



Analysis of Canadian Sport Policy Renewal (CSPR) F-P/T Government Consultations and e-Survey Data

Prepared by:
The Conference Board of Canada

Presented to:
Interprovincial Sport and Recreation Council (ISRC)

October 20, 2011

This report was prepared by The Conference Board of Canada under the direction of Michael Bloom, Vice-President, Organizational Effectiveness and Learning.

The report was written by Alison Howard, Jessica Edge, and Douglas Watt. The report was prepared with financial support from the Interprovincial Sport and Recreation Council (ISRC).

CONTACT:

Dr. Michael Bloom

Vice-President
Organizational Effectiveness and Learning
The Conference Board of Canada
255 Smyth Road
Ottawa, ON K1H 8M7

Tel: (613) 526-3280 ext. 229

Fax: (613) 526-4857

Email: bloom@conferenceboard.ca

Douglas Watt

Associate Director
Organizational Effectiveness and Learning
The Conference Board of Canada
255 Smyth Road
Ottawa, ON K1H 8M7

Tel: (613) 526-3280 ext. 246

Fax: (613) 526-4857

Email: watt@conferenceboard.ca

About The Conference Board of Canada

We are:

- The foremost independent, not-for-profit applied research organization in Canada.
- Objective and non-partisan. We do not lobby for specific interests.
- Funded exclusively through the fees we charge for services to the private and public sectors.
- Experts in running conferences but also at conducting, publishing and disseminating research, helping people network, developing individual leadership skills and building organizational capacity.
- Specialists in economic trends, as well as organizational performance and public policy issues.
- Not a government department or agency, although we are often hired to provide services for all levels of government.
- Independent from, but affiliated with, The Conference Board, Inc. of New York, which serves nearly 2,000 companies in 60 nations and has offices in Brussels and Hong Kong.

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Chapter 1: Introduction	6
Chapter 2: Reasons for Promoting Participation in Sport.....	9
Chapter 3: Defining a Quality Sport Experience	24
Chapter 4: Values and Sport	31
Chapter 5: Under-Represented Groups	36
Chapter 6: Official Languages	43
Chapter 7: Roles and Responsibilities of Government in High Performance Sport.....	48
Chapter 8: Canadian Sport 4 Life (CS4L) Model.....	52
Chapter 9: Canada’s Sport Development Delivery System.....	61
Chapter 10: Canada’s High Performance Delivery System.....	68
Chapter 11: Resources for Delivering Sport Programs and Services	75
Chapter 12: Human Resource Capacity	85
Chapter 13: Benefits and Challenges of NSO and PTSO Linkages	94
Chapter 14: Benefits and Challenges of PTSO and Community Linkages	102
Chapter 15: Promoting Sport for Community Building Purposes	114
Chapter 16: Canada’s International Involvement in Sport	121
Chapter 17: Conclusions	124
Appendix A: Consultation Sessions	133

Executive Summary

At a Glance

- This report is one piece of analysis being conducted for the Federal-Provincial/Territorial Sport Committee (FPTSC) as it, in collaboration with the sport sector, undertakes the development of a new Canadian Sport Policy.
- The Conference Board of Canada analyzed data that was collected April-August, 2011, from a series of 50+ consultation sessions and an e-survey; responses to the questions asked in the consultations and e-survey are presented in individual chapters.
- Seven major themes emerged from the analysis: Sport Participation; Sport Development; High Performance Sport; Capacity and Resources; Linkages, Partnerships and Collaborations; Community Building; and International Involvement.
- These themes cross-cut through the development, delivery and evaluation of sport policies and programs. Incorporating them, and associated issues, in the new Canadian Sport Policy will be important to the future of sport in Canada and its contribution to achieving broader economic and social goals.

The development of a successor policy to the current Canadian Sport Policy, and the accompanying action plans of federal and provincial/territorial governments, is being informed by several research resources. The Conference Board of Canada's contribution is an analysis of data collected from a series of national and provincial/territorial consultations conducted from April to August 2011, and from an e-Survey that was designed and conducted by Sport Information Resource Centre (SIRC) from May to July 2011.

The Conference Board of Canada assisted the FPTSC by:

- analyzing and synthesizing data collected from the national and provincial/territorial consultations and the e-survey; and
- preparing a *summary report* on key findings based on the responses to the 15 questions asked in the consultation sessions and e-survey.

Participants in the e-survey included 796 organizational respondents ('organizations') and 2,500 individual respondents ('individuals'). Participants in the 50+ consultations ('consultation participants') totalled well over 500. Collectively they are referred to in the analysis below as 'participants'. Chapters 2-16 of this report summarize the answers to 15 core questions asked in the consultation sessions and the e-survey.

The final chapter presents a summary of the major themes that emerged from the overall analysis. These themes are all equally important in their impact on sport and related social and economic outcomes. It is important to note that they are often intertwined, with challenges and opportunities in one area affecting one or more of the other areas—a reflection of the reality that sport is a complex system with far reaching impacts. As a result, future policies, programs and

initiatives will need to take a multi-faceted approach to ensure maximum reach and effectiveness.

The seven major themes that emerged from the analysis are:

- sport participation;
- sport development;
- high performance sport;
- capacity and resources;
- linkages, partnerships and collaborations;
- community building; and
- international involvement.

The main messages from the consultations and e-survey are substantially consistent across geography, political boundaries and sporting jurisdictions. They are substantially consistent among the different stakeholder groups, including athletes, participants, volunteers, parents, coaches, officials, employers, and researchers. They are also substantially consistent among public, business, not-for-profit, education, and sport organizations. The five special interest groups (women, official language minority, Aboriginal peoples, persons with a disability, ethno-cultural populations), in addition to focusing on issues affecting them directly, also expressed views that were consistent with other participants.

Key messages from participants:

Value

- Sport is fun.
- Sport is important *in itself* as a form of personal activity and development.
- Sport participation significantly improves the health of people.
- Sport is important *beyond itself*—it positively affects Canada’s social and economic well-being.
- Sport creates social cohesion by connecting people and communities.
- Sport has the potential to do more to integrate diverse cultures and populations into Canadian communities.
- Promoting sport participation for community building purposes will improve education and health outcomes; increase sport programming and participation; improve self-esteem; and enhance community development.

Challenges and Success

- Inadequate financial resources, human resources and facilities limit sport participation and the ability of sport organizations to achieve their potential in delivering sport programs and services.
- Efforts should be made to increase participation by under-represented groups, including women and girls, children and youth, persons with a disability, Aboriginal people, ethno-cultural communities, and low income individuals.
- Top priorities for Canada's sport development delivery system are: funding; coaches and instructors; facilities and equipment; the school sport system.
- Success of the sport system requires cooperation, integration and collaboration on a much larger scale than is the case today.
- Partnerships, promotions and marketing can help overcome the challenges.

Linkages

- Better linkages between NSOs and their PTSO counterparts will lead to improved sport governance, more efficient sport systems and programs.
- Challenges of improving F/PT sport organization linkages include competing or conflicting priorities and practices, resource issues, lack of awareness, and a lack of trust.
- Benefits to improving linkages between PTSOs and community organizations include improved governance, more efficient use of resources, improved communications, more efficient systems and programs, increased participation, partnership development, improved training opportunities, sharing of best practices, and improved inclusiveness.
- Challenges to improving these linkages include competing or conflicting priorities and practices, resource issues, lack of awareness/communications issues, recruitment and retention issues, lack of training/skills/knowledge, and resistance to change.

High Performance

- Investment in high performance sport brings value to Canada's *whole* sport system.
- Improved coordination and communication between jurisdictions, and establishing clear definitions of "high performance" and "excellence" for this purpose, is a clear priority.
- Inadequately resourced aspects of the high performance delivery system include: direct athlete support and incentives; coaches and technical leadership; and athlete talent identification, recruitment and development.

International

- Canada's international involvement in sport should focus on building Canada's reputation as a leader; adopting a strategic policy; promoting Canadian values and ethics internationally; contributing to the governance of international sport bodies; hosting international sporting events; and fighting doping in sport.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter Summary

- This report is one piece of analysis being conducted for the Federal-Provincial/Territorial Sport Committee (FPTSC) as it, in collaboration with the sport sector, undertakes the development of a new Canadian Sport Policy.
- This report summarizes the findings of a series of national and provincial/territorial consultations and an e-survey that asked stakeholders about their views on sport in Canada.
- The analysis of data focuses on the top priorities for the sport community, as well as those communities that position themselves around sport (e.g., civic community, social development, skills development, social cohesion, personal development).

Context

Federal, provincial and territorial governments, in collaboration with the sport sector, are undertaking the development of a successor policy to the current Canadian Sport Policy as well as an accompanying joint action plan for the federal and provincial/territorial governments. The new policy will be based, in part, on findings from a series of national and provincial/territorial consultations that were conducted in the summer of 2011 and from an e-survey that was conducted from May to July 2011.

In addition, other pieces of analysis are being researched as part of the policy development process (e.g., SIRC e-survey analysis, Public Policy Forum consultation analysis, etc.). However, these pieces are beyond the scope of the Conference Board's project.

Project Objectives

The Conference Board of Canada assisted the FPTSC in its work by:

- Analyzing and synthesizing data collected from the national and provincial/territorial consultations and the e-survey. The Conference Board provides independent, 3rd party analysis as well as new perspectives and insights. Its work is not intended to replicate others' efforts and analysis.
- Drawing conclusions for each of the 15 questions asked in the consultation sessions and e-survey and preparing a *summary report* on key findings. This Summary Report highlights major themes, areas of common ground, and conflicting viewpoints.

Methodology

Participants in the e-survey included 796 organizational respondents (‘organizations’) and 2,500 individual respondents (‘individuals’). Participants in the 50+ consultations (‘consultation participants’) totalled well over 500. Collectively they are referred to in the analysis below as ‘participants’.

The Sport Information Resource Centre (SIRC) designed and facilitated the e-survey in both official languages.¹ The data runs examined by the Conference Board include responses by type of respondent and by province/territory as well as by level of engagement. Open-ended responses to questions were also analyzed.

The Conference Board’s analysis of the consultation data includes the reports on each of the national and provincial/territorial consultation sessions in addition to the five special targeted populations (i.e., women, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal Peoples, ethno-cultural populations, and official language-minority communities). For a list of consultation session dates and locations, see Appendix A.

The e-survey data and the consultation data were sorted into 15 separate reports—one for each of the 15 core questions asked. Each of the 15 “Question” documents was then reviewed and sorted into major and minor themes. Chapters 2-16 of this report summarize the answers to the 15 core questions asked in the consultation sessions and the e-survey. Chapter 17 presents a summary of the major themes that emerged from the analysis.

Conference Board Approach

In conducting its analysis, the Conference Board’s purpose was to consider all of the data already collected and answer some foundational questions. When framing the case for sport and communities, the following questions were considered:

1. What are some of the top priorities for the sport community, as well as those communities that position themselves around sport (e.g., civic community, social development, skills development, social cohesion, personal development)? What are the implications of these priorities for sport and for the broader sport community? Will community building be the future lynchpin for sustainable sport funding?
2. Where do the major groups/stakeholders (e.g., government, athletes, coaches/trainers, schools, NGOs, NSOs, CSOs) stand on these priorities and issues? Beyond ‘lip service’ of supporting or being in favour of different priorities or addressing different issues who is ready and willing to act (e.g., implement programs, target funding, implement change)?
3. Many groups increasingly see value of sport beyond sport itself; however, many do not know how to implement changes or cannot implement changes. Why?

¹ For more information on SIRC, see www.sirc.ca.

4. What is the right balance for stakeholders and stakeholder groups of sport related activities – is it a mix of both high performance initiatives as well as community/health/skills development initiatives? Is there a sweet spot?
 - What choices different stakeholders make in supporting programs, policies, funding models, definitions is very important, yet the analysis is limited by the survey and consultation instruments used. However, wherever possible, the data was analyzed for indications of decision making (i.e., how people will spend money if they have to choose between high performance and community building priorities).
5. To what degree are stakeholders looking for more clarity (re: programs, policies, mandates, roles and responsibilities, definitions, language, etc.) to help them understand how to find and access funding, access resources and develop appropriate strategies, programs, and activities?

Chapter 2: Reasons for Promoting Participation in Sport

Chapter Summary

- Individuals who participate in sport most frequently cited fun, health, and competition as the reasons for their participation. Individuals from national and provincial/territorial sport organizations were more inclined to say they participate in sport for the competition, compared to individuals involved in sport at the community level.
- The main reasons why organizations promote participation in sport include: fun and a love of sport, healthy lifestyle, personal development, and community building.
- The biggest challenges that affect the ability of organizations to promote and increase participation in sport are a lack of financial resources, insufficient facilities, and inadequate human resources.
- Consultation participants felt that the challenges they face in promoting participation in sport can be addressed through partnerships with other actors, promotions and marketing, changes to existing sport programs, and increased human resource and facilities capacity.

Individual e-survey respondents were asked to indicate the reasons why they choose to participate in sport. Organizations responding to the e-survey and consultation participants were asked why their organization promotes participation in sport. Individuals responding to the e-survey were also asked about the barriers they face in participating in sport. Individuals responding on behalf of organizations to the e-survey and consultation participants were asked to indicate the most important challenges affecting their efforts to promote and increase participation in sport. Some consultation sessions also discussed strategies to address the challenges that were identified.

Reasons for Participation in Sport

The e-survey asked individuals to indicate why they participated in sport. Respondents most frequently cited “fun” (85 per cent) and “health” (80 per cent) as reasons for participating in sport (n=2471). Other common reasons for participating in sport were “competition” (73 per cent), “skill development” (61 per cent), and “to be with friends” (60 per cent). Nine per cent of respondents also answered “other.”²

Different types of individuals emphasized different reasons for participating in sport. Respondents that indicated they were “athletes only” (n=299) or “coaches only” (n=180) most frequently selected “competition” as their reason for participating in sport (95 per cent; and 78 per cent, respectfully).³ “Employees only” (n=90) most frequently indicated “health” (90 per

² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³ Individual e-survey respondents were allowed to categorize themselves as having multiple types of roles in sport (e.g. coaches, athletes, volunteers). “Only” refers to respondents who categorized themselves as only having one role in sport.

cent) as a reason for participating in sport, and placed less emphasis on “skill development” (41 per cent) and “competition” (37 per cent).⁴

Table 2.1 Reasons for Participating in Sport by Respondent’s Level of Engagement⁵

Level of Engagement ⁶	Reason for Participation in Sport					
	Fun	Health	Competition	Skill Development	To be with Friends	Other
All Individuals	85%	80%	73%	61%	60%	9%
Individuals Only – National (n=327)	71%	62%	84%	51%	44%	8%
Athletes – National (n=155)	71%	58%	94%	50%	46%	8%
Coaches – National (n=421)	83%	78%	88%	68%	56%	11%
Individuals Only – Provincial/Territorial (n=233)	76%	73%	66%	52%	48%	7%
Athletes – Provincial/Territorial (n=25)	80%	64%	100%	64%	56%	4%
Coaches – Provincial/Territorial (n=643)	89%	83%	86%	74%	64%	11%
Individuals Only – Community (n=655)	90%	85%	57%	57%	67%	7%
Coaches – Community (n=791)	92%	85%	81%	73%	68%	9%

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

⁶ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as being engaged in sport in multiple ways. “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

Individuals with different levels of engagement in sport (national, provincial and community) diverged in their reasons for participating in sport (See Table 2.1 above.) Individuals involved in sport at the national (n=327) and provincial/territorial (n=25) levels most frequently cited competition (84 per cent; 100 per cent) as a reason for participating in sport. Individuals involved in sport at the community level (n=655) were less likely to cite competition (57 per cent) as a reason for participating in sport.⁷

There were minor geographical differences in how individuals responded to the e-survey. Individuals from all provinces and territories most frequently said that “fun” and “health” were why they participated in sport. “Competition” was the third most common reason why individuals participated in sport with some exceptions. In Newfoundland (n=18) it tied for third with “to be with friends” (50 per cent), and in Prince Edward Island (n=57) it was the fourth most commonly indicated reason why individuals participated in sport (70 per cent). “Competition” (58 per cent; 60 per cent) was the least frequently indicated reason for participation amongst respondents from Nunavut (n=33) and the Yukon (n=48).⁸

Organizations responding to the e-survey were asked why they promote participation in sport. The most common reasons given by organizations (n=763) were “promote healthy lifestyles” (84 per cent), “increase the exposure of children and youth to sport” (77 per cent), “foster participation for coaches, officials, administrators, and/or volunteers” (62 per cent), “improve athlete performance (national/international level)” (61 per cent), and “increase individual and family-based participation” (58 per cent).⁹

As shown in Table 2.2 below, there were differences in how different types of sport organizations responded to the e-survey. The top two reasons respondents offered for promoting participation were “promote healthy lifestyles” and “increase the exposure of children and youth to sport.” An exception was respondents from publicly-funded organizations (n=70) whose second-most frequently indicated reason for promoting participation was “contribute to community building” (80 per cent). Publicly-funded organizations were far less likely to select “improve athlete performance (national/international level)” (34 per cent). National sport organizations (n=125) listed “improve athlete performance (national/international level)” (89 per cent) and “foster participation for coaches, officials, administrators, and/or volunteers” (76 per cent) as their top two reasons for promoting participation in sport. Education organizations’ (n=59) second-most frequently indicated reason for promoting participation was “foster participation for coaches, officials, administrators, and/or volunteers” (56 per cent), while “increase the exposure of children and youth to sport” (49 per cent) was ranked fourth.¹⁰

⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

⁹ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁰ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Table 2.2 Reasons for Promoting Participation in Sport by Type of Organization¹¹

Type of Organization ¹²	Reason for Promoting Participation in Sport										
	Promote healthy lifestyles	Increase the exposure of children and youth to sport	Foster participation for coaches, officials, administrators, and/or	Improve athlete performance (national/international level)	Increase individual and family-based participation	Increase sport opportunities for under-represented groups	Contribute to community building	Contribute to social development (youth-at-risk)	Reduce sport dropout rates	Foster civic engagement	Other
All organizations (n=763)	84%	77%	62%	61%	58%	55%	54%	44%	37%	26%	11%
Publicly funded only (n=70)	91%	77%	54%	34%	76%	64%	80%	69%	34%	44%	10%
Not-for-profit/voluntary only (n=259)	87%	77%	52%	49%	56%	57%	57%	40%	29%	24%	10%
National Sport Organizations (n=125)	74%	75%	76%	89%	52%	61%	42%	36%	47%	25%	5%
Provincial/Territorial sport organizations (n=179)	84%	88%	80%	77%	64%	58%	47%	42%	45%	23%	7%
Corporate/for profit only (n=8)	62%	75%	25%	38%	62%	38%	38%	50%	50%	38%	12%
Education only (n=59)	86%	49%	56%	51%	39%	31%	47%	49%	34%	31%	24%

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

¹¹ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹² E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of organization. “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

Geographical analysis of reasons for promoting participation in sport reveals that organizations from Manitoba (n=67), Newfoundland (n=10), Nova Scotia (n=16), and the Northwest Territories (n=36) were more likely to say that they promote participation in sport to “increase individual and family-based participation” (73 per cent; 80 per cent; 69 per cent; 77 per cent).

Social development (62 per cent; 77 per cent) was more commonly indicated by respondents from Nunavut (n=29) and the Northwest Territories (n=13). Respondents from the Northwest Territories were also more likely to answer “contribute to community building” (69 per cent), and “foster civic engagement” (38 per cent). Organizations from Quebec (n=66) were less likely to select “increase the exposure of children and youth to sport” (58 per cent) and “foster participation for coaches, officials, administrators, and/or volunteers” (48 per cent). Finally, organizations in Saskatchewan (n=36) were more likely to indicate community building (67 per cent) as a reason for promoting participation and less likely to cite improvements in athlete performance (42 per cent).¹³

Consultation participants also discussed their motivations for promoting participation in sport. The following discussion addresses the main reasons for promoting participation in sport that emerged in the consultation sessions and in the e-survey.

Fun and a Love of Sport

In the e-survey, ‘fun’ was a major reason given by individuals from across the country to explain why they promoted participation in sport (responses ranged from 80 to 98 per cent). A wide range of consultation participants also cited fun and enjoyment as major reasons why they chose to promote participation in sport.¹⁴ Participants noted that sport offers “opportunities for our people (young and old) to have fun”¹⁵ and “engages people in ‘fun,’ enjoyable and positive social activities.”¹⁶

Healthy Lifestyle

The most frequently indicated reason for promoting participation in sport by organizations (n=763) responding to the e-survey was “healthy lifestyles” (84 per cent). Health was the second-most common reason cited by individuals responding to the e-survey for participating in sport. A wide range of consultation participants also strongly emphasized the health benefits of sport.¹⁷ For example, out of a list of ten priorities, a Manitoba consultation session ranked

¹³ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁴ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Education Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁵ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁶ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁷ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations),

“promoting healthy living in communities” as their number one reason for promoting participation in sport.¹⁸ Physical activity was seen to play a role in reducing health care costs.¹⁹

Personal Development and Socialization

Consultation participants indicated that the positive role sport can play in personal development was a significant reason why they promoted participation in sport. Sport can contribute to socialization and team work,²⁰ build self esteem and confidence,²¹ teach goal setting and hard work,²² and promote leadership, citizenship and volunteerism.²³ Organizations responding to the e-survey (n=763) did not cite “contribute to social development (youth-at-risk)” (44 per cent) and “foster civic engagement” (26 per cent) as major reasons for promoting participation in sport, perhaps because of the narrower focus of these categories.

Community Building

The emphasis placed on community building by e-survey respondents varied by type of organization. Respondents representing publicly-funded organizations (80 per cent) and not-for-profit/voluntary organizations (57 per cent) were most likely to emphasize community building. National sport organizations (42 per cent) and corporate/for-profit organizations (38 per cent) were least likely to emphasize community building.

In a wide range of consultation sessions, community building was also cited as a major reason for promoting participation in sport.²⁴ For example, the Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations) listed community building and health as its top reasons for promoting participation in sport.²⁵ Sport is seen to play a role in facilitating social inclusion in

Spring/Summer 2011; Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Aboriginal Sport Council), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Health Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁸ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sports Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²² Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²³ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Official Language Minority Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁴ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Recreation Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁵ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

communities.²⁶ The role that sport can play in bringing community members together and fostering value for different cultures received particular emphasis in consultations with under-represented groups.²⁷

Accessibility for Under-Represented Groups

Of all organizations responding to the e-survey, 55 per cent cited “increase sport opportunities for under-represented groups” as a reason for promoting participation in sport. In the consultation sessions, the desire to ensure the inclusion of particular groups, such as women, youth-at-risk, new Canadians, low income individuals, and Aboriginals, was noted by a range of stakeholders.²⁸ Consultations with under-represented groups were most likely to emphasize accessibility.²⁹

Recruitment of High Performance Athletes and Promoting Excellence

In the e-survey, national sport organizations (n=125) cited “improve athlete performance (national/international level)” (89 per cent) as their primary reason for promoting participation in sport. Other types of sport organizations did not cite this as a major reason for promoting participation. While a range of consultation participants noted a desire to recruit high performance athletes and promote excellence,³⁰ this motivation was most salient in consultation sessions with national and provincial sport organizations.³¹

Economic Benefits

While not a major motivation for promoting participation in sport, consultation participants noted that they promoted participation due to the economically beneficial impact it can have on

²⁶ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ethno-Cultural Communities Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Official Language Minority Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Ethno-Cultural Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁹ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Aboriginal Sport Council), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Ethno-Cultural Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

sport organizations and communities. Sport can be an ‘economic generator,’³² and higher participation rates can lead to increased organizational revenue.³³

Challenges and Opportunities

The e-survey asked individuals about barriers that limited their participation in sport. Responses to the e-survey were as follows: “time” (63 per cent), “cost” (63 per cent), “location” (40 per cent), “insufficient programs” (31 per cent), “quality of programs” (28 per cent), “other” (15 per cent), and “language availability” (1 per cent) (n=2423). An analysis of respondents by type revealed some differences in their responses. Individuals that self-identified as “athletes only” (n=287) and “coaches only” were less likely to cite “time” (41 per cent; 47 per cent) as a barrier to participation. “Employees only” (n=90) were more likely to indicate that “time” (82 per cent) was a challenge and less likely to say that “cost” (51 per cent), “location” (22 per cent), and “quality of programs” (17 per cent) were challenges. “Cost” (45 per cent) was less likely to be a barrier for respondents that are “participants only” (n=86).³⁴

Analysis of e-survey responses by individual level of engagement reveals that individuals as a broad group who were engaged in sport at the national level (n=321) were less likely to indicate that “time” (51 per cent) was a barrier. Athletes engaged in sport at the national level (n=150) and the provincial or territorial level (n=22) were more likely to indicate “cost” (76 per cent; 77 per cent) as a barrier, and less likely to say “time” (42 per cent; 45 per cent) was a barrier.³⁵

While responses were largely consistent across the provinces and territories, with time, cost and location most frequently indicated as barriers, there were some deviations. “Insufficient programs” was the second-most frequently indicated barrier (56 per cent) by respondents from Newfoundland (n=18), and the third-most (48 per cent; 52 per cent) by respondents from New Brunswick (n=66) and Nunavut (n=33). Respondents from Nunavut were more likely to say that “location” (70 per cent) was a barrier and less likely to say that “cost” (36 per cent) was a barrier. Respondents from the Northwest Territories (n=21) were more likely to say that cost was a barrier (81 per cent) compared to respondents as a whole.³⁶

Organizations responding to the e-survey were asked to indicate the most important challenges that affected their ability to promote and increase participation in sport. As shown in Table 2.3 below, the most significant challenges indicated by respondents (n=753) were: “funding/sponsorship” (77 per cent), “size, availability, and/or suitability of facilities” (59 per cent), “dependency on volunteers” (53 per cent) and “human resource capacity” (50 per cent).³⁷

³² Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³³ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Swim Manitoba), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁵ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁶ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁷ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Table 2.3 Challenges by Type of Organization³⁸

Type of organization ³⁹	Challenge								
	Funding/sponsorship	Size, availability, and/or sustainability of facilities	Dependency on volunteers	Human resource capacity	Program development	Communication with stakeholders	Governance and management issues	Growing popularity of non-traditional sports and physical recreation	Other
All organizations (n=753)	77%	59%	53%	50%	28%	25%	16%	13%	12%
Publicly Funded Only (n=69)	65%	61%	49%	58%	36%	28%	17%	19%	16%
Not-for-Profit/Voluntary Only (n=254)	76%	59%	59%	38%	26%	23%	13%	11%	10%
National Sport Organizations (n=124)	84%	56%	48%	64%	32%	30%	19%	12%	14%
Provincial/territorial sport organizations (n=179)	82%	65%	65%	55%	26%	22%	17%	16%	9%
Corporate/For Profit Only (n=8)	75%	50%	12%	25%	25%	25%	0%	12%	12%
Education Only (n=59)	68%	66%	25%	58%	32%	19%	17%	7%	12%

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

³⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³⁹ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of organization. "Only" refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

Different types of organizations emphasized different challenges (See Table 2.3, above.). Not-for-profit/voluntary organizations (n=254) were slightly less likely to indicate “human resource capacity” (38 per cent) as a challenge, while national sport organizations (n=124) were more likely to say human resources (64 per cent) were a challenge. Provincial/territorial sport organizations (n=141) were more likely to cite “dependency on volunteers” (65 per cent) as a barrier. Education organizations (n=59) were less likely to say that a dependence on volunteers (25 per cent) was a problem. Corporate/for profit organizations (n=8) were less likely to say human resources (25 per cent) and a dependence on volunteers (12 per cent) were challenges.⁴⁰

Geographical analysis of the e-survey results revealed that respondents from Manitoba (n=67), Nunavut (n=28), the Northwest Territories (n=13), Prince Edward Island (n=34) and the Yukon (n=13) were more likely to cite “dependency on volunteers” as a challenge (responses ranged from 71 to 85 per cent). Organizations located in Quebec (n=64) were much less likely to feel that their “dependency on volunteers” was a challenge (30 per cent). Respondents from the Northwest Territories and the Yukon were more likely to say that “human resource capacity” was a challenge (77 per cent; 62 per cent). Responses revealed that facilities were less of a challenge in Prince Edward Island (41 per cent) and the Yukon (38 per cent).⁴¹

Participants in the consultation sessions discussed the challenges that impeded their efforts to promote and increase participation in sport. The major themes that arose in the consultations, along with major challenges indicated in the e-survey, are discussed below.

