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Prefatory Remarks

This report constitutes the research team’s response to the research framework, objectives and background that are reproduced in Section One. The development of the background and the section headers and outcomes was undertaken by the Department of Sport and Recreation and Curtin has, by and large, undertaken a desktop review and limited literature review in order to respond to each element provided and to establish a set of general attributes against which the Department can assess its next steps. In essence, this is Phase One of a multi-phase body of work. The recommendations related in this report are intended to inform the development of Phase Two.

In undertaking this work, Curtin also conducted a roundtable consisting of people involved in the project and dealing with a number of key questions. The results of this roundtable are reported on elsewhere, suffice to say at this point that those results may inform the Department’s reaction to the attributes and other information provided herein.

Overall, this document is intended to present a set of attributes that we consider will form a basis for establishing the next phase of work to be done and which will also inform the Disability Sport and Active Recreation Implementation Plan and intentions of the Department into the future.
Section One – Reproduced Background

The Department of Sport and Recreation (DSR) has a mission to enhance the quality of life of Western Australians through their participation and achievement in sport and active recreation. A key outcome is for a more physically active society in which sport and active recreation maintain and increase their contribution to community wellbeing. One of the key strategies is to facilitate initiatives to increase community participation, with a particular focus on groups with low participation levels.

In April 2011, DSR engaged consultants to review the disability sport and active recreation sector. The purpose of the review was to identify good practice and gaps in service provision and to develop recommendations to improve the coordination of services for people with disabilities (PWD) in Western Australia (WA). Based on the findings, outlined in the preliminary findings and issues paper, the consultants formulated a ‘Recommendations report’ containing 19 recommendations.

DSR developed an implementation plan, approved by the Minister for Sport and Recreation in August 2012. Since then, 13 strategy teams have been established and are progressing implementation of selected recommendations, described in the following pages.

Specification
DSR requested the Curtin Centre for Sport and Recreation Research facilitate enquiry that will inform the implementation of the recommendations. Eleven of the above-mentioned strategies require additional enquiry to assist in the progress of their strategic goal. The areas of enquiry being as follows:

Areas of Enquiry
Taking into consideration relevant local, national and selected* international information and practice with particular focus on the needs of the PwD end-user, conduct an enquiry and provide considerations for implementation in WA on the following:

Strategic Framework:
Identify relevant inclusion frameworks.
(To include a cross agency and stakeholder collaboration lead by DSR)

Engagement and Communication Strategies:
Identify strategies used to ***engage PwD to participate in sport and active recreation. Consideration should be given to a range of engagement tools including online e.g. websites.

Collaboration, Cooperation & Support:
Identify funding models that utilise ‘purchasing services’ to increase the participation of PwD in sport and active recreation.
(Phase 2 to include cross agency and stakeholder collaboration)
**Benchmarking tool:**
Identify benchmarking tools that will assist stakeholders self-assess their readiness to engage PwD into sport and active recreation.

**Data Collection Frameworks:**
Identify frameworks for data collection. Consideration should be given to relevant data collection points and methods. Where research specifically relevant to PwD (physical, sensory, intellectual, vision impaired) is not available consideration should be given to the following low participation groups; Aboriginal, Low Socioeconomic and Culturally and Linguistically Diverse.

*Selected international = New Zealand, UK, Canada and USA.
***strategies to reach PwD and inform what is available in a sport and active recreation context AND how clubs and services can reach PwD in their usual membership drives etc.

**Outputs**

1. **Strategic Framework:**
   A review of relevant national and international* strategic frameworks and provide recommendations for core content.

2. **Engagement and Communication Strategies:**
   An audit detailing – effective strategies used to **engage** PwD to participate in sport and active recreation, conclusions to be drawn based on findings as to the most effective strategies.

3. **Collaboration, Cooperation & Support:**
   Draft Framework – Draft funding models specific to funding sport and active recreation (and based on service deliverers ‘purchasing services’ from service providers).

4. **Benchmarking Tool:**
   An audit of similar benchmarking tools from within WA, interstate and internationally and provide options for consideration for core content.

5. **Data Collection Frameworks:**
   Comparison table of existing frameworks for data collection and key/common data collected. Conclusions to be drawn based on findings as to key/common data to be collected.

6. **Recommendations provided for the approach of Phase 2 across all areas of enquiry**

Guiding principles for the specification are included at Appendix 1.

The following sections of this report (Section Two to Section Seven) address each of the above required outputs in turn.

In reviewing each of these sections it is important that the reader considers them together. The findings and ideas expressed in one section are not necessarily re-examined in each subsequent section. Additionally, the recommendations should also be read together.
Section Two - Strategic Framework

Enquiry
Identify relevant inclusion frameworks.
(To include a cross agency and stakeholder collaboration lead by DSR)

Output
A review of relevant national and international* strategic frameworks and provide recommendations for core content.

Desk top review

Summary of Literature

This section is intended to provide a summary of the literature identified out of the desk top review process and which focuses on the established frameworks in existence in the targeted countries, including Australia. The discussion highlights the key elements of each framework

The Commonwealth Framework

In 2011 the Commonwealth and States and Territories signed a National Sport and Active Recreation Policy Framework (Government of Australia, 2011). This is an overarching document and only notes issues of disability in passing. It is important in the context of the Western Australian direction as Western Australia has signed up to this framework. The national framework includes the expectation that commonwealth and state governments and state sporting organisations will:

Partner[…] with service providers to improve participation outcomes to targeted populations (e.g. disabled, Indigenous, rural/remote, Culturally and Linguistically Diverse, women and socially disadvantaged).

(Government of Australia, 2011)

Other documents and websites refer to two other national frameworks – the National Plan for Disability Sport (Government of Australia, 2011), and the Sport Connect framework (Government of Australia, 2011). There is evidence that Sport Connect might still be active and at least influencing policy; there is no readily available information on the National Plan. We assume that this has lapsed. The Sports Connect paradigm is provided in figure one while the national framework is schematically demonstrated in figure two.

![Sports CONNECT](image)

Figure One: Sports Connect Paradigm (ASC)
Figure Two: National Sport and Active Recreation Policy Framework Governance
In essence, Sports Connect used a partnering arrangement to assess preparedness of sports organisations to admit members with disability and also provided training, via Disability Service Organisations, aimed at enhancing clubs’ understanding of disability and accessibility issues.

There are a number of programs extant at the national level in Australia that also impact on this area notwithstanding they were not developed with inclusivity for people living with disability. An example here is the national Play by the Rules (Play by the Rules, 2014) program. This program was developed by the Commonwealth government in conjunction with the states, territories and Not-for-profit organisations. While its principal focus is on safe and fair participation with a focus on bullying prevention and broad inclusivity, it does focus on inclusivity in the context of people with disability. Indeed, while those with disability are not central to the original purpose of this program, ‘accessibility’ is one of the so-called ‘seven pillars of inclusion’ of the national Play by the Rules program. We have taken this to mean including accessibility in the context of people with disability.

A number of Australian jurisdictions have frameworks or other broad policy documents. In each case these cover similar areas to the Western Australian Framework. We now give a brief overview of these frameworks.

Other Australian Jurisdictions’ Framework

The Tasmanian Sport and Recreation Framework for People with a Disability was announced in 2009 (Government of Tasmania, 2009) while New South Wales first released its You’re in the Game – NSW Disability Sport and Physical Activity Framework around 2006/07, and updated it in 2009 (Government of New South Wales, 2009).

These frameworks have similarities to the main parts of the Western Australian Framework (see Appendix Two), but also have two critically important differences. First, they are both focused on inclusivity and people with disability. Secondly, both the Tasmanian and New South Wales documents include accessibility as a priority. The key benefit of including this priority is that it lends itself to strong assessment or measurement.

For example, the New South Wales document includes the following outcomes under the heading of ‘accessibility’:

- Create facilities and venues that are physically, socially (attitudinally) and financially accessible;
- Educate industry stakeholders on risk management procedures related to the participation of people with a disability in sport and physical activities;
- Broaden the range of competition and skill development opportunities available;
- Provide access to appropriate sporting equipment; and
- Create an environment where all people feel safe and welcome.

Appendices 3 and 4 provide a complete list of outcomes included in the New South Wales and Tasmanian frameworks respectively.
International Jurisdictions

Internationally, the Canadian government created a *Policy on Sport for Persons With a Disability* in 2006 (Government of Canada, 2006). The main features of this policy are again similar to the Western Australian Framework (Government of Western Australia, u.d.(a)). However, there are two main high level differences between the Canadian and Western Australian cases. Firstly, in the Canadian version, the vision includes and is focused on people with disability – that is, an explicit expression describing the reason the policy has been created. Secondly, and similar to the New South Wales and Tasmanian cases, the Canadian version includes the priority of ‘increasing participation’. Again, this makes for focussed planning and easier assessment with regard to performance and outcomes.

Beyond the bureaucratic aspect of being able to assess or measure success, the New South Wales (Government of New South Wales, 2009), Tasmanian (Government of Tasmania, 2009) and Canadian priorities should have the effect of focussing attention on the main purpose of having the policy or framework. As previously described in this review, this area is very complex with many interests, governments and organisations involved. Therefore, the clearer the identification of targets can be the more likely effective planning, communications, the allocation of responsibility and engagement of all of these parties will result in the outcomes envisaged.

The New Zealand government has created a framework entitled *No Exceptions* and this is a similar framework as that in Australia, although, of course, it does not have the difficulty of working within a federation (Sports New Zealand, 2005). The framework is now nine years old. In 2009 the original framework was replaced by a *No Exceptions Investment 2009-2012* policy which incorporated the original framework but also made funds available to organisations seeking to pursue the framework’s objectives (Sports New Zealand, 2009). The funds were made available but were contestable for projects with lifespans of between one and three years.

Finally, in preparation for the 2012 Olympics and Paralympics, the Greater London Authority released a disability sport policy framework in 2007. This framework – *Inclusive and Active* – describes itself as an ‘active plan’ (Barker and Watson, 2007). Building on the success of the 2007 version, an updated framework was issued in 2010 – *Inclusive and Active 2* (Lucas and Sackett, 2010).

