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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Canada may be the only country outside the USA that depends on its educational system for sport programs that develop its top athletes in many sports. Over the past 25 years, however, what was once a pre-eminent example of a successful marriage of education and sport has stalled. Both the Canadian High Performance Sport System and Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) have failed to keep pace with improvements in other nations’ athlete development systems. In particular, there are serious limitations for many athletes in university-based sports. Student athletes seeking a high performance sport development environment are forced to pursue it elsewhere. Many see the American National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) as the alternative.

Canada’s escalating “athlete drain” should be of serious concern to our universities. In 2008/09/10, Canadian National Sport Organizations (NSOs) reported over 2,000 Canadian athletes aged 18 to 23 in the NCAA in sports offered by CIS. This is not simply a “brawn” drain as many of these student athletes are academically gifted. This is a “talent drain,” depriving Canada of thousands of future leaders: scientists, doctors, teachers, social workers, researchers and yes, sporting heroes. Loss of these multi-talented individuals to the NCAA also deprives Canadian universities of a valuable future asset. As alumni, their loyalty and future accomplishments will enhance American, not Canadian, institutions.

As with the successful reversal of the “brain drain” of the 1990s, the challenge now is to reverse the “talent drain” and keep our best and brightest student athletes at home.

Each year, more Canadian student athletes choose the NCAA. Athletes and their families are strongly motivated by the prospect of the NCAA’s “full ride” scholarships. As well, they perceive NCAA programming as being at a higher level and NCAA institutions as more flexible than CIS in dealing with the needs of its student athletes. And finally, there is the incredible “hype” and media-celebrated prestige of “achieving” an NCAA scholarship.

Contrary to these popular perceptions, however, the NCAA focus is almost exclusively on winning, rather than developing high performance athletes. In this environment, the reality is that many Canadian student athletes are lost forever to our national teams and may never reach their full potential as athletes.

Canadian international performance in team sports has declined dramatically in the past 25 years. National teams historically comprised primarily of CIS athletes generated three 4th places, a 5th place and an 8th place at the 1984 Olympic Games. By 2004 and 2008, not one team even qualified for the Olympics. With the exodus of student athletes, national teams dependent on the university athletics system are starved of potential international-level performers.

How do we improve our athlete development system and keep our student athletes at home? At the direction of the Minister of State (Sport), Own the Podium (OTP)
convened a working group of stakeholders to examine these issues in depth. Their deliberations have resulted in the concept of a new, CIS High Performance Program that would address the weaknesses in our sport system and the ongoing “talent drain” to the NCAA. Both the greatest impact on Canada’s high performance team sports and the greatest potential for their rejuvenation are through CIS. Indeed, our universities are the only institutions that can serve the needs of this vital demographic.

There are two fundamental objectives that must be met:

- To retain Canada’s top student athletes in superior athlete development programs within Canadian universities.
- To improve Canada’s flagging international performances in selected sports highly dependent on Canadian universities for their athlete development pathway.

Universities with their “excellence” mandate are already positioned to champion a new vision of “excellence in sport.” CIS states that its mission is “pursuit of the highest possible standards of excellence in sport in an educational context.” If enough of our universities accept that “excellence in sport” means aspiring to the highest level as measured by international performance standards and results, then they accept the CIS mission to be, in fact, the pursuit of “high performance sport.”

“High performance sport” is the pursuit of excellence in sport to the highest possible level of achievement. This is completely compatible with a university’s overarching mission. Indeed, there are many benefits to institutions that commit to high performance sport.

There exists a real opportunity to create a new, CIS High Performance Program in university-based sports. This would see a limited number of universities commit to high performance standards in a limited number of team sports and is intended to raise the standard of selected CIS sports to a higher level. The proposal is based on the need for a systematic increase in training hours with a clear focus on athlete development to prepare student athletes for international level competition. Winning teams would follow as the natural byproduct of the quality athlete experience.

To keep our student athletes at home, Canada must offer both better athlete development programs and a better financial assistance package than the NCAA.

We must create a clear athlete development pathway from a younger age through CIS to our national teams. There are several key structural elements essential to filling this requirement that must be put in place to support a CIS high performance structure.

- Formal sport-specific Athlete Talent Identification Tools must be developed with the objective of making contact with all potential international-level athletes before they leave secondary school. Every identified player should be included in the pool of potential student athlete recruits for the CIS High Performance Program.
- Professional development for coaches is a “must” for those CIS coaches who take up the challenge of developing themselves into successful high performance
coaches. It is the coach who guides the student athlete through the continuum of development and it is the coach’s technical expertise and teaching ability combined with high level leadership skills that defines the quality of the athletic experience.

- Participating institutions should establish **Training & Development Academies** complementary to elementary/secondary school and club teams to attract young athletes to the CIS Program and begin the development process at an earlier age. The Academies will act as feeder systems to the CIS High Performance Program and future high performance coaches can be identified, recruited, and provided with professional development. It is anticipated that Academies will operate close to self-sufficiency with athlete fees and sponsorship revenues covering operating costs.

- The **full commitment of the NSO** is essential to the successful development of a CIS High Performance Program in that sport.

**We must provide sufficient training and competition opportunities.** It is a tenet of athlete development that reaching the pinnacle in any sport requires 10 years and 10,000 hours of “deliberate” practise. In Canada, it takes well beyond 10 years as few athletes meet the 1,000 hours required annually. The developmental club system for the very successful Argentine basketball teams trains and competes over a 10-month season comprising 250 to 300 training sessions and 40 to 50 games. Compare this to the CIS alternative of a six-and-a-half month season, 120 to 160 training sessions and 30 to 40 games. In the process of developing this proposal, it has been determined that, in general, a team sport league of a minimum of 12 and maximum of 20 teams training and competing in two equal conferences over a 10-month season is optimum to provide the necessary intensity and duration as well as the talent concentration for high performance athlete development. These numbers may have to be reviewed in the context of the realities of existing CIS sport programs. However, it is clear that Canada’s university-based athlete development programs require an increased number and quality of training hours to close the gap between Canada and its competitor nations.

**We must close the developmental gap that exists between Canadian athletes and their foreign counterparts of the same age.** Extending the season is one strategy but increasing eligibility from five to seven years and raising the age cap to 25 years of age within the High Performance Program are other means of closing the developmental gap. The belief is that by age 25, a student athlete’s national team potential will be fully realized, unlike the current situation.

**We must offer a high performance environment superior to that of the NCAA.** The criteria for a generic model of a high performance environment in a university setting and an outline of minimum requirements under each are detailed in Section 9.0. Major parameters are:

- coaching requirements, including certification and experience;
- other staffing such as logistics, promotional, etc.;
- training and competitive scheduling including competition formats;
• an Integrated Support Team of sport medicine, paramedical and sport science services that is vital to prepare athletes for international-level competition;
• facilities requirements and access (NCAA facilities are generally superior to those of the CIS but a well-planned program can make the most of what we have.); and,
• athlete selection and recruitment with recommended changes to the CIS Transfer Rules affecting the Program in the initial two years.

CIS Program sports will need to offer a financial assistance package that is more attractive than the NCAA scholarships. The suggested criteria for student athlete financial support are detailed in Section 10.0. It is important to note that student athletes must meet an institution’s entrance standards and must maintain their academic eligibility and demonstrate progress towards a degree throughout their athletic career. Other requirements include being formally “talent identified” by the NSO and CIS Program coaches and affirming a high level of commitment to the Program. CIS student athlete financial assistance award policy should include coverage of:
- tuition and fees;
- books;
- room and board – either a place in residence or the dollar equivalent for off-campus living; and,
- living allowance of $200 per month during the academic/sport year.

Assistance in the areas of flexibility in course load and scheduling (permitting student athletes to spread their full-time credit courses over three semesters), admissions, and the provision of academic support services would also be important factors in attracting student athletes to the CIS Program.

It is clear that the collaboration of all levels of government and the corporate, education and sport sectors will be necessary to support the level of financial assistance for Canadian student athletes that is crucial to success. Sample cost projections show the order of magnitude of the necessary financial commitment. The student athlete financial assistance package represents the greatest cost increase over the status quo, while coaching salaries and sport medicine/sport science are also budget growth areas. Stakeholders will be looking to the Federal Government for leadership in realizing this program. It is proposed that a consortium of sport and senior university officials approach the Federal Government to seek a similar type of support as the Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarships that helped reverse the “brain drain.”

There are still major parameters to be resolved through an extensive consultation process.
• Sport selection will be key. This proposal envisions a startup pilot phase of one or perhaps two CIS sports selected on factors such as dependence on CIS for national team athletes and vulnerability to threat from the NCAA, marketability, and NSO readiness to participate. After a review of both CIS individual and team sports in consultation with the respective NSOs, basketball and volleyball have been identified for purposes of discussion. Given the magnitude of the change, the number of uncertainties and the readiness of specific NSOs, a “phase in”
approach to implementation is clearly needed in terms of both human and financial resources.

- **Budgets** must be fully developed. As yet, we are unable to project revenues, such as gate receipts, sponsorships or institutional contributions, to offset projected costs. The marketing expertise required to attract, at a minimum, a television sponsor, an airline sponsor, and a league title sponsor is crucial to success but is beyond the scope of this paper. Information regarding third-party funding currently available to each participating institution was not available during development of the concept but must be ascertained to identify the scope of financial shortfall in the student athlete assistance awards.

- Without **acceptance of the concept at the institutional level** there will be no program. In conjunction with circulating the discussion paper, OTP is seeking confirmation of interest and support from those universities philosophically in agreement with introducing high performance sport programs at their institutions. Given the degree of interest expressed while researching this concept, an agreement in principle by at least 12 universities is a feasible goal.

