

Case study

Sport development planning: The Sunny Golf Club

Abstract

Sport development is about helping people from all backgrounds to start playing a sport, to stay in their chosen sport, and to succeed at it. Sport development planning is a key process for achieving these goals. However, due to a lack of sport-specific planning tools, sport organisations have long borrowed and applied generic management principles, theories and models (such as situation analysis and strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis). As sport management is an established field of study, the need to develop sport-specific practices and theories is clear. This fictional case study, involving the sport development officer of a local golf club in Queensland, Australia, uses a sport development planning (SDP) process which blends traditional planning processes with sport-specific analyses of the attraction, retention/transition and nurturing (ARTN) of participants. The SDP process and its embedded ARTN processes form an empirically derived model based on the study of 35 sports. The model points the students towards a three-way analysis of (a) sport development stakeholders, (b) sport development strategies, and (c) sport development pathways that drive the ARTN of participants. This case study provides students with the challenge of planning for sport organisations using a structured and empirically derived method.

Keywords: Sport development; Sport planning; Sport development planning process; Sport development officer; Attraction, retention, transition and nurturing; Pathways; Club management

Teaching Note and Overview for Uses on Class

Sport development planning: The Sunny Golf Club

Introduction

Sport development is about helping people from all backgrounds to start playing a sport, to stay in their chosen sport, and to succeed at it. It is a field of study that has received increasing scholarly attention since the 1970s. Sport development has been defined by Collins as “a process of effective opportunities, processes, systems and structures that are set up to enable people in all or particular groups and areas to take part in sport and recreation or to improve their performance to whatever level they desire” (1995, p. 3). It is generally accepted that sport development has three goals (Siedentop, 2002): (i) a *public health* goal which involves participation for personal wellbeing; (ii) an *educational* goal where sport participants’ personally referenced excellence may be achieved through improving personal best times and (iii) an *elite performance* goal where excellence takes the form of success on the international stage and higher levels of competitions are involved (Bailey et al., 2010).

Sports organisations are a vehicle for achieving sport development goals. Like businesses, sporting organisations engage in planning processes. Traditionally, sport development officers (SDOs), policy planners, and sport managers have borrowed and applied generic strategic management principles and processes to shape and implement their plans. More recently, there is evidence (e.g. Amateur Swimming Association, 2003; Brentwood Borough

Council, 2007; Morton, 2010) of efforts to use sports-specific planning processes. These efforts, and earlier ones, have led to the use of non-empirically derived frameworks.

The most prevalent framework, the sport development pyramid (Eady, 1993) is a static representation which shows mass participation at the base of the pyramid and elite participation at the top. The sport development continuum model (Bramham, Hylton, Jackson, & Nesti, 2001) is also represented by a triangle shape and has four phases: *Foundation* at the base representing a basic level of performance and skill acquisition; *Participation* for fun, enjoyment, health and fitness; *Performance* at club, regional, state level and *Excellence*, based on national and international standards. The Long Term Athlete Development model is a coaching- and sport science-based framework that, depending on the sport, may include up to six training levels: (a) FUNdamentals (b) learning to train (c) training to train (d) training to compete, (e) training to win and (f) retirement and retainment (Balyi, 2001).

However popular they may be, these frameworks have been widely criticised for the lack of construct validity as they are not empirically derived (B.C. Green, 2005; Lang & Light, 2010; Shilbury & Kellett, 2011; Wolstencrof, 2002). Furthermore, as these frameworks are *sports science*-based they may be helpful to coaches and sport scientists but not to policy makers and sport development officers whose task it is to plan for sport development. That is because sport development planning is a process that requires an *organisationally* based framework.

One of the strengths of this case study is that it utilises an empirically derived model to portray sport development planning and processes. More specifically, after investigating 35 sports over a period of four years, Sotiriadou, Shilbury, and Quick (2008) framed the Sport Development Processes (SDP) model from an organisational perspective. The SDP model features three processes: the attraction; retention/transition; and nurturing (ARTN) of sporting participants.

