

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF 69th ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE MEMBERS OF WOMEN'S  
LEAGUE OF HEALTH AND BEAUTY**

**HELD ON SATURDAY 2ND NOVEMBER 2019 AT 2.00PM AT BLOOMSBURY CENTRAL BAPTIST**

**CHURCH, 235 SHAFTESBURY AVENUE, LONDON, WC2H 8EP.**

**Chair:** Daniel Robinson

**Board Members:** Sally Floyd  
Robert Jones  
Heather Jordan  
Innes Milne  
Jane Ross  
Christine Underhill

**Clerk to the Trustees:** Karen Monaghan

**Apologies:** 13 apologies were noted

**Present:**

There were 32 members present plus 16 proxy votes. Unfortunately this meant the meeting was not quorate. Therefore, on circulation of the minutes, members will be asked to raise any votes not in favour of the decisions listed below at items 3 – Approval of the Minutes of the 2018 AGM, 4 – Approval of the Statement of Accounts to 31 March 2019, and 5 – election of Members to the Board of Trustees. If no response is received from the member, then it is assumed that the member votes in favour of the proposed decisions.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Marcus Kingwell, the new CEO of EMD UK.

The Trustees introduced themselves to the meeting.

**1. NOTICE OF MEETING**

The Clerk to the Trustees read the Notice of Meeting.

**2. MINUTES OF THE AGM HELD ON SATURDAY 24<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2018**

The Chair proposed the approval of the Minutes. The Minutes were approved unanimously.

**3. STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS TO 31 MARCH 2019**

The Report and Financial Statement had been made available in advance of the meeting.

The Chair presented the WLHB accounts and his report. He commented that although the reserves are high, the reality is that expenditure is higher than income. The question for

members to consider is what is the right shape of the organisation and how should we achieve that?

The Chair offered the opportunity to raise any questions on the accounts:

Gary Douglas: wished to know what the royalty income referred to and how this came about. Jane Ross pointed out that it was not actual royalty income but covered the membership and teacher fees. This was confirmed by Alison Howard after the meeting. However Alison will contact the accountants to see if they can give a further explanation which she will then pass to Gary Douglas.

Gary Douglas: wanted to understand how the EMD income works.

Brian Smith: asked if the Chair could provide an explanation of the accounts.

Another member asked what the consultants' fees of £43,000 covered and could the consultants be referred to as something else.

Margaret Peggie: stated that the term consultants was used because of tax purposes as they were not employees. She suggested an explanatory note could be added to future reports. She added that the five consultants' fees given as £43,000 in the accounts also included their expenses.

The Chair agreed with Margaret Peggie and agreed a note could be added to explain this.

Once members agreed with these explanations, Jane Ross proposed that the Statement of Accounts and Financial Report for 2018/19 be approved and adopted. Seconded by Janice Gronow.

Voting: 32 in attendance plus all proxy votes in favour. The motion was carried.

#### **4. ELECTION OF TRUSTEES**

The Chair explained that with Jane Ross and Kim Davies coming to the end of their terms, the Trustee Board felt that 6 Trustees was sufficient for the time being. This simplified the organisation and cut the cost of meetings.

1. Robert Jones – All in attendance plus all proxy votes in favour of appointment.
2. Innes Milne – All in attendance plus all proxy votes in favour of appointment.

The motion was carried.

#### **5. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next AGM would be fixed in due course, with consideration given to changing the time of year for the AGM.

This concluded the formal part of the meeting.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION FOLLOWING THE WLHB AGM ON 2<sup>ND</sup> NOVEMBER 2019

1.

Susan Webster: Asked for an explanation of the pilot scheme and were the Trustees thinking of closing the charity.

Heather Jordan replied that the Board were not planning to close the charity but were looking at the synergy between FExercise, WLHB and EMD UK. There had been exploratory discussions on changing the name to make the organisation easier to understand to newcomers.

Pilot Scheme:

Dan Robinson advised that the biggest challenge is different teachers experiencing different issues, mostly between new and established teachers. It was difficult for new teachers to stay as they felt uncomfortable asking for membership fees. Established teachers were mixed between finding membership a positive step for participants, or feeling it was difficult to offer membership. If the charity was to become more competitive and ultimately reorganise completely how it operate, this would present a big change and is a big risk so the pilot is viewed as a way to test the waters.

The pilot works by removing the need to ask for membership fees upfront, and instead 25 pence per participant is paid per class, with funds submitted monthly by the teacher to the charity. On non-pilot classes, the membership fee has been reduced to £15.

Jenny Dingley: In the past, the vote on membership from teachers was close. 96% of income is through membership so why reduce the amount from £23 to £15? Personally she had no problem with membership and does not agree with decreasing the fee.