- **CIS and its member universities must accept the concept** and understand that the creation of a High Performance Program with its associated Training & Development Academies does not threaten, but will indeed enhance their existing programs. While developing this paper, several issues were raised that must be resolved by the CIS and it is critical that this proposal in its final form respect the concerns of those institutions that will not be part of the High Performance Program. An early endorsement of the concept by the CIS Board of Directors is key to moving the proposal forward.

An institutional commitment by the President and Board of Governors will be crucial to success. Not all universities offer PhDs in all subjects and not all universities will want or be able to participate in all sports in the new Division. The pursuit of high performance excellence will be costly and universities should view such a commitment as an opportunity to engage governments, alumni, community and corporate sectors in support of this initiative. However, OTP, Sport Canada, the respective NSOs and several universities have demonstrated their interest and eagerness to explore this approach.

Reversing the “talent drain” will be neither quick nor cheap, but it can be done if the institutional commitment and political will are there. Canadian universities have proven this through their successful partnership with the federal government to reverse the “brain drain” of the 1990s. The institutional commitment and political will were there; the results speak for themselves.

The consultation process initiated with the circulation of this discussion paper is intended to gather the insights, information and agreements in principle necessary to fully develop the concept into a detailed proposal for approval by the potential partners.
NEXT STEPS

1. OTP/CIS will develop and lead a communications initiative to ensure widespread understanding and feedback from within CIS.

2. OTP/CIS will collaborate to consult with and receive input from all CIS member institutions and gather expressions of interest and support.

3. OTP/CIS will consult with interested CIS member institutions on the overall financial status of their sport programs, including identifying and quantifying third-party contributions.

4. OTP/CIS will consult with the Federal and provincial governments, foundations and other third-party funders of student athletes to share the concept of the CIS High Performance Program discussion paper and to determine the nature and objectives of their funding programs.

5. OTP will consult in-depth with the CIS Board to further refine the discussion paper.

6. OTP/CIS will further consult with specific institutions to finalize requisites for potential participation.

7. OTP will prepare a final High Performance Program proposal for approval by the Boards of OTP, CIS, NSOs and CIS General Assembly.

8. OTP/CIS will develop a work plan for the funding and implementation of the Program.

There is an enormous amount of work to be done concurrently on many fronts and intensive consultation and mutual cooperation will be required of all the partners. All facets of the concept will be under continuous review and development for several months to come. The “talent drain” and its detrimental effect on Canada’s national teams were first brought to the attention of the Minister of State (Sport) and OTP in 2010. It has taken until 2012 to begin full discussion of creating a High Performance Program within CIS. It is incumbent on all stakeholders to approach their participation in this process as a matter of great urgency as the first possible launch date now appears to be 2014.
PART ONE:
DEFINING THE PROBLEM – DETERMINING THE SOLUTION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Canada may be the only country in the world other than the USA that depends on its educational system for sport programming to develop its top athletes in many sports. Between the 1976 Olympic Games in Montreal and the 1984 Olympic Games, which saw Canada’s best Olympic results ever, Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) programs were comparable to or better than those of most other countries.

The 1984 Olympic Games triggered a huge growth in the commercialization of international sport. National sport bodies worldwide evolved to become businesses with athletic performance as their “profit.” There has been an athlete transition from amateurism to professionalism as careers became possible in more and more sports. This has led to a significant development of foreign sport systems, particularly in Europe, as smaller sporting nations strove to compete for the financial return on their investment in high performance sport.

Over the past 25 years, however, what was once a pre-eminent example of a successful marriage of education and sport in Canada has stalled. Both the Canadian High Performance Sport System and CIS have failed to keep pace with the improvements made in other countries. CIS does not today develop athletes of a sufficient standard to contribute significantly to Canada’s performance on the world stage. This is understandable since CIS has never had as its goal the development of international athletes. Therefore, it is not surprising that CIS has not kept pace with the system development of our top competitor nations in terms of quality athlete development.

2.0 CANADA’S ESCALATING “ATHLETE DRAIN” AND ITS EFFECT ON NATIONAL TEAM PERFORMANCES AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

Since the 1970s, the institutions of the American National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) have become voracious recruiters of talent, both male and female, as they make every effort to achieve the athletic success that brings ever-increasing dollars to their programs. Through its proximity to the USA, Canada is a prime recruiting ground and each year, many of Canada’s best university-aged and, more recently, high school athletes leave the country to train and compete in the NCAA or its feeder system. What was an athletic exodus trickle in the 1970s and 1980s has become a torrent today, to the increasing detriment of the quality of CIS competition and also to Canadian national team performances, particularly in those sports most closely associated with CIS.

In 2008-2009, Canadian National Sport Organizations (NSOs) reported over 2,000 Canadian athletes enrolled in NCAA sport programs in sports offered by CIS. These 18-to 23-year-olds should be the core of our Canadian university sport programs and the backbone of future Canadian teams at World Championships and the Olympic Games.
Certainly, there are Canadian student athletes who are not happy with the NCAA experience and return to CIS but actual numbers and, more importantly, overall impact on our national teams have not been quantified. Unfortunately, however, many more of these athletes are lost forever to Canadian national teams. In fact, there is a direct correlation between the number of student athletes leaving Canada and the decline in performance of our national teams. Further, and sadly, many may never reach their full potential as athletes.

Contrary to popular perception, the NCAA is not dedicated to developing international or professional level athletes. Restrictions on coach-athlete contact hours almost preclude it. The focus is almost exclusively on winning – frequently and at all costs and at the expense of athlete development. To this end, they often refuse to release Canadian student athletes in their programs for our national team activities during the school year. Further, many of Canada’s best young national team prospects are encouraged to remain on their American campuses all summer either to lighten their “in season” academic load via summer classes or simply to train under their NCAA coach’s supervision.

A detailed summary of Canadian athletes in CIS sports in the NCAA 2008/2009/2010 is provided in Appendix A.

2.1 Why Should Universities Be Concerned with an “Athlete Drain”? 

While some still traditionally view the function of universities to be strictly academic, their mandate has broadened. Institutions now see themselves as dedicated to providing opportunities for their students to excel in their chosen fields to the benefit of the student, the university and Canadian society as a whole. They are now committed to developing and training students and leaders who strive for excellence in many areas valued by society, including such non-academic fields as music, art and theatre.

Sport, too, is valued by society although its value to an institution often may not be fully realized in an academic environment. It is not a case of “brawn” versus “brain.” Student athletes are more than one-dimensional. They bring the same focus and commitment to their studies as they do to their training and, in fact, many student athletes are also academically gifted.

The “athlete drain” must, therefore, be viewed as an overall “talent drain.” It is depriving our universities and our country not just of current student athletes but of thousands of future leaders: scientists, doctors, teachers, social workers, researchers and yes, sporting heroes. The future loyalty of these multi-talented individuals will be to NCAA institutions and this loyalty is relentlessly cultivated. Their future accomplishments will reflect well on American, not Canadian, universities.

Our universities became seriously concerned in the 1990s when they realized that the “brain drain” was depriving them of the very people who would ensure their future claim to academic excellence. They partnered with the Federal Government to address the problem over the long term and the results are clear. In fact, citing the Washington DC-based journal Chronicle of High Education during a speech at Hamilton’s McMaster
University in August, 2011, the Prime Minister announced that the “brain drain” has officially been reversed.

The challenge now is to address the “talent drain” created by the annual loss of many of our best and brightest student athletes to the USA. How can we keep our student athletes at home?

2.2 Why Do Our Student Athletes Continue to Choose the NCAA?

The issue is not an academic one: our Canadian universities provide some of the highest quality academic opportunities in the world and many student athletes would prefer to obtain a Canadian education. As well, most Canadian university facilities are among the finest in their communities and in some cases, sport medicine and sport science specialists are already in place. Through CIS, the universities have an established competitive structure and the stated goal of being the “destination of choice” for Canada’s student athletes.

The NCAA is noted for its “full ride” scholarships and the prospect of having all or part of their education paid for is strong motivation for student athletes and their families. Beyond this, the perception among the vast majority of young athletes, their families and the media is that NCAA programming is far superior to that in Canada from a variety of perspectives – coaching, intensity, training partners, development opportunity, etc. The NCAA also has the reputation of being more flexible with its student athletes to facilitate their athletic careers.

NCAA coaches are professional recruiters and the Canadian approach seldom matches the enthusiasm or quality of an NCAA “sales pitch.” They make the student athlete feel that he/she is tremendously valuable to their program and therefore that he/she is really “wanted” by the whole university. A CIS High Performance Program approach to recruiting must be equal to or better than that of the NCAA.

Above all, there is incredible “hype” associated with the top NCAA sports and the apparent prestige associated with “achieving” an NCAA scholarship is irresistible to many athletes. This is a very sad commentary and indeed it may be viewed as an indictment of Canada’s athlete development system as it exists in university sport. Until we change this perception of the NCAA and the role of CIS, it will continue to be our reality.

The CIS advises that academic researchers have just begun a study of the reasons Canadian athletes go to the USA, what causes them to stay, and what the Canadian sport system and CIS can learn from this. The results of this study may well provide additional insights at such time as their paper is completed and the results published.
2.3 Impact on Canada’s International Sport Performance

With the exodus of student athletes and the improvement of other nations’ sport development systems, Canadian national teams that depend on our education system are starved of potential international-level performers. A history of Canada’s international performances in CIS sports is included in the Addendum to the Discussion Paper.

**FACT:** Canadian international performances in team sports have declined dramatically over the past 25 years.

There are five national teams that have been historically drawn primarily from CIS athletes: men’s and women’s basketball, men’s and women’s volleyball, and women’s field hockey.

