



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities Survey

Final Report

**Prepared for Indigenous Sport Unit Programs Division of Sport
Canada, Canadian Heritage**

Supplier Name: Environics Research Group

Contract Number: C1111-22-0166

Contract Value: \$100,941.77 (including HST)

Award Date: September 20, 2022

Delivery Date: May 17, 2023

Registration Number: POR 046-22

For more information on this report, please contact Canadian Heritage at: address@canada.ca

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français

Canada 

**Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities Survey
Final Report**

Prepared for Indigenous Sport Unit Programs Division of Sport Canada, Canadian Heritage by Environics Research

May 2023

Permission to reproduce

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from the Department of Canadian Heritage. For more information on this report, please contact the Department of Canadian Heritage at: PCH.info-info.PCH@canada.ca.

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Canadian Heritage, 2023.

Cat. No. CH24-53/2023E-PDF

ISBN 978-0-660-67582-4

Aussi offert en français sous le titre *Sondage sur le Sport au service du développement social dans les communautés autochtones – Rapport final*.

Table of Contents

Executive summary	i
Background and objectives	i
Methodology	i
Key Findings & Recommendations	iv
Contract value	xii
Political neutrality statement and contact information	xii
Introduction	1
I. Detailed findings – Qualitative Phase	3
A. Program expectations and impressions	3
B. Stream One	6
C. Stream Two	7
Stream Three	9
II. Detailed Findings – Quantitative Phase	12
A. Familiarity with SSDIC program	12
B. Application Process	13
C. Defining Indigenous Organizations	17
D. Eligibility	19
E. Funding Distribution	22
Appendix A: Resources	26
Appendix B: Detailed methodology	34
Appendix C: In-depth interview discussion guide	41
Verbal Consent	42
Appendix D: Survey questionnaire	47



Executive summary

Background and objectives

May 2019 marked the launch of the Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities (SSDIC) component of the Sport Support Program (SSP), delivered by Sport Canada. The objective of SSDIC is to close gaps between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities in terms of social development indicators in the areas of health, education, employability, and the reduction of at-risk behaviours. The program is currently delivered in three funding streams:

- **Stream One:** Available to the 13 Indigenous Provincial/Territorial Aboriginal Sport Bodies (PTASBs) and the Aboriginal Sport Circle (ASC).
- **Stream Two:** Available to Indigenous governments, communities, and organizations as well as other delivery organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous communities whose programs serve Indigenous participants.
- **Stream Three:** Available to Indigenous governments, communities, and organizations, as well as other organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous groups whose programs serve Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ participants.

Sport Canada wanted to hear directly from diverse Indigenous stakeholders, including Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ representative organizations, on how to improve the design and delivery of the three funding streams, to ensure SSDIC serves their self-identified social development goals. Overall objectives were to:

- Determine levels of awareness of and familiarity with the SSDIC program, along with general views on the SSDIC program;
- Measure levels of satisfaction with the application and reporting processes;
- Gather feedback on current applicant eligibility criteria
- Perceptions of current funding distribution model; and
- Help inform the design and delivery of the newly established *Reconciliation and Strength of Indigenous Women and Girls through Sport for Social Development* (Stream Three) initiative, which aims to ensure that Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ peoples have access to meaningful sports activities that support the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) Calls for Justice.

Sport Canada's ultimate objective was to ensure that all voices and diverse perspectives were heard and reflected in the results of the program review, to ensure that all three streams meet the needs and expectations of program recipients.

Methodology

From the outset, as part of their commitment to the principles of Reconciliation and to Indigenizing the design and delivery of the SSDIC program, Sport Canada was committed to hiring an Indigenous research firm to guide the design and implementation of this consultation. Environics Research and Sisco & Associates Consulting

Services (SISCO), an Indigenous consulting firm specializing in research with and for Indigenous organizations and communities, partnered on this research. The research was conducted by both parties in two phases and reporting was done collaboratively to ensure the diversity of Indigenous voices was accurately captured¹.

SISCO routinely uses collaborative, community-based partnership research (CBPR) and participatory approaches together with Indigenous methodologies in our work to foreground the voices of Indigenous partners and participants. Consistent with community-based partnership research (CBPR), the SISCO team, which included two Indigenous researchers, was engaged as full partners throughout the process at critical junctures to ensure input into the project work plan (design), knowledge gathering (data collection and analysis), and knowledge sharing (validation session, reporting, and presentations).

SISCO is committed to employing protocols based on Indigenous data sovereignty, including OCAP® (Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession), USAI (Utility, Self-Voicing, Access, Inter-Relationality), Principles of Ethical Métis Research, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), and First Nation community-level protocols. This project did not engage specific First Nations, Métis, or Inuit communities, and therefore there is not one or several targeted communities to which the data belongs and could be transferred back to in raw form. Rather, Indigenous organizations involving and serving Indigenous communities and peoples, the five Rs of CBPR and the USAI principles would be most appropriate to guide the work. The table below demonstrates how each set of principles were upheld.

Five Rs of CBPR	USAI Principles
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respect for Indigenous knowledges, ways of knowing and doing (including in research and engagement), and multiple perspectives. 2. Relevance of research to the cultures and communities engaged, including Indigenous organizations and the communities they serve. 3. Reciprocity in knowledge exchange through the sharing back of information gathered from Indigenous partners in accessible ways (member checking of interview notes and validation session), and of benefits like the programming changes. 4. Responsibility of researchers to empower community research partners (in this case Indigenous organizations and the SISCO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility, like relevance, reflects a need for relevant vision and reflection on useful action. This project is applied and action oriented, impacted the SSDIC programming that is relevant to Indigenous organizations and the communities they serve. • Self-voicing is demonstrated through the foregrounding of Indigenous organization participant voices throughout the report, based on both research conversations and survey data, that was validated through member checking and a validation session with participants. • Access acknowledges that all life manifestations (all of creation) is relevant in research and ensures that findings can be understood all. This is the purpose of the validation session.

¹ In early discussions, Environics Research provided research published by the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Businesses (CCAB), funded by the Government of Canada, that highlights the challenges Indigenous businesses face in the Federal procurement process. Sport Canada is committed to working with contracting and procurement services to address these challenges for future research needs.

<p>research team) through engaging them throughout the process, and disseminating research outcomes that are accessible and respectful for audiences.</p> <p>5. Relationships as the foundation to the work, as demonstrated through the approach (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1999).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-Relationality is demonstrated through the foregrounding of relations as context to all findings and the overarching approach (OFIFC, 2016).
--	---

Qualitative: Qualitative in-depth interviews (IDIs) were led by SISCO. The research team reached out to 39 Indigenous organizations for interviews, including to an initial list provided by Sport Canada of 28 organizations previously involved in SSDIC in some capacity, plus an additional 11 organizations referred by interview participants.

Between December 2022 and March 2023, a total of 22 individual interviews were conducted as follows:

- 12 interviews with PTASBs and the ASC that are eligible for funding through Stream One.
- 10 interviews with National Indigenous Organizations, National Indigenous Women’s Organizations, and 2SLGBTQIA+ organizations, to help inform the design and delivery of Stream Three.

Interviews were conducted as participant-led research conversations with Indigenous partners drawing on the principles of sharing circles and a focus on honouring participants’ stories of lived experiences. Sharing circles are comparable to focus groups in that they involve group discussion, but distinct in that they are a healing method in which all participants (including the facilitator) are equals engaged in sharing and learning together in a wholistic way that involves the heart (emotional), mind (intellectual), body (physical), and spirit (spirit of everyone present, their ancestors and the Creator) (Lavallee, 2009). Circles create non-judgmental, safe spaces for important conversations (Lavallee, 2009).

Consistent with community-based partnerships research (CBPR), which is the gold standard of working with and for Indigenous communities, organizations, and people, the qualitative phase included several components meant to include participants as partners in the research process and share information back to demonstrate respect, ensure relevance, in the spirit of reciprocity, and as a part of the team’s responsibility as researchers to taking a relationships-based approach. These components included: member checking interview notes, and engaging participants in a validation session for input into and reaction to the preliminary findings and recommendations.

Quantitative: An online survey was conducted with Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations potentially eligible for funding through Streams Two and Three. A survey methodology was selected to collect feedback from a broader group of organizations than the IDIs, ensuring that those who wished to provide input had the opportunity.

Sport Canada initially provided Environics/Sisco with a list including email addresses and/or phone numbers of 336 organizations who were previous applicants and/or recipients of SSDIC funding. Environics emailed invitations to potential research participants and followed up numerous times, including phoning non-respondents. To increase accessibility, alternative methods of survey completion were offered. Due to an initial low survey response rate, it was agreed to have Sport Canada subsequently share by email an open survey link

with a broader audience of 2,147 organizations, including those that had applied to the most recent 2023-2024 program intake and those identified as potential future applicants. A total of 121 organizations completed the survey between January 3 and March 10, 2023.

Further discussion of methodology can be found in Appendix B.

The discussion guide and questionnaire can be found in Appendices C and D.

Statement of limitations. Qualitative research provides insight into the range of opinions held within a population, rather than the weights of the opinions held, as would be measured in a quantitative study. The results of this type of research should be viewed as indicative rather than projectable to the population.

The online survey was an attempted census of Indigenous organizations engaged to some extent with the Indigenous Sport Unit of Sport Canada. There is no margin of sampling error since no sample was drawn. However, due to the potential for non-response bias (i.e., a potential difference in views between organizations that responded to the survey and those that did not), the results should be interpreted with caution.

Key Findings & Recommendations

This section of the executive summary is subdivided into three parts: the context in which the study recommendations are ultimately situated, and the study limitations, for readers to be aware of; research findings organized by the key questions and research intentions originally provided by the SSDIC program; and, the recommendations stemming from the research findings, organized into short-term, medium-term, and long-term implementation, which captures participant input as well as practical considerations for government implementation.

Study Context and Limitations

Like many federal government programs, SSDIC funding flows from the federal government to organizations that in turn provide services to Indigenous Communities. While it is and has been the practice of the SSDIC program to fund Indigenous communities directly or ensure they are supportive of the programming to be delivered in their community, strictly speaking the latter approach can undermine Indigenous sovereignty by conflating Indigenous organizations (typically those that are Indigenous-owned or -operated) with Indigenous Nations and Communities, who should have a right to jurisdiction over programs affecting them. This happens because Indigenous Communities are often mistakenly regarded as subsidiary groups within Canada, which erases their Nationhood and self-determination.

The Indigenous Communities in greatest need of SSDIC funding are not necessarily the ones with Indigenous service providers in proximity or, put another way, access to organizations that can provide appropriate services can be limited. This is especially true for rural and remote Communities. It must also be acknowledged that external organizations are often not as adept at providing for the unique needs of each individual community, considering the incredible diversity of Indigenous Nations and Communities. As such, it is key for government funding programs to consider prioritizing Indigenous communities themselves. This approach will respect Indigenous sovereignty by investing dollars into the hands of Communities themselves who are then empowered to make their own decisions for how services will be developed. Doing so will also support grass-roots capacity and allow communities to delegate funds to outside organizations should they choose to do so.

Honouring Indigenous sovereignty over sports programs would involve transferring funding directly to Indigenous Nations or Communities and supporting their jurisdiction to allocate funding. Indeed, as a consulting firm that has extensive experience and expertise in engaging Indigenous Communities, SISCO has found that Indigenous Communities are increasingly advocating for control over programs designed to serve them. Indigenous Nations and Communities are best positioned to understand their needs, not service providers nor the federal government. Critically, it is incumbent upon governments to recognize and support Indigenous sovereignty, including the right to “maintain, control, protect and develop...sports and traditional games” as stated in Article 31 (1) of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples (UNDRIP, 2007, p. 22).

If the federal government is committed to implementing UNDRIP and therefore contributing to current reconciliation and decolonization efforts, then a more thorough consideration of how to support Indigenous sovereignty must be at the heart of the design and delivery of all its funding programs. This study was initiated partly in response to requests from ongoing recipients of SSDIC funding (the ASC and PTASBs) to more fully integrate their diverse perspectives into the design and delivery of the SSDIC program. At the same time, the intention of this research has been to hear from as many other diverse Indigenous voices and potential program stakeholders as possible, specifically all NIOs, NIWOs and 2SLGBTQI+ organizations as well as hundreds of Indigenous communities across all jurisdictions. While this broad reach is commendable and has been partially achieved, there remain limitations to research projects that arise out of western or non-Indigenous methodologies.

Recommendations set forth below will evolve the SSDIC program to be even more aligned with the diverse perspectives of the Indigenous communities it seeks to serve, and yet, there is still a long way to go to decolonize the way these types of funding programs are conceived of and delivered.

