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FOREWORD - EUROPEAN OBSERVATOIRE OF SPORT & EMPLOYMENT

Sport, is healthy, beneficial and fun, and should be accessible to all - few would disagree with this sentiment. However, barriers to participation exist in a variety of guises throughout society and across sectors. It is the responsibility of the Sports Sector to look at itself and strive to ensure that these barriers are limited, and ideally removed.

We clearly cannot eradicate barriers, if we do not know what or where they are. The All for Sport for All project has taken the first important step in addressing this very issue. Through mapping the perspectives of Sport for people with a disability we can better understand what our objectives, as a sector, should be. These objectives should transcend borders, culture and language, to ultimately be realised on an International level.

Through the Lisbon Treaty a formal EU competence on sport has provided sport with a voice on a European level; it is down to projects like All for Sport for All to ensure that this platform is used correctly and effectively. This, I feel, has been achieved. It is now our responsibility, as Sector stakeholders, to work together in order to realise the goals and targets set out through the recommendations of this project.

In my capacity as President of the European Observatoire of Sport & Employment (EOSE), I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all involved in the project. The efforts of the partnership, alongside sustained support from the EU, have allowed the key issues relating to Disability Sports in Europe to be highlighted, leading to the creation of a plan for future development.

It is important to state that the conclusion of the All for Sport for All project is not the end, but merely the beginning of a journey. With the momentum created through the committed input from all involved in the project, it is essential that the development plan created is enacted and pursued through collaboration between all Sector stakeholders, and the EU, to diminish the existing barriers to participation for all in the sector.

Steven Studd
European Observatoire of Sport & Employment
President
FOREWORD - EUROPEAN PARALYMPIC COMMITTEES

The European Paralympic Committees (EPC) mission is to secure the provision of excellent sporting opportunities for European athletes with a disability as part of the world-wide Paralympic movement. The EPC seek to boost the participation of citizen’s with particular needs through sport, this participation goes beyond merely practising sport in the community. The EPC believes sport involves sharing time and space with others, including intercultural dialogue, enhancing unity and promoting respect for diversity amongst our 47 member nations.

It is the view of the EPC Executive Committee that to achieve these goals we must first take stock and establish what provisions for sport are available to disabled people throughout the European Region. By establishing our areas of strength and weaknesses we can better plan for the future. It was for these reasons that the EPC were delighted to enter into partnership with EOSE to support the “All for Sport for all” project.

As President of the EPC I would like to thank all those involved in the project. Without their commitment and determination the project would not have been the success it has been. I would also like to acknowledge the support of the EU, without which the project would not have got off the ground.

The EPC see the conclusions of the “All for Sport for All” as starting point and the EPC wish to use the findings of the project to help determine our strategic plan for the next decade. To achieve our goals and objective, it is crucial that we not only work in partnership with our member organisations but with all stakeholders in the sector including the EU.

John Petersson
European Paralympic Committees
President
FOREWORD - EUROPEAN COMMISSION SPORTS UNIT

The European Union promotes the active inclusion and full participation of disabled people in society, in line with the EU’s human rights approach to disability issues. Enabling people with disabilities to enjoy these rights is the main purpose of the EU’s long-term strategy for their active inclusion. By 2020, the European Commission wants to see improvements in employment prospects, accessibility, independent living and also a higher participation in sport. This approach is also at the core of the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities, to which the European Community is a signatory.

While sport for disabled people is not a new concept, recognition of the potential of sport as a means for fostering inclusion and well-being for disabled people is relatively recent. More and more evidence has been found to prove that sport can be an effective tool for social integration.

Sport can change community perceptions of disabled persons by focusing attention on their abilities and moving their disability into the background. At the same time, sport can also change the disabled persons themselves. It enables them to make choices and take risks on their own. It builds self-confidence and provides opportunities to develop social and physical skills, to develop independence and become empowered to lead and make change happen.

The growing interest of people with a disability in sport in general and more specifically in events such as national championships or the Paralympic Games is having a considerable impact. But where to go if you have this concrete interest is not always clear. It is really depending on where you live in Europe, what has been organized in your local areas and what sort of policy and strategies, special programs have been developed. In some EU countries special programmes have been developed and universities and institutes have become more involved in research and scientific innovation in the area of sport for disabled persons. In other countries local initiatives are successful but we do not have an overview and we do not know why they are successful.

In its Resolution on the White Paper on Sport of April 2008, the European Parliament called on the Commission to propose Preparatory Actions in the field of sport as of 2009. The objective of the 2009 Preparatory Action in the field of sport was to prepare future EU actions in this field. The 2009 Preparatory Action has been used to test the establishment and functioning of suitable networks and good practices in four areas including disability sport. The All Sport for All Project has been one of the selected projects.

It is with great interest the Commission has followed this project in which EOSE has functioned as an excellent service provider for the European Stakeholders in sport for people with a disability. Now it is up to them to take the challenge and to use the parts and pieces delivered by the project in combination with vision and policies and start the construction of a European strategy on All for Sport for all: United in diversity.

Bart Ooijen
European Commission Sports Unit
Policy Officer
Sport plays a big role in the lives of many Europeans. It is an essential element in childhood and youth education, an important tool for the health and well-being of adults, probably the most popular way of entertainment, and of course it is also an important industry. However, there are many Europeans that cannot fully enjoy the numerous benefits that sport can bring. Europeans with disabilities have to face a number of additional obstacles that hinder their participation in sporting activities, such as accessibility barriers to sporting venues and services, lack of training and awareness about disability, insufficient resources for the organisation of disability-specific activities and events. The removal of those barriers is an important policy priority for the European Commission, since participation in sport has proved to be a powerful tool for the inclusion in society of people with disabilities.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities calls on State Parties to take all appropriate measures to promote the participation of people with disabilities in mainstream sport as well as disability-specific sporting activities, and to ensure that sporting venues and services are accessible to them. The European Union, as a full party to this Convention, is committed to do what is needed to encourage and support its Member States to develop those measures. The project “All for sport for all” is an excellent example of the added value that initiatives at European level can have to remove the existing barriers to an effective participation of people with disabilities, not only in sport, but in an inclusive society.

The European Commission especially welcomes the data collection and analysis carried out by the project: this can be an interesting starting point to assess the main achievements and problems in the field of disability sport in Europe. Such data should enable us to better target our future initiatives in this field.

Johan ten Geuzendam
European Commission Directorate-General Justice
Head of Unit Rights of persons with disability
SUPPORTING NOTE - DEPUTY STATE SECRETARY FOR SPORT HUNGARY

Competitive sport for disabled people has undergone enormous changes in the last twenty years, becoming more professionalized and integrated to non-disabled competition systems. A huge development can be experienced both in techniques and performances. The produced technical solutions are so developed that these enable people with disabilities to do sports without difficulties. Nowadays, several disabled athletes have the chance to join the championships of non-disabled people, too. Competing together is necessary, because all the sport facilities, professionals and training partners are typically organized on the field of non-disabled sports. In our country all the disabled sports are built around special institutions, like in other countries, too, whatsoever the birthplace of the Paralympic Movement is also a rehabilitation centre. Unfortunately, a less adopting approach can be experienced in many cases, but the taken efforts and effective work of our ancestors opened the door towards merging the two different types of sport, thanks not just to civil efforts but a significant governmental role, too.

The Orbán-government’s period between 1998 and 2002 was a significant term regarding the Hungarian situation, because that was the first time when a government dealt with disabled sport as a separate field. At that time, I was responsible for disability matters as the deputy state secretary; various achievements have been in this field, which results can be a perfect fund for my current work (including disabled and non-disabled sports) as the Deputy State Secretary for Sport. Distribution of proportions is very important, which I am keen on searching over the past twenty years of my life. The active presence of both the governmental and civil side is needed for development of sport. They cannot exist without each other, because there is no sport without the civil side, however there is no state support without the presence of the governmental side either.

All of these processes entered to my life in the ‘80s, when I could experience the first Hungarian disabled sport success, as a TV-viewer, during the Sitting Volleyball World Championship organized in Hungary. I did not even hear about the existence of any other Paralympic sport than sitting volleyball, nor that did the Hungarian Team prepare to the Paralympic Games. The Hungarian media did not report about disabled events so much, so that Seoul used to be the first place where I met with Paralympic logos and realized that the Olympic Game is followed by the Paralympic one.

However a car accident made me a member of the Paralympic family happened in 1991. After winning European and World Championships, Fate showed me the challenge to build a kind of a bridge between the two dramatically distinct communities. First, I could see differences, completely different structures and a system organized by disability-grounds.

The most striking differences were the sport activities organized around disabled people, schools and institutions; but the coaches’ obsessions, the athletes’ fanaticism were the same, thus we could immediately found the common voice. Thanks to the effect of my Paralympic gold medal in Barcelona, the Hungarian wheelchair fencing started to revive. My personal relevance had a chance to catalyse the process which previously could only be dreamed, which was the long-term aim of the movement. The most strange first was the sight of the many injured people; I used to it after a few competitions, which helped a lot in adopting myself, thus I did not feel strange when the national anthem was heard. I experienced victories as an athlete and not as a disabled person. Practically the first feelings of success gave me back my self-respect and provided power for the continuation. After 20 years I can say that I live a complete life, I am a leading governmental official for the second time. Between 1999 and 2005 I worked as Deputy State Secretary for Disabilities, nowadays I am responsible for sport as the Deputy State Secretary. I am happy to see that many of the previously born dreams became true. The performance of a world or Paralympic champion being a real sport value is not a question any more. I do trust that many of my companions will realise themselves in sport too.

Regarding the situation in Europe, the Lisbon Treaty may open new dimensions in relation to the whole area of sport, including disabled sports as well. It is essential to achieve an EU-level dialogue between state and private structures. Personal equitation to disabled sports also shows the level of Europeanism. My thoughts above are fully interwoven by the spirit of Europeanism.

Páll Szekeres
Ministry of National Resources Hungary
Deputy State Secretary for Sport

All for Sport for All
1) PREFACE

Due to the nature of the Preparatory Action Project, this Summary Report is not meant to be a scientific paper covering all details and concepts related to disability sport, nor was it able to include all kinds and varieties of disability sports or national disability sport sector aspects, information, activities, practices and contributions. This Summary Report nonetheless has been duly built on the information received from national project and associate partners who are experts in the field and who duly researched information and practices within the time and resources given.

The report shall be read together with the detailed work package and sector reports that are available online at www.allforsport.eu and include further country data, practices and references.

In regards of proper use of terminology, the All for Sport for All project team has been aware and acknowledges that there are considerable debates on the different terms related to the sector. We are aware that the translation and use of some terms might be difficult and used differently in each European country, such as e.g. “disabled people” or “disability sports”. However, the international team has decided and is confident that even an incoherent use of terms within the project or this publication (e.g. “sport for people with a disability” and “disability sport” to describe sport activities that have been developed for people with a disability) will not detract substantially from the general points we wish to make. For reasons of legibility, we also refrained from referring in every case to both sexes. References to persons are generally not gender-specific.

The report’s objective is to provide the reader and especially the EU and national sport authorities and stakeholders dealing with sport for people with a disability or with disability in general with an overview and review of the current status quo of the sector. The Summary Report reflects the view of the experts involved in this project activity. By drawing conclusions and recommendations, the report shall help opening the door for a broader European dimension of disability sport with further trans-national and trans-sectoral cooperation and sustainable development, and a more aligned and evidence based work in the future.

2) INTRODUCTION

Sport for athletes with a disability has existed for more than 100 years but is as it exists in its modern form a relatively recent phenomenon. Sports clubs for deaf people, for example, have been existing since 1888 and the International Committee of Sports for the Deaf (CISS) was founded in 1924. In the same year the first games for athletes with a disability, known as The Silent Games, were organised with 148 athletes from nine European nations participating.

In 1944, with Dr. Ludwig Guttmann, a new approach has introduced sport as a paramount part of the remedial treatment and total rehabilitation of persons with a disability. Rehabilitation sport evolved rather quickly to recreational sport and the next step to competitive sport was only a matter of some years. In 1948, the first competition for athletes in wheelchairs - the Stoke Mandeville Games - was introduced. In 1960, the first Paralympic Games were held directly following the Olympic Games in Rome, including already 400 athletes from 23 countries, whilst the first Paralympic Winter Games took place in 1976. Since then different disability sports and multi-disability sport competitions have been developed and run under the umbrella of the different disability-orientated international organisations created, including e.g. the International Stoke Mandeville Games Federation (1952), the International Sport Organisation for the Disabled - ISOD (1964), Special Olympics (1968), the Cerebral Palsy International Sport and Recreation Association - CPISRA (1978), or the International Blind Sports Association - IBSA (1980).

In 1989, the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) has been founded and the European Paralympic Committee (EPC) has been created as the IPC European Committee in November 1991, adopting its current name in 1999. The EPC is currently composed of forty-seven National Paralympic Committees and the European branches of four disability-specific International Organisations of Sports for the Disabled (IosDs). The European Paralympic Committee’s mission is to secure the provision of excellent sporting opportunities for European athletes with a disability as part of the world-wide Paralympic movement and seek to boost the participation of citizen’s with particular needs through sport in Europe.

Throughout the entire European Union people with disabilities have similar concerns, face similar obstacles and experience similar discrimination. To reflect its commitment to, and the rights of, people with disabilities the European Union developed

---

1 For further information regarding definitions on disability in Europe see: Definition of disability in Europe - A comparative analysis (2002), Brunel University / DG Employment & Social Affairs
2 See CISS at http://www.deaflympics.com
3 The word “Paralympic” nowadays derives from the Greek preposition “para” ("beside" or "alongside") and the word "Olympics" meaning the ‘Paralympics’ being the parallel Games to the Olympics, whilst it had been originally combining ‘paraplegic’ and ‘Olympic’, however with the inclusion of other disability groups and the associations with the Olympic Movement, it now represents ‘parallel’ and ‘Olympic’ to illustrate how the two movements exist side by side.
4 Referred to and partly cited from the International Paralympic Committee: ‘History of Sports for Persons with a Disability’ and ‘IPC’ (www.paralympics.org)
a Charter in which it states “the EU recognizes and respects the right of persons with disabilities to benefit from measures designed to ensure their independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community” (Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, Article 26).

In so stating, the EU has shifted the concept of disability away from “objects” of charity, medical treatment and social protection towards “subjects” with rights, capable of claiming those rights and making decisions and being active members of society. This shift in EU policy reflects the changing theory of disability; from a medical to a socially constructed phenomenon.

As seminal authors such as Oliver (1990) state, and the EU policy developments indicate, although there is no universally accepted definition of disability, there has been a gradual broadening of the concept of disability over the last 30 years and in the western world has shifted toward a greater acknowledgement of the social context in which disability is created and maintained (Oliver 1990; Barton & Oliver 1997). The shift towards a social understanding of disability and of the social and environmental constraints which are believed to ‘disable’ people has also helped the disabled people’s movement to bring about significant policy change by governments (Barnes, Mercer & Shakespeare 1999).

To further its policy commitment to people with disabilities, in 2007/2008 the EU developed its Anti-discrimination legislation: Directive 2000/78 on equal treatment in employment and occupation, in which employers are encouraged to take measures to enable a person with a disability to have access to employment and training. Since 2009, the consolidated version of the ‘Treaty on the functioning of the European Union’ (hereafter ‘Treaty of Lisbon’) specifically relates to non-discrimination and citizenship of the European Union, including people with disabilities with its Article 10 (combating discrimination including if based on disability as a general provision) and Article 19.

In the same document, the significance of sport for Europe is explicitly acknowledged and the promotion of sport as a European Community objective is emphasised, since sport is anchored for the first time through Article 6 and Article 165 in the Treaty of Lisbon. In addition to the EU’s policy on people with a disability, the Treaty of Lisbon aligned with the EU White Paper on Sport (2007) to promote the integration and equal treatment of people with disabilities.

As ‘sport has a major potential as a tool for promoting social inclusion and social cohesion in European societies’ (EU Sport Unit 2010), the European Commission largely promotes an inclusive approach to sport in order to allow all residents of the European Union access to sport. In November 2010, the “European Disability Strategy 2010-2020: A Renewed Commitment to a Barrier-Free Europe” (COM(2010) 636) (following the Strategy from 2004-2010) has been developed to promote the integration and equal treatment of people with disabilities.

The Strategy shows strong convergence with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol, to which the European Community is a signatory, calling for EU countries to promote the participation of and access for persons with disabilities in mainstream sporting activities at all levels. In this regards, the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities’ (UNCRPD) plays another major role in the development and support of better participation for people with disabilities in sports. On 30 March 2007, there were 82 signatories to the Convention, 44 signatories to the Optional Protocol, and one ratification of the Convention; being the highest number of signatories in history to a UN Convention on its opening day (UN 2010). The European Union took over a lead role in the progress of adopting the Convention. As of March 2010 the European Community and all its Member States signed the UNCRPD, and as of November 2010 16 out of 27 member countries have ratified the Convention. Article 30 refers to the ‘participation in cultural life, recreation, leisure and sport’ with the aim to: “promote the participation of persons with disabilities in mainstream sporting activities at all levels; ensure that persons with disabilities have an opportunity to organize, develop and participate in disability-specific sporting activities; ensure that persons with disabilities have access to sporting venues and services.”