- These teams generated three 4th place finishes, a 5th place and an 8th place at the 1984 Summer Olympic Games.
- In 1996, they managed only a 9th and an 11th place; three teams did not qualify to participate.
- By 2004 and 2008, not a single team even managed to qualify for the Olympic Games and that is not expected to change in 2012.

Many NSOs have recognized their system deficiencies and attempted to enrich their programming. However, those dependent on the school system have found it impossible to compensate for the shortcomings of sport in the educational environment. Canada’s national teams have continued to lose ground internationally to superior club-based systems.
Canadian sport needs the collaboration of the education sector. The alternative of developing a Canadian club system comparable to that of other nations is a much longer-term proposition and the reality of current enrichment efforts is that they are simply not adequate to compensate.

Stemming the “talent drain” is crucial to the future of Canadian sport. This is not solely a post-secondary issue. However, both the greatest impact on Canada’s high performance team sports and the greatest potential for their rejuvenation are through our universities.

2.4 Why Should Universities Be Concerned with Canada’s International Sporting Performances?

Reversing the “talent drain” is one crucial factor to the future of Canadian sport but it is a symptom of the larger problem. Strengthening the Canadian sport system is another crucial factor.

Fact: The Canadian High Performance Athlete Development System in university-based sports has serious limitations.

The Canadian High Performance Sport System in university-based sports has not kept pace with that of other countries. It is lacking in resources and does not have the volume, intensity or quality of our competitors’ systems. Some NSOs have attempted to address these weaknesses but with varying degrees of success. CIS, with its present structure and programming, offers very few opportunities to pursue the duration and intensity of training and competition necessary to produce national team athletes. In fact, the CIS institutional philosophy appears almost identical to that of its NCAA counterparts, i.e. a singular focus on winning national championships.

Student athletes seeking a high performance athlete development environment are forced to pursue it elsewhere and many see the NCAA as this alternative.

There is a need for collaborative leadership to address these systemic problems and our universities are perfectly situated to lend their expertise to facilitate the process of change.

2.5 How Do We Improve Our Athlete Development System and Keep Our Student Athletes at Home?

When the 2010 Winter Olympic Games were awarded to Canada in 2003, governments took a renewed interest in sport. Own the Podium 2010 and Road to Excellence were created for winter and summer sports respectively and a new era of investment in sports with podium potential began. (The two agencies merged as Own the Podium in 2009.)

Following the success of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games in Vancouver and the huge increase in awareness of and appreciation for Olympic sport throughout the country, the
May 2010 discussion paper *The Challenge Facing Canadian Interuniversity Sport* highlighted Canada’s “talent drain,” its effect on CIS, and the opportunity for change.

In response to the discussion paper, Mr. John Furlong, Chair of OTP, asked the summer sport NSOs if the “talent drain” to the NCAA was negatively affecting the performance of Canadian national teams. The answer was a resounding and unanimous, “Yes!”

As a consequence, the Federal Government has tasked OTP to examine in depth the shortcomings of our education-based sport development system and the serious issue of the “talent drain” and its effect on Canadian sport. An OTP working group, which includes representation from select NSOs, CIS and Sport Canada, has debated the issue and developed this proposed concept to address the creation of high performance sport programs within CIS that would both strengthen our High Performance Sport System and address the loss of Canadian student athletes to the NCAA.

### 3.0 A NEW VISION OF “EXCELLENCE IN SPORT”

Academic excellence is recognized through a series of escalating qualifications and achievements. “Excellence” at the BA level is not of the same stature as “excellence” at the post-doctoral fellowship level. It is the highest achievement that contributes most to a university’s prestige and our universities pursue and promote such achievements.

So it is with sport. A CIS championship is not of the same stature as a World Championship or an Olympic medal. A high performance athlete who is focused on achieving at the world level should not be constrained to a lower level of training and competition. The long-term development of an athlete who can compete and win on the world stage in sport is analogous to that of the highest academic achievement.

Universities with their “excellence” mandate are already positioned to champion a change in CIS sport and - perhaps more importantly - to provide leadership throughout the education sector on the merits of enhancing Canada’s athlete development system.

Canada has a small population and limited athlete pool. Therefore, it requires the right environment to develop and nourish athletic talent to a superior level. Unless and until that environment is available in the Canadian university system, our outstanding student athletes will continue to take their athletic and academic talents to the NCAA.

What constitutes that environment? This discussion paper outlines the criteria for creating a high performance athlete development environment in a university setting.

### 3.1 “Excellence” and “High Performance Sport”

“High Performance Sport” is the pursuit of excellence in sport to the highest possible level of achievement.
“High performance sport,” as used throughout the Canadian sport system, describes the training and development of athletes and teams representing Canada at the top levels of international competition. As such, involvement in “high performance sport” is completely compatible with the overarching mission of Canadian universities.

CIS has defined as its mission the “pursuit of the highest standards of excellence in sport in an educational context.” It also wants Canadian universities to be “the destination of choice for Canadian student athletes.” If enough of our universities accept that “excellence in sport” means aspiring to the highest level of achievement – as measured by international performance standards and results – then they accept that a university’s sport mission is, in fact, the pursuit of “high performance sport.”

The challenge is to pursue true excellence in academics and in athletics concurrently.

3.2 Existing Involvement in “High Performance Sport”

Supporting high performance athlete development within individual institutions is not a new concept. Some universities have partnered very successfully with an NSO to support a specific sport. Excellent examples include:

- University of Manitoba with Volleyball Canada;
- University of Victoria’s National Training Centre for middle distance running;
- University of Victoria and The University of Western Ontario Rowing Centres;
- University of British Columbia and University of Calgary National Swimming Centres;
- University of Alberta’s National Track and Field Coaching Education Centre;
- University of Calgary’s National Track and Field Centre; and,
- University of Toronto’s National Swimming Centre and National Track and Field Development Centre.

These programs have produced student athletes who have represented Canada and medaled at the World University Games, world championships, and the Olympics as well as other international multi-sport games.

3.3 A New CIS Commitment to “Excellence” as “High Performance Sport”

There is no question that having all or a substantial portion of their college education paid for is a primary motivation drawing Canadian student athletes to the NCAA, but it is not necessarily the most compelling. Along with the perceived cachet of the NCAA, athletes focused on achieving at the international level often believe that they will find a more supportive sport development environment and better competition experiences in the NCAA than those available in Canada through CIS. Clearly, the challenge is to change this perception and this can best be done by unveiling a superior system of athlete development in Canada.
Canadian universities are uniquely positioned to stop the ongoing “talent drain.” Indeed, it is only through our universities that the needs of this demographic can be served. Redefining “excellence” in Canadian university sport and committing to a sport development environment where such excellence can flourish are fundamental to change.

**Fact:** *To keep our student athletes in Canada, Canada must offer both better athlete development programs and a better financial support package than the NCCA.*

Neither CIS alone, nor any single sport group or government agency can accomplish this in isolation. It requires both will and commitment on the part of universities, governments and the NSOs to develop and sustain such a program. The Federal Government has initiated the process. OTP and Sport Canada have demonstrated their interest, and the NSOs are eager to move forward. Several universities have also expressed their desire for change.

It will not be quick. It will not be cheap. But it can be done, as Canadian universities have already proven through their successful partnership with the Federal Government to reverse the “brain drain” of the 1990s. The political will and the institutional commitment were there; the resulting benefits to the universities speak for themselves.

### 4.0 THE CONCEPT: CREATE A NEW PROGRAM WITHIN CIS

There has never been a university-led initiative to upgrade the sport system. CIS has traditionally been more concerned with “maintaining its internal competitive balance.” Over time, this approach has resulted in a sport environment focused on parity as opposed to one striving for excellence.

There exists a real opportunity to create a new, high performance program within CIS, comprising a limited number of universities with teams committed to supporting high performance athlete development in a limited number of sports. This proposal is not intended to replace existing CIS programming but rather to raise the standard of a limited number of programs to a higher level.

CIS offers sport programming in both individual and team sports and, while their problems are similar, this proposal suggests solutions that fit their different needs.

### 4.1 Institutional Involvement in Individual Sports

The common best practice in individual sports is hybrid partnerships between a university and a high performance club or NSO training centre. Numerous examples of these partnerships are detailed in Section 3.2.

Wrestling Canada is perhaps the best example, having established a competitive network of 17 “training centres” that includes 15 universities. Of these, Simon Fraser University produced Olympic gold medalists Daniel Igali in 2000 and Carol Huynh in 2008. SFU
continues to reap the public relations benefits associated with the medal performances of its student athletes.

As with swimming and athletics, all CIS athletes involved in these wrestling programs retain their eligibility for CIS national championships.

It is proposed that these CIS individual sports continue to pursue the creation and/or strengthening of such NSO/high performance club/institutional partnerships. This can be accomplished within the current CIS structure. While there have been preliminary discussions with each of these sports, it is not clear as yet how each sport would like to proceed. There is a need for significant additional consultation before specific program directions can be established.

Regardless of these partnerships, however, our universities continue to lose athletes to the NCAA and both Swimming Canada and Athletics Canada have identified the “talent drain” within their sports as a significant issue. The adoption of a more high-performance-oriented philosophy and more comprehensive financial support within these programs could bridge the gap.

4.2 Institutional Involvement in Team Sports

There have also been partnerships between individual institutions and some national team programs, primarily in volleyball. In these cases, however, the athletes involved were deemed ineligible for CIS competition as they “upset the competitive balance.” There is a modest partnership between CIS women’s field hockey and the Canadian Field Hockey Association to try to sustain this sport within CIS but it has not addressed “excellence” or “high performance.”

For team sports, the approach must be different. Team sports need a training and competition structure of longer duration and a specific focus on athlete development as a systematic, intense, long term process. It is proposed that a new CIS High Performance Program would initially commit to the fundamental prerequisites of high performance athlete development in selected team sports.