Findings by Project Aspect:

Project Aspect & Question	Corresponding Findings
<p>1. Review the Stream One ‘regional distribution’ formula: How should this funding formula for the PTASBs be calculated?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants identified community needs, remoteness, population, and data accuracy as the most important eligibility criteria for consideration. Participants shared that eligibility should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be based on outcomes and community impact (e.g., overall satisfaction with program, improved participant wellness, sense of hope and belonging, etc.), as opposed to reach; ○ Consider individual community context, needs, and capacity (e.g., remoteness of location and associated costs and logistical challenges, available resources, accessibility barriers, etc.); and ○ Take a distinctions-based approach, which should have P/TASBs encouraged to demonstrate equitable funding distribution among First Nations, Métis, and Inuit through developing separate funding pots and considering data on needs. • Interview participants said that funding distribution should consider population, geography, and community needs together as the most

	<p>important factors to reflect the specific needs and costs of communities in rural and urban settings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Factors that may reflect community need include existing access (or lack thereof) to sport programs and other related resources (e.g., other health or mental health programs), as well as remoteness of location as well as associated costs and logistical challenges (e.g., fly-in communities).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the calculation be based on relative population sizes or are there other needs-based formulas that are potentially more appropriate? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both survey and interview findings suggest that Indigenous organizations believe a funding formula based on per capita alone is inadequate. Other important considerations are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the higher costs of programming for smaller and under resourced regions, especially those with many fly-in communities (which is included in the current funding formula); and ○ the significant impacts smaller regions have on those they service, who tend to be in greater need of programming.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the different viewpoints of our stakeholders and how can we reach a sustainable solution? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants generally agreed that the formula should not be strictly based on per capita but should be both needs- and distinctions-based. • There was no consensus among participants in terms of how the SSDIC program could be structured to meet the needs of each Indigenous distinctions-based group (First Nation, Métis, and Inuit), as this might require technical expertise in formula funding modelling. • However, participants suggested considering new distinct funding pots within Stream One for each group (i.e., for First Nation, Métis, and Inuit) (which, we note, is consistent with views about how Streams Two and Three should be structured).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are complex issues to do with distinctions-based identity groups and/or regional considerations taken into consideration? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview participants were clear in wanting funding decisions to take a distinctions-based approach and consider community needs, so that First Nation, Métis, and Inuit groups as well as specific communities' individual expenses and access to resources are taken into consideration. • They did not feel the current process is distinctions- or needs-based.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What data-sets should be considered in calculating the formula? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current data on Indigenous Community needs is unreliable and there are widespread gaps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is because of incompletely enumerated Indigenous communities, low participation (due to a trust deficit because of a long history of research practices that have harmed Indigenous communities), and cultural differences in how research is conducted (including the way in which questions are framed, indicators that reflect community needs and interests, data collection methods, reporting, etc.). • For these reasons, participants would prefer data to be Indigenous-sourced. However, a comprehensive Indigenous-sourced data set does not currently exist. Investment in developing primary data is needed. • The gold standard for Indigenous data collection is to conduct research in partnership with the Indigenous Communities who have an interest (in this case, who have a need or stated interest in enhancing sports

	<p>programming). Conducting research through the government or other external organizations is generally ineffective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The specific data-sets of interest should be determined by the Indigenous Communities who opt to participate because of a need or interest in sports programming. However, based on the findings of this project, we expect that indicators would relate with a combination of population, geography, and community needs.
<p>2. Review eligibility for Stream Two and Three: What is the best approach for determining the distribution of these funds?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will 'Indigenous organizations' be defined in the context of SSDIC eligibility (e.g., Friendship Centers or other organizations in urban settings)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey participants widely agreed that Indigenous organizations are majority Indigenous-owned/operated (86%) or operate Indigenous programs (programs serving Indigenous people) (82%). Participants were less likely to define an Indigenous organization as one founded by an Indigenous person (or people) (72%) or controlled by a majority Indigenous Board of Directors (69%). This indicates the latter two criteria are not considered sufficient on their own without <i>also</i> being Indigenous-owned or -operated or serving Indigenous populations. The qualitative data further shows that interview participants think Indigenous organizations should be defined as Indigenous-owned or -operated and primarily serving Indigenous populations specifically. They noted that organizations that are not Indigenous-owned or -operated should not be considered Indigenous organizations (even if they primarily serve Indigenous populations specifically). (Please see section 3 below for additional discussion of Stream Three eligibility specifics). This differs from definitions widely used by the Government of Canada (including the Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Business (PSIB)) and Indigenous Organization's like the Canadian Council on Aboriginal Businesses (CCAB) who require majority (51%+) Indigenous ownership (shareholders) and control (Board membership) as well as significant (33%) Indigenous operation. These definitions generally do not include criteria for serving Indigenous people.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the recommended percentage (if any) of non-Indigenous delivery organizations that should be eligible for Streams Two and Three? Is it only Indigenous organizations who can apply (as opposed to some non-Indigenous orgs who serve Indigenous populations)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While participants did not provide percentages, responses were mixed in terms of support for funding non-Indigenous organizations (who do not meet the above definition of an Indigenous organization). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most survey participants opposed funding non-Indigenous service providers for Stream Two (64%) and Three (60%) on their own (outside of partnerships with Indigenous organizations). This is consistent with SSDIC current eligibility criteria which does not fund non-Indigenous organizations on their own. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview participants indicated that non-Indigenous organizations could be eligible for Stream Two and Three funding if they primarily serve Indigenous populations specifically. However, Indigenous organizations should be prioritized, meaning they should be funded first, with non-Indigenous organizations funded only if there is a remaining surplus of funds. In practice, the over-subscription to SSDIC means non-Indigenous organizations are unlikely to receive funding.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was no consensus on funding non-Indigenous organizations that are partnered with Indigenous organizations but fewer than half of survey respondents were in favour (43% for Stream Two and 48% for Stream Three). It is possible that a greater percentage of respondents support these partnerships for Stream Three because of a recognized shortage of Indigenous 2SLGBTQQA+ organizations. There was also no consensus on whether the current funding reserved for partnerships should remain capped at 25 percent (32%), lowered (20%) or eliminated (17%), or increased (21%). ▪ In the interviews and the open-ended survey comments, there is recognition of the capacity benefits of partnership but also concerns about how to determine if these partnerships are authentic and truly benefit Indigenous communities and organizations especially in the longer-term (by allowing them to develop their own capacity). To ensure that is the case, interview participants want the Indigenous organization to be the primary applicant and to receive the funds.
<p>3. Consult with Indigenous Women, Girls, and 2SLGBTQQA+ organizations on the design and delivery of the Stream Three component: What is the recommended design and delivery for the new Stream Three funding?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine formula(s), eligibility, other considerations (e.g., review committee processes) of the Stream Three component as this has not yet been done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey respondents favour making Stream Three funding available to any Indigenous organization servicing women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQA+ communities (70%), and not only to organizations led by individuals from these communities (23%). That is, Stream Three applicants do not necessarily need to be owned or operated by Indigenous women or 2SLGBTQQA+ people, but need to serve these populations (whereas Stream Two needs to be both owned/operated by and serve Indigenous populations). This may reflect awareness of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a shortage of organizations led by Indigenous women, girls, and members of the 2SLGBTQQA+ community; and / or ○ capacity shortages among the few existing organizations that are led by Indigenous women, girls, and members of the 2SLGBTQQA+ community. • Interview participants recommended that service provider organizations be required to provide evidence of their focus and impact on these populations (e.g., mission or mandate, strategic plan, testimonials). • To ensure equity in serving both groups, interview participants suggested allocating separate funding pots within Stream Three for projects for women and girls and for 2SLGBTQA+. This is best accomplished as an additional consideration within the Stream (like geography or distinction) since the priority should be impact.
<p>4. Additional Considerations (not posed in the statement of work)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for Multi-Year funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants raised a number of challenges with the current approach requiring annual funding applications, including an administrative burden that falls on already underfunded and understaffed organizations and communities, and the associated costs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Multi-year funding has a number of benefits that collectively support program sustainability, including:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ reduced administrative burden and associated costs; ▪ enhanced staff retention; ▪ more reliable program data as an evidence base to inform program planning; and ▪ longer-term program outcomes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stable funding for federal government Indigenous sports programs is among the TRC’s Calls to Action Report (90(i)) (TRC, 2015)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide greater flexibility to organizations in how they define and measure success (impact). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview participants want greater flexibility to define their own goals and measures of success to be more reflective of Indigenous values and ways of knowing and being. For example, organizations may find it more relevant to share success stories in audio-visual format rather than demographic or other statistical information.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are framed within a staged approach for implementation in the short-, medium-, and long-term. Short-term recommendations provide small changes that can be made within the current SSDIC system, without substantive modifications; medium-term recommendations promote a more rigorous process of redeveloping the funding formulas for these Streams in the interim; and long-term recommendations relate to a substantive program transformation to a community-driven, needs-based approach grounded-in Indigenous sovereignty that honours UNDRIP and the TRC Calls to Action. Collectively, they provide a roadmap for the transition to occur through the implementation of a series of steps over time.

Short-Term (1 year)	Medium-Term (2-3 years)	Long-Term (4-5 years)
<p>1. Provide multi-year funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide opportunities for multi-year funding across all Streams to promote program stability consistent with the TRC’s Call to Action 90(i) (TRC, 2015, p. 10). <p>2. Update and clarify Indigenous Organization definitions and eligibility criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the definition of Indigenous organizations for all Streams as those that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Indigenous-owned (51% + Indigenous shareholders) or Indigenous-operated (51% + Indigenous staff)²; 	<p>5. Develop funding formula for Stream One, and consider implications for Stream Two/Three consideration matrices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Indigenous Community data framework for needs and other factors with Indigenous communities based on a process of engagements and community-based partnership research. • Collect data on community needs and other factors to inform funding formula development. • Collect data on how to define an Indigenous Community and other factors (such as how to 	<p>7. Pilot community- and needs-based formula funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply Community formulas to funding allocation by Stream. • Develop and implement a communications plan and materials to ensure Indigenous Communities (and service providers) understand the new formula and have equitable access to funding, based on eligibility. <p>8. Evaluate community- and needs-based formula funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct an Indigenous community-based program evaluation of the pilot.

² The research did not delve into which employee types (full-time, part-time, seasonal) should be considered for a calculation of 51%+ Indigenous staff. However, with the goal of being as inclusive as possible and recognizing the structural inequities which may lead Indigenous people towards part-time or seasonal work (e.g., lack of child care, lack of education), we recommend that all employees be counted towards this 51%+ target.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ and primarily serve Indigenous populations through their programs (51% + clients are Indigenous); ○ and emphasize the inclusion of Métis organizations and Communities as eligible funding recipients more explicitly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop a program communications plan for all Streams, with specific materials and actions to promote this information to Métis organizations and Communities. • For Stream Three, eligible organizations (that are not Indigenous Communities/Nations) should be required to have a mandate to serve Indigenous women / girls / 2SLGBTQQIA+ primarily or exclusively. <p>3. Allocate funding to both Indigenous and Non-Indigenous organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Stream Two, continue to allocate at least 75% of the funding to organizations that are majority Indigenous-operated (and / or Indigenous-owned), and up to 25% to non-Indigenous organizations that primarily serve Indigenous populations specifically and are partnering with Indigenous organizations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As noted in the context section, while organizations favoured an approach that prioritizes Indigenous organizations, this could lead to widespread funding gaps for Indigenous communities that are not in close 	<p>ensure funding Indigenous people in urban settings) that will inform the transition of the funding flow from government to Indigenous Communities directly (as opposed to the funding flowing to organizations serving Communities).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop funding formula for allocation of Stream One (and for possible consideration for Streams Two and Three) to organizations, based on the data collected from this process using this framework, with funding formula expert modelling formulas based on needs and distinctions-based funding formula model that consider community barriers, access to resources, and transportation costs in each region, in combination with population and geography. • Develop preliminary funding formula for allocation of all Streams to Indigenous Communities, based on the data collected from this process using this framework, with funding formula expert modelling formulas based on needs and distinctions-based funding formula model that consider community barriers, access to resources, and transportation costs in each region, in combination with population and geography. • Share back the funding formula model options (suggest 3 to 5) with organizational and Community stakeholders, modelling specific scenarios and outcomes, and engage them in an options analysis to develop a consensus on the most suitable model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share back the results of the evaluation and recommended program changes with Communities for validation. • Adjust the community- and needs-based approach, including the formulas as needed based on the evaluation and Community validation results. <p>9. Implement the adjusted community- and needs-based formula</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the new community- and needs-based approach, including the formulas as needed based on the evaluation and Community validation results. • Develop and implement a communications plan and materials to ensure Indigenous Communities (and service providers) understand the new formula and have equitable access to funding, based on eligibility. <p>10. Support longitudinal Community data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed an ongoing community evaluation process that collects long-term data aligned with the data framework developed to provide outcomes across all indicators in the long-term.
--	---	---

<p>proximity to an Indigenous service provider and because Indigenous organizations are not necessarily representatives for the Communities they serve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Set and communicate a timeline for eliminating the 25% allocation to non-Indigenous organizations so that Indigenous Communities/Nations can prepare accordingly. • For Stream Three, allocate funding by priority group as follows, until funding is expended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First to organizations owned (51% + shareholders) or operated (51% + staff) by Indigenous women / girls / or members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community and primarily serve Indigenous women / girls / or members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community through their programs (51% + clients); and ○ Then to organizations Indigenous-owned (51% + Indigenous shareholders) or Indigenous-operated (51% + Indigenous staff) and primarily serve Indigenous women / girls / or members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community through their programs (51% + clients); and ○ Finally to organizations that do not meet the above criteria but primarily serve Indigenous women / girls / or members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community 	<p>6. Implement organization formula funding in the interim</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply formulas to funding allocation by Stream. • Develop and implement a communications plan and materials to ensure all stakeholders understand the new formula and have equitable access to funding, based on eligibility. 	
--	---	--

<p>through their programs (51% + clients).</p> <p>4. Gain Community input on needs to inform Stream One funding formula</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore how to develop a data framework to collect data on community needs and other factors that will inform the development of the funding formula. While this process must engage Indigenous communities, it could include collaborations with other Government programs or identifying existing sources of this information, in the interest of reserving as much program funding as possible for communities. • Retain an expert on funding formulas to ensure process supports collection of data that can inform funding formula options to present to stakeholders for all streams. • Maintain the current Stream One formula while this work is underway. 		
---	--	--

Contract value

The contract value was \$100,941.77 (HST included)

Political neutrality statement and contact information

I hereby certify as senior officer of Environics that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada, and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research. Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Sarah Robertson
 Vice President, Public Affairs
 Environics Research Group
 sarah.roberton@environics.ca
 613-793-2229

Supplier name: Environics Research Group

PWGSC contract number: C1111-22-0166

Original contract date: 2022-09-20

For more information on this report, please contact the Department of Canadian Heritage at: PCH.info-info.PCH@canada.ca.

Introduction

Background

May 2019 marked the launch of the Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities (SSDIC) component of the Sport Support Program (SSP), delivered by Sport Canada. The objective of SSDIC is to close gaps between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities in terms of social development indicators in the areas of health, education, employability, and the reduction of at-risk behaviours. The program is currently delivered in three funding streams:

- **Stream One:** Available to the 13 Indigenous Provincial/Territorial Aboriginal Sport Bodies (PTASBs) and the Aboriginal Sport Circle (ASC).
- **Stream Two:** Available to Indigenous governments, communities, and organizations as well as other delivery organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous communities whose programs serve Indigenous participants.
- **Stream Three:** Available to Indigenous governments, communities, and organizations, as well as other organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous groups whose programs serve Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ participants.

More details about the program can be found in Appendix A.

Objectives

Sport Canada wanted to hear directly from diverse Indigenous stakeholders, including Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ representative organizations, on how to improve the design and delivery of the three funding streams, to ensure SSDIC serves their self-identified social development goals. Overall objectives were to:

- Determine levels of awareness of and familiarity with the SSDIC program, along with general views on the SSDIC program;
- Measure levels of satisfaction with the application and reporting processes;
- Gather feedback on current applicant eligibility criteria and funding models; and
- Perceptions of current funding distribution model; and
- Help inform the design and delivery of the newly established *Reconciliation and Strength of Indigenous Women and Girls through Sport for Social Development* (Stream Three) initiative, which aims to ensure that Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ peoples have access to meaningful sports activities that support the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) Calls for Justice.