The specific Action Plan for 2010-2015 (SEC(2010) 1324 final) to implement the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 considers the role sport plays in promoting the integration of people with disabilities and dedicates a special notice to sport participation, too:

“Ensure equal opportunities for persons with disabilities and their families to fully participate in all aspects of social and economic life, namely:

- to exercise all their Union citizenship rights, in particular the right to free movement and residence
- to be able to choose where and how they live
- to have full access to cultural, recreational, leisure and sports activities.” (p. 6)

---

7 Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.
In more detail, the List of Actions 2010-2015 states as key objectives to “Promote the participation of people with disabilities in sports [and therefore to]:

- Develop and disseminate standards for accessibility of sports, leisure, and recreation organisations, activities, events and venues (2010-2015)
- Promote the participation of people with disabilities in European sport events as well as the organisation of disability-specific events including Special Olympics (ongoing)
- Include a priority on Social inclusion through and in sport, with a particular regard to persons with disabilities, in the future Commission policy and incentive measures in the field of sport (2011-2012)” (p. 8).

In addition to the EU action at the European (sport) political level, in 1986 the Council of Europe (CoE) has extended the recognition of people with a disability and their right to participate in sport by creating the ‘Sport for All: Disabled People charter’, after having had formulated the policy on “Sport For All” which was passed in 1976 declaring that every individual shall have the right to participate in sport. One aim of this Recommendation No R (86) 18 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the “European Charter on Sport for All: Disabled Persons” (adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 4 December 1986 at the 402nd meeting of the Ministers’ Deputies) is that “sport should become a driving force for the disabled to seek or restore contact with the world around and the recognition as an equal and respected citizen”. In this regards, the governments of the CoE member states should encourage and work closely with the sports organisations concerned in order:

- “to develop appropriate activities at all levels of sport for disabled persons and to ensure in particular that recreational participation in sport is adequately provided for;
- to continue the efforts, at national, regional, and local levels, and within the competent international sports organisations to harmonize, simplify and, where appropriate, to reduce the classification categories and the eligibility criteria for participation at competitions between disabled persons” (CoE R (86) 18, 1986, Part B, No 1 and 6).

As latest action and first documents to be adopted by the European Union’s Education, Youth, Culture and Sport Council following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty in late 2009, in November 2010 the EU Sport Ministers adopted a Resolution and two sets of Conclusions in the field of sport. The Draft Council Conclusions on the role of sport as a source of and a driver for active social inclusion also include the matter of participation of people with disabilities in sport (14535/10 SPORT 12 SOC 615, article 4.1, extract):

“Support the ‘Sport for All’ principle based on equal opportunities by:

1. Increasing the overall participation in sport and providing encouragement for physical activities to as many citizens as possible, including young people.
2. Paying special attention to social inclusion in sport of people who are currently not physically active, mainly among socially disadvantaged groups.
3. Bearing in mind that access to ‘sport for all’ is important, including the accessibility and availability of sport facilities, infrastructures and venues to as many people as possible, in particular to persons with disabilities, as well as the importance of enabling persons with disabilities to participate on an equal basis with others in recreational, leisure and sporting activities.”

The shift towards ‘mainstreaming’ and access to provision only enjoyed hitherto by non-disabled became central to EU policy and as can be seen later in this report, it reflects the dominant policy direction in sport for disabled people.9

3) ALL FOR SPORT FOR ALL PROJECT

As mentioned above, the Treaty of Lisbon and the EU White Paper on Sport demonstrate the EU’s commitment to the development of sport for people with disabilities. The White Paper on Sport (2007) stressed the need to address the “needs and situation of underrepresented groups” and “the special role that sport can play for young people, people with disabilities and people from less privileged backgrounds”.

To identify and address the needs of people with a disability in sport, in 2009 the European Commission published a call for proposals within its first Preparatory Action on Sport in the area of intervention “Promoting European Fundamental Values

---

9 Bearer in mind the Resolution AP (84) 3 adopted in the framework of the Partial Agreement in the Social and Public Health Field, on a coherent policy for the integration of disabled people which states, in paragraph 2.4 of its appendix, that “participation in sport should be encouraged” (CoE 1986).

10 For details please see especially the ASA Reporting Fact Sheet: Disability Sport Policies (Nigel Thomas)
by Encouraging Sport for Persons with Disabilities”. The “All for Sport for All: Perspectives of Sport for People with a Disability in Europe” project has been a reply to this call and was then funded under the identification number EAC/21/2009/146.

OBJECTIVES AND AIMS

The All for Sport for All (ASA) project’s main aim was mapping the status quo of the disability sport sector and then providing information on future challenges and recommendations for aligned activities in the sector at the European level. Furthermore, the project aimed to set the base and check the feasibility for developing a Strategic Working Group for Sport for Persons with a Disability at the European level, in order to better cross-link the single sub-sectors and stakeholder groups, and to provide EU stakeholders a better platform for exchange on and for future development.

The All for Sport for All Project has been built on a strong sector need and was conducted from 01st of March 2010 until 28th of February 2011 as a conjoint project of the European Observatoire of Sport and Employment (EOSE) and the European Paralympic Committee (EPC) and 14 partner organisations.

EUROPEAN OBSERVATOIRE OF SPORT & EMPLOYMENT

In 2002, the European Observatoire of Sport and Employment (EOSE) registered in France as a non-for-profit membership association, and its network is now composed of regional and national observatories, members and collaborators from each country of the European Union.

The scope of EOSE is understood to cover the entire Sport and Active Leisure sector. EOSE acts at the European level with the goal to serve as a source of knowledge and a strategic facilitator to support the development of Sport and Active Leisure including employment, sport systems, developing standards, competences, qualifications and Vocational Education and Training (VET). The main objective of EOSE is to monitor and promote a dialogue and a strong link mainly regarding employment, education and training at the regional, national and European level between all key stakeholders of the Sport and Active Leisure sector. Furthermore, EOSE has been involved since several years in EU projects and activities and has built specific experience and expertise in developing research methodologies across Europe, analysing national sport and education systems, supporting better health, social and cultural developments, and economic growth across the EU, and to develop and manage large projects within the entire Sport and Active Leisure Sector.

With the All for Sport for All project, EOSE has again taken its role as a facilitator of the Sport and Active Leisure Sector and served as initiator and guide for action for European stakeholders involved in sport for people with a disability at the different levels.

EUROPEAN PARALYMPIC COMMITTEE

The European Paralympic Committee (EPC) was founded as the IPC European Committee in November 1991, and adopted its current name in 1999. In 2008 the permanent Office and Headquarters was established in Vienna, Austria. The EPC is composed of forty-seven National Paralympic Committees and the European branches of four disability-specific International Organisations of Sports for the Disabled.

The EPC’s mission is to secure the provision of excellent sporting opportunities for European athletes with a disability as part of the world-wide Paralympic movement, and the EPC seek to boost the participation of citizen’s with particular needs through sport; this participation goes beyond merely practising sport in the community. The EPC believes that sport involves sharing time and space with others, including intercultural dialogue, enhancing unity and promoting respect for diversity amongst their 47 member nations.

It is the view of EPC Executive Committee that to achieve these goals we must first take stock and establish what provisions for sport are available to disabled people throughout the European Region. By establishing our areas of strength and weaknesses we can better plan for the future. The EPC does not have the expertise or resources to conduct such a large piece of research independently, and it was for these reasons that the EPC entered into partnership with EOSE to support the “All for Sport for All” project and to take the lead on it whenever specific expertise and contacts for disability sport had to be provided.

PARTNERSHIP

The All for Sport for All Project was conducted by a European partnership of 16 organisations gathering a mix of key stakeholders of the sport sector, such as Paralympic and Olympic Committees, universities, European networks and national decision makers:

- European Observatoire of Sport and Employment
- European Paralympic Committee
Although a strong partnership had been established from the very beginning, the work for the All for Sport project would not have been possible without the support of various external associates outside the ‘core’ project partnership. Altogether more than 50 organisations from 17 countries\(^{10}\) have contributed to the project outcomes.

**METHODOLOGY**

The All for Sport for All project’s aim was to highlight a possible future direction and perspectives of sport for people with a disability in Europe in five areas of intervention by undertaking a first mapping process on existing information in the disability sport sector at the trans-national and European level. In this regards, reporting fact sheets have been elaborated in the following areas: 1) Disability Sport Policies, led by Nigel Thomas (Staffordshire University, UK), 2) Participation in Disability Sport, led by Gregor Hovemann (University of Leipzig, DE) & Matthias Guett (EOSE), 3) Disability Sport Facilities and Infrastructure, led by Benjamin O’Rourke (SkillsActive UK), 4) Disability Sport Events, led by Simone Digennaro (CONI School of Sports, IT), and 5) Disability Sport Human Resources, led by Jean Camy & Michel Fodimbi (University Claude Bernard Lyon 1, FR).

Beyond, it has been decided to provide information on selected sport sector practices and to investigate a possible further development of the European Paralympic Movement; reporting fact sheets have been provided for: 1) Golf for People with a Disability, led by Tony Bennett (Professional Golfers’ Associations of Europe), Pieter van Duijn (European Disabled Golf Association) & Matthias Guett (EOSE), 2) Suppliers and Manufacturers of Adapted Fitness Equipment, led by Cliff Collins (European Health & Fitness Association), and 3) Sector Challenges as seen by the European Paralympic Committee, led by Craig Carscadden (European Paralympic Committee).

The common approach for the main mapping process has been based on a legitimate ‘hybrid’ of qualitative and quantitative methodologies espoused by social science researchers such as Bryman (1989) and Gratton & Jones (2004). Although a hybrid, it was predominantly qualitative, as this provides what Bryman suggests is a “better position to explore people’s interpretations” (1989, p. 102). The data mapping process comprised four phases:

1. The project research team has undertaken an inventory of existing data both at the national and EU level individually for all five sections (policies, participation, facilities, events and human resources). It was then decided that due to a limited level of previous research, questions posed within the data collection should remain broad, as to ascertain the maximum level of data possible. The risk of following this method was that a vast amount of data would be received, thus diminishing the capability of the researcher to effectively analyse and draw conclusions from the material provided given the timescale of the project. However the research team agreed that the questions should not limit the scope of information even if data might not be comparable.

\(^{10}\) See a full list at [www.allforsport.eu](http://www.allforsport.eu)
2. A mapping questionnaire / guided interview has been developed comprising five sections and including an annex containing guidance and examples, and a glossary of key terms (all documents were developed both in English and French). The questionnaire has been pre-tested in four countries, after which it was adapted / revised and distributed centrally by EOSE (to the ASA project partnership and members of the Informal EU Working Group on Social Inclusion and Equal Opportunities in Sport) and the EPC (to all EPC national member organisations).

3. Within the implementation phase - given a general lack of systematic statistics in the field and due to previous experience - respondents were required to adopt multiple sources of information such as national statistics, official database and scientific directory information, etc. accompanied by guided interviews with national sector experts. Analysis provided at the national level came from a secondary analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data.

4. A process of data revision has followed pre-analysis, and then both inductive and deductive qualitative content analysis was used to identify and finalise key themes based on the analysis of the content (ref. Mayring 2000) in order to develop conclusions on the current situation. The recommendation development process has been based on the data analysis, accompanied by online and face-to-face consultation processes.

Altogether information from 21 countries has been collected\(^1\):

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Cyprus
- Denmark
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Italy
- Lithuania
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Switzerland
- United Kingdom

**LIMITATIONS**

In general the All for Sport for All data mapping has been undertaken as a complex activity\(^2\) of a trans-national partnership, carried out within a variety of cultural, legal, economic, and political environments from twenty-one European countries and different disability sport sector pre-settings, which are certainly bound to influence the results, its scope and its focus.

The Preparatory Action mapping activity has involved experts from different backgrounds (National Paralympic Committees, National Olympic Committees, universities, sport authorities etc.) with their own specific priorities and procedures within a given time line and a limited frame work of human and financial resources. All national data may need to be considered in regards of the leading organisation filling the questionnaire, as a National Paralympic Committees might in some countries rate ‘sport for people with disabilities’ more in regards of ‘elite sports’ and/or related to sport competition, whilst national governments or welfare organisations might consider a more inclusive sport for all approach or physical activity concept. In that regard, the All for Spot for All responses might not – nor perhaps could they – (always) reflect an ‘official’ perspective.

While a glossary of key terms was circulated, it is apparent from responses that due to cultural and sport (political) background, and presumably also language barriers, the interpretation of terms and questions have varied. For example, there were different perspectives on what constituted e.g. ‘government policy’, ‘sport participation’, ‘national disability sport events’ or ‘international athletes’. In addition, despite the glossary, key terms used - specific to the disability sport context - may have been interpreted differently in each country (for example; ‘mainstream’ and ‘disability sport organisations’, ‘national and local sport providers’, ‘competitive and recreational sport’).

Finally, the data requested, only referred to disabled people or people with disabilities. It did not distinguish between or ask for specific data on disabled people by gender, race, country of origin or nature and severity of impairment. That is not to suggest that people with a disability are or should be treated as an homogenous group or that their experiences are not affected by such (as well as the treatment of disability in the country they reside), however responders in using the terms ‘people with disability’ or ‘disabled people’ are almost certain to have been referring to different individuals and groups.

4) **ALL FOR SPORT FOR ALL SECTOR MAPPING**

The following section summarises the information received and interpreted through the data mapping and shall provide the reader with key facts about the five investigated ASA areas, an example of findings from golf for people with disabilities and a

---

\(^1\) Information and number of countries in the different reporting fact sheets may vary as e.g. individual desk research has been undertaken and time lines for interpretation has been different. Furthermore, the provision of data (in terms of quantity and quality) varied.

A) DISABILITY SPORT POLICIES

Most countries demonstrate a commitment to sport for disabled people although not many have clearly articulated and detailed policies.

A broad range of aims are evident; from improvement in sports provision for disabled people; to better results in competitions; to the social and health benefits of participation.

A range of key organisations are involved, including various national disability sport and mainstream sport organisations but not disability organisations.

A key policy aim between countries is the shift of responsibility to mainstream organisations, although there is limited and variable evidence of its successful implementation.

Within and across countries national structures and pathways are often complex.

The need for more educated and trained staff, improved infrastructures and support, and accessible facilities are consistent challenges.

Nineteen countries responded to the questions on policies from the All for Sport All data mapping. While the detail and depth of responses varied the data was rich and clear. As this is a summary of key findings only, the reporting fact sheet shall provide full information of each country's response in relation to its policies, key organisations, campaigns and challenges, and further information on the research approach applied. What follows is a summary of the discussion of the main findings, drawing on examples and quotes from each country's response.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

It is apparent from responses that there is – in the main - government interest in, and support for, the development of sport for disabled people. While the majority do not have specific policies on sport for disabled people (only 8 out of 19) the majority (15 out of 19) have government policies on sport which include statements relating to provision for disabled people. Some such as Finland were able to state that "The Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture has published three national developmental plans (1981, 1996, and 2003) concerning sport for people with a disability". It is only Denmark, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Switzerland whose responses indicate that there are no specific government policies or policy statements about sport for disabled people. That is not to say that necessarily these two countries do not have national organisations working in this area or that there is no government interest.

Notwithstanding the variability in the status of ‘ministries’, ‘federations’ or ‘national organisations’ involved, each country was able to provide a direct if sometimes brief translation or interpretation of the government policy. There were examples of policy statements based on regulations and laws that relate to provision (from for example, France, Portugal, Lithuania). Portugal for example refers to its Basic Law on ‘Sport and Physical Activity’, though it was unclear – given the limitations identified earlier, of the extent to which the statements reflected laws that were enforced, or were statements to reflect what that country aspires to. The statements from Greece and Cyprus for example also demonstrate the legislation that underpins its work in this area.


Cyprus Sports Organisation has to supervise and advise within the framework of all kinds of extracurricular sports, sports Federations, sport clubs and sport facilities, to promote the organisation objectives and ensure the proper, faithful and accurate implementation and conduct of extracurricular sport programs within the recognised ethical and sport ethics. (CSO LAW, 87/1985 87(1)/1996)(Cyprus)
Physical education and sports activity shall be based on the following principles, one of which is Equality: to seek to create conditions for all to go into sports, without discrimination on the grounds of their sex, age, disability, religion or belief, sexual orientation and social or economic status. Separate competitions for men, women, disabled persons, competitions according to age groups, limitation of the number of participants in competitions shall not be regarded as violation of the principle of equality. (Lithuania)

Other countries provided responses that summarized a perspective of a key policy maker. For example, in the response from France there is a clear statement of aims and intentions by the Minister for Sport. He stated that:

Foremost at stake is the promotion, and social and professional integration of disabled people and the improvement of France’s world rankings (notably at the Paralympics). The primary objective is to enable disabled people, whatever their disability, to access the physical and sports activities of their choice, on a leisure or competition basis. To realise this objective the minister disposes of human, material and financial resources’. (France)

There is interest therefore in sport for disabled people in each country but the level of policy details and extent to which policy is implemented varies significantly.

GOVERNMENT AIMS AND MOTIVES

The main aims for each country vary slightly. For some the aims seem more focussed on sports participation and performance and in particular supporting success in elite completion (e.g. Switzerland), for the majority however, (e.g. UK, France, Greece, Germany) the aims are broad including improving opportunities for participation, performance and elite success but also on the social, psychological and health benefits that can be brought about as a consequence of sport participation. For a few (such as Bulgaria) the use of sport as a tool for rehabilitation, social integration and health dominate the motives for government interest. That said, while there is some variance, there’s significant overlap in the appreciation of the importance of sport as both an aspect of life to which disabled people have an entitlement and as a tool for wider social and health benefits. To be more specific key aims reported can be categorised into the following eight areas:

- increasing accessibility of sports venues, clubs and opportunities
- increasing participation opportunities at all levels
- improving infrastructures, support and funding
- improving performances in elite competition
- increasing the role of mainstream organisations
- promoting social and health benefits
- increasing awareness of opportunities among potential participants
- educating public and training providers

Some examples of the statements on government aims are provided below:

Physical and sports activities constitute an important element of education, culture, integration and social life. Most notably, they help reduce failure at school and social and cultural inequalities and promote health. The promotion and development of physical and sports activities for all, particularly for the disabled, is in the general interest. The Netherlands Government supports sport because of the social benefits of sport... related to health, youth policy, education, values and integration.