Not all universities can offer a PhD program in all subjects. Similarly, not all universities will want or be able to offer high performance sport opportunities in all sports. To be successful, the creation of this new program within CIS must accommodate those institutions wishing to participate with only one or two teams.

Likewise, not all coaches will wish to make the commitment to becoming high performance coaches, nor will all athletes choose to commit the time and effort required by a high performance program. Some athletes may be concerned only with playing well enough to have their educations paid for and will continue to look to the NCAA. The proposed new program must focus on those coaches and athletes with the passion to succeed that drives all top performers.
4.3 Integrating High Performance Sport into CIS

At present, most members of CIS focus on competition, with success measured by winning conference and national varsity championships. Athletic Departments are often understandably more concerned with team results, rather than quality of individual performance.

It requires a more balanced focus to develop an international athlete. The CIS High Performance Program would have an increased focus on athlete development where success is measured in incremental improvements across all parameters of sport performance. Winning teams will follow as a natural byproduct of the high quality athletic experience.

4.4 Institutional Commitment Is Vital

An institutional commitment is a key prerequisite for participation in a new CIS program. A formal endorsement from the President and Board of Governors committing the institution to pursue the standards necessary to fulfill a high performance mandate is crucial to success.

The pursuit of high performance excellence will be costly and institutions should be prepared to collaborate with partners to develop the necessary financial resources to meet the criteria. This should be viewed as an opportunity to better engage governments, alumni, community and corporate sectors in support of this initiative.

5.0 THE BENEFITS OF HIGH PERFORMANCE SPORT

For the past 45 years, CIS has remained outside of the Canadian High Performance Sport System. Its historical athlete development contribution was coincidental to the fact that its programming was better than that of our competitor countries. This, however, has changed as we have seen by Canada’s declining international performances.

By extending the CIS mandate to embrace high performance athlete development, Canadian universities can provide the platform upon which public and private sectors may collaborate to deliver a continuum of sport development. The benefits of CIS involvement to our national teams are obvious. Equally, there are many benefits to those institutions willing to commit to this strategy.

5.1 Raised Public Profile

In each Olympic cycle, there are a few individual Canadian performances that inspire and uplift the entire country and generate tremendous media coverage. Interestingly, it is more pronounced in team sports, the hallmark of CIS, but Canada’s success has been limited of late except in ice hockey. It is a fact that athletic success generates positive media coverage for a university and the higher the level of achievement, the broader the media coverage becomes. The university’s athletes and teams are its “public face” in the
community. Athletes who excel at world and Olympic level substantially impact their university’s public profile and add luster to its reputation.

Athletic success enhances a university’s appeal to prospective recruits – both faculty and students. A university’s sport teams create common ground across different faculties and encourage cross-faculty interaction and cooperation. Its athletes and teams are key elements in an institution’s community outreach.

5.2 Alumni Enhancement

The alumni associations of the NCAA are driving forces in NCAA program funding. Whether through individual donations, fundraising activities or by attracting sponsorships from those corporations to whom sport is an important marketing tool, alumni are vital to any institution. When sport becomes a significant part of university life, it creates a much greater affinity between graduates and their university, enhancing alumni development and corporate networking.

Local media celebrate when a Canadian student athlete goes south, yet a valuable university asset has been lost. Canadian universities boasting world-class athletes could benefit significantly from their life-long association with the institution.

5.3 Additional Revenue Opportunities

There are corporations and foundations that target their grants and sponsorships specifically toward health and wellness, youth and sport. Athletic success on an international stage is significant to these benefactors. Participation in a CIS High Performance Program could open new doors to funding partnerships not currently available to the institution. Professional marketing direction will be key to capitalizing on new opportunities.

The Federal Government occupies a unique niche in supporting high performance sport and has begun this process through Own the Podium. Given the commitment of the number of institutions necessary to provide the desired high performance environment, it is anticipated that the Federal Government will be open to making a funding commitment to its own initiative.

Education is a provincial responsibility, however. Provincial governments are already involved in many ways with the universities in their jurisdictions. As the new program evolves, the provincial governments should be approached for additional assistance by demonstrating the distinct benefits associated with a high performance institution recruiting within their province.

5.4 Additional Event Opportunities

International-style competition is vital to a high performance sport program. There will be increased opportunities for high profile competition in league play as well as in
national- and international-level tournaments. A higher level of competition, if marketed and promoted properly, will create more excitement amongst both campus and community fans. This will generate greater attendance and increased gate revenues as well as increased media coverage. Local media coverage can be both a driver and a result of high performance competition, further raising the university’s profile in the community. To capitalize on this, universities may have to enhance their promotion and communications capacity.

5.5 True Leadership in Canadian Sport

Including a high performance component will be a new direction for CIS that will position it to fulfill its goal of becoming “the destination of choice” for Canadian student athletes. The very process of creating a program to reverse the “talent drain” and to produce international level competitors within Canadian university environments will be unique in the world and will gain a high level of public support.

Participating institutions will have the opportunity to truly lead – and be seen to be leading - in raising the standards of Canada’s international sport performance through the creation of a superior athlete development pathway while avoiding the exaggerated emphasis on winning that has resulted in much-publicized abuses within the NCAA.

Canadian universities have the opportunity to create programs which will see young Canadian student athletes receive the best in academic and athletic training in a Canadian environment with Canadian values.

6.0 OPPORTUNITY IS HERE

A new CIS High Performance Program will systemize and build on the success of existing individual initiatives and provide an assured platform upon which Canada’s national teams in CIS sports can plan.

It is time for like-minded universities with high performance philosophies to come together and create an athlete development program in selected sports that will:

- offer a better athletic/academic experience than the NCAA;
- provide a better financial package than that of the NCAA;
- keep Canadian student athletes at home;
- capture the interest and support of the Canadian sports media, local communities and corporate Canada;
- rejuvenate and strengthen Canada’s high performance athlete development system; and,
- restore Canada’s international standing in team sports.
It is time to take the first steps to reverse the athlete talent drain. It is time to commit to bringing our best Canadian student athletes back to Canada to the benefit of our universities, our national teams and our country.

PART TWO:
DEVELOPING THE CONCEPT — DESIGNING THE MODEL

7.0 HIGH PERFORMANCE PROGRAM GOALS

It is clear that, to keep our student athletes home, CIS must create a better athlete development environment and provide a better financial support package than the NCAA. The development of a unique, made-in-Canada synthesis of academia and sport may well become the model for the entire Canadian education system. Other countries may well come to look to Canadian universities as the model for high performance athlete development in an educational setting.

Designing a uniquely Canadian system will enable us to adopt and adapt “best practices” of other nations while avoiding the historical abuses of the NCAA. It will be the opportunity to advance academic and athletic excellence together at the same level.

A new CIS High Performance Program with the primary focus on athlete development cannot be launched in isolation. There are a number of key program elements (such as the Athlete Talent Identification Tool and Training & Development Academies detailed in Section 8.1) that are necessary to support the proposed high performance structure and these must also be developed either in advance or during the initial phase-in years.

7.1 Long-Term Objectives

There are two major long-term objectives for the introduction of a high performance program to the CIS:

- To retain Canada’s top student athletes in superior athlete development programs within Canadian universities.
- To improve Canada’s flagging international performances in selected sports highly dependent on Canadian universities for their athlete development pathway.

Success will depend on a full partnership between the CIS, OTP, the Federal and provincial governments, the high performance university teams, and the NSOs and their PSOs in the selected sports.

To become the “destination of choice” for Canada’s student athletes, CIS must reposition itself so that:

- high performance student athletes, their families and the media will see that their training, development and financial support will be superior through the new High Performance Program at a Canadian university to that of the NCAA;
• student athletes will come to view Canadian university sport as the best pathway to represent Canada internationally;
• Canadian university sport will act as a feeder to national teams;
• Training & Development Academies associated with universities in the Program will provide young student athletes with a pathway through CIS to the national teams; and,
• within 10 years, CIS student athletes or its graduates will comprise 70% of Canada’s national teams in CIS sports.

In order for the NSOs to achieve their goal of returning to the pinnacle of international sporting performance, they must collaborate closely with the universities to:
• design and implement a superior Canadian athlete development pathway within an educational setting that will:
  ➢ identify and work with young athletes through the Training & Development Academies;
  ➢ increase the size of their high performance athlete pool; and,
  ➢ increase both size of and expertise in their high performance coaching pool.
• utilize the Athlete Talent Identification Tool to establish a student athlete pool of those with the highest potential to participate on Canada’s senior national teams; and,
• develop athlete-specific metrics to assess the success of the new CIS initiative.

8.0 BUILDING THE PROGRAM

8.1 Key Structural Elements

8.1.1 Athlete Talent Identification Tool

It will be important for the NSOs, universities and other partners to identify highly-skilled student athletes as well as those whose outstanding physical attributes give them the potential to play at the next level. A comprehensive Athlete Talent Identification system is needed that will be administered by the NSOs together with their Provincial Sport Organizations (PSOs), secondary schools and universities to create a recruitment pool of student athletes.

Formal sport-specific Athlete Talent Identification Tools will be phased in over time with the objective of making contact with all potential international-level athletes before they leave secondary school. Every identified player should be included in the pool of potential student athlete recruits for the CIS High Performance Program.

OTP is currently developing a “Talent Identification” initiative that can provide the model structure for such a system. Using this model, NSOs will have to collaborate with CIS Program coaches to identify the sport-specific criteria to be applied. A comprehensive talent identification system is a vital structural element in the High
Performance Program and cannot be initiated by an NSO alone. Implementation will require the assistance and cooperation of the PSOs and CIS Program coaches.