Sport Canada's ultimate objective was to ensure that all voices and diverse perspectives were heard and reflected in the results of the program review, to ensure that all three streams meet the needs and expectations of program recipients.

Use of findings of the research. The information gathered from this research will be used to inform policy and program design for subsequent intakes.

About this report

This report begins with an executive summary outlining key findings and recommendations, followed by a detailed analysis of the interview findings and a detailed analysis of the survey data. Provided under a separate cover is a detailed set of “banner tables” presenting the survey results for all questions by subgroups. These tables are referenced by the question number in the detailed analysis.

In this report, quantitative results are expressed as percentages unless otherwise noted. Results may not add to 100% due to rounding or multiple responses. Net results cited in the text may not exactly match individual results shown in the tables due to rounding.

I. Detailed findings – Qualitative Phase

The following section presents the detailed findings of the interviews conducted with Indigenous organizations, including the PTASBs and ASC eligible for funding through Stream One (n=12) and National Indigenous Organizations, National Indigenous Women's Organizations, and 2SLGBTQIA+ organizations (n=10).

The findings are presented beginning with perceptions of the SSDIC program overall, followed by findings as they relate to each stream of funding. It is important to note that as interviews were conducted as participant-led research conversations with Indigenous partners, some participants did not provide answers to each of the questions, rather they shared and elaborated on the key questions they wished to discuss. Participants who did not use all funding streams or have prior knowledge of them all did not feel they had a sound understanding of certain streams and chose not to answer.

A. Program expectations and impressions

"The support from the Sport Canada team has been very helpful, always available and answered right away. Reporting process has been challenging and they support us with any questions we have along the way."

"It's been amazing and we would not be able to do what we have done with Stream One and Stream Three, the amount of young women able to be a part of our programs with Stream Three was pivotal."

Interview participants who have been involved with the Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities (SSDIC) program tended to describe it as monumental. The program has helped many of their respective organizations meet the educational, physical, and social developmental needs of the Indigenous communities they serve. Participants said the funded community programs generally had positive outcomes, largely due to the staff they were able to hire to help bring their programs to the community. Overall, these participants said their organization and the community programming they provide would not be where they are today without this funding support from the SSDIC program.

Representatives of organizations that have either previously applied for the SSDIC program and did not receive funding, or that are interested in applying in the future, believe this funding would increase their opportunities to reach and serve more Indigenous youth within their communities. Some of these participants expressed confusion about program eligibility guidelines. For example, a few said it was unclear whether the definition of sports programs included traditional and cultural sports (e.g., snowshoeing, Inuit games, snow snake game, traditional dance) and non-traditional sports (e.g., skateboarding, bowling, dance). Participants identified this as an area they did not understand and said providing clear examples would encourage more organizations to apply. A clearly defined list of eligible and ineligible programs may help organizations to better understand how they fit the SSDIC eligibility criteria.

Application Process

Generally, the representatives of organizations that have completed more than one application process shared that the process has improved over time and is now more accessible and streamlined. They also said that Sport Canada is easy to work with. In terms of opportunities for improvement, a few participants said the deadline for applications is rushed and having more time to write and submit by the same date each year could improve application quality.

Many of the participants representing organizations who applied and received funding through the SSDIC program shared that they had assistance from writing specialists within their organizations or consultants to

support them with their applications. Conversely, the organizations who previously applied, or almost applied, but did not receive funding identified capacity issues as a major challenge in the application process. For example, these organizations said they lacked staff, time or the expertise required to develop a strong application. SSDIC could address these challenges by providing additional support for organizations experiencing capacity issues, such as:

- implementing a consistent annual application deadline;
- offering application training workshops;
- holding meetings where staff respond to inquiries prior to submission and give feedback when submissions are unsuccessful; and
- pre-submission application reviews by staff who are not on the selection committee, and who can provide organizations with feedback to strengthen their applications.

Program Applicant Eligibility

Currently, for the purposes of SSDIC funding, Sport Canada uses the following definition of ‘Indigenous organization’:

- A First Nation band recognized by the Government of Canada;
- Tribal Council recognized by registered First Nation bands;
- Inuit Communities as recognized by the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement, James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, and other recognized provincial/territorial/federal agreements with Inuit populations;
- Representative organizations who provide services, programs, or lobbying for a membership consisting of recognized First Nation bands; or
- Representative organizations who provide programs, services, or lobbying for Section 35 Rights holders.

Participants were asked to share their perspectives on the effectiveness and appropriateness of SSDIC’s definition of Indigenous organizations. Overall, many of the participants found the current definition of Indigenous organizations unclear, and all agreed that the definition was not inclusive of Métis Nations. Some of the organizations said they are recognized as an Indigenous organization by the Government of Canada, and therefore, clearly eligible. The other organizations felt it was either unclear whether they would be eligible or anticipated they would be excluded as organizations representing and serving Métis Nations. Métis Nations do receive funding as part of this program but the eligibility wording does not explicitly mention this. Therefore, when tested, this was the first thing that stood out to participants. To address this, the formal definition should be updated to include Métis Nations and governments going forward.

Interview participants were also asked a series of questions designed to assist Sport Canada in understanding how to define an Indigenous organization for the purpose of the SSDIC program. Overall, participants tended to define Indigenous organizations as those that are majority Indigenous operated (staffed) and mostly (but not exclusively) serve Indigenous Peoples (Indigenous participation). Indigenous control or governance (Board of Directors representation) was not considered to be as important to this definition and is not considered

sufficient without also being Indigenous-owned or -operated or serving Indigenous communities, as is also reflected in the quantitative findings.

A series of questions was asked to determine which of the following are appropriate definitions of an Indigenous organization; the following paragraphs summarize respondent reactions:

- A First Nation or Band Council should be considered an Indigenous organization; however, they are recognized as a government.
- The proportion of Indigenous Board Members should not be the only criteria of an Indigenous organization, and its mandate and mission statement in relation to serving Indigenous Peoples should be included in the application process to be considered for approval.
- It is important to support Indigenous organizations that are operated (staffed) by a majority (51%+) of Indigenous peoples to ensure programming is Indigenous led in its delivery.
- Organizations do not necessarily need to be founded by an Indigenous person or group, but the history and mandate of the organization in relation to serving Indigenous Peoples should be included in the application process to be considered for approval.
- The organization must provide programming for Indigenous people, however in some cases, including when Indigenous families have non-Indigenous siblings, inclusivity is important for families, community and creating strong youth social development skills.

Based on the participants' feedback, a revised definition of an Indigenous Organization could be:

- A First Nation or Band Council recognized by the Government of Canada [Same as previous];
- Tribal Council recognized by registered First Nation Bands [Same as previous];
- Métis Nations and Governments recognized by the Government of Canada [New addition];
- Inuit Communities as recognized by the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement, James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, and other recognized provincial/territorial/federal agreements within Inuit populations [Same as previous];
- An organization whose mission and mandate relates to explicitly serving at least one of the following groups: First Nations, Métis, or Inuit [New addition]; and
- An organization which provides programming delivered by First Nations, Métis, and Inuit staff (51%+ operated³) and for Indigenous people [New addition].

There is a consensus among participants that programming needs to be provided by Indigenous people. Therefore, most participants agreed that the definition of Indigenous organizations should be changed to

³ The research did not delve into which employee types (full-time, part-time, seasonal) should be considered for a calculation of 51%+ Indigenous staff. However, with the goal of being as inclusive as possible and recognizing the structural inequities which may lead Indigenous people towards part-time or seasonal work (e.g., lack of child care, lack of education), we recommend that all employees be counted towards this 51%+ target.

include majority Indigenous operation (staffing of 51%+ Indigenous Peoples) as a criterion to ensure the programming is Indigenous-led in its delivery. This means organizations that are not majority Indigenous-operated would be ineligible. Should SSDIC allow organizations that are not Indigenous-operated to apply in partnership with Indigenous communities or organizations, the funding should go to (be managed by) the Indigenous community or organization. The additional benefits of enhancing support for programming designed by and for Indigenous peoples include increased procurement to Indigenous businesses, job and wealth creation for Indigenous communities, and community support for the programming.

B. Stream One

Stream One funding is allocated for 13 PTASBs as the primary Indigenous sport delivery organizations within each province or territory. Stream One provides annual base funding for all PTASBs of \$150,000. Additional funding is currently based on two main criteria according to 2016 Canadian Census data:

- The percentage of the Indigenous population within the province/territory relative to the overall Indigenous population in Canada; and
- The percentage of the Indigenous population within the province/territory living in rural communities.

Allocation and distribution of Stream One funds

Interview participants who commented on Stream One (mainly PTASBs and the ASC) identified **population**, **geography**, and **community needs** as the most important factors to consider when determining funding allocation and distribution. Further, funding distribution should consider these factors in combination with one another to reflect the specific needs and costs of communities in rural and urban settings. By using this approach, a revised funding distribution will take into account community barriers, access to resources, and transportation costs in each region, in combination with population and geography.

Participants said that distributing funding using a straight per capita population approach does not account for the higher costs of programming for smaller and under resourced regions, especially those with many fly-in communities. Current distribution does not account for the significant impacts smaller regions have on those they service, who tend to be in greater need of programming.

Additionally, a distinctions-based approach would benefit each First Nation, Métis, and Inuit group by recognizing each of these groups' individual expenses and access to resources. In terms of how the SSDIC program could be structured to meet the needs of each Indigenous distinctions-based group, participants suggested considering new distinct funding pots or distribution measures within each Stream for each group (i.e., have a stream for each First Nation, Métis, and Inuit group). They also noted the existing access (or lack thereof) to sport programs should be considered when distributing funding.

Evaluation Criteria

Participants identified community needs, remoteness, population, and data accuracy as the most important eligibility criteria for consideration. Participants shared that eligibility should:

- Be based on outcomes and community impact (e.g., overall satisfaction with program, improved participant wellness, sense of hope and belonging, etc.,)

- Consider individual community context, needs, and capacity (e.g., remoteness of location and associated costs and logistical challenges, available resources, accessibility barriers, etc.); and
- Take a distinctions-based approach, which should reflect equitable funding distribution based on community needs, remoteness, population and data accuracy among First Nations, Métis, and Inuit through separate funding pots.

Participants do not think that applications should be approved based on the strongest or highest scored, but be based on community needs.

Measuring program impact and success

Interview participants recommended that SSDIC adapt their reporting process to allow PTASBs greater flexibility in defining and measuring success. For example, instead of providing demographic information on participation, organizations could choose to share success stories as well, video testimonials, or photovoice, and also include a section on what kind of barriers they faced that may have impacted program outcomes. Additionally, participants said that SSDIC should allow PTASBs to include long-term goals, educational goals past the program's end date, and think about the impacts both within and outside the program. Further, participants said that when measuring goals and outcomes, SSDIC should:

- Consider what long-term benefits may result beyond program completion;
- Identify and measure notable trends that lead to success and simplify outcomes; and
- Consider any significant events occurring in the region or communities within that time frame, (i.e., loss, grief, etc.), that may have worked to counter the program and suppressed the potential benefits.

Design and delivery

Interview participants said that design and delivery could be improved by learning from National Indigenous Organizations (NIOs) that distribute funds based on factors beyond population data, although no specific examples were provided. No other recommendations were made for changing Stream One program design and delivery.

C. Stream Two

Stream Two funding is currently available to Indigenous governments, communities, and organizations, including non-Indigenous delivery organizations working in collaboration with Indigenous communities. Projects must provide sport opportunities in Indigenous communities that support the SSDIC Social Development Goals, including improved health, educational outcomes, and employability, as well as a reduction of at-risk behaviours.

Allocation and distribution of Stream Two Funds

Participants identified distinction-based allocation as being the most appropriate for Stream Two funding distribution. Using a distinction-based approach allows organizations to identify and seek to address their own distinct needs and challenges, which vary greatly among First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Nations. Participants also raised concerns about allocating funding to non-Indigenous organizations, and suggested that funding should be

given to the Indigenous community rather than the non-Indigenous partner. As with Stream One, participants recommended that SSDIC offer distinct funding to First Nation, Métis, and Inuit groups, rather than grouping them together.

When asked about considerations for equitable distribution to all First Nations, Métis, and Inuit groups, there is no simple answer. Participants encouraged a participatory approach that involves reaching out to communities to identify needs and desired outcomes. This requires on-going relationship building and working with political bodies and organizations doing the work in the community's specific region or area.

Ultimately, however, SSDIC should ensure it is providing funding to all 13 provinces and territories, and consider the population and remoteness of each province and territory, as well as the specific barriers they face. As with Stream One, participants felt there is currently too strong a focus on per capita in funding distribution for Stream Two, and that unique community needs and barriers should be given greater weight in decision-making and funding distribution.

Applicant Eligibility findings

Many of the interview participants said that the Stream Two programming should be provided by Indigenous peoples. Thus, if non-Indigenous organizations are to be included, they should be majority Indigenous operated (51%+ Indigenous staff).

Measuring Stream Two impact and success

Interview participants said that gaining community feedback on outcomes is the best way to accurately measure program success. Each organization's understanding of community impacts, and willingness to share these stories, will vary. SSDIC can support communities by allowing more flexible reporting requirements, including:

- Allowing communities to define and demonstrate success based on their culturally-defined goals, outcomes, and measures in relation to traditional sports and culture; and
- Creating space for organizations to identify factors that may have interfered with programming results.

While SSDIC recipients are currently able to report using other modes of reporting (e.g., audio-visual, storytelling, etc.), the option to report in these formats is either not being communicated clearly or not seen as providing enough flexibility alongside the fillable PDF form.

Design and Delivery

While Stream Two currently allows funding to go to non-Indigenous organizations that have partnered with Indigenous organizations, some participants suggested that priority should be given to the Indigenous organizations. Specifically, SSDIC could fund Indigenous-operated organizations first, and then consider applications from non-Indigenous organizational partners if there is a funding surplus.

A distinction-based approach to serve each group was also encouraged to include more Métis organizations. Some interview participants said that SSDIC should also consider in their application review process the extent to which organizations are prioritizing, complying with, and responding to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) Call to Action #90. i within sports. Specifically, this action states *"#90. We call upon the federal government to ensure that national sports policies, programs, and initiatives are inclusive of Aboriginal*

peoples, including but not limited to, establishing: i. In collaboration with provincial and territorial governments, stable funding for, and access to, community sports programs that reflect the diverse cultures and traditional sporting activities for Aboriginal peoples” (Government of Canada, 2023, para. 4)⁴

There were several recommendations brought forward through the interview process that can support improvements to Stream Two, which include:

- Requiring Indigenous community organizations to be the primary applicant in any partnership with a non-Indigenous organization, to ensure funding is going directly to Indigenous communities and that Indigenous individuals are hired to provide programming;
- Having a distinction-based approach for all groups to consider and meet specific community needs, identify, and leverage resources, and address challenges; and
- Focus on TRC Call to Action, including #90. i in relation to providing long-term and stable funding for community sports that are inclusive of diverse and traditional sporting activities.

