was considered to be very unlikely. 	EF/SC/EG	25/02/11
6	Management Board Strategic Plan		
6.1	<p>Executive Officer Report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) EF did not propose to go through staff updates, but was happy to answer any questions now or later. 2) <i>Photo shoot proposal</i> – EF presented this proposal from LF, which had the support of both Committees and the Editorial Board. It had a budget of around £2K, but there would be additional costs for venue hire, travel etc. After discussion, it was agreed to take the proposal forward, with a ceiling of £5K, including VAT. RR felt it was appropriate for this to come from the Development Fund. BA believed it should not be one-off, and expectations should be set on how regularly it should be done. MB questioned 	EF/LF	asap

	<p>value for money on the photographers currently used, eg at the AGM/Conference Weekend. It was confirmed that the number of suitable photographs was low and had been used already for a number of purposes, including website, magazine, leaflets, annual review document etc.</p> <p>3) <i>Property</i> – A briefing from WW had been circulated. The new owners above (Kingsford Estates) had now engaged in discussions regarding the roof and downpipe. A camera inspection of the pipe had taken place, identifying where the problem lay but not how to repair it. Three quotes for the roof had been obtained, at £40.6K, £42.5K and £50.7K (+ VAT in each case). Our share had been agreed at 40%, in terms of floor space. It was agreed to suggest 5-yearly reviews to Kingsford, to avoid large bills in future. MB asked whether we should be interested in leasing any of the above space, but EF felt additional office space was unnecessary, although it would be worth investigating the cost of making the external storage space useable. EF to confirm whether the quotations were from local or national contractors. EF to consult insurers whether any additional security would be required due to scaffolding. WW estimated the pipe work would cost around £5K max, in addition to the roof. The Board agreed that the work had to be done, and agreed in principle to go ahead and get roof work and pipe done at the same time. Agreed to accept WW and EF’s recommendation and the cost for our share of both should be max £25K + VAT.</p> <p>4) <i>Building rental</i> – EF tabled a paper showing costs of comparative venues. She had not yet worked out what recommendation to make to the Board. It was suggested all should consider what would be reasonable between now and next meeting and send comments to EF. A sliding scale may be the best approach. EF was not keen to let rooms on a commercial basis, as no part of building could be secured. Insurance position to be clarified.</p>	<p>EF/WW</p> <p>EF</p> <p>EF</p> <p>EF/WW</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>EF</p>	<p>asap</p> <p>28/02/11</p> <p>04/03/11</p> <p>asap</p> <p>21/04/04</p> <p>By May MB</p>
6.2	<p>SP Review & Update</p> <p>1) EF reported that the SP had not moved as quickly as last year, but the current plan runs to end March. She and the Convenors were now fairly clear on what would go into the next plan (no major changes, just in detail) and there would be a full update for the May meeting. Current budget was based on overall expenditure.</p> <p>2) JP questioned the number of magazines sent out; he had been told Boston received many more than they needed. EG did not understand this as the magazine was sent directly to members, not in bulk to branches, although that had been done for Boston initially when they had refused to provide members addresses.</p> <p>3) The meeting with Hopscotch Films had been cancelled at the last minute, to be rescheduled for March.</p> <p>4) JTH asked for clarification on the comment in CJ’s report about hotel negotiations being undertaken centrally: Linda Gaul had done an exemplary job initially in persuading the hotel to take on the School. Now it was established, the suggestion was that future negotiations might better be carried out with EF taking a stronger negotiating line. EW asked if we had been aware swimming and sauna facilities would not be available for Winter</p>		

	School attendees, being closed for 3 weeks; RB did not know the answer, would speak to the Co-ordinator and inform the Board. <i>Post-meeting note: This was totally out of the Co-ordinator's control.</i>	RB	asap
7	MB Panels & Working Groups		
7.1	Panels		
7.1.1	<p>Conferences</p> <p>1) Overseas & Europe – RB noted it was not straightforward to create a programme, as each event had to be negotiated individually. So far, International Branch had agreed to hold a forum in Prague in June, which RB and JW would attend. RB had been negotiating with NZ to go there end 2011: it was difficult to negotiate much beyond that and clearly better to link to an existing event. For 2012, she had been in touch with San Francisco Branch, who was keen to have a forum at Asilomar, but it would fall around our AGM weekend. The Branch does not choose the date but is told when the venue is available, so 2012 cannot be confirmed until they know this. Other possibilities included TAC summer school again, and Australia in 2013.</p> <p>2) England & Wales – There was extensive discussion around timing, Regional possibilities, and whether it should be a standalone event or tie in with existing dancing events, as for overseas & Europe. The possibility of sending out a questionnaire for more feedback on preferences was raised. MB had already proposed the Harrogate weekend; there was a room in the hotel which could hold 80/90, or an additional room could be booked. Local marketing could be done by the Branch but it could also be advertised on the RSCDS website and in branch mailings. Marketing should be clear that the forum was not just for people attending the dancing weekend, and LO thought it essential to explain this resulted from feedback on the previous conference attempt. EW suggested if this route were taken, other branches holding weekend schools could be asked if they were interested in doing something similar. Agreed to take forward plans to hold a forum at Harrogate, LO to work with MB.</p> <p>3) Scotland & N Ireland – The report had been circulated. From the very open feedback, delegates appeared to want more time in discussion and less in presentations. The Conference generally was very successful.</p>	LO/MB	asap
7.1.2	<p>Constitution</p> <p>1) Models – The revised model LA constitution was now on the website, shortly to be followed by the revised licence agreement.</p> <p>2) Delegate numbers – KS confirmed that the group was reviewing delegate numbers as part of the next stage. EF noted that there was a query for the Constitution WG from FGAG, which RR said could be addressed outwith the meeting (see 7.3.9 below).</p> <p>3) New Zealand Branch – RB was conscious not everyone had been present at the January meeting so no decisions had been made on how to take this issue forward. Some members of NZ Branch were of the opinion that the findings of the questionnaire had never been adequately communicated. LO did a huge amount of work on the analysis, which resulted in 72% overall being in favour of the status quo. Katharine Hoskyn analysed the data</p>	EG	28/02/11

	<p>differently, and found only 54% overseas branches in favour. Some Branch members were concerned that nothing was fed back formally at the following AGM. The results, however, were sent to members via branches and posted on the website by the deadline of June 2009, when the report indicated that because it was a large majority (72%) it would not be raised again at the AGM. JTH felt there were two essential points; firstly, the original motion was an attempt by the then Branch Committee to pass the problem on to the Board, and secondly, this was not just a NZ issue but a widespread general problem about members who just want to dance and are not interested in Society management. RB agreed, but had committed to NZ Branch that the issues would be discussed. There was broad agreement this formed part of a longer-term strategy to review structure. EF suggested that if radical action/change seemed likely, an external financial analyst would be essential to assess the implications. RB asked the Board to address firstly her commitment to discuss the matter initially and feed back to the branch, and secondly the NZ remit itself and how to deal with it. With regard to the first element, it was agreed to report that the Board had discussed the matter and felt they had examined the NZ motion and resulting questionnaire data to the best of their ability within the time limits. RB would compose a letter to the Branch and LO would have sight of it. Regarding the second element, further thought and discussion were required. There was discussion on what “benefits” might be being offered with their proposal, and on possible misunderstandings created on how RSCDS and branch subs were perceived. RR confirmed that in NZ Branch, subs received and paid to the Society were held in a clearing account, available for members to see. It was agreed to say to the Branch that fundamental issues had been raised and further discussion was needed. All to consider further, and this would form part of the Board’s discussions on structure.</p> <p>4) <i>RSCDS as Company Limited by Guarantee</i> – RB, JW and EF had met with the lawyer the previous day. Alastair Keatinge (AK) had provided a briefing note, which was tabled. He believed the cost of making the change would be around £3-5K. The Society was in a period of change and modernisation, moving into new areas, and there was greater potential for things going wrong. Apart from the initial cost of making the change, there would be an annual cost of £50 to submit accounts to Companies House online and there would be additional costs in amending headed paper etc. Constitutional change would be required, which would have to be approved at AGM before the change of status could be implemented. RR was not convinced of the need for change, as the Society had more than enough funds to meet any expectations of claims. RB suggested that was true for the moment, but it was essential to consider the longer term. AK thought the issue of public perception was important, there was less likelihood of someone taking action against the Society as a company then against an individual, which would be the case currently. Indemnity insurance would still be required. It was agreed as the</p>	<p>RB</p> <p>RB ALL</p>	<p>asap</p> <p>asap ongoing</p>
--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

	paper had been tabled only today, Board members needed time to consider the issues further. To bring to next agenda	RB/EF for agenda	26/04/11
7.1.3	HR A meeting of the HR Panel had been arranged for 9 th April.		
7.1.4	Investment 1) The Panel held its first meeting the previous week, with the original group plus Nigel Fairhead. 2) It dealt with residual investments held: two were unsellable, but there had since been partial realisation, so some money would come in. The report from Newton had been circulated. Performance was ahead of benchmark, and RR was comfortable that the fund managers were performing acceptably. 3) At the last Board meeting a change of investment policy had been agreed, that the dividend from the General Fund would not just be accumulated. The Panel was considering putting out more funds to another fund manager, ie not just adding to Newton, for safety reasons. Three fund managers would be selected and reviewed. The suggestion was to put £100K with a fund manager, and put any remaining cash balances into bank accounts of different types, no more than £50K (this might be higher with the news that protected amounts have been increased) in each. 4) The investment policy approved in October would be reviewed.		
7.1.5	JMMF Nothing further to report.		
7.1.6	Magazine Editorial Board Any suggestions for Editorial Board members should be sent to AK.	ALL	ongoing
7.2	Working Groups		
7.2.1	Engagement of overseas members LB reported there had been no great response and it was unclear why. There could be a brief article in the next magazine, but LB would leave that with PW, who was taking over as Convenor; it might also be mentioned in the next ezine. The group's original remit was to get people involved in Panels and WGs and that had been achieved in creating the process that allowed applications. RB to consider the remit and structure of the group to take things forward. RB felt the remit should focus more on asking overseas members what they wanted and needed. Francis Walduck (Australia) had been invited onto the DSW group, but no-one had applied for the Constitution Panel or the Magazine Editorial Board. PW believed the original remit should be kept open, given not many people came forward.	RB	asap
7.2.2	External Events RB, JW and EF had met to discuss this the previous day. The Commonwealth Games was looking for a legacy event. One suggestion was to hold "commonwealth ceilidhs", with a competition for a dance from each country, to be included eventually in a book for 2014. Another suggestion was a competition for dances for people in wheelchairs, also for publication in a book. In Glasgow, they were looking for local projects, for example "come & try" sessions in prestigious locations around the city, but that would be discussed by Glasgow Branch. PW suggested a legacy project might link in with the new Health Strategy WG. The opening ceremony was quite separate, and we had already registered interest, but RB thought it would be		

	organised by a professional company. JTH noted Dundee Branch runs an annual international ceilidh for students. All to consider with suggestions to RB.	ALL	asap
7.3	<p>Finance and Governance Advisory Group</p> <p>1) The group had its first meeting the previous Friday. The original remit was four people, in fact six attended. A draft budget for 2011-12 had been prepared and the group thought the following year would be broadly in line. The conclusion was a balanced budget for 2011-12 with a small surplus. On that basis, unless there was an adverse year end outcome, RR proposed there was no need to recommend a subscription increase; subscription cost would be re-visited at year end.</p> <p>2) The group agreed the quarterly accounts were in a format that provided a workable document and need not be changed.</p> <p>3) For future planning, it would be useful to have statistics relating to Summer School. There had been a suggestion of a "hardship" fund for Summer School in the context of providing public benefit. Devising criteria and a measurement system could be difficult and it was suggested this might be something to request of the JMMF Panel.</p> <p>4) When available, information on the new Development Fund and how to access it should be on the website.</p> <p>5) The group felt the large section on sub-committees in the Annual Report & Accounts could be rationalised: it was a document to fulfil statutory requirements and the Annual Review was more informative for members.</p> <p>6) The group proposed to change the Reserves Policy, so as not to be constrained by a formula.</p> <p>7) The group believed it should be recommending to the Board that the current pension fund is closed to new staff members as the scheme has unavoidable liability. An alternative scheme to offer to new staff should be found. Full proposals would be brought to the next Board meeting.</p> <p>8) EF had prepared the budget, with input from SC and Isobel Gray. LO asked why the figure for royalties had been increased so much; EF to investigate and respond. RR asked the Board to formally approve the budget, and this was agreed.</p> <p>9) RR suggested that it was an anomaly that the FGAG sat as a group and thought it should be a permanent Panel. EF believed it should remain as an advisory group during the trial period, and EW suggested it remain as such pending overall structure review. RR also suggested that neither the Chairman nor Chairman Elect should attend; it was one forum where EF could raise any matters of concern. RB pointed out that the RSCDS Constitution provided for the Chairman and Chairman Elect to attend any meeting – but they could choose not to attend! Constitution Panel to look at this position and wording regarding the status and responsibilities of an Advisory Group member – was s/he a "shadow trustee"?</p> <p>10) The group was happy with the Risk Management Plan, but felt assessment of net risk was perhaps overly high in some areas as a lot of work had taken place over the last 2 years. It was for MB to consider net risk. It was also suggested the finance sub-sets</p>	RR	asap
		RR	Next MB mtng.
		EF	asap
		Const Panel	15/04/11

	should have separate scores. All to consider and let EF have views in advance of next meeting.	ALL	15/04/11
8	Management Committees		
8.1	Education & Training Committee		
	<p><i>Notes of Meeting on 29 January 2011 tabled.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) DR apologised for E&T minutes being unavailable before today. 2) Youth Director was uncertain whether the Pudsey event came within her remit; although it involved children, it was organised by adults. DR thought expressions of interest could be invited, Ian Hale & Sue Petyt were happy to help/support any other branches, and this would be mentioned in the magazine. The aim was for it to be a biannual event. 3) PW asked whether the Summer School online booking was yet resolved, and whether there was any potential risk of loss of income. EF reported that the situation had proved difficult to resolve; there had been a problem with inappropriate and inconsistent application of VAT and overseas shipping charges. The developer had been working on this and for no other customers this week. Staff, particularly CJ, had been doing their best to keep people informed, BA had also had a lot of input. The decision to take booking offline was not taken lightly, but it was felt better to take it down and fix the problems rather than leave it and constantly have to reimburse people. EF believed it was close to being resolved. BA pointed out that the issue had been very obscure, needing line by line analysis of software. It was confirmed the discount deadline would be pushed back. RB gave credit to BA and CJ for all their work. 4) Winter School had 120 attendees for the first week and 60 for the second. Sue Porter will be next year's Co-ordinator. E&T was still discussing whether to revert to one, rather than two sessions. A post-WS review would be useful. 5) It was hoped Spring Fling would attract at least 60 bookings, with 30 at the moment. Bookings for this event were usually later. 6) Scholarships would be agreed in March. There had been communication with a group in Gdansk who wanted several people to attend. DR was prepared to be flexible with scholarship money if it was not all used up. 7) DR had set up a steering group for the Manual, consisting of Helen Russell, BA, Ann Dix and herself. They would look at the overall document and co-opt people to work on different elements. The first meeting would be in March. 8) EW had agreed to rewrite the protocol for the Adjudication Panel. 9) Helen Russell was continuing to lead and chair the group on CPD workshops; the next meeting would be mid-May. Irene Bennett was preparing a list of dances for primary grades and George Meikle would have input on music. At the end of the second week at Summer School there would be a full day CPD workshop, which would be advertised in the magazine. 10) RR reminded DR that Sue Duckett needed to be asked for the John Duckett scholarship money; EF to forward agreed procedures for the John Duckett and Derek Haynes scholarships to DR. 	DR/EG	28/02/11
		EF	04/03/11

	<p>11) Noted the International Teacher Development Fund was not a separate fund as such, the money came from JMMF.</p> <p>12) DR was planning to hold another examiners' seminar at Summer School 2012, and had made allowances for the associated travelling expenses etc in her budget. JW suggested DR liaise with the Schools Director to ensure a music course was not held in the same week as the examiners' seminar.</p>		
8.2	Membership Services Committee		
8.2.1	<p><i>Notes of meeting of 22 January 2011 & 29 January 2011</i></p> <p>1) The Guide to Scottish Country Dancing (formerly the Collins book) was back in print. MT had done an excellent job in acquiring the copyright from Collins.</p> <p>2) BA pointed out that the comment re stock figures at 5(b) (4.0) in the notes did not refer to the entire committee. He had discussed new stock models being devised in-house with the committee. He believed stock control no longer sat comfortably with MS, but was better dealt with in HQ. EF confirmed a working model was being developed based on the stock control elements of Sage.</p> <p>3) KS recommended that Colin Dewar be asked to play the original music first time through at his recording; this formed part of the agreement signed with the band and George Meikle would be providing the music.</p> <p>4) The idea for Bruce Frazer's DVDs was that they would be made available via YouTube, with a link back to our website. A tribute to BF could be placed on our website with a link to the YouTube videos. The Board agreed to this suggestion.</p> <p>5) DR noted that Margaret Baker on E&T thought the website was very static for a dance website, and wondered if she could help in any way. BA would return to this later in the agenda. EF confirmed focus to date had been the "bricks & mortar" of the website, but LF would be carrying out occasional reviews. Notionally BA was responsible for monitoring the website on the committee's behalf, but he was thinking of opening that out.</p> <p>6) It was confirmed that the dance descriptions for new member packs would be proofread; some books had never been updated.</p> <p>7) It was confirmed Ann Dix and Graham Donald from E&T had been involved in the collected books: 19-24 would be the next.</p> <p>8) The meeting on 29 January had followed very closely on the previous meeting, so there was little further development.</p>	BA/LukeB	TBD
8.2.2	<p><i>DSW & Conference Weekend</i></p> <p>1) The priority for DSW would return to recruitment; the aim would be to provide assistance with marketing for branches to recruit locally. The original DSW was set up for Scotland –an issue in itself - as it was perceived as spending money in Scotland and not taking the wider membership into account. Wording of letters etc needs to be very careful.</p> <p>2) Feedback showed no real support either for separation of the business/social aspects of the Conference Weekend or for reducing the number of activities. The TAs workshop was well received; it was planned to make this a biannual event.</p> <p>3) There were tensions in the committee around age limits for evening Ball/Dance and various views were expressed by the</p>		