The following table (Table One National and International Strategic Frameworks: Characteristics comparison matrix) provides a snapshot summary of the frameworks literature.
## Table One - National and International Strategic Frameworks: Comparison matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework title</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
<td>Our communities provide an inclusive environment where all Western Australians participate equitably, in a spirit of mutual respect, experiencing the benefits of sport and recreation.</td>
<td>People with disability having the opportunity to participate in sport and physical activity; and Sport and physical activity providers ensuring that their services are inclusive and accessible for all people with a disability.</td>
<td>All Tasmanians have the opportunity to participate in sport and recreation activities of their choice, at all levels.</td>
<td>All people participating in the physical recreation and sport activities of their choice.</td>
<td>More active disabled Londoners, achieving their full sporting potential.</td>
<td>The Policy on Sport for Persons with a Disability envisions the full and active participation of persons with a disability in Canadian sport at all levels and in all forms, to the extent of their abilities and interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives/priority areas</strong></td>
<td>• Leadership • Capacity building • Partnerships • Advocacy, awareness and promotion Regional Western Australia</td>
<td>• Accessibility • Capacity building • Networks and partnerships • Marketing, promotion and education</td>
<td>• Capacity building • Collaboration • Information, awareness and promotion Accessibility</td>
<td>• Access to sport and recreational activities • Quality physical recreation • The benefits of participation understood by all • Disabled people knowing about opportunities and accessing those they choose • Disabled participants recognised as role models</td>
<td>• Changing the culture • Being inclusive • Getting people active • Creating sporting pathways Developing people</td>
<td>• Increasing participation • Supporting excellence • Building capacity Fostering interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes included</strong></td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>• Yes</td>
<td>• Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Recommendations provided for the approach of Phase 2

The following table (Table Two summarises characteristics for consideration in Phase 2.

Table Two – Characteristics of a Strategic Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Measurable Outcomes</td>
<td>Determine success or otherwise of the Framework and its implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appropriate Definitions</td>
<td>Provide clarity as to purpose and objectives of the Framework. This would include identifying those people intended to benefit from the Framework’s implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A Clear Framework Formulation Process Including People With Disability</td>
<td>This element would describe how people with disability would be accessed and how their feedback and ideas would be captured and incorporated into ongoing iterations of the Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A Clear Framework Formulation Process Including Sporting and Recreation Organisations</td>
<td>This element would describe how sporting and recreation organisations would be accessed and how their feedback and ideas would be captured and incorporated into ongoing iterations of the Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mapping of Tasks and Responsibilities</td>
<td>To ensure responsibilities are communicated and agreed to by various parties including government agencies and clubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Workable Time Frame</td>
<td>Communicate desired achievement timeline and demonstrate to Framework users. Helps to ensure expectations are maintained at an appropriate level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Identification of strategies to be employed</td>
<td>To communicate to all parties what the Department and other organisations will do in order to achieve the outcomes identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Appropriate Governance Strategy to be Articulated</td>
<td>This element will identify the governance arrangements to be put in place in order to achieve the outcomes identified. It would include the nomination of steering or other governance committee personnel, timings for meetings, where the secretariat responsibilities lie, the timing for meetings and the reporting pathways and timetables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A Clear Framework Review Process Including Opportunities for Regular Enhancement</td>
<td>This element is important in order to capture the elements that have worked and those that have failed as well as to incorporate the feedback from people with disability and sporting and recreation clubs in a timely and useful fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provision for Overt Agreement to be Demonstrated</td>
<td>Allow for various government departments and NFPs to acknowledge and demonstrate their commitment to the Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Communicate Outcomes</td>
<td>Gain support and understanding of purpose and objectives of the Framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Three – Engagement and Communication Strategies

Enquiry
Identify strategies used to engage PwD to participate in sport and active recreation. Consideration should be given to a range of engagement tools including online e.g. websites. (strategies to reach PwD and inform what is available in a sport and active recreation context AND how clubs and services can reach PwD in their usual membership drives etc.).

Output
An audit detailing effective strategies used to engage PwD to participate in sport and active recreation, conclusions to be drawn based on findings as to the most effective strategies.

Desk Top Review
Summary of Literature
As part of the review of the Western Australian and other jurisdictional frameworks, we considered the engagement and communications strategies utilised. This is a critical aspect in relation to the success or otherwise of such frameworks. However, given the technical nature of the term “audit” we confirm that we have not undertaken an audit of this aspect of the engagement strategies utilised by other jurisdictions. Rather, we have conducted a desktop review of these jurisdictions.

Engagement can consist of a number of active processes including undertaking communications programs and exercises as well as providing incentives to people and organisations to undertake communications processes in the interests of the Department’s objectives. However, it can also include the provision of tools and other advice and services (such as case studies) which assist organisations in meeting the objectives of the Framework. Such assistance can mean the difference between organisations actively pursuing the outcomes and stepping back due to their resource constraints and the prioritisation of other foci.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the main and most important communication tool identified involves using the internet to host online communications. Concomitantly, the greatest challenge is to create online environments that engage with users effectively. For government, the added challenge is to enhance effectiveness in a time of budget constraint. Such constraints also, of course, affect the capacity of government to fund engagement programs as, usually, such programs require the employment of personnel and the creation of resources. Additionally, while engagement strategies are required to increase the participation of those people with disability, such strategies are also required to demonstrate the benefits and processes to organisations which might be the focus of inclusivity.

All relevant public sector agencies and government policies were identified online as were a number of relevant Not-for-profit programs and organisations. Links to relevant sites are provided at Appendix Five. The majority of relevant websites were hosted on government sport and recreation department sites. Of critical importance, most of these sites were only found after circuitous, determined and dedicated pursuit. Therefore, not only does any future
site have to be compelling it also has to be readily accessible. Such accessibility is, arguably, a higher priority in terms of access to information to fulfil the needs of those people with disability who are less likely to have the capacity to visit prospective clubs or, perhaps, less likely to have personal networks that encompass contacts within clubs. This problem is exacerbated when we consider the inherent difficulties in identifying that incalculable majority of people living with disability that are not captured in government databases. The British examples, discussed and referenced below, constituted examples of apparently well developed and accessible websites. It must also be remembered that the term "accessibility" relates to both finding the information and also being able to access it in forms that are readable or comprehensible for PwD. As such, accessibility relates to:

- Information find-ability
- Information understand-ability
- Access to personnel for further information and assistance

National Disability Services, the national peak body for disability service providers, provides information for addressing these kinds of issues (See for instance: National Disability Services; Senses Foundation – See Appendix Five).

In terms of the Western Australian model, the Department of Sport and Recreation provides access to numerous guides and tools on its website (see bibliography). These are intended to increase participation and accessibility for people in various demographic target groups including disability. In comparing these resources with those provided in British websites, it is clear there are some gaps in terms of resources available, but overall they appear to provide a reasonable resource base. The prospects for achieving additional engagement with respect to organisations across the sporting spectrum would be enhanced if more tools and cases, specific to inclusion of people with a disability, were developed and included on the web.

Additionally, the Department has a small number of disability-specific documents available on its website. Some of these are elements that appear to originate in the New South Wales framework (Government of New South Wales, 2004). Documents provided by the Department’s website include non-disability specific inclusivity resources, case studies specific to disability inclusion and a disability inclusion project case study (See Government of Western Australia u.d. (a), (b), (c) and (d)).

International Examples of Resourcing and Communications Strategies - United Kingdom

Prior to moving to a review of the English strategies, it is worth noting that we have allocated a considerable amount of space in this report to the English experience for two reasons. Firstly, we consider that the resources and strategies adopted are amongst the most mature that we identified during the desktop review process. Secondly, the English arrangements are integrated such that accessibility is, arguably, enhanced for people with disability, their carers and the clubs themselves. We consider this latter aspect to represent an important attribute that we have included in our discussion below.
In terms of the United Kingdom, the first example to be reviewed is the Inclusive Fitness Initiative (IFI) (English Federation of Disability Sport, u.d. (a)). This program has been running for a decade in England, and is an accreditation system for leisure facilities.

Currently there are 400 centres accredited to the initiative. While it is based on improving access and services for people with disability, it is also makes the case that accreditation is a positive opportunity that is likely to increase business for leisure centres. It includes staff to guide organisations and web-based support, including a listing of accredited centres.

![Figure Three - Inclusive Fitness Initiative Objectives (English Federation of Disability Sport, u.d. (a))](image)

The online assistance includes planning guides, parking requirements, links to training enrolments, links to disability-friendly fitness equipment, and more. The key areas covered by the IFI (see Figure Three above) are very similar to those covered by the Australian and Canadian frameworks discussed in the following sections. However, unlike most frameworks reviewed, the IFI also implements execution strategies aimed at achieving the framework objectives.

While it may not be appropriate for the Department to seek to emulate the full IFI framework, the web site and the concept are useful resources for the Department, the Disability Services Commission and those interested in inclusivity.

A further English program examined is the Inclusion Club Hub which is also hosted by the English Federation of Disability Sport (English Federation of Disability Sports, u.d. (b)). This initiative has a broader aim than that of the IFI discussed above, though it is a smaller project. In essence, it is a self-assessment tool for sporting and recreation clubs linked to a library of guidance and best practice exemplars. Clubs register their interest. They then complete a simple questionnaire. The questionnaire is in fact similar to the New South Wales No Limits document (Government of New South Wales, 2004).
Essentially, the questionnaire presents 21 questions with yes/no options and grouped into the following five categories:

- Your Activities
- People
- Management
- Promoting your club
- Volunteering.

After completing the online questionnaire, the respondent almost immediately receives an automated reply.

The facility gives a non-judgemental response to the answers, as well as some general advice about what might clubs might do next. As such, it includes a ‘next steps’ and a ‘useful contacts’ section. A key strength of this document is that it includes links to external exemplars and guidance material and these are embedded so that the highlighted text can be clicked on for access to additional resources.

In effect the Inclusion Club Hub is an automated library and distribution point for information and guidance. This information includes case studies from a number of sporting organisations of varying size and location. Such an approach has a sound, real-world impact. If clubs answer positively to questions, they are asked if they would like to submit their stories or documents to the site to build the resource bank. In this way, the site is both inclusive and self-regenerating.

Beyond the online tool discussed above, the English Federation of Disability Sport also has other resources, including a paper based assessment checklist for organisations (English Federation of Disability Sports, u.d. (c)). The Inclusive Club Hub and IFI also fit within a broader recreational club accreditation scheme. Called ClubMark (English Federation of Disability Sport, u.d. (a)), it is an accreditation scheme that helps interested people to easily identify sporting clubs and gyms that have reached a certain set of standards. Its website states that more than 14,000 community clubs have so far been accredited and 4,000 are in the process. Its accreditation process covers the following main areas:

- Activity/playing programmes - this includes, for example, coaching qualifications required, insurance and coach to participant ratios
- Duty of care and welfare - appropriate risk assessments, health and safety policies, training, compliance and child protection policies
- Knowing your club and its community - this ensures that your club is committed to fairness and equity in respect of the way in seeks to attract and retain members from your local community
- Club management.