Financial Limitations

“Funding/sponsorship” (77 per cent) was the challenge most frequently indicated by organizations responding to the e-survey. Financial challenges were also a major theme in the consultation sessions. Representatives from a variety of organizations emphasized that they lack adequate funding.⁴² This challenge is captured in the following comment from the Aboriginal Roundtable: a “lack of funding and sustained funding...affects capacity, material resources, infrastructure, etc.”⁴³ Participants stressed that the rising cost of insurance and the costs of travelling to competitions strains the financial capacity of sport organizations.⁴⁴

Sixty-three percent of individuals responding to the e-survey indicated that “cost” is a barrier that inhibits their ability to participate in sport. A wide range of consultation participants also stressed

⁴⁰ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

⁴¹ E-survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

⁴² British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sports Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁴ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sports Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

that the cost of participating in sport is a significant barrier to participation for many Canadians.⁴⁵

Facilities

Organizations responding to the e-survey ranked the “size, availability, and/or suitability of facilities” as one of the top three challenges affecting their ability to promote and increase participation in sport. A lack of adequate facilities and access to facilities was also a common challenge voiced by consultation participants. There are not enough facilities available,⁴⁶ and existing infrastructure is aging.⁴⁷ Sport organizations also have a difficult time accessing school facilities.⁴⁸

Human Resources

Fifty per cent of organizations responding to the e-survey stated that “human resource capacity” was a challenge. Additionally, 53 per cent of respondents felt that “dependency on volunteers” was an issue. Human resources issues were a major theme in all of the consultation sessions. Participants said there were inadequate numbers of coaches and officials,⁴⁹ insufficient funds to pay staff,⁵⁰ and inadequate resources to train and certify staff and volunteers.⁵¹ Participants representing under-represented groups felt there was a lack of staff attuned to their specific needs.⁵² Consultation participants also emphasized a number of challenges related to the dependence on volunteers in sport, particularly volunteer burnout⁵³ and difficulties in recruiting new volunteers.⁵⁴

⁴⁵ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Official Language Minority Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁶ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁷ Ethno-cultural Communities Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁸ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sports Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁹ Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵¹ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵² Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer Consultation; Ethno-Cultural Communities Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵³ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁴ New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Governance and Management Issues

While resource-related issues were the primary challenges cited by both e-survey respondents and consultation participants, governance and programming issues were secondary concerns. Some consultation participants pointed to a lack of clarity regarding the roles of sport organizations at different levels of governance⁵⁵ and a need for clearer organizational mandates.⁵⁶ A need for better leadership within the sport sector was identified by some participants.⁵⁷ Consultation participants noted that some sport organizations were sometimes reluctant work together⁵⁸ and that sport organizations often operate in “silos”.⁵⁹ Partnerships and collaborations were seen as potential solutions to some of these challenges.⁶⁰ However, sport organizations may be reluctant to work together if they compete for the same participants.⁶¹

Program Development

Program development was cited as a challenge by 28 per cent of organizations responding to the e-survey. Challenges related to program development were also discussed in the consultations. There is tension between the competitive and participatory aspects of sport. Some consultation participants felt that sport was too competitive, specialized or elite and that this can negatively impact participation rates.⁶² For example, participants in the Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations) stated, “Many sports are driving children away and/or not attracting them in the first place because they have become too bureaucratic, too organized and too competitive.”⁶³ Consultation participants from both community and national sport organizations also noted that it can be a challenge to find a proper balance between recreational and high performance sport.⁶⁴ Community-oriented organizations were more likely to voice the opinion that elite athletes receive too much of available funding.⁶⁵

⁵⁵ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁶ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Recreation Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁸ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁹ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁰ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Sport Club Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations Challenges), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Recreation Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶² Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶³ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁴ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations) Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁵ Ethno-Cultural Communities Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

In Ontario, several consultation participants revealed that they lacked the capacity to meet the high demand for sport programs.⁶⁶ However, consultation participants from other regions said that they did not have an adequate number of participants for their programs and consequently, that they competed with other sport organizations for participants.⁶⁷ The decreasing emphasis on physical education in the school system was also viewed as a challenge by some participants.⁶⁸

Northern and Rural Challenges

Consultation participants from northern and rural Canada indicated that they face unique challenges due to their small populations that are dispersed over a large geographical area. Small, dispersed populations mean limited numbers of participants for sport programs, fewer programs offered, a lack of trained coaches, and fewer volunteers to draw upon. These factors can make it difficult to provide quality sport programs. Programs that are offered will often include a range of participants with vastly different skill levels.⁶⁹ The cost of travelling to practices and competitions was also higher for individuals from Northern and rural areas, especially if an individual wishes to compete at a elite or competitive level.⁷⁰

Social and Cultural Factors

A minor theme that emerged in the consultation sessions was the impact of social attitudes and trends on sport. Sport competes with sedentary activities such as the Internet, television and video games as a pastime for youth.⁷¹ Sport organizations may lack the skills, information, and/or willingness needed to accommodate groups such as new Canadians and individuals with a disability.⁷² New Canadians may have limited exposure to traditional “Canadian” sports⁷³ and

⁶⁶ Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Recreation Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Education Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sports Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁷ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁹ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Aboriginal Sport Council), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷⁰ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷¹ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Health Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷² Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Ethno-Cultural Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷³ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

may prefer to participate in other sports instead.⁷⁴ The Ethno-Cultural Communities Roundtable noted that new Canadians may face unique barriers to participation; many newcomers have limited time because they are busy looking for jobs, working multiple jobs, or helping other family members.⁷⁵

Strategies

Partnerships

Many consultation sessions strongly emphasized the need for partnerships and collaborations with a wide range of actors to address the challenges discussed above. Participants suggested collaborations or partnerships with other sport organizations, schools, various levels of government, health organizations, the private sector, and community organizations such as immigrant settlement agencies.⁷⁶ Partnerships and collaborations can help sport organizations access new resources, share resources, gain new expertise, and reach out to new participants, including under-represented groups.⁷⁷

Promotions and Marketing

A number of consultation sessions felt that participation rates could be increased through the improved promotion of sport programs and the benefits of sport.⁷⁸ In particular, social media was seen as platform through which sport could be promoted.⁷⁹ Participants felt that the benefits of sport could be better communicated to the general public and governments.⁸⁰

Program Development

Consultation participants offered a range of suggestions for how sport programs could be altered to promote increased participation. Strategies include offering less competitive grassroots

⁷⁴ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ethno-Cultural Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷⁵ Ethno-Cultural Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷⁶ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷⁷ Ontario Consultation (Education Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷⁸ Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁷⁹ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

programs, multi-sport programs, and events where potential participants can try a sport.⁸¹ The cost of participating in sport was recognized as a barrier. Strategies to address this issue include sharing equipment amongst participants and providing program subsidies or discounts.⁸²

Human Resources

Consultation participants felt that there was a need to increase training opportunities for coaches and volunteers.⁸³ Mentorship was seen as a way to recruit and train coaches and volunteers.⁸⁴ Some also felt that there was a need for more paid coaching positions to be created, particularly at the community level.⁸⁵ A need to reward volunteers was also noted by participants.⁸⁶

Facilities

Consultation participants stressed the need for increased investment in facilities.⁸⁷ It was suggested that multi-use facilities can better accommodate a variety of activities.⁸⁸ Some participants felt that improved strategies to allocate facilities were needed.⁸⁹

⁸¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸² Ethno-Cultural Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸³ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸⁴ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Health Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸⁵ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸⁶ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸⁷ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸⁸ Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Education Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁸⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ethno-Cultural Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 3: Defining a Quality Sport Experience

Chapter Summary

- The factors that define a quality sport experience include fun, personal development, skill development, sport programming, and resources (human resources and facilities).
- Human resources, facilities and the affordability of sport were identified as the primary barriers to a quality sport experience.

E-survey respondents (both individuals and individuals responding on behalf of organizations) were asked to write-in their own definition of a quality sport experience.⁹⁰ Consultation participants discussed the characteristics that define a quality sport experience and in some cases ranked those characteristics. Consultation participants then discussed barriers to a quality sport experience.

Defining a Quality Sport Experience

Fun

Fun was emphasized as a major component of a quality sport experience by both individuals and organizations responding to the e-survey.⁹¹ The importance of fun and enjoyment was also emphasized by consultation participants.⁹² Both the Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting) and a British Columbia Consultation session ranked fun as their number one characteristic of a quality sport experience.⁹³ A number of consultation participants noted that when participants have an enjoyable sport experience, they are more likely to return.⁹⁴

Personal Development and Socialization

Both individuals and organizations responding to the e-survey noted the positive contribution sport can make to personal development. However, individuals engaged in sport at the national level and national sport organizations were somewhat less likely to emphasize the contribution

⁹⁰ Survey respondents were asked to provide an open-ended answer on their perspectives around a “quality sport experience.”

⁹¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

⁹² Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁹³ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁹⁴ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

sport makes to personal development.⁹⁵ The personal development of the individual was also strongly emphasized by consultation participants as a major factor that defines a quality sport experience.⁹⁶ Participants stated that a quality sport experience increases self esteem,⁹⁷ encourages personal achievement,⁹⁸ and contributes to overall personal growth.⁹⁹

A secondary theme emphasized by consultation participants was socialization. Sport was seen to have an important social aspect¹⁰⁰ and contribute to team and community building.¹⁰¹ E-survey participants noted how the social aspect of sport contributes to the quality of a sport experience.

Skill Development

The development and improvement of sport-related skills was emphasized as a major characteristic of a quality sport experience by both individuals and organizations responding to the e-survey,¹⁰² as well as consultation participants.¹⁰³ Participants at an Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting) ranked skill development amongst their top five factors that determine a quality sport experience.¹⁰⁴

Sport Programming

E-survey participants and consultation participants both emphasized that sport programming played a major role in determining the quality of a sport experience. Individuals and organizations responding to the e-survey,¹⁰⁵ as well as consultation participants emphasized that sporting events and experiences need to be well organized.¹⁰⁶ However, organizations

⁹⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

⁹⁶ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁹⁷ Alberta Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁹⁸ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁹⁹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Municipal Organizations, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁰⁰ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁰¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁰² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁰³ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations - Aboriginal Sport Council), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁰⁴ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁰⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁰⁶ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

responding to the e-survey, particularly national sport organizations, were somewhat less likely to note the need for a quality sport experience to be well organized.¹⁰⁷

A quality sport experience was also seen as one where there are opportunities for participation and participants wish to return.¹⁰⁸ Consultation participants noted the need for opportunities for meaningful participation at a variety of different skill levels in a variety of sports.¹⁰⁹ A number of e-survey respondents (both individuals and organizations)¹¹⁰ and consultation participants stated that competition plays a role in shaping a quality sport experience.¹¹¹ Many emphasized that there must be an appropriate level of competition.¹¹² While some consultation participants felt winning contributes to a quality sport experience,¹¹³ others emphasized participation instead.¹¹⁴

Resources

In the e-survey, individuals and organizations emphasized that the quality of coaches and, to a lesser extent, officials, have an impact on a sport experience.¹¹⁵ Consultation participants emphasized that human resources were a major factor that shapes the quality of a sport experience. A wide range of consultation participants noted the importance of having well trained and certified coaches and officials.¹¹⁶ For example, participants in an Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations) stated that, “It is the coaches that define a quality experience. You are a mentor, parent, role model and friend to the athletes. Having quality coaches, leads to quality sport.”¹¹⁷

E-survey respondents (both individuals and organizations) indicated that the quality and accessibility of facilities shapes the sport experience.¹¹⁸ Consultation participants also noted the

¹⁰⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁰⁸ Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁰⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹¹⁰ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹¹¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹¹² Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹¹³ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹¹⁴ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹¹⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹¹⁶ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations - Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹¹⁷ Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹¹⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

role that facilities and equipment play in defining the quality of a sport experience.¹¹⁹ However, facilities and equipment received less emphasis in the consultations than human resources.

Safety

A number of e-survey respondents (both individuals and organizations) noted that safety is part of a quality sport experience.¹²⁰ A range of consultation participants also emphasized the importance of a safe environment.¹²¹ However, safety was not emphasized as strongly as the issues discussed above.

Accessibility

A number of individuals and organizations responding to the e-survey emphasized the theme of accessibility.¹²² Accessibility also arose as a secondary theme in the consultations.¹²³ Consultation participants noted that sport should be both affordable¹²⁴ and accessible to different groups.¹²⁵

Sportsmanship

Sportsmanship and associated ideas, such as respect and fair play, were mentioned by some individuals and organizations responding to the e-survey.¹²⁶ Sportsmanship was also a secondary theme in some consultation sessions.¹²⁷

¹¹⁹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹²⁰ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹²¹ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹²² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹²³ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹²⁴ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹²⁵ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Disability Roundtable (Spring/Summer 2011).

¹²⁶ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹²⁷ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation (Spring/Summer 2011).

Barriers

Human Resources

Consultation participants identified human resource issues as a top barrier to a quality sport experience. Consultation participants felt that there are inadequate numbers of experienced and qualified coaches.¹²⁸ The cost and availability of training for coaches was seen as a barrier.¹²⁹ Consultation participants noted that there is a lack of volunteers for sport and that there needs to be better training opportunities for volunteers.¹³⁰ A decreasing willingness on the part of the public to volunteer for sport was also identified.¹³¹

Facilities and Equipment

Inadequate facilities were seen as a significant barrier to a quality sport experience. The age and/or condition of many facilities,¹³² the cost of facilities,¹³³ and a lack of access to appropriate facilities were cited as problems.¹³⁴ The affordability of equipment was also identified as a barrier,¹³⁵ although this issue did not receive as much emphasis in the consultation sessions.

Affordability and Accessibility of Sport

Consultation participants cited the inability to access sport as a barrier to a quality sport experience.¹³⁶ Funding issues impact on the ability of sport organizations to provide quality sport experiences¹³⁷ and a lack of funding may make sport unaffordable for some groups. Indeed, the cost of participating in sport was identified as a barrier for some individuals.¹³⁸

¹²⁸ British Columbia Consultation (Spring/Summer 2011); Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹²⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³² British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³³ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³⁴ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³⁵ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³⁶ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³⁷ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³⁸ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver

The Organization and Programming of Sport

Consultation participants also raised problems related to the organization of the sport sector and the programming of sport. Several consultation sessions noted that there is a lack of coordination between various sport bodies, including those at different levels, and that there is competition between sport organizations for the same participants.¹³⁹ This may lead to scheduling conflicts that impede participation in sport.

Some participants also felt that sport can be too focussed on winning and competition.¹⁴⁰ A few consultation sessions highlighted the importance of ensuring all participants have an opportunity to play (this could be through ensuring sport programming is available for participants with a variety of different skill levels).¹⁴¹

Attitudes about Sport

A secondary theme raised by some consultation participants focused on how attitudes about sport can be a barrier to a quality sport experience. Due to competing demands, sport is often not a priority for many individuals.¹⁴² In particular, many youth have a number of competing commitments (e.g., school, part-time jobs) that may impede their ability to participate in sport.¹⁴³ Sport also competes with technology, such as television and social networking, for the attention of children and youth.¹⁴⁴ Children and youth that are registered in multiple sports may miss events or practices due to scheduling conflicts between different activities.¹⁴⁵

Poor sportsmanship was an issue raised in some consultation sessions, although it did not receive significant emphasis.¹⁴⁶ Some felt that negative parental attitudes may be a barrier to a quality

Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Women and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹³⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴⁰ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴² Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴³ Alberta Consultation (Alberta Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Health Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴⁴ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴⁵ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴⁶ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

sport experience.¹⁴⁷ A number of consultation participants, particularly in the Manitoba consultations, felt some parents did not understand the health and social benefits of sport.¹⁴⁸

Rural and Northern Concerns

Rural and northern regions with small populations may lack adequate pools of participants and the human resources to make sport programs viable.¹⁴⁹ While the cost of travel and transportation was raised as a concern in a few consultations, this issue was of particular concern in the North where high travel costs make it difficult for players to participate in events outside their communities.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁴⁹ British Columbia (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁵⁰ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 4: Values and Sport

Chapter Summary

- The primary values that should define sport as practiced on the field of play, in Canada, are sportsmanship, inclusion and accessibility, the pursuit of excellence and enjoyment.
- Safety, teamwork and personal development were also seen as values that should define sport.

Both individuals and organizations responding to the e-survey were asked what values should define sport. Consultation participants also discussed the values that should define sport. Some consultation sessions ranked the values that should define sport in order of importance.

Values

Individuals responding to the e-survey most commonly indicated that enjoyment (89 per cent), respect (86 per cent), fair play (76 per cent), the pursuit of excellence (individual/personal) (76 per cent), and teamwork (72 per cent) were values that should define sport in Canada (n=2,169). Results were generally consistent across different types of individuals. However, while 68 per cent of individuals cited safety as a value that should define sport, “athletes only” (n=246) were less likely to cite safety as a value (44 per cent), while “coaches only” (n=160) were more likely to (78 per cent).¹⁵¹

Individuals responding on behalf of organizations to the e-survey most commonly cited enjoyment (90 per cent), respect (89 per cent), fair play (78 per cent), safety (77 per cent), the pursuit of excellence (individual/personal) (74 per cent) and accessibility for all (74 per cent) as values that should define sport (n=680). However, there were provincial differences in the values most emphasized by respondents. Respondents from New Brunswick (82 per cent) and Nunavut (88 per cent) placed more emphasis on teamwork as a value that should define sport (n=34; n=26). Respondents on behalf of organizations in Saskatchewan (60 per cent), Prince Edward Island (50 per cent) and the Yukon (57 per cent) placed less emphasis on pursuit of excellence (individual/personal) (n=35; n=30; n=14). Respondents from Quebec (61 per cent) and Newfoundland (60 per cent) placed less emphasis on safety (n=56; n=10).¹⁵²

¹⁵¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁵² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Table 4.1 Values by Type of Organization¹⁵³

Value	Type of Organization ¹⁵⁴						
	All Organizations (n=680)	Publicly Funded Only (n=62)	Not-for-Profit/ Voluntary Only (n=233)	National Sport Organizations (n=109)	Provincial/ Territorial Sport Organizations (n=163)	Corporate/For Profit Only (n=8)	Education Only (n=50)
Enjoyment	90%	100%	91%	80%	94%	75%	78%
Respect	89%	90%	90%	88%	90%	62%	82%
Fair play	78%	82%	77%	78%	87%	25%	58%
Safety	77%	84%	79%	75%	82%	50%	58%
Pursuit of excellence (individual/personal)	74%	52%	68%	85%	90%	50%	50%
Accessibility for all	74%	87%	76%	69%	77%	62%	50%
Teamwork	71%	85%	72%	63%	71%	38%	62%
Integrity	69%	71%	63%	68%	78%	50%	70%
Ethical conduct	67%	71%	60%	74%	71%	50%	68%
Participant-centred	65%	68%	61%	61%	72%	50%	54%
Moral education and development	53%	63%	47%	50%	55%	62%	60%
Pursuit of excellence (objective/measured)	47%	26%	38%	61%	58%	38%	50%
Knowledge-based	46%	55%	44%	47%	50%	38%	30%
Other	6%	3%	5%	10%	4%	0%	10%

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

¹⁵³ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁵⁴ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of organization. “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

As shown in Table 4.1 above, there were also differences in the values emphasized by types of organizations. Publicly-funded organizations (n=62) placed more emphasis on teamwork (85 per cent) and accessibility for all (87 per cent) and less on the pursuit of excellence (individual/personal) (52 per cent). National (n=109) and provincial/territorial (n=163) sport organizations placed more emphasis on the pursuit of excellence (individual/personal) (85 per cent; 90 per cent).¹⁵⁵

The values emphasized by consultation participants were similar to those emphasized by e-survey respondents. A discussion of the specific values emphasized by e-survey and consultation participants follows. In an effort to organize responses into a number of meaningful themes, the following section has aggregated responses from the e-survey into larger categories (e.g., sportsmanship includes respect, fair play, integrity, and ethical conduct).

Sportsmanship

Individuals from organizations responding to the e-survey strongly emphasized values associated with sportsmanship, including “respect” (89 per cent), “fair play” (78 per cent), “integrity” (69 per cent) and “ethical conduct” (67 per cent). Individuals responding to the e-survey placed similar emphasis on these values.¹⁵⁶ Sportsmanship was also a major value emphasized by consultation participants. Participants stressed the importance of respect,¹⁵⁷ fair play,¹⁵⁸ and integrity¹⁵⁹ in sport. For example, participants in the Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations) ranked “respect” first and “fair play” third in a list of five values that should define sport.¹⁶⁰

Inclusion and Accessibility

While individuals and organizations placed some emphasis on “accessibility for all” (63 per cent; 74 per cent) as a value that should define sport, this issue did not receive as much emphasis as other values.¹⁶¹ However, inclusion and accessibility were emphasized by consultation participants as major values that should define sport.¹⁶² For example, participants in the Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations) ranked “social inclusion and accessibility” as the top values that should define sport.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁵⁶ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁵⁷ Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁵⁸ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations) (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁵⁹ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organization), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁶⁰ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁶¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁶² Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁶³ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Pursuit of Excellence

The “pursuit of excellence (individual/personal)” was one of the top five values emphasized by individuals (76 per cent) and organizations (74 per cent) responding to the e-survey.¹⁶⁴ Consultation participants also placed considerable emphasis on excellence.¹⁶⁵ A number of organizations indicated excellence was amongst the top five values that should define sport.¹⁶⁶

Consultation participants also emphasized the values of hard work and perseverance,¹⁶⁷ although they were not ranked as top values by participants. Consultation sessions with national sport organizations were most likely to list hard work and perseverance as values.

Enjoyment

In the e-survey, enjoyment was the value most emphasized by both individuals (89 per cent) and organizations (90 per cent).¹⁶⁸ Consultation participants also emphasized enjoyment and fun.¹⁶⁹ For example, participants from the Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations) ranked fun and a positive experience second, while participants from the Ottawa consultation ranked fun and enjoyment fourth.¹⁷⁰

Safety

Safety was the fourth-most commonly indicated value that should define sport by organizations (77 per cent) responding to the e-survey. Individuals responding to the e-survey placed less emphasis on safety (68 per cent). Among consultation participants, safety was listed as a value, but not emphasized as strongly as the values described above.¹⁷¹

Teamwork

In the e-survey, teamwork was the fifth-most emphasized value by individual respondents (72 per cent), and the seventh-most indicated value that should define sport (71 per cent) by

¹⁶⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁶⁵ Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations - Swim Manitoba), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁶⁶ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁶⁷ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁶⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁶⁹ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations - Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations - Water Polo), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁷⁰ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁷¹ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

organizations.¹⁷² Consultation participants also placed a moderate amount of emphasis on teamwork. None of the consultations that ranked the values that should define sport include team work amongst their top five.¹⁷³

Personal Development

Moral education and development was not strongly emphasized as a value in the e-survey by individual respondents (48 per cent) or organizations (53 per cent).¹⁷⁴ A number of consultations noted that learning life skills¹⁷⁵ and personal development¹⁷⁶ were values that should define sport, although these values were generally not as strongly emphasized as the values discussed above.

¹⁷² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁷³ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁷⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁷⁵ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁷⁶ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 5: Under-Represented Groups

Chapter Summary

- The majority of both e-survey and consultation participants felt that efforts should be made to increase the participation of under-represented groups in sport.
- Potential groups that should be targeted to increase their participation include: women and girls, children and youth, persons with a disability, Aboriginal Peoples, immigrants and visible minorities, and low income individuals.
- Reasons why under-represented groups should be targeted to increase their participation in sport are: the health benefits of sport, community building, accessibility, and personal development.

Organizations and individuals responding to the e-survey were asked if efforts should be made to increase the participation of under-represented groups in sport. E-survey participants who answered the question in the affirmative were asked to identify groups that should be targeted to increase their participation in sport. E-survey respondents who felt that under-represented groups should not be targeted were asked to indicate why they felt this way. Consultation participants were also asked if efforts should be made to increase the participation of under-represented groups. A number of consultation sessions identified specific groups that they felt should be targeted. They also discussed why under-represented groups should or should not be targeted and how under-represented groups should be identified.¹⁷⁷

Targeting Under-Represented Groups

The vast majority of both consultation participants and e-survey respondents felt that efforts should be made to increase the participation of under-represented groups in sport. Ninety-two percent of individuals responding on behalf of organizations (n=661) to the e-survey agreed that efforts should be made to increase the participation of specific population groups in sport. This was consistent across different types of organizations and most provinces and territories. Of individuals responding to the e-survey (n=2,129), 92 percent supported efforts to increase the participation of specific groups. This was consistent across all types of respondents.¹⁷⁸

A substantial majority of consultation participants agreed that efforts should be made to increase the participation of under-represented groups in sport. However, some consultation participants

¹⁷⁷ For further discussion of the inclusion of under-represented groups in sport see Chapter 9, “A Strong Voice for Equity.”

¹⁷⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

felt that efforts to target under-represented groups should not occur at the expense of the broader population.¹⁷⁹

Groups to Target

E-survey respondents who agreed efforts should be made to increase the participation of under-represented groups in sport were also asked to identify groups that should be targeted. Individuals responding to the e-survey were most likely to cite children and youth (82 per cent), youth at risk (57 per cent), economically disadvantaged individuals (57 per cent), young girls and women (56 per cent) and persons at risk for obesity and obesity-related illness (47 per cent) as groups that should be targeted (n=1,965). This was largely consistent across individuals of different types, with different levels of engagement in sport, and from different provinces and territories. However, while 38 per cent of respondents felt that Aboriginal Peoples should be targeted, there were higher levels of support for targeting Aboriginals amongst individuals from Nunavut (n=30, 57 per cent), the Northwest Territories (n=20, 70 per cent), and the Yukon (n=36, 56 per cent). National level athletes were also less likely to indicate that specific groups should be targeted with the exception of children and youth (n=119).¹⁸⁰

Individuals responding to the e-survey on behalf of organizations were most likely to state that the following groups should be targeted: children and youth (84 per cent), girls and young women (61 per cent), youth at risk (56 per cent), economically disadvantaged individuals (56 per cent), persons with a disability (52 per cent) (n=623). Newcomers to Canada (35 per cent) and visible minorities (31 per cent) were some of the groups selected least often (See Table 5.1, below.) These results were largely consistent across different types of organizations, with the exception of corporately funded organizations (n=8).¹⁸¹

As shown in Table 5.1 below, geographical analysis reveals that organizations from Nunavut and the Northwest Territories were more likely to indicate that Aboriginals (69 per cent, 75 per cent) and persons at risk for obesity and obesity-related illness (69 per cent, 75 per cent) should be targeted (n=26, n=12). Saskatchewan respondents (n=33) were also more likely to want to target Aboriginals (64 per cent).