	<p>Board. On a vote, a majority voted in favour of an age limit of 12 and over (supervised by parent/guardian) for the Ball and this policy agreed from 2011.</p> <p>4) Planning was progressing well for this year's event. There would be a civic reception in the City Chambers with a wine reception at Kelvin Hall for those not going to City Chambers. The Saturday class would be taken by Craig Houston, with Michael Nolan suggested as the musician. The Sunday workshop theme would be "Does the music tell you?", with Muriel Johnstone asked to lead it. There would be recaps at both Ball and Dance this year. Programmes had been invited from Berks/Hants/Surrey Border (Ball) and Vancouver (Dance).</p>		
8.2.3	<p>Stock policy – 3rd party stock</p> <p>This had arisen from a request to stock Red Thistle DVDs. There was a policy, which BA recommended be clarified and extended. BA invited comment from the Board on the paper circulated. There were issues about assessing quality of material, and EF felt it important to have an independent panel to make that judgement. BA felt it was an opportunity to establish and build on the RSCDS "brand" and would provide a service to members. BA sought the Board's agreement to tighten up the policy, make people aware of it, and widen it out by including more people in the process. The recommendations outlined in the paper circulated were agreed.</p>		
8.2.4	<p>Recording priorities</p> <p>1) There was very little left to record in the RSCDS canon, mainly the remaining Miscellany and "Collins" dances. Plans were already made for recording the remainder of Collins (ca 18 dances), as it seemed a good idea to link with sale of the book now it was back in stock. <i>The Kandahar Reel</i> will also be recorded at this session with a view to releasing it as a digital single.</p> <p>2) Two further CDs would be required to complete recording of the Miscellanies; however, there was a question over commercial viability and how this would be received by the membership. Other possibilities included providing music to support smaller class sizes (eg 6x32) or difficult formats. The four Perth 800 dances could be tagged on to something else and might generate more interest in the dances. The Board felt that, whilst recording the Miscellanies and Perth800 dances to complete the canon was commendable, this was not in itself viable and should be an adjunct to other recording priorities.</p> <p>3) BA proposed to speak to George Meikle about recording for 6x32 and other formations and to view the outstanding Miscellanies as something to be done on the back of other things, ie cover the canon but not as a commercial undertaking. This was agreed. JTH pointed out that many remaining Miscellany dances were two couple dances and could satisfy the requirement for 6x32 dances.</p> <p>4) LO suggested focussing on branches, groups and teachers to establish their recording priorities; while he understood that point, BA's preference was to consult as widely as possible.</p>		
8.2.5	<p>Digital distribution</p> <p>1) Digital downloads first came under consideration around four years ago. The idea then was to test the market with half a dozen</p>		

	<p>CDs now out of print. This caused BA concern, because they were not all good quality and had been around for a long time. He suggested that instead the focus should be on quality products. The Board agreed. BA suggested that Book 47 be released in digital and physical format simultaneously. The contract that had been on the table was royalty based; they take 25% and £200 has to be accumulated before any money can be withdrawn. The world has moved on since that contract was considered. BA suggested a royalty-based agreement was not the best choice.</p> <p>2) BA, George Meikle and David Cunningham had discussed the issue at length, and felt the important issue was the RSCDS brand and, rather than distribute material through Amazon or iTunes, it would be better to get people to come to us. Their discussion was summarised in the paper circulated. BA recommended paying David Cunningham to work up a proposal or at least for David and George to present their ideas to the Board. The Board was persuaded by the arguments presented in the paper and, after discussion, it was agreed to ask David and George to talk to the Board and provide a one-page, brief highlight of what they might propose before that meeting. Aim for next meeting. BA to obtain cost estimate from David to prepare a full proposal.</p> <p>3) Keith Bark and Brian Charlton had submitted an electronic version of the Manual for consideration. As DR had reported, a review of the Manual was about to begin, but this could be an opportunity to put it on-line now and incorporate rolling changes as the project progressed. BA did not have a firm proposal but asked the Board to allow further discussions with KB and BC. DR's concern about rolling updates was that the Manual was used to set exams and it would need to be very carefully managed. Alternatively, it could remain on the website as it stands until the complete new Manual is produced. Agreed to take forward and make it available on the website for members only. At some point in the future, the Board should review whether to make it available to non-members.</p>	<p>BA</p> <p>BA</p> <p>BA/EG</p>	<p>14/05/11</p> <p>asap</p> <p>asap</p>
9	Appointed Posts Nothing to report.		
10	Branches Nothing to report.		
11	Affiliated Groups Nothing to report.		
12	Board Member/Trustee Issues None raised.		
13	Correspondence Nothing to report.		
14	<p>AOCB</p> <p>1) EG to check that the branch application form had been updated to delete the word "special" from the phrase "...providing or helping to provide special education."</p> <p>2) RB had circulated the Board about the Queensland situation and had consulted with the lawyer. Money can be raised for other charities/charitable purposes provided all costs are met and what is done remains within the Society's aims and objectives; ie</p>	<p>EG</p>	<p>04/03/11</p>

	<p>money to replace an instrument or provide a band was acceptable, but not provision of household goods etc. EF expressed the view that it was essential that before embarking on this it was made clear how the funds would be distributed, who the money would go to and how decisions would be made. RB suggested asking the Branch what might be helpful to them. RR suggested that branches be asked to consider the issue and, if they wished to donate, to transmit the money themselves, absolving the Society of the responsibility of managing it. EF reiterated that, although she appreciated the idea, it was very difficult and complex and needed to be thoroughly thought through. RB to suggest a process and email it round asap for all to comment. All to consider meantime.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: completed.</i></p> <p>3) DR reported that the Girl Guides were having a worldwide conference in Edinburgh from 12-16 July. She wanted people to be aware this was an excellent opportunity for a workshop, and the youth dem team with Edinburgh co-ordinating.</p> <p>4) EF reported that invitations had once again been received for the Royal Garden Party in July if anyone was interested. JTH noted that the Archivist would like to attend. Interested parties will be invited to send their name through to HQ.</p>	RB ALL	28/02/11 asap
	<p>Date of Next Meeting 14 May 2011</p> <p>Meeting to discuss RSCDS strategic direction and structure 15 May 2011 (10.00am – 1.00pm)</p>		

BA	Bill Austin	JTH	Jim Healy	JW	John Wilkinson
RB	Ruth Beattie	MH	Marjorie Hume	SC	Shona Coyle
MB	Malcolm Brown	LO	Lorna Ogilvie	MCH	Marilyn Healy
LB	Lyn Bryce	JP	Jack Pressley	HR	Helen Russell
KE	Keith Evans	DR	Di Rooney	WW	William Whyte
EF	Elizabeth Foster	RR	Ross Robertson		
LF	Liz Fraser	KS	Keith Stacey		
AG	Alex Gray	PW	Philip Whitley		
EG	Elsbeth Gray	EW	Elaine Wilde		

MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

Saturday 14 May 2011

RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.30am

AGENDA (v5)

Enclosures/Papers

- 1 **Apologies**
- 2 **Notes of Meeting of 19 February 2011** *Attached*
- 3 **Matters arising from Notes not listed elsewhere**
 - 3.1 **Chairman's Remarks**
 - 3.1.1 "Information Highway" *Paper circulated directly by EW*
 - 3.1.2 SNDC and ISTD *Attached (AG)*
 - 3.1.3 Donation - £1,000
 - 3.1.4 President *Re-circulation Attached*
 - 3.1.5 AGM 2011 – Saturday morning Question Time format?
 - 3.1.6 AGM 2011 - Scrolls
- 4 **Finance**
 - 4.1 Management Accounts to end of March 2011 *Attached*
 - 4.2 Treasurer's Report *Attached*
- 5 **Management Board Strategic Plan**
 - 5.1 Executive Officer
 - 5.1.1 Report *Attached (3 papers) + paper from WW*
2 Attached papers (SC, and Spring Fling Report MT)
 - 5.1.2 SP 2011-13
- 6 **Management Board Panels & Working Groups 2010-11**
 - 6.1 Panels
 - 6.1.1 Conferences
 1. Regional Conferences (O/seas, Europe, England, Wales) (Ruth)
 2. Scottish and NI Branches Conference 2011 (Lorna)
 - 6.1.2 Constitution (Keith Stacey) *Attached*
 - 6.1.2.1 New Zealand Branch (Ruth)
 - 6.1.2.2 RSCDS as Company limited by Guarantee (Ruth) *Re-circ attached*
 - 6.1.2.3 RSCDS as SCIO (Keith) *Re-circ attached+ 1 Paper*
 - 6.1.3 HR (Ruth)
 - 6.1.3.1 Staff Salaries (Cost of Living Increase) 2011-12
 - 6.1.4 Investment (Ross) *Attached (2 papers)*
 - 6.1.5 JMMF (Marjorie) *Attached*
 - 6.1.6 Magazine Editorial Board (Andrew K) *Attached*

- 6.2 Working Groups *Attached*
 - 6.2.1 Engagement of Overseas Members (Philip) *Attached*
 - 6.2.2 External Events (Ruth) *Attached*
 - 6.2.3 Health Strategy (Lyn)
 - 6.3 Finance and Governance Advisory Group (Ross) *Attached (CMcE)*
 - 6.3.1 Development Fund
- 2.00pm Presentation by David Cunningham (See Item 8.2.5 on Notes of 19.02.11)

7 Management Committees

- 7.1 Education and Training Committee (Di Rooney) *Attached*
 - 7.1.1 Minute of Meeting of 5 March 2011
 - 7.1.2 Strategic Plan Update, incl. Schools, Spring Fling, RSCDS Manual and Curriculum for Excellence updates *Attached*
- 7.2 Membership Services Committee (Bill Austin) *Attached*
 - 7.2.1 Minutes of Meetings of 16 April 2011
 - 7.2.2 Strategic Plan Update, incl. AGM Conference Weekends (2011, 2012) and DS2011 updates *Attached*

8 Appointed Posts

- 8.1 Treasurer: recruitment
- 8.2 Archivist: one further year possible 2011-12, or for replacement from November 2011

9 Branches

- 9.1 Nothing to date

10 Affiliated Groups

- 10.1 Nothing to report

11 Board Member/Trustee Issues

- 11.1 Nothing to date

12 Correspondence

- 12.1 Nothing to date

13 Any Other Competent Business

- 13.1 Nothing to date

14 Date of Next MB Meeting

2 July 2011

Date of Meeting to discuss RSCDS strategic direction and structure

15 May 2011 (10.00am-3.00pm estimate)

Please notify the Secretary/Executive Officer at HQ at least 5 days before the meeting, in writing, if you have any item you wish to be discussed under Any Other Competent Business.

**Notes of meeting of the Management Board
held on 14 May 2011
at RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.30am**

Present: Ruth Beattie (Chairman and Convenor of meeting)
John Wilkinson (Chairman Elect)
Bill Austin (Convenor, Membership Services Committee)
Di Rooney (Convenor, Education & Training Committee)
Ross Robertson (Treasurer)
Malcolm Brown, Lyn Bryce, Marjorie Hume, Jack Pressley, Keith Stacey, Philip Whitley, Elaine Wilde.

In attendance: Elizabeth Foster (Secretary/EO), Elspeth Gray (Notes)

Apologies: Keith Evans, Lorna Ogilvie

	Decision/Action	Member/s responsible	Date to be completed
1	Notes of Meeting of 19 February 2010 The minutes of 19 February were accepted as an accurate record.		
2	Matters Arising/Chairman's Remarks		
2.1	There were no Matters Arising which were not listed elsewhere.		
2.2	<i>19 Feb 2011, item 3(1), "Information highway"</i> EW highlighted some of her concerns. Agreed to set up a working group to consider matters further, comprising EW, EG & JP, and LO to be invited to join. RB suggested that Board members should try to have regular contact with their Branches, and pass information to them. It was suggested that there could be a secretaries' forum at the AGM/Conference Weekend – to be considered further.	Sheila West/MT	24/6/11
2.3	<i>19 Feb 2011, item 4.3, ISTD and SNDC</i> 1) The update from AG had been circulated. RB and EF had agreed that AG should continue the negotiations with SNDC, the main objective being to secure the formula. Some of the stock had now been delivered and was again available for sale. 2) AG had taken up discussions with ISTD, following JTH's withdrawal. It seemed that we would not get copyright if the books were revised into standard format, but AG felt the important thing was to keep them available. Agreed to maintain them as they stood, as "historical" documents, although they could become part of the RSCDS canon. Wording would not be changed, but they would be produced with modern typeset. A written agreement/contract would be negotiated with ISTD.	AG/EF	Update for 2/7/11
2.4	<i>Donation</i> £1,000 had been donated by a Japanese lady, through Bill Clement, who had suggested that some of it be given to Sinclair Barbour and his group. It was agreed to suggest to the group that they should apply for JMMF funding, as a better way of handling this issue. Agreed to include a reminder in the Youth article in the next magazine that JMMF funds can be applied for.	MH DR inform Deb Lees	24/6/11 30/06/11

2.5	<p><i>President</i></p> <p>Alastair MacFadyen's treatment was progressing, although not yet complete. One of his objectives was to chair the 2011 AGM. However, he felt he could commit to no more than that, and suggested another President should be in place by 2013. RB had asked JW to form a group to re-open the matter, to make recommendations to the Board. MB suggested asking HM The Queen to propose a successor. Agreed all to pass ideas to JW. Although the group would revisit the work of the previous working group, only minor changes were envisaged.</p>	All	asap
2.6	<p><i>AGM – Saturday morning discussion</i></p> <p>Agreed not to have a formal presentation, but rather have a panel of Chairman, Chairman Elect, Executive Officer, Treasurer and Convenors. Questions in advance to be requested, but questions from floor would be accepted. EG to inform branches and update website.</p>	EG	31/05/11
2.7	<p><i>Scrolls of Honour</i></p> <p>RB reminded Board members that this information was strictly confidential. The Scroll Panel had considered seven nominations, of which they recommended that five receive a Scroll. RB read out the names and nominating Branches. Letters to nominators and recipients would be sent out within 10 days.</p>	RB/EG	24/05/11
3	Finance		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The draft accounts for the year showed a comfortable surplus of £65K. This was subject to adjustments, which were likely to be small amounts between the General Fund and JMMF and likely to make no significant difference overall. 2) Subscription income was down, although there were four Branches outstanding. RR suggested letting that income, when received, sit in next year's accounts. 3) It had been a good year for sales. It might be worth reviewing the way stock was valued at some point, but the way it was done now was consistent with previous practice. EF noted from SJP's recent report that sales remained consistently up on a quarterly basis - more active management was helping. It was confirmed that when stock was written off it could still be sold. Cost of sales was £37K, although there was more sitting in JMMF, which would be sorted out in the statutory accounts. 4) It was important to keep an eye on membership levels. There was a general decrease of around 4% this year. 5) In the current year, a legacy of £19K had been received. 6) A new pension fund for staff was still being sought; this was not urgent but had to be done within the next 3 years. 7) RR suggested the level of travel expenses should be reviewed, specifically whether all costs should be paid for those travelling from abroad. This would be particularly relevant to Summer School, and he suggested that if SS staff were to be paid at this level, then all expenses should be treated the same. The issue had been discussed at Schools Sub-Committee the previous day, when the group concluded that there should be a sum of money for the Schools Director to spend at their discretion, either partly or wholly financing staff travel. No specific amount had been discussed. Any agreement could not be implemented until Summer School 2012, and would be separate from the Teacher 		

	Development Fund. RB stressed that policy was decided by the Board. Agreed to postpone decision to July meeting, to take account of E&T response to SS proposal, and the Board's discussions the following day.	RB/EF for agenda	17/06/11
4	Management Board Strategic Plan		
4.1	<p>Executive Officer Report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) As notified in the report circulated, Craig Jackson had a new job very suited to his skills and experience, and would leave on 27/5. 2) Coates Crescent rental costs for were agreed as circulated; insurance was not an issue, with lets only to known groups. 3) WW had been invaluable in managing the roof repair project. Despite the need for additional unforeseen work, the cost was still likely to be under the £25K approved. 4) SC's report was late; she had been selected for jury duty on a case scheduled to last 7-8 weeks. It had been decided to proceed with the audit, which began a week later than indicated. As indicated earlier, there was a potential drop of 4-5% overall in membership this year. From previous investigations with Branches regarding significant changes in membership, reasons given were almost always to do with local action/inaction. It was difficult to do much more centrally; one of the things several branches had requested was more marketing materials, which had been done. The Board, however, could not take lightly the loss of 400-500 members a year. There was discussion about teachers' age – a possible contributory factor - some teachers were in their 80's and had an out of date approach with no appeal for new members - this could be part of tomorrow's discussion. 5) Spring Fling had gone very well, and returned a small surplus. 6) EF had circulated information on the Treasurer post in the last Branch mailing, and advertised externally on the Good Moves website. There had been no expressions of interest so far. She asked Board members to consider whether they knew of suitable candidates who they might encourage to apply. RR had taken the post on the understanding it would be for one year only and would prefer to see people apply, but he would not walk away. 7) LB, PW, DR and EW would attend the Royal Garden Party. 8) Irene Bennett and Heather Battson had greatly enjoyed the reception at Buckingham Palace the previous week, where they represented the Society. 9) Invitations had been received from Newton to attend a corporate reception on the Royal Yacht Britannia on 9 June, 7.00-10pm. EF or EG to be informed if anyone would like to attend. 10) Over several years, the Society has had a contract with Peninsula for oversight of health & safety, including annual inspection, updates, 24-hr helpline, proformas etc. currently at a cost of £70/month. Peninsula was introducing a new system to include employment law & advice, and could provide both services at a total cost of £150/month. EF noted that currently, if there were any issues, the recourse was to the solicitor, which was infrequent but expensive when necessary. The Peninsula synopsis would be in the lunch room for MB members to view. 	All	asap
4.2	Strategic Plan 2011-13, Review & Update	RB/EF for agenda	17/06/11

