

Submission from Pro-Active East London

Dear Mr Berry,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a written contribution to the London Assembly's Economy, Culture and Sport Committee review into how to increase participation of disabled people in sport and physical activity in London.

I am the Director of Pro-Active East London - the East London based County Sport Partnership serving the ten boroughs of East London. Additionally, as part of the Sports Regeneration Framework (SRF) work, I act as the champion for disability sport across the 6 host boroughs and work with colleagues and partner organisations to improve provision for physical activity and sport across the board which includes work directly linked to disabled participants. It is in the role as 'disability champion' and Director of Pro-Active East London that I provide this response.

The committee has identified four key questions and for ease I have identified brief bulleted points under each of the questions.

1. What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners?

- a. Good progress has been made in the improvement of provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners but we believe that much more can be done to drive improvement.
- b. The Olympic and Paralympic Games has made a significant difference in raising the profile of Paralympic sports locally and as such, we have seen more evidence of funding being given to disability sports projects and a higher profile of the sports that form part of the Paralympics.
- c. The increased profile and focus on East London has encouraged many National Governing Bodies (NGBs) who focus on disabled sport (for example Wheelchair Basketball) to work in the locality and as a consequence, has provided significantly more disability sport provision for East Londoners. This has been incredibly positive for the area and we would want to encourage an extension of this focus beyond the Games for all sports organisations in receipt of public funding.
- d. Where significant milestones have been achieved in East London, it has been where Boroughs have worked collectively on common outcomes – two examples of this are the 'Time to Shine'¹ and 'Chairs in the Community'² projects.
- e. Both projects have made significant progress in providing high quality opportunities for a range of impairment groups to participate. From the work in these projects and the outcomes delivered, it is clear that this will be an approach in East London that is adopted into the future and a recommendation to the Committee that more of this collective project work should take place in disability sport with a view to improving provision across London.

f. 'Local brokers' between clubs and local deliverers who can translate between strategic funding bodies and these deliverers has also proven successful. Most notably, when that broker can align strongly with the disability organisations at a delivery level and have strong links into the strategic bodies for example those that have funding or those that commission services. An example of this would be the part time staff member at PAEL and some Local Authorities employ in order to fulfill this function.

g. In our experience, it is the success in these practical projects and brokering that is making the most significant impact in provision of sport and physical activity. While important to ensure strategic influence, this alone is not enough to change provision. A positive feature of the work since the Strategic Regeneration Framework has been developed and moved into implementation stage has been that East London partners, including Boroughs, have embraced working across boundaries, and with charities and other organisations rather than deliver direct. Borough and OPLC / LVRPA support for these projects has been vital, as has the recognition that there are advantages in these projects being driven in across the whole of East London and by a 'neutral' organisation.

h. In this sense, it is difficult to see strong evidence showing how the focus on strategies and strategic influencing alone, for example Inclusive and Active 2, has made a practical difference within an organisation.

2. How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

a. In order to maximise value for sport participation with less public money available there are a number of key areas we would wish the Committee to focus the strategic alignment of the GLA.

c. Clustering, particularly in geographical areas, has proven successful through the work of the host boroughs – we would encourage more of this practice where appropriate and agreed by key partners.

d. There are many examples of small delivery organisations or organisations within the charitable sector, that need support in engaging with the right organisations e.g. local authorities and those that hold funding. More local brokering should be the focus to help delivery organisations do more on the ground and make more practical changes at a local level for example, supporting clubs to practically become more inclusive.

d. As such, we would urge the Committee to align strategic outputs and outcomes with practical delivery, as opposed to strategic influencing, and have this as a strong focus going forward.

e. More could be done in the availability of equipment for disabled users in community facilities. An example of this is the SportsDock facility at UEL's Docklands Campus will have 8 wheelchairs from the Chairs in the Community Programme, thus offering a wheelchair user the opportunity to casually play in an inclusive environment, rather than always having to be involved with structured 'made to measure' sessions.

3. What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

- a. We believe there is more that many organisations can do however, we would like to take the opportunity to highlight a few below.
- b. Organisations should focus on working more collectively to make an impact in participation rates for disabled people in London we would be happy to share case studies and leanings from successful projects in our area.
- c. The focus for Interactive's work in London should be more flexible to include delivery and localised support to clubs and local delivery organisations. Indeed, this could become the focus of their work. We also believe there is a key role for Interactive in playing the 'local broker' that we have previously highlighted.
- d. Use expertise within the sector to influence project design, funding and delivery.
- e. The Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC) and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) have a key role to play in ensuring the Park, and its new facilities, positively encourage disabled people to actively participate. The relevant policies of each organisation (especially OPLC Sport and Health Policy and the emerging policy from LVRPA) and engagement in the work to date gives every indication that they will provide a pro-active role in promoting disability sport in state-of-the-art facilities. Areas where it is crucial they are involved are:
 - i. Facilities need to be able to cater for disability specific equipment and their storage needs;
 - ii. Dedicated time in facilities for disability sport, with facilities provided to meet needs (for example increased pool temperature). Boroughs could work with OPLC and LVRPA to provide high quality experiences in the Olympic Park venues and encourage economies of scale by hosting groups from a number of Boroughs during dedicated times;
 - iii. Ensure training for all staff on disability awareness – throughout the operators and different organisations working within the Park;
 - iv. Programming of Park facilities specifically for disability sport, high quality cross borough projects that focus on the local area but provide opportunities for all Londoners;
 - v. The park site and its facilities being an exemplar in disability sport provision from delivery through to customer service. The OPLC's aim is to create an accessible and inspiring new place, which welcomes and attracts diverse communities; building on Olympic and Paralympic heritage to ensure that after the Games the parklands, venues and neighbourhoods created and managed by the Legacy Company represent one of the most accessible and inclusive parts of a major world city;
 - vi. Equipment storage sites within the Park for disability sports available for community groups to use and get access to and would ask that this is considered

as part of transformation planning for example adequate storage on site at the Copper Box;

vii. The OPLC and LVRPA should ensure appropriate resources to drive Paralympic legacy on the Park;

viii. Disability provision should be embedded within commissioning and contractual arrangements including specifications for venues on the Park;

ix. There needs to be a stronger disability focus on the following;

1. More clubs
2. More events
3. Appropriate outreach work provided

x. In all of these areas above the work should link to the OPLC's sport and healthy living policy (where some of this is already highlighted) and ring fenced money should be made available for this.

f. We know for example, that the OPLC have been working with designers to develop a prototype bespoke new pool lift product in the form of a 'pod' to improve access into pools. This will be trialled in the Aquatics Centre once testing has been completed and will aim to provide permanent improved access opportunity for disabled and non-disabled swimmers get in and out of the pool offering independent dignified use as well as assisted use.

g. Through the LVRPA's legacy planning for all venues they will manage in legacy mode, we know that significant consideration is being given to actively increasing access for disabled participants view to positively influencing participation rates in disabled participants.

h. It goes without saying that the above also applies to local facilities provided by the public and private sector. The Olympic Park must not be regarded as the only place to disability sport or a panacea to providing for disability sport. The improvements to all facilities (through for example the Inclusive Fitness Initiative) and staff awareness of disability sport issues must continue.

i. We acknowledge that the GLA has incorporated a commitment in past funding award conditions to focus on disabled sport. We would encourage this practice to continue. However, in any future funding award agreements in both capital and revenue projects, we wish to see more focus on practical award conditions rather than just sign up to a strategic document. These practical stipulations need to be embedded into the terms and conditions of any future award agreement and monitored. The GLA should continue to focus on using experts to review funding documents and give practical advice to projects and advice to funding panels on award conditions.

Additionally, you asked for comment on a section of Interactive's letter. Cultural change and empowerment of disabled people are key elements of Stewart's letter that we agree play a role in influencing participation. However, whilst we agree that cultural change is an important factor in driving participation rates for disabled people, we do

not believe that the focus of resources should lie solely in cultural change and amending people's perceptions.

It is our experience that local deliverers and sports clubs are in desperate need for support at a practical level. We wish to see more focus on practical projects and delivery and replication of models that have been proven to work.

We also believe that a key focus of Interactive's work should be about playing the local brokering role and working more closely with delivery organisations to support local delivery, greater accessibility and higher quality provision.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment as part of the Assembly review. I would be happy to talk further with you or provide further information and/or evidence to back up our case.

Yours faithfully,

Jo Aitken
Director of Pro Active East London

Submission from RLSB

Dear Richard

London Assembly review: Provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners

RLSB exists to help blind and partially sighted people live life without limits. With a history spanning more than 170 years, RLSB has become an expert in helping people achieve their goals in life and in that time we've helped thousands of people across London and the South East.

Blind young people are adamant that they're not 'disabled' just because they can't see everything. They're ambitious, determined and want the same things as we all do. RLSB provides a range of services designed to help blind young people achieve their aspirations in respect of personal development, formal education, participation in sports and creative pursuits.

We invite those who see no limits (whether they are visually impaired or not) to support our work and use their knowledge, skills and enthusiasm to create a better world for blind young people.

Notwithstanding the impetus provided by Inclusive and Active, the provision of and access to sport and physical activity for disabled people in London still remains much below participation rates of non disabled people and inadequate.

While we fully support the 5 major themes outlined in Inclusive and Active 2, in our view, there are two main barriers to improved access and inclusivity: a skilled workforce and successful engagement with disabled people.

The challenge that we face is no longer about access to properly equipped facilities. We know that these exist. What we have not yet done is to persuade disabled people to change their lifestyles. Our experience suggests that this will require more than the creation of opportunities and signposting. Our beneficiaries tell us that it requires a huge effort to take that first step towards participation in a sporting activity. And a poor first experience has long term implications in terms of unwillingness to try again, lower participation rates, increased costs of physical and mental health. We therefore need to engage at an individual level so that we can understand not only the interests and aspirations of each visually impaired person, but also the practical, social and psychological barriers that stop them being more active. For example, they might have difficulty travelling to a venue, be reluctant to try something new on their own, or just lack confidence.