KEY ORGANISATIONS

Across the European countries surveyed the key organisations involved in the development and delivery of sport for disabled people include national Paralympic and Olympic committees, government sport departments, mainstream national sport federations, disability sport organisations and non-sport related organisations for (and of) disabled people.

- **State Department - State Dept of PE and Sport in Lithuania**: National organization responsible for PE and sport development policy for all including disabled people in the country
- **Mainstream sports federation - National Table Tennis Association of Slovenia (NTTA)** has a representative for athletes with a disability, who cooperates with the NPC to identify and support athletes to in competition. NTTA also provides some equipment and accessories.
- **DSO – National Paralympics Committee in Romania**: National Championships and organising international selection for Paralympic sport
- **DSO - The English Federation of Disability Sport (EFDS)** is responsible for the promotion and development of sporting opportunities for all disabled people in England. It works closely with the National Disability Sports Organisations (NDSOs) recognised by Sport England to develop sporting opportunities for the 11 million disabled people in England
- DSO - Special Olympics in Greece: Offer participation opportunities (training and games) to people with intellectual disabilities in twenty-two Olympic-type sports

It should be noted that these organisations have been chosen to reflect the type and breadth of organisations involved and provides an indication of the roles they perform. It does not include all types of organisation and should be presumed that the examples of each type are typical in each country. That is to say, a National Paralympic Committee (NPC) in one country may play a slightly different role to that in another. For example, it is clear from the responses, that while each Paralympic Committee plays a lead role in the support and management of elite sport, for some, national and elite competition is the only focus, while others have a broader development role. For example, the Slovenian NPC provides programs (training, prep-camps, medical support, etc) for elite athletes to compete in international events (Paralympics, World and European championships, international championships and tournaments), but also coordinates school sport competition and promotes the integration of children with disability in mainstream school sport events. In Germany:

- The German National Paralympic Committee (DBS) divides disability sports in the categories of rehabilitation sports, recreational (leisure) sports and competitive sports. There exist also other terms such as integration sports or integrated disability sport, but also sports therapy and health sports.

And in Italy its NPC (CIP) provide a similarly broad role.

- Cip disciplines, regulates and manages sport activities for people with disabilities within National territory, in accordance to democratic criteria aimed at guaranteeing the right to participate for all. Cip embraces four models of intervention: introduction to the practice, promotion of sport activity for people with disability, high level sport activities (that are not part of the Paralympic Movement, Paralympic activities

Whereas in the UK, its NPC is focussed only on elite competition; More specifically:

- The British Paralympic Association is responsible for selecting, preparing, entering, funding and managing Britain’s teams at the Paralympic Games and Paralympic Winter Games

The number, type and role of organisations involved in sport for disabled people at a national level vary considerably across countries. Even those with similar titles (e.g. NPCs play different roles).

WHO LEADS

The survey suggests that five countries believe sport for disabled people should be the ‘responsibility of and lead by’ disability sport organisations. In Belgium for example, the Flemish and French decrees recognise and grant its disability sport organisations (the VLG and LHF) the status of a “unisport federation” and is the sole federation in this category.

Responses from two countries indicates that it should be mainstream organisations and twelve that it should be the responsibility of and lead by both disability sport and mainstream sport organisations. For example:

- In France, the policy on physical activities and sports for people with disabilities is part of the general sport policy. The State is responsible for the definition and the running of that policy through its Ministry of Health and Sports and more specifically by its State Secretariat in charge of Sports. It “delegates” to the mainstream and specific federations the power to organize and promote their own sport.

While not always explicit in the responses, most countries indicate that the provision, coordination and administration of sport for disabled people can best be achieved through an increased role of mainstream sport organisations. Indeed this process, of ‘mainstreaming’ or ‘inclusion’ or ‘integration’, even if not named specifically, should be considered as central to most countries’ policies on sport for disabled people.

Responses clearly indicate for example, that educating teachers in mainstream schools, training sports coaches how to include disabled children, increasing access to sports facilities and supporting clubs to be more welcoming, places the responsibility on mainstream providers. In some countries this responsibility is made clear in government policy. For example in the UK;

- Sport England will expect NGBs to deliver more on disability sport’ (DCMS, 2008:14) and ‘developing the girls’ and women’s game - and disability sport - is not an optional extra, but a vital part of what governing bodies will be required to do’ (DCMS, 2008:2)

This approach recognises the need to consider disabled peoples’ rights to be active members of society as reflected in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU (Article 26). However, while the shift toward greater involvement of mainstream organisations is a consistent theme, there was little evidence of its successful implementation. That is to say, despite aims reflecting the need for greater involvement and leadership on the part of mainstream organisations, such as the national
sport federations, there were few examples submitted in the responses of this happening in practice. One of few such examples is provided by Greece in which it is made clear, according to the respondents, that the national federations for rowing and sailing are responsible for ‘development, management and promotion’ of those sports for athletes with disabilities. There are also examples in the UK and in Slovenia among others of specific sports taking on and leading provision for disabled people. In the UK the Football Association provide a strong example.

It is evident that the FA’s vision includes both the inclusion of disabled people in the existing mainstream football community but also the improvement of links with DSOs, specific impairment pathways for participating, officiating and coaching and work with special schools and disability sport groups. The extent that inclusion is now embedded in FA policy is evident from FA’s recent statement (2010: 25) that ‘in the light of the current economic environment, it is unlikely that specific disability facilities will be developed outside of the mainstream projects’ and in their expectation that every National Game sponsorship deal is expected to include disability football.

Notwithstanding this focus on using the human resources, infrastructure and facilities available to non-disabled people – and the major contribution made by those such as the FA - organisations dedicated specifically to sport for disabled people, have continued to be the main providers. That is disability sport organisations, such as the National Paralympic Committees and national federations of sport for disabled people (such as the German Disabled Sports Organisation) remain leading agencies. This range varies from country to country. While in some the NPC is the lead and perhaps only agency working in sport for disabled people, most others have national federations of disability sport as well as other disability sport specific organisations (such as the Hellenic Wheelchair Basketball Federation). In addition, there are organisations that are specifically for people with particular impairments (e.g. Special Olympics for people with learning disability, and the Sports Federation for the Visually Impaired in Bulgaria).

And, current organisational arrangements, coordination and responsibilities vary considerably across countries (and within countries it’s not always clear). E.g. some work closely with disability sport organisations others not. It is also interesting to note the near absence of any reference to disability organisations, that is, those organisations whose interest is in various non-sport specific aspects of disabled people lives despite these organisations having access to potential participants, resources and expertise.

It is clear however that in the European countries surveyed, mainstreaming is the central tenet of sport policy for disabled people. Previous studies by for example Thomas and Smith (2009), Goodwin and Johnson (2009), Nixon (2007), and Sorenson and Kahrs (2005) have highlighted some challenges with this policy direction within disability sport. Nixon (2007: 420) for example reminds us that access to mainstream sports models does not mean that disabled people are being satisfactorily served by governing bodies and that talk of mainstreaming does not remove all the ‘barriers of stigma … as well as practical difficulties (that) have blocked access and complicated integration efforts for people with certain types of disability.’

Connected to this, the sports or impairment groups that are not prioritised for mainstreaming can leave some disabled people ‘perennial outsiders’ (Devine, 2004: 155).

Such arguments are supported by Goodwin and Johnson (2009) who highlight that the ‘segregated physical activity experiences of people with disabilities against the pervasive ideology of inclusion’ (Goodwin and Johnson, 2009: 104). Thomas and Smith’s (2009) case study of the pervasive policy of mainstreaming in four sports in the UK highlighted; varying degrees of success, differing models of relationships, and the limited commitment to it by both national sports federations and disability sport organisations. And, Sorenson and Kahrs (2006) in their study of mainstreaming in Norway found that despite a national commitment to mainstreaming, 61.2% of club leaders did not feel that their work had been affected by the inclusion agenda. The authors concluded that a ‘top-down initiative’ was largely to blame for its limited success (Sorenson and Kahrs, 2006: 191).

Research suggests that while mainstreaming has been central to sport policy for disabled people, it has not necessarily – thus far at least – been successful and may need further dialogue between all agencies to establish which models are most likely to work and what roles these organisations may need to adopt.

EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE

There are numerous examples of work being carried out by National Paralympic and Olympic Committees, National Sports Federations and others, ranging from awareness-raising in schools to supporting elite athletes. For example:

- The Hellenic Paralympic Committee in conjunction with the National Confederation of Sport Journalists have run seminars ‘to seek the continuous global promotion and media coverage of the Paralympic Movement’. The seminars aim to convey ‘the Paralympic vision of inspiration and excitement through sport, its ideals and activities’ encouraging use of appropriate terminology.
And, with Special Olympics an “ATHENS 2011” Volunteers Program to create a team of 25,000 inspired volunteers that will provide high quality services to the athletes and the games participants.

- The Sports for All Children project in Finland 2002–2008 (Liikuntaa Kaikille Lapsille in finnish), was launched by three Finnish disability sport organisations as an answer to the challenge of inclusion: it set out to gradually change the Finnish culture of physical activity into one that facilitates the participation of children with special needs in mainstream activities. Training, interaction and developing activities in cooperation with mainstream organisations turned out to be the most effective means of encouraging participation and promoting accessible physical activity.

The examples of practice provided by respondents shows that there is considerable experience and expertise in delivering training, running events and developing programmes which have the potential to benefit a wider community.

**KEY CHALLENGES**

The challenges listed in each country’s responses reflect the diversity in their own aims for disability sport but also perhaps their different contexts. While some seem to have a long and well established history of working in disability with a large web of interrelated organisations, for others the NPC is the only organisation working in the area. In that specific sports regard the contexts are different. It needs to be noted also however, that each country has a unique set of cultural, political and economic circumstances all of which impact upon its provision of and challenges in sport for disabled people.

Analysis of the responses indicate that the main challenges relate to a need for more educated and trained staff, improved infrastructures and support, and accessible facilities. While these challenges will be further discussed in other fact sheets and in different contexts they seem to reflect ‘barriers’ in relation to participation, events and competition and the workforce.

**CHALLENGE 1: EDUCATION AND TRAINED STAFF**

The need for more specialists in adapted physical activity and physical education in schools who know how to teach disabled children in special and mainstream schools is a commonly cited aim and a concern. It reflects the need to educate teachers as well as sports specialists such as sports coaches, administrators, sports centres assistants and the general public on the rights of disabled people in sport.

**CHALLENGE 2: IMPROVED INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUPPORT**

Sport for disabled people has typically been lead, organised and provided for by disability sport organisations. The shift toward mainstream agencies taking more responsibility requires education and training but also structures and pathways that enable a disabled person the opportunity to participate, be coached and excel in the sport of their choice. Whether provision is being lead by mainstream or disability sport organisations establishing clear pathways and providing the necessary human and financial resources is clearly a challenge for many.

**CHALLENGE 3: ACCESSIBILITY**

The phrases ‘access’ and ‘accessibility’ are routinely used in connection with the provision of and opportunities in sport. It’s likely that this term is being used differently, in some cases referring to physical access to a sports centre in others it may be more related to attitudinal access (e.g. being welcomed by staff). Broader interpretations may also have been used to reflect the need for better access to knowledge or expertise. It is clear however, that insufficient or inadequate access to provision is a major challenge and one which is given further attention in the sections that follow.

**CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION**

**RECOMMENDATION 1: DATA COLLECTION**

Further data collection and more detailed data needs to be gathered on each country’s own specific circumstances, resources and aspirations – so that disability sport policy development is understood within its wider political content. The recommendations that follow are suggested in the context of the wide differences in each country’s circumstance and should be considered as opportunities for each to consider.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT AND EXCHANGE**

Given the specific and different sport and non-sport circumstances in each country it is important that – for any intervention in policy to work – each country is involved and engaged and empowered as a necessary participant - so that any tools or resources or working practices are sensitive to its needs and consequently more likely to be adopted.

**RECOMMENDATION 3: DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEAN RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ‘SPORT’ AND ‘DISABILITY’ POLICY**

To improve understanding and provision, engagement in sports organisations needs to improve within and between countries but also between sectors. It is most notable how infrequently (if at all) organisations of and for disabled people are mentioned in the survey responses. These disability organisations have driven the improvement in access to a broad range of services for disabled people, yet sports organisations have not made best use of their political influence.
RECOMMENDATION 4: INFORMATION
The development of a basic database of publicly accessible information organised via country and also via subject matter (e.g. accessibility, teacher training). The ASA fact sheets could be used for this initially.

RECOMMENDATION 5: EUROPEAN POLICY AND STRATEGY
The development of a European Policy on Sport for Disabled People which reflects the broad commitment of each country and a Strategy to determine each country’s response to the policy aims. Each country could identify which of the specific Strategy’s actions it would implement and how.

RECOMMENDATION 6: PRODUCTS, RESOURCES & TOOL KITS
There is already an impressive range of activities within many of the countries, many of which have an international relevance (e.g. training for teachers, workshops for journalists, guidelines on physical access, organisational structures). A few of these – e.g. training aids and resources for teachers and coaches - could be interpreted for wider European use and as a strategy for achieving the aims of the newly developed European policy / strategy.

B) PARTICIPATION IN DISABILITY SPORT

- Despite growing policy interest in promoting participation in sports for people with disabilities at the European (sport political) level, view quantitative and qualitative research has been undertaken that enables to monitor the status quo in the sector.
- As definitions of disability, sport and participation vary widely across the EU, comparison of available data is hardly possible; standard processes for recording data are mostly missing.
- There are only few specific policies concerning the participation of people with disabilities existing.
- At once the main barriers and challenges to sport participation are ‘accessibility’ and ‘financial support’; another main challenge is also ‘cooperation’ between stakeholders. Main measure to overcome participation barriers is ‘communication and awareness-raising’.

Twenty-one countries responded to the questions on sport participation of people with a disability from the All for Sport for All data mapping questionnaire. As this is a summary of key findings only, the reporting fact sheet shall provide further information on the results and the research approach applied. What follows is a summary of the discussion of the main findings.

Despite growing policy interest in promoting participation in sports for people with disabilities at the European (sport political) level, scanning existing research concerning sport participation for people with disabilities shows that only few up-to-date quantitative and qualitative researches exists at the European level. Besides selected national surveys very view international surveys exist, and there has been no survey provided that further examines any disability sport political backgrounds or further indicators with participation surveys at the EU level.

Furthermore, comparison between different countries proves to be complicated due to the fact that the terms ‘sport’, ‘disability’, and ‘disability sport’ as well as ‘participation’ in such are not clearly defined or in particular aligned within different countries. The variable ‘sport participation’ is used differently in most surveys and the span reaches from physical leisure activities to (core) sport activities, which are indicated e.g. by increased heart rate and transpiration (cf. Breuer & Wicker).

DESK RESEARCH FINDINGS
In order to enable somehow classifying information and partly comparing figures from the different ASA surveyed countries, as a first step, background and general sport participation information has been collected from latest available Eurostat data.

In general, the number of persons with disabilities in the EU is difficult to estimate due to both a lack of official data and a common definition of what concerns “disability”: EU sources based on data provided by Eurostat state that numbers range

---

15 The corresponding reporting fact sheet has been produced under the leadership of the University of Leipzig, Institute of Sport Management led by Gregor Hovemann and Matthias Guett (EOSE).
16 Available at www.allforsport.eu
17 Please not that Eurostat data varies, as it may refer to 2010 or 2008 figures. From some countries there has been no official data available the time being.
18 See e.g. Roadmap to the EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020
between 50 and 65 million persons, which would make app. 10% of the EU population. It is estimated that e.g. the last two enlargements increased the number of persons with disabilities in the order of an extra nine million persons.

According to the 2002 Labour Force Survey special module, Europe-wide average share of persons who see themselves as restricted in their functioning in regards of employment is 10.4% of the labour force. According to the 2004 EU-SILC data, over 17% of those aged 16-64 who were strongly limited in what they could do had income below the risk of poverty line compared to just over 10% of those not limited at all. The correlation between disability and ageing is that 63% of people with disabilities are older than 45. Nearly 30% of people in the age group ‘55-64’ report a disability and so the incidence of disability will increase as the EU population gets older. Meaning that we are talking e.g. in Finland - that shows the highest percentage from Eurostat data – about a total number of app. 1.2 million people or for the UK of about 11.7 million people.

To conclude, one can state that availability of comparable and consistent data is still insufficient at the EU level and that definitions of disability vary widely across the EU. At the moment even official data allow only limited comparison at an EU level.

In regards of sport participation, data from the latest Eurobarometer on Sport and Physical Activity (EBS 2010) reveals that “40% of all Europeans exercise Sport at least once a week. A clear majority of EU citizens (65%) get some form of physical exercise” at least once a week. However, 34% of respondents say that they seldom or never do physical exercise. Men in the EU play more sports than women overall. However, the disparity is particularly marked in the 15-24 age group, with young men tending to exercise considerably more than young women. The amount of sport that people play tends to decrease uniformly with age. However, 22% of the respondents in the 70+ age group still play sports. The citizens of the Nordic countries and the Netherlands, generally speaking, are the most physically active in the EU. Meanwhile, the citizens of Mediterranean countries and the 12 new Member States tend to exercise less than average.”

