# **2020 Learning and Development and Every Club Review**

# Phase Two Consultation Summary – Response to Preliminary Findings

## Background

The Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries (DLGSC) engaged an independent consultant to:

* Review the current learning and development strategy (2018-2020) deliverables and consult with industry to inform the development of relevant and contemporary learning and development opportunities for the sport and recreation sector.
* Consult with industry and local governments (LGAs) to clarify their views on the roles and responsibilities related to club development in WA and inform the department’s future policies.
* Review the four components of the Every Club Program (2018-2020) and provide options and recommendations for the delivery of future club development opportunities in WA.

The phase one consultation process was completed in early 2020. It captured feedback from a total of 52 State Sporting Associations (SSAs), 46 LGAs, 17 clubs and 24 individuals from a combination of DLGSC offices, Peak Bodies, training providers, consultants and industry groups.

In May 2020, the final report was submitted and included three components:

1. Learning and Development Review
2. Every Club Program Review
3. Club Development Roles and Responsibilities Discussion Paper

## Methodology

In July 2020, a phase two consultation process was initiated to establish the extent of industry support across the report findings and recommendations. All reports were published on the department’s website for public viewing and a survey created to allow stakeholders to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with report findings and recommendations. Respondents were also able to provide qualitative feedback through written commentary throughout the survey.

Feedback was received from representatives from SSAs, LGAs, clubs and individuals from a combination of DLGSC offices, peak bodies, training providers, consultants and industry groups. The survey was open for two weeks and the following number of responses were received for each component:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Report Component** | **Survey Reponses** |
| Learning and Development Review | 46 |
| Every Club Program Review | 29 |
| Club Development Roles and Responsibilities Discussion Paper | 28 |

Analysis

Phase two survey feedback has been analysed as follows:

* Where respondents indicated they ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ with a finding or recommendation these figures have been combined to identify a level of agreement and support.
* Where respondents indicated they ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’ with a finding or recommendation these figures have been combined to identify a level of disagreement or lack of support.

Conclusion

The results of the phase two consultation process will be used as follows:

* Findings and recommendations across the three report components that have a high degree of support (approx. 80% agreement and above) are likely to be accepted and implemented as part of the Learning and Development Framework and Every Club implementation plan.
* A small number of findings and recommendations across the three report components have discrepancies in their level of support (refer highlighted in tables below). These will be discussed further and addressed with the relevant Learning and Development or Every Club Advisory Group.

## **Survey Results**

## **Part 1: Learning and Development Review**

## Consultation Summary - Findings

Forty-three of the respondents (93%) had read the phase one learning and development review report before completing the survey and 79% had participated in the phase one consultation. The survey was completed by representatives from LGAs (57%), SSAs (32%), industry representative organisations/peak bodies (4%), not for profit/community clubs (2%) and other organisations (4%). A total of 82% of all respondents were satisfied with the consultation process (phase one and two) whilst 18% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Overarching Themes / Principles** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **1** | A central theme to the delivery of all learning and development support is that it must be provided with the needs of the end user at the forefront of all planning and decision making. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **2** | It is important that sport and recreation organisations have a clear understanding of their learning and development needs. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **3** | The changing nature of the role of the department and its relationship with industry requires the department to reconsider its approach towards the provision and delivery of learning and development support. | 84% | | 8% | 8% | |
| **4** | There are relatively large numbers of sport and recreation organisations providing learning and development opportunities to their paid workforce. | 45% | | 29% | 26% | |
| **5** | There is not currently an evaluation framework that measures the impact of the learning and development strategy of the department. | 84% | | 13% | 3% | |