8.1.2 Professional Development for Coaches

It is a fact that Canada does not have a full complement of coaches in our team sports who currently possess the required expertise, experience and focus on athlete development to drive the new High Performance Program in the selected sports. Of all the hurdles to overcome in implementing the Program, coaching leadership may be the largest challenge. The shift in mindset from focusing on athletes winning CIS championships to attaining international standards and results requires a giant leap.

It is the coach’s technical expertise and teaching ability combined with high level leadership skills that defines the quality of the athletic experience. A passion for lifelong learning is a prerequisite and a professional development plan is a “must” for these coaches. It must be combined with a high level of enthusiasm and energy by those who take up the challenge of developing themselves into successful high performance coaches.

Comprehensive coaching professional development is a fundamental structural element and must begin as soon as a commitment is made to a program launch.

8.1.3 Training & Development Academies

Some European and South American countries have stemmed their “talent drain” to the NCAA by creating Training & Development Academies sponsored by their professional club teams. Young athletes are signed as early as 15 years of age and enrolled in these academies while continuing their secondary education. These academies have developed athletes whose abilities surpass those of similar-aged athletes in the NCAA.

To attract young athletes to the CIS Program and begin the development process at an earlier age, it is proposed that each institution participating in a specific high performance sport establish a Training & Development Academy in that sport for the elementary and secondary school athletes in their region. Academies are not intended to replace the student athletes’ school or club teams, but to operate in a complementary fashion during the existing season and become fully operational during the “off season.”

The Academies will act as feeder systems to the CIS High Performance Program. They will facilitate recruitment through a combination of a clear athlete development pathway through CIS and established athlete-coach relationships that should also prove effective deterrents to NCAA recruiters.

Just as important to the long-term success of the Program, the Academies would also include coaching development and succession planning to ensure a steady stream of talented coaches. Enthusiastic young coaches aspiring to become high performance
coaches can be identified, recruited, and provided with well-planned professional development through the Academies. Academy coaches could also mentor the coaches of Academy athletes who continue playing with their school/club teams.

A few Canadian universities currently operate a form of Training & Development Academies within their sport programs. These would need to be upgraded to a uniform standard that will be developed for the CIS Program.

Setting a launch date for the Academies will be included in the negotiation phase of the startup process. A business model will be established and it is anticipated that the Academies will operate close to self-sufficiency with athlete fees and sponsorship revenues covering operating costs.

8.1.4 NSO Commitment

It is essential that NSOs and PSOs are collaborative and contributing partners to the High Performance Program initiative. While identifying and ranking potential sports for the High Performance Program, the NSOs of each of these sports were consulted. As with the universities, it was very encouraging to find most NSOs eagerly embracing the concept. All saw the benefits of this approach.

Regardless of the ongoing financial challenges facing NSOs, there are many ways in which an NSO can provide support to the CIS Program, including but not limited to:

- collaborating in the development and administration of the Athlete Talent Identification Tool that is a key building block in the high performance concept;
- development of sport specific technical requirements for the student athletes’ training programs. This would range from requirements for hours and type of training, to developing the metrics to measure progress;
- involvement in professional development programs for the coaches of the High Performance Program and the Training & Development Academies (The NSOs must make every effort to assist the coaches to upgrade their skills to top international level. This will include providing individual and group opportunities to the coaches, such as national and regional seminars and assistant coach assignments at international competitions);
- availability of NSO national team coaches to work with CIS coaches;
- availability of NSO’s national sport medicine/sport science team leader to collaborate with CIS coaches in developing annual training plans for national team athletes in the CIS Program as well as providing expertise in developing progression targets for all high performance athletes in the division;
- involvement in the overall High Performance Program evaluation;
- involvement in revenue generation and/or search for creative financial solutions to support the CIS Program; and,
• taking a strong advocacy position promoting the benefits of the CIS Program and encouraging Canadian athletes to participate.

8.2 Structure and Membership Options

The structure of a new CIS High Performance Program would be tailored to current CIS and NSO realities. In team sports, the number of teams in a league will be determined in consultation with the respective NSOs by the degree of CIS participation and the size of the eligible athletes’ pool.

In large participation sports such as basketball, volleyball, soccer, hockey and rugby, a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 20 university teams committed to high performance athlete development would seem possible. In general, a league of 12 participating teams has been identified as the preliminary target considering available talent, the need to avoid too much dilution of talent and the requirement to provide the necessary intensity of competition. Twenty participating teams are recommended as the maximum.

It is necessary, however, to be respectful of sustaining the sport programs of those universities who remain outside the new Program. A sport-by-sport examination of minimum/maximum numbers will be required in consultation with CIS to establish final parameters. Women’s field hockey may have to be considered as a separate case as its current participation in CIS has dwindled to 14 institutions in the 2011/2012 season.

This new program would ideally be divided into two conferences of equal membership, comprising institutions providing similar levels of support to their athletes and teams.

There are several possible options in structuring the new High Performance Program.

8.2.1 Option One

The Program could comprise a single group of like-minded institutions that would participate in every selected sport. Given the significant resources that would be required to support operation at the high performance level, it seems unlikely that this option will be feasible.

8.2.2 Option Two

The Program could comprise a few institutions participating in every selected sport, with the balance of participation in each sport drawn on an individual basis from other institutions. It is possible that the Program could evolve in this direction in future.

8.2.3 Option Three

Participation in the Program could be open to all institutions prepared to commit the necessary resources in one or more selected sports, limited only by the minimum and
maximum numbers noted previously. This seems the most feasible model to facilitate an early launch of the initial phase.

An institution’s level of participation will be dependent upon its ability to meet the criteria which will be established to set baseline high performance levels of operation and the financing to implement them. To assist in decision making, estimated costs of the Program in team sports are detailed in Section 13.0.

Discussions with the NSOs of individual sports such as athletics, swimming and wrestling have not yet identified the program elements to be added to make the Canadian program superior to that of the NCAA.

8.3 High Performance Program Options

Canadian NSOs understand that the development of an international athlete is a long term, systematic, intense process. Reaching the pinnacle in any sport requires 10 years and 10,000 hours of “deliberate” practise. They also understand that our current athlete development system has serious shortcomings at virtually every level. In Canada, it takes well beyond 10 years as few athletes meet the 1,000 hours required annually. It simply takes longer - in most cases, beyond the end of a student athlete’s CIS career – for our most talented student athletes to reach their full potential and this is reflected in the average age of many of our Senior National Teams. Proper preparation begun at a younger age and maintained throughout their university years would produce athletes ready earlier for international competition and with the prospects of longer contributions to national team success.

At a “Basketball Summit” held in May 2010, an Argentine participant familiar with Canada was asked why Argentina was so much more successful than Canada on the international stage. He replied simply that players in all age groups in the club-based Argentine system trained and competed over a 10-month season comprising 250 to 300 training sessions and 40 to 50 games.

Compare this to the CIS alternative of a six-and-a-half month season, 120 to 160 training sessions and 30 to 40 games. It is easy to understand the observation by one National Coach that CIS and NCAA graduates coming to the national team program were three to five years behind their counterparts in other countries in terms of individual development. The situation is compounded by similar deficiencies at the elementary and secondary school levels which the Training & Development Academies are intended to address.

Clearly, the minimum prerequisite to upgrade Canada’s high performance athlete development system is to offer more training hours through an extended season. Ten months is recommended generally as optimum but this would likely vary by sport. During the development of this proposal, Canada Basketball and Volleyball Canada expressed their preference for this to be a single CIS season commencing in June and finishing with the traditional CIS season in March. This option is explored in detail in Section 9.3: “Training and Competition Scheduling.”
While an extended season is the recommended approach, there is an alternative. If the new High Performance Program retains the traditional CIS season of September to March, each institution could then offer a high performance club program from April to July operating under the same requirements as the CIS program. This option, while not optimum, would have the potential to allow promising international-level CIS graduates as well as exceptional high school athletes to participate in a “super summer” league. Variations of this option could also be explored relative to an incremental increase in the CIS season in the first phase of the Program.

8.4 Certification and Evaluation Options

The full development of a new CIS High Performance Program will be an evolutionary process. To have a sport program certified as high performance, institutions will have to demonstrate that they can meet the critical requirements for that sport. An annual review process would need to be developed to ensure that participating institutions continue to meet these criteria.

It is proposed that the success of the High Performance Program be measured by both athlete progression and team success to avoid the overemphasis on winning that is characteristic of both the NCAA and CIS. Therefore, it is proposed that all teams in the High Performance Program gain automatic entry to year-end play-offs. Much like national teams that focus on World Championships and Olympic Games, the focus will be on “performance on demand” at the end of the season.

Program assessment elements may include the completion of a program profile as well as the assessment of the progress of each high performance athlete. There may also be an element of financial accountability to external funding parties.

An appropriate certification and review process will ensure clear and comprehensive reporting of the performance return on an institution’s athlete development investment. It will provide needed accountability to CIS and its partners in the Program.

9.0 CRITERIA FOR A HIGH PERFORMANCE ENVIRONMENT IN A UNIVERSITY SETTING

With the leadership of Sport Canada and the assistance of Canadian Sport for Life, every Canadian NSO has created its Long Term Athlete Development (LTAD) plan. These plans set the standards for the sport from entry level to Olympics and ultimately to the continuance of activity for life. LTAD models now provide a blueprint for all aspects of national sport development in Canada. The LTAD model development was an inclusive process with many CIS coaches having input into the content for their sport. This process serves as an excellent guide for developing the minimum requirements for the High Performance Program.

The NSO should be an active participant in defining sport specific CIS high performance requirements according to its own LTAD. NSOs are now in the process of developing
their technical and tactical sport-specific packages that will guide the implementation of a key structural element: professional development for coaches.

