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| Summary  Key findings from the three year national evaluation of Inclusive Sport. |

# Project Background

Inclusive Sport is an investment of £10.2 million of National Lottery funding, by Sport England, in 42 projects (Round 1) around the country, with the aim of helping more young people and adults (aged 14+) with a disability play sport more regularly. The investment aimed to tackle the opportunity gap that sees considerably fewer disabled adults playing sport regularly, when compared to non-disabled adults, by developing understanding of what makes sport a viable choice for disabled people.

The evaluation was commissioned to create an understanding of what works, how and in what context. The final report focuses specifically on the key learnings that have arisen over the last three years of the national evaluation of Inclusive Sport; it includes results from participant surveys (two primary formats were used: a main survey for participants and a picture-based (easy read) survey for respondents with an intellectual impairment), a project lead survey, management information and case studies.

# Impact of Inclusive Sport: outcomes against the original objectives for the programme

In total, round 1 of Inclusive Sport funded 42 individual projects with the overall targets of engaging c.57,000 disabled people and c.878,000 attendances at project activities. Progress reporting against these targets provides a strong indication that the final project totals will be in excess of these target figures.

Results from both the project lead and participant surveys revealed positive results against key strategic outcomes for the Inclusive Sport initiative, these include (but are not limited to):

* A 35 percentage point increase in the proportion of disabled respondents who participated in sport for 30 minutes or more at least once a week (63% rising to 98%);
* A 13 percentage point increase in the proportion of disabled respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have more opportunities to take part in sport at a venue of their choice (33% rising to 46%);
* A 12 percentage point increase in the proportion of disabled respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that there are high quality opportunities available for them to take part in sport (47% rising to 59%);
* 96% of projects have improved partnerships between sporting and disability organisations; and
* 89% of project leads who responded to our survey agreed that they have a greater awareness of the barriers to disabled people taking part in sport.

For participants, a number of positive impacts emerged including: an increase in social capital, improved health (physical, mental and emotional) and an increase in confidence and self-esteem.

# Key lessons learnt from the process evaluation

The process evaluation identified key lessons learnt from the initiative and provided findings which would outline the best way to approach setting up a new Inclusive Sport.

#### Targeting and recruiting participants

Selecting **who** to target emerged as possibly the most significant challenge in the design and planning stage of an Inclusive Sport project. A key consideration for future projects is demographic prioritisation. Disabled people are often provided for based upon the fact that they have an impairment, however, Inclusive Sport projects emphasised the importance of giving at least equal weight to the consideration of other demographic characteristics too. Targeting ‘all disabilities’ can be a barrier to some potential participants and their family/carers who will perceive that the offer may not be specific enough for them.

The need for buy-in from friends/family and partnership(s) with disability organisations should not be under-estimated as they are deemed crucial for the successful recruitment and engagement of potential participants. It is important to note that these avenues may not always be the most reliable though and raising awareness of a project generally takes longer than expected. Most projects became known via word of mouth and personal networks which took time to get any traction.

#### Delivery offer

There were three models or approaches which emerged in regards to deciding on the offer to present/deliver:

* Specific sport focus: this model provided participants with the opportunity to undertake a single sport and to develop their ability in that area;
* Multiple sport offer: this model provided opportunities to undertake multiple different sports; and
* Taster/trial sessions: this model provided participants with the option to trial several different sports to find one that they particularly enjoy. They would then be signposted to opportunities to further pursue that sport.

In order to support participants effectively: know **how** participants will get to sessions and plan accordingly and have sufficient support available to enable participation.

#### Establishing a workforce

Key lessons realised in regards to workforce establishment included being prepared to need one-to-one support for participants – particularly if the target audience has more than one disability and having a constant strategy to recruit and retain volunteers to support staff and participants. Whilst sports knowledge and skills are valuable for staff, knowing how to apply these to specific impairments is essential for a successful project. If an organisation does not have these skills it is essential to seek a partner organisation that does – this will also help identify and recruit the target audience.

#### Partnership working

Establishing partnerships was viewed as critical for an Inclusive Sport project; multiple partners are likely to be needed for a project to be successful and often required partnerships will be with organisations that have not been worked with before. To overcome communication difficulties it is useful to map and identify the aims, objectives and priorities that align between partnering organisations.

#### Sustainability

There were two ways considered to achieve sustainability: 1) create a sustainable project infrastructure so that it can continue to deliver beyond the funding period and/or 2) signpost participants to opportunities to undertake sport outside of the funded project. Identifying partners was considered the greatest requirement for achieving sustainability because they are often able to provide the ability to complete the other infrastructure requirements.
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| 1. Introduction   This chapter outlines the background context, aims and objectives of the evaluation of Inclusive Sport projects (Round 1). |

This report provides the key findings over the three years of the national evaluation of Inclusive Sport projects.

# Places People Play: People Projects

Places People Play (PPP) was an investment of £155million designed to deliver a mass participation sporting legacy from the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The People strand of this initiative was designed to inspire people to make sport happen at the local level, embedding the Olympic and Paralympic values in grassroots sport. There are three strands to the People projects: Sport Makers, Club Leaders and Inclusive Sport. This report focuses on the evaluation of Inclusive Sport.

Inclusive Sport is an investment of £10.2 million of National Lottery funding, by Sport England, in 42 projects (Round 1) around the country, with the aim of helping more young people and adults (aged 14+) with a disability play sport more regularly. This investment aimed to tackle the opportunity gap that sees considerably fewer disabled adults playing sport regularly, when compared to non-disabled adults, by developing understanding of what makes sport a viable choice for disabled people.

For the Inclusive Sport investment, projects were required to provide evidence of current insight into disabled people’s needs, expectations and motivations as they relate to physical activity and sport. Additionally, they were expected to detail any previous successful activities that could be repeated or scaled-up with more investment and also state what sustainable links they would make to the disability sector.

# Project Background

CFE Research was commissioned to undertake an evaluation to assess the impact of the People strand of projects and provide an evidenced understanding of the processes and mechanisms by which the outcomes Sport England set out to achieve have been realised or not. This evaluation creates an understanding of what works, how and in what context. The evaluation of all three strands focused on three main objectives:

* Measure the impact and assess the value for money of Sport Makers, Club Leaders and Inclusive Sport;
* Find out what works, how, in what context and for whom; and
* Communicate the evidence effectively to optimise its influence on policy and practice and to demonstrate accountability for public investment.

Sport Makers[[1]](#footnote-1) and Club Leaders both ended previously and were evaluated separately by CFE Research on behalf of Sport England. Formative evaluation reports for Inclusive Sport have been produced for Sport England and this final report provides the summative findings over the full three years of the evaluation.

# Policy context

In December 2015 the Government published ‘Sporting Future: A New Strategy for an Active Nation’ (2015)[[2]](#footnote-2). At the heart of the strategy, Government sets out “five simple but fundamental outcomes”: physical wellbeing, mental wellbeing, individual development, social and community development and economic development.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The strategy makes a commitment to "distribute funding to focus on those people who tend not to take part in sport including women and girls, disabled people, those in lower socio-economic groups and older people.”[[4]](#footnote-4) Clearly, those groups with lower levels of participation are not exclusive and where there is overlap, barriers to participation may be even greater.

As this is a new strategy for sport in England, the evaluation framework developed here was not originally constructed to reflect this. However, it is possible, and useful, to consider the emerging findings in relation to this new strategy (Dec 2015). To do this, we consider the impact evaluation against four of the five broad outcomes described above, excluding only ‘economic development’ which was outside the scope of this evaluation.

A key area of focus for the evaluation is the barriers to disabled people participating in sport and physical activity and what we have learned about how to overcome them. We know from existing literature that there are a number of barriers to participation in sport for disabled people. For this evaluation we draw on the previous research by Mary-Anne Rankin (2012) for the English Federation of Disability Sport which grouped barriers into three main categories[[5]](#footnote-5):

* **Physical**: Adaptations and changes needed to support participation are not available / have not been implemented – this could be in terms of the facility, equipment or health and safety;
* **Logistical**:Logistics can include the location of activities/facilities, the expense of transport and/or of playing the sport, the support of others, communication issues and the suitability of a sport for a person’s disability; **and**
* **Psychological:** Attitudes, opinions and perceptions preventing participation in sport. This can include personal perceptions, as well as the attitudes of others.

As part of this report we will detail how Inclusive Sport projects have begun to tackle these barriers and how they have impacted participants, partners and lead projects in ways that meet four of the five ‘Sporting Future’ outcomes. To do this, we will outline best practice approaches to designing and delivering an Inclusive Sport initiative along with identifying key lessons learnt by participating organisations.

# This report

This report focuses specifically on the key learnings that have arisen over the last three years of the national evaluation of Inclusive Sport; it includes results from participant surveys, a project lead survey, management information and case studies. The report is structured into two distinct sections: an impact evaluation focusing on what the projects achieved and a process evaluation – looking at how projects were set-up and delivered. The impact evaluation covers the original programme objectives and the following four themes: physical wellbeing, mental wellbeing, individual development and social and community development – thus aligning to the new strategy for sport (December 2015). The process evaluation looks at what we have learned about how projects are set up; recruitment of participants, workforce development, partnership working and delivery.

Findings of the process and impact evaluation are presented in this report based around key themes, rather than methodological processes. Not all themes are covered by all data sources. All findings are based on ‘valid’ response rates with “don’t know”/”can’t remember” responses or missing answers removed from the analysis. Sample bases vary and are provided on all figures and tables. Responses have been rounded to the nearest decimal place and may not sum.

Please note that where comparisons are made with the baseline we have used the findings from the Year 2 survey. We have not aggregated data for Year 1 and 2 to provide a comparison as we were not able to eliminate the potential for double counting responses.

