

**FORMATIVE EVALUATION
OF THE
PARTICIPATION ELEMENTS
OF THE
SPORT SUPPORT PROGRAM**

**Evaluation Services
Corporate Review Branch**

February 24, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Purpose of the Evaluation	1
1.2. Scope of the Participation Elements of the SSP	1
1.3. Organization of the Report.....	2
2. Profile.....	3
2.1. Rationale	3
2.2. Expected Results	4
2.3. Participation Elements	5
2.4. Target Populations	8
2.5. Delivery Approach.....	9
2.6. Resources	9
2.7. Governance Structure.....	10
3. Evaluation Profile	11
3.1. Overview of the Evaluation Methodology.....	11
3.2. Evaluation Issues and Questions.....	11
3.3. Information Sources and Methods for Collection and Analysis	12
3.3.1. Document Review.....	12
3.3.2. Literature Review.....	12
3.3.3. Key Informant Interviews	12
3.3.4. Database Review.....	13
3.4. Limitations of the Evaluation.....	14
4. Evaluation Findings	15
4.1. Effective Implementation.....	15
4.2. Implementation Constraints	20
4.3. Design Considerations	22
4.4. Research Contribution	28
4.5. Initiatives Undertaken.....	33
4.6. Evidence of Progress.....	35
5. Conclusions.....	41
5.1. Effective Implementation.....	41
5.2. Implementation Constraints	41
5.3. Design Considerations	42
5.4. Research Contribution	43
5.5. Initiatives Undertaken.....	44
5.6. Evidence of Progress.....	45

6. Recommendations and Management Response.....	47
Appendix A – Evaluation Framework	53
Appendix B – Documents Reviewed.....	56
Appendix C – Literature Reviewed	60
Appendix D – List of Key Informants	61
Table 1: Contributions by Funding Element by Year: 2002-2003 to 2007-2008.....	16
Table 2: Percentage Contributions by Funding Element: 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 (combined)	17
Table 3: Numbers of Projects by Strategic Priorities and Funding Element: 2004-2006.....	18
Table 4: Contribution Funding by Strategic Priorities and Funding Element: 2004-2006.....	19
Table 5: Projects and Contributions for Target Groups by Funding Element: 2004-2006.....	34
Table 6: NSO Projects with Target Group Objectives: 2003-2004 and 2004-2005	35
Table 7: Participation Data from NSO Projects: 2003-2004 and 2004-2005	36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report presents the results of a formative evaluation of the participation elements of the Sport Support Program (SSP), one of three Sport Canada funding programs. The terms and conditions of the other two programs, the Athlete Assistance Program (AAP) and the Hosting Program (HP), have been extended to March 31, 2006. The renewal of the SSP is being brought forward by 21 months so that all three Sport Canada programs can be renewed in the same time frame.

Sport Canada has placed more emphasis on funding efforts to improve participation activities since the adoption of the Canadian Sport Policy in 2002, the enactment of the Sport and Physical Activity Act in March 2003, and the subsequent broadening of Sport Canada's mandate to include participation. This formative evaluation of the participation elements of the SSP is required to support decision-making about program renewal. The evaluation addresses issues related to the implementation, design and delivery, and progress toward the achievement of intended outcomes of the participation elements of the SSP.

Profile

The Sport Support Program, formerly known as the National Sport Organizations (NSOs) Support Program, is the primary means by which the federal government provides funding for: a) developing athletes and coaches at the highest international levels; b) providing sound technically-based sport programming for athletes at all levels; and, c) increasing the proportion of Canadians from all segments of society participating in sport. This funding is provided to NSOs, Multisport Service Organizations (MSOs), provincial/territorial (P/T) governments, universities, foundations and other non-government organizations in support of their programming that supports the goals of the Canadian Sport Policy.

Since the participation element of the NSO component was initiated in 2002-03, the participation elements of the SSP have been broadened to include sport participation elements for MSOs and other organizations, a strategic investment element, a P/T bilateral element, and a research element. Special consideration is given to projects that will increase participation in children and youth, with an emphasis on the following under-represented groups: girls and young women; Aboriginal people; persons with disabilities; visible minorities; youth at risk; and, the economically disadvantaged.

The participation elements of the SSP are the primary funding mechanisms to achieve both the participation objective of the SSP, and when approved, Sport Canada's Sport Participation Strategy. The objective of the draft Sport Participation Strategy is "to

increase the number of Canadians participating in sport, particularly among children and youth, and other identified groups, in a manner consistent with targets agreed upon by the federal, provincial and territorial ministers responsible for sport.”

For the years from 2003-04 to 2007-08, the annual budget for the participation elements of the SSP is \$10M, of which, approximately \$8.8M is for Contributions, and \$1.2M is for Operations.

Evaluation Profile

The evaluation questions identified by the Corporate Review Branch of Canadian Heritage and addressed during this study were as follows:

1. Is the program being implemented effectively? If not, where are the weaknesses?
2. Has implementation of the program been hampered by any internal or external issues? If so, what are these and to what extent have the challenges encountered during the implementation been addressed? Are there issues that have not been addressed?
3. Are there any elements of the program’s design that limit the ability of the participation component to achieve its objectives? If so, what are these and to what extent have they been addressed? Are there any that have not been addressed?
4. To what extent do the program’s research activities directed toward sport participation projects and policies help increase the body of knowledge with respect to participation? What, if any are the shortcomings?
5. To what extent have initiatives been undertaken to increase the number of participants and quality of participation in sport, including the participation of under-represented groups? Are they adequate to achieve program objectives?
6. What evidence is there that progress is being made towards increasing participation in sport? To what extent is it adequate?

The evaluation relied on four information sources and methods for data collection and analysis.

Document Review – A comprehensive review of Sport Canada documents related to the participation elements was conducted to address the relevant evaluation questions. Each document was analysed to determine which, if any, of the evaluation questions in the Evaluation Framework it addressed. Follow-up correspondence was undertaken with Sport Canada to obtain additional information where needed.

Literature Review – The Literature Review explored evidence about how to increase sport participation and how to measure sport participation. Sport Canada identified two

areas of emphasis: 1) studies that deal with sport participation, including the Carter Report, that examined how to ensure better co-ordination of effort and resources in sport in England, and the COMPASS Project, which is examining how to measure sport participation through national sport participation surveys in Europe; and, 2) a comparative analysis of the Netherlands and France, two countries selected by Sport Canada on the basis of their extensive participation and excellence results in both summer and winter sports.

Key Informant Interviews – Interviews were conducted with 15 key informants selected from the following categories: Sport Canada managers (n=4), representatives of NSOs and MSOs (n=6), representatives of Provincial and Territorial governments (n=3), and other funded organizations and experts (n=2).

Review of databases – The evaluation included a review of the following databases used by Sport Canada to support program management and to help monitor program performance: Sport Canada Sport Database; Sport Canada Contribution Program Database (SCCP); NSO National Standards Data Collection; Sport Canada Client Data Collection; Grants and Contributions Management Information System (GCMIS); and, Systems, Applications and Products Database (SAP). Some ad hoc Sport Canada files that include data on program activities also were reviewed.

Evaluation Findings

Q. 1 Effective Implementation

There has been strong support and a high level of uptake amongst sport organizations and P/Ts. Contribution funding for the participation elements has increased from \$914,500 in 2002-03 to \$8,760,350 in contributions in 2005-06. Early implementation in 2002-03 focused on established relationships and mechanisms with NSOs, MSOs and P/T governments.

Currently, P/T partners receive approximately half of the funds, with another quarter allocated to NSOs. Larger allocations for council-based research are committed for 2006-07 and 2007-08 (\$2.1M). Among the five Sport Canada strategic priorities for sport participation, approximately one-third has been allocated to projects for the target groups, and one-third to enhancing community based-sport.

Leveraging has been key to successful implementation through matching funds provided through the P/T Bilateral Agreements. There is also some funding leveraged from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) for the council-based portion of the Research element.

Partnerships have been an important element of project design and implementation, especially at the community level. However, the evidence suggests that the impact of partnerships is limited from a sustainability perspective because organizations and P/Ts may not be able to continue funding their sport participation initiatives in the absence of Sport Canada funding.

Q. 2 Implementation Constraints

The initial problem of providing participation funding late in the first fiscal year of multi-year agreements, which caused difficulties for recipients in spending the funds, and, in the case of P/Ts, securing matching funds, has been addressed by Sport Canada.

Problems with data collection and reporting associated with the use of current Sport Canada database applications remain and program performance reporting is difficult. This problem has been identified in Sport Canada's IT/IM plan.

Communication between Sport Canada and potential funding recipients is good when agreements are being discussed and terms negotiated. However, there is limited communications during implementation, including feedback from Sport Canada about monitoring reports submitted by funding recipients.

Q. 3 Design Considerations

The design of the participation elements has evolved and broadened over time and has provided Sport Canada with the flexibility to fund a variety of organizations to increase sport participation.

A thorough application review process, with guidance to Program Officers, is in place for all elements. For NSOs, MSOs and others, a revised evaluation grid was developed in 2004-05 that assessed past performance (for projects funded for more than one year), as well as the key principles. Also in 2004-05, a revised SPDP Application Review process with an internal three person Review Committee was implemented, and a Monitoring Report Template for use by NSOs was introduced for year-end reporting on results.

For the F-P/T Bilaterals, a formal application and review process is initiated when the P/T Minister responsible for sport submits a funding proposal and a formal request to enter into a multi-year F-P/T agreement. A Draft Template for Proposal Assessment was introduced in 2005-06.

The multi-year agreements, partnerships, leveraging of funds and the flexibility in the design of the participation elements of the SSP are seen as strengths. There are however opportunities to make better use of existing resources to assist organizations developing programs for under-represented groups, and to examine the differences in target groups amongst the six elements and the maximum duration of project funding.

The design of the participation elements is generally consistent with the approaches being taken by the Netherlands and England, with two exceptions. Both the Netherlands and England allocate significantly more resources to sport participation than Sport Canada and have adopted an integrated, community-based bottom-up approach to increasing sport participation. Such a direct approach to community based-sport by Sport Canada is not possible as community-based sport is within P/T jurisdiction. As a result, Sport Canada support to community-based projects is achieved through bilateral agreements with P/T governments.

Q. 4 Research Contribution

The research element of the SSP is part of Sport Canada's Policy Research Program and is in the early stages. To date, a small number of research projects have been commissioned by Sport Canada, the most notable of which is the CFLRI Sport Benchmark / Monitoring Program, and the recently completed Conference Board of Canada study on *Strengthening Canada: the Socio-economic Benefits of Sport Participation in Canada*. Council-based research partnerships with SSHRC and CIHR were introduced in 2005-06 and future research funding will focus on these partnerships, with funding of \$800K and \$1.3M allocated for research in 2006-07, and 2007-08. The design of the Council-based partnerships reflects the expert advice of leading academics in sport participation.

Components of the design of the research element that still need to be completed include implementing the Monitoring Panel for the Council-based portion of the research element, completing the knowledge dissemination strategy (e.g., the web-based portal, one day conference to share results), ensuring research commissioned by Sport Canada under the participation research element of the SSP focuses on sport participation, determining the need for a standardized research protocol to measure sport participation, and deciding on the most appropriate mechanism for expert input from organizations representing under-represented groups (e.g., Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport and Physical Activity, Canadian Paralympic Committee).

Q. 5 Initiatives Undertaken

Partnerships among provinces and territories, sport organizations, and local communities, as well as those between national, provincial and local sport organizations, are integral to project implementation and for achievements made to date. Sport Canada's target groups have been the focus of approximately one-third of all contributions in the last fiscal year. For example, in 2004-05:

- approximately \$1.3 million of P/T project funding was directed to target groups, including close to \$900,000 on projects for Aboriginal people; and,
- a large majority of NSOs conducted projects directed at one or more target groups including girls and women (38%), persons with a disability (24%), Aboriginal people (19%), youth at risk (14%), and visible minorities (11%).

Sport Canada databases include much financial information but little data on the characteristics of projects or participation results. Much of the information on projects and participation presented in this evaluation is derived from ad hoc data files and project summaries prepared by program staff.

Q. 6 Evidence of Progress

Preliminary evidence about results and achievement of participation objectives is positive, including the available data about the numbers of projects and participants,

partnerships, and anecdotal feedback about progress from key informants and Sport Canada officials.

While all funding recipients submit reports about their project activities and spending, the available empirical data about participation results for most funding elements is however limited. Summaries of participation data are available only for NSOs for 2003-2004 to 2004-2005, two years for which NSOs reported a total of 357,603 participants for their projects – an average of over 175,000 per year. All of the participation elements have some form of monitoring and evaluation requirements associated with them but a precise measurement strategy has not yet been developed for all six elements.

Sport Canada has provided NSOs with a reporting template, however similar reporting templates for P/Ts and other funding recipients have not been provided. P/Ts submit some participation data with their monitoring reports that has not yet been aggregated or summarized. Sport Canada has recently provided P/Ts with a draft tracking template to assist with the compilation of participation data.

Conclusions

Effective implementation

The implementation of the participation elements has been iterative, with early implementation focusing on established relationships and mechanisms with NSOs, MSOs and P/T governments. Based on further consultation and deliberation, the remaining elements were developed and implemented.

There has been strong support and a high level of uptake amongst sport organizations and P/T governments. However, the lack of explicit targets for the allocation of contributions by funding element and strategic priority makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of implementation.

Implementation constraints

There are opportunities for better communications from Sport Canada, including feedback on proposed targets and monitoring and evaluation strategies in proposals, and feedback on the activity and monitoring reports submitted by funding recipients.

Sport Canada has an opportunity to clarify the relationship between the participation elements of the SSP and their contribution to the draft Sport Participation Strategy.

Design considerations

The design of the participation elements has evolved and broadened over time and has provided Sport Canada with the flexibility to fund a variety of organizations to increase sport participation. Strengths of the design include multi-year agreements, partnerships, leveraging of funds and flexibility within the participation elements. While maintaining

flexibility, Sport Canada will need to monitor P/T bilaterals to ensure that they continue to focus on Sport Canada priorities.

With the evolution of the design, there is now an opportunity to further advance various aspects of the design including opportunities for greater integration amongst the various elements, linkages between clients, maximum duration of funding for projects and a strategy for long-term sustainability of the sport participation initiatives.

Initial evidence suggests that France, England and the Netherlands allocate significantly more resources to sport participation than Sport Canada. As a result, one would only expect very modest increases in sport participation through the participation elements of the SSP.

Research

Over the past few years, the focus has been on developing Sport Canada's policy research capacity, through the newly created Sport Policy Research Initiative (SCRI). As a result, there has not yet been a significant amount of research undertaken within the research element of the SSP. A small number of research projects have been undertaken to date, with future research focus primarily on Council-based partnerships with SSHRC and CIHR, with funding of \$800K and \$1.3M allocated for research in 2006-07, and 2007-08.

It will be important for Sport Canada to fully implement the remaining aspects of the research element, including monitoring closely the academic community's response to directed policy research through the Council-based research partnerships with SSHRC and CIHR.

Initiatives Undertaken

Both client organizations and Sport Canada officials are satisfied with the progress made so far with their participation initiatives. For the P/Ts in particular, the funding has opened up new areas of activity that are incremental to their existing initiatives. Moreover, funding recipients believe that their current projects are laying the foundation for future successes.

Evidence of progress

Preliminary evidence about results and achievement of participation objectives, while encouraging, is limited. Overall evidence from key informants about progress is positive, including the available data about the numbers of projects and participants, partnerships, and anecdotal feedback about progress. However, the available empirical data about participation results for most funding elements, including breakdowns by types of participants, are not available in any detail.

To better measure increases in sport participation, there is a need to develop a specific measurement strategy that allows for the measurement and reporting of the progress and impacts of all participation elements of the SSP. This strategy would be over and above

the national data on sport participation that will be provided through the CFLRI's Sport Benchmark / Monitoring Program.