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A Marketing & Communications Plan had been finalised and was circulated. EF had held discussions with BA and DR regarding their areas, and planned to complete the SP by end May. It would be circulated to the Board before the next meeting. 2) Joomla was the operating system used for the website. With 50% cost support from a successful application to Skills Development Scotland, a trainer from northern England (no local trainers had been found) would work with the HQ team on 25 May. 	EF	02/07/11
5	MB Panels & Working Groups		
5.1	Panels		
5.1.1	<p>Conferences</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>Overseas & Europe</i> – Plans were in place for the IB Prague event in June - RB and JW would do a session on Friday afternoon. As previously reported, RB and JW would visit NZ later in the year. 2) <i>England & Wales</i> – MB confirmed that the conference session was definitely going ahead within the Harrogate weekend, although some practical details had yet to be finalised. 3) <i>Scotland & N Ireland</i> – No report on this occasion. 		
5.1.2	<p>Constitution</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Most of the Panel’s work had been around the structure, to be discussed the following day. KS had picked up, however, that although the Board had agreed last year to delete the word “special” regarding educational purposes in the Constitution, this was not included in the motion to the AGM. Agreed to put a motion to this year’s AGM as proposed. 2) <i>New Zealand</i> – RB had kept in touch with NZ since last meeting, and little had moved since then. She believed much would depend on the Board’s decisions about the licence agreement, and they would wait to see what was decided. The licence agreement would form part of the next day’s discussions. 2) <i>RSCDS as Company Limited by Guarantee and RSCDS as SCIO</i> – There was extensive discussion regarding the two options, with opinions for and against both being expressed. On one hand the Company Limited by Guarantee was a known quantity, tried and tested; on the other hand, the SCIO had been set up in conjunction with OSCR as an entity for Scotland in line with Scottish legislation, but there could be risks attached to being “in the vanguard”. One aspect of the SCIO, which could be problematical, was the requirement to keep a list of members, past and present. Member names currently are not linked with subscriptions received, and not all Branches reliably keep their member data up to date. Without direct membership except for HQ members, this may not fit well with the SCIO. The status quo was also identified an option. Agreed to defer a decision pending the following day’s discussions. 	KS/EG/EF	02/07/11
5.1.3	<p>HR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The HR Panel (RB, JW, RR, EF and Craig Houston) had met in April to discuss various issues, and a summary was tabled. 2) EF & EG left the meeting while the Board discussed salaries. 3) On their return, it was confirmed that a 1% across the board pay rise for staff had been agreed. 4) RB read out JTH’s resignation letter and outlined action taken. 	EF	31/05/11

	5) BA confirmed that it had been decided to issue the original tune for <i>Best Set in the Hall</i> as an official alternative.		
5.1.4	<p>Investment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To spread risk, future funds would be placed with a fund manager other than Newton. 2) Reports from Newton and Deutsche Bank had been circulated. Investment with Newton was in a common fund, producing quarterly income and remitted to the Society on a quarterly basis. 3) There was one outstanding issue, to open the account with Scottish Widows; this would be progressed asap. 	SC	asap
5.1.5	<p>JMMF</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) MH reported the following amendments/additions to the paper circulated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P2, 4 – summary of projects approved for funding sent to magazine editor for report to members • P8, 2(e) add “in your area” • P9, 3(c) – add third box saying “no local branch” • P9, 5, (c) add “be willing to provide an article for inclusion in <i>Scottish Country Dancer</i>” • P11, Annex A, at end where says “other”, add “please specify”. 2) Once approved, the application form and guidelines would go onto the website. 3) With reference to the recommendations included in the Report to MB as item 6: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Application form and guidelines as presented were agreed. (b) Agreed it was a good idea to identify an individual to provide pre-application advice, although it was not clear who this should/would be. (c) With regard to a formula for spending from JMMF, MH reported that current spend (except recordings) was broadly within the annual interest; interest + 10% was suggested as a formula. International Teacher Development Scheme (ITDS) had been allocated £6K from JMMF, which was not included; it was a policy decision that the ITDS come from JMMF, as it clearly met JMMF purposes. RR recommended going with the suggested formula, and emphasized it was important to have a clear monitoring system. (d) Agreed to set an upper limit of £1K on any one grant. (e) It would be good practice for someone to monitor all youth events and feed back to the JMMF panel; agreed this should be the Youth Director. (f) Agreed information on decisions made should be circulated via the website and branch mailings. (g) Agreed feedback and reporting information to the Board should start with the basics, and could be built on. 4) Agreed next stage for the Panel was to finalise all documentation. MH was thanked formally for completing this very large task. 5) EF noted that Colin McEwen and MH talked regularly to ensure consistency in style, etc between JMMF and Development Fund applications and guidelines. 6) Agreed the May Board meeting was the best time to set what the maximum amount would be for the following year. 	MH	
		MH	
		MH/ Deb Lees	
		EG	
		MH	
		MH	
		RB/EF	

5.1.6	Magazine Editorial Board It was felt that the strategic value of the magazine was currently under-utilised. The Society invested a lot of money in the magazine, it was constantly being talked about by members, and warranted serious consideration. Agreed to take more time to discuss fully, including possible future editors, at next meeting.	RB/EF for agenda	17/06/11
5.2	Working Groups		
5.2.1	Engagement of overseas members There had been no response to the magazine article or the Branch mailing, although there were two previous expressions of interest from Jon Allen-Friend and Murray Corps. There was discussion about the purpose of the group. It was noted that some WGs (eg Manual WG) consciously involved overseas members in any case. RB suggested it should be possible for volunteers to be engaged in all Panels and WGs, but some Board members felt it would not necessarily work with all Panels/WGs. PW questioned whether there was a need for this group, if involvement was being achieved in other ways. EF suggested it would be useful for the group to identify best ways to facilitate participation, eg a phone conferencing system, Skype, etc. RB recommended changing the remit of the group to offer the full range of Panels/WGs, subject to agreement of Convenors; the group to come back to the Board with recommendations on how to spread that information, and take EF's point into account.	WG	02/07/11
5.2.2	External Events Many suggestions had been made at the meeting - all ideas to be forwarded to Liz Fraser, to suggest how to present them to Branches etc. PW asked if production of a Commonwealth book of dances for 2014 was too close to Book 47; BA felt it was close, but possible.	RB	02/07/11
5.2.3	Health Strategy A paper for health professionals had been circulated. The group was working on a simpler version, for health centres etc, for customisation by local Branches. It was hoped to find some Branches interested to pilot the strategy. Scottish government "approval" might be helpful to the project? EF suggested that it might be useful to ask for examples of successful practice in this area.	WG	02/07/11
5.3	Finance and Governance Advisory Group 1) FGAG had not met since the last Board meeting. Work on the Development Fund had been progressed by Colin McEwen, and was not quite finalised. There had been no spend from the Fund yet, and it would be useful to know if anything was planned. RR suggested eligibility for Branches and Committees, but not individual members. The Fund's purpose was envisaged for projects taking forward the Strategic Plan, which should be included in the guidelines. A section on monitoring and evaluation was to be added. 2) The group would meet in June, to review the accounts, before the next Board meeting. 2) With JTH stepping down, there was a vacancy on the group. RR proposed asking William Whyte; this was agreed .		
6	Management Committees		
6.1	Education & Training Committee		
	<i>Notes of meeting of 5 March 2011</i>		

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There had been no volunteers to run a BBC Children in Need event. DR asked all to consider whether they knew anyone who might be encouraged to do it. She reiterated that Ian Hale and Sue Petyt were very happy to liaise. 2) DR and Deb Lees were in contact with someone regarding the Girl Guides World Conference. It was hoped to provide small items to be given out. There would be a demo, and more importantly, a ceilidh to involve the young people. As it was in Edinburgh, Edinburgh Branch would be involved. 3) There was discussion regarding the search engine developed by Vladimir, for dances contained in the beginners' grid. It was a quick way of selecting dances, not a teaching tool. E&T had some doubts about it being on the RSCDS website, but after discussion the Board agreed it should be. It was based on Minicrib wording, but DR would amend it as appropriate. 4) E&T notes, p4 (iii) (b) – Agreed to remove specific name. 5) E&T notes, p3 (d) – There had been no liaison with Edinburgh Branch; this was felt to be a communication and wording issue. 6) E&T notes, p4 (iii) (d) – The Examinations sub-group had discussed Mervyn Short's paper, and felt he might not have realised the implications and impact of his suggestions. His concerns were understood. He would be advised, however, that as a tutor with concerns about someone's dancing, it was his responsibility to advise him/her not to present for examination. 7) The Curriculum for Excellence group was meeting the following Thursday and making good progress. 8) The only volunteer for hosting Spring Fling 2012 was Dundee, with Luke Brady leading. Oxford & Cambridge were considering offering joint hosting in 2013. 9) The committee had been discussing production of a DVD relating to the steps and formations sections of the Manual; support from the Development Fund would be sought. This may tie in with David Cunningham's presentation/proposals. 	All	asap
		DR/EF/EG	asap
		DR/CJ	asap
6.2	Membership Services Committee		
	<p><i>Notes of meeting of 16 April 2011</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Luke Brady had resigned from MS and from Dance Scottish WG. 2) Various arrangements for DS2011 were now in place, including a possible workshop at RSAMD. It was suggested there should be a special communication for the southern hemisphere; it may be useful to have someone there to co-ordinate. 3) AGM & Conference Weekend arrangements were moving smoothly, with a site visit. Online booking with payment was up and running. PW was working on a survey. It was confirmed that hard copy booking forms were available from HQ on request. 4) MS Notes, p3, 5, 1.2 – BA explained "Huddle" was a discussion forum. 5) The Collins 3 CD may not be ready for Summer School. 6) Eric Ferguson would produce cribs for the Conference Weekend. 		
7	Appointed Posts		
7.1	<p><i>Treasurer</i></p> <p>Those interested had been asked to submit a letter with their background experience and skills; the deadline was 27th May. An</p>		

	interview date had yet to be confirmed, and the process defined. Agreed RR, EF and RB to review applications and make their recommendation to the Board by email. Appointment would be subject to references and subsequent approval at the AGM.	RR/EF/RB	31/05/11
7.2	Agreed to ask the Archivist if she wished to serve for one further year. For succession planning, it would be helpful if the next person appointed were to work with her for say 6 months.	EF	30/06/11
8	Branches 1) There were developments in Cape Town Branch, but the picture was not yet clear. 2) The issue with Aberdeen Branch concerning disclosure applications had been resolved.		
9	Affiliated Groups Approved: Minsk Scottish Dance Club, Belarus.	SC	asap
10	Board Member/Trustee Issues None were raised.		
11	Correspondence There were no items of correspondence.		
12	AOCB 1) Following JTH's resignation, the branches allocated to him would be divided up between remaining Board members. 2) It was confirmed Nairobi Branch had paid their members' subscriptions.	EG	30/06/11
13	David Cunningham David's presentation is summarised at Appendix A, and he provided handouts. There was general support for his views and ideas. BA could not think of anyone else with the same skill set David could offer. Agreed BA should continue discussions on establishing this project with David.	BA	ongoing
14	Date of Next Meeting Saturday 2 nd July.		

BA	Bill Austin	JTH	Jim Healy	EW	Elaine Wilde
RB	Ruth Beattie	MH	Marjorie Hume	JW	John Wilkinson
MB	Malcolm Brown	LO	Lorna Ogilvie	SC	Shona Coyle
LB	Lyn Bryce	SJP	Sarah-Jane Paterson	MCH	Marilyn Healy
KE	Keith Evans	JP	Jack Pressley	HR	Helen Russell
EF	Elizabeth Foster	DR	Di Rooney	WW	William Whyte
LF	Liz Fraser	RR	Ross Robertson		
AG	Alex Gray	KS	Keith Stacey		
EG	Elsbeth Gray	PW	Philip Whitley		

David Cunningham presentation

In the past, David has done much for the Society that was just guidance. RSCDS has been and still is his life, he is very passionate about it and feels strongly he wants to do what he can to help and move things on. His role is in industry, music and media, and he hopes to spark the Board's enthusiasm and answer some of their questions. The Society has enormous potential that is not being tapped as well as it could.

There was clearly a lot of material already on e.g. YouTube, but as an umbrella body he feels the Society should set a benchmark, rather than just pull together what other people do. He feels it is important to get people to come to the Society, for music, visual media, etc – it should set the standard. From the Society's perspective, music has been produced as a tool for teaching dance, but he feels it could be much more than that. There is a difference between good music to dance to and good music to teach with. David believes there is a massive market; bands could be given their head, and we could produce music that would let other people in.

Take the Floor has been produced for the last 70 years. It used to be that when bands were asked to do it, they had to provide 70% RSCDS dances. David questions why there is no longer a close relationship with this programme, and feels it is an unexploited partnership.

David believes there is huge revenue potential with regard to back catalogue management. Re-licensing could be considered. Another idea might be next time a band is recording, to have them produce the usual "tool" recording, but also another 5/10/whatever tracks with a different perspective, that might enthruse people. "Listening" music would make it more attractive to others. That approach would have connotations for the back catalogue as well – producing that type of music would open the possibility of other ways of promoting etc.

On digital distribution, David believes there are two approaches: one that would allow the Society to reach a wider market, and one that would allow the Society to reach its current market. If it was on the Society's site, we would get more revenue from the site. It was suggested that the approach to recordings outlined above would be good not just for the Society but also for musicians in Scotland; the Society could invest in young musicians, bring them on, promote them. If the brand was built up, to bring young people on and give them opportunities, the Society would in effect be a record label that would "sign up" bands, and promote them. David notes that he has never yet seen any CD reviews in Scottish newspapers, magazines, etc, and that could be done. The Society could function as the central source for Scottish music worldwide.

The next step up would be working with the existing community, taking on others' productions and selling them – like iTunes for Scottish music. There is a built-in marketplace. It was probably worth putting some things – the right things, with the right people – on iTunes, or on YouTube. From David's knowledge of web development it is a very simple process; he is also familiar with the licensing required. It would be good to create perceived kudos for bands from working with the Society.

David sees advertising – primarily online – as having huge potential. Additionally, there was nothing to stop the Society from broadcasting via internet, which could include advertising. There could be a radio station on the internet, or podcasts, all generating revenue. David recognises it could cost a lot to put in place, but firmly believes that whatever is spent, the Society would get at least double back.

RB asked David how long it might take to recover input; clearly this would depend on exactly what the framework was, but he felt it would be quick. For example, just using Google advertising on the website would generate revenue immediately.

EF noted that many in the Society's customer base already produced their own material, and wondered about the competition. David agreed this was true, and brought him back to the benchmark scenario – the Society should be setting the quality standard. The RSCDS already is a brand, which is known. There are opportunities to generate income not necessarily based on members.

Music and video could be a bridge to bringing in younger people, within a bigger plan.

DR pointed out that E&T has a couple of current projects where they envisage producing DVDs, and need skills and expertise to do that successfully. David has the ability not just to do the management side, but also to film, edit, etc and make it happen – ie not just overseeing, but practical involvement. With regard to costs, using external companies to provide these services would be very expensive; David would like to be benevolent but clearly cannot do this work for nothing. He can guarantee, however, to cost much less than using companies for all these various elements.

With regard to an implementation programme, David would need much more information about what was already in place, what the current direction is, etc.

**Summary of Management Board discussion
held on Sunday 15 May 2011
at RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.00am**

- Present:** Ruth Beattie (Chairman and Convenor of meeting)
John Wilkinson (Chairman Elect)
Bill Austin (Convenor, Membership Services Committee)
Di Rooney (Convenor, Education & Training Committee)
Ross Robertson (Treasurer)
Malcolm Brown, Lyn Bryce, Marjorie Hume, Jack Pressley, Keith Stacey, Philip Whitley, Elaine Wilde.
- In attendance:** Elizabeth Foster (Secretary/EO), Elspeth Gray (Notes)
- Apologies:** Keith Evans, Lorna Ogilvie

1 RSCDS Legal Form

There was further discussion on this issue, brought forward from the previous day's meeting. Points made included:

Company limited by guarantee:

- Too expensive in long term
- Very easy to manage, but issue is about what is right for the organisation
- Most big charities are incorporated, in this form

SCIO:

- Written in Scottish law to protect Scottish charities
- Makes clear that AGM always held in Scotland
- Would require subscriptions to be submitted direct; would give the Board full control of finances and member register. Some doubt as to how many members would do this.
- Set up specifically for Scottish organisations
- Is untested; will be some time before useful information is available

General:

- Status quo still an option
- Scottish government only providing funding to incorporated organisations
- Not decide before discussing structure further

It was agreed to go into the discussion on structure and come back to this issue later.

2 Function and Structure

Ruth proposed to deal with questions 1 & 2 first – function and structure. She wanted to come to an agreement on restructuring E&T, even if everything else was not achieved. There were papers from Malcolm, Jack, Keith E, Keith S and Jim. Ruth proposed to give each person 15-20 minutes to speak to their papers, she had summarised those from Keith E and Jim. She urged members to consider commonalities.

- (a) **What is our main function, are we:**
- (a) **A teaching organisation**
 - (b) **A publisher of dances and music**
 - (c) **An agency organising events**
 - (d) **A members' organisation**

- At least, publisher of dances and music
- Trainer of teachers
- Events organiser; have to organise events to be out in the market
- If a teaching organisation, who is "we"? Society or branches?
- We examine teachers and ensure teaching to standard, but don't train
- Society seen as organising eg Summer School, but outside, when branches do similar, not seen as Society, but as branch
- Some branches feel isolated, "on their own"
- Involvement with Society hard to maintain and generate interest in at branch level
- Most members loyal to branch rather than Society; tends to be teachers and those involved in Society matters that have loyalty to Society
- Society cannot control what branches are doing
- There is currently no mutuality, not clear what is expected of branches; licence agreement is very weak
- If RSCDS symbol is badge of quality, Society should have expectations about eg who should be allowed to teach in branches
- Need for charter or code of understanding setting out expectations for each other

Recap: the majority agreed that functions were as listed in the agenda, but all were interdependent and it was hard to say which was the "main" function. Malcolm was still unhappy with the term "members' organisation", not clear what that means. Other specific words that had been used in Liz's earlier exercise were "standards" and "co-ordinating" – these should perhaps be added.