International Examples of Resourcing and Communications Strategies – Canada

The Canadian Government established its Policy on Sport for Persons With a Disability (Government of Canada, 2006) with a view to communicating its objectives with regard to
increasing the participation of PwD in sport. This policy is considerably aged now. However, there are a number of strengths that we consider it useful to point out. Specifically, the policy provides for increased awareness by:

- Increasing stakeholders’ awareness and understanding of sport for people with disability;
- Early childhood sport and physical “literacy” is a major focus; and
- The provision of resources.

Additionally, the Canadian Government has developed its various sporting policies – regardless of the foci of each element – under the singular banner of Sport for Life (Canadian Sport Institute, 2014). This document brings together the key policy descriptions for all aspects of Sport and Recreation as developed by the Canadian Government affording a singular point of reference, uniform livery and styling and language so that users are able to make connections across the objectives and to develop more specific policies and resources connected to this central policy (see for instance Higgs, 2011).

By and large, further countries reviewed including New Zealand and the Australian jurisdictions presented similar resources and strategies for engagement and these are summarised in Table Three below. However, a number of other attributes were identified with respect to how engagement might be maximised and made more effective in relation to sport and active recreation for PwD. Specifically these included:

- That PwD need to be engaged with in order to ensure the policy objectives developed and the engagement processes contemplated meet with their needs and preferences;
- That sporting and recreation clubs need to be consulted in order for Government agencies to appreciate the capacity for the clubs to meet policy directions established by Government and to ensure the resources developed are of the appropriate type and pitched at the correct level;
- That the Government’s policy objectives should be realistic in order that the expectations of PwD and clubs are not let down by an expectation gap created out of communications of Government intentions;
- That the appointment of personnel with specific responsibility for the development and implementation of initiatives focused on increasing inclusion of PwD;
- That the provision of non-financial resources can be important in ensuring people who access web sites remain and review content. Simple statements of intent are less likely to gain engagement than the provision of tools and other resources; and
- That some Governments placed responsibility for increasing inclusion with the clubs as well as the Government. In other words, the clubs were admonished to ensure they pursued policies and practices that enhanced their involvement with PwD and take responsibility for their own inclusivity record.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Title / Name</th>
<th>Website &amp; Resources Vision - Impaired Accessibility</th>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement</th>
<th>Disability Service Provider Engagement</th>
<th>Integrated Singular Holistic Sport Policy Framework</th>
<th>Provision of Non-Financial Resources – Enhancing Engagement</th>
<th>Outcomes Reporting Required</th>
<th>Responsibility Mutual¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Sport for Life</td>
<td>Text Size</td>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes: Checklists</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Case Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Web Based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: Recognised Training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Case Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Checklists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Incorporate Accessibility into Organisation Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Build Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Personnel with PwD Inclusive Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Web Based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>No exceptions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes: Checklists</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Case Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Web Based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This element relates to whether or not the jurisdiction has incorporated mutual responsibility into its policies with regard to the role of clubs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Title / Name</th>
<th>Website &amp; Resources Vision - Impaired Accessibility</th>
<th>Stakeholder Engagement</th>
<th>Disability Service Provider Engagement</th>
<th>Integrated Singular Holistic Sport Policy Framework</th>
<th>Provision of Non-Financial Resources – Enhancing Engagement</th>
<th>Outcomes Reporting Required</th>
<th>Responsibility Mutual¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>English Federation of Disability Sport</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Yes: - Disability Awareness training - Guides and “Kitbags” - Examples of Engagement Strategies that Work</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Fair Play Framework</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes: - Checklists - Case Studies - Framework - Web Based</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Australia</td>
<td>Sports Ability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes: - Videos - Publications (at cost) - Webinars - Reports &amp; Research - Factsheets</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Participation and Facility Program</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes: Web Based Education Assist PwD to undertake off-field roles Develop material for promotion of active recreation and sport Build Networks and Partnerships</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Tasmanian Sport and Active Recreation Framework for People With Disability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes: Education Information Web Based Monitoring and Six Monthly Reporting Required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendations provided for the approach of Phase 2**

**Output**
An audit detailing – effective strategies used to ***engage PwD to participate in sport and active recreation, conclusions to be drawn based on findings as to the most effective strategies.

From the review and discussion of the previous section, the following attributes emerge to be evaluated as part of Phase 2 of this project and, if found of value, pursued by the Department, viz:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible Information</th>
<th>Websites and other information should be accessible to those the Department is seeking to engage. Types of accessibility to consider include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Location of documents and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Processes required to be entered into to access resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Web accessibility including sound conversion and re-sizing fonts etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Readable / accessible resources such as guides, case studies and other PDF format documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Stakeholder Engagement | The policy framework, the objectives and the initiatives developed should be based on input from those who the Department is seeking to engage with. Such input might be gained from regular surveys, focus groups and a feedback mechanism via clubs. |

| Club Engagement | The policy framework, the objectives and other initiatives should also be developed after consulting the clubs and associations that are critical to the successful achievement of the objectives sought. Surveys, questionnaires, and reporting requirements included in any funding arrangements might be incorporated here. |

<p>| Integrated Policy | Building a unitary, integrated policy appears to provide increased recognition and is more likely to enhance mainstream connection to the aspirations of the Department and the use of a single, standard livery and wording can enhance the connections. A single unitary policy takes the engagement of PwD out of a “side line” activity and makes it part of the mainstream. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Provision of Resources</strong></th>
<th>The provision of resources is critical to ensuring those that are engaged and enter the Website are able to see value and access information in a quick and easy way. The continued development of cases, examples and check lists that can be accessed and utilised by clubs is critical. Additionally, as the Department’s information database grows, it would be useful to provide direct access via the Department’s website to clubs that are inclusive-ready.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Whole-of-Government Website</strong></td>
<td>The Department should investigate the development of a website that provides PwD access to information relating to all services provided by the State and including sport and active recreation opportunities, resources and inclusive-ready clubs. This will assist PwD to gain access to support and resources without having to have knowledge of the structure of the Machinery of Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realistic Representations</strong></td>
<td>The Department should evaluate its Framework and other statements to ensure the communications made present a realistic and achievable set of objectives. This is especially important in the case of the development of policy in the context of resourcing capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion-Specific Staff</strong></td>
<td>The Department should consider the option of appointing personnel with a specific and singular role aimed at implementing the Department’s initiatives with respect to inclusivity and PwD. This will help to ensure that the objectives are pursued and give the Department the greatest opportunity for success. For instance, current thinking is that the Department’s agents might also spearhead this strategy in the field. It might be of value to consider the appointment of specific personnel for this aspect of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting of Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>The Department should report outcomes associated with increased participation as a result of its initiatives and actions. Such reporting is crucial in ensuring the initiatives are appropriate and that resources are allocated effectively. Such reporting would include quantitative movements in numbers of the target population involved and qualitative representations relating to the quality of that engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Four – Collaboration, Cooperation & Support

Enquiry
Identify funding models that utilise ‘purchasing services’ to increase the participation of PwD in sport and active recreation.

Output
Draft Framework – Draft funding models specific to funding sport and active recreation (and based on service deliverers ‘purchasing services’ from service providers)

Desk top review
Summary of Literature
The survey of extant materials was unable to locate exemplar funding models. General information and a number of key attributes associated with likely successful funding models were identified as a result of the desktop review and these are reported upon below.

The funding models reported upon are framed in the context of the two major disability funding reforms that have been undertaken in Western Australia and at a national level and which may colour the Department’s thinking regarding the appropriate form of funding model to put in place. Specifically, the State Government’s Delivering Community Services in Partnership Policy (Government of Western Australia, 2011) and the National Disability Insurance Scheme (National Disability Insurance Agency, 2013) (NDIS) are both likely to have a significant impact on Departmental considerations regarding funding models. The former provides a sound framework which establishes a number of key policies associated with procurement from Community Organisations. We understand that the Department currently applies the Grants Section of this policy. While there are a significant number of elements associated with this document, for the purposes of this discussion, we highlight that it sets out three principals which the Department may care to consider in making a determination regarding the attributes they seek to put in place in relation to any funding arrangements they may develop outside of Grants they might make, viz:

(1) Any agreement must be focused on outcomes rather than outputs;
(2) The price paid for services delivered must be a sustainable price; and
(3) Acquittal arrangements must adhere to State Government policy.

(Government of Western Australia 2011)

The latter, the NDIS, has been established by the Commonwealth Government on two fundamental bases being that individuals are to become the centre of care and support decision making, and funding will be provided by a Commonwealth agency after being collected via a levy incorporated into the Income Tax system.

The Western Australian government has agreed to participate in this scheme and a test site has been established in the state. In terms of this program and any prospective objectives to be developed at a state level, it is currently unknown what capacity for policy development and
implementation will be retained by the State much less what financial resources will be allocated by the State toward disability services generally or programs like an inclusion program particularly. A key issue to consider from the Department’s perspective is the degree to which government and NFPs will have the capacity to be funded to provide services under this model given a major element of the policy is aimed at giving individuals increased capacity to make choices. While this may still mean that individuals may choose to spend their funding in mainstream sporting organisations, the sustainability of programs that might have otherwise operated under block funding arrangements may be threatened.

Additionally, the State has developed a similar scheme which it is also testing called My Way and which is planned to be similarly recipient centric in terms of funding and care planning (Disability Services Commission, 2014). The same issues arise here but with the added complexity of the fact that we do not yet understand how My Way and the NDIS will operate especially in the area of funding for services delivery outside of the mainstream disability services offerings.

Crucially, this paradigm shift in the provision of disability services and support to a national funding base and to a person-centred care and individualised funding regime may well see the decision making centre relative to this policy area shift away from the State. This does not mean that this project and others relative to the disability sector cannot be pursued but it may have implications for funding arrangements and the extent to which other agencies, especially the key agency being the Disability Services Commission, will continue with the capacity to participate.

The funding models reviewed have been summarised in Table Four. While it is not necessary to recap here the fundamental elements, we make some comments regarding the important aspects of the funding models examined. Additionally, we identify key attributes of the funding models in Table Five below and we base our recommendation with respect to phase two and funding on this table.

Importantly, in the Western Australian context, the Department of Sport and Recreation established a program of funding for sport and recreation organisations called the Inclusive Sports Funding Program 2009. This program seeks to provide funding in support of inclusion in sporting activities those people with disability and with CALD backgrounds. The Program was evaluated in 2012 (Department of Sport and Recreation 2012) and data has been collected with a view to evaluating the projects outcomes.