Recommendations and Management Response

On the basis of the formative evaluation findings, the following recommendations are suggested for consideration by Sport Canada.

Recommendation 1: Under the new management structure for the participation elements of the SSP, complete the Sport Participation Strategy to describe all aspects of participation activities carried out by Sport Canada.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

Enhanced Participation is one of four goals outlined in the Canadian Sport Policy (CSP), adopted in 2002 by the Federal and Provincial/Territorial Ministers responsible for sport, physical activity and recreation. The F-P/T governments subsequently adopted a set of priorities for collaborative action for the period of 2002-2005 to contribute to the achievement of the four policy goals, including Enhanced Participation. Sport Canada is in the process of drafting a Sport Participation Strategy that will identify objectives and a set of priority activities to advance the Enhanced Participation goal. In developing this strategy, consideration will be given to possible bilateral and multilateral initiatives with the provinces and territories. These would in turn need to be incorporated into the renewed F-P/T priorities for collaborative action for 2006-09.

The Director of Policy and Planning will be responsible for completion of the Sport Participation Strategy.

Implementation Schedule: December 2006

Recommendation 2: Develop and implement a performance measurement strategy for the participation elements of the SSP that is integrated with the overall Sport Canada performance measurement strategy.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

This is a timely recommendation as the final report of the Sport Benchmark/Monitoring Project is expected in March 2006 and this will yield some baseline data on sport participation. In addition, Sport Canada is in the process of developing a comprehensive Performance Measurement Strategy that will, among other things, provide a framework for the collection of results data on sport participation.

This recommendation has both short and longer term implications. In the short term, Sport Canada will proceed with developing a clear definition of what success looks like in the area of participation, with accompanying targets and indicators, applicable to the participation elements of the SSP. This will include a determination of how these are to

be measured. In addition, data already collected from recipients will be used to assist in the development of the targets. In the longer term, Sport Canada will develop processes to i) increase the capacity of Program Officers to advise/guide recipients on the reporting of results, and ii) increase the capacity of recipients to report on key results.

The Director of Policy and Planning will be responsible for coordinating the development of the performance measurement strategy, and will work with the Director of Sport Support Programs to increase the capacity of Program Officers and recipients to report on key results.

Implementation Schedule: Performance measurement strategy - December 2006;
Capacity development - March 2007

Recommendation 3: Examine opportunities to enhance integration and information sharing amongst the participation elements of the SSP, as well as make better use of existing expertise and resources.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

Sport Canada will undertake an examination of each of the four areas cited in the recommendation, with an initial focus on the opportunities to enhance information sharing amongst all funding recipients and opportunities to make better use of existing expert groups.

The Director of Sport Support Programs will be responsible for these examinations in conjunction with the Director of Policy and Planning.

Implementation Schedule: March 2007

Recommendation 4: Examine the longer-term sustainability of the sport participation initiatives.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

Sport Canada will undertake an examination of the long-term sustainability of the sport participation initiatives. Such an examination would clarify Sport Canada's expectations with respect to the sustainability and sustainable impact of sport participation projects, consider the role partnerships can continue to play in these projects, and review the number of years a project should be funded by Sport Canada in order to maximize effectiveness.

The Director of Sport Support Programs will be responsible for this work.

Implementation Schedule: March 2007

Recommendation 5: Fully implement the remaining aspects of the Sport Policy Research Initiative.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

Since the development of the Sport Policy Research Initiative in 2004 Sport Canada has focussed on developing partnerships with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Now that these partnerships are established and research projects will be undertaken under their auspices as of 2006-07, Sport Canada can focus on the continued development and implementation of the remaining aspects of the Sport Policy Research Initiative. In the first instance the Monitoring Panel will be formalized and the web portal will come on-line. Additionally, the academic communities response to the call for policy research through CIHR and SSHRC will be monitored, with the view of holding a conference for grant recipients and policy makers during 2007-08.

The Director of Policy and Planning will be responsible for the continued implementation of the Sport Policy Research Initiative.

Implementation Schedule: Monitoring Panel and web portal - Fall 2006;
Conference - by March 2008

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of the Evaluation

This report presents the results of a formative evaluation of the participation elements of the Sport Support Program (SSP) conducted by Jennifer Birch-Jones Consulting between October and December 2005.

The SSP is one of three Sport Canada funding programs; the other two being the Athlete Assistance Program (AAP), and the Hosting Program (HP). The terms and conditions of the AAP and HP have been extended to March 31, 2006. To renew all three Sport Canada programs in the same time frame, the renewal of the SSP is being brought forward by 21 months, bringing the renewal of all three programs to March 31, 2006.

Both the HP and the AAP have undergone recent summative evaluations. Given the early renewal of the SSP and that the outcomes of the program, (including strategic end outcomes), are not expected to be achieved until 2007, an evaluation of the SSP in 2005 would normally include the measurement of progress toward outcomes, without a clear picture of full program impacts. However, in response to the adoption of the Canadian Sport Policy in 2002, the enactment of the *Physical Activity and Sport Act* in March 2003, and the subsequent broadening of Sport Canada's mandate to include participation, additional emphasis has been placed on funding efforts to improve participation activities. Consequently, a formative evaluation of the participation elements of the SSP is required.

This evaluation was designed to address issues related to the implementation, design and delivery and progress toward the achievement of intended outcomes of the participation elements of the SSP.

1.2. Scope of the Participation Elements of the SSP

Sport Canada's Sport Support Program (SSP), formerly known as the National Sport Organizations (NSOs) Support Program, is the primary means by which the federal government funds initiatives of the Canadian Sport Policy (2002) and the *Physical Activity and Sport Act* (2003). The SSP provides funding aimed at developing athletes and coaches at the highest international levels; providing sound technically-based sport programming for athletes at all levels; and increasing the proportion of Canadians from all segments of society involved in sport. This funding is provided to NSOs, Multisport Service Organizations (MSOs), provincial/territorial (P/T) governments, universities, foundations and other non-government organizations in support of their programming that supports the goals of the Canadian Sport Policy.

The participation element of the NSO component of the SSP was initiated in 2002-03 to begin addressing the Canadian Sport Policy goal of “increasing the proportion of Canadians from all segments of society involved in quality sport activities at all levels and in all forms of participation”. Since then, the participation elements have been broadened to include sport participation elements for MSOs and other organizations, a strategic investment element, a P/T bilateral element, and a research element. Special consideration is given to projects that will increase participation in children and youth, including the following under-represented groups:

- girls and young women;
- Aboriginal people;
- persons with disabilities;
- visible minorities;
- youth at risk; and,
- the economically disadvantaged.

The annual budget for the participation elements of the SSP is \$10M, of which, approximately \$8.8M is for Contributions, and \$1.2M is for Operations. An additional \$5 million has been confirmed in 2005-06; however these funds were to have been provided through the Supplementary Estimates Process, which did not occur before the government was defeated.

1.3. Organization of the Report

This report is divided in six sections. After this introduction, Section 2.0 presents a profile of the participation elements of the SSP. Section 3.0 outlines the evaluation methodology used to collect data to address the evaluation issues. Section 4.0 presents the evaluation findings by key evaluation issue. Sections 5.0 and 6.0 provide the evaluation team’s conclusions and recommendations. Appendices include the evaluation framework, the documents reviewed, the international literature reviewed, the list of key informants and the interview guide and contact scripts.

2. Profile

This section provides the rationale underlying the participation elements of the SSP, the expected results, a description of each of the six participation elements, the target populations, delivery approach, resources and governance structure.

2.1. Rationale

The participation elements of the SSP are supported by a strong legislative and policy rationale. The Canadian Heritage Act¹ describes the powers, duties and responsibilities of the Minister as including “the encouragement, promotion and development of amateur sport.” The Physical Activity and Sport Act² specifies that “... the Minister may take any measure appropriate to...encourage, promote and develop physical activity and sport in Canada.”

The Canadian Sport Policy³, endorsed in April, 2002 by Federal, Provincial and Territorial Ministers responsible for sport, articulates a vision for sport where, by 2012, Canada will have: “a dynamic and leading-edge sport environment that enables all Canadians to experience and enjoy involvement in sport to the extent of their abilities and interests and, for increasing numbers, to perform consistently and successfully at the highest competitive levels.” There are four goals to the policy, including Enhanced Participation in which “a significantly higher proportion of Canadians from all segments of society are involved in quality sport activities at all levels and in all forms of participation.”

As well, two of the F-P/T Priorities for Collaborative Action for the Canadian Sport Policy⁴ deal with sport participation: Priority 1 - Increase Participation in Sport; and, Priority 2 - Increase Sport and Physical Activity in Schools.

The participation elements of the SSP are also well supported in Sport Canada’s Strategic Plan in which the mission is “to enhance opportunities for Canadians to participate and excel in sport.” Moreover, Sport Canada is striving to establish Canada as a leading sport nation, where all Canadians and their communities enjoy, value and celebrate the benefits of active participation and excellence in sport.

In addition, the participation elements of the SSP are the primary funding mechanisms to achieve both the participation objective of the SSP, and when approved, Sport Canada’s Sport Participation Strategy. The objective of the draft Sport Participation Strategy is “to

¹ *Department of Canadian Heritage Act* (1995).

² *Physical Activity and Sport Act* (2003).

³ *The Canadian Sport Policy* (May 2002).

⁴ *The Canadian Sport Policy -- Federal-Provincial/Territorial Priorities for Collaborative Action 2002-2005* (May 2003).

increase the number of Canadians participating in sport, particularly among children and youth, and other identified groups, in a manner consistent with targets agreed upon by the federal, provincial and territorial ministers responsible for sport.”⁵

To achieve the sport participation objectives of the draft Sport Participation Strategy, Sport Canada works to enhance access to sport by children and youth, and identified under-represented groups, by focusing on the following strategic priorities:

- increase the practice of sport in schools;
- enhance community-based sport;
- strengthen sport participation opportunities for targeted groups;
- advance the importance of sport; and,
- expand the body of knowledge about sport participation.⁶

The six target groups of the draft Sport Participation Strategy are identical to those of the participation elements of the SSP.

2.2. Expected Results

The expected results for the participation elements of the SSP are articulated in a number of sources. The relevant SSP objectives are as follows:

- increasing the proportion of Canadians from all segments of society involved in quality sport activities at all levels and in all forms of participation (overall);
- increased participation in sport, including under-represented groups by 2007; and,
- increased participation of Canadians from all segments of society in quality sport activities at all levels by 2012.⁷

The logic model for Sport Canada’s three funding programs⁸ has two relevant outcomes for the participation elements under the SSP: (1) improved opportunities and access to sport participation (immediate outcome); and (2) enhanced participation (ultimate outcome). Two research and policy-related outcomes under the policies and plans stream are also relevant to the research element of the SSP: (1) clearer direction for Sport Canada funding and priorities (immediate); and (2) improved capacity for evidence-based sport policy development.⁹

⁵ Sport Canada (May 10, 2005). Sport Participation Strategy - Draft.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Sport Canada (November 9, 2005). RMAF for Sport Canada’s Three Funding Programs - Draft Report.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

The participation elements of the SSP contribute to the departmental strategic objective relating to “Participation in Community and Civic Life” in which “Canadians live in an inclusive society built on inter-cultural understanding and citizen participation.”¹⁰

2.3. Participation Elements

NSO Element: Since 2002, NSOs have been eligible for sport participation funding. The first call for applications under the new Sport Participation Development Program (SPDP)¹¹ for NSOs was made April 12, 2002. The SPDP was open to NSOs that had met the full requirements of the Sport Funding Accountability Framework (SFAF), with preference given to projects that targeted the following groups:

- children and youth;
- girls and young women; and,
- under-represented groups (Aboriginal people, people with disabilities, youth at risk, visible minorities, and the economically disadvantaged).

Priority is given to projects that:

- collaboratively involve the NSOs P/T sport organizations;
- have the greatest potential to significantly increase sport participation;
- are based on partnerships, i.e., education system, municipal sport and recreation services, Multi-sport organization, or other National Sport Organization(s), etc.;
- can demonstrate a measurable increase in membership in the sport;
- utilize quality instructional materials that are based on the sport’s Participant Development Model (PDM);
- ensure the future sustainability of the project, without government of Canada funding; and,
- identify and employ a reasonable monitoring and evaluation process.¹²

When the NSO participation funding was first introduced during 2002-03, the duration of funding was for one year, with the understanding that if the project was progressing well funding would be available for a second year. Multi-year funding was introduced in 2004-05 to a maximum of four years.¹³

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ The term SPDP was phased out in 2005-06 when funding for sport participation for NSOs was integrated into their overall contribution application process.

¹² Sport Canada (April 12, 2002). Memorandum: Sport Participation Development Program for NSOs.

¹³ Sport Canada correspondence dated November 28, 2005.

An example of a project funded under the NSO element is Speed Skating Canada's *Cutting Edge* initiative. It is targeted at elementary school children four to thirteen years old and entails delivery of a skills program that would be integrated with the elementary school system during school hours when ice time is more available.

MSO Element: Based on further consultations with the sport community,¹⁴ MSOs became eligible for the SPDP funding in 2004-05, with July 31, 2004 being the initial deadline for funding applications. Multi-year funding is available for a maximum of 4 years.

The objective of the MSO SPDP is to increase the number of children and youth participating in sport. The strategic priorities are to:

- increase the practice of sport in schools;
- enhance community-based sport programs; and,
- strengthen sport participation opportunities for targeted groups.

The MSO element is open to MSOs that are currently receiving a contribution from Sport Canada under the Multisport Service Organization component of the SSP.

Preference is given to projects that target children and youth from the following under represented groups:

- girls and young women;
- persons with a disability;
- the economically disadvantaged; and
- Aboriginal Peoples.¹⁵

Since 2005-06, MSOs "participation" project requests are screened to determine whether they meet Project Stream criteria found in the 2005-07 Contribution Guidelines. There are 22 project stream criteria that are considered by a three person Committee comprised of the Assistant Director, Sport Programs; Senior Policy Advisor and Senior Program Officer.¹⁶ Once screened in, the MSO application follows the same review process as the applications by NSOs.¹⁷

An example of a project funded under the MSO element is the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Girls and Women in Sport and Physical Activity's (CAAWS) *Team Spirit: Aboriginal Girls in Sport*. Developed and delivered in collaboration with the

¹⁴ Sport Canada (February 2004). Investing in Sport Participation 2004-2008: A Discussion Paper.

¹⁵ Sport Canada (undated). Memorandum: Sport Participation Development Program for MSOs, plus Detailed Guidelines.

¹⁶ Sport Canada correspondence dated December 15, 2005.

¹⁷ Sport Canada correspondence dated October 3, 2005.

Aboriginal Sport Circle (ASC), the project is designed to increase community-based sport participation opportunities for Aboriginal girls and young women (ages 9-18) in Aboriginal communities across Canada.

Project Stream - Other Element: In 2005-06 the Project Stream – Other element was created so the SSP could accommodate funding requests from organization that were not classified as NSOs or MSOs under the SFAF eligibility process, but which could be otherwise eligible to receive funding under the SSP. As with MSOs, if the organization's application was screened in, it then went through essentially the same review process for the NSOs and MSOs outlined above.

An example of a Project Stream – Other project is funding to the Esteem Team Association which will focus on increasing the sport participation of under-represented groups (Aboriginal Peoples, women and girls and youth) through a number of initiatives, including their athlete role model program; promoting sport in Aboriginal communities; organizing the second national youth conference; and identifying and documenting barriers to sport participation of girls and women.

Strategic Investment Element: This participation element of the SSP was introduced in 2003-04. It is part of the “strategic partnerships” mechanism identified in Sport Canada's draft Sport Participation Strategy that includes: interdepartmental and inter-sectoral partnerships to promote sport participation and advance its importance to other federal objectives; and, partnerships with not-for profit organizations and the private sector in support of sport participation.¹⁸

An example of a project funded under the Strategic Investment element is the Canadian Tire Foundation for Families JumpStart Program. In cooperation with existing Provincial/Territorial sport federation KidSport Programs, the Foundation will provide small grants to assist children from economically disadvantaged families to participate in organized sport.