(b) Structure to support above

(i) Malcolm

- Tried to see what is being uniquely done, which is primarily maintaining standards – but problem that once qualified, are qualified for life!
- Many affiliated groups are bigger than branches – why not call them all branches?
- Suggest we should change to a regional structure; we are a worldwide organisation, and probably the only one without any regionalisation. One person from each region could come to meetings in Edinburgh. Would encourage contribution and discussion.
- When we say we are a members' organisation and want people to be represented, we have to remember that most people just want to dance!
- People vote for who they know, rather than who they don't know. It is not necessarily the best way to get the best people for a job – much better to find people with skills, approach them and appoint them.
- Understand why propose and second people standing for election, but 10 additional signatories is pointless.

Comments:

- There is no point having one member one vote – very hard to engage local people in anything other than dancing. Even getting them to volunteer for local committee is difficult. Representation is best way forward.
- Important concept is about people who just want to dance. May need to look at two-tier.
- Many affiliated groups big enough to become branches.

(ii) *Jack*

- I belong to an affiliated group; it existed for 40 years, lost affiliation because the Society refused to affiliate, but then reapplied and were reaffiliated.
- Frustrating being an affiliated group. We pay more money as individuals and supposed to get same amount of news etc back from HQ. Only thing we get is a letter 1x year that renewal is due.
- Why do affiliated groups exist? There is a bad history, created by them or members.
- There are many groups who are not even affiliated – nobody is approaching these people and trying to help.
- Affiliated groups have similar structure as branch, but a different name.
- Breakaway branches/groups are usually to do with individuals.
- There is a problem with groups and branches, and the idea of saying to groups to join local branch will not work.
- Shouldn't be two different types of "group", should all be the same. Branches have "mandate" to grow group, and are supposed to have 100% Society members.

Comments:

- In most branches, everyone who dances is a member. May not be true for all branches. In some, members pay more for classes and dances.
- What Jack describes is an opportunity for the Society; 100% membership in branches is a barrier.
- BHS works because branch acts as an umbrella, involving all clubs in area. That may not work in other countries, where the next group might be 3 hour drive away.
- An affiliated group member who isn't a HQ member can't access info that we produce, that's a barrier –BHS example is "best practice" and should be pushed out to branches.
- If we are a members' organisation, affiliated groups are part of that.

(iii) *Keith Evans*

Ruth summarised the key proposals for change from Keith's paper:

- A more proactive relationship with branches
- Regional forums
- Mergers between branches and affiliated groups could occur over time (but could not be enforced)
- Branches pay "fee" to Society, commensurate with size
- HQ to facilitate regional forums to develop

(iv) *Jim Healy*

Ruth summarised the key points and proposals for change from Jim's paper:

- He queries the £15 sub and what it provides – magazine, teachers, standards, schools, "international family"

- Magazine versus subscription copy – teachers more than anyone raise the issue of “lost” subscription copy.
- Possibly reduce Society to a Teachers’ Association only.
- 2 tiers: tier 1 = teachers and branch organisers, and tier 2 = dancers. Tier 1 “controls”. Subscriptions of £30 & £10 respectively would bring in almost the same as the current subscription.

Comments on Keith’s and Jim’s papers:

- One of Jim’s points valid, the lack of continuity at management level; personnel change and history is lost.
- Biggest lack of continuity is chairman – why 2 years not 3? 1 as Chairman Elect and 3 as Chairman makes more sense.
- Committee membership used to be very static, but now almost gone too far other way.
- Decisions made get lost, aren’t visible to next people who come on to committee.
- Main continuity has to come from Liz and staff – they are ones who implement. Should be pushing more out of committees and toward professional staff. Have to recognise huge role that Liz and team can make, perhaps need to increase investment in central staff. Has a cost, but get value for it.
- Need to rotate regularly; but rotating doesn’t necessarily mean lack of continuity.
- MS is good example where decisions and processes lost – not enough things written down.
- We are guilty of keeping things to ourselves, should be using professional services more.
- If did that, don’t need such a large board, much more decision making.
- This size of group seems to be optimum number – 13 works, 17 would be too big.

(v) *Keith Stacey*

- Feel need to retain President and VPs.
- Would like Board reduced, 18 too high. Charity regulators suggest 7-12 ideal.
- Schools Director very important and should be part of Board.
- Committees too large and too diverse.
- Don’t think need to have 2 examiners on E&T.
- MS when first produced was bit concerned, seemed to be sidetracked and not concentrating on member services; since Bill started has been working much better, but still think too large.
- Concept of Dance Scottish needs changing.
- Have talked for many years about regionalisation, and have suggested how a regional structure might operate. Need to get communication aspect resolved – people who run Society need to be “out there”.
- Prefer regional councils to branches executive.
- Appointment of an EO has brought change in how Society is perceived.
- Voting procedures: every branch have spoken to has said we pay our subs and we don’t have a vote – appoint delegates but how do we know they vote as we want? With advance of electronics, feel is an opportunity to take on OMOV.
- Need to look at collaboration and cooperation.
- Look at society as a banking system – they have created branches to service customers, as we have branches to service members.

Comments:

- Reasonable to reduce Board size, not convinced 10, think 12 in total better.
- Di initially thought having Schools Director on Board would be useful, but having talked to others and considered, think they have onerous job, and might be more difficult to get a Schools Director if on top of that they had to be a Board member.
- Although she agreed that E&T does need restructure, Di would adamantly say definitely need 2 examiners.
- Good point that E&T and MS need to be more closely linked – needs to be consultative process eg re new publications. Need to be formalised.
- Not necessary for Schools Director to be full Board member, work of Director too onerous; could perhaps attend when necessary.
- John saw E&T redistribution as: Schools/exams, medal tests and DPA/youth and CPD. Saw MS redistribution as: recordings and publications/ shop/events.
- **It was agreed that Chairman, Chairman Elect, Liz and Di are the people who should decide what is most appropriate for E&T.**
- To change committee structure, have to change constitution; are other ways you could divide up the work and make more efficient. Liz not enthused about saying should have six committees.
- Perhaps better to look across the board, eg external events could include Summer School, Winter School, AGM/Conference Weekend and Dance Scottish. Want to alleviate pressure rather than create more.
- Liz had never worked for an organisation that presented constitutional changes to every AGM.
- Di very worried about youth – we don't have group of people focussing on that.
- We are touching on competencies of elected members; perhaps should be asking future candidates if they have competencies other than teaching.

(vi) Ruth was pleased that one positive decision had been made, for a small group to discuss the structure of E&T and make recommendations to the Board.

After lunch, she wanted Board members to be clearer about what structure we might move towards.

[Lunch]

3 Structure (continued)

- Board – Schools Director should attend as requested, but not as full member of Board, possibly still attend E&T.
- 12 felt like a much more workable size; would include the two appointments (Treasurer & EO).
- If there was one more committee, there would be another Convenor.
- Would the David Cunningham-type role report to Liz? Liz felt there was a lot to unpack re all the Director posts; eg if David C taken on, what is the Music Director role? There were several posts that had Convenor support and a possible sub-group structure. Directors should have a strategic role – should be suggesting at appointment what want to achieve etc. If they are voluntary, best practice is to have them supported in some way.

- Group looking at E&T could expand by one, ie Bill, and take in Director posts as well.
 - We are looking at matters top down, when it was more pressing to look from member upwards. The relationship between key elements was more crucial, committee structure etc was more to do with modus operandi.
 - Think need to change the constitution, make it simple and straightforward, and change as need be. One thing to consider is that do not have to have set of rules attached – can have constitution only, although some members could see that as giving the Board carte blanche to do whatever they want. Chairman, Chairman Elect and Board would have to “sell” it.
 - Alternatively, like the Inner Wheel, have a permanent group to review constitution.
 - The constitution should be a guideline to operate under.
-
- There are branches, affiliated groups and people who dance and support us, and there are people who dance and don’t care about the Society.
 - Why do we insist on groups affiliating to the Society rather than to a branch?
 - Ruth gathered that NZ will try to introduce two-tier membership.
 - What they are looking at is rewarding loyalty – reducing the subscription after x years. Something the Society has never considered.
 - Would it solve the problem if groups in NZ became affiliated? Better than losing the membership because they aren’t happy. Division of assets might be difficult.
 - A radical suggestion – we could not have members as now, but charge teachers depending on number of people they have in class and they register with us. That would work if teaching a fair-sized group, but some classes very small. The idea was not to have different tiers of membership, and it would be teachers who provide income stream. But we would not know who members were.
 - One thing that could help membership, is to develop what David C suggested yesterday, where the Society is the central point for anything re SCD.
 - Would like to see the Scottish government give “endorsement” that RSCDS was responsible for all SCD.
 - Another suggestion – drop the notion of a membership organisation, have the main relationship with branches and apply a capitation fee.
 - Another way could be as in some other professional organisations, where you have basic membership plus membership for a particular area or region, or for particular interest groups, eg reelers.
 - Capitation fee could apply to affiliated groups too.
-
- In the short term, the only solution Ross saw for NZ was to negotiate what fees they were prepared to pay. But don’t want every branch knowing.
 - NZ constraint is that branch members have to be society members – just remove that. Two-tier thing doesn’t work. Take the risk of big hit and say branches can have members that aren’t paid-up Society members. Could be a major risk.
 - Fail to see why members wouldn’t join – is about supporting an organisation, not about what get for it.
 - The Society is a lot more intangible than eg the National Trust.
 - Alarmed at Ross’s suggestion, would create a real precedent, much better if any change going to happen that it’s discussed and agreed here.

- Feel need new direction. Licence agreement needs amendment and constitution needs simplified. Keith suggested we work towards those in next couple of meetings.
- If we go for a two-tier system, are we not basically accepting NZ's proposed "friends" of the Society?
- Lot of problem in NZ is money, the way they are charging members; they may not all be fully cognisant.
- Members have to appreciate that dancing doesn't just happen, many people dance on back of hard work of small minority. Not in favour of two tier.
- We can simply say to NZ that we have debated and discussed, and are not making any change to the licence agreement now.
- If NZ change things, we would need to write to every member there and make sure they understand.
- We could have a short article in next magazine that sets out what members get for their subscription, and explain that they pay extra to branches for local admin. Also include exchange rate, or say at time of going to press, £15 = whatever in foreign currency. Comparative cost of joining other organisations could be included.
- Have to come back to role of branches and affiliated groups and how the Society is presented. To many (most?) members out there, especially remote, it means nothing – what is real to them is branch activities.
- Important that we say money comes to the Society, not to HQ. Need to stress the Society's role as charity, members support the existence of dancing, not just local classes.

4 Conclusions

- Ruth to pull a response together for New Zealand, saying we will:
 - try to make the constitution simpler
 - look at rewriting the licence agreement although will take some time
 - have regular articles in the magazine about what members get for their money
 - at regional forums, "sell" what the Society does and how important it is in keeping SCD alive.
- If having regular updates in the magazine, who will do? Ruth felt it was not necessary to decide right now. Elaine offered to do.
- Potential role for David C to be specified, Bill and Ruth had already discussed.
- We used to print the Society's aims and objectives in every book. They could also go in the next magazine.

5 Future

- Need more discussion, haven't concluded lot of things today.
- Put on regular agenda for meetings, or have separate meetings on structure.
- Possibly start meeting earlier, at 10.00am.
- Dates of meetings for next year to be reviewed.

Ruth thanked everyone for their time and thoughts. We may only seem to have moved forward a little, but we have moved.

MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

Saturday 2 July 2011

RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.00am

AGENDA (v3)

10.00-11.00am Continuing Discussion of RSCDS Organisational Structure

Enclosures/Papers

- 1 **Apologies**
- 2 **Notes of Meeting of 14 May 2011**
- 3 **Matters arising from Notes not listed elsewhere**
 - 3.1 Chairman's Remarks
 - 3.1.1 SNDC and ISTD Update
 - 3.1.2 Donation - £1,000 Update
 - 3.1.3 AGM 2011 – Draft Agenda
- 4 **Finance**
 - 4.1 Trustees Report and Annual Accounts to end of March 2011
(Arnold Black, Auditor, in attendance for this item)
 - 4.2 Treasurer's Report
 - 4.2.1 Volunteer Expenses
 - 4.2.2 RSCDS Subscriptions 2012-13
- 5 **Management Board Strategic Plan**
 - 5.1 Executive Officer
 - 5.1.1 Report
 - 5.1.2 Peninsula
 - 5.1.2 SP 2011-13
 - 5.1.3 Risk Management Plan 2011-12 (for information)
- 6 **Management Board Panels & Working Groups 2010-11**
 - 6.1 Panels
 - 6.1.1 Conferences
 1. Regional Conferences (O/seas, Europe, England, Wales) (Ruth)
 2. Scottish and NI Branches Conference 2011 (Lorna)
 - 6.1.2 Constitution (Keith Stacey)
 - 6.1.3 HR (Ruth)
 - 6.1.4 Investment (Ross)
 - 6.1.5 JMMF (Marjorie)
 - 6.1.5.1 Maximum Spend in 2011-12
 - 6.1.6 Magazine Editorial Board (Andrew K)
(Discussion of Agenda Item 5.1.6 from May meeting)

- 6.2 Working Groups
 - 6.2.1 Engagement of Overseas Members (Philip)
 - 6.2.2 External Events (Ruth)
 - 6.2.3 Health Strategy (Lyn)
 - 6.2.4 Information Highway (Elaine)
 - 6.2.5 RSCDS President (John)

- 6.3 Finance and Governance Advisory Group (Ross)
 - 6.3.1 Development Fund

Time reserved for Board discussion (or post-lunch)

7 Management Committees

- 7.1 Education and Training Committee (Di Rooney)
 - 7.1.1 Minute of Meeting of 21 May 2011
 - 7.1.2 Strategic Plan Update, incl. Schools, Spring Fling, RSCDS Manual and Curriculum for Excellence updates
- 7.2 Membership Services Committee (Bill Austin)
 - 7.2.1 Minutes of Meeting of 11 June 2011
 - 7.2.2 Strategic Plan Update, incl. AGM Conference Weekends (2011, 2012), DS2011 Updates and further discussions with David Cunningham

8 Appointed Posts

- 8.1 Archivist: response to Board invitation to continue for one final year

9 Branches

- 9.1 Nothing to date

10 Affiliated Groups

- 10.1 Nothing to report

11 Board Member/Trustee Issues

- 11.1 Nothing to date

12 Correspondence

- 12.1 Nothing to date

13 Any Other Competent Business

- 13.1 Allocation of MB members to Branches (revised June 2011)

14 Date of Next MB Meeting

1 October 2011

Please notify the Secretary/Executive Officer at HQ at least 5 days before the meeting, in writing, if you have any item you wish to be discussed under Any Other Competent Business.

**Notes of meeting of the Management Board
held on 2 July 2011
at RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.30am**

Present: Ruth Beattie (Chairman and Convenor of meeting)
Di Rooney (Convenor, Education & Training Committee)
Ross Robertson (Treasurer)
Lyn Bryce, Keith Evans, Marjorie Hume, Lorna Ogilvie, Jack Pressley.

In attendance: Elizabeth Foster (Secretary/EO), Elspeth Gray (Notes)

Apologies: John Wilkinson, Bill Austin, Malcolm Brown, Keith Stacey, Philip Whitley, Elaine Wilde.

Decision/Action	Member/s responsible	Date to be completed
<p><i>RB outlined the format for the day. The meeting unfortunately was inquorate, but would proceed as normal, with relevant decisions to be approved later by those not present. Before the formal meeting, the discussion on organisational structure would continue.</i></p>		
<p>Continuing discussion of organisational structure EG had typed up the note of the meeting on Sunday 15 May, which RB had summarised and read out the key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was discussion concerning the organisation's status, and whether it should adopt the SCIO or Company Limited by Guarantee. It was concluded the discussions should continue, and the decision be partly dependent on outcomes of discussions regarding structure. • RB had proposed four questions regarding the organisation; the conclusion was that we were all four, with an appropriate supporting structure. • MB spoke to his paper; it was thought OMOV was impractical. • JP spoke to his paper; issues concerned affiliated groups - not all branch members were Society members -there should be a clear place for affiliated groups. • RB summarised KE's paper, which proposed a more proactive relationship with branches; regional forums; merging branches; and branches paying fees commensurate with their size. • RB summarised JTH's paper, proposing two levels of membership. • KS spoke to his paper, which proposed regional forums, reduction in Board & Committee numbers, and OMOV. <p>The main comment was that Education & Training Committee required review.</p> <p>The major issue with New Zealand was highlighted. Some consideration was given to amendment of the licence agreement; the conclusion was that RB should write to NZ indicating the licence agreement would be reviewed in time, but the status quo would remain for the moment -more discussion required on the whole issue.</p> <p>RB believed the Board needed immediately to (a) reduce Board size; (b) split</p>		

<p>E&T in two; (c) create a structure for regionalisation; and (d) review the licence agreement. Today, RB proposed to focus on E&T, and asked DR to speak to the proposal sent to the Board as a paper for Agenda item 7.1.2.</p> <p>Following discussion with various people, the split DR suggested was for "E&T" to continue with responsibility for exams, schools and training, and a new committee to be created with responsibility for youth and CPD. Youth was very important, and it would be better for members interested in youth and young children to volunteer for a committee dedicated to that: most people standing for E&T are more interested in exams. The Convenor of the new committee would sit on, and be accountable to the Management Board. Due to overlap, the two committees would need to work together. DR suggested six ordinary members + Convenor. Both committees could meet on the same day, with an opportunity to meet together for 30 or so minutes.</p> <p>In the first instance, if the proposal were accepted, DR suggested the committee would need a strong Convenor, who could be appointed for a year before elections were held, similar to the Treasurer post. Clear communication and co-operation across all three committees would be very important; a call could be made for volunteers to be co-opted for the new committee's first year</p> <p>The Board agreed to approve the formation of a new Youth Services Committee. The detail would have to be written, and the Constitution group would have to review this, in time for inclusion in the draft AGM agenda. DR had amalgamated the Youth Director role and an old Youth Committee Convenor remit. All to review and feed back to DR anything they felt should be included or changed. It was agreed unanimously to put the proposal to the AGM and appoint a Convenor who could then stand for election in 2012.</p> <p>Although fully in favour of the proposal, EF noted that she was concerned there was not sufficient capacity within the office to support an additional committee. If it went ahead, the Board would have to look seriously at how it was serviced.</p> <p>With the advent of the new committee, the post of Youth Director would no longer be required. Deb Lees had been elected until November 2012; the situation would have to be handled diplomatically.</p>	<p>DR / Const WG</p> <p>ALL</p>	<p>19/08/11</p> <p>asap</p>
--	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------

