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Q109 The Chairman: Good morning. Thank you very much for joining us today. I should tell you that this is a public session, and that it is being webcast. You will be sent the uncorrected transcripts of the session and given the opportunity to suggest corrections on points of fact. As an incentive for you to do that quickly, in the interim, the uncorrected transcripts will appear on the website. If you need to correct any factual errors, it would help to do so quickly. We have a number of questions for you. I am going to start off by asking both of you to consider the issue of whether it is really realistic to expect the Games to deliver a long-term legacy of increased sports participation, when every other previously Olympic Games has failed to do so. How confident are you, and why are you confident, that London is going to succeed where others have failed? Jennie Price, do you want to go first?

Jennie Price: Thank you, my Lord Chairman. I think it is a very understandable question, given that, as you say, it is not something that other host cities have achieved. However, I think London and successive Governments are very unusual in the way that they have
approached this. They set out, when they bid for the Games, to make participation in sport important and to make the legacy important. They have planned for it. They have put significant funding into participation and into other aspects of legacy, and—very unusually, compared to other host cities—they have followed through on that funding. I think there was significant concern amongst sports and other commentators when London won the bid that there would be a peak of funding; we would have the Games, and then the funding and the interest would drop off. That has not happened.

Just very briefly, if I may, my Lord Chairman, by way of contrast: I visited Athens shortly after I was appointed to talk to them about participation and about legacy, and they had not made any plans whatsoever. I think Beijing was similar, in the sense of not prioritising participation. This is a different approach.

Charles Reed: From our point of view, looking at grassroots disability sport, undoubtedly what the Paralympics did was make a significant step change in the awareness of Paralympic sport and, through that, disability sport. Undoubtedly, perceptions were changed, and I can say that from first-hand experience of being at the Olympic Park and seeing that. What we have to do is build on that start and ensure that the energy that we are putting in through working together with Sport England and other partners allows us to try to move from some of the incremental change that we have seen—and, undoubtedly, there has been some positive movement—and actually try to increase that to get some transformational change into disability sport.

The Chairman: Can I just come back, first, on Jennie Price’s answer? If I paraphrase—no doubt this is unfair—what you are saying is, “We have to be better than anybody else, because nobody has even thought about it.” What I am not quite clear on is why thinking about it is automatically leading through to increased participation.
**Jennie Price:** I do agree, my Lord Chairman, that doing no more than thinking about it will not work. The fact is that the choice was made to prioritise this, and then substantial funding was devoted to it. The previous Government devoted almost £900 million to grassroots sport to increase participation, and we have a budget going forward of over £1 billion, specifically on participation. We have tasked governing bodies very specifically to increase participation, and they know they lose funding as a result if they fail to do so. We have created an environment where it is more likely to happen than not. Although we have had a dip in the most recent figures, overall in the long term we have seen some increase so far. There are 1.4 million more people playing sport. It is not enough yet, but it is a reasonable beginning. There is some other evidence.

**The Chairman:** We are about to come on to that. Mr Reed, could you also tell us what is there to make this step change anything more than a “let us try and do something about this” feeling?

**Charles Reed:** The practical actions are the things that are most important to us, and obviously to you as a Committee. As Jennie has said, for the first time, the national governing bodies have now been specifically targeted with increases in the number of disabled people who are taking part in their sport. That, I think, is a really significant change, and what that has meant is that we have found in the English Federation of Disability Sport that we are working closer with those national governing bodies and with Sport England in agreeing the way that these actions can be followed through so that the targets are being achieved. Equally, when the national governing bodies are being expected to achieve targets, otherwise they will not receive the level of funding that they expect, then that in itself is a very important factor. If I may add one point, I believe that the media attention that was given to the Paralympics and is following through is something that exceeded expectations. I
am certain that that has had a beneficial effect in raising people's awareness and their interest, as disabled people, in undertaking sporting activity.

Q110 Baroness Billingham: Can I ask both of you, actually, what your definition of grassroots sport is? There is a lot of confusion as to what that means. Does it mean children in primary schools? What is your actual definition? I know that Sport England did not have six-year-olds as their original definition. You were talking about 14 to 16-year-olds. Could we be clear on what we are talking about?

Jennie Price: Certainly, Baroness Billingham. The scope of Sport England’s work is specifically on 14 and over, and the measurement we take—the Active People Survey and the figures we will be quoting today—are, at the moment, on 16 and over. We are just in the process of dropping the age range to 14. It is teenagers, and then the whole of the adult population.

The Chairman: Lord Arran, do you want to come back on that?

Earl of Arran: Just, really, to ask Jennie Price: how really confident are you that there is going to be a legacy, in spite of all the good intention and in spite of all the funding? I want to press you on this. Also, how long is it going to take to see if this legacy is working or not?

Jennie Price: I am reasonably confident.

Earl of Arran: Only reasonably?

Jennie Price: I think that the continued public interest and debate is enormously helpful to legacy. The fact is that we do have four-year plans going forward with the sports, so we have not just committed funding or a measurement framework for one year. That is up to 2017, so there is continued pressure on them to grow participation. We have seen some encouraging signs so far, but if we were to take our eye off the ball, there would be a significant risk.
Charles Reed: From my point of view, there are two aspects. This is going back to the old demand and supply. We are working hard with Jennie’s team, with the national governing bodies of sport, with the county sport partnerships, and down to the clubs. There is work going on with EFDS at school level through the Sainsbury’s Active Kids for All programme to improve the ability of teachers to engage with disabled youngsters as well. There is a lot of work going on around the provision of facilities and the interest at that side. Equally, we are doing research and work with disability organisations to understand more about the drivers for disabled people, about what will encourage them to undertake sporting activity, if they have not already done it. That leads you to think that there are some logistical issues about access or transport and physical issues about the equipment they might have to use, but a lot of it—and the most important thing—is the psychological issues. We have to work on those to understand what it is that causes disabled people to say, “I cannot do that because I am disabled.” We need to work through that and provide them with the opportunities.