The following generic framework, however, is applicable to all sports.

9.1 Coaching Requirements

It is the coaches who must provide the requisite leadership and guidance for young student athletes entering the proposed continuum of development. A successful program will require a minimum of one full-time Head Coach and one full-time Assistant Coach (depending upon the model, more coaches may be required). Partnership opportunities may exist to assist funding.

The Head Coach must have the necessary skills and competencies to be certified by his or her NSO at the sport’s highest technical level. He or she must have full knowledge and understanding of the sport’s LTAD and a demonstrated adherence to the planned focus on athlete development. He or she must be committed to involvement in the national team program, and the NSO must, in turn, commit to the coach’s further technical and professional development.

The Assistant Coaches may be somewhat less qualified but should also be mentored and provided with professional development opportunities as part of succession planning. Assistant Coaches can also serve other functions such as videographer/performance analyst, recruiter, etc.

The success of a high performance program depends in many ways upon the Head Coach. Ideally, the Head Coach would have:

- outstanding sport specific technical knowledge and leadership skills, combined with outstanding teaching ability;
- a strong commitment to all phases of athlete development including the element of competitive toughness;
- national and international knowledge and coaching experience;
- a history of developing high performance athletes to international level;
- experience in coordinating a team of sport medicine and sport science specialists and therapists;
- commitment to work with NSO talent identification initiative;
- strong sales and recruiting ability;
- commitment to mentoring his or her coaching staff; and,
- commitment to developing the requisite skills to lead a high performance program.

The Head Coach position must be fully committed to the Program. Creating a development plan for every athlete and implementing that plan - a fundamental requisite
of any high performance program - necessitates a tremendous level of commitment and focused and meticulous work by the Head Coach and his/her staff over an extended season. Increasingly, fundraising demands have been downloaded from Athletic Departments to coaches in the belief that they will be motivated to raise more funds to grow their programs. While he/she would undertake duties such as representing the university in promotional activities, the responsibility of sport revenue generation for the high performance programs should not be a Head Coach responsibility.

9.2 Other Staff Requirements

To achieve optimal performance, a high performance team requires a variety of other support functions. While this will be negotiated with each NSO, these functions generally include but are not limited to:

- Logistics – to organize logistical requirements from travel, accommodation and meals to facility bookings, scheduling, etc.
- Team practise and match support – to include provision of athlete support services such as practise/game equipment, uniforms, team kit, laundry, etc.
- Advanced audio/visual technical services.
- Home game staging – organization of minor officials, facility setup, game operation, collaboration with TV broadcast team, etc.
- Promotion and Communications – liaison with all media, preparation of media releases, overall program and game promotion, ticket sales, etc.

9.3 Training and Competitive Scheduling

National team athletes need to be made available for national team activities. Therefore, domestic and international training and competition schedules will have to be developed collaboratively by the High Performance Program coaches and the NSO. However, there are several key factors that must also be taken into consideration. For simplicity, this proposal addresses only the optimum option of a 10-month season.

9.3.1 Extended Training Season

At this level, athletes should be training formally for a minimum of 10 months of the year and working out individually with a prescribed program for the balance of the year. As applied to sports such as basketball and volleyball, for example, the training season would begin on June 1. The competition season would end as is traditional at mid-March, to allow the student athletes time to prepare for and write exams in April. Their “down time” would start at the end of exams.

The extended training season will allow student athletes to spread their academic course loads over three semesters to balance their increased commitment to the CIS Program. The requirements for training to competition ratios, number of matches, etc. will be determined in collaboration with the sport specific NSO with the caveat that
“too many games, too little training” is as detrimental to athlete development as “too much training, too few games.”

9.3.2 Competition Format

It is important to replicate the international competition format to adequately prepare athletes to compete at this level. Most World Championships or Olympic Games require teams to play six or seven games in seven or eight days. While the regular season can continue with single “home” and “away” matches, the conference and national championships in the High Performance Program should mimic the format of the top international tournaments. These types of competitions emphasize the need for team depth or quality of player pool, a key focus of the High Performance Program concept.

9.3.3 Exhibition Games

Collaboration will be needed within the specific sports of a High Performance Program with respect to planning and organizing exhibition tournaments with Canadian and foreign teams. Aside from the benefits to the teams, these have the potential to become revenue generators to support the Program.

9.3.4 Scheduling

It is important to recognize the need to schedule regular competitions at the participating universities. It is the excitement of the “home game” against tough opponents that draws the fans – and their revenues – and generates positive media coverage. Every opportunity must be considered when scheduling to ensure this benefit to the participating universities.

It will also be important to schedule collaboratively with the NSO National Team Program to avoid conflicts. Such activities need to be known well in advance so the necessary accommodations may be made. One example was the Pan American Games that took place in October 2011. The Canadian team was largely drawn from CIS athletes and coached by CIS coaches. The CIS adjusted its rules and schedules to accommodate those selected for the national teams.

9.4 Sport Medicine and Sport Science Support

International team sport has evolved dramatically in the areas of sport medicine and sport science over the last 35 years and, while many CIS teams have kept pace, participation in the High Performance Program will require a very specific emphasis on medical, paramedical and sport science services to support athlete and team development. The services of an Integrated Support Team (IST) are vital to athletes to prepare them for the rigours of high-level competition. The availability and extent of sport medicine/sport science support is an important motivator to student athletes when choosing between the NCAA and CIS.
The minimum requirements in this area will be developed with each sport specific NSO and must clearly define the expectations of and costs to the universities considering participation in the CIS Program.

It is, however, possible to provide a generic list of potential core services to be included:

- **Medical** – a team of sport medicine specialists should be recruited to provide preventive and rehabilitative advice and necessary referrals to other medical specialists.

- **Paramedical** – each team should have access to an array of paramedical services including but not limited to:
  - Physiotherapy
  - Athletic therapy
  - Massage therapy
  - Chiropractic

- **Sport Science** – there is a wide array of potential services in this area including but not limited to:
  - Physiology
  - Sport psychology
  - Biomechanics
  - Nutrition
  - Strength and conditioning
  - Performance analysis

The long-term goal is a team of dedicated specialists working in close concert with the coaching staff to provide the support necessary for “optimal growing conditions” for the student athlete.

The Head Coach must work together with the IST to develop an individual yearly training plan for each student athlete that is a continuum of development, properly periodized over 12 months, containing benchmarks for measuring improvements. As an active partner in the program, it is envisioned that the NSO national team IST will provide some oversight to and consultation with CIS Program ISTs.

### 9.4.1 Canadian Sport Centres

There are eight Canadian Sport Centres (CSCs) across the country committed to assisting in the development of high performance athletes. Their mandate includes the provision of sport medicine and sport science support to Canada’s top athletes. These are generally located in major urban centres and in some instances, on university campuses, although there is little to no interaction between the CSCs and the university athletic programs. Where the CSC is not actually located on campus, it is readily accessible to CIS athletes.

Given a commitment to a high performance program, OTP will work with the CSCs and sport specific NSOs to ensure that their own and other potential service providers
are identified and available to the new CIS Program teams. In cities with no CSC, IST services must be provided on campus or close to it. Many universities have such practitioners already available on their campuses.

9.5 Facilities Access

In American institutions, athletics and recreation are separated and the NCAA athletes and teams have facilities dedicated solely to their training needs. In Canadian universities, athletics and recreation are generally combined, and both indoor and outdoor training space must serve multiple users, from intramural programs to community events.

To succeed, a high performance program requires:

- High quality training space available 12 months of the year:
  - Dedicated access to training space for up to 2 ½ hours daily, six days a week.
  - Additional access to training space for individual workouts according to athlete availability.
  - Mitigation of distractions within shared facilities. Universities must commit to the development of training environments that free them from the noise and disruptions created by other activities.
- Ideally, a dedicated weight room. Or:
  - Dedicated team time blocks in the weight room.
  - Guaranteed access to the weight room for athletes according to their individual schedules.
- Dedicated team rooms.
- Access to classroom space and state-of-the-art technology for such activities as video sessions.
- Access to sport science laboratories.
- An athletic therapy clinic.
- Access to recovery/regeneration support facilities.

Regardless of a university’s desire to join the High Performance Program, participation may be problematic if its facilities are not adequate. An institution must commit to meeting these facility requirements for each team prior to launching a high performance program in its chosen sport(s). In general, NCAA facilities are superior to CIS facilities and, as such, are a focal point in recruitment. It is incumbent on the CIS Program to make the most of what it has.

9.6 Athlete Transfers

At present, the CIS Transfer Rule requires student athletes transferring to a new university to sit out for a year. In the first two years of the new CIS Program, an amnesty on the return of players from the NCAA and the transfer of CIS players from non-High
Performance Program institutions should be declared to encourage participation by ‘blue chip’ prospects in the Program.

Likewise, those student athletes who may be displaced when a team moves into the High Performance Program should be allowed to transfer to another CIS program without penalty. As well, any athletes who may be unwilling or unable to meet the demands of the High Performance Program and hence desire to transfer to a non-high performance team should be able to do so at any time without penalty. It should be recognized that the initial years of the Program will see only a limited influx of high performance student athletes as a team transitions into the new league and transfers in the first two years should be at a student athlete’s discretion.

10.0 CRITERIA FOR STUDENT ATHLETE SUPPORT

10.1 Eligibility

10.1.1 Talent Identification

Before being eligible for participation in a CIS high performance program, the student athlete must have been formally “talent identified” by the NSO in concert with the high performance universities and other partners.