Overall, notwithstanding the difficulty in analysis, there are not great differences between funding models, especially in relation to the general requirements, objectives and eligibility elements. With respect to eligibility, by-and-large, the types of organisations included as eligible for sport inclusion incentives and funding were National Sporting Organisations (NSOs), State Sporting Organisations (SSOs) and Not-for-profits. Broader funds aimed at increasing inclusion of people from CALD communities or Indigenous people in sport and active recreation also included Local Authorities in the list of eligible organisations.

General requirements regarding project types, organisational capacity requirements and measurement requirements included, by and large, an understandable requirement for the funded organisation to operate within the jurisdiction providing the funding, for the organisation.
to be able to deliver inclusivity and other access services as discrete programs and for the programs to be developed and / or delivered within a specific timeframe. Additionally, more mature program requirements included measurement and reporting of outcomes, financial acquittals and progress reporting. From the point of view of requiring acquittals, the ongoing policy setting at State and Commonwealth level is that acquittals are likely to be focused on quality and quantity of services together with outcomes measurement rather than the traditional financial acquittal models. Therefore, the Department may wish to consider the nature of acquittal processes to be adopted if funding is provided for an inclusivity program of some sort.

Requirements that stood out as of value but which were not well represented across the models considered included a requirement for a pre-funding assessment for suitability2, a requirement to demonstrate a capacity to successfully partner with other organisations, a timing deadline for project completion, and, interestingly, only two models were overt in describing their application process as one of competitive tendering. Additionally, two models required a contribution of at least 50% from the funded organisation – one either in cash or in kind and the other in cash. While this might be a useful cost mitigation strategy for the Government, it is likely that such measures will reduce participation of organisations in any incentive building arrangements due to costs. Perhaps such a measure is logical in future iterations of the funding arrangements and as the program gains momentum, with moral expectations building on sporting organisations.

Funds were made available for capital projects and ongoing operational funding. In the case of the former, funds were offered for the development of infrastructure, the purchase of equipment and the provision of one-off capacity building projects such as governance building and financial management. In the case of the latter, funds were offered for the payment of coaching and other staff wages, to cover costs of participation that were in excess of the cost to an able-bodied participant and for inclusivity programs themselves.

Beyond government funding arrangements, we have included for completeness’ sake, two examples of co-funding arrangements. The first is an example of a Trust Fund administered via a government agency in New Zealand. There is relatively little of value here in exploring this example in terms of new funding models. However, the second relates to Social Investment Bonds and the prospects for government / philanthropic investment in this area.

Social Investment Bonds (SIBs) are a form of financial instrument that seeks to push risk from government back to an investor by leveraging the increasing desire for socially aware investment, the measurability of outcomes in relation to certain service delivery types and the willingness of investors and NFPs to work together to maximise the opportunity for achieving outcomes from funded programs (Liebman and Sellima 2013; Callanan and Law 2012; Butler et al. u.d.). In essence, the investor places capital with the NFP to be used in achieving service delivery outcomes. The NFP works toward achieving the outcomes and the government agrees to value and pay a premium in the case that the outcomes sought are achieved. The premium is paid together with the return of funds to the investor. Ostensibly, the premium is calculated using the value to the community and savings resultant from the effective services delivery as a

2 This may be of interest with respect to the current funding regime in disability services wherein providers are pre-approved via a due diligence process before funds are allocated for a specific service or program.
basis. The successful implementation of a SIB will require the Department to work with a broker to establish the arrangement, establish a value for funding required to be provided by the investor – typically the amount of funding that would otherwise be provided by the government – and to assess and ultimately pay the value of the premium. This is an area of funding that the State Government is exploring and the Department may seek to pursue it further but may need to adopt the policy settings outlined in the Delivering Community Services in Partnership Policy in order to access SIBs as a funding solution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Program Name / Description / Funds Source</th>
<th>Funding Targets and Project or Continuing</th>
<th>Mainstream Participation / Para-Sports</th>
<th>Alt. Uses Allowed</th>
<th>Areas of Operational Funding Allowed</th>
<th>Outcomes / Outputs &amp; Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Name: National Disability Insurance Scheme Description: National comprehensive disability funding scheme. Funds Source: Australian Government</td>
<td>• Target: Individuals with disability • Continuing</td>
<td>Not specific to sporting access but may be available for such access</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>• Yet to be determined</td>
<td>• Demonstrate outcomes for individual people living with disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Name: Multicultural Youth Sports Partnership Program Description: Supporting partnerships to develop opportunities for youth from CALD backgrounds Funding Source: National Government</td>
<td>• Target: Organisations that can partner to provide sport and recreation participation opportunities for CALD youth including Local Governments • Once off projects</td>
<td>Mainstream participation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>• Programs for sport and recreation that assist in integrating CALD youth into sporting and recreation activities</td>
<td>• Demonstrate capacity to successfully partner with other organisations to integrate CALD youth into sport and recreation activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Name: Indigenous Sport and Active Recreation Program Description: Supporting partnerships to develop opportunities for Indigenous people Funding Source: National Government</td>
<td>• Target: Any NFP or Local Authority • Applications must be undertaken after a community consultation process</td>
<td>Mainstream participation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>• Any programs that focus on increasing the participation of Indigenous people</td>
<td>• Not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Name: Unnamed Description: Focused on National Sporting Organisations (NSOs) with programs for training PwD or for projects aimed at developing such programs. Funds Source: National Government</td>
<td>• Target: National Sporting Organisations • Continuing where a program in place. • Project where a NSO seeks to establish a program</td>
<td>Para-Sports Programs</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>• Operations / Programs • National Teams • Coaches &amp; Other Staff • Participation Development</td>
<td>• Demonstrate ongoing provision of high performance services to PwD • Demonstrate ongoing provision of high quality participation projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Name: Sport England Small Grants Description: Small grants (up to GBP10,000) to assist NFPs to help more people to play sport Funding Source: Lottery Funding</td>
<td>• Target: NFPs</td>
<td>Mainstream participation</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>• Programs and initiatives which will increase participation in sport • Must be new projects or activities</td>
<td>• Must finalise program within 12 months of acceptance letter • Complete a form reporting the end of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Program Name / Description / Funds Source</td>
<td>Funding Targets and Project or Continuing</td>
<td>Mainstream Participation / Para-Sports</td>
<td>Alt. Uses Allowed</td>
<td>Areas of Operational Funding Allowed</td>
<td>Outcomes / Outputs &amp; Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Name: Community Sport Activation Fund Description: Intended to provide funding for “grassroots” sport participation by commencing new projects or activities. Grants range from GBP50,000 to GBP250,000. Funding Source: Lottery Funds</td>
<td>• Target: NFPs</td>
<td>Mainstream participation</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>• Programs and initiatives which will increase participation in sport • Must be new projects or activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Name: Participation and Facility Program Description: Funding is made available to NSW associations with a view to increasing participation in sport. Funding Source: State Government</td>
<td>• Target: Any NSW Association with an object of increasing participation in sport</td>
<td>Mainstream participation – not aimed at any one group in the community</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>• Participation Projects: Deliver sport or recreation participation outcomes to an identified group or people • Facility Development Projects: Building new or upgrading facilities • Costs including the removal of barriers to access • Costs associated with building new systems or capacity for organisations to deliver programs that increase participation</td>
<td>• Funding should be expended within 18 months • Anywhere in NSW • Partner organisation must contribute at least 50% of the cost of the project in dollars or in-kind or a mix • A pre-funding assessment is required to be undertaken • A post-program acquittal is required • A post-program report is required including reporting on outcomes and outputs achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Name: Allsports Activity Fund Description: Provides funding to individuals or groups of people with disability under 21 years of age or their carers and guardians to assist in accessing sport. Funding Source: Halberg Trust – Halberg Disability Sport Foundation (Private)</td>
<td>• Target: Individuals or Groups of people under 21 or their carers / guardians • Project / Once-off</td>
<td>Any sport access</td>
<td>Must be sport</td>
<td>• Coaching costs • Additional costs incurred as a result of having a disability • Organisational support • Equipment</td>
<td>• Minimal reporting requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Program Name / Description / Funds Source</td>
<td>Funding Targets and Project or Continuing</td>
<td>Mainstream Participation / Para-Sports</td>
<td>Alt. Uses Allowed</td>
<td>Areas of Operational Funding Allowed</td>
<td>Outcomes / Outputs &amp; Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Zealand    | Name: No Exceptions Investment Framework  
Description: Intended to provide funding to increase the participation of PwD in recreation and sport.  
Funding Source: National Government | • Target: Generally NSOs and National Recreation Organisations  
• Avoid replication and Value for Money | Any access project | N/a | • Any funding one to three year project that meets the priorities of Sport New Zealand. | • Demonstrate measurable impact |
| Tasmania       | Name: State Grants Program; Minor Grants Program and Major Grants Program  
Description: Provision of grants to SSOs, Community Organisations and State Recognised Recreation Providers  
Funding Source: State Government | • Wide ranging but including Inclusivity | Mainstream participation | No | • Coach training  
• Participation  
• Governance development  
• Inclusive programs | • Interim progress reports required  
• Final acquittal reports including financial reporting and demonstration that money was spent on the program as expected  
• Outcomes must be measurable and reported upon |
| Victoria       | Name: Access for All Abilities  
Description: Funding available for SSOs and organisations working with SSAs toward increasing the participation of PwD in sports  
Funding Source: State Government | • SSAs – to assist in building the capacity of clubs to increase inclusivity  
• Clubs and Community Organisations that can assist SSAs in the development of inclusivity via the delivery of targeted programs | Mainstream participation | Unknown | • Club capacity building  
• Program delivery  
• Service delivery | • Competitive tendering |
| Western Australia | Name: Delivering Community Services in Partnership Policy  
Description: State Government holistic community services procurement policy framework.  
Funds Source: State Government | • Target: All Providers of Community Services  
• Continuing Service Delivery Procurement | Not Specific to Sport | N/a | • Variable in context of the services being procured by the government agency | • Demonstrate outcomes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Program Name / Description / Funds Source</th>
<th>Funding Targets and Project or Continuing</th>
<th>Mainstream Participation / Para-Sports</th>
<th>Alt. Uses Allowed</th>
<th>Areas of Operational Funding Allowed</th>
<th>Outcomes / Outputs &amp; Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Western Australia   | Name: Inclusive Sports Funding Program  
Description: Program provides funding for State Sporting Associations to enhance their capacity to deliver inclusive sport programs for PwD and people with CALD backgrounds. Funds Source: State Government | - Target: SSAs  
- Continuing                               | Any access project                        | N/a                                   | - Any operational funding that increases the opportunity for PwD and CALD to participate in SSA activities. | - Demonstrated Outcomes                         |
Recommendations provided for the approach of Phase 2

Output
Draft Framework – Draft funding models specific to funding sport and active recreation (and based on service deliverers ‘purchasing services’ from service providers).