Q111 Lord Addington: If you look at this, you are the first people who have tried, so you are actually going to make the initial mistakes as well. It is almost guaranteed that you are going to be some of the people. What structure do you have in place for effectively being able to publicly say, “We have tried, we have failed, and we have written it off?” How much of an international model are you taking forward, as the Olympics is probably the ultimate international movement? Are you taking this on, say, as a model that can be taken on by other people, or has that not started to engage with you yet?

Jennie Price: We have discovered, my Lord Chairman, that there is not really a clear pathway to follow for this. If one is trying to replicate elite success in a particular sport, as you say, there is normally a process one can follow from someone else. We are not in that happy position. We are having to experiment; we are having to draw from other sectors, because this is effectively a behavioural change challenge. It is about mass participation, so
we are having to learn from the health sector and from other areas where this has been done successfully.

Interestingly, just in the last month, I have personally been visited by the Chair and Chief Executive of the Australian Institute of Sport and the Chief Executive of Sport New Zealand, both of whom think that we are approaching this in the right way and want to replicate what we are doing with substantial funding to governing bodies of sport, coupled with—because that is not the only thing we fund—funding to local organisations and others. If things do not work, and particularly if governing body funding does not work, we have a mechanism to remove that money. We also do do some things that are slightly higher-risk in some areas. We are funding a mass table tennis project, for example, under the name of Ping!, which involved putting table tennis tables outside in cities. That was risky, but in fact was very, very successful, and the participation figures in table tennis have gone up. We do have to be prepared to do some unconventional things.

Charles Reed: If I may, my Lord Chairman, I think the point in looking at the Paralympic model is not simply because Stoke Mandeville is the home of the Paralympics. During the Paralympics itself, and in meeting and discussing our position with people from several different countries, I think there is a recognition that within Paralympics GB and everything we put around it, we actually are some way ahead of the majority. We are looking there at Paralympic sport, and I would say that it is this whole area that we are working on. It is not just about the Paralympic events themselves: there are other sports that do not feature in the Paralympics that we are keen to engage disabled people in. We are anxious to get that, but I think the view that is taken is that we are actually further advanced. That does not mean that we can easily engineer this step change—it is going to take a lot of work—but the partnerships that we have across the board with the different disability sport organisations, the county sport partnerships, the NGBs and others puts us in a good position to achieve
that. I think it is a position that is recognised outside of these shores, and people are envious of it.

Q112 Lord Moynihan: I would like to follow up, if I may, with a question about Sport England’s remit. Recently you have been focusing on the 16 to 25-year-olds. You mentioned in your opening remarks that you are going to 14, but surely one of the key groups that we need to inspire from the hosting of the Games, both Olympic and Paralympic, are the primary school-aged children? We need to capture those children at an earlier stage and provide opportunities for them to enjoy participation in sport. I am not talking about elite sport, but the remit of Sport England. Why—when the Government appear now on the one hand to be beginning to respond to primary school children—is there not a parallel response from Sport England?

Jennie Price: Our policy remit is set for us by government, as are our targets. They are very clear that they wish us to focus on 14 and above and, to a very limited extend, on other secondary school children.

Baroness King of Bow: Do you think, then, that the Government should review its targets for you, with your hat on as someone who is looking at how we get the best results going forward?

Jennie Price: Our expertise is primarily in what happens at the community level, in clubs, and with governing bodies. I think the age at which young children interact with them varies enormously, and in many sports it is at secondary age. There is a rationale for having a split between primary and secondary. Certainly what happens to children within the school environment—which is not our expertise—is absolutely crucial. The argument is probably finely balanced, to be fair.

Lord Moynihan: Do you really think that? If you go down to Richmond Rugby Club on a Saturday morning, you see eight, 10 and 12-year-old kids playing touch rugby. Unless you
capture them at that age in the community, you cannot start at 14, especially after the Olympic Games. If you see the Olympic Games as an inspiration to people getting into sport, can you really argue from the Sport England perspective that it is not actually a priority until they are 14? It is only 14 recently. Before that, it was “until they are 16-year-olds”.

**Jennie Price:** I am not commenting, my Lord Chairman, on the priority of that issue. I absolutely agree that getting young children playing sport and learning very early on is incredibly important, but the scope of my organisation’s responsibility is the scope of my organisation’s responsibility, and I do not set that.

**Lord Addington:** Just to follow that up: there are different sporting cultures—for instance, rugby union, and the fact that the minis and the juniors are usually integrated into clubs at a very early age. Would you see it as part of your organisation to encourage that for the governing bodies?

**Jennie Price:** We certainly work very closely with all of the major governing bodies, including those leading ones, where, as you say, there is tremendous take-up at primary age. We give them substantial funding, and a lot of that funding does then allow them to concentrate their other sources of income on the very youngest children. We have a role to play there. We are obviously interested in doing a reasonable job, but primarily our focus is 14 and over.