1. Impact evaluation

This chapter provides evidence and key learning from our evaluation of the impact of Inclusive Sport projects.

Many positive impacts emerge from our evaluation of Inclusive Sport projects, including: an increase in social capital, improved health (physical, mental and emotional), an increase in confidence and self-esteem, new organisational partnerships and increased disability awareness in communities. This chapter details the impacts of the programme in greater depth and presents the findings against the original programme objectives and under the key outcome headings of the government’s ‘Sporting Future: A New Strategy for an Active Nation’. It also details additional outcomes specific to the Inclusive Sport initiative.

# Outcomes against the original objectives for the programme

#### Throughput and participation targets

In total Round 1 of Inclusive Sport funded 42 individual projects with the overall targets of engaging 57,000 disabled people and 878,000 attendances at project activities. Progress reporting against these targets provides a strong indication that the final project totals will be in excess of these target figures.

#### Impact on 1x30

One of Sport England’s key strategic measures is the proportion of people who participate in sport at least one day a week for a minimum of 30 minutes. The evaluation of Inclusive Sport projects reveals that Sport England’s funding has achieved a 35 percentage point increase in the proportion of disabled respondents who participated in sport for 30 minutes or more at least once a week (63% rising to 98%). Inclusive Sport projects were most likely to see an increase in participation for disabled people for those individuals with an intellectual (learning) disability.

#### Attribution to the Inclusive Sport project

Our participant survey in Year 2 of the evaluation revealed that nearly half (46%, base=434) of respondents to the main[[6]](#footnote-6) online survey stated that they would not be able to play sport if their Inclusive Sport project did not exist. Over half of these respondents (51%, Base=197) were not participating in at least 30 minutes of sport per week prior to the beginning of their local Inclusive Sport project. In line with findings presented from our Year 1 survey, this suggests that projects have been successful in engaging disabled people who felt they were not previously able to take part in sport. The funding has also helped enable previous sporting participation to be continued, since 34% of main survey respondents, who *had* participated in sport prior to the project, stated that they would not be able to play sport if their Inclusive Sport project did not exist.

#### Impact on overall participation in sport

Inclusive Sport projects have not only successfully engaged disabled people in sport, but also enabled general participation levels to increase. As Figure 3 shows, respondents to both the picture (easy read)[[7]](#footnote-7) and main survey in year 2 indicate that they take part in sport more now than they did this time last year (71% and 69% respectively).

Figure : Variation in participation rates compared with this time last year (2015 v 2014) (Sample bases in parentheses)

Respondents to the project lead survey agree that a number of other key outcomes have been achieved by the programme:

* 98% agree that the programme has improved the quality of opportunities for disabled people to take part in sport;
* 98% agree that the programme has increased the number of disabled people seeing sport as a viable lifestyle choice;
* 96% of projects have improved partnerships between sporting and disability organisations; and
* 89% agree that they have a greater awareness of the barriers to disabled people taking part in sport.

The results of the participant surveys also revealed positive results against the key strategic outcomes for this initiative, as summarised in Table 1, below.

| **Strategic /Intervention Outcome** | **Indicator (Survey Question)** | **Baseline Result (%)** | **Year 1 Result (%)** | **Year 2 Result (%)** | **Percentage Point Change (since baseline)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Increase participation in sport | % of respondents who participated in sport on at least 1 day in the last week before and after engaging with their Inclusive Sport project | 63%  (before project)[[8]](#footnote-8) | 94% (after project) | 98% (after project) | + 35 |
| More disabled people see sport as a viable lifestyle choice for themselves | % of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: Sport is an important part of my life. | 61% | 67% | 61% | none |
| More opportunities to take part in a sport of their choice | % of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: I can take part in the sport of my choice | 45% | 59% | 55% | + 10 |
| More opportunities to take part in sport at a venue of their choice | % of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: I can take part in sport at a venue of my choice | 33% | 46% | 46% | + 13 |
| Higher quality opportunities are available for disabled people to take part in sport | % of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: Opportunities for me to take part in sport are of a high quality | 47% | 66% | 59% | + 12 |

Table : Progress against Strategic Outcomes for Inclusive Sport after 2 years

# Physical wellbeing

The evidence that sport provides physical benefits to participants is the primary reason that the government invests in increasing sport participation. The new sports strategy for England (December 2015) asserts that physical activity has proven to:

Reduce the risk of developing type 2 diabetes by 30-40%, and can reduce the risk of a range of medical conditions, including cancer, dementia, strokes, heart disease and depression.

* Sporting Future: A New Strategy for an Active Nation

Our project lead survey found that 91% of responding projects agreed that their Inclusive Sport project had improved the physical health of participants. Indeed, Inclusive Sport projects found that physical benefits achieved by participation included: increased fitness, weight loss and increased physical ability. This was also backed up by the qualitative fieldwork conducted. One participant described how their participation in one project improved their physical recovery following an accident and how this impacted on their employment prospects:

My physical recovery has come on leaps and bounds and I am now also a group exercise instructor so have started teaching classes too. I am very grateful for all the help I received from [the project] and for giving me the confidence to go back into the industry.

* Project participant

Some projects found that offering competition opportunities to participants spurred their desire to improve both their skill and fitness levels. Consequently, one project provided further training sessions for participants and also arranged healthy eating classes. Spinning classes were offered after the provided football sessions and swimming has also been supported. The increase in fitness has provided physical benefits such as improved stability and agility which has resulted in participants having fewer accidents. Some participants have lost weight and a couple of the players improved their fitness sufficiently that they entered the Great North Run to raise money for their project:

They’re going to be stronger. They’ll have more stamina. They’re going to be healthier but also the physical process of learning to play football makes them more stable on their feet. Makes them more agile. They’re less likely to have an accident because…on some of the training [it is] about not straining your muscles. That’s going to bleach in everything in their lives really.

* Henshaws

# Mental wellbeing

Physical activity can reduce stress and anxiety. Mastering new skills can increase confidence and self-esteem….Research has shown that exercise can be as effective as anti-depressants for those with mild clinical depression. These positive mental wellbeing outcomes are every bit as important as the physical benefits from [taking] part in sport.

* Sporting Future: A New Strategy for an Active Nation

The Sporting Future strategy states that there is currently a paucity of evidence between the precise links of mental wellbeing and sporting behaviours, however, Inclusive Sport projects report witnessing the positive impact of sports participation on the mental wellbeing of participants. The national evaluation has provided a number of statistical findings in regards to mental wellbeing and sports participation; the project lead survey in year 3 of the evaluation revealed that:

* 92% agreed that Inclusive Sport had improved the mental health of participants; and
* 98% agreed that the initiative had increased the personal development of participants (e.g. confidence, self-esteem).

The participants’ survey conducted in year 2 of the evaluation found that:

* 97% of respondents to the picture-based (easy read) survey stated that playing sports makes them happy – 75% of whom said it made them very happy; and
* 76% of respondents to the Year 2 main survey agreed that they enjoyed taking part in sport.

Happiness, improved confidence and greater self-esteem enable participants to improve their quality of life in a number of key ways illustrated in the figure below:

By improving the mental wellbeing of participants Inclusive Sport projects have seen a reduction in two of the key psychological barriers to participation – attitudes of others and lack of confidence – both were judged to be a barrier by fewer respondents in the Year 2 survey than in Year 1 (a reduction of 9 percentage points for both barriers).

# Individual development

Qualitatively, projects have reported a number of personal impacts to participants such as: improved behaviour, communication skills, social skills, team-work and leadership skills. One project found that individual skills have been more noticeably developed by older participants (18+) who projects have found are more likely to sustain participation than younger ones (who were perceived to ‘dip in and out’ of provision). As a result coaches have been able to develop the skills and abilities of the players which in turn has retained their interest levels in sport. One particular football team was impressed with the level of commitment and focus of the older payers and so they funded the development of the Level One Coaching Certificate for players aged 18+. Currently six players (across the country) have been through and completed the certificate and the individuals now assist in coaching mentoring other players.

Volunteering to support sporting activities is a primary intervention outcome of Inclusive Sport projects which seeks to see more disabled people acting as positive role models in the sport workforce. As noted above, indicatively, older respondents (25+ years old) are significantly more likely to volunteer in sporting activities than younger respondents (26% of 45+ years olds and 23% of 25-44 year olds compared to 8% of <18 year olds, although sample sizes are small). Individuals with a physical disability (25%) are significantly more likely to volunteer than those with other/multiple impairments (9%).

During the three years of the evaluation, Inclusive Sport projects have recruited new volunteers whilst also managing to retain existing volunteers. The last participant survey (Year 2) revealed that 23% of respondents (n=127) agreed that they currently support sporting activities as a volunteer or employee.

# Social & community development

As well as developing individuals, sport can help build stronger communities by bringing people together, often from different backgrounds, to make them feel better about where they live, improve community links and cohesion and build social capital.

* Sporting Future: A New Strategy for an Active Nation

Inclusive Sport projects have qualitatively evidenced an improvement in social and community development through the views of participants, parents, coaches, projects and even the Chair of a disability organisation:

‘I love it being here with my friends, I haven’t really got anyone to talk to at school’…These comments reflect the reasons why we want to increase participation in sport, not only to improve fitness and health but also to reduce isolation and improve general wellbeing for people with disabilities living in our community.

* Project participant and Inclusive Sport Project

(The project) has enabled 8 players (and their parents) to have social activities, evenings out, birthday parties…you can’t put a price on that.

* Football coach

It has improved his self-confidence and social abilities to a level that I didn’t even think existed.

* Parent

It can be isolating being the only person of a level of ability... (the project) helps with self-esteem….they show their medals and it provides more to talk about with peers.

