



**Australian Government**  
**Australian Sports Commission**

# **Addendum to the Submission of the Australian Sports Commission to the Commonwealth Government's Independent Review of Sport in Australia**

**February 2009**

© Australian Sports Commission 2009

This addendum has been prepared by the Australian Sports Commission for the purposes of the Commonwealth Government's Independent Review of Sport. Use of any of the information contained within this document should be done so with appropriate attribution to the Australian Sports Commission.

*Addendum to the ASC Submission to the Independent Review of Sport*

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Stakeholder forums</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1.1 Community sport forum</b> .....	<b>2</b>
1.1.1 Issues facing community sport	2
1.1.2 What has worked well to date	3
1.1.3 A new model for community sport	3
1.1.4 Roles of stakeholders	4
<b>1.2 Sporting excellence forum</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1.2.1 National leadership –national focus, alignment and coordination	6
1.2.2 Coaching pathways, education and profession.	7
1.2.3 Athlete recruitment, identification, retention, and development	8
1.2.4 Participation and developing the base of sport	9
1.2.5 Sport infrastructure	9
1.2.6 Tax issues and funding diversification	10
<b>1.3 High performance coaching forum</b> .....	<b>11</b>
1.3.1 National pathways	11
1.3.2 Coach development, education & training	12
1.3.3 Coaching 'council'/ coach representation	13
1.3.4 Sport science and sport medicine	13
<b>2 Support for high performance pathways</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>2.1 National Institutes of Sport Model</b> .....	<b>15</b>
2.1.1 Purpose	15
2.1.2 Terms of reference	15
2.1.3 Operational processes	16
2.1.4 Principles	16
2.1.5 Accountability	17
2.1.6 Sports science and sports medicine	17
2.1.7 Monitoring and review	18
2.1.8 Benefits and risks of the model	18
2.1.9 Alternative option	19
<b>3 Coaching</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>3.1 National coaching advisory panel</b> .....	<b>21</b>
3.1.1 Purpose	21
3.1.2 Terms of reference	21
3.1.3 Composition	22
3.1.4 Secretariat	22
3.1.5 Remuneration and funding	22
3.1.6 Accountability	22
3.1.7 Operational processes	23

<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix A: List of participants in the ASC’s Community Sport Forum, 2-3 October, 2008.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix B: List of participants in the ASC’s Sporting Excellence Forum, 9-10 October, 2008 .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix C: List of participants in the ASC’s High Performance Coaching Forum, 17 October, 2008 .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendix D: Proposed time frames for National Institutes of Sport operational planning and review process.....</b>	<b>29</b>

## Introduction

As part of the preparation for the Australian Sports Commission's (ASC) submission into the Commonwealth Government's Independent review of Sport, three stakeholder forums were held during October 2008. The three forums were as follows:

- 2nd-3rd October – “*Community Sport*” (Canberra), involving representatives from state/territory departments of sport and recreation, the health and education sectors, as well as clubs, national sporting organisations and other relevant community sport groups.
- 9th-10th October - “*Sporting Excellence Forum*” (Melbourne), with National Sporting Organisation Presidents and Executive Directors, representatives from the Australian Olympic Committee, the Australian Paralympic Committee, the Australian Commonwealth Games Association, all the state/territory institutes and academies of sport as well as other key stakeholders.
- 17th October – “*High Performance Coaching*” (Brisbane) involving a group of 10 representatives from a diverse range of sports.

The time lines for submissions to the Independent Review meant that considerations from the latter two of these forums could not be included in the ASC's original submission. Initial considerations from the Community Sport forum were incorporated into section 4 of the ASC submission.

This addendum will include a summary of the main issues identified by the stakeholder groups at all three stakeholder forums, as taken from forum notes and presentations.

In addition this addendum will expand on two key issues which were highlighted in the forums and on which the Commission would like to clarify and elaborate with suggested models for the future.

# 1 Stakeholder forums

## 1.1 Community sport forum

The Community Sport Forum was held in Canberra on 2-3 October 2008. It was attended by over 70 stakeholders from a broad range of community sport related organisations including representatives from state and territory departments of sport and recreation, health and education, National Sporting Organisations (NSO) as well as representatives from a range of community groups with involvement in sport and physical activity. All attendees are listed at Appendix A.

The aim of the forum was to help inform the future direction of community sport, and in particular to discuss the issues currently facing community sport, identify effective strategies for delivering community sport and discuss a possible future model for delivery. For the purpose of the forum, community sport was defined as 'structured physical activity that occurs at a set time and place that is facilitated within your community'.

After the forum, a comprehensive summary was collated from presentations and notes from the discussion groups at the forum. This was set out to all participants. The key points were then reflected in the ASC's submission to the Independent Review (section 4). The issues and points below are a further summary of the forum notes, reflecting the discussion outcomes from the forum.

### 1.1.1 Issues facing community sport

The Forum confirmed that community sport is operating in a changing landscape. Significant societal and environmental challenges and differing government priorities are impacting on what is delivered, and Australia's traditional sporting structures are struggling to adapt to these challenges.

Key issues identified included:

- Societal changes, including working families, child safety issues, a decline in volunteer support, accessibility, affordability, legal issues/insurance, crowded school curriculums, increased expectations concerning quality and changing community structures;
- Environmental factors, including the availability and quality of facilities and infrastructure, the availability and cost of transport particularly in regional and remote areas, and the impact of the drought and climate change;
- Duplication of services, fragmentation and lack of consistent vision and direction for community sport across federal, state and local government agencies;
- Capacity of 'traditional' sport delivery structures to meet current and changing expectations in relation to the delivery of community sport; and
- Need for evidence-based decision making, with a greater focus on the need to collect, collate, interpret and share information, and make decisions based on this information.

Forum participants noted that these issues vary across different demographic areas – metropolitan, regional and rural, and that individuals and groups will have different experiences with these issues depending on these demographics.

### 1.1.2 What has worked well to date

Within this challenging environment, the forum participants identified strategies and initiatives which have been successful at national, state or local level in one or more of the following areas:

- building industry capacity,
- building community capacity,
- resourcing and delivery.

A number of common themes emerged from these discussions.

- *Community engagement and ownership* – Successful community sport programs have been developed by the community to meet local needs. They build on existing community strengths and resources, with delivery on the ground by people who know and understand their communities.
- *Strategic partnerships* – Long term strategic partnerships are critical for any successful program, with all parties having clearly defined roles and responsibilities and contributing to provide strategic benefit to all organisations involved.
- *Long term investment and resourcing* – Adequate ongoing resourcing is needed to sustain successful programs at the community level. The forum participants identified the need to rethink some of the current approaches to funding, moving towards a more partnership based approach with clear and transparent guidelines for accessing funds.
- *Central coordination and local delivery with a focus on building both industry and community capacity* – A number of the successful programs discussed benefited from a centrally coordinated structure and strategic direction, whilst retaining the flexibility to tailor program delivery to meet the needs identified within individual communities. The need for quality training, education and resources was highlighted, noting that there was a need to build capacity at all levels within the sporting system and within each community.

These themes provide an effective blueprint for the development of a new community sport model into the future.