P/T Bilaterals Element: This participation element of the SSP was implemented in 2002-03. The Federal-Provincial/Territorial bilateral agreements must have a sport focus and are negotiated on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis. P/Ts are responsible for entering into agreements with their recipient organizations to deliver the participation initiatives. P/Ts are required to match the federal funding contribution.¹⁹ By 2003-04 (the second year of the program), almost all of the P/Ts had signed a three year agreement.

An example of a project funded under the P/T Bilaterals element is Saskatchewan's *Games Management Mentoring Program* in which management mentoring was conducted within the 2005 Canada Summer Games Host Committee structure to address Aboriginal issues and enhance Aboriginal participation in planning and hosting a major multi-sport event.

¹⁸ Sport Canada (May 10, 2005). Sport Participation Strategy - Draft.

¹⁹ Ibid.

Research Element: Some early research activities were undertaken in 2003-04. In July 2004, an implementation strategy and a revised research framework for the Canadian Sport Policy Research Initiative (CSPRI) was developed, which included the research element of the SSP. The objective of the CSPRI is to create a foundation of knowledge to achieve the Canadian Sport Policy (enhanced participation, excellence, capacity and interaction) and to demonstrate the contribution of sport to other public policy priorities.

There are 10 key principles of the CSPRI. One recognizes the importance of research that addresses underrepresented groups in Canadian sport. A second key principle recognizes the importance of knowledge translation and dissemination.

As of 2006-07, the primary focus of the research element of the SSP will be on Council-based research through new partnerships with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). (See Section 4.4 for more detail.)

An example of a project funded under the research element was the recently completed study by the Conference Board of Canada examining the socio-economic benefits of sport participation in Canada. The study explored how participation in sports can have a positive impact on economic performance, population health, skills development for citizenship and workplace, citizen engagement and social cohesion.

2.4. Target Populations

The overall focus of the participation elements of the SSP is children and youth, with the six specific target groups being:

- girls and young women;
- Aboriginal people;
- persons with disabilities;
- visible minorities;
- youth at risk; and,
- the economically disadvantaged.

These target groups are reached indirectly through the participation elements of the SSP. The “direct” reach (through the signed contribution agreements) includes NSOs, MSOs, other organizations, P/T governments, SSHRC, CIHR, Conference Board of Canada, and other research agencies and researchers. The indirect reach (through the funding recipients) includes P/T sport, recreation and physical activity organizations, local deliverers, including municipalities, clubs, schools and school boards, and academics. It is these intermediary organizations that directly reach the target groups.

2.5. Delivery Approach

The primary mechanism for delivery of the participation elements of the SSP is through contribution agreements with recipient organizations, including bilaterals with P/T governments. The Minister of State (Sport) is responsible for final approval of all contribution agreements. Funds for SSHRC and CIHR will be transferred annually through the supplementary estimates process.

2.6. Resources

The February 2003 Federal Budget allocated \$45 million over five years to Sport Canada for sport participation: \$5 million for 2003-04, and \$10 million per year for 2004-05 and beyond. The \$10 million per year has since been consolidated into Sport Canada's annual base, of which, approximately \$8.8M is for Contributions, and \$1.2M is for Operations.²⁰

It is difficult for Sport Canada to determine precisely the staff resources allocated specifically to the participation elements of the SSP. Currently, staff from three Divisions (Sport Programs, Canadian Sport Policy, and Hosting and Major Games) spend part of their time on participation related matters, either from a funding or policy development perspective. The large majority of these staff are from the Sport Programs Division and the Canadian Sport Policy Division. The estimated staff resources allocated to the participation elements of the SSP, other than Division Directors or Managers, with one exception, is as follows:

- NSO element - two Sport Programs Division officers and one Canadian Sport Policy Division officer spend about 10 per cent of their time on this element. Another seven officers from the Sport Programs Division spend a smaller portion of their time on participation.
- MSO element - six officers from the three Divisions spend a small portion of their time on participation, as per the NSO element.
- P/T Bilateral element - one officer from the Canadian Sport Policy Division spends about 50 per cent of his time on P/T bilaterals.
- Strategic Investment, Research and Other Elements - all staff involvement for these three elements are from the Canadian Sport Policy Division and the work is divided between funding and policy. One Manager spends 60 per cent of his time on participation, one officer spends a large proportion of his time on participation, including the 10 per cent in the NSO element, another spends about 60 per cent of her time on participation primarily related to research, while another officer spends a small portion of her time on participation.

²⁰ Sport Canada (June 30, 2005). Investing in Sport Participation (Deck).

2.7. Governance Structure

The participation elements of the SSP are currently managed by five senior staff (Executive Director, Director and Manager levels) from two Divisions within Sport Canada (Canadian Sport Policy and Sport Programs). Overall direction on sport participation is provided by the Director General.

In the recently approved organizational structure for Sport Canada, which will take effect in early 2006, responsibility for the program aspects, i.e., funding, will be amalgamated under one Manager under the Director of the Sport Support Program. Similarly, the Director of Policy and Planning will be responsible for the policy-related aspects of the participation elements of the SSP, as well as other aspects of Sport Canada's draft Sport Participation Strategy.

All contributions for the participation elements of the SSP are approved by the Minister of State for Sport, based on Sport Canada's recommendations, and the Contribution Agreement is signed by the appropriate Director. Funding provided to CIHR and SSHRC (as of 2006-07) will be provided through the supplementary estimates process.

3. Evaluation Profile

This section presents the overall methodological approach chosen to conduct this study, the evaluation issues and questions, the information sources and methods for collection and analysis, as well as the limitations of this evaluation.

3.1. Overview of the Evaluation Methodology

The formative evaluation utilized a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods, including a comprehensive document review, an international review of literature, key informant interviews, and a database review.

3.2. Evaluation Issues and Questions

The evaluation questions identified by the Corporate Review Branch of Canadian Heritage and addressed during this study were as follows:

1. Is the program being implemented effectively? If not, where are the weaknesses?
2. Has implementation of the program been hampered by any internal or external issues? If so, what are these and to what extent have the challenges encountered during the implementation been addressed? Are there issues that have not been addressed?
3. Are there any elements of the program's design that limit the ability of the participation component to achieve its objectives? If so, what are these and to what extent have they been addressed? Are there any that have not been addressed?
4. To what extent do the program's research activities directed toward sport participation projects and policies help increase the body of knowledge with respect to participation? What, if any are the shortcomings?
5. To what extent have initiatives been undertaken to increase the number of participants and quality of participation in sport, including the participation of under-represented groups? Are they adequate to achieve program objectives?
6. What evidence is there that progress is being made towards increasing participation in sport? To what extent is it adequate?

Appendix A contains the evaluation framework that maps each evaluation question to each data collection source.

3.3. Information Sources and Methods for Collection and Analysis

3.3.1. Document Review

A review of all documents listed in Appendix B was conducted to address the relevant evaluation questions listed in the Evaluation Framework. Each document was analysed to determine which, if any, of the evaluation questions in the Evaluation Framework it addressed. As well, follow-up correspondence was undertaken with Sport Canada to obtain additional information where needed.

The Document Review for the participation elements of the SSP is consistent with, but more comprehensive than, the recently completed Document and Literature Reviews for the Evaluation Assessment of Sport Canada Funding Programs.²¹

3.3.2. Literature Review

A list of the literature reviewed is included in Appendix C. Sport Canada had identified two areas of emphasis:

- 1) Studies that deal with sport participation – the Carter Report²² examined how to ensure far better co-ordination of effort and resources in sport in England, and the COMPASS Project²³ is examining how to best measure sport participation through national sport participation surveys in a consistent and standardized way in Europe.
- 2) Comparative analysis of the Netherlands and France – These two countries were selected by Sport Canada on the basis of their extensive participation and excellence results in both summer and winter sports. The analysis was restricted to sport participation documents found on the government of France's and Netherlands' respective websites.

The Literature Review addressed two of the six evaluation questions: design considerations (Q3), and progress made towards increasing participation (Q6).

3.3.3. Key Informant Interviews

A series of key informant interviews were conducted to address all six of the main evaluation questions. Interviews were conducted with 15 key informants selected from the following categories:

²¹ Evaluation Services, Canadian Heritage (October 12, 2005). Document and Literature Reviews for the Evaluation Assessment of Sport Canada Funding Programs Documents. Version 2.

²² Patrick Carter (March 2005). Review of National Sport Effort and Resources. Downloaded at http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_2005/carter.htm on October 4, 2005.

²³ Downloaded from the COMPASS website at <http://w3.uniroma1.it/compass/index.htm> on October 4, 2005.

- senior departmental managers and staff, including Sport Canada managers (n=4);
- representatives of NSOs and MSOs, including organizations that have received funding for at least two years (n=6);
- Provincial/Territorial governments, including representatives from one large province, one small-medium population province, and one territory (n=3); and,
- other funded organizations and experts (n=2).

Interviews were conducted with an interview guide developed from the list of issues in the evaluation framework and translated. Interviews were conducted in the respondent's official language of choice. A list of key informants is included in Appendix D.

Interviews conducted with Sport Canada officials and with NSO/MSO officials based in Ottawa were conducted in person. Other interviews were conducted by telephone. Interviews lasted an average of 60 minutes in duration. Interviews were conducted between October 21 and November 8, 2005.

3.3.4. Database Review

A review of related files, databases and systems created to support program management for ongoing performance measurement of program activities was conducted to acquire information relating to four evaluation issues: effective implementation (Q1), implementation constraints (Q2), initiatives undertaken (Q5), and evidence of progress (Q6).

Sport Canada maintains or has access to a number of databases to help monitor program performance. This evaluation reviewed relevant data from the following databases:

- Sport Canada Sport Database;
- Sport Canada Contribution Program Database (SCCP);
- NSO National Standards Data Collection;
- Sport Canada Client Data Collection;
- Grants and Contributions Management Information System (GCMIS); and,
- Systems, Applications and Products Database (SAP).

In addition, a number of ad hoc Sport Canada files were reviewed that include summary data on certain variables.

These databases were reviewed for the availability and usefulness of any data related to participation. The review included the following activities:

- discussions with staff responsible for the individual databases to review the format, contents, and how the information is used;
- review of sample outputs;
- requests from the appropriate databases of information that may be related to participation, and analysis of the outputs; and,
- discussions with database managers and, if necessary, requests for more information.

The Database Review for the participation elements of the SSP is consistent with but more comprehensive than the results reporting in the Document and Literature Reviews for the Evaluation Assessment of Sport Canada Funding Programs.²⁴

3.4. Limitations of the Evaluation

Representativeness of Stakeholder Views

The small number of key informant interviews with external stakeholders (n=11) limits the extent to which the views can be interpreted as being representative of the national sport community and P/T governments, and key stakeholders. Wherever possible, the views of the key informants were supplemented with other data sources.

Limited Availability of Data

The data to examine evidence of progress on increasing sport participation (Q6) was limited. The data sources provided by Sport Canada did not contain all of the key information captured in, for example, the Monitoring Reports completed by NSOs and MSOs. As a detailed project-level file review was beyond the scope of this evaluation, more detailed sport participation data could not be retrieved or the quality and completeness of the data reported by funding recipients assessed.

In addition, only one year of complete data was available, limiting the comprehensive analysis of the sport participation data. Due to resource constraints during the evaluation, Sport Canada was only able to categorize one year of sport participation projects using the analysis framework, i.e., categorizing projects by participation element, strategic priority, and target group. As a result, analysis of sport participation data for these three key variables was only completed for 2004-05 for P/T projects and 2005-06 for projects in the other funding streams.

²⁴ Evaluation Services, Canadian Heritage (October 12, 2005). Document and Literature Reviews for the Evaluation Assessment of Sport Canada Funding Programs Documents. Version 2.

4. Evaluation Findings

This section presents the findings for the six evaluation questions: findings for each question are presented in a sub-section. The findings are based on the four methods used in the evaluation: i.e., literature review, document review, database and file review, and key informant interviews. A table showing the methods used to address each of the evaluation questions is presented in Appendix A.

4.1. Effective Implementation

This subsection presents the findings that address the following evaluation questions: Is the program being implemented effectively? If not, where are the weaknesses?

Contributions by Funding Elements

Contribution funding has been allocated to each of the six project streams, starting with the initial investment in 2002-03 of close to \$1 million allocated to the NSO and P/T Bilateral streams. Program implementation stepped up significantly following a funding allocation in the February 2003 federal budget of \$45 million for sport participation initiatives: \$5 million for 2003-04 and \$10 million per year for four years through to 2007-08. Contributions have increased with each year, to a high of approximately \$8.8 million for 2005-06, the level at which contributions will be maintained until 2007-08.²⁵ Contribution funding for the Strategic Investment and Research streams began in 2003-04. Funding for all of the participation elements was achieved in 2004-05 with the addition of contributions for the MSO and other projects streams.

Contributions for 2003-04 and 2004-05 were less than the maximum available: i.e., \$3.35 million of \$4.4 million available for 2003-04, and \$6.84 million of \$8.8 million available for 2004-05. Funds were not received until well into the fiscal year and it was not possible to transfer all of the allocation for contributions to clients. Similarly, because of the timing, some clients were not able to spend all their allocated funds by fiscal year end; these funds were returned to Sport Canada and re-allocated to other areas. Funds not returned within the financial year lapsed and Sport Canada did not have access to them.

²⁵ In 2003-04, \$4.4 million was allocated for SSP - Participation contributions and \$600,000 for O&M. For 2004-05 through to 2007-08, \$8.8 million per year was allocated for SSP - Participation contributions and \$1.2 million for O&M.

Table 1: Contributions by Funding Element by Year: 2002-2003 to 2007-2008

Funding Element	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006¹	2006-2007²	2007-2008²
NSOs	\$586,500	\$1,268,500	\$1,884,416	\$2,000,000	\$809,000	\$252,000
Project Stream - MSOs	n/a	n/a	\$308,665	\$528,120	\$295,120	\$87,000
Project Stream - Others	n/a	n/a	\$340,000	\$340,000	\$340,000	\$0
P/T Bilaterals	\$328,000	\$1,780,000	\$3,610,039	\$4,446,080	\$3,432,380	\$3,432,380
Strategic Investment	n/a	\$250,000	\$319,100	\$1,320,900	\$180,000	\$0
Research	n/a	\$54,529	\$381,971	\$125,250	\$800,000	\$1,300,000
Total	\$914,500	\$3,353,029	\$6,844,191	\$8,760,350	\$5,856,500	\$5,071,360

Source: Sport Canada, updated as of November 4, 2005.

1. Estimate

2. Funding projections for 2006-07 and 2007-08 are based on the amounts that have already been committed through existing multi-year agreements and do not cover any projected commitments not yet covered by agreements. The projected budget for P/T bilaterals for 2006-07 and 2007-08 remains at \$4.4 million for each year.

Bilateral Agreements were finalized with all provinces and territories by 2004-05. In 2002-03, there were Agreements with one province and two territories. In 2003-04, Agreements were in place with all provinces and territories except Ontario and Québec. Based on figures available in November 2005, provinces and territories have contributed or plan to contribute approximately \$17.1 million in matching funds for their participation initiatives (including a small amount of in-kind contributions). This amount from the P/Ts will increase as commitments are finalized for the next two fiscal years. Sport Canada has committed \$17 million for F-P/T bilateral agreements over the six year period. The total for Sport Canada is expected to be \$2 million higher once additional commitments for 2006-07 and 2007-08 are finalized (i.e., up to the \$4.4 million annual budget).

For 2004-05 and 2005-06, the two most representative fiscal years for contributions to participation elements, the percentage of funding allocated to the different streams is included in Table 2 below.

Contributions by Strategic Priorities

Based on contribution data for the most recent reporting year²⁶, there have been a total of 198 funded projects undertaken across all Funding Elements.

