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Purpose of Report

- Year 1 of the C4A Evaluation was Case Study Focussed. Year 2 has been a Thematic focus. Themes of:
  - Participation
  - Governance and Partnership
  - Value for money
- This Report feeds back on findings and key themes of the 3 studies
- Includes outputs from Project and SW Case Officer Workshops on emerging themes
- Opportunity to apply lessons from the Studies to the final year of the Programme
- Note that the context has changed during the year.......so we have placed findings in the context of the Independent Review
Independent Review of Sport Wales: Policy

- Welsh Government to prepare a long-term policy statement and strategy for physical activity

- Will set out shared outcomes, budgets and means to measure performance of all partners

- **Sport and Health mandated to collaborate** on investment, research, social marketing and advocacy
Independent Review of Sport Wales: Strategy

Sport Wales to lead a new, long term, strategy for Sport in Wales that:

- responds to WG policy direction for sport to create a healthy and active Wales;
- based on full engagement with the sport sector and others
- connect the Wellbeing Act with community sport and the performance pathway;
- encompasses elite as well as community/grass roots sport
- defines success and relationship to the wider policy agenda;
- robust outcomes, metrics and performance framework with ownership clarity, and transparent investment
C4A: Impact & Learning: The Big Lessons

- It is possible to engage hard to reach groups
- This includes women, and BAME, disabled and disadvantaged people
- Direct costs can be high in headline unit costs per participant
- Both direct and indirect value created are not currently clearly enough for cost/benefit analysis or social return on the investment to be calculated
- Engaging these groups entails innovative methods......
  ....both in terms of governance and partnership.....
  ....and delivery.
- Also entails a degree of reputational and financial risk which can be accepted and managed, but which remains......
- Lessons from C4A can inform Community Sport, public health, and wider well being objectives
Can C4A Learning Now Connect with SW and WG
Direction of Travel?

If so, how is that best done and what will be the key learning to convey?
The aim….

...of this Report is to highlight key learnings from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Year of the C4A evaluation so that they can be applied both:

- In C4A’s 3\textsuperscript{rd} year
- Elsewhere in Sport Wales
- Three sections – one each, freestanding, on the three themes
Participation Thematic Study
Purpose of this Section

- To feedback to the Sport Wales Board and key stakeholders the findings and key themes of this thematic study

- Place the findings in the context of the Independent Review of Sport Wales

- Create opportunity to apply key lessons to activities and objectives in the final year of the Programme and elsewhere in Sport Wales
Key questions for this Thematic Study

Which of the Elements of Engagement have been most relevant to projects?

How does achieving greater participation relate to change, and especially change in organisations?

What is the importance of ‘agents’ in accessing and/or encouraging/supporting new participants amongst the target groups?
Sport Wales have supported and connected traditional and non-traditional partners through C4A to deliver physical activity projects.

Sport Wales was commended for the managed risk approach it adopted for C4A.

The approach Sport Wales took with the Calls4Action programme was seen as a refreshing departure from the norm.
The key areas of learning for Participation

- The character of participation in each project

- The Elements of Engagement – the factors which promote or inhibit individual participation which are awareness, access (opportunity and resources), motivation, confidence, and the experience of participating

- Agents and their role in increasing participation

- Participation and change
The Projects: The Character of Participation

Project focus varies between:

- A single sport/activity focus

- A multi sport focus

- A ‘context changer’ approach – where the project has tried to create change by influencing the context in which participation takes place
The Projects: The Character of Participation cont.

The worlds of participation vary between the Projects in terms of a focus on:

- Foundation – preparing all individuals to participate in sport for life and achieve their potential
- Well being – providing opportunities for individuals to improve their fitness and wellbeing in a fun and social environment
- Progression – participation in recognised competition formats which are athlete-centred, workforce supported and facility-related
- Performance – excellence in the form of high level sporting performance where achievement is measured against an identified set of standards established by the NGB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION ‘WORLD’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBNPA</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and some progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME Sport Cymru</td>
<td>Multi Context Changer</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend CBC</td>
<td>Context changer</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket without boundaries</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Cycling</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Guides</td>
<td>Multi sport</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Gymnastics</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale change</td>
<td>Context changer</td>
<td>Foundation and well being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street football</td>
<td>Multi Context Changer</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to change Wales</td>
<td>Single sport</td>
<td>Foundation, well being and progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Us girls</td>
<td>Multi/context changer</td>
<td>Foundation and well being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziggies</td>
<td>Context changer</td>
<td>Foundation and well being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements of Engagement: How do the projects see them in relation to their work?