The Chair responded that Jenny's strength of opinion is equal and opposite of those against it. Reducing expenditure has also been implemented to counteract the fall in income. Many teachers thought the membership fee was too high and so the pilot has been brought in to try and address both sides of reasoning on the membership fee.

Carolyn Kingdon: Agreed with Jenny Dingley and suggested that membership should offer something more. Also, the teachers' affiliation levy of £60 seems high without greater benefits being available and could this be looked at by the Board?

Rosemary Barber: noted that she was aware of the differing opinions but thinks 25 pence is too small a contribution. Full paying members are then subsidising those paying this lower amount. An incentive is needed for teachers to recruit members as they work very hard. Why drop the membership fee if more income is required.

Sally Flloyd: pointed out that the Futures Fund donations were eligible for Gift Aid, whereas membership wasn't so those on the lower amount could increase their support that way. Also, all payments made by teachers on the pilot scheme are eligible for Gift Aid, provided the teacher is a tax payer.

Brian Smith: This membership fee is less but seems to require greater administration.

The Chair noted that the pilot is just that, a trial to try out different options to see if what works.

Heather Jordan: commented that she was on the pilot scheme and her administration had not increased.

Natalie Green: agreed with Rosemary Barber. She was worried about changing as the loss of £4 would impact her own business as it helped to support her overheads with printing, travel costs, etc. She noted that she has received no new members via FLEXercise and EMD UK support.

Gary Douglas: From the most recent teacher survey, 75% thought the membership fee was the right level so why reduce it?

Natalie Green: Why not try the pilot just for new teachers?

The Chair explained that the pilot scheme was an opt-in option. He recognised that the Board did not have to drop the membership fee as well as trial the pilot but this was decided upon as a result of feedback from 25 teachers requesting a reduction in the membership fee, or complete removal of membership. This is the purpose of the pilot, to try and identify a solution for all.

Gary Douglas: Could the Trustees share a financial analysis of how they got to the reduced figure.

The Chair responded that the Trustees had agreed to underwrite the shortfall in income for 1 year through cutting expenses.

Brian Smith: asked when the pilot would be reviewed.

Heather Jordan responded that it would be reviewed in January.

Margaret Peggie: commented that this was not a new idea. It had been fully discussed 2-3 years previously due to the pressure from teachers. Some teachers don't offer membership but the Board would not remove membership if it was not working. Unfortunately it is a widespread problem for many organisations to get teachers to train and stay with them.

Carolyn Kingdon: Agreed with Margaret Peggie, but felt that you can take the membership in by just putting the fee up a bit. Teachers could pay the membership up front and recoup the cost over the year.

It was recognised that some teachers operated in less affluent areas where this might not be possible.

Judith Holpin: remarked that there used to be a fund to support teachers in times of need.

The Chair stated that this had been considered but it would be hugely discretionary and ultimately would still be paid for by other teachers.

Paul Barber: noted that there were no new teachers attending the AGM to give their thoughts.

Rosemary Hampson: stated that she had only been teaching 5 years and opted to trial the pilot. She felt it was better and was happier to have the option.

Susan Webster: noted that she was a member not a teacher and why no members had been asked for their thoughts. Why was there not a document to introduce new participants to how the membership came about?

Heather Jordan: noted that there is a leaflet for new members explaining this.

Janice Gronow: commented that training teachers can be difficult as it is a constantly changing marketplace. She needs to ensure that enough teachers are being trained and have an incentive to sign up through FLEXercise rather than then go elsewhere where often they receive better support and/or benefits.

The Chair agreed that this was true for some but it was difficult to balance completely opposing views. The Board had noted that member and teacher numbers were falling which needs to be addressed. However, with the changing face of the exercise industry, we cannot continue to rely on historic ways of working and need to change to fit with our competitors.

## 2. Changing the name of the Charity.

The Chair explained that there had been discussion regarding changing the name of the charity and the Board would like to know people's thoughts on this.

After a series of discussions, the general consensus was noted that no-one wanted to see another name change and there was no need for this. 2 attendees were not in favour of this decision.

## 3.

The Chair stated that the Board would like to know views on whether members could continue to vote at the AGM as again, conflicting opinions had been put forward to them regarding this. It was noted that many felt that teacher representation on the Trustee Board was essential in ensuring member views were taken into account and put forward.

Gary Douglas: agreed that administering a large membership for voting was a difficult task. He suggested that perhaps class members who would like to vote could choose to opt-in.

The Chair agreed that this was a proposal to consider and welcomed the level of interest by the attendees.

## 4.

The Chair thanked everyone for their input and remarked that it was good to hear their views. He hoped that all attendees felt that they had the opportunity to have their voice heard. He asked if the attendees felt the meeting had been valuable, to which the majority agreed it had.

The meeting closed at 4.05pm with refreshments provided afterwards.