* DSA Chairman

Almost all the respondents to the project lead survey (94%) agree that Inclusive Sport reduced the social isolation of participants. Linked to a reduction in isolation and improved social networks, a quarter of projects reported that they had achieved successes in moving the inclusivity agenda forwards. Working with partners to improve awareness of disability sports and encouraging sports providers to engage with disabled people has allowed many individuals to participate in mainstream, community sports:

Our first club link was with Brighton Table Tennis Club. We set up a disability session as part of their club offer and the session and integration of participants with disabilities in the club has gone from strength to strength. They have the opportunity to participate and also compete with all the main stream participants bringing together community cohesion, teaching young people about disabilities and allowing them to see it as normal.

* Inclusive Sport Project

Over two-thirds (67%) of respondents to the project lead survey agreed that Inclusive Sport increased social cohesion in the community. Perhaps the greatest contributor to this impact has been initiatives’ ability to move the inclusivity agenda forward. One example of this is how the initiative had challenged staff perceptions at one project in regards to what disabled people are capable of in a sporting capacity:

I have thoroughly enjoyed being part of the project and have nothing but praise [for the person] who brought in clients in electronic wheelchairs with severe learning difficulties. I couldn’t see what one client would be able to do in the gym and yet I observed [the person] completing an effective workout with them. Having [the person] at the club and watching him work with his clients from the day centre was an education for all the staff including myself. It made us realise that all members can achieve some form of physical fitness regardless of disability.

* Project partner

1. process evaluation

This chapter provides the key findings of the process evaluation of Inclusive Sport projects (Round 1). It presents the evidence and key learning from the three years of the national evaluation, outlining ‘what works’ in designing, setting up and running an Inclusive Sport project.

A process evaluation, examines the delivery of a programme, the quality of its implementation and the organisational context, personnel, structures and procedures. We have taken the key lessons learned from our evaluation of the Inclusive Sport initiative and present below ‘what works’ in the design and delivery of such projects and outlined issues to be aware of and how these may be overcome. Please note that the variety of projects undertaken as part of this initiative means that not all options hold true in all contexts.

# Planning an Inclusive Sport project

Through the online survey of project leads, semi-structured interviews and case studies we explored what lessons could be learned about the planning stage of Inclusive Sport projects. One message which emerged clearly from this was that it is important to undertake a mapping exercise of current offers in the local area for disabled people prior to setting up any new opportunities. Some projects found that the target group they had selected to work with were already well catered for in the local area whilst others found it hard to identify and contact the groups they had chosen to work with.

Our biggest challenge was the variety of other projects that cater for exactly the same target group within the local area.

* Inclusive Sport Project

Investment in a new project or scheme may not be required, rather it may be more beneficial to combine your aims/objectives with an existing offer, working collaboratively to increase participation. Once aware of the offers in the local area, the following considerations have emerged from the evaluation as a useful scoping exercise prior to setting up a new project/opportunity:

1. **Who** is your target audience? What provision already exists for them in your local area?
2. **What** problem are you trying to solve? **What** opportunity/offer do you wish to present?
   1. Does it already exist, could an existing offer be improved to provide the offer without a new project being set up?
   2. Would the opportunity suit an alternative target audience if your initial choice is already well catered for locally?
3. **When** do you plan to deliver your offer?
4. **Where** will you deliver your offer (location and type of venue)?
5. **How** will you make your audience aware of your offer?

#### Who: Selecting your target audience

Selecting who you wish to target emerged from the evaluation as possibly the most significant challenge in the design and planning stage of an Inclusive Sport project. A key consideration is demographic prioritisation. Disabled people are often provided for based upon the fact that they have an impairment, however, Inclusive Sport projects emphasised the importance of giving at least equal weight to the consideration of other demographic characteristics too. For example, due to the narrow gap between physical and cognitive ability, irrespective of age, for individuals with Down’s Syndrome, provision is often based on wide age ranges which can be uncomfortable for older participants and act as a barrier to participation:

(It is) hard to take a 21 year old when there are 6 and 7 year olds playing.

* Parent

Similarly, the available provision may be less appealing to a specific gender, for example, female participants over the age of 14 showed a decline in interest in DSActive due to its predominant football focus:

(This isn’t specific to us but) There is a significant drop off from the ages of around twelve to fourteen of girls and women and that’s because they pick up different interests.

* DSActive Sports Manager

The majority of (Round 1) Inclusive Sport projects (95%) provided opportunities to take part in sport to groups of disabled people with a mixture of impairment types; 82% of projects provided activities for disabled people to take part alongside non-disabled people. However, almost a third (32%) of participants indicated a preference for ‘participating in sport with people who have a similar disability to me’. Female participants in particular were more likely to have a preference for taking part in sport with people with similar impairments (35%) than males (29%). Consequently, it is important to consider whether pan disability provision is appropriate for your offer as your target audience may not agree with you. The key here is to understand the local target audience for your project and not make generalisations or assumptions about what opportunities would best meet local needs.

Disabilities get lumped together. What is appropriate for one is not for another.

* Parent

One potential target group that is often under-provided for are adults (aged 18+) with a disability. There is provision to participate in sport for disabled children and young people (through school) and for older individuals (through day centres) but limited opportunities for individuals after they leave school. Cost and limited support networks emerged as significant barriers for this target group to access provision. Some Inclusive Sport projects found success in reaching this target group by expanding junior programmes to adults, for example Henshaws and DSActive.

|  |
| --- |
| Case Study 1: Involving disabled adults in sport – Henshaws[[9]](#footnote-9)  Henshaws ran a programme called *Skill Step* that was a lottery funded 10 week programme that focussed on IT, looking for work, personal and social development. One individual on the programme was interested in football and got paid employment at the Newcastle United Foundation [the foundation]. Part of the project was to get a team of visually impaired players together. Henshaws generated significant interest but mainly in adults and the programme was for under 14 year olds – which is primarily for whom the foundation receives funding support for. The youth project saw visually impaired children and their parents being motivated by sports participation. The children were eating less crisps and sweets and focussing on fitness in order to play better football. Henshaws saw the positive outcomes of providing sporting support to the children and wanted to expand the opportunity to adults. However, the provision for sport for adults with a disability was still extremely limited. A unique partnership The unique partnership set-up between Henshaws Newcastle and the Newcastle United Foundation would not have been generated if it had not been for the one individual who accessed Henshaws for *Skill Step.* Henshaws has community services in Greater Manchester & Merseyside, but it is only in its North East service based in Newcastle that it has such a partnership. It was this partnership that applied for the Sport England’s Inclusive Sport funding opportunity. An application that could only occur because of the knowledge held by both partners:  We sort of went through the application and thought, well, you know...I don’t understand all this stuff and he’s like [partner from the Newcastle United Foundation] well, that’s this and that’s what that means...They’re asking me to do this because they want to show it’s sustainable...I don’t know what’s a club mark...All these things which I’d never come across before and he helped us to kind of navigate some of that stuff.  **Henshaws**  The bid was successful and as a result, an adult team of visually impaired football players was formed from the interest initially generated during the *Skill Stop* project. A group of players who stated that prior to the project, there was no opportunity for them to participate in sport:  They’ve all said....that they wouldn’t have done any sport at all or they certainly wouldn’t have done football. They never thought they could do this because they didn’t know there was somewhere they could go where they could develop the skills where they felt safe. Where someone understood their needs...  **Henshaws** The project – Visually Impaired Adult Football Development The funding allows for a fixed weekly session of football for adults with visual impairments, 48 weeks of the year. No sessions have been missed since the project started in January 2013. Over the year, the players have improved in skill and fitness and the team has now entered a tournament in Sunderland. Having a competition level to the project has allowed players to focus on improving their skills and become a more cohesive team – it has also provided a goal – to win. By having a goal, the weekly sessions become more than simply a ‘pass-time’ for the players.  It exposes competition and highlights where [they] need to improve... [it] motivates [them] to be better.  **Henshaws**  In order to improve their skills and fitness levels, players are attending further training sessions and undertaking healthy eating classes. Spinning classes are offered after football and swimming sessions have been supported. Newcastle City Council has been working with Henshaws to develop the offer over time and has now become a major delivery partner. The Team The picture below is the Henshaws Visually Impaired football team wearing their new uniforms. The team raised the money for their kit which was selected to be visible to all the players both indoors and out.  Henshaws Team.jpg |

Case Study : Involving disabled adults in Sport - Henshaws

#### What: Deciding on the offer to present/deliver

There are several models that can be adopted to provide opportunities for disabled people to participate in sport; selecting which models or approaches to follow is a key primary task. The three models which emerged from the evaluation of Inclusive Sport projects (Round 1) are:

1. **Specific sport focus:** This model provides participants with the opportunity to undertake a single sport and to develop their ability in that area. Projects that were most likely to offer a single sport option provided opportunities in football, cycling and table cricket. These were sports that had ample existing provision in a local area and were often surrounded with opportunities for an individual to follow a progression pathway. As the participant gains confidence and ability in the sport they progress to participating in clubs and leagues in their local area. This model is most likely to be used with a target audience with a specific impairment.
2. **Multiple sport offer**: In this model projects provide opportunities for disabled participants to undertake multiple different sports. This has typically been delivered by an organisation who has regular contact with a particular cohort of disabled people. The delivery can vary from running a set number of weeks of a particular sport and then changing to a new one to providing the cohort with a number of options so that individuals can participate in a sport of their preference. This model is most likely to be used with a mixed target audience based in a single location. It will often involve providing opportunities for multiple age ranges and/or pan disability.
3. **Taster/trial sessions:** This model provides participants with the option to trial several different sports to find one that they particularly enjoy. They would then be signposted to opportunities where they could further pursue that particular sport. 93% of funded projects in round 1 provided this as an opportunity (though not necessarily exclusively as the only model). It is worth noting that there is currently a gap in knowledge as to the proportion of individuals who 'convert' from trying a new sport to regularly participating. Future funding of similar projects would benefit from encouraging monitoring mechanisms which record such conversions.