**Table 2: Percentage Contributions by Funding Element:
2004-2005 and 2005-2006 (combined)**

Funding Element	Percentage of total contributions
NSO	24.9%
Project Stream – MSO	5.4%
Project Stream – Other	4.4%
P/T Bilaterals	51.6%
Strategic Investment	10.5%
Research	0.3%

- two-thirds of recent projects (67%) have been conducted by provinces and territories through the F-P/T bilaterals (i.e., 132 of 198 projects); and,
- 21 percent of recent projects have been conducted by NSOs.

These 198 projects address all of the five strategic priorities of the Draft Sport Participation Strategy.

- 41 percent of recent projects have been directed to initiatives that strengthen sport participation opportunities for targeted groups (i.e., 82 of 198 projects);
- 31 percent of projects have been directed to initiatives that enhance community-based sport (i.e., 61 projects);
- 20 percent of projects have been directed to increase the practice of sport in schools (i.e., 40 projects); and,
- the remaining eight percent of projects were to advance the importance of sport (12 projects) and expand the body of knowledge about sport participation (three projects).

²⁶ Breakdowns of contributions spending are available for all Funding Elements except F-P/T Bilaterals for 2005-06. For F-P/T bilaterals, the most recent data available are for 2004-05 as the details of projects and allocation of Sport Canada contributions are only available after the provinces and territories submit their monitoring reports.

**Table 3: Numbers of Projects by Strategic Priorities and Funding Element:
2004-2006¹**

Strategic Priorities Funding Element	Advance the importance of sport	Enhance community- based sport	Expand the body of knowledge about sport participation	Increase the practice of sport in schools	Strengthen sport participation opportunities for targeted groups	Total
MSOs	1	1		1	5	8
NSOs	1	15		11	15	42
Other	2	1		1	1	5
P/Ts	3	44		26	59	132
Research			3			3
Strategic Investment	5			1	2	8
Total	12 (6.1%)	61 (30.8%)	3 (1.5%)	40 (20.2%)	82 (41.4%)	198 (100.0%)

1. Breakdowns of contributions spending are available for all Funding Elements except F-P/T Bilaterals for 2005-06. For F-P/T bilaterals, the most recent data available are for 2004-05 as the details of projects and allocation of Sport Canada contributions are only available after the provinces and territories submit their monitoring reports.

The strategic priorities with the highest levels of funding are strengthening sport participation opportunities for targeted groups (34% of contributions - \$2.7 million), and enhancing community-based sport (30% - \$2.4 million). Other relevant findings include the following.

- expanding the body of knowledge about sport participation received the lowest level of funding (2%). Contributions to this strategic priority will increase significantly in future years with the higher allocations to Research for the Council-based research partnerships with CIHR and SSHRC;
- for the P/T element, enhancing community-based sport (43%) received the highest level of funding (approximately \$1.3 million of \$3.8 million);
- one-fifth (20.6%) of all contributions made to the participation elements have been allocated to enhancing community-based sport through the F-P/T Bilateral Agreements; and,
- about one-sixth of all contributions (16.3%) have been allocated to projects for target groups through the F-P/T bilaterals.

**Table 4: Contribution Funding by Strategic Priorities and Funding Element:
2004-2006¹**

Strategic Priorities Funding Element	Advance the importance of sport	Enhance community- based sport	Expand the body of knowledge about sport participation	Increase the practice of sport in schools	Strengthen sport participation opportunities for targeted groups	Totals ²
MSOs					\$448,120 (5.6%)	\$448,120 (5.6%)
NSOs		\$758,333 (9.4%)		\$568,000 (7.0%)	\$646,166 (8.0%)	\$1,972,499 (24.5%)
Other	\$340,000 (4.2%)					\$340,000 (4.2%)
P/Ts	\$286,296 (3.6%)	\$1,658,981 (20.6%)		\$577,068 (7.2%)	\$1,312,200 (16.3%)	\$3,834,545 (47.6%)
Research			\$125,250 (1.6%)			\$125,250 (1.6%)
Strategic Investment	\$640,900 (8.0%)			\$400,000 (5.0%)	\$300,000 (3.7%)	\$1,340,900 (16.6%)
Total	\$1,267,196 (15.7%)	\$2,417,314 (30.0%)	\$125,250 (1.6%)	\$1,545,068 (19.2%)	\$2,706,486 (33.6%)	\$8,061,314 (100.0%)

1. Breakdowns of contributions spending are available for all Funding Elements except F-P/T Bilaterals for 2005-06. For F-P/T bilaterals, the most recent data available are for 2004-05 as the details of projects and allocation of Sport Canada contributions are only available after the provinces and territories submit their monitoring reports.

2. The totals listed for the MSO, NSO, P/T bilateral, and Strategic Investment elements, as well as the overall total, differ somewhat from the actual contribution amounts (as presented in Table 1). These differences are based on discrepancies between the project listings by strategic priority and the financial summaries provided by Sport Canada. It should be noted that these discrepancies are relatively minor and do not effect the substantive interpretation of these findings.

Views of key informants about implementation

NSOs, MSOs and other organizations expressed very positive opinions about the participation objectives of the Sport Support Program and the way it is being implemented. In general, they strongly support Sport Canada's participation initiatives and see huge potential for benefits from these types of activities.

Partnerships have been important to successful implementation. In the view of both internal (Sport Canada) and external respondents, the funding elements have fostered stronger partnerships and a greater number of them: e.g., among national and provincial sport organizations; and among P/Ts and sport organizations, non-profit organizations, and community groups.

Leveraging

The P/T element has been successful in leveraging significant funds. In addition to the \$17 million provided to date by Sport Canada and committed for the next two fiscal years, an additional \$17.1 million in matching contributions have been either made already or committed by P/T governments, including a small amount of in-kind

contributions. (It should be noted that these contribution totals for Sport Canada and P/Ts will increase somewhat after some agreements have been extended and the final totals are in at the end of 2007-08.) The NSO, MSO, Other and Strategic Investment Elements also require in-kind contributions by the recipient's organization.

Similarly, through the partnership with the CIHR, the research element of the SSP has leveraged additional funds (\$400K) for the first two years of the council-based research activity.²⁷

4.2. Implementation Constraints

This subsection presents the findings that address the following evaluation questions: Has implementation of the program been hampered by any internal or external issues? If so, what are these and to what extent have the challenges encountered during the implementation been addressed? Are there issues that have not been addressed?

Views of key informants about implementation constraints

Funding recipients are generally satisfied with the administration of the different funding elements. An important exception is the timing of the contribution funding for the first year of multi-year agreements. Many NSOs, MSOs and P/Ts received money late in the fiscal year, causing difficulties for them to spend the money properly and, in the case of P/Ts, to secure matching funds.

External respondents reported that communications with Sport Canada have been good at the front end of the process when agreements are being discussed and terms negotiated. The rest of the time, funding recipients do not receive much information or feedback from Sport Canada. They reported that there is little or no feedback from Sport Canada about the semi-annual monitoring reports submitted.

There were some comments about the need for better communications in the following areas:

- from Sport Canada about what other organizations or P/Ts are doing: e.g., what projects are working? what are the successes?; and,
- among P/Ts, NSOs and MSOs – with communications coordinated by Sport Canada – to reduce the risk of duplicating initiatives, and so that P/Ts and NSOs can benefit from the knowledge and experience of MSOs.

Sport Canada officials indicated that there is not yet a standardized procedure for dealing with “non-traditional” applications (e.g., for strategic investments). While they see the advantage of a Strategic Investment element that allows for projects outside the normal streams, the lack of clear criteria is seen as a potential problem and the matter is currently under discussion.

²⁷ This is estimated figure as it deals with future years.

Participation information in Sport Canada databases

While the various databases²⁸ include a great deal of information on financial contributions, they do not include much information on participation that can be related to the participation elements of the Sport Support Program.

- the Sport Canada Sport Database includes membership data, based on fees, in four categories: coaches, athletes, officials, and club members. The participation data is aggregate data for the year in question (most recently 2004), summarized within the main categories. The database does not include participation or membership information related to specific participation initiatives. Also, since the detailed surveys are conducted only once every four years, the participation data are not useful for the evaluation of the participation elements of the SSP. While the data could be useful for tracking broad-based participation over the long term, none of this information could be attributed directly to the participation elements as they are currently configured;
- the Sport Canada Contribution Program Database includes funding information for the participation elements of the Sport Support Program. It is used by Sport Canada to produce reports by “Block and Activity” that cannot be produced by GCMIS, e.g., total funding for all athletes with a disability components, or for all NSOs. The SCCP database does not include participation information, e.g., numbers of participants that can be related to the participation elements of the SSP;
- the NSO National Standards Data Collection does not include information that can be related to the participation elements of the SSP; and
- GCMIS now has the ability to “tag” individual variables and groups of variables, including those related to participation. While GCMIS includes mostly financial information, this new capability could be useful to track different types of projects (e.g., for different target groups), and more detailed participation data for the fields from updated monitoring reports that are captured in GCMIS.
- SAP does not include participation data.

The various databases used by Sport Canada have been characterized as “multiple uncoordinated applications” in the recent IM/IT Plan²⁹ that makes program performance reporting difficult. Sport Canada has recognized several problems for data collection and reporting associated with the use of current applications, including a risk of data entry error, duplication, and loss of knowledge of the application. The 2005-2008 Business Plan recognizes these problems and the need for a solution through a better IM/IT strategy. The various corporate applications used for IM/IT purposes were deemed to be appropriate when they were first put in place. These applications are no longer sufficient as some have reached their potential and they are uncoordinated, leaving some data collection in silos with incompatible systems. This lack of coordination makes it more difficult for program performance reporting and promotes the possibility of information duplication. Sport Canada currently is undertaking an assessment of the Branch’s

²⁸ For a more detailed listing and discussion of the databases, see the Summary Methods Report for the Dbase Review PE SSP (Dec. 05-05).

²⁹ *Information Management and Information Technology Plan* (Annex B), Sport Canada, 2005.

information management and information technology practices, needs, capacity, gaps and risks. The planned outcome of this assessment will be an IM/IT strategy that is consistent with PCH corporate strategy and that makes the best use of corporate systems. Sport Canada expects the new IM/IT strategy to be implemented commencing in 2006-07.

Much of the information used by Sport Canada to monitor objectives related to participation, including overall numbers of participants by project or sport (e.g., NSO) and numbers of participants by target group, is included in ad hoc data files prepared by program staff. These ad hoc files include data from the semi-annual monitoring reports that contribution agreement holders are required to submit. However, there is no standardized reporting template yet for P/T bilateral agreements (one is being developed). The reporting template for NSOs was introduced in 2004-05 and will be revised for reporting in 2006-07. A new template for MSOs is also being developed.

Relationship to the draft Sport Participation Strategy

There is an opportunity to clarify the relationship between the participation elements of the SSP and Sport Canada's draft Sport Participation Strategy. In the draft Strategy, the participation elements of the SSP are not clearly identified, nor are the roles they play relative to other sport participation initiatives, such as those funded under O&M. As there are a number of other Sport Canada initiatives underway to increase participation in sport, including F-P/T Working Groups, it is not always possible to determine whether a sport participation initiative falls under the participation elements of the SSP. Making a clear link between the participation elements of the SSP and the draft Sport Participation Strategy is also made more difficult by the varying terms used to describe the participation elements of the SSP.

There are two projects which do not appear to fit into the participation goal of the SSP: (1) Phase two of the Sport Web portal, and (2) Sport Matters funding. Sport Canada officials note that these two projects are eligible under the Terms and Conditions of the SSP, but should not have been listed under the participation element.³⁰

4.3. Design Considerations

This subsection presents the findings that address the following evaluation questions: Are there any elements of the program's design that limit the ability of the participation component to achieve its objectives? If so, what are these and to what extent have they been addressed? Are there any that have not been addressed?

Opinions of key informants about design strengths

All respondents agreed that Sport Canada involvement in participation initiatives, multi-year agreements, and the flexibility of the agreements are strengths of the participation elements.

³⁰ Sport Canada correspondence dated December 20, 2005.

Respondents with provinces and territories identified the following additional strengths of the F-P/T Bilateral Agreements.

- flexibility (i.e., allows for a wide range of activity);
- multi-year agreements;
- clear Sport Canada priorities (e.g., under-represented groups, links to sport policy);
- matching funds;
- the funding formula (which is viewed as “reasonable”);
- the opportunity to partner with Sport Canada on participation initiatives; and,
- opening up new areas of activity (incremental to previous P/T activity).

Other respondents, including those with NSOs and MSOs, identified the following strengths of the participation elements.

- Sport Canada involvement in participation;
- multi-year agreements;
- flexibility (e.g., different activities, different stages of athlete development); and,
- national dimension.

Opinions of key informants about design weaknesses

Respondents with provinces and territories identified the following additional weaknesses of the F-P/T Bilateral Agreements:

- potential for only loose affiliation with Sport Canada objectives (i.e., too flexible);
- delays in signing agreements;
- timing of funding in the first year of agreements; and,
- sustainability – finite deadline of current agreements; possible assumption that projects will be able to be self-funding after agreements expire; a particular concern for smaller and northern jurisdictions.

Other respondents, including those with NSOs and MSOs, identified the following weaknesses (or potential weaknesses) of the participation elements.

- long-term sustainability of projects if funding sunsets;
- less flexibility than for P/T bilaterals (i.e., NSOs are limited to activities in their sports); and,
- capacity of NSOs to deliver programs at the community level.

All respondents emphasized the importance of taking a long-term view, by thinking about the long-term sustainability of participation initiatives. External respondents cautioned Sport Canada against the belief that participation initiatives, particularly ones for target populations or in smaller and northern communities, will be sustainable over the long term without federal support.

Iterative approach

In the early stages – specifically in the first year when funding was under \$1 million, implementation of the participation elements of the SSP preceded comprehensive program design. Early implementation focused on established relationships and funding mechanisms with NSOs and then P/T governments. Sport Canada officials reported that implementation of the participation elements of the SSP was initiated without a “big strategy.” Since the allocation of \$45 million over five years in the 2003 federal budget, the program has evolved, with better guidelines being developed over time and as the funding increased (i.e., with the maximum level of funding being achieved in the third year).

Sport Canada officials also noted that funding was given to NSOs because of the established relationships with these organizations (e.g., NSOs qualified for Sport Canada contributions through the Sport Funding Accountability Framework) and their willingness and readiness to undertake participation initiatives. Agreements were put in place with P/Ts without much specification of project criteria (i.e., much was left to the P/Ts, who built on what they already were doing).

Further development of the elements was based on deliberation, research, consultations and expert input, including the Sport Policy Research Programme roundtable and report, the consultations with the national sport and physical activity community, and consultations with P/T governments on the F-P/T Bilateral agreements.

Partnerships

Partnerships have been an important element of project design and implementation, especially at the community level. Partnerships are a requirement for NSO and MSO projects, as it is the partners at the grass roots level who actually deliver the program. Similarly, for the F-P/T bilaterals, most of the P/T projects involve partnerships with sport organizations (e.g., coaching, provincial sport organizations, disability sport organizations), and community and other organizations (e.g., school boards, Aboriginal organizations, municipalities).

International practices

There are a number of relevant findings on the design of Canada’s approach to increasing sport participation that emerge from the review of England’s Carter Report³¹, and the initiatives underway by the Netherlands’ Government, and to a lesser extent, the

³¹ Patrick Carter (March, 2005). Review of National Sport Effort and Resources. Downloaded at http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_2005/carter.htm on October 4, 2005.

Government of France³². Sport participation, including participation by under-represented groups, is a priority for all three countries. There may also be some valuable information on the success and lessons learned to date from the Netherlands Sport for All initiative as it has been in place since 1999.