	Decision/Action	Member/s responsible	Date to be completed
	RB formally opened the Board meeting.		
1	Notes of Meeting of 14 May 2010 The minutes of 14 May were accepted as an accurate record.		
2	Matters Arising/Chairman's Remarks		
2.1	Duns & District Branch had agreed to run a Children in Need event.		
2.2	<i>14 May 2011, item 2.3, ISTD and SNDC</i> AG continued to deal with these matters, but had been unable to produce a report for this meeting. He still did not have the formula for SlipStop, but discussions were progressing.		
2.3	<i>14 May 2011, item 2.4, £1,000 Donation</i> There had been a misunderstanding about what was proposed for this donation in the original discussion with Bill Clement. The total £1K was intended for any youth project, but had a covering request that some		

	should go to Sinclair Barbour's group. RB had explained to Bill what the Board had agreed at its previous meeting, ie the process should be for Sinclair to apply for funds from JMMF.		
2.4	<p><i>AGM 2011 Draft Agenda</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) An opportunity for "Chairman's Remarks" (Society, not AGM Meeting Chairman) would be on the agenda. 2) This year, there was no space for a "branch secretaries' forum", but this may be worth considering for a future event. 3) LB queried whether the membership subscription should be a motion, following the decision at last year's AGM. Agreed that it should be included under motions as item 14.1. 	EF	19/08/11
3	Finance		
3.1	<p>Treasurer's Report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FGAG had met the previous week and, in the current healthy financial position, recommended no change to subscription level for 2012-13. Indeed, subscription might be held at the same level for some time if income could be increased from other sources. 2) RR had submitted a proposal regarding travel expenses as discussed at FGAG, which had approved the proposal with the proviso of a cap to be identified for each financial year. For its scheme, E&T had discussed a figure of roughly £7,500 in 2012, or as may be available each year from adding £10 to the Summer School fee; the figure being an overall sum for use at Director's discretion. RR calculated that expenses would be roughly £15K this year; his proposal could take that to £30K, which may be difficult to justify in terms of OSCR's view of "public benefit". RR suggested allowing £5K for the remainder of this financial year. EF felt the system for expenses might benefit from an in-depth review, but agreed an additional £5K to the end of the financial year was acceptable. EF also thought there was a need to consider other ways in which overseas members could be enabled to participate in meetings. 3) Interviews for the new Treasurer were still under way. Agreed RB would seek MB approval of appointment by email. 	EOM WG RB	When poss. When poss.
3.2	<p>Trustees' Report & Annual Accounts to end of March 2011</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) RR thanked EF and the Convenors for their contributions to the report. RB was concerned about the drop in membership. She believed some figures may be incorrect, eg one branch was quoted last year as having 20 members and this year only 5. RR felt the figures had to be taken at face value; they were a snapshot at a particular time and there would be distortions. In any case, the trend was down. Noted that there should be no "long-term" members left, as that option ceased in 1999. <p><i>Arnold Black, Auditor (AB) joined the meeting.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) AB noted that one or two minor changes had been made since the accounts were circulated to the Board, amending some narrative in the notes and correcting typing errors. The accounts had been prepared under the requirements of charity accounting legislation and followed the standard format of trustees' report, followed by auditor's report then financial statements. He proposed to talk to the two main financial statements. 2) Page 14, Statement of Financial Activities. AB described the 	SC to investigate	19/08/11

	<p>differences across fund types: 'unrestricted' describes charitable income with no stipulation on how it should be spent; 'designated' is where a charity designates money for particular expenditure (e.g. JMMF, and £100,000 to the Development Fund); 'restricted' is where funders make requirements on how money is spent (e.g. Creative Scotland grant).</p> <p>3) Total incoming resources for the year was up approx £83K on the previous year, mainly from increased investment income; also more had been put into investments. Increased sales had added approx. £72K to incoming resources from charitable activities. Summer School income was up, Winter School down.</p> <p>4) On the expenditure side, there was an increase of £33K in the year; there were various ups and downs, an increase in staff costs of around £13K, costs of the Young Dancer project, magazine cost (an extra edition in the year) and cost of products. Overall expenditure was up by £33K, so there was a surplus of £54K for the year. Focussing more on unrestricted funds, they showed a surplus of £62K for the year.</p> <p>5) There were transfers out, the main one being £100K to the new Development Fund, and gains from valuation of investments. Overall total funds increased by £87K in the year. Arnold suggested the ideal was to make a small surplus over breakeven and to build up reserves during the year.</p> <p>6) Overall the Society was in a strong financial position. Investments had increased in value. Cash in bank remained strong</p> <p>7) 'Creditors' was not entirely creditors as such, but rather deferred income (subscriptions) coming in before the start of a new year. Within £250K, £181K was Summer School payments, the remainder including deferred income on subscriptions.</p> <p>8) The audit report had an unqualified opinion. In terms of Society controls, all points raised in previous years had been addressed.</p> <p>9) AB recommended continuing with the current practice of not including the value of property in the accounts; instead there was a note on fixed assets and property, which was insured for a rebuild value of £889K.</p> <p>10) RR noted that the outcome of the financial year reflected earlier planning. EF had been working with BA to prepare a rational forward plan as part of the Strategic Plan, to "smooth out" the process and avoid big "bumps" when multiple new products are launched in one year. RR warned that next year's figures would not be so good.</p> <p>11) AB was thanked for coming to the meeting and for his work on the accounts. The Board agreed to give approval to RB to sign the accounts, and the audit management letter and this was done.</p> <p>12) RB noted that AB was retiring at the end of the year, and on behalf of the Board thanked him and wished him well. AB thanked everyone on the staff for their assistance.</p>		
4	Management Board Strategic Plan		
4.1	Executive Officer		
4.1.1	<i>Report</i>		
	1) EF updated the Board on the current staff situation. Moira had been in one or two days, but was still very fragile; Liz had		

4.1.2	<p>discussed a planned phased return with her. There continued to be pressure on staff and Eileen Watt had been engaged to cover Moira's two weeks at Summer School. Agency costs were very high and outstanding administrative work was routine but time-consuming. EF had kept down the cost of cover by employing her daughter to assist in data processing the backlog of subscription and affiliation renewals, front office Reception work and Summer School packing, saving £40/day on agency costs.</p> <p>2) External consultants – The <i>Marketing Officer</i> contract was normally addressed at this meeting. In the light of the Marketing/ Communications plan, EF recommended that the arrangement be continued, and suggested the Board might consider an 18-month, rather than 12-month contract to dovetail with the current strategic plan. The rate had not been increased since Liz Fraser started. Susan Rhodes had achieved much in the <i>Young Dancer Project</i> and, hopefully, the proposed new committee would be able to take forward the broad strategic frame she had developed. Creative Scotland would usually expect this type of work to take about 3 years to develop and mainstream; a third year of grant would be applied for, but could not be guaranteed. The amount of grant applied for could be increased, depending on what was expected of the role. Following his presentation to the Board, David Cunningham had outlined what he would like to be offered to “<i>professionalise RSCDS music</i>”, at a rate/cost somewhere between the other two external consultants. His input would address an area of some complexity, featuring also in the RSCDS risk management plan, in terms of control and work in the best interests of the organisation.</p> <p>3) The cost of work on premises had increased, but was still within the amount approved by the Board.</p> <p>4) From staff updates: there had been a slight increase in 2010/11 in young members; bookings were still coming in for Summer School; Basic Teaching Skills was proving popular (the latter should be highlighted on the website).</p> <p>5) David Cunningham's appointment would be dealt with later in the agenda. The Board agreed that EF should apply for a third year of grant for Susan Rhodes' post. Regarding the Marketing Officer post, RB reported that JW had some ideas about this and believed there were less expensive options for marketing. The contract was not due for renewal until September but renewing the contract for six months only was not ideal. After discussion, it was agreed unanimously to renew the contract for another year. In the meantime, JW could present his ideas/proposals to the Board; the sooner they had details, the better. There was no proposal to change the rate. If there were any issues, EF should bring them back to the Board.</p> <p>6) JP questioned why so many magazines had been returned; this was a problem if it became a burden on staff, getting data correct was branch secretaries' responsibility. EG to investigate how many were returned and why.</p> <p>1) A contract had been in place with Peninsula for a number of years,</p>	<p>EG</p> <p>EF</p> <p>EF</p> <p>EG</p> <p>EF</p>	<p>When approp.</p> <p>When approp.</p> <p>When approp.</p> <p>16/09/11</p>
-------	--	---	---

	covering health & safety. They were now offering an additional “employers” service at a joint rate, which had been outlined at the previous meeting and should be manageable within the current budget. Agreed unanimously to take up offer.		When approp.
4.2	<p>Strategic Plan 2011-13</p> <p>The SP was in a slightly different format, with no separate written document. It had six objectives/action areas. The amalgamated version included Board, committees and staff. MS-led objectives were in blue, E&T’s in red, Queries in purple. Due to configuring problems, there was a duplicate sheet attached for E&T (i.e. DI’s original). All to review and refer any queries back to EF. Last year’s plan had included quite a lot of detail as the concept was new; this year’s was more strategic. BA’s original submission had been more detailed, but only the summary was included; for further detail, refer to BA.</p>	All	31/08/11
4.3	<p>Risk Management Plan</p> <p>FGAG was very happy with this plan and had recommended the removal of some items, as they had been addressed. The RMP was circulated to the Board primarily for information. The two blue areas were ongoing issues that should still be borne in mind.</p>		
5	MB Panels & Working Groups		
5.1	Panels		
5.1.1	<p>Conferences</p> <p>1) <i>Overseas & Europe</i></p> <p>(i) <i>Prague</i> – RB had circulated a report of the session, which was very successful, with 50+ participants. She and JW had found the general attitude towards the Society was very positive. The International Branch had been very helpful in facilitating the Forum. There was clearly great enthusiasm for dancing in Europe. There were a number of dedicated groups not connected with the Society, and it would be helpful for them to have a register of teachers available and engage more with the RSCDS.</p> <p>(ii) <i>New Zealand</i> – RB had circulated a recent exchange of emails. FGAG thought there was a need to look at changing the licence agreement, and the financial effect that would have. Part of the problem was that NZ members paid so much more than UK branch members. RB asked all to consider the position very seriously: this would be a major item for the October meeting, by which time there would be a report from NZ Branch August committee meeting. Clearly the major concern was that if NZ Branch agreed to a “Friends” option, other branches would follow. After discussion it was agreed, in addition to the planned piece for the magazine to explain where subscription fee goes, that there should be an email communication presenting the Board’s case to go to all NZ members with email addresses, with the agreement of the NZ Branch Chairman. This could include comparative subscriptions for other branches, but should also promote the long-term view about supporting RSCDS as a charity and its future. Agreed RB, JW, EF, EG to discuss and initiate.</p> <p>2) <i>England & Wales</i> – The North of England conference had been confirmed for February, in Harrogate.</p> <p>3) <i>Scotland & N Ireland</i> – PW would take over from LO as group convenor. Feb. 2012 was not ideal, with several events already that</p>	RB/EF	Oct agenda
		RB, JW, EF, EG	asap

	month. Agreed to check Dunblane availability for two dates in March. (<i>Post-meeting note: booked for Saturday 31/03/2012</i>)	PW/EG	asap
5.1.2	Constitution The issue of regionalisation needs further discussion and will be the focus of the pre-meeting session in October. It was agreed unanimously that the suggestion regarding disbanding/merging branches would not be for discussed further.		
5.1.3	HR A date had been arranged for EF's appraisal. Margery McBain of Gravitare would be involved.		
5.1.4	Investment The Panel had not met; nothing further to report at present.		
5.1.5	JMMF 1) There were two outstanding issues: formula for spending, and identification of someone to give advice on applications. Re; the latter, RB suggested AG, and would contact him to discuss. 2) Spend level could be agreed in May each year: previously, a formula of 1.5 x previous year's income had been suggested. International teacher development (ITD), however, would take a substantial amount of that and, after discussion, it was agreed the amount available for JMMF this year would be £12,500. DR was concerned about ITD; part of the rationale for establishing it was that overseas travel costs were not paid for Summer School, but that policy had been changed (see 3.1 (2) above). 3) Once established, there would be 3 meetings a year to consider applications, possibly by conference call. At the pilot stage, however, face to face meetings may be required.	RB	29/07/11
5.1.6	Magazine Editorial Board 1) Editor – RB to contact Michael Nolan to ask if he was interested in the Editor role; if not, it should be advertised. 2) SCD - could focus more on income generating activities such as schools and products. DR felt Summer, and Winter School adverts should be bigger. JP suggested a mutual agreement with Dance On, to advertise in each other's magazines at no cost. 3) Board ideas - there could be a mechanism to flag up at each meeting on what the Editorial Board should focus.	RB	asap
5.2	Working Groups		
5.2.1	Engagement of overseas members JP would take over from PW as group convenor. It was agreed that FGAG and the Investment Panel were not appropriate to be involved. Agreed distribution of the letter to branches should be handled in conjunction with the Information Highway WG.		
5.2.2	External Events RB had attended an evaluation day on the Commonwealth Games, which was not looking for a traditional SCD group/demonstration at the opening ceremony. They envisioned involving people who would not normally participate in that kind of event, with a focus on "legacy" to encourage people to volunteer in different ways: Scottish, but not traditional. It was hoped the RSCDS might be involved in some way.		
5.2.3	Health Strategy 1) The group had been working on a poster, with the help of Eric Ross from Duns & District; examples were circulated, which could		

	<p>be downloaded and personalised. It was pointed out, however, that a strategic objective was to establish and promote corporate identity through consistency in printed material; Liz Fraser, therefore, should be consulted for comment on the ideas.</p> <p>2) It had been suggested previously that a pilot project should be set up, but LB's preference was to widely circulate the materials when ready, and perhaps include a questionnaire to gather feedback; Branches could be asked if they had used the material, had any response to it, gained any new members, etc. Branches could also be provided with a list of places where the material might be posted e.g. health boards, GP surgeries, etc. BA had looked into the on-line use of SurveyMonkey. LB to contact him.</p>	LB	29/07/11
5.2.4	<p>Information Highway In EW's absence, JP reported that things had progressed since the last meeting; he hoped for a proposal for the next meeting. JP did not feel the WG needed more guidance, but there was still work to be done.</p>		
5.2.5	<p>RSCDS President JP had been involved in this WG with JW: the President should not be a figurehead but someone who would further the Society and help get publicity etc. LB noted this had not been the view of the previous group (the final paper from the previous WG had been circulated for the last Board meeting). JW had some ideas he was following up.</p>		
5.3	<p>Finance and Governance Advisory Group</p>		
5.3.1	<p>FGAG had met the previous week and discussed the pros and cons of the SCIO and limited company. Richard Austin, now on the group, recommended that one or other should be adopted, his preference being for limited company as the more secure route. The group discussed travel expenses, with the recommendation put to today's meeting, and looked in detail at the Trustee Report & Accounts. As reported earlier, the group recommended no change to subscription.</p>		
5.3.2	<p>Development Fund</p> <p>1) There was now a final version of the paper outlining the process for applications. RR suggested this process be tested on the first application. Originally a £10K upper limit for Chairman, Chairman Elect, Convenors or EF to approve without recourse to the Board had been agreed, but was now reduced to £5K.</p> <p>2) Although the current method of valuing stock was tried and tested, RR noted it was complicated; there must be a better way to do it. He also thought there was an increasing need for cash flow forecasting. LO believed some initial work (by AG, LO, MH?) was done on this at the onset of the NZ issue; EG to check back.</p> <p>3) RR believed that a reliable database of members was critical, and strongly recommended investing in commercial, not bespoke, software to provide what was required.</p> <p>4) As a result of the legacy of £20K in last year's accounts, FGAG discussed whether there should be a policy on the use of legacies. This was partly about visibility; using such funds on visible "products" under a name might encourage others. Agreed that for now, legacies should be put into the General Fund.</p> <p>5) The section of the paper on the administration of the Development Fund would be reviewed, corrected if necessary and re-circulated.</p>	LO, MH, EG RR/EF CMcE	16/09/11 asap

6	Management Committees		
6.1	Education & Training Committee		
6.1.1	<p><i>Notes of meeting of 21 May 2011</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Children in Need - DR was delighted that Duns & District had volunteered to run a Children in Need event. 2) Girl Guide Conference - DR was pleased that Margo Priestley and Andrew Nolan had been involved with the Girl Guide Conference and made various arrangements, including giving all participants a printed copy of The Dhoon, with a CD of its music, along with a few other pieces of music. 3) Summer School - arrangements were on schedule. There were now Taster Sessions bookings for each week except Week 2. 4) Examiner Applications - There had been ten applications from across the world and all Panel decisions were unanimous. Of the ten, three were directly appointed pending the "sight unseen" references due by 18 July. Two applicants would be advised they need not reapply but would be appointed as probationers following some additional tutoring. Five were rejected as they did not meet the tutoring criteria. The Board endorsed the process and agreed established criteria had to be met in full. 5) JP's affiliated group found they often had families dancing, and he asked the Board to consider the possibility of a family membership, where there were 2 or 3 children. 		
6.1.2	<p>SP update, inc Schools, Spring Fling, Manual and CforE WGs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Adjudication Panel had not met. DR reported on an issue being dealt with from Boston, where 6 out of 10 candidates had failed Unit 2 and felt their candidate course had not properly prepared them for the exam. As tutors were not appointed centrally, there was little that could be done. 2) The Manual review continued to process contributions, and any contributions/ suggestions would be responded to directly. 		
6.2	Membership Services Committee		
	<p><i>Notes of meeting of 11 June 2011 & SP update, inc AGM/Conference Weekends, DS2011, David Cunningham</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The most important issue was the appointment of David Cunningham. What was proposed was 20 hours per week for a monthly payment of £1,500, for which BA was asking for Board approval. If agreed, stage 1 would be the production of a business plan. EF had been involved in the meeting with David; he was uncertain as to what were the best plans to implement initially for the benefit of the Society. In the first 3 months, he would investigate all that was going on and produce a forward plan, with a clearer timeline or set of ideas for the Board to help prioritise. It was not clear whether a 3 or 12 month contract was being recommended. RR noted this could be supported by the Development Fund, for which a procedure had been agreed, but the project had not been presented in that way. At the meeting, BA, George Meikle and David had talked about a role rather than a project, which created some complexity. Of itself, a new "role" would not normally come out of the Development Fund, although suitable projects might be generated by the new role. RB's preference would be to agree a contract for 3 months, during which 		

	<p>time a proposal/forward plan would be produced for the October Board meeting when, if approved, a contract for a further 12 months could be offered. EF would be the day-to-day contact and monitor with a steering group including the Music Director.</p> <p>Agreed to go ahead as outlined, outcomes for the October Board.</p> <p>2) RB to clarify mention of Edinburgh perhaps "hosting" AGM & Conference Weekend 2012 with Convenors at their next meeting.</p>	EF	immed.
		RB	tba
7	Appointed Posts		
7.1	<i>Archivist</i> - MH had agreed to remain until November 2012 as Archivist.		
8	Branches There was nothing to report.		
9	Affiliated Groups A logo was being prepared for affiliated groups.		
10	Board Member/Trustee Issues None raised.		
11	Correspondence 1) There had been a complaint from New York, expressing disappointment members had to pay for Book 46 and asking about plans for digital downloads. RB to reply, along the lines that revenue came in from book sales, there was still demand and we were looking to progress with downloads in future. 2) RB noted regional conferences were held by negotiation and it had been agreed previously that the aim would be to attend two each year. This year was Prague, and New Zealand would take place at the end of the year. She hoped Asilomar would be confirmed for autumn next year and the President of TAC had indicated she would be pleased to host a Forum in Portland, Oregon next summer. Agreed RB should proceed as planned.	RB	asap
12	AOCB 1) The re-allocation of Board members to Branches had been circulated: if there were any issues/ problems, inform EG. 2) Kandahar Reel – Major Robertson of ABF was not promoting RSCDS but asking for our help without mentioning us. He tended to give the book away rather than sell it. 3) RB asked everyone to make regular reports back to the Board on "their" branches, even if it was to say there had been no contact or that there was nothing to report. She hoped to see reports in February, May and October, and urged Board members to initiate contact if branches did not make contact with them. 4) Cape Town – there was nothing specific to report. RB, however, had spoken with a member, who felt things were moving forward but the situation was still quite difficult.	All All	asap ongoing
13	Date of Next Meeting – Saturday 1 st October 2011.		