45% from the EBS 2010 respondents complain that a shortage of time is the factor why they are physically inactive. In regards of disability (or illness!) 13% of the respondents say that this prevents them from taking part in sporting activities.

So as disability increases with age (see above), EBS 2010 reveals that physical activity decreases with age, though not among those who exercise regularly: “Although regular exercise decreases after the 15-24 age group (32%), it then stabilises at 26-27% for all other age categories. [...] 74% of 15-24 year-olds exercise at least once a week; this falls to 65% in the 25-39 group, and stays at that level among 40-54 year-olds and 55-69 year-olds; then dips again to 58% in the 70+ group. [...] Only 7% of 15-24 year-olds never exercise at all, as opposed to 27% of respondents in the 70+ group.”

A logical second step of desk research enabling better classification for the ASA surveyed countries was gathering participation data from International (Disability) Sport Governing bodies (ISGB / IDSGB).

In this regards, one needs to keep in mind that the following participation data included is very much a product of how each IDSGB defines participation and what is included in their records. The data presented includes athletes entered in official sport competitions. One has to consider that (cf. Lauff 2007) participation data in international disability sort / Paralympic games is / has been created by the organising committees and that there are / have been no standard methods or processes for recording such data, resulting in the fact that even the IDSGB “struggle to maintain accurate records of each game”.

The Summer and Winter Deaflympics are among the world’s oldest sports events offering competition at elite sport level. In 1924 in Paris 148 athletes from nine European nations took part; in 2009, in Taipei 2,493 athletes from 77 countries participated. The first Winter Games, held in Seefeld in 1949 included 33 athletes from five nations; in the 2007 Winter Deaflympics in Salt Lake City already 298 athletes from 23 countries participated.

Also Special Olympics report in 2009 that they continue to expand its reach across the globe and to increase athlete participation: Currently Special Olympics serves 3.43 million athletes worldwide. During 2009, Special Olympics reached out to 254,162 new athletes – an 8% increase in the number of individuals served.

The elite-sport-level Summer and Winter Paralympic Games are organised by the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) that serves as the International Federation for nine sports, for which it also supervises and co-ordinates the World Championships and other competitions. The IPC is committed to enabling Paralympic athletes to achieve sporting excellence and to developing sport opportunities for all persons with a disability from the beginner to elite level. The following figures...
shows an overview of participants from the ASA surveyed countries at both the 2010 Winter and 2008 Summer Paralympic Games.

DATA COLLECTION FINDINGS

Sport Participation Policies

Only five country representatives stated that they are aware of a separate government policy or policy statement on sport participation for people with a disability. Those countries comprise Finland, Greece, Lithuania, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. Gaining insight into the (partly translated) data provided one must mention that even those policy statements do not relate exclusively to sport participation of people with disabilities but nonetheless strongly foster participation. Some policy statements are included in a wider (overall) sport perspective (e.g. The Netherlands) whilst others relate to disability sports only but not only in relation to participation matters (e.g. UK). From the data provided and the countries surveyed so far no correlation between such existing policy on sport participation for people with disabilities and the number of athletes at the e.g. Deafllympic, Special Olympic or Paralympic Games could be clearly stated. The following examples on ‘specific policies’ show the range of understanding of such policy documents and how different countries may deal with it.

Policy example – United Kingdom:

For the United Kingdom, a policy statement has been produced providing a summary of the government’s aims in relation to the benefits it plans to bring about for disabled people as a part of its preparation for and hosting of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The policy statement is not just in relation to participation but is aimed at ‘helping to bring about lasting change in society’s behaviour towards disabled people to achieve greater social justice’, ‘boosting participation of disabled people in sport and physical activity’, and ‘improving facilities and services that businesses offer to disabled people’ (DCMS 2010, p. 1). Key quotations from the document include:

- “Our goal is not only to host the most accessible Games ever, but also to ensure that we harness the full power of London 2012 to help realise progress towards achieving equality for disabled people by 2025 (DCMS 2012, p. 2)”.
- “A successful Paralympic Games will raise awareness, help to challenge stereotypes, and improve understanding, while at the same time raising the profile of disability sport in a way that reflects the Paralympic values of determination, courage, inspiration and equality (DCMS 2010, p. 11)”.

Increasing levels of participation was a priority for the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) and Sport England up until London won the 2012 Games bid after which the focus has shifted to elite competition and preparing sports, teams and individuals to maximise medal winning potential. In 2008 Sport England published ambitious aims to increase participation across all groups and not specific to disabled people. In 2008 its stated intention was to increase participation by 1 million adults.

Policy example – Lithuania:

In Lithuania, the national Law on Social Integration of Disabled Persons (2004) together with the Strategy for Physical Education and Sport (2005 to 2015) have the objective to ensure equal opportunities and possibilities in society, to define the principals for people with disabilities for social integration, to determine the system of social integration and it’s presumptions

---

as well as the conditions for the institutions realising social integration for people with disabilities, and to regulate the provision of the services of professional rehabilitation. A major aim of that law and strategy is to reach the level of 3% of all the population with disabilities to be involved in sport until 2020.

Policy example – The Netherlands:
Sport has become an important role in the Dutch policy programme 2007 to 2011 ‘Work together, Live together’. The Government states that sport holds huge importance for the community underlining the intrinsic value of sport. Within this Government policy there have been 10 million Euros available in 2008 and 20 million Euros in 2009.

On 11th of February 2008, the Ministry of Development Cooperation and the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport launched the policy document ‘Een kans voor open doel. De kracht van sport in ontwikkelingssamenwerking’ (‘A chance to score in an open goal. The power of sport in development cooperation’). The ministries want to make better use of sport as a means of combating poverty and promoting welfare and peace in developing countries. The memorandum sets out policy and names the main target groups and the various stakeholders. The memorandum identifies people with disabilities as one of the priority target groups, stating: “In many countries, including the Netherlands, people with disabilities live in isolation, sometimes even hidden from the outside world. Participating in sports can bring them out of their isolation and even give them the chance to excel. We want to promote the exchange of expertise about adaptive methods, facilities and materials, and the training of support workers.”

General Data on Sport Participation
General data regarding the sport participation of people with a disability has been made available from different studies/data provided in the ASA forms from twelve countries. Due to the above stated limitations of this preparatory work for the sector (mapping activity) participation rates for people with a disability are not exactly/equally answered in the majority of participating countries and are hardly comparable.

Nonetheless e.g. from France detailed data could be provided stating that “0.38% of all ‘license holders’ from the French sport federations are persons with a disability: That sums up to a total of 47,815 persons. In regards of types of disability, 11,771 persons have a physical disability, 2,658 persons are deaf, 1,857 persons have a visual impairment 7,015 persons are invalid, and another 24,514 persons have any mental disability.” But also it has to be noted that other country representatives although being experts in the field of disability sport even stated that there is no general data regarding the sport participation of people with disabilities available (e.g. in Bulgaria, Slovakia and Malta).

One can also conclude from the information provided that different types of research models for disability sport participation are used in the EU countries: As a good practice, in England for example, a sport participation research regarding people with disabilities in 2000/2001 has been connected to the National Labour Force Survey and the General Household Survey (England), and also in 2010 based on the Active People Survey (APS) (said as to be the “largest survey of sport and active recreation to be undertaken in Europe”) undertaken by Sport England24, the government agency responsible for building the foundations of (all) sporting success.

Popular sports
The most popular sports among people with a disability mentioned by respondents (out of a ‘top 5 rating’ provided) are 1) Swimming (8x), 2) Football / Wheelchair Football / Goalball (7x), 3) Athletics (6x), 4) Basketball / Wheelchair Basketball (6x), and 5) Petanque / Boccia / Bowling (4x).

For better context: The Beijing 2008 Paralympic Games e.g. included twenty sports: Archery, Athletics, Boccia, Cycling, Equestrian, Football 5-a-Side, Football 7-a-Side, Goalball, Judo, Powerlifting, Rowing, Sailing, Shooting, Swimming, Table Tennis, Volleyball (Sitting), Wheelchair Basketball, Wheelchair Fencing, Wheelchair Rugby and Wheelchair Tennis. The most popular sports in terms of media coverage have been Athletics and Swimming, followed by Cycling; From the Special Olympics Reach Report (2009) as most popular sports have been reported: 1) Athletics, 2) Football, 3) Basketball, 4) Bowling, 5) Aquatics, and 6) Table Tennis.

Membership structure
The number of clubs and the number of members in disability sport clubs provided by ASA correspondents show in general that ‘larger’ countries tend to have a higher number of clubs than ‘smaller’ countries. Germany e.g. has by far stated the highest number with 532.671 club members. Surprisingly – in terms of inhabitants – Germany is then followed by Finland (app. 250.000), one of the leading countries in Europe for physical activity and where sports activities are organised mainly by sports clubs and federations, and then by France with a number of 66.216 sport club members with disabilities.

---

24 Sport England is the government agency responsible for building the foundations of sporting success, by creating a world-leading community sport environment of clubs, coaches, facilities and volunteers; it is working in partnership with UK Sport, which has responsibility for elite success, and the Youth Sport Trust, which is focused on PE and school sport.
The information provided from 17 ASA countries estimates sports club membership towards around one million persons with disabilities. But, again one has to consider that interviews with the correspondents revealed that different methods and definitions of both defining and tracking clubs and membership are currently used by the EU countries and have been applied by the correspondents in this preparatory action: Some country data include disability sport clubs only, others members with disabilities in mainstream sport clubs or departments of those, or they include APA institutions or school activities (Finland e.g. stated that they counted 316,400 members in 957 APA organisations in 2009), whilst some only include data available from clubs related to elite sports or on athletes registered for sport competitions. Furthermore, not all respondents have been able to gather / receive valuable data from all national stakeholders in sport for people with a disability (e.g. only from the Paralympic movement but not from Special Olympics). Another fact to be considered is certainly also the different sport systems that underlie such comparison at a trans-national level.

As one good practice of tracking membership data Germany for instance could be mentioned where a regular membership participation survey is undertaken by the German Sports Federation for the Disabled / National Paralympic Committee (DBS/NPC) that is the federal governing body for (most) disability sports, starting from the year 1951.

Barriers to sport participation and measures to raise participation
At individual level, people with disabilities often face even more barriers to sport participation compared to people without a disability. Besides physical and social-economic barriers also a range of specific social and cultural barriers may often impact on their sport participation. In this regards, the ASA correspondents were asked to mentioned the three main barriers in their country for people with disabilities to participate in sport and physical activities (based on either studies’ results or experts’ views). The following six categories have been mentioned most:

1) Accessibility of venues (14)
2) Financial factors (13x)
3) Structural / political problems (6x)
4) Lack of information (6x)
5) Transportation (4x)
6) Lack of experts (4x).

Qualitative interviews have revealed that also psychological and sociological factors including attitudes towards disability of coaches and teachers still do limit the participation in sports. In addition, limited access to information and resources by people with disabilities themselves about any applicable sports offered (nearby and for them) is often missing. Although actions towards raising participation have well started in many countries throughout the last years, the lack of early experiences in sport still limits participation for ‘older persons with disabilities’ in sports.

In regards of main measures that could raise participation the following five have been identified as those mentioned most (from lists mentioning the three most important ones from each country):

1) Better communication, information and increase of general awareness (13x)
2) Better accessibility of venues (7x)
3) Better educated coaches and better programmes (6x)
4) Better cooperation between disability organisations and schools and/or sport clubs (6x)
5) Better financial support (5x)

Challenges in sport participation
Undoubtedly there are still many challenges the disability sport sector is facing at the EU and trans-national level with many basics still not being aligned. The main challenges faced in regards of the participation in sport for people with a disability stated by the ASA respondents include:

1) Better cooperation between disability organisations and sport clubs or schools (9x)
2) Accessibility (8x)
3) Financial challenges (7x)
4) Increase of information (6x)
5) Networking (5x)
CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION

CONCLUSION 1: METHODOLOGY
The ASA data mapping comprised both desk and primary research but has been undertaken as a complex activity\(^{25}\) of a transnational partnership, carried out within a variety of cultural, legal, economic, and political environments from twenty-one European countries and different disability sport sector pre-settings, which are certainly bound to influence the results, its scope and its focus. The EU Preparatory Action mapping activity has involved experts from different backgrounds (NPC, NOC, University etc.) with their own specific priorities and procedures within a given time line and a limited frame work of human and financial resources. Furthermore, each data collection sheet may need to be considered in regards of the leading organisation filling the questionnaire, as NPCs might in some countries rate ‘sport for people with disabilities’ more in regards of ‘elite sports’ and competition related, whilst national governments or welfare organisations might consider a more inclusive sport for all approach.

CONCLUSION 2: PARTICIPATION POLICY
EU policy both from a social inclusion and sports perspective well started recognising the need to foster participation of people with disabilities in sport activities.


Nonetheless, political structures need to be updated and adjusted as there are e.g. only few or mostly no government policies or policy statements relating specifically to sport participation for people with a disability in most countries.

CONCLUSION 3: PARTICIPATION RATES
Despite growing policy interest in promoting participation in sports for people with disabilities at the European (sport political) level, view quantitative and qualitative research has been undertaken that enables to monitor the status quo in the sector. The special Eurobarometer on Sport and Physical Activities e.g. does so far not consider sport for people with disabilities.

Therefore, in general, the numbers and preferences of persons with disabilities practicing sports in the EU are difficult to measure due to a general lack of data and also due to a lack of common definitions about what is comprised under the umbrella of ‘disability’, ‘sports’ and ‘participation’. Information from disability sport governing bodies e.g. on international disability sport competitions partly lack the use of standard methods, and EU countries use not only different processes but also different ‘lead organisations’ for counting and tracking their sport clubs, members or active citizens with a disability.

Furthermore, the participation of people with disabilities certainly does not relate only to disability-specific sports but also to mainstream sport activities. There, persons with disabilities participate alongside athletes who do not necessarily have a disability (for example, when a hearing-impaired athlete participates in university soccer with peers who are not hearing-impaired) which is difficult to measure.

CONCLUSION 4: PARTICIPATION BARRIERS & CHALLENGES
At once the main barriers and challenges to sport participation are ‘accessibility’ and ‘lack of financial support’. But even though it is clear that ‘getting rid off’ those barriers will make highest demands towards EU member states, another main challenge mentioned is - as ‘simple’ as it may sound – better ‘cooperation between stakeholders’. The main measure mentioned by the All for Sport for All correspondents to raise sport participation in their country seems to be an obvious step, too: ‘Better communication between stakeholders, provision of better information and raising general awareness on sporting possibilities’; but might need to be well prepared and supported from the EU sector stakeholders.

Certainly also local circumstances dictate what sporting activities are the most appropriate for people with a disability (e.g. skiing in Austria), or other national specific barriers, as for instance bureaucracy in Poland or the application of specific laws in Portugal influence sport participation.

One needs also to consider that a barrier-free environment might be unachievable (at least in a short term perspective) throughout all European countries and that not every person with a disability might experience these barriers equally, but in

the interest of facilitating participation of people with disabilities, those barriers and challenges stated by the sector shall be duly recognized by national and European authorities.

To conclude, (comparable) participation data (at the elite and leisure sport level) is widely needed to equip all sector stakeholders with relevant data on the scope of the sector and to support proper EU policy development regarding better accessibility to sports for people with disabilities.

The preparatory action mapping proofs that there is already impressive action regarding the improvement of participation and inclusion of people with disabilities in sport in many countries, and that data collection (mostly at the elite sport level regarding disability sport events) is on its way to be established, although a lack of resources and funding seems to accompany those action in most countries.

In this regards, this data collection on participation in sport by people with a disability clearly only marks a first step to approach, measure or even analyse the sector on a base of comparable data, but shall open the door to further standardised comparable research within the coming years. For the future the following recommendations are made by the research team:

RECOMMENDATION 1: COOPERATION
The disability sport sector is fragmented and stakeholders themselves seek for better cooperation and communication at all levels. In this regards, in the near future more and closer cooperation and exchange of information at the national, trans-national and at the European level, but also at a trans-sectoral level is needed.

It is recommended that such cooperation will not only be kept within the different national and sectoral disability sport organisations but will be also ‘extended’ to the ‘sport’ and ‘disability sport’ sector as disability sport shall not be seen outside the scope of ‘sport’. Furthermore, cooperation with ‘disability organisations’, such as the European Disability Forum, or the Directorate-General of Justice\textsuperscript{26} is strongly recommended as the importance of sport is already recognised by them, but concrete cooperation with disability sport organisations is still rare.

The EU (sport) authorities will be able to support such cooperation through project and/or organisational funding and the provision of information (platforms), as well as through expert and working group meetings / conferences or eventually through applicable policies, whilst it is recommended that the initiative must be taken from sector stakeholders themselves whether at the national or the European level.

RECOMMENDATION 2: TOOLS
In order to support cooperation between the disability sport stakeholder groups, it is recommended that round tables and focus groups at both the national and then international level should be established, as better, visible and clear communication at all stakeholders’ levels is needed.

It is recommended that a central coordination point for collecting data on sport participation including information besides those from national and international disability sport events should be introduced. An independent web platform – owned by all sector stakeholders commissioned by the European Union – could be established (through further project funding) that could help closing the gap between further developed and more developing countries in the sector.