### 1.1.3 A new model for community sport

Forum participants provided feedback on a possible community sport model, with forum participants agreeing that key components of a model were: local ownership and delivery, strategic partnerships with clearly defined roles and responsibilities, and long term resourcing. Forum participants highlighted the need for a clear definition of Community Sport and what a model is trying to achieve, an evidence-based approach, and learning from existing or previous models and approaches.

Based on this discussion, a model has been developed which provides for the following key elements:

- A national implementation plan detailing the objectives, roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders, funding arrangements, delivery framework and coordination arrangements;
- Community sport officers within local communities, with the role to scope existing resources and initiatives and specific needs for that community;
- Development of a tailored local plan detailing strategies to provide more opportunities for all community members to engage in community sport. The development of this plan would be facilitated by the community sport officer building on the outcomes of the scoping exercise and would provide the blueprint for future activity.
- The plan would include detail of the investment required to achieve the objectives listed, including the identification of possible local and regional funding sources.
- Allocation of funding at a national level that could be invested within communities to contribute towards their plans.

#### **1.1.4 Roles of stakeholders**

Whilst it was identified that all of the parties represented at the forum have a role to play in moving forward with community sport, a strong message to come out of the forum was that the ASC is ideally placed and should take a leadership role in bringing together the stakeholders and facilitating the change.

In moving forward, forum participants reiterated the need for a clearly articulated and shared vision for community sport, a strategic approach to influencing decision makers, with a coordinated strategy incorporating both media campaign and grassroots activity, and a focus on empowering key partners and local communities.

## 1.2 Sporting excellence forum

The Sporting Excellence forum was held in Melbourne on 9-10 October 2008 and involved representatives (senior staff and board) from 38 National Sporting Organisations (NSO) as well as representatives other organisations related to the Australian sporting system, including the Australian Olympic Committee (AOC), the Australian Paralympic Committee (APC) and each of the State/Territory Institutes and Academies of Sport (SIS/SAS). All attendees are listed at Appendix B.

The aim of the forum was to discuss and workshop the challenges currently facing the Australian sporting system and identify what is needed for an effective and sustainable sport system into the future.

At the forum all breakout discussions groups created presentations and summary notes, which were presented back to the overall group. These notes along with overall forum presentations were made available to all participants after the forum. The issues and points below are a collation and summary of these presentations and notes taken from the forum.

**The overarching message identified by the collective stakeholder group was that there is a need for:**

- Whole of sport solutions for sustainable success;
- Clear simple unified message/vision – unity of purpose;
- Clear national leadership and coordination, backed by clearly articulated roles and responsibilities for all stakeholders;
- Long term planning and accountability;
- Enhanced relationships between all stakeholders;
- A unified structure and streamlined processes for operating in the federated system;
- Increased resourcing to enhance the capacity of the whole system;
- Industry representation and advocacy – unified voice.

**The major Issues Identified were:**

- The difficulty of attaining clear leadership (both for the ASC and for NSOs) due to the federated structure under which sport operates and diversity of stakeholders.
- Lack of alignment of stakeholders and unity of focus across the ASC/AIS, NSOs, SIS/SAS, AOC, etc.
- The ASC and AOC must find a way to work together. At the Olympic high performance end, they have the same objectives.
- The need for more funding and the fact that sport is already doing “more with less”. How to obtain and/or justify more resourcing and how to increase capacity of the sport system to deliver sport at every level.
- The coaching profession – higher numbers of quality coaches are needed.
- Attracting, retaining and developing athletes – links with participation
  - engaging the education system (national benchmarking and testing);
  - delivery of programs through a well structured sport system;
  - Participation outcomes driven by elite success;
  - Increased participation in sport activity will drive increase capacity;
  - Funding to sport to promote participation in sport pathways;

- Fractured pathways need to be repaired. Delivery of programs at community level, but led nationally.
- Commercialisation – NSO ownership of properties. Some non-Olympic sports have greater opportunities through a top down funded whole of sport pathway. Many Olympic sports are disparate leading to difficulty in exploiting commercial opportunities.
- Tax deductibility of donations to sport.
- Sport science, medicine, research and technology investment, coordination and innovation – Loss of priority focus, Australia has been overtaken, talent drain, (key areas sports psychology, professional therapies people and sports medicine). Role of AIS as breeding ground for innovation and growth of system. Access to technology and innovation.
- The fundamental issue that national program delivery (NSO driven) is essential for effective sport delivery, but is very difficult to achieve.

### 1.2.1 National leadership –national focus, alignment and coordination

Gaining a mandate for clear national leadership with a national focus, alignment and coordination was identified as a major issue across all levels. There is a need for a collaborative, integrated structure linking organisations both horizontally and vertically in order to drive sport outcomes, removing fragmentation and duplication between the key partners. Achieving this within the federated system requires strong ‘unity of purpose’ resulting in unified behaviour. This is a major challenge both within and across:

- Governments – there is a need for Commonwealth and State/Territory Governments to have a unity of purpose in terms of their sport policies in order to achieve national alignment and coordination towards the desired sporting outcomes for Australian society.
- Sporting organisations – there is a need to assist and support NSOs to gain unity of purpose and alignment across their state and local affiliates.
- The sports institutes system – there is need for agreement on the objective of Australian sporting success above state parochialism. The institutes system was identified as a major issue for most stakeholders with significant frustration occurring with regards agreement, planning and implementation of a system of institute support that aligns with the needs of the NSOs rather than the needs of the SIS/SAS. Misalignment of the SIS/SAS is frustrating the ability of NSOs and, in turn, the ASC to be accountable for delivery of target high performance outcomes.

Stakeholders expressed a clear desire for strong leadership from the ASC as the one body with the ability to have a truly national perspective. It was clearly felt that the ASC is the one organisation with the ability to facilitate coordination the entire system; provide systemic support programs; distribute best practice models of operation; and set standards of accountability for the sports industry.

#### Proposed solutions:

- National leadership, local delivery
  - That the ASC fund sport based on their efforts to gain national alignment and behaviours by establishing a system that incentivises state based delivery, but operates under the guidance of nationally agreed business processes, philosophy and governance.
  - ASC business support centre for lower funded NSOs

- National Elite Sports Network/ Council
  - Need for a national approach to the delivery of elite sport in Australia.
  - Single point of accountability and decision making through an overriding strategic mechanism – necessitates an inter-governmental agreement.
  - Sport to set the plan, AIS and SIS/SAS to support.
  - Agreement established between the AIS and SIS/SAS as to what role each plays in the elite pathway of high performance athletes. AIS should be the clear leader the institute system.
  - Improved services to athletes.
  - This approach must maximise resource alignment and more importantly, philosophical alignment that complements the national plan established by the national sporting organisation.
  
- Sport needs better advocacy and a voice to government and the public. This must be funded and driven collectively by the sports themselves. It cannot and should not be the ASC's role, as the ASC is the direct agent of government and already plays a (different) advocacy role.