Attraction is the process whereby sport development strategies draw new participants to sport organisations. The attraction process has a twofold aim: to increase awareness, participation and membership of general participants, and to nurture large numbers of young participants.

Retention/transition is the process whereby policies, strategies and programs are implemented to (a) provide quality experiences to existing participants in order to retain them and (b) offer opportunities to those participants who have the desire and the ability to make a transition to a higher level of participation and achieve higher standards of performance.

Nurturing is defined as the process whereby development programs and practices are tailored to various groups of participants (e.g. master sport participants), athletes, teams or sports to achieve excellence on the national and international sporting stage. The aim is to nurture the finest participants or athletes in each sport, to work towards their success at

prestigious international events and competitions, and to sustain a culture of continued success at the highest levels.

For the ARTN processes to be successful, the requirements are simple. There needs to be (a) *input* from various sport development stakeholders; (b) *throughputs* such as strategies, policies, competitions and events, facilities and sport development programs tailored to the needs of each of the ARTN processes; and (c) *outputs* such as sport development pathways that take participants from one level of participation to another (Figure 2). Because the ARTN processes were developed from a study of 35 sports, they are designed to apply to a wide range of situations. Therefore, it is only after these processes and their input-throughput-output properties are closely examined on a sport-by-sport basis that they can be adapted so that they become useful to the planning efforts of individual sport organisations.

Research on sport club management (e.g. Wicker & Breuer, 2011) shows that clubs are faced with increasing competition from commercial sport providers, decreasing public subsidies, and increasing energy costs. They also have to cope with demands for use of social media to connect with fans, an unpredictable economic environment and constant social changes including people wanting to move to a 'pay as you play' approach to sports. These trends mean that sport managers face pressure to increase membership, because membership fees are an important income source (Sotiriadou, 2009). As sport development practices, processes, goals and strategies have evolved over time, the application of an

empirically derived sport development planning process like the one described in this case study offers is timely. Specifically, this case study:

- presents and outlines a practical use of the *Sport Development Process (SDP)* planning model
- helps analyse the roles and responsibilities of sport development stakeholders (input), their strategies (throughputs) and the outcomes of their involvement (output)
- examines sport-related development processes (attraction, retention/transition and nurturing processes) and pathways
- engages students in activities that help them to understand sport development as a key process for achieving organisational goals.

Students may come to the classroom with no knowledge about sport development. On the other hand they may possess a wealth of knowledge about sport development, the sport system and its stakeholders, and planning and club management and this knowledge may influence how they interpret and organise incoming information. To optimise their interpretation of new information and to positively affect student learning, we offer the following advice to instructors.

Assessing prior knowledge

Instructors may assess student prior knowledge and skill through an initial in-class discussion using questions such as: 'in your view, what is sport development?', 'how do you think sport clubs facilitate sport development?', 'in your previous or current involvement

with sport, what sport development programs and pathways have you experienced?', 'when you play sports who else (e.g. parents, coaches) is involved and in what ways?', 'what is the structure and who are the key stakeholders of the sport system?'. Depending on the range of potential responses from students, and depending upon the type of course (e.g. undergraduate vs. postgraduate, first-year vs. third-year) the instructor should adjust the level of complexity and the time spent on the topic.

Readings

Several sources cited in this case study can be used as readings for students to further advance their knowledge prior to assessment. In particular the document by Sport England (2001) may be useful. It has a glossary of terms on sport development, and deals with sport development pathways, the network of stakeholders involved with the development process and their roles, planning principles, the planning process and the reasons why sport organisations need to plan for sport development. Another useful source of information is exercise, recreation and sport surveys (i.e., ERASS reports), including the 2010 ERASS annual report (i.e., Australian Sports Commission, 2011). These reports offer comprehensive summaries on sport participant trends since 2001, as well as information on the frequency, duration, nature and type of physical activity of persons aged 15 years and over. Lastly, sport-specific reports can be important sources of insights into sport development for particular sports. For golf, this includes Golf Australia's annual report (2010) and documents such as the Australian Golf Industry's Economic Report (2010) which can be found on the Australian Golf Industry Council's website (www.agic.org.au).