Stream Three

Stream Three aims to ensure that Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ people have access to meaningful sports activities that support the following Social Development Goals, drawn from the MMIWG Calls for Justice, including:

- physical and mental health,
- suicide prevention,
- sexual trafficking awareness and prevention,
- safe and healthy relationships, and
- sexual positivity (2SLGBTQQIA+).

Currently, Stream Three funds can be available to Indigenous governments, Indigenous communities, and other Indigenous organizations, as well as non-Indigenous delivery organizations that are collaborating with Indigenous organizations. Projects must deliver sport activities to Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ people that support the above SSDIC Stream Three Social Development Goals.

Allocation and distribution of Stream Three funding

Participants felt that designing programming to fit into MMIWG and 2SLGBQQIA+ people is challenging for some organizations. These two demographics have distinct lived experiences and needs, and would therefore be best served through dedicated individual programming. To ensure equity in serving both groups, SSDIC might consider allocating separate funding pots within this Stream for each. At the same time, SSDIC should consider impacts over potential reach. Participants explained that a smaller community may only have a few individuals who identify as 2SLGBQQIA+ compared to urban communities, but that this programming could be critical to that small number of participants.

⁴ <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1524505883755/1557512006268>

To ensure that SSDIC funding reaches First Nation, Métis, and Inuit groups, participants recommended that the service provider organizations should be required to provide evidence of their focus on serving Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ people and their impact in doing so. For example, organizations could provide copies of their impact statements (Mission, mandate, vision), strategic plan, testimonials, project samples, and evaluations. The organizations providing programming need to have the expertise and some form of honourable and/or credible proof of their work to serve this demographic, which should be demonstrated in applications.

Most participants agreed that organizations within all 13 provinces and territories should receive funding. Each province and territory should have the opportunity to apply and the specific needs and demographics for each region should be considered in funding distribution. Overall, participants wanted to see a needs-based approach balanced with equitable distribution across geographic jurisdictions. Participants did not indicate a minimum percentage of funding per jurisdiction.

Participants were asked to share if there are any formulas or distribution models that would serve to benefit both large National Organizations and Grassroots, community-level organizations. Most participants felt that funding should be shared between both types of organizations, but otherwise had no specific recommendations or examples of when this has been successfully achieved. In reviewing applications, SSDIC should also consider the advantages of larger organizations (such as National Indigenous Organizations), compared to smaller, grassroots organizations, the former of whom typically have more time, resources, experience and overall capacity to support application writing and programming reach.

Applicant eligibility findings

Participants were asked a series of questions relating to proposed eligibility for Stream Three. Most participants would prefer that this Stream not be open to organizations that are not Indigenous-operated. However, if SSDIC chooses to allow applications from non-Indigenous organizations, funding priority should go to Indigenous-operated applications. For example, there could be a first review process for Indigenous-operated organizations only, and then a secondary process open to organizations that are not Indigenous-operated in instances in which there is a surplus of funds.

Most interview participants seemed to agree that Stream Three should be an open call and accept all applications from any Indigenous organization or community if they can prove they work with these specific audiences. Participants expressed confusion regarding the terms of eligibility and how MMIWG relates to sport and recreation. Clarifying the programming associated with the TRC Calls to Action and MMIWG Calls to Justice would help organizations to understand what programs are eligible under Stream Three.

Further, participants do not think that funding should be limited to the strongest applications, regardless of distinction and jurisdiction. SSDIC should request that applicants demonstrate ability (through experience or expertise) to deliver these programs in a culturally safe, trauma-informed, and effective manner. For unsuccessful applications, whether due to application strength or something else, there needs to be support or a follow-up measure in place to help organizations improve future applications.

Measuring Stream Three impact and success

While social, educational, and physical outcomes can be important measures of success, participants said that measuring outcomes and success should be defined by each community. Priorities, concerns, challenges, and context varies significantly from one community to the next, and this will influence how outcomes are measured and success is defined. For example, an organization based in a remote Inuit community with a suicide epidemic

related to 2SLGBTQIA+ alienation and under resourcing may have very different perspectives on program success, compared to an urban organization servicing Indigenous women experiencing domestic violence. Specific considerations that were shared by participants include:

- Shifting definitions of success to focus on resilience and adaptability in addressing challenges to meet participant needs, rather than narrowly focusing on set criteria for outcomes; and
- Accepting alternative reporting options, such as videos highlighting community feedback in place of a written evaluation report.

It is worth noting that a portion of research participants were previous recipients of SSDIC funding and may not have engaged with the program's newly developed application and reporting forms. Sport Canada currently allows for flexibility and creative formats for reporting on funded projects. The new interim and final report templates (see Appendix A) are provided to recipients as a tool to fulfill the terms of their funding agreement. The new forms are fillable PDFs that include checkboxes and areas to enter concise information about the activities completed. There is also space for clients to share what they would like to highlight in whatever style they wish to capture the success stories, including videography, photos, artwork etc. Reporting outcomes include: 1) Increase opportunities for Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQIA+ people to participate in sport activities, captured by identifying the number of communities reached and number of participants included and 2) Support communities' self-determined social development goals, captured by identifying if and to what degree participants report feeling they have improved on the project's identified social development goals and are feeling more positive about their own health and wellness.

Design and Delivery

Participants did not identify a particular data set that could effectively determine distribution. Instead they shared that community-specific data would be the most beneficial, as well as referring to the TRC Calls to Action and the MMIWG Calls for Justice.

Interviews participants reiterated what was shared regarding Stream One and Two. Additionally, participants noted that there may be underreporting in program data because some individuals do not feel comfortable providing personal information. SSDIC could work with organizations to co-develop a common data framework and enter into data sharing agreements with organizations to enhance its evidence-based decision-making capacity.

II. Detailed Findings – Quantitative Phase

The online survey was completed by 121 Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations potentially eligible for SSDIC funding through Streams Two and Three. These include a range of organizations such as Indigenous communities or governments, sport organizations, women, girls and/or 2SLGBTQQIA+ organizations, non-profits, and Friendship Centres. Six in ten organizations had applied for funding through SSDIC; one in four (28%) of responding organizations had successfully received funding.

A. Familiarity with SSDIC program

There is mixed familiarity with the SSDIC program: one-third of organizations are very familiar with it and another four-in-ten are somewhat familiar.

Organizations responding to the online survey were asked their level of familiarity with the SSDIC program delivered through Sport Canada. Just over one-third (36%) are very familiar and 40 percent are somewhat familiar. One-quarter do not consider themselves familiar with the program (16% not very familiar and 7% not at all familiar). Strong familiarity (i.e., very familiar) is higher among organizations that have previously applied for SSDIC funding (57%), as well as among the smaller group that has successfully received funding (74%).

Familiarity with SSDIC program

Familiarity	Total (n=121)
NET Familiar	77%
Very familiar	36%
Somewhat familiar	40%
NET Not familiar	23%
Not very familiar	16%
Not at all familiar	7%

A1 *The Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities (SSDIC) is a program delivered by Sport Canada. SSDIC aims to enhance health, education, employability, and well-being for Indigenous communities through sport. How familiar are you with the SSDIC program? BASE: All respondents*

B. Application Process

Applied for SSDIC Funding

A majority of responding organizations had applied for funding through SSDIC.

Six in ten organizations have applied for funding through SSDIC in the past (60%). The remaining four in ten are split between those who had not applied (19%) or were not sure (21%).

Applied for SSDIC funding

Applied for funding	Total (n=121)
Yes	60%
No	19%
Unsure	21%

C1. Has your organization ever applied for funding through SSDIC? BASE: All respondents

Reasons for not applying. Among the small group of organizations that have not applied for SSDIC (n=23), the main reason is a lack of awareness: 13 of 23 say they did not know the program existed and another five found out too late to apply. Other reasons included not thinking their organization would be eligible (3), not having enough capacity to complete the application (2), finding the application process too complicated (2), and not knowing how much to apply for (1).

Satisfaction with application process

Just over half of applicants are very satisfied with the application process; the rest see room for improvement. Satisfaction ratings are higher among applicants who successfully received funding; these organizations tend to point to the straightforward application process and support they received from ISU staff

Among organizations that have applied for SSDIC, a majority are very satisfied with the application process (56%). One-third are somewhat satisfied (36%) and close to one in ten (8%) are dissatisfied. As one would expect, strong satisfaction with the process is much more widespread among successful applicants (71%, vs. 20% who did not receive funding). Thus, because the success rate is highest (to date) for the 2021-2023 intake year, this group of applicants is relatively more satisfied with the process (64%).

Satisfaction with application process

Satisfaction	Applicants (n=72)
NET Satisfied	92%
Very satisfied	56%
Somewhat satisfied	36%
NET Dissatisfied	8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	7%
Very dissatisfied	1%

C7. Thinking of the application process, how satisfied were you with the experience overall? BASE: SUBSAMPLE: Applicants

Reasons for satisfaction. Respondents very or somewhat satisfied with the application process were asked the reasons why (Question C7a). The reasons fall into two broad themes: the easy and straightforward online application and the positive experience with/support received from staff at the Indigenous Sport Unit.

Online application

“Relatively user-friendly and easy process” (Very satisfied)

“Easy to answer questions and very precise directions” (Very satisfied)

“Online application is convenient.” (Somewhat satisfied)

“The software template is tricky to get used to, but it worked out in the end.” (Somewhat satisfied)

Program support

“There is ongoing support from the moment you apply to when you do your reporting.” (Very satisfied)

“Support from SSDIC representatives was good.” (Very satisfied)

“Lots of lead time on the application, easy to understand, clear application guide, helpful contacts at HQ to assist with any questions or technical issues.” (Somewhat satisfied)

Reasons for dissatisfaction. Similarly, dissatisfaction with the application process (n=6) is based mainly on the contrasting experience: having their applications declined or receiving less funding than requested, or issues with clarity of the application or support from staff.

Application process

“I needed more help with what was actually required in the grant overall. I did answer all the comment areas, it was just the finance.” (Somewhat dissatisfied)

“Not very clear.” (Somewhat dissatisfied)

Did not receive funding

“Not having an understanding on why we did not qualify.” (Somewhat dissatisfied)

“The funding applied for and the funding approved were very different.” (Somewhat dissatisfied)

“We feel that we have the support of [Indigenous political organization], and because we are Indigenous women led, and live in a First Nation community, that our work should have been recognized and funded.” (Very dissatisfied)

Funding formula should be based on need

“The formula for funding allocation restricted the amount of monies needed to deliver the community programs. If we are basing things on formulas let's look at statistics on where most harm is reported and the geography of our lands we live on. To give any community program it's proper roll out or recruiting, training and implementation for our many Indigenous communities in our Province this program has

*many short falls. A one year apply and implement cannot touch the surface of the work that is required.”
(Somewhat dissatisfied)*

Opinions of application process

Applicants hold more positive opinions about the information provided to determine eligibility and receiving adequate time to complete the application; they are relatively less positive about the ease of fulfilling the application requirements.

Applicants were asked to rate specific aspects of the application process. While they hold generally favourable opinions, they are most positive that it was easy to determine which stream to apply for (64% strongly agree), eligibility information was straightforward (58%) and they had adequate time to complete the application (56%). By comparison, fewer than half strongly agree that they were able to find contact information or support (49%), it was easy to find program information (47%), eligibility requirements are reasonable (47%), the application form was easy to use (44%). Notably, only one-third (35%) strongly agree it was simple to pull together the required information.

Opinions of application process – Applicants (n=72)

Agreement statement	NET Agree	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	NET disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
I was easily able to determine which stream to apply for	94%	64%	31%	4%	3%	1%
Eligibility information was straightforward	93%	58%	35%	6%	6%	-
I had enough time to complete my application	88%	56%	32%	10%	10%	-
Application guidelines were easy to follow and understand	92%	51%	40%	8%	7%	1%
I was able to find contact/support information when needed	83%	49%	35%	10%	8%	1%
It was easy to find information about the SSDIC program	93%	47%	46%	5%	4%	1%
Eligibility requirements are reasonable	89%	47%	42%	10%	7%	3%
Application form was easy to use and submit	88%	44%	43%	11%	7%	4%
Pulling together the required information was simple	85%	35%	50%	14%	13%	1%

C8. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about the SSDIC application process. BASE: All respondents

Favourable opinions are consistently higher among organizations that are more familiar with or more satisfied with SSDIC (as would be expected).

Applicants also had the opportunity to share comments about the application process (open-ended, without providing response categories). Those who chose to comment mentioned concerns about excessive burden of the application process, had mixed views about the application form itself (some said it has improved while others felt more improvement is possible), and appreciation of support from Sport Canada.

Application burden

“Applying year after year is time consuming and a waste of time. I have no problem reporting the work and sharing the experience but this applying for our Funding on an annual basis is ridiculous. There is too much work to be done in our Indigenous communities to be caught up.”

“The information that needed to be submitted was somewhat arduous to pull together. Our work that we’re doing now should be indicative of what we would be capable of if we had funding.”

“Obtaining letters of support from the community is not easy. Most do not have access to a computer, reliable internet access or any idea of what to include. I wish I could show the work through images, emails, etc. and showcase that the work we have done speaks for itself.”

Application form

“The new application is much more accessible and less cumbersome. The last one was extremely cumbersome and inaccessible for many communities and bands I have talked to. The [lack of] accessibility just leads to a skew towards non-Indigenous organizations such as Right to Play and more established Indigenous organizations.”

“You do not have enough character space to explain your concept or implementation of your sports proposal. 1000 characters is not enough.”

Support

“The communication with our contact at Sport Canada was a huge resource for our organization. Being able to ask questions about reporting, future application info, eligibility, etc. really contributed to our success.”

C. Defining Indigenous Organizations

Agreement with existing definition

Most responding organizations agree with Indigenous Sport Unit’s definition of an Indigenous organization, but three in ten either disagree or are unsure. As with the findings of the qualitative research, it is clear the exclusion of Métis organizations from the definition is a key concern.