**Q113 Lord Addington:** We are now coming to the not terribly good results from the Active People Survey, which says that we have got a fall since last October in people doing activity once a week of 200,000. Is this cause for concern or a blip, and if it is a blip, why is it a blip?

**Jennie Price:** That set of results was obviously disappointing. Any downward trend in participation is disappointing. It was not unexpected, because we do have some lead
indicators that sit alongside our survey. We knew, for example that the London Marathon had 1,000 extra people dropping out compared to normal because of the very bad weather in their training period. During March, 96% of all rugby league fixtures were cancelled in one week, so we knew there was a lot happening in a poor winter. They were not unexpected. Obviously they are disappointing: I would have preferred them to have gone up.

If I may answer the second part of your question, “Is this a blip?”, our judgement and our analysis of the results is that it is more likely to be a dip than a cause for long-term concern. I think you have seen—forgive me if I refer to a chart that I think the clerk has provided for you—the chart that shows the normal seasonal curve of participation. There is a grey line that shows what normally happens during a calendar year, and it goes like that.

What happened during the Olympic year was that, after the Games, participation tracked significantly above that line. Interestingly, it continued to do so right through the winter until we got to December. Then, when we got the very bad weather in January and, in particular, in March, it undershot the seasonal average very significantly. That does tend to indicate that something very unusual and unexpected happened in March, and that did coincide with the coldest March for 50 years and 18 days of frost. Whilst we cannot be absolutely certain, it looks as though there is good evidence. Also, when we look at the individual sports that dipped, it was the ones that are most likely to be affected by bad weather. It was sports that were affected by frozen pitches, cycling, and running. Those were the things that went down.

**Lord Addington:** In other words, you think that it was basically a bad winter?

**Jennie Price:** We think that is what brought them down, yes. We have taken some soundings subsequently, because we keep in touch with the sports about things like fixtures, cancellations and activities subsequently. Certainly cycling, which had an unexpectedly bad winter, has found that since March their figures have recovered almost completely.
Q114 Lord Moynihan: If you look at the graph that you provided us with, are you not disappointed that since we made such a major priority of participation as a result of hosting the Games, there was not an exponential increase that took us way above the average recorded in the past, both for the Olympian and the Paralympian disciplines? Surely, if you asked Athens, you would probably get much the same result, and if you asked Beijing you would get much the same result. Would you not have hoped that a whole series of policies, by making it a major priority, would have taken us to a totally different dimension in terms of participation?

Jennie Price: I would have hoped it would have been higher. I cannot say that that is not the case. However, we did have a significant jump from the 14.8 million up to the 15.5 million in December. That is an extra 750,000 people. That is a statistically significant jump, and a real jump in the face of some really quite challenging conditions. Economic conditions, in particular, do affect people’s propensity to play sport. There are some drag factors in here, as well as the very positive impact around the Games. To go back to an earlier question, if I may, about the length of time it takes, I think the correct time to judge whether we have had sustained growth is probably going to be in three, four, or maybe even 10 years’ time, which is the timescale that Lord Coe has set for judging whether we have really succeeded. If there has been an exponential, strong change up until then, then I think that will be real success.

Lord Moynihan: Could you explain the methodology used for the Active Peoples Survey?

Jennie Price: Yes, certainly. My Lord Chairman, the methodology is to ask individuals directly how much sport they have played in the previous 28 days. It is certainly the largest participation survey in Europe, and according to Australian research, it seems to be the largest in the world at 160,000. That is 500 people in every local authority area. We use a variety of modes to ask the question—it is a series of questions. It is predominantly a
landline telephone survey, but in the last two years we have also conducted extensive face-
to-face research, research using mobile phones, and we are in the middle of a trial to move part of the survey to mobile phone apps and also to online collection of data.

Lord Moynihan: Is a landline survey really the appropriate way of identifying whether 16, 18, 20, 22-year-olds participate in sport and getting accurate data? In your experience do young people tend to use their mobiles more than their landlines?

The Chairman: They do not have landlines.

Jennie Price: In terms of whether it is an accurate method, my Lord, the advice we get from the statisticians is that it is effective. The 160,000 includes 15,000 interviews with people in the 15-25 age range. Although many young people have a clear preference for their mobiles, they will actually use a landline if it is called persistently enough, which is exactly what this survey company do. For exactly the reason you cite, what we are doing is to move on to a much more mixed mode survey where we can get the same kind of random sampling that we get for the Active People Survey through other means, and in particular online and using mobile phone apps.

Baroness King of Bow: Could I just add to that? In terms of what you are asking people—because a few weeks ago I picked up my landline, which I only do about once a year, and said I did not want whatever they were selling; she said, “No, no, it is a sports survey,” and I did this survey—I wondered what Sport England considers to be a recreational activity. I was asked about walking to work, for instance, walking to the station and that sort of thing. Is that considered recreational sporting activity? Is gardening considered a recreational sporting activity?

Jennie Price: No, neither would be considered sporting activities or feature in the 15.3 million that we talk about. The survey does include questions asked on behalf of the Department of Health, who are interested in broader physical activity, which does include
things like walking. There were also a few questions for the Department of Transport, which was probably the source of the question about walking to the train.

**Lord Moynihan:** So walking is not considered in the Active People Survey?

**Jennie Price:** No, it is not included in the figures we report.

**Lord Moynihan:** If somebody was walking to keep fit regularly that would not be considered, but if they got on a cycle for half the time it would be?