Respondents from Newfoundland (n=10) were less likely to feel that a number of groups should be targeted, particularly Aboriginals (10 per cent). Respondents from the Northwest Territories (n=12) were less likely to feel economically disadvantaged individuals should be targeted (33 per cent). Respondents from Quebec (n=55) were less likely to indicate that Aboriginals should be targeted (25 per cent), while respondents from the Yukon (n=12) were less likely to indicate that persons at risk for obesity and obesity related illnesses should be targeted (25 per cent). Respondents from Nova Scotia (n=12) were more likely to indicate persons with a disability (75 per cent), visible minorities (58 per cent), and parents (50 per cent) should be targeted.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁸⁰ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁸¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

¹⁸² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Table 5.1 Groups for Targeting by Location of Organization¹⁸³

Location of Organizations	Groups for targeting											
	Children and youth	Girls and young women	Youth at Risk	Economically disadvantaged individuals	Persons with a disability	Aboriginal peoples	Persons at risk for obesity and obesity-related illness	Aging population	Newcomers to Canada	Parents	Visible minorities	Other
All organizations (n=623)	84%	61%	56%	56%	52%	46%	45%	39%	35%	33%	31%	6%
British Columbia (n=64)	95%	65%	46%	55%	46%	52%	37%	43%	26%	34%	29%	8%
Alberta (n=131)	82%	53%	53%	59%	53%	38%	44%	37%	33%	28%	28%	6%
Saskatchewan (n=33)	85%	58%	61%	70%	64%	64%	48%	45%	48%	42%	36%	9%
Manitoba (n=47)	85%	49%	57%	43%	43%	47%	36%	43%	36%	32%	23%	9%
Ontario (n=162)	80%	64%	56%	52%	58%	48%	44%	36%	42%	31%	34%	8%
Quebec (n=55)	89%	65%	58%	67%	38%	25%	45%	31%	24%	31%	24%	2%

¹⁸³ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Location of Organizations	Groups for targeting											
	Children and youth	Girls and young women	Youth at Risk	Economically disadvantaged individuals	Persons with a disability	Aboriginal peoples	Persons at risk for obesity and obesity-related illness	Aging population	Newcomers to Canada	Parents	Visible minorities	Other
Nova Scotia (n=12)	83%	83%	58%	58%	75%	50%	50%	58%	33%	50%	58%	8%
Newfoundland (n=10)	80%	70%	50%	40%	50%	10%	50%	40%	10%	20%	10%	0%
Prince Edward Island (n=25)	72%	72%	64%	56%	48%	48%	56%	48%	44%	40%	36%	8%
New Brunswick (n=33)	82%	58%	64%	55%	61%	48%	52%	30%	39%	30%	36%	3%
Nunavut (n=26)	96%	65%	65%	62%	58%	69%	69%	58%	38%	58%	35%	8%
Yukon (n=12)	83%	67%	42%	58%	42%	42%	25%	25%	50%	25%	33%	0%
Northwest Territories (n=12)	67%	67%	58%	33%	42%	75%	75%	50%	17%	42%	33%	0%

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

Consultation participants also suggested different groups that should be targeted to increase their participation in sport. While participants suggested a wide range of groups that could be targeted, there was particular emphasis on the need to target the following groups: females (particularly

girls),¹⁸⁴ youth,¹⁸⁵ persons with a disability,¹⁸⁶ Aboriginal populations,¹⁸⁷ immigrants and visible minorities,¹⁸⁸ and low income individuals.¹⁸⁹ While a significant number of e-survey respondents felt persons at risk for obesity and obese persons should be targeted, the vast majority of consultation sessions did not cite this group as one that should be targeted.

Reasons to Target Under-Represented Groups

Health Benefits

The reason emphasized most often by consultation participants for targeting under-represented groups was the health benefits of sport.¹⁹⁰ Sport was seen to contribute to the prevention and management of chronic disease and the reduction of health care costs.¹⁹¹

Community Building

Community building was a major reason given by consultation participants for targeting under-represented groups.¹⁹² Sport can play a role in building communities and creating a more inclusive society.¹⁹³

¹⁸⁴ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Recreation Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Women and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁸⁵ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sports Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁸⁶ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁸⁷ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organization), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁸⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁸⁹ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Under-Represented Groups), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹⁰ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Under-Represented Groups), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹² Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Under-Represented Groups), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹³ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Accessibility

Accessibility was also emphasized as a major reason for the targeting of under-represented groups.¹⁹⁴ Consultation participants stated that everyone should have the opportunity to participate in sport and enjoy the benefits of sport.¹⁹⁵

Personal Development

A secondary reason given by consultation participants for targeting under-represented groups was the beneficial impact of sport on personal development.¹⁹⁶ Participation in sport can benefit self esteem,¹⁹⁷ independence¹⁹⁸ and socialization.¹⁹⁹

Reasons Not to Target Under-Represented Groups

Need to Focus on the Broader Population

The most common reason given by e-survey participants (both individuals and organizations) as to why specific groups should not be targeted is that it is better to focus on the Canadian population broadly. This was common across all types of respondents. As one “athlete only” respondent stated, “I don’t think any population should be targeted more than the others. Sport is important for all people!”²⁰⁰ Consultation participants also indicated the need to focus on the broader population as a major reason why specific groups should not be targeted.²⁰¹

Lack of Resources

A secondary reason given by e-survey respondents (both individual and individuals responding on behalf of organizations) as to why specific groups should not be targeted relates to the limited capacity and resources of many sport organizations.²⁰² This was also a major reason indicated by

¹⁹⁴ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; National Sport Organizations (Montreal Consultation), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹⁵ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹⁶ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹⁷ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹⁸ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011.

¹⁹⁹ Ontario Consultation (Under-Represented Groups), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁰⁰ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

²⁰¹ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁰² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

consultation participants. Some participants noted that they already lacked the resources to sufficiently deliver current programs.²⁰³

Identifying Groups to Target

Partnerships

The primary suggestion consultation participants had for how to target under-represented groups involved partnerships with other actors. While some participants suggested working with individuals and organizations involved in sport, the majority suggested working with stakeholders outside of sport that are involved with under-represented communities. A number of consultation participants felt that the school system was a good avenue through which to target under-represented groups.²⁰⁴ Other suggestions for partnerships include non-sport organizations delivering services to under-represented groups (such as immigrant services organizations), social services and health providers.²⁰⁵

Data Analysis

Consultation participants suggested that under-represented groups be identified through data collection and analysis. Participants suggested under-represented groups could be identified through statistical data, such as that collected in the census and other Statistics Canada surveys.²⁰⁶ The use of community based or oriented data sources were also suggested.²⁰⁷ For example, participants in a Manitoba Consultation suggested using the United Way 'Peg' database, which contains data on Winnipeg.²⁰⁸

²⁰³ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁰⁴ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁰⁵ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Volunteers), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁰⁶ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁰⁷ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁰⁸ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 6: Official Languages

Chapter Summary

- The majority of individual e-survey respondents indicated that they are able to access sport programs in the official language of their choice. The extent to which organizations offer programs and services in both official languages varies considerably depending on their geographic location.
- Challenges individuals face in accessing programs in the official language of their choice include: a lack of staff and volunteers that speak their official language, a lack of available programs in their official language, the location of programs in their official language, and the cost of programs.
- Sport organizations stated that inadequate human resources and funding were the primary barriers they faced in offering programs and services in both official languages.

Individuals responding to the e-survey were asked if they were able to access sport programs in the official language of their choice. Individuals responding to the e-survey were also asked about the challenges they faced in accessing programs in their official language. Organizations responding to the e-survey and consultation participants were asked if they offer programs and services in both official languages. They were also asked about the challenges they face in providing programs and services in both official languages.

Providing Programs and Services in Both Official Languages

Individual respondents to the e-survey were asked if they are able to access programs in the official language of their choice. Ninety-one per cent of individuals were able to access programs in the official language of their choice. This result was consistent across different types of individuals (e.g., coaches or athletes), individuals at different levels of engagement, and individuals in different provinces and territories. Respondents from the Northwest Territories were an exception, with only 60 per cent indicating that they were able to access programs in their choice of official language (n=20).²⁰⁹

Thirty-six per cent of organizations that responded to the e-survey indicated that they offered programs and services in both official languages, while 64 per cent did not (n=670). This was consistent across different types of organizations. As shown in Table 6.1, geographical analysis of the e-survey results revealed significant regional differences. Respondents from New Brunswick (n=34) were most likely to indicate that their organization offered programs and services in both official languages (62 per cent) (See Chart 6.1, below.)²¹⁰

²⁰⁹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

²¹⁰ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Table 6.1 Programs and Services in Both Official Languages by Location of Organization²¹¹

Location of Organization	Does your organization offer programs and services in both official languages?	
	Yes	No
All organizations (n=670)	36%	64%
British Columbia (n=70)	27%	73%
Alberta (n=143)	22%	78%
Saskatchewan (n=35)	11%	89%
Manitoba (n=55)	22%	78%
Ontario (n=176)	61%	39%
Quebec (n=54)	48%	52%
Nova Scotia (n=12)	0%	100%
Newfoundland (n=10)	10%	90%
Prince Edward Island (n=29)	17%	83%
New Brunswick (n=34)	62%	38%
Northwest Territories (n=12)	25%	75%
Yukon (n=14)	21%	79%
Nunavut (n=26)	27%	73%

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

Consultation sessions that discussed this question varied considerably in their responses. The extent to which organizations provide programs and services in both official languages varies depending on the needs of the population they service. Some organizations experience no demand for programs and services in both official languages.²¹² Other organizations offer some programs and services in both official languages, but their resource capacity constrains their ability to do so.²¹³

²¹¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

²¹² Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²¹³ New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Challenges

Individuals responding to the e-survey were asked what challenges they face in accessing programs and services in both official languages. Responses (n=1,552) were as follows: staff/volunteers with appropriate language skills (45 per cent), availability (42 per cent), location (33 per cent), cost (31 per cent), time (16 per cent) and other (12 per cent). Respondents who indicated ‘other’ typically did so because they did not face any challenges or did not see the issue as applicable to them.²¹⁴

Individuals engaged at the national level (n=168) and athletes engaged at the national level (n=84) were less likely to indicate that a lack of staff and volunteers with appropriate language skills is an issue (30 per cent; 24 per cent). Athletes engaged at the provincial and territorial levels (n=17) were more likely to indicate location (53 per cent) and cost (47 per cent) as challenges. Respondents from Newfoundland (n=10) were more likely to cite availability of programs and services as an issue (80 per cent). Respondents from Nova Scotia (43 per cent) were less likely to indicate location as an issue (19 per cent). Respondents from the Northwest Territories (n=17) and the Yukon (n=30) were more likely to select a lack of staff and volunteers with appropriate language skills (71 per cent; 60 per cent).²¹⁵

Organizations responding to the e-survey were asked about the challenges they faced in offering programs and services in both official languages. Respondents (n=640) indicated that funding (68 per cent) and human resources (62 per cent) were the biggest challenges they faced (See Table 6.2, below.). Twenty-one per cent of respondents also answered “other,” which may reflect their experience of no demand for programs and services in both official languages. These results were generally consistent across different types of organizations with some exceptions. National sport organizations (n=105) were more likely to say that funding was a challenge in delivering programs and services in both official languages (84 per cent). Corporate/for profit only organizations (n=7) were more likely to say that program enrolment was a challenge in delivering programs and services in both official languages (43 per cent).²¹⁶

As shown in Table 6.2 below, geographical analysis revealed that more emphasis was placed on the issue of funding by respondents from Nova Scotia (n=12), New Brunswick (n=34) and Ontario (n=171) (92 per cent; 79 per cent; 81 per cent). Fifty per cent of respondents from Newfoundland responded ‘other’ due to a lack of demand for services and programs in both official languages. In Nunavut (n=25), resource support received more emphasis from e-survey participants (56 per cent). Respondents from the Northwest Territories (n=11) and the Yukon (n=13) placed greater emphasis on human resource challenges (91 per cent; 85 per cent).²¹⁷

²¹⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

²¹⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

²¹⁶ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

²¹⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Table 6.2 Challenges by Location of Organization²¹⁸

Location of Organization	Challenge				
	Funding	Human Resources	Resource Support (Tools, Programs, etc.)	Program Enrolment	Other
All organizations (n=640)	68 %	62 %	38%	25%	21%
British Columbia (n=65)	69%	58%	31%	20%	34%
Alberta (n=137)	56%	58%	42%	29%	25%
Saskatchewan (n=30)	60%	63 %	30%	37%	23%
Manitoba (n=53)	60%	60%	40%	42%	21%
Ontario (n=171)	81%	65%	39%	18%	15%
Quebec (n=51)	63%	71%	39%	14%	20%
Nova Scotia (n=12)	92%	75%	17%	25%	8%
Newfoundland (n=10)	60%	40%	10%	40%	50%
Prince Edward Island (n=28)	50%	61%	29%	32%	32%
New Brunswick (n=34)	79%	53%	41%	24%	3%

²¹⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Location of Organization	Challenge				
	Funding	Human Resources	Resource Support (Tools, Programs, etc.)	Program Enrolment	Other
Northwest Territories (n=11)	64%	91%	36%	27%	27%
Yukon (n=13)	77%	85%	31%	31%	15%
Nunavut (n=25)	56%	64%	56%	28%	20%

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

Consultation participants were also asked about the challenges they faced in delivering programs and services in both official languages. Insufficient funding was raised as a major issue.²¹⁹ A lack of human resources, including the reliance on volunteers in the sport sector, was also identified as a problem.²²⁰ As stated by participants in the Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), “Many participants felt it was not realistic to offer programs and services in both official languages due to the high cost of translation and the limited availability of human and financial resources to run programs. A heavy reliance on volunteers in the sport system, many of which are unilingual, would also make it difficult to offer programs in both official languages.”²²¹

Resource support was often not identified as an issue by consultation participants, although the Official Language Minority Communities Consultation did note that more training needs to be available to coaches in both official languages.²²² Program enrolment was not raised as an issue by consultation participants. However, some participants did question whether there is a need for programs and services in both official languages in all communities and whether offering programs and services in both official languages is a good use of limited resources.²²³

²¹⁹ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²²⁰ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Official Language Minority Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

²²¹ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²²² Official Language Minority Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

²²³ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 7: Roles and Responsibilities of Government in High Performance Sport

Chapter Summary

- Consultation participants believe that government investment in high performance sport brings value to Canada's sport system.
- Canada's high performance sport initiatives need to be better aligned, connected and coordinated within the broader sport system.
- Better communication and coordination between jurisdictions and among all stakeholders is also needed.

Consultation session participants were asked if there is a need for governments to better define the respective roles and responsibilities of the federal and provincial/territorial governments with regard to high performance sport (given that Sport Canada and many provincial/territorial governments have significantly increased their involvement and investment in high performance sport in recent years). They were asked to elaborate on why or why not; to identify areas in need of special attention; and what factors are most likely to make a significant difference.

Governments need to better Define their Respective Roles with Regard to High Performance

Consultation participants generally agreed that the federal, provincial and territorial governments need to do a better job in defining their respective roles with regard to high performance. What these roles were, and how they might be achieved varied greatly among the consultation sessions, nevertheless, two broad themes emerge:

- A need for a more clear and concise definition of high performance so that all stakeholders within Canada's sports system understand its value and importance.
- A need for better communication and coordination between jurisdictions (federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal/regional).

A Comprehensive and Coordinated View of High Performance

Many consultation participants highlighted the need for a clear and common definition and philosophy of 'high performance' at the provincial, territorial and national levels.²²⁴ One participant noted a need for "a clear, defensible position on why we spend what we spend on

²²⁴ Montreal Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (School Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011;

high performance sports and athletes, and why it is important.”²²⁵ Other consultation participants were in agreement:

- “Non high performance people do not see the reasoning for targeting high performers, and municipal staff do not have a mandate to support this, so this creates a disconnect. The key will be working collaboratively to support high performance sport. There has been no clear direction to do this, but there is great opportunity.”²²⁶

Other consultation participants noted a lack of coordination among different levels of government, sport organizations and the public. For example:

- “There seems to be a lack of information sharing related to ‘high performance’ between the government, sport organizations and the general public.”²²⁷
- “In addition to the federal and provincial governments, municipalities need to buy-in to the high performance mandate, be prepared to provide the services and funding required by the targeted sports and athletes to support that mandate.”²²⁸

Improving High Performance Outcomes

Integrated Pathways and Cooperation for Excellence

Many consultation participants voiced their desire for a more coordinated and unified athlete development system that starts with community participation and continues to high performance.

One consultation participant noted that: “there is not a clear line dividing development and high performance and where an athlete, for example, crosses the line to a national development program. The continuum has a considerable amount of overlap (necessarily).”²²⁹ Another consultation participant suggested that there is “a need to consider funding and support for the whole sport system, as lower levels feed into high performance.”²³⁰

In a roundabout way, one British Columbia consultation participant said it best: “Sport performance leads to sport participation, which in turn, leads back to sport performance. They are independent, so you cannot take funding away from sport participation to support sport performance, [but] you cannot take funding away from sport performance to support sport participation. If one area suffers, the other area will also suffer.”²³¹

²²⁵ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²²⁶ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²²⁷ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²²⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²²⁹ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²³⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²³¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

A number of comments raised by Manitoba consultation participants raised similar points of view.²³²

- “Much greater coordination of funding and planning between the key partners at both national and provincial levels” is needed. “There is no connection between the national ‘Own the Podium, and Road to Excellence’ programs and most province’s high performance plans and programs.”
- “With proper consultation between national sport organizations, provincial sport organizations, provincial and territorial governments, and the federal government a more consistent system could be put in place for funding and training—as current models for some sports leave athletes in isolated areas such as the Maritimes and the prairies with far fewer opportunities to excel.”
- “A strategy or communication plan needs to be developed to deal with the ‘push back’ from many non-sport groups that question ‘why so much funding is going into high performance and not to them, as well.’”

There were a number of suggestions from consultation participants for ways to improve coordination and cooperation among different stakeholders, levels of government, and interested groups. They include:²³³

- “Incentives for municipalities to buy-into the sport performance mandate.”
- “A communications strategy that provides key messaging to communities regarding the sport performance mandate.”
- “Integrated sports teams that address every aspect of an athlete’s needs.”
- “Celebrating Canadian athletes in the media so they are seen as icons to inspire Canadians.
- Increasing the profile of high performance sport through a national media communications plan.”

Clearly Defined Roles and Responsibilities with Improved Communication and Coordination

A British Columbia consultation participant noted that: “Respective roles are unclear at the community and regional level. Communication does not filter down to the local sport organizations; therefore, unless there is direct communication through a provincial or national sport organization, or through a direct relationship (e.g., a club coach is also a provincial or national program coach) clubs are not informed as to how they can implement programs such as their long-term athlete development initiatives.”²³⁴

²³² Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²³³ British Columbia (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²³⁴ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

In Alberta, some consultation participants noted that:²³⁵

- “Individual sport organizations are not communicating from the national sport organization down to the clubs regarding high performance athletes.”
- “National sport bodies ‘drive’ the rules for all, even if it is not appropriate.”
- “The provincial government does have a role in high performance sport, but the role needs to be defined—due to geographical issues (Canada is so large, and facilities and training centres are spread). [High Performance] cannot be centralized, so the provinces need to play a role.”

Optimal Use of Funding and Resources

Many consultation participants had strong views about how Canada’s sport system might maximize the allocation and use of resources. In addition to the general consensus that “success cannot come without funding,” the notion that “a long term commitment is needed to ensure success” was also raised by many consultation participants.²³⁶

Other funding issues that emerged from the consultation sessions include the need for transparency, and a balanced approach when it comes to the distribution of funds (e.g., at the local, provincial and national levels; among different sports and sport activities; and among different stakeholders). For example:

- At a Manitoba consultation it was noted that “increased investment and involvement is not supporting Aboriginal kids striving, and/or with the potential, to participate in high performance sport,” and that “more funding for the development and training of qualified and dedicated coaches and staff who are sensitive to Aboriginal cultures’ is needed.”²³⁷
- A Vancouver consultation participant noted that “more conscious targeting of particularly promising sports, while adopting a broader approach that will allow more national sport organizations to develop athletes and get the funding to pursue performance objectives” is needed.²³⁸
- At a British Columbia consultation session a participant suggested that “funding needs to be used wisely and fairly for the further growth of demographic and socio-economic differences of our country.”²³⁹ And that “a look at best practices in other countries (e.g., Australia and Germany)” might be a good thing to do.²⁴⁰

²³⁵ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011.

²³⁶ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²³⁷ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organization/Aboriginal Sport Council), Spring/Summer 2011.

²³⁸ Vancouver Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²³⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁴⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 8: Canadian Sport 4 Life (CS4L) Model

Chapter Summary

- Although many consultation participants and e-survey respondents are aware of the Canadian Sport for Life model more needs to be done.
- The CS4L model raises awareness around the relevance of sport in Canada, provides many stakeholders with a common language and nomenclature, and brings coordination and cohesiveness to the multitude of sport organizations found across the country.
- If correctly implemented and properly supported CS4L has the potential to improve participation in sport at all levels, better connect with other sectors of the economy, and influence the health and well-being of Canadians.

Consultation session participants and e-survey respondents were introduced to Canadian Sport for Life (CS4L) as a model that has been widely adopted by many governments and sport organizations throughout Canada as a means of delivering developmentally appropriate quality sport experience to participants of all ages and at all levels of development. They were asked in the consultation sessions and e-survey to comment on the current and future impact of CS4L implementation. They were also asked to identify some of the current barriers to successful implementation of the CS4L model.

Many are Aware of Canadian Sport for Life (CS4L) or Long Term Athlete Development (LTAD) but Pockets of Unawareness are Present

A majority of e-survey respondents—sixty-nine per cent of individuals (n=2078) and seventy-nine per cent of organizations (n=648)—indicated that they were aware of CS4L or Long Term Athlete Development (LTAD).²⁴¹

Those e-survey respondents most familiar with CS4L or LTAD include: researchers (91 per cent), coaches (87 per cent), employees (86 per cent), officials (81 per cent), volunteers (75 per cent), and parents (72 per cent).²⁴² Two respondent groups—athletes and participants—were the least familiar with CS4L or LTAD. Just 45 per cent of athletes (n=229), and 38 per cent of participants (n=74) indicated that they had heard of CS4L or LTAD.²⁴³

Across Canada, awareness among individuals of CS4L or LTAD varied from a high of 85 per cent in the Northwest Territories, to a low of 45 per cent in Nunavut. Other levels of individual awareness include: 82 per cent in Manitoba; 81 per cent in Nova Scotia; 73 per cent in British

²⁴¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁴² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁴³ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

Columbia; 72 per cent in New Brunswick; 71 per cent in Yukon Territory; 69 per cent in Ontario; 67 per cent in Alberta; 65 per cent in Saskatchewan; and just 56 per cent in Québec.²⁴⁴ The relatively low level of awareness in Québec can be partially explained by the promotion of the region's own athlete development models under the Ministry of Education, Recreation and Sports (Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport); its efforts to support the development of excellence (PSDE), and psychomotor and physically active lifestyles (e.g., Québec en Forme); and in its adoption of a sport development plan to support Québec sports federations (Programme de soutien aux fédérations sportives québécoises-PSFSQ).²⁴⁵

The extent to which different individuals (e.g., coaches, athletes, or individuals) are aware of CS4L or LTAD is illustrated in Table 8.1, below.

It is noteworthy that among all e-survey respondents Canada's athletes—at both the national and provincial levels—are the most unaware of CS4L or LTAD. Just 51 per cent of national athletes and 40 per cent of provincial athletes indicated that they are aware of CS4L or LTAD. On the other hand, national, provincial and community coaches are most aware of CS4L and LTAD, with 89 per cent, 84 per cent, and 79 per cent of coaches indicating awareness of the programs.²⁴⁶ (See Table 8.1.)

Table 8.1 Awareness of CS4L or LTAD by Type of Individual²⁴⁷

Type of Individual	Awareness of CS4L or LTAD	
	Yes Aware of CS4L or LTAD	No Not Aware of CS4L or LTAD
All individuals (n=2078)	69% (1,444)	31% (634)
National Coaches (n=378)	89% (335)	11% (43)
Provincial/Territorial Coaches (n=570)	84% (476)	16% (94)
Community Coaches (n=703)	79% (552)	21% (151)
National Individuals (n=254)	72% (182)	28% (72)

²⁴⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁴⁵ Québec Consultations, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁴⁶ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁴⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

Type of Individual	Awareness of CS4L or LTAD	
	Yes Aware of CS4L or LTAD	No Not Aware of CS4L or LTAD
Provincial/Territorial Individuals (n=196)	70% (138)	30% (58)
Community Individuals (n=542)	59% (320)	41% (222)
National Athletes (n=118)	51% (60)	49% (58)
Provincial/Territorial Athletes (n=20)	40% (8)	60% (12)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

CS4L Model Raises Awareness around the Relevance of Sport, Provides a Common Language, and Brings Coordination and Cohesiveness to Sport Organizations

When asked to indicate the changes to programming in sport or community attributed to CS4L or LTAD, many e-survey respondents pointed out that, to date, the impacts have been relatively minimal. As illustrated in Table 8.2, below, many individuals—be they athletes, coaches, officials, or volunteers—indicated that the CS4L program has led to no program changes at all.²⁴⁸ One e-survey respondent’s comments mirrored those of many others, stating that “the theory is very much alive, but the practice is absent, and not a lot is being carried out.”²⁴⁹ Another e-survey respondent noted that “the current impact is marginal as the implementation has been too slow, and has not targeted the primary audience: parents, who pay for and enrol their kids, and who participate themselves. A bottom-up social marketing campaign is needed sooner than later that strategically targets parents and kids.”²⁵⁰

These findings corroborate one of the major themes coming from a majority of consultation session responses that: “although CS4L is a driver of change, and provides significant momentum to improve the quality of sport in Canada, the impacts are not yet consistently reflected across Canada as the program is in its infancy, and will take some time to see the full benefits of the model.”²⁵¹

²⁴⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁴⁹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁵⁰ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁵¹ Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

It is also noteworthy that while the great majority of e-survey respondents and consultation participants indicated support for the CS4L and LTAD models, a number articulated their discomfort with the programs. One e-survey respondent noted, for example, that they “disagree with LTAD as it does not work for all sports.” Other e-survey respondents said that they “opposed the removal of tiering at an earlier age” and “thanks for making my job as a coach harder because now everyone has an opinion on how their child should be developed.”²⁵²

Nevertheless, when asked to identify changes to sport or community programming related to CS4L or LTAD, e-survey respondents noted that changes were evident (or beginning to show signs of evidence) to their sport or community in:²⁵³

- training for coaches and volunteers related to CS4L;
- children being encouraged to participate in other sports, and to not specialize too early;
- grouping players by development level, not by chronological age;
- increasing the amount of practice time compared with competition time; and
- offering more program choices.