Anecdotally, Sport Canada has heard from some organizations that have questioned the way “Indigenous Organization” is currently defined for the purpose of the SSDIC program. The definition was shown during the survey to gather feedback:

- A First Nation band recognized by the Government of Canada;
- Tribal Council recognized by registered First Nation bands;
- Inuit Communities as recognized by the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement, James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, and other recognized provincial/territorial/federal agreements with Inuit populations;
- Representative organizations who provide services, programs or lobbying for a membership consisting of recognized First Nation bands; and
- Representative organizations who provide programs, services or lobbying for Section 35 Rights holders.

Seven in ten (71%) responding organizations agree with the current definition. The remaining three in ten either disagree with the definition (15%) or are unsure (14%).

Agreement with existing definition

Agree	Total (n=121)	First Nations Government, Nation, or Community (n=52)	All Other Organizations (n=76)
Yes	71%	88%	62%
No	15%	2%	22%
Unsure	14%	10%	16%

B1. Is this an appropriate definition for Indigenous Organizations? BASE: All respondents

Note: Sub-groups are not mutually exclusive; respondents could self-select as a category within either or both sub-groups, so total exceeds 121

First Nations governments, communities and Tribal Councils (88%) are more likely than other types of organizations (62%) to agree with this definition.

Disagreement with definition. Respondents who did not agree with the definition or were unsure (n=35) were asked the reasons why (open-ended) (Question B1a). Those who felt the current definition of an Indigenous organization is not appropriate cited lack of mention of Métis people/settlements, and the need to prioritize Indigenous-led organizations. Others noted the need to be more inclusive of non-profit organizations and of organizations that serve Indigenous people living both on/off reserve and in urban areas.

Inclusion of Métis

"I can't believe that the Métis were excluded in the definition!"

"There should be a Métis specific definition."

"I do not see Métis mentioned in name as an Indigenous stakeholder. The category you have placed us in is broad. I find this disrespectful in that we are legally recognized by name and are one of the 3 Indigenous groups in Canada. As you name First Nation and Inuit and uphold their value, I ask you to do the same with the Métis Nation."

Include organizations serving people living on/off reserve, urban and rural

"Addition of Indigenous led non-profits/organizations who serve an urban, on and off-reserve, and wide population of Indigenous groups and folks."

"Need to include organizations that support urban Indigenous groups and individuals including First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples."

Indigenous-led

"Indigenous-led organizations should be at the forefront."

"It's important to target Indigenous-led and managed organizations to ensure that services are delivered [in a] culturally safe [manner]."

Other organization types

"Indigenous non-profit organizations"

"First Nations School Board for the territories."

Factors in defining Indigenous organizations

Organizations find Indigenous ownership/operation and programming that serves Indigenous people to be the most important factors in defining an Indigenous organization for SSDIC funding.

Respondents were asked if they consider four potential definitions to be an "Indigenous organization". Most organizations consider each of the proposed definitions to be an "Indigenous organization", but there is the greatest consensus about organizations that are majority Indigenous-owned/operated (86%) and that operate programming specifically for Indigenous people (82%), ahead of those founded by an Indigenous person or group (72%) or with a majority of Indigenous board members (69%). There were no significant differences in opinions between sub-groups.

Factors in defining Indigenous organizations

Factor	Yes	No	Unsure
Organization that is majority Indigenous owned/operated	86%	10%	4%
Organization that operates programming specifically for Indigenous people	82%	12%	6%
Organization that was founded by an Indigenous person or group	72%	16%	12%
Organization that has a majority of Indigenous board members	69%	19%	12%

B2A. Which of the following would you consider to be an "Indigenous Organization" in your/your organization's view? BASE: All respondents

D. Eligibility

Survey questions about eligibility were prefaced with the following description of the baseline eligibility. Currently, organizations must meet specific eligibility requirements in order to be recommended for funding through SSDIC:

- Stream Two or Stream Three: organizations must be Indigenous/Indigenous-led, or non-Indigenous organizations in authentic partnership with Indigenous organizations.
- Stream Two programs must serve all Indigenous peoples
- Stream Three programs must provide opportunities to women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ people specifically.

Reaction to Stream Two and Stream Three baseline eligibility

Few organizations (16 out of 121) expressed a concern (unprompted) about the baseline eligibility for Streams Two and Three.

Respondents were asked an open-ended question about their reaction to the baseline eligibility for SSDIC funding. The few organizations that expressed concern about the baseline eligibility (n=16) spoke about the inclusion of non-Indigenous organizations and the lack of clarity around what defines an authentic partnership, and about the eligibility criteria forcing organizations to fit into a "box", leading to exclusion rather than inclusion (e.g., of youth, underrepresented groups).

Reaction to Stream 2 and 3 Eligibility*

Concern	Total (n=121) #
No concern mentioned	105
Concern about non-Indigenous partnerships	8
Recommend one funding bucket without streams	4
Needs youth-specific language	2

Excludes other underrepresented identities	1
Stream 3 focus should be all non-binary	1

D1. What is your reaction to this baseline eligibility? Do you have any concerns about who will/will not be eligible for funding? BASE: All respondents
 *Data is represented in counts due to low response to this question

The following are some of the open-ended comments:

“I don't agree with Non-Indigenous organizations being able to apply for any funding earmarked for Indigenous people.”

“I honestly don't think we should segregate Indigenous peoples, it all seems so Residential again. We are all one; if we are to heal from Truth and Reconciliation, then we should not have any streams to seek funds. I believe in fairness and inclusion.”

“I do not appreciate how 2SLGBTQIA+ people are lumped in with Women and Girls, the appropriate level would be based on Trans and two-Spirit people as Indigenous gender nonconforming folks are the ones who are not served by mainstream sport... The key metric of those who are denied access to sport are the people who do not fit the binary”.

Non-Indigenous eligibility through partnership

Opinions are mixed about whether non-Indigenous should be eligible for SSDIC funding through partnership with Indigenous organizations. There is slightly higher agreement that they should be eligible for Stream Three, possibly due to a recognized shortage of Indigenous 2SLGBTQIA+ organizations

Unprompted. Respondents were asked an open-ended question about their views on non-Indigenous organizations receiving funding through SSDIC in partnership with an Indigenous organization, and responses were subsequently coded into categories. Organizations have mixed opinions: three in ten (31%) support non-Indigenous partnership and a further quarter (28%) support it with caveats – that it serves an Indigenous population, is done in a good way, and is not prioritized over Indigenous organization funding. Three in ten do not support non-Indigenous eligibility through partnership (29%), while one in ten have no opinion (9%).

Non-Indigenous eligibility through partnership – Open end*

Eligibility through partnership	Total (n=121)
Support	31%
Support with caveat	29%
Do not support	30%
No opinion	10%

D2. Sometimes Indigenous communities and organizations partner with non-Indigenous organizations to apply for funding for their program. This could be due to capacity issues, scope of service, or a strong pre-existing relationship between the organizations. How do you feel about non-Indigenous organizations receiving funding through SSDIC in partnership with an Indigenous organization? BASE: All respondents
 *Respondents were asked an open-ended question, data were coded into categories

The following are some of the open-ended comments:

“I love this idea! Capacity is always an issue and partnering fosters education and mutual respect within governments and organizations.”

“It is all dependent on the circumstances. If there is a fair process for the applications and Indigenous communities are always considered as priority for funding, this should not be deemed as an issue.”

“I do not think [non-Indigenous organizations] should be eligible. There are enough Indigenous communities and organizations that are desperate for funding. If the application was accessible and there were more supports, there should and would be no need for these organizations.”

There were no statistically significant differences in opinions between sub-groups.

Prompted. A second question asked respondents directly if non-Indigenous organizations that partner with Indigenous organizations should be eligible for funding. Once again, opinion is mixed: four in ten (43%) say non-Indigenous organizations should be eligible in this way for Stream Two, while almost half (48%) say they should be eligible for Stream Three.

Non-Indigenous eligibility through partnership

Stream	Yes	No	Unsure
Stream Two	43%	45%	12%
Stream Three	48%	37%	15%

D3./5. Do you think non-Indigenous organizations who partner with Indigenous organizations should be eligible for funding for Stream Two/Three? BASE: All respondents

First Nations Government, Nations, communities and Tribal Councils are less likely than all other organizations to say non-Indigenous organizations should be eligible for funding through partnership for both Streams Two (27%) and Three (35%).

Non-Indigenous eligibility (outside of partnerships)

By a large margin, respondents disagree with allowing non-Indigenous organizations that serve an Indigenous audience to apply for funding on their own.

Although there are mixed views about non-Indigenous eligibility through partnership, there is clearly a lack of support for non-Indigenous organizations being eligible for funding on their own. Around six in ten respondents do not believe non-Indigenous organizations that serve an Indigenous audience should be eligible for funding on their own (64% for Stream Two and 60% for Stream Three). This is nearly three times the number of respondents in favour of non-Indigenous eligibility.

Non-Indigenous eligibility

Stream	Yes	No	Unsure
Stream Two	24%	64%	12%
Stream Three	23%	60%	17%

D4./6. Do you think non-Indigenous organizations offering sport activities to Indigenous groups and communities should be eligible for funding for Stream Two/Stream Three, even if they do not partner with an Indigenous organization? BASE: All respondents

Disagreement with non-Indigenous eligibility is higher among organizations that are very familiar with the SSDIC program (80% for Stream Two and 70% for Stream Three).

Stream Three Eligibility

The balance of opinion is that Stream Three funding should be made available to any Indigenous organization serving women, girls, and 2SLGBTQIA+ communities, and not only to those organizations led by people from these communities.

Seven in ten respondents (70%) believe any Indigenous organization aiming to serve Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ communities should be eligible for Stream Three funding. By comparison, about two in ten (23%) believe the organization applying should specifically be owned/operated by Indigenous women, girls and/or 2SLGBTQIA+ people to be eligible. Seven percent are unsure.

Stream Three eligibility

Options	Total (n=121)	First Nations Government, Nation, or Community (n=52)	All Other Organizations (n=76)
As long as the organization is aiming to serve Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ communities, any Indigenous organization should be eligible	70%	60%	78%
The organization should be owned/operated/mandated by Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ people in order to be eligible	23%	35%	16%
Don't know	7%	6%	7%

D7. Do you think Stream Three should be available to all Indigenous organizations seeking to provide programming to Indigenous women, girls, and/or 2SLGBTQIA+ peoples? Or should the organizations be owned/operated/mandated by Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ peoples in order to be eligible? BASE: All respondents

Note: Sub-groups are not mutually exclusive; respondents could self-select as a category within either sub-group, so total exceeds 121

These opinions are largely consistent across organizations types, although belief that organizations should be owned/operated by Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ is somewhat higher among First Nations governments, Nations, communities or Tribal Councils (35%). Among the small group of Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ organizations responding to the survey (n=11), half favour an inclusive approach and the other half prefer prioritizing funding to organizations owned/operated by Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQIA+.

E. Funding Distribution

Important factors in funding distribution

Organizations favour funding that prioritizes inclusivity and perceived need, including grassroots or community-based organizations as well as organizations serving remote and rural communities. Comparatively fewer prioritize decisions based on merit, capacity or the organization’s ability to continue beyond SSDIC funding.

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of various factors to determining funding distribution. Majorities consider all nine categories to be at least somewhat important; however, there is a clear trend in the factors that organizations consider most important. More than half believe it is very important to ensure all

three distinction groups (65%) and each province and territory (59%) receives funding, and that the organization applying is a grassroots or community-based organization (54%). Half say it is very important that the organization serves remote communities (50%) while slightly fewer place the same importance on organizations serving rural communities (42%). Respondents are least likely to prioritize applicants with a plan to continue programming beyond SSDIC funding (27%), well-established organizations (21%), organizations serving urban communities (21%) and merit-based applications (20%).

Important factors in funding distribution

Factor	NET Important	Very important	Somewhat important	NET not important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant
Ensure all three distinction groups (First Nations, Métis, Inuit) receive funding	90%	65%	25%	10%	6%	4%
Ensure there are funded projects in each province and territory (jurisdiction)	89%	59%	31%	11%	8%	2%
The organization applying is a grassroots or community-based organization	87%	54%	33%	13%	10%	3%
The organization applying is or serves in a remote community(ies)	86%	50%	36%	14%	10%	4%
The organization applying is or serves in a rural community(ies)	83%	42%	41%	17%	11%	6%
The organization applying has a plan that will allow programming to continue beyond SSDIC funding	74%	27%	46%	26%	21%	5%
The organization applying is a well-established organization with high capacity	65%	21%	45%	35%	27%	7%
The organization applying is or serves in an urban community(ies)	63%	21%	42%	37%	26%	12%
Funding is recommended based only on merit	62%	20%	42%	38%	31%	7%

E1. How important are each of the following factors to you when considering what should determine funding distribution? BASE: All respondents

First Governments, Nations, communities and Tribal Councils are more likely to think it is very important that all three distinctions groups receive funding (81%, vs. 54% of other organizations).

When asked for additional input into the factors to be considered in funding distribution (open-ended), comments fall into themes around the importance of needs-based over merit-based funding, and ensuring

funding is inclusive of all Indigenous people and not solely based on an organization’s ability to complete the application form.

“Assist communities, regions or Nations that could use the help most, regardless of capacity etc. If an application is poorly completed, it often gets dismissed, however, support to enhance the application and modify it, if necessary to deliver something important is of more value. Giving funds to non-Indigenous organizations, regardless if they support Indigenous youth is not getting funds directly where it helps the most.”

“Funding should be allocated so that there is programming and dollars offered in each province/ territory. If an application does not come in from an area then staff should work to consult with organizations and people in those areas to assist.”

“Remote communities always have funding issues for community programming and should have a higher consideration for funding.”

“Within the current organized sports available to Indigenous Youth, there lies a gap where Urban Indigenous youth (including Metis, non-status and Inuit) are falling through the cracks of sporting opportunities in our province.”

Population size as a factor in funding distribution

There are mixed views about whether relative population should be a factor in funding distribution, but fewer than four in ten agree. If population data is used in the funding distribution formula, organizations believe it should be Indigenous-sourced data.

Fewer than four in ten think population size should be a factor in determining funding distribution (37%), five in ten think it should not be a factor (53%), and one in ten are unsure (10%). While this is a complex topic that is challenging to clearly present in a survey environment, these results are generally consistent with the qualitative findings suggesting that Indigenous organizations believe a per capita funding formula is inadequate.

Should population size be a factor in funding distribution?