BA	Bill Austin	JTH	Jim Healy	EW	Elaine Wilde
RB	Ruth Beattie	MH	Marjorie Hume	JW	John Wilkinson
MB	Malcolm Brown	LO	Lorna Ogilvie	SC	Shona Coyle
LB	Lyn Bryce	SJP	Sarah-Jane Paterson	MCH	Marilyn Healy
KE	Keith Evans	JP	Jack Pressley	HR	Helen Russell
EF	Elizabeth Foster	DR	Di Rooney	WW	William Whyte
LF	Liz Fraser	RR	Ross Robertson		
AG	Alex Gray	KS	Keith Stacey		
EG	Elsbeth Gray	PW	Philip Whitley		

MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

Saturday 1 October 2011

RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.00am

AGENDA (v4)

**10.00-11.00am Continuing Discussion of RSCDS Organisational Structure
(incl. NZ Branch development)**

Enclosures/Papers

- 1 Apologies**
- 2 Notes of Meeting of 2 July 2011**
- 3 Matters arising from Notes not listed elsewhere**
 - 3.1 Chairman's Remarks
 - 3.1.1 SNDC and ISTD Update
 - 3.1.2 AGM 2011 – Agenda and Motions
 - 3.1.2 Motion from Toronto
 - 3.1.3 The National Trust for Scotland and the Army Benevolent Fund
 - 3.1.4 Meeting on Affiliated Groups
 - 3.1.5 Feedback from Board Members re local Dance Scottish activities
 - 3.1.6 Board and Committee Member Training Event (3/12/11)
- 4 Finance**
 - 4.1 Quarterly Accounts to end of June 2011
 - 4.2 Treasurer's Report
 - 4.2.1 FGAG
 - 4.2.2 Development Fund
 - 4.2.3 Introduction of new Treasurer to the Board
- 5 Management Board Strategic Plan**
 - 5.1 Executive Officer
 - 5.1.1 Report, including Update on Strategic Plan
- 6 Management Board Panels & Working Groups 2010-11**
 - 6.1 Panels
 - 6.1.1 Conferences
 1. Regional Conferences (O/seas, Europe, England, Wales) (Ruth)
 2. Scottish and NI Branches Conference 2011 (Philip)
 - 6.1.2 Constitution (Keith Stacey)
 1. Company limited by Guarantee and SCIO
 - 6.1.3 HR (Ruth)
 - 6.1.4 Investment (Ross)
 - 6.1.5 JMMF (Marjorie)
 - 6.1.6 Magazine Editorial Board (Andrew K)

- 6.2 Working Groups
 - 6.2.1 Engagement of Overseas Members (Jack)
 - 6.2.2 External Events (Ruth)
 - 6.2.3 Health Strategy (Keith Evans)
 - 6.2.4 Information Highway (Elaine)
 - 6.2.5 RSCDS President (John)

(Nb David Cunningham will present his paper at noon then join the MB for lunch)

Time reserved for Board discussion

7 Management Committees

- 7.1 Education and Training Committee (Di Rooney)
 - 7.1.1 Minute of Meeting of 10 September 2011
 - 7.1.2 Strategic Plan Update, incl. Schools, Spring Fling, RSCDS Manual and Curriculum for Excellence Updates
- 7.2 Membership Services Committee (Bill Austin)
 - 7.2.1 Minutes of Meeting of 3 September 2011 *Attached*
 - 7.2.2 Strategic Plan Update, incl. AGM Conference Weekends (2011, 12, 13), DS2011, General Updates *Attached*

8 Appointed Posts

- 8.1 Schools Director Designate – for ratification

9 Branches

- 9.1 Nothing to date

10 Affiliated Group Applications

- 10.1 Brussels Dance Scottish
- 10.2 University of St Andrews Celtic Society

11 Board Member/Trustee Issues

- 11.1 Marketing (John Wilkinson)

12 Correspondence

- 12.1 Nothing to date

13 Any Other Competent Business

- 13.1 Report on OSCR Annual Open Meeting 2011 (Philip Whitley and Elizabeth Foster)

14 Date of Next MB Meeting

- 19 November 2011

Please notify the Secretary/Executive Officer at HQ at least 5 days before the meeting, in writing, if you have any item you wish to be discussed under Any Other Competent Business.

**Notes of meeting of the Management Board
held on 1 October 2011
at RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.00am**

Present: Ruth Beattie (Chairman and Convenor of meeting)
John Wilkinson (Chair Elect)
Di Rooney (Convenor, Education & Training Committee)
Bill Austin (Convenor, Membership Services)
Ross Robertson (outgoing Treasurer)
William Whyte (incoming Treasurer)
Malcolm Brown, Keith Evans, Marjorie Hume, Lorna Ogilvie, Jack Pressley, Keith Stacey, Philip Whitley, Elaine Wilde.

In attendance: Elizabeth Foster (Secretary/EO), Elspeth Gray (Notes)

Apologies: Lyn Bryce

	Decision/Action	Member/s responsible	Date to be completed
	<i>RB welcomed all to the meeting and outlined the format for the day. She welcomed WW, joining the Board for the first time as Treasurer.</i>		
	<p>Discussion on structure</p> <p>Having made the decision regarding E&T, RB now wished to move forward to consider the regionalisation element of the structure, and asked KS to begin the discussion.</p> <p>KS had plotted branches and affiliated groups across the UK. He felt that road and rail routes were important, and concluded that there should be SE, SW, Central, NE and/or NW regions, with around 28-30 groups in each. He suggested it should be open to anyone in the regions to be involved, not just branches and groups. Norwich felt its natural line of communication would be towards the Midlands rather than SE.</p> <p>In terms of the benefit of regionalisation to the Society, KS believed people did not know what was going on; the membership did not have access to information. At the moment, information went to branch secretaries, who did not pass it on. JP felt the Information Highway WG (IHWG) was looking already at how to communicate information to grass roots, not just secretaries; there was no guarantee regionalisation would improve matters. EW noted that some branches disseminated information very well, but others not at all, and the focus for IHWG was to help those who did not.</p> <p>LO felt that many branches had no mechanism to get information to their members easily and cheaply. She questioned the need for regional meetings unless there were big issues to discuss; such meetings were unlikely to attract the "normal members". PW felt 5 meetings a year was a lot, given what is already done with Scottish and English conferences. MH suggested a pilot in one region.</p> <p>BA thought it was not just about information flow, but also visibility. We should be getting information out electronically as well as talking to</p>		

	<p>and engaging with members, although not all members would be interested. KS suggested the possibilities of “spin-off” – e.g. re Commonwealth Games, there may be opportunities to bring events and PR together with regional meetings.</p> <p>EW felt that pilot or not, there had to be a specific outcome(s) for any meeting, something to attract people. The culture needed to change for people to feel safe to come together to talk.</p> <p>BA suggested that a pilot should be self-selecting; engage an interested group of people then let them set the agenda. LO said that was what had happened with SNIBC and had been successful.</p> <p>Conclusion: It was agreed to have a pilot. It was agreed to put the idea out for areas to volunteer, if interested.</p> <p>EF felt if regions beyond the UK were not to be involved, it should be explained very clearly why they were not.</p> <p>The discussion was concluded at this point. It was suggested that the afternoon of the training day could be used for further Board discussion on structure. If another day was required, the February meeting weekend was suggested.</p> <p>New Zealand</p> <p>RB had received an email on 12 September from Fiona Bullivant: the NZ committee felt the remit being put to their AGM was something that would increase membership. RB was concerned, however, that it would open a door for members to take a cheaper option, and could spread worldwide: when they visit NZ, JW and RB will strongly promote the benefits of membership. PW felt the remit was being driven by a small, vociferous minority, and the Board must not back down. EF suggested that there was time between now and the NZ AGM for the Board to decide on what action to take. RB had been told that NZ had sought legal advice and had been advised that the proposal was not against the licence agreement. She asked for the Board’s agreement to consult our own lawyer and this was agreed. If it was against the licence agreement the branch would have to be told and, if it went ahead, they might lose their branch status.</p> <p>Following the May Board meeting, at the request of the NZ branch, RB had agreed not to write directly to NZ members as the branch said it had already sent something out in support of the Society. The committee, however, seemed to have shifted slightly since then. WW noted that if the proposal was accepted, and their licence agreement withdrawn, some groups in NZ might decide to become branches and the NZ entity would lose income; it was therefore a considerable risk to them, and could break up the NZ entity.</p>		
1	<p>Notes of Meeting of 2 July 2011</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) As this meeting had been inquorate, RB asked for agreement to the decisions taken. No-one disagreed, and decisions taken ratified. 2) Corrections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1.2, Constitution – delete the word “for” in last line. 3) With the above correction, the minutes were accepted as accurate. 	EG	Immed.
2	Matters Arising not listed elsewhere/Chairman’s Remarks		

2.1	<i>Notes of 2 July 2011, item 3.2 (1)</i> – The issue of “long-term members” in branches had been investigated by SC and should now cease.		
2.2	<i>ISTD and SNDC</i> Due to family bereavement, AG had been unable to progress acquisition of the Slipstop patent but was still pursuing it. Leftover stock of books and leaflets sold at Summer School had generated around £700.		
2.3	<i>AGM 2011 Agenda and motions</i> 1) Alastair MacFadyen did not feel well enough to chair the AGM, so RB would chair the meeting. Alastair had appreciated the kind communications from everyone. 2) Appointment of Treasurer - currently item 11, this should move to 6.3, as WW would present the Annual Report & Accounts. 3) With regard to motions, the following was agreed: 13.1 – WW to propose, RR to second 13.2 – DR to propose, JW to second. It had been suggested that if this motion were passed, the YS Convenor should also be part of E&T. No amendment to that effect was received, however, and, if raised, would constitute an emergency motion - DR to stress the existing close working relationship between convenors. 13.3 – KS to propose, PW to second. 13.4 – WW to speak to the motion. RB had spoken to the Toronto Chairman, who believed that repeat funding from JMMF would not be available. Toronto had sent in a modified motion but, as it was effectively a new motion and had arrived after the deadline for submission, it could not be accepted. 4) Scroll recipients were announced: Anne Archdeacon (Queensland), Jean Hamilton (Toronto), Andrew Smith (Bristol), Moira Stacey (Gatehouse of Fleet), and Rachel Wilton (London).		
2.4	<i>National Trust for Scotland & Army Benevolent Fund – Partnership working</i> 1) Due to the personal intervention of an RSCDS member, a meeting was held with the NTS Chairman in September, with discussion of a number of possible areas of mutual interest, including RSCDS demos at NTS sites, education, joint events, etc. Further meetings will take this forward, including financing of any projects. 2) Working with the ABF had gone well initially, but they had been making copies of <i>The Kandahar Reel</i> freely available (not selling them) and not advertising the Society. They approached us with ideas about a promotional record-breaking Strip the Willow next year to promote their new tartan and/or a Parliamentary reception to launch it, for which we might provide dancers. Further discussions might take place when their plans are clearer.		
2.5	<i>Meeting on Affiliated Groups (AGs)</i> A new logo for AGs had now been designed and would be circulated to groups. There was discussion on whether an AG licence agreement was desirable, along with controlled use of the logo. On balance, it was felt more important to encourage groups and to not put them off by requiring them to sign an agreement. MB suggested if we wanted more UK groups to affiliate, they had to be offered something. Branches were covered by the umbrella PPL licence, but groups had to pay; he wondered if they might be included in the licence. MS Committee to consider and make suggestions.	BA	Next mtg
2.6	<i>Feedback from Board members re local DS activities</i>		

	RB had asked Board members to keep in touch with “their” branches and report back on contacts at some MB meetings. All fed back on recent contacts. All asked to forward details of DS events to EG.	All	asap
2.7	<i>Board & Committee member training event (3 Dec 2011)</i> A half day training event on 3/12/11 in the King James Hotel would reserve the afternoon for structured discussion with Board members. <i>(Post-meeting note: The training event is now taking place at Blue Sky Experience, Bachilton House, Methven, PH1 3QX; start time 09.30 for 10.00am, finish time 4.00pm.)</i>		
3	Finance		
3.1	Quarterly Accounts to end June 2011 RR stressed this was only a small part of the year and he would not wish to extrapolate too much: the only significant thing was the overspend on property costs; the roof repair had been known about, but could not be put into the previous year, so the cost was sitting in this year’s accounts. September accounts will be available shortly, and generally are more informative than the first quarter.		
3.2	Treasurer’s Report 1) <i>FGAG</i> Total donations to the disaster fund came to just under £6K; £48K in total was sent, including our contribution. In terms of the FGAG composition, RR would be standing down and WW would assume the chair at the next meeting in February. 2) <i>Development Fund</i> The Application process was submitted for final approval and agreed . MH had a small wording amendment, which she would email to EF. Thanks were recorded to Colin McEwan. 3) <i>Introduction of new Treasurer to Board</i> The recruitment process had been followed and WW selected. RR would resign at the end of this meeting and WW would take over and present the accounts at the AGM. 4) RR wished to make some closing remarks. He had seen huge changes for the better since he had been on “GP&F” and the Board. The Board was more cohesive and well chaired. Finances had never been better. The threats from some branches to go their own way and an ageing membership, however, meant the Board could not be complacent. He believed there was a need to market St. Andrews as a location and Summer School as an event; as the showcase, it was important to market it well, get numbers up and keep its “sparkle”. The teaching was very important. He thought the Board should hold more editorial control of the magazine, to get it doing more of what the Board wants. Finally, he believed there was a need to invest in a new database. RB thanked RR for his input during his time on the Board as wise and supportive.	MH	asap
4	Management Board Strategic Plan		
4.1	Executive Officer Report 1) There had been staffing issues over the summer for a variety of reasons, but things appeared to be settling down. Candidates had been interviewed for the Office Manager post and one was starting the following week, initially on a temping basis. 2) Susan Rhodes’ two year contract would finish at end March 2012.		