Table 8.2, below, identifies the top ranked program changes (or lack of changes) to sport or community related to CS4L or LTAD. Although there is no one change that the majority of e-survey participants identified (e.g., over 50 per cent of any one type of individual) it is clear that change is taking place among coach and volunteer training activities, and that many children are being given the opportunity to engage in multiple sports.

Table 8.2 Program Changes to Sport or Community Related to CS4L or LTAD, by Individual Type²⁵⁴

Type of Individual	Program Changes Related to CS4L or LTAD					
	Training for Coaches and Volunteers	No Changes	Children Encouraged to Participate in Other Sports and Not Specialize too Early	N/A	Players Grouped by Development Level Not Age	Ratio of Practice Time to Competition Time has Increased
All Individuals (n=1972)	Rank 1 (32 %)	Rank 2 (29 %)	Rank 3 (26 %)	Rank 4 (19 %)	Rank 5 (18 %)	Rank 6 (17 %)
All Athletes (n=206)	Rank 3 (17 %)	Rank 2 (29 %)	Rank 4 (15 %)	Rank 1 (38 %)	Rank 5 (14 %)	Rank 6 (7 %)

²⁵² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁵³ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁵⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

Type of Individual	Program Changes Related to CS4L or LTAD					
	Training for Coaches and Volunteers	No Changes	Children Encouraged to Participate in Other Sports and Not Specialize too Early	N/A	Players Grouped by Development Level Not Age	Ratio of Practice Time to Competition Time has Increased
All Coaches (n=145)	Rank 1 (47 %)	Rank 4 (25 %)	Rank 2 (39 %)	Rank 7 (6 %)	Rank 5 (21 %)	Rank 3 (32 %)
All Officials (n=345)	Rank 1 (41 %)	Rank 3 (30 %)	Rank 2 (32 %)	Rank 6 (10 %)	Rank 4 (23 %)	Rank 5 (20 %)
Volunteers (n=875)	Rank 1 (37 %)	Rank 2 (29 %)	Rank 3 (27 %)	Rank 6 (15 %)	Rank 4 (20 %)	Rank 5 (19 %)
Employees (n=73)	Rank 2 (37 %)	Rank 4 (22 %)	Rank 1 (42 %)	Rank 7 (14 %)	Rank 3 (32 %)	Rank 5 (21 %)
Parents (n=548)	Rank 1 (32 %)	Rank 1 (32 %)	Rank 3 (25 %)	Rank 6 (16 %)	Rank 5 (17 %)	Rank 4 (18 %)
Researchers (n=114)	Rank 2 (33 %)	Rank 1 (38 %)	Rank 3 (26 %)	Rank 6 (11 %)	Rank 6 (11 %)	Rank 5 (13 %)
Participants (n=69)	Rank 8 (6 %)	Rank 2 (33 %)	Rank 3 (14 %)	Rank 1 (36 %)	Rank 7 (7 %)	Rank 4 (10 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

Consultation participants identified a number of common themes raised across the country, most notably that:

CS4L Provides Good Value Yet it is Still Too Early to See Full Benefits

Many consultation participants felt that the underlying principles and direction of CS4L was the correct approach, yet still in its early stages of development and implementation. A Montreal consultation participant, for example noted that “the model is accepted in theory, but not yet in practice.”²⁵⁵ And in New Brunswick a consultation participant said that “there is still a lot of work to be done to align sport with CS4L principles; and that the model had yet to penetrate

²⁵⁵ Montreal Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

down to the grassroots level in most sports.”²⁵⁶ Another individual from New Brunswick talked about a sport leader referencing a sport specific LTAD guide not realizing that it was related to CS4L, noting that “even as change impacts the system, many people will be unaware of its links to CS4L.”²⁵⁷

CS4L Provides a Common Language and Clear Pathway

Consultation participants in Vancouver, Ottawa, Montreal, Calgary, Alberta, and Manitoba all recognized the value that CS4L brings to the Canadian sport system in terms of providing a common language. Vancouver consultation participants, for example, said that: “CS4L provides a common nomenclature that allows partners and stakeholders involved in sport and recreation to understand each other. It also provides a concrete pathway for athlete development that can be clearly articulated and understood.”²⁵⁸ In Ottawa, consultation participants noted that: “CS4L provides a common language for sport program implementation based on sound scientific principles (e.g., physical literacy) that organizations, schools, teachers, parents, clubs and governments have adopted.”²⁵⁹

CS4L Provides an Impetus for Change

A number of consultation participants noted that CS4L is an impetus for change within the entire Canadian sport system, and “especially within national sport organizations.”²⁶⁰ A Manitoba consultation participant noted that “CS4L will help various partners and stakeholders in sport, recreation, physical education, and health/healthy living to define their interests and roles in supporting specific stages within the model.”²⁶¹ And in Calgary a participant said that: “CS4L identifies gaps in programming, and drives positive change to participant development within the provincial sport system.”²⁶² Some consultation participants also noted how CS4L has led to a “change from a competitive to a recreation/participation model—resulting, in some areas, in decreased interest and quality experience.”²⁶³

CS4L Provides an Opportunity to Review, Revitalize and Rationalize

Numerous consultation participants noted that the CS4L model “encourages sports organizations to review their programming, analyze what is going well, where there is room for improvement, and what gaps currently exist.”²⁶⁴ CS4L also encourages organizations to “start an age appropriate review of their programs and competitions, modify their rules and equipment for

²⁵⁶ New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁵⁷ New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁵⁸ Vancouver Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁵⁹ Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶⁰ Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶¹ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶² Calgary Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶³ British Columbia Consultations, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶⁴ Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

younger participants, improve their coaching development resources and tools, and reassess staff roles and responsibilities based on the LTAD model.”²⁶⁵

CS4L Looks Beyond Sports

A number of consultation participants talked about how CS4L has “provided an opportunity for sport to engage other sectors,” and how there is an “acceptance growing in the health sector of the importance of sport and physical activity.”²⁶⁶ Another consultation participant noted that “all participants have a basic understanding of the CS4L model and the roles that various partners in sport, recreation, physical education, healthy living, and Aboriginal affairs may be able to play in implementing a joint planning framework.”²⁶⁷

CS4L Coordinates and Aligns Efforts and Brings Greater Cohesiveness to the Canadian Sport System

Consultation participants across the country noted that the CS4L model brings greater collaboration between sport groups, provinces, and sectors; and that it brings alignment from the grassroots up moving towards higher levels of athlete and coach development. In Calgary, consultation participants noted that CS4L is “contributing to sport system alignment among provincial and national sport organizations.”²⁶⁸ In Manitoba the CS4L model has been used as “one of the key foundations in the development of Winnipeg’s Community Sport Policy” which will be shared among six participating partner organizations; and Special Olympics Manitoba is “currently working with Sport Manitoba on developing its CS4L implementation plan.”²⁶⁹

The Future Impact of CS4L Includes a Healthier Population, Improved Participation in Sport, and Greater Connections to Other Sectors

Consultation participants across Canada identified a number of broad themes or elements that they believe will be the future impact of CS4L implementation. They include:

- A healthier population. “If CS4L is promoted better, we will see in the next generation or two a healthier population.”²⁷⁰
- Improved understanding and awareness of physical literacy. “If CS4L mandate is brought into communities it could drive community programming and could also improve access to physical literacy if more citizens know about its benefits and have resources or programs that foster its implementation.”²⁷¹

²⁶⁵ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶⁶ Alberta Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶⁷ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶⁸ Calgary Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁶⁹ Manitoba Consultations, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷⁰ Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organization), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

- More lifelong interest and participation in sport. “Ideally, the future impact of CS4L will be increased participation in sport at all levels, and a more physically literate population that is physically active for life.”²⁷²
- A platform for community involvement and community development. “The CS4L model has the opportunity to grow communities, improve linkages between communities and sport organizations, promote long-term involvement in sport, and become a platform for community engagement. By teaching today’s kids, you are actually teaching tomorrow’s parents.”²⁷³
- A more cohesive, better coordinated, and more collaborative sport system that engages many different stakeholders. The CS4L model has the potential to better “engage the education system into the sport development process; align provincial and territorial sports organizations with national sports organizations; break down barriers to collaboration among all stakeholders; help define various partners’ and stakeholders’ interests and roles; and improve relationships between athletes, coaches, and parents using a common language.”²⁷⁴
- Improved skills development. “If you develop skills as a child, there is no fear later in life to use those skills and carry them on to other activities. There will also be a broader demand for ‘fundamental’ skill education in a wide range of sport choices and recreational activities.”²⁷⁵
- Increased participation and retention of athletes at all stages and levels of sport. “CS4L may support a much more rewarding quality sport experience, produce less burn-out and serious injuries among children and youth as age-appropriate training is adopted, and strengthen the sport continuum from participation to high performance.”²⁷⁶
- Improved efficiencies and effectiveness. “Better utilization of resources—creating efficiencies; more consistency among programs—decreasing duplication; increased integration between sectors; and increased opportunity for partnerships.”²⁷⁷

Current Barriers to Successful Implementation of the CS4L Model Include a Lack of Awareness, Poor Communications, a Lack of Resources, and Resistance to Change

Across Canada consultation participants voiced their concerns over a number of barriers to the successful implementation of the CS4L model. Points raised in multiple consultation sessions include:

²⁷² New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷³ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Montréal Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷⁴ Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷⁵ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷⁶ Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montréal Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷⁷ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

- A lack of awareness, promotion, communications, buy-in, and support for CS4L. “There is minimal use at grassroots. Provincial Sport Organization staff members have to continuously educate their key volunteers and leaders on the purpose, intent and benefits of adopting CS4L/LTAD.”²⁷⁸ “There is inconsistent messaging; there is a lack of understanding of the model among parents and others outside the sport community; and the lack of communication between national and provincial sports organizations is [a significant] barrier.”²⁷⁹
- A resistance to change. There is a “lack of sport willingness to change the athlete development model; and CS4L implementation may challenge the existing culture of certain sports.”²⁸⁰ The “‘win at all costs’ attitude is a barrier.”²⁸¹
- A lack of resources, funding, and clarity around roles and responsibilities for the adaptation and implementation of the CS4L model. “Costs and efforts to implement the full national sport organizations LTAD are too big for provincial sport organizations.”²⁸² “There is a lack of resources and volunteers to implement change at the grassroots level. Clubs and club leaders often have limited resources and do not have the time, energy, and expertise to modify their programming; many provincial sport organizations feel that they have limited human and financial resources to achieve what they are currently achieving, and require additional funding or resources to expand or increase what they do.”²⁸³ “It is as important to address the implementation plan as it is the development of the policy.”²⁸⁴
- Difficult to incorporate CS4L model into existing programs. “There are other visions and models for participant and athlete development that can be strategically applied to properly develop sport.”²⁸⁵
- Difficult to measure the success or impact of CS4L. “The impact and benefits of the model have not yet been assessed. Is increased participation, for example, due to CS4L?”²⁸⁶

²⁷⁸ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁷⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸⁰ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸² Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sports Organization), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸³ Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸⁴ Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸⁵ Québec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸⁶ Ottawa Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 9: Canada's Sport Development Delivery System

Chapter Summary

- The top priorities for Canada's sport development delivery system, according to a majority of consultation participants and e-survey respondents are: coaches and instructors; facilities and equipment; the school sport system, organizational capacity; and officials.
- Equity policies is a top issue among numerous stakeholder groups, including women, people with a disability, ethno-cultural populations, Aboriginal Peoples, and rural/remote communities.
- Although the majority of consultation participants and e-survey respondents believe that Canada's sport development delivery system is sufficient in terms of capitalizing on international events, many feel that more programming is needed for coaches and instructors.

Consultation session participants and e-survey respondents were asked to rank—in order of importance—the top five priorities for Canada's sport development delivery system from a list of 10 options.²⁸⁷ Subsequently, they were asked to identify the top three components in which programming is currently sufficient and/or appropriate, and the top three components in which programming is currently insufficient and/or inappropriate.

Top Priorities for Canada's Sport Development Delivery System

Coaches and Instructors, Facilities and Equipment, and the School Sport System Top the List of Priorities

There was overwhelming consensus among consultation participants, and e-survey respondents, around the top five priorities for Canada's sport development delivery system. They include:

- coaches and instructors;
- facilities and equipment;
- school sport system;
- organizational capacity; and
- officials.

A number of consultation session participants from the Alberta Provincial Stakeholders meeting, for example, noted that: "coaches are fundamental to all programs, and participant retention is

²⁸⁷ The 10 components from which consultation session participants and e-survey respondents could select include (alphabetically): capitalizing on international events; coaches and instructors; equity policies; facilities and instructors; officials; organizational capacity; parasport development; research and innovation; and school sport system.

linked to quality instruction.”²⁸⁸ Another participant noted that: “programs do not exist without facilities.”²⁸⁹ And in one of the Prince Edward Island consultation sessions a point was made that demonstrated the synergies and interconnectedness between the top priorities: “there [are] some schools that have the facility to support a program, but don’t have the funding to bring in the coaches, referees, etc.”²⁹⁰

Although there were some regional differences in terms of the overall placement or ranking of these top five priorities (e.g., Québec ranked facilities and equipment higher than coaches and instructors), each of the five listed components consistently made the ‘top of’ list for the majority of the national, provincial, community and sport organization consultation sessions.

E-Survey Respondents Identify Coaches, Facilities, and School Sport System as Top Priorities

The findings from the consultation and roundtable sessions were consistent with the e-survey responses. Ninety-three per cent of all individuals who responded to the e-survey (n=1,669)—whether an athlete, coach, official, or volunteer; and ninety-one per cent of all organizations (n=554)—whether private, public or not-for-profit identified ‘coaches and instructors’ as the top priority for Canada’s sport development delivery system. Tables 9.1 and 9.2 below, highlight the top rankings for each type of responding individual and organization.

Table 9.1 Top Priorities for Canada’s Sport Development Delivery System, by Type of Individual²⁹¹

Type of Individual ²⁹²	Top Priorities				
	Coaches/ Instructors	Facilities/ Equipment	School Sport System	Officials	Organizational Capacity
All individuals (n=1799)	Rank 1 (93 %)	Rank 2 (82 %)	Rank 3 (74 %)	Rank 4 (54 %)	Rank 5 (49 %)
Athletes Only (n=189)	Rank 1 (90 %)	Rank 2 (82 %)	Rank 3 (76 %)	Rank 6 (40 %)	Rank 8 (30 %)
Coaches/Instructors Only (n=135)	Rank 1 (95 %)	Rank 2 (82 %)	Rank 3 (73 %)	Rank 4 (50 %)	Rank 4 (50 %)
Officials Only	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 4	Rank 3	Rank 5

²⁸⁸ Alberta Consultations (Provincial Stakeholders Meetings), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁸⁹ Alberta Consultations (Provincial Stakeholders Meetings), Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁹⁰ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁹¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁹² E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of organization. “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

Type of Individual ²⁹²	Top Priorities				
	Coaches/ Instructors	Facilities/ Equipment	School Sport System	Officials	Organizational Capacity
(n=327)	(96 %)	(82 %)	(73 %)	(74 %)	(53 %)
Volunteers Only (n=794)	Rank 1 (94 %)	Rank 2 (80 %)	Rank 3 (72 %)	Rank 4 (62 %)	Rank 5 (56 %)
Employers Only (n=70)	Rank 1 (91 %)	Rank 2 (90 %)	Rank 3 (81 %)	Rank 5 (51 %)	Rank 4 (60 %)
Parents Only (n=500)	Rank 1 (96 %)	Rank 2 (83 %)	Rank 3 (78 %)	Rank 4 (65 %)	Rank 5 (56 %)
Researchers Only (n=111)	Rank 1 (89 %)	Rank 3 (62 %)	Rank 2 (70 %)	Rank 6 (38 %)	Rank 5 (41 %)
Participants Only (n=55)	Rank 2 (76 %)	Rank 1 (87 %)	Rank 3 (75 %)	Rank 5 (33 %)	Rank 4 (47 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

The top five priorities identified by individuals responding to the e-survey were: coaches and instructors; facilities and equipment; school sport system; officials; and organizational capacity. One area of slight divergence was found among athlete responses where a slightly higher priority was placed on the capitalizing on international events (4th place), and training and pathways to employment components (5th place). (See Table 9.1.)

Table 9.2 Top Priorities for Canada’s Sport Development Delivery System by Type of Organization²⁹³

Type of Organization ²⁹⁴	Top Priorities				
	Coaches/ Instructors	Facilities/ Equipment	School Sport System	Officials	Organizational Capacity
All organizations (n=606)	Rank 1 (91 %)	Rank 2 (84 %)	Rank 3 (74 %)	Rank 4 (63 %)	Rank 5 (59 %)
Publicly Funded Orgs	Rank 1 (86 %)	Rank 2 (84 %)	Rank 3 (75 %)	Rank 5 (47 %)	Rank 4 (74 %)

²⁹³ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

²⁹⁴ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of organization. “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

Type of Organization ²⁹⁴	Top Priorities				
	Coaches/ Instructors	Facilities/ Equipment	School Sport System	Officials	Organizational Capacity
(n=57)					
Not-for-Profit/ Voluntary Orgs (n=204)	Rank 1 (90 %)	Rank 2 (86 %)	Rank 3 (73 %)	Rank 4 (55 %)	Rank 4 (55 %)
National and Multi- Sport Orgs (n=102)	Rank 1 (92 %)	Rank 2 (78 %)	Rank 3 (76 %)	Rank 5 (49 %)	Rank 4 (69 %)
Provincial/Territorial Sport Orgs (n=148)	Rank 1 (95 %)	Rank 2 (85 %)	Rank 5 (70 %)	Rank 3 (73 %)	Rank 4 (72 %)
Corporate/ For Profit Orgs (n=8)	Rank 3 (62 %)	Rank 1 (100 %)	Rank 2 (88 %)	Rank 5 (38 %)	Rank 4 (50 %)
Education Orgs (n=42)	Rank 2 (90 %)	Rank 3 (79 %)	Rank 1 (95 %)	Rank 4 (69 %)	Rank 5 (50 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

The top five priorities identified by organizations responding to the e-survey were much the same, with coaches and instructors; facilities and equipment; school sport system; officials; and organizational capacity grabbing the top five positions. Two areas of slight divergence were found among education organization responses which placed the school sport system atop of the rankings; and the responses from corporate/for profit organizations which identified facilities and equipment as their number one priority. (See Table 9.2.)

Geographical analysis of the top priorities for Canada's sport development delivery system revealed no significant differences. E-survey respondents, whether they lived in British Columbia, Canada's north, Quebec, or Atlantic Canada shared similar opinions when it came to identifying the top priorities for Canada's sport development delivery system.

A Strong Voice for Equity

Participants who attended the special interest roundtables on sport and ethno-cultural populations, women, Aboriginal Peoples, and persons with a disability shared a number of similar points of view—particularly around the need to focus on organizational capacity, coaches and instructors, and school sport systems priorities. However, these groups also consistently ranked equity policies as a top one or two priority. To ensure that sport in Canada is equitable,

inclusive, and open to the diverse interests, needs and desires of all Canadians numerous participants noted that more needs to be done. For example:

- Participants at the Ethno-cultural Populations and Sport Roundtable raised concerns around the perception that sport for ethno-cultural populations is at the bottom end of priorities at the municipal level, and that more needs to be done to maximize participation of ethno-cultural populations.²⁹⁵
- Participants at the Aboriginal Peoples and Sport Roundtable noted that the new Canadian Sport Policy should, among other things, express and acknowledge the unique identity of Aboriginal Peoples, reflect Aboriginal culture and realities, and determine what Aboriginal Peoples can contribute to Canadian sport.²⁹⁶
- Participants at the Women and Sport Roundtable were concerned that issues for women and girls may no longer be a concern of the sport community, and that some people may feel that women have reached parity with men, and that the sport system could move on to other challenges.²⁹⁷ They also noted that “there is a need to continue to increase opportunities for women and girls by enhancing existing opportunities and creating new ones;” and that there must be measures in place that hold publicly funded organizations that receive core funding accountable to provide and support equitable opportunities.”²⁹⁸
- Participants at the Persons with a Disability and Sport Roundtable noted that programs and resources continue to be insufficient to ensure equitable participation by people with a disability.²⁹⁹

For additional analysis on this theme, see Chapter 5 “Under-Represented Groups.”

Sufficient and Appropriate Sport Programming Components

Many See International Events, Equity Policies, and Research and Innovation Components to be Sufficient and Appropriate

Although a number of participants from different consultation sessions found it difficult to identify components in which current sport programming activities was sufficient (including, for example the British Columbia Provincial Sport Organization consultation sessions held in Abbotsford, Kamloops, and Prince George where participants said they were not satisfied that any sport programming components were currently sufficient), a general consensus did emerge.³⁰⁰ The top three components in which consultation participants found programming to be at a sufficient level (regardless of geographic location, type of individual responding, or type of organization) include:

- capitalizing on international events;

²⁹⁵ Ethno-Cultural Populations and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁹⁶ Aboriginal Peoples and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁹⁷ Women and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁹⁸ Women and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

²⁹⁹ Persons with a Disability and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁰⁰ British Columbia Consultations, Spring/Summer 2011.

- equity policies; and
- research and innovation.

E-survey respondents corroborated the consultation findings. The top three components identified by individual e-survey respondents (n=1,667) were: equity policies (37 per cent), research and innovation (27 per cent), and capitalizing on international events (27 per cent).³⁰¹ Organizations responding to the e-survey (n=549) identified: capitalizing on international events (32 per cent), equity policies (32 per cent), and research and innovation (30 per cent) as the top three components in which programming is currently sufficient.³⁰² It is important to note, however, that no one programming component received a majority of individual or organizational votes in terms of being at a sufficient level. Whereas ‘equity policies’ and ‘capitalizing on international events’ ranked first or second among most individual and organizational responses, neither one ever received more than 44 per cent of the popular count. There were a number of consultation sessions across Canada that attempted to articulate this point.

Participants at the Women and Sport Roundtable, for example, were “dismayed to learn from the consultations to date that equity policies were identified as an area within the sport delivery system where programming was deemed efficient. Despite increased opportunities as athlete/participants overall participation rates of women and girls continue to decline, and there has been little or no progress to increase the involvement of women in leadership roles as coaches, officials, administrators and volunteer leaders.”³⁰³

And participants at the Sport and Ethno-cultural Populations Roundtable noted that “a truly inclusive sport system, where all Canadians have opportunities to participate and excel in sports requires intentional efforts that go beyond a simple ‘everyone is welcome’ policy. Language, cultural and religious considerations, and newcomer issues all need to be taken into account.”³⁰⁴

Insufficient and Inappropriate Sport Programming Components

Many See Coaches and Instructors, Facilities and Equipment, and School Support System to be Insufficient and Inappropriate

Consultation participants and e-survey respondents were much more vocal and clear in their identification of where programming is currently insufficient or in need of improvement. Indeed, one comment from the New Brunswick Consultation sums up the opinion of many consultation participants:³⁰⁵

³⁰¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³⁰² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³⁰³ Women and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁰⁴ Ethno-Cultural Populations and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁰⁵ New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

“While the sport system has moved forward in the last 10 years, it has taken a small step forward rather than large leaps. Without radical changes to funding, its volunteer base, and infrastructure, the sport system will continue to inch rather than bound forward. It is restrained by the same factors now as it was 10 years ago and likely 20 years ago. A sport system run largely by volunteers; with a chronic shortage of funding, leadership, and volunteers; and [a system] with an over-reliance on inconsistent partnerships for facilities (schools and municipalities) is always likely to fall short of growing public expectations.”

The top three components identified by consultation participants and e-survey respondents deemed to be insufficient or in need of improvement include:

- coaches and instructors;
- facilities and equipment; and
- school sport system.

These three components—considered to be insufficient or in need of improvement—closely align with the top five priorities for Canada’s sport development delivery system as identified by consultation participants and e-survey respondents. (See section above.) At the Newfoundland and Labrador consultation session, for example, participants noted that “there were serious deficiencies in the area of sport, recreation and leisure infrastructure,” which, from a community perspective is difficult, because “amateur sport, in particular, is highly dependent on schools and municipal governments for access to facilities.” And beyond this challenge, there was also agreement on the less than desirable emphasis on the training of coaches and officials—which is particularly challenging when attempting to run a provincial competition.³⁰⁶

A fourth component, organizational capacity, was also identified by a number of consultation participants. At the Nunavut consultation, for example, participants remarked that “high personnel turnover rates at the community level meant that successful programs with high participation are often put on hold when volunteers move on. Improving organizational capacity at all levels (e.g., sport clubs, municipalities, and provinces) is very important to initiating and maintaining sporting programs and opportunities.”³⁰⁷

Finally, at the ethno-cultural populations and sport roundtable participants noted that “overt and systemic racism is more prominent and frequent than before, and starting at a younger age.” And that a lack of cultural sensitivity (e.g., the failure [of Canada’s sport delivery system] to recognize different approaches, philosophies, or restrictions due to cultural/religious beliefs); and a lack of acknowledgment that racism and discrimination is a problem—not just restricted to coaches, but also an issue with referees and parents—needs to be addressed through a ‘sports racism policy’ that is on the agenda at all levels of government.³⁰⁸

³⁰⁶ Newfoundland and Labrador Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁰⁷ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁰⁸ Ethno-Cultural Populations and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 10: Canada's High Performance Delivery System

Chapter Summary

- The top priorities for Canada's high performance delivery system, according to a majority of consultation participants and e-survey respondents are: coaches and technical leadership; training and competition; athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development; and direct athlete support and incentives.
- Although regional and organizational differences emerged, a majority of consultation participants and e-survey respondents indicated that sport science, sport medicine and technology; the hosting of international events in Canada; and research and innovation components of Canada's high performance delivery system are sufficiently and appropriately resourced.
- Components of Canada's high performance delivery system considered to be insufficiently or inappropriately resourced include: direct athlete support and incentives; coaches and technical leadership; and athlete talent identification, recruitment and development.

Consultation session participants and e-survey respondents were asked to rank—in order of importance—the top five priorities for Canada's high performance delivery system from a list of 10 options.³⁰⁹ Subsequently, they were asked to identify the top three components in which programming is currently sufficient and/or appropriate, and the top three components in which programming is currently insufficient and/or inappropriate.

Top Priorities for Canada's High Performance Delivery System

Coaches and Technical Leadership; Training and Competition; and Athlete Identification, Recruitment, and Development Top the List of Priorities

Much like the responses found in Chapter 9 on Canada's sport development delivery system, there was consensus among consultation participants and e-survey respondents around the top five priorities for Canada's high performance delivery system. They include:

- coaches and technical leadership;
- training and competition;
- athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development;

³⁰⁹ The 10 components from which consultation session participants and e-survey respondents could select include (alphabetically): athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development; coaches and technical leadership; direct athlete support and incentives; facilities and equipment; hosting of international events in Canada; integrated athlete development pathways; organizational capacity and sustainability; research and innovation; sport science, sport medicine, and technology; and training and competition.