The Netherlands' Sport for all Policy includes an NSO element similar to the participation element of the SSP. However, both the Netherlands and England have a club-based system for sport delivery, and are utilizing a bottom-up, locally driven multi-sectoral approach for increasing sport participation, with local authorities (Canada's equivalent of municipalities) being the lead. Links to the school sector are an integral part of both approaches. Such a direct approach to community based-sport in Canada by Sport Canada is not possible as community based-sport is within P/T jurisdiction.

Although it was recognized by Sport Canada that the integrated, community focus approach had significant potential to increase sport participation in Canada, the jurisdictional issue and relatively modest budget for the participation elements of the SSP did not make this approach viable. However, opportunities for enhancing integration amongst the existing participation elements of the SSP, especially amongst the P/T, NSO and MSO partners, may enhance effectiveness. For example, NSOs or MSOs wishing to increase participation by Aboriginal groups or girls and young women in their sport could collaborate with P/Ts which also have identified these under-represented groups as a priority.

The amount of funding for sport participation, relative to the remainder of the sport budget, is significantly higher in all three countries examined. In the Netherlands, the Sport for All Funding incentive is for eight years only, but includes a phased intensification that, by 2002, was 18.741MEuro (25M CAN\$) annually. More recent data on the funding of the Netherlands' new national sport policy (Time for Sport) indicates that just under two-thirds of the of 98.2M Euro (137.5M CAN\$) annual budget are devoted to either Sport for All or grass roots sport participation.³³ The Carter Report called for funding from existing and new sources, including substantial private sector investment. Initial data from France indicate that of the total sport budget of 270M Euro (378M CAN\$), at least 107M Euro (231M CAN\$) is given to sport associations (clubs, committees, leagues, training) and is directly aimed at sport participation at the grass root level.³⁴

Of potential interest to Canada may be the following developments and resources referenced in either England's Carter Report or the Netherlands Sport for all Policy.

- all known research within the United Kingdom into the barriers on the uptake of sport and physical activity has been summarized by a team at Oxford University and will be used by England to inform future interventions. This could be a valuable

³² There was very little information found on the Government of France website on more detailed policies or approaches to increasing sport participation.

³³ Correspondence from Mr. Kemper, Netherlands Sport Directorate, dated December 19, 2005.

³⁴ Data on sport funding in France was provided by Raphaël I. Israël, Manager, Strategic Initiatives International Sport at Canadian Heritage in email correspondence dated November 17, 2005.

resource for Canada in enhancing the design of sport participation projects to maximize uptake by under-represented groups;

- a campaign has been piloted in the North East of England ('Everyday Sport'), with promising results related to raised awareness levels and engagement of media, public sector agencies and the private sector. The pilot is being used to refine the campaign strategy and roll out 'second stage' pilots in the regions in 2005-06;
- the recent 'Choosing Health' White Paper in England recognized the need to promote physical activity and has indicated a way forward in its recently published delivery plan. It also profiled the North East pilot as a case study, and endorsed the need to implement a marketing campaign to tackle obesity through physical activity. This may be of interest to Canada in the design of any future promotional campaign;
- the Active Places database was launched in England in July 2004 and provides information on 20,000 sites for playing sport. From May 2005, a 'power user' application will enable Local Authorities (LAs) and other public agencies to undertake robust supply and demand analysis for sports facilities. This may be of interest to Canada for future facility planning; and,
- an innovative information-sharing agreement is in place between England and the Australian Commission for Sport. A similar information sharing agreement between Canada and England, if appropriate, may yield significant mutual benefits in increasing and measuring sport participation.

Application review process

There is now a thorough application review process (and guidance to Program Officers) now in place for all elements. For NSOs, MSOs and others, a revised evaluation grid was developed in 2004-05 that assessed past performance (for projects funded for more than one year), as well as the key principles.³⁵ Also in 2004-05, a revised SPDP Application Review process with an internal three person Review Committee was implemented, and a Monitoring Report Template for use by NSOs was introduced for year end reporting on results.³⁶ For the F-P/T Bilaterals, a formal application and review process is initiated when P/T Ministers responsible for sport submit a funding proposal and a formal request to enter into a multi-year F-P/T agreement. A Draft Template for Proposal Assessment was introduced in 2005-06.³⁷ The Strategic Investment application review process is designed to enable support to be directed towards non-traditional sport clients that can assist in furthering the objectives of the SSP, particularly the participation objective. Currently there is not a call for applications; rather requests are handled as they are presented.

Use of expert resources

³⁵ Sport Canada (undated). 2004-2005 SPDP Application Review.

³⁶ Sport Canada (undated). 2004-2005 Monitoring Report Template.

³⁷ Sport Canada (undated). Draft Template for Assessment of Proposals - 2005-06.

There are opportunities to make better use of existing expert resources available to assist organizations developing programs for under-represented groups. For example, CAAWS has developed a resource to assist organizations in developing effective programs for girls and women that could be used by organizations with projects targeting girls and women. There may be other excellent resources available for the target groups. However, there is not currently a mechanism in place to advise expert organizations of sport participation projects in their area, nor is there a list of resources provided by Sport Canada to funding recipients.

Design variations amongst elements

Given the iterative approach and decentralized management of the various participation elements of the SSP, it is not surprising that there are a few variations in design. The most significant variation in design are the target groups for the various elements, which are as follows:

- NSO element – targets girls and young women, Aboriginal peoples, persons with a disability,³⁸ the economically disadvantaged, youth at risk, and visible minorities.
- MSOs, Others and the Strategic Investments elements (all are eligible under the project stream of the SSP) – same as NSOs except youth at risk are excluded.³⁹
- P/T bilaterals element - the under-represented groups are those that had been identified in the F-P/T Priorities for Collaborative Action which are girls, persons with a disability, Aboriginal peoples and visible minorities.⁴⁰
- Research element - no target groups are identified as priorities for research for the SSHRC⁴¹ and CIHR.⁴²

A second variation is the expanded scope of the P/T bilaterals which allows P/Ts to include some physical activity projects, such as traditional Aboriginal dance, as well as sport in their projects.

A third variation exists in the maximum duration of funding: For the NSOs, MSOs, partners and other elements, the maximum duration of funding is four years. For P/T bilaterals, the initial agreements have been extended for one to four additional years, depending on the agreement.

With all six elements of the SSP now underway, there is an opportunity for Sport Canada to revisit the design and further consider whether these variations are appropriate. When

³⁸ Sport Canada (undated). Contribution Guidelines 2005-07. Downloaded from http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/sc/contributions/2005-2006/2005-2006_e.pdf on November 14, 2005.

³⁹ Sport Canada (undated). Memorandum: Sport Participation Development Program for MSOs, plus Detailed Guidelines.

⁴⁰ Sport Canada (June 3, 2004). F-P/T Bilateral Agreements: New Directions for 2004-08.

⁴¹ SSHRC. Sport Participation Research Initiative. Downloaded from http://www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/program_descriptions/sport_can_e.asp on November 12, 2005.

⁴² CIHR. Team Planning and Development Grants- Sport Participation to Enhance the Quality of Life. Downloaded from <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/28260.html#Objectives%20and%20Relevant%20Research%20Areas> on November 12, 2005.

examining the maximum duration of funding amongst the elements, it will also be important to consider what is the minimum duration of funding needed to increase sport participation, especially amongst harder to reach target groups, and in smaller communities and the North.

Coordination amongst participation elements

There are likely opportunities for greater synergy amongst the various elements of the SSP. There is no one person responsible for sport participation below the Director General (DG) level in Sport Canada. Moreover, the participation elements of the SSP have been developed iteratively and independently by a number of different Sport Canada officials who report to different Managers or Directors. Excluding the Program Officers who review the NSO Project Stream applications under the SSP, there are approximately eight Program Officers/ Managers/ Directors responsible for different aspects of the participation elements of the SSP, with the DG responsible overall.⁴³ With the implementation of all six elements completed, an integrated mechanism for management of the participation elements of the SSP, which is linked to the management of Sport Canada's Sport Participation Strategy, would enhance coordination and consistency.

4.4. Research Contribution

This subsection presents the findings that address the following evaluation questions: To what extent do the program's research activities directed toward sport participation projects and policies help increase the body of knowledge with respect to participation? What, if any are the shortcomings?

Research undertaken

Over the past few years, the focus has been on developing Sport Canada's policy research capacity, through the newly created Sport Policy Research Initiative (SCRI). Sport Canada officials view this as a "rebirth" of sport research in Canada and note that it is the first time there has been a focus on "policy" research.⁴⁴ As result, there has not yet been a significant amount of research undertaken.

Since 2003-04, funding for research initiatives has totalled just over \$550,000, with the bulk of the research dollars expended in 2004-05 (\$380K). As noted previously, future research funding will primarily focus on the Council-based partnerships with SSHRC and CIHR, with funding of \$800K and \$1.3M allocated for research in 2006-07, and 2007-08.

The research undertaken to date falls under the four activity streams of the SPRI, and is as follows.

Surveys and statistics: Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute (CFLRI) is conducting a sport monitor (2004-2009). In the absence of sport baseline data for priority

⁴³ Sport Canada correspondence dated November 14, 2005.

⁴⁴ Sport Canada correspondence dated December 20, 2005.

groups, the Interprovincial Sport and Recreation Council (ISRC) contracted the CFLRI to collect baseline data for a host of factors related to sport participation. The Sport Benchmark / Monitoring Program began data collection in November 2004. An analysis of data collected between November 2004 and May 2005 is examining sport participation as well as local opportunities for sport participation on a sample of 3,500 individuals. The first report is expected in December 2005.⁴⁵

Impact Analysis Research: The Conference Board of Canada – Strengthening Canada: the Socio-economic Benefits of Sport Participation in Canada. The objective of this project is to improve the state of knowledge on the socio-economic benefits of sport participation so that the federal government and Canadians can gain a better understanding of its importance to the well-being of individuals and communities, the Canadian economy and society. It explored how participation in sports can have a positive impact on economic performance, population health, skills development for citizenship and workplace, citizen engagement and social cohesion. It examined the connections between the policy goal of enhanced sport participation and other public policy priorities.⁴⁶

Targeted Research: A number of studies or initiatives have been conducted under this stream, which are as follows.

- an initial study was completed on the volunteer capacity of Canadian Sport;⁴⁷
- three studies have been conducted on sport sponsorship: (1) Increasing Corporate Sponsorship of Sport: Making the Case to Business, Making the Case to Canadians; (2) Sponsorship Case Studies Report; and (3) Final Report Sport Sponsorship Survey 2005;⁴⁸
- a study of policy factors leading to international sport success is underway, with the report available in December 2005;⁴⁹ and,
- an Aboriginal Sport Forum was held in November 2005 to identify the research priorities in Aboriginal sport as it relates to the four pillars of the new Canadian Sport Policy (2002). These discussions were set within the context of Aboriginal priorities for sport.

There is not yet information available on how the results of these completed research studies will be used to develop or revise sport participation policy, a key objective of both the research element of the SSP, and the SPRI.

Research under the SPRI is not limited to sport participation and may include, for example studies which focus on excellence. These other types of studies would be funded through other aspects of the SSP. In the future, however, there is an opportunity to more closely link research funded through the research element of the SSP with sport participation. A few of the studies funded through the research element of the SSP do not

⁴⁵ Sport Canada (undated). Sport Policy Research Program Snapshot.

⁴⁶ Sport Canada (undated) Targeted Research Description.

⁴⁷ Sport Canada correspondence dated October 5, 2005.

⁴⁸ Sport Canada (undated). Targeted Research Description.

⁴⁹ Sport Canada (undated) Sport Policy Research Program Snapshot.

appear to have a strong sport participation focus, i.e., the international sport policy paper deals with international success rather than sport participation and the three sponsorship studies appear to primarily focus on a number of aspects of marketing other than sponsorship of sport participation initiatives.

Partnerships with Funding Councils

As mentioned earlier, as of 2006-07, the majority of the funding for the research element of the SSP will be directed at Council-based research stream. The Council-based portion is a credible approach that builds the body of evidence-based knowledge that meets more rigorous academic standards.

The current design of the Council-based portion of the SPRI (which includes the research element of the SSP), is based on recommendations by consultants from the University of Toronto's Centre for Sport Policy Studies and from the University of Ottawa's Research Centre for Sport in Canadian Society. Under their leadership, Sport Canada convened a Sport Canada Research Roundtable on October 29, 2004 with invited representatives from the sport research community, the policy / sport policy community, and representatives from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).⁵⁰ Based on the Roundtable, a Final Report was submitted to Sport Canada that made detailed recommendations on the scope, design and delivery of the Council-based portion of the research element of the SSP, as well as the research priorities or themes.⁵¹

Both the SSHRC and CIHR research partnerships were launched in 2005-06, with a call for applications in Autumn 2005. The SSHRC grants for sport participation research that are available, along with the timelines, are as follows:⁵²

- research grants of up to \$100,000 per annum, but not totalling more than \$250,000 in a three-year period, will be available for up to three years, with results announced April 2006;
- postdoctoral Fellowship Supplements of \$10,000 in addition to the value of the Postdoctoral Fellowship will be available for a 12 month period, with the results announced in February 2006; and,
- doctoral Award Supplements of \$10,000 in addition to the value of the doctoral award will be available for a 12 month period, with the results announced in April 2006.

The Institute of Musculoskeletal Health and Arthritis's sport participation research funding includes grants for the support of planning and/or development activities of multidisciplinary and/or cross pillar research teams. The maximum amount awarded for a

⁵⁰ Dr. Peter Donnelly, Dr. Bruce Kidd, and Dr. Jean Harvey (undated). Sport Canada Research Policy Programme Final Report (Draft).

⁵¹ Sport Canada (undated). Sport Policy Research Program Snapshot.

⁵² SSHRC. Sport Participation Research Initiative. Downloaded from http://www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/program_descriptions/sport_can_e.asp on November 12, 2005.

single grant is \$100,000 per annum for up to 1 year, with the results announced in March 2006.⁵³

Knowledge dissemination strategy

The knowledge dissemination strategy for the research element of the SSP (and the SPRI) is currently under development, and focuses on two areas:

- a Sport information Research Centre web portal that will provide access to all research information carried out under the auspice of any one of the four streams of the CSPRI. The project is progressing, but will not be on-line until next fiscal year; and,
- a one day conference of academics and policy-makers is currently under discussion within Sport Canada. The conference would bring together recipients of council research grants to share their results with other grant holders, Sport Canada policy makers, and others. Such a conference would not occur until 2007-08, when the first research results from council supported research will be available.

Monitoring Panel

The Monitoring Panel recommended by the Sport Canada Policy Research Programme Report is not yet formally in place. The Report recommended that a panel of three (3) academics, together with the Sport Canada research coordinator, be established to monitor the SPRI. The Monitoring Panel would:

- determine the eligibility/appropriateness of research topics submitted for consideration under the SPRI, identified from the ‘check-box’ applications to SSHRC and applications to the CIHR project; and,
- plan and organize a series of annual, one day academic conferences bringing together grant holders, Sport Canada policy makers, and others, to report on research projects, and determine the contribution and direction of the SPRI.”⁵⁴

As noted by a PCH official during an earlier presentation on the key findings of the evaluation, it will also be important to monitor closely the uptake of the sport participation grants as resistance amongst academics to directed policy research may be a limiting factor.

Sport Canada is currently developing the Terms of Reference for the Monitoring Panel. Until the Monitoring Panel is formally in place, the consultants mentioned above are fulfilling that role.

Standardized research protocol for measuring sport participation

⁵³ CIHR. Team Planning and Development Grants- Sport Participation to Enhance the Quality of Life. Downloaded from <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/28260.html#Objectives%20and%20Relevant%20Research%20Areas> on November 12, 2005.

⁵⁴ Sport Canada (undated). Sport Canada Research Policy Programme Final report (Draft).

Currently, Sport Canada does not have a standardized research protocol in place to measure sport participation. As a result, sport participation research undertaken by Council-based grant recipients and other researchers in Canada runs the risk of not being comparable. However, based on other country's experiences, there may be potential difficulties in the widespread adoption of a common definition / methodology in Canada to measure sport participation.