	<p>EF proposed engaging her for one day/week for a further year at RSCDS cost, to consolidate her work to date and support the new Youth Committee. If the Board agreed in principle, a request could be submitted to the Development Fund.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Work continued on the website and database. JW intended to become more involved. 4) The Strategic Plan was tabled at the last meeting. 5) There were some versions of a Health strategy poster for the WG to consider and feed back to EF. 6) This year’s Annual Review document was almost ready. Janet McCrorie had given permission to use her paintings as part of the design; samples were available to view at lunchtime. 7) Costs for website development had been discussed with Web Foundry, but they may have submitted a “blue sky” version. 8) Some subscription income was still coming in. 9) Sara had assumed Sarah-Jane’s previous post, managing the online shop and new products. Her comments in the report were informative on the extent to which staff members have had to “firefight”, rather than “develop” this year. 10) Images from photoshoots had been received, but a process for making them available had not yet been agreed. 11) Creative Scotland currently has 2 major documents: a 5-year strategic plan; and a research report on how to get Scotland dancing. Money was available for projects and the Society was actively encouraged to access this. Each funding stream had a specific page on its website and all Scottish branches should have a look, working through the detail to identify the best funding opportunities for what they might wish to do. Creative Scotland also raised the possibility of part-funding 2 part-time dance development posts, to become self-sustaining over 2-3 years. Should the RSCDS have a Dance Director post to consider pioneering work such as dance fusion, along with other areas where SCD could be promoted? If action is not taken, these opportunities will disappear. They may not translate immediately into membership, but will reach many people and enable the RSCDS to become better known as an outward-looking agency. DR and BA both thought the possibilities were very exciting. 12) DR formally proposed supporting the proposal on Susan Rhodes’ post. Funding for this work would not be forthcoming from Creative Scotland, as it was about consolidating what has been done in the Society. It would be important to make goals and expectations clear. The proposal was agreed. 		
5	<p>Presentation from/discussion with David Cunningham (DC)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) DC’s report was short: his first few weeks had been interesting and busy. Some areas needed more investigation re: the new media side of his role. 2) RSCDS engaging directly with members via YouTube was important. DC suggested a “video of the month” or similar, where the chosen video could be topped and tailed with high end titling and branded as RSCDS with our “seal of approval”, to pull people in, professionalise the output and control content in a subtle way. 3) DC had been involved with two copyright infringement/publishing 		

	<p>issues, mentioned in the report, which he explained further.</p> <p>4) DC proposed to publish dance instructions and printed music as pdf paid downloads, costing around £0.75p. Books 1-24 were available in the most recent format and could be converted immediately to pdf. Potential benefits were not only about income, but also about improving the Society's image.</p> <p>5) At the meeting with Web Foundry, downloading mp3 files had been discussed, but their proposal needed further discussion and examination. DC was fairly confident a pdf download facility could be made available without massive cost investment.</p> <p>6) There would be more detail and indication of timescales, in DC's proposal in November.</p>		
6	MB Panels & Working Groups		
6.1	Panels		
6.1.1	<p>Conferences</p> <p>1) Regional RB and JW were in Prague in June and in NZ in December, and plans for next year had already been shared. The English conference had been advertised in NE Diary; MB had sent application forms for the branch weekend to members and branches in the area, and would shortly advertise the conference. There was also a piece in the magazine.</p> <p>2) Scotland & N Ireland (Saturday 31/03/2012) New members of the group to replace Lyn Bryce and Sue Porter were Carol-Ann Robertson and Fiona MacIver. Any other suggestions for topics to be sent to PW by email by 15 October.</p>		
6.1.2	<p>Constitution</p> <p>1) Nothing to report regarding Constitution as such.</p> <p>2) Company Limited by Guarantee (CLG) and SCIO KS remained in favour of SCIO; the question of accuracy of membership data could be satisfied in-house. He had asked OSCR if it had encountered any difficulties with conversion and, if so, where responsibility lay. They replied that any difficulties after conversion to SCIO and/or change in regulation affecting agencies would be their responsibility.</p> <p>3) At the OSCR annual meeting, it was intimated that membership organisations should not choose SCIO because of strict membership requirements. JW had discussed the issue with a solicitor, who strongly recommended not considering SCIO: it was early days for the SCIO, whilst company law was well established.</p> <p>4) PW felt the only possible difficulty might be dual reporting to OSCR and Companies House, but EF reported that our accountants were of the view that we could use virtually the same financial report for both, there was very little difference.</p> <p>5) The cost of the CLG option would be in the region of £4-5K, depending on number of meetings and how much was involved. This was understood to include the cost of any changes needed to the Constitution.</p> <p>6) On a vote between SCIO and CLG, the majority voted for CLG.</p> <p>7) On a further vote between CLG and the status quo, the majority voted for CLG.</p>		
6.1.3	HR		

	A meeting the previous day had discussed a number of issues. The Complaints Procedure was used rarely; there may be a need to promote this more. Appraisals had been completed. An appropriate pension fund for staff was still being sought.		
6.1.4	Investment This Panel had not met since the last Board meeting. WW was on the Panel already, so it was potentially one member down. No action had been taken on placing cash deposits or investing further money with the investment company, but WW would take this forward.		
6.1.5	JMMF The end of the project, final versions of the guidelines and form had been circulated. Alex Gray had agreed to provide pre-application advice, through HQ. MH would stay on the Panel for a year. Procedures and paperwork were agreed , and thanks recorded to MH for her work.		
6.1.6	Magazine Editorial Board RB had contacted Michael Nolan regarding editorship, but he was not interested. No further names had been suggested, and there would be a call for interest in the next edition of the magazine. If no-one came forward, it would have to be managed with a small sub-committee. The work Andrew Kellett had done should be recognised next year.		
6.2	Working Groups RB and EF proposed that the groups should be reviewed as it was felt that there were too many. After the AGM, a list would be distributed so that Board members could indicate preferences.		
6.2.1	Engagement of overseas members 1) JP had communicated with John and Murray: various groups would have to contact them for their input. Murray was happy to provide input, but needed an approach. It was suggested the terms of reference for the group needed to be redefined, or perhaps it should not be a separate group? It was previously understood that volunteers would become full members of whichever group they chose. RB felt there had been misunderstanding, but also that things had shifted. The remit should be reconsidered. 2) EF believed there was a wider point on how to involve people. She felt that whenever the Board/Committees initiated a project or activity, it should consider <u>how</u> it will engage members, particularly overseas – there was a need for a longer-term strategy and general awareness-raising.		
6.2.2	External Events It was planned to join the External Events WG with Dance Scottish, although a chairperson had not yet been identified. A communication had gone to all branches with suggestions about what they might do with regard to the Commonwealth Games, but the Group needed an effective chairperson.		
6.2.3	Health Strategy There had been different lines of activity: a letter for health professionals, referenced on research on the benefits of SCD, and a poster for GPs and other health professionals to put up in Health Centres and surgeries. The latter had been through several iterations. RB stated that the Board was not the right place to decide photos; it was a work in progress. It was suggested that when finalised, government backing should be sought, with a high profile launch.		

6.2.4	Information Highway The first two points of the report were still to be actioned due to work pressure at HQ. The main crux was for HQ to have a flexible system to enable targeting at a click of a button to specific groups for mailings, and so members got information directly. A “buddy system” for branch secretaries who were not IT literate was about helping them to feel more confident in the role. RB noted that we were seeking improvements in the database, which would help to move these ideas forward.		
6.2.5	RSCDS President JW reported a number of members questioning the need for a President. The decision to become a CLG may affect that. He would like more people to be involved in reviewing the decisions made last year, as he felt the Society had moved on and attitudes had changed. All to consider and give their views to JW.	All	???
7	Board discussion – EF and EG not present		
8	Management Committees		
8.1	Education & Training Committee		
8.1.1	Notes of meeting of 10 September 2011 and Update 1) RB chaired the last E&T meeting in DR’s absence. 2) <i>Notes, item 6 (i) (b)</i> – correction: Duns & District are holding the BBC Children in Need event in 2012, not 2013. 3) There was discussion about Summer School; some Board members felt there was increasing dissent, particularly in the Very Advanced class. DR noted that EW had already given her views in writing to Margo, and urged anyone else to do the same. It was important to remember that TAC and Thistle School were technically vying for our business. DR believed a strategic consideration of Summer School might be required; EW would be happy to be involved. 4) In response to a query, DR explained that the suggested £60 per hour fee for CPD training was in line with the market price. This was not to go into schools to teach children, but to provide training to non-dancing teachers to enable them to teach SCD. The team had been working very hard to produce lesson plans, and George had prepared the music. At the moment, the material was being trialled, but when finished would be available to anyone. 5) Any question or issues concerning the Manual revision should be addressed to DR outwith the meeting.		
8.2	Membership Services Committee		
8.2.1	Notes of meeting of 3 September 2011 and Update 1) It was agreed that merging the External Events and Dance Scottish WGs was a good idea. 2) The Committee would look at possible mechanisms for joining online, as a service to branches. 3) Arrangements for the Conference Weekend were on schedule, numbers were down a little from last, but there was still time for bookings to come in. 5) The Committee may look at ideas on workshops for younger musicians and dancers, possibly in Aberdeen. Frank Thomson, George Meikle and David Cunningham would be involved. Bill would be happy to receive further suggestions. 6) The Corn Exchange in Edinburgh was being considered as a Conference Weekend venue for 2013.	All	???

	<p>7) It was agreed that “movement” on the website should be progressed as quickly as possible.</p> <p>8) BA was keen to involve members in reviewing the navigational aspects of the website. Some restructuring was in order, but it was important to avoid it becoming bloated – it was not necessary to have <u>everything</u> on the website.</p> <p>9) Choosing a branch/group of the month could be a way towards pulling branches/groups in, and encouraging them to use the website more. There would need to be discussion about how to manage and take this forward. This could be a good training day discussion, particularly if DC was available.</p> <p>10) There would be a call for dances in the October magazine. Anne Carter had produced a project plan, submission guidelines and a form/cover sheet to be sent with every submission. BA would like the Board to approve one new book per year, with a submission process being held every two years. EW asked if a new book every year was needed. BA believed that if we were not producing books of dances, we were no longer relevant. EW suggested that, to reduce the escalating number of dances, every second year a book could consist of dances already published.</p> <p>11) BA was considering where best to put the electronic Manual on the website. Brian & Keith were delighted this was being done.</p>		
9	<p>Appointed Posts <i>Schools Director Designate</i> – E&T recommended Ruby Wilkinson; agreed.</p>		
10	<p>Branches Nothing to report.</p>		
11	<p>Affiliated Groups The following affiliation applications were approved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brussels Dance Scottish • University of St Andrews Celtic Society 		
12	<p>Board Member/Trustee Issues <i>PR and Marketing</i> – Paper from JW to be carried to the next meeting.</p>		
13	<p>Correspondence Nothing to report.</p>		
14	<p>AOCB</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A report on OSCR Annual Open Meeting 2011 had been circulated. 2) The taster days at Summer School had gone well; it would be interesting to see if any who attended come to Schools in future. 3) Five dances submitted for the dance deviser competition would be danced by a dem class this week, for RB and Sheila West to decide. 		
15	<p>RB thanked MH, LO and LB for all their efforts and hard work over the years, as this would be their last meeting.</p>		
16	<p>Date of Next Meeting – Sat.19 Nov. 2011, with no pre-Board discussion.</p>		

BA	Bill Austin	JTH	Jim Healy	EW	Elaine Wilde
RB	Ruth Beattie	MH	Marjorie Hume	JW	John Wilkinson
MB	Malcolm Brown	LO	Lorna Ogilvie	SC	Shona Coyle
LB	Lyn Bryce	SJP	Sarah-Jane Paterson	MCH	Marilyn Healy
KE	Keith Evans	JP	Jack Pressley	HR	Helen Russell
EF	Elizabeth Foster	DR	Di Rooney	WW	William Whyte
LF	Liz Fraser	RR	Ross Robertson		
AG	Alex Gray	KS	Keith Stacey		
EG	Elsbeth Gray	PW	Philip Whitley		

MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

Saturday 19 November 2011
RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.30am

AGENDA (v2)

Enclosures/Papers

- 1 **Apologies**
- 2 **Notes of Meeting of 1 October 2011**
- 3 **Matters arising from Notes not listed elsewhere**
 - 3.1 Chairman's Remarks
 - 3.1.1 SNDC and ISTD Update
 - 3.1.2 Affiliated Groups
 - 3.1.3 Training Day on 3 December 2011
 - 3.1.4 New Zealand
 - 3.1.5 National Trust for Scotland
- 4 **Finance**
 - 4.1 Quarterly Accounts to end of September 2011
- 5 **Management Board Strategic Plan**
 - 5.1 Executive Officer (report to the AGM and 2011-12 SP)
- 6 **Management Board Panels & Working Groups 2011**
 - 6.1 Panels
 - 6.1.1 Conferences
 1. Regional Conferences (O/seas, Europe, England, Wales) (Ruth)
 2. Scottish and NI Branches Conference 2011 (Philip)
 - 6.1.2 Constitution, incl. Company Ltd. By Guarantee (Keith Stacey)
 - 6.1.3 HR (Ruth)
 - 6.1.4 Investment (William) *Attached*
 - 6.1.5 Magazine Editorial Board (Andrew K)
 - 6.2 Working Groups
 - 6.2.1 External Events, incl. DS, Health Strategy, Olympics, Commonwealth Games (Ruth)
 - 6.2.2 Information Highway inc. O/seas member engagement (Elaine)
 - 6.2.3 RSCDS President (John)
 - 6.3 Finance and Governance Advisory Group (FGAG) incl. Dev. Fund (William)

- 7 **Management Committees**
- 7.1 Education and Training Committee (Di Rooney)
- 7.1.1 Strategic Plan Update, incl. Schools, Spring Fling, RSCDS Manual and Curriculum for Excellence Updates, along with the Adjudication and Technique Advisory Panels
- 7.2 Membership Services Committee (Bill Austin)
- 7.2.1 Strategic Plan Update, incl. AGM Conference Weekends (2011, 12, 13) and Professionalizing RSCDS Music & New Media Production
(nb David Cunningham to present full proposal paper to the Board)
- Attached (2 papers)*
- 8 **Appointed Posts**
- 8.1 Nothing new to report
- 9 **Branches**
- 9.1 Nothing to date
- 10 **Affiliated Group Applications**
- 10.1 Bedford Scottish Dance Group
- 10.2 Marlow Scottish Dance Club, Bucks
- 11 **Board Member/Trustee Issues**
- 11.1 Marketing (John Wilkinson)?
- 12 **Correspondence**
- 12.1 Nothing to date
- 13 **Any Other Competent Business**
- 13.1 Nothing to date
- 14 **Date of Next MB Meeting tbc**

Please notify the Secretary/Executive Officer at HQ at least 5 days before the meeting, in writing, if you have any item you wish to be discussed under Any Other Competent Business.

**Notes of meeting of the Management Board
held on 19 November 2011
at RSCDS Headquarters, 12 Coates Crescent, Edinburgh at 10.30am**

Present: Ruth Beattie (Chairman and Convenor of meeting)
John Wilkinson (Chair Elect)
Di Rooney (Convenor, Education & Training Committee)
Bill Austin (Convenor, Membership Services)
William Whyte (Treasurer)
Malcolm Brown, Keith Evans, Iain Hutchison, Jean Martin, Jack Pressley, Helen Russell, Keith Stacey, Philip Whitley, Elaine Wilde.

In attendance: Elizabeth Foster (Secretary/EO), Elspeth Gray (Notes)

Apologies: Neil Copland, Alan Macpherson, Alan Marchbank

	Decision/Action	Member/s responsible	Date to be completed
	<i>RB welcomed new and continuing members to the first meeting following the AGM.</i>		
1	Notes of Meeting of 1 October 2011		
1.1	<p>Corrections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>Minute 6.1.1 (2)</i> – Replace the names “Caroline Robertson and Fiona Spence” with “Carol-Ann Robertson and Fiona McIver”. 2) <i>Minute 2.3, (3)</i> – Last line, insert the word “be” before “accepted”. 3) With the above corrections, the minutes were accepted as an accurate record. 		
1.2	<p>Matters arising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>Minute 2.1</i>, re long term members – Some branches had issued LT memberships that should not have been issued, all were expected to terminate this year. 2) <i>Minute 2.5</i>, re PPL for affiliated groups – As there had not been a MS meeting, it was suggested that a teleconference could be considered. 3) <i>Minute 4.1, (10)</i> re process for making images from photoshoots available – EF confirmed that the Marketing Officer and the designer were reviewing all images to select a number for exclusive RSCDS use; a protocol would then be agreed as to whether the rest should be freely available, or access restricted, and how they would be available. 4) <i>Minute 8.2.1, (5)</i>, re workshops for younger musicians – As Spring Fling was being held in Dundee, and IVFDF was in Aberdeen, it was suggested that a location other than Aberdeen for these workshops might be better. 		
2	Matters Arising not listed elsewhere/Chairman’s Remarks		
2.1	<p><i>ISTD and SNDC Update</i></p> <p>AG had sent a report to RB the previous day. There had been family difficulties on both sides, but he had now made some progress. It was confirmed that this was in connection with acquiring the SlipStop</p>		

	formula, which he now had. All remaining stocks of SlipStop were held at HQ.		
2.2	<p><i>Affiliated Groups</i></p> <p>There had been one meeting on affiliated groups some time ago. RB was keen to review the affiliation application form and to consider any other potential benefits. A logo had been designed with guidelines for use. There were many groups not associated with the Society, and a survey might indicate why this was so. RB had spoken to the International Branch chairman and formed the impression he thought it might be difficult – for further discussion when the opportunity arose.</p>		
2.3	<p><i>Training Day, 3 December 2011</i></p> <p>In light of the meeting with Creative Scotland, and following up on the opportunities mentioned at the last meeting, the afternoon of the training day would be used to consider the strategic plan, specifically developmental aspects of SCD and music related to the work of David Cunningham, Susan Rhodes and Liz Fraser, with a view to taking things forward in a more integrated way. Creative Scotland had suggested we consider the “big picture” and development work overall, then tailor any application to that. EF would present an overview, then DC, SR and LF would do short presentations on their roles in helping to deliver the strategic plan. In addition, KS would talk about the way forward on the Constitution and Company Limited by Guarantee.</p>		
2.4	<p><i>New Zealand</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) RB explained the background for new members. The Board had been deeply concerned about a proposal being put to the NZ Branch AGM offering a class of branch membership that would not require RSCDS membership. It was decided at the October Board meeting to write to all NZ members with email addresses, and this had been done. There had been little response. RB and JW would hold a regional forum at NZ summer school, prior to the AGM, when they would reinforce the importance of what is done at HQ and members having full membership. 2) HR noted that NZ had been advised their proposal was not against the licence agreement, and asked what our lawyers’ view was. RB reported that the lawyer had said it was a very fine line between legality and illegality; the matter had been discussed with convenors and EF, and the view was that if it were pursued legally it could result in long and possibly very expensive litigation. 3) MB understood some people to say that if the proposal was accepted, the Board might no longer allow NZ to be a branch. He thought this was a risky approach that should be avoided. JP felt there was greater danger in not standing up to the proposal. 4) EW was concerned that our legal advice was not clear. She believed it was important to look at problem resolution, and consider more carefully why the proposal was being made. RB believed one of main issues was the distance and lack of contact. EW pointed out that was why the IHWG was set up, through which the issues should be addressed. 5) It was generally felt that strategies should be developed to clarify that many of the problems in NZ were related to the costs caused by their structure. Many members in NZ were unaware of this. JM noted that when a new structure was proposed in Alan Mair’s 		