**\*Comments:**

* Evaluation frameworks are usually developed by LGA running a workshop or the like. Most evaluation will centre around the program and an objective required to be achieved.
* One idea would be to share the learning from larger SSAs that are developing enhanced in-house internal training. It would be valuable to learn from those that are able to do this in-house delivery and the findings.
* Identify clear benchmarks of a competent club for all clubs and organisations to reference. Discover why these are important. Identify key needs. Goal setting for clubs and organisations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Industry Needs** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **6** | There is a relatively low uptake of workforce development plans amongst sport and recreation organisations. A lack of capacity to develop a workforce plan was identified as the main reason why organisations did not have one. | 80% | | 17% | 3% | |
| **7** | Governance education remains a key priority for the boards of sport and recreation organisations. Priority areas for development include *understanding the role of the board, developing strategy and managing risk.* The value of board evaluation processes was noted however, the follow up and implementation of identified improvements was an area boards require assistance. | 97% | | 3% | 0% | |
| **8** | The highest priority needs for executive & leadership teams are strategic planning, understanding self and leading others, and working with the chair and board. | 92% | | 0% | 8% | |
| **9** | The priority learning and development needs for management staff are project management, finance for non-finance managers and managing staff. | 72% | | 25% | 3% | |
| **10** | Industry specific training such as marketing to grow participation and membership and event management training has been identified as an area of industry need. | 83% | | 11% | 6% | |
| **11** | Developing regionally based staff, both paid and unpaid is challenging for sport and recreation organisations due to challenges around accessing opportunities and suitability of content to address local development needs. | 80% | | 17% | 3% | |
| **12** | Sport Australia is updating the Coaching & Officiating Framework to assist in providing a more holistic, participant / player focused approach to servicing individuals needs and learning and development requirements. | 55% | | 39% | 6% | |
| **13** | Whilst there is a linkage between those employed in a sport and the volunteers who give up their time to contribute to their club/sport, there are differences in why they are involved and what they want from the experience. There is a need for those employed within a sport to develop the skills in training and managing the volunteer workforce. | 94% | | 6% | 0% | |

**\*Comments:**

* One centralised, well-promoted, go-to location for learning and development support and opportunities.
* Board – also need Risk Management planning, assessment, gap analysis etc. Staff – also need Operational Planning
* Retention, rotation of board/committee.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Delivery Options** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **14** | There is a growing trend towards training being provided in ‘bite-size chunks.’ | 89% | | 11% | 0% | |
| **15** | While individual board member training is an important part of the education mix, the ability to bring the whole board along the development journey offers enhanced development outcomes for their board and organisation. | 97% | | 3% | 0% | |
| **16** | While digital and online training is seen as an important form of learning and development, face-to-face is still largely seen as the most preferred method of training. | 75% | | 17% | 8% | |
| **17** | A wide variety of providers are accessed by sport and recreation organisations for their learning and development needs with larger SSA’s increasing their in-house capability to develop their teams. | 53% | | 36% | 11% | |

**\*Comments:**

* There is an opportunity for LGAs and SSAs to come together to deliver training in local areas, specific to local club needs.
* It would be highly valuable if larger SSAs that have the capacity to deliver in-house learning and development could share their learning with other SSAs.
* The cost (finance and time) is a significant barrier for both employed staff and volunteers, particularly those sports that don’t fall within the category of ‘larger SSAs.’
* Competency based learning options for different modes of learning and relative to the competency. There are different opportunities for metro, country, disabled, age based, cultures. And much different in committee, board, coach, official and event-based learning. When the motivation is there, people wish to learn then and there so delivery options need to be learner paced at any time…. Less set dates. Volunteer development requires a holistic approach. To profile volunteers by having their own learning portal transferable competencies between sports with ability for sport and rec to know more of the number of volunteers, what skill set they have, what roles they do etc. etc.