Other resources

Examples of useful websites for club-based sport systems and structures include the Australian Sports Commission (www.ausport.gov.au), Sport and Recreation New Zealand (www.sparc.org.nz), and Sport England (www.sportengland.org). In addition, a good source of information on structures and stakeholders in relation to sport clubs and other voluntary sport organisations is offered by the book edited by Robinson and Palmer (2011).

Assessment: The Sport Development Process (SDP) planning activity

This case study includes assessment tasks that engage students in shaping a sport development plan for the Sunny Golf Club through the SDP planning activity. The aim of this activity is to reflect on the five-stage SDP planning process (see Figure 1) and to demonstrate that each of the five stages includes tasks that are essential for successful planning. Examples of the tasks included are: the setting of specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound (i.e., SMART) objectives; using the sport-specific sport development three-way analysis; preparing an action plan; and monitoring/evaluating the plan. Given that the five-stage SDP planning model is based on the premise that strategic management is required, this assessment can be easily adapted and used in a strategic sport management class or a club management class. .

We recommend that students be required to submit a written sport development plan for assessment. The stages and tasks of a sport development plan which displays the SDP planning process are reflected in Figure 1 in below. The tasks for completing this activity are described in the next section and are presented to students progressively in the case study.

These stages and their embedded tasks reflect the sport development planning stages and tasks illustrated in Figure 1. A brief overview of these stages and tasks is presented here.

Stage One: Where are we now?

Task 1: Snapshot of the club's current situation

The first task for students is to create a *snapshot of the Club's current situation* using the information given in Appendix 1 and in other relevant documents which could be provided by the instructor. This may include details about the club (such as information on its structure, programs, core functions, events and competitions, and statistics on current membership fees). Students also need to examine the history of the club, its development and its successes, and they need to assess current income streams including sponsorships, donations and grants. As the case is fictional, students are encouraged to be inventive and make up other relevant information to complete the task. This could include inventing sport development and coach development programs, and coach education programs.

Task 2: SWOT Analysis

To complete Stage One of the SDP planning students should use the information they generated in Task 1 to carry out a SWOT analysis of the Club's sport development practices. Students can create their own strengths and weaknesses as long as they use that information in a consistent way throughout the document and subsequent sections of the SDP.

Stage Two: What are our sport development processes?

Task 3: Analysis of the ARTN of members

Based on the information given in the Strategic Plan (Appendix 1) and their own creativity, students should discuss how the Club engages, or could engage, in attracting, retaining, and

nurturing its participant members. These strategies could include such things as marketing campaigns, loyalty programs and competitions. Students could report on these suggested activities using a dot point list for each of the ARTN processes. Once that initial brainstorming is completed they can move to Task 4.

Task 4: Three-way stakeholder analysis (input-throughput-output)

Using Table 2 students can list the various stakeholders that may be involved in the ARTN processes of the Club, the stakeholders' possible roles (input) and the ways each type of stakeholder may facilitate or encourage sport development (throughput). On the same table students can report the key outputs or pathways of the various stakeholder roles and their involvement with sport development strategies. This task helps to indicate whether sport development stakeholder involvement is achieving the outputs required for sport development. At the end of the three-way stakeholder analysis, students should be in a position to identify potential gaps in the sport development delivery system of the Club (for instance lack of competitions or development programs that would help with the transition of junior athletes to senior levels).

The stakeholders involved in sport development include, but are not limited to, the coaches, managers, sport development officers, participants, parents, volunteers, local councils, schools, Departments for Sport and Recreation, and state sporting associations. Note that stakeholders' levels of involvement may vary depending on the development process involved. For instance, a coach's role during the attraction process may be very different to the coach's role during the nurturing process. Hence, students need to provide responses

for three separate sections under throughputs for each sport development process as shown in Table 2. Sport development stakeholders may assist with the implementation of strategies, programs, funding and competitions, or they may contribute by offering their expertise and time to facilitate sport development. Students may choose to assume, for example, that the Club has strong parent involvement and support, that it has a growing collaboration with local schools, that it lacks sponsorship or any other scenarios they consider appropriate.