At RLSB we want to train more volunteers to engage with visually impaired people and provide friendly informal support for participation in

sports activities and other kinds of physical exercise. They will provide practical assistance in locating venues and arranging travel, provide encouragement to build enthusiasm and introductions to staff who can offer specialist disability training in various physical activities. It is absolutely critical that the first visit by visually impaired people into gyms and sport clubs is positive, supportive and empowering. This is the missing bridge between isolated and depressed visually impaired people and the wide range of excellent sports venues now available in London. Availability is not enough and disability organisations must be involved from the start on the journey from engagement to sustained participation and talent development.

In summary, we believe that the GLA has a crucial role to play in working with disability organisations. By investing in a skilled workforce (many of whom could be volunteers) to motivate and empower disabled people to become active, the GLA could maximise the benefits from previous investments in venues and facilities with a very much reduced level of ongoing financial commitment. We should be very happy to discuss these ideas in more detail.

Yours sincerely

Tom Pey
Chief Executive

Submission from Tower Hamlets Youth Sport Foundation

Good afternoon Richard,

With reference to the below email I am writing to you with a viewpoint from the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and more precisely, the Tower Hamlets Youth Sport Foundation. We were the borough's School Sport Partnership but with the support of the local authority, borough schools and the local business community we have not only survived the Coalition Government's cuts to our programme, but have actually expanded our remit to encompass all youth sport – including all club and community participation.

Our thoughts on participation in disability sport is as follows:

- ☐ In Tower Hamlets, around 80% of young people never opt into sport outside of school and the vast majority of our disabled students would fall into that category. Therefore, the recent cuts to school sport affect young disabled people as much (if not more so) than anyone else. At the same time local authorities are having to cut back on services that allow them to offer bespoke services to schools and young people with specific needs, an initial engagement in sport for young disabled people is difficult.
- ☐ Schools, on the whole, are very good at providing inclusive PE lessons and a lot of work continues to be done around differentiating lessons and providing support that allows young disabled people to be physically active.
- ☐ Pastoral and general educational support and awareness of need also remains very high in schools and within our local authority
- ☐ We have also seen an increased awareness in disability-specific sports and an interest in sport for disabled young people brought around by the hosting of the 2012 Paralympic Games.
- ☐ The areas in which young disabled people continue to be let down are:

- **Competition:** Although many schools and boroughs will run inclusive sports competitions, they invariably cater for young people with learning difficulties and often lack the competitive atmosphere and opportunity for achievement that would engage a young person with a physical disability or sensory impairment.

- **Club Links:** Many clubs, particularly those in inner city areas like our own, will always struggle to meaningfully cater for young athletes with disabilities. We only have 6 Clubmark clubs and under 3% of adults volunteer any time for sport, so it is very important to us to know exactly where our nearest clubs are that CAN cater for a specific need. We feel an obligation to offer information to young people about where the nearest mainstream club that can physically accommodate them is, AND where the nearest club that offers impairment specific activity for young people with similar needs to them is too. This information should also be available to them across the full cross-section of sports.

- **Talent ID and Support:** In our opinion, this is the number one thing that restricts young disabled people participating further. In an area like Tower Hamlets where there are so many barriers to participation, young people demonstrating a talent in school often receive extra support and attention. Teachers and coaches are prepared to go the extra mile to ensure that a talent does not go to waste. I am in little doubt that the same support would be shown to young disabled people with sporting talent, but for the vast majority of

coaches and teachers it is virtually impossible for them to assess and contextualise whether a young person is talented or not. A document which helps teachers/coaches and young people (and where relevant parents) to categorise a the student, which then gives them a guide on levels nationally competing athletes at their age groups/gender are reaching would be invaluable. EXAMPLE – In rowing, we know what times national squad Year 7 girls are achieving and so can therefore assess ability amongst our own students accordingly. We may well have a world class visually impaired 400M runner at one of our schools, and we probably wouldn't know. Admittedly, such a document would be more difficult to produce for more subjective sports such as gymnastic events and team sports, but nonetheless a guide would prove invaluable.

- **Sports Leadership:** I have no doubt there are a large number of disabled young people with an attitude and personality that lends itself to coaching, managing, officiating and generally volunteering in sport but as the majority of sports leadership projects are focussed on older age groups, I imagine that young disabled people are under-represented in this area because many have already decided sport is not for them by this stage.

☐ We concur with Stewart Lucas of Interactive that opportunities for young people to participate are not particularly the issue. Accessible opportunities consider a young person's location and background are an issue though, but this is consistent with participation issues for able-bodied young people in Tower Hamlets. It is the general barriers that restrict take up amongst young disabled people the same as any other young person – economics, distance, other priorities, cultural issues, lack of support from home.

☐ There is often also a general lack of value placed in sports participation amongst Asian families (particularly Bangladeshi) and this is certainly personified for young disabled people. I hope our comments provide some help and insight but if I can assist you in any other way, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,
Chris Willetts

Chris Willetts
Tower Hamlets Youth Sport Foundation – Interim Manager

Submission from Panathlon Challenge

Dear Dee Doocey,

Provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners

Thank you for your letter dated 9th December seeking views on the provision on provision of sport and physical activity for disabled Londoners.

The 2006 report made four recommendations, the first three of which I feel I can comment upon;

1. London Boroughs should be encouraged to do more to help disabled people participate in sport
2. Teachers need to be better equipped to teach children with SEN
3. Funding should only be made to clubs accredited to work with disabled people.

I feel that these three areas are still wholly relevant in 2012 as they were in 2006. That is not to say progress has been made in the last six years, but still much work is required. London Boroughs, mainly through sports development departments have made progress in the last 6 years and I believe more opportunities are available for disabled people now than they were back in 2006. However with the more recent pressures on local authorities with spending cuts, this will become more difficult.

Teachers still need to be better equipped to work with SEN children who are in mainstream schools. Teachers in Special Schools are much better positioned to offer specialist sporting participation to children, however there are still shocking examples of children in mainstream schools missing out on mainstream "PE". Our charity the Panathlon Challenge, offers free coaching courses for teachers and carers in a range of sports in London, but we have limited resources, compared to those organisations responsible for providing teacher training at a national level.

Funding should only be made available to sports clubs accredited to working with disabled people. The finest example of this is the recent Mayors Sports Fund where condition of grant was the signing up to Inclusive & Active 2, including an action plan to make opportunities available to disabled people.

I don't feel able to comment on the 4th recommendation regarding Transport for London as this is not my area of expertise.

Therefore some progress has been made since 2006, but still there is a long way to go regarding equality of provision for disabled and non-disabled people. I think it is right to re-look at these areas and ask the questions –

- 1. What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity for disabled Londoners ?**

The Panathlon Challenge is a charity that started offering sporting opportunities (coaching, equipment provision and sports competitions) for severely disabled

young people in 2000. Since then we have grown across London year by year, but the biggest boost we have received is in the last three years with support from the Mayor of London through the Sports Legacy Fund. For the first time ever, 2012 will see us offering our programme in all 32 London Boroughs. Panathlon has received over £250,000 support from the Mayors office over the last three years as a great example of direct funding to a small grass roots organisation, who benefit disabled young Londoners. Over this 3 year period, Panathlon will have increased the number of young disabled people participating in sport from 755 in 2009 to 1,915 by summer 2012. This growth would not have been possible with the fantastic support received from the Mayors Office in the last three years. We are on target to create 15,000 hours of sporting activity this year, this is a fantastic "legacy" of Mayoral funding, pre the Olympic and Paralympic games taking place in London in late summer 2012. Legacy has happened in London between 2009 and 2012 -not some hypothetical benefit post 2012. This is a prime example of direct funding from the GLA / Mayors Office to a deliverer of sporting participation for disabled Londoners, which has a profound effect.

2. How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available ?

Any public money available should be targeted to those grass roots organisations that directly deliver and benefit disabled Londoners. Too often public monies get caught up in bureaucracy and strategy, without filtering down to benefit those most in need. That is what has been hugely beneficial about the investment from the Mayors Sports Legacy Fund, it has gone direct to organisations delivering grass roots sport in London. Sadly those most in need and with the lowest participation rates in sport and physical activity; disabled people, often are the ones that miss out if direct funding from public bodies are withdrawn. This is the group that is least likely to be able to fund their own participation and will always require some level of public subsidy. There is generally a belief by funding bodies, that after 2 or 3 years financial support, organisations should become self sustaining and be magically able to survive without continued funding. However the reality is that the people we work with – physically impaired young Londoners some with severe learning difficulties and hearing and visually impaired, are very rarely within a structure to continue their sporting participation, without subsidy or support.

3. What could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

Panathlon is working with 32 London Boroughs, 100+ schools, sports clubs, governing bodies of sport and other organisations in London to enable nearly 2,000 disabled young people to receive sporting participation in 2012. We are working to the maximum (or beyond ?) of our means and hope that beyond the Olympics and Paralympics in late summer 2012, funding is still available to continue the progress made over the last few years. It would be a shame, post Olympics, if participation rates dropped off, through lack of public monies being available. Pressure should be maintained and increased on Public bodies and

sporting organisations in receipt of public funding, to support those working 'at the coalface' and grass roots organisations who deliver benefits directly to Disabled Londoners.

4. Interactive's views on sporting provision for Londoners.

I believe it is important that Interactive continue to advocate at a strategic level for disabled people in London and welcome their stance of inclusion and appropriate sporting opportunities for specific impairment groups. It is important that someone is championing the cause the equality. However I have discussed with Stewart Lucas my concerns of his written submission on one fundamental point. He reports that for disabled people's inclusion, *"we need to move away from the perceived notion that simply more wheelchair basketball (for example) or having additional support workers, will actually make any fundamental difference."* I am very uncomfortable with this statement. Statistically I understand his point that a 1% increase in sporting participation will only result in a 15,000 increase, which in the bigger picture in London, is a tiny amount. However I would argue that for those 15,000 people we would have made a fundamentally difference and had a massive impact on their lives. If we don't ensure we continue to fund and provide even for 1% of disabled Londoners, then we may all just give up now and not bother to work with the most needy in our society. We have to start somewhere ! As a grass roots provider that has seen the massive difference Panathlon makes to many hundred disabled Londoners, it would be a disaster if resources were not targeted at this area. I say, more, not less funding for wheelchair basketball (for example) and it does make a fundamental difference !