- BBNP – they now emphasise the confidence of participants and the experience of participation as the most important factors in securing involvement. At the application stage, they thought that lack of opportunity for young people to access the National Park was the biggest barrier. But in practice the lack of confidence of the young people from disadvantaged backgrounds was the biggest barrier. There was also a difference between girls and boys participation - girls’ growth in confidence led onto significantly more activity and a willingness to take on leadership roles within the activity.

- Welsh Gymnastics – their initial focus was giving young girls the opportunity to do gymnastics, but the potential participants and their families also had to become aware that they could participate in a girls’ only environment, and gain understanding of how a gymnastics club could operate to reflect their needs and concerns. Continuity of the leaders of the activities, and building relationships across cultural boundaries, were also important factors.
Elements of Engagement: How do the projects see them in relation to their work? Cont.

- Bridgend CBC – awareness and opportunity were initially central to their approach, although they emphasise also the importance of understanding differing levels of inclusion which impact on disabled people. There is a need to engage beyond the participant sometimes - e.g. carers or family members can be the key to participation. Success has come through engaging siblings so that activity can be a household event for both those with disabilities and also those without, rather than each engaging in separate activities.

- Us Girls – they targeted youngsters but actually needed to create bonds at group level first. They needed to design their approach across a spectrum to accommodate differences in need and responsiveness amongst the target population in order to be successful in achieving participation of the individual youngsters.
Street Football Wales – being client led, participation followed demand and activities developed in response to need. They found that linking with other agencies who were already in touch with their target population was key to accessing and then attracting new groups of participants. The ethos of activity – fun, safe environment, etc – and experience is important. The absence of competition may impact the ability of participants to progress.

Ziggies – began with Foundation Phase (3-7 years) and moved to be inclusive for older children. They encourage parents to join in too.

Cricket Wales – they found that where they could work with siblings they were more likely to get engagement because the siblings engaged better if they participated together. Involving parents in the activities was also important because it both legitimated and supported the participation of the children. They found demand from girls which they had not expected initially.
Elements of Engagement: Responses....cont.

- ABUHB – they engage with public sector partners to utilise existing resources in support of increasing participation. Awareness through social media had an important and a ‘snowball’ effect. They found that creating opportunities and deploying resources were both needed in order to encourage access and stimulate participation – for example by providing leaders for activities who would support and guide participants. They strive to maximise the existing resource available within the ‘system’ to increase participation.

- BME SC – the combination of creating opportunities and deploying resources in order to achieve access is also key for this project. Simple access to facilities needs to be complemented by support and active encouragement, at least initially. Trust is also very important, and is required prior to engaging. Once engagement has been achieved then familiarity and continuity - for example in the leaders and coaches - are important in creating ongoing relationships and sustaining participation.
Possible ‘agents’ who support participation – the different kinds of agents and their different functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Comfort &amp; acceptance</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Gateway &amp; access</th>
<th>Communicator/amplifier</th>
<th>Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers/coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents &amp; family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; voluntary sector partners &amp; peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workers/leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport orgs/clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants as agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agents and Participation

- Note the sheer range of potential agents.....
- .....and range of potential functions in supporting participation
- Agents may engage with different elements of engagement
- Agents may not understand which of the elements of engagement they are working to with participants
- Role of agents is key as influencers wider than sport e.g. health
- The agency ‘matrix’ above could be adapted as a priority menu, and utilised to track skills and capacities within SW and also as a ‘gap’ analysis tool for Projects in optimising the use of agents in maximising participation
Change associated with greater and different participation

The change which can occur as a result of C4A projects is potentially several fold:

a) Changes in attitudes/behaviours in ‘traditional’ sport bodies including NGBs, such as Cricket Wales. C4A can be a tool or a ‘channel’ so that an NGB can put into practice what they ‘ought’ or would like to do in engaging hard to reach groups, but where they may not have the resources or the right experience and personnel to actually make it happen.

b) Changes in established bodies eg Girl Guides – where C4A provides an opportunity to add ‘sport’ and especially sport for disadvantaged groups to their ‘portfolio’ of existing activities

c) Change through capacity building such as in developing infrastructure, skills and experience in sport development in the BME communities, which BME Sport Cymru has focussed on through regional partnerships of sporting and equality bodies

d) Change in Sport Wales itself and in Welsh Government policy

How far change will occur in these various ways, and to what extent, depends upon a mix of factors which need to be explored further
Relating these findings to the Independent Review....which said....

