

and women with funding streams and service delivery more focused on customer needs.

3. Mega sporting events: the need for a more cautious approach to hosting major sporting events. A set process for government involvement, including a clear assessment of the benefits was required. Obviously the award of the 2012 Olympic Games to London has, to all intents and purposes, meant that this objective became outdated and in need of significant modification.
4. Delivery: organisational reform and determining exactly what is effective before any further increase to investment in sport is made by the central government. A reduction in bureaucracy and increased partnership working between public, private and voluntary sectors towards a common goal.

The Funding of High Performance Sport

Whilst the focus of the chapter is upon funding of schemes designed to increase participation, equality and equity within sport, it is useful to briefly examine the funding of elite sport. Elite Sport Development has been a 'key policy concern' since the mid-1990s (Green, 2004) and is currently the responsibility of UK Sport, who receive funding from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to address three strategic priorities, those of World Class Success, Worldwide Impact and World Class Standards. To achieve these, eight 'Primary Activities' have been agreed between DCMS and UK Sport, these being (DCMS, 2005):

World Class Success:

1. Support athletes to succeed in world class events.
2. Develop skilled people to support UK world class athletes.
3. Drive the development of a world class high performance system for the UK.

Worldwide Impact:

1. Establish the UK as an authoritative and leading player in world class sport.
2. Develop an international development assistance programme in and through sport.
3. Develop a sports-focused strategy for staging major international events across the UK.

World Class Standards:

1. Lead a world class anti-doping programme for the UK.
2. Work with athletes and others to promote the highest standards of conduct in sport.

will be first to examine the general context of sport funding. A brief examination of the funding for elite sport will be provided. The focus then turns to the funding related to increasing participation in sport, with an emphasis upon the processes associated with Sport England and National Lottery funding. The role of performance indicators and critical success factors will be discussed. The chapter will conclude with a brief discussion of the inherent risks of funding sport development initiatives.

The Sports Development Funding Context

Sport and physical activity is delivered through four sectors: local government, educational establishments, the voluntary sector and the private sector. The overall responsibility for sport policy however, which guides funding, lies with Central Government. The majority of funding for sport in the UK is channelled through Local Government. Although budgets for the provision of sport have increased in recent years, increases have been below inflation, and thus there has been a gradual real-terms decrease in the funding for the public sector and subsequently an increasing reliance on lottery funding. This has taken place in a context that has begun to value economic efficiency above social criteria (Henry and Theodoraki, 2002). The five Sports Councils have a key role in the distribution of both government and lottery funding which form the link between government and sports organisations, clubs and bodies, operating at 'arms length' from government, although accountable to key stakeholders, such as Central Government and the general public. UK Sport focuses on high-performance sport, whereas the other four Sports Councils (Sport England, sportscotland, the Sports Council for Wales and the Sports Council for Northern Ireland) have a much broader remit.

A key driver influencing the ethos underlying the funding of sport is the Game Plan document (DCMS, 2002), which identified a number of issues concerned with participation in sport and physical activity within the UK. These issues included both the quantity and quality of participation being below a desired level, with high levels of drop out and lower levels of participation amongst women, lower socio-economic groups, ethnic minorities and the disabled. Whilst successful in some sports, success in key sports was limited. The funding of sport was identified as fragmented and potentially unsustainable given the decline in National Lottery sales and increasing pressures on Local Authority budgets.

Within this context, four key objectives were outlined in the Game Plan document. These were

1. Grassroots participation: the need for a wide range of initiatives, with a focus on economically disadvantaged groups, in particular the young, women, disabled and the elderly. Such initiatives were needed to remove structural barriers to participation such as failures in appropriate provision.
2. High-performance sport: A need for prioritisation of which sports were to be funded at the highest level; better development of talented sportsmen

Funding of Sport Development

an Jones



Introduction

This chapter explores the funding of sport development activities, focusing particularly on the issues related to the actual processes by which funding is gained and the key concerns affecting both funding bodies and those seeking funding. The main focus of the chapter is to examine some of the issues related with funding sport development within a complex and dynamic environment, with a focus upon public sector involvement in the broad aim of increasing participation. The funding network for sport is extremely complex, and within the constraints of a single chapter, it is simply not possible to address all of the appropriate sources and mechanisms via which money is channelled into sport. Neither is the intention of the chapter to simply list those sources of funding available, as this detail is available elsewhere (see, for example, http://www.sportengland.org/index/get_funding.htm). There will obviously be some omissions that are worthy of debate beyond that available here, for example, the massive unpaid contribution of the vast number of volunteers who contribute to sport (see, for example, Nichols et al., 2004). Instead, the chapter will focus upon some of the key funding sources and examine some of the issues associated with the use of these sources in funding sport development. The provision of such funding in itself does not lead to positive outcomes, such as increased participation, and some of the concerns surrounding the associated resource issues of using such funding will also be discussed. Whether the focus of sport development is on equity, or equality, 'many SDO's and deliverers of sport development programmes more prosaically have identified a lack of funding as the major obstacle to achieving equality of opportunity' (Jackson and Nesti, 2001, p. 151). Public sector funding of sport has faced, and will continue to face, a variety of challenges and the National Lottery is only a partial answer. As Jackson and Nesti (2001, pp. 156-7) suggest, 'if there is to be a realistic chance of Sport England's strategy achieving its objectives, the mission of More People, More Places, More Medals is implicitly underpinned by another catchline of More Money'.

Such financial support will always be finite, however, and thus the means by which such funding is provided is important not only to which schemes receive funding, but also those which do not. Thus the structure of the chapter

nationally is a possible explanation for the slow pace at which some are becoming embedded in the local sports development strategy. Secondly, within partnerships there needs to be space to negotiate a shared sense of purpose and common objectives. Once more the examples of the NOPES partnerships in Midcity and Northtown provide examples of the successful creation of a local vision for the programme within the wider objectives set nationally for the programme by the Big Lottery Fund. In the broader partnership literature, Huxham and Vangen (2005) identify the importance of developing of shared objectives although they also suggest that this is not always a quick or easy process.

An important barrier to realising the potential of partnerships is often the general congestion in the policy area and the need to compete with other agencies and partnerships for similar policy space. For example, local authority sports development units, County Sports Partnerships, SSPs and Specialist Sports Colleges are among the range of partnerships and organisations aiming to increase the participation levels of young people. In the Metcity case study (on the website), partnership working was inhibited by the variety of organisations, all with slightly different agendas and ethos, involved in sports development in the local area. The risk is that the establishment of a cluster of delivery mechanisms results not in synergy and the development of specialist expertise, but in confusion, competition and congestion. A second concern, and one discussed in the introduction, is that the concept of partnership implies a degree of equity between members that often masks a substantial imbalance in power: the rhetoric of horizontal interdependency and goal consensus hides the reality of hierarchy. There is still far too little examination of power in partnerships because, as Klijn and Skelcher note, 'of the powerful underlying assumptions of cooperation, mutuality and consensus between actors' (2007, p. 602). While much partnership working in the area of sport can be seen as benign, there is much evidence of local authority sports development units and particularly sports clubs adopting partnership outcomes with a degree of reluctance. A third general concern is the *blurring of lines of accountability*. It is often unclear to whom and by what means partnerships are accountable. Far from re-energising local democracy (John, 2001) partnerships may 'obfuscate and undermine ...democracy' (Greenaway et al., 2007, p. 718). Most striking is the fact that very often the last group to whom a partnership is accountable is its partners.