I hope my comments above are of some use. I can only thank the Mayors office for the support and funding received over the last 3 years, which has made a massive difference to disabled young Londoners sporting participation.

I am happy to help further if required,

Kind regards,

Ashley Iceton.

Director.

Panathlon Challenge

www.panathlon.com

Submission from Cricket for Change

Responses to questions relating to participation of people with a disability in London since 2006

- 1) What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners?

I feel that there has been a positive stride in relation to engaging with disabled Londoners through the role of Interactive and their ability to work as a strategic body. Rather than it being disability organisations that have taken the responsibility for people with a disability to take part in sport historically, mainstream organisations are now taking a role in this.

It has been the positive adaption from 'Inclusive and Active' to 'Inclusive and Active 2' that has also enabled a more flexible approach to including people with a disability. I am a big advocate that provision can be both inclusive and cater for people specifically with a disability. This is recognised far more through 'Inclusive and Active 2' rather than the first version that was heavily prescriptive and therefore makes a better landscape for the development of opportunities for people with a disability.

The Mayor of London's funding around the legacy of the Olympics/Paralympics in 2012 has also assisted organisations such as ours to provide opportunities for more people with a disability. However a very positive stride that they made through this funding was to link it's awarding to people adopting 'Inclusive and Active 2' and hitting targets of disability provision whether a mainstream or disability focused project.

- 2) How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

I would suggest through greater innovative partnerships. There non-governing body organisations that are doing fantastic work, who can work with governing bodies locally and nationally to assist in the provision of opportunities. There is also the opportunity of greater partnership work taking place between local authorities and other organisations such as our own. With less resources available perhaps local authorities will be able to look creatively at what they can bring to the partnership to support the development of opportunity in this area.

- 3) What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

I feel that stakeholders working with people with disabilities need to look into charitable trusts and foundations, the public sector and the corporate world to gain funding to continue developing work that enhances opportunities for people with a disability. It may be that partnerships with sporting providers and non-sporting disability organizations can offer mutually beneficial partnerships that provide opportunity for people with a disability and a reduced cost due to a combining of resources.

I feel that the media could play a role in positively promoting the opportunities that are offered to people with a disability. There is still a low expectation within both mainstream and some special schools to what young people with a disability can achieve. Stakeholders within the environment of working with people with a disability need to ensure they positively promote the role of people with disabilities within their organization and actively recruit people with disabilities to positions within their organization.

The more people with a disability who are seen actively engaged in employment and creating opportunities for other people with a disability the better the perception of other organizations and people to what people with a disability can achieve.

Stakeholders in this area also need to continue lobbying mainstream schools in relation to including people with a disability into sporting provision. We still hear too many stories about how young people with a disability are sent to a Library to do academic work whilst a PE lesson takes place because the ability to include the young person with a disability doesn't exist within the school. This is training and resource issue within schools and needs to be tackled nationally as I do not believe it is a London centric issue.

- 4) As part of the Committee's February 2011 report into Sporting Legacy, Interactive wrote to the Committee about the current provision of sport and physical activity for disabled Londoners. A section of Interactive's letter is enclosed (page 3 and 4 of attachment). Please comment on the views put forward by Interactive. What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners?

I feel the letter from Interactive draws out some valuable points.

The environments we can be active in must be accessible and feel inviting to those with disabilities.

Regularly still in facilities employees have very little idea of how to cater for people with a variety of disabilities.

Also education is a big key for me. The culture and understanding for being active needs to be through the education system. If it is normal and what we do through our education then it is likely to become ingrained in our activities after our school years.

Submission from Dame Kelly Holmes Legacy Trust

Dear Richard,

Please find below The Dame Kelly Holmes Legacy Trust's response to the call for evidence for the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners. The Dame Kelly Holmes Legacy Trust was set up fairly recently, in 2008, we have therefore concentrated on questions 2-4.

1. What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of Sport and Physical activity to disabled Londoners?

2. How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

The culture of disabled people's participation in sport needs to change which could happen through a number of ways. Disabled people that are currently participating in sport could become champions for their local sports and physical activity provisions in order to encourage more disabled people to participate. The hosting of the 2012 Paralympics may also raise the profile of disabled people's participation in sport and may therefore have a positive effect on the rates of sports participation for disabled Londoners. Volunteering opportunities surrounding sports and disabled people could be developed, not only to provide support during physical activity but also to advocate sports participation as a viable lifestyle choice in the first place.

A linking up of organisations that work either with disabled people and/or in sports and physical activity could provide mutually beneficial outcomes, and would allow the sharing of knowledge and opportunities. Social media and the internet could be a powerful tool for the promotion of sports and physical activity to disabled people.

3. What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

The adoption by organisations of an Active and Inclusive 2 action plan generates awareness within an organisation of the inclusion of disabled people, and if adopted by a significant number of London based organisations will lead to the development of an inclusive culture and will allow organisations to work collaboratively to improve provisions for disabled people.

The 2012 Paralympic games provides our particular organisation with a significant opportunity to improve support for disabled people in sport. Our charity works to provide support for current and retiring athletes (as well as in creating life chances for young people) and the impact of the 2012 games is likely to increase this area of our work. Through this, these Paralympic athletes can grow their own work and careers, as well as work within the organisation on young people's projects, which will ultimately raise the profile of disabled people in sport.

4. As part of the Committee's February 2011 report into a Sporting Legacy, Interactive wrote to the Committee about the current provision of sport and physical activity for disabled Londoners. Comment on the views put forward by interactive.

The response from Stewart Lucas, CEO of Interactive, indicates that simply providing opportunities for disabled people is not enough to ensure higher participation in sport and physical activity. Stewart suggests that more needs to be done to advocate being active as a healthy life choice for disabled people. If this is the case there needs to be a cross-organisation approach to ensuring the inclusion of disabled people. Organisations need to work together with Disabled People's Organisations to develop not only the opportunities that are on offer to disabled people, but also the initial engagement and referrals to the sports and physical activity, and the appropriate promotion of these opportunities.

Submission from Inclusion London

Dear Richard,

Apologies for the delay in responding to your email below.

As a pan London Deaf and disabled people's organisation we are currently responding to a whole range of issues and have chosen to work with Interactive – a disability equality in sport disabled people's organisation - on specific issues relating to sport /activity in London.

As such we very much share Interactive's view, that currently activity and sport is not on the agenda for most Deaf/ disabled Londoners and that real strategic 'buy in' at a mayoral level is needed to help make this shift towards a genuinely inclusive approach to sport and activity.

Inclusion London is working with Interactive to discern how we can ensure all disabled Londoners view being active as a viable lifestyle choice and I know Interactive will be playing an active role in your important, and very welcome, review.

Kind regards,
Tracey Lazard

Chief Executive
Inclusion London

Submission from Interactive

1. What progress has been made so far in achieving a Paralympic sporting legacy in London?

I think there are two points that need to be made here, in advance of trying to answer the question posed. Both of these can be seen to be semantics but both are of major importance when looking at what actually we are trying to achieve. The first question is what do we mean by 'Paralympic legacy' and supplementary to that 'are we confusing a Paralympic legacy with a legacy for disabled People'.

The simple fact is that the Paralympics is not the disability Olympic Games and nor does it claim to be. It is an elite competition structure parallel to the Olympic Games that contains certain specific sports that are designed for participation in by particular impairment groups and classifications. It does not cater for, nor seeks to cater for, all disabled people. In fact barely twelve percent of people who would be classed as a disabled person within the social model of disability would be eligible to participate in the Paralympics.

There are no events that contain deaf athletes, there are no sports involved that cater specifically for individuals with mental health conditions and there are no classifications that take on board neuro diverse conditions and those within the autistic spectrum or with impairments such as Asperger syndrome. Learning Disabled athletes have been re-admitted but under such strict classifications that it will only benefit a small percentage of the learning disability world.

I am not stating this in order to argue that the Paralympics should be opened up; I am stating this in order to prove that the Paralympics does not in any way represent all disabled people and to illustrate that speaking of a Paralympic legacy actually alienates a large component of disabled people. The disabled community is not a homogenous group, unlike other equalities based communities where there is, for an example, shared common heritage etc. The only defining factor that we all have in common is that society disables against us. Our actual impairments are all different and in many cases contradictory. Therefore to assume that an event featuring a person with cerebral palsy will inspire a person with dyspraxia is wrong and misguided.

Essentially this about what the legacy of London 2012 will be for disabled people, not just the Paralympics but the games as a whole. If we talk about a Paralympic legacy we are essentially talking about a legacy that is aligned to a small grouping of impairments and a small grouping of specific sports. Semantics yet, but still incredibly important because the vast majority of disabled people would not necessarily align themselves to the Paralympics because they happen to be disabled, but would align themselves to the London 2012 as a whole because they view themselves as Londoners.

The second point is what is actually meant by legacy. This is an overused and misunderstood phrase and in the context of the question is not clear what it is actually referring to. A specific Paralympic legacy would be in regard to how the 2012 Paralympic games impacts on how this particular elite competition is viewed and what increases in opportunities there are in London in specifically within the sports and disciplines featured in the Paralympic game. However Interactive and the mayor's office would argue that if this is the legacy, then this is the role of Paralympic GB and the national governing bodies of those specific Paralympian sports and disciplines.

What we are both more interested in (Interactive and the Mayor), and what we would prefer for the London Assembly to refer to, is the legacy for disabled people from the games. This is in regard to both the larger legacy in how the games can change the way that disabled people are viewed in London and how it can be a catalyst for change in regard to access and other issues, but also in regard to the specific issue of participation in sport and physical activity.

The larger overall legacy is being lead on by the Mayor's office in regard to their work on the Disability Equality Scheme and will also be lead by a specific Paralympic advisor who has recently come into post at the GLA. The legacy component we at Interactive are focused on, with the Mayor's Office, is the one of sports and physical activity participation. How do we ensure that we use the opportunities of the games to get more disabled Londoners active? One of the key issues is to ensure that this work is done as an embedded part of the work undertaken to ensure that the game's results in an increase in participation levels for all Londoners. Disabled People are not a separate group; they are an integrated part of society.