- direct athlete support and incentives; and
- sport science, sport medicine and technology.

There were some regional differences in terms of the overall placement or ranking of these top five priorities. The Québec consultations, for example, ranked facilities and equipment, organizational capacity and sustainability, and research and innovation, higher than coaches and technical leadership. And ‘training and competition’ did not make the Québec consultations’ top five priority list.³¹⁰

At the Manitoba Provincial Sport Organization’s consultation session ‘direct athlete support and incentives’ ranked second among the group’s top five priorities (behind ‘coaches and technical leadership’ and ahead of ‘training and competition’; ‘organizational capacity’; and ‘facilities and equipment.’ ‘Athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development’ did not make this provincial sport organization consultation session’s top five high performance priorities—ranking a distant tenth.

E-Survey Respondents Identify Coaches and Technical Leadership; Training and Competition; and Athlete Talent Identification, Recruitment and Development as Top Priorities

The findings from the consultation and roundtable sessions were consistent with the e-survey responses. Eighty-one per cent of all individuals who responded to the e-survey (n=1,635)—whether an athlete, coach, official, volunteer, employer, parent, researcher, or parent; and eighty-two per cent of all organizations (n=564)—whether private, public or not-for-profit identified ‘coaches and instructors’ as the top priority for Canada’s high performance delivery system.³¹¹

Tables 10.1 and 10.2 below highlight the top rankings for each type of responding individual and organization.

The top five priorities for Canada’s high performance delivery system identified by individuals responding to the e-survey were: coaches and technical leadership; training and competition; athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development; direct athlete support and incentives; and sport science, sport medicine and technology.³¹² These rankings were consistent among all individual types: including, athletes, coaches, volunteers, parents, and participants.

One area of moderate divergence was found in the responses of officials and employers both ranking ‘athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development’ as a higher priority (ranked 2) than ‘training and competition’ (ranked 3rd). (See Table 10.1 below.)

³¹⁰ Québec Consultations, Spring/Summer 2011.

³¹¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³¹² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

Table 10.1 Top Priorities for Canada’s High Performance Delivery System, by Type of Individual³¹³

Type of Individual ³¹⁴	Top Priorities HP Delivery				
	Coaches and Technical Leadership	Training and Competition	Athlete Talent ID, Recruitment/ Development	Direct Athlete Support & Incentives	Sport Science, Sport Medicine and Technology
All individuals (n=1635)	Rank 1 (81 %)	Rank 2 (71 %)	Rank 3 (65 %)	Rank 4 (59 %)	Rank 5 (50 %)
Athletes Only (n=174)	Rank 1 (74 %)	Rank 2 (71 %)	Rank 4 (65 %)	Rank 3 (70 %)	Rank 5 (59 %)
Coaches/Instructors Only (n=128)	Rank 1 (88 %)	Rank 2 (82 %)	Rank 3 (70 %)	Rank 4 (59 %)	Rank 5 (52 %)
Officials Only (n=302)	Rank 1 (84 %)	Rank 3 (74 %)	Rank 2 (75 %)	Rank 4 (61 %)	Rank 5 (48 %)
Volunteers Only (n=723)	Rank 1 (81 %)	Rank 2 (71 %)	Rank 3 (66 %)	Rank 4 (61 %)	Rank 5 (49 %)
Employers Only (n=67)	Rank 1 (84 %)	Rank 3 (60 %)	Rank 2 (69 %)	Rank 3 (60 %)	Rank 4 (48 %)
Parents Only (n=447)	Rank 1 (79 %)	Rank 2 (72 %)	Rank 3 (65 %)	Rank 4 (60 %)	Rank 6 (46 %)
Participants Only (n=46)	Rank 1 (61 %)	Rank 1 (61 %)	Rank 3 (50 %)	Rank 5 (41 %)	Rank 5 (41 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

The top five priorities identified by organizations responding to the e-survey were similar to the individual responses. The coaches and technical leadership component is clearly the top priority among all organizational types; followed by training and competition; athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development; direct athlete support and incentives; and sport science, sport medicine and technology. (See Table 10.2.)

³¹³ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³¹⁴ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of organization. “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

A number of organization types placed ‘facilities and equipment’ in their top 5 priorities for Canada’s high performance delivery system. As illustrated in Table 10.2, publicly funded organizations, businesses, not-for-profit and volunteer organizations, and educational organizations all ranked ‘facilities and equipment’ as their 5th priority, dropping sport science, sport medicine and technology into the 6th position.

It is also interesting to note that the national sport organizations, multiple sport organizations and CSC respondents all ranked ‘athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development’ higher than the ‘training and competition’ component in terms of being a priority for Canada’s high performance delivery system. (See Table 10.2.)

Table 10.2 Top Priorities for Canada’s High Performance Delivery System by Type of Organization³¹⁵

Type of Organization ³¹⁶	Top Priorities HP Delivery				
	Coaches and Technical Leadership	Training and Competition	Athlete Talent ID, Recruitment/ Development	Direct Athlete Support & Incentives	Sport Science, Sport Medicine and Technology
All organizations (n=564)	Rank 1 (82 %)	Rank 2 (72 %)	Rank 3 (67 %)	Rank 4 (54 %)	Rank 5 (46 %)
Publicly Funded Orgs (n=50)	Rank 1 (74 %)	Rank 2 (66 %)	Rank 3 (64 %)	Rank 4 (44 %)	Rank 6 (36 %)
Not-for-Profit/ Voluntary Orgs (n=183)	Rank 1 (74 %)	Rank 2 (72 %)	Rank 3 (64 %)	Rank 4 (57 %)	Rank 6 (46 %)
National and Multi- Sport Orgs (n=96)	Rank 1 (91 %)	Rank 3 (64 %)	Rank 2 (67 %)	Rank 5 (47 %)	Rank 4 (48 %)
Provincial/Territorial Sport Orgs (n=142)	Rank 1 (87 %)	Rank 2 (82 %)	Rank 3 (70 %)	Rank 4 (56 %)	Rank 5 (46 %)
Corporate/ For Profit Orgs (n=8)	Rank 1 (75 %)	Rank 2 (62 %)	Rank 2 (62 %)	Rank 2 (62 %)	Rank 6 (38 %)

³¹⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³¹⁶ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of organization. “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

Type of Organization ³¹⁶	Top Priorities HP Delivery				
	Coaches and Technical Leadership	Training and Competition	Athlete Talent ID, Recruitment/ Development	Direct Athlete Support & Incentives	Sport Science, Sport Medicine and Technology
Education Orgs (n=42)	Rank 1 (93 %)	Rank 3 (67 %)	Rank 2 (76 %)	Rank 4 (60 %)	Rank 6 (45 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

Sufficient and Appropriate High Performance Programming Components

Many See Sport Science, Sport Medicine and Technology; Hosting of International Events in Canada; and Research and Innovation as Sufficient and Appropriate

Those consultation groups that identified the top three components in which programming is currently sufficient and/or appropriate generally predominately agreed that sport science, sport medicine and technology; and the hosting of international events in Canada topped the rankings.

Interestingly, a number of consultation groups (e.g., Montreal, Ottawa, Calgary, and Quebec) indicated that ‘direct athlete support and incentives’ was a top three component in terms of being sufficient and appropriate.³¹⁷ This goes counter to the majority of e-survey respondents and a great number of other consultation session findings that found programming for ‘direct athlete support and incentives’ to be insufficient and inappropriate. (See next section, below, for details.)

However, a number of consultation sessions had divergent perspectives and ranked components differently. For example, participants at one of the Yukon consultations noted that ‘coaches and technical leadership’, and ‘facilities and equipment’ were sufficient and appropriate within the high performance delivery system.³¹⁸ Indeed, at both a Yukon and a Manitoba consultation session participants ranked ‘coaches and technical leadership’ (1st and 2nd respectfully), and ‘facilities and equipment’ (2nd and 3rd respectfully)—deeming both of these components to be sufficient and appropriate.³¹⁹

At the persons with a disability roundtable, participants identified ‘facilities and equipment’ as being sufficiently and appropriately resourced (ranked second).³²⁰ It is interesting to note, however, that fifty per cent of participants at this roundtable did not indicate any areas as being sufficient. At the Québec consultations ‘athlete talent identification, recruitment, and

³¹⁷ Montreal Consultation Session, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation Session, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation Session, Spring/Summer 2011; and Quebec Consultation Sessions, Spring/Summer 2011.

³¹⁸ Yukon Consultations, Spring/Summer 2011.

³¹⁹ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³²⁰ Persons with a Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

development' was ranked as the third most sufficient and appropriate programming component just behind hosting of international events in Canada (ranked 2), and direct athlete support and incentives (ranked 1).³²¹

E-survey respondents were mostly in agreement with the consultation rankings and perspectives. The top three programming components identified as being sufficient and appropriate by individual e-survey respondents (n=1542) were: hosting of international events in Canada (33 per cent); sport science, sport medicine and technology (32 per cent); and research and innovation (27 per cent).³²² However, there were some notable differences. Consultation participants and e-survey respondents differed, for example, on the extent to which they believed direct athlete support and incentives were sufficient and appropriate. Whereas the majority of consultation sessions ranked 'direct athlete support and incentives' as being a sufficient or appropriate component of Canada's high performance delivery system, just 13 per cent of e-survey respondents said the same—ranking it 10th (or last).³²³ In fact, a review of all individual types responding to the e-survey showed that 'direct athlete support and incentives' ranked very low.

According to organizations responding to the e-survey (n=518) the top three components in which high performance programming is currently seen as being sufficient or appropriate, include: hosting of international events (33 per cent); sport science, sport medicine and technology (31 per cent); and research and innovation (29 per cent).³²⁴

Insufficient and Inappropriate High Performance Programming Components

Many See Direct Athlete Support and Incentives; Coaches and Technical Leadership; and Athlete Talent Identification, Recruitment and Development to be Insufficient and Inappropriate

Consultation participants identified a number of high performance programming components that are currently insufficient and inappropriate. Participants in the Ottawa, Montreal, and Calgary consultation sessions, for example, noted that programming for 'coaches and technical leadership;' and 'athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development was currently insufficient.'³²⁵ 'Organizational capacity and sustainability' was also ranked as a top three component in the Ottawa and Yukon consultation groups.³²⁶

Yukon and Calgary consultation participants also ranked "integrated athlete development pathways' as their top or second-ranked components, respectfully, in which programming is

³²¹ Québec Consultations, Spring/Summer 2011.

³²² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³²³ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011. It is noteworthy that 26 per cent of e-survey respondents said N/A.

³²⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³²⁵ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³²⁶ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

currently deemed to be insufficient or inappropriate.³²⁷ In the Quebec and Manitoba consultations ‘facilities and equipment’ ranked first, and ‘sport science, sport medicine and technology’ received the 3 ranked position.³²⁸ Finally, participants at the persons with a disability roundtable identified “athlete talent identification, recruitment and development; ‘organizational capacity’; and ‘facilities and equipment’ as the top three components in which programming is currently insufficient or inappropriate for Canada’s high performance delivery system.”³²⁹

Individuals who responded to the e-survey (n=1601) identified the following three components within Canada’s high performance delivery system as being currently insufficient or in need of improvement:³³⁰

- direct athlete support and incentives (47 per cent);
- coaches and technical leadership (41 per cent); and
- athlete talent identification, recruitment, and development (36 per cent).

Organizations that responded to the e-survey (n=549) ranked the following components as the top three in terms of being insufficient or in need of improvement:³³¹

- coaches and technical leadership (46 per cent);
- direct athlete support and incentives (42 per cent); and
- facilities and equipment (39 per cent).

As one New Brunswick consultation participant noted: “the results show, once again, scattered results, which lead [us] to conclude that all or many programs are insufficient.”³³²

³²⁷ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³²⁸ Quebec Consultations, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³²⁹ Persons with a Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

³³⁰ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³³¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

³³² New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 11: Resources for Delivering Sport Programs and Services

Chapter Summary

- The top resources needed for delivering sport programs and services, according to consultation participants and e-survey respondents, were financial resources, human resources, and facilities.
- Inadequate financial resources, human resources and facilities limit the ability of sport organizations from fully achieving their potential in delivering sport programs and services.
- Strategies to address limitations include new funding solutions and models, and better training and compensation for coaches and volunteers. Participants also felt that they could gain resources and expertise by engaging in partnerships and collaborations with other actors.

Individuals responding to the e-survey on behalf of organizations and consultation participants were asked what resources (e.g. human, financial, equipment, facilities) their organizations needed to fully achieve their potential in delivering sport programs and services. E-survey respondents were asked to describe the limitations their organizations faced. Consultation participants also discussed the limitations they faced. In addition, consultation participants discussed the strategies they have used or could potentially use to overcome resource limitations. While some participants gave examples of successful strategies their organizations have implemented, the majority of the discussion focussed on potential strategies that could be implemented in the future.

Resources

Organizations responding to the e-survey were asked to select the resources they needed to fully achieve their potential in delivering sport programs and services.³³³ As shown in Table 11.1, the top five resources selected by organizational respondents (n=572) include: financial (78 per cent); human resources (59 per cent); facilities (45 per cent), program—e.g.; equipment, tools, etc. (28 per cent); and governance—e.g., templates, training, assistance, etc. (19 per cent).³³⁴

There were some differences in how respondents from different types of organizations answered this question. Respondents from publicly funded organizations (n=51) were more likely to indicate a need for clear programming objectives (29 per cent). Respondents from corporate/for profit organizations (n=7) were less likely to indicate a need for human resources (43 per cent), governance (0 per cent) and clear programming objectives (0 per cent) and were more likely to say they needed facilities (71 per cent) and program resources (43 per cent).³³⁵

³³³ This question was not asked of individuals responding on their own behalf to the e-survey.

³³⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³³⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

There were provincial and territorial differences in how respondents answered the e-survey question (See Table 11.1.). Respondents from Nunavut (n=24), the Northwest Territories (n=11), and the Yukon (n=14) placed less emphasis on financial resources (results range from 55 to 58 per cent). Respondents from the Northwest Territories and the Yukon were more likely to indicate they needed additional human resources (91 per cent; 86 per cent), and were less likely to say that facilities were an issue (27 per cent; 29 per cent). Organizations located in Alberta (n=119) and New Brunswick (n=28) were less likely to indicate they needed additional human resources (44 per cent; 43 per cent). Organizations in New Brunswick (n=28) and Manitoba (n=43) placed a greater emphasis on the need for facilities (64 per cent; 63 per cent). Greater emphasis was placed on the need for strategic plans (38 per cent; 33 per cent) by organizations located in Newfoundland (n=8) and Nunavut. Organizations located in Nunavut and Quebec (N=50) also indicated a need for more program resources (42 per cent; 50 per cent).³³⁶

Table 11.1 Resource Needs by Location of Organization³³⁷

Location of Organization	Resources Needed							
	Financial	Human resources	Facilities	Program (equipment, tools, etc.)	Governance (templates, training, assistance, etc.)	Strategic plan	Clear programming objectives	Other
All organizations (n=572)	78%	59%	45%	28%	19%	18%	16%	5%
British Columbia (n=61)	80%	67%	46%	18%	8%	13%	16%	8%
Alberta (n=119)	71%	44%	48%	25%	24%	16%	16%	5%
Saskatchewan (n=27)	85%	52%	37%	37%	30%	30%	30%	0%
Manitoba (n=43)	79%	53%	63%	37%	23%	14%	19%	0%

³³⁶ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³³⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

Location of Organization	Resources Needed							
	Financial	Human resources	Facilities	Program (equipment, tools, etc.)	Governance (templates, training, assistance, etc.)	Strategic plan	Clear programming objectives	Other
Ontario (n=153)	84%	65%	38%	22%	13%	21%	14%	8%
Quebec (n=50)	80%	64%	56%	50%	14%	8%	10%	4%
Nova Scotia (n=10)	80%	70%	60%	20%	30%	10%	10%	10%
Newfoundland (n=8)	88%	75%	50%	12%	12%	38%	12%	0%
Prince Edward Island (n=24)	79%	71%	21%	25%	17%	33%	42%	4%
New Brunswick (n=28)	86%	43%	64%	36%	18%	11%	4%	4%
Yukon (n=14)	57%	86%	29%	21%	29%	7%	21%	0%
Northwest Territories (n=11)	55%	91%	27%	36%	18%	18%	18%	0%
Nunavut (n=24)	58%	62%	50%	42%	46%	33%	21%	0%

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

Consultation participants were also asked about the resources required by their organization to fully achieve their potential in delivering sport programs and services. The required resources indicated by both consultation participants and e-survey participants are discussed below.

Financial Resources

Both consultation and e-survey participants emphasized financial resources as one of their most significant needs for delivering sport programs and services. Seventy-eight per cent of organizations responding to the e-survey indicated a need for financial resources.³³⁸ Consultation participants stressed the need for increased funding for a variety of purposes including program delivery,³³⁹ travel costs,³⁴⁰ training costs for staff and volunteers,³⁴¹ elite athletes,³⁴² and equipment.³⁴³ Limited funding³⁴⁴ and the need for increased funding stability³⁴⁵ were also raised as issues in the consultations.

Human Resources

E-survey respondents strongly emphasized the need for human resources (59 per cent), as did consultation participants.³⁴⁶ Consultation participants felt that there is a need for greater numbers of qualified coaches.³⁴⁷ Participants also noted that there is a need for more professional administrative staff³⁴⁸ and specialists such as nutritionists and psychologists.³⁴⁹ A need for improved training and professional development opportunities for staff was also identified.

The sport sector's heavy reliance on volunteers was identified as a problem. It can be difficult to recruit and retain volunteers.³⁵⁰ Volunteers also require more opportunities to receive quality training.³⁵¹

³³⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³³⁹ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴⁰ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴¹ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴² British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴³ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴⁴ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴⁵ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴⁶ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁴⁷ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴⁸ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁴⁹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁵⁰ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Facilities

Inadequate facilities were major issue identified by both consultation participants³⁵² and e-survey respondents (45 per cent). Many facilities are in high demand and it can be difficult to access facilities, particularly during peak hours.³⁵³ Insufficient access to school facilities was also identified as an issue in several consultation sessions.³⁵⁴

Equipment

Individuals responding on behalf of organizations to the e-survey placed moderate emphasis on the need for program resources including equipment and tools (28 per cent).³⁵⁵ Consultation participants also raised the issue of equipment resources, although this issue was not strongly emphasized.³⁵⁶

Governance

Individuals responding to the e-survey on behalf of organizations did not place strong emphasis on governance issues (19 per cent), although this varied considerably depending on the location of the organization, as discussed above. Issues related to governance were moderately emphasized in the consultation sessions. In a few consultation sessions held with national and provincial sport organizations, participants noted that sport requires greater political support from the provincial and federal governments.³⁵⁷ The need for better collaboration and partnerships between both sport and non-sport organizations was also raised in a number of the consultation sessions.³⁵⁸ Partnerships with the private sector and the health and education sectors were suggested in the consultations.³⁵⁹

³⁵¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁵² Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁵³ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations - Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁵⁴ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Official Language Minority Communities Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁵⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁵⁶ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁵⁷ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁵⁸ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁵⁹ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Marketing and Promotion

A secondary issue that emerged during the consultation discussions was the need for marketing tools and promotional opportunities. A few respondents who indicated “other” in the e-survey also indicated a need for better marketing tools and promotional opportunities.³⁶⁰ Marketing and media expertise and a marketing budget could help sport organizations succeed in attracting more participants and resources to their programs.³⁶¹ The need for support from the media and media coverage of a wider range of sports was also noted in a few consultation sessions.³⁶² Consultation sessions with national and provincial sport organizations were most likely to indicate a need for marketing tools and promotional opportunities.

Limitations

Financial

E-survey respondents (n=368) from different types of sport organizations and most of the provinces and territories indicated that inadequate financial resources were a challenge in delivering sport programs and services.³⁶³ Consultation participants also strongly emphasized the issue of insufficient financial resources.³⁶⁴ Limitations include too much reliance on short term funding, constantly changing funding criteria, and unstable funding sources (e.g. reliance on fundraising).³⁶⁵ A number of consultation sessions also raised the issue of high insurance costs.³⁶⁶

Human Resources

E-survey respondents and consultation participants identified inadequate human resources as a major limitation to the delivery of sport programs and services.³⁶⁷ A need for more qualified

³⁶⁰ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁶¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations - Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁶² Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁶³ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁶⁴ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁶⁵ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁶⁶ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁶⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

coaches and other sport staff was identified.³⁶⁸ Many sport organizations lack the financial resources to hire paid staff.³⁶⁹ Sport staff may also be unable to access regular, quality training.³⁷⁰

Both e-survey respondents and consultation participants noted that the sport sector's heavy reliance on volunteers as a limitation.³⁷¹ There are challenges in recruiting sufficient numbers of volunteers.³⁷² Some consultation participants attributed this in part to a declining sense of volunteerism in the general population.³⁷³ Retaining volunteers was also named as a challenge, in part due to volunteer burnout.³⁷⁴ Finally, many volunteers were said to lack adequate training.³⁷⁵

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities were identified as a significant issue by e-survey respondents from all types of sport organizations and all provinces and territories, with the exception of respondents from the Northwest Territories (n=6).³⁷⁶ Consultation participants also felt that a lack of adequate facilities was a significant issue. Sport organizations may lack access to appropriate facilities (especially during peak periods of use),³⁷⁷ or may not have the financial resources to access existing facilities.³⁷⁸ A few consultation sessions noted that it can be difficult to access school-based facilities.³⁷⁹ While a small number of consultation sessions and e-survey participants raised the issue of the cost and accessibility of equipment, this issue was not strongly emphasized.³⁸⁰

³⁶⁸ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁶⁹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁷⁰ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁷¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁷² Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁷³ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁷⁴ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁷⁵ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Consultation), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁷⁶ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁷⁷ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁷⁸ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁷⁹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁸⁰ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Lack of Understanding of the Benefits of Sport

Consultation participants felt that there was a lack of understanding of the broad benefits of sport (e.g., health and social benefits) from both the general public and various levels of government.³⁸¹ These concerns were echoed by a small number of e-survey respondents.³⁸²

Lack of Clear Programming Objectives

In a few consultation sessions it was noted that the sport sector often lacks a shared vision and overall plan.³⁸³ The concerns of consultation participants that raised this issue are captured in the following statement from the British Columbia Consultation: there is a “lack of definition/vision of where sport is going in the future.” These concerns were also voiced by a small number of e-survey participants.

Governance Issues

Governance issues were raised by both e-survey and consultation participants, although they were not strongly emphasized.³⁸⁴ Organizational capacity was identified as a challenge in some instances.³⁸⁵ In a few consultation sessions concerns were voiced about a “divergence” or “disconnect” between the various levels of government.³⁸⁶

Concerns about the impact of the school system on the sport system were raised in a few consultation sessions and by a few e-survey participants. These concerns related in part to the quality of physical education in some schools.³⁸⁷ A need for stronger linkages between the sport community and the school system was also identified.³⁸⁸

Recruitment and Retention of Participants

In a few consultations, participants identified challenges in recruiting and retaining participants. Some regions have growing populations and may not have adequate resources to serve those populations.³⁸⁹ Other regions, particularly rural and Northern regions, have small or declining

³⁸¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁸² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁸³ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁸⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre – SIRC), 2011.

³⁸⁵ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁸⁶ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting); British Columbia Consultation; National Sport Organizations—Ottawa Consultation; Prince Edward Island Consultation.

³⁸⁷ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Newfoundland Consultation (Sport Professionals), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁸⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁸⁹ New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

populations and may lack the resources or participant base to provide quality sport programs and services.³⁹⁰ Sport organizations also compete with one another for athletes.³⁹¹ A couple of consultation sessions noted that some participants may lack the financial resources to take part in sport programs.³⁹²

Strategies to Address Limitations

Funding

Strategies to address funding limitations were a major topic of discussion during the consultation sessions. Some consultation participants suggested that sport organizations diversify their funding sources to be less reliant on one source of funding (i.e., government).³⁹³ In particular, it was suggested that sport organizations work with the private sector.³⁹⁴ Other consultation participants expressed a desire for increased government funding and new models for delivering government funds.³⁹⁵ A few consultation participants noted the importance of fundraising.³⁹⁶

Human Resources

Strategies to address insufficient human resources received significant attention from consultation participants. Participants emphasized the need for more paid coaching positions.³⁹⁷ A wide range of ideas about how training opportunities for coaches could be made more available and accessible were also raised.³⁹⁸ A significant portion of the consultation discussion focussed on how to recruit and retain volunteers. It was suggested that sport organizations could partner with other organizations to recruit volunteers. Others suggested giving volunteers training and incentives (e.g., tax credits; internships).³⁹⁹

³⁹⁰ New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹² Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Women and Sport Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹³ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹⁴ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹⁵ Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹⁶ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations - Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹⁷ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹⁸ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

³⁹⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Facilities

Strategies to address facilities limitations were another major theme in the consultations. A number of consultation participants identified a need to better share the use of facilities.⁴⁰⁰ It was suggested that sport organizations try to find alternative facilities not directly associated with sport or gain access to private facilities when they are not in use.⁴⁰¹ A need for new facilities was identified. Some participants raised the importance of consulting with stakeholders in the development of facilities.⁴⁰²

Communicate the Benefits of Sport

In a number of consultations, it was felt the sport sector could do a better job communicating the benefits of sport to governments and the general public. Participants emphasized the need to promote: the health benefits of sport, the favourable impact sport has on personal development, and the economic benefits that can arise from hosting sporting events.⁴⁰³ Participants felt sport organizations must work together to effectively communicate these benefits.⁴⁰⁴

Partnerships and Collaboration

Throughout the discussion of potential strategies to deal with the limitations facing sport organizations, consultation participants emphasized the importance of working with other actors including governments, the school system and other sport organizations.⁴⁰⁵ Participants felt that partnerships and collaborations would allow them to share and gain additional resources and expertise.⁴⁰⁶

⁴⁰⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁰¹ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁰² British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁰³ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁰⁴ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁰⁵ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Recreation Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁰⁶ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 12: Human Resource Capacity

Chapter Summary

- The majority of consultation participants and e-survey respondents indicated that they did not have the human resource capacity to meet the demands of the next decade.
- The top human resource issues facing Canada's sports system include strategic planning, funding, recruitment, retention/succession planning, skills and training, compensation/recognition/rewards and working conditions/work-life balance.
- Potential solutions to addressing the human resources capacity issues include ideas for strategic planning, new funding models, recruitment and retention incentives, providing enhanced training opportunities, establishing effective partnerships and improving working conditions.

Consultation participants and e-survey respondents were asked whether their organizations had sufficient human resource capacity to meet the demands of the next decade. E-survey respondents from organizations were also asked to rank their top human resource issues. Consultation participants were then asked to discuss the major issues with respect to the recruitment, training and retention of staff and volunteers. Some consultation session also discussed potential solutions to these issues.

Human Resource Capacity

The majority of consultation participants indicated that their organizations did not have the human resource capacity to meet the demands of the next decade. Eighty per cent of e-survey respondents answering on behalf of their organizations agreed (n=564).⁴⁰⁷ “No” e-survey responses from the individual provinces and territories responses ranged from 74 to 100 per cent. Corporate or for profit e-survey respondents were the exception, with 57 per cent answering “yes” (n=7). Three-quarters of e-survey respondents from each of the provinces and territories were also negative in their outlook on their human resource capacity (ranging from 74 to 100 per cent).