In Europe, considerable work has been completed on developing a standardized approach to measuring sport participation, through the COMPASS Project⁵⁵. Initiated in 1996, COMPASS is a jointly funded initiative of the Italian National Olympic Committee (CONI), UK Sport and Sport England to examine existing systems for the collection and analysis of sports participation data in European countries with a view to identifying ways in which harmonization may be achieved, so that greater comparability of data from different European countries will become possible. COMPASS is concerned with data collected in national sports participation surveys that use questionnaires to collect information on a range of specified sporting activities over a specified period of time.

Also of potential interest to Canada may be the Netherlands' RSO-guidelines⁵⁶ as they provide an approach to standardize sport participation research in Canada. First published in 2000, they offer a modular framework for sports participation surveys, consisting of a basic (general) module, additional (specific) modules, a research protocol and guidelines for research presentation and registration, geared to the COMPASS analytical framework. All are available on the web and can be downloaded by researchers for use.

Expert input on research priorities

The Aboriginal Sport Forum model being used to assist in developing research priorities could also be used to set other research priorities for underrepresented groups, i.e., girls and women, youth at risk, visible minorities, etc. This would allow expert organizations such as CAAWS to be part of the priority-setting process for research in their area. Alternatively, representatives from expert groups could be invited to the annual conference, as well as participate in any discussions on future research priorities for their respective areas.

⁵⁵ All information on COMPASS was downloaded from the COMPASS website at <http://w3.uniroma1.it/compass/index.htm> on November 1, 2005.

⁵⁶ Sports in the Netherlands: Policy, research, participation, harmonizations. A Paper for the third Compass workshop May 23rd-25th 2002, Rome, Italy, presented by Koen Breedveld and Maarten van Bottenburg. Downloaded from <http://w3.uniroma1.it/compass/report/Netherlands.doc> on November 1, 2005.

4.5. Initiatives Undertaken

This subsection presents the findings that address the following evaluation questions: To what extent have initiatives been undertaken to increase the number of participants and quality of participation in sport, including the participation of under-represented groups? Are they adequate to achieve program objectives?

Views of key informants

Key informants generally think that good progress has been made with the participation initiatives. Funding recipients are satisfied with the results achieved so far with the current levels of funding. Moreover, respondents with sport organizations and other recipients (e.g., for Strategic Investments) expect that their current projects are laying the foundation for future success. They attribute much of the success achieved to date to the partnerships that they have formed to implement participation projects.

Representatives of provinces and territories reported that they have conducted two types of projects through the F-P/T Bilateral Agreements. Initially, P/T projects built upon their existing initiatives, and broadening the reach of these initiatives. More recently, P/Ts have been undertaking exploratory projects in areas and in communities where they have not been tried before. Under-represented (target) groups have been the focus of many P/T projects.

Overall funding for target groups

Across all Funding Elements, approximately one-third (30%) of all contributions for 2004-05 (\$2.67 million) have been spent on projects directed to one or more of Sport Canada's target groups. The distribution includes the following percentages of contributions (including the percentages of total contributions of approximately \$8.8 million):

- close to \$1.0 million for Aboriginal peoples: 37.1 percent of all target group funding and 11.3 percent of all project funding;
- \$250,000 for the economically-disadvantaged: 9.4 percent of all target group funding and 2.8 percent of all project funding;
- close to \$760,000 for girls and young women: 28.6 percent of all target group funding and 8.7 percent of all project funding;
- close to \$500,000 for persons with a disability: 18.2 percent of all target group funding and 5.5 percent of all project funding; and,
- approximately \$180,000 for youth at risk: 6.7 percent of all target group funding and 2 percent of all project funding.

**Table 5: Projects and Contributions for Target Groups
by Funding Element: 2004-2006¹**

	Aboriginal People	Economically disadvantaged	Girls and women	Persons with a disability	Youth at Risk	Total – All target group funding
MSOs			\$273,000	\$175,120		\$448,120
NSOs	\$160,000		\$316,166	\$75,000	\$95,000	\$646,166
Other						
P/Ts	\$781,670		\$174,415	\$235,615	\$84,500	\$1,276,200
Research						
Strategic Investment	\$50,000	\$250,000				\$300,000
Total project funding	\$991,670	\$250,000	\$763,581	\$485,735	\$179,500	\$2,670,486
Percentage of target group funding: \$2.67M	37.1%	9.4%	28.6%	18.2%	6.7%	100.0%
Percentage of total funding: \$8.8M	11.3%	2.8%	8.7%	5.5%	2.0%	30.3%

1. Breakdowns of contributions spending are available for all Funding Elements except F-P/T Bilaterals for 2005-06. For F-P/T bilaterals, the most recent data available are for 2004-05 as the details of projects and allocation of Sport Canada contributions are only available after the provinces and territories submit their monitoring reports.

F-P/T Bilaterals – Total funding for projects for target groups is highest for the F-P/T Bilateral Agreements, with close to \$1.3 million directed to projects for these groups (29 percent of all F-P/T project funding). The greatest proportion of target group funding under the F-P/T bilaterals – close to \$1 million or two-thirds of all such directed funding – was allocated to projects for Aboriginal people.

Some provinces focused more explicitly on target groups while some others seem to be trying to increase participation in general. Most P/Ts funded projects for Aboriginal peoples in 2004-05. About half of the P/Ts funded projects for children and youth and persons with a disability. Funding for youth at risk and women and girls was limited to fewer provinces.

NSOs – Summary data on target group funding were available from the NSO monitoring reports for the years 2003-04 and 2004-05. In both of these years, all of the NSOs conducted projects directed at one or more of the target groups identified by Sport Canada. In both of these years, a large majority of NSOs also conducted projects aimed at students from primary school to the post-secondary level: 70 percent of NSOs in 2003-04 and 86.5 percent in 2004-05.

For NSO projects in 2004-05:

- over one-third of NSOs (37.8%) conducted projects aimed at increasing participation among girls and women;
- almost one-quarter of NSOs (24.3%) conducted projects for people with a disability;
- 18.9 percent conducted projects for Aboriginal people;

- 13.5 percent conducted projects for youth at risk; and,
- 10.8 percent conducted projected for visible minorities.

Table 6: NSO Projects with Target Group Objectives: 2003-2004 and 2004-2005

Target Groups	2003-2004		2004-2005	
	Number of NSOs (of 40)	Percentage	Number of NSOs (of 37)	Percentage
Persons with a Disability	4	10.0%	9	24.3%
Girls and Women	6	15.0%	14	37.8%
Youth at Risk	2	5.0%	5	13.5%
Visible Minority	n/a	n/a	4	10.8%
Aboriginal People	6	15.0%	7	18.9%
Economically-Disadvantaged	3	7.5%	n/a	n/a
Aimed at Students ¹	28	70.0%	32	86.5%

Source: Sport Canada, Review of SPDP Projects, spreadsheets prepared by program staff.

1. 2003-2004 projects include 26 aimed at “youth” and two aimed at “college-aged” participants; 2004-2005 projects include four aimed at primary school students, 21 at secondary school students, and nine at college/university students.

4.6. Evidence of Progress

This subsection presents the findings that address the following evaluation questions: What evidence is there that progress is being made towards increasing participation in sport? To what extent is it adequate? The information focuses on two related aspects; (1) what does the existing sport participation data indicate; and (2) how can the sport participation data be improved for the summative evaluation?

Views of key informants on progress

Overall, the evidence from key informants about progress towards increasing participation seems to be good, including the available participation numbers, the numbers of projects, the number and types of partnerships, and the anecdotal feedback to sport organizations and Sport Canada officials. NSOs, MSOs, and other respondents generally are positive about the progress being made to increase participation and are optimistic about the potential for participation initiatives. However, while projects generally have been implemented as planned, most organizations were cautious in their claims about the numbers of participants and the fulfillment of their objectives. They do not have a lot of detail in their participation numbers from delivery partners and, with the exception of their own project projections; they do not have benchmarks with which to compare results. They also noted that they have not received feedback from Sport Canada about their monitoring reports. Sport Canada officials similarly were cautious about assessing results because the empirical results about participation are not available in any detail.

Availability of participation data

Sport Canada has not assembled the baseline data from the information provided by recipients regarding participation levels generally from which to assess the incremental impacts of the participation elements of the SSP, nor is there an integrated results framework within which to capture this information consistently. Currently NSO, and MSO funding recipients are required to include targets as part of their proposal, along with a monitoring and evaluation strategy. As well, NSOs and MSOs submit participation data with their bi-annual monitoring reports. However, it is highly aggregated and counts the numbers of participants. Breakdowns by type of participant (e.g., priority groups) can only be inferred from the project type / characteristics and by whatever project descriptions are provided in the NSO monitoring reports.

The NSO reporting form asks funding recipients to report the number of new participants, both members and non-members, resulting from project implementation. Summaries of these participation data are available for 2003-04 and 2004-05.

Table 7: Participation Data from NSO Projects: 2003-2004 and 2004-2005

	Fiscal Year		Total
	2003-2004	2004-2005	
Estimated number of increased participants	262,124	184,065	446,189
Actual number of new participants¹	152,401²	205,202	357,603

1. Numbers of participants are not available for four NSOs (e.g., they reported the number of schools or P/Ts participating).

2. Most of the difference between estimated and actual numbers of participants in 2003-04 is attributable to one sport.

Participation data from NSO projects for 2003-04 and 2004-05 have been summarized in more detail by Sport Canada in the Contributions – Summary Progress Report for each year. Some participation data for 2002-03 is also available from the 2002-2003 Contributions – Summary Progress Report. Participation data for this first year includes the number of schools and teachers for youth-oriented programs conducted through schools and the number of participants in projects conducted by sport organizations.

P/Ts are also required to set targets (as articulated in their key objectives / expected results) as part of their proposal. Annually, P/Ts are required to submit activity reports annually in “such a way that shows progress in relation to the defined objectives and expected results of the Projects”. As well, at the end of the funding period, P/T partners are required to submit an evaluation plan but the content is not defined.

P/Ts provide some participation data for projects funded under the P/T Bilateral Agreements through the annual monitoring reports submitted to Sport Canada. This data has not yet been aggregated or summarized. Sport Canada has recently provided P/Ts with a draft tracking template to assist with the compilation of participation data.

- The 2004-2005 results by province/territory are listed by Sport Canada in Report #3: Project Summaries by Province/Territory (2004-2005), prepared on September 23,

2005. The P/T Bilateral Agreement participation data have not been aggregated by province/territory;

- the 2004-2005 results by target group are listed by Sport Canada in Report #5: 2004-2005 FPT Bilateral Funding – Projects Summaries by Target Group. The P/T Bilateral Agreement participation data have not been aggregated by target group; and,
- the results reporting requirements for the projects in the Other and Strategic Investment elements varies, but is dictated by the nature of the project but is not yet complied or aggregated.

Measuring sport participation in Europe

Given the limited success to date in measuring sport participation, the work underway in Europe to measuring sport participation is germane. Measuring and defining sport participation in a consistent and accurate way is very challenging, both within a country and especially between countries. However, the work being done by COMPASS to collect sport participation data in a systematic and standardized way amongst European countries has made significant initial progress and can be built upon by Canada.

A key consideration for Sport Canada has been, and continues to be, the definition of sport used to measure sport participation. The definition and analytical framework being used to measure sport participation in Europe is significantly broader and more comprehensive than the existing Sport Canada definition and analytical framework being used in the CFLRI Sport Benchmark Monitoring Program to measure sport participation in Canada. In England's Carter Report, both physical activity and "informal sport"⁵⁷ were considered important in understanding and measuring sport participation; "informal sport" was found to account for a significant proportion (43%) of all sporting activity, is cheap to deliver but has gone relatively unsupported (compared to traditional organized sport).⁵⁸

Both England and the Netherlands appear to have a strong history of evidence-based policy-making and numerous instruments to measure sport participation that may be of further interest to Canada. For example, a monitoring and evaluation toolkit has been developed in England to track throughput and usage profiles for individual projects. The toolkit is currently being applied to 250 'Active England' projects, an innovative multi-sport pilot programme to determine what works best in increasing and widening participation. As a number of key informants expressed concern about their ability to collect participation data, a similar tool kit could be used to build capacity in funded organizations.

Despite the challenges, the widespread use of data to identify and understand key issues on sport participation in Europe, and in particular by England and the Netherlands, serves to reinforce the importance of evidence-based information in Canada's sport participation policy process.

⁵⁷ Informal sport includes, for example, swimming, fitness classes, yoga, cycling, weights, running or jogging, football (unorganized) and golf (unorganized).

⁵⁸ Patrick Carter (March, 2005). Review of National Sport Effort and Resources. Downloaded at http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_2005/carter.htm.

A measurement framework for sport participation

There are a number of aspects to the measurement strategy for the participation elements that need to be developed and implemented in order to have good data on the impacts of the sport participation projects. All of the participation elements of the SSP have some form of monitoring and evaluation requirements associated with them but a precise measurement strategy has not yet been developed for all six elements. To better measure increases in sport participation, it will be important to develop a specific measurement strategy that allows for the measurement and reporting of the progress and impacts of all participation elements of the SSP.

At the national level, increases in sport participation in the Canadian population are being measured through a number of different surveys, including the CFLRI Sport Benchmark and Monitoring Program, two Aboriginal peoples surveys (North of 60 and First Nations on reserve), and the General Social Survey, cycle 19. However, given the modest reach and resources associated with the participation elements of the SSP, it is unlikely that the participation elements of the SSP will result in changes in sport participation levels at a national level. Similarly, it would be difficult to attribute any changes in sport participation levels nationally, or even with a NSOs' membership data, given the number of other variables that may influence overall sport participation by the target groups.

Using the national data on participation rates to determine the effectiveness of the participation elements would be similar to only considering medal counts to determine the effectiveness of the AAP. Although the national participation data may show overall progress, only a more focused approach with the participation elements of the SSP will allow Sport Canada and the partners to know whether the participation elements of the SSP have been an effective mechanism by which to increase sport participation in Canada. However, any effort to measure the impact of the participation elements of the SSP must reflect the fact that it is a component of the SSP, and has a modest budget relative to Sport Canada's three main funding programs.

As part of the measurement strategy for the participation elements of the SSP, it will be important to clearly define what success looks like for the participation elements of the SSP. Currently, it is not clear if the criteria for success should be an increase in the number of participants during a project, and/or if the project attracts new participants (rather than participants who were already active in another sport), and/or if the participants stay involved in sport after they have completed the initial introductory program. Nor are the definitions clear for a number of the target groups, i.e., youth at risk, economically disadvantaged, with funding recipients responsible for developing their own criteria.

Capturing reliable sport participation data, especially the tracking of longer-term participation, i.e., after the sport participation project, has been identified as a concern by a number of funding recipients. This information is asked for by Sport Canada as part of the monitoring report. However, a number of NSO, MSO and P/T partners expressed concern that the organizations delivering the projects currently do not have the resources or expertise to do this. Assuming that post-project participation in sport is an important

indicator of success for Sport Canada, there is a need to look at alternate ways to capture this data. One alternative is for Sport Canada to undertake a study with a sample of project participants to track their longer-term participation in sports over a number of years following their respective sport participation project. Such a study would also address the concern raised by a key informant about the capacity of NSOs and MSOs to effectively deliver sport participation.

The research element has already identified two indicators for success, but is still considering what results information will be collected, especially as it relates to the merit of the research. Currently, the RMAF for Sport Canada's Three Funding Programs⁵⁹ identifies two indicators to measure "improved capacity for evidence-based sport policy development." The output measures include the "number of research reports, analyses and data runs related to understanding the needs of athletes, organizations and Canadians". The outcome indicator is "whether policy makers are aware of the evidence related to the needs of athletes, organizations and Canadians". It is important to note, however, that these indicators do not actually measure whether evidence-based information is actually used by policy-makers, a key objective of both the research element of the SSP and the SPRI.