#### Competition

Regardless of the model/type of approach adopted, offering competition opportunities is another key consideration in project design. The evaluation found that offering the opportunity to compete was well received by participants with projects citing the following as key benefits for them:

* Providing a sense of progression/achievement (91% of projects agreed with this);
* Developing personal skills (84%) and
* Increasing enjoyment in the sport (84%).

By having a goal, the weekly sessions become more than simply a ‘pass-time’ for the players:

*It exposes competition and highlights where [they] need to improve… [it] motivates [them] to be better.*

* Inclusive Sport Project

Other benefits reported include improving mobility skills and social interaction. As such, it is unsurprising that two-thirds of projects surveyed (66%) offer regular opportunities for participants to take part in competition through their project. Competition opportunities offered include:

* Opportunities to play against other participants in sessions (83%);
* Opportunities to play in a league or formal competition (61%); and
* Opportunities to ‘compete in friendly games with players/teams in the local area’ and ‘outside the local area’ (both 56%).

There are some potential negatives to providing competition opportunities, these included an increase in logistical issues; the creation of practical issues (such as matching skills and capabilities) and increasing costs for participants. However, 73% of funded projects believe that, despite the potential negatives, on balance, Inclusive Sport projects should offer competitive opportunities (just 2% thought they should not and 26% said maybe).

#### When: Scheduling

Selecting when to deliver the sporting offer also emerged as of paramount importance through the evaluation. This can be particularly challenging given the number of resources and individuals who would be required to be involved. Participants often have busy and inflexible schedules due to medical appointments, structured routines to manage their impairment and reliance on others/public transport for access to any opportunities.

*I’d like to play more sport during the week but I cannot make it to clubs in time due to school transport*

* **Inclusive Sport participant**

*Most clubs (in my local area) are on the SAME DAYS- please Saturday AFTERNOON- nothing happens then!!!*

* **Inclusive Sport participant**

Consideration of the availability of friends/family/carers who may need to provide transport or support during the activity also needs to be considered, as well as venue availability and staff/volunteer availability. Round 1 funded projects have found it very challenging to accommodate everyone’s availability, particularly in relation to sourcing a suitable time to access a venue. Suitable times for participants often clash with school/club bookings.

Scoping venue availability against suitability for participants and staff availability is critical before any opportunity if offered.

#### Where: location

Finding a suitable location is critical to the success of any Inclusive Sport delivery; participants responding to surveys in the evaluation indicated that they were not always able to access sports activities at the right venue (29% in Year 1 and 27% in Year 2). Location preference is often given to venues currently used by disabled people, public sporting venues (e.g. council run gyms) and public, open spaces; however, project staff and participants identify the following challenges with those potential locations:

1. Playing sports at venues currently used by disabled people for other activities [e.g. day centres / community halls] is viewed as difficult because of the lack of space or due to the fact that the area that could be used for sport is not sufficiently differentiated as a ‘playing space’ for example, a car park;
2. Sports venues can be difficult to arrange at suitable times for disabled people’s schedules. For example, participants stated that ‘good’ times for availability would be between 11am – 3pm. This time slot allows for individuals to be brought to day centres by transport, receive medications and attend a sporting activity. It also allows for individuals to return home via provided transport in time to receive care at home. However, these time slots are often utilised by local schools and are unavailable. In addition, some individuals find going to a sports centre with ‘lots of fit sporty people’ to be very intimidating; and
3. Playing sport in public open spaces can provide issues in regards to participants feeling ‘self-conscious’. Disabled people have reported that people ‘staring’ and dogs trying to ‘join in’ had deterred them from wanting to use free public open spaces.

As well as considering safety, availability and sufficient demarked space, Inclusive Sport projects must also assess a venue’s suitability in relation to the disability(s) of the target audience. For example, when providing football sessions for the visually impaired, one project accessed a football training facility but learnt the following key lessons:

* It was necessary to learn the venue layout so that players could navigate the grounds safely. This included many things such as knowing where the changing rooms and toilets were, to how a broken lamp in the car park caused great difficulty for a visually impaired person to navigate their surroundings;
* The lighting inside the venue can affect accessibility of a game for some players: the highly polished surface of the indoor space made it difficult to distinguish the ball for some players. Adjusting the lights between emergency and main lighting established the right level that was required; and
* Sharing spaces with other sporting activities can be detrimental: visually impaired football is a game played primarily on ‘sound’ so sharing an indoor space with another sporting activity can detract from the players’ ability to participate.

One way to overcome these issues is to identify alternative venues:

*We have tried to identify new venues and partners that can help us deliver sessions that meet the needs of participants- e.g. working with university sports teams who already have access to sports hall space.*

* **Inclusive Sport Project**

A second, and more innovative approach has been that taken by the Motivate East project who explored the feasibility of creating a ‘throw down mat’ to take to day centres and community spaces, effectively making the space a differentiated sports space:

*Let’s take sports to them, make them feel [that they are] in a sporting environment.* **Motivate East**

The case study below provides information on their approach in more detail.

|  |
| --- |
| Case Study 2: The participation mat – Motivate East and the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) Innovating the participation mat The team at LLDC designed a participation mat that is described to be akin to a judo mat ‘but lighter’. The mats are:   * Brightly coloured and come in sections so they can be sized to fit most spaces; * Useable indoors and out as they are waterproof; * Designed with Velcro lines so that they can be marked out for a number of different sports, including (but not limited to): Boccia, wheelchair basketball, sitting volleyball, bowling and New Age Kurling; and * Soft to ‘break falls’ but rigid enough to allow a non-slip surface and provide ‘grip’ for wheelchairs.  Benefits of the participation mat The mat has a number of benefits:   * Taking the sport to the disabled person overcomes the barriers of transport and accessibility of a venue; * The mat provides the opportunity to play sport in a safe environment that the participants are familiar and comfortable with, allowing them to enjoy participation in a positive manner; * The size of the mats ensures that numerous individuals can take part in a sport at any one time; consequently more individuals can play frequently rather than on a rotational basis; and * The Velcro strips depict numerous sports to provide variety rather than restricting individuals to one type of sport offer.   Mats.jpg  Impact of the mats  Tower Project is a day service, based in Tower Hamlets. They have 60 service users aged 19-45 years old with most between 24-35 years of age. There are a diverse range of abilities from complex to mild/moderate learning disabilities and people on the autistic spectrum. There is a high demand within the local community for sporting activities for adults with disabilities. Staff at the Tower Project are keen advocates of sport for providing positive mental health and they aim to ensure a sporting activity occurs every week at their centre. However, they find it difficult to maintain sporting fixtures in the local area for all their users because of transport issues [having 24 wheelchair users], the lack of availability of local venues at convenient times and dealing with the confidence and self-conscious issues experienced by disabled people when playing sporting activities where other people can watch them. Consequently, sport is undertaken on a rotational basis so not all service users can access the sport weekly, nor can they all play together and in some cases service users are unmotivated to participate.  The charity was approached by Motivate East to use the mats and have used them on loan, once a week for the majority of the summer months to provide sporting activities for all their service users. Motivate East brought the mats to the Tower Project, set them up and showed staff how to assemble them. The mats have been used in the project’s outdoor space providing service users with:  *A sense of freedom, fresh air, [it is not ] stuffy [like indoor sporting venues] and [it provides] a safe environment.*  **Tower Project**  *[Which sports did you try?] We tried everything, we would like them permanently. When you have proper equipment they played on and on because they are all marked out and have a ‘different feel’. [They are] bright colours, attractive, [everyone] wanted to take part – they had to take turns....before they just watched and didn’t want to play.... [The mats are] well laid out and very safe... [they have made sport] accessible for everybody.*  **Tower Project** |

Case Study : The participation mat– Motivate East and LLDC

#### Transport

Participants require ease of access to sessions and if public transport is not available from their home to the activity location this dissuades individuals attending. This is a particular issue for those participants living rurally and/or with mobility impairments. Further, not all disabled participants are confident in using public transport alone. Without access to public transport, individuals rely on the commitment of a friend/family/carer to take them to sessions and this can be difficult to arrange/secure on a regular basis.

As a key barrier to participation, transport to activity was a focus for many projects. A number of approaches have been used to overcome this issue:

* Sourcing a transport provider to cater for the project’s needs
* Ensuring the sessions are available aligned with when public transport is running
* Providing volunteers to accompany participants on their transport routes until they gain confidence to undertake it on their own or with another participant:

Where possible the befriender nature of the project will extend here to see volunteers help these young people access public transport and manage their schedules in order to attend the sessions they would like to take part in.

* Inclusive Sport Project
* Running sessions that include friends/family/carers so that attend at the same time and provide transport support

#### How: Marketing methods

Once the ‘*who, what, where and when*’ has been established, it is important to consider *how* the target audience will be made aware of what opportunities are on offer. The participant and project lead surveys provided some key insights into the types of marketing methods organisations could consider when advertising any sporting or physical activity opportunity to disabled people.

Initially, funded projects utilised a number of different methods to advertise with posters/leaflets (96%) and via word of mouth (95%) being the most employed approaches. Although marketing opportunities by visiting employers was not a well-used approach, those that did so (13%) found it to be a successful marketing method (86% who used employers to advertise opportunities found it a successful method).

Traditional avenues for discovering information – internet searches (3%) and newspapers/magazines (2%) – were very infrequently the means through which a potential participant became aware of opportunities to take part in sport/physical activities. It is unclear to what extent this was because individuals did not search these channels or because they did search but information was unavailable.

