Figure 1 The ingredients of a realistic evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997: 72).
Women and girls, people with a disability and the elderly have the lowest sports participation rates in the Borough. Little is known of the participation rates in rural communities.

**Figure 2 Logic model for the ‘Sport for All Hub’ and related programmes.**

**INPUTS (Partners)**
- Disability Sports Coaches
- Families (inc. guardians)
- Wingate Centre (Rural Sport)
- Cheshire Academy for Integrated Sports and Arts.
- Rural Communities

**ACTIVITIES (Outputs)**

**Disability Sports:**
- Girls' football
- Athletics
- Three specialist gymnastics session per week.
- Two football coaching sessions per week.
- One per week athletics events (indoor)

**Rural Sports Hub:**
- Exercise/fitness Sessions
- Circuits and aero sessions twice per week.

**INITIAL OUTCOMES**
- Increase participation in sport and exercise.
- Increase the number of coaching and volunteer opportunities.
- To offer a range of sports activities specifically targeting children, young people and adults with a physical, sensory and/or learning disability.

**INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES**
- Participants progressing and staying within the sporting infrastructure, achieving, and succeeding in their chosen sport.
- Provide role models especially in the field of disability sport.
- Encourage wider participation and greater access for the hard to reach groups such as females and disabled groups.

**LONG TERM OUTCOMES**
- Widen access and increase participation.
- Contribute to improved health and wellbeing.
- Create safer, stronger communities.
- Developing education and skill.

**KPIs**
- Increase the number of new participants by 165 after one year and a further 150 by the end of year two.
  - Increase the number of male participants by 115 in year 1 and 189 by year 2.
  - Increase the number of female participants by 50 in year 1 and 126 by year 2.
  - Increase the number of ethnic minorities in sport by 2 in year one and at least 3 by year 2.
  - Increase the number of participant >45 years by 91 in year 1 and 173 by year 2.
  - Increase the number of participants <16 years by 74 in year 1 and 142 by year 2.
- Increase the number of coaches by 7 in year 1 and 14 by year 2 (Male = 4 year 1; 8 by year 2).
- Increase the number of Volunteers by 11 in year 1 and 22 by year 2 (Male = 8 year 1; 18 by year 2).

Figure 2 Logic model for the ‘Sport for All Hub’ and related programmes.
Statement of Problem:

Only 7.1% of local people currently contribute to sport in a voluntary capacity. A further 40% say they would like to in the future. The borough lacks an extensive infrastructure for volunteering in sport. The proportion of young people dropping out of sport between 16 and 19 years is high, particularly among girls.

Figure 2 Logic model for the ‘Coaching and Volunteering Hub’ and related programmes

KPIs
- Establish 10 male and 5 female mentors by the end of year 1 and 20 male and 10 female mentors by the end of year 2.
- Train and develop 26 male and 15 female coaches by the end of year 1 and 58 male and 50 female coaches by the end of year 2.
- Recruit 15 male and 11 female volunteers by the end of year 1, and 37 male and 27 female volunteers by the end of year 2.
Table 1 CMO configurations for the Coach Mentoring Programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mentoring process</td>
<td>• Using more than one mentor per mentee</td>
<td>• Improved coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Varied interpretations of what mentoring is and how it may happen</td>
<td>• Empowering the mentee to have a greater degree of control over mentoring activity and frequency (informal process).</td>
<td>• A more distinct and individual style of coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Differing styles and approaches of mentoring.</td>
<td>• An understanding between the Coach Mentor and the Coach that the mentoring process was mutually beneficial.</td>
<td>• Benefit/ rewarding for the mentor as well as the mentee. Mutual benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants having financial support</td>
<td>• Greater number of better coaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 CMO configurations for the Disability Sports Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant development and progression</strong></td>
<td>• Differentiating participant groups based on ability with (with younger participants)</td>
<td>• Observation of improved physical/ motor abilities of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coping with the impact of the programme on the participants</td>
<td>• One to one coach support with younger age groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability and development related to age</td>
<td>• Mini competitions introduced with increased ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coaches’ inexperience with younger age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role and influence of family</strong></td>
<td>• Allowing parents to be involved with the initial sessions with coach assistance</td>
<td>• Parents enthused by child’s sense of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taking on the family and involving them in the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved parent/ sibling relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age and levels of disability important</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Longer term engagement of children with the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents socialise with and support other parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>