Furthermore, it is recommended to think about a possibility for regular reporting from the sector whether via an EU or member states initiated Disability Sport Conference or at least within established structure such as the EU Sport Forum or the EU Disability Forum. National disability sport organisations are recommended to contact national governments (e.g. before and during EU Presidencies) to support their aims and to help establishing trans-national cooperation to raise sport participation.

RECOMMENDATION 3: AWARENESS-RAISING CAMPAIGNS
In order to increase sport participation rates of people with disabilities, it is recommended that awareness will be raised at the different levels, where national governments and sport sector stakeholders should be involved, but also the ‘bottom of the pyramid’ the persons with a disability themselves should addressed and well informed about existing possibilities to practice sports and to be active considering their disability.

From a sport for all and general sport participation increase perspective, it is recommended that such awareness-raising campaigns should be undertaken (at its best) aligned by (all) the different disability sport / APA stakeholders with the support from the mainstream sport movement, the national sport and disability sport authorities, and also from disability organisations.

\textsuperscript{26} Directorate D: Equality, Unit D.3: Rights of persons with disabilities
It is recommended that such campaigns should be realized stakeholder specific, as for example by age group and disability types, by considering national / regional preferences and cultural backgrounds etc. Especially the younger generation should be paid attention to by involving also parents and teachers. But also the group of ‘older’ persons with disabilities should be addressed specifically as they face high disability rates and often lack early experiences in sport that limit their participation in adapted sport activities.

RECOMMENDATION 4: FURTHER RESEARCH

There is still only limited research that explores the specific barriers to participation in sport for people with a disability in all EU countries or at the trans-national level. Therefore it is recommended that further research based on this very first data mapping related to sport participation will be undertaken.

More detailed data needs to be gathered on each country’s own specific circumstances, resources and organisational establishment. A proper analysis by using scientific methods and better exploitation of IDSGB information (events etc.) and national data collection resources authorities, as well as longer term tracking of data is recommended. In this regards, at the EU level collaboration with e.g. the envisaged COMPASS survey on sport participation, but also with the next issues of the ‘Special Eurobarometer Survey on Sport and Physical Activity’ should be envisaged.

Another problem has been encountered within the ASA mapping regarding common structures to define the participation rate in all countries which might also be able to consider sports organised outside formal organisation. In this regards defined formula on how to calculate this rate would need to be introduced: A core European definition of disability sport (inclusive model of sport for the elderly, rehabilitation sport), and of participation (rates) should be elaborated.

Such analysis could then also take into consideration the determinants influencing sport participation of people with disabilities in the European Union and in each member state regarding e.g. age, gender, social class, educational background, residential area, occupation, migration background, familiar background, and disability related determinants such as accessibility of facilities and clubs, qualified trainers and coaches, type of disability etc. Also analysis of national disability sport systems and policies need to go alongside such participation research.

C) DISABILITY SPORT FACILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE

- Policy regarding the accessibility of sporting infrastructure is in the main administered as part of an umbrella access policy encompassing all public facilities. When applied to sporting facilities, such policies ensure a minimum level of horizontal and vertical accessibility for all participants and spectators.
- From feedback received it seems that there is a scarcity of information regarding the accessibility of facilities. The lack of a centralised database at the national level, incorporating the number of facilities deemed accessible, is prevalent in 15 of the 19 member states contacted.
- This project has seen good practice which has been realised through the production of infrastructure guidelines, providing operators with points of reference to manage the construction of facilities in line with the needs of participants with disabilities. Such guidelines have been produced in some cases by sports ministries and in others by disability sports organisations.

Eighteen countries responded to the questions on facilities and infrastructure from the All for Sport for All data mapping. As this is a summary of key findings only, the reporting fact sheet shall provide further information on the results and the research approach applied. What follows is a summary of the discussion of the main findings.

Because there was relatively little good data available, it was decided that a comprehensive comparative analysis was not possible. Instead it was decided that the data would be presented, and if possible provide some background to good practice. Therefore through a content analysis generalisations were sought between commonalities in data feedback. This method was based on the Grounded Theory approach, allowing conclusions to build up around the research, thus guiding the researcher to relevant key findings rather that the study being led by pre conceptions or existing results. These results were presented in a mixture of graphs and tables, and subsequently interpreted.

The lack of data was something which had to be handled carefully in the analysis and interpretation of information. It was decided that a breakdown regarding the existence of a comprehensive database on a nation by nation basis would be produced in order to portray the correct national situation, according to the information received.

---

[27] The corresponding reporting fact sheet has been produced under the leadership of SkillsActive led by Benjamin O’Rourke.
[28] Available at www.allforsport.eu
[29] Grounded Theory – The Discovery of Grounded Theory
CHALLENGES

Terms and Definitions
The definitions and terminology used in the questionnaire were considered carefully however there were certain aspects of interpretation could not be eradicated. Efforts were made to consider the connotations attached to each term to ensure that neither the quality nor quantity of data was affected.

Interpretation of terms is inevitably subjective, especially when considered in a reader’s second or third language. Furthermore the application of terminology will be assessed by the reader given the norms of the structure and administration of sport in their given country. Therefore it must be noted that certain phrases or definitions may hold different connotations in one country to the next.

The term ‘accessibility’ was recognised as an ambiguous term which would have a broad scope of interpretation. Feedback received through desk research confirmed this case. Some organisations will term a facility as ‘accessible’ if adaptations have been made to allow disabled participants (including spectators) to have horizontal and vertical access to the building. Other organisations however will only deem a facility as accessible if sufficient adaptations have been made so that a disabled participant can be completely independent when using the facility. This level of accessibility extends into areas such as the conduct of staff and transport links.

With reference to the term, it was decided that a disaggregation of accessibility would not be presented by the researcher in order to retrieve a broad level of data. It was intended that the detail of accessibility would be clarified by the good practice element of the questionnaire.

Furthermore, the term ‘adaptation’ was included despite concerns that the reader may view it as unclear. It was felt that the most appropriate term to use when describing an element of a facility which has been tailored to the use of a participant with a disability would be an adaptation. The concern was that the reader would only include or be led to include details of a physical adaptation, of a change to infrastructure, rather than a cultural amendment or disability specific equipment.

Administration of Sport
It should be noted that difficulties were encountered in retrieving information which could be considered as a reflection of a national situation due to the differing system of sports administration. What has been considered as a nation in this project reflects the status of the country as considered by the EU. The two particular cases where problems were encountered were the UK and Belgium. In the UK, sport is a devolved administration where each Home Country is responsible for producing their own set of statistics relating to the nation, as is the case in Belgium albeit on a community basis.

Therefore the situation was encountered (relating to a database of accessible facilities) whereby high quality data was received from some of the devolved administrations, but no there was no data available in others all. Therefore the research could only claim to have reflected the situation in the given nation partially. The decision was taken to include the data through best practice and as a reference point but to exclude it from the comparison of national data’.

As a result of the differing approaches to sports administration, the fields by which adapted facilities were organised also posed problems in terms of the comparison of data. Some facility fields are held under the different definitions, allowing for facilities bracketed under ‘Physical Education sites’ in one country being included under ‘Gymnasiums and Sports Halls’ in another. The ambiguity surrounding such terms did not allow for comparisons to be drawn under the disaggregation of sporting facilities.

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION 1: POLICY
Although policy regarding accessibility requires the basic level of infrastructure outlines to ensure that sporting facilities are horizontally and vertically accessible, there is scope to improve accessibility in a broader sense of the word. Through best practices, guidelines are required to ensure that a facility is accessible to the point where a disabled participant can be completely independent.

These guidelines should not necessarily (and may benefit from not) being produced by the government or sports administration alone. The built environment is not the only contributor to accessibility and the broader components required to bring disabled participants closer to complete independence should be considered. Input is required from disability organisations, disability sports organisations and mainstream organisations to create training structures for facility employees, to ensure that staffs have the skills required to support disabled participants if required.

Furthermore, there is a difficulty with some of the policy models where enforcement applies to publicly funded facilities. This model can be particularly effective in countries where a public body is responsible for the construction of all sports and
leisure facilities. However in many European countries this isn’t the case, where a mixture of public and private construction exists. A comprehensive guideline for structures would be more applicable to such systems where private enterprises don’t necessarily have to adhere to more advanced disability, equality or construction policies.

RECOMMENDATION 2: FACILITY INFORMATION

It is clear that there is a substantial lack of data available regarding accessible facilities throughout Europe. Data is available but it is un-collated, partial or incomparable. Further research into this area would provide much firmer information regarding the true situation of sporting facilities and accessibility.

The small sample group showed relatively high proportions of accessibility in their given nation, however, by dint of their grasp on the statistical background to the situation, it can be supposed that their progression in the field is also relatively well advanced. Therefore further research would allow for the situation in less well developed European member states to be mapped and thus creating a more realistic interpretation of the current situation.

RECOMMENDATION 3: GOOD PRACTICES

A comprehensive database of facilities has been highlighted as a key component to better understanding the situation with regards to accessibility. In terms of technology, good practice has been recognised in the UK through Active People, Active Places. It has been shown that such information can be effectively managed and manipulated to provide end users with facility accessibility information on a localised basis.

The progression of existing tools and technologies regarding facilities should be explored and developed to provide a better understanding of the situation at a European level but also to ensure that information is tailored and accessible.

Although there are instances of good practice throughout the member state there is a need to explore and further formalise the process by which these are examples are realised. Further investigation is needed to discern whether fully accessible facilities are a result of exceptional projects and programmes, such as sporting events (the Olympic and Paralympic Games in Greece 2004), or borne out of policy and legislation.

The scope of this research did not allow for the cause and effect of the good practices to be fully established as the variables associated to it could not be sufficiently separated. Therefore it is recommended that a research project to review the national situation and resulting good practices should be undertaken in order to further understand the origins of such good practice.

D) DISABILITY SPORT EVENTS

- Awareness of issues related to sport events & competitions for people with a disability is high.
- The sector has been seldom investigated. Few official studies/researches have been mentioned and a large use of secondary analysis has been adopted.
- Excluding a few countries, there are not separated and specific policy statements concerning the organisation of sport events and competitions.
- The majority of international events and competitions organised are led by the NPC’s along with the Disabled Sport Federations and the Mainstream Sport Federations.
- A significant alignment can be identified in the nature of the dominant organisation in the sector across the different countries.

Nineteen countries responded to the questions on disability sport events from the All for Sport for All data mapping questionnaire. As the following is a summary of key findings only, the reporting fact sheet31 will provide the full overview of each country’s responses and the research approach applied. What follows is a summary of the discussion of the main findings.

Awareness of sport events and competitions for people with a disability is high. At elite level the Paralympic Games are gaining in importance. It has been estimated that during the Paralympic Games London 2012 more than 1.5 million spectators are expected to travel to the Olympic Park and the River Zone to watch the competitions. Then, competitions and

---

30 The corresponding reporting fact sheet has been produced under the leadership of the School of Sport - Coni Servizi / OPOS led by Simone Digennaro.
31 See www.allforsport.eu
events will be held over a period of eleven days. In Beijing, more than 470 competitions were organised involving athletes coming from all the five continents. Nonetheless, it is recognised in this report that the Paralympic movement is only the pick of a wider movement embracing a growing number of people with disability taking part in a wide array of sport events and competitions.

In order to have a common understanding of the terms used and uniformity in the collection of data, the research team adopted the following definitions concerning events and competitions:

- A sport competition is an activity that has been created or developed for the specific benefit of people with disability and in which individuals or organisations compete with each other to achieve a specific goal (the victory in a tournament, a medal, etc.)

- A sport event is an activity that has been created to promote disability sport and/or increase the awareness around the role of sport for people with disability and/or promote the disability sport movement.

As expected, there are no separated policy statements concerning the organisation of sport events and competitions within countries analysed. In certain contexts - such as the UK, Netherlands, Greece, Belgium and Romania - specific indications can be reported either as part of general laws concerning sport or as part of the National Paralympic Committee’s statutes. Generally speaking, a lack of a framework giving specific indication for the implementation of policies in the organisation of sport events and competitions for people with disability can be reported.

It can be reported that, considering the size of the sector, a general lack of information exists. Few official studies/researches have been mentioned and a large use of secondary analysis has been adopted. In addition, the data at disposal comes from different sources and, as consequence; it is not possible to make valid trans-national comparisons. Notwithstanding this, it is possible to have a general overview of the sector especially for what concerns the international and national level. It is worth noting that at international level data emanates from official statistics of the National Paralympic Committees. Events at regional and grassroots level are seldom investigated and few official statistics can be reported at this level.

The majority of international events and competitions organised are led by the NPC’s along with the Disabled Sport Federations and the Mainstream Sport Federations. In Italy, the NPC organised 91 events (2009) and competitions both inside and outside the Paralympic movement. In France 14 international events (2009) have been organised with sports such as tennis, cycling, football, fencing, Nordic ski, track and field, kayak, shooting, table-tennis and sailing promoted. At national level, there are countries like France and Lithuania that respectively reported more than 150 and more than 70 sporting activities organised in the year 2009.

Although it is not possible to accurately count the number of activities organised at regional and grass-roots level (excluding countries like Belgium, France, and Greece), it can be maintained that the movement has a strong base with a large involvement of people with disabilities in sport events and competition both formal and informal.

The pursuit of excellence and the promotion of elite sport are two of the main tasks of the National Paralympics Committees in all countries analysed. It should be noted that with the aim to promote elite sport, the NPC’s develop sporting opportunities for athletes of all levels, from grass-roots to elite. Furthermore, in collaboration with many other organisations, NPC’s have taken on the cause of promoting the right to a free participation in sport events.

A significant alignment can be identified in the nature of the dominant organisation in the sector across the different countries. Excluding Belgium, where the Belgian Paralympic Committee is reported as having a secondary role, in all countries analysed the NPS is indicated as having a dominant role, being the leading organisations in the sector. In addition, the Disabled Sport Federations and the Mainstream Sport Federations are widely indicated as key entities. The core paradigm of these organisations is the promotion of sport for people with disability. It is then combined with paradigms like the promotion of elite sport, the integration and the development of sport for all, etc.

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Even though the sector has been seldom investigated, it can be maintained that an awareness of such issues within all countries analysed is high. The sector can be described as a very dynamic movement, with a large number of events and competitions organised at local, national and international level. Despite this dynamicity a lack of specific policy statements can be reported as a general trend, including many European countries. Given these circumstances, there is the need for a disability policy at EU level that can drive the implementation of national policies.

---
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To this end the article 30.5 of the “Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities”, signed by the EU in 2007, requires to: “encourage and promote participation, to the fullest extent possible, of persons with disabilities in mainstream sporting activities at all levels”. Then, with a specific focus on the organisation and development of sporting activities the same article requires to: “ensure that persons with disabilities have an opportunity to organise, develop and participate in disability-specific sporting and recreational activities and, to this end, encourage the provision, on an equal basis with others, of appropriate instruction, training and resources.”

While improvements have been made in many European countries, the fact remains that without a specific policy in the sector, the right of these members of society cannot be effectively guaranteed. Society should be required to overcome those physical and societal barriers preventing people with a disability to take part in sport events and competitions. After that, a more integrated approach in the organisation of sport events and competitions should be promoted with people with a disability taking part within those mainstream sport events: “in a competitive arena, athletes can benefit physically from achieving superb fitness, and mentally from gaining the identity of “athletes”.” Integrated and well-oriented participation may offer positive effects with participants gaining in terms of confidence, mutual understanding, self-esteem and identity; then benefits connected with an “active” participation are numerable: organised sport promotes and fosters positive socialising influences by enlarging the number of constructive incentives for both youths and adults.

Although the disability sport movement has made great strides to spread the role of sport for an integrated approach within the European countries, more programmes are needed to give people with a clear perspective of the potential for impact.

From an economical point of view, it is undeniable that the organisation of sport events and competition can be seen as a tool for economic development. The “legacy” of a specific event, especially at national and international level, may result in accessible infrastructures, new professional profiles, positive environmental changes and legislative improvement. In the light of that, investments in the sector constitute a critical challenge for the main stakeholders involved. This is essential to keep the pace of the enlargement of the number of people with disabilities involved in the sport sector at all levels and for a further development of the whole sector.

E) DISABILITY SPORT HUMAN RESOURCES

- A minority of EU member states have a specific policy related to human resources in the area of sport for people with disabilities.
- Due to poor information existing on other sub-sectors (e.g. human resources from the mainstream sport sector devoted to sport for the people with disabilities, or personnel from public authorities - at the local, regional or national level - or other special institutions) one can only comment on the specific situation of human resources working in Disability Sport Organisations.
- The human resources of the Disability Sport Organisations are mostly volunteers although a limited numbers of paid personnel play important roles. As a rough estimate there are less than 1,000 full time paid personnel in the EU countries working in Disability Sport Organisations.
- Those Disability Sport Organisations have few qualified staff that comes mainly due to still a low/poor image of disability sport, a lack of adequate specific training, and limited financial resources.
- Training systems in general are based on a double stream structure: On the one side universities deliver general Adapted Physical Activity courses (which tend to have a poor connection with the specific labour market). On the other side, service training exists that is provided by the Disability Sport Organisations (independently or in partnership with other providers) - If those courses are specific and strongly related to the field, they are usually basic courses.
- As a consequence of the human resources situation outlined, and the structure of training systems, there are significant skills shortages and skills gaps in the sub-sector of disability sport.