In terms of the questions posed:

What would you have expected to happen by now?

Interactive is very aware that an increase in sport and physical activity participation rates of disabled people will not be achieved by simply providing more opportunities. This is proved by the fact that since 2007 there are at least 300 new or enhanced opportunities across London for disabled people to participate in sport and physical activity and that over 1,000 clubs and providers have been provided with expert advice on how to include disabled people, yet participation rates (as shown in Sport England's active people survey) have stayed constant at around 9% for the last three years. This shows more needs to be done and this will be addressed in the next question.

The move to increase participation rates is about cultural change and amending people's perception about who disabled people actually are, how they can participate and what the actual barriers to participation are. Key to this cultural change is getting those who set strategy and policy to see the bigger picture and understand that participation will not be increased by focusing just on exclusive disability provision or by working with small groups.

There are approximately 1.5 million disabled people in London. Which means that 1.125 million disabled Londoner are completely inactive (75%) and an additional 240,000 are not reaching the recommended level (3x30 mins). Therefore only 135,000 are achieving the recommendations meaning that work needs to be undertaken to get the other 1.365 million either more active or active in the first place.

To achieve change on this scale we need to ensure that disabled people's inclusion is seen as a fundamental part of all provision and to reach a point where the inclusion of the disabled people is seen as every provider's responsibility. For this to happen we need to move away from the perceived notion that simply more wheelchair basketball (as an example) or having additional support workers will actually make any fundamental difference. Even a one percent increase in participation levels is 15,000 people so logically the only way of achieving and sustaining that level of increase is with the existing sport and physical activity structures and opportunities.

In regard to what has already happened there has been a real shift in the way the agencies view disabled people and we have seen many key organisations really buy into the agenda. The success of the first Inclusive and Active and the interest that has been created by second strategy, 'Inclusive and Active 2', really illustrates that. Policy has been changed and the culture (at least within sport and physical activity) is beginning to shift. A key element to this has been how the Mayor's office has embraced the concept of responsibility for all and how they are ensuring that everything that they fund and everything that they endorse has inclusion as a key thread.

What more needs to be done?

There is a fundamental barrier that needs to be addressed and that is ensuring that disabled people view being active as a viable lifestyle choice for them. This is the work that still needs to be done and this can only be achieved by working with the disability sector and with Disabled People's Organisation (DPO's). During the delivery of the first Inclusive and Active it was identified that the area of creating and stimulating demand was not being focused on. The leading issue and drive of the first plan was the creation of new opportunities for disabled people to be active and supporting existing opportunities to become inclusive. This was being based on a 'build it and they come' ideology, i.e. the mentality was that if new opportunities were developed then there was a ready-made audience for them.

The lack of any identifiable increase in participation shows that this has not worked and we need to look at how we advocate being active as a viable lifestyle choice for disabled people and how we dispel the assumptions across the disability sector that sport and physical activity is not for them and that there are not the opportunities on offer. The discussions we have had with literally hundreds of disabled people are almost identical:

Disabled Person: I would be active but my local gym/club/provision will not be able to cater for me

Interactive: Have you tried your local gym/club/provision
Disabled Person: No but I am a disabled person therefore my local gym/club/provision will not be able to cater for me.

Therefore much more emphasise needs to be put on how we empower disabled people themselves to influence the supply. If we simply develop the provision without changing the attitudes of those we wish to access those provisions, then we will just be catering for those who already active and there will continue to a stability of numbers rather than an increase. We need to stimulate the demand side so that it forces an increase in supply of appropriate provision. This can be achieved by viewing disabled people's involvement in sport and physical activity not as a good cause, a charitable endeavour or a 'nice to have' additionality but as a fundamental disability right.

This, as expressed, is where the disability sector comes. We are working with agencies such as Rader, Inclusion London, Scope and Leonard Cheshire to look at how they advocate activity and how they spread the word that being active is a personnel choice and that disabled people have the right to expect to be included rather than waiting for the provision to come to them. It is our belief that if mass demand is created then appropriate supply will follow. This is the approach that has worked in regard to culture and to the arts.

As an example if disabled people on mass demand to be allowed to take part in certain activities or access certain facilities then experience tells us that those opportunities will quickly adapt to include that market. The economic argument is key to this and we need to shift from viewing disabled people as a supplementary market that needs to be provided to for free. 48% of disabled people in London are in some form of paid employment (720,000 people) and therefore have some level of disposable income. All of these issues are clearly addressed within Inclusive and Active 2.

What has been done well?

A clear success over the last three years has been the impact of the first Inclusive and Active and the fundamental shifted that has occurred in how sport and physical activity policy makers and providers view disabled people. This has been achieved through influencing, lobbying and clear articulation of the issues. This has been achieved because of the role that Interactive has taken as the custodians of archiving equality for disabled people in sport and physical activity.

A few examples of what has been achieved and the impact of this are:

- a) **Playsport London.** Through influencing work with the London Development Agency, Interactive achieved the outcome that they (LDA) agreed to set a specific disability participation figure for every project funded from the playsport London pot. The figure of 10% of participants being disabled people was placed on every project and the support to achieve this was then provided by sub-regionally based

Interactive staff. Whilst there was initial scepticism about mainstream clubs being able to meet that requirement, figures have proved that it can be achieved. In 2008/9 the participation figures for disabled people were an average of 18% across all Playsport London projects.

- b) **Local authorities.** Half of London's 33 local authorities committed to the first Inclusive and Active. This commitment was achieved at executive level and the results were that links started to be forged between the different components of a local authority that have responsibility for disabled people. Within the committed local authorities there has been a visible shift away from the responsibility to achieve increased level of disabled people's participation being seen as primarily the role of the leisure department.
- c) **Supporting clubs and providers.** Within all five Pro-active sub-regions work has been ongoing to support mainstream clubs and opportunities to be inclusive in the activities that they provide. Since the creation of the first Inclusive and Active around 100 grass root providers have been supported to become inclusive. This means that they have moved from having no disabled participants to providing inclusive opportunities for the first time. Over 200 further clubs and opportunities have been supported to expand and increase their provision, many of these creating pathways from disability specific provision to inclusive mainstream opportunities.
- d) **Sub-regional Steering Groups.** A fourth and final example has been the creation of five robust and influential Inclusive and Active steering groups, one in each sub region. These groups have been in existence for three years now and play a clear and pivotal role in bringing together local authorities, national governing bodies of sport and disability organisations to share good practise and to co-ordinate provision across each sub-regional area.

2. **What impact will funding from the Mayor have on sporting legacy in London?**

The Mayor has allocated £15.5 million from 2009 to 2012 to invest in grass roots sport.¹

The first point to make is that Interactive feel that the provision of legacy funding is only a part of the role that the Mayor can and is playing in regard to creating a clear participation legacy for disabled people in London. Whilst any investment into increased opportunities is welcome, we cannot fool ourselves into thinking a short term injection of cash will actually solve all the issues that cause non-participation rates amongst disabled people.

What is much more important in Interactive's eyes is that fact that the Mayor and the sports unit at the GLA have taken on board the issue of inclusion and

¹ Mayoral documents show that "to date, in excess of £1 million has been spent, with a further £15 million to be invested by 2012. With matched funding, this will see a total in excess of £30 million invested in grass roots sport. Source: <http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/sport/funding-and-projects>

have embedded it within all their initiatives and undertakings. The fact that the Mayor and the sports unit have got fully behind Inclusive and Active 2 and have decreed that all opportunities that they support and that they endorse will have to have inclusion at their core will have far more impact than short term funding.

A key undertaking has been the fact that the London Community Sports Board have adopted inclusive and Active 2 and see it sitting alongside 'A Sporting Future for London' as a strategy that they own and endorse. We believe this is vital because the issue is how we ensure that all resources and investment into sport and physical activity benefit disabled people rather than just the mayoral investment.

What should be done with this funding?

In regard to the funding, we would say what should be done with it is what is planned to be done with it, which is, as we understand, to fund projects that provide additional opportunities for inactive people to be active.

How will it be best targeted?

The clear issue here is the creation of sustainable opportunities that do not require continued investment. It can be argued that the issue is not the lack of investment or resources but how those resources are best used. It can be argued that if disabled people make up one fifth of the total population in London, then one fifth of the total sport investment in London should be targeting disabled people.

Therefore the key needs to be the inclusivity of all projects that are funded through the mayoral fund. This has already been achieved by the fact that an adherence to the principals of Inclusive and Active 2 is seen as a key criteria and by the fact that all success agencies will need to adopt the strategy.

3. **During its investigation in 2006, the Committee highlighted barriers which prevented people with disabilities** *(It is kindly requested that the London Assembly do not use 'people with disabilities' as a term and replace it in all documents and communications with disabled people. This is recognised terminology and fits in the social model of disability)* **from achieving their sporting potential. Could you please set out what progress has been made to remove these barriers as set out below?**

a. **the sidelining of children with special needs in mainstream school sports provision with a lack of appropriate training for their teachers;**

Interactive acknowledge the fact that the Committee felt that 'the sidelining of children with special needs in mainstream school sport provision with a lack of appropriate training for teachers' was a key barrier. This was included as a key target within the first Inclusive and Active. However it became clear that

this was not an area that could be tackled or changed on London specific basis. Work was undertaken to try influence teaching training qualifications but this was not achievable by a London agency such as Interactive. However this area has been taken on by Youth Sports Trust and through initiatives such as 'playground to podium' they have sought to provide specific training to PE teachers in regard to including disabled pupils.

It should be noted that whilst Interactive acknowledge that ensuring that disabled children in schools have adequate opportunities to be active this is an area that is specifically the responsibility of Youth Sport Trust and they are very clear in their assertion that this is an area that they are developing within London.

b. an inadequate and uncoordinated system of public, community and door-to-door transport services;

Whilst not meaning to be in anyway conflictual, Interactive has concluded that this is not a priority issue and that as a barrier it is not actually one that is a major contributory factor. The simple fact is that London actually has the most accessible public transport system in Europe, whilst there are still access issues this is not something that Interactive can necessarily influence. It is our belief that simply the introduction of improved transport systems would not result in increased participation rates. This can only be achieved changing perceptions both within the sports and disability sectors.

c. the absence of a clear pathway from grassroots to elite activity;

Again Interactive would argue that it this is actually not the barrier that needs to be addressed. Participation rates will not actually be affected or changed by providing clearer pathways from grassroots to elite as this assumes that all disabled people will want to take part in elite opportunities or that all opportunities have or need to have an elite angle. The issue of increasing participation is one of ensuring that people view being active as being a viable lifestyle choice for them and the simple fact is that will not be achieved through increased opportunities to achieve elite status. Interactive has moved to focus on grass root opportunities, ensuring that what is already provided is done so in a way that is inclusive and accessible.