10.1.2 Program Eligibility

The majority of Senior National Team student athletes competing at international level are identified between the ages of 18 and 25. Even though CIS has a five-year eligibility period (one more than NCAA), the majority of athletes have graduated by age 23. Many have not yet reached their physical peak and are below the threshold age for Senior National Team selection. This is due, in part, to inadequate preparation at younger ages and within NCAA and CIS programs. It is a significant jump from CIS/NCAA to foreign professional leagues and even more so to the Senior National Team. There are no other adequate post-CIS training or playing opportunities available in Canada for such recent graduates.

Accordingly, it is proposed that student athletes meeting the universities’ academic requirements be eligible for support for a maximum of seven years or until age 25, whichever comes first, provided they continue to make academic progress towards a Bachelor or post-graduate degree. Student athletes in the High Performance Program must be allowed to spread the credits required to maintain full-time status at the institution over three semesters.

10.2 Athlete Commitment

The eligible student athlete will be expected to demonstrate a high level of commitment to both academic and athletic requirements. As a member of a high performance program, the student athlete must:
• meet and maintain academic eligibility according to the standards set by the university;
• demonstrate continued progress toward an academic degree;
• meet the NSO talent identification criteria;
• commit to and uphold the policies of the NSO and the CIS Athlete Code of Conduct;
• commit to a 12-month training program;
• meet all training standards: physical, mental, technical, athletic and academic; and,
• be available for and participate in national team activities.

10.3 Financial Assistance

Canadian athletes often perceive NCAA scholarships as a four-year “worry free” commitment. It is not necessarily understood that, in reality, these scholarships are offered for one year only and must be renewed each year thereafter. The challenge will be to change perceptions by educating athletes, parents and also the media on the merits of the new CIS High Performance Program and how it is superior to the NCAA.

CIS Program sports will need a financial assistance package that is more attractive than the NCAA athletic scholarships. It must be understood that the proposed awards are not “scholarships” in the usual sense that implies an academic achievement, other than meeting a university’s entrance/eligibility standards. They are athletic awards that enable student athletes to meet the new Program’s training and competition requirements. These financial assistance awards would be available only to the student athletes participating in specific CIS High Performance Program sports.

CIS should work with its institutions to identify those requirements that may be fully covered by participants in the Program. Financial packages will vary somewhat from university to university, depending on their cost structures, but will have the commonality that creates a level playing field among institutions.

CIS student athlete assistance award policy should include coverage of:
• tuition and fees;
• books;
• room and board – either a place in residence or the dollar equivalent for off-campus living; and,
• living allowance of $200 per month during the academic/athletic season.

A student athlete assistance award that may be in the $20,000 per annum range is a significant increase over the status quo. Once the concept of a High Performance Program is accepted, efforts will be made to secure external financial support, public and/or private, to assist universities to meet this target.
CIS should also offer these assistance awards for a multi-year period, to be reconfirmed annually based on the student athlete demonstrating both athletic and academic progress.

10.4 Flexibility in Course Load and Scheduling

CIS High Performance Program sports must work with their respective NSO’s – with mutual respect for each other’s scheduling priorities - to create an integrated competition calendar.

It is a given that student athletes must maintain academic standards. However, the institution must commit to a level of flexibility that will enable the student athlete to successfully participate in the CIS High Performance Program.

Universities participating in the CIS Program should consider policies such as:
- broad-based admissions that include consideration of exceptional student athletes who can benefit from and contribute to academic life in the university (this is current practice at many Canadian universities);
- priority advance registration to assist athletes in making their academic timetable dovetail with their sport timetable;
- early planning to allow student athletes to spread their course load over three semesters;
- special eligibility consideration to allow reduced course loads for potential Olympians in the year leading up to an Olympic Games; and,
- commitment to release student athletes for national team competition and training camp obligations.

10.5 Academic Support

In the same way that the Head Coach develops an individualized training plan for the student athlete, an Academic Advisor should be assigned to each student athlete to assist in designing an individualized academic plan. This will ensure that academic integrity is a focus while providing a clear progression to the degree(s) necessary to a future career outside sport.

Athlete support services provided by CIS institutions should include:
- provision of tutoring to assist participating athletes;
- consideration of alternative administration of exams if academic and sport schedules conflict; and,
- consideration of alternative assignments if a professor is uncomfortable with early or late mid-term exam writing.
11.0 SPORT ASSESSMENT

Football is a prominent CIS sport. This proposal does not address football as it is not on the Olympic program and therefore not within the mandate of OTP. Certainly it could be included within a High Performance Program if that is a priority of CIS and participating institutions. However, for the purposes of this proposal, football will not be part of the discussion.

CIS men’s ice hockey - while played at a high level - is not currently linked to Hockey Canada’s high performance athlete development system. Since the National Hockey League (NHL) will almost certainly continue to be the source of players for the Canadian Olympic Team, and since CIS is not a significant developer of athletes for the NHL, men’s ice hockey cannot be considered a priority for the proposed Program. As with football, CIS has the option to include men’s ice hockey according to the minimum expectations of the High Performance Program should there be an interest to do so. Hockey Canada, however, is very interested in how this concept may be applied to its women’s high performance program and has stated that, at the appropriate time, it would welcome the opportunity to review this in more detail.

Statistics for men’s soccer also suggest that neither CIS nor NCAA soccer are significant contributors to Canada’s Olympic or World Cup teams and therefore, men’s soccer is not a strong consideration at this time for inclusion in the High Performance Program. Soccer Canada is, however, very aware of the “talent drain” to the NCAA in women’s soccer, but at time of writing, was not sure which model should be used to keep their best in Canada.

There are teams that have CIS participation but have come to depend almost exclusively on the NCAA as the training ground for their national team athletes. These include men’s and women’s basketball, women’s field hockey, women’s soccer and women’s ice hockey. Women’s volleyball loses many players to the NCAA and has difficulty getting them back for national team activity. Men’s volleyball, however, does not have to compete with the NCAA for athletes but needs a stronger domestic program to improve their international success.

An opportunity exists in women’s rugby to create a new high performance pathway for the Sevens game that has been added to the 2016 Olympic program. Currently, CIS rugby participates in the Fifteens game.

11.1 Evaluation of Existing CIS Sports

The NSOs of both CIS team and individual sports were consulted during the preparation of this discussion paper. An assessment of each sport including its needs, its ability to contribute to the proposed Program, its readiness to participate, and the potential benefits it may derive from such a partnership is provided in the Addendum to the Discussion Paper.
11.1.1 Assessment of Team Sports

Working with CIS, NSOs and Sport Canada, specific CIS team sports were identified in which the “talent drain” is greatest and/or in which Canada has the best chance of future international success.

These sports were then ranked according to their potential to benefit from CIS involvement. The sports were further categorized according to their dependence on the university sport system for national team athletes and the level of threat to the national teams created by the ongoing “talent drain.” (Table A)

Priorities were then developed for inclusion in a new CIS High Performance Program.

Table A: Assessment of Existing CIS Team Sports
(scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least and 5 is greatest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>No. of CIS Teams</th>
<th>Depend On Education Sector</th>
<th>NCAA Threat</th>
<th>Internat’l Podium Potential</th>
<th>Potential to Benefit</th>
<th>HP Division Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball - Men</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball - Women</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball - Men</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball - Women</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey - Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer - Women</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey - Women</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby 15s - Women</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer - Men</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey - Men</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football - Men</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.1.2 Implementation Priority for Team Sports

Given the magnitude of the change, the number of uncertainties and the readiness of individual NSOs, an incremental approach to implementation is clearly needed in terms of both human and financial resources.

Based on the assessment in Table A, the potential teams have been further prioritized into three groups, with the recommendation that Group 1 – those with the potential
for a CIS High Performance Program to most rapidly evolve – be addressed first. (Table B)

In recommending the following priorities, heavier emphasis was placed on those NSOs who are most ready to participate in and can make the greatest contribution to the startup phase. As well, the potential for revenue generation was given serious consideration as a requisite for the startup phase.

### Table B: Priority for Implementation – Team Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 Team Sports</th>
<th>NSO Readiness</th>
<th>Revenue Potential</th>
<th>Phase One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball - Men</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pilot Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball - Women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pilot Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball - Men</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pilot Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball - Women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pilot Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 Team Sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey - Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer - Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2nd Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey - Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 Team Sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby 15s – Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3rd Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11.1.3 Assessment of Individual Sports

Similarly, individual sports were assessed against the same criteria to determine their potential for inclusion in the new CIS High Performance Program at some future time. (Table C.)

### Table C: Assessment of Existing CIS Individual Sports

*(scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is least and 5 is greatest)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>No. of CIS Teams</th>
<th>Depend On Education Sector</th>
<th>NCAA Threat</th>
<th>Internat’l Podium Potential</th>
<th>Potential to Benefit</th>
<th>HP Division Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics - Cross Country - Indoor Track</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3 2 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 2 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4 5 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.1.4 Implementation Priority for Individual Sports

These are sports with existing partnerships with NSOs/high performance clubs/institutions that can continue to be developed and strengthened. Individual sports were ranked primarily on their state of readiness to become CIS high performance sports. (Table D) When interviewed in the course of preparing this paper, none of the individual sport NSOs had ready for implementation any clear program ideas on how CIS programs could be made superior to those of the NCAA.

Table D: Priority for Implementation – Individual Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 Individual Sports</th>
<th>NSO Readiness</th>
<th>Revenue Potential</th>
<th>Phase One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling - Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Post Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling - Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Post Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 Individual Sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming - Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Priority TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming - Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Priority TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics – Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Priority TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics - Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Priority TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.2 Circulation of the Discussion Paper to Gauge Interest

In developing this proposal, Athletic Directors from a cross-section of Canadian universities were consulted to determine their degree of interest in the concept and what their major issues and concerns may be. In four instances, either the university’s President or a President’s delegate also participated in the discussion.