Another key element of the measurement strategy will be clearly defining the specific indicators for the different types of projects underway, especially given the variety of projects being delivered through the F-P/T bilaterals. A reasonable approach would be to categorize similar types of projects, e.g., school-based projects, community-based projects, promotional campaigns, and develop a few key indicators for each type of project.

It will also be important to incorporate the work already being considered by Sport Canada, including:

- definitions for visible minorities, youth at risk, persons with a disability, and economically disadvantaged which are currently being considered by Sport Canada;
- how to overcome sampling challenges associated with measuring changes in these target groups in the population; and,
- how to define and measure the "quality" aspect associated with increasing sport participation.⁶⁰

Another key element of the measurement strategy will be the setting of performance targets. In 2006, based on the initial baseline data available through the initial data from the CFLRI Sport Monitoring Benchmark initiative, the F-P/T Ministers will be setting overall targets for children and youth, girls and women, and Aboriginal children and youth to increase participation in sport. However, these groups do not include all of the target groups for the participation elements of the SSP, nor are they applicable to the

⁵⁹ Sport Canada (November 9, 2005). RMAF for Sport Canada's Three Funding Programs - Draft Report.

⁶⁰ Sport Canada correspondence dated October 27, 2005.

sport participation projects funded through the SSP which have a much more limited focus.⁶¹

Finally, any measurement strategy developed for the participation elements of the SSP should be linked to, and consistent with, other research initiatives underway within Sport Canada to measure sport participation.

⁶¹ Sport Canada (November 30, 2004). F-P/TSC - Briefing Note - Increasing Participation in Sport: Targets and Collaborative Actions, Draft.

5. Conclusions

5.1. Effective Implementation

The implementation of the participation elements has been iterative, with early implementation in 2002/03 focusing on established relationships and mechanisms, i.e., NSOs, MSOs and P/T governments. Based on further consultation and deliberation, the remainder of the six elements were developed and implemented, with the Council-based portion of the research implemented most recently in 2005-06.

Funding for the participation elements has increased significantly; from \$914,500 in 2002-03 to \$8,760,350 in contributions in 2005-06. The lack of explicit targets for the allocation of contributions by funding element and strategic priority makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of implementation. Nonetheless, there has been strong support and a high level of uptake amongst sport organizations and P/Ts.

The funding allocations by element reflect the iterative development of the participation elements; P/T partners receive approximately half of the funds, while another quarter is allocated to NSOs. Although only a small amount of funds have been allocated to research thus far, larger allocations for council-based research are committed for 2006-07 and 2007-08 (\$2.1M). Among the five Sport Canada strategic priorities for sport participation, approximately one-third has been allocated to projects for the target groups, and one-third to enhancing community based-sport.

5.2. Implementation Constraints

There are a number of implementation constraints that should be addressed that would enhance implementation. Sport Canada has already addressed the initial problem of providing participation funding late in the fiscal year, which caused difficulties by recipients in spending the funds, and, in the case of P/Ts, securing matching funds.

The most significant constraint remaining is the problem with data collection and reporting and its relationship with current Sport Canada database applications that make program performance reporting difficult. This problem has been identified in Sport Canada's IT/IM plan.

Although communication with potential funding recipients at the front end of the process is good, when agreements are being discussed and terms negotiated, there are opportunities for better communication of information by Sport Canada. This includes feedback on proposed targets and monitoring and evaluation strategy in proposals, as well as feedback on the activity and monitoring reports submitted to Sport Canada.

There is also an opportunity to clarify the relationship between the participation elements of the SSP and their contribution to the draft Sport Participation Strategy, as well as agree on consistent terminology to be used in describing the various elements.

5.3. Design Considerations

The design has evolved and broadened over time to provide Sport Canada with the flexibility to fund a variety of organizations to increase sport participation. With the iterative evolution of the design, there is now an opportunity to reconfirm the design of the participation elements of the SSP.

In general, it is consistent with the approaches being taken by the Netherlands and England, with two important exceptions. First, as both countries have a strong club-based system for the delivery of sport at the grass roots level, these two countries have opted to focus on an integrated, community-based bottom-up approach to increasing sport participation. A similar approach was not considered appropriate by Sport Canada due to jurisdictional considerations between Sport Canada and P/T governments, and the lack of funds. However, there are opportunities for greater integration amongst the various elements. This may mean, for example, that a P/T partner who wishes to target girls and young women, would work with CAAWS and other interested NSOs, their respective PSOs and other provincial organizations to develop a more integrated and focused approach in that province. As well, an integrated community-based approach with links to the education sector merits further consideration, at least on a pilot basis in a smaller community, should more funding become available and P/T governments be in agreement.

Second, the overall amount of funding allocated to the participation elements of the SSP may limit the impact on sport participation. France, England and the Netherlands all allocate significantly more resources to sport participation than does Sport Canada, even when taking into account leveraging. As a result, one would only expect very modest increases in sport participation through the participation elements of the SSP.

The multi-year agreements and the flexibility in the design of the participation elements of the SSP are seen as strengths. However, the flexibility of the P/T bilaterals has allowed provinces and territories to interpret the terms broadly and include activities in some projects that do not directly, but rather more indirectly support Sport Canada priorities. Sport Canada recognizes this situation but does not consider it an issue. Other variations in the design that also need to be considered include differences in target groups amongst the six elements, and the maximum duration of funding for projects.

Leveraging has also been an important aspect of the design, with matching funds provided through the P/T Bilateral element, and with some funds leveraged through CIHR for the council-based portion of the research element.

Partnerships have been an important element of project design and implementation, especially at the community level. However, long-term sustainability of the sport

participation initiatives is an issue that needs to be resolved. There are two aspects to sustainability. The first is the duration of time required by an organization to develop, implement and sustain a project for it to have significant impact over a number of years. Early lessons learned amongst delivery organizations, especially with harder to reach target groups, smaller communities, and in the North, suggest that the four year maximum funding duration may not be sufficient. In the Netherlands, funding for the Sport for All incentive is eight years. The second aspect is whether, in the absence of Sport Canada funding, organizations and P/Ts will be able to continue funding their sport participation initiatives. The evidence suggests that although partnerships are an important element of the design, their impact is limited from a sustainability perspective.

The participation elements of the SSP will be better connected within Sport Canada under the new management structure for sport participation (to be implemented early in 2006). There are also a number of other opportunities where linkages could be improved, including: better use of expert groups and their resources by organizations delivering programs targeted at these groups; sharing of information on what projects are being funded, best practices and lessons learned amongst the recipients and the larger sport community; and involvement of expert representatives from the under-represented groups in the priority setting mechanisms for research in their area.

5.4. Research Contribution

Over the past few years, the focus has been on developing Sport Canada's policy research capacity, through the newly created Sport Policy Research Initiative. As a result, there has not yet been a significant amount of research undertaken within the research element of the SSP. A small number of research projects have been commissioned, the most notable of which is the CFLRI Sport Benchmark / Monitoring Program, and the recently completed Conference Board of Canada study on *Strengthening Canada: the Socio-economic Benefits of Sport Participation in Canada*.

Future research funding will primarily focus on the Council-based partnerships with SSHRC and CIHR, with funding of \$800K and \$1.3M allocated for research in 2006-07, and 2007-08. Both the SSHRC and CIHR research partnerships were launched in 2005-06, with a call for applications in the Fall of 2005. The design of the Council-based partnerships reflects the expert advice of leading academic in sport participation, and is intended to build the body of evidence-based knowledge on sport participation that meets more rigorous academic standards. However, given that there may be some resistance by academics to directed policy research, it will be important to monitor closely the uptake of the sport participation grants.

There is not yet information available on how the results of the research projects completed to date have been, or will be used, to develop or revise sport participation policy, a key objective of both the research element of the SSP, and the SPRI.

There are a number of aspects to the design of the research element that still need to be completed. These are as follows:

- implementing the Monitoring Panel for the council-based portion of the research element;
- completing the knowledge dissemination strategy, including the web-based portal and a one day conference to bring together recipients of council research grants to share their results with other grant holders, Sport Canada policy makers, and others, starting in 2007-08;
- more closely linking research commissioned by Sport Canada under the research element of the SSP with sport participation;
- determining the need for a standardized research protocol to measure sport participation for use by academics and other researchers, using the COMPASS work to date and Netherlands web-based protocol and module as a starting point; and,
- deciding on the most appropriate mechanism for expert input from organizations representing under-represented groups, e.g., CAAWS and CPC, on the research priorities for their respective areas of interest, and considering the most recently completed Aboriginal Research Forum as a possible model.

5.5. Initiatives Undertaken

It is difficult to adequately assess progress made based on the limited data available. The various databases used by Sport Canada include a great deal of information on the financial contributions for the participation elements but do not include much information on the characteristics of projects or participation results of the initiatives. Much of the information on projects and participation presented in this evaluation is derived from ad hoc data files and project summaries prepared by program staff. With the exception of financial data, comprehensive participation data was only available for the NSO and P/T elements for 2004-05.

Moreover, it is difficult to determine the appropriateness of projects amongst the target groups and strategic priorities, without a sense of what criteria are being used to judge success. That is, without any targets for allocations amongst the target groups themselves, as well as the four other strategic priorities, it is difficult to determine whether the allocations are appropriate.

In 2004-05, approximately \$1.3 million of P/T project funding was directed to projects for target groups (29 percent of federal contributions to F-P/T bilaterals). Two-thirds of P/T target group in 2004-05 was allocated to projects for Aboriginal people, with most provinces and territories undertaking one or more projects for Aboriginal people. About half of the provinces and territories funded projects for children and youth and persons with a disability. Funding for youth at risk and women and girls was limited to fewer provinces. Representatives of the province and territories indicated that more recently, they have been undertaking new exploratory projects with target groups and in communities where they have not been tried before.

For NSOs, a large majority conducted projects directed at one or more of Sport Canada's target groups in 2004-05: 38 percent of NSOs conducted projects aimed at increasing participation among girls and women. Another 24 percent of NSO projects were targeted at persons with a disability (24 percent); followed by Aboriginal people (19 percent); youth at risk (14 percent); and, visible minorities (11 percent). Most of the NSO projects (86 percent) were also aimed at students from primary school to the post-secondary level.

Both client organizations and Sport Canada officials are satisfied with the progress made so far with their participation initiatives. For the P/Ts in particular, the funding has opened up new areas of activity that are incremental to their existing initiatives. Moreover, funding recipients believe that their current projects are laying the foundation for future successes.

5.6. Evidence of Progress

Preliminary evidence about results and achievement of participation objectives, while encouraging, is limited. Overall evidence from key informants about progress is positive, including the available data about the numbers of projects and participants, partnerships, and anecdotal feedback about progress. However, the available empirical data about participation results for most funding elements, including breakdowns by types of participants, are not available in any detail.

Breakdowns by type of participant (e.g., target groups) can only be inferred from the project type and by the project descriptions provided in the NSO monitoring reports. For the last two fiscal years (2003-04 and 2004-05), NSOs reported a total of 357,603 participants for their projects – an average of over 175,000 per year.

Provinces/Territories and other types of funding recipients (e.g., for Strategic Initiatives) have not been provided with a reporting template by Sport Canada. Nevertheless, P/Ts submit some participation data with their monitoring reports. Sport Canada has not yet produced comprehensive aggregations of the P/T participation data from their monitoring reports. However, P/T projects for 2004-05 have been listed, and summarized to some extent by target group, in a set of recent reports (e.g., *Report #4: 2004-2005 FPT Bilateral Funding – Projects Summaries by Target Group*).

For broad comparisons or assessments of incremental impacts, Sport Canada does not have baseline data about participation levels generally from which to assess the results of participation initiatives, including the participation elements of the SSP.

A measurement framework for sport participation

There are a number of aspects to the measurement strategy for the participation elements that need to be developed and implemented in order to have good data on the impacts of the sport participation projects, over and above the national data on sport participation that will be provided through the CFLRI's Sport Benchmark / Monitoring Program. The key aspects of the sport participation measurement strategy are as follows:

- a clear definition of success is needed for the participation elements of the SSP that specifies whether the criteria for success should be an increase in the number of participants during a project, and/or if the project attracts new participants (rather than participants who were already active in another sport), and/or if the participants stay involved in sport after they have completed the initial introductory program;
- a strategy to reliably capture longer-term sport participation data, i.e., after the sport participation project, which may include a longitudinal study of a sample of participants in the years following their sport participation project;
- an approach to developing appropriate targets for the participation elements that will allow Sport Canada to know whether a particular element is effective in increasing participation in sport;
- completion of the work underway to define children and youth, visible minorities, youth at risk, persons with a disability, and economically disadvantaged, as well as how to define and measure the "quality" aspect associated with increasing sport participation;
- a strategy to increase the capacity of funded recipients to develop, implement, and report on key results of their sport participation projects to Sport Canada, with consideration of a number of relevant resources already developed in England; and,
- a strategy to increase the capacity of Sport Canada staff to assess and provide feedback to funded recipients on their expected results, their proposed monitoring and evaluation strategy, and ongoing monitoring data.

Finally, the measurement strategy developed for the participation elements of the SSP should also be linked to, and consistent with, other initiatives underway within Sport Canada to measure sport participation.

6. Recommendations and Management Response

On the basis of the formative evaluation findings, the following recommendations are suggested for consideration by Sport Canada.

Recommendation 1: Under the new management structure for the participation elements of the SSP, complete the Sport Participation Strategy to describe all aspects of participation activities carried out by Sport Canada.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

Enhanced Participation is one of four goals outlined in the Canadian Sport Policy (CSP), adopted in 2002 by the Federal and Provincial/Territorial Ministers responsible for sport, physical activity and recreation. The F-P/T governments subsequently adopted a set of priorities for collaborative action for the period of 2002-2005 to contribute to the achievement of the four policy goals, including Enhanced Participation. Sport Canada is in the process of drafting a Sport Participation Strategy that will identify objectives and a set of priority activities to advance the Enhanced Participation goal. In developing this strategy, consideration will be given to possible bilateral and multilateral initiatives with the provinces and territories. These would in turn need to be incorporated into the renewed F-P/T priorities for collaborative action for 2006-09.

The Director of Policy and Planning will be responsible for completion of the Sport Participation Strategy.

Implementation Schedule: December 2006

Recommendation 2: Develop and implement a performance measurement strategy for the participation elements of the SSP that is integrated with the overall Sport Canada performance measurement strategy.

The strategy would include:

- a clear definition of what success looks like, along with targets and key indicators that will allow Sport Canada to know whether a particular element is effective in increasing participation in sport
- completion of the work underway to define children and youth, visible minorities, youth at risk, persons with a disability, and economically disadvantaged, as well as how to define and measure the “quality” aspect associated with increasing sport participation;

- an approach to reliably capture longer-term sport participation data, i.e., after the sport participation project;
- an approach to increasing the capacity of funded recipients to develop, implement and report on key results of their sport participation projects to Sport Canada, , and considering a number of relevant resources already developed in England; and,
- an approach to increasing the capacity of Sport Canada staff to assess and provide feedback to funded recipients on their expected results, their proposed monitoring and evaluation strategy, and ongoing monitoring data.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

This is a timely recommendation as the final report of the Sport Benchmark/Monitoring Project is expected in March 2006 and this will yield some baseline data on sport participation. In addition, Sport Canada is in the process of developing a comprehensive Performance Measurement Strategy that will, among other things, provide a framework for the collection of results data on sport participation.

This recommendation has both short and longer term implications. In the short term, Sport Canada will proceed with developing a clear definition of what success looks like in the area of participation, with accompanying targets and indicators, applicable to the participation elements of the SSP. This will include a determination of how these are to be measured. In addition, data already collected from recipients will be used to assist in the development of the targets. In the longer term, Sport Canada will develop processes to i) increase the capacity of Program Officers to advise/guide recipients on the reporting of results, and ii) increase the capacity of recipients to report on key results.