**Jennie Price:** Yes.

**Q115 Lord Addington:** Having two people in the room who have done this survey, and two people who probably should not have stayed still for that many periods of time, there are a lot of quite strange questions. The one that got me was, “Do you go to gym?” “Yes.” “What do you do?” “Well, I work out.” Then this confusion, “What do you do when you work out?” “Generally I just work out.” “No, no, do you lift the weights or something?” It seems to have a problem in that engagement with somebody who is actually taking activity; it seems a bit clunky. Have you had a look at it?

**Jennie Price:** We have had a look at it, and I completely appreciate your concern. The difficulty is that to get something statistically robust, the statisticians advise us that we should prompt as little as possible. If you say, “Do you lift weights?”, the propensity of people to say, “Oh, yes, of course,” is very much greater, so they do try to get the most neutral sources of information. You may also have been asked, “Do you get out of breath?” What they are reaching for there is the intensity of the activity because we don’t count very low intensity. If you were not getting out of breath at all at the gym then you would not get into these figures. Similarly, if you were just standing around at the shallow end of the swimming pool you would not be counted as swimming. That is what the questions are seeking to tease out. I apologise if it feels rather clunky, but it is what the survey designers are advising us is the best to get a good set of information.
Lord Moynihan: Do you feel that 180 people per constituency, on the basis of the methodology used, is sufficiently rigorous to make major financial decisions?

Jennie Price: It is 500 people per local authority area.

Lord Moynihan: In my former constituency of Lewisham East, we had three seats in one local authority. That is why I come to the 180 figure.

Jennie Price: I completely understand the point behind the question. I guess, my Lord Chairman, the challenge here is to balance the costs of the survey and the amount of time and effort that is put into the survey with the results. Given that we are already at the largest sample size for virtually any telephone survey, certainly of this nature on this type of activity, we have a granularity and amount of detail that is very, very unusual. It is one that other European countries and the Australians and New Zealanders envy enormously. What it allows us to do is to very reliably track, and certainly with statistical rigour, at the local authority level, where a lot of the spending decisions are made. That is really what keeps the survey sample high, and it is the reason why we have to limit the face-to-face element of the survey. It costs 10 times as much to conduct a face-to-face interview as opposed to one over the phone. There is a constant balance of costs, benefits and accuracy. Whilst I would love to spend more money on it, it does cost £2.7 million a year, which is less than 1% of our income, and that feels rigorous and appropriate at that level. If it was very much higher I suspect you would be challenging me, rightly, on that point.

The Chairman: Lord Bates, clearly walking from Athens to London would not count as far as this is concerned.

Lord Bates: No. I am one of the inactive members of the population. “What did you do?” “I walked 3,000 miles.” “It doesn’t count. Did you go to the gym?”

I am just interested in the granular level. When you talk about the seasonal effect of this, and you mentioned about cycling and rugby going down because of the bad weather, do you
also find a corresponding increase in sports such as swimming, basketball or visiting the gym during times of poor weather?

Jennie Price: It is not a necessary consequence, but in this set of figures that did happen. Swimming got better; some of the indoor sports did get better. Some of the Olympic sports that were showcased very effectively during the Games, like basketball and volleyball, went up partly because there is the opportunity to play them indoors. To an extent, therefore, there is gravitation to indoors. Some people who might have run outside would go to the gym, so that definitely does appear to happen.

Q116 Lord Stoneham of Droxford: There has been a bit of discussion about merging the Active People Survey with the DCMS’s Taking Part survey. I wondered if you could take us through the likely costs and benefits of doing that, and what the risks are. Would a merger reduce our ability to monitor the long-term trends in sports participation?

Jennie Price: Of course, my Lord. The issue here is one of taking a lot of expert advice, because the surveys are quite delicate in terms of preserving a background of data and being able to compare with confidence. In order to do that we have taken advice from the Office for National Statistics, the Government Statistical Service and the very large survey company that at the moment conducts both surveys, and we have evaluated the cost and benefit. The main benefits are that you will end up with the strengths of the two surveys combined. The big strength of Active People is its size and scale: about 160,000 people. The big strength of Taking Part, in so far as it applies to sport, is the face-to-face element, and the fact that you get a higher response rate from the people you ask. It also means that you do not have two surveys pointing in different directions. That has happened on occasion, and it has normally been Taking Part that has been slightly higher. It has never happened in the long term, it has tended to be a single set of results, but it does create some confusion. Thirdly, it should save some money. We cannot anticipate precisely how much because at the moment Taking
Part covers many other things as well as sport, so it is not replacing two surveys with a single survey; it is taking questions out. However, there are significant benefits that accumulate that.

**Lord Stoneham of Droxford:** Are you in favour of it bringing them together then?

**Jennie Price:** Yes, I think it will help. I think having a single measure of sports participation, making sure that it is fully mixed mode, and therefore as accurate as possible, is to be desired. The risk is the one you have identified, and it is the one we are very concerned about: that it should not impact on the authority of the data. The advice we have had there is that during the integration, we need to take it very much step by step. The first thing is to harmonise the questions in the two surveys, so you are asking for exactly the same data. You then use one data set to validate another before you merge. Then you take the final step of merging. At the moment we are using them to cross-validate; the final step of merging will happen a bit later in this funding cycle for governing bodies. We think that by doing it that way we will firstly maximise the cost savings, because if we were to go out to procurement now to a single survey company for a merged survey, they would price a significant risk and there would be an increase in cost. By doing it in this way we can integrate progressively, and I have been advised that the risks are very, very low in terms of it affecting the data.