The aim of this task is to illustrate how the same stakeholders may play different roles depending on the sport development process they are involved with. For instance, coaches play an important role at all levels of sport participation. However, their qualifications and educational requirements as well as their roles within each process vary from offering fun activities and modified sports at junior levels to high performance coaching at the elite level. Importantly, this task will help tease out sport development stakeholder relationships and highlight the importance of their collaboration for a better output (at this point it is assumed that students have a basic familiarity with various players and the structure of the sport system).

Stage Three: Where do we want to be?

Task 5: Review of the vision and mission statements

In light of the new information they will have produced in the preceding tasks, and based on information given in Appendix 1, students may now determine whether the current mission

and vision statements of the Club are reflective of its sport development aspirations. Students can modify and update these statements as required.

Task 6: Outline sport development goals and SMART objectives

For this task, students need to outline the Club's sport development goals and formulate SMART sport development objectives that will assist the Club achieve its goals. Some of the renewed goals may include: streamlining the structure of competitions; increasing local participation; restructuring membership and fees; revisiting coaching and developing programs, improving communications with members, increasing membership and increasing members' benefits. An example of a SMART objective would be 'to increase the Club's overall membership by 3.5 per cent per annum over the next three years'. With current membership being 292 members (see Appendix 1) this increase represents 10 additional members in the next year and an average income increase of around \$5,200. Regardless whether this objective is seen as conservative or optimistic, it would require the Club to take actions (next student task) in order to make it easier and more affordable for people to be involved in golf and join the Club.

Stage Four: How will we get there?

Task 7: Design a detailed action plan

Using Table 3 and the information generated during Task 6 students need to produce a complete action plan for the club. Students should be encouraged to offer as much detail as possible on the requirements and expected outcomes of the actions as this information will assist them in the next task of evaluating and monitoring the plan.

Stage Five: Are we getting there?

Task 8: Monitoring and evaluation against goals, objectives, and actions

What is left to do in order to complete the plan is to provide evidence that the Club is 'getting there'. This is achieved through (a) constantly monitoring how the implementation of the plan is progressing and (b) an overall evaluation of which objectives have been achieved. The main differences between monitoring and evaluation are the timing, scope and frequency of observations. Monitoring is more frequent and ongoing whereas evaluation is conducted at the end of the plan's life and assesses the plan as a whole. More specifically, monitoring helps 'keep the work on track' and allows management to know when things are not going as planned. Monitoring provides a useful base for evaluation. Evaluation is the comparison of the actual outcomes with the agreed goals. Evaluation looks at what you set out to do, what you have accomplished, and how you accomplished it.

For this task students need to discuss the ways they will monitor and evaluate against the Club's sport development goals, SMART objectives, and planned actions. In their discussion they may include ways they could revise and improve the Club's future sport development plan and its ARTN goals and objectives. They may also identify problems in planning and/or implementation and make adjustments. Students are encouraged to consider ideas such as using the Club's website for a members' survey for feedback on the Club's services and programs. However, it is important to remember that the data collection for monitoring and evaluation purposes needs to closely reflect the goals and objectives of the plan.

Task 9: Compile a sport development plan

Students could now use the information that they produced during tasks 1–8 to compile a sport development plan for the Sunny Golf Club. Students should aim to deliver a professionally presented document free of grammatical errors for evaluation and assessment. As a marking and assessment guide for the sport development plan, it is recommended that tasks 3, 4 and 7 attract 15 marks each, that tasks 1, 2, 6, 8 and 9 attract 10 marks each; and that task 5 attracts 5 marks if the activity/assignment is to worth a total of 100 marks. This is because the different tasks involve differing levels of difficulty and engagement. Instead of a written report the students could deliver a practical exercise during class to generate discussion and a brainstorm on sport development. In this instance, the instructor should allocate a minimum of four hours of face-to-face classroom time to allow for deep learning.