The quantitative elements of the evaluation found that the most successful marketing method was perceived to be advertising via existing community organisations/clubs (75% of projects stated this) and the largest proportion (43%) of participants stated this was how they became aware of an Inclusive Sport project). Whilst working with organisations who have existing contact with disabled people is a primary way to contact them about sporting opportunities, this approach focuses recruitment on individuals who already have access to support networks. A potential solution to this, is to recruit potential participants indirectly via their friends/family/carers.

The qualitative fieldwork undertaken for the evaluation emphasised the importance of directing marketing to friends/family/carers in order to ensure that increased awareness of sporting offers is made available to target audiences; interviewed parents widely acknowledged that it would be unlikely that their child would search for opportunities themselves. As part of any marketing to third parties (friends/family etc.) the evaluation found that it is important to reassure people that adequate support will be provided and that the disabled person is able to take part. Some projects found this a particularly difficult hurdle to address. It may be worthwhile obtaining testimonials from current participants and friends/family members whose attitudes towards an active lifestyle have changed because of Inclusive Sport. Alternatively, a successful approach has been to provide sessions where both the disabled person and their family/friend/carer are able to participate. However, consideration needs to be made as to suitable timings with family members (if required for support and transport) preferring evenings/weekends, but venue availability and participant preference tend to be towards daytime or weekdays.

Inclusive North Tyneside, a round 1 funded Inclusive Sport project, utilises a mixed method approach to marketing their opportunities but focused on maximising the successful method of using word-of-mouth and existing organisations/community clubs to reach their target audience. The case study below details their approach.

|  |
| --- |
| Case Study 3: Mixed method marketing approach – Inclusive North Tyneside  This project aimed to utilise multiple marketing methods to ensure the greatest coverage and visibility to raise awareness of the activities they had to offer. Although multiple methods were utilised, the project focused on the knowledge that ‘word of mouth’ is the most successful avenue in terms of raising awareness with disabled people; as such, each method utilised worked with that premise in mind.  ***Please note Sport North Tyneside is the recognised brand for sporting provision in the local area; Inclusive North Tyneside is a sub-part of that brand and refers to the disability sports provision in the local area.***   1. **Inclusive North Tyneside is advertised on the Sport North Tyneside website:** By providing information on disability sports provision using the known brand of Sport North Tyneside, the project was able to achieve the following:    1. By providing the information alongside mainstream advertising the opportunities for being seen by a wider audience were higher. As such, there were greater opportunities for provision to be discussed via ‘word of mouth’;    2. Disability sports provision was listed alongside mainstream provision, for example, summer camps; it was therefore clear that there were sporting opportunities available for all;    3. Using a recognised, known and established brand allowed for cost-savings and a higher chance of sustainable marketing after the funding period would cease; and    4. As the website is well used, it is regularly updated with weekly timetables and specific sessions advertised clearly meaning that information was current, timely and trustworthy.   Specific searches via a search engine for ‘disability sport’ and ‘North Tyneside’ automatically sent a user to the disability section of the website. Therefore awareness could be raised via direct searches and also indirectly through visiting mainstream sources directly.  In addition, the website has a section on ‘accessibility’ which details how to access the information in a variety of formats making the site accessible for everyone, such as those with visual impairments.   1. **Social Media (Facebook and Twitter):** Similar to the website, social media runs through the recognised brand of ‘Sport North Tyneside’ and so has the same benefits listed above. As a tool, Twitter is, in effect, an electronic ‘word of mouth’. The Sport North Tyneside has over 1,500 followers who share the content posted to their networks. 2. **Direct mailshots:** Inclusive North Tyneside had a launch event which attracted a large number of disabled people. Individuals and organisations who attended the launch were asked to provide their email address in order to stay informed of the provisions that would be made available as part of the project (and beyond). This initial database grew over the course of the project as organisations and individuals told others about the provision – the majority of contacts, since the launch event, have been generated via ‘word of mouth’ or through the project’s outreach work. 3. **Outreach:** The project staff undertook outreach work contacting local organisations and informing them of the sporting offer. Taster sessions were offered to organisations which generally led into more sustained provision over time. For example, LD North East undertook 6 taster sessions for archery with their users and has now requested frequent archery sessions to be delivered which are financially subsidised by participants. 4. **Referrals:** Referrals to the project could be made by local NHS Centres and also disability organisations. 5. **Posters/leaflets/flyers:** Printed media was available across the local area in places such as the Council, leisure centres and disability organisations such as LD North East – places where disabled people, or those working closely with them, are most likely to access. A standardised template was utilised which included the recognised Sport North Tyneside branding: 6. **Incentives:** To encourage participation in sessions and to advertise the project more widely, incentives were offered to participants, these included: branded drawstring bags and water bottles as well as family passes to sporting facilities/sessions. |

Case Study : Mixed method marketing approach – Inclusive North Tyneside

# Establishing a workforce

Access to a sufficiently skilled workforce emerged as another important component for delivering an Inclusive Sport project. The project lead survey revealed that the most essential skill for staff employed in an Inclusive Sport project was ‘soft people skills’ (95%). Other key skills required included: participation coaching skills and experience (87%), disability-specific skills (86%) and sport-specific skills (82%).

One reason why disability-specific skills may be slightly more important than sport-specific skills is because understanding a disabled person’s impairment, and any impacts that may have on their participation in a sport, is key to that individual’s ability to be able to fully participate and enjoy the sport. Individuals with multiple impairments can have very high levels of support needs and this can put a strain on delivery resources:

Meeting the individual need of the young people, enabling them to participate in a meaningful way [is a challenge]. This includes young people with social, emotional and behavioural needs, mental health and disabilities. Our sessions involve the support of specialist trained staff to compliment the sport facilitation. The sports staff do not have the expertise to independently run the sessions. Although we are committed to training existing staff additional support is required to manage risk etc.

* Inclusive Sport Project

It was not felt that performance coaching skills experience was essential for coaches and leaders in an Inclusive Sport setting (27%). Other staff skills that projects have found useful include: mental health awareness, enthusiasm, club promotion skills and problem solving skills:

It very much depends on the nature of the activity as to how qualified the coach should be, all sports sessions should provide opportunity for skill development so a coach needs to have a good knowledge… disability knowledge and experience can make a difference to how comfortable disabled people feel, however it is not necessarily in depth knowledge that is required but an inclusive ethos and problem solving attitude. Those with impairments should play a pivotal role in championing and leading the activity.

* Inclusive Sport Project

A key workforce challenge for delivery emerging from the evaluation is organisational change resulting in staff leaving or not having sufficient staff in place to provide support to participants. This can restrict an organisation’s capacity to deliver. Whilst it can be difficult to mitigate for organisational change, projects did develop strategies to help increase resources to manage the delivery of their projects. This included the recruitment of new staff and recruiting volunteer support workers.

The challenging behaviours and complex needs of some clients continue to require us to provide one-to-one support. We are therefore recruiting volunteer Support Workers to support our paid staff as well as provide trained cover for staff leave.

* Inclusive Sport Project

Dealing with organisational change and employing mitigation strategies will have a knock-on effect on delivery costs and this can be detrimental where budgets are very tightly managed. One project saw an increase in costs when their organisation introduced holiday pay for their staff and another project overspent on their budget for the mileage rate paid to staff due to increases in the cost of travel.

# Partnership working

[Inclusive Sport] has resulted in a merger of the sporting sector with the disability support sector on a scale that has not been achieved for many years.

* Inclusive Sport Project

The evaluation found that partnership working is crucial to the success of Inclusive Sport projects. It requires a wealth of skills and experience, resource and commitment to provide the necessary conditions to enable inclusivity in sport and physical activity for disabled people. This is not something that one organisation can currently achieve on their own.

#### Types of partnerships established

A number of different types of partnerships have been developed across Inclusive Sport projects. Some partnerships were already in existence prior to this investment being made and these partnerships were most likely to have occurred with Local Authorities (54% of projects agreed)[[10]](#footnote-10). The partnerships that were already in existence but were strengthened by the Inclusive Sport initiative were the following types of organisation:

* National Governing Bodies (50%);
* Community sports clubs (52%);
* Community groups (54%):
* Charities (54%); and
* Schools/colleges/universities (55%).

Finally, in order to establish an Inclusive Sport project many organisations *had* to set up new partnerships. These were most likely to occur with health providers such as the NHS (36%), community groups (33%) and charities (30%). Projects were unlikely to set up partnerships with either private businesses (62%) or local town and parish councils (61%).

## purpose and benefits of partnerships

A number of reasons were identified in the evaluation as to why partnerships are required in order to successfully design and deliver an Inclusive Sport project. This section examines those reasons in further detail.

#### Recruitment and Marketing

Partnerships provided an opportunity for Inclusive Sport projects to identify and reach the target audience and inform them about provision as well as a means to engage people to participate in sport:

* Three-quarters of projects have been able to use their partners’ networks and reputation to market their provision and recruit participants.
* Two-fifths of projects highlighted that they rely upon referrals from their partners to recruit participants to their projects.

One project explained that working with a disability organisation helped to break down barriers in engaging participants:

Working in partnership with these organisations enables project staff to engage with potential participants in a very effective way as they are much more trusting of new workers and projects if their support workers are present. Support workers also have the capacity to accompany participants to sessions which goes a long way to removing the fear of accessing a new facility or activity.

* Inclusive Sport Project

Another project highlighted the mutual benefits experienced by the service user and the partner organisation:

These groups provide invaluable support through the referral of individuals to [our project] recognising the mutual benefit that the programme offers to many of their own service users as they become involved in regular sports participation.