As cited at the outset of this section, we were unable to locate comprehensive funding models pertinent to the delivery of inclusivity programs for PwD in sport and active recreation. However, the following table identifies key elements of prospective funding arrangements based on two levels of funding – small and large. Each level of funding would attract a different level of governance and reporting requirements from the Department. This differentiation would help ensure red tape is kept to a minimum; that the governance arrangements are proportionate to the risk being taken by the Department; and applicants are able to respond to the requirements in accordance with their capacity.

Small projects would include the provision of small amounts of funding for operating and capital items such as equipment. Large would be similarly available for operating expenses and capital items but would relate to funding over a certain limit. Again, these are only examples and it would be up to the Department to decide the points of delineation between one type of grant / funding arrangement and the next.

It must also be noted that, as these are exemplar funding models, they should be considered in the context of the program ultimately to be put in place by the Department and in the context of procurement and other government policy as it may apply from time to time.

The following table (Table Five) summarises recommended characteristics for core content for a funding model to be explored in Phase 2. Readers should note that the column headed “Governance Element’ relates to the restrictions, requirements and reporting arrangements to be put in place while “S” and “L” relates to the type of grant that the Governance Element is applicable to – that is a “Small” or “Large” funding arrangement. The “Purpose” column is intended to provide a rationale for the restriction or inclusion.
### Table Five - Core Content Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Element</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Type – SSO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Organisation must be an SSO</td>
<td>Restrict the types of organisations that can access this type of funding to organisations that have a close and historic working relationship with the Department. Also, restricts the funding of large amounts to organisations that have other strategic and reporting commitments to the Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Type – NFP and Local Government Authorities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Organisation must be a NFP, Local Government or an SSO</td>
<td>Typically, partnering NFPs and Community Organisations can have an interest in the delivery of sport and recreation services as well as in increasing inclusivity options for PwD. However, it would not be typical of such organisations to seek to access large infrastructure funding for sports and recreation related infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery Geographically Restricted to State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>All funding must be used to deliver services or provide infrastructure in Western Australia</td>
<td>Restrict State Government funding to Western Australian benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded via a Competitive Tender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That the allocation of significant funding be undertaken as a result of a competitive tender process and provided all other elements are met as required.</td>
<td>To help ensure the best projects are delivered with minimal risk to the Department by SSOs that have the capacity to develop and manage a comprehensive tender process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a track record of successful service delivery and grant fulfilment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricts the provision of sizable grants to organisations with a proven track record of service delivery to the State Government</td>
<td>To help to ensure the funded organisation is likely to deliver on its responsibilities related to the funded activity or project and to ensure non-performance-risk is minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 These columns represent S = Small, L = Large, I = Infrastructure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Element</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Agreement Due Diligence Assessment Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricts the provision of substantial grants to organisations that have the capacity to carry out the project to its successful conclusion and which have adequately planned in relation to the implantation, management and ultimate operation of the project.</td>
<td>To help ensure the funded organisation has adequate capacity to plan for and implement the project as well as to meet contingencies and report on the project progress, over runs in time and cost and to complete the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing for Calls of Expressions of Interest:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>In the case of Small grants, applications can be received at anytime throughout the year. In the case of Large grants and Infrastructure grants, the Department will hold funding rounds that would be advertised at least twelve months in advance and include application decision time frames and process to be undertaken for successful applicants.</td>
<td>This will assist applications to plan their capital and project requirements as well as assist the Department in planning its assessment processes and timelines, its cash flow requirements and to help in setting its priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquittal Requirements – Measurable and Reportable Outcomes Assessment at Project end</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Simple acquittal requirements to incorporate the reporting of measurable, demonstrable outcomes achieved as a result of the funding provided.</td>
<td>The acquittal processes might focus on outcomes rather than traditional acquittal foci which include outputs and financial acquittals. This will assist the Department in acquiring assurance that the funds were allocated such that they achieved outcomes while also reducing red tape to the funded entity to the highest degree possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquittal Requirements – Measurable Outcomes, Project Report and Audit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>The funder acquittal must incorporate assurance with respect to the financial and qualitative aspects of the project to ensure that all of the specifications of the project have been met to the satisfaction of the Department</td>
<td>This will assist the Department to ensure it is spending public money appropriately and in accordance with the State’s financial management legislation. Assurance would consider each of the elements of quantity, quality and price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Element</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-contributions in-kind and in cash</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>That funds are provided subject to the funded entity shouldering a proportion of the project risk by contributing a proportion of the resource requirements either in kind or in cash at the Department's discretion.</td>
<td>This could be a discretionary requirement which would allow the Department to shed risk and stretch its resources via co-contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Costs Covered</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>This element would delineate specific costs that the Department believe ought to be incorporated into the categories of funding.</td>
<td>This element would provide the Department with a basis for decision making and also prospective applicants with a pre-application hurdle that would ensure they and the Department do not waste time in the evaluation of applications that are not aimed at the Department's priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of participation targeted</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>This element seeks to specify the type of participation that the grant funding is available for.</td>
<td>The Department might use this element to determine that the funds made available are only available for programs and projects that increase the participation of PwD in mainstream sports and active recreation for instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise Requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>This element would see the Department advertise all of its funding requirements comprehensively.</td>
<td>The advertising of all of the definitions, requirements and acquittal procedures would assist prospective applicants in assessing whether they wish to apply and to ensure the Department is not fielding questions and reviewing applications that do not conform to the requirements as they might be from time to time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Five - Benchmarking Tool

Enquiry
Identify benchmarking tools that will assist stakeholders self-assess their readiness to engage PwD into sport and active recreation.

Output
An audit of similar benchmarking tools from within WA, interstate and internationally and provide options for consideration for core content.

Desk top review
Summary of Literature

In order to benchmark the effectiveness of an inclusion model it is necessary that measurable outcomes and outputs are identified and information gathered and reported upon regularly. As such, the key elements of any benchmarking system include the definition of benchmarked elements, the measurement of those elements and the reporting of the measurements. In many respects, the benchmarking discussion in this section brings together components of other sections of this report and should be read concomitantly. These sections are:

- Section 3 – Engagement and Communications Strategies
- Section 4 – Funding Models
- Section 6 – Data Collection Frameworks

As stated previously, we must also highlight that, given the technical meaning of audit and the processes required to report upon an audit, we confirm that this section has been developed out of a desktop review and constitutes a summary of our findings and a set of components / attributes of an effective benchmarking tool.

Several of the previously cited policies and frameworks from other jurisdictions are relied upon in this section in order to identify the attributes of workable and effective benchmarking arrangements. Frameworks for benchmarking can be passive or active. Additionally, a benchmarking tool or framework can have a number of objectives which are neither mutually exclusive nor mandatory. Generally, we consider that benchmarking tools and frameworks are developed and disseminated with a view to (Gilchrist, 2012):

- Demonstrating better practice;
- Demonstrating and disseminating required practice or minimum standards;
- Disseminating models and tools;
- Encouraging self-assessment within organisations; and
- Providing a framework against which an individual organisation’s practice can be assessed and evaluated.

Gilchrist (2012)

In the case of passive benchmark frameworks, these are usually focused on demonstrating and communicating tools and ideas while active benchmarking processes usually
incorporate a specific measurement regime and a reporting process at an industry or sector level. Passive benchmarking can include the development and dissemination tools against which organisations can assess their maturity and with which they can improve their standing. It is passive because it is neither mandatory nor, necessarily, overt benchmarking. However, the provision of tools and templates will naturally lead organisations to adopt certain practices and models. Typically, passive benchmarking arrangements do not incorporate a reporting and assurance element.

Active benchmarking, on the other hand, often incorporates an element of mandatory activity, reporting arrangements and independent assurance or assessment arrangements. It is important to remember that this dichotomy between active and passive benchmarking is not a hard delineation and that attributes might be incorporated into any benchmarking framework depending on the Department’s intentions. For instance, the Department might insist on a particular assurance framework being followed but leave the compliance models to be developed by the funded organisation.

Additionally, the Department can also create a multi-period benchmarking arrangement where non-mandatory and passive tools and frameworks are adopted in the short and medium term and then a more active benchmarking arrangement adopted over the medium to longer term. Key elements which will drive the Department’s thinking in this regard include:

- Whether it is appropriate to make it mandatory for funded organisations to respond to the benchmarking framework;
- Whether it is appropriate to incorporate assurance arrangements;
- Whether it is appropriate for the benchmarking framework to be included in funding arrangements; and
- Whether the contents of the benchmarking framework are able to be maintained and enhanced over time given the resourcing requirements of such an undertaking.

In terms of the literature review, passive and active benchmarking tools identified and already discussed in this report are itemised in Table Six below.

Table Six - Examples of Passive and Active Benchmarking Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Active / Passive</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Federation of Disability Sport</td>
<td>Inclusive Fitness Initiative</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>(u.d.(a))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Federation of Disability Sport</td>
<td>Inclusion Club Hub</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>(u.d.(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Federation of Disability Sport</td>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>(u.d.(c))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Federation of Disability Sport</td>
<td>Club Mark</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>(u.d. (d))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Western Australia</td>
<td>Inclusion Checklist</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>(u.d.(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Western Australia</td>
<td>How to Make Your Club More Inclusive</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>(u.d.(c))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Western Australia</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>(u.d.(d) (e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearly, those benchmarking frameworks and systems that incorporate measurable outcomes, reporting and assurance arrangements are more likely to result in higher impacts than those that are more passive in nature and rely on engagement and other frameworks to make headway.

An example of a measurable outcome is provided by the Inclusivity Framework of the Greater London Authority discussed in Section Two (Barker and Watson, 2007). This model incorporates targets and timeframes. Without such targets and timeframes, active benchmarking cannot be as effective as it might otherwise be. Therefore, a mature and comprehensive benchmarking tool will include measurable actions which could increase the opportunities for benchmarking. While the Department might consider it unwarranted to develop a highly active benchmarking strategy in the first instance, it could consider the longer term strategy value in setting measurable targets. The Greater London example of a hard target is:

*Our aim is a one per cent increase in regular participation by disabled people in sport and physical activity each year for the next five years. This is a demanding target, equivalent to an additional 8,000-9,000 disabled people participating each year or 40,000-45,000 between now and 2012.*

Barker and Watson (2007).