## Consultation Summary - Recommendations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Recommendation** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| **1** | **Common Strategic Framework:** (See Finding/ Observation 1 & 2)  That a common strategic framework for Learning and Development within the sport and recreation industry is adopted. The framework is built on the Guiding Principle of a User Centred Approach supported by five ‘enabling’ pillars:   1. Leadership & Vision 2. Planning & Coordination 3. Networking 4. Resources & Training 5. Investment | 97% | | 0% | 3% | |
| **2** | **Workforce Development Plans** (See Finding/ Observation 2)  A focus of any future learning & development strategy needs to have an emphasis on the development and adoption of workforce development plans by state sport and recreation organisations. | 94% | | 6% | 0% | |
| **3** | **Role of the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries** (See Finding/ Observation 2, 3, 4 & 5)  That the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries continues to support the sport and recreation industry by:   * providing support to state sport and recreation organisations to develop workforce development plans; * partnering with the industry in setting the strategy and agreed processes for learning and development; * continuing to invest in learning and development opportunities for sport and recreation organisations with limited capacity; and * developing and implementing a comprehensive evaluation framework to measure the impact of the learning and development strategy within the industry. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **4** | **Governance Improvement** (See Finding/ Observation 7 & 15)  That governance improvement continues to be prioritised for industry support noting the following areas for improvement:   * ensuring that content is refreshed and re-packaged to continue to engage current directors / board members; and * implementing opportunities to engage the full board in governance improvement activities, in conjunction with individual director training and education. | 94% | | 3% | 3% | |
| **5** | **Learning & Development delivery methods** (See Finding/ Observation 14 & 16)  That the delivery of learning and development continues to focus on meeting the needs of the end user, utilising a variety of traditional and contemporary methods including:   * packaging training options into smaller parts that can be more easily accessed; * effective utilisation of digital and online learning; and * the complementary use of digital and online learning to enhance face-to-face learning where appropriate. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **6** | **Collaborative approach** (See Finding/ Observation 10, 11 & 17)  That the industry takes a collaborative approach to better support the learning and development needs of the industry, including:   * accessing industry expertise to address specific learning needs; and * working with industry partners and stakeholders to enhance regional learning and development delivery. | 94% | | 6% | 0% | |
| **7** | **Volunteer Workforce** (See Finding/ Observation 13)  That those responsible for managing the volunteer workforce within sport and recreation organisations are appropriately supported and developed to perform this role. | 94% | | 6% | 0% | |

**\*Comments:**

* Concern partnering versus leading… who is taking the lead role? Someone has to take the lead and be accountable.
* DLGSC needs to be the leader for sport and recreation in the State. There is currently limited direction and as a result the various sport and recreation bodies in the state have a wide discrepancy in the service and the commitment, they have to support staff learning.

**Are there any findings or ideas that have been missed?**

* The concern is that there is nothing new or ground-breaking to the review. The needs have been the same for a number of years, however, I am not sure what has been done in terms of investment and strategy to address these needs. I understand the Department has undergone significant change in recent years, hence the requirement of this review – however I would recommend the outcomes and the strategy to support the industry in learning and development be well published within industry. It seems less and less investment and resource are being allocated by the state and more being pushed back to SSAs and other organisations with perceived lack of support. Within smaller SSAs, it is difficult to achieve proper workforce planning given the capacity of executives/ leaders who either don’t have the time or necessarily the appropriate skills. In a perfect world, external consultancy advice (outside of the DLGSC Sports Consultant) would be helpful in assisting consulting the required stakeholders, analysis, identifying requirements and packaging it up as part of the sports integrated planning framework. I also have a concern that DLGSCs shifting to a ‘partner’ and not identifying the organisation who the responsibility will sit with is creating an accountability issue and will not create traction.
* A very worthwhile, well intentioned and necessary review, which, if harnessed in an effective manner, should prove beneficial and positively impactful to the sporting landscape in WA.
* More time to allow have allowed for greater regional and club level consultation would have been beneficial. More concrete actions from the review would be ideal.
* This kind of review and the finding are unlikely to change the current issues facing the industry. There is no appetite to change the current establishment within the state. There is very little collaboration and the majority of sporting entities only operates for the benefit of their existence as they fight fo r the limited funding that is available.
* I like the idea of supporting the needs of the end user…
* I feel we were adequately consulted throughout the process with a one on one meeting and a follow up workshop session.
* As a small SSA which is completely volunteer staffed a large amount of this survey was inapplicable.
* I think the user centred approach is vital, however, there are so many varied parties that it can on occasion become very confusing. Whilst a collaborative approach is also vital, given the number of parties involved there will need to be an organised structure developed with some rigour in regard to who has what role and/ or responsibility. To achieve this will take a significant resource and expertise.

## **Part 2: Every Club Program Review**

## Consultation Summary - Findings

All survey respondents had read the phase one Every Club program review report and a total of 87% participated in the phase one consultation. The survey was completed by representatives from local government (69%), State Sporting Associations (21%), not for profit/community clubs (7%) and other organisations (3%) such as Future Now.