* Inclusive Sport Project

Recruitment and marketing has occurred either by disseminating information via email, newsletter or during consultation or by presenting information in drop-in sessions and events. For example, one project provided marketing resource for contacting all people with a specific impairment within a local radius via their membership database. This allowed the sporting team to advertise their local offer to potential players. Further, the database was used to inform players about local, regional and national fixtures which sporting teams saw as the strength of the partnership offer because players wanted the opportunity to compete.

Examples of partners used to market provision include: sport clubs, leisure centres, County Sports Partnerships (CSPs), National Governing Bodies (NGBs), schools, local authorities, health care and disability organisations.

#### Workforce establishment

Partnerships have been used to assist in the recruitment of staff at the design stage of projects and the recruitment of volunteers during the delivery stages. For example, the project BID Services used their partners to advertise job vacancies for the project and successfully appointed a Deaf Inclusive Sports officer and coaches.

In addition, projects reported working with their partners to train their staff and volunteers. Sports clubs and organisations frequently provided crucial coaching training and qualifications to enable projects to deliver their provision. Meanwhile, disability organisations provided training which focused on working with disabled people and special educational needs. The example below is how DSActive worked with local football coaches:

They taught us how to read facial expressions, use Makaton[[11]](#footnote-11)....packs were provided to hand out with bullet points on the main traits of Down’s; problems they find, case studies, coaching suggestions, warm up game examples...It is a really good resource and they are very helpful when you get in touch.

* Football Coach

A couple of projects also reported the need to occasionally provide training to their participants to overcome issues with regards to using public transport independently. This was sometimes provided by partnerships with other organisations. One project explained:

The training is particularly useful in supporting young people accessing [the project] and can potentially help them travel to and from their chosen sport.......where appropriate.

* Inclusive Sport Project

#### Delivery partners

Partnerships remain pivotal in the delivery of provision as outlined by approximately half of projects. Organisations such as local sports clubs, leisure centres, schools, universities and charities are working with projects to deliver sessions or provide suitable coaches, equipment or venue space.

Around a quarter of projects report engaging with their partners and their respective networks to tailor their provision. This is paramount to recruiting participants and ensuring that the project has longevity, as described by this project lead:

[The organisation] understand and value the importance of partnership working to meet the needs of users and achieve high quality support and outcomes. [The organisation] engage with parents and carers who provide essential insights enabling support staff to better understand and support the needs and behaviours of individual users.[The organisation] have learnt from experience that a joined up approach is essential to support and sustain lifestyle changes.

* Inclusive Sport Project

Some projects have experienced practical delivery issues when differing priorities and difficulties in communication have occurred between organisations. For example, sporting organisations have had difficulties understanding why care facilities make decisions on participation for individuals (as opposed to the disabled person making the decision themselves). It can take time to understand organisational priorities and to communicate effectively and this can impact on delivery.

The case study below provides an example of a funded project that developed a significant number of partnerships as part of their Inclusive Sport project.

|  |
| --- |
| Case Study 4: Maximising partnership utilization –  Royal London Society for the Blind (RLSB)  As a charity focusing on disability, RLSB required partners for referrals and delivery. Prior to Inclusive Sport funding, the organisation had only a limited number of ‘active’ partnerships for sporting activities. Generally, contacts were based on past relationships and were very informal. Sport England funding led to a significant process of sourcing and obtaining partners to deliver sporting provision for vision impaired people. This process began with ‘mapping out’ available provision and facilities across London. As part of this exercise, project staff gained an understanding of local authority strategic priorities and challenges as each borough is run differently.  ‘Sport without Limits: Active’ created partnerships with a variety of sporting organisations, from those with a national focus – UK Athletics[[12]](#footnote-12), Tennis Foundation[[13]](#footnote-13), Fit for Sport[[14]](#footnote-14), to those with a specific focus in the local area and/or on disability sports, such as Metro Sports[[15]](#footnote-15). It was estimated that only around a fifth (20%) of these partnerships existed prior to Inclusive Sport funding.  Operational partners assisted with the delivery of the 20 engagement events and provided mentoring for individuals engaged with the project. Referral partners recommended participants to the project and strategic partners assisted with links to wider organisations and contacts outside of the RLSB’s current network.  Each partnership brought skills and strengths to the project to ensure its success:   1. **Utilisation of high profile organisations, such as Premier League football clubs:** These partners enhanced the visibility and attractiveness of the project to both participants and other partner organisations. They helped facilitate engagement with local sports clubs and grass-root level sporting enterprises. Their involvement was crucial because it helped ensure sustainable partnerships were formed at grass-roots levels providing more locally accessible opportunities for disabled participants; 2. **Partnering with non-governmental organisations (NGOs), education establishments and Local Authorities**: Disabled people will utilise established organisations, with whom they have direct contact, to become aware of opportunities to them. Working with such organisations was imperative to ensure that potential participants heard about and were duly referred into the project. Receiving a ‘recommendation’ or ‘referral’ from a known organisation provided a more personal (and often face to face) approach which was proving key to engaging participants; 3. **Accessing the skills and knowledge of sports clubs and national sporting organisations:** The expertise, resources and knowledge of different sports clubs and organisations can be encompassed into the project to ensure that participants have access to not only a variety of sports they can choose from but also a ‘quality’ offering.   One vision impaired individual who attended our second event in Whitechapel, came to us with both limited English and learning difficulties. He was referred to us by the Newham sensory team as he has engaged very little in the past in activities and never in sport. We had discussions with him before the event and through the use of our volunteer buddy system we were able to assist him in getting to the venue. It was clear from the outset that he struggled to engage in all the activities due to his impairment but he really excelled in the cricket. After the session he expressed an interest in attending cricket on a regular basis and we managed to find him a cricket club in Middlesex. After attending the first session at the club he found the interaction very enjoyable and is now regularly participating in the cricket. [In terms of measuring impact] ‘How many hours a week do you do activity in the last six months, would you estimate?’ His was zero, so we’ve managed to increase his regular physical activity by a couple of hours.   * Sports without Limits   As an organisation with relatively limited experience in the sports sector these connections brought in new learning opportunities for the charity which, longer term, allowed them to improve the quality and effectiveness of the service provision they could offer to the individuals that accessed their sport services. At the same time, sporting organisations engaged with the project, gained greater disability awareness and learnt new ways in which to encourage participation of disabled people into their sporting activities. For example, Tottenham Hotspur Foundation has already benefitted from engaging with individuals on the programme:  We manage the Blind and partially sighted centre of excellence and player development centres for the FA for London and Middlesex, and the access that we get to individuals through the engagement events is beneficial and complementary to these. We are only a small part of the project financially, but the stake in it is fantastic for us, because not only can we develop our work with disability charities, but we are able to increase membership on our own programmes. An individual may come to the engagement day, and through that process, realise that they want to become a blind or partially sighted footballer for England.   * Tottenham Hotspur Foundation |

Case Study : Maximising partnership utilisation - RLSB

# Delivery – supporting participants

Many of the decisions for delivery will have been made during the design stages of a project but the most important consideration for any Inclusive Sport project is to provide sufficient support for participants. The evaluation has found that the reliance on others in order to participate in sport is crucial, whether that is availability of transport (and finding a time to suit all), awareness of opportunities or ability to support the individual in sessions.

Older disabled participants are more likely to have primary carers who are elderly, such as their parents, who are less likely to be able to provide the support their child needs in order to be involved. Indeed, during our baseline evaluation it was revealed that there are significant differences by age for those who cite that lack of support is a primary barrier for them to participate in sport. Disabled people aged 25/26 -44 years old were significantly more likely (62%) to say they needed help to play sport and did not have any. This compares to 49% of <18 year olds, 44% of 18-24/25 year olds and 43% of 45+ year olds. Potentially, this indicates that younger respondents may have access to family support and older respondents to care facilities whereas middle aged respondents may have less access to support:

*Can't get myself changed, I fall over, my children don't really bother with me*

* **Picture-based survey respondent**

Providing sporting opportunities to include both the disabled individual and their family/friend/carer and/or keeping good communication channels with families are key methods projects reported could increase participation rates:

*Our staff team maintain a good working relationship with families and attendance has been good.*

* **Inclusive Sport project.**

However, it is worth noting that offering combined sessions can be costly, particularly for adults. Our evaluation found that parents often detailed the issue of increased costs once their child reached 18 and could no longer receive concessions for mainstream activities.

Providing support at the projects for participants (e.g. with staff/volunteers/buddies) could be equally beneficial – which explains the high proportion of projects that promoted this provision opportunity.

It is also possible to improve an individual’s confidence so that they can become independent and access provision on their own:

We have had success in getting people with learning difficulties using mainstream facilities on a more individual basis. We are using some of the funds allocated to this part of the project to provide individual support to people to use facilities, for example, we have provided staff to go with two people for their first few visits to a gym and are going to pay the entrance fees for volunteers to continue with support until the people are able to go on their own.

* Inclusive Sport Project

# Sustainability

One of the most important aspects of any funded programme is the ability of projects to be sustainable beyond the funding period. There are two ways to achieve this:

* To create a sustainable project infrastructure so that it can continue to deliver beyond the funding period;
* To signpost participants to opportunities to undertake sport outside of the funded project.

## sustaining the projects

If projects are to be sustainable beyond the funding period then a suitable infrastructure needs to be available, the figure below illustrates what is required according to our evaluation of Inclusive Sport projects.