The plan has a built-in timetable for achieving success – the five years leading up to the Paralympics.

Arguably, the most active form of benchmarking incorporates measurable outcomes, time frames, targets and assurance all leading to an accreditation process - accredited organisations can advertise a mark or banner indicating that they are of a particular class accepted as highly inclusive. The Clubmark, IFI and Inclusion Club Hub (English Federation of Disability Sports (u.d. (a); u.d. (b); u.d. (c)) all have benchmarking capabilities based on participation levels and accreditation. For instance, as noted above, 14,000 clubs have been accredited by Clubmark.

Further, examples of measurable and effective targets are included in the Canadian policy introduced in Section Two, isuch as:

*The achievement of the Policy’s objectives can be characterized by the following desired outcomes:*

- An increase in the number of persons with a disability participating in competitive and recreational sport;
- An increase in the number of coaches and volunteers supporting sport for persons with a disability;
- An increase in the number of appropriate domestic competitive structures and opportunities for athletes with a disability;
- An increase in the number of sport participation development projects and bilateral agreements with provincial/territorial governments concerning persons with a disability.

Finally, the Department also needs to consider the extent to which any benchmarking arrangement established will inadvertently deliver unintended consequences – both good and bad. It is axiomatic that what is measured is focused upon and, so, the Department has a duty of care to ensure that the behaviour encouraged as a result of the measurement and assessment process will not invoke behaviour that could be classed as game-playing. Elements of benchmarking frameworks – particularly active and mandatory benchmarking arrangements – that can increase the risk of game-playing and unintended consequences can include the establishment of punitive actions if the requirements are not met by a funded organisation; either the benchmarked requirements are not met or the targeted outcomes are not met within the timeframe and at the quality and quantity as required. Game playing can also increase where the definitions and requirements are not specified adequately and precisely enough. Additionally, the development of a well communicated benchmarking regime combined with a capacity to identify cases and exemplar better practices and training opportunities might also reduce the level of game-playing if the Department focuses on learning and development.

Recommendations provided for the approach of Phase 2

Output
Table Seven itemises the key elements of a benchmarking tool and provides points for discussion when entering Phase 2.

Table Seven – Core Content of Benchmarking Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>A&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objectives Set</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The Department to (re)confirm its objectives in order to determine what attributes are relevant in the case that they decided to establish a benchmarking system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identified Base Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>To measure outcomes achieved as an advancement on the situation at the commencement of the benchmarking regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Knowing the Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ensure that the outcomes targeted meet the expectations and requirements of those PwD and the clubs targeted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>4</sup> Generally, game-playing is a term used in economics to denote instances where actors pursue a particular action or method of operation with a primary objective of being seen to achieve the objective set rather than pursuing that objective in good faith and in the best interests of the stakeholders affected.

<sup>5</sup> Active Benchmarking

<sup>6</sup> Passive Benchmarking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>A*</th>
<th>P*</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Establish Objectives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Regardless of the extent to which the Department intends to establish a passive or active benchmarking regime, the Department needs to identify what it hopes to achieve out of the regime. It should do this in conjunction with element 3 above because, if the Department knows the requirements of PwD, it will have the capacity for identifying what its objectives are and the outcomes it is seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Measurable Outcomes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>The identification of outcomes targets that are assessable, communicable and measurable. This will assist the Department in reporting its achievements with respect to its policy objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Measurable Outputs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>While typically measurable outcomes would not be used as a method of assessing the effectiveness of a benchmarking system due to the reduced resourcing usually allocated to such systems, it is desirable to assess outputs. Reporting such outputs would provide some sense of the net improvement. So, for instance, increases in numbers of PwD as members of mainstream sporting clubs might be an outcome measurement while the quality of that membership and the degree to which it represents a successful outcome for PwD is an outcome measurement and, typically, is more expensive and more difficult to measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mandatory Participation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Usually the establishment of a benchmarking system under a mandatory regime requires considerable resources on the part of the Department administering it and on the part of the funded organisation. Tying the benchmarking regime to the funding arrangement is generally required when the framework is to be implemented by funded organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tied to Funding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Where the benchmarking regime is to be mandatory, the identification and timing of outcomes and the reporting of same needs to be identified in the funding arrangements to be put in place between the Department and the funded entity. This will allow the Department to assess future funding for each organisation and raise the relevance and importance of the benchmarking outcomes in the minds of those managing the funded organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Department will need to consider the extent to which it will require some form of independent assurance to be undertaken to ensure the outcomes reported are reflective of the real situation. Arguably, this is especially the case if the benchmarking arrangement is to be mandatory and framed around the funding contracts to be put in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Better Practice Focus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The development of a culture of better practice and limited oversight wherein the Department focuses on learnings dissemination and the sharing of knowledge through case studies and training, may well reduce the incidence of game-playing and increase the focus on funded organisations on implementing better practice processes and models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Broad Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The communication of its objectives and the benchmarking framework to be put in place in order to achieve those objectives ought to be communicated beyond those targeted audiences. Clearly the dissemination of the benchmarking arrangement and its purpose will assist all in understanding better what is being sought and how the benchmarking arrangements are to be arranged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The collection of data should be tied into the broader data collection process utilised by the Department when collecting data from its funded organisations. Whether participation in the framework is mandatory and whether the funded organisation receives resources specifically for participating is irrelevant, what is important is that the process of data collection is as efficient as possible, that data is only collected once and that definitions, elements of data and methods of collection are commonly understood. (See Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Sector (2014)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reporting Outcomes at Sector Level</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Once data has been collected and analysed and individual organisational performance assessed, it is usually of significant benefit to utilise the aggregate and anonymous data to report back to the sector the key attributes of successful organisations, what the average organisation is reporting and what kinds of things the organisation might focus on in order to increase its performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Element</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tools and Case Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Tools and case studies are germane to the transfer of knowledge and understanding and to provide entities with an appreciation of how they could do things that meet the outcomes sought by the framework. The reporting of outcomes discussed at item 13 above could include the use of the data gathered in such materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Six – Data Collection Frameworks

Enquiry
Comparison table of existing frameworks for data collection and key/common data collected. Conclusions to be drawn based on findings as to key/common data to be collected.

Output
Identify frameworks for data collection. Consideration should be given to relevant data collection points and methods.

Desk Top Review
Summary of Literature

This section is intended to provide a summary of literature and resources accessed in order to develop a set of data collection attributes that the Department might consider as a part of its assessment of the Framework in Phase Two of this body of work.

The identification, collection and reporting of data is an activity that is central to the planning, implementation and ongoing operation of an inclusivity framework as it is for any other corporate activity. Measuring outcomes as opposed to outputs is somewhat more difficult and the establishment of such a system requiring the identification of measureable outcomes can be more time consuming, labour intensive and challenging (Gilchrist, 2012). However, it is critical that such activities are undertaken by government funding agencies in order to ensure that their objectives are clearly defined, the outcomes are identified and measurable and the achievements related to a particular policy are reportable and transparent (Gilchrist, 2013).

Fundamentally, the purpose of information gathering as far as the Inclusivity Framework goes is to allow the Department to develop an understanding of the effectiveness of its policy objectives, to assess the extent to which funded organisations are meeting their obligations and to inform policy and practice in order to effect changes that may be warranted. This section of our report needs to be considered in the context of the following earlier sections as they are inherently conjoined in terms of the outcomes sought and the impact that each element has prospectively on the achievements driven by the other elements:

- Section 3 – Communications Models
- Section 4 – Funding Models
- Section 5 – Benchmarking Tools

Additionally, when considering each of these sections, the Department should also have cognisance with respect to the drive across the economy for red tape reduction and a working definition of this phenomenon is useful here. Specifically, Gilchrist (2013a) identifies that Red Tape is:

*that administrative practice that delivers greater cost to the organisation, government and/or the community than the benefits that the administrative practice returns in total.*
Therefore Red Tape is that administrative activity that delivers less overall return to the community than the cost associated with meeting its requirements (Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission, 2013). This is an important definition for the Department to consider as it relates specifically to the information to be collected and helps to ensure that the information to be collected does have value over and above the costs of its collection. Equally, it is an important definition because it takes into account the fact that sound administrative reporting practice must deliver benefits over and above the costs of meeting its requirements to the community – not necessarily to the funded organisation that is reporting. That is, the Department should be persuaded that the information to be collected under a benchmarking and reporting regime is necessary for the development and implementation of successful policy outcomes rather than the extent to which the data collection process is necessarily of value to the funded organisations. Of course, the best position to be in is one in which the collection of data rewards both the funder and the funded organisations. Additionally, the Department should always be sensitive as to the data it collects and the cost to the organisation providing the data.

Finally, the models already discussed in previous sections have also been a source for this section. Specifically, the following models have helped inform the contents:

- English Federation of Disability Sport: Inclusive Fitness Initiative
- English Federation of Disability Sport: Inclusion Club Hub
- English Federation of Disability Sport: Club Mark

Additionally, the reporting arrangements identified as part of the funding models discussed in Section Four are also used in arriving at the conclusions developed in this section.

Clearly then, the data to be collected should have a number of key attributes which are reported upon below. However, in terms of the literature and the examples identified, we are focusing on the following models:

- No benchmarking – Specific Quantitative Reporting of demographic and similar data
- Passive Benchmarking – Limited Quantitative Reporting: Demographic and Activity Data
- Active Benchmarking – Quantitative and Qualitative Reporting: Reporting of Data Against Agreed Criteria
- Exemplar Reporting – Qualitative and Quantitative Exemplar Reporting: Collection of examples practices, models and tools for dissemination throughout the population.

In terms of a case where there is to be no benchmarking or passive benchmarking, the development and implementation of a passive benchmarking system would necessitate the minimum of reporting requirements. Generally, as the idea is to persuade and encourage organisations to become more inclusive, data collected would typically be quantitative and generally demographic in nature. As such, data might include numbers of PwD as members of the club(s) and the types of activities they are involved in and reported in a “tick box” arrangement. Additionally, the reporting time frame would likely be co-dependent on the normal reporting cycle agreed between the Department and those funded bodies while the actual reporting of data would be undertaken via a modified version of the current reporting
arrangements. It might also be worthwhile considering the potential for implementing an Inclusion Club Hub style of web based questionnaire and response type mechanism. Such a model might be used to both disseminate ideas as well as gather exemplars for use more broadly (see section three above).