A total of 26 findings were identified and linked to key focus areas. All findings were supported by the majority of respondents with the level of support ranging from the lowest at 52% to 100%. The level of support for each is listed in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Club Centred Approach** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **1** | The models of support currently available to clubs are not necessarily developed with the specific needs of clubs as the primary driver and are instead influenced by the needs of other stakeholders. | 68% | | 18% | 14% | |
| **2** | The administration of clubs is challenging for volunteers with significant administration and compliance responsibilities. Both governing bodies and government need to consider ways to reduce the impact on community clubs. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |

**\*Comments:**

* I believe that many do not understand the rationale for having good governance and management systems/practices in place, hence support is not suitable - especially in local government. many SSAs are focused on participation and membership as these are metrics for external funding and/or organisational revenue. while many LGAs are focused toward facilities and appropriate maintenance, I believe there has been a shift from exclusive use lease agreements putting all the responsibility on the club towards a ‘hire’ arrangement, putting the maintenance responsibilities back on the LGA. as such, many LGAs see this as their investment to enable club volunteers to focus on administering and delivering sport. by reducing the financial burden and risk on the club, the unintended consequence is less diligent in appropriate planning and financial management.
* In my experience the majority of clubs do not have the volunteers with the skills to deal with admin and compliance required.
* Reducing administrative burden for all parties involved in club development is imperative, at every level the significant number of administrative requirements and compliance responsibilities just continue to grow. it is difficult enough for salaried staff personnel for volunteers it is rapidly becoming unsustainable.
* I can only comment on our approach to club development which does place the club and its needs at the centre of our program and service delivery.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Leadership and Vision** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **3** | There is a gap in overall leadership and vision as to what club development is and what are the respective roles and responsibilities of LGA’s, SSA’s & the DLGSC. | 92% | | 0% | 8% | |
| **4** | Both SSA’s and LGA’s have varying views as to what should be the focus for club development. This is in part dependent on the strategic priorities for the respective SSA or LGA. | 85% | | 11% | 4% | |

**\*Comments:**

* Club development needs to be considered a key priority for a respective sport organisation regardless of their KPIs or funding model. Club development has long been neglected by the industry and as a result the foundation of organised sport (sporting clubs) has started to deteriorate.
* I think it depends on what the LGA or SSA know is best for their clubs. If the LGA knows their clubs well, the will focus on meeting their needs and the LGA strategic Community Plan is driven by the community then it will match. the views may vary as they survey clubs all over WA versus the LGA who are only looking at clubs in one area and the needs will vary depending on where they are located.
* A position statement or similar identifying club development, even also capturing recreation development, leisure planning, community development, participation, coach development etc. would be handy.
* Since the disintegration of the previous iteration of DSR, a significant void of leadership and lead agency has formed within the industry.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Planning and Coordination** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **5** | There is an absence of an overarching plan for state-wide club development support. | 96% | | 4% | 0% | |
| **6** | Overall, there is relatively limited coordination in the delivery of club development support between the key stakeholders. This has theeffect of support being delivered that does not necessarily address specific club needs, lack of a planned approach to support delivery and duplication of already limited resources. | 96% | | 0% | 4% | |
| **7** | Clubs require access to support from different sources including SSA’s, LGA’s and DLGSC (regional) amongst others. | 89% | | 4% | 7% | |

**\*Comments:**

* Coordinated support is often left up to the individuals in organisations and their networking abilities.
* There needs to be regional experts put in place to provide stability. North, South, East and regional areas will all have different needs based on socio-economic status and there needs to be consistency and people in place that understand the requirements within an area. Club development has been looked at too generically as a one size fits all approach. Its not the case, club development needs to be very targeted and specific for the required purpose.
* It should be noted that support to clubs can be very intensive on both the LGA and SSAs – especially when there are other priorities or a large number of clubs/associations requiring support.
* It would be really good to have an overarching plan with some higher-level objectives that created in partnership with all parties who deliver club development including Good Sports, Clubs WA, Sports Community, SSAs and LGAs. Then each one has their own plan which sits under this. Would be good to pinpoint any gaps.
* It ultimately depends on the club development need of the individual club which in turn could be the need of the individual volunteer and / or the type of sport/ recreation, the age of members and the list is endless – this is why this remains so challenging to resolve.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Networking** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **8** | It was consistently highlighted during the discussion that networking is highly valued, however has fallen away in recent years, particularly since the establishment of Every Club. There was strong support for improved networking opportunities that bring together SSA and LGA partners, to discuss and identify solutions to problems. The value of club to club networking was also highlighted noting the benefits of discussing issues and identifying solutions that are common and experienced across all clubs. | 96% | | 4% | 0% | |
| **9** | It was evident during the consultation process that several regional areas have established well developed networks which bring together the different stakeholders to provide club support. In these examples the regional DLGSC office played a leadership role in bringing the different stakeholders together to share information and communicate local level plans for the delivery of club development support. | 86% | | 14% | 0% | |
| **10** | Local Governments noted the benefits that arose from the networking that occurred under the previous Club Development Office Scheme. | 89% | | 11% | 0% | |
| **11** | There is currently no human resource allocated for the coordination of networking across the sector. | 85% | | 11% | 4% | |
| **12** | The Every Club focus area of ‘Facilitate’ is generally not associated with networking by SSA’s and LGA’s. | 82% | | 7% | 11% | |