- Sport Wales have supported and connected traditional and non-traditional partners through C4A to deliver physical activity projects. C4A tackles the obstacles that prevent specific groups from participating in community sport.....the second phase of C4A specifically targeted under-represented groups with opportunities to develop the right skills to be physically active.

- Sport Wales was commended for the managed risk approach it adopted for C4A. Partners welcome the opportunity to access funding that was more flexible to allow innovative solutions to challenges without the risk of being penalised if they were not successful.

- ........a clearer line of sight between the strategic priorities and objectives of Sport Wales and those of Welsh Government. Sport Wales is working with Public Health Wales to develop performance indicators aligned with the Chief Medical Officer’s physical activity guidelines.

- The current metrics used by Sport Wales to measure the performance of their partners are not robust and an approach using social return on investment would be useful in levering investment from other sectors.
Relating these findings to the Independent Review....which said....cont.

- The approach Sport Wales took with the Calls4Action programme was seen as a refreshing departure from the norm....partners would welcome more flexibility in criteria for funding and access to funds that allow them to be creative and innovative.

- There was some appetite within Sport Wales to follow a more innovative approach with the introduction of Calls4Action, the Community Sport and Activity Programme, the Governance and Leadership Framework and the Four Worlds Model. The formation of the Sport Wales Advisory Group (SWAG) was also considered a bold and progressive move.
Key questions for this Thematic Study

Which of the Elements of Engagement have been most relevant to projects?

How does achieving greater participation relate to change, and especially change in organisations?

What is the importance of ‘agents’ in accessing and/or encouraging/supporting new participants amongst the target groups?
Which of the Elements of Engagement have been most relevant to projects?

- Wide variety of both elements and combinations across the projects
- Need to be agile and flexible in approach
- Need to change and develop approach in practice from that expected initially
- Need to recognise importance of ‘agents’
- Need for ‘holistic’ approach – link the engagement elements to an appreciation of the complexities of personal, group, and community dynamics
What is the importance of ‘agents’ in accessing and encouraging new participants?

- This is a key aspect – it goes beyond the important of ‘pied pipers’, the community representatives who facilitate access and contact, and have the talent to enthuse participation. But this describes only one class of ‘agents’ and only one ‘function’ which they might perform, when there are many agents and many different potential functions of agents, as shown in the earlier table.

- Agents are especially crucial in connecting with hard to reach groups. The kind of agents who can reach the people that others can’t reach vary as between hard to reach groups.....

- ......and there are differences between sub-sets of hard to reach groups, as well as between the hard to reach groups overall i.e. boys versus girls from disadvantaged backgrounds, as well as between (say) youngsters from disadvantaged or BME backgrounds.

- Importantly it is not just different agents who can have most effect – the way in which they have that effect varies as well.

- The value and impact of agents can be enhanced if consciously understood and conditions optimised........but further work is needed to understand fully how best to do that.
How does achieving greater participation relate to change, and especially change in organisations?

- Sport Wales is facing a major period of change
- C4A is a major source of experimentation and learning to inform what the change should be and how it can best be implemented
- Its change impact has been on individuals but also on their ‘significant others’ – families have become more engaged (for example in Bute Gymnastics) and community leaders have helped projects connect to new groups of participants (for example in Street Football Wales)...
- C4A has also facilitated change in sponsoring organisations, both traditional Sport Wales partners and also new partners (for example in Cricket Wales and BBNPA)....
- ...and in Sport Wales itself in terms of a greater awareness of what works in engaging hard to reach groups – although that change in Sport Wales can be more fully embraced and exploited
All of this has significant potential implications......

- For Sport Wales policy....

- ......for programme application criteria and project application assessments.....

- ....for the skills and capacities of Sport Wales officers
So what?