### 1.2.2 Coaching pathways, education and profession.

Coaching was identified as an integral part of all sports at all levels. The coaching 'profession' was seen as in need of support, development and recognition. The coaching pathway is narrow and with too few paid positions and opportunities for coaches to develop and advance. Coaching in general is not seen as a career prospect by the broader community and thus may not be attracting the best people. The major issues were as follows:

- Limited resources to attract, recruit and retain good people at all levels.
- Quality of coaching is ad hoc and relies too much on volunteers at lower end of elite pathway. Need for development and maintenance of standards.
- Limited capacity of (smaller) NSOs and state sporting organisations to deliver quality education and keep resources current. Promotion of and access to courses is limited at grassroots level. Capacity to deliver quality coach education, limits the ability of sports to set high standards for coach accreditation.
- Difficulty in developing a nationally consistent approach to developing athletes. Matching of appropriate coach to athlete level is a huge challenge.
- We know coaches are important but we can't afford them.
- Recognition that needs of high performance coaches are unique. Need to reward high performance coaches at appropriate level and attract best coaches.
- Foundations of the system are in place through the ASC's Coaching and Officiating unit (including the National Coach Accreditation Scheme, Elite Coach development, coaching scholarships), but further investment is needed.
- Coach scholarship scheme and other programs are effective, but there is not necessarily support and pathway to keep the coaches in Australia.
- Are best coaches caching? We may not be attracting the most talented coaches and our senior coaches are taking on a much greater administrative and coordination role (for which they are not always prepared).
- Need to utilise the knowledge of senior coaches in coach development.

## Proposed solutions

1. Need to develop a nationally planned professional coaching pathway.
2. ASC provides leadership role in promoting education and coach development opportunities:
  - a. Need money further down pathway to employ more coaches;
  - b. Need greater resources for education and development opportunities;
  - c. Building across industry links, especially with the education sector;
  - d. Greater financial reward and support for coaches in the high performance system (national and state level);
  - e. NSOs need more resources to develop and promote standards within their sport and ensure coach education is delivered adequately;
  - f. State sporting organisations need more resources to deliver quality coaching education and development at grass roots level;
  - g. Funding for employment of national and state coaching directors in sports is a priority. Coaching development coordinators are a desired option;
  - h. Succession planning and knowledge management through coach mentoring and assistant coach scheme;
  - i. Resource administrative responsibilities of head coaches.
3. Greater prioritisation of coaching with national structure
  - a. Reinstitute National Coaching Council (leadership), with a mandate to look after the interests and represent the professional coaching industry.
  - b. Increase the number of coaching scholarships available.
  - c. Introduce direct funding support for coaches.
  - d. Examine a higher education requirement within the elite coach education pathway.

### 1.2.3 Athlete recruitment, identification, retention, and development

Athletes are the core of sport, from participation through to elite performers. The stakeholders identified the increasing need to recognise that there is a continuum that includes increasing participation, talent identification, athlete development and athlete retention. With changing society and a decreasing 'talent pool', this progression is less likely to happen 'naturally' and needs to be systematically supported.

Two of the major issues identified were:

- National Talent Identification and development
  - The need to focus on opportunities in each sport and enhancing existing pathways
  - Recognising the resources required to support good talent. More money is required in athlete development not necessarily talent identification.
  - Recognition of different models for different sports.
  - Not only athlete development but must have coach development opportunities as well.
- Athlete Retention
  - Rewards and support scheme (Australia Government Sports Training Grant) for elite and developing athletes is essential.
  - Support networks for older athletes.

## Proposed solutions

One proposed solution was an idea to 'employ' athletes through NSOs instead of a direct athlete support grant. For example provide minimum wage to top 1000 athletes nationally (\$40,000 per athlete = \$40 million), under a whole of sport package where each athlete is contracted as elite athlete but also have a development and community contribution requirement. Athletes can opt in or out. This would cater for the need to provide adequate level of ongoing base funding to identified elite athletes for their ongoing competitive requirements, but also provides a valuable resource for the development and enhanced capacity of the sport.

### 1.2.4 Participation and developing the base of sport

It was identified that there is a need to increase participation, especially in the smaller sports. There was also a strong feeling that sport and the education system had grown apart and there is an urgent need to re-establish that partnership. In particular the issues and ideas associated with participation were identified as follows:

- Need to ensure quality access for primary aged students to PE in schools, provided through qualified teachers. It should be the responsibility of the education system to teach basic movement skills to all children.
- Sport needs to 'sell its case', advertise and partner with schools.
- Expansion of the Active After-school Community program, with increasing links directly to sporting organisation. Provide more funding to develop sports specific manuals for those sports that can't develop then themselves.
- Targeting sports to introduce obese individuals to activity.
- Link with University for facility access as well as tapping into the student population as a resource for sport (participants, volunteers, researchers, etc)
- Bring back student contribution to sporting services in universities.
- Employment of development officers for sport to assist in grassroots development.
- Sports need to develop products relevant to contemporary market needs.

### 1.2.5 Sport infrastructure

Infrastructure was also identified as a major issue, encompassing physical infrastructure and facilities, as well as 'people' infrastructure and human resources. There were numerous stories from almost every sport highlighting the inadequacy of current sporting infrastructure which is in turn limiting the ability of sport to grow its resource base – both in terms of membership and related financial capital. The lack of adequate infrastructure is also hampering the long term growth of the broader Australian community benefits such as preventative health and social inclusion/cohesion.

Issues highlighted in the stakeholder discussions on infrastructure included:

- This is a long term and strategic issue.
- A national audit of sporting facilities is absolutely critical, resulting in a national database of supply and demand.
- Research is required on best practice in facility development and management.

- Involves construction of new facilities as well as more efficient use/upgrading and improving the operation of existing facilities.
- New developments are often driven by commercial considerations as opposed to practical requirements.
- Right now there is no single body responsible for sporting infrastructure.
- Can sports get access to school grounds that often sit idle?
- There was a \$1 billion plan submitted to the previous government (*Place to Play*). This could be revisited.
- Sports are often dictated to be state/local governments for access to facilities.
- There is a need to invest in the capacity of people – across governance, management and volunteers.
- Sport needs to value and bolster volunteerism, but at the same time reduce reliance on volunteers
- Additional grants and funding should be invested in people first.
- There is a need to increase the capacity and capability of the people in the industry and reduce the variability of skill levels (sport has an abundance of low paid or volunteer people filling key roles).
- Sport must address the changing needs of the Y Generation – in both facility development and in human resources in the workplace

### **Proposed solutions**

That the ASC be given the mandate to establish a national facility/infrastructure plan, engaging with the appropriate across government body. Build on the work already done:

- Scoping and facility audit done by ASC.
- Reactivate *Place to Play* proposal.

### **1.2.6 Tax issues and funding diversification**

Tax issues were again seen as a major issue for the industry, both in terms of the difficulty in third parties making tax deductible donations to sport and also the fact that there are no incentives through the tax system for people to participate in sport.

While the existence of the Australian Sports Foundation was acknowledged as valuable for making tax deductions to sport for various purposes, its mechanisms were not well understood and were seen to be quite complex.

Suggestions put forward by the group included:

- Sport tax offsets, rebates for club membership;
- Favourable tax treatment for coaches and athletes;
- A proportion of alcohol (and fast food) tax levies to sport;
- A national sports lottery (strongly supported);
- Company tax breaks for contribution to sport;
- Strategic partnerships across sports to gain cost efficiencies (e.g. in IT systems, insurance, travel, telecommunications).