Sixteen countries responded to the questions on workforce and human resources in disability sport from the All for Sport for All data mapping questionnaire. As the following is a summary of key findings only, the reporting fact sheet will provide the full overview of each country’s responses and the research approach applied. What follows is a summary of the discussion of the main findings.

35 The corresponding reporting fact sheet has been produced under the leadership of the University Claude Bernard Lyon 1, France, and was led by Michel Fodimbi and Jean Camy.
36 See www.allforsport.eu
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HUMAN RESOURCES POLICIES

“Policies” are understood within this work package as “public policies” settled by or under the responsibility of public authorities in charge of sport and physical activities for people with disabilities. Such information gives us an idea of the specific importance granted by public authorities to sport for people with disabilities and in a complementary way to the respective role given to the “civil society” and to the public authorities in that matter.

Seven countries (out of the fifteen which answered to the question) state that at least some dimensions of the administration of human resource are regulated by public authorities. Eight countries have no explicit public policy in the area of human resources dedicated to sport for the people with disabilities. When they have one, that policy is part of the general sport policy. That means on the one side that sport for people with disabilities is not seen by most public authorities as a topic they have to govern (we can see that when referring to the section on ‘policies’ above) and, on the other side that there is limited consideration of a specific competence for human resources in the area of sport for people with disabilities. When a country has such a policy, most of them (Greece, Portugal, Finland, and Slovenia) regulate the access to paid positions, whilst other countries take care of the promotion/provision of volunteerism (e.g. Belgium, the UK). The related policy in France, for example, covers both issues.

SITUATION OF THE HUMAN RESOURCES

We have already said that data on the human resources of organisations in charge of sport and physical activities for people with disabilities are difficult to gather and to interpret. We have considered three main issues: 1) the total number of paid personnel and volunteers; 2) the number of paid personnel and volunteers by key function (administration/coaching and instructing/guiding); and, 3) the sharing of human resources in the different organisations dealing with sport and physical activities for people with disabilities.

Paid personnel and volunteers

We have quite reliable data on the paid personnel from the disability sport organisations (main occupation/secondary occupation) and we have tried to list them apart. It seems that all countries have hired full time personnel but the numbers are limited. In absolute numbers from this preparatory survey France appears as the best equipped country in paid personnel with and, as we could have expected, the less populated countries (Cyprus) with the lowest number of paid work force. But if we relate these numbers with the numbers of affiliates, another situation appears.

It is a lot more risky to present data on volunteers as they appear immediately as having been produced within different frameworks. Contextual information on global volunteering in the EU countries shows that there are important cultural and socio-political differences between the countries.

“The national studies on volunteering show that the level of volunteering is:

- Very high in Austria, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK as over 40% of adults in these countries are involved in carrying out voluntary activities.
- High in Denmark, Finland, Germany and Luxembourg where 30%-39% of adults are involved in volunteering.
- Medium high in Estonia, France and Latvia where 20%-29% of adults are engaged in voluntary activities.
- Relatively low in Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ireland, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Romania, Slovenia and Spain as 10%-19% of adults carry out voluntary activities.
- Low in Bulgaria, Greece, Italy and Lithuania where less than 10% of adults are involved in voluntary activities” (Volunteering in the European Union, DGEAC official report from GHK, 2010).

In the sport sector, “volunteering is exceptionally commonplace in a number of Member States, with the Nordic Countries again leading the way: Sweden (18%), Finland (18%) and Denmark (15%) all show high levels of voluntary participation. Volunteering is also widely practiced in the Netherlands (16%), Austria (15%), Luxembourg, Ireland and Slovenia (14%). Poland (2%), Greece (2%), Portugal (2%), Italy (3%) and Bulgaria (3%) are among the EU members where volunteering to help local sports projects is relatively rare” (Eurobarometer p. 334, 2010).

Even if we cannot provide absolutely reliable and detailed data, nevertheless it can be stated that in all European countries, the sport and physical activities for people with disabilities is mainly run by volunteers (this being particularly true in the Northern European countries including Germany). Two other statements could also be presented: 1) the level of development of the human resources in sport and physical activities for people with disabilities (measured through the ratio between the paid personnel and the population with disabilities in the EU countries) and 2) the level of “professionalization” of the disability sport organisations (measured by the ratio between paid personnel and affiliates of those organisations). As we could expect there is a contrast between the southern European countries having a rather high level of “professionalization” (Greece leading with one paid personnel for forty five affiliates before Italy and Cyprus) and the
Northern Countries with a more limited level of professionalization (related to a number of paid staff) - Germany leading that category before Finland.

Tasks and functions
How are those human resources used?
Which tasks and functions do they cover and how do they share between those tasks and functions?

We have used a very basic framework considering three main functions: 1) administration (covering all range of activities related to the running of the organisation from the management to the secretarial work); 2) coaching/instructing (running and supervision of the sporting activities of the members); and 3) guiding (a function specific to sport for people with disabilities).

We have also considered the statute of those human resources, either paid personnel or volunteers. As usually in official statistics, when people are contributing to several functions and tasks, they have been allocated to their major one.

The situation seems very different from country to country and from function to function. The situation then is sufficiently diverse so that we may interrogate the meaning of such differences. Clearly, the numbers of volunteers have been underestimated by the national ASA correspondents replying to the questionnaire in most of the countries (if we just count the numbers of clubs and national regulations to administrate them). Volunteer administrators are dominant in numbers in comparison with coaches/instructors and, if we include the part-time employees, the situation is the opposite when considering paid personnel. Paid guides, for example, are extremely rare and their global number also seems to be an under-estimate. The structure of human resources will be related later on to the correspondent training efforts (see below).

Contribution of disability sport organisations, mainstream sport organisations, public authorities and special institutions paid human resources to sports for people with disabilities

This question was targeted to give an idea on the respective roles played by the main stakeholders in sport for people with disabilities. Firstly some evident limitations of our ASA statements must be stated that: The numbers of paid human resources is an indicator which doesn't give a realistic idea of the balance between sub-sectors, as in some of them, volunteers may compensate the limited numbers of paid personnel. In addition, very few countries have been able to provide complete data including the four sub sectors and when they have done so, they often mentioned that there were only estimates given or available from the experts contacted.

Knowing these limitations, the first comment is that if reliable data had been supplied on the paid personnel acting in the Disability Sport Organisations, it is still very difficult to identify who and for which amount of time (at least half time) is dealing with sport for people with disabilities.

So far, the very limited information we have collected within this preparatory action seems to indicate that the Mainstream Sport Organisations are playing a limited role in comparison with Disability Sport Organisations.

Concerning the role of public authorities, it is very difficult to have a precise idea of the numbers of paid personnel who are taking care as their main occupation of sport for people with disabilities. Where available, data shows that their role seems to be quite important, more than the one played by Mainstream Sport Organisations. Special Institutions dealing with the sector are still widely undiscovered even if they might hold a key position operating sometimes independently, sometimes even within the framework of Sport Organisations.

The Training of Human Resources

Training systems and providers

Within a first dimension of training of the human resources consideration is given to the formal training system and its main training providers. In a previous research (Vocasport: Vocational education and training in the field of sport in the European Union: Situation, trends and outlook, EOSE 2004) three components have been identified that characterise a vocational education and training system in the field of sport:

1) "Decision-making bodies", which devise the structural frameworks (laws, decrees, agreements, etc.), choose policies, organise the allocation of resources required, with the support of the administrative techno-structure;
2) "Training institutions", i.e. all the specialised and non-specialised systems that implement training initiatives; and
3) "Regulation processes", i.e. the set of principles and rules that organise the system.

It was found that generally the same decision-making bodies exist in all EU member states; what does change, however, is the power that each one wields.

• Ministries of Education tend to have the main responsibility exerted by public authorities, whether alone or supported by the Ministry of Labour. This responsibility is sometimes shared by the Ministry or ministerial departments in charge of sport.
The regional bodies in charge of training are also often involved. The situation does vary, of course, depending on whether the country is highly centralised or decentralised / federalised. Situations also exist in which responsibilities have been given to the sports movement itself. Germany, for example, offers this type of training system, created within the sports movement and operating under its control, with mainly financial support from the public authorities (local, above all). More rarely, it is the social partners that take the main responsibility for defining the framework and content of vocational training and education in the field of sport. Lastly, also situations exist that give a lot of freedom to initiatives taken by players in the field, such as employers or instructors, within a fairly unrestrictive framework.

Concerning training providers, four categories of training providers have been identified: 1) Higher Education institutions (universities, colleges etc.), 2) training bodies relating to disability sport organisations; 3) training bodies relating to mainstream sport organisations; and 4) training centres/bodies belonging to the public sport administration (e.g. the Ministry in charge of sports). Very often there are collaborations in the running of such training programmes between e.g. sports organisations and the public sport administrations.

Training programmes
The training programmes are delivered by training providers. When available, information on the content and targets of the training programmes has been gathered. Consideration was given to three main categories of programmes related to the key functions identified: 1) training programmes in sport administration; 2) training programmes in coaching; and 3) other training programmes (officials, guides, etc.).

Taking into account the limited number of available responses, and the fact that most of the universities’ programmes do not easily fit in our categories, it has only been stated that 2/3 of the programmes are related to coaching/instructing which doesn’t really correspond to the data submitted on employment or volunteering. University programmes are for their great majority full time programmes dedicated to initial training. Alternatively, programmes run by sports organisations are organised during short and intensive periods, in relation to practical experiences, in a lifelong learning perspective. This situation corresponds to what we have already observed for the whole sport sector in a previous European project (Vocasport, EOSE 2004). In this regards, training in the sector is run, on the one side by highly theoretically qualified training with few connections to the specific field and on the other side by the organisation of often only basic training but in close connection with the field problems.

Number of yearly successful trainees
The key information is to know how many people are trained each year by the different training providers and how these numbers could be related to the human resources active in the sector.

It has already been mentioned that Higher Education programmes are often not directly targeted to the special needs of sport for people with disabilities. This explains the way data has been presented in the different countries, either mentioning that most higher education courses related to sport, there are courses related to sport for the people with disabilities (e.g. this is the case in the UK and at another scale in Slovenia). But most of the time they consist of very general and basic information. In addition, some programmes cover a broad range of topics related to Adapted Physical Activity (this is the case of the 833 trainees in Higher Education in France). Only very few courses provided in Higher Education are fully dedicated to sport for the people with disabilities and provide a broad range of competences necessary to act as an expert coach or an administrator being ‘fully aware’ of the sector.

The situation is different for the training programmes operated by the Disability Sport Organisations themselves. The courses seem to take care of the specificity of the sector but they are most of the time short and basic, and don’t cover all the sector’s needs. If we look to the total number of people who have been trained successfully each year, the number is impressive (12,469 excluding those who have only received general information on the topic!). That number corresponds to fifteen times the number of paid personnel and a little less than half of the total of volunteers. Either there is a clear “overtraining” of the people in charge, or there is a high turnover with the necessity to train a great number of new comers every year. We will see further on that there are skills shortages and skills gaps in many countries. This statement strengthens the second hypothesis with a complementary explanation related to skills gaps, and the difficulties in providing adequate training in correspondence with all needs, in particular for expert coaches and administrators.
SKILLS GAPS AND SHORTAGES

Skills gaps and shortages are key concepts related to employment of the work force. There is a skills shortage in a specific area where employers don’t find human resources in the job market. There is a skills gap where the human resources available are missing the appropriate competences and skills expected by the industry.

In the sport for people with disabilities sector, we are confronted again with two different situations:

- The first situation concerns the recruitment of paid personnel. In this area, we have mainly identified problems related to the supply of jobs. It is evident that in most countries the difficulties to recruit paid personnel is presented as a consequence of the limitation of financial resources; this limitation has been often related to the limitation of public funding. However there are other reasons which might be more easily related to skills shortages. Several countries’ correspondents insist on the effect of the depreciated social image and statute of the activity in the context of sport. Sport for people with disabilities is seen as a second choice for people interested in working within sport, and qualified to do so. The situation of skills gaps varies from country to country but there are frequent complaints on the lack of specifically trained personnel recruited, most of them having been only trained on a general basis either in sport or in their specialty (administration, coaching) without any emphasis on the special context of the sport for people with disabilities.

  Summarizing the findings, the main difficulties in recruiting paid personnel come from the limited job supply and a depreciated image in the context of sport which makes it become rather a second choice only. Difficulties also occur from inadequate (or not enough specialised) training (skills gaps).

- The second situation concerns the recruitment of volunteers. The question of the global statute of volunteering in society is crucial in the issue and is strongly related to the cultural and socio-political context into which it occurs (as we have seen above). We have already seen that volunteering is at a high rate in the Nordic countries and lower in the southern and eastern European countries (“working without being paid is nonsense” said one of our correspondents from an eastern European country). Of course the statute of the sport for persons with disabilities is another issue which has also effected the recruitment of volunteers. The same kind of remarks can be made concerning the effects of the depreciated image of sport for people with disabilities on the recruitment of volunteers than we have had for the recruitment of paid personnel. It seems to become more and more difficult to recruit volunteers in this area, and most of all, to find qualified personnel. Besides the depreciated image of sport for people with disabilities in comparison with mainstream sport (concurrence) and its effects on recruitment, another reason is often put forward for recruiting volunteers rather than paid personnel: the lack of adequate/specific training. As already outlined, there are few specific training courses at a reasonable level taking into consideration the characteristics of disability sport. The choice is often between in depth mainstream courses and short initiations to disability sport.

To summarize, there are more skill gaps than shortages in both statutes (paid personnel and volunteers) but the situation is worse for volunteers. The lack of financial resources, the depreciated image of sports for people with disabilities and the lack of adequate/specialised training are from our data received the main issues.

GOOD PRACTICES IN HUMAN RESOURCES

“Good practice” is a broad and sometimes vague notion which should be used carefully. It may signify on the one side “a process or a methodology that represents the most effective way of achieving a specific objective” or even “a practice that has been proven to work well and produce good results, and is therefore recommended as a model”. Using good practice in this perspective means that we can classify practices and identify the good ones in whichever context they operate.

Such an exercise rather supposes an almost neutral view from an “objective international experts” able to discriminate what is good or not in the running of a country. On the other side, and it is the way we will use the notion in this chapter, we can consider the choice of “good practices” only as examples put forward by national authorities. In this case, “good practices”, whatever they are, are expressing what country’s authorities consider as references in the area of human resource development in sport for people with disabilities.

Firstly we have to underline the limited number of examples provided (only eight countries have submitted one or two cases). This probably gives an indication on the limited importance played by that domain in the running of the sector. The content is also a little surprising as quite all of them are related to training and their majority to higher education initiatives. Nevertheless if we look more precisely to the answers we see some cases insisting on joint initiatives between Higher Education and Disability Sport Organisations while others are purely academic. In both cases it seems there is a need for more integration between the different stakeholders.
CONCLUSIONS

Sport and physical activities for people with disabilities is - as it is the case in any other service industry - strongly dependent on human resources. As a very first conclusion of this preparatory action survey, the situation can be summarised as follows:

- A minority of EU member states have a specific policy related to human resources in the area of sport for people with disabilities (either regulating/promoting volunteering or regulating employment). For the others, general human resource policies are applied in the sector.
- Due to poor information existing/provided, one can only make a statement regarding the situation of human resources in Disability Sport Organisations to give any reliable conclusion. Information has been (too) insufficient regarding the other sub-sectors involved in the field, such as regarding human resources from the mainstream sport movement devoted to sport for the people with disabilities, or from public authorities (local, regional or national) or special institution personnel.
- The human resources of the Disability Sport Organisations are mostly volunteers - even if the limited numbers of paid personnel are playing an important role. As an estimate there are less than 1,000 full time paid personnel in the EU countries currently working in Disability Sport Organisations.
- Those organisations do not have the adequate staff resources mainly due to the still low/poor image of disability sport, a lack of adequate specific training, and limited financial resources.
- The training systems are in general based on a double stream structure: On the one side universities are delivering general Adapted Physical Activity courses with, most of the time, poor connection to the specific labour market. The Disability Sport Organisations constitute a very small market for them and their dedication to the sector is therefore rather poor. Most of the educated students work in special schools/institutions. Alternatively, the bulk of training provided is provided by Disability Sport Organisations, either independently or in relation with other providers (such as Mainstream Sport Organisations, Public Sport Authorities, or/and universities etc.). If these courses are specific and strongly related to the field, they are usually only provided at a basic level.
- As a consequence of the situation of the human resources and of training systems, there are important skills shortages and most of all skills gaps.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is always critical to put forward statements and recommendations when very little reliable information exists / could be provided. Nevertheless, in the following it has been tried to take the best out of the information provided in order to identify some priorities and make recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 1:
The first recommendation, supported by several of our correspondents in the EU countries, is related to the fact that poor information is available: Organise a coordinated basic data collection system in the area to give tools to support decision making and evaluate impact of policies.

In this regards, the first objective shall be to collect systematic information on the human resources operating in the four main components of the sector (including numbers per functions, statute, qualifications). The second objective will be to cover questions regarding the training system (Who is doing what?). The third objective will be to analyse the job market and more specifically the skills gaps and shortages.

RECOMMENDATION 2:
The second recommendation is related to attracting and retaining human resources in Disability Sport Organisations. We would like to put forward two proposals:

A. Fight against the depreciated image of disability sport. Those actions have to take into consideration the diversity of practices, from grassroots to high performance. Their target will be on the one side to stimulate volunteering in the sector and, on the other side to avoid poor recruitment of paid personnel.