Figure : Requirements for a sustainable infrastructure[[16]](#footnote-16)

Of all the requirements listed in Figure 2, ‘identifying partners’ is considered the greatest priority for sustainability. Indeed, 76% of Round 1 funded projects who are planning to keep running beyond the funding period have already identified their delivery partners. The reason partnerships are a priority is because they often provide the ability to complete many of the other infrastructure requirements. Projects explained that partnerships with other organisations could help them to secure additional funding, whilst others explained that partners offered established, successful delivery mechanisms that they were able to use. One project described how using mainstream provision with additional support, in the first instance, would help ensure that participants could transition to mainstream sport at the end of project delivery:

Partnerships with local (amateur) sports clubs have been formed to enable us to put on sessions at a local venue and then allow people the opportunity to join a 'community' sports club once the planned sessions have finished. This direct 'exit route' from a supported session to a community club has already worked with one person joining a tennis club independently as he felt comfortable and knew the coaches.

* Inclusive Sport Project

Other projects reported that they have been able to draw upon their partners’ expertise and experience to ensure that they provided demand led provision which would ensure the project’s viability in the long run:

Partners also possess a level of expertise that we do not have ‘in-house’ and this has been beneficial to delivering specialist activities and training sessions. Additionally, partners’ contributions have helped us establish successful activities that can be carried into the future based upon their uptake, demand and efficient means of delivery.

* Inclusive Sport Project

What emerges from the evaluation here is that sustainability (of participation) for the individual is inextricably linked to sustainability of projects. Having partnerships between organisations and a pathway through which individuals can continue to participate in different ways also helps to sustain projects, for example, through reciprocal benefits for organisations, increasing referrals and word of mouth.

## sustaining partcipation by signposting to local provision

If a project in itself is not sustainable beyond a funding period a key consideration is to ensure that the overarching aim of an initiative is achieved; in this instance, the participation of a disabled person in sport/physical activity. A key way to do this would be to encourage participants to take part in sporting opportunities outside of the project. Therefore, it is an important element of any Inclusive Sport model to encourage participation in a sport that the individual enjoys and to signpost them to additional, sustainable opportunities where they exist.

Most Inclusive Sport projects funded in round 1 supported disabled people into participating in sport outside of their project (82%); this was primarily done by signposting them to opportunities in the local area. The level of support to undertake this varied by project with the basic level of support being the encouragement of other providers of sporting opportunities to promote their activities to participants at events that the funded project ran. Greater levels of support were offered by some projects by providing information to participants and their family/friends/carers in a variety of ways, including: websites, newsletters, via social media and through leisure directories. Those who offered the highest level of support paired participants with volunteers/buddies who helped them gain access to sporting activities outside of their project:

Our activators have, on occasions, assisted people to access other community sessions such as lead walks, cycling projects, healthy eating education courses, sports club coaching etc. This has often required supporting people with travel training, getting the bus with people the first few times to familiarise people with the route, or attending sessions as a buddy for a few weeks until someone feels safe and comfortable. Other times, pairing people up to similar activities and forming friendships and encouraging shared transport etc. We have also utilised volunteers on the scheme to support people in accessing community activities.

* Inclusive Sport Project.

South Gloucestershire’s Inclusive Sport project, Choices4U, implemented a multitude of processes and actions to ensure that they would be sustainable beyond the funding period. Key factors to achieving this revolved around obtaining high levels of interest, providing client-led activities, ensuring finance for activities was not generated from a singular source and developing strong local partnerships to achieve commissioning clout. The case study below provides further details.

|  |
| --- |
| Case Study 5: Obtaining a sustainable infrastructure beyond the funding period – Choices4U  South Gloucestershire’s Inclusive Sport project has secured a sustainable approach beyond the funding period through several different approaches.   1. **Utilisation of community based sites:** Choices 4 U based their activities in local leisure centres. Participants had full access to facilities such as inclusive gym equipment, hoists and changing beds/rooms. 2. **Embedding activities into mainstream sessions:** Disabled people were able to participate in mainstream sessions, for example, aqua aerobics – this level of inclusivity was seen to assist in breaking down ‘real and perceived barriers’ surrounding disabled people’s participation in sport.   What you’ve got to remember is that we’re actually also based in a leisure site, so we’re in the community, we’re not hidden in some room. We’re actually in the community. We’re actually engaging the community at all times, and I think one of the benefits for the leisure centres is having that continuous disability presence creates a better understanding for their staff and for the people who live and work there, but also the customers that come in because our clients are always there. I think that, along with the fact that we have such great relationships with the centre staff, is what makes us a great, sustainable project. **Choices4U**   1. **Offering multiple activities to participants:** Ensuring that a variety of activities are available on a programme enabled individuals to try a variety of sports or physical activities and hopefully identified one that interested them enough to continue with in the long term. Choices 4 U offered a range of activities including fencing, scuba diving, cycling, orienteering, Boccia, table tennis and badminton. The variety provided an engaging programme of events that encouraged interest levels to be maintained whilst ultimately providing a client-led service:   So the whole point of Choices 4 U is that it’s client led. So every six to eight weeks they get to pick what activities they want to try and then, following that, they would then give that a try and then there would be options that they could go off and do that independently if they want to. If not, they’ve tried a new activity and they would then go onto the next thing. **Choices4U**   1. **Enabling access to venues:** Choices 4 U worked with their clients to support them to travel independently to venues wherever possible. In this way, participants gained confidence and had the knowledge of how to access their activities without necessarily requiring assistance; 2. **Providing a full ‘health and wellbeing’ approach:** Although the main thrust of the programme focused on increasing sports participation of disabled people, it also offered a more holistic line-up of services to improve an individual’s health and wellbeing. The focus was primarily on leisure but also expanded to assist individuals with support into volunteering and employment too:   In regards to what we’re offering, we’re offering opportunities to live a healthy, fulfilled lifestyle, as much as can be, the same as everybody else and it doesn’t necessarily have to be a sporting activity, we are a leisure provision. So although I’ve come from a sports background, and a lot of what I do is around the sporting field, the majority of what my clients do is working around what they want to do. So it could be that they want to increase their arts and crafts, it could be that they want to support their CV. We link in with employment services to help include that side of things. I think that’s more our uniqueness. **Choices4U**   1. **Financially affordable provision for participants:** Due to the partnerships providing a reduction in fees due to collective commissioning, Choices4U was able to offer a pricing structure for activities that were lower than those offered at other providers. This helped attract many participants and offered a competitive and affordable service for disabled people. In addition, the project linked directly with the direct payments scheme:   One of the reasons why we are so sustainable is because we link in with direct payments and we link in with being commissioned. Within what we do, we have a set number of people that we need to work with to make the sessions sustainable (and some sites cost slightly more than others) but, depending on the site, if we’ve got seven people attending that session, our site is fully sustainable on the costings that we currently have. **Choices4U**  The costs at which Choices4U could provide the activities were a third to half those offered by alternative providers. For example, a half day of full activities was £21 and a full day was £42 – alternative providers ranged from £60-100 for a full day. |

Case Study : Obtaining a sustainable infrastructure beyond the funding period – Choices4U

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Conclusions and recommendations   This chapter provides the overall conclusions from the evaluation and provides recommendations where appropriate. |

# Positive impact of Inclusive Sport

Inclusive Sport projects report a large number of beneficial outcomes for participants and the wider sports and disability sectors resulting from Sport England’s funding. Participants and projects state that the initiative has allowed disabled people to see sport as a viable lifestyle choice for themselves; a greater variety of sporting opportunities has been offered and where possible, relevant support structures have been established and utilised. Consequently, Inclusive Sport projects have not only successfully engaged disabled people in sport, but also enabled general participation levels to increase.

The positive impacts of Inclusive Sport projects align with the five broad outcomes set out in the new Government strategy for sport (December 2015), showing participant improvement in physical and mental wellbeing, as well as individual, social and community development. Alongside the assessment of impact, the evaluation has also identified ‘what works, how, for whom and in what context’ with regards to the planning and delivery of Inclusive Sport projects. These results provide a solid evidence base for the future development of sport projects targeting disabled people.

# Best way(s) to engage participants

Using existing community organisations/clubs and word of mouth is the best way to market new opportunities to disabled people. It is also important to consider directing marketing to friends/family/carers in order to ensure that increased awareness of sporting offers is made available to any target audiences.

As part of any marketing to third parties (friends/family etc.) it is important to reassure them that adequate support will be provided and that the disabled person is able to take part. Some projects found this a particularly difficult hurdle to address and so it may be worthwhile obtaining testimonials from current participants and friends/family members whose attitudes towards an active lifestyle have changed because of Inclusive Sport. Alternatively, a successful approach has been to provide sessions where both the disabled person and their family/friend/carer are able to participate. However, consideration needs to be made as to suitable timings with family members (if required for support and transport) preferring evenings/weekends, but venue availability and participant preference tend towards daytime and weekdays.

As the majority of projects have promoted opportunities to existing clubs/organisations and worked, in the main, with partnerships they had prior to Inclusive Sport, it is worth further consideration about how to access disabled people who do not already access mainstream disability or sporting provision. These are individuals who may benefit substantially from increased activity and the social benefits afforded by sports participation. The challenge will be to not only reach these individuals, but also to ensure that adequate transport and support are available for them to participate – challenges that remain a key concern for current participants and project leads alike.

# Delivery: what works

The delivery of a successful inclusive project relies on a combination of different elements; the following emerged from the evaluation as particularly important:

* *Varied and skilled partnerships where staffing contacts are consistent;*
* *Having volunteers and peer mentors available to support participants;*
* *Offering a variety of sporting opportunities;*
* *Providing competition opportunities to participants;*
* *Having staff who have strong ‘soft people skills’ and a team who collectively have knowledge and experience of both sport and disability.*

It is clear that partnerships are crucial to the success of Inclusive Sport projects. It requires a wealth of skills and experience, resource and commitment to provide the necessary conditions to enable inclusivity in sport for disabled people. This is not something that one organisation can currently achieve on its own. However, over time, with greater awareness raising of disability in the sporting sector and further individuals participating and becoming role models for others, it is possible that inclusivity could become less resource intensive in the future as skills are shared across partnerships.