**\*Comments:**

* Networking is left to each individual and their ability, comfort and manager support.
* The Every Club program was a tick box option undertaken by the department to save costs and make it look like it cared about club development. It provided generic online information (the was often 10 years old). There is limited opportunity for meaningful change within a club is the information and assistance provided is unhelpful. Every Club did not hit the mark and it wasn’t promoted properly.
* Any networking needs to be well planned and managed to be useful. As such, this needs to sit with one organisation or group moving forward if DLGSC is not undertaking this task.
* The previous PD sessions run by DLGSC were really beneficial and assisted CDOs to feel supported.
* Every Club has aimed to bring SSAs and LGAs together through workshops. this has benefited me. I believe the point was raised that this was good and beneficial and more was needed rather than it not existing.
* There is generally a lack of support and guidance form DLGSC in the metro area. there is no single point of contact that we can touch base with to discuss challenges or issues. the regional areas do an excellent job in offering support and bringing stakeholders together to network and discuss ideas.
* whilst the CDO network offered opportunities for the LGA staff to network this was rarely extended to SSA club development staff/ volunteers and from my experience there has been limited networking between LGAs and SSA apart from in regional areas. Providing these types of opportunities is important in the future.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Resources and Training** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **13** | It was evident through the consultation that there is a significant amount of resources developed by various stakeholders including DLGSC, SSA’s, LGA’s and private providers. Questions were raised as to their effectiveness in providing a solution focussed approach and practical measures as to how particular issues and challenges can be addressed. | 93% | | 7% | 0% | |
| **14** | Access to a human resource who has the credibility and skills to support the club address their issues was considered the most important method of support desired by clubs. | 96% | | 4% | 0% | |
| **15** | Due to the vast differences in size, location, sophistication, learning preference and local club needs, there was strong agreement throughout the consultation that a mix of delivery methods is required. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **16** | There is a slow but increasing trend towards providing more focussed support to clubs at a 1 to 1 level rather than solely workshops and events as the main method of club development support. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **17** | Webinars and online learning methods, whilst an important part of the overall education mix, do have limitations, particularly in regional areas often due to limitations of internet connectivity. | 85% | | 11% | 4% | |
| **18** | There is broad agreement that there is still a need for a centrally coordinated hub of resources. While a small number of SSA’s have their own portals or resource hubs, the majority of small to medium sized sports do not have the capacity to develop and maintain their own customised suite of resources. | 82% | | 4% | 4% | |
| **19** | The Every Club Hub is not easy to navigate, attempts to cover a large number of topics and does not necessarily provide current contemporary content. | 74% | | 22% | 4% | |
| **20** | While SSA’s and LGA’s had relatively high levels of awareness of the Every Club program and the Every Club hub, there was limited understanding of what was available through the Every Club Hub.  Clubs consulted during the project had limited awareness of the Every Club Hub.  The Every Club focus area of *Communicate* is generally not associated with the resources available through the Every Club Hub. | 92% | | 8% | 0% | |