## 1.3 High performance coaching forum

The High performance coaching forum was held in Brisbane on 17 October 2008. It involved a small but select group of some of Australia's top coaches and national performance directors from Olympic and Paralympic sports. All attendees are listed at Appendix C.

The aim of the forum was to discuss and workshop the challenges currently facing the Australian sporting system from the view point of the coaches. The objective of the forum was to identify the issues and solutions in order to maximise and sustain Australia's high performance sporting success. The issues and points made in this section are a summary of notes made on the discussions at the high performance coaching forum. A similar (but slightly longer) summary was sent out to all attendees.

A strong message to come out of the forum was that, the coaches felt the ASC needs to be the leader of sport in Australia - lead with a vision, strategy and templates for a coaching pathway and regulated profession. There is a need equivalency across sports and the ASC is the only organisation that can provide this. The coaches felt that sports appreciate the direction from the ASC to assist them in implementing strategies, programs and change. Currently there is too much fragmentation in the industry with too many bodies trying to do their own thing.

### **There were four key issues identified by the coaching group:**

1. National Pathways
2. Coach Development, Education & Employment
3. Coaching Council/ coach representation
4. Sports Science and Sports Medicine

### 1.3.1 National pathways

The first major issue for the coaching group was that of the national sporting pathways, and in particular the system of support by the AIS and SIS/SAS. A collation of the main comments from the forum is as follows:

- The ASC needs to have more influence over SIS/SAS. We need alignment between levels and the ASC has to be the leader.
- Central pool of funding needed, but funding still through the NSOs.
- SIS/SAS say they want partnerships but still want parochial results. Sports caught in the middle. Battle exists and sports/head coaches have to play 'politics', often compromising their needs to get SIS/SAS support.
- Coaches report that they often cannot 'trust' their investment with SIS/SAS.
- SIS/SAS should provide a service - as needed by the national coaches for the sport and the athletes.
- Need to change the way sports reach agreements with the SIS/SAS with contractual agreements for distribution of funding/resources.
- Need planning process that works for the sports - decision, action outcomes and just one presentation of the plan
- Coaches believe there is too many 'middle managers' across the ASC, AIS and SIS/SAS. Duplication in administration.

- Debate about the Professional sports and whether they should buy their AIS/SIS/SAS programs or whether the ‘token’ amount is worthwhile.

#### **Proposed solutions**

1. There needs to be an agreement between Govt’s that mandates SIS/SAS into the collective National Pathway. ASC-NSO relationship as the cornerstone.
2. Possibility of a ‘National Scholarship Program’ where every SIS/SAS supports the national level athletes. National funds to national level athletes, state funds to state level athletes.
3. Sport needs to get onto the COAG agenda – we are nowhere now.

### **1.3.2 Coach development, education & training**

Coach development, education and training was a major issue for the coach group. There was much discussion over the coach education pathway and the balance between a full, ‘professional’ tertiary education with a high level of quality control/assurance vs short, time and cost effective coaching accreditation which is accessible for all. The main points across coach development were as follows:

- The ASC coach support programs such as the Coach Career Management and Elite Coach Development programs are invaluable and should be continued. It is a positive to have coaches in these roles.
- Coaching as a profession is not valued in Australian society.
- Funding needed for NSOs to employ and give security of tenure. Short term employment results in short-term vision and decisions.
- Our system does not identify talented coaches.
- Similarly we do not find a way to retain the knowledge of experience coaches. There are very few options for retiring (head) coaches to be utilised by the system.
- Increasing scholarship coach positions (and length) would be good, but they need a pathway surrounding it (before and after the scholarship position).
- Use of the Tertiary education system resources:
  - Tertiary studies as part of development (all levels of coaches)
  - Use tertiary courses as lower level coach ‘scholarships’
  - Align tertiary courses with needs of the industry
  - Use existing coaches to lecture in tertiary courses
  - There are 2-3 examples of universities that offer scholarships for athletes and coaches, but more must be encouraged.
- Need to identify and fast track former athletes who show coaching talent.
- Leadership and management skills are a big issue for coaches in the industry. Most National HC’s have learnt these skills on the job. Again, there is the need for case management. The Elite Coach Development program assists in this.
- In the system of one-line appropriation, some of the core objectives have been lost. Funding needs to be tied to the achievement of core objectives.

#### **Proposed solutions**

1. National leadership within each sport is necessary in order to case manage each pathway coach and their development. Sports need a National Coach Manager as well as increased resources to run coach education at all levels.

2. Possibility of coaching managers across a number of sports (ASC employed), but the bigger sports need a designated individual.
3. Australian sport should have an industry standard – min level to be an ‘employed’ coach (e.g. Tennis). Regulated definitions, standards, pay rates and quality assurance.

### 1.3.3 Coaching ‘council’/ coach representation

There was discussion on whether a reigniting of the old ‘Australian Coaching Council’ and what additional coach servicing or representation was needed. The coaching groups felt that the current ASC Coaching and Officiating Unit, along with other related ASC/AIS services were providing very good support for high performance and developing coaches. However, more of the same was needed. The comment was made that “Coaching and Officiating is under resourced”. In addition the coaches felt a coaching advisory and leadership group would be beneficial for the industry in helping to lift the profile and professionalism of coaching in Australia.

The concept of a coaching advisory group is expanded on in section 3 of this addendum.

### 1.3.4 Sport science and sport medicine

The fourth main issue for the coaching group was the relevance, use and delivery of sport science and sport medicine (SSSM). The key points were as follows:

- Perception that there are too many SSSM staff in the wrong areas.
- Sports/Head coaches want to have more choice in what they want rather than having to fit into current staff numbers and services on offer.
- Most sports use the services because they are part of the agreements.
- Very little ability for sports to select and retain the ‘best fit’ SSSM provider(s) with the particular skills they want. Locked into who is allocated to their sport.
- This is true right across the system. Coaches would rather have the particular staff they want/need *consistently* rather than bits of time from a wide range of staff across the AIS and SIS/SAS system. There is not the capacity for this to happen within the current structure.
- Psychology is a huge issue. Very few good sport psychologists around. The few that exist are stretched thin. Sports need consistency and longevity in psychology staff to form relationships with their athletes and program. Psychologists should work with the coach first and assist in coach-athlete relationships.
- Perception also that there are now too many ‘managers’ in SSSM as well as too many PhD students, but not enough staff in the middle willing to do the work.
- When sports come to the AIS for camps, they have to fit in with existing staff and their existing load. Provision is not readily made for camps (including AIS camp programs) and they are ‘not allowed’ to bring in their preferred staff if from outside.
- Criticism that research in SSSM is too often what staff wants to do rather than what sports want and need.
- Competitive advantage was achieved in SSSM through the ‘90s and Australia was world leading, but it has changed – the type of staff have changed as have the culture and systems. Many of them don’t understand sport (only science). *In the 90’s many of the Sports Scientists were ex teachers who understood sport as*

*well. In recent times they tend to be PhD only. They are intelligent with no 'feel' for the actual sport or elite sport.*

- SSSM is only as good as the people interpreting and delivering. The key is people and partnerships (service providers and coaches and athletes). Successful sports find the people they need despite the system.
- There is a need to find ways to retain good staff. Many see AIS/SIS/SAS as a stepping stone to higher paid jobs with professional sports.
- SSSM Coordinator role is effective where it is in place (and the right person).