# Sustaining participation

Supporting participants to access and participate in sport is key to encouraging interest and attendance at sessions. Once engaged the challenge is to find ways of sustaining that participation. Whilst offering taster sessions and one-off drop-ins to trial new sports is an excellent way of introducing new opportunities to participants, there is currently a gap in knowledge as to the proportion of individuals who ‘convert’ from trying a new sport to regular participation. Future funding of similar projects could benefit from encouraging monitoring mechanisms which record such conversions.

The majority of currently funded projects state that participants are signposted to new opportunities but we are unable to provide details on how many participants have been signposted, where they have been signposted (in order to understand which opportunities are most sought after) and indeed whether any participants followed through with opportunities they were signposted to. Inclusive Sport projects have certainly increased interest, availability and variety of sporting opportunities for disabled participants, and participation has increased for those individuals taking part. The extent to which such activity has, or will be, converted into sustained participation beyond the funded activities is currently not known.

What sport has brought about for disabled participants is an increase in social capital, improved health (physically, mentally and emotionally) and an increase in confidence and self-esteem. Similar benefits of sports participation are reported by participants, deliverers, family/friends and healthcare professionals.

Appendix 1: Methodology

The national evaluation of Inclusive Sport, conducted by CFE Research, included conducting online surveys with participant and project leads, case studies (including depth interviews) and secondary analysis of regularly collected monitoring information (MI). The table below provides an overview of the timetable of evaluation activities.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2013** | | **2014** | | | | **2015** | | | | **2016** | |
| **Activity** | **Jul-Sept** | **Oct-Dec** | **Jan-Mar** | **Apr-Jun** | **Jul-Sept** | **Oct-Dec** | **Jan-Mar** | **Apr-Jun** | **Jul-Sept** | **Oct-Dec** | **Jan-Mar** | **Apr-Jun** |
| Project commences | July |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline Wave 1 administered |  | October |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interim report provided |  | November |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline Wave 2 administered |  | November - March | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2nd Interim report provided |  |  |  | May |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 survey administered |  |  |  | June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 report provided |  |  |  |  | July |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 2 survey administered |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | May |  |  |  |  |
| Year 2 report provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | July |  |  |  |
| MI Data analysed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | October |  |  |
| MI Data reported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | November |  |  |
| Project Lead survey administered |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Lead report provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Nov-Dec |  |  |
| Case Studies provided |  | December | February |  | July |  |  |  |  |  | January |  |
| Final report provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | March |  |
| All outputs completed and signed off |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | June |

Table : Overview of evaluation timetable

# Participant Surveys

CFE Research designed the baseline, Year 1 and Year 2 surveys and agreed the content with Sport England prior to going to field. The surveys were created primarily to track current and changing participation in sport and/or physical activity over the duration of the programme. It was not possible to collect participation data (the 1x30 measure) for individuals *prior* to their engagement with Inclusive Sport projects.

#### Baseline

In order to provide a survey that would be accessible to individuals regardless of impairment, the baseline survey was provided in four variations:

* An online ‘main survey’;
* An online survey with British Sign Language [BSL] video clips and subtitles;
* An online AAA easy read format for those with visual impairments and access to screen readers; and
* An online picture based format accompanied by an Excel data collection tool for project leads – primarily for use with participants with learning disabilities.

CFE Research provided the projects with a fieldwork window of one month in which to collate and return responses to the first wave of the baseline. The deadline for survey submission was 27th October 2013. The second wave of the baseline ran from November 2013 – March 2014 with participants completing the survey when they started participating at a project.

A data collection tool was also developed to collate key metric data required for analysis that could not be transferred into an ‘easy read’ picture format for participants. As such, the tool, along with the picture-based survey, provided a cumulative data response akin to a beneficiary having completed the ‘main survey’.

The tool required projects to tally responses at the overall project level for key metric questions (i.e. not at an individual level. This decision was made for ease of use and to reduce the burden on project leads and sports coaches (of whom a large proportion were volunteers).

We asked projects to complete the data collection tool only for respondents who had submitted a survey response using the picture-based format. However, there was a slight discrepancy in the figures reported by some projects on the data tool compared to survey responses, so some bases differed.

#### Years 1 and 2 participant surveys

Due to the low take-up of AAA and BSL survey formats and difficulties in data collection cited by participating projects the methodology was amended in Years 1 and 2 (although the surveys retained core metrics for comparability).

The Year 1 and Year 2 surveys were based on the original baseline survey design. Two survey formats were utilised:

* An online ‘main survey’
* An online picture based ‘easy read’ format– designed primarily for use with participants with learning disabilities

The Year 1 survey was disseminated during the month of June 2014. The Year 2 survey was disseminated from Friday 24th April until Friday 29th May 2015.

All survey responses were captured online in SNAP™ and exported into SPSS™ software for analysis. The ‘main survey’ and ‘picture-based’ survey datasets were cleaned and analysed independently and, where possible, variables from each were combined to facilitate analysis and comparison across these two groups. Statistical tests were applied to the data to examine whether differences between groups within the Year 2 survey sample. If present, these indicative differences were stated in the report though some caution should be taken here as base population profile (all disabled people) is not known and is an area of wider debate. For this reason, and due to the absence of the population profile for Year 2 (participant throughput), the bias presented in the collected sample (survey respondents) is unknown and hence cannot be adjusted. Without this adjustment, it is not possible to conduct robust comparative statistical analysis between years.

#### Project Lead Survey

CFE Research designed the project lead survey and agreed the content with Sport England prior to going to field. The survey was created to further understand some of the key themes and issues arising from both the participant surveys (conducted in years 1 and 2) and the wider disability insight work developed by Sport England.

The online survey was disseminated from Tuesday 11th November until Friday 11th December 2015 to project leads from both Round 1 and Round 2 of Inclusive Sport. Projects from Round 1 only received a reminder email at the end of November and a follow up phone call on the 14th December for non-responders. Round 2 projects were not involved in the previous aspects of the evaluation and non-responders were not followed up.

All survey responses were captured online in Confirmit™ and exported into SPSS™ software for analysis. The Round 1 and Round 2 survey datasets were cleaned and analysed separately. Where judicious to do so, variables were combined to facilitate analysis and make comparisons across the two rounds of funding. Statistical tests were applied to the data to examine whether differences between funding rounds existed. If present, these indicative differences were stated in the interim report though some caution should be taken here as base population profile (all project leads) is relatively small.

**Copies of the surveys can be provided upon request.**

#### Management Information Analysis

Project leads were required to submit management information to Sport England every 6 months whilst in receipt of funding. This information was provided in the form of a ‘project progress report’. CFE Research conducted thematic analysis (using Nvivo™ software) of the most recently submitted reports from all projects within funding Round 1 during October 2015. It is important to note that not all projects had provided up-to-date reports at the point this analysis was carried out – 20 of the 43 funded projects had not submitted a progress report within the last 6 months and 10 of these had not done so in the last year.

#### Case Studies

Projects identified to be case studies were agreed with Sport England based on thematic areas of interest:

* An Inclusive Sport funded project that exhibits the greatest level of sustainability beyond the funding period;
* A disability sector organisation that does have a substantial track record of previous service delivery in the field of sports participation;
* A disability sector organisation that does not have a substantial track record of previous service delivery in the field of sports participation;
* An Inclusive Sport funded organisation that has overcome a significant barrier (or barriers) to participation for disabled people;
* An Inclusive Sport funded project that has generated, fostered and developed excellent partnerships; and
* An Inclusive Sport funded project that utilised a variety of marketing methods to attract disabled people into participating in sport.

Once agreed suitable projects were contacted and site visits were arranged. At each project interviews were conducted with key stakeholders, project leads and participants. Information from the interviews, augmented by additional data provided by projects, was combined to provide a suite of case studies for Sport England on ‘what works, for whom and in what circumstances’.

1. The evaluation report for the ‘Sport Makers’ strand of the People projects can be downloaded here: <http://www.sportengland.org/media/10214/sport-makers-evalution-final-report-cfe-research.pdf> last accessed March 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/486622/Sporting_Future_ACCESSIBLE.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Ibid page 9 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Ibid page 10 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Mary-Anne Rankin. April 2012. ‘Understanding the barriers to participation in sport: Views and opinions of active and non active disabled people’. English Federation of Disability Sport. Summary report available here: <http://www.efds.co.uk/assets/0000/3833/Understanding_the_barriers_to_participation_20120510.pdf> last accessed March 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The participant survey in Year 2 had two versions: one ‘main’ survey designed for participants without a learning disability and/or those who had the support of a carer to respond to those questions; the second version was ‘picture based’ for those with a learning disability. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This survey was designed for respondents with intellectual impairments. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Baseline level of participation before involvement with the project was collected retrospectively in the year 1 and year 2 surveys. The result shown here is the baseline level reported by respondents to the year 2 survey. We have not aggregated data for Year 1 and 2 to provide a comparison as we were not able to eliminate the potential for double counting responses. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Further information on the lessons learnt and benefits of this case study can be found on Sport England website: <https://www.sportengland.org/media/1130/20140219-casestudy_henshaws.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. It is worth noting that 16 of the responding projects to the project lead survey (29%) were led by a Local Authority. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Makaton is a language programme using signs and symbols to help people to communicate.  [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.britishathletics.org.uk> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. <http://www.lta.org.uk/Tennis-Foundation/Home/> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. <http://www.fitforsport.co.uk/> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. <http://www.metroblindsport.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. ‘Other’ tasks to ensure sustainability include: increasing the target market and reviewing project components to embed them into local strategies. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)