Human Resource Issues

E-survey respondents were asked to select their top human resource issues. Table 12.1 below shows the top five choices of each type of responding organization. Compensation, recruitment, retention, training and skill set were the top five human resource issues for all types, although the order of choice differed. For instance, while retention was the top issue for publicly funded

⁴⁰⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011. This question was not asked of individuals responding on their own behalf to the e-survey.

organizations (i.e., municipal, provincial/territorial or federal government), compensation was the top issue for national and provincial/territorial sport organizations as well as for educational organizations.

Table 12.1 Human Resource Issues by Type of Organization⁴⁰⁸

Type of Organization ⁴⁰⁹	Human Resource Issue				
	Compensation	Recruitment	Retention	Training	Skill Set
All organizations (n=564)	Choice 1 (55 %)	Choice 2 (55 %)	Choice 3 (55 %)	Choice 4 (42 %)	Choice 5 (36 %)
Publicly Funded Only (n=49)	Choice 5 (39 %)	Choice 2 (51 %)	Choice 1 (65 %)	Choice 4 (47 %)	Choice 3 (49 %)
Not-for-Profit/ Voluntary Only (n=190)	Choice 3 (52 %)	Choice 1 (60 %)	Choice 2 (56 %)	Choice 4 (42 %)	Choice 5 (31 %)
National Sport Organizations (n=95)	Choice 1 (63 %)	Choice 3 (52 %)	Choice 2 (55 %)	Choice 4 (41 %)	Choice 5 (37 %)
Provincial/Territorial Sport Organizations (n=141)	Choice 1 (60 %)	Choice 2 (60 %)	Choice 3 (56 %)	Choice 4 (44 %)	Choice 5 (40 %)
Corporate/ For Profit Only (n=7)	Choice 5 (29 %)	Choice 3 (29 %)	Choice 2 (43 %)	Choice 1 (57 %)	Choice 4 (29 %)
Education Only (n=41)	Choice 1 (56 %)	Choice 5 (32 %)	Choice 3 (39 %)	Choice 2 (44 %)	Choice 4 (37 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

Geographical analysis of human resource capacity issues reveals that recruitment was the top issue for organizations in Alberta, New Brunswick, and the Yukon while compensation was the top issue for organizations in British Columbia, Newfoundland and Labrador, Ontario and Saskatchewan. These two issues tied for the top spot in Manitoba with retention creating a three-way tie in Nova Scotia. Retention was the most frequently selected human resource issue for

⁴⁰⁸ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁰⁹ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of organization. "Only" refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

organizations from Nunavut, the Northwest Territories and Prince Edward Island. Training was the top issue cited by Quebec organizations.

Consultation and e-survey participants provided details about a variety of specific issues that were hampering their human resource capacity. A discussion of the major human resource capacity issues follows.

Strategic Planning Issues

Staff-specific

Consultation participants noted a general absence of long-term strategic planning by governments and organizations. Overall, there was a sense of limited ability to “identify and manage risk”⁴¹⁰ which will hinder the sport community in meeting its future goals. It was mentioned that some sport organizations will need to plan ahead to ensure that their governance models will comply with the upcoming Canada Not-for-Profit Corporations Act.⁴¹¹

Strong leadership was seen as a requirement for planning ahead to meet current and future challenges and to overcome human resource capacity issues. Leadership planning includes focusing on the recruitment of young leaders to ensure continued success in the future.⁴¹²

Volunteer-specific

It was mentioned by some that too often, sport organizations were not operated as “businesses” and therefore, were not run as efficiently as they could be—perhaps due to the high level of dependence on volunteers.⁴¹³ Consultation participants noted that “many, if not most, volunteer based local and provincial sport organizations are currently just struggling to survive”.⁴¹⁴

Funding Issues

Funding issues affected organizations’ strategic plans and their ability to put their plans into action. Insufficient or decreasing funding or changes to the funding landscape all result in impacts on sport organizations. Consultation participants mentioned that funding in the form of year-to-year grants, rather than long-term funding commitments, leads to uncertainty and staff retention issues.⁴¹⁵ Others stated the need for increased funding assistance in order to maintain operations⁴¹⁶ and pay salaries for sufficient numbers of expert coaches and administrators. Many organizations observed that a lack of funds was leading to understaffing, overwork and staff burnout.

⁴¹⁰ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴¹¹ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴¹² Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴¹³ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴¹⁴ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴¹⁵ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴¹⁶ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

Recruitment Issues

Staff-specific

Consultation participants stated that there was a need to recruit for administrative and skilled staff positions as well as coaches and officials who are trained to implement CS4L⁴¹⁷.

Recruitment challenges include low interest in working in the area along with long hours and heavy workloads due to insufficient staff sizes to perform the work needed. Another recruitment challenge is that those who would normally fill the roles of administrators, coaches and officials do not have the time as they are staying active longer as sports participants.⁴¹⁸ Northern communities experience challenges in recruiting skilled staff and in keeping northern citizens in the north when they must leave to find relevant post-secondary programs and training opportunities.⁴¹⁹

Volunteer-specific

Participants commented that sport is built on a volunteer governance model and that volunteers are necessary to support operations and participation.⁴²⁰ Consultation participants expressed concern over the declining number of volunteers⁴²¹, partly due to an aging population that is remaining active longer in sports rather than turning to volunteerism.⁴²² Another part of the volunteer equation is that the system is highly parent-driven; parents tend to volunteer only so long as their own children are involved.⁴²³ It was also noted that volunteers today have different expectations than in the past⁴²⁴ and that sport must compete with other interest areas for volunteers.⁴²⁵

Retention/Succession Planning Issues

Staff-specific

Consultation participants lamented the high staff turnover rates in sport organizations.⁴²⁶ They pointed to insufficient or absent succession planning, especially with regard to engaging an

⁴¹⁷ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴¹⁸ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴¹⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²⁰ Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²¹ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²² Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²³ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²⁴ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²⁵ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²⁶ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

incoming generation of staff.⁴²⁷ Organizations without succession plans are especially vulnerable to departures of key staff, such as retiring workers who take valuable corporate knowledge with them.⁴²⁸

Volunteer-specific

Consultation session participants likewise commented on the high turnover of volunteers.⁴²⁹ Succession planning needs, therefore, are critical for organizations that rely on the assistance of volunteers.⁴³⁰

Skills and Training Issues

Staff-specific

Sport organization staff need the right skill sets to ensure their organizations operate effectively and efficiently.⁴³¹ While it was recognized that professional training was necessary to keep staff engaged and current in their skills⁴³², participants noted the general lack of funding available in sport organizations for training, professional development and learning plans.⁴³³ Keeping technological skills current with limited Information Technology funding was a particular challenge for some organizations.⁴³⁴ Insufficient opportunities for training was also mentioned in consultation sessions as an issue in terms of ensuring adequate capacity for program delivery.⁴³⁵ In addition, participants noted the need to be able to reach out cross-culturally in communities where English was not the first language spoken at home.⁴³⁶

Volunteer-specific

Consultation participants discussed the need to provide appropriate training for volunteers, especially when volunteers are continually asked to take on increasingly important roles, ranging from writing grant applications to recruitment of officials and training others.⁴³⁷ On the other hand, training that is too time consuming or otherwise onerous can deter participation.⁴³⁸

⁴²⁷ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations – Sport Canada), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²⁸ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴²⁹ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³⁰ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³¹ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³² Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³³ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³⁴ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations – Sport Canada), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³⁵ Aboriginal Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³⁶ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³⁷ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴³⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Compensation/ Recognition/Rewards Issues

Staff-specific

Participants noted difficulties in organizations' ability to provide competitive wages and benefits to skilled staff, managers and coaches, especially in smaller and remote or rural communities.⁴³⁹ The resulting high turnover rates in turn lead to recruitment and retention issues.⁴⁴⁰

Volunteer-specific

Recognition and rewards for volunteer efforts were lacking in sport organizations, according to participants.⁴⁴¹ Inadequate numbers of paid staff members often leads to heavy work loads for the remaining staff and for the volunteers involved. It was felt that insufficient appreciation of volunteers was another factor in their declining numbers.⁴⁴²

Working Conditions /Work-Life Balance Issues

Staff-specific

Inadequate staff numbers, declining numbers of volunteers and increasing workloads were seen by consultation participants as leading to staff burnout and retention issues. To combat their working situations, staff are increasingly asking for better work-life balance options such as flexible work environments and schedules.⁴⁴³ Lack of appreciation and respect were also mentioned as sore points for many skilled staff, coaches and officials.⁴⁴⁴

Volunteer-specific

Increasing expectations, demands and work-loading of a limited number of volunteers in sport organizations has often lead to volunteer burnout.⁴⁴⁵ Lack of appreciation and respect were

⁴³⁹ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁴⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁴¹ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 201; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁴² Manitoba Consultation (Individual Sport Organizations – Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁴³ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 201; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁴⁴ Manitoba Consultation (Individual Sport Organizations – Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁴⁵ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

additional factors contributing to volunteer retention difficulties.⁴⁴⁶ Consultation participants pointed to lack of time as an issue for many volunteers: while they may wish to assist with one particular event, they may not be interested in a long-term volunteer commitment.⁴⁴⁷

Potential Solutions

Strategic Planning

Participants stressed that strategic planning is vital to the future success of sport in Canada. Development of governance models that complement the vision of the Canadian Sport Policy was named as one solution.⁴⁴⁸ The establishment of community sport councils and national sports institutes were also suggested.⁴⁴⁹ Business models with tools for decision-making as well as regional sport development plans within provinces and territories were also mentioned as strategic planning approaches.⁴⁵⁰

Overall, a coordinated sport system would allow for improved coordination within and between sports and enhanced collaboration between stakeholders at all levels.⁴⁵¹ A better coordinated system would also result in improved efficiencies in facility use, infrastructure and human resources.⁴⁵² Continuity of vision and consistent messaging of the benefits of sport will lead to improved communications and participation levels.⁴⁵³

Within organizations, establishing mission statements and mandates would help staff [and volunteers] to better understand their roles and the values of the organization.⁴⁵⁴ The identification of priorities in order to focus efforts and maximize limited resources was also seen as a needed solution.⁴⁵⁵ Through strategic recruitment, retention and succession planning, human resources and corporate knowledge can be managed more effectively.⁴⁵⁶

⁴⁴⁶ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Water Polo), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁴⁷ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁴⁸ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁴⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁵⁰ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁵¹ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁵² British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁵³ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁵⁴ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁵⁵ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁵⁶ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

New Funding Models

To manage changing funding levels, consultation participants suggested that organizations find new funding models. The need to establish sustainable funding from a variety of sources, including private sector funding, was discussed.⁴⁵⁷ Overall, participants agreed that increased funding for qualified staff, including administrators and coaches and to build capacity was essential for continued operations and growth.⁴⁵⁸

Recruitment and Retention Incentives

Consultation participants discussed a number of incentives to recruit and retain staff and volunteers in sport organizations. Offering more paid positions for administrators, coaches and educators was suggested, in addition to flexible work environments.⁴⁵⁹ Providing other means of compensation to coaches and officials, such as benefits, professional development opportunities, honourariums, and recognition were also suggested as incentives.⁴⁶⁰ Another discussion point was the importance of staying connected with parent-coaches after their children have moved on in the system and providing incentives for them to continue coaching.⁴⁶¹

Participants agreed on the need to increase the number of volunteers in sport, potentially through recruiting outside of traditional volunteer areas or building volunteer pools across sports.⁴⁶² One suggestion to boost volunteer recruitment was to establish a strategic partnership with Canadian Inter-university Sport (CIS).⁴⁶³ Providing incentives to attract volunteers to sport was discussed by participants. Ideas for volunteering incentives include tax credits, more affordable insurance, flexible opportunities, internships and educational credits.⁴⁶⁴

Enhanced Training Opportunities

Participants were in favour of enhancing the training and orientation opportunities for sport organization staff and volunteers. By offering development opportunities, organizations will gain employees and volunteers with more expertise and greater loyalty to the organization.⁴⁶⁵

⁴⁵⁷ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁵⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁵⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁶⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁶¹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁶² Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁶³ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁶⁴ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁶⁵ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Providing training and development opportunities for coaches at all levels will result in greater competencies and professionalism within the coaching ranks.⁴⁶⁶ It was also suggested that if organizations had access to more training and certified exercise physiologists, they could better identify talent and monitor athlete health.⁴⁶⁷

Establish Effective Partnerships

Effective partnerships create positive linkages between sports regions and individual clubs.⁴⁶⁸ Consultation participants attested that partnerships with defined roles and responsibilities provide support to high performance and sport development programs.⁴⁶⁹ Establishing links with the education sector can lead to better integration of post-secondary training with sport sector needs. There is also the potential to place paid physical education specialists in Canadian schools to support athlete identification and development.⁴⁷⁰

Improve Working Conditions

By improving the working conditions for staff and volunteers, turnover and burnout issues may be reduced. Consultation participants commented that in some cases, organizations could operate more effectively with clear job descriptions for staff and volunteers and more modern technology.⁴⁷¹ Recognition programs were put forward by participants as a method of enhancing loyalty and job satisfaction for staff and volunteers.⁴⁷² Greater flexibility in the workplace (e.g., tele-working, flexible hours) and better work-life balance were also suggested as potential solutions to improving the working conditions in sport organizations.⁴⁷³

⁴⁶⁶ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁶⁷ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁶⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁶⁹ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁷⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁷¹ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁷² Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁷³ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 13: Benefits and Challenges of NSO and PTSO Linkages

Chapter Summary

- Benefits of improving linkages between national sport organizations and their provincial/territorial counterparts include improved sport governance, more efficient sport systems and programs, and more efficient use of resources.
- Challenges of improving these linkages include competing or conflicting priorities and practices, resource issues, lack of awareness, and a lack of trust.
- Potential solutions offered to address the challenges include improving communications and promotional efforts, using established business practices, and clearly defining roles and responsibilities of the organizations involved.

Consultation participants were asked to discuss the benefits of improving linkages between national sport organizations and their provincial and territorial counterparts. E-survey respondents were asked to select from a given set of benefits and also had the opportunity to give an open-ended response. Consultation participants were then invited to share their thoughts on the challenges of improving these linkages. Again, e-survey respondents were asked to select from a given set of challenges and also had the opportunity to give an open-ended response. Though not a core question, some consultation sessions also asked participants for potential solutions to the challenges of improving linkages between national sport organizations and their provincial/territorial counterparts.

Benefits of Improving Linkages between National Sport Organizations and their Provincial/Territorial Counterparts

Both consultation and e-survey participants reported that improving the linkages between national sport organizations and their provincial/territorial counterparts would result in a number of mutually-beneficial outcomes. While consultation participants discussed the benefits in an open discussion, e-survey participants were asked to select from a given set of benefits. The set of benefits offered in the e-survey differed in focus from the consultation session responses. However, the open-ended responses to the e-survey showed more similarity to the consultation discussion areas of focus. Highlights of the e-survey results are found in Table 13.1 below, and are followed by a description of the benefits discussed most frequently in both the consultation sessions and in the open-ended e-survey responses.

E-survey respondents were asked to select the top benefits of improving linkages between national sport organizations and their provincial/territorial counterparts. Table 13.1 below shows the top choices for each type of responding individual. Athlete development was selected most often by almost all individual respondents, with coach/leader development as the second choice for most. Knowledge transfer was selected third most often, followed by program partnerships, relevant programming, and improved services which alternated as the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-selected benefits.

Table 13.1 Benefits of NSO-PTSO Linkages by Type of Individual⁴⁷⁴

Type of Individual ⁴⁷⁵	Benefit of NSO-PTSO Linkages					
	Athlete Development	Coach / Leader Development	Program Partnerships	Relevant Programming	Knowledge Transfer	Improved Services
All individuals (n=1,637)	Choice 1 (80 %)	Choice 2 (75 %)	Choice 4 (54 %)	Choice 6 (39 %)	Choice 3 (70 %)	Choice 5 (50 %)
Athletes Only (n=172)	Choice 1 (85 %)	Choice 2 (64 %)	Choice 5 (41 %)	Choice 6 (32 %)	Choice 3 (62 %)	Choice 4 (43 %)
Coaches Only (n=127)	Choice 2 (80 %)	Choice 1 (81 %)	Choice 4 (50 %)	Choice 6 (30 %)	Choice 3 (69 %)	Choice 5 (39 %)
Officials (n=307)	Choice 1 (82 %)	Choice 2 (80 %)	Choice 4 (55 %)	Choice 5 (44 %)	Choice 3 (74 %)	Choice 6 (50 %)
Volunteers (n=731)	Choice 1 (80 %)	Choice 2 (78 %)	Choice 4 (59 %)	Choice 6 (43 %)	Choice 3 (74 %)	Choice 5 (53 %)
Employees Only (n=69)	Choice 1 (78 %)	Choice 1 (78 %)	Choice 2 (70 %)	Choice 3 (48 %)	Choice 2 (70 %)	Choice 3 (48 %)
Parents (n=446)	Choice 1 (84 %)	Choice 2 (78 %)	Choice 4 (53 %)	Choice 6 (42 %)	Choice 3 (71 %)	Choice 5 (51 %)
Researchers (n=103)	Choice 2 (79 %)	Choice 3 (73 %)	Choice 4 (56 %)	Choice 6 (46 %)	Choice 1 (81 %)	Choice 5 (54 %)
Participants Only (n=46)	Choice 1 (61 %)	Choice 2 (57 %)	Choice 5 (43 %)	Choice 6 (26 %)	Choice 3 (52 %)	Choice 4 (50 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

⁴⁷⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁷⁵ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of individual (e.g., athlete and volunteer). “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

An examination of the individual responses to the e-survey by geographical location produced the same selection pattern of benefits, as did the analysis of response by level of engagement.⁴⁷⁶

Improved Sport Governance

Participants agreed that a major benefit of improving linkages between national and provincial/territorial sport organizations is improved governance through better aligned organizational goals, strategic policies, mandates and plans.⁴⁷⁷ A better understanding of organizational goals and plans will allow these organizations to take collective action on common objectives in a transparent fashion.⁴⁷⁸ The end result will be improved support and efficiencies through streamlined decision-making for programming (including LTAD⁴⁷⁹) and use of resources, including funding and facilities.

More Efficient Sport Systems and Programs

Much of the consultation participants' discussions revolved around how to create efficiencies across the sport system through improved linkages. Increasing the level of understanding among partners was felt to be the best approach to creating better partner relationships and enhancing coordination among partners.⁴⁸⁰ The CS4L and LTAD initiatives were seen as powerful tools that should be used to unite national and provincial/territorial sport organizations in developing and implementing cohesive joint plans and programs.⁴⁸¹ Shared implementation of LTAD efforts will help to ensure consistency and open communication between the various levels of sport organizations.

More consistent and higher quality programming was discussed as another benefit of improving linkages between national and provincial/territorial sport organizations.⁴⁸² Improved linkages will also help sport participants by facilitating better access to information on training programs, events, sources of expertise and competition opportunities.⁴⁸³ A more efficient and effective athlete development pathway is another important potential outcome of improving sport programming through enhanced linkages between national and provincial/territorial sport organizations.⁴⁸⁴

⁴⁷⁶ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁷⁷ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁷⁸ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁷⁹ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁸⁰ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁸¹ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁸² Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁸³ Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁸⁴ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

More Efficient Use of Resources

Improved linkages between national and provincial/territorial sport organizations would lead to better alignment and utilization of resources, according to the participants.⁴⁸⁵ For example, access to and use of facilities could be better planned and coordinated.⁴⁸⁶ In fact, consultation participants suggested that a comprehensive facility plan could serve as a tool to build linkages and capacity in sports through competition hosting, revenue stream generation and high performance training. They also highlighted the importance of collaboration between national and provincial/territorial organizations at the onset of facility planning and development to ensure maximum efficiency of use.⁴⁸⁷

Participants' discussions of resources extended to personnel. Improving linkages between national and provincial/territorial sport organizations would help to eliminate the duplication of effort and overlapping of staff functions.⁴⁸⁸ Furthermore, better communications would lead to improved clarity around roles and responsibilities across sport systems.⁴⁸⁹ Improved linkages between levels of organizations would facilitate sharing of expertise and skills as well as knowledge transfer and support, resulting in more effective and efficient systems and programs.⁴⁹⁰

Challenges of Improving Linkages between National Sport Organizations and their Provincial/Territorial Counterparts

While consultation participants discussed the challenges in an open discussion, e-survey participants were asked to select from a given set of challenges. The set of challenges offered in the e-survey differed in focus from the consultation session responses. However, the open-ended responses to the e-survey showed more similarity to the consultation discussion areas of focus. Highlights of the e-survey results are found in Table 13.2 below, and are followed by a description of the challenges discussed most frequently in both the consultation sessions and in the open-ended e-survey responses.

E-survey respondents were asked to select the top challenges to improving linkages between national sport organizations and their provincial/territorial counterparts. Table 13.2 below shows the top selections for each type of responding individual. Communications was chosen most often by all types of individual respondent, except for Researchers, for whom communications was the second choice. Governance structure was selected second most often, while human

⁴⁸⁵ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁸⁶ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁸⁷ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁸⁸ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁸⁹ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁹⁰ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

resources was chosen third most often. Personalities and culture conflicts were the fourth- and fifth-selected challenges. An examination of the individual responses to the e-survey by geographical location produced the same pattern of selected challenges, as did the analysis of response by level of engagement.⁴⁹¹

Table 13.2 Challenges of NSO-PTSO Linkages by Type of Individual⁴⁹²

Type of Individual ⁴⁹³	Challenges of NSO-PTSO Linkages				
	Communication	Human Resources	Culture Conflicts	Governance Structure	Personalities
All individuals (n=1,621)	Choice 1 (73 %)	Choice 2 (50 %)	Choice 3 (25 %)	Choice 4 (56 %)	Choice 5 (40 %)
Athletes Only (n=168)	Choice 1 (77 %)	Choice 3 (36 %)	Choice 5 (15 %)	Choice 2 (44 %)	Choice 4 (27 %)
Coaches Only (n=127)	Choice 1 (77 %)	Choice 2 (54 %)	Choice 5 (20 %)	Choice 3 (50 %)	Choice 4 (43 %)
Officials (n=303)	Choice 1 (70 %)	Choice 3 (51 %)	Choice 5 (23 %)	Choice 2 (60 %)	Choice 4 (48 %)
Volunteers (n=723)	Choice 1 (73 %)	Choice 3 (52 %)	Choice 5 (28 %)	Choice 2 (58 %)	Choice 4 (46 %)
Employees Only (n=70)	Choice 1 (76 %)	Choice 2 (63 %)	Choice 4 (19 %)	Choice 2 (63 %)	Choice 3 (29 %)
Parents (n=442)	Choice 1 (70 %)	Choice 3 (52 %)	Choice 5 (25 %)	Choice 2 (55 %)	Choice 4 (40 %)
Researchers (n=103)	Choice 2 (68 %)	Choice 3 (50 %)	Choice 4 (42 %)	Choice 1 (73 %)	Choice 4 (42 %)
Participants Only (n=46)	Choice 1 (74 %)	Choice 3 (41 %)	Choice 4 (30 %)	Choice 2 (59 %)	Choice 4 (30 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

⁴⁹¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁹² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁹³ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of individual (e.g., athlete and volunteer). “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

Competing or Conflicting Priorities and Practices

One key challenge to improving the linkages between sport organizations is that they do not always use the same type of governance structure.⁴⁹⁴ Participants noted that the governance model used in some sport organizations follows the federal government model, while others are based on a corporate governance model.⁴⁹⁵ The result is difference structures, reporting requirements and priorities.⁴⁹⁶ Participants also discussed how the differing governance structures hinder organizations from developing at the same pace.⁴⁹⁷ These differences may impede or deter sport organizations at different levels or within the same sport from partnering or collaborating with each other.

Resource Issues

Funding variances between levels and regions as well as divergent funding practices, models and insurance programs are additional obstacles to building linkages between national and provincial/territorial sport organizations.⁴⁹⁸ Participants also mentioned capacity issues, including a lack of time, energy and human resources that make it difficult to establish and maintain partnerships.⁴⁹⁹ Also, varying capacity levels between the national and provincial/territorial levels create obstacles to improving linkages between levels of sport organization.⁵⁰⁰

Lack of Awareness

Participants discussed a lack of awareness of the benefits of linkages in general, but also of where to find partners, existing programs, and opportunities for partnering. A key challenge to improving linkages, participants said, was finding effective ways to demonstrate the value of creating and maintaining those linkages.⁵⁰¹ Another issue was the lack of understanding between various sport groups and organizations or of what each has to offer.⁵⁰² Moreover, knowledge transfer within sports is hampered by the absence of a “roadmap” to encourage athletes to become coaches, administrators or volunteers once they are no longer actively pursuing their sport.⁵⁰³

⁴⁹⁴ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁹⁵ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁹⁶ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁹⁷ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁴⁹⁸ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁴⁹⁹ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁰⁰ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁰¹ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁰² Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁰³ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Participants felt that some parents were not aware of or do not understand the Canadian Sport for Life ethos. Further, sport participants (e.g., parents, teachers, school administrators) often do not fully appreciate the nature of individual sport cultures and how they may affect younger participants' enjoyment of certain sports. Youth enjoyment of sports is also influenced by their ethnic culture and any special needs they may have. Consultation participants noted that while the needs of school-age children can vary widely, these varying needs are often not addressed by sport organizations' policies and programs.⁵⁰⁴

Lack of Trust

Participants discussed how a lack of trust between sport organizations hinders the creation or improvement of linkages between them. Discordant visions and objectives lead to a lack of cooperation and flexibility when it comes to working together.⁵⁰⁵ A consultative, collaborative approach is often wanting, according to participants.⁵⁰⁶ As one e-survey respondent commented, "[There is a] lack of appreciation by NSO of the valuable role PSOs play in developing athletes and promoting the sport."⁵⁰⁷ Further, there was some resistance to change noted, especially on developing and integrated model of sport policies and programs.⁵⁰⁸

Solutions for Improving Linkages

Consultation participants recognized the need to identify ways in which linkages between partners can be "win-win" situations in order to encourage more collaborative methods of engagement.⁵⁰⁹ For example, provincial/territorial sport organizations could collaborate to provide complementary off-season activities as well as cross-training opportunities.⁵¹⁰ In general, better communications, especially between national and provincial/territorial sport organizations, would benefit all partners and would assist in program and funding alignment to achieve mutual objectives.⁵¹¹ Communications efforts should extend to ensuring that sport organizations are capable of working with other sport organizations in both official languages.⁵¹²

⁵⁰⁴ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁰⁵ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁰⁶ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁰⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁰⁸ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁰⁹ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵¹⁰ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵¹¹ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵¹² Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Good governance and established business practices were mentioned as methods of increasing the effectiveness and capacity of sport organizations.⁵¹³ Clearly defined roles and responsibilities for federal and provincial/territorial level champions would enhance efforts to promote the Canadian sport brand.⁵¹⁴ Promotion of the CS4L and LTAD elements is an area that could be particularly improved, especially in terms of teacher education and training.⁵¹⁵ In addition, physical literacy instruction for teachers would help to address the needs of children with cultural, learning or behavioural challenges.⁵¹⁶

⁵¹³ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵¹⁴ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵¹⁵ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵¹⁶ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 14: Benefits and Challenges of PTSO and Community Linkages

Chapter Summary

- Benefits to improving linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations include improved governance, more efficient use of resources, improved communications, more efficient systems and programs, increased participation, partnership development, improved training opportunities, sharing of best practices, and improved inclusiveness.
- Challenges to improving these linkages include competing or conflicting priorities and practices, resource issues, lack of awareness/communications issues, recruitment and retention issues, lack of training/skills/knowledge, and resistance to change.
- Benefits and challenges of developing a common Community Sport for Life Plan were offered by some participants, as well as examples of successful collaborations between community sport partners.