**\*Comments:**

* Online learning and communication have proven itself valuable during COVID.
* Every Club was a disaster, that erased many years of heard work put into club development by the department through the club development officer scheme.
* The Every Club hub has amazing potential to become a central point for resources with a dedicated staff person who understands club development and can provide a face to the portal.
* There is a lot of duplication of resources and support offered to club. Every Club hub probably isn’t as effective or useful as planned which has led LGAs and SSAs investing in similar and more advanced systems (sports community club spot). from my personal experiences in accessing the hub the information tends to be outdated and focused on the issue rather than providing practical solutions. Ideally, there should be leadership in this area from DLGSC, Sport West etc to provide a central library of useful resources to minimise the duplication across the sector. SSSs may still choose to provide sport specific resources for their clubs.
* A multiple of professional and relevant resources are readily available through google and you tube. the creation of any more is an unnecessary duplication that only confuses.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area: Investment** | | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **21** | While some recipients of funding under the previous Club Development Officer scheme lamented the changes to the Every Club funding, there was acknowledgment of the increased flexibility of the Every Club funding model which supported a flexible approach to servicing local needs. | 66% | | 30% | 4% | |
| **22** | Challenges with short term funding agreements were noted by participants with a request for longer term funding commitments to encourage longer term appointments of club support personnel. This will in turn aide in the skills and capability of the support person and the relationships they can build with clubs. | 96% | | 4% | 0% | |
| **23** | The need for funding in the metropolitan area is not as high as in regional areas. This is primarily to do with the greater accessibility that clubs have to support within the metropolitan area. | 52% | | 26% | 22% | |
| **24** | There is a range in skills, knowledge and experience of personnel in SSA’s and LGA’s delivering club development support, including some staff who may have a community development background. | 96% | | 4% | 0% | |
| **25** | Recipients of funding (both Every Club and previous CDO Scheme) noted a need for a shift away from focussing on measuring outputs such as number of workshops delivered without necessarily understanding the outcome or impact of the funding. | 89% | | 11% | 0% | |
| **26** | There was limited evidence to support the investment in third party programs that provide resources / templates as delivering effective outcomes. | 69% | | 31% | 0% | |

**\*Comments:**

* Historically regional areas would require additional funding however COVID has proven online methods can be useful.
* Online learning and resources have a place but are only a small part of the club development process.
* If councils can afford to hire CDO that have the skills that is great but those who only have community development staff should be able to use funding to employ someone.

## Consultation Summary - Recommendations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Recommendation** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **1** | **Club Centred Approach** (See Finding/ Observation 1)  That all stakeholders and service providers adopt a model of support that is clearly focussed on meeting the needs of clubs as the end user. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **2** | **Partnership Approach** (See Finding/ Observation 5)  That a partnership approach between service providers is adopted to ensure the most effective model of support is provided to clubs. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **3** | **Industry Leadership** (See Finding/ Observation 3 & 4)  That the industry takes on a greater role in leading and setting the vision for club development. The design of the most appropriate leadership model for club development should be further tested with the stakeholders in the industry (once the DLGSC has declared its preferred position). | 92% | | 4% | 4% | |
| **4** | **Planning & Coordination** (See Finding / Observation 6 & 7)   * That an overarching strategy for state-wide club support is developed. * That to be eligible for any investment, State Sporting Associations and Local Government Authorities will need to have an articulated club support strategy within their planning documents. | 89% | | 4% | 7% | |
| **5** | **Every Club Focus Areas** (See Finding and Observation 12 & 20).  That the four focus areas of the Every Club program are retained with the following focus areas updated to better reflect their application:   * The focus area of *Facilitate* is renamed to *Network.* * The focus area of *Communicate* is renamed to *Resources.* | 74% | | 22% | 4% | |
| **6** | **Centralised Resource Hub** (See Finding/ Observation 13, 18, 19 & 20)  That a centralised hub of resources continues to be made available for the industry. It is recommended that:   * the industry has a greater role in the coordination of the resource hub; * a marketing and awareness campaign is undertaken to increase awareness of the hub; and that the useability of the centralised resource hub is improved through a rationalisation of resources which are kept up to date and address contemporary issues facing sport and recreation clubs. * Resources should be solution focussed and provide practical measures as to how particular issues and challenges can be addressed. | 89% | | 7% | 4% | |
| **7** | **Networking** (See Finding/ Observation 8 & 11)  That a strategy is developed to facilitate improved networking with the following priorities:   * networks are coordinated across key stakeholders including Local Government, State Sporting Associations and regional offices of the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries; * greater emphasis is placed on providing opportunities for clubs to come together at the local level to discuss issues and undertake peer-to-peer learning as part of local club development plans; and * a resource dedicated to the enhancement and coordination of network opportunities is allocated to the Every Club Program. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **8** | **Professional Development** (See Finding/ Observation 10)  Industry personnel including local government and State Sporting Association staff tasked with assisting clubs are supported through a targeted professional development strategy. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **9** | **Recommendation 9:** (See Finding/ Observation 14, 15, 16 & 17)  That learning and development is developed and delivered by the following approach:   * Delivery method meets the needs of clubs.   Via a mix of learning methods, with an emphasis on providing support via a ‘human resource’ / trusted advisor’ to clubs where this is possible. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **10** | **Flexible Funding Approach** (See Finding / Observation 21, 22 & 25)  That a flexible approach towards the investment of Every Club funding is adopted which incorporates:   * an outcome focussed approach enabling funding recipients to determine how local club needs can best be addressed; * recognition of the greater need for funding in regional areas. * longer term funding agreements of three to five years where appropriate; and * agreements which facilitate partnerships between club support stakeholders are encouraged. | 85% | | 15% | 0% | |