B. Promote social dialogue also in the disability sport sector to consider the sustainability of employment and the possibilities for paid personnel to share part-time jobs and to enhance decent employment for them.

RECOMMENDATION 3:
The third recommendation is to support Disability Sports Organisations in collecting public and private financial support in order to recruit paid personnel. Disability Sports Organisations are in a key position to develop adapted and specific services
for people with disabilities either to deliver such services directly or in cooperation with Mainstream Sport Organisations (inclusion). It is crucial to promote such organisations to a leadership position and to support their promotional campaigns.

RECOMMENDATION 4:
As the fourth and last recommendation one has to relate to the clear lack of adapted specific training covering the whole range of required competences in the sector. The main providers/stakeholders have the resource to provide adapted and specific training, but each of them act mostly independently following the given institutional logic. In this regards, it seems crucial to organise cooperative training initiatives between Disability Sport Organisations and Mainstream Sport Organisations, with the support of universities and, when available, the contribution of any Special Institutions working in the sector, and also with the Public Authorities. Those cooperative initiatives might be run under the leadership of sector employers and employees (social partners) for paid personnel, and under the leadership of sports organisations for volunteers, in close relation with each other in order to tackle the existing and future needs with appropriate training forms and formats.

F) DISABILITY SPORT EXAMPLE: GOLF FOR PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY37

There are approximately nine million people playing golf in Europe each year with 4.3 million registered with their Federation (European Golf Association 2007). The European market is serviced by a workforce of over 350,000 employees (KPMG/Oxford Economics 2009) that are required to deliver services which not only keep golfers in the game, but attract new participants and develop elite athletes.

“Golf is a sport for everyone: Regardless of age, gender, physical condition or physical challenge.” In this regards, the sport is also widely enjoyed by people with disabilities. In order to overcome certain unique problems that some disabled golfers encounter when playing golf, a “Modification of the Rules of Golf for Golfers with Disabilities” containing advice and permissible modifications to the golf rules exist. Although the sport is generally played on a level playing field, the guide provides a means by which disabled golfers may play equitably with able-bodied golfers or golfers with other types of disabilities. From a practical standpoint, disabled golfers are subdivided into groups, referring to different golf rules modifications: 1) Blind golfers, 2) Amputee golfers, 3) Golfers requiring canes or crutches, 4) Golfers requiring wheelchairs and 5) Golfers with learning disabilities (R&A 2011).

HISTORY

The history of golf for people with disabilities is explained and can be written as follows38: From the early nineties disabled golf developed in quite a number of European countries rapidly. The interpretation of the word “disabled” at that time, however, varied in each country; experience in organising tournaments and support from other sources was still in its infancy. Each country decided who were allowed to play, ranging from wheelchair players, amputees and blind players to players with diabetes, deafness and “les autres”.

Strokeplay and Stableford (both are golf scoring systems), based on physical disabilities or playing handicap, were mixed in wanted and unwanted varieties. Players with divergent disabilities, common and uncommon, appeared in tournaments and championships around Europe. Players grumbled and resistance was made at prize giving ceremonies with the appearance of winners with a vague disability. Socializing elements, curiosity and playing capabilities were the binding factors of success, however, the cry for equal standards of tournaments and objective controlled definitions of impairments were heard more frequently.

In 1998 an international Working Group was formed by committed officers from the Netherlands, Sweden and Germany to prepare the starting points for a co-ordinated body, and in the summer of 1998, during the Swedish Open for disabled players first “Definitions of impairments” as a long awaited answer for equal rules regarding the minimum physical disabilities for entering tournaments were presented. This just and fair considered document was accepted as being the standard for organisers of tournaments as being vital to create fair competitions.

To ensure continuity in the future, the Working Group prepared the founding of an international identity. As a result of this the European Disabled Golf Association (EDGA) was founded by organisations from six nations: the Netherlands, Sweden, Germany, Italy, France and Iceland.

---

37 The corresponding reporting fact sheet has been produced under the leadership of the Professional Golfers’ Associations of Europe (PGAE) and the European Disabled Golf Association (EDGA) led by Tony Bennett, Pieter van Duijn and Matthias Guett (EOSE).
38 Based on and partly cited literally from the European Disabled Golf Association 2011 at www.edgagolf.eu
BACKGROUND
The All for Sport for All project included a specific focus aimed at mapping the background and opportunities of golf for people with disabilities in Europe with perspectives (of providing a practice) for integrating people with a disability within mainstream golf clubs and events. Thus, both qualitative and quantitative analysis have been undertaken to provide a better account of the current state of the golf sector from both the disability golfers’ and professional golfers’ perspective.39

CONCLUSIONS
The qualitative golf sector analysis and the All for Sport for All Golf Online Survey results that the sport of Golf generally operates a totally inclusive practice and that there is a broad support for the further inclusion of golfers with physical impairments. The structure of the game allows for all golfers to play the sport on equitable terms with the application of Golf’s handicap scoring system.

From a coaching perspective the ability to perform at a high level relies on a player being able to employ a wide variety of tools, some visible and others more difficult to assess. In coaching circles the holistic approach recognises the various maturities required for a player to reach the highest standards amongst which are technical, strategic, mental, emotional and physical skill sets. A player with limited skills in any of the previously mentioned skill sets will receive a handicap allowance which may be taken from their score. Therefore player ‘A’ who exhibits a high degree of skill in all areas and player ‘B’ who receives a handicap allowance may compete together and assuming that both play on any given day to the same capacity of their game, for example 75%, then the match score will be likely be level.

Even though the Golf sector considers the sport to be very inclusive, there is a genuine interest from many of the game’s administrators and the industry to make the game even more inclusive. There is an openness and readiness to share good practice, research and to increase awareness of the possibility for the physically impaired to engage with Golf as a sporting option.

From a more general perspective, ‘Disability Sports’ – including Golf – are still often considered more related to healthcare and therapy, whilst in many cases it is desired by the athletes that it should be treated as ‘Sport’ and/or ‘Top Level Sport’; as the sport itself remains the same whether executed by disabled or able-bodied sportsmen and sportswomen. In this regards, as outlined above Golf shows a good example for first success of such concept of integration.

In order to develop (better) integration there is still change needed: Change of the public opinion and the courage of stakeholders and administrators to accept and implement disabled sports. To allow such change, cooperation of all stakeholders must be further fostered, and guidance and guidelines as ingredients for (EU) governments and sport administrators to incorporate disability sports as such should be developed. In addition the awareness of existing (integrated) sporting possibilities, such as Golf, must be raised to people with disabilities. Also Golf is unfortunately still an example for an unknown ‘true sport’ for people with physical limitations.

“You have to see it before you believe it”, is a much heard reaction from people getting involved in disability sports for the first time, and associations and clubs in different kind of sports often have the experience that acceptance of disabled people is a true enrichment – as one can see that the ‘sport’ remains the same, only being executed in a different way.

Having tried to foster such awareness-raising and integration through cooperation, Golf is now at the edge of a breakthrough by organising an International Conference on organisational, technical and medical issues related to disabled golf, by drawing a parallel with the IPC Classification System and by offering training courses run in cooperation of EDGA and the PGAs of Europe.

In this regards, it is clear also from a golf sector’s perspective that guidance and guidelines are essential at the European level (and beyond) for promoting the Paralympic concept, and that the European Commission and national (sport) authorities as well as the sport sector stakeholders must be made aware that this preparatory action project has allowed the sector to understand better its current set up but must be considered as just “a start” to foster a true movement of “All for Sport for All”.

39 The detailed reporting fact sheet on Golf for People with a Disability is available at www.allforsport.eu.
G) CONCLUSIONS & CONSOLIDATED RECOMMENDATIONS

The All for Sport for All project’s main aim was to highlight a possible future direction and perspectives of sport for people with a disability in Europe in the above described five areas of intervention by undertaking a first mapping process on existing information in the disability sport sector at the trans-national and European level. This report’s objective is to provide the reader and especially the EU and national sport authorities and stakeholders dealing with sport for people with a disability or with disability in general with an overview and review of the current status quo of the sector.

Besides the main findings of the mapping process, the above sections already provided us with information on future challenges and recommendations for aligned activities in the specific sectors. Nonetheless, in the following, further conclusions and related consolidated recommendations for action have been developed that try to somehow overarch and summarize those findings.

Those consolidated recommendations try to give an impetus on the basis of the provided information and practices and shall be considered again within the context of a trans-national approach trying to be as concrete as possible but to include also most views possible, recognising different sport systems, sector approaches and cultural identities towards sport and disability. The set of guidelines is also to be understood under the circumstances of preparatory action, meaning that further action and in depth analysis must be undertaken afterwards and those guidelines rather comprise the start of action than any end. We are aware that the All for Sport for All conclusions might not reflect the entire sector’s situation and opinion but they try to summarise well the view of the sector experts consulted and the facts provided from the mapping activity during the one-year project. Drawing such conclusions and recommendations shall help opening the door for a broader European dimension of disability sport with further trans-national and trans-sectoral cooperation and sustainable development, and a more aligned and evidence based work in the future.

RECOMMENDATION 1: COLLABORATION AT DIFFERENT LEVELS AND FORMS

From the All for Sport for All mapping, a fragmentation of the sector can be highlighted so that relationships between key stakeholders must be duly considered, as differing approaches can reduce the potential for impact. Therefore all the main stakeholders and key actors involved in the sport sector for people with disability are encouraged to establish a higher level of interaction and networking through different forms of collaboration, such as

- Implementation of cooperative policy;
- Sharing of economical, intellectual and physical resources;
- Creation of pan-European tools, such as a communication platform;
- Preparation and dissemination of specific guidelines based on the identification of good practices;

Related action includes:
- Identify who those stakeholders are, consider their relationships, and consider how to best facilitate interaction.
- Establish an adequate environment for cooperation (Informal Working Group – see below)
- Collect and share further good practices; translation into the different EU languages shall be ensured.

RECOMMENDATION 2: FURTHER RESEARCH AND DATA EXCHANGE

The implementation of in-depth analysis and studies is recommended, both at qualitative and quantitative level, concerning the main issues related to the sector of sport for people with a disability, aligned with the creation of a basic database with comparable information, accessible at EU and international level.

- The findings of this research could be described as ‘cosmetic’. A comprehensive research project would allow for the aspects which this project did not have the capability to explore.
- Further research will give us a better understanding of the main issues existing within the sector.
- A better understanding would provide the grounding for the implementation of provided recommendations.

Related action includes:
- Trans-national research studies/analysis.
- Implementation of comparable methods/techniques and methodologies.
- The facilitation of such research based exchange. The sector requires encouragement to exchange on (evidence-based) knowledge, information and good practices.
- Check the feasibility to develop a European Observatory for Disability Sports.
RECOMMENDATION 3: EXCHANGE OF TOOLS
The identification and development of tools and technology which have the potential to enhance the realisation of sector specific actions is needed. It is recommended to engage in a process which will centralise instances of good practice in member states which can act as a support mechanism at a national, European and international level.

- To successfully implement actions on a European and national basis a supporting structure is required.
- It is proposed to consolidate the good practices in the project and develop tools which can be tailored for implementation in EU member states.
- Common tools will create equality within the sector on a European basis. EU members who are less well developed will benefit from the creation of tools and technology, creating a situation whereby the sector can develop collectively.
- Competence already exists within the sector to a certain degree; however there must be a willingness to consult with other sectors to discern if good practices can be adopted.
- Following the recommendations it should be clarified whether and how (common and applicable) tools can be developed and implemented to support them. Tools could include campaigns for awareness-raising.

RECOMMENDATION 4: EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF HUMAN RESOURCES
The All for Sport for All data shows that a clear lack of adapted / specific training covering the whole range of required competences and skills in the disability sport sector exists. Furthermore statements reflect also a clear need to educate teachers as well as sports specialists such as sports coaches, administrators, sports centre assistants and the general public on the rights of people with a disability in sport.

Related action includes:
- Fight against the depreciated image of disability sport.
- Promote social dialogue also in the disability sport sector to consider the sustainability of employment.
- Organise cooperative training initiatives between Disability Sport Organisations and ‘Mainstream Sport Organisations’, with the support of external training providers and public authorities, possibly aligned by European Education and Training Stakeholders.

RECOMMENDATION 5: INVESTMENTS
Investments constitute a critical challenge: They are essential in keeping the pace required for the enlargement of the number of people with disabilities involved in the sport sector at all levels, alongside the further development of the whole sector.

In this regards, it is recommended that Investments should be considered in the context of the sector when conceiving an applicable funding strategy. Funding should be assessed in terms of outcomes for the sector with the strategy emanating from such considerations. From the All for Sport for All findings, funding for accessibility e.g. regarding infrastructure (transportation) is recommended.

Related action includes:
- Consultation with key stakeholders at a national and European level to consider the most appropriate funding model.
- An impact based analysis of an investment strategy, including funding sources, distribution and outcomes

RECOMMENDATION 6: APPLICABLE POLICY
Sector specific policy to prioritise the approach to fundamental issues inherent within disability sport at a European level is recommended. Based on an analysis and development of elements existing within established policies, the process would seek to better reflect such issues.

- Policy is diverse, in its political nature, structure and enforcement. In order to successfully implement actions to develop the disability sport movement a pan-European set of regulations, guidelines or legislations to support it is recommended.
- Furthermore, policy is limited in terms of a specific applicability to disability sport. There is a requirement to standardise a basic set of regulations or guidelines to ensure that progression in the sector is realised.
- The structure of such policy would require consultation with the sector through key stakeholders to ensure that policy is applicable, based on the issues raised.
- It is understood that policy would be the result of a regulatory process. The project and its recommendations consider that this would be a long term goal, however, it is felt that a standardised approach based on good practice and sector specific requirements (guidelines) would benefit the development of disability sport.
- In general, regulation is, by its very nature, sensitive. The process by which a policy on disability sport is pursued would have to be managed carefully.
Related action includes:

- The nature of such a policy/regulation/guideline would be borne out after consultation with the sector. Although the process will involve delicate political management, the potential impact on the sector would be sizeable. Such a set of ‘guiding principles’ would provide the sector with a collective set of standards which doesn’t currently exist.
- Special attention shall be paid to accessibility, young people and the elderly.

ACCESSIBILITY

As outlined above, the phrases ‘access’ and ‘accessibility’ are routinely used in connection with the provision of opportunities in sport. It is likely that this term is being used differently by different stakeholders and in the EU countries, in some cases referring to physical access to a sports centre in others it may be more related to attitudinal access (e.g. being welcomed by staff). Broader interpretations may also refer to reflect the need for better access to knowledge or expertise.

There has been no specific recommendation developed to accessibility, but the All for Sport for All project sees accessibility as an ‘overarching principle’ for all the consolidated recommendations, as it is clear that insufficient or inadequate access to provision at all levels and aspects of disability sport is still ‘the’ major challenge.

ROLES OF STAKEHOLDERS

Public Authorities

Public authorities both at the European and national level play a key role in initiating and supporting actions in the field of disability sports although it is the view from the All for Sport for All mapping that the sector itself shall lead initiatives and shall be duly consulted regarding the direction of development.

In regards of sport for people with disabilities data mapping has proved that authorities involved vary from each country. Through All for Sport for All, we would like to encourage the different national authorities involved in disability sports and sports, as well as the authorities involved in the direction of disability matters to consider and possibly support action recommended by the project. It is important that - for any intervention in policy to work - each country is involved and engaged and empowered as a necessary participant - so that any tools or resources or working practices are sensitive to its needs and consequently more likely to be adopted. Action could relate to the establishment of e.g. cooperative financial funding schemes, applicable policy (e.g. through the EU) and coordinated awareness-raising and exchange of good practice.

Furthermore, EU stakeholders, such as the EU Sports Unit and the EC DC-Justice are recommended to further support within their rolling agenda aligned action at the EU level as this project has proven that cross-links between disability sport, sport and disability can be well enhanced by them at the European level. The action started through the EU Informal Working Group on Social Inclusion and Equal Opportunities in Sport is warmly appreciated by the sector and it is necessary that the EU ensures that disability sport in all its facets remains a key priority also when it shall come to a EU sports programme.

Disability Organisations

The All for Sport for All mapping proved that to improve understanding and provision, engagement in sports organisations needs to improve within and between countries but also between sectors. It is most notable how infrequently (if at all) organisations of and for disabled people are mentioned in the survey responses. These disability organisations have driven the improvement in access to a broad range of services for disabled people, yet sports organisations have not made best use of their political influence. In this regards, both at the national and EU level it is recommended that the disability sport organisations further enhance cooperation with disability organisations. At the European level it is recommended that especially cooperation with the European Disability Forum shall be fostered that well links most disability organisations at the EU level and provides a good platform for awareness raising and exchange of practices.

Sport Organisations

The All for Sport for All research suggests that while mainstreaming has been central to sport policy for disabled people, it has not necessarily – thus far at least – been successful and may need further dialogue between all agencies to establish which models are most likely to work and what roles these organisations may need to adopt. Besides, most ASA collaborators state that ‘disability sport’ must not sit aside the ‘sport movement’. For example, common training of human resources or the marketing power of ‘mainstream sport’ together with the media exposure generated could greatly benefit disability sport provided so that a coherent message is portrayed.

Disability Sport Organisations

Last but not least, the disability sport organisations need to take further action regarding cooperation themselves. The All for Sport for All data mapping showed that cooperation within the single disability sports and its organisations does exist but better exchange and closer collaboration has been expressed widely. It is recommended that the disability sport movement shall use its existing structures of communication and the platform created by the All for Sport for All initiative in order to speak at the European sport political level “unified in diversity”.