- Real potential benefits from C4A for.....
  - **Sport Wales** – informing its new strategy from the practice of projects on the ground engaging with hard to reach groups
  - **Partners** – greater recognition of what new and different partners can bring to the task of increasing participation amongst hard to reach groups
  - **Sport development professionals** – understanding better about what is most likely to work on the ground, and how to facilitate and support success in being the key mechanism for translating the learning into practice
  - **Projects trying to engage hard to reach groups** – providing exemplars of practice and pointing up how governance, partnership, and using agents effectively can improve their chances of success
Governance and Partnerships
Thematic Study
Purpose of Section

- To feedback to the Sport Wales Board and key stakeholders the findings and key themes of this thematic study
- Place the findings in the context of the Independent Review of Sport Wales
- Create the opportunity to apply key lessons to activities and objectives in the final year of the Programme and elsewhere in Sport Wales, its partners and other agencies
Key questions

What are the strengths and drawbacks of different approaches to governance in terms of project delivery and effectiveness?

How have projects approached partnership arrangements and sustainability - what have been their strengths and drawbacks?

Are there examples of ‘what works’ that we can learn for future initiatives especially with regard to sustainability?
Independent Review

Section 6, Rec vi – ‘A more flexible and mixed funding approach should be considered by SW to allow for creativity, innovation and sport specific or local needs based solutions.’

Section 7, Rec ii - ‘In developing initiatives or new ways of working, Sport Wales should engage partners at the outset and adopt a transparent process where their views are considered and receive feedback.’

Section 8, Rec vi - ‘Managers should create an environment with SW where innovation and creativity is promoted and celebrated.’
Overall Project Analysis

- In order to answer the three questions set out at the start, each project was reviewed in relation to three broad areas of analysis:
  - Project governance
  - Project management
  - Project partnership
Project Governance

Under project governance each C4A project was analysed against a number themes which included:

- The extent to which used existing structures and systems or created bespoke solutions (Existing / New)
- The extent to which the governance reflects the target groups and addresses explicitly equality and diversity (Yes / No)
- Are there measures to demonstrate that risk is being managed at the project level (Implicit / Explicit)
- Extent to which performance data are in place (Low / Medium / High)
## Governance Overview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Structures &amp; Systems</th>
<th>Target Group / plus E&amp;D Focus</th>
<th>Addressing Risk Management</th>
<th>Use of Perf Data / Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geo-caching</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziggies</td>
<td>Bespoke</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTCW</td>
<td>Bespoke</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Football</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGC</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Us Girls</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bute GC</td>
<td>Bespoke</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The role of a senior advocate (at management / board level) was viewed as a strength in connecting the board to project delivery
Governance – Project Level, Headline Analysis

- **BBNP** – Use BBNP existing structures and systems with employee in place to run project
- **Ziggies** – Trivallis leads with a consortium steering group and provides admin support
- **LSC** – AB Health Board leads, culture change across the organisation – Board and delivery
- **Bridgend CBC** – Operates to BCBC structures and systems
- **TTWC** – Steering group in place and Programme Board used to develop the project
- **Street Football Wales** – Managed within Pobl
- **Girl Guiding Cymru** – Board level ownership and project with senior advocate for project
- **Breeze** – British Cycling own project, managed by Welsh Cycling with project officers
- **Us Girls** – Street Games control project, managed by Wales with project officer
- **Bute GC** – Joint development by WG and Diverse Cymru with specific Steering Group
- **Cricket Wales** – Use Cricket Wales’ structures and systems, project developed via EDI sub-group

Abbreviations: **BBNP** = Brecon Beacons National Park; **LSC** = Large Scale Change; **AB** = Aneurin Bevan; **Bridgend CBC / BCBC** = Bridgend County Borough Council; **TTCW** = Time to Change Wales; **Pobl** = host organisation; **Bute GC** = Bute Gymnastics Club; **WG** = Welsh Gymnastics; **EDI** = Equality and Diversity Inclusion sub-group.
Strengths and Drawbacks of Different Governance

**Strengths**

- Governance is evident in all projects and feels generally proportionate although it is variable - it is often incorporated into existing set-ups and there is some evidence of mechanisms if / when problems arise plus there is SW’ own M&E processes.
- Projects who have a senior advocate / champion provide an important connection between governance and project management and delivery.