### **Proposed solutions**

1. Flexibility is important. Sports don't want to be force-fed programs they won't use.
  - a. Supply-demand audit of SSSM is needed.
  - b. Onus is on the National head coach. Need to invest in quality head coaches and develop them over time to be able to optimally utilise SSSM.
  - c. Sports want resources, flexibility, control and more targeted approach. Coaches want people they can trust and consistency.
2. Need opportunities to get coaches and scientists together – to exchange ideas and network. Across sports and across SSSM disciplines. Stimulate thinking.
3. Research: sport is not on the agenda of government research agencies.
  - a. Research has to be led by AIS. But need much better communication and information from AIS back out to the industry. Central pool of research and communication.
  - b. Research is needed on 'best practice' (e.g. of coaches and coaching methods).

## 2 Support for high performance pathways

Competing priorities and the lack of a nationally coordinated approach and process across the institutes and academies of sport (state and national) has been identified as a major issue for NSOs in gaining optimal support for delivering their high performance pathways. There are significant frustrations over the time and resources required by each NSO to negotiate support separately from each SIS/SAS, as well as the lack of agreement and alignment with regards the national plans of NSOs and of Australia's overall high performance objectives.

The following is a proposed solution for achieving alignment, unity of purpose and endorsement of NSO pathways across the national institute system in order to better support high performance sport in Australia.

[It must be noted that the institutes system is only one component of high performance sport in Australia – the component which supports the daily training environment, including sport science and sports medicine (SSSM) for selected (priority) sports and athletes. There are athletes in priority sports who are not supported by the institutes system (e.g. professional basketball players) and there are priority sports with only minimal institute support (e.g. equestrian, sailing, shooting). There are also significant components of the high performance pathways that are delivered outside of the institutes system by the NSOs themselves, with support and augmentation from the ASC and its umbrella programs.]

### 2.1 National Institutes of Sport Model

#### 2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of a new 'National Institutes of Sport model' would be to create a charter whereby all the members of the 'National Institutes' (AIS and all SIS/SAS) agreed to principles and a process for supporting the National Pathways Plans of NSOs. The result would be agreement and alignment on prioritisation of resources and coordinated support of the Australian high performance system, which would then contribute to international success at Olympic/Paralympic/Commonwealth Games and other significant international events.

#### 2.1.2 Terms of reference

The National Institutes of sport model will be united by a Charter that will commit to a process of:

1. Endorsing the national pathways plan of select sports and collectively agreeing on the role and resources required (including sports science and sports medicine resources) to deliver that plan at AIS/SIS/SAS level.
2. Endorsing the international performance indicators as developed by the national sporting organisation as part of their national pathway plan.
3. Standardising national timeframes for decision making in relation to resource support to national sporting organisations and for AIS/SIS/SAS programs.

4. Formalising a process of agreement between national sporting organisation and AIS/SIS/SAS on a single national pathways plan and through ongoing monitoring ensure commitment to that plan.

### 2.1.3 Operational processes

The process under the National Institutes of Sport Charter will be as follows:

**Stage 1:** Each national sporting organisation develops their national pathways plan following consultation and engagement with key stakeholders such as the ASC, AIS, SIS/SAS, Australian Olympic Committee, Australian Paralympic Committee, Australian Commonwealth Games Association etc. The plan will need to identify resource needs at each level of the pathway.

**Stage 2:** National sporting organisations present their national pathways plan, including sports science and sports medicine plan to the ASC.

**Stage 3:** The ASC then:

1. works with each national sporting organisation to reach agreement on proposed pathway plan;
2. identifies and confirms selected sports;
3. allocates Commonwealth Government resources to national sporting organisations to deliver their pathway plan.

**Stage 4:** Each national sporting organisation in partnership with the ASC presents their pathway plan to the National Institutes, who after any feedback and refinement, collectively agree on defined roles and the allocation of resources of AIS/SIS/SAS program funds to support the implementation of each priority sport's pathway plan by AIS/SIS/SAS service providers.

**Stage 5:** Development of service agreements, containing clear key performance indicators, between all relevant parties.

Timeframes for this process are outlined at Appendix D.

A crucial additional part of the process will be the initial benchmarking of the delivery of program services in the AIS/SIS/SAS, including sport science and sports medicine services, to ensure optimal effectiveness and national consistency in program delivery. The benchmarking process should be repeated and updated regularly (preferably at the start of each cycle).

### 2.1.4 Principles

- The National Institutes of Sport model Charter will about a coordinated and streamlined process to gain agreement and commitment from members on allocation of national and state resources towards an international performance outcome for Australian athletes.
- As a result all National Institutes agree to support the collective national interests and the agreed national pathways plan of targeted sports.

- A national pathways plan is the strategy developed by a national sporting organisation that addresses the structure, partnerships, resources and systems required to support athletes from their emergence as potentially elite athletes to the achievement of international performance goals.
- The national pathways plan, including the required sporting infrastructure (physical and personnel), and the optimal daily training environment needs, will define the necessary national support structure for each sport.
- ASC funding will still go directly to national sporting organisations in the form of high performance grants. This funding will include a component that the national sporting organisation will allocate to SIS/SAS partners in accordance with the national sporting organisations pathway plan (same as the current system).
- Through the operational process for National Institute support, each of the AIS/SIS/SAS will agree to allocate the bulk of their program funding and servicing resources to the collective support and prioritisation of NSO national pathways plan implementation.
- Funding coming from any institute must remain within that institute, but can be redistributed within that institute based on agreed priorities.
- Allocation of SSSM resources are considered within the context of the national pathways plans (individual and collective) and decisions are made collectively, based on benchmarking, on how to best deliver the SSSM support across the institutes system.
- Each national sporting organisation will be bound by their Funding and Service Level Agreement with the ASC to ensure that where appropriate the AIS/SIS/SAS are the primary service providers (it could be agreed by all parties that there are better alternative in some circumstances) for national or state programs.
- It is important to recognise that the current role of the SIS/SAS in providing a national leadership/team role in some sports or disciplines of sports should continue to be promoted when it aligns with the NSO national pathways plan. For example the role of South Australian Sports Institute with Beach Volleyball, Western Australian Institute of Sport with Pole Vault, Queensland Academy of Sport with Canoeing and Tasmanian Institute of Sport with Mountain Biking.
- Opportunities should also be considered for flexibility in the system including drawing in other stakeholders who can play a role as important contributors to the delivery of services to athletes (for example the university sport network).

### 2.1.5 Accountability

Accountability for international success will remain with the national sporting organisation that own and run the sport. In addition the ASC will lead the process and retains overall accountability as the Government's agency responsible for delivering national sport outcomes. National sporting organisation accountability for outcomes is supported by the ASC's performance monitoring and resource allocation role. Accountability for the AIS/SIS/SAS program will be aligned to the specific international, national and state based key performance indicators agreed with each national sporting organisation and defined in the national sporting organisations' pathway plans.

### 2.1.6 Sports science and sports medicine

As part of this model the AIS will lead the coordination of a national SSSM delivery system for the high performance sport system, by first benchmarking national delivery of SSSM,

and then ensuring adequate quality and quantity of service providers are available to select sports and emerging athletes, and thus contributing to international success.