**\*Comments:**

* The Every Club name is generic and needs to be replaced. It doesn’t mean anything and will never service every club. as a club volunteer looking for club development resources “every club“ is not somewhere you would look for help.
* Industry does need to be involved / consulted in the decision making, however as mentioned previously, who is accountable for delivery of outcomes. With regard to training LGA/SSA personnel who are at the coal face with clubs – if a well planned and managed networking/training program was developed, I would expect LGAs would be supportive on contributing costs for staff to attend.
* I valued the report very much and thought it captured well what was discussed at workshops.

## **Part 3: Club Development Roles and Responsibilities Discussion Paper**

## Consultation Summary - Findings

All survey respondents had read the phase one club development roles and responsibilities discussion paper and a total of 85% participated in the phase one consultation. The survey was completed by representatives from local government (68%), State Sporting Associations (14%), not for profit/community clubs (11%) and other organisations (7%) such as Future Now. A total of 80% of all respondents were satisfied with the consultation process (phase one and two) whilst 20% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

A total of nine findings and six key options were identified from the discussion paper for consideration of the role and responsibility of club development moving forward.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Finding** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **1** | There is no clear single allocation of role and/or responsibility for ‘industry’ or local government for club development support. | 84% | | 12% | 4% | |
| **2** | The role of the lead agency or organisation is to ensure that club development support is designed and delivered in partnership with the key stakeholders to be successful. | 96% | | 0% | 4% | |
| **3** | LGAs and SSAs considered there was an opportunity for the industry itself to take on a greater role in setting the direction for club development. | 88% | | 8% | 4% | |
| **4** | There is no overarching plan for state-wide club development support developed with input and engagement from key stakeholders. | 96% | | 4% | 0% | |
| **5** | A coordinated approach between all stakeholders providing club support is required to develop plans that identify the priority needs of the club and how this can be best supported. | 96% | | 4% | 0% | |
| **6** | Many SSAs, some LGAs and private providers develop and make available resources for clubs. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |
| **7** | Education and training via workshops, seminars and webinars meet the needs of local clubs when they are coordinated as part of a local and regional planning process rather than through centrally coordinated workshops. | 69% | | 31% | 0% | |
| **8** | Networking was identified as highly valued and an area where significant improvement to the delivery of club support can be attained. | 92% | | 4% | 4% | |
| **9** | DLGSC, LGAs and SSAs acknowledged they have a significant role in providing funding for club development support and the focus of their support is clear; state-wide (DLGSC), geographic (LGAs) or activity (SSAs). | 96% | | 4% | 0% | |

**\*Comments:**

* The collaborative approach is essential and has been the section of delivery that has been missing. This is very complex and as indicated in the report ‘one size does not fit everyone’ which makes connecting all of the parties challenging. The concept of networking is essential, and this must be cross-sector not in individual silos. The other party that is missing in the discussion to date is the role of the national Sporting associations and their requirements in relation to affiliation, membership and related activities, which add another constraint, group to work with particularly for SSAs and then in turn the individual clubs and associations. Training for the ‘people’ that deliver this is also essential noting that often positions in this area of sport and recreation are not well paid (as is the case for the majority of the industry) and staff knowledge and expertise levels are still to be learnt and experienced, further turnover is high which means that consistency is hard to maintain.