The other issue is that there is there is a myriad of pathways, some the same as the ones for non-disabled people, some fundamentally different (for instance Paralympian disciplines). However just stating that the absence of a clear pathway from grassroots to elite activity is a barrier is dramatically over simplifying the matter in hand. The key is getting National Governing Bodies of Sports to view the pathways for disabled people (where separate) as being as of equal importance as the pathways of non-disabled people and to view the pathways for non-disabled as being open to (where appropriate) disabled people. So the issue in hand becomes not the pathways themselves, but National Governing Bodies of Sport viewing themselves as responsible for all elements and areas of disabled people's involvement in their sports and

viewing that responsibility as being equally valued as their responsibility for non-disabled people.

This is an area where we have had much success and where Inclusive and Active has made large inroads. Athletics, Football and Swimming as three examples have begun to really grasp that disabled people are not an additional or extra responsibility but are actually a core component of their functions.

d. sports clubs that did not meet the needs of athletes with disabilities;

As stated the term *athletes with disabilities* is not appropriate and not in line with the social model of disability. We should be referring to disabled athletes, and even here there is a discussion to be had if the term athletes is appropriate. The term athletes reinforce the impression that this is about elite performance or at the least competitive opportunities. What we are essentially talking about is clubs and opportunities being open to all disabled people. The fact is that there is not one discernable 'need of' a disabled participant and actually the types of reasonable adjustment that are required are as broad and varied as the terms of impairments that may be displayed. Essentially what a person 'needs' is unique and individual to them.

Therefore the issue is clubs not taking on the responsibility of providing for disabled people and not seeing themselves as a potential place a disabled person could be active within. One of the major reasons for this assumption is the belief in the falsehood that all disabled people require specialised equipment, coaches and provision. This is the area that Inclusive and Active has worked on and as described over 300 clubs can now be described as having become inclusive.

e. Inadequate data at a borough level on sports participation among people with disabilities.

This again is an area that has been moved into the mainstream. This is not just about inadequate data at a borough level on sport and physical participation for disabled people but for participation as a whole. So the issue is now not about collecting separate disability data but instead about how we collect data on everyone's participation and how we ensure that includes information about a person's impairment.

The other area where things have moved on is in regard to the Active People Survey. Rather than collecting their own data, local authorities are now using the active people survey as the vehicle for showing the level of participation within their borough.

4. Could you show what progress has been made to implement the Committee's recommendations from its investigation, that were referenced in the first Inclusive and Active strategy, and how they have been incorporated into the second version?

The Committee recommended that:

- **London Boroughs should be encouraged to do more to help people with disabilities participate in sport and to share best practice across London:**

This has been one of the areas of most success. However a few words need to be said about the language. The agenda has shifted from being about 'encouraging boroughs to do more to help disabled people participate in sport' which places it as a non-mandatory and additional requirement, to actually being part of the disability equality responsibility. This is now not about helping disabled people be active (which in its self could be viewed as patronising). This is about providing opportunities that are inclusive and accessible and providing it in such a way that it views and places the disabled person as a central part of the prospective customer base.

There has been a real shift across the boroughs towards the idea that everything they do and provide should include disabled people. All 33 boroughs have been encouraged to view the provision of inclusive sport and physical activity as part of their equality duty rather than a separate provision. Therefore this immediately opens up more opportunities because what is already there becomes inclusive, rather than setting up new separate opportunities.

In regard to sharing good practise, five Inclusive and Active steering groups have been set up that provide an opportunity for local authority representatives (from across the portfolio of each authority) to discuss opportunities and to look at replicating successful approaches. Also over half the CSPAN's in operation have been supported to have a disability sub group (around 14 in operation) to again share good practise on a borough specific basis. Lastly, there is the club resource pack which has been produced by Interactive and provides clear guidance about good practise and clear examples to follow.

In terms of how this has been incorporated into Inclusive and Active 2, the adoption by local authorities is still a central component. The strategy is that all 33 local authorities will have adopted the strategy and have the associated action plans in place by 2012. The action plans will contain borough specific objectives in regard to how the services they provide, in regard to sport and physical activity, can be provided in an inclusive manner. This therefore will continue to ensure that local authorities understand their responsibility to inclusively provide for disabled people and that this responsibility is embedded within their structures and policies at a senior level. Support has been provided by the Mayor's office, through the deputy Mayor Richard Barnes, to influence local authorities at a Chief Executive level to adopt Inclusive and Active 2.

- **Teachers must be better equipped to teach physical education to children with special needs;**

By children with special needs we are assuming that this refers to all disabled children rather than just those with what would be referred to as having special educational needs. We agree that teachers need to be better equipped, but for this to become sustainable this needs to be part of the mainstream support to and provision for teaching staff. This would be in the form of continuing professional development.

Interactive would argue that providing courses that sit outside of the mainstream provision will only attract those who are already persuaded of the need to be better equipped to support the physical activity needs of disabled children. Therefore the strategy has been to continually influence Youth Sport Trust in regard to the portfolio of support services they provide mainstream teachers and to ensure that this includes physical education for disabled children as a core component. To a degree this has been successful and the advent of the playground to podium's initiative has seen more PE teachers supported to include disabled children.

In terms of the ongoing strategy, there is a clear priority within Inclusive and Active 2 to ensure that those who provide sport and physical activity opportunities have the appropriate training to both understand the potential issues faced by disabled people and to provide their opportunities in an inclusive and appropriate manner. This includes teachers and the expectation is that this will feed into the action plans of the local authorities in a manner where the education departments take on the responsibility to ensure that the schools cover provide the adequate support to teachers.

- **Funding should only be made available to sports clubs that had achieved, or were working towards, accreditation for the service they provide to people with disabilities;**

This requirement has evolved over the last few years. Funding is recognised as an appropriate conduit to achieve inclusion and all mayoral funding will require successful agents to adopt Inclusive and Active 2, this will be the same with play sport London. There is also an aspirational outcome within the strategy for all present and future funding streams that relate to sport and physical activity to have specific disability participation targets.

It has been decided that setting disability participation targets is a more functional aim to put before clubs than reaching a specific accreditation. One of the reasons that has been decided is the lack of an appropriate accreditation in London. Club mark does not presently provide an adequate level of requirement to show the actual inclusiveness of a club (all it asks is for them to have an equal opportunities policy) and Inclusive Fitness Initiative accreditation only relates to fitness environments.

Interactive feels that if an inclusion 'kite mark' were to be created for clubs that it needs to be a national initiative. This is because of the national focus of NGB's who would have to buy into it. Therefore it feels that the adoption of Inclusive and Active 2 fills the gap, as it requires all adopted bodies to create

a robust and organisation specific action plan that will be influenced to create clear commitment to inclusiveness of offered opportunities.

- **Information should be provided on the opportunities for sports people with disabilities.**

This is another area where successful work has been undertaken. 'Get Active London' is a web portal that has been developed by the five Pro-active partnerships and Interactive has seen this as the best vehicle to provide clear information on the opportunities that are available for disabled people in regard to sport and physical activity. This web portal is linked with the 33 local authorities and provides information on where clubs and other opportunities are available in London. Through Interactive's influence this portal ensures that all entries lists the inclusiveness of their opportunities. At present a quarter of all entries state which impairments their club or opportunity can cater for and work is ongoing to ensure that by 2012 all entries provide information on their inclusiveness of and accessibility for disabled people. The desire has been to ensure that there is not a separate list of disability provides would be seen to strengthen the belief that disabled people need to be catered for separately.

There is also a clear aspirational outcome in Inclusive and Active 2 that inclusive sport and physical activity opportunities are adequately mapped. This is presently undertaken by Interactive's team of four strategic development officers who on a yearly basis undertake a through audit of the opportunities that exist within their relevant sub-regional areas. This involves mapping what specific and inclusive sport and physical activity opportunities exist. However the expectation is that responsibility will be moved across to mainstream agents and as part of the creation of action plan's agents (such as with national governing bodies and local authorities) they will be expected to put in place objectives ensuring that details of the inclusive nature of opportunities will be captured alongside the other information that they collect.

5. How should progress be measured following the removal of participation targets from the Inclusive and Active strategy?

The first 'Inclusive and Active Action Plan' set out the aim of a one per cent increase in sport and physical activity each year for five years.

Progress will be measured by a number of indicators.

- **The number of Bodies adopting Inclusive and Active 2 and creating organisational specific action plans with clear objectives and targets.**
- **The success and achievement of the objectives and targets within the organisation specific plans**
- **An increase in participation levels of disabled people within Active People.**

It should be noted that a participation target still exists but it has not been defined as it was within the first Inclusive and Active. The target is now to create an increase rather than to hit a pre-ordained percentage. The reason

for this is that this is about creating equality that is sustainable and that is embedded in the way organisations operate and the strategies and policies that they set. The view was that a set percentage that needs to be achieved within a certain time limit can and did lead to fake activity, it encouraged activity that was about unsustainably meeting a specific deadline and provided one off activity that provided the numbers but did not change the landscape.

The participation of disabled people will only increase through the stimulation of the demand side and this will take time and development. Putting short term targets will only encourage short term solutions that will not sustain participation. The target is that organisation's operate in an inclusive manner and change the way that they regard disabled people, rather than identify easy and non-sustainable ways to achieve numbers.

6. How can sport participation rates be increased with less public money available?

Is London's legacy still achievable given the current budgetary pressures?

The simple answer is yes. This is not amount new money and this is not about new resources and this about the equalitarian and fairer use of existing money. Inclusion is about including disabled people in what is already being provided and will be provided within a decreased budget. Additional and what can be described as 'nice to have' activity will be danger in of budget cut, but the simple fact is that no matter what the budget cuts sport in London will continue to happen and continue to be provided.