Other assessment tasks

1. Mapping sport development pathways

Reflecting on the sport development models provided in the case study (e.g. the pyramid model, the sport development continuum, Long Term Athlete Development and the ARTN) and with the help of Table 1, students can (a) ‘map’ the potential development pathways and then (b) list the pros and cons that have been revealed by the exercise. The aim of this activity is to illustrate the dynamic nature of sport development that requires a framework that is more inclusive than, for instance, the static representation of a pyramid. By mapping pathways using each of the models, the student should be able to see their limitations and why and how the ARTN process can perhaps better support their sport development planning needs. This comparison of models can be a group or an individual activity which

may be completed before the SDP planning task in order to advance student prior knowledge.

Please insert Table 1 somewhere here

2. Comparisons of ARTN processes between sports

In an essay form, or in an exam setting, students could discuss how the ARTN processes and the sport development pathways (i.e. the pathways from one sport development process to another) across different sports may vary. Consider drawing comparisons between (a) individual and team sports, (b) Olympic and high profile vs. non-Olympic or low profile sports, and (c) sports that require large numbers of grassroots participants from which to draw talented athletes vs. sports that do not rely on grassroots participation for elite success.

3. The ARTN processes and barriers to participation

In an essay or in class discussions students could analyse the barriers to participation for individuals from different sport development segments or target groups (e.g. female or older participants) at different levels of participation (attraction, retention/transition and nurturing) and provide realistic and effective ways of overcoming these barriers.

Resources

Bloyce, D. & Smith, A. (2009). *Sport, Policy and Development: An Introduction*. London: Routledge

Bryson, J. M. (2004). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations*. 3rd Edn, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach* (Boston, MA: Pitman). New York, McGraw Hill.

Houlihan, B. & Green, M. (2011). *Routledge Handbook of Sports Development*. London: Routledge.

Hoye, R., Nicholson, M. & Houlihan, B. (2010). *Sport and Policy*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hylton, K. & Bramham, P. (Eds) (2008). *Sports Development: Policy, Process and Practice*, 2nd Edn. London: Routledge

Nicholson, M. & Hoye, R. (Eds) (2008). *Sport and Social Capital*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Nicholson, M., Hoye, R. & Houlihan, B. (Eds) (2011). *Participation in Sport: International Policy Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

References

Amateur Swimming Association (2003). *The swimmer pathway: Long Term Athlete Development*. Author, Loughborough, UK.

Australian Golf Industry Council (2010). *The Australian Golf Industry Economic Report: 2010*.

Ernst & Young, Melbourne: Author. Retrieved December 19 from <http://www.agic.org.au/>

Australian Sports Commission (2011). *Participation in Exercise, Recreation and Sport: Annual*

Report 2010. Belconnen, ACT: Author. Retrieved December 19 from http://www.ausport.gov.au/information/casro/ERASS/exercise_recreation_and_sport_survey_past_reports/erass_2010

Balyi, I. (2001). *Sport system building and long-term athlete development in British Columbia*. Canada: SportsMed BC.

Bailey, R., Collins, D., Ford, P., Macnamara, A., Toms, M., & Pearce, G. (2010) Participant development in sport: An academic review. Leeds: SporsCoachUK.

Bramham, P., Hylton, K., Jackson, D., & Nesti M. (2001). Introduction. In K. Hylton, Bramham, P., Jackson, D., & Nesti M. (Ed.), *Sport development: Policy, process and practice* (pp. 1-6). London: Routledge.

Brentwood Borough Council (2007). *Sports Development Strategy 2007-2011*. Author, Essex: UK.

Collins, M. (1995). *Sport development locally and regionally*: ILAM: READING.

Eady, J. (1993). *Practical Sports Development*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Golf Australia (2011). *Annual report*. South Melbourne, VIC: Author. Retrieved December 19 from

https://secure.ausport.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/429723/Golf_Australia_Annual_Report_2010.pdf

Green, B.C. (2005). Building sport programs to optimize athlete recruitment, retention, and transition: Toward a normative theory of sport development. *Journal of Sport Management, 19* (3), 233-253.