Where there is to be active benchmarking, it is likely that the information collected would be both qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative data might relate to outcomes achieved pertaining to concepts such as “satisfaction”, “enjoyment”, “inclusion” and “participation” – all elements that are germane to the Department’s policy objectives as we understand them but that are also difficult to define, measure and report on. Further, these types of indicators often only make themselves felt over the medium term due to the time taken to change cultures and to recruit prospective participants – both PwD and clubs. Finally, qualitative outcomes measurement is often a costly process as methods, such as surveying and interviewing, take time to develop, and evaluate and analyse. Therefore, should an active benchmarking regime be decided upon, there is likely to be a number of macro issues that the Department should consider. These include:

- What the funded organisation should report;
- What is the cost of that reporting process to the reporting organisation; and
- What is the time frame for reporting.

For instance, the Department might determine that it is most appropriate for reporting entities to report quantitative data on an annual basis while it might report qualitative data (say, resulting from undertaking a survey) on a biennial basis. Such a reporting regime would help to keep costs down to the reporting entity while also ensuring the data gathered tells a story.

The other element that is critical for the Department to consider relates to the storage of longitudinal data. The annual and biennial / other reporting will mean that considerable data is collected over the years and longitudinal reporting will add depth to the reports of the Department. However, an added challenge here will be need to maintain aging data in an accessible form and so storage systems and reporting processes should be considered in that light. The Department's IT strategic plan will inform this aspect of the Department's decision making.
Recommendations provided for the approach of Phase 2

Output
Identify frameworks for data collection. Consideration should be given to relevant data collection points and methods.

The following table provides the key attributes that a data collection framework might have and discussion points for consideration in Phase 2.

Table Eight – Attributes of a Data Collection Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clear Outcomes</td>
<td>Clear outcomes should be identified prior to a reporting framework being developed in order that the framework is fit for purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Built on Current Reporting Framework</td>
<td>As a preference and in order to reduce Red Tape to the sector as well as reporting costs, the framework should be developed as part of any existing framework to the extent that the current reporting framework can meet the reporting requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consideration Given to Cost of Reporting for Reporting Organisations</td>
<td>The Department needs to consider the cost of reporting to the organisations that are required to report. Generally, this is a difficult estimate to make but one that is essential to ensure the cost of the entire reporting system (including cost to government) is outweighed by the value inherent in the data gathered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frequency of Data Collection</td>
<td>The Department needs to consider how often it collects certain types of data. The collection of data that is immature and / or is collected too soon or too often will add cost to the reporting organisation (in terms of submission costs) and to the Department (in terms of analysis costs) but may not deliver value in terms of the data collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Especially in the case of establishing an active inclusion benchmarking arrangement or some other active regime, the Department must also consider the extent to which it ought to include a requirement for assurance to be gained over the data submitted. Such assurance could be provided on a semi-regular basis and might also be appended as a requirement to the broader acquittal requirements associated with the funding arrangements in place from time to time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Types of Information Sought</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative data serve useful but differing purposes. The Department would need to consider what type of data would provide the most useful, telling and efficient form of reporting for its purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Web Based Reporting</td>
<td>The reporting process is likely to be most convenient and efficient if it can be made via a web based reporting facility. This will allow reporting organisations to report via one portal and the Department to ensure the data is received in a useful format while also ensuring costs of data collection and reduced as far as possible leaving more resource for data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Timing of Reporting</td>
<td>Data can be collected on an annual basis, biennial or some other basis as well as on a continuous basis. The Department needs to consider the impact on reporting organisations a high-frequency reporting regime will have but, at the same time, balance the need for timely information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Free Text Commentary</td>
<td>The use of free text capacity within a reporting framework is useful as it allows additional information that is of some import to the reporting organisation to be collected and potentially gives the Department a sense of sentiment within the funded sector that it engages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Data Use and External Reporting</td>
<td>The Department should consider the use of the data it analyses from the collection process and ensure that they report back to the funded sector the findings of the report. This can be useful for a number of reasons not least of which it will ensure data reporters see data they provide is used, that the analysis gives them something to consider in relation to their operations and, longitudinally, the trajectory of the development of the funded sector is made clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>The Department should consider the extent to which it provides training in relation to the data to be collected and also the use of any reports that it develops for public consumption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Seven - Summary and Conclusion
Including Recommendations provided for the approach of Phase 2 across all areas of enquiry.

DSR has developed a Disability Sport and Active Recreation Implementation Plan, approved by the Minister for Sport and Recreation in August 2012. Since then, 13 strategy teams have been established and are progressing implementation of selected recommendations. DSR requested the Curtin Centre for Sport and Recreation Research facilitate enquiry to inform the implementation of the recommendations. Resulting from that enquiry overall, there are a number of useful examples of models and precedents in the Anglophone world that have been used to assist in developing a number of recommendations pertaining to each section of this report. The attributes developed are both based on the findings of the desktop research process and anecdotal descriptions of experiences of actors in this context. In terms of concluding remarks, a few points need to make.

Firstly, each of the preceding sections seeks to respond directly to the Department’s original brief and to provide a set of attributes / characteristics that will meet the needs of the Department, those organisations with which it works and the broader community. In short, each of these sections relates particular experience and deals with particular elements of an inclusivity plan (or indeed, any program) but, in order to achieve the best possible outcome, each section needs to be considered jointly with the others. The implementation plan needs to be considered as a whole in order to effectively deploy the elements discussed in each section herein to best effect.

Secondly, a number of key decisions need to be made prior to assessing the attributes. These include assessing the budget available, personnel available and roles and responsibilities of key departments and clubs. Additional thought needs to be given to the timeframe to be adopted for strategic planning and the reporting of outcomes. Additionally, issues such as whether a mandatory or voluntary system should be established, whether there should be separate reporting regimes to current funding regimes and how liaison between departments and clubs should be best handled are all issues to be dealt with prior to assessing each of the attributes discussed above. Essentially, this is because answers to those macro questions will help to establish or otherwise the relevance of the attributes. A number of these elements were discussed in the roundtable introduced in the prefatory remarks of this report.

Finally, it is noted that the development of an Disability Sport and Active Recreation Plan and its successful implementation depends to a significant degree on the involvement of the PwD and the clubs. Both of these constituencies have an interest in being heard and will respond positively to any framework, including one relating to inclusivity, provided they recognise their needs and opportunities in it. Of course, the Department may have a set of objectives that run beyond any one population or demographic group. However, it is a general rule that consultation and inclusion at the very start of the program is essential to its acceptance and successful conclusion.

Overall then, the Department may need to consider (or re-visit) some higher level decisions before assessing the various attributes provided above. These higher level decisions include the allocation of resources (human and financial) to the program, the development of core objectives and the establishment of measurable outcomes. The development of responses to these questions will assist the Department significantly in arriving at solutions in relation to the other attributes. A number of these elements were discussed in the roundtable referenced in the prefatory comments.
Appendices
Appendix One - Guiding Principles for the Specification

Based on the findings, outlined in the preliminary findings and issues paper, the consultants formulated a ‘Recommendations report’ containing 19 recommendations. A precursor to the development of the recommendations was the development of a set of six guiding principles. These are:

1. **End-user Centred**
   
   To optimise sustainable and high quality disability sport and active recreation services across WA, there needs to be clarity about the needs and wants of the end-user.

2. **Optimal Sector Funding**

   Major funding agencies need to clarify their focus within the sector to reduce overlap, and maximise the effectiveness of government investment. A collaborative approach to ongoing funding support for people with a disability, and the service providers that work with them would create increased sustainability and better outcomes.

3. **Service Provider Readiness**

   To maximise investment returns for funding agencies, DSR and other network partners need to identify service providers that are ‘ready’ to be invested in, and those that require added support.

4. **Network Partnerships**

   The WA Disability Sport and Active Recreation Network needs to effectively engage in numerous recommendations in the report. This includes forming proactive partnerships to create a single cohesive WA network.

5. **Open Access to Information**

   End-users, service providers and funders of Disability Sport and Active Recreation Services need to be able to easily and conveniently access relevant and reliable information.

6. **Sector Support**

   Providers of Disability Sport and active recreation Services need access to the consultation, direction and support necessary to ensure they meet individual client and member needs.

-. List of Definitions

(What these terms mean to DSR)

**End-User**

- This is the person who uses, or is the recipient/beneficiary, of a community service that is developed and delivered by others.

**Participant**

- A participant is a person who takes part in a sport or active recreation pursuit as a player, official, administrator or general volunteer.

**Community Development**

- This is the process of enhancing participation in sport and active recreation that is driven by the community and its needs, goals and aspirations.

**Community development approach**

- The approach is where the principles of community development are applied (including community ownership, collective action, collaboration, access and equity, inclusion and capacity building).

**Community Engagement**

- Community Engagement is the process of building relationships with community organisations/individuals, through the application of appropriate techniques.
Service Deliverer
- A Service Deliverer is an organisation whose core/sole business is sport and/or active recreation; i.e. State Sporting Association, clubs, recreation bodies (e.g. PLA, Outdoors WA), and recreation centres.

Service Provider
- Service Providers are organisations whose core/sole business is not sport or active recreation; i.e. settlement agencies (eg Communicare), community service organisations (eg Edmund Rice), disability organisations (eg Cerebral Palsy Association).

Purchasing Consultancy
- This is a process whereby a Service Deliverer engages a Service Provider to assist the deliverer in helping a person with a disability to participate in their sport, through the provision of resources, advice, training, education or other support. The amount of consultancy purchased would be for a specific number of hours/days, and/or monetary value.

Inclusion Spectrum
- This is a model of inclusion outlining the different ways people with disabilities may be included in a sport/activity. That is, an open, parallel, separate or modified activity, or one that is specifically for the particularly disability type.

Inclusion
- Regardless of age, gender, race and ability, inclusion ensures all have an equal opportunity to participate – at a level or in a capacity, they choose.

Sport and Active Recreation Participation
- Sport - A human activity capable of achieving a result requiring physical exertion and/or physical skill, which, by its nature and organisation, is competitive and is generally accepted as being a sport.
- Active recreation activities are those engaged in for the purpose of relaxation, health and wellbeing or enjoyment with the primary activity requiring physical exertion, and the primary focus on human activity. Participation – in any of the above and in a capacity of an individual’s choosing.