What Inclusive and Active 2 and Interactive seek to do is to ensure that the core offer is Inclusive and that providers take on the clear responsibility to include disabled people in all that they, no matter what cuts they face. The more we make this about money the more that money becomes an excuse for not doing things. This has to be about a co-ordinated approach and a change in attitude.

Secondly the demand side has to be crucial. Provision will always be available if a demand is there. So we need advocate to disabled people that they have the right to be active, even if being active is just going to the local park. If we continue to entrench the ideal that disabled people can only take part in sport if someone comes along and provide an impairment specific opportunity (and takes them to and from that activity) we will not achieve a legacy because those types of activities will be the first to be cut. Therefore people will do less and less. However if we empower disabled people to feel that they have a right to be active and it is their responsibility to articulate and push that right, funding is not an issue or a requirement.

Finally, the Committee would welcome any further information you have to show the progress made so far in increasing sporting participation for disabled Londoners.

Interactive would state that the initial London Assembly was the catalyst for what has been a monumental change in the way that sport and physical activity for disabled people is viewed. If it was not for the report then Inclusive and Active would not have been created and we would not have started down this road. London is now leading the way in the regard to how you effectively and sustainably increase participation levels for disabled people and this is thanks to the committee.

Submission from London Youth Games

Dear Dee

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your committee's investigation into the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners and the opportunity to present our views to the Committee last week.

I wanted to follow up that meeting to highlight the most important areas for consideration to support the provision of sporting opportunities for young disabled Londoners. We focus here on the specific areas around strategy, policy and funding for sport, rather than the broader barriers to participation (such as transport).

- Further work needs to be concentrated on those young people in mainstream education. Physical Education is a key part of the curriculum for Special Schools, however there remains a significant challenge to ensure that PE in mainstream schools is inclusive and that the school is capable of, and encouraged and motivated to provide disability specific opportunities for young people with a disability in their school and community.
- Funding for disability sport is needed outside of curriculum time and to ensure that there is provision beyond the School Gates. The recent Youth Sport Strategy, published by DCMS highlights the drop off in participation at key life stages, such as leaving full time education. They highlight the need to ensure that by this point that young people are involved in community sport. This is also true of disabled people. The work of interactive is helping make clubs and community providers more inclusive in their approach, but this is where interventions funded by the GLA should focus attention, rather than on funding curriculum coaching provision which should be the obligation of the school. Further support in ensuring that sport provision is a statutory obligation would help ensure provision.
- Community competitive structures and events that are both inclusive as well as offers specific participation opportunities for young disabled athletes. Creating a high quality competitive structure for a sport is more difficult than generating individual coaching programmes, because of the collaboration and communication required, yet it offers the benefits of creating "something to aim for" and leads to more sustained participation in sport. The support of the competition structure becomes more cost effective than funding individual participation opportunities because the competition incentivises athletes and volunteers to participate regularly. The GLA should consider how it can play a strategic and funding role in ensuring that there is a regular competitive structure in disability specific sports outside of school hours.
- GLA / Mayors funding of disability sport should focus on being a long term strategic enabler. With recognition that provision of sport for disabled people is more expensive and may need long term financial support from the public sector, it is important that community organisations can focus on delivery, rather than a continual search to replace funding from one source with a different source (or a different initiative from the same provider). This can be achieved with longer term funding than is often provided.
- Finally we believe that the GLA can play an important role in raising the sporting aspirations of disabled young Londoners, through raising the visibility of disability sport - both of those achieving at an elite level as well as those enjoying sport. This greater visibility will help create a culture where disability participation in sport is 'normalised'.

Submission from Kids Company

Here at Kids Company we engage with young people with a range of disabilities, the majority of these manifest themselves in disturbed and challenging behaviour due to traumatised childhoods and abject poverty and neglect. They display a disability in the management of their behaviour due to the impact of their traumas, which is where we intervene to do reparenting work offering them the boundaries that can be missing at home.

Our sports and activity programme offers the children opportunities to thrive and excel and expend energy in a safe way at the same time. We use a high staff:child ratio in our sessions to ensure each young person is afforded a good amount of positive attention. We have a thorough, therapeutic system of managing the children's behaviour based on the Attachment Theory model which emphasises the importance of a trusted, consistent adult figure in their lives. Our ethos is inclusive so that any person who approaches Kids Company seeking support will be assessed and offered a tailored service reflecting their individual needs, this might be emotional and practical support for the adult carer and a safe space for their child to play and grow at our activity programmes, of which we have several based at our different centres in London.

We offer a range of physical activities in partnership with local services such as borough sports centres and local activity providers. This acknowledges the importance of partnership working between ourselves and other agencies.

Submission from University of East London

Alan Skewis has forwarded me your email requesting information on how the Newham High Performance Programme (formerly Newham Academy) is engaging with and supporting disabled athletes. The University of East London recently took over the running of the programme on behalf of Newham, and I co-ordinate the programme from our end. Below are some of our thoughts on what we are currently doing, and what we plan to put in place to ensure additional engagement with athletes with a disability. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information or clarification.

How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

While the Newham High Performance Programme doesn't specifically deal with participation rates, and though the success of the programme is measured on the quality, rather than the quantity of the athletes receiving support, there are a number of ways in which it can contribute to increased, and enhanced, participation rates for disabled Londoners.

Firstly, supporting talented disabled athletes, through bursaries and support, will help to retain disabled athletes in sport. Disabled athletes have additional training and participation requirements, and financial support, and access to support networks experienced in providing support to a range of disabilities can help ease some of the barriers faced by disabled athletes participating in sport. All athletes will have access to the performance gym in the new UEL SportsDock facility, which is fully wheelchair accessible. The new S&C coach which UEL are about to appoint will have experience in supporting disability athletes, and will provide suitable gym inductions and support to any disability athlete on the programme.

A lot of the work planned for the Newham High Performance Programme involves supporting clubs, and helping them enhance their provision for high performance athletes. As part of this, clubs would be supported to enhance their provision for disability athletes.

Part of the funding has been put aside to run talent ID days for various sports. In collaboration with other stakeholders, a specific day could be set aside to identify disability athletes who could feed into local club networks (or to have a disability element to each of the days run).

What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

It is important that disability athletes are aware that they have the same opportunity as able bodied athletes to be part of the Newham High Performance Programme. While the current application information states that athletes in all Olympic and Paralympic sports are eligible to apply, this could be further emphasised by featuring disability athletes already on the programme.

Ensuring that support specific to the needs of disability athletes is provided is crucial to ensuring the success of the Newham High Performance Programme for disability athletes. Providing suitable training and CPD opportunities to support staff and learning from and education coaches is paramount. Drop-out from sport is a significant contributor to reduced participation, and while encouraging disabled athletes to participate in sport to begin with, may be the main barrier, retention of athletes is also important.

Regards,

Elizabeth Egan
High Performance Sport Manager
University of East London

Submission from London Borough of Hackney

Provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners – Thomas Smith – 2012 Unit. London Borough of Hackney.

What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners?

Hackney has been working with Sport England on a community Investment Fund Disability sport project. We started the project in 2007 and will complete it in May 2012.

We have worked with multiple partners to improve 5 key sports and a multi sports club.

- Boccia
- Goalball
- Athletics
- Swimming
- Wheelchair Basketball
- No Limits Multi Sport Club.

Each sport has had some success with swimming and boccia the most popular. Impairment specific sports are always difficult to get significant numbers along to participate.

The borough also runs open days at leisure centers and two fully inclusive sports programmes; Personal Bests and The School Sports Championships (Hackney Learning Trust)

Local provision is supported by projects like London Youth Games and Time to Shine that give disabled young people further opportunities to participate and compete at many different sports.

Hackney is a partner organisation with Interactive and is just completing sign up and an action plan for Inclusive and Active 2.

How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

Community sports participation rates in London are highly linked to transport. Facilities are in general very good and many disabled people that want to participate in sport will adapt to make things possible. For many young disabled people they rely on school transport provision making it difficult to attend a community club post school as their transport is pre booked as a pick up and drop off from school. The transport issue means that many young people only participate in sport at school and never get into the habit of attending a community club or leisure centre, this is a barrier they take into later life.

The current action plan from Interactive focuses strongly on changing the culture, this is key, disability sport must be part of main stream provision. Stewarts letter is correct in that the message of go out and be active is for all, empowering people of all abilities to take action themselves as it is going to be extremely difficult going forward with less officers and financial resources.

What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

The Paralympic Games provides a once in a lifetime opportunity for disability sport to be in the living room of the nation for 2 weeks. We must utilise our athletes to spread their messages, tell their stories as they may well provide the empowerment needed to individuals around the country.

Within sport participation we so often talk about barriers, cost, time, facilities...Paralympians all over London have had barriers put in front of them and overcome them, it's these messages that could truly inspire London disabled population to participate in sport. Within Hackney we use local Paralympian Dervis Konuralp to promote disability sport and how people can get more involved.

From a boroughs point of view the one thing I would need more of is access to databases held by medical practitioners. Wheelchair services, resource centres etc etc so we can directly target people with specific sports. We have meetings and partnerships with many agencies trying to spread the word and promote activities but no direct control.

A common issue is staff training in our leisure centres, we are working with our leisure provider all the time but staff turnover means that many disabled people have had a bad experience.

Submission from England Athletics

Please find below the England Athletics Run! project response to the call to action:

1. What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners?

The Run! project has fully adopted Inclusive and Active 2 with 10 specific Athletics action plans for the boroughs of Newham, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest, Hackney, Greenwich, Haringey, Lewisham, Brent, Hammersmith and Fulham Westminster and Lambeth. Interactive are working in parallel with those who have adopted including our NGB England Athletics which has produced a club and Athletics Network IA2 resource guide. Through this adoption boroughs are encouraged to do more to help disabled people participate in Athletics and we are sharing best practice across London.

2. How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

Run! Recognises a more direct link with partner organisations is needed to provide what disabled Londoners want and what will work well for them. The Run! Activators are looking at the bigger picture working with partners to increase participation rates and addressing the barriers to participation. There is a specific England Athletics NGB Policy in place to stimulate the demand in coaching and participation.