**Drawbacks**

- All projects / partnerships would benefit from SW officer input at the start to ensure fit for purpose governance and project management approaches - and this is especially evident for more complex projects.
- As part of the project planning phase, scope to address governance explicitly and ensure clarity of roles. Consider additional areas: project skills, find ways to co-create project with target group; address E&D; and sustainability.
Overall Analysis – Potential Learning

- At project approval stage applicants could be reviewed by SW to ensure there is sufficient resource and ability to manage governance at the project level including: planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation (1)

- In view of the targets for C4A the project planning stage could be extended and SW ensure these requirements are addressed by all projects: (i) issues of sustainability (ii) ensure the target group and equality and diversity agenda is core; and (iii) undertake a skills audit for project officers/managers and establish a training plan (2)

- There can be a danger that approved projects move to implementation too quickly and ahead of completing the above tasks as part of the project set-up. Also project implementation (activity) should be closely tied to project sustainability (3)

Note: These points are illustrated (1),(2),(3) on the next slide in summary form
Considerations for Governance & Project Management

A project process that includes governance as central to the project management (1) .....and ensure alignment with C4A by extending governance to include (2):

- Target group plus E&D
- Sustainability From the Outset
- Project Management / Officer Skills

.....and an emphasis on project set-up (3)
Project Partnerships

Under project partnerships each C4A project was analysed against a number themes which included:

- The type of project partner: traditional sporting partner; non-traditional sporting partner; non-traditional non-sporting partner
- Complexity of partnership arrangements: principal partner; principal partner +1 / Joint; and many partners involved
- The extent to which the project looks beyond sport and embraces other sectors: Local Authority; Health; Voluntary; BME; Education
- The extent to which sustainability considerations are relevant: Extended (refers to project extension); re-alignment of projects and project dates; and evidence where projects are addressing sustainability
## Partnerships Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional or New Partner</th>
<th>Complexity of Partnership</th>
<th>Cross Sector Working</th>
<th>Sustainability Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geo-caching</td>
<td>New NSP</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziggies</td>
<td>New NSP</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Housing, Education</td>
<td>Re-aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>New NSP</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>Traditional SP</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Health, Disability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTCW</td>
<td>New NSP</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Football</td>
<td>New SP</td>
<td>Principal +1</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGC</td>
<td>New NSP</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze</td>
<td>Traditional SP</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Us Girls</td>
<td>Traditional SP</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Re-aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bute GC</td>
<td>Traditional SP</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>Sport, BME</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>Traditional SP</td>
<td>Principal +1</td>
<td>Sport, BME</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partnerships – Project Level, Headline Analysis

- BBNP – Focus on different activity for SW (walking) and outdoors
- Ziggies – New partners collaborating, early years focus and peer to peer between parents
- LSC – Complex project revolving around cultural change; seeking wide scale collaboration
- Bridgend CBC – Co-produce with Disability Support Network, Impairment Groups, schools
- TTCW - New partnership between sport and health
- Street Football Wales – Extreme social exclusion, profile raised through support from actor
- Girl Guiding Cymru – Raising the profile of sport and challenging GGUK
- Breeze – Women into cycling, building on a successful pilot run by British Cycling
- Us Girls – Girls creating their own agenda, building on a pilot in England
- Bute GC – Joint partnership, developing trust between organisations
- Cricket Wales – Opening up an organisation to invite in the wider community

Abbreviations: BBNP = Brecon Beacons National Park; SW = Sport Wales; LSC = Large Scale Change; Bridgend CBC / BCBC = Bridgend County Borough Council; TTCW = Time to Change Wales; GGUK = Girl Guides UK; Bute GC = Bute Gymnastics Club.
Strengths and Challenges of Different Partnerships

**Strengths:**
- Sport Wales engaging with new partners
- Sport Wales engaging in new projects that are cross sector - some risks taken
- Confidence in the project lead partner

**Challenges:**
- Developing relations and trust with new partners takes time and understanding
- Learning from C4A: some ‘Looking out from sport’ & others ‘Looking into sport’
- Some partners still learning about SW and developing their relationship
- No private sector partners under C4A

Note: Looking out from sport refers to sporting organisations finding potentially non-sport ways to engage participants (socialising; health; beauty) and ‘Looking into sport’ refers to non-sporting organisations seeking support from sport (Girl Guides; Large scale change).
Overall Analysis – Potential Learning