	Total (n=121)
Yes	37%
No	53%
Unsure	10%

E3. The current funding distribution also takes into consideration the size of the Indigenous population living in the applicant’s province or territory compared to that of Canada. Should relative population size play a role in funding distribution? BASE: All respondents

Source of population data. Among those who believe relative population should be a factor in funding distribution (n=45), the largest proportion prefer using data provided by Indigenous organizations (49%). Smaller proportions think Indigenous Services Canada (20%) or Census (16%) data should be used.

Should population size be a factor in funding distribution

	Support population size in funding model (n=45)
First Nations, Métis, Inuit, or Non-Status and Off-reserve organization data	49%

Indigenous Services Canada data	20%
Census data	16%
Other	7%
Don't know	9%

E4. If the funding distribution includes population-based factors, what data should be used to support the model? SUBSAMPLE: those who support population size as factor in model n=45

Proportion of funding for partnerships

As with views about whether non-Indigenous organizations in partnership with Indigenous organizations should be eligible for SSDIC funding, there is no consensus about whether the current funding reserved for such partnerships should be kept, reduced or eliminated, or increased.

Currently up to one-quarter of SSDIC funding is available for non-Indigenous organizations in authentic partnership with Indigenous organizations. There are mixed views about if this should change and how: one-third say the proportion of funding reserved for partnerships should remain capped at 25 percent, another third say it should be lowered (20%) or eliminated entirely (17%), while one in five (21%) believe it should be increased.

Proportion of funding for partnerships

	Total (n=121)	First Nations Government, Nation, or Community (n=52)	Organization (n=76)
It should be increased	21%	12%	26%
It should stay the same	32%	40%	28%
It should be decreased	20%	27%	16%
There should be no non-Indigenous organizations eligible via partnerships	17%	13%	20%
Don't know	10%	8%	11%

E5. At this time, there is a maximum of 25% of SSDIC funding that is available for non-Indigenous organizations in authentic partnership with Indigenous organizations to apply for. Do you think this percentage should increase, decrease, or stay the same? BASE: All respondents

Note: Sub-groups are not mutually exclusive; respondents could self-select as a category within either sub-group, so total exceeds 121

Appendix A: Resources

Links to Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities Resources

1. [SSDIC Main Page](#)
2. [SSDIC Stream One and Two Application Guidelines](#)
3. [SSDIC Stream Three \(interim\) Application Guidelines](#)

Sample Final Reporting Requirements – Stream 3



ANNEX D REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FINAL ACTIVITY REPORT

Reset Form

Section 1 - GENERAL CLIENT INFORMATION

Recipient Organization Name:

Funding Stream:

Funding Term:

Reporting Period:

Section 2 - PROJECT(S) OVERVIEW

We know that you have worked hard to bring quality programming to the communities and people you serve, and we want to celebrate your accomplishments. Please share some of the highlights of the projects that you offered this year. You are also very welcome to share Imagery; We would love to see photos or videos of your projects in action. If you are going to capture any content, please bear the following in mind: Consider taking high resolution Images whenever possible; Please be sure to obtain proper informed consent of any participant identifiable in the photos or videos. We also welcome testimonials from participants, or other forms of storytelling to showcase your project's impact. Please use the Sharepoint Link your Program Analyst shared with you to upload content.

Key Successes

What worked well? What are some notable accomplishments, positive feedback, surprises, and success stories from your project and participants?

Key Challenges

Did you experience any challenges, setbacks, or learning opportunities? What strategies did you use to overcome obstacles or what would you like to have happen differently next time?





**ANNEX D
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
FINAL ACTIVITY REPORT**

Reset Form

SSDIC Outcomes & Indicators

The SSDIC Stream Three Outcomes and Indicators are required for reporting purposes. Please fill in your projects corresponding numbers for each of the Indicators below. The text boxes that follow are for any additional or contextual information.

#1. Increase the opportunities for indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQIA+ people, to participate in sport activities

Number of communities reached:

Community Name	Community Location (if different from community name)
Add a community	Remove last community

Number of participants reached:

Please indicate participant demographics (such as gender, age, etc.) when appropriate

#2. Support communities' self-identified social development objectives (physical and mental health, suicide prevention, sexual trafficking awareness and prevention, safe and healthy relationships, and sexual positivity 2SLGBTQIA+)

Have participants improved on the identified social development objectives? Yes No Partially

Have participants felt more positive about their health and wellness? Yes No Partially

Any additional comments (e.g. How did you collect this information from your participants?)



ANNEX D
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
FINAL ACTIVITY REPORT

Reset Form

Section 3 - PROJECT INFORMATION

Please refer to Annex A of your Contribution Agreement for project title(s).

Project # 1 Name: [text input field]

Project Location: [text input field]

Project Dates: [text input field]

Need and rationale

What self-identified social outcome(s) of the SSDIC Stream Three program component did your project seek to address? Please select all that apply. Use the text box to add additional context and information if you wish.

- Physical and mental health
Suicide Prevention
Sexual trafficking awareness and prevention
Safe and healthy relationships
Sexual positivity (2SLGBTQIA+)

[text input field for additional context]

Planned Activities

How did your project address the SSDIC Stream Three program component outcomes listed above? Please briefly summarize/list the activities that were planned by referencing the planned activities from your Contribution Agreement.

[text input field for planned activities]

Did any activities change as you completed your project(s)? Yes No

Expected Results



**ANNEX D
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
FINAL ACTIVITY REPORT**

Reset Form

Expected Results	Actual Results
Add a row	Remove last row

If your actual results differ from what you originally expected, how have they changed and why?

Additional Project

If your funding was for multiple projects, please click the button below and complete for each additional project.

Add a project

Remove last project

SSDIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Tell Us How We Are Doing

We value your perspective and insight into how the SSDIC Stream Three program component is impacting your organization and the communities you serve. This section is to invite your feedback on the SSDIC Stream Three program component in general as well as to hear your stories about what is working and what can be improved upon. We endeavour to share collective learnings in order to improve the positive impact that SSDIC Stream Three program component projects have on Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQIA+ people across Canada.

Your Insights

How has the SSDIC Stream Three program funding overall impacted your communities and participants?



**ANNEX D
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
FINAL ACTIVITY REPORT**

Reset Form

Your Needs

Do you feel like the SSDIC Stream Three funding met your needs and/or helped you to address your targeted social development outcomes for Indigenous Women, Girls and 2SLGBTQIA+ peoples? Please tell us about any barriers or facilitators you may have experienced.

Your Recommendations

What would you like us to know or consider as we work to continually improve on our program and services?

Additional thoughts?

Government of Canada Contribution Agreement Requirements		
Requirement/Results	Achieved?	Please describe. Quantify, where applicable.
Through its funding, the Government of Canada wishes among other things and, where appropriate, to promote English and French languages and to support the development of official languages minority communities. To support the Government in achieving these objectives, the Recipient will provide general information on the SSDIC funded activities and promote it in French and in English, as the case may require. (Annex A, clause 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	



**ANNEX D
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
FINAL ACTIVITY REPORT**

Reset Form

Requirement/Results	Achieved?	Please describe. Quantify, where applicable.
The Recipient shall have policies and procedures in place to prevent and respond to incidents of maltreatment, including independent procedures for reporting and investigating complaints, or be subject to the relevant policies and procedures of their governing body or provincial/territorial government. (Annex A, clause 5.1.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The Recipient shall communicate information on organizational policies and procedures, available resources, including access to a third party if applicable, and general awareness on preventing and addressing maltreatment of individuals affiliated with the organization and participants in activities of the organization. (Annex A, clause 5.1.2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The Recipient must publicly acknowledge, in English and in French, the financial support received from the Government of Canada, in all communication materials and promotional activities related to the Agreement, such as advertising, promotional and project materials, public announcements, speeches, website, social media, etc. The Recipient must also comply with all the clauses included in Annex E of this Agreement .	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The Recipient followed Sport Canada on social media by subscribing to the Twitter account @SportCanada_EN and @SportCanada_FR and Facebook page at www.facebook.com/SportCanadaEN , www.facebook.com/SportCanadaFR , the Instagram page, and shared content of interest with its own subscribers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	



**ANNEX D
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
FINAL ACTIVITY REPORT**

Reset Form

Thank you!

If you have any questions, concerns, or additional feedback, please connect with your Program Analyst

Appendix B: Detailed methodology

Methodology

From the outset, as part of their commitment to the principles of Reconciliation and to Indigenizing the design and delivery of the SSDIC program, Sport Canada was committed to hiring an Indigenous research firm to guide the design and implementation of this consultation. Environics Research and Sisco & Associates Consulting Services (SISCO), an Indigenous consulting firm specializing in research with and for Indigenous organizations and communities, partnered on this research. The research was conducted by both parties in two phases and reporting was done collaboratively in order to ensure that the diversity of Indigenous voices was accurately captured.

SISCO routinely utilizes collaborative, community-based partnership research (CBPR) and participatory approaches together with Indigenous methodologies in our work to foreground the voices of Indigenous partners and participants. Consistent with community-based partnership research (CBPR), the SISCO team, which included two Indigenous researchers, was engaged as full partners throughout the process at critical junctures to ensure input into the project work plan (design), knowledge gathering (data collection and analysis), and knowledge sharing (validation session, reporting, and presentations).

SISCO is committed to employing protocols based on Indigenous data sovereignty, including OCAP® (Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession), USAI (Utility, Self-Voicing, Access, Inter-Relationality), Principles of Ethical Métis Research, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), and First Nation community-level protocols. This project did not engage specific First Nations, Métis, or Inuit communities, and therefore there is not one or several targeted communities to which the data belongs and could be transferred back to in raw form. Rather, Indigenous organizations involving and serving Indigenous communities and peoples, the five Rs of CBPR and the USAI principles would be most appropriate to guide the work. The table below demonstrates how each set of principles were upheld.

Five Rs of CBPR	USAI Principles
<p>6. Respect for Indigenous knowledges, ways of knowing and doing (including in research and engagement), and multiple perspectives.</p> <p>7. Relevance of research to the cultures and communities engaged, including Indigenous organizations and the communities they serve.</p> <p>8. Reciprocity in knowledge exchange through the sharing back of information gathered from Indigenous partners in accessible ways (member checking of interview notes and validation session), and of benefits like the programming changes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility, like relevance, reflects a need for relevant vision and reflection on useful action. This project is applied and action oriented, impacted the SSDIC programming that is relevant to Indigenous organizations and the communities they serve. • Self-voicing is demonstrated through the foregrounding of Indigenous organization participant voices throughout the report, based on both research conversations and survey data, that was validated through member checking and a validation session with participants.

<p>9. Responsibility of researchers to empower community research partners (in this case Indigenous organizations and the SISCO research team) through engaging them throughout the process, and disseminating research outcomes that are accessible and respectful for audiences.</p> <p>10. Relationships as the foundation to the work, as demonstrated through the approach (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1999).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access acknowledges that all life manifestations (all of creation) is relevant in research and ensures that findings can be understood all. This is the purpose of the validation session. • Inter-Relationality is demonstrated through the foregrounding of relations as context to all findings and the overarching approach (OFIFC, 2016).
---	---

Qualitative methodology

Target audience/sampling. A total of 22 individual interviews were conducted with:

- Provincial/Territorial Aboriginal Sport Bodies (PTASBs) and the Aboriginal Sport Circle (ASC) that are eligible for Stream One funding.
- National Indigenous Organizations, National Indigenous Women Organizations, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ groups that may be eligible for Stream Three funding.

Recruiting. SSDIC provided an initial list of 28 organizations. These organizations were initially contacted by email and follow-ups were made by phone. The research teams also used a snowball sampling method, whereby interview participants were asked if there were other organizations that should be engaged for interviews. This approach was helpful for increasing the number of organizations beyond the original list. In total, the research team reached out to 39 organizations for interviews.

Semi-structured Interview Guide and Recruiting. The interview guide was designed as a collaboration between Environics, SISCO and the Indigenous Sport Unit (ISU) of Sport Canada. The team also developed a recruitment email, which SISCO researchers sent to the stakeholder list to introduce the project, and invite them to participate in an interview. The SISCO research team sent out one initial email invitation, and up to two email reminders and two phone reminders where required.

Interviewing. Interviews were conducted as participant-led research conversations with Indigenous partners drawing on the principles of sharing circles and a focus on honouring participants’ stories of lived experiences. Sharing circles are comparable to focus groups in that they involve group discussion, but distinct in that they are a healing method in which all participants (including the facilitator) are equals engaged in sharing and learning together in a wholistic way that involves the heart (emotional), mind (intellectual), body (physical), and spirit (spirit of everyone present, their ancestors and the Creator) (Lavallee, 2009). Circles create non-judgmental, safe spaces for important conversations (Lavallee, 2009).

Consistent with community-based partnerships research (CBPR), which is the gold standard of working with and for Indigenous communities, organizations, and people, the qualitative phase included several components

meant to include participants as partners in the research process and share information back to demonstrate respect, ensure relevance, in the spirit of reciprocity, and as a part of the team's responsibility as researchers to taking a relationships-based approach. These components included: member checking interview notes, and engaging participants in a validation session for input into and reaction to the preliminary findings and recommendations.

Interviews were conducted online via Zoom between December 2022 and March 2023. Interviews were conducted in respondents' official language of choice, resulting in English (20) and French (2) interviews. The interviewer typed interview notes, which were validated with participants through member checking (sharing back the notes to ensure accuracy of interpretation and provide an opportunity to add, change, or remove information). Additionally, participants were invited to participate in an online validation session to review the key findings identified by the SISCO team based on thematic content analysis. All participants have also been provided a final opportunity to engage in the interpretation and analysis of data, as well as a copy of the final report.

The 22 interview participants included:

- PTSABs and the ASC (12),
- National Indigenous Organizations (NIOs) (3),
- National Indigenous Women's Organizations (NIWOs) (1),
- Nations Political Organizations (NPOs) (1), and
- Other organizations (5) that provide sport and recreation programs/education to Indigenous youth.

Quantitative methodology

The quantitative research phase consisted of a **quantitative online survey** conducted between January 3 and March 10, 2023. In total, 121 organizations that have been involved with SSDIC in some capacity, either by applying for or receiving project funding, as well as those that ISU identified as potential future applicants participated in the survey.

Population and Sampling

Sport Canada provided Environics with an initial list of 336 organizations with phone numbers and/or email addresses. This list was primarily focused on organizations who had applied for SSDIC funding in the 2019-2020 and 2021-2022 intake years. It was anticipated that encouraging participation would be a challenge, due to various factors including the limited size of the list, an unknown level of current engagement with organizations on the list and organizations' capacity constraints to participate in such research.