**Lord Stoneham of Droxford:** Will the length of the survey, the time it takes to collect the data—I mean, the advice I have had when I do surveys is that the longer it takes the less value the data has as it goes on—

**Jennie Price:** Certainly, the more annoyed people get the lower adherence you get, so making sure that it does not elongate the survey is very important. That is partly why we have harmonised the questions very precisely.

**The Chairman:** Mr Reed, I sensed you wanted to comment.
**Charles Reed:** Thank you, my Lord Chairman. It was simply to say that as a disability sport organisation, we are consulted when the Active People Survey questions are being drawn up. However, beyond that we feel that it is important to have specific pieces of research that are being carried out that focus entirely on the area of disability sport—so carrying out a lifestyle survey and research immediately in the aftermath of the Paralympics to ascertain what people were feeling, whether they were likely to want to do more sport. We will continue to do those bits because I think, if you look at the Active People Survey overall, it is comprehensive. However, we need to do some digging down into certain aspects to do with disability, so we work on those questions together for the Active People Survey.

**Q117 Baroness Billingham:** Could I ask you how you are working with governing bodies and other partners to increase participation amongst those demographic groups with lower levels of sporting ability? Will the whole sport plans specify targets for under-represented groups as well as general participation groups?

**Jennie Price:** In terms of under-represented groups, there are probably three that we prioritise specifically. Women as a group are significantly under-represented with an average participation rate of 35%. Women’s participation rate is around 31% compared to men at 40%, so we clearly need to do extra and specific programmes for women. For people in lower socioeconomic groups similarly, participation rates are around 26% compared to 40% for professional and managerial groups. My colleague has covered disability in some detail already. We do not include targets in the whole sport plans for anything other than disability. The reason that the decision was taken on disability is that when one is in an overall numbers-driven environment, disability is an obvious one that will not get prioritised unless there is a specific target attached to it. They have a target for 42 of the 46 governing bodies. There are no specific targets for women’s participation or for lower socio-demographic groups, but we have a lot of programmes that focus in those areas, some with
governing bodies, some elsewhere. I am very happy to give you examples if that would be helpful.

**Charles Reed:** Do you want me to—from the disability point of view—

**Baroness Billingham:** I do not know if you answer is any different to Jennie’s.

**Charles Reed:** It would be confirming the benefit of having targets for disability sport.

**Baroness Billingham:** In which sports do you expect to see the greatest increases in participation from these groups? Which are the sports that you think are likely to be taken up by the slack that we can now perceive?

**Jennie Price:** For women, if I may, we know that popular sports are swimming, dance and fitness-related sports, so cycling and running are extremely popular, as are tennis and badminton. They are probably the group that is highest. Lower socio-demographic groups vary enormously according to gender and age. Younger women are likely to be very interested in dance-related activities, badminton, and those sort of activities. Swimming is extremely popular. We have a particular targeted programme we have just completed with StreetGames for girls in deprived areas, where we worked with 34,000 women. The preferences there were for dance-related fitness activities, swimming and badminton, which is what we would expect from the participation figures. We challenge those governing bodies hard to make sure that they have a good offer for those groups and that they are thinking about what they might find interesting and attractive.

**Q118 Baroness Billingham:** I am glad to hear you use the word “challenge” towards the governing bodies. I am interested in the challenge that you could potentially be making to the Government. The question “Did you agree with the level of where the grassroots start?” has already been asked. We seem to think that they start at six; the Government seems to think that they start at 16. When we have a Prime Minister who speaks
disparagingly about Indian dancing as being a form of activity for girls, and then substituting that for competitive sport, did you challenge that? It seems such an absurd view.

**Jennie Price:** We have had quite a lot of discussions with Government about what activities are going to be appealing, particularly to girls and women. I think there is an increasing understanding that although there will be some girls and young women who love competitive sport and excel at it—and we had some fantastic examples of that in the Games—if you are working on mass participation, then the motivation is often health, fitness and social. You therefore have to follow people’s preferences and make sure that what they are going to find interesting, exciting and rewarding is what sport can offer them. That is certainly the way we try to configure our work.

**Charles Reed:** With Sport England, we have identified a number of key national governing bodies that we are working with. There are 11 of those out of the overall 46 national governing bodies. Virtually every one of the 46 has agreed targets for increasing disability sport. The most popular sports for disabled people are swimming, cycling, football and athletics. We have gone beyond that, and are also now looking at gymnastics, tennis—which is a partnership that is developing very well, I am glad to say—and also badminton, cricket, and equestrian. We have identified those as core. We are providing support for the other NGBs, but these are the ones that together we feel are the ones most likely to generate the increases of significant size.

**Baroness King of Bow:** Have the actual targets themselves been helpful in motivating organisations to improve participation?

**Charles Reed:** From a disability point of view, yes. The reason I say that is because it has focused the thinking of the national governing bodies, but also the organisations that they work with and we work with: the national disability sport organisations, such as British Blind Sport, Dwarf Sports, Deaf Sport, WheelPower and so on. It has helped them focus in
because they now know that there are some targets within sports that they are involved in primarily. Referring back to an earlier comment with regard to young people, those national disability sport organisations are engaging in multi-sport activities with youngsters. I was at a Dwarf Sports national games where they had youngsters down to the age of two who were taking part, and up to 60, so that was great.

Baroness King of Bow: This is a question for Jennie: what I am not clear on is, if these targets focus the mind, why would we not want to focus the mind on increasing participation amongst women and lower socioeconomic groups?