- The next slide provides a matrix analysis of partnerships and projects
- The 12 projects are mapped according to partnership complexity and the potential learning suggests, ‘no one size fits all’
- Projects are rated green (most straightforward) amber (some complexity) and red (more complex as a new project and perhaps with a new partner)
- The highest risk and most innovative projects appear to be those identified as ‘context changers’ (under participation matrix) - these tend to have multiple partners
- The projects rated red suggest closer management and support from SW
Considerations of Project Partnership Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Many Partners</th>
<th>Time to Change Wales</th>
<th>Us Girls</th>
<th>Large Scale Change BME Ziggies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner +1</td>
<td>Bute Gymnastics</td>
<td>Street Football</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Principal Partner</td>
<td>Welsh Cycling, Welsh Cricket BBNPA</td>
<td>Girl Guides</td>
<td>Bridgend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Sport</td>
<td>Multi Sport</td>
<td>Context Changer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Arrow denotes line of potential innovation and risk
What Works

- This final question looked at the project analysis undertaken as well as the initial review of literature.
- At the project level, three specific examples are highlighted to demonstrate strengths ... and limitations as a means of developing learning.
- Looking at the wider literature, there are some interesting and relevant examples.
- Note the importance given to governance currently.
What Works – C4A Exemplars

- **Bute Gymnastics Club** – Focus from the outset on developing a joint partnership with Diverse Cymru and establishing a Steering Committee that involved the local community / target group. Leadership was very evident and time was spent on governance and project management. The commitment to ensure the partnership was jointly developed was time-consuming and required advocacy and flexibility. Sustainability is about creating a ‘forever club.’

- **Girl Guiding Cymru** – This is a new partner for Sport Wales. The project seeks to use sport as a way of raising the profile of Girl Guides Cymru and potentially to challenge Girl Guides UK who do not focus on sport. Time early on was spent at board level gaining understanding of the project and its importance. The GGC Chief Commissioner took lead responsibility and it has been a centrally run pilot project. Sustainability is about developing accredited sports leaders who can train other members thereby providing new leadership opportunities.

- **Us Girls** – Us Girls is run by Street Games who produced an analysis of the target market of ‘Little Lisa.’ This provided the focus for 33 projects to be working with inactive and semi-active 13-19 year olds living in deprived communities in Wales. Project management is a strength of Us Girls – each individual project required a plan (resulting in 33 individual service level agreements) together with robust quarterly monitoring that uses ‘views,’ with payment linked to compliance.
What Works – Wider Context Exemplars

Sport Wales, Governance and Leadership Framework for Wales (2015) – This focuses on seven principles of good governance which are enhanced by considering how each principle is put into practice by considering ‘minimum expectations’

UK Sport and Sport England, A Code for Sports Governance (2017) – This sets out new standards expected for any organisation seeking funding (annually) and is proportionate via three tiers: Tier 1 covers organisations funded up to £250K; Tier 2 covers organisations funded between £250 and £1 million; and Tier 3 covers organisations funded at over £1 million

WCVA, Good Governance Code (2012) – Although a focus on organisations the six principles of good governance are transferable to project governance

Audit Commission, Governing Partnerships (2005) – This provides some fundamental key questions about partnership governance and emphasises that there is no one size fits all solution to the governance of partnerships

IDeA, Making Partnership Work Better in the Culture & Sport Sector (2009) – This uses the PiiSA framework – p=purpose; i=influence; s=systems and structures; and a=action. It is based on a ‘balanced scorecard’ approach a well known performance management model that typically looks at four areas – financial; customer; internal processes; and learning and growth.
We have aimed to answer....

What are the strengths and drawbacks of different approaches to governance in terms of project delivery and effectiveness?

How have projects approached partnership arrangements and sustainability - what have been their strengths and drawbacks?

Are there examples of ‘what works’ that we can learn for future initiatives especially with regard to sustainability?
Relating these findings to the Independent Review

Section 6, Rec vi – ‘A more flexible and mixed funding approach should be considered by SW to allow for creativity, innovation and sport specific or local needs based solutions.’

Section 7, Rec ii - ‘In developing initiatives or new ways of working, Sport Wales should engage partners at the outset and adopt a transparent process where their views are considered and receive feedback.’

Section 8, Rec vi - ‘Managers should create an environment with SW where innovation and creativity is promoted and celebrated.’

Recognition that innovative programmes require risks and a shared understanding that some projects may not succeed. This thematic study on governance including partnerships has considered these issues.

If ‘hard to reach groups’ are to be successfully engaged, there was a sense from this thematic study that more attention could be given by SW earlier on to project governance and project management as pre-requisites before implementation commences.