Thus, a multi-pronged recruitment approach was used to maximize participation. Sport Canada sent out an initial email to alert organizations on this list to the upcoming survey and request their participation. Next, Environics sent an email invitation containing a link to complete the survey to organizations with valid email addresses. Two email reminders were sent to non-respondents to the initial invitation. Finally, telephone contact was attempted with non-responders to the email reminders. Up to two attempts were made to reach the organizations by phone. These calls were for recruitment purposes only; the only data collected/confirmed

was a valid email address for the purpose of sending the survey link. This process generated 47 completed online surveys between January 3 and February 22, 2023.

Due to this low response rate and Sport Canada's desire to yield as inclusive a survey as possible, a decision was made for Sport Canada to share (by email) an open survey link with a broader stakeholder audience of 2,147 organizations, including those that applied to the most recent 2023-2024 intake and those the Indigenous Sport Unit had identified as potential applicants (excluding organizations on the initial list to avoid duplication). The open link was shared on February 23, 2023, and generated a further 74 completions by March 10, 2023, for a total of 121 completions. Open links were sent from the Indigenous Sport Unit of Sport Canada to email addresses that are likely to be familiar with the organization and likely had a higher open-rate than emails from Environics.

This survey is an attempted census of organizations engaged with the Indigenous Sport Unit of Sport Canada. There is no margin of sampling error since no sample was drawn. However, due to the potential for non-response bias (i.e., a potential difference in views between organizations that responded to the survey and those that did not), the results should be interpreted with caution.

Questionnaire and pretest. Environics, in conjunction with Sport Canada – Indigenous Sport Unit, designed an online questionnaire that addressed the study objectives. Environics also drafted the initial survey invitation email, ensuring it included all required information such as informing respondents of their rights under the Privacy and Access to Information Act, and the text for the reminder emails.

Environics translated the email invitation, questionnaire and reminder text into French. Test links in both languages were provided to Sport Canada for approval prior to launch.

Prior to fieldwork, a soft launch was conducted with a small proportion of contacts. Standard government-accepted probing questions on comprehension and appropriateness of language were asked at the end of each pretest interview, and Sport Canada was given the pre-test results for review prior to full launch.

Survey administration. Environics assumed overall responsibility for all aspects of the survey fieldwork.

The survey was conducted according to the following steps:

- Environics programmed and hosted the online survey on a secure server. All data were stored on Canadian servers and Canadian back-up servers located and only accessible in Canada, and physically independent from all other databases, directly or indirectly, that are located outside Canada.
- Invitation e-mails including a unique URL link (to ensure only one version of the survey is accepted per respondent) were sent to all stakeholders with an email address. A maximum of two reminders were sent to non-respondents to the initial invitation. In some instances, automatic replies were received providing an email address for the new contact at that organization; in these instances, new invitations were sent to the new contact at the same organization.
- Technical support was provided to online survey respondents as required. Steps were taken to assure (and also guarantee) complete confidentiality and anonymity of survey responses.
- Phone recruitment to the online survey was attempted with non-responders to the email reminders. We made up to two attempts to reach the contact person. Please note the purpose of this call was for recruitment purposes only; the only data collected/confirmed was a valid email address for the purpose of sending the survey link.

- An open link was sent via Sport Canada – Indigenous Sport Unit to an expanded list of organizations that applied for the 2023-2024 intake or are identified as potential future applicants.
- All online survey responses were electronically captured as they were submitted, and combined into an electronic data file that was coded and analyzed (including open-ended responses).

All respondents were offered the opportunity to complete the survey in their official language of choice. All research work was conducted in accordance with the Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research for online and telephone surveys, as well as applicable federal legislation (Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, or PIPEDA). Environics is a founding member of the Canadian Research Insights Council (CRIC) and registered the survey with CRIC’s Research Verification System.

Data coding and tabulation. Following data collection and prior to analysis, data analysts performed a data-cleaning and validation process, in accordance with the highest industry standards. Environics designed banner tables in consultation with the project authority. Data were not weighted. Data tables were submitted in CSV format; verbatim comments were made available in an Excel document after review to ensure they do not compromise confidentiality. Open-ended question data were reviewed and coded thematically for this report, but are not included in the tables.

Completion results. The completion results for the survey sent by Environics (excluding the open link) are presented in the following table.

Contact disposition – online survey*

Disposition	N
Total invitations (c)	340
Total completes (d)	121
Qualified break-offs (e)	166
Disqualified (f)	0
Not responded (g)	53
Quota filled (h)	0
Contact rate = (d+e+f+h)/c	84.41
Participation rate = (d+f+h)/c	35.59

*Contact disposition is for unique links distributed by Environics and does not include data for the open links sent by ISU.

Respondent profile

The following tables present the distribution of survey participants by key firmographic (data related to the organization itself) and other variables. Note some tables include multiple mentions.

Organization type

Organization Type	# of all respondents (n= 121)
First Nations Community or Nation	34%
First Nations Government	12%
Indigenous Sport Organization (ISO)	12%

Indigenous Women, Girls, and/or 2SLGBTQQA+ Organization	9%
Non-profit Organization	9%
Other Sport Organization	7%
Métis Settlement	5%
Friendship Centre	5%
Provincial/Territorial Aboriginal Sport Body	3%
School Board	3%
Social & Community Service Organization	3%
National Indigenous Organization (NIO)	2%
Regional Indigenous Organization	2%
Tribal Council	2%

S1. How would you describe your organization? Please select all that apply.

Location

Province	# of all respondents with location data (n= 46)
British Columbia	22%
Prairies	39%
Ontario	24%
Québec & Atlantic Canada	9%
Territories	7%

*Location data was coded based on the contact list, and therefore is only available for the initial recruit (n=47, minus one record without location data), not for respondents to the open link.

Survey language

Survey Language	# of all respondents (n= 121)
English	95%
French	5%

LANG. Survey language

Year applied for funding

Year	# of applicants (n= 72)
2019-2021 intake	39%
2021-2023 intake	50%
2023-2024 intake	50%
Don't know	7%

C3. When did you apply for funding through SSDIC? Note this was a multiple response question so responses do not add to 100%

Stream applied for funding

Year	# of applicants (n= 72)
Stream 1	6%
Stream 2	85%
Stream 3	6%
Don't know	4%

C4. Which stream did you apply for?

Received funding

Year	# of applicants aware of stream they applied to (n= 65)
Yes	52%
No	15%
Don't know	32%

C5. Was your application recommended for funding?

Appendix C: In-depth interview discussion guide

Miigwech, Anushiik, Yaw[^]ko, Marsi, Nakurmiik, thank you for participating in this online interview. We would like to facilitate this session with the principles of a sharing circle in mind, in a culturally safe, trauma-informed, and participant-led way that will allow you to share your thoughts and experiences.

Sisco & Associates Consulting Services Inc. (SISCO: siscoconsulting.ca) and Environics Research (Environics: <https://environics.ca/>) are working together to gather input from Indigenous communities and organizations involved or interested in the Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities (SSDIC) program at Sport Canada, including but not limited to:

- Aboriginal Sport Circle (ASC)
- Provincial / Territorial Aboriginal Sport Bodies (PTASBS)
- National Indigenous Organizations
- National Indigenous Women Organizations
- Indigenous 2SLGBQQIA+ people or groups

This information will be used alongside information gathered from an online survey to inform a review of the [Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities \(SSDIC\) program](#). The review will focus on:

- aspects of the funding formula,
- funding distribution elements,
- eligibility criteria, and
- any related considerations.

The information gathered from these engagements will be used to inform policy and program design ahead of the next intake of applications for all three streams of the SSDIC program. In particular, we are interested in your input to inform the design and delivery of the recently developed *Indigenous Reconciliation and Strength of Indigenous Women and Girls through Sport for Social Development* (SSDIC Stream Three initiative), which seeks to support Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ peoples to have access to meaningful sports activities.

Although the content of our questions is not anticipated to cause any harm, it is possible that conversations surrounding any negative experiences may be triggering to participants. If you need support, please access any of these available resources:

- Hope for Wellness: 1-855-242-3310 or hopeforwellness.ca
- 24/7 Indian Residential Schools Crisis Line: 1-866-925-4419
- 24/7 Indian Residential School Survivors Society Crisis Support: 1-800-721-0066

Participation is voluntary and you can stop participating at any time. Your information will remain confidential, and all data will be de-identified and combined with general themes shared by other participants. After all interviews are completed, there will be an opportunity for you to participate in a group conversation with other participants/stakeholders with the intention of coming to some consensus. Due to the fact that others will be present, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed for those who choose to participate in this voluntary validation session. You will also have the opportunity to review and validate the interview notes and will receive a copy of the final report.

If you have any questions about this interview, you may contact Jana George at jana@siscoconsulting.ca. If you have any questions about the project, you may contact:

Verbal Consent

1. Do you understand the purpose of this project, and do you agree to participate in this online interview?

Background Information:

Stream One: for the 13 PTASBs and the ASC

Stream Two: for Indigenous governments and communities, as well as other delivery organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous communities

Stream Three: for Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ peoples to access meaningful sports activities through the SSDIC program (Note: design, implementation, and delivery of this Stream will be directly informed by the results of this engagement process)

Guiding Questions:

Section 1: Awareness & Experience

2. Please share a bit about your current role and the organization you represent.
3. Prior to this interview, were you aware of this program?
 - How did you hear about the program?
4. In the past, have you either applied for or received funding through this program?
 - How was your experience with the application process?
 - i. What made the experience positive?
 - ii. Did you face any challenges in completing the application? (i.e., time, capacity, lack of information, etc.).
 - iii. What could have improved the experience?
 - How was your overall experience with the SSDIC program?
 - i. What made the experience positive?
 - ii. What could have improved the experience?
 - Do you feel your organization might benefit from this funding or be interested in participating in this program. Why / why not?
5. Currently, for the purposes of SSDIC funding, Sport Canada utilizes the following definition of 'Indigenous organization':
 - A First Nation band recognized by the Government of Canada;
 - Tribal Council recognized by registered First Nation bands;
 - Inuit Communities as recognized by the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement, James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, and other recognized provincial/territorial/federal agreements with Inuit populations;
 - Representative organizations who provide services, programs or lobbying for a membership consisting of recognized First Nation bands; and
 - Representative organizations who provide programs, services or lobbying for Section 35 Rights holders.

Is this an appropriate definition for Indigenous Organizations?

- Would a First Nation or Band Council be considered an Indigenous Organization?
- If an organization has a majority of Indigenous Board Members, would they be considered an Indigenous Organization?
- Does the organization need to be majority Indigenous operated to be considered an Indigenous Organization?
- Does the organization need to have been founded by an Indigenous person / group?
- Does the organization need to be operating programming for Indigenous people specifically?

6. How does SSDIC's definition of an Indigenous Organization impact your funding eligibility?

- What implications could this have on other Organizations or programs?
- In instances where a non-Indigenous organization partners with an Indigenous community or organization, should they be eligible for funding?
- What percentage, if any, of the funds should go to non-Indigenous organizations who partner with Indigenous communities or organizations?

Section 2: Stream One (only for by PTASBS)

Approximately 45 percent of all SSDIC funding is made available to 13 PTASBs through Stream 1. Stream 1 provides a base funding for all PTASBs of \$150,000 and additional funding based on two main criteria:

- Based on Canada 2016 Census data, each PTASB will receive an amount that takes into consideration the percentage of their Indigenous population in relation to the overall Indigenous population in Canada; and
- Each PTASB will receive an amount that takes into consideration the percentage of their population living in rural versus urban communities.

7. How should Stream One funding be allocated and distributed across Canada? What factors should be considered?

- How should Stream One funding distribution be calculated?
- Should the calculation be based on relative population sizes or are there other needs-based formulas that are potentially more appropriate?

8. What should be considered when determining Stream One program eligibility and distribution?

- Remoteness of communities (rural, remote, urban): should remoteness be considered?
- Population: should funding distribution be based on Indigenous population size?
- Distinctions-based: how can the program ensure First Nations, Métis, and Inuit groups all receive funding?
- Merit-based: should the strongest or highest scored applications receive funding?
- More accurate data (i.e., most recent census data, AFN, ISC, or other First Nations, Métis, Inuit, or non-status and off-reserve organization data)

- Do you know of any formulas that effectively capture these considerations?
9. Is there anything you would change about the Stream One program design and delivery? Please explain.
10. How should the success of Stream One be measured?
- What does success look like (i.e., the activities offered, how participants feel, program impacts)?
 - What measures or indicators should be considered?
 - How can information be collected from participants (i.e., sharing circles, surveys, program feedback forms, testimonials, etc.)?

Section 3: Stream Two

11. Stream Two funding is currently available to Indigenous governments, communities, and organizations, including non-Indigenous delivery organizations working in collaboration with Indigenous communities. Projects must provide sport opportunities in Indigenous communities that support the SSDIC Social Development Goals, including improved health, educational outcomes, and employability, as well as a reduction of at-risk behaviours.
- How should Stream Two funding be allocated and distributed across Canada?
 - How can we ensure equitable distribution is provided through the program?
 - Do you have any concerns with definitions or eligibility?
12. What should be considered when determining applicant eligibility and distribution for Stream Two funding?
- Remoteness of communities (rural, remote, urban): should remoteness be considered?
 - Population: should funding distribution be based on Indigenous population size?
 - Distinctions-based: how can the program ensure First Nations, Métis, and Inuit groups all receive funding?
 - Jurisdictions (Provinces / Territories): should all 13 jurisdictions (Provinces / Territories) be guaranteed funding?
 - Merit-based: should the strongest applications receive funding, regardless of distinction and jurisdiction?
 - More accurate data (i.e., most recent census data, AFN, ISC, or other First Nations, Métis, Inuit, or non-status and off-reserve organization data)
13. Is there anything you would change about the Stream Two program design and delivery? Please explain.
14. Stream two currently looks at measuring two specific outcomes to help ensure Indigenous people can benefit from the program, including:
- Increased opportunities for Indigenous people to participate in sport activities; and

- Supporting communities' self-identified social development goals (i.e., improved participant health and wellness).

How should the success of Stream Two be measured?

- What does success look like (i.e., the activities offered, how participants feel, program impacts)?
- What measures or indicators should be considered?
- How can information be collected from participants (i.e., sharing circles, surveys, program feedback forms, testimonials, etc.)?
- How could the reporting process better reflect Indigenous ways of knowing and community-based processes?

Section 4: Stream Three

15. Stream Three aims to ensure that Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ people have access to meaningful sports activities that support the following Social Development Goals, drawn from the MMIWG Calls for Justice, including:

- physical and mental health,
- suicide prevention,
- sexual trafficking awareness and prevention,
- safe and healthy relationships, and
- sexual positivity (2SLGBTQQIA+).