Jennie Price: There was a practice two cycles ago in 2004 to 2009, where there were targets for a number of groups, for almost everybody except white men, in the end.

Baroness King of Bow: Poor white men.

Jennie Price: The impact that had was that the governing bodies had a series of perhaps unconnected projects where they could show they were doing things with those groups, but it did not necessarily add up to a coherent strategy. What I think lies behind your question, your Ladyship, is that it is absolutely right that targets focus the mind, and they focus resources. However, a proliferation of inner targets does not necessarily have that effect. Certainly if I was asked for advice, I would say the choice is really important if there were to be other targets, because perhaps one other target or a maximum of two could have that effect. If you over-cumulate it tends not to be very effective.

Q119 Lord Addington: I think we covered a little bit of this, but which of the governing bodies is probably best at preparing people to become part of your target? I was wondering about them, because it seems to be an appropriate thing of the time: which governing bodies get in to do the work for physical awareness, teambuilding and culture building to actually make them easy targets to fulfil with your area down there? It seems to be something that is important and we have not quite brought out yet.
Jennie Price: In terms of growing participation and creating a climate where people are likely to play sport, the two star performers are cycling and netball. Cycling is a star performer because it has prioritised participation at the grassroots and across the age ranges with the same vigour and expertise that it has devoted to winning medals, and it genuinely believes as a governing body that the more people it gets on a bike the more medals it will win. Therefore its members and its governance are completely behind that target. They have also benefitted enormously from their partnership with Sky, which is incredibly customer focused and very good at getting data about what people really do and do not like very quickly; they have learnt a lot from them.

At the other end of the spectrum in many ways there is the much more formal and traditional team sport of netball, where they have really got under the skin of what girls and women are interested in when they play sport. They have prioritised a social offer and have not said, “We are going to deal with all girls at the age of 16 up to 25 as a group.” They have accepted that what a 16 to 18-year-old wants is utterly different to what a 23 to 25-year-old wants. They have designed versions of their game—environments in which their game can be played with exactly that in mind.

Q120 Lord Wigley: I would like to come back to the disability dimension, which is of course relevant to both of you. I noted, Mr Reed, your comments about incremental change moving over to transformational change, and the comments that you made on a number of prioritised sporting governing bodies being asked to develop their offer for disabled people. I note specifically that you are supporting the delivery of whole sports plans to include disabled people. In that context, how exactly are the national governing bodies encouraged to increase participation amongst disabled groups, and how will these outcomes be measured in terms of the targets? Have you got a methodology in place? Do you have incentives to do that?
"Charles Reed": The work that we as EFDS are doing with the individual national governing bodies ranges from the relationship management—making sure that we are sitting down with them on a regular basis—to exploring the research behind the expectation that we have of an increase. Then in terms of the numbers, we will be working with Sport England to see how those increases are measured. We are the catalyst, if you like, and it is our job to partner those organisations to come up with the supply of opportunities to increase it. Equally, as I hinted earlier, it is important that we understand what drives the demand side, so again we can work with the disabled people’s organisation and the national governing bodies to come together to say, “This is the opportunity set for you, but this is actually what is driving the demand,” and bring those together.

Lord Wigley: Given that, what is the role of Sport England in taking that on?

Jennie Price: Our role, my Lord, is obviously to invest, and specifically to invest against participation targets. It is a real “money in, results out” relationship. If the results out are not delivered then we will remove funding from the governing bodies. We have a measurement system through Active People, which is sufficiently sensitive to measure 10 of the NGBs: sailing, riding and tennis, for example, can all be measured through Active People. Where the numbers are too small—and across 42 governing bodies, many of them are too simple to be picked up even by that big survey—we create a sport specific measure. Sometimes it is literally counting the participants who go through the programmes because they are small enough to do that. Sometimes we will do a survey of a particular impairment group that might have a particular interest in that sport, but every single one has a method of measuring attached to it designed for that sport if it is not Active People.

Lord Wigley: Are Sport England totally signed up to the whole sport plans, including disabled people?

Jennie Price: Totally.
Lord Wigley: Would any circumstances arise where funding could be totally conditional on compliance?

Jennie Price: With the disability target, my Lord?

Lord Wigley: Yes.

Jennie Price: I am not sure we would remove the whole of the funding if a disability target was not reached. Clearly if a governing body had indicated it was going to deliver a particular programme and failed to do so, then that takes it out of just a poor performance and into a serious breach of contract. We would then have an extremely tough conversation with that governing body that would include more than just disability funding.

Lord Wigley: Are you happy with that, Mr Reed?

Charles Reed: Yes, and particularly that we were invited by Sport England to review those whole sport plans for these major national governing bodies as they came through to make certain that we were comfortable that there were proper targets, and the activities behind the plans were going to deliver against those targets.

Q121 Earl of Arran: We may have already covered, or certainly touched upon this, but how the devil do you decide which sports are going to get more money and which are going to get less?

Jennie Price: We started off, my Lord, with a group of 46, who we had funded in the previous round. We took a decision in principle that if they gave us decent plans, we would look at a submission from each of those 46. That included every Olympic and Paralympic sport, together with all of the major participation sports, such as cricket, rugby and so on, that are not in the Olympics. We started with a field of 46. They then issued very detailed submissions to us when we had set out clearly what we wanted, which was growth in participation, good talent systems and growth in disability participation. On a preliminary assessment of those, based on value for money, what they had done in the past and the
quality of their plan, we gave them a funding range. Some of the submissions were 25 pages long for a tiny disability sport; some of them were 400 or 500 pages, so there was a whole team of people in Sport England whose job for about six months was to assess that rigorously, drawing on expertise from people like Charles’s organisation and others. We also liaised extensively with UK Sport on the talent element of the funding, and took external advice wherever that was appropriate. We also interviewed every one of the 46 sports, and tested them quite rigorously on any weaknesses or concerns we had about the plans. We then came up with the funding recommendations.