There appeared to be different levels of commitment within SW regarding innovation. This thematic study reflected that the projects are very different and thus different levels of support from SW should be expected.
So what?

- The quality of governance of projects matters, and makes a difference to likely success or otherwise.
- That quality sometimes occurs ‘naturally’ but often has to be worked at actively, especially in territory which is ‘new’ either for Sport Wales or its delivery partner, or both.
- This puts responsibility on Sport Wales’ officers as well as project applicants to think through project partnership and governance arrangements at an early stage.
- By the same token, these new and different partnerships create new opportunities to sponsor participation amongst new and ‘hard to reach’ groups, involving partners that have real ‘sport’ capital to leverage with the people they work with......
- ...which makes the extra effort valuable, including the extra investment in training and developing Sport Wales officers so they are better equipped in guiding innovative partnerships.
Value for Money Thematic Study
Purpose of this Section

- To feedback to the Sport Wales Board and key stakeholders the findings and key themes of this thematic study
- Place the findings in the context of the Independent Review of Sport Wales
- Create the opportunity to apply key lessons to activities and objectives in the final year of the Programme and elsewhere in Sport Wales, its partners and other agencies
This section reports on three key questions:

1. How has Sport Wales and its partners assessed the VFM C4A, and are measures robust and appropriate?
2. What approaches to measuring VFM are available, and which might be relevant to C4A?
3. Can any reliable preliminary assessment be made of the value for money of C4A projects?
The Independent Review said ....

Section 3.9, Paragraph 1 - ‘There is an urgent need ..... to agree shared outcomes, budgets and performance measures and indicators to assess the impact and return on investment of individual departments and their external partners.’

Section 3.9 Recommendation ii) - ‘The policy statement/strategy should set out very clearly the shared outcomes, budgets and means by which the performance of all partners should be measured .... a transparent investment process.’

Section 5.14, Recommendation iv) - ‘Assessment tools should be developed to measure the sector’s impact and social return on investment and should form part of the evaluation of progress towards the wellbeing objectives Sport Wales sets itself.’
How have Sport Wales and its partners assessed VFM?
Most projects think value is important but (for understandable reasons) haven’t measured it
Views about measuring value

- Sport Wales officers and C4A projects agree that measuring value is important
- Some believe social value is more relevant than value for money
- Explicit measures of value were not included in the application process so they feel like a later ‘add on’
- A few projects have attempted to measure social value
- All projects would appreciate help to demonstrate their value
Most projects have measured

- Engagement and Participation
  - All projects record numbers of participants
  - A fifth also record systematically frequency and types of activities

- Direct costs – all projects

- Some have begun to measure savings to other services

Not surprisingly, direct costs per participant are high compared to conventional sport/physical activity programmes.
Most projects haven’t measured

- Indirect costs (just 20% of projects)
- Outcomes
- Value for money

Most have not benchmarked costs and benefits against other sports and physical activity programmes
The current state of play at project level

- Breeze - record participants, length of rides, health impact, CO2 benefits
- Ziggies – measuring social value
- Street Football Wales - evaluated value for money and social value
- Brecon Beacons National Park - added value (outcomes) recorded though not monetarised
- Welsh Gymnastics - participant numbers and scoping wider value attributable to the project
- Girl Guiding Cymru - internally focussed value for effort
- Bridgend – seeking credible evidence of savings to health and social care
- BME SC - important to demonstrate impact but don’t do so at the moment
- Large Scale Change - not formally measuring value
- Cricket Wales – very important though limited activity to date – community benefits
- Street Games – very important, could do more, delivery has been driver to date
What approaches are available and which might be relevant to C4A?
## Different methods answer different questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost effective analysis</td>
<td>Compares alternative projects to achieve the same goal</td>
<td>Which programme is most effective at achieving a stated outcome(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost utility analysis</td>
<td>Takes account of beneficiaries’ preferred outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost benefit analysis</td>
<td>Do benefits outweigh costs? Which projects offer best ratio?</td>
<td>Does the value created by a programme merit the cost of running it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social return on investment</td>
<td>Measures social, environmental and economic costs and benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank correlation of cost vs impact</td>
<td>Relative measurement of VFM across a menu of actions</td>
<td>What are the relative costs and benefits of different programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource efficiency analysis</td>
<td>Compares VFM between projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Fleming (2013)
Some recent approaches applied to sport