3. What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

Maintain an increase in DET training for coaches and volunteers, encourage clubs and coaches to complete their inclusive health checks as they are working towards accreditation. Activators are empowering disabled people themselves to influence the supply utilising role models in the local community. Promote direct links between NGBs, clubs, coaches and the disabled community.

4. As part of the Committee's February 2011 report into a Sporting Legacy, Interactive wrote to the Committee about the current provision of sport and physical activity for disabled Londoners. A section of Interactive's letter is enclosed with my letter. I would appreciate if you could comment on the views put forward by Interactive.

Run! agrees with the views put forward by Stuart that participation demand of disabled people will not be achieved by simply providing more opportunities. Run! also feels that there has to be a balance between supporting clubs and coaches, and consulting on demand from the disabled community to be able to address the inactive numbers apparent; to focus support in only one direction is not a holistic and effective approach. Through the Mayor's Legacy Participation fund Interactive are linking with England Athletics to create that demand.

Submission from British Fencing

1. What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners?

Our efforts have been focused on strategic change and education. We have achieved foundation standard for equality. British Fencing is currently as separate organisation from the British Disability Fencing Association and we are both working towards a merger of the two organisations.

On a practical level we run equity courses for coaches and volunteers and give practical support our clubs to develop as inclusive clubs through SwordMark.

2. How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

Focus on changing perception – enabling sports organisations to be more open and understand how to support disability, conversely as Stuart mentions; breaking down perception barriers for disabled Londoner's. We need to remove perceived barriers and push that there are opportunities to participate and you will be able to take part.

Understand what the current barriers actually are and market directly to disabled Londoners.

Make best use of Channel 4 current investment in to the promotion of Paralympic sport.

Focus on promotion of activity rather than paying for delivery.

3. What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

We will continue the strategic and educational processes with our stakeholders and the BDFA.

4. As part of the Committee's February 2011 report into a Sporting Legacy, Interactive wrote to the Committee about the current provision of sport and physical activity for disabled Londoners. A section of Interactive's letter is enclosed with my letter. I would appreciate if you could comment on the views put forward by Interactive.

I agree with Stuart's comments I think there is a perception issue stemming from a feeling that sports providers will not cater for disabled Londoners, I also agree that it is a perception and not fact. As with all facets of sport there is a gap between sports provision and those that the provision is aimed at. It is extremely difficult for people to find out where to do sporting activity and it is marketed ineffectively.

Submission from Sport England

1. What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners?

Overview

- Since the London Assembly published their report in 2006 we believe that positive progress has been made in terms of ensuring more disabled people have access and are enabled to play sport. However, we also recognise that more needs to be done if we are to capitalise on the opportunities afforded to us from the Paralympics in 2012.
- In terms of overall participation rates for disabled participants, the latest Active People Survey (APS) figures - Active People is the survey which Sport England uses to measure sporting participation across the country - indicate that there has been an increase since 2006. Our latest figures from APS 5 (December 2011) show that 10.6% of disabled Londoners participate regularly in sport. This is up from 9.2% in APS 1 (2005-06).
- This is a promising trend and reflects the work and the investment made over the last six years. Appendix one shows the levels of investment by Sport England. Sport England has worked with partners to develop the capacity and influence of disability sport in London.

The disability sport landscape

- As well as witnessing a trend of growing participation over this period, Sport England has also gained a better understanding and knowledge of growing participation further, through consultation with the disability sport sector.
- As a result we have taken steps to better position the sport disability sector to support the national governing bodies of sport in delivering their offer to disabled participants. This has included restructuring the disability sports landscape so that organisations serving disabled participants better meet their needs.
- Primarily, this was done through a grant award of £319, 277 to transform the London Sports Forum for Disabled People from a small activity provider into being an integral part of the strategic sporting landscape in London. The Sport England grant allowed the organisation to rebuild its infrastructure and to develop capacity to operate in a manner that influences, challenges and supports policy setters in a way which it was unable to do previously. This shift was signified through the Forum's re-launch under the 'Interactive' brand in 2010.
- Following this investment, Interactive has reported to us that the biggest achievement is a noticeable shift in perception away from disability sport being seen as a separate strand to one of being integrated as part of all sporting opportunities. This impact can be seen in the investment decisions

and delivery plans for a variety of national governing bodies of sport (NGBs), Local Authorities, Pro-Actives and the Mayor's Office which show a greater awareness of the issues around disability participation.

- A clear example of this work in practise was the role that Interactive played in relation to the Mayor's fund, ensuring that all of the projects that they fund adopt the Inclusive and Active Toolkit. This has been integral in ensuring that organisations across both the disability and sport sectors take on board the messages.

Partnership working

- In addition to the work that we have carried out in relation to the structure of the disability sport landscape, we have also tried to change attitudes with those that deliver sport, publically setting high expectations within the sporting system about the outcomes we want to achieve in this area. Through our investment in national governing bodies we have made it clear that disability sport is not an optional extra, but a vital part of delivery.
- We have also developed relationships with disabled organisations outside of the sporting landscape to provide us with the insight and understanding needed to effectively market and deliver sport to disabled people. For example, through our work with Leonard Cheshire Disability we found that 68% of older disabled women said they would like help finding buddies to participate in sport and 85% wanted advice on appropriate sports, facilities and sessions. As a result, we worked with Leonard Cheshire Disability to establish around 2000 volunteer buddies for this segment of the population to enable them to take part in sport with confidence.

Next Steps

- Progress has been made in terms of increasing overall participation rates, gaining a greater understanding and insight into the barriers affecting participation, developing strong partnerships with expert organisations outside of sport and the development of broader partnerships. However, we recognise that there is still a long way to go before we reach better parity with non-disabled sports participation.
- The average figure for disabled Londoners participating is still far lower than the level of participation for non-disabled Londoners (21.2%). Of the 9 million disabled people in England, just 16% belong to sports clubs, compared with 26% of non-disabled people.
- Our challenge now is to ensure that lessons learnt are applied in a practical sense and that future investment is targeted at those organisations and projects with a firm understanding of what is needed to drive increases in participation in sport for disabled people.

2. How can sports participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

- Given the current financial restraints it is integral that we channel the funding that is available into those programmes that are best able to maximise this opportunity whilst also ensuring we get value for money from our investment.
- We need to use our evidence and understanding of what has delivered an impact to disabled participants to inform investment decisions in the future. If we apply the lessons that we have learnt from the past six years and invest the funding that is available into these projects, then real change can be delivered. Below are some considerations we will make when investing.
 1. Ensuring there is not a one size fits all approach - catering for a broad range of impairment is vital if disabled people are to be encouraged to take part and stay involved for the long-term. This means that coaches must be skilled in teaching their sports to individuals with different abilities. It also means understanding that there may be a need to co-ordinate with support workers, club leaders or parents.
 2. Whilst it is important to share the broad understanding of what motivates disabled people to take part in sport, each sport must develop its own unique offer because each sport is different in terms of how accessible they are to disabled participants. For example, the British Equestrian Federation's disability programme targets people who want to use horse riding as a therapy, as well as a fitness vehicle. Through their work, British Equestrian has found that horse riding has helped participants develop a sense of personal achievement. This has helped individuals to combat social isolation, build relationships, enjoy events and competition and develop self-confidence. By contrast, Wheelchair Rugby tends to attract people who want to engage in a highly competitive and physical game. From 2013-2017 we will be working with each of our funded NGBs to identify their unique disability offer.
 3. Participation should also be inclusive, so that disabled individuals are able to participate within the context of a sporting environment that already exists. Within this context there may be a need to offer dedicated disability sessions, which are exclusive to disabled people, but the emphasis should be on creating an experience for the individual where they can participate alongside their peers.
- One example of a project that we believe exemplifies the three criteria above is Ealing Extreme Ability. The project received £75,000 from Sport England in 2008. The aim of the project was to increase the number of opportunities for disabled people to participate in sport. This was done by helping sedentary disabled people become physically active; equipping partners and voluntary sports clubs staff with the skills, knowledge and equipment to be more inclusive; identifying talented disabled people who could participate in the 2012 Paralympics; raising awareness of health related issues, and

understanding the importance of becoming active and participating in sport and physical activity.

- The project has been a great success. The original target of 225 participants over its lifetime was far outreached with 638 disabled participants benefitting from the opportunities provided. The project helped to raise awareness amongst mainstream providers who will subsequently take forward some of the sporting opportunities once the project finishes. The project was also a success due to the strong local partnerships that were forged. This included engaging with local schools and sports clubs, which enabled the project to expand its range to cover children from 8+ despite the initial focus on 16+.
- With less public funding available it is ever more important to use the expert knowledge and understanding of what works to help lever in investment from other sources such as the commercial sector. Public finances alone will only bring about limited change. If we are to create a cultural change on a broader scale then we need to convince others that investment through corporate social responsibility programmes will make a lasting difference to people's lives.
- As well as engaging the commercial sector, broader partnership working becomes even more important with less financial assistance. Working more effectively with the third sector will ensure that best practice is shared, that resources are pooled where appropriate and that we are not reinventing the wheel or making unnecessary mistakes.
- Sharing best practice across the sports sector and across multiple sectors (commercial, third and disability) will also help more organisations roll out programmes that are proven to be effective.
- Raising the profile of disability sport so that more disabled people are inspired to participate is a vital ingredient to success in this area. The Paralympics and the coverage from Channel 4 will create an unprecedented opportunity to capture the imaginations of disabled participants. From there, we need to ensure effective signposting is available so that those who are interested are able to find opportunities to participate locally.

3. What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

- Sport England is at the forefront of driving increases in participation in sport for disabled people, as shown in the investment we have made since 2006 (see appendix one). We are the single biggest funder of sport for disabled people in England, all facilities funded by Sport England must as a minimum be DDA compliant, and in many cases we require accessibility of equipment as well as the facility itself. We have also laid down investment principles to the bodies we fund to ensure disability sport is a feature of their strategic plans for their sport.
- A clear example of our role as the leading agency in this area is the £1.3m investment made in 2011 to fund six disability sport expert organisations to

advise, support and guide other sports bodies as they create opportunities for participation by disabled people.