The AIS will work with the selected sports identifying the sports science and sports medicine resource needs as part of their national pathway plan throughout the national institutes system. This includes accessing, creating and coordinating appropriate partnerships to resource SSSM support, as well as research priorities and technology needs, both in Australia and overseas.

For each sport a national 'network' of service providers will be established, primarily from the AIS/SIS/SAS, but this network could also include private providers, clubs, universities, etc to meet the needs identified in the sports national pathways plan. These networks will be established, led and coordinated by the AIS.

The 'network' will be responsible for meeting the needs of coaches in the form of support, technology and research to ensure performance goals are achieved.

### 2.1.7 Monitoring and review

The monitoring and review process will include:

1. Following the annual ASC review process, SIS/SAS joint management committee meetings and AIS performance enhancement framework meetings, the ASC will collate and coordinate an annual 'strategic' report with the NSOs and National Institutes. This will include the achievement of SSSM performance goals.
2. A review will be conducted every two years by the ASC (following Commonwealth Games and following summer Olympic and Paralympic Games) on each national sporting organisation's satisfactory achievement of key performance indicators against its national pathway plan. The results of this review could include:
  - a. a change to select sports;
  - b. a change in resource allocation to national sporting organisations;
  - c. a change to the defined role and resource allocations for institute service providers.
3. Regular and ongoing communication and discussion of any substantive changes required to national sporting organisation pathways plan and subsequent system support, will occur through the National Elite Sports Council meetings.

### 2.1.8 Benefits and risks of the model

The **benefits** of the National Institutes of Sport model will include:

- Clearer direction and prioritisation for Australian high performance objectives;
- Improved ability to leverage support across government;
- Collective assessment and benchmarking of NSO high performance needs;
- A more inclusive, cooperative and streamlined process of allocating resources;
- A more effective process of identifying roles and responsibilities, and of monitoring and reviewing outcomes across the system;
- Improved high performance outcomes resulting from a more efficient system.

The **risks** of the proposed model include:

- Failure of the National Institutes to come to collective agreement and alignment on priorities, roles and allocation of resources;
- Failure of all stakeholders to buy into the process in good faith, and to recognise the independent national leadership of the ASC;
- Lack of resources to adequately support the high performance system;
- Lack of communication leading to mistrust in the absence of a more formal governance structure.

### 2.1.9 Alternative option

An alternative option is a more formal governance structure, with an 'Institutes of Sport Council' formed by establishing a binding intergovernmental agreement that commits national and state resources to international performance outcomes. The Governance through a Council would comprise persons of knowledge and standing, with two nominations each from the Australian Sport Commission, national sporting organisations and the National Elite Sports Council.

This formal governance structure would only be implemented if it was considered that the less formal operational process through a Charter agreement would not work.

### 3 Coaching

The Australian Government's *Australian Sport: Emerging Challenges, New Directions* document released in May 2008 included, amongst other things, reference to encouraging greater recognition of the importance of coaches, examining the re-establishment of the Australian Coaching Council or other measures and enhancing recognition that coaches are role models and mentors.

In May 1979, the Australian Coaching Council (ACC) was established as an initiative of the Sport and Recreation Minister's Council. Located in Canberra, the first Chairman was Paul Brettel. In 1991, the Sport and Recreation Minister's Council agreed that the ACC should remain an advisory body to the ASC, but the staff and programs be incorporated into the ASC operating structure.

The main objectives of the ACC were to coordinate coaching in Australia, coordinate an effective National Coaching Accreditation Scheme (NCAS), improve the standard of coaching available to all Australians at all levels of sport, promote coaching as a professional career, improve the status of coaches and coaching in Australia and ensure that Australia adopts a national and coordinated approach to coaching strategies and policies.

By 2000 the Board of the ACC was dismantled and the operations fully integrated into the ASC as the role of the unit expanded to take on other areas of sport education, most notably a role with the development and accreditation of officials. The inadvertent result of this evolution was a reduction in the profile and level of influence of the coaching group. The integration did however result in synergies and benefits in areas such as women, junior, indigenous, disability, club development, ethics and high performance; and provided economies of scale in terms of corporate servicing.

In July 2008 an ASC interim Divisional restructure provided an opportunity to review the ASC's coaching and officiating strategy and operational structure of the Coaching and Officiating Unit and National Coach and Athlete Career and Education Program. The review methodology included consultation with a sample group of high performance coaches and fifteen national sporting organisations, along with an audit of the ASC's current coaching initiatives and internal consultation.

Findings from this review included the need to fill the vacuum left by the dissolution of the ACC and formalise the ASC's current ad hoc coaching advisory groups by establishing one pre-eminent coaching advisory panel to provide "a voice" and visibility to reflect the value and needs of coaching to Australian sport.

The review also found the need to enhance the ASC's provision of innovative and sustainable coaching and officiating services and support for to national sporting organisations and other key stakeholders. The review findings were reaffirmed by participants at all three stakeholder forums as outlined in section 1 of this addendum.

As a result of the ASC's coaching and officiating review and in order to address the identified needs to stakeholders, the ASC Board has endorsed the establishment of a National Coaching Advisory Panel as outlined below. The Panel will provide strategic advice to the ASC Board, as well as address the profile and level of influence of the coaching profession in Australian sport. It is intended that the National Coaching Advisory Panel strategy be implemented in April 2009, with costs covered by existing funding.

## 3.1 National coaching advisory panel

### 3.1.1 Purpose

The National Coaching Advisory Panel will provide strategic advice to the ASC Board and senior management on all facets of coaching to ensure that the ASC continues to provide national leadership that strengthens the community coaching and high performance coaching system of national sporting organisations and key stakeholders.

### 3.1.2 Terms of reference

The Panel will:

- Advise the ASC on how sports can develop and deliver coaching pathways that are at the forefront of international coaching developments.
- Promote the importance of coaching and the coach pathway as a vital part of the athlete development pathway and Australia's future sporting success at all levels.
- Articulate the challenges and issues facing coaches and the coaching system at all levels of Australian sport.
- Input into the ASC's realignment of its strategic direction for coaching, in the form of a revised plan or framework, incorporating the development and enhancement of coaches at all levels of Australian sport. Including, but not limited to:
  - Coaching strategies that will develop, continuously improve and support the implementation of high quality coaching structures and systems in Australian sport.
  - Coaching strategies that will develop sustainable coaching career, profession and skills development pathways for individuals and national sporting organisations.
  - Coaching strategies that will provide a greater recognition of the value of coaching and coaches and acknowledgement that coaches are role models and mentors.
  - Coaching strategies to advance coaching information, awareness, education (including accreditation), training and professional development.
- Act as ambassadors on issues related to coaches and coaching. Including attending and presenting at ASC convened workshops, conferences and other events as appropriate.
- Provide a forum for communication and cooperation between the ASC Board, senior management and key stakeholders, including state and territory departments of sport and recreation and state/territory institutes and academies of sport.