- **Sport England (2015) Saving Lives and Saving Money (Moves)**
  Online instrument (requiring a login) designed to help demonstrate the economic benefits of improved health through participation in sport and other forms of physical activity

  Physical Return on Investment tool produced by National Institute of Health and Care Excellence

- **Public Health England (2013) Health Impact of Physical Inactivity Tool**
  Models health benefits to society of increased physical activity
Some recent approaches applied to sport

- **Sport England (2015) Economic Value of Sport**
  Online tool used to provide an indicative, annual value for a range of different elements of the sports economy in England

  Online tool to estimate value of reduced mortality from specified amounts of walking or cycling

- **Betsi Cadwaladr and Disability Sport Wales Health Disability Sport Partnership and Health Impact Assessment and (2016) A Social Return on Investment Analysis**
  Concluded £1 investment in sport added £124 in value (physical and mental health and wellbeing of participants with disabilities)
Can any reliable preliminary assessment be made of the value for money of C4A projects?
The current data collected by Sport Wales and Projects don’t enable an assessment of value

More data are needed about all four components of value namely:

1. Costs
   - Direct and Indirect
   - Numbers of people and duration/intensity

2. Participants
   - Well being, new skills, more resilient communities

3. Outcomes
   - Reduced costs, efficiency and prevention savings, benchmark comparison

4. Savings
Measures of the value of C4A will need to include ....

**Costs**

- Direct costs – to Sport Wales and other funders
- Indirect costs – including offices and other equipment, volunteers’, parents’, coaches’ time

**Participants**

- Numbers of participants
- Frequency of activities
- Quality – nature, intensity and duration of activities
Outcomes

- Participants – e.g. confidence, motivation, skills, wellbeing
- Parents and siblings – e.g. family activities
- Communities – e.g. resilience, attitudes to girls’ sports participation, anti-social behaviour
- Economy – e.g. physically and mentally healthier workforce

Savings

- To health, social services, criminal justice and other services
C4A also requires a ‘multi-factor’ approach

Multi factor analysis for measuring 'value for money'

If $X = \£$ and $Y = \text{people}$ then typically $\frac{X}{Y} = \text{Unit cost per participant}$

But what if we have a menu of different values, some monetised, some not but more systematically comparable:

$P + Q + R + S + T$

e.g. participation + families + social contact + skills + volunteers = 

[Image showing icons of people, money, etc.]
The value ‘multi factors’ relevant to C4A

A number of indicators or factors are valued outputs or outcomes from increased participation. All can be measured but they cannot be simply summated as an overall monetary sum of value created, nor of savings made. Some cannot be readily equated with a monetary value, and many are best measured on different and largely incompatible scales.

- Number of participants and number of repeat participants
- Level of engagement of participants and whether they become ‘hooked’
- Changes in participants’ confidence – baselined on a rating scale and re-measured periodically
- Whether there has been significant behavioural change (eg where participation has led to better personal timekeeping and team working) – baselined and re-measured
- Whether there has been transformational changes (eg where participation has been the key to major life changes such as becoming properly ambulant) – systematically recorded
- Numbers of coaches and leaders and ambassadors trained/working as volunteers or employees
- Changes in organisational practice e.g. among clubs or governing bodies – measured through document review/interviews
- Increases in community engagement in and changing perceptions of sport participation
Applying the lessons to respond to the review

- There is strong qualitative evidence that C4A produces considerable value
- Some projects estimate the social return on investment but the data collected - by Sport Wales and projects – don’t allow cost/benefit or SROI analysis at programme level
- Measures of social value are vital to lever future funding from other sectors
- Projects need multi-factor approaches and dashboards of indicators
- Sport Wales should require evidence of outcomes/impacts and baselines at the application stage for projects like C4A
- Sport Wales could assist partners by providing frameworks and advice on measuring value – from its research team and/or a panel of external experts
Final Overview: The 3 Thematic Studies
Informing the Future

- The two critical and major planks for Sport Wales and for sport policy in Wales in the period ahead are:
  - The Independent Review
  - The Wellbeing Act

- C4A provides a very rich source of relevant evidence and ideas about:
  - Participation
  - Governance and Partnership
  - Value for Money and Social Return on Investment

- As set out in the body of this Report, that evidence can be leveraged to inform future direction in ways which will benefit hard to reach individuals and communities especially, and enrich Community Sport in Wales.