	<p>time, hopes in NZ had been raised; the current suggestion was not dissimilar to that proposal. Although there was some feeling that information about member subscriptions and how they were spent should be disseminated to NZ members before the forum, RB was of the opinion it would appear as poor management to send something now that had not been included in the original communication.</p>		
2.5	<p><i>National Trust for Scotland</i> There was nothing further to discuss as yet. The following week JW and EF were meeting with the Burns Federation, who were also interested in working with us.</p>		
3	Finance		
3.1	<p>Quarterly Accounts to end September 2011</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The six-month accounts were a good indication of how things were moving ahead. Overall, the balance of income and expenditure was much the same as last year. There was a continued slide in membership fees, exacerbated in terms of amount because of offering joint membership. The main expenditure affecting the bottom line was property costs; there had been a major programme of work on the roof and railings, and there was a need to deal with windows. At the moment this was detailed in I&E, affecting the bottom line. The budget had been set at a modest £7K profit, at this point £10K either way would be what could be reasonably expected within budget. 2) Summer School – overall, profit was similar to last year. 3) JP noted that in the Annual Review membership figures seemed to be down about 9%, but membership income had not decreased much. EF replied that as WW had explained, joint membership meant that members were retained but with a drop in income. WW noted that reported number of life members showed no change from last year, which he considered was unlikely. He also pointed out that a quarter of membership income was carried forward to the next year, because the financial year ended in March and the membership year in June. 4) JP suggested that the figures for sales of Book 46 suggested that there should be a new book every year. It was not known what percentage of sales was made at Summer School. BA confirmed it was planned to have a new book each year. 5) RB clarified that “Chair’s expenses” included Chairman and Chairman Elect, and their regional conferences costs. The Board had agreed that there should be two regional conferences per year. 6) There were no figures for Winter School and the Conference Weekend, as figures were not finalised. Despite suggestions that estimated figures could be included, it was felt it would not be appropriate to do so in this document, an accounting statement. 7) WW asked what the estimate was for the end of year; EF responded that she hoped it would be near break-even. 		
4	Management Board Strategic Plan		
4.1	<p>Executive Officer <i>Report to AGM and 2011-12 Strategic Plan</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) EF normally submitted a detailed report on the work in which office staff had been engaged. As this meeting occurred so soon 		

	<p>after the AGM, and the Annual Report had been produced, she had not done so for this meeting.</p> <p>2) EF had hard copies of the Strategic Plan (SP) if anyone wished to take one away. From 1st April the SP was going into its third year; she would shortly be looking at the next SP and what should be included in it. The SP was continuing development, and she did not regard it as a tablet of stone.</p> <p>3) JM appreciated the colour coding, but asked for E&T to be changed from pink, with a larger font as it was difficult to read.</p>	EF	New version
5	MB Panels & Working Groups		
5.1	Panels		
5.1.1	<p>Conferences</p> <p>1) <i>Regional</i> As reported at the last meeting, JW and RB had gone to the International Branch event in Prague and held a discussion session. As the result of a phone call saying they were considering withdrawing from the Society, RB had recently visited Cornwall Branch, where a presentation was made, incorporated within a planned workshop. Feedback had been very positive. RB noted that they had many groups but no Branch class, which they recognised was a problem. There was clearly a strong Cornish identity, and RB had suggested that they might be interested in a regional conference, linking with other areas nearby. Based on the decision at the last Board meeting regarding a “self-selecting” pilot regional conference, KS had contacted Andrew Smith about the possibility of Bristol hosting a south-west conference, and he had been enthusiastic. RB felt there was insufficient time although the Bristol Branch 50th anniversary ball was on 10th March and a forum could possibly be held on the 11th. WW asked for an estimate of the cost; KS reported that Andrew Smith was putting figures together, an agenda would need to be drawn up, and suggestions invited from the region. It was understood the cost of the hall would be reasonable. Concern was not so much about the cost as making a decision with inadequate support.</p> <p>2) <i>Scotland & N Ireland (Saturday 31/03/2012)</i> All information had now been widely circulated. A letter had been sent to branches asking for agenda items, it was included in the last magazine and there were flyers and cards at the Conference Weekend. There had been one application so far. [<i>As a side issue, consideration should be given to managing the number of flyers etc on tables at the Conference Weekend.</i>] Very few agenda items had been received from branches. The next step was to write to branches with delegate application forms. Any suggestions for topics to PW asap. A dance issue might be a good innovation.</p>	All	asap
5.1.2	<p>Constitution, inc Company Limited by Guarantee (CLG)</p> <p>1) KS gave a quick recap of this topic for new members. Discussions on structural review had resulted in change to E&T and the creation of the new Interim Youth Services (IYS) Committee. Regional conference forums had also come from discussions. Downsizing the Board to 12 in total had also been proposed. WW confirmed the Board had already made the decision to go down the route of incorporation, ie change the RSCDS from an</p>		

	<p>Unincorporated Association to a Company Limited by Guarantee (CLBG). The implications were that the RSCDS would be registered as a company and would have to submit accounts to Companies House as well as OSCR. Most charities of a similar size took this option. With staff, an office and a large amount of money, it was better to have the protection of a CLBG. Trustees were also protected. The general plan would be to agree a completely new set of Articles of Association and Constitution with the lawyer, agree them with OSCR, then put them to the AGM next year. It was hoped to present a set of statutes and new constitution to the Board in February. Another aim was to take the opportunity to slim down the constitution, so that changes were not required at practically every AGM. RB noted that this would be dealt with by the Constitution Panel who would liaise with the lawyer. EF would also be involved.</p> <p>2) WW noted that for a non-informed person, the process appeared complex, but the reality was not complicated. Presentation and the way it would be put to members were critical. JM had a copy of "Charity Scotland – A Summary Document" which was out of date, and asked for the up to date version to be acquired.</p>	EG	20/01/12
5.1.3	<p>HR Nothing to report since last Board meeting.</p>		
5.1.4	<p>Investment JP thought Board members should be aware that investment values were volatile, and figures would change drastically if there was a "double dip" in the recession.</p>		
5.1.5	<p>Magazine Editorial Board</p> <p>1) There was no formal report from Andrew Kellett but he wished to remind Board members of the urgency to find a new editor. Jenny Copeland has expressed interest in joining the Editorial Board. RB had approached 3 people regarding the editorship, but no-one was interested. If no-one came forward, the Chairman and Chairman Elect would work with the Editorial Board.</p> <p>2) JM noted that when demitting office, Ross Robertson had said he thought the Board should hold more editorial control. She pointed out that if the Board wished to influence the April edition, now was the time to communicate the direction/focus to Andrew. Far too often editors had found themselves trying to get information from office-bearers late in the day and copy had been held up.</p> <p>3) EF noted that Andrew had stressed the point that he was keen to use the magazine as a more strategic vehicle, and the Board should think more about using it to put out important messages. It was essential that any information was fed to Andrew early enough.</p>		
A	<p><i>At this point, the business of the meeting was suspended and David Cunningham joined Board members to present his paper.</i> DC realised that having seen the document, Board members were likely to have many questions. He would try to summarise his approach and his objectives. He had been asked to be involved in professionalising music and new media, and had become involved very quickly; he had spent more time working on copyright issues than on his proposal.</p> <p>The main purpose of the project was about developing a community,</p>		

something people want to be involved in. He believed a mechanism to do this was broadcasting via the internet. It was about communication and credibility: fast, fluid communication with members. A lot of talk on the internet tended to be trivial; we need to make something to talk about. He proposed a weekly programme to go out on Facebook, YouTube and the website – a driving force. Using Facebook created a two-way buzz, and could lead to the commercialisation aspect. With a high enough number of people viewing on a regular basis, big companies could be approached - a free ad for discount to members; this was down the line but DC saw it as part of the big picture. As far as music was concerned, we had a huge network of people. At the moment, most musicians did not feel recordings were “theirs” and tended to disassociate themselves from it. Frank Thomson did a study looking at musicians wanting to be involved in SCD, and most did not. If we had a communications network with members, brought young musicians into it, along with outreach work with schools, if young musicians saw a ladder they could climb, it would really encourage involvement. The tools were there, waiting to be used, and it could be really exciting.

This was the big picture and where we want to get to, but smaller steps were needed first; the proposal covered many of those. It appeared that iTunes could effectively be “wrapped” within our website, so it would appear to the user that they were still on our website. DC’s vision was to enable RSCDS to produce “popular Scottish” as opposed to “educational” music; the average person might not see lot of difference, but musicians would.

EF noted that because of pressure of time, DC had not yet worked up his proposal fully with budgets. DC believed that, if done properly, there would be no huge financial burden on the Society in the long term. Some investment/capital would be needed to start, but it would pay for itself and generate income over the long period.

DC believed the Society needed to be more like a recognised record company, not treating every recording as one-off, small projects. Musicians were not seen as part of the “group”.

EF said that initial thinking was that pump-priming money would come through an application to the Development Fund, although obviously small amounts may be managed within the operational budget.

Within, say, six months DC thought that the priority was to put as much of the catalogue as possible on iTunes, inside our website. There was already a Facebook page and YouTube channel. Developing the sale of music we already have was not a massive step, but would be seen by members as a big development. MB asked if books should be available online; DC felt they should, and that would be part of the first six months’ activities.

HR asked what would be involved in weekly podcasts, how much time would be required for a pilot, who would have editorial control. DC

	<p>replied that this was part of the development and would have to be directed; it was important to find people who knew what they were talking about, topics members would find interesting, and to consider the image and how it was done.</p> <p>RB thanked DC for coming in to talk to his proposal. DC was happy to have done so; he found the project very exciting and thought there were opportunities waiting to be exploited.</p>		
B	<p>David Cunningham contract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) RB noted that a decision had to be made on DC's contract. What was originally proposed was a 12-month contract, with a review after DC's report at this point. There was strong support for continuing, but there were concerns about lack of costings. 2) WW wanted to ensure the Board were adequately informed. Members were being asked to approve an initial cost of £18K per annum, and there would be further costs as the proposal and projects went forward. At the moment, DC worked to EF on a day-to-day basis and a steering group including BA, JW and George Meikle met regularly. It was this group that would prioritise his work areas. This management structure had been circulated previously and agreed by the Board. 3) EF clarified that the original decision was that the contract would be 3 months + 12 months. The cost of the first 3 months would be put to the Development Fund. A new contract was not required, but there should be a work plan, based on his proposal. It was possible that he might be involved in other projects, outwith the proposal, but he would have to be paid separately for those. 4) There were some concerns about lack of clarity. Priorities had not been made clear, but these were still developing. 5) DR formally proposed extending DC's contract by 12 months, seconded by PW. There were 12 votes for, and 1 against. The contract would therefore be extended for 12 months. 		
	<i>Numbering now reverts to follow on from before DC presentation</i>		
5.2	Working Groups		
5.2.1	<p>External Events, inc Dance Scottish, Health Strategy, Olympics, Commonwealth Games</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Dance Scottish was ongoing, although very few people had reported events. BA thought it was a good idea to incorporate it with external events, but it would be kept under review. 2) EW reported that a draft Health strategy had been produced for RB and JW for a meeting with parliament; no-one else had seen the draft, and RB would ensure it was circulated. Efforts had been made to try to finalise the poster. LB was prepared to carry on as Convenor until new Panel/Group memberships were agreed. A meeting with the parliament was being negotiated. 3) During the Olympics, London Branch would be holding events in Kensington Gardens. There was no input to the opening and closing ceremonies by the Society. Information had been circulated to branches to encourage them to take up suggestions re the Commonwealth Games. RB had met with the Glasgow committee, who were hoping to initiate events related to the Commonwealth Games that would meet their targets of being inclusive, multi- 	RB	25/01/12

	<p>cultural, reaching out to community, open to public, etc. Alan Munro was leading the sub-committee.</p> <p>4) Major Roy Robertson (ABF) wanted to hold an event next summer; it had been suggested this should be linked with the Commonwealth Games, which he agreed.</p>		
5.2.2	<p>Information Highway, inc Overseas Member Engagement</p> <p>1) EW apologised for information being sent out late; she, JP and EG would be having a short meeting after the Board meeting.</p> <p>2) JP believed that the change in remit for the Engagement of Overseas Members group had caused confusion. Those concerned had been advised to select the WG or committee where they felt they had most to offer, then work with that group to give an overseas perspective.</p> <p>3) Sue Ronald and Jon Allen-Friend had intimated to RB that they did not think inviting people onto two or three WGs or Panels was helpful. They felt the link with Board members was a better way forward in terms of engaging with overseas members. It was suggested that as well as reporting back 2 or 3 times a year on contact with “their” branches, Board members could find out when their committee meetings were, so that their contact was relevant. Allocation of Board members to branches would be done shortly. Some people thought that more conferencing should be explored, as a more meaningful way of contributing to a WG or Panel.</p> <p>4) JP and EW would maintain Engagement of Overseas Members as a monitoring group, with any progress being reported to the Board. EF noted that Convenors had discussed the previous day that engagement of overseas members was everyone’s responsibility; when setting up a project or activity, it was the responsibility of group convenors to make sure overseas members were engaged.</p>		
5.2.5	<p>RSCDS President</p> <p>Nothing to report since last meeting, but JW undertook to have something for the next meeting.</p>	JW	25/01/12
5.3	<p>Finance and Governance Advisory Group (FGAG), inc D’vlpment Fund</p> <p>FGAG had not met under WW. They would meet in January when they would consider budget and risk management before the February MB.</p>		
6	<p>Management Committees</p>		
6.1	<p>Education & Training Committee</p> <p>1) The Committee had not met since September, and would be meeting on the Sunday following the training day.</p> <p>2) DR was delighted that the new Youth Services Committee was approved at the AGM. Since then, she and others had been trying to put together an interim group. Roy Bain had agreed to chair it, as an interim arrangement, and possible members had been approached. [Post-meeting note: interim membership confirmed as Roy Bain, Deb Lees, Susan Rhodes, Jim Stott, Philippa Revill, Louise Macdougall, Adam Brady, Fiona McIver, Anne McArthur). It was agreed Roy Bain should be invited to the December training day.</p> <p>3) Work on the Manual review was ongoing. Discussions had been held with DC about visual accompaniment to the printed Manual, and it was suggested it should be filmed; some “multi-purpose” filming could be done at the same time. It might be possible to approach the National Trust for use of an appropriate venue. These</p>		

	<p>were all just ideas at the moment, DC was costing various things and there would be more for discussion at the next meeting.</p> <p>4) There was discussion about Summer School evaluation. DR reported that class titles would be changed to try to get people to select the right class for them. Options other than self-selecting, which may work elsewhere, would be difficult to implement at Summer School. Staff were advised to assess their classes and recommend whether some people should move up or down.</p> <p>5) EF noted that with regard to YS Committee, the Board had earlier agreed in principle that SR would be retained on 1 day per week at the end of her contract, to work with the new Committee and consolidate the work that she had already done.</p>		
6.2	Membership Services Committee		
	<p>1) The Committee had not met since the last Board meeting.</p> <p>2) The main event that had happened was the AGM & Conference Weekend, which seemed to have been successful. In 2012 it would be held in Aberdeen. For 2013, Edinburgh had been considered, specifically the Corn Exchange, but it was not big enough. 2013 was a big year for the Society. Other options suggested were DG1 in Dumfries or Bucht Sports Centre in Inverness, or Perth. This would be left with MS to consider, BA was happy to receive comments or suggestions. A meeting to review the 2011 weekend would be held. Not all costs had been submitted, but it appeared that there would be around £2K contribution.</p> <p>3) MS had an unfilled place; BA was considering involving Keith Bark, for one year, as a trial. Other members could also be co-opted, eg for proof-reading projects.</p> <p>4) The collected Books 19-24 were nearing fruition, and may be ready for Winter school. Thanks were expressed to all involved.</p> <p>5) BA was happy to put the Saturday am discussion notes online.</p>	All	asap
7	Appointed Posts Nothing to report		
8	Branches Nothing to report.		
9	Affiliated Groups The following affiliation applications were approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bedford Scottish Dance Group • Marlow Scottish Dance Club, Bucks 		
10 10.1	Board Member/Trustee Issues <i>PR and Marketing – Paper from JW</i> <p>1) JW felt there was a need for a significant PR and marketing presence, which he did not feel Liz Fraser provided – indeed had not been asked to provide. He believed there was a need to seriously consider a higher PR presence; not a lobbyist, but someone with contacts and the ability to make contacts, generating opportunities to be able to meet people, especially in eg the parliament and the press.</p> <p>2) EF believed LF was more of a marketing person, but also had limited time. There had been discussions about Olympics, Commonwealth Games, Homecoming, RSCDS anniversary – all of these were time-consuming and resource intensive to do well, and she believed LF did not have the capacity to undertake that, being</p>		

	<p>employed for one day per week.</p> <p>3) EW suggested a tender for such work could be put to Edinburgh PR companies: there was a need for greater visibility/ recognition.</p> <p>4) The financial aspect would have to be considered, but EF pointed out that the corollary was our ability to respond – if there was someone initiating activity/opportunities, we would have to be in a position to take them up.</p> <p>5) JW felt that branches would be keen on something like this, as they would see the spin-off of benefits to them.</p> <p>6) It was felt that more investigation was required before forthcoming regional conferences. JW and EF to discuss further.</p>	JW/EF	ongoing
11	Correspondence There was no correspondence to be dealt with.		
12	AOCB <p>1) EF clarified that DC's 12 months would begin on 1st December.</p> <p>2) RB informed new members that at a previous Board meeting an unminuted session of around 30 minutes for Board members only before the start of the formal Board meeting had been agreed to enable free-ranging discussion on any topics Board members wished to raise.</p> <p>3) JW had tried to amend the meetings timetable but it was not straightforward. It was agreed to leave the schedule as it was for this year, and create a slightly different version for next year. Any suggestions for next year to JW. There was brief discussion about using the Sunday following the February Board meeting, another Saturday, or a mid-week meeting to discuss structure and any changes to the constitution. RB and JW to discuss further.</p>	All RB/JW	ongoing ongoing
13	Date of Next Meeting – 11 th February		

BA	Bill Austin	AM	Alan Marchbank	WW	William Whyte
RB	Ruth Beattie	JM	Jean Martin		
MB	Malcolm Brown	JP	Jack Pressley	SC	Shona Coyle
NB	Neil Copland	DR	Di Rooney	DC	David Cunningham
KE	Keith Evans	HR	Helen Russell	LF	Liz Fraser
EF	Elizabeth Foster	KS	Keith Stacey	AG	Alex Gray
EG	Elspeth Gray	PW	Philip Whitley	MCH	Marilyn Healy
IH	Iain Hutchison	EW	Elaine Wilde	SR	Susan Rhodes
AMac	Alan Macpherson	JW	John Wilkinson		