### 3.1.3 Composition

- The Panel will have at least six members and no more than eight members, including a Chair and Deputy Chair that the Panel will self-elect.
- Representation will be from both grass roots and elite coaching and will include an AIS head coach.
- The Panel will include an ASC Board Commissioner as one of its members.
- Panel member nominations will be sought from the coaching community and key stakeholders, including national sporting organisations, state and territory departments of sport and recreation and state/territory institutes and academies of sport.
- National sporting organisations, state and territory departments of sport and recreation and state/territory institutes and academies of sport and key stakeholders will be asked to endorse any nominee from their sport/organisation.
- ASC senior management will consider all nominees and will determine a short-list based on a nominee's specific coaching knowledge, experience and the high regard with which their organisation or other sport industry representatives hold them.
- The short-list will be submitted to the ASC Board who will appoint Panel members for a period of two years. Members will be eligible for re-appointment.
- The panel appointments will include persons of appropriate experience and standing that adequately reflect the diversity of the Australian sport coaching sector.
- Working parties may be formed from the Panel as required to address particular issues. Additional temporary members can be invited to join these working parties, subject to ASC Board approval and endorsement.

### 3.1.4 Secretariat

ASC management will appoint a senior officer to act as the secretariat to the Panel. The secretariat will draw on the extensive knowledge and experiences within the ASC on the broad range of coaching issues.

### 3.1.5 Remuneration and funding

The Panel will not be remunerated, however all reasonable expenses will be borne by the ASC, including applicable attendance and meeting costs. The operational budget of the Panel will be met from within Commission resources.

### 3.1.6 Accountability

- The Panel will be accountable to the ASC Board.
- Accountability for coaching developments remains with all relevant stakeholders responsible for various coaching groups, including the ASC/AIS, national sporting organisations, state and territory departments of sport and recreation and

state/territory institutes and academies of sport, state sporting organisations and clubs.

- National sporting organisations and key stakeholders remain accountable for the development of coaches (paid and unpaid) within their sport/organisation, including utilising the services and programs offered by the ASC and other stakeholders.
- The ASC remains accountable for the leadership and direction of national initiatives and specific programs implemented by the ASC. This also applies to joint initiatives.
- Panel members will be expected to contribute to the sport industry and ASC's strategic goals and objectives through proactive participation, sharing of knowledge and contributing to discussions in a positive and constructive manner.
- Panel members will be required to exercise care and diligence in discharging their obligations. This includes disclosing material personal interests and acting as a representative of the Australian sporting industry as opposed to any one individual sport/organisation.

### 3.1.7 Operational processes

- The Panel will meet on at least four occasions in each financial year. Teleconference and out-of-session processes will also be accommodated as required.
- Members of the Panel will be encouraged to attend all meetings. A quorum will comprise four members of the Panel.
- Papers for meetings will be provided, where possible, one week prior to meetings. Minutes will be sent out no later than three weeks after meetings.
- The proceedings of each Panel meeting will be minuted. The minutes will be provided to the members of the Panel within three weeks of each meeting.
- A written report will be provided to the ASC Board for decision and or information after each Panel meeting.
- The ASC Board Commissioner who serves on the Panel will discuss the written report at ASC Board meetings, as and when the need arises. This includes communicating the deliberations and recommendations of the Panel to the Board and the arrangement of access to the minutes of the Panel meetings if the Board so requires.
- The Terms of Reference (points 1 – 7 inclusive) will be reviewed annually.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: List of participants in the ASC's Community Sport Forum, 2-3 October, 2008

NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION
Phil	Alchin	Disability and policy coordination Branch ACT FAHCSIA
Hiba	Ayache	Islamic Women's Welfare Association
Peter	Bartels	Australian Sports Commission Board
Kristen	Beams	Cricket Australia
Andrew Colin	Bell	Hunter New England Population Health
Peter	Bennett	Archery Victoria
Graham	Brimage	Strategic policy and planning
Sue	Brown	School of Human Movement and Sport Sciences, Uni of Ballarat
Darryl	Buchanan	Wheelchair Sports SA
Rita	Butera	Diversity & Multicultural Agenda, Beyondblue
Bill	Caddey	Jump Rope for Heart & Walking, National Heart Foundation - ACT
Sally	Carbon	Australian Sports Commission Board
Anthony	Castro	Indigenous Sport Program, Sport & Recreation, NT
Emma	Clarkson	SunSmart Youth & Sports, The Cancer Council Victoria
Nicole	Colev	Gymnastics Tasmania
Richard	Crane	South Metropolitan Public Health Department of Health, WA
Pamela	Creed	National Institute of Circus Arts
Janice	Crosswhite	Australian Womensport & Recreation Association
Neil	Dalrymple	Bowls Australia
Brendan	Denning	Game Development, Hockey Australia
Roger	Desailly	Stockland Park
Alexander	Donaldson	School of Human Movement and Sport Sciences, Uni of Ballarat
Micaela	Drieberg	Australian Drug Foundation
Jeff	Dry	one eighty sport and leisure solutions
Jeffrey	Emmel	ACHPER
Craig	Fosdike	St Josephs Memorial School, SA
Ali	Gaden	Sport & Recreation Services, Sport & Recreation, TAS
Lindsay	Gardner	Hunter Orthopaedic School, NSW
David	Gould	Wheelchair Sports SA
Andrew	Gow	Health Development, Greater Sthn Area Health Service
Toni	Gray	Health & Wellbeing, Depart of Education
A/Prof Beth	Hands	Health & Physical Education, School of Health Sciences, Uni of Notre Dame, WA
Dennis	Harris	Parkside Primary School, SA
Michael	Haynes	GM Community Basketball, Basketball Australia
Dennis	Keats	Sport and Recreation Tasmania, Dept of Economic Development and Tourism
Rebecca	Kelley	Sport and Recreation Services ACT
Megan	Kerr	Community Renewal, Dept of Planning & Community Development
Mecca	Laalaa	Lakemba sports club
Greg	Lacey	Tyabb Primary School, Victoria
Rod	Leonarder	Department of Education & Training
Gavin	Macdonald	ACTSport
Kyle	March	Associated & Catholic Colleges of WA
Maria	Marriner	Health Promoting Schools, Dept of Employment, Education & Training
Craig	Martin	Sport & Recreation, TAS
Mark	McAllion	Softball Australia

Sue	McGill	Sport and Recreation Victoria
Peter	McKay	Longwarry Primary School
Graham	McNaney	NSW Rugby League
A/Prof Phillip	Morgan	School of Education, University of Newcastle
Paul	Oliver	Aus Human Rights Commission
Damian	O'Sullivan	Health Promotion Unit, Queensland Health
Kate	Palmer	Netball Australia
Joshua	Patterson	Minto Housing Communities assistance program
Geoff	Rietschel	Gymnastics Australia
Gabby	Ripoll	Campbelltown Council
Peter	Roberts	Sport, Swimming & Aquatics, Dept of Education & Children's Services SA
Kate	Roffey	VicSport
Steve	Rossingh	Sport & Recreation, NT
Michael	Schetter	State Department of Sport & Recreation
Ahmed	Shaker	Punchbowl boys high
Annabel	Sides	Sports medicine Australia
Anthony	Stewart	Basketball Tasmania
Trin	Taber	Special O
Helen	Taylor	School Sport, NT
Neil	Thompson	Department of Sport & Recreation, WA
Rob	Thompson	WA Sports Federation
Shanthi	Thuraisingam	National Heart Foundation - Victoria
Rhonda	Turnbull	PE & Sport Unit, ACT Dept of Education and Training
Melanie	Water	Kidsafe Victoria
Carolyn	Watts	YWCA VIC
Steve	Whisker	Kelly Sports Canberra
Dean	Williamson	Campbelltown Council
Simon	Wood	Australian Flying Disc Association