Lang, M. & Light, R. (2010). Interpreting and implementing the Long Term Athlete Development Model: English Swimming coaches' views on the (Swimming) LTDA in practice. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 5*(3), 388-402.

Morton, O.C. (2010). *Swanston Golf Junior Golf Development Plan*. Swanston Golf Academy, Swanston: UK

Robinson L., & Palmer, D. (2011). *Managing voluntary sport organisations*. 1st Edn. New York: Routledge

Shilbury, D. & Kellett, P. (2011). *Sport Management in Australia*. 4th Edn. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Shilbury, D., Sotiriadou, P., & Green, C. (2008). Sport development. Systems, policies and pathways: An introduction to the special issue. *Sport Management Review, 11*(3), 217-223.

Siedentop, D. (2002). Content knowledge for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 21*(4), 368-377.

Sotiriadou, P., Shilbury, D., & Quick, S. (2008). The attraction, retention/transition and nurturing processes of sport development: Some Australian evidence. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 247-272.

Sotiriadou, P. (2009). The Australian sport system and its stakeholders: Development of cooperative relationships. *Sport in Society*, 12(7) 842-860.

Sport England (2001). *Developing your sports action plan? What is development & why should I plan?* Bloomsbury Square, London, Author. Retrieved December 19 from <http://www.susport.org.uk/assets/good%20practice/sportdev-running-sport.pdf>

Wicker, P. & Breuer, C. (2011). Scarcity of resources in German non-profit sport clubs. *Sport Management Review*, 14, 188–201.

Wolstencroft, E. (2002) *Talent identification and development: An academic review*. Sport Scotland, Edinburgh.

Case study

In 2012 Mick Portman was appointed as a sports development officer (SDO) at the Sunny Golf Club ('the Club'), on the Gold Coast, Australia. It was his first full-time job in the sport industry and he was excited to be employed in a sport he had loved since he was a child. This was just months after he had graduated with his Bachelor of Sport Management.

The first responsibility he was given was to develop the Club's inaugural sport development plan. Scott Maureen, the Club's manager, handed him a copy of the Club's strategic plan for 2012-2015 (see Appendix 1) and said, "If we could convert one per cent of recreational golfers into Club members we would solve our financial woes and secure the future of our Club and its public profile. We might even be able to pay your salary!" and laughed. "Our objective as a golf club", Scott explained, "is to increase participation and offer quality and safe experiences to our existing members. Unfortunately, we have been on a downward trend over the past few years. The previous SDO resigned seven months ago after giving only short notice. We need to take action and we need to do so now".

Mick nodded confidently while thinking to himself, "Great ... I have been playing golf for years and never saw the need to join a club ... how on earth am I going to increase the Club's membership?". Before he started to sink into a deep depression, daunted by the task ahead and worrying about losing his job within days of starting, he retrieved the Club's strategic plan as it was the only document that was handed to him and began to flick through the pages. It was a 12-page document with vision and mission statements, the

Club's history, goals and strategies, an outline of the organisational structure, an environmental analysis and information on membership fees and trends, as well as the financial position of the Club and a brief action plan.

Mick started checking his USB flash drive where he had stored all his recent assignments from university. Bingo! There was his assessment paper on strategic management ... After he sat down for a few hours and made comparisons between the two documents, it became clear to him how to proceed with this big task and he went outside to talk to Scott who was attending to some repairs.

"Perhaps we need to take things one step back with our sport development planning process" said Mick, "and explore *where we are now* and *what our sport development processes are* before stating *where we want to be* as a Club ... and then find out *how we will get there*". Scott listened intently. "Once we set out *who* is going to do *what*, *when* and *how much* it is going to cost us", he continued, "we will have clear lines of responsibility and know where we stand. This will allow us to implement ongoing *monitoring* processes, for example a checklist or Gantt chart of tasks and timeframes. This will be something we can continually refer to and it will enable us to track our achievements".