Consultation participants were asked to discuss the benefits of improving linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and municipal-level sport clubs, schools and recreation departments/organizations. E-survey respondents were asked to select from a given set of benefits and also had the opportunity to give an open-ended response. Consultation participants were then invited to share their thoughts on the challenges of improving these linkages. E-survey respondents were asked to select from a given set of challenges and also had the opportunity to give an open-ended response.

Though not a core question, some consultation sessions also asked participants about the benefits and challenges of developing a common Community Sport for Life Plan. These sessions also discussed examples of successful practices where community partners in sport, education, recreation and healthy living were currently working together.

Benefits of Improving Linkages between Provincial/Territorial Sport Organizations and Community Organizations

Both consultation and e-survey participants reported that improving the linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and municipal-level sport clubs, schools and recreation departments/organizations (“community organizations”) would result in a number of mutually-beneficial outcomes. While consultation participants discussed the benefits in an open discussion, e-survey participants were asked to select from a given set of benefits. The set of benefits offered in the e-survey differed in focus from the consultation session responses. However, the open-ended responses to the e-survey showed more similarity to the consultation discussion areas of focus.

Highlights of the e-survey results are found in Table 14.1 below. They are followed by a description of the benefits discussed most frequently in both the consultation sessions and in the open-ended e-survey responses.

Table 14.1 Benefits of PTSO-Community Linkages by Type of Individual⁵¹⁷

Type of Individual ⁵¹⁸	Benefit of PTSO-Community Linkages						
	Relevant Programming	Targeted Uptake	Shared Expertise	Partnerships	Knowledge Transfer	Improved Services	Wider Audience
All Individuals (n=1,582)	Choice 3 (60 %)	Choice 5 (35 %)	Choice 1 (70 %)	Choice 4 (55 %)	Choice 1 (70 %)	Choice 2 (62 %)	Choice 4 (55 %)
Athletes Only (n=163)	Choice 5 (49 %)	Choice 7 (31 %)	Choice 2 (67 %)	Choice 6 (43 %)	Choice 1 (69 %)	Choice 4 (57 %)	Choice 3 (61 %)
Coaches Only (n=122)	Choice 3 (61 %)	Choice 7 (31 %)	Choice 2 (69 %)	Choice 6 (43 %)	Choice 1 (70 %)	Choice 4 (50 %)	Choice 5 (46 %)
Officials (n=299)	Choice 3 (66 %)	Choice 7 (39 %)	Choice 1 (71 %)	Choice 6 (57 %)	Choice 2 (70 %)	Choice 4 (61 %)	Choice 5 (59 %)
Volunteers (n=709)	Choice 3 (64 %)	Choice 6 (36 %)	Choice 1 (75 %)	Choice 4 (60 %)	Choice 2 (74 %)	Choice 3 (64 %)	Choice 5 (56 %)
Employees Only (n=68)	Choice 3 (63 %)	Choice 7 (26 %)	Choice 4 (62 %)	Choice 1 (72 %)	Choice 5 (60 %)	Choice 2 (68 %)	Choice 6 (59 %)
Parents (n=432)	Choice 4 (62 %)	Choice 7 (33 %)	Choice 1 (75 %)	Choice 5 (57 %)	Choice 2 (69 %)	Choice 3 (64 %)	Choice 6 (56 %)
Researchers (n=101)	Choice 4 (61 %)	Choice 7 (34 %)	Choice 2 (77 %)	Choice 5 (60 %)	Choice 1 (80 %)	Choice 3 (67 %)	Choice 6 (54 %)
Participants Only (n=47)	Choice 2 (53 %)	Choice 6 (30 %)	Choice 1 (64 %)	Choice 5 (32 %)	Choice 2 (53 %)	Choice 3 (49 %)	Choice 4 (47 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

⁵¹⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵¹⁸ E-survey respondents were allowed to identify themselves as belonging to more than one type of individual (e.g., athlete and volunteer). “Only” refers to e-survey respondents who selected only this type.

E-survey respondents were asked to select the top benefits of improving linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations. Table 14.1 above shows the top choices for each type of responding individual. Shared expertise was chosen as the top benefit most often, followed by knowledge transfer. Relevant programming, partnerships, improved services and wider audience were selected next by respondents in alternating order. However, targeted uptake was universally selected least often from the given list of benefits.

An examination of the individual responses to the e-survey by geographical location produced similar selection patterns, as did the analysis of response by level of engagement.⁵¹⁹

Improved Governance

By involving community-level stakeholders in decision-making, provincial/territorial sport organizations would have a better understanding of issues and needs at the grassroots level (e.g., needed training opportunities for coaches of a particular sport).⁵²⁰ The majority of consultation participants agreed that improving linkages would result in improved sport governance through opportunities to integrate and support policies and plans.⁵²¹ Establishing a common vision and goals among partners would facilitate shared decision-making, responsibility and ownership of mutual efforts.⁵²² Linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations would also help to create consistency between provinces and a unified voice for sport in Canada.⁵²³ However, potential linkages should be discussed and actual linkages should be evaluated for impacts and outcomes to determine the real benefits to all partners on an ongoing basis.⁵²⁴

Consultation participants felt that a benefit of enhanced linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations would be the opportunity to clearly define roles and responsibilities within an integrated governance model.⁵²⁵ Clearly delineated roles would lead to a better understanding of expectations and capacities at respective levels. In addition, improved linkages would allow for standardization of structures, rules and processes, including safety standards across various sports and across school boards.⁵²⁶

Improving linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and education system partners would be particularly beneficial, according to consultation participants. For instance,

⁵¹⁹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵²⁰ Ontario Consultation (Education Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵²¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵²² Alberta Consultation (Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵²³ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵²⁴ Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵²⁵ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵²⁶ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Education Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

provincial/territorial sport organizations could then be better represented on school boards.⁵²⁷ The resulting improvements in communication would help to resolve issues of sport in school curricula and scheduling of school sport and other sport activities for school-age children.⁵²⁸

More Efficient Use of Resources

Many consultation and e-survey participants stated that improved linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations would prevent duplication of effort and result in greater efficiencies.⁵²⁹ Better coordination of funding and alignment of human resources, volunteers, facilities, and equipment were also mentioned as benefits of improving these linkages.⁵³⁰

Better use of available facilities and installations would be a particularly beneficial outcome of improving linkages, according to the participants.⁵³¹ Establishing working relationships and networks between community-level partners and other stakeholder organizations would allow for better planning of shared facility usage and optimal use of facility capacity. Improved planning would lead to better access to facilities as well as the building of new facilities that meet the specific needs of provincial/territorial sport organizations and community sport clubs.⁵³² Developing joint-use agreements between stakeholder groups, such as schools and municipalities, would help to ensure planned, coordinated facility access.⁵³³

Better use of funds and financial resources was another important benefit of improving linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations, according to participants.⁵³⁴ Sharing or pooling of financial resources between provincial and local sport organizations would allow for mutual planning and efficient decision-making.⁵³⁵ Improved linkages would facilitate fundraising efforts that benefit common initiatives for both

⁵²⁷ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵²⁸ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵²⁹ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵³⁰ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (Organizations National Sport –Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵³¹ Ottawa Consultation (Organizations National Sport – Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵³² Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Persons with a Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵³³ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholder Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵³⁴ Alberta Consultation (Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵³⁵ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

provincial/territorial and community organizations.⁵³⁶ While sport partners could enjoy the positive outcomes of shared funding, they could also create economies of scale by sharing costs.⁵³⁷

Participants also mentioned the benefits of the increased amount of information and resources that would be available to community sport clubs and other stakeholders (e.g., schools) as a result of increased linkages with provincial/territorial sport organizations.⁵³⁸ In addition, better linkages would provide community organizations with enhanced access to technical experts and specialists within or connected to provincial/territorial sport organizations.⁵³⁹

Improved Communications

Many participants noted that improved communications between stakeholders would result from improved linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations.⁵⁴⁰ Improved communications were defined by participants as open and two-way interactions between interest groups on needs, capacity and roles.⁵⁴¹ The ability to build effective partnerships and initiate formal dialogues with stakeholder groups (e.g., recreational departments) on sport would additional beneficial outcomes of improved linkages between provincial and community organizations.⁵⁴² Further, improved coordination of tournaments and championship games to minimize conflicts between sports would be especially helpful in rural and remote regions with lower populations where athletes and other participants are active in more than one sport.⁵⁴³

Improved linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations would reveal champions that could work with local clubs and assist with promotion and information sharing.⁵⁴⁴ Improved linkages would also lead to greater transparency of decisions and operations as networking and awareness levels increase.⁵⁴⁵ Sport organizations would gain a better understanding of other programs being offered as well as memberships in

⁵³⁶ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵³⁷ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵³⁸ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵³⁹ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁴⁰ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nova Scotia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁴¹ Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (Organizations National Sport – Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁴² Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁴³ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁴⁴ Ottawa Consultation (Organizations National Sport – Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (Organizations National Sport – Schools), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁴⁵ Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

other programs and organizations.⁵⁴⁶ Armed with better knowledge, sport stakeholder groups will be better prepared to market the benefits of sport participation to key contacts in communities and schools.⁵⁴⁷

More Efficient Systems and Programs

Many participants felt that improved linkages would facilitate a better overall sport system in Canada. Specifically, improved efficiencies and reduced duplication of programs, services and operations and a more organized structure were mentioned as potential benefits.⁵⁴⁸ Greater opportunities to share resources, including facilities and expertise, as well as opportunities to develop standardized rules and policies across the sport system were discussed as additional benefits.⁵⁴⁹

Participants also stated their belief that the quality of sport programming would be enhanced through improved organizational linkages.⁵⁵⁰ In addition, improved linkages would lead to better alignment of programs, with fewer scheduling conflicts, gaps and duplication.⁵⁵¹ The ability to provide better services to members, particularly to municipal-level sport clubs, was mentioned as a benefit of improved linkages.⁵⁵²

A benefit of note discussed by consultation participants of improved linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations was the potential for “seamless” development of athletes.⁵⁵³ In other words, a more efficient system would lead to enhanced athlete support through better talent identification, program delivery and athlete development opportunities.⁵⁵⁴

⁵⁴⁶ Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁴⁷ Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁴⁸ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁴⁹ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁵⁰ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁵¹ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁵² Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁵³ Alberta Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁵⁴ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations – Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Increased Participation

The perception is that improved linkages will result in increased participation in sport through increased opportunities to participate and more exposure to new sports.⁵⁵⁵ For example, a soccer camp may be offered by a local recreation department, promoted by the local school, and have transportation provided by a local business. Improving the connections between schools and sport governing organizations and clubs could result in increased exposure to a variety of sports during school hours and improve access to school facilities and equipment for community programming outside of school hours.⁵⁵⁶ Improved linkages between levels of sport organizations were thought to enhance recruitment rates of coaches and volunteers as well as athletes and to enhance retention rates as well.⁵⁵⁷ This point is reflected in a success story offered by a consultation participant: “The Yukon Soccer Association makes an effort to visit rural communities and offers introductory camps for athletes and coaches. This generates interest to participate as an athlete or coach.”⁵⁵⁸

Other benefits of linkages, particularly involving educational organizations, are the increased opportunities for youth to participate in sports at various levels, from high performance to grassroots.⁵⁵⁹ Improved linkages also offer new opportunities to introduce community and provincial sport organization activities to students.⁵⁶⁰ By visiting schools, provincial/territorial sport organizations and athletes provide students with role models and information on how to participate and succeed in sport.⁵⁶¹ Youth health would also be improved, as stated by an e-survey respondent: “Improving PSO presence in schools will help combat childhood obesity and will help make sport more accessible to Canadian children.”⁵⁶² Schools act as a feeder system to sport, by introducing students to physical literacy and contributing to the development of high performance athletes.⁵⁶³

Partnership Development

While many provincial/territorial sport organizations already have developed linkages, if not formal relationships with minor-league sport organizations, clubs and teams as well as schools, community centres and municipal recreation departments, participants emphasized the benefits

⁵⁵⁵ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Persons with a Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Swim Manitoba), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁵⁶ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁵⁷ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁵⁸ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁵⁹ Alberta Consultation (Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Cycling), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁶⁰ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁶¹ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁶² E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁶³ British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

of building and improving on these linkages.⁵⁶⁴ Clearly defined roles and responsibilities, increased networking and collaboration opportunities would help to build stronger partnerships, according to participants.⁵⁶⁵ Respect, energy and commitment from each partner is essential for success and achievement of mutual goals, such as community development, creating active, safe neighbourhoods and providing alternative programming for specific populations.⁵⁶⁶

Improved Training Opportunities

Improved linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations were said to lead to enhanced access to training opportunities for staff, coaches, schools and athletes. Recreation departments and organizations as well as municipal-level clubs would gain from guidance and support on program start up and multi-sport program delivery.⁵⁶⁷ Consultation participants also noted better quality control of program delivery as an advantage to improving linkages between these groups.⁵⁶⁸ Further, schools and student athletes would benefit from tapping into the sport skill training expertise of provincial/territorial sport organizations.⁵⁶⁹

Enhanced training opportunities for coaches were specifically mentioned by consultation participants from several regions as a positive outcome of improved linkages. Coaches often need particular qualifications but do not always have access to the required training. Clinics, internship programs, and transfer of coaching knowledge were put forward as potential opportunities to improve coaching training through linkages and partnerships between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations.⁵⁷⁰

Sharing of Best Practices

Improved linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations would generate new opportunities to share best practices across the sport system in Canada.⁵⁷¹ For example, successful school sport systems and exemplary municipal-level sport clubs could share their knowledge, expertise and methods with others.⁵⁷² Also, organizations that

⁵⁶⁴ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁶⁵ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders Meeting), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁶⁶ Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Persons with a Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁶⁷ Prince Edward Island (E-mail from First Nation Multi-sport Organization), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁶⁸ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁶⁹ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷⁰ Ontario Consultation (Education Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Persons with a Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷¹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷² Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

have successfully implemented LTAD initiatives could share their success stories from which others could learn from and “borrow” from as appropriate for their needs.⁵⁷³

Improved Inclusiveness

Consultation participants recognized the potential for improving the inclusiveness of sport programs through better linkages.⁵⁷⁴ Improved communications and better access to information and resources could assist community organizations to improve participation opportunities for Aboriginal Peoples⁵⁷⁵ and of schools to offer after-school programs in low income neighbourhoods.⁵⁷⁶ Local or community organizations could tap into the expertise of regional or provincial/territorial sport organizations to recognize and accommodate athletes with special needs.⁵⁷⁷

Challenges of Improving Linkages between Provincial/Territorial Sport Organizations and Community Organizations

Competing or Conflicting Priorities and Practices

A key challenge to improving linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations is governance issues due to differing mandates and priorities which often lead to competing agendas.⁵⁷⁸ Conflict over “ownership” and territory are obstacles to the creation of a common vision and effective partnerships.⁵⁷⁹ In addition, a lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities over programming, athlete development, accountability and contact points leads to misunderstandings and inefficiencies.⁵⁸⁰ Similarly, a lack of communications around scheduling of competitions sometimes leads to academic conflicts.⁵⁸¹

⁵⁷³ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations – Municipal-level Sport Clubs), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁷⁴ Persons with a Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷⁵ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷⁶ Ontario Consultation (Community Recreation Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷⁷ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷⁸ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport), Spring/Summer 2011; Persons with a Disability Roundtable, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁷⁹ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁸⁰ Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations – Special Olympics), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁸¹ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011.

Resource Issues

Efforts to improve linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations are hampered by a lack of capacity and resources—specifically, of human resources (including staff and volunteers), funding, time and facilities.⁵⁸² Competition for scarce resources between organizations and between regions, such as rural and urban, gives rise to conflict and an unwillingness to collaborate.⁵⁸³

Lack of Awareness/Communications Issues

Participants expressed concern over a lack of awareness of where to find information, expertise, partners, programs, and opportunities to form or improve linkages.⁵⁸⁴ They noted that communications challenges between levels impede linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations.⁵⁸⁵ They also pointed to a need for greater recognition of the benefits and value of recreation within communities.⁵⁸⁶

Recruitment and Retention Issues

Recruitment of staff is challenged by funding capacity while recruitment of volunteers is hampered by competition for their time and the requirements to be involved.⁵⁸⁷ High turnover rates are caused by heavy workloads and burnout of key people.⁵⁸⁸ Knowledge transfer issues ensue as replacement staff must develop new relationships with partners and other stakeholders.⁵⁸⁹

Lack of Training/Skills/Knowledge

Improving linkages between provincial/territorial-level and community-level sport organizations is challenged by high staff turnover rates which lead to knowledge transfer and skills issues.⁵⁹⁰ In addition, fewer physical education specialists in schools negatively impact the sport skills that can be taught to students.⁵⁹¹ Consultation participants also pointed to a need for a common

⁵⁸² Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer, 2011.

⁵⁸³ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁸⁴ Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁸⁵ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁵⁸⁶ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁸⁷ Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁸⁸ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁸⁹ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁹⁰ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁹¹ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011.

language and vocabulary between stakeholders⁵⁹² as well as a need for more sharing of sport technical skills.⁵⁹³

Resistance to Change

Consultation participants from many regions stated that a general resistance to change hinders the potential to improve linkages between provincial/territorial sport organizations and community organizations.⁵⁹⁴ Territoriality, lack of will, energy and commitment and fear of the unknown were mentioned as factors that challenge the development of sport linkages.⁵⁹⁵

Benefits to Developing a Community Sport for Life Plan

Manitoba Consultation sessions also asked participants about the benefits of developing a common Community Sport for Life Plan that could be shared between local sport organizations/clubs, schools, municipal recreation departments/organizations and other key stakeholder organizations within communities. The benefits discussed include:⁵⁹⁶

- improved governance through a shared understanding of goals;
- more efficient use of resources, such as funding, facilities, human resources, etc.;
- community development, including infrastructure, citizenship, community pride, reduced crime, inclusion, leadership, etc.; and
- more efficient systems and programs.

Challenges to Developing a Community Sport for Life Plan

Further to discussing the benefits, Manitoba consultation participants also considered the challenges to developing a common Community Sport for Life Plan. The challenges discussed include:⁵⁹⁷

- competing or conflicting priorities and practices;
- insufficient resources;
- resistance to change; and
- lack of awareness/communications issues.

⁵⁹² Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁹³ Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁹⁴ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁹⁵ Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport), Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁹⁶ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁵⁹⁷ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Successful Practices of Collaboration between Community Sport, Education, Recreation and Healthy Living Partners

Manitoba consultation participants offered examples of successful practices of collaboration between sport, education, recreation and health living partners in their communities. The categories of practices include:⁵⁹⁸

- municipal government partnerships; and
- other organizational partnerships—such as local sport organizations/clubs, schools, NGOs, etc.

⁵⁹⁸ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Chapter 15: Promoting Sport for Community Building Purposes

Chapter Summary

- The majority of consultation participants and e-survey respondents (92 per cent of organizations by type) support promoting sport participation intentionally for community building purposes.
- Positive outcomes of promoting sport participation for community building purposes include: improved education and health outcomes; increased sport programming and participation; improved self-esteem; and community development.
- Challenges to developing and maintaining effective partnerships include: a lack of resources; lack of awareness; and conflicting or competing priorities, mandates or focus.

Consultation participants and e-survey respondents were asked to discuss whether they promoted sport participation intentionally for community building purposes (where community building is defined as pursuit of non-sport outcomes such as youth development, health promotion, gender equity, social inclusion, and conflict resolution) or primarily for sport objectives. Those who said that they did promote sport for community building purposes were encouraged to share the positive outcomes of their efforts. E-survey respondents were asked about potential focus areas of such efforts.

Those consultation participants who indicated they did not promote sport participation intentionally for community building purposes were also asked why they did not and about any conditions that would be required in order for their organizations to pursue non-sport outcomes.

Consultation participants discussed the merit of partnerships between sport organizations and non-sport organizations as a means to pursue non-sport objectives and whether such partnerships lead to the ability to leverage greater resources and access new audiences to increase sport participation. Consultation participants discussed the benefits and challenges for sport organizations in partnering with non-sport groups who have a focus on community building objectives. E-survey respondents were also asked about potential barriers or challenges to promoting community building programs.

Promoting Sport Participation Intentionally for Community Building Purposes

The majority of consultation participants and e-survey respondents indicated support for promoting sport participation intentionally for community building purposes. At least 92 per cent of e-survey individual respondents by type indicated that they thought that sport should be used intentionally for community building purposes, while at least 94 per cent of individuals by location agreed. Between 63 per cent and 78 per cent of e-survey organizational respondents by type said that they promoted sport participation intentionally for community building purposes

while between 58 per cent (Manitoba) and 90 per cent (Nunavut) of organizations by location agreed.

Many, if not the majority, of groups represented in the consultation sessions said that they did promote sport participation primarily for community building purposes and the benefit for youth.⁵⁹⁹ Some participants expressed the view that rural organizations were more likely to do so than were urban organizations.⁶⁰⁰ Most organizations had similar reasons for promoting sport for community building purposes, such as:

- creating social cohesion;
- building youth social and leadership skills;
- promoting healthy lifestyles;
- building awareness of benefits of sport;
- improving inclusiveness, integration and a sense of belonging;
- economic development;
- partnership development;
- fundraising;
- tourism;
- building self-confidence; and
- community development legacy in facilities, equipment, programs and leadership provided by hosting major championships and Games.⁶⁰¹

Participants in the Aboriginal Roundtable added that sport is a community building exercise that reflects a holistic approach to fostering health, culture and leadership.⁶⁰²

Those consultation participants who said that their organizations intentionally promoted sport participation for community building purposes shared a number of positive outcomes of their efforts including:

- improved education outcomes, such as school attendance and performance;
- improved health outcomes, such as reduced tobacco use and engagement in activity;
- increased sport programming and participation;
- improved self-esteem of participants; and

⁵⁹⁹ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁰⁰ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁰¹ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Calgary National, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Municipal/Club Sport Meeting), Spring/Summer, 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Community Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Official Language Minority Communities Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁰² Roundtable on Sport for Aboriginal Peoples, Spring/Summer 2011.

- community development, including infrastructure, citizenship, community pride, reduced crime, improved inclusion, etc.⁶⁰³

E-survey respondents were also asked to consider the most important areas of focus for efforts to promote sport for community building purposes. Highlights of the e-survey responses from organizations by type are found in Table 15.1 below. While youth development was chosen as a priority focus area most often, health promotion was selected next most often. Gender equity and social inclusion alternated as the third and fourth-selected focus area, while conflict resolution was selected least often as a focus area from the given list.

Table 15.1 Focus Areas – Promoting Sport Participation for Community Building Purposes⁶⁰⁴

Type of Organization	Focus Areas – Promoting Sport Participation for Community Building Purposes				
	Youth Development	Health Promotion	Gender Equity	Social Inclusion	Conflict Resolution
All organizations (n=387)	Choice 1 (86 %)	Choice 2 (74 %)	Choice 4 (32 %)	Choice 5 (51 %)	Choice 5 (13 %)
Publicly Funded Only (n=37)	Choice 1 (84 %)	Choice 1 (84 %)	Choice 3 (38 %)	Choice 2 (65 %)	Choice 4 (14 %)
Not-for-Profit / Voluntary Only (n=135)	Choice 1 (84 %)	Choice 2 (76 %)	Choice 4 (26 %)	Choice 3 (54 %)	Choice 5 (15 %)
National Sport Organizations (n=62)	Choice 1 (82 %)	Choice 2 (58 %)	Choice 4 (35 %)	Choice 3 (50 %)	Choice 5 (6 %)
Provincial / Territorial Organizations (n=94)	Choice 1 (91 %)	Choice 2 (71 %)	Choice 4 (37 %)	Choice 3 (52 %)	Choice 5 (16 %)
Corporate / For Profit Only (n=4)	Choice 2 (75 %)	Choice 1 (100 %)	Choice 3 (25 %)	Choice 3 (25 %)	Choice 4 (0 %)
Education Only (n=32)	Choice 1 (81 %)	Choice 2 (75 %)	Choice 4 (25 %)	Choice 3 (38 %)	Choice 5 (12 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

⁶⁰³ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer, 2011; British Columbia Consultation; Spring/Summer 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation (Spring/Summer 2011).

⁶⁰⁴ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

An examination of the organizational responses to the e-survey by geographical location produced the same overall pattern of results.⁶⁰⁵

Non-Promotion of Sport Participation for Community Building Purposes

Those consultation participants who indicated they did not promote sport participation intentionally for community building purposes were also asked why they did not and about any conditions that would be required in order for their organizations to pursue non-sport outcomes.

Some organizations stated that the promotion of sport participation for community building purposes was not in their mandate or was not one of their objectives, especially at the municipal and provincial sport organization levels.⁶⁰⁶ Instead, their focus tended to be on promoting and supporting sport in general, including preparing for competitions or major game events.⁶⁰⁷ Some participants suggested that provincial sport organizations with adequate financial resources were more likely to promote sport for community building purposes while others with minimal resources were struggling simply to survive.⁶⁰⁸

Other consultation participants noted that while their organizations did not intentionally promote sport participation for community building purposes, they did recognize the value of doing so. These organizations were more likely to say that community building was often a by-product of sport participation, and as such, did not need to be promoted with intent.⁶⁰⁹

Further, some participant organizations hesitated to establish community building as an objective since the outcomes would be difficult to measure.⁶¹⁰ Other reasons for not promoting sport participation intentionally for community building purposes include a lack of resources, including funds, human resource capacity, facility access and time.⁶¹¹

Suggestions offered by consultation participants on the conditions that would be needed for their organization to pursue non-sport outcomes include:

- creating credible, long-term partnerships;
- improving integration of sport, culture and recreation efforts;
- enhancing collaborations with governments;

⁶⁰⁵ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

⁶⁰⁶ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁰⁷ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Alberta Consultation (Provincial Stakeholders), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁰⁸ Newfoundland Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶⁰⁹ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer, 2011; Prince Edward Island Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Municipal Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶¹⁰ Ontario Consultation (Education Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation (Health Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶¹¹ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

- establishing methods of measuring success; and
- raising awareness of the benefits of physical activity in communities.⁶¹²

Benefits of Partnerships between Sport Organizations and Non-Sport Organizations

Consultation participants were asked to discuss the merit of partnerships between sport organizations and non-sport organizations as a means to pursue non-sport objectives while simultaneously leveraging greater resources and accessing new audiences to increase sport participation. Participants stated that they had experienced a number of benefits as a result of partnerships between sport and non-sport organizations including:

- improved access to resources, including funding, facilities, personnel, etc.;
- attracting new participants to sport, including athletes, administrators, and volunteers; and
- positive social outcomes, such as improved health and quality of life.⁶¹³

Some examples of successful partnerships between sport and non-sport organizations include:

- RONA, the Canadian Olympic Committee (COC) and VANOC offer training opportunities to youth at risk so they can develop work skills.⁶¹⁴
- The Healthy Brandon in Motion coalition annually engages over 7,000 citizens (20 per cent of the population) in coordinated activities.⁶¹⁵
- More Sports is a collaborative sport programming initiative with a special focus on under-represented groups. The objective of the More Sports' YELL (youth, engage, learn, lead) program is to develop youth volunteers and leaders.⁶¹⁶

Challenges of Partnerships between Sport Organizations and Non-Sport Organizations

Consultation participants also discussed the challenges for sport organizations in partnering with non-sport groups who have a focus on community building objectives. E-survey respondents were asked about potential barriers or challenges to promoting community building programs. Consultation participants and e-survey respondents focused on similar barriers, reflecting common experiences and perspectives.