The Director of Policy and Planning will be responsible for coordinating the development of the performance measurement strategy, and will work with the Director of Sport Support Programs to increase the capacity of Program Officers and recipients to report on key results.

Implementation Schedule: Performance measurement strategy - December 2006;
Capacity development - March 2007

Recommendation 3: Examine opportunities to enhance integration and information sharing amongst the participation elements of the SSP, as well as make better use of existing expertise and resources.

This would include examining:

- opportunities for greater collaboration, integration and a more focused approach amongst the existing elements and the various funding recipients, e.g., a focus on girls or Aboriginal peoples in a particular province or territory;
- the feasibility of piloting an integrated community-based approach with links to the education sector in a community;
- opportunities to enhance information sharing about what projects are being funded and the sharing of best practices amongst all funding recipients and the larger sport community; and,
- opportunities to make better use of existing expert groups and their available resources on designing effective programming for sport participation projects involving their respective target groups.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

Sport Canada will undertake an examination of each of the four areas cited in the recommendation, with an initial focus on the opportunities to enhance information sharing amongst all funding recipients and opportunities to make better use of existing expert groups.

The Director of Sport Support Programs will be responsible for these examinations in conjunction with the Director of Policy and Planning.

Implementation Schedule: March 2007

Recommendation 4: Examine the longer-term sustainability of the sport participation initiatives.

This would include:

- clarifying Sport Canada's expectations with respect to sustainability of sport participation initiatives;
- considering the role partnerships can play in these projects; and
- determining how long a sport participation project should be funded by Sport Canada in order to maximize its' effectiveness.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

Sport Canada will undertake an examination of the long-term sustainability of the sport participation initiatives. Such an examination would clarify Sport Canada's expectations with respect to the sustainability and sustainable impact of sport participation projects,

consider the role partnerships can continue to play in these projects, and review the number of years a project should be funded by Sport Canada in order to maximize effectiveness.

The Director of Sport Support Programs will be responsible for this work.

Implementation Schedule: March 2007

Recommendation 5: Fully implement the remaining aspects of the Sport Policy Research Initiative.

This would include:

- formally implementing the Monitoring Panel for the Council-based portion of the research element which would be responsible for developing and implementing a strategy to monitor uptake of directed sport participation research by academics, after the first sets of awards are announced by SSHRC and CIHR in 2006;
- completing the knowledge dissemination strategy;
- determining how the results of sport participation research will be used to develop or revise sport participation policy;
- ensuring that research commissioned by Sport Canada under the research element of the participation component of the SSP supports sport participation policy and program development;
- determining the need for a standardized research protocol to measure sport participation for use by academics and other researchers, using the COMPASS work to date and Netherlands web-based protocol and module as a starting point; and,
- deciding on the most appropriate mechanism for *expert* input from organizations representing under-represented groups on the research priorities for their respective areas of interest.

Management Response: Recommendation accepted

Since the development of the Sport Policy Research Initiative in 2004 Sport Canada has focussed on developing partnerships with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Now that these partnerships are established and research projects will be undertaken under their auspices as of 2006-07, Sport Canada can focus on the continued development and implementation of the remaining aspects of the Sport Policy Research Initiative. In the first instance the Monitoring Panel will be formalized and the web portal will come on-line. Additionally, the academic communities response to the call for policy research through CIHR and SSHRC will be monitored, with the view of holding a conference for grant recipients and policy makers during 2007-08.

The Director of Policy and Planning will be responsible for the continued implementation of the Sport Policy Research Initiative.

Implementation Schedule: Monitoring Panel and web portal - Fall 2006;
Conference - by March 2008

Appendix A – Evaluation Framework

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Methodology			
	Document Review	Literature Review	Dbase Review	Key informants
Is the program being implemented effectively? If not, where are the weaknesses?				
1. What progress has been made on implementing the following aspects of the four participation elements of the SSP: stream funding for NSOs; Project Stream funding for MSOs and other eligible organizations; Bilateral agreements with Provincial/Territorial governments; Research?	X		X	X
2. Are there any aspects of the participation elements that have not been implemented as intended? If so, what are these and what impact if any, may this have on program effectiveness?	X		X	X
Has implementation been hampered by any internal or external issues? If so, to what extent have the challenges encountered during the implementation been addressed? Are there issues that have not been addressed?				
3. Has the implementation been hampered by any internal issues such as funding approval mechanisms (initial and ongoing), definitions, review and selection of applicants, information dissemination and sharing, information management, results tracking, etc.?	X		X	X
4. Has the implementation of the program been hampered by any external issues, e.g., awareness and understanding of the participation elements, application process, funding approval, results reporting, etc.? If so, to what extent have the challenges encountered during the implementation been addressed?	X			X
5. Are there other issues that have not been addressed?	X			X
Are there any elements of the design of the participation elements that limit the ability of these elements to achieve their objectives? If so, what are these and to what extent have they been addressed? Are there any that have not been				

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Methodology			
	Document Review	Literature Review	Dbase Review	Key informants
addressed?				
6. What is the design being used to achieve the objectives of the participation elements of the SSP, including funding allocations?	X			X
7. What are the strengths of the design of the participation elements?	X	X		X
8. Are there any weaknesses in the design of the participation elements of the SSP that limit their ability to achieve objectives, e.g., eligible organizations, eligible projects, funding allocations, sustainability, etc.? If so, what are these weaknesses and to what extent have they been addressed?	X	X		X
9. Are there any that have not been addressed?	X	X		X
To what extent do the SSP's participation research activities directed toward sport participation projects and policies help increase the body of knowledge with respect to participation? What, if any are the shortcomings?				
10. What design is being used to achieve the SSP research element, including funding allocations and external partnerships? Is knowledge transfer included in the design of the research element?	X			
11. What research activities have been undertaken to date?	X			X
12. How will the results of SSP research be used to increase the body of knowledge with respect to participation and inform programs and policies?	X			X
13. Are there any shortcomings associated with the research element of the SSP? If so, how can these be overcome?	X			X
To what extent have initiatives funded by the participation elements of the SSP been undertaken to increase the number of participants and quality of participation in sport, including the participation of under-represented				

Evaluation Issues / Questions	Methodology			
	Document Review	Literature Review	Dbase Review	Key informants
groups? Are they adequate to achieve objectives?				
14. What participation-related projects funded by the SSP have been implemented by eligible NSOs, MSOs and others and P/Ts?	X		X	
15. Are the intended target groups being reached by these projects?	X		X	
16. Are projects being conducted with intended partners? If not, why?	X		X	X
17. Are the projects undertaken adequate to achieve objectives?	X		X	X
What evidence is there that progress is being made towards increasing participation in sport? To what extent is it adequate?				
18. What are the key progress results achieved to date to increase sport participation, and in particular, the 6 under-represented target groups?	X		X	
19. Are the reporting and feedback mechanisms adequate to provide appropriate results information?	X		X	X
20. Are recipients providing the required information for progress reporting?	X		X	X
21. What have been the challenges and lessons learned to date?	X			X
22. What evidence is there that other countries sport participation initiatives are increasing participation?		X		

Appendix B – Documents Reviewed

General

- Sport Canada Annual Program Profile - 2003-04 - Quick Facts undated
- Sport Canada Annual Profile Questionnaire - 2004-05
- Umbrella RMAF- draft September 28, 2005
- Umbrella RBAF- draft October 3, 2005
- Canadian Heritage (Sport Canada) Policy on Sport for Persons with a Disability - draft May 2005
- Terms and Conditions - Sport Support Program Dec. 1 2002 - Dec. 1, 2007
- Canadian Sport Policy: Evaluation Framework and Performance Management Strategy, April 2005, and related Briefing Note to F-P/T Deputy Ministers Committee, May 6, 2005

Sport Support Program

Participation Stream

A General

- Investing in Sport Participation - June 30, 2005
- Sport Participation Strategy - draft May 10, 2005
- Investing in Sport Participation 2004-2008: A Discussion Paper - February 2004
- Executive Summary: Response to the Canadian Heritage Discussion Paper - Investing in Sport Participation 2004-2008 undated
- SPDP NSO Funding: 2002-03 to 2007-08 June 17, 2005

B National Sport Organizations

2002-2003:

- Canadian Heritage News Release: “Paul Devillers Contributes \$551,500 to Increase Participation in Sport”
- SDPD Backgrounder
- Memorandum: Sport Participation Development Program for NSOs April 12, 2002
- SPDP Project Assessment/ Assessment Grid
- Funding Application Checklist for the SPDP March 2002
- Memorandum: Participation proposals from NSOs June 11, 2002
- Memorandum to the Honourable Paul Devillers (for decision) 2002-03
- NSO Projects Applications for 2002-03
- SPDP NSO Project Applications - Outstanding Projects
- Memorandum: SPDP NSO Projects not being recommended, and sample letters

- Memorandum: SPDP Projects - Tennis and the Canadian Wheelchair Sports Association, July 17, 2002
- Project Funding Review and Assessment undated
- SPDP 2002-2003 Contributions - Summary Progress Report undated
- Outline of “review and decision processes” for NSOs undated

2003-2004:

- SDPD Backgrounder undated
- Memorandum to the Honourable Paul Devillers 2003-04 undated
- Appendix A: NSO Project Application 2003-04 undated
- Appendix B: 2002-2003 Contributions- Summary Progress Report undated
- SPDP Project Assessment 2003-04 undated
- SPDP Project Funding Review and Assessment 2003-04 undated
- 2003-2004 Review of SPDP Projects undated
- SPDP Evaluation - Rated According to Funding June 2004
- SPDP 2003-2004 Contributions- Summary Progress Report

2004-2005:

- Memorandum to Judith A. Larocque, Deputy Minister 2004-05 undated
- Appendix A: NSO Project Applications (with Multi-year funding) undated
- Appendix B: 2003-2004 Contributions – Summary Progress Report undated
- Appendix C: Evaluation Grid 2004-05 undated
- Annex H: SPDP Evaluation Report for Projects Funded in 2003-2004 undated
- SPDP Evaluation Grid Guidelines undated
- 2004-2005 SPDP Application Review undated
- 2004-2005 Monitoring Report Template undated
- Monitoring Report Example - Football, 2004-2005 undated
- 2004-2005 SPDP Review by NSO and Target Group undated
- SPDP 2004-2005 Contributions - Summary Progress Report

2005-2006:

- Memorandum to Judith A. Larocque, Deputy Minister 2004-05 undated
- Appendix A: Projects receiving multi-year funding undated
- Appendix B: 2004-2005 Summary Progress Report undated
- SPD Project Funding Recommendations 2005-06 June 17, 2005
- 2005-2006 SPD Project Reviews undated
- SPD Funding Overview by NSO and Target Groups undated

C. Multisport Service Organizations

- Memorandum: Sport Participation Development Program for MSOs, plus detailed guidelines undated
- SPSP - Results Report for MSOs Annex A undated

- 2004-05 to 2007-08 Funding by Organization undated
- MSO SPDP Evaluation Grid undated
- SPDP Evaluation Grid Guidelines undated
- 2004-05 MSO SPDP Overview and Analysis undated

D. P/T Bilateral Agreements

- F-P/T Bilateral Agreements on Sport and Physical Activity - Draft October 2002
- Discussion Paper: F-P/T Bilateral Agreements - New Directions for 2004-08
- Sport Canada Letter to Provinces and Territories - 2003
- Bilateral Agreement FAQ undated
- Reporting Requirements undated
- Draft Template for Submissions undated
- Draft Template for Assessment of Proposals - 2005-06 undated
- Sample GCIMS Entry undated
- Sample Contribution Agreement undated
- Summary of Existing F-P/T Bilateral Agreements undated
- Draft Outputs to be Tracked undated
- Outline of “review and decision processes” for P/T Bilaterals
- Draft reports on P/T Bilateral Activity Reporting (7 documents)

Research - Participation

- Sport Policy Research Program Snapshot undated
- F-P/TSC - Briefing Note - Increasing Participation in Sport: Targets and Collaborative Actions, Draft November 30, 2004
- Strengthening Canada, The Socio-economic Benefits of Sport Participation in Canada, Conference Board of Canada, August 2005
- Sport Canada Research Policy Programme Final Report (Draft) undated
- New Funding for Sport Participation Research in Canada Announcement at http://www.caaws.ca/e/print_story.cfm?ID=509.
- Targeted Research Description undated.
- Sport Policy Research Program Snapshot. undated

Other

- Sport Canada Contribution Guidelines 2003-2004
- Sport Canada Contribution Guidelines 2004-2005
- Sport Canada Contribution Guidelines 2005-2007
- Evaluation of the NSO Support Program: National Sport Federation (NSF), Sport Organizations for Athletes with a Disability (SOAD), and Domestic Sport Organization (DSO) Components (Goss Gilroy, Jan. 31, 2002)
- Document and Literature Reviews for the Evaluation Assessment of Sport Canada Funding Programs Version 2, October 12, 2005

Sport Canada Web

General

- Act to Promote Physical Activity and Sport - 2003
- Sport Canada Strategic Plan - 2004-2008
- SFAF III
- Canadian Sport Policy
- Canadian Sport Policy - F-P/T Priorities for Collaborative Action 2002-2005
- Policy on Aboriginal People's Participation in Sport - 2005
- Policy on Women in Sport - 1986

PCH Web

- Sport Support Program Audit - 2003

Appendix C – Literature Reviewed

- Review of National Sport Effort and Resources, Patrick Carter, March 2005 at http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_2005/carter.htm.
- Compass related documents (a project seeking the coordinated monitoring of participation in sport in Europe) at <http://w3.uniroma1.it/compass/>.
- Monitoring sport and physical activity participation internationally. A Paper for the third Compass workshop May 23rd-25th 2002, Rome, Italy, presented by S. Russell and C. Craig, Canadian Fitness & Lifestyle Research Institute – Canada at <http://w3.uniroma1.it/compass/report/Canada.ppt>.
- Towards greater inclusion in sport - The big issues. A Paper for the third Compass workshop May 23rd-25th 2002, Rome, Italy, presented by Nick Rowe, Sport England and Co-director of the Compass Project at <http://w3.uniroma1.it/compass/report/UK.ppt>.
- Sports in the Netherlands: Policy, research, participation, harmonizations. A Paper for the third Compass workshop May 23rd-25th 2002, Rome, Italy, presented by Koen Breedveld and Maarten van Bottenburg at <http://w3.uniroma1.it/compass/report/Netherlands.doc>
- Towards an “active policy. October 16, 2003. Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, Netherlands located at http://www.minvws.nl/en/folders/ds/towards_an_active_policy.asp
- Sport for all Incentive in the Netherlands – Policy Letter Sport for All (dated December 2000). Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, Netherlands located at http://www.minvws.nl/en/folders/ds/sport_for_all_incentive_in_the_netherlands.asp
- Relevant sport participation program information available at the French Ministry of Youth and Sport website located at <http://www.jeunesse-sports.gouv.fr/>.

Appendix D – List of Key Informants

List of Key Informants

Sport Canada:

- Joanne Butler, Director, Special Projects
- Lane MacAdam, Executive Director, Canadian Sport Policy
- Roger Ouellette, Director, Sport Programs
- Judy Rash, Manager, Sport Programs

NSOs and MSOs:

- Athletics Canada
- Table Tennis Canada
- Alpine Canada
- Canadian Paralympic Committee
- Volleyball Canada
- Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women in Sport and Physical Activity:

Provincial/ Territorial Governments:

- Alberta: Steven Patrick, Program Coordinator, Sport and Recreation, Alberta Community Development; Roger Kramer, Manager of Sport Services
- Nova Scotia: Farida Gabbani, Senior Director, Sport & Recreation Division; Stephen Gallant, Manager, Sport Opportunities; Jamie Ferguson, Executive Director, Sport Nova Scotia
- NWT: Gary Schauerte, Manager Sport & Recreation Programs, Department of Municipal and Community Affairs

Others:

- Canadian Tire Foundation for Families
- University of Toronto