Scott thought for a moment, silence hanging in the air. "Mmm ... that sounds pretty good. Let's see it on paper ... shall we? We have a board meeting early next month. It would be good to have a draft discussion paper".

“Okay ...” Mick nodded and smiled, hiding his concern. He realised he was alone on this one and now had a responsibility in his role to deliver a detailed plan. This was his chance to apply what he had learned throughout his degree. Over the next few days, he was able to piece together their sport development plan using the following five stages (see Figure 1):

- i) Where are we now?;
- ii) What are our sport development processes?;
- iii) Where do we want to go?;
- iv) How will we get there?;
- and v) Are we getting there?.

Please insert Figure 1 somewhere here

Stage 1: Where are we now?

Mick started by developing an understanding of the Club’s current sport development situation and answering the question *where are we now* as an organisation? He completed two tasks: (a) a snapshot of the Club’s current situation, and (b) an analysis of the Club’s sport development strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). In SWOT analyses ‘S’ and ‘W’ stand for the internal strengths and weaknesses ‘O’ and ‘T’ are the external opportunities and threats.

Stage 2: What are our sport development processes?

Sport organisations deliver sporting opportunities at various levels of competition that cater for all participants regardless of age, gender, ethnicity and skill level. Hence, an essential step in compiling a sport development plan is to examine the ways the organisation develops sport at different levels. Analysing the Club’s sport development processes is critical to gaining a picture of *who* is involved (stakeholders/input) with developing golf at each level of participation, *how* they are involved (sport development

strategies/throughput), and with *what* results (sport development pathways/output). This is when Mick's search for a sport development model to use as a springboard for his analysis began. Initially he looked at the sport development pyramid (Eady, 1993). The base of the pyramid represents mass participation and the top represents elite participation. He immediately realised the pyramid, however attractive its simplicity, was not very useful in helping identify the gaps in the Club's sport delivery process. It was just a static representation of a linear progression which assumed that people progress logically to the next level of sport participation without any movement between recreational competitions and semi-elite or elite competitions.

Then he searched sport development online and he found the *Sport Development Continuum* (Bramham, Hylton, Jackson, & Nesti, 2001) which comprises the following four phases: *Foundation*; *Participation*; *Performance*; and *Excellence*. The continuum was not going to be very helpful with his analysis of *who* was involved in the Club's sport development processes, or of *how* they were involved, and with *what results*. He could find no evidence that this framework was the outcome of empirically based research. He then did a search of journal databases which yielded coaching and sport science-based results such as *Long Term Athlete Development* (Balyi, 2001) framework. All the material he found was for coaches, sport psychologists and sport educators. He needed something that would be sport management-related or at least something with an organisational perspective, like a sport development planning tool for managers, planners, policy makers and sport development officers.

Mick kept searching for more information and he read an article by Sotiriadou, Shilbury and Quick (2008) which looked at the sport development process from an organisational perspective. It talked about the *attraction, retention/transition and nurturing* (ARTN) of sporting participants, the variety of stakeholders involved with sport development and their roles, the various strategies required for sport development and sport development pathways. The ARTN model was generic as it represented results from a study of 35 sports. After reading the article, he used Figure 2 as an overview of the sport development processes. This figure shows the attraction, retention/transition and nurturing (ARTN) processes and how they interact. These processes have three elements in common (as shown at the centre of Figure 2).

Please insert Figure 2 somewhere here

These elements are: (a) sport development stakeholders (input), (b) sport development strategies (throughput) and (c) sport development pathways (output) that facilitate movement from one process to another. These pathways are represented in Figure 2 by the circle that links the ARTN processes. All Mick had to do was make the model golf-specific and apply the concepts to the Club's context! He broke Stage 2 down to two tasks:

(a) analyse the ARTN process of the Club

(b) analyse the input, throughput and output of stakeholder involvement.