- In April 2012 Sport England will be announcing details of an £8m investment programme for disability sport. The overarching outcome of this money will be increasing and sustaining participation by disabled people.
- We aim to use this money to scale and/or replicate ideas/projects/programmes that can demonstrate they have increased disabled sport participation. For example, scaling up successful projects - turning a local programme into a regional or national programme or replicating the ideas from one project to another or across other parts of the country.
- We are currently consulting with disabled people (including specific consultations within London) and reviewing projects that we have previously funded, looking for critical factors in the successful projects that will help set the criteria for the delivery of the £8m legacy investment.
- We will also look to use this funding to get the sporting and disability sector to work more closely. We want to consider the possibility of developing closer relationships with charities and local authorities to get greater access to disabled people. We know that there are 1.5million disabled people in London, but NGBs find it hard to access them. As a sporting sector, we need to work more closely with organisations that provide services to disabled people so that we can more easily identify those who want to participate in sport.
- We are making progress in this area by working with DotComUnity which will give Sport England access to a network of 45,000 organisations that provide services to disabled people. 7,000 of these provide sports participation opportunities. We want to build on these partnerships and look to create more opportunities to engage with disabled individuals.
- We also believe that there is a role that technology might be able play in bridging the gap between being inspired to participate and finding opportunities to participate. More details will be available following the announcement of the disability legacy funding in April.

4. As part of the Committee's February 2011 report into a Sporting Legacy, Interactive wrote to the Committee about the current provision of sport and physical activity for disabled Londoners. A section of Interactive's letter is enclosed with my letter. I would appreciate if you could comment on the views put forward by Interactive.

- We agree with the appendix from Interactive which states that funding must be about more than purely getting more money out the door.
- We fully support and endorse the work that Interactive has carried out with the Mayor's fund, ensuring that all of the projects that they fund adopt the Inclusive and Active Toolkit. This has been integral in ensuring that organisations across both sectors take on board the messages.

- As can be seen from the points that we have made in the previous answers – the key to any future funding is to take on board the lessons that we have learnt since 2006 and apply them in a robust way to any future funding.

Appendix one: Sport England national investment into disability sport

- Through our work with the National Governing Bodies we have invested directly into disability sport through their Whole Sport Plans (Strategic plans for investment)
- Playground to Podium - £4.5m. Playground to Podium is a dedicated initiative designed to identify and nurture disabled young people and disabled adults with the potential to be elite athletes
- School Games – £1m over four years (previously the London Youth Games). They work hard to ensure that disability provision is a key part of the offer.
- £2m funding for the English Federation of Disability Sport
- £8m funding as part of Places People Play (Sport England's legacy programme)
- National Disability Sports Organisations - £1.37m of national lottery investment to support those organisations to advise, support, and guide other sports bodies as they create opportunities for disabled people to participate in sport.

Supplementary information received from Sport England

Hi Richard,

Apologies if the wrong figure was included in the consultation but the actual figure for APS5 for long term limiting disability or illness for London was 10.8% rather than 10.6%. This was just a typo!

In terms of your questions, the figure refers to APS5 which ran October 2010 to October 2011 and if we want to be exact, given that the survey relates to what people did in the 4 weeks prior to the phone call, its effectively what Londoners did between September 2010 and September 2011.

In terms of the numbers behind the figure it depends exactly what is meant by the number of respondents. If I'm reading the question correctly then hopefully the following figures are what you are looking for:

- The number of people that responded (in London) with a LLTID was 2,561
- The number of people that responded (in London) without a LLTID was 13,872
- Giving a total London response rate of 16,433.

However this is weighted to match the demographic profile for London, achieving an NI* 3x30 rate of 10.8%.

I hope that's of help but let me know if you need anything further

Thanks,
Alice

Submission from Skills Active

Dear Dee Doocey AM,

Thank you for your letter regarding the London Assembly's investigation into a sporting legacy for disabled people. SkillsActive are supportive of the focused look at participation rates and opportunities for disabled Londoners. SkillsActive have worked closely with the partners referenced in your letter and have supported the steps made to improve the infrastructure to allow disabled Londoners to participate in sport and physical activity.

In response to your specific questions:

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SINCE 2006 TO IMPROVE THE PROVISION OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY TO DISABLED LONDONERS?

SkillsActive's remit in improving the provision of sport and physical activity for Londoners has centred on developing the paid and voluntary workforce supporting participation in London. SkillsActive has worked to develop a qualification and training infrastructure to support disability specific sport and a workforce to cater for disabled participants. We have actively encouraged NGB's to include disability specific training elements within coaching qualifications and worked with SCUK and providers to develop industry led inclusive training to target at mainstream and disability focused coaches.

SkillsActive and the National Skills Academy have secured a range of funding streams to support Londoners to access training to allow them to work with disabled candidates. From 2007-9, SkillsActive administered the London coaching bursary supporting the cost of training, including disability specific and inclusive coaching. From 2010 to present, SkillsActive has administered the Mayor's Legacy fund with supports the cost of training for sport volunteers. Within this fund there is a specific disability strand of work targeting disabled people to enter the paid or voluntary workforce and also volunteers working with disabled candidates. To date 257 disabled candidates have accessed training, and over 300 coaches have accessed inclusive coaching courses giving them the skills to work with disabled participants.

To ensure further courses can be delivered to coaches, we have worked with SCUK to develop a coordinated pan London delivery network of the new SCUK inclusive coaching workshop, addressing logistical barriers such as the practical element of delivery to disabled athletes, the only region in England to have developed tutor workforce and delivery network.

We have worked closely with Interactive to develop elearning to be accessed by all sports organisations at all levels. The elearning develops knowledge of being inclusive from policy stage through to delivery. This is helping address the culture of the industry.

HOW CAN SPORT PARTICIPATION RATES FOR DISABLED LONDONERS BE INCREASED WITH LESS PUBLIC MONEY AVAILABLE?

SkillsActive believes training has a large role to play in this. By giving people the skills to existing clubs and coaches to be inclusive within mainstream clubs you are increasing the number and range of opportunities for disabled Londoners. It ensures that limited funds are used for capacity and project start ups. Working within the existing structures maximised already invested funding.

New funding for programmes need to ask specific disability questions around how the project or programme will engage with disabled Londoners and ask for evidence that the strategy described works.

WHAT MORE COULD YOU AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS DO TO IMPROVE CURRENT PROVISION IN LONDON?

In a climate where funding from Sport England is being driven by increasing participation, National Governing Bodies need to recognise that the disabled population is a target audience which can quickly have huge impacts on participation rates if needs and preferences are addressed.

Sports partners should continue working with Interactive to embed inclusion within mainstream work to address the cultural barrier that disabled candidates all need separate provision, whilst this might be the case for some disabilities it does not apply for the vast majority.

DO YOU BELIEVE THERE IS A SHORTAGE OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISABLED PEOPLE TO PARTICIPATE, OR LACK OF DEMAND FOR OPPORTUNITIES THAT EXISTS? WHY?

SkillsActive has no evidence to support either statement, however demand for courses, training and anecdotal evidence would suggest that there are a lack of opportunities for disabled candidates and a lack of awareness within the disabled communities of where to go. There are pockets of best practice which illustrates that when you get the model right, there are plenty of disabled candidates that engage and participate.

If you would like further detail with regards to anything detailed within this letter, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours Sincerely,

Katie Couchman
Project Manager – Mayor's Legacy Programme
SkillsActive

Submission from British Cycling

Dear Dee

Within cycling there is a split between those disabled people that can ride bikes with no or minimal adaption and those that need adapted / specialist bikes. In London the chance to ride adapted / specialist bikes is generally run by businesses and charities that charge. Volunteer run British Cycling Go-Ride clubs cannot generally afford to have a stock of adapted / specialist bikes, but would be willing to do minor adaptations.

1. What has been done since 2006 to improve the provision of sport and physical activity to disabled Londoners?

British Cycling's London Recreation Manager works with all the disability cycling businesses and charities in London. He is working with some of these organisations to engage the London Disability Cycling forum and has regular meetings with Interactive (formally London Sports Forum for Disabled People). This year British Cycling are seeking to make the London Sky Ride Local (250+ led rides) more accessible to people with disabilities through working with 14 of the London boroughs, Interactive and the local disability organisations. Ride Leaders will be provided with disability awareness training; a number of All Inclusive led rides will be offered and promoted via these organisations.

With regards to British Cycling's offer for young disabled people, all our staff coaches are trained to deliver disability cycling. This training is also available to all our volunteer club coaches and disabled riders are welcome at all British Cycling Go-Ride clubs. British Cycling has over 30 Go-Ride clubs in London, having established 20 new clubs in the last four years. Each of these clubs runs regular sessions with qualified coaches. They are all formally constituted, insured, have trained welfare officers and all volunteers have CRB checks.

2. How can sport participation rates for disabled Londoners be increased with less public money available?

Ensure that funding goes to those organisations that have the long term aim and proven track record of setting up and equipping volunteer run clubs. In addition, wider promotion of the existing disability cycling activities that are already available.

3. What more could you and other stakeholders do to improve current provision in London?

More groups need to work together to help bridge the gap with access to adapted bikes for disabled people. An example of this is the work British Cycling is doing to bring the Velo Club Londres and Wheels for Wellbeing together at Herne Hill Velodrome. With a number of existing groups with access to adapted bikes, British Cycling could assist with the signposting to appropriate cycling programmes and clubs for this group of people.

As mentioned British Cycling via the Recreation Manager is working with Interactive and other disability cycling organisations to make the recreational cycling programme more accessible.

4. Do you believe that there is a shortage of opportunities for disabled people to participate, or a lack of demand for opportunities that exist? Why?

A bit of both. If a disabled person needs access to an adapted / specialist bikes or can ride a standard bike, if they contact the wrong organisation or access the wrong cycling activity for their ability level, they may think that cycling cannot provide for them.

At the same time when there are appropriate cycling activities or access to adapted bikes available to disabled people, they are not always aware of these opportunities and more needs to be done to promote these opportunities to encourage more demand pan London.