⁶¹² Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ontario Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶¹³ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; British Columbia Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶¹⁴ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶¹⁵ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶¹⁶ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Consultation participants noted a number of specific challenges to developing and maintaining effective partnerships. The following issues were said to impede efforts to collaborate:

- lack of resources, including funding, facilities, time, human resource capacity, and skills;
- lack of awareness of benefits of partnerships; and also of where to find partners, existing programs, opportunities, etc.; and
- conflicting or competing priorities, mandates, or focus.

E-survey respondents were asked to consider the barriers to promoting community building programs. Highlights of the e-survey responses from organizations by type are found in Table 15.2 below. Lack of funding was selected as the barrier most often, followed by human resources. Not a policy or organizational mandate was selected as the next critical barrier for organizational respondents. Partnerships and lack of communication strategy alternated as the fourth and fifth-selected barrier, while programming was selected least often from the given list.

Table 15.2 Barriers to Promoting Community Building Programs⁶¹⁷

Type of Organization	Barriers to Promoting Community Building Programs					
	Not a Policy / Organization Mandate	Lack of Funding	Human Resources	Programming	Partnerships	Lack of Communication Strategy
All organizations (n=495)	Choice 3 (35 %)	Choice 1 (70 %)	Choice 2 (57 %)	Choice 5 (21 %)	Choice 4 (31 %)	Choice 4 (31 %)
Publicly Funded Only (n=45)	Choice 3 (38 %)	Choice 1 (69 %)	Choice 2 (64 %)	Choice 6 (18 %)	Choice 5 (29 %)	Choice 4 (36 %)
Not-for-Profit / Voluntary Only (n=164)	Choice 3 (32 %)	Choice 1 (70 %)	Choice 2 (57 %)	Choice 6 (21 %)	Choice 4 (31 %)	Choice 5 (30 %)
National Sport Organizations (n=82)	Choice 3 (39 %)	Choice 1 (71 %)	Choice 2 (52 %)	Choice 6 (16 %)	Choice 4 (35 %)	Choice 5 (32 %)
Provincial / Territorial Organizations (n=129)	Choice 3 (33 %)	Choice 1 (70 %)	Choice 2 (64 %)	Choice 6 (24 %)	Choice 5 (26 %)	Choice 4 (29 %)

⁶¹⁷ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

Type of Organization	Barriers to Promoting Community Building Programs					
	Not a Policy / Organization Mandate	Lack of Funding	Human Resources	Programming	Partnerships	Lack of Communication Strategy
Corporate / For Profit Only (n=5)	Choice 2 (40 %)	Choice 1 (60 %)	Choice 3 (20 %)	Choice 2 (40 %)	Choice 2 (40 %)	Choice 2 (40 %)
Education Only (n=35)	Choice 3 (34 %)	Choice 1 (74 %)	Choice 2 (43 %)	Choice 5 (23 %)	Choice 4 (29 %)	Choice 4 (29 %)

Source: The Conference Board of Canada, SIRC, 2011.

Chapter 16: Canada's International Involvement in Sport

Chapter Summary

- Participants felt that Canada's involvement in sport should focus on building Canada's reputation as a leader, adopting a strategic policy, and promoting Canadian values and ethics internationally.
- Areas to increase or maintain involvement include supporting the Canadian sport system, influencing international development and advocating for the engagement of diverse groups in sport.

Consultation participants and e-survey respondents were asked for their views on Canada's objectives in international sport. They then discussed the areas in which Canada's involvement in international activities should be modified, increased or decreased. E-survey respondents were asked to indicate whether Canada's involvement in a given list of activities should be increased, continued, decreased or discontinued.

Canada's Objectives in International Sport

Consultation participants offered a number of potential objectives for Canada's involvement in international sport. The objectives comprised the following categories:

- build Canada's reputation internationally as a leader;
- adopt a strategic policy approach to sport;
- influence international sport policies;
- promote values and ethics in sport (e.g., doping-free, gender equity);
- facilitate exchange of best practices and knowledge sharing (e.g., Canada Games);
- build business opportunities for Canadian organizations; and
- be a positive influence on international development.⁶¹⁸

Consultation participants also discussed the areas in which Canada's involvement in international activities should be modified, increased or decreased.

⁶¹⁸ Calgary Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer, 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Manitoba Consultation (Individual Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Quebec Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011; Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

Areas in which Canada's involvement in international activities should be started or maintained were said to include:

- supporting the Canadian sport system to allow National Sport Organizations (NSOs) and Multi-Sport Organizations (MSOs) to engage in international activities;
- promoting values and ethics in sport through leadership;
- influencing international development by using sport to promote social change;
- broadening Canada's international involvement in sport;
- building and leveraging Canada's reputation internationally;
- advocating for engagement of diverse groups in sport;
- building business opportunities; and
- taking a strategic policy approach to sport.⁶¹⁹

Areas in which Canada's involvement in international activities should be changed were said to include:

- influencing international sport policies by ensuring international bilateral agreements align with Canadian sport policies;
- taking a strategic policy approach to sport that focused and balanced;
- facilitating exchanges of best practices that are mutually beneficial;
- broadening Canada's international involvement in Sport through strategic, long-term planning; and
- supporting the Canadian sport system to align regional visions and objectives.⁶²⁰

Areas in which Canada's involvement in international activities should be discontinued include:

- taking part in international exchanges, unless they have defined high performance purposes; and
- participating in international games not aligned with LTAD (e.g., Youth Olympic Games).

E-survey respondents were also asked about Canada's involvement in international activities and whether a given set of activities should be increased, continued, decreased or discontinued. At least 80 per cent of individual respondents of each type and 79 per cent of organizational responses by type felt that Canada's involvement in the following international activities should increase or continue:

- participating in international competitions and events;

⁶¹⁹ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶²⁰ Ottawa Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011; Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

- contributing to the governance of international sport bodies;
- hosting international sporting events;
- fighting doping in sport; and
- promoting quality sport for disadvantaged or underrepresented groups.⁶²¹

⁶²¹ E-Survey Data (Sport Information Resource Centre - SIRC), 2011.

Chapter 17: Conclusions

Chapter Summary

- The Conference Board of Canada assisted in developing a new Canadian Sport Policy by analyzing data that was collected April-August, 2011, from a series of 50+ consultation sessions and an e-survey.
- Seven major themes emerged from the analysis: Sport Participation; Sport Development; High Performance Sport; Capacity and Resources; Linkages, Partnerships and Collaborations; Community Building; and International Involvement.
- These themes cross-cut through the development, delivery and evaluation of sport policies and programs.
- Incorporating them, and associated issues, in the new Canadian Sport Policy will be important to the future of sport in Canada and its contribution to achieving broader economic and social goals.

The development of a successor policy to the current Canadian Sport Policy and the accompanying action plans of federal and provincial/territorial governments will be informed by several research resources. The Conference Board of Canada is supporting this work by analyzing a significant amount of data collected from a series of national and provincial/territorial consultations conducted from April to August 2011, and from an e-Survey that was conducted from May to July 2011.

Participants in the e-survey include 796 organizational respondents (‘organizations’) and 2,500 individual respondents (‘individuals’). Participants in the 50+ consultations (‘consultation participants’) totalled well over 500. Collectively they are referred to in the analysis below as ‘participants’. This chapter summarizes the findings of these consultation sessions and the e-survey that are presented in chapters 2-16, above.

The 15 core questions asked in the consultation sessions and e-survey touch on a variety of important themes and issues for sport in Canada. This concluding chapter highlights the major findings that emerged from responses to the 15 core questions.⁶²²

The themes presented below are all equally important in their impact on sport and related social and economic outcomes. It is important to note that they are often intertwined, with challenges and opportunities in one area affecting one or more of the other areas—a reflection of the reality that sport is a complex system with far reaching impacts. As a result, future policies, programs and initiatives will need to take a multi-faceted approach to ensure maximum reach and effectiveness.

⁶²² The detailed findings for each of these questions are discussed in chapters 2-16 within this report.

Major Themes

Analysis of the dialogue and responses from the consultation sessions and the e-survey reveals seven major themes, and associated issues. The state of Canada's sport systems and communities is substantially framed by these themes and issues. Not only do they point to areas of success and innovation already implemented, they also raise questions about current levels of support, coordination and collaboration within and among levels of sport organizations and individual sport communities. Because they cross-cut the development, delivery and evaluation of sport policies and programs, they are critical to the future success of sport in Canada and its contribution to achieving broader economic and social goals.

The seven major themes are:

- Theme 1 Sport Participation
- Theme 2 Sport Development
- Theme 3 High Performance Sport
- Theme 4 Capacity and Resources
- Theme 5 Linkages, Partnerships and Collaborations
- Theme 6 Community Building
- Theme 7 International Involvement

Theme 1 Sport Participation

Several consultation and e-survey questions asked about sport participation issues, including the motivations for participating in sport, how to define a quality sport experience, and the values that should define sport. Responses shed light on what attracts people to participate in sports and on their expectations regarding their participation.

The top reasons given by organizations for promoting participation in sport include: to promote healthy lifestyles; to increase the exposure of children and youth to sport; to foster participation for coaches, officials, administrators, and/or volunteers; to improve athlete performance (national/international level); to increase individual and family-based participation; and to contribute to community building. Overall, individuals most frequently cited fun, health and personal development as reasons for participating in sport. The factors that were said to best define a quality sport experience include fun; personal development; skill development; sport programming; and available resources. The top values that should define sport include: sportsmanship (i.e., respect, fair play, and ethical behaviour); excellence; fun; commitment; personal development; inclusion and accessibility; and safety.

The biggest challenges affecting organizations' ability to promote and increase participation in sport are a lack of financial resources, insufficient facilities, and inadequate human resources. These same three issues were also identified by individuals as the primary barriers to a 'quality sport experience'. Consultation participants felt that some of these challenges could be addressed through partnerships, improved marketing efforts, changes to existing sport programs, and increased human resource and facilities capacity.

Additional questions asked about targeting under-represented populations to participate in sport and about participants' experience with accessing sport programs and services in both official languages. The answers yield insights on inclusive and accessible sport experiences and the likelihood or ability of individuals to participate.

Most participants feel that efforts should be made to increase the participation of under-represented groups in sport, including: women and girls; children and youth; persons with a disability; Aboriginal Peoples; immigrants and visible minorities; and low income individuals. The reasons given for targeting under-represented groups to increase their participation in sport are: the health benefits of sport; community building outcomes; personal development; and to ensure accessibility. For example, a consultation session participant noted the importance of ensuring accessibility to sport programs and services and the "ability to participate regardless of income."⁶²³

While the majority of individual e-survey respondents indicated that they are able to access sport programs in the official language of their choice, organizational responses varied, depending on their geographic location. Challenges faced by individuals in accessing programs in the official language of their choice include: a lack of staff and volunteers who spoke their official language; a lack of available programs in their official language; the inconvenient location of programs available in their official language; and the cost of these programs. Sport organizations stated that inadequate human resources and funding are barriers to offering more programs and services in both official languages.

Theme 2 Sport Development

Athletes are at the core of the sport community. To reach their personal potential, athletes require assistance in the form of expertise, resources and programs, all working together in a cohesive, co-ordinated system. In order to fully support athletes in achieving their sporting goals, improvements in athlete identification; athlete 'pathway development'; funding availability; facility access; and coach recruitment are needed.

Effective and efficient sport systems are essential to enabling athletes to develop and reach their potential. However, participants note a need for better alignment of systems to improve efficiencies and effectiveness among the different levels of sport, from national to provincial/territorial to community. Better alignment within administrative functions and demands would help to streamline systems and avoid duplication while increasing organizations' ability to share valuable information with each other and with other stakeholders. Improved alignment of sport funding programs would lead to streamlined application systems and assist in decisions regarding 'community building' as a sport objective. Further, improved efficiencies in the development, use of, and location of resources and facilities would result from improved alignment of sport systems.

⁶²³ Saskatchewan Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Sport organizations play a vital role in sport systems by acting as decision-making bodies. They also develop and deliver sport programs and services. The top priorities reported by sport organizations for promoting participation in sport are: community building; encouraging participation and a love of sport; increasing health outcomes; skill development; and recruiting high performance athletes.

In pursuing these priorities, sport organizations face a number of challenges, including limited capacity and resources (e.g., funding, time, personnel, skills, and facilities); individual sport cultures that may be too specialized; a high dependence on volunteers (who are declining in numbers); and a decreased emphasis on physical education in schools. In rural and/or remote communities, lack of transportation to sporting events and facilities as well as a general lack of participants are particularly challenging.

Potential solutions suggested for sport organizations to overcome the challenges mentioned above are: using innovative promotion and marketing efforts such as social media; promoting positive messages about sport, including lifestyle and health outcomes; establishing partnerships with levels of government, schools, community groups, business, etc.; and hosting more events to raise funds and profile/awareness.

According to participants, the Canadian Sport for Life (CS4L) program is another solution to overcoming barriers faced by sport organizations. The CS4L program is said to: provide a common language and clear pathways; bring alignment and cohesiveness to the sport system; facilitate changes that address sport priorities, needs and activities; raise awareness and promote sport; and facilitate program review and revitalization. A specific example of CS4L benefits was noted during a consultation session in Manitoba: the “major benefit to date is that it has helped some PSOs to start an age appropriate review of their programs and competitions, modify their rules and equipment for younger participants, and improve their coaching development resources.”⁶²⁴

The major challenges of the CS4L initiative are: a lack of awareness, promotion and support for CS4L; difficulties in measuring its success and impacts, given that it is still a relatively new program; stakeholder resistance to change; and a lack of resources in some regions and communities to adapt and implement CS4L. For example, one consultation session participant observed that there is a “lack of resources at the provincial level for on-the-ground implementation [of CS4L].”⁶²⁵

Theme 3 High Performance Sport

The question of how to prioritize efforts to develop high performance sport in Canada was raised in the consultation sessions and e-survey. According to participants, major priorities for high performance sport include: achieving “excellence” (i.e., high podium achievements, gold medals at major games, personal performance bests) and finding sources of sustainable funding and

⁶²⁴ Manitoba Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶²⁵ Montreal Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

support. Participants agree that “success cannot come without funding. A long term commitment is needed to ensure success.”⁶²⁶

Improving coordination and communication between jurisdictions is another key priority for high performance sport, where “much greater coordination of funding and planning between key partners at both national and provincial levels is needed.”⁶²⁷ Establishing clear definitions of “high performance” and “excellence” would help to improve communication efforts among jurisdictions. The ability to contribute to positive social outcomes (e.g., civic pride, nationalism, and active living) is another important priority for high performance sport.

Before high performance sport priorities can be addressed, a number of challenges must be met. The top challenges for delivering high performance sport are: finding and keeping talented coaches and technical leadership and addressing the issue of limited organizational capacity. Difficulties in identifying, recruiting and developing athlete talent are additional key challenges for high performance sport, where athlete development pathways remain unclear.

Theme 4 Capacity and Resources

Participants expressed concern about capacity and resource issues that affect sport development and delivery. Inadequate financial resources, human resources and facilities are seen to be limiting the ability of sport organizations to fully deliver sport programs and services. Most participants feel that their organizations do not have the human resource capacity to meet the demands of the next decade. The top human resource issues discussed include: strategic planning; funding; recruitment, retention and succession planning; skills and training; compensation/ recognition/rewards as well as working conditions and work-life balance.

Difficulties in finding and retaining qualified coaches were also noted by participants. Coaches, as the athlete’s partner in their pursuit of sport goals, share their technical expertise, their knowledge and experience with athletes. In order to fully support coaches in their careers, improvements in recruitment and retention; compensation; training and professional development opportunities; facility access; and level of respect are needed.

Increasingly, volunteers are a vital lynchpin in the successful engagement of sport systems and delivery of sport programs. However, many sport organizations struggle to attract and retain sufficient numbers of skilled volunteers. In order to fully support volunteers in their efforts to assist with coaching, administering, and managing within sport organizations, improvements in their engagement, training, and recognition are needed.

Participants suggested several strategies to address capacity limitations. These include ideas for strategic planning, new funding models, recruitment and retention incentives, providing enhanced training opportunities, and improving working conditions. Participants also feel that resources and expertise could be gained by engaging in partnerships and collaborations with

⁶²⁶ Alberta Consultation (Schools Athletic Association), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶²⁷ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

others. For example, “non-sport groups can often provide a source of volunteers for sporting activities and events. Working with these groups may also enable access to a needed facility or space, and can potentially increase membership by attracting participation from the non-sport group.”⁶²⁸

Theme 5 Linkages, Partnerships and Collaboration

Linkages, partnerships and collaborations are currently being leveraged in many sport communities to solve a number of issues. Participants identified a number of benefits to building and supporting linkages, partnerships and collaborations within sport communities. One of the top benefits is a shared and improved understanding of goals and planning. As stated in one consultation session, improved linkages allow for “shared strategic planning [between PSOs and each sport’s NSO], as well as ongoing monitoring and evaluation processes, to attain mutual goals.”⁶²⁹ Other top benefits are: increased capacity (i.e., more efficient systems and programs, more efficient use of resources including facilities, personnel, volunteers, etc.); coordinated leadership at all levels; and the opportunity to share best practices.

In developing and maintaining linkages, partnerships and collaborations, several issues must be addressed to ensure success. A key challenge is insufficient resources—particularly capacity, time, energy and funds. In addition, competing priorities among partners often create conflict. In other words, “discordance on vision, objectives and inflexibility”⁶³⁰ hampered organizations’ and partners’ ability to work together. Similarly, “turf” protectionist attitudes and legal-jurisdiction conflicts create barriers to effective collaborations. Another key challenge is a general lack of awareness, not only of the benefits of collaborative efforts, but also of where to find potential partners and information on existing partnerships and linkage opportunities. Finally, resistance to change and the need to adapt in order to meet new challenges is also evident.

Theme 6 Community Building

Most organizations intentionally promote sport participation for community building purposes. This includes economic development, social cohesion, youth and leadership development, health promotion, and partnership building. Some organizations do not, because community building is not their focus, or because they lack the resources to pursue it as a goal. As stated in one consultation session, “funding is not currently allocated toward support of non-sport objectives.”⁶³¹ Others feel that there is no need to focus on promoting sport for community building, since “sport leaders see community development as a bi-product of their efforts.”⁶³²

⁶²⁸ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶²⁹ Manitoba Consultation (Provincial Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶³⁰ Vancouver Consultation (National Sport Organizations), Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶³¹ Nunavut Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶³² New Brunswick Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Participants note a number of positive outcomes from promoting sport for community building purposes, including: improved health and education; increased sport programming and participation; and improved self-esteem and self-confidence of participants. For example, it was mentioned in a consultation session in the Yukon that “women living in volatile home environments gained coping and communication skills, self-esteem and self-confidence through a sport and physical activity program likened to Outward Bound.”⁶³³

Several specific community development outcomes are also realized, including improved infrastructure, greater sense of citizenship, reduced crime, increased community pride, improved inclusion and integration, and better leadership. In a British Columbia consultation session, it was noted that “sport activities are utilized on a seasonal and annual basis to promote neighbourhood, community and city development to further community spirit and economic development.”⁶³⁴

Theme 7 International Involvement

Responses regarding Canada’s future international involvement in sport focused on leveraging Canada’s expertise and leadership. Priorities for international efforts should centre on building Canada’s reputation as a leader and promoting Canadian values and ethics internationally. For example, Canada’s international involvement in sport should contribute positively to the governance of international sport bodies; hosting of international sporting events; and fighting doping in sport.

Areas to increase or maintain international involvement include: supporting the Canadian sport system, influencing international development, and advocating for the engagement of diverse groups in sport. Overall, participants feel that Canada should adopt a strategic policy regarding international involvement in sport to ensure that the full range of benefits and challenges are addressed.

Conclusion

The main messages from the consultations and e-survey are substantially consistent across geography, political boundaries and sporting jurisdictions. They are substantially consistent among the different stakeholder groups, including athletes, participants, volunteers, parents, coaches, officials, employers, and researchers. They are also substantially consistent among public, business, not-for-profit, education, and sport organizations. The five special interest groups (women, official language minority, Aboriginal peoples, persons with a disability, ethno-cultural populations), in addition to focusing on issues affecting them directly, also expressed views that were consistent with other participants.

⁶³³ Yukon Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

⁶³⁴ British Columbia Consultation, Spring/Summer 2011.

Key messages from participants:

Value

- Sport is fun.
- Sport is important *in itself* as a form of personal activity and development.
- Sport participation significantly improves the health of people.
- Sport is important *beyond itself*—it positively affects Canada’s social and economic well-being.
- Sport creates social cohesion by connecting people and communities.
- Sport has the potential to do more to integrate diverse cultures and populations into Canadian communities.
- Promoting sport participation for community building purposes will improve education and health outcomes; increase sport programming and participation; improve self-esteem; and enhance community development.

Challenges and Success

- Inadequate financial resources, human resources and facilities limit sport participation and the ability of sport organizations to achieve their potential in delivering sport programs and services.
- Efforts should be made to increase participation by under-represented groups, including women and girls, children and youth, persons with a disability, Aboriginal people, ethno-cultural communities, and low income individuals.
- Top priorities for Canada’s sport development delivery system are: funding; coaches and instructors; facilities and equipment; the school sport system.
- Success of the sport system requires cooperation, integration and collaboration on a much larger scale than is the case today.
- Partnerships, promotions and marketing can help overcome the challenges.

Linkages

- Better linkages between NSOs and their PTSO counterparts will lead to improved sport governance, more efficient sport systems and programs.
- Challenges of improving F/PT sport organization linkages include competing or conflicting priorities and practices, resource issues, lack of awareness, and a lack of trust.
- Benefits to improving linkages between PTSOs and community organizations include improved governance, more efficient use of resources, improved communications, more efficient systems and programs, increased participation, partnership development, improved training opportunities, sharing of best practices, and improved inclusiveness.

- Challenges to improving these linkages include competing or conflicting priorities and practices, resource issues, lack of awareness/communications issues, recruitment and retention issues, lack of training/skills/knowledge, and resistance to change.

High Performance

- Investment in high performance sport brings value to Canada's whole sport system.
- Improved coordination and communication between jurisdictions, and establishing clear definitions of "high performance" and "excellence" for this purpose, is a clear priority.
- Inadequately resourced aspects of the high performance delivery system include: direct athlete support and incentives; coaches and technical leadership; and athlete talent identification, recruitment and development.

International

- Canada's international involvement in sport should focus on building Canada's reputation as a leader; adopting a strategic policy; promoting Canadian values and ethics internationally; contributing to the governance of international sport bodies; hosting international sporting events; and fighting doping in sport.

Appendix A: Consultation Sessions

Consultation	City	Date	Group (if applicable)
National Sport Organizations	Moncton	April 2011	National Sport Organizations
	Vancouver	June 15, 2011	National Sport Organizations
	Calgary	June 17, 2011	National Sport Organizations
	Montreal	June 21, 2011	National Sport Organizations
	Ottawa	June 23, 2011	National Sport Organizations
Alberta	Edmonton	May 13, 2011	Alberta Schools Athletic Association
	Red Deer	June 10, 2011	Alberta Municipal/Club Sport Meeting
	Edmonton, Calgary	June 14-15, 2011	Alberta Provincial Stakeholders Meeting
British Columbia	Kamloops	June 23, 2011	
	Victoria	June 29, 2011	
	Kelowna	July 5, 2011	
	North Vancouver	July 7, 2011	
	Richmond	July 12, 2011	Provincial Sport Organizations
	Nanaimo	July 12, 2011	
	Prince George	July 14, 2011	
	Abbotsford	July 15, 2011	
Manitoba	Brandon	May 18, 2011	
	Winnipeg	June 1, 2011	
	Winnipeg	June 2, 2011	
	Winnipeg	June 2, 2011	Provincial Sport Organizations

Consultation	City	Date	Group (if applicable)
New Brunswick	Saint John	May 25, 2011	
Newfoundland and Labrador	St. John's	May 26, 2011	
Nova Scotia	Halifax	June 13, 2011	
	Halifax	July 19, 2011	Provincial Sport Organizations
	Halifax	July 20, 2011	
Nunavut	Baker Lake	June 11-16, 2011	
	Iqaluit	June 20-24, 2011	
Ontario	Kingston	May 5, 2011	Municipal Organizations, Community Sport Organizations, Community Recreation Organizations
	Toronto	May 10, 2011	Municipal Organizations, Community Sport Organizations, Community Recreation Organizations, Education Organizations, Health Organizations, Under-Represented Groups
	North Bay	June 2, 2011	Municipal Organizations, Community Sport Organizations, Community Recreation Organizations, Education Organizations, Under-Represented Groups
	London	June 6, 2011	Provincial Sport Organizations, Municipal Organizations, Community Sport Organizations, Education Organizations
	North York	June 8, 2011	
	Toronto	June 8, 2011	Provincial Sport Organizations, Municipal Sport Organizations

Consultation	City	Date	Group (if applicable)
	Thunder Bay	June 13, 2011	Municipal Organizations, Community Sport Organizations, Health Organizations, Under-Represented Groups
Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown	June 23, 2011	
	O'Leary	June 27, 2011	
	Montague	June 29, 2011	
	Not applicable	June 29, 2011	First Nation Organization (email)
Quebec	Sherbrooke	May 16, 2011	Association québécoise du loisir municipal
	Trois-Rivières	May 26, 2011	Réseau du sport étudiant du Québec
	Montréal	June 1, 2011	Sports-Québec Provincial Sport Organizations
	Not Applicable	June 8, 2011	Unités régionales de loisir et de sport (conference call)
	Montréal	June 20, 2011	Centre national multisport - Montréal
Saskatchewan	Saskatoon	May 30, 2011	
	Regina	May 31, 2011	
Yukon	Dawson City	May 31, 2011	
	Watson Lake	June 2, 2011	
	Carmacks	June 6, 2011	
	Whitehorse	June 9, 2011	
	Whitehorse	June 11, 2011	
	Not available	June 14, 2011	YG Women's Directorate

Consultation	City	Date	Group (if applicable)
	Mayo	June 20, 2011	
Official Language Minority Communities	Gatineau	August 3, 2011	
Women and Sport Roundtable	Toronto	July 7, 2011	
Ethno-Cultural Populations Roundtable	Toronto	August 16, 2011	
Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable	Montreal	July 15, 2011	
Disability Roundtable	Toronto	July 19, 2011	