Porter (1985) refers to the linkages between input, throughputs (or processes) and outputs as a value chain. So, Mick called that three-way analysis the *sport development chain analysis*. To enable the analysis he shaped a template (see Table 2). Sport development stakeholders were broken down into two categories: (a) stakeholders that shape and initiate strategies and policies and offer advice and other resources. Examples include sports federations, the Australian Sports Commission, or the Queensland Department of Sport and Recreation, and (b) stakeholders or individuals who help adapt and implement these policies, programs and other sport development strategies. For instance, coaches, umpires, athletes, sponsors, volunteers, high performance managers, team leaders and other staff are involved with various activities including the maintaining facilities, organising competitions or events, umpiring games, and running training sessions.

Please insert Table 2 somewhere here

Stage 3: Where do we want to be?

The results of Mick's SWOT analysis during Stage 1 and his sport development chain analysis during Stage 2 highlighted the critical issues the Club faced, and this set the scene for reviewing and re-setting the Club's *sport development goals*. As a result of the work Mick did in Stages 1 and 2, the Club was already better positioned plan and increase membership. The challenge was now to choose which of the identified issues were the most critical ones and address them. With the mission and vision statements at hand it was time for Mick to set specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (i.e. SMART) *objectives*

(Doran, 1981) to achieve the Club's newly set *goals* and then set out the required *actions* that would help achieve them.

Stage 4: How will we get there?

Developing a robust yet practical action plan was essential to ensuring that the Club's objectives were achieved. The template shown in Table 3 was all Mick needed. This template includes the following: what needs to be done; who is responsible for carrying out each action; a time frame with potential milestones; the human, financial and physical resources required; and tangible, measurable expected outcomes (Key Performance Indicators or KPIs) (Parmenter, 2010).

Please insert Table 3 somewhere here

Stage 5: Are we getting there?

The last component of the plan is the implementation schedule which helps the Club monitor and evaluate its progress toward achieving its goals (Mintzberg, 1976). Although Mick was preparing a sport development plan for the next three years, he knew that the Club's goals and targets should be revisited and the plan should be updated every year. That is because plans are essential but they are not set in concrete. To ensure progress toward the Club's goals and vision, individuals assigned with tasks on the action plan should review those tasks even more frequently – sometimes even monthly or weekly. Monitoring and

evaluation are both tools which help an organisation know when plans are not working, and when circumstances have changed.

After completing Stage 5 it was easy to see whether or not the Club had achieved its objectives. Mick found that while some results met or exceeded the Club's expectations, there were areas where the plan did not produce the anticipated outcomes. At least the Club's management knew about it and how to do things differently in future. Furthermore, the Club recognised the need to be more accurate with goal setting and more careful with how it allocated and used its resources.

Mick's sport development plan became the blueprint for the Sunny Golf Club and was used as a reference for regular guidance and direction. The experience Mick gained was invaluable and next time around he would be more prepared and experienced. Planning is an ongoing process. You just revisit the SDP planning model (Figure 2) by asking *where are we now?*, plan again and make changes to bring about further improvements.

References

Balyi, I. (2001). *Sport system building and long-term athlete development in British Columbia*. Canada: SportsMed BC.

- Bramham, P., Hylton, K., Jackson, D., & Nesti M. (2001). Introduction. In K. Hylton, Bramham, P., Jackson, D., & Nesti M. (Ed.), *Sport development: Policy, process and practice* (pp. 1-6). London: Routledge.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2010). *Australian Sport: The pathway to success*. Canberra: Department of Health and Ageing.
- Doran, G. T. (1981). There's a S.M.A.R.T. way to write management's goals and objectives. *Management Review*, 70(11), 35-36.
- Eady, J. (1993). *Practical sports development*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Mintzberg, H. (1976). Planning on the left side and managing on the right. *Harvard Business Review*, 54, 49-58.
- Parmenter, D. (2010). *Key performance indicators: Developing, implementing and using winning KPIs*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Porter, M. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. London: Collier MacMillan
- Sotiriadou, P., Shilbury, D., & Quick, S. (2008). The attraction, retention/transition and nurturing processes of sport development: Some Australian evidence. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 247-272.