**Earl of Arran:** When you speak of value for money, what is the value? Is it winning a gold medal?

**Jennie Price:** No. Our scope is very much about grassroots participation. We looked at how many people they thought they could both sustain and increase playing their sport regularly, both in the 14 to 25 age range and over, and with a disability, and the quality of their talent plans. We stop at the top of what we call the England talent pathway, so when somebody goes into GB or international, that becomes the responsibility of UK Sport. We are looking at numbers of participation and quality of talent system.

**Earl of Arran:** Do you separate men from women?

**Jennie Price:** We assess the quality of the plans that they put forward. Wherever they put forward plans for women’s participation, which they did in several areas, then we do look at the quality they offer.

**Q122 Baroness King of Bow:** I just wondered how you were measuring the outcomes of the Places People Play initiative. What has worked best in terms of investment? Which investment under that programme has resulted in the most participation? Also, if you are looking at investing in either volunteers and coaches on the one hand, or facilities on the
other, which do you think is most important, or which ratio is best? I would also be interested, Mr Reed, in hearing which ratio is important in terms of disability.

**Jennie Price:** In terms of how we measure, we measure two things. We measure the thing itself, as it were, the output that it produces, so we count the number of volunteers that are trained, coaching sessions that are taken or facilities that are funded. Then we also count wherever we can the participation impact that that has. In terms of the things that have had the most impact, at this early stage where these programmes are still being delivered, the programmes where we invest in people have the biggest impact in the short term—the coaching sessions we offer young people through Sportivate and the training we give to volunteers through Sport Makers. In the case of Sportivate, 245,000 young people have had coaching sessions and are still playing those sports. Sport Makers have impacted on over 600,000 people playing sport. That is where the big figures are. However, in terms of medium and long term, my view is that the facilities investment over the long term will probably have the bigger impact because of its sheer size and scale. This is £140 million across a large number of small clubs and also a few big investments and quite a lot of playing field investment. We evaluate that for a period of up to seven years. Classically, when you have new facilities or improved facilities, you get a few more people coming and it then tends to build up over time, provided that is a flourishing place to play.

In terms of the balance between people and facilities, it genuinely does depend on the sport. There is not really a generic answer. If you are looking at increasing participation in running, for example, your critical thing is activators, people running running groups, coaches, training. If you are looking at a pitch-related sport, particularly where demand outstrips supply as it does for football, then building pitches undoubtedly increases participation. I would say one that has a mix is tennis, although I would probably balance tennis towards coaches and activators because there are an enormous number of public courts and park
courts that are underused at the moment, and really what we need to invest in there is people to get people playing. There is not really a generic approach.

**Charles Reed:** For me, certainly access is one of the key determinants of people’s ability and willingness to take part—people who are disabled—in a sporting activity. We are very pleased to see the number of improvements that are going on across the sports and across the clubs. There is also, of course, an additional sum that Sport England is putting into inclusive funding projects, which is going to have a significant impact as well. Some of those are around increasing coaching facilities, training facilities; some of them are around the actual physical assets at those clubs as well. That is important. A third strand that we are doing, which I feel is helping, is that we are inviting clubs to carry out a self-assessment of their own situation, so they can see just how they stack up in terms of accessibility and, if you like, customer friendliness for the disabled people who wish to use those facilities.

Q123  **Lord Moynihan:** The volunteers who were recruited by LOCOG were one of the outstanding successes of the Games. How many times have you approached that group of volunteers to link them directly with clubs and ongoing support for sports participation since the Games?

**Jennie Price:** What I would like to do, my Lord, is to make sure I give you a comprehensive answer, so I can give you a written answer. However, I will tell you what I know off the cuff, which is that they were given the opportunity to become Sport Makers if they wished to: that is training that enables them to activate and organise sport at local level. We communicate with them very regularly through the LOCOG database, which we have inherited—both before we inherited it and subsequently—to make sure they are aware of opportunities to volunteer locally, and their interest is still incredibly high. They still open almost every communication that comes from that source. We do communicate and engage
with them as much as we can, and many of them, as you know, did come from sport originally and are still connected with the places from where they came.

Lord Moynihan: That is the important detail that we would like to see: of the Sport Makers, how many were not actively involved at club level beforehand? In other words, what did the Games do to inspire those volunteers, for the first time, to be actively involved at local club or local authority level?

Jennie Price: We will get that data for you.

The Chairman: That is very helpful.

Q124 Lord Best: 40% of your funding goes to the people over 25. The vast majority of the population is actually over 25, and for that younger age group up to 25 you have lowered the threshold to 14-year-olds from 16-year-olds. Are you going to need to revisit this if the statistics are pointing us in the right direction when they show that it is the older people who seem to be falling off in terms of participation? How rigid is the 60/40 split? How long does it last? When will you have another look at that one in the light of some of these stats?