## Consultation Summary - Options

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Option** | **Supported** | | **Neutral** | **Not supported** | |
| **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** |
| **1** | **Lead role for state-wide club development - DLGSC**  DLGSC resumes its role as lead agency for the state-wide delivery of club development with increased engagement and input from LGAs and SSAs. The lead role includes facilitating:   * the development a state-wide club development strategy; * a coordinated approach between stakeholders to support planning of club support at a local level; and * a partnership approach to develop and design a centralised hub of resources. | 92% | | 4% | 4% | |
| **2** | **Lead role for state-wide club development – Industry organisation**  An appropriate industry organisation is identified to adopt the role as lead agency for the state-wide delivery of club development. The lead role will include the functions outlined above. *Note: This would need to be further investigated to clarify which organisation has the capacity and capability to assume this role.* | 65% | | 19% | 16% | |
| **3** | **Lead role in regional WA - DLGSC**  DLGSC regional offices continue their role as lead agency in their particular region with engagement and input from LGAs and SSAs/RSAs. The regional lead role includes:   * Planning and coordination – continue to facilitate a coordinated approach to planning * Education and training – take on a greater role in supporting options in partnership with LGAs and SSAs/ RSAs to meet the needs of local clubs. * Networking – continue to play a coordination role in bringing together key stakeholders to share information and communicate local level plans for the delivery of club development support. | 85% | | 15% | 0% | |
| **4** | **Education - Metro**  LGAs and SSAs to work in partnership to deliver education and training to clubs via workshops, seminars and webinars. | 85% | | 15% | 0% | |
| **5** | **Networking – Metro**  LGAs and SSAs to work in partnership with a focus on geographically coordinated local planning. | 92% | | 8% | 0% | |
| **6** | **Investment**  DLGSC, LGAs and SSAs continue to focus their investment in club development support to their role i.e. state-wide (DLGSC), geographical (LGAs) and activity (SSAs) ensuring that they are complementary, create greater impact and can leverage additional investment from other sources. | 100% | | 0% | 0% | |

**\*Comments:**

* DLGSC as the primary funding and support agency to the entire sport and re industry needs to be the lead agency in the holistic support of sport. any other organisation has a vested interest.
* Club development is not taken seriously by relevant sporting industry bodies such as Sports West. It is of great concern that strategic priorities for sport and recreation in the state are developed by Sports West who only represent sporting groups that pay a fee. It should be wholly representative and represent all sport regardless of membership. this includes SSAs and LGAs.
* I feel the right needs have been identified however it is important the solutions are correct and can be adequately resourced. If the department is moving towards a ‘facilitator/partner’ – then their only choice is to provide an industry organisation the funds to resource the future program and framework.
* Should DLGSC take the lead role, they need to be equipped with the appropriate resources to lead. Over the past 2-3 years, there has been minimal contact in comparison to 8-10 years ago (from an LGA perspective). whoever takes that lead role, needs to be able to facilitate strong partnerships to drive the creation of local plans between SSAs and LGAs and enable motivation to do so.
* It cannot be assumed that all LGAs and SSAs can/ will do any aspect of club development at all. A centralised body that offer opportunities to ALL clubs, regardless of the LGA or sport needs to be implemented to cater for EVERY club. Clearly DLGSC would be best placed to do this however resourcing/priorities may not allow it so another body may need to be resourced. The success of DLGSC regional offices in coordinating club development support shows potential of this model.
* In the past there has been much conflict where similar workshops are being offered by multiple LGAs and SSAs. The generic approach does not target the individual club needs. Outlining the responsibilities in the SSAs education/workshop provision in addition to the responsibilities of the LGAs education/workshop provision will increase clarity, effectiveness and ensure financial resources are allocated effectively. Similarly, a coordinated and collaborative approach for metro LGAs to deliver education opportunities would see a greater range of workshops being delivered which would increase the potential for this resource to target the needs of clubs and ensure financial resources are allocated effectively.
* The importance of working together collectively should not be underestimated. There are a number of other ‘club development’ areas that may / may not have been covered in this report, but they are also yet another requirement that can be overlaid in the complexity of this area – these include Good Sports, To Club, Healthy Club Checklists, individual SSA / NSO club systems, individual LGA systems, the name a number of them.