---
Considering the variety of stakeholders involved in the sector and the difficulty observed by EU stakeholders to approach “the entire sector”, the All for Sport for All project already aimed to set the base or better to “check the feasibility” for developing a “Strategic informal Working Group on Sport for Persons with a Disability” at the European level. Such group could then help to better cross-link the single sub-sectors and stakeholder groups, and to provide EU stakeholders a better platform for exchange on and for future development. In this regards from the information gathered through the project activities it is recommended to take the following action as a first step in order to support the above recommendations:

CREATION OF A STRATEGIC INFORMAL WORKING GROUP

From the All for Sport for All project’s perspective, the complexity of the sector and the above proposals in the field of sport for people with a disability require - as a first action - the establishment and continuation of cooperation structures between each of the stakeholder groups (disability sports, sports and disability organisations), by including the corresponding EU authorities and the Member States in order to ensure a continued exchange of information and good practice and to ensure (further) aligned development of the disability sport sector.

Data collection showed that a variety of organisations is involved in lead positions, therefore key organisations involved in such an Informal Working Group need to vary according to the needs and circumstances of each country. In general, it is key to have a balance of decision makers from each participating country together with ‘experts’ who may offer a broader, more analytical perspective. It is recommended that such group would also include observers that represent the different disability sports and movements e.g. through their representative bodies at the EU level.

Such Working Group shall duly be kept “informal” and shall not replace existing structures nor act as a formal body, but could guarantee, through detailed discourse, to increase the level of understanding of key disability sport (policy) issues, and identify possible solutions to problems the group members have capacity and authority to implement at the European level.

Due to the nature of such preparatory action, the above All for Sport for All recommendations shall be regarded as a dynamic document that must be updated and further developed consecutively, and seek for approval by the stakeholders involved (e.g. through a future Informal Working Group).

At this stage, they shall guide and help to better orientate the disability sport stakeholders and motivate them to further exchange practices and to learn from each other. Until today more than 50 organisations have collaborated for and supported the common aim: “All for Sport for All” - and we duly hope being able to further extend this partnership with support from the European Commission.

5) SECTOR CHALLENGES AS SEEN BY THE EUROPEAN PARALYMPIC COMMITTEE

The European Paralympic Committee’s Executive Board has reviewed the results of the All for Sport for All project and whole heartedly endorse its findings. The challenges identified in the project of education and trained staff, improved infrastructure and support and accessibility, could have been predicted by many and certainly will come as no surprise to those involved in the disability sport sector. What the project has done is provided ‘empirical evidence’ to support perception within the sector.

To some the projects findings may seem rather negative. They would question with the legislation now in place, the resources available within the sector and the increased profile of the Paralympic sport, why more progress has not already been made in addressing the challenges highlighted in the report. The European Paralympic Committee accepts that more progress could have been made in the last decade and would concede that its own performance, in particular their lack of direction and purpose may have been a contributory factor. The EPC do not want to dwell in the past and see the findings of the project as a blue print for the future from which a successful disability sports sector within Europe can be built.

The project has identified a number of issues and challenges and the EPC would like to take the opportunity to comment on the points raised both as standalone issues but also how in the opinion of the EPC they interact and overlap with each other. In doing so the EPC would make the following comments:

EDUCATION AND TRAINED STAFF

The project has identified the need for more specialists in adapted physical activity and physical education in schools who know how to teach disabled children in special and mainstream schools. Physical education at school is where many young people get their first taste of and develop their passion for sport and disabled youngster should be no different. It is clear therefore that teacher must be properly equipped to deliver sporting opportunities to disabled young people. The EPC would support the improvement in the provision of sport for the disabled in schools. To do this would require a shift in policy by

---

40 The corresponding reporting fact sheet has been produced by the European Paralympic Committee led by Craig Carscadden.
education providers and require legislation. The EPC, and the other stakeholders in the sector, can champion this cause by lobbying government at local, national and EU level.

The training and educating of teachers, sports coaches, administrators and officials is extremely important and a number of initiatives are in place or are being developed to help facilitate this. The IPC Paralympic Academy where online training modules are being developed in classification and sports rules for IPC sports is an example of good practice in this area. The EPC needs to work with the IPC to raise awareness of this online training aid amongst the EPC members and other stakeholders in the sector.

The internet is a relatively inexpensive and effective platform to deliver training nationally and regionally. The EPC is not in a position to provide such training opportunities but it can work with the other stakeholders in the sector to lobby, Sports Federations, disability specific or mainstream and ISODs have training material that is easily accessible and disability specific.

In the conclusion of the report the need for further research is highlighted. The EPC is committed to this objective and is already collaborating together with EOSE on the EU funded project “Training 4 Volunteers: Mapping Strategies and Good Practices of Human Resource Development for Volunteers in Sports Organisations in Europe” by providing the disability perspective to this research.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUPPORT

The project has highlighted the fact that historically sport for disabled people has typically been lead, organised and provided for by disability sport organisations. The EPC would acknowledge that this has been the case.

The pioneering work of these organisations should not be understated. Without the existence of these organisations the foundations of disability sport would not have been built.

However much of this development work was piecemeal and often the structures were disability specific rather than sports specific. The effect of this was that many of these organisations worked in silos, with little communication between disability groups within a sport or between disability sports groups and their mainstream sports federation. One of the draw backs of such a structure was that it at best it was difficult to share best practise and expertise or at worse there was a reluctance to do so for political or self-serving motives.

The EPC also acknowledges that there has been a trend to mainstreaming of disability sport. Mainstreaming of disability sport has occurred at different levels depending on the sports in question.

In many countries it is government policy to mainstream disability sport as a way to facilitate the integration of disabled athletes. In such instances the governance of the sport at National level comes under the auspices of National Sports Federation but the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) remains the International Governing Body for the disabled sport. Swimming and Athletics are examples of this in practice.

In other instances the governance of the disabled element of the sport has been transferred from the IPC to the International Federation and they have become the governing body for the whole sport. Lawn tennis and cycling are examples where this process has been completed.

The EPC supports the mainstreaming of disability whether at National or International level but share the concerns highlighted in the project.

The report highlights two particular areas of concern, namely the provision of pathways and education. It is crucial for the development of disability sport that each sport has a structure where entry points and pathways to success are easily identifiable to potential young athletes. To date much of the mainstreaming of disability sport by National Federations, and the associated funding has been focused on the elite element of the sport with little or no provision given to grassroots development or competition pathways. The effect of this is that in some sports the competition pathways at national level can be nonexistent in some countries or lack clarity in others. Either way this acts as a barrier to participation. Similarly in some cases the lack of grass roots development work done has resulted in a dearth of young talent emerging when the demand from athletes for sporting opportunities is increasing.

In the conclusions of the project, reference is made to investment and the need for consultation with other stakeholders to ascertain the appropriate funding models. EPC would support this process. However the EPC would state now that in terms of mainstreaming of disability sport, they would be campaigning for a model that includes the whole spectrum of a particular sport from grassroots to elite. In terms of measuring the success of any model, the EPC would suggest that this should be evaluated in a wider context than the number of medals won at the Paralympic Games.

41 EU Preparatory Action Project 2010, led by the Leadership Academy of the German Olympic Sports Confederation, see www.t4v.eu
The EPC feels that the work done by the International Paralympic Committee in successfully creating a structure for International Competition in IPC governed sports should be acknowledged. One area that needs further development is in the area of international Junior competitions, this is an area where the EPC could have a role to play in collaboration with the IPC and IOSDs’. This work has already started with the first disability youth games scheduled to take place in Czech Republic in June 2011.

The importance of education is a constant thread throughout the report and this is no different in relation to mainstreaming of disability sport. If mainstreaming is to succeed then investment is required in education; both in terms of general disability awareness training and that specific to the sport in question. In addition it should not be forgotten that there is a pool of experts in disability issues held within disability sports organisation that could be utilised in mainstream sport given the appropriate training in sports specific areas. As stated earlier the EPC is not in a position to provide such training opportunities but it can work with the other stakeholders in the sector to lobby, Sports Federations and governments to ensure that resources are invested to allow training to be delivered.

ACCESSIBILITY

In the report it suggests that accessibility is being used in different contexts. By some it mean merely access to facilities, while others put it a wider context to mean access to quality coaching and expertise. The EPC feel that accessibility must be talked about in the widest possible context. There is no point in a disabled person gaining access to a sports centre, athletics track, or swimming pool if they are not openly welcomed, can access without restriction and have equal access to specialised coaching.

It is for this reason that the EPC has placed so much emphasis on training in response to the project results. In the conclusions of the project the need for a funding strategy is highlighted. When considering funding in the sector, there is a need to look beyond infrastructure and also consider investment in training and education of human resources.

The report also emphasises the need to share good practise and expertise and the need for countries and individuals to have access is knowledge and the latest coaching techniques. In the projects conclusions suggest a platform should be created to facilitate this information sharing. The idea of a platform where good practise and knowledge can be shared is a good one and one that the EPC would support this both in principal and in practise. The start up cost of such an electronic information directory has always been a drawback to such a facility being developed. With the advances in technology and the almost universal use of social network, it is now feasible that such a platform could become a reality, The EPC would like to explore with other stakeholder in the sector whether the EPC website could be the home for such a European wide information source.

CONCLUSION

The general challenges identified by the “All for Sport for All” project will give the EPC a great deal to think about. The project will provide the foundations to develop a strategic plan. The plan must have the project’s challenges and conclusions as its main objectives and goals if the issues identified are to be comprehensively addressed within a reasonable time frame.

The EPC is a relatively small organisation with limited resources and to date its role within the disability sports movement in Europe has not always been clear. The “All for Sport for All” outcomes will help the EPC define its role. The EPC is not “the governing body for disability sport in Europe, nor is it the provider of elite competition.” It is clear from this report that the main role of the EPC should be that of lobbyist, campaigner and information provider to ensure that disability sport in the European Region can develop and meet the challenges and recommendations outlined in the project are met.

It would be naive to think that an organisation of the size of the EPC can address these issues alone. It is fundamental that we work in collaboration with others if the EPC’s goals and objectives are to be fulfilled. It is crucial that we not only work in partnership with our member organisations and other stakeholders in the sector including the EU and IPC. This will require the EPC to successfully maintain and foster new relationships with the stakeholders. In terms of the IPC this will mean continuing to rebuild a relationship that until recent years the EPC were reluctant to foster which meant there was little in the way of co-operation between the organisations. By doing so the EPC can be a catalyst for change and help meet the challenges of the project.
6) ANNEX – SUPPORTING STATEMENTS

“Our participation to the All for Sport for All programme was very helpful to understand how other countries deal with sport for people with a disability. Our mission is to clarify our specific national policies and to learn about remarks and comments coming from the other ASA members. It increases our open-mindedness and also our awareness concerning the limited attention dedicated to Belgian (infra)structures and policies with regard to the sport for people with disabilities.”
Thierry Zintz, Head of the Chaire Olympique Henri de Baillet Latour & Jacques Rogge en Management des Organisations Sportives & Vice-President of the Belgian Olympic Committee

“The EPC’s involvement in “All For Sport For All” has been a very useful project. It has helped the EPC gauge how some of our member nations cater for disabled people wishing to participate in sport. By doing so, this will assist in the EPC in fulfilling its mission to securing the provision of excellent sporting opportunities for European athletes with a disability as part of the world-wide Paralympic movement. From this prospective the EPC believe the “All for Sport For All” project has been a major success, despite the fact that it has raised significant challenges for the disability sports sector.”
Craig Carscadden EPC Executive Board Member

“The development of the sport for people with disability sector represents a key issue at European level because it embraces many political dimensions such as: education, individual health, human rights, social integration and equal opportunities. The <<Project All for Sport for All- Perspective of Sport for People with Disability>> offered, for the first time, the grounding for a better understanding of this crucial sector by providing concrete data and feasible proposals for supporting all Member state actions in this field.”
Cristina Almeida, Researcher at the Portuguese Institute of Sport (IDP)

“Having been involved in the "All for Sport for All: Perspectives for Sport for People with a Disability in Europe" Project both as national facilitator for Germany and leader of the work package on sport participation, I believe that this EU funded project has tackled a key issue at the European but also national level: The understanding of sport for people with disabilities based on a concept of mutual exchange of expertise and good practice. I believe that the outcomes of the preparatory action project will support the recognition of the sector in Europe, and I hope that through further research and cooperation proper development will be enabled for the future.”
Gregor Hovemann, Full Professor for Sport Management at the University of Leipzig

“The Austrian Paralympic Committee (ÖPC) has followed and supported the work of the All for Sport for All Project from the very beginning as the ÖPC is seeking to place sports for athletes with disabilities at the same level as sports for athletes without disabilities. Therefore access for all athletes needs to be the same all over Europe. In this regards, the ÖPC strongly believes that the work and outcomes delivered by this EU funded project has raised further awareness and will support the development of the sector both at the national and European level. The All for Sport for All outcomes set a first common base to meet the sector’s challenges and to start the construction of a common European strategy.”
Petra Huber, Secretary General of the Austrian Paralympic Committee

“The University Claude Bernard Lyon and its Adapted Physical Activities Department has contributed with great pleasure and enthusiasm to the ASA project. We have discovered how far we are from a reasonably standardized collection of data in the area of sports for the disabled and the work to be undertaken by all stakeholders, including universities involved in that area all over Europe, to collect such data. Without that information it will be impossible to design and evaluate properly national and European policies... We hope that the ASA project will be the start of a “European Observatory of Sport for the disabled”, within and using the experience of EOSE, under the guidance of key European stakeholders in the area (EPC/IPC, EFD, E.U. public authorities in charge, area social partners...)”
Jean Camy, EOSE honorary member and UCBL Emeritus professor/ Dr Michel Fodimbi, head of the UCBL APA Department

“I would kindly like to express my gratitude and honor to work with all organizations involved in the conjoint of the EOSE and the EPC project “All for Sport for All”. Having the unique opportunity to be a “fellow traveler” in this joint effort to assess, progress and highlight the future direction of sport for people with disability in Europe I had the chance to cooperate in mapping the status quo and then to provide the features “to break the barriers” that can lead to all Europeans with disabilities more independent lives.”
Margarita Karadimitropoulou, Hellenic Paralympic Committee
“The development of the sport for people with a disability sector represents a key issue at European level because it embraces many political dimensions such as: education, individual health, human rights, social integration and equal opportunities. The Project “All for Sport for All: Perspectives of Sport for People with a Disability in Europe” offered, for the first time, the grounding for a better understanding of this crucial sector by providing concrete data and feasible proposals for supporting all Member state actions in this field.”
Simone Digennaro, Researcher, CONI School of Sport- OPOS

“The All for Sport for All Project has succeeded in providing an introduction to understanding the perspectives of sport for people with disabilities throughout Europe. More importantly, the project has acted as an important catalyst in the sector, encouraging key stakeholders to interact and exchange on common themes and topics. The foundations for collaborative working should now be developed and sustained, not only to further the base of knowledge and outcomes established by the project but also for the benefit of the sector as a whole.”
Benjamin O'Rourke, Executive Officer at SkillsActive UK

“The All for Sport for All project has been a fruitful experience for me and has brought great support towards the exchange of practices and information at a national and trans-national level. From my view, the development of disability sport at the national level is now determined by: 1) A more coordinated policy among all stakeholders involved in the process (state, local municipalities, mainstream sport organizations, disability sport organisations, training providers, etc.), 2) Better involvement of disabled people, especially young persons, 3) The promotion of disability sport clubs through local communities, and 4) Through the development of a date base regarding the availability of sport facilities for disability sport. This must be accompanied by professionalization of the labour force in disability sport for better recruitment of professional staff (recognition of adapted physical education occupation, qualification requirements for coachers, etc.).”
Vilma Cingiene, Associate Professor at the Lithuanian Academy of Physical Education

“The Project “All for Sport for All” is the result of a common effort of experts from different EU countries and levels of involvement. Its purpose is to facilitate ‘benchlearning’ and change process, by providing a comprehensive documentation and an easy to use tool mapping the sport sector for people with disabilities, through exchange of experience, know how and good practices, as well as recommendation of proposals for the improvement of existing structures and development of new ones. The Project also establishes a discussion platform and a network to promote dialogue and cross border cooperation, involving all stakeholders in the mainstreaming and policy decision making process. The contribution of the Project is in line with the EU key objectives for social inclusion, accessibility, full active participation, as well as independent living and quality of life for people with disabilities.”
Nektaria Kontaxaki, MSc, Executive Officer, Secretariat General of Sport - Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Tourism

“Even if the status and organizational models of disability sport varies between European countries the UN convention will no doubt lead us to the direction of increased inclusion. It is essential to know where we are now to be able to evaluate progress and even learn from others experiences. I hope that ASA work is a start towards regular and systematic data collection as well as spreading best practises at the European level.”
Aija Saari, Finnish Sports Association of Persons with Disabilities

“The involvement I have had in the disability sport sector for a considerable number of years and my role in this EU Preparatory Action Project - both as national correspondent for the UK and as leader of the work package on disability sport policies – has led me to view the wide differences we have explored through the All for Sport for All Project as considerable opportunities. Given the specific and different sport and non-sport circumstances in each country it is important that – for any intervention in policy to work – each country is involved, engaged and empowered as a necessary participant. With this commitment, it will be possible to ensure that any tools, resources or working practices are sensitive to varying needs and consequently more likely to be adopted”
Nigel Thomas, Head of Sport and Exercise, Staffordshire University
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