Jennie Price: The 60/40 split, my Lord, was particularly around the investment between the period of 13 to 17 in the governing bodies. To an extent, we have a methodology that is going to be with us for a while although, obviously, if the statistics continue the trend that has been showing more recently, there is no reason why we cannot review that. The rationale for doing it originally was the fact that although younger people have a tremendous propensity to play sport, actually increasing the proportion of young people who were playing is proving to be really difficult. When the general numbers were going up, the people in that age range were actually going down or staying flat up until the most recent set of figures. There was clearly an issue there and we were also aware that the traditional issue of taking young people who play sport at school and encouraging them to play in their own
time was very, very difficult to crack. Simply creating a link between a sports club and a school was not enough. There is such an enormous gap between having everything delivered to you in a school environment compared to joining a club in your own time and going to a different environment.

A lot of that investment to which you refer is centred in that age range for transitional clubs, different types of clubs that young people are going to be more interested in, and higher and further education sports clubs, to keep them playing throughout that period on the basis that if they have a very strongly established habit by the age of 25 and a lot fewer breaks, they are then likely to continue. The statistics certainly indicate that if you have had a good experience through that end of your school period and early adulthood, you are more likely to carry on playing thereafter.

**Lord Best**: Is it the same on the Paralympic side, Mr Reed?

**Charles Reed**: Very much. I think it is important to recognise as well that, although Sport England may not be focusing finance directly on the under-14s through the provision of funding to the national disability sport organisations, that is one example—as I hinted before with Dwarf Sports—where we are getting younger people engaged. The funding that is going into the primary schools for coaching of young people who are disabled is another example, and also some of the work that goes on with an organisation called Panathlon Challenge, which is for younger people as well. That is picking up and recognising—as was hinted before—the importance of getting a sporting habit for life built in at an early stage. Equally, when we are assessing these results that come through from the Active People Survey, we are looking at breaking it down by age group as well as gender. The Baroness has left now, but one of the encouraging factors that I see from the latest Active People Survey is the increase in the number of women who are taking part in disability sport. What
we have to be careful of is that there is a slight dip in the number of men compared with the last one. We need to understand that, but we are looking at all of these various age groups.

**Q125 Lord Bates:** We are very short of your time, but thanks for your contributions. The question I have relates to how you work with UK Sport. Could you just tell us, structurally or systematically, how you work together setting targets and developing strategy and liaising with governing bodies? What are the structures that make that happen?

**Jennie Price:** The essential divide is that they target medals and world level performance, and we target participation numbers and talent structures. The place where we intersect very strongly is in that talent pathway where they fund the upper half and we fund the lower half. What we do there is discuss our approach to each sport very carefully in the four-year period for which we are setting the target. Our talent teams cross-assess the submissions that we each receive, so UK Sport’s team look at the lower part and we look at the upper part. We try to make sure that it is seamless. We certainly changed a number of our funding recommendations as a result.

**Lord Bates:** I am more interested in how that happens structurally. What are the mechanisms?

**Jennie Price:** Structurally, the two talent teams and the two Directors of Sport literally work together. Our directors meet every month during the assessment process. The teams that were assessing the bids met weekly. Where there were any areas that were difficult to resolve, myself and the Chief Executive of UK Sport met to discuss and resolve those. It is essentially, therefore, through liaison between the teams. From 2014 we will be co-located, so that liaison and discussion will be easier and more practical than it is now.

**Q126 Lord Addington:** What would be the downside of that? This was not a universally, shall we say, welcomed situation. There were grumblings.
Jennie Price: I think the distinction, my Lord, is probably between co-location and merger. Structurally, we are not merging. We are two separate organisations with separate boards and separate leadership teams, and they are different disciplines. The knowledge you need to have to help people win medals compared to boosting participation is very different. Structurally, we will remain separate, but we will be physically in the same building and we will be sharing the neutral back office services like finance and IT, which should deliver some cost savings.

The Chairman: Let us make sure we understand this. You have two separate bodies that operate in the same premises, which have all the same back services, and whenever there is anything to be discussed the two Chief Executives end up meeting to talk about it. What is the justification for having two separate, publicly funded bodies?

Jennie Price: The main distinction is really in the nature of the activity. Grassroots sport is fundamentally different to elite sport. Grassroots sport is about mass participation, long-term behavioural change, local delivery chains and links with other policy areas such as health. The kind of relationships you need, the understanding, the skills, are entirely different to the very focused work you need to have with the very small number of athletes, with strong international links and highly technical and scientific disciplines. If you try to merge the two, the very significant risk is that grassroots ends up being the poor relation. There being a distinction is very good for grassroots sport and is very strong. It is one of the reasons why we are managing to grow participation.

Lord Moynihan: Do you not agree with the concept of the Performance Pathway, whereby at the base level, you encourage as much participation as possible in schools, you identify talent, you work through the clubs, you come up through the governing bodies and, ultimately, you have Team GB? That is a Performance Pathway, not two wholly distinct roles.
Jennie Price: I completely agree with the strength of the Performance Pathway, but I do strongly believe that the people who are not at the top of the Pathway and who are never going to get there are equally important. If you focus only at the bottom of the Pathway for the purposes of what you get out at the top, you do not give the mass a good experience of participation in sport. I think there always has to be that duality. There is inevitably a join where you have the two separate organisations, but I genuinely believe that inside that talent pathway now, we are more streamlined than we have ever been before.

Earl of Arran: How many people are employed in your organisation?

Jennie Price: 240.

The Chairman: Okay, I think we have to draw it to a close there. Can I thank you both for coming along? We look forward to any further information you may want to supply to us. Thank you very much indeed.