Currently, Stream Three funds can be available to Indigenous governments, Indigenous communities, and other Indigenous organizations, as well as non-Indigenous delivery organizations who are collaborating with Indigenous organizations. Projects must deliver sport activities to Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ people that support the above SSDIC Stream Three Social Development Goals.

How can Stream Three funding be best allocated and distributed across Canada?

- How can we ensure equitable distribution is provided through the program?
- Remoteness of communities (rural, remote, urban): should remoteness be considered?
- Population: should funding distribution be based on Indigenous population size?
- Distinctions-based: how can the program ensure First Nations, Métis, and Inuit groups all receive funding?
- Jurisdictions (Provinces / Territories): should all 13 jurisdictions (Provinces / Territories) be guaranteed funding?
- Merit-based: should the strongest applications receive funding, regardless of distinction and jurisdiction?

How should Stream Three funding be allocated and distributed across Canada? What factors should be considered?

16. What do you think should be considered or included in the design and delivery of Stream Three?

- Should Stream Three be open to non-Indigenous organizations? Why / why not?
- Are there considerations for a distribution model or formula to guide funding large, established national organizations compared to grassroots, community-level organizations serving Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ people?
- Should Stream Three have an open call and accept applications from any Indigenous organization / community? Why / why not?
- Should Stream Three only be open to Indigenous Women Organizations and 2SLGBQQIA+ organizations? Why / why not?
- Should Stream Three also be open to PTASBs? Why / why not?
- Are there any data sets that could be used to help determine the distribution of Stream Three funds?
 - i. Most recent census data
 - ii. Data from AFN, ISC, Métis / Inuit groups, or non-status or off-reserve organization data
 - iii. Other

17. Stream Three may look at measuring the following outcomes to help ensure Indigenous people can benefit from the program, including:

- Increased opportunities for Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBQQIA+ to participate in sport activities; and
- Supporting communities' self-identified social development goals (i.e., improved participant health and wellness).

How should the success of Stream Three be measured?

- What does success look like (i.e., the activities offered, how participants feel, program impacts)?
- What measures or indicators should be considered?
- How can information be collected from participants (i.e., sharing circles, surveys, program feedback forms, testimonials, etc.)?

Section 4: All Streams

18. Is there anything else you would like to share about the SSDIC program?

19. Do you know anyone else that should be included in this engagement process?

Miigwech, Anushiik, Yaw^ko, Marsi, Nakurmiik, thank you for sharing your experience and input with us! In the coming weeks there will be an opportunity to participate in a voluntary validation session with other participants after all interviews are completed in order for participants to move towards some consensus. If you choose to participate in this second stage of the research, confidentiality will not be guaranteed as other participants will hear your responses. You will also have the opportunity to review and validate the interview notes and will receive a copy of the final report.

Appendix D: Survey questionnaire

Canadian Heritage – Sport Canada

Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities Survey

LANDING PAGE

Please select your preferred language for completing the survey / Veuillez sélectionner la langue de votre choix pour remplir le sondage.

01–English / Anglais

02–Français / French

Background information

Miigwech, Anushiik, Yaw^ko, Marsi, Nakurmiik, Thank you, for participating in this online survey. Sisco & Associates Consulting Services Inc. (SISCO: siscoconsulting.ca) and Environics Research (Environics: <https://environics.ca/>) are working together to gather input from Indigenous communities and organizations involved or interested in the Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities (SSDIC) program at Sport Canada. This information will be used alongside information gathered from interviews to inform a review of the SSDIC program.

The questions in this survey are about aspects of the SSDIC program design and delivery, such as eligibility, funding models, and key definitions. While it is not anticipated, questions associated with any negative experiences may be triggering to participants. If you need support, please access any of these available resources:

- Hope for Wellness: 1-855-242-3310 or hopeforwellness.ca
- 24/7 Indian Residential Schools Crisis Line: 1-866-925-4419
- 24/7 Indian Residential School Survivors Society Crisis Support: 1-800-721-0066

This survey should take 10 – 12 minutes of your time. Your input stands to benefit Indigenous communities across Canada as your answers will be integrated into potentially new ways of offering the SSDIC program. We would like to offer you a \$5 Tim Horton's gift card for your time. Participation is voluntary and you can stop participating at any time. Your information will remain anonymous and confidential, and all data will be de-identified and grouped with data from others (aggregate). If you have any questions about the project, you may contact Alanna Sawatzky at Alanna.Sawatzky@environics.ca

[CONTINUE TO SCREENING]

< PROGRAMMING NOTE: All questions are mandatory.>

Eligibility/Screening

S1. How would you describe your organization? Please select all that apply.

- 01 - Indigenous Sport Organization (ISO)
- 02 - Indigenous Women, Girls, and/or 2SLGBTQQIA+ Organization
- 03 - First Nations Government
- 04 - First Nation Community or Nation
- 05 - Tribal Council
- 06 - National Indigenous Organization (NIO)
- 07 - National Indigenous Women's Organization (NIWO)
- 08 - Provincial/Territorial Aboriginal Sport Body (PTASB)
- 09 - Other Indigenous Organization (Please specify) [Textbox]

A. Awareness of SSDIC

A1. The Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities (SSDIC) is a program delivered by Sport Canada. SSDIC aims to enhance health, education, employability, and well-being for Indigenous communities through sport. How familiar are you with the SSDIC program?

- 01 - Very familiar
- 02 - Somewhat familiar
- 03 - Not very familiar
- 04 - Not at all familiar

B. Defining Indigenous Organizations

B1. Currently, for the purposes of SSDIC funding, Sport Canada utilizes the following definition of 'Indigenous organization':

- A First Nation band recognized by the Government of Canada;
- Tribal Council recognized by registered First Nation bands;
- Inuit Communities as recognized by the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement, James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, and other recognized provincial/territorial/federal agreements with Inuit populations;
- Representative organizations who provide services, programs or lobbying for a membership consisting of recognized First Nation bands; and
- Representative organizations who provide programs, services or lobbying for Section 35 Rights holders.

Is this an appropriate definition for Indigenous Organizations?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - Don't know

B1. [IF QB1=02, 03] What would be a more appropriate definition of Indigenous Organizations in your view?
[text box]

B2. Which of the following would you consider to be an “Indigenous Organization” in your/your organization’s view? Consider each response option independently of the others. [Randomize rows]

Response Option	01 - Yes	02 - No	99 Don’t know
a. Organization that has a majority of Indigenous board members			
b. Organization that is majority Indigenous-owned/operated			
c. Organization that was founded by an Indigenous person or group			
d. Organization that operates programming specifically for Indigenous people			

C. Application Process

C1. Has your organization ever applied for funding through SSDIC?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - Don’t know

C2. [IF QC1=02] Why did your organization not apply to one of the SSDIC funding streams? Select all that apply. [Randomize]

- 01 - We could not find information about eligibility
- 02 - We did not think we would be eligible
- 03 - We did not have enough capacity to complete the application
- 04 - We did not know how much funding to apply for
- 05 - We found out about the program too late to apply
- 06 - We did not know this program existed
- 07 - We found the program application process was too complicated
- 08 - Other, please specify [textbox]
- 99 – Don’t know [exclusive]

C3. [If QC1=01] When did you apply for funding through SSDIC? Select all that apply.

- 01 - 2019-2021 intake
- 02 - 2021-2023 intake
- 03 - 2023-2024 intake (note: this is the intake accepting applications between December 2022-January 2023)
- 99 – Don’t know

C4. [If QC1=01] Which stream did you apply for?

- 01 - Stream 1: Available to the 13 Provincial/Territorial Aboriginal Sport Bodies (PTASBs) and the Aboriginal Sport Circle (ASC);
- 02 - Stream 2: Available to Indigenous governments and communities, as well as other delivery organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous communities

03 - [show only if QC3=03] Stream 3: Available to Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQA+ groups to ensure access to meaningful sports activities

99 - Don't know

C5. [IF QC4=01,02] Was your application recommended for funding?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 – Don't know

C6. [IF QC5=02] Why do you think your application was not recommended for funding? [textbox]

C7. [IF QC1=01] Thinking of the application process, how satisfied were you with the experience overall?

- 01 - Very satisfied
- 02 - Somewhat satisfied
- 03 - Somewhat dissatisfied
- 04 - Very dissatisfied

C7a. [If QC7=01,02] Why were you satisfied with the overall process? [textbox]

C7b. [If QC7=03,04] Why were you dissatisfied with the overall process? [textbox]

C8. [IF QC1=01] Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about the SSDIC application process: [GRID, RANDOMIZE ROWS]

Response Option	01 – Strongly agree	02 – Somewhat agree	03 – Somewhat disagree	04 – Strongly disagree	97 – Not applicable
a. It was easy to find information about the SSDIC program					
b. I was easily able to determine which stream to apply for					
c. Application guidelines were easy to follow and understand					
d. Application form was easy to use and submit					
e. Eligibility information was straightforward					
f. Eligibility requirements are reasonable					
g. Pulling together the required information was simple					
h. I had enough time to complete my application					
i. I was able to find contact/support information when needed					

C9. [IF QC1=01] Do you have any other comments about each of the above components of the application process? [optional textbox]

D. Eligibility

Organizations must meet specific eligibility requirements in order to be recommended for funding through SSDIC. To be eligible for Stream Two or Stream Three, organizations must be Indigenous/Indigenous-led, or non-Indigenous organizations in authentic partnership with Indigenous organizations. **Stream Two** serves **all Indigenous peoples**, whereas **Stream Three** must provide **opportunities to women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQA+ people specifically**.

D1. What is your reaction to this baseline eligibility? Do you have any concerns about who will/will not be eligible for funding? [textbox]

D2. Sometimes Indigenous communities and organizations partner with non-Indigenous organizations to apply for funding for their program. This could be due to capacity issues, scope of service, or a strong pre-existing relationship between the organizations.

How do you feel about non-Indigenous organizations receiving funding through SSDIC in partnership with an Indigenous organization? [textbox]

NOTE: We're going to ask you some questions about eligibility and who should be eligible to receive funding through SSDIC. The first set of questions will ask about **Stream Two**. Stream Two is available to Indigenous governments and communities, as well as other delivery organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous communities.

D3. Do you think non-Indigenous organizations who partner with Indigenous organizations should be eligible for funding for Stream Two?

01 - Yes

02 - No, funding should be available to Indigenous/Indigenous-led organizations only

99 - Don't know

D4. Do you think non-Indigenous organizations offering sport activities to Indigenous groups and communities should be eligible for funding for Stream Two, **even if they do not partner with an Indigenous organization**?

01 - Yes

02 - No, funding should be available to Indigenous/Indigenous-led organizations only

99 - Don't know

NOTE: Now we're going to ask you about eligibility for **Stream Three**. Stream 3: Available to Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQA+ groups to ensure access to meaningful sports activities

D5. Do you think non-Indigenous organizations who partner with Indigenous organizations should be eligible for funding for Stream Three?

03 - Yes

04 - No, funding should be available to Indigenous/Indigenous-led organizations only

99 - Don't know

D6. Do you think non-Indigenous organizations offering sport activities to Indigenous groups and communities should be eligible for funding for Stream Three, **even if they do not partner with an Indigenous organization**?

03 - Yes

04 - No, funding should be available to Indigenous/Indigenous-led organizations only

99 - Don't know

D7. Do you think Stream Three should be available to all Indigenous organizations seeking to provide programming to Indigenous women, girls, and/or 2SLGBTQQIA+ peoples? Or should the organizations be owned/operated by Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ peoples in order to be eligible?

01 - As long as the organization is aiming to serve Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ communities, any Indigenous organization should be eligible

02 - The organization should be owned/operated/mandated by Indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQI+ people in order to be eligible

99 - Don't know

E. Funding Distribution

Funding distribution means the way that the money available is divided among applicants. Funding distribution can take a number of factors into consideration including the communities being served, the organizations applying, as well as population size, geographic regions, and distinctions-based factors (i.e., First Nations, Métis, Inuit). The next section will ask for your input about how funding should be distributed across Canada.

E1. How important are each of the following factors to you when considering what should determine funding distribution?

[GRID, RANDOMIZE ROWS]

Response Option	01 – Very important	02 – Somewhat important	03 – Somewhat unimportant	04 – Very unimportant
a. The organization applying is or serves in a remote community(ies)				
b. The organization applying is or serves in an urban community(ies)				
c. The organization applying is or serves in a rural community(ies)				
d. The organization applying is a well-established organization with high capacity				
e. The organization applying is a grassroots or community-based organization				
f. The organization applying has a sustainability plan that will allow programming to continue beyond SSDIC funding				
g. Ensure there are funded projects in each province and territory (jurisdiction)				
h. Ensure all three distinctions groups (First Nations, Métis, Inuit) receive funding				
i. Funding is recommended based only on merit (i.e. highest scored applications by review committee) regardless of distinction or jurisdiction				

E2. Do you have any additional comments regarding the factors considered in funding distribution? [optional textbox]

E3. The current funding distribution also takes into consideration the size of the Indigenous population living in the applicant’s province or territory compared to that of Canada. Should relative population size play a role in funding distribution?

- 01 - Yes
- 02 - No
- 99 - Don’t know

E4. [IF E3=01] If the funding distribution includes population-based factors, what data should be used to support the model?

- 01 - Census data
- 02 - Indigenous Services Canada data
- 03 - First Nations, Métis, Inuit, or Non-Status and Off-reserve organization data
- 04 - Other, please specify [textbox]
- 99 – Don’t know

E5. At this time, there is a maximum of 25% of SSDIC funding that is available for non-Indigenous organizations in authentic partnership with Indigenous organizations to apply for. Do you think this percentage should increase, decrease, or stay the same?

01 - It should be increased

02 - It should be decreased

03 - It should stay the same

04 - There should be no non-Indigenous organizations eligible, even if partnering with Indigenous organizations

99 Don't know

F. Final Thoughts

F1. Is there anything else about the application process, eligibility, or funding model that you want to share with us? [optional textbox]

Thank you for sharing your experience and input with us! Fill out the form below to receive your \$5 Tim Hortons gift card.

Name	
Email	

When this research is completed, a final report will be available to view via Library and Archives Canada. We would love to share the results of your input with you. In order to receive a copy, please check the box below and be sure to provide your email above. Note: Your responses to this survey will still remain anonymous.

Optional Checkbox: "Please send me a summary report when research is complete"

[PROGRAMMING NOTE: ADD PRE-TEST QUESTIONS]