Relevant Recommendations
1.2 - DSR to partner with the Australian Sports Commission (ASC) sector funding agencies, service providers and suitable WA academic institutions, to undertake ongoing research to identify the needs and wants of people who have a disability across all areas of the inclusion spectrum. Note – this research should look to build on the current ASC research project in collaboration with the University of Technology, Sydney – i.e. identifying the sporting needs of people with disability.
1.3 - Through the use of a community engagement model such as ActiveSmart or other existing community resources (inclusion officers, Local Area Coordinators etc.) there must be a clear identification of the needs and wants of people who have a disability and the development/delivery of services must be designed to best meet these needs.
2.1 - The Fair Play Strategy Group to work collaboratively with other major funding agencies such as Lotterywest and Healthway to clarify their focus within the sector to reduce overlap and maximise the effectiveness and efficiency of WA government investment in the sector.
2.2 - DSR to review its current model used to fund major WA disability sport and active recreation organisations. The new funding model would see DSR ‘purchasing’ consultancy and support services from disability sport and active recreation organisations, to improve the readiness of other sport and active recreation service providers (e.g. SSAs, RSA, clubs, etc.)
to more effectively deliver services, which meet the identified needs and wants of people who have a disability.

2.3 - Funding and support is offered by relevant agencies to assist the major disability sport and active recreation organisations review and where necessary adjust their current business model in the light of this review and change in the landscape of disability sport and active recreation that has occurred over the last decade.

2.5 - All major funding agencies (i.e. DSR, DSC, Lotterywest and Healthway) to work collaboratively to develop a single funding performance monitoring and evaluation tool/system which allows all agencies to more accurately assess the impact of their funding on the sector.

3.1 - All major funding agencies (i.e. DSR, DSC, Lotterywest and Healthway) to work collaboratively to identify the core competency areas which would allow them to accurately identify ‘Ready Service Providers’ i.e. service providers with the necessary capacity, competence and commitment in place allowing funding agencies to effectively prioritise their investment in sport and active recreation for people who have a disability.

3.2 - Building on recommendation 3.1 – major funding agencies to work together to develop and implement a service provider Readiness Assessment Tool (RAT). This tool should preferably be an interactive on-line tool.

4.1 – The membership of and the terms of reference for the FairPlay Network are reviewed and if necessary redefined to reflect the core values and priority areas of the FairPlay document (Strategic framework), particularly relating to facilitating increased collaboration within the sector.

5.1 - A single on-line information portal to be developed to allow individuals, groups or organisations interested in the access to, or provision and/or funding of sport and active recreation services for people who have a disability, to simply and quickly access appropriate information. Fair Play Network members and other key stakeholders to link their websites to the portal, to allow multiple entry points to the repository.

5.2 - Funding agencies and service providers to improve the collection, analysis and use of all relevant data relating to their programs (e.g. population statistics per disability type, per geographic area, per age group, identified sport and active recreation needs of people who have different types of disabilities, etc.) Wherever possible, this information should be uploaded to the single information portal referred to in Recommendation 5.1.
Appendix Two - Fair Play – WA Strategic Framework

Priority Areas and Outcomes

Leadership

- The Department of Sport and Recreation is recognised as the led government agency in promoting, developing and supporting inclusive sport and recreation at all levels
- Government agencies, both State and local, with expertise in their relevant areas play a leadership role through providing information, expertise and support for inclusive sport and recreation
- Local government supports local community leaders in their role as inclusive practitioners
- Community support the development of individuals and initiatives that encourage and support inclusive practice
- Individuals and community providers of sport and recreation opportunities are encouraged to show leadership in inviting local community members to participate in their activities, which are supported and facilitated through government information and promotion

Capacity Building

- The Department of Sport and Recreation develops and implement strategies that build the capacity of all groups to offer sport and recreation to a wide range of people with disabilities.
- Local government authorities and other State Government agencies provide assistance and support through the sharing of information, expertise and resources at strategic and local levels
- Sport and recreation groups, both formal and informal, commit to explore and implement capacity building projects
- Communities support the providers (public, private and community) develop the skills of individuals with the capacity to work effectively with the full diversity of their service users and encourage their involvement
- Private and community organisations work together to provide sport and recreation activities to a diverse range of local people
- Community members including families, carers, clubs and informal recreation groups are supported to develop the expertise to provide sport and recreation activities to a diverse range of local people
Partnerships

- Department of Sport and Recreation actively promotes and facilitates partnership development across sport and recreation
- State and local government agencies work in partnership to develop and implement inclusive practice models at the local level and in response to local need
- Collaboration and partnerships for inclusive sport and recreation are developed between and within community, private and government agencies
- Partnerships are supported through the allocation of appropriate and relevant resources, support and information
- Partnerships are developed that foster the cross-fertilisation of ideas and expertise across mainstream and specialist groups
- Opportunities for informal partnerships are encouraged and supported by all groups

Advocacy, awareness and promotion

- Government, both State and local, actively promotes the benefits of inclusive practices and attitudes across all sectors
- Government, both State and local, ensures that the relevant groups are aware of available resources, support and information in a timely manner
- Inclusive practices are considered an integral component of all program development, within all sectors – public, private and the community
- Processes are developed and effectively targeted to enable informed decisions and choices for all involved
- Awareness-raising strategies acknowledge the diversity within the disability population and the unique responses this requires

Regional Western Australia

- Government, both State and local, supports the sustainable development of rural and remote area partnerships in sport and recreation
- Communities are supported in developing inclusive sport and recreation services, and working with local mainstream providers – public, private and community – that address their needs
- Specific community needs for sport and recreation are locally identified and are addressed at the local level
Appendix Three - New South Wales Outcomes

Accessibility

- Create facilities and venues that are physically, socially (attitudinally) and financially accessible
- Educate industry stakeholders on risk management procedures related to the participation of people with a disability in sport and physical activities
- Broaden the range of competition and skill development opportunities available
- Provide access to appropriate sporting equipment
- Create an environment where all people feel safe and welcome.

Capacity Building

- Foster a culture of inclusion across all organisations in sport
- Develop and implement policies that reflect inclusivity
- Educate staff and volunteers so that they can embrace diversity
- Assist people with a disability to undertake a range of roles such as coach, official, administrator and director
- Lead the development and communication of clearly designated pathways (vertical and horizontal) for people with a disability to progress in sport.

Networks and Partnerships

- Develop partnerships of mutual benefit and links in order to use available resources to maximum effect
- Communicate what is widely available
- Establish a network to leverage the use of existing resources
- Work with sporting organisations to assist them to become more inclusive

Marketing, Promotion and Education

- Educate the community at large to respect and embrace all difference, whether due to disability or some other factor (age, cultural background, etc.)
- Promote the abilities and interests of people with a disability and the opportunities that exist in sport and physical activity
- Promote and highlight positive attitudes towards disability and encourage and support the development of inclusive practices
- Promote activities and materials relating to wellness, health, or sport and physical activity inclusive of everyone in the community.
Appendix Four - Tasmanian Outcomes

Capacity Building

- implementing inclusive policies and practices within the sport and recreation sector
- educating staff and volunteers to embrace diversity and offer participation, coaching, officiating and administration roles to people with a disability
- expanding the range of skill development opportunities available to people with a disability
- ensuring people with a disability are provided with sustainable opportunities for inclusion in sport, recreation and physical activity

Collaboration

- ensuring the sport and recreation sector and the disability sector work together to provide inclusive participation opportunities for people with a disability
- developing an effectively functioning disability sport and recreation network to improve communication and develop partnerships between the sport and recreation sector and the disability sector
- building and maintaining a relationship with the Department of Education to improve the provision of inclusive sport and recreation opportunities within the education system.

Information, awareness and promotion

- providing and promoting information on sport and recreation opportunities for people with a disability
- ensuring the sport and recreation sector and the disability sector are aware of the funding and services available to assist with providing sport and recreation opportunities for people with a disability
- increasing the level of knowledge and understanding between the sport and recreation and disability sectors
- promoting positive images of people with a disability participating in sport, recreation and physical activity.

Accessibility

- increasing awareness of the need for sport and recreation facilities to meet current accessibility standards and guidelines
- ensuring a wider range of sport and recreation programs, services and facilities are available to people with a disability
- improving the participation rates of people with a disability in local sport, recreation and physical activity options
- encouraging the provision of sport and recreation programs and services across the inclusion spectrum.
### Appendix Five – Matrix of Organisations and Web Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction &amp; Framework</th>
<th>Hyperlink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada - Policy on Sport for Persons With a Disability</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/sc/pol/spt/pwad-eng.pdf">http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/sc/pol/spt/pwad-eng.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curtin Centre for Sport and Recreation Research</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://research.humanities.curtin.edu.au/centres/csrr">http://research.humanities.curtin.edu.au/centres/csrr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Sport and Recreation - Case Study: Community Sport and Recreation Disability Project</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.dsr.wa.gov.au//assets/files/Disability/Case%20study%20inclusion.pdf">http://www.dsr.wa.gov.au//assets/files/Disability/Case%20study%20inclusion.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction &amp; Framework</td>
<td>Hyperlink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Sport and Recreation – Fair Play Case Studies</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dsr.wa.gov.au/fair-play-industry-case-studies">http://www.dsr.wa.gov.au/fair-play-industry-case-studies</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Sport and Recreation – How Inclusive is Your club?</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dsr.wa.gov.au/howinclusiveisyourclub">http://www.dsr.wa.gov.au/howinclusiveisyourclub</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Care Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.disabilitycareaustralia.gov.au/">http://www.disabilitycareaustralia.gov.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Resources and Checklists – English Federation of Disability Sports</td>
<td><a href="http://www.efds.co.uk/assets/0000/3470/EFDS_Inclusive_Club_health_check_7a_.pdf">http://www.efds.co.uk/assets/0000/3470/EFDS_Inclusive_Club_health_check_7a_.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Club Hub - British Engagement Example</td>
<td><a href="http://www.inclusion-club-hub.co.uk">http://www.inclusion-club-hub.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction &amp; Framework</td>
<td>Hyperlink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Fitness Initiative - British Engagement Example</td>
<td><a href="http://www.efds.co.uk/inclusive_fitness/the_ifi_mark">http://www.efds.co.uk/inclusive_fitness/the_ifi_mark</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Disability Services</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nds.org.au">www.nds.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senses Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.senses.org.au">www.senses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction &amp; Framework</td>
<td>Hyperlink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom Accreditation Scheme – ClubMark</td>
<td><a href="http://www.clubmark.org.uk/">http://www.clubmark.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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