## Appendix B: List of participants in the ASC's Sporting Excellence Forum, 9-10 October, 2008

NAME	SURNAME	JOB TITLE	ORGANISATION
Emery	Holmik	Manager	ACT Academy of sport
Gregory	Goebel	National President	Archery Australia
Dan	Corcoran	CEO	Athletics Australia
David	Grace	Board Director	Athletics Australia
John	May	CEO	Australian Baseball
Geoff	Pearce	President	Australian Baseball
Brett	Pickett	High Performance Manager	Australian Baseball
Danielle	Woodward	Chair	Australian Canoeing
Andrew	Ius	Secretary General	Australian Fencing Federation
Helen	Smith	President	Australian Fencing Federation
Lawrie	Woodman	National Coaching Director	Australian Football League
Yvonne	Hay	General Secretary	Australian Ice Racing
Jim	Hewish	President	Australian Ice Racing
Cheryl	Arnol	President	Australian International Shooting Limited
Nick	Sullivan	CEO	Australian International Shooting Limited
Fiona	De Jong	Director of Sport	Australian Olympic Committee
Tony	Holding	Event Knowledge Services	Australian Olympic Committee
Craig	McLatchey	CEO Event Knowledge Services	Australian Olympic Committee
Craig	Phillips	Secretary General	Australian Olympic Committee
Jason	Hellwig	Deputy CEO	Australian Paralympic Committee
Geoff	Carr	Chief Executive	Australian Rugby League
Bill	Palmer	General Manager	Australian Rugby League Development
Peter	Friend	Chief of Staff	Australian Rugby Union
Peter	McGrath	Chairman	Australian Rugby Union
Benjamin	Battisson	Director Strategic Partnerships	Australian Sports Anti Doping Agency
Don	Knapp	CEO	Australian University Sport
Peter	Kerr	President	Australian Water polo Inc
John	Whitehouse	Secretary General	Australian Water Polo Inc
Matthew	Curtain	Chief Executive Officer	Australian Weightlifting Federation
Robert	Kabbas	President	Australian Weightlifting Federation
Paul	Brettell	CEO	Badminton Australia
Geraldine	Brown	Director	Badminton Australia
Matthew	Gillie	Board Member	Badminton Australia
Scott	Derwin	CEO	Basketball Australia
Diane	Sias	Board Member	Basketball Australia
Barry	Knight	President	BMX Australia
John	Leary	Vice President	BMX Australia Inc
Neil	Dalrymple	CEO	Bowls Australia
Kim	Littlejohn	High Performance Manager	Bowls Australia
Brian	Marsland	President	Bowls Australia
Ron	Pengelly	High Performance Director	Boxing Australia
Ted	Tanner	Chairperson	Boxing Australia
Damien	Bown	General Manager, Game Development	Cricket Australia
Michael	Christo	Government Relations Manager	Cricket Australia
Peter	Warner	Board member	Cricket Australia
Graham	Fredericks	CEO	Cycling Australia
Michael	Victor	President	Cycling Australia
Mary	Godden	CEO	Diving Australia

Philip	Pullar	Chairman	Diving Australia
Brett	Mace	High Performance Manager	Equestrian Federation of Australia
Franz	Venhaus	CEO	Equestrian Federation of Australia
John	Boulton	Head of National Teams Unit and Football Development	Football Federation Australia
Leeanne	Grantham	Head of Women's Football	Football Federation Australia
Stephen	Pitt	CEO	Golf Australia
Jane	Allen	CEO	Gymnastics Australia
Margot	Foster	Board Director	Gymnastics Australia
Linden	Adamson	CEO	Hockey Australia
Peter	Always	President	Judo Federation of Australia
Gail	Galea	High Performance Officer	Judo Federation of Australia
Peter	Herrmann	High Performance Manager	Judo Federation of Australia
Noeleen	Dix	President	Netball Australia
Kate	Palmer	Chief Executive	Netball Australia
Ian	Ford	CEO	NT Institute of Sport
Geoff	Lipshut	CEO	Olympic Winter Institute of Australia
Ken	Norris	CEO	Podium Performance
Bennett	King	CEO	Queensland Academy of Sport
Andrew	Dee	CEO	Rowing Australia
Noel	Donaldson	High Performance Director	Rowing Australia
Patrick	McNamara	President	Rowing Australia
Dean	Gosper	President	Ski & Snowboard Australia
Michael	Kennedy	CEO	Ski & Snowboard Australia
Phillip	Matthewson	President	Softball Australia
Mark	McAllion	CEO	Softball Australia
Wes	Battams	CEO	South Australian Sports Institute
Leighton	Wood	Executive	Sport Knowledge Australia
Gary	O'Donnell	Chief Executive Officer	Squash Australia
Brett	Williamson	CEO	Surf Life Saving Australia
Kevin	Neil	CEO	Swimming Australia
Alan	Thompson	Head Coach	Swimming Australia
David	Urquhart	President	Swimming Australia
Will	Goodier	President	Table Tennis Australia
Sue	Stevenson	High Performance & Coaching Coordinator	Table Tennis Australia
Paul	Austen	Director	Tasmanian Institute of Sport
Craig	Morris	Athlete Development Manager	Tennis Australia
Craig	Tiley	Director of Tennis	Tennis Australia
Ken	Bonham	President	Triathlon Australia
Andrew	Hamilton	CEO	Triathlon Australia
Anne Marie	Harrison	CEO	Victorian Institute of Sport
Joan	Perry	CEO	Volleyball Australia
Riad	Tayeh	Finance Director	Volleyball Australia
Steve	Lawrence	Executive Director	Western Australian Institute of Sport
Phil	Jones	CEO	Yachting Australia
Andrew	Plympton	President	Yachting Australia
Kate	Allen	Board Member	Australian Sports Commission
Sally	Carbon	Board Member	Australian Sports Commission
Greg	Hartung	Board Member	Australian Sports Commission
Kyle	Vander-Kuyp	Board Member	Australian Sports Commission

## Appendix C: List of participants in the ASC's High Performance Coaching Forum, 17 October, 2008

NAME	SURNAME	JOB TITLE	ORGANISATION
Shayne	Bannan	National Performance Director	Cycling Australia
Barry	Dancer	National Men's Head Coach	Hockey Australia
Bill	Davoren	National Performance Director	Triathlon Australia
Myriam	Fox	Head Coach (Slalom)	Australian Canoeing
Steve	Graham	Head Coach	Australian Paralympic Skiing
Peggy	Liddick	Head Coach (Women's artistic)	Gymnastics Australia
Cliff	Mallet	National relays Coach and Educator	Athletics Australia/ Uni of Qld
Greg	McFadden	National Women's Head Coach	Water Polo Australia
Jan	Stirling	National Women's Head Coach	Basketball Australia
Alan	Thompson	National Head Coach	Swimming Australia

Appendix D: Proposed time frames for National Institutes of Sport operational planning and review process