In general, the response was either “very committed” to the concept or “very interested but not committed.” Where the Athletic Directors were “very interested,” most noted that they would need to follow up with their President. Only one Athletic Director suggested that it may not be appropriate for the AD’s own institution but offered some very constructive input.

There has been enough interest and support expressed for the project from both a cross-section of universities and the NSOs to encourage moving forward with the concept. Therefore, OTP has begun the necessary process of full consultation by widely circulating this discussion paper. OTP will now engage intensively with all of the stakeholders to facilitate ongoing discussion, affirm interest and obtain input. It is recognized that CIS members will have concerns and questions regarding the proposed Program. Not all questions can have answers at this point. However, the concerns raised and questions asked will provide additional direction as the concept advances from proposal to implementation.
Much institution- and sport-specific information is needed to allow detailed budget planning and implementation of the Program. OTP will seek initial expressions of interest from those universities that are willing to make a philosophical commitment to high performance sport at their institutions. Further development plans to launch the proposed Program will focus on the ability of these institutions to participate. It is estimated that extensive consultation and further development of the proposal will take the project through spring 2012.

### 11.3 Phase One Sport Selection

For purposes of discussion, it is recommended that one and perhaps two of the Group 1 Team Sports be chosen to launch the first phase of the new structure. The sports of basketball and volleyball would appear to be obvious choices. Men’s basketball may have the potential to generate the most revenue to support a high performance program. Men’s volleyball already has their best athletes in Canada and need only address raising their standards of training to the high performance level. Their NSOs are the most ready to proceed and they are also two of the teams with the greatest potential for international success, having suffered most heavily from CIS program limitations and the ongoing “talent drain.”

There is also the necessity to be aware of gender balance in launching the Program. Women’s volleyball, women’s basketball and possibly women’s soccer and women’s ice hockey (the latter two are unsure as to their exact model) could also be considered.

A minimum number of committed institutions will be needed to launch the initial phase of the Program. The exact number will be negotiated. There is much work to be done both by the NSOs, the participating universities and OTP to determine which sports to include in a launch, since at this point there are many unknowns including exact costs, revenue sources and facility availability to mount the project.

A rigorous assessment process will ensure that the system is “fine tuned” before expansion into the second phase – Group 2 Team Sports and/or Group 1 Individual Sports – the timing of which will depend upon available resources. Ideally, one to two sports/teams would then be added to the new league each year.

### 12.0 PROGRAM COSTS

To indicate the order of magnitude of the costs involved in implementing a CIS High Performance Program, this discussion paper includes sample budget projections for consideration. Obviously these must generic at this point but are indicative of what it might cost to train and compete at this level.

A major objective of the consultation process will be to refine and confirm budget numbers. Once the participating universities have been identified and the phase one sport(s) decided, the gap in funding can be determined between what those institutions currently budget for the team(s) and the projected costs of the new Program. This gap in
funding will identify the necessary financial targets to achieve with all the methods of funding at our disposal.

CIS itself will incur additional corporate expenses. There will be increased costs associated with activities such as additional championships, websites, web streaming etc. which will need to be identified and included in the overall costs of the High Performance Program.

12.1 Student Athlete Annual Financial Assistance Estimate

Student athlete financial assistance will be the single biggest additional expense. The following table reflects a fully-evolved program with the assumptions that:
- there will be 12 members on each team;
- that all 12 team members would receive assistance; and,
- that each student athlete would receive the maximum amount.

A “high/low” range is estimated as the total package will be university-specific, dependent on each institution’s own tuition and fee structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teams Group 1</th>
<th>No. of Athletes</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Room &amp; Board</th>
<th>Living Allowance</th>
<th>Per Athlete</th>
<th>Per Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>282,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>234,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This estimation shows what is necessary to compete with NCAA financial incentives. The total estimation will most certainly not be the case for the first phase of the program as not all of the athletes will be of high performance standard. However, some additional costs for current athletes may have to be included to allow them to commit to the 10-month season.

12.1.1 Potential Funding Assistance

The Federal Government partnered with Canadian universities to help reverse the “brain drain” by providing Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarships valued at $50,000 per year to more than 500 students - an annual commitment of over $25 million - over a three-year period. It is proposed that a consortium of sport and senior university officials collaborate to seek a similar type of support to stem the “talent drain” of our best and often brightest student athletes to the NCAA.

Similar approaches should be taken with provincial governments from whom a smaller commitment would be sought. As well, participating NSOs and their PSOs should be prepared to commit some kind of support to the CIS High Performance Program athletes. Universities may also be able to reallocate existing funds to the project or to develop other sources of support.
Outside funding support would be phased in over several years as the program evolves. There has always been a major dilemma facing team sports in Canada: it is very costly to keep a core group of athletes together in high performance training for an extended period of time. It is only a unified approach amongst the Federal and provincial governments, and the corporate, education and sport sectors that can solve this problem.

### 12.2 Sample Program Budget

A comparison of the current CIS budget to a proposed maximum budget for a high performance team with 12 fully-supported student athletes shows the variance in cost to upgrade these teams to a high performance standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Estimate</th>
<th>HP Program Estimate</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conference Championship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National Championship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Salaries</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>-85,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assistant(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-9,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coach travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Athlete campus visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uniforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Practise gear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Technology</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>-2,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Management</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-8,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Support Team</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-31,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paramedical</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sport science</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tape, supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-2,500</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athlete Awards</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>-245,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tuition &amp; fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Books</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Room and board</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Living allowance</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>373,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>781,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>-408,000</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes to Sample Budget**

1. Assumes travel parameters as set out in Appendix B based on average travel of Canada West teams.
2. Assumes minimum of two full-time coaches.
3. Assumes building a reserve to replace uniforms over time.
4. Assumes use of existing technology. There are better, more expensive versions available which may lead to increased costs in future.
5. This is a key budget growth area: focus on paramedical and strength & conditioning.
6. Assumes travel only to annual professional development events.
7. Total cost at high end of tuition range for 12 student athletes presented - University share would be less. Assumes room and board in campus accommodation to be “break even” over three semesters.
8. Tuition costs are specific to each institution. It is estimated that they range in amount from $5,000 to $9,000. The highest figure of $9,000 has been used in the sample budget. These are real costs that have to be included in the individual institutional commitment. However, there may be potential for “in kind” tuition waiver in part or in total.
9. Off-campus living is an option with the recommendation that student athletes share accommodation (two or three per apartment) and that the Athletic Department seek a partnership with a local Property Manager to secure enough accommodation for the entire team. There should also be a Code of Conduct contract that defines the student athlete’s responsibilities to respect the accommodation being provided, etc.
10. At this point, we do not have the ability to project revenues, such as gate receipts, sponsorships or institutional contributions, to offset the maximum costs as depicted in this sample budget.

It is clear that the unified approach to Federal and provincial governments should target support for the athlete assistance awards costs, which represent the largest investment in developing our student athletes. As well, we should look to government to lead in creating a joint effort with the corporate and education sectors to generate the revenue necessary to offset the increased costs of coaching salaries, travel and the sport medicine/sport science services necessary to the Program’s success.
12.2.1 Head Coach Incentives

As noted in Section 9.1, the expectation is that the Head Coach must be an outstanding leader, an outstanding teacher and have international-level expertise in the sport. The Head Coach will be accountable for the progress of all athletes in the High Performance Program – whether on the CIS team or enrolled in the associated Academy. Therefore, the Head Coach must be compensated accordingly.

Coaching positions in CIS have diverse methods of appointments: academic appointments, administrative professional appointments, union appointments, etc. The institution determines its method of assessing the coach on his/her performance. In the case of the High Performance Program, it is proposed that specific criteria be applied to the performance appraisal of the Head Coach based on the student athletes under his/her direction achieving improvement in performance across a wide range of metrics as outlined in their individual yearly training plans.

It is proposed that the partners in the CIS Program develop a recommended salary scale as well as a standard method of performance appraisal for the coaches in the Program. Some form of bonus should be considered for outstanding performance across specific parameters which could include both athlete progression as noted and performance at the League championships.

12.2.2 Potential Revenue Opportunities and Sponsorships

One significant consideration in designing the High Performance Program concept was “marketability” or revenue generation potential. The High Performance Program and its participating teams would be new marketing properties for CIS and there will be potential to “sell” the concept to the corporate sector both nationally and at the local level.

Collaboration will be needed from CIS to ensure there are no conflicts with respect to their existing sponsors and partnerships. However, the stakeholders in this new league can be challenged to come together and secure professional marketing support to attract, at minimum, a television sponsor, an airline sponsor, and a league title sponsor. Such marketing expertise is acknowledged as crucial to success but is beyond the scope of this paper.

Consideration has also been given to generating gate receipts from the higher profile events. Potential revenue generation is sport specific and will vary from team to team and by differing markets. It will be necessary to develop an individual revenue plan for each team that will depend on the level of marketability of that team and include the NSO’s/PSO’s ability to contribute. As well, each university, in concert with the High Performance Program, must have a thoroughly professional marketing/promotional plan including game presentation.
CIS involvement will be crucial to ensure the appropriate fit with its existing marketing initiatives.

12.2.3 Pooling Travel Costs

Compared to the European sport scene, Canadian teams are geographically challenged. Therefore, it is suggested that consideration be given to the concept of pooling travel costs either by conference or nationally. This would serve to “equalize” the commitment by the high performance institutions and to share the costs between like-minded universities.

Travel costs in the proposed “Western Conference” may well be similar to the existing costs, whereas costs for travel in the “Eastern Conference” are likely to be significantly higher than the existing costs for conference travel.

PART THREE:
CONSULTING THE STAKEHOLDERS – REFINING THE CONCEPT

13.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS - NEXT STEPS

The need for a plan began when the Minister of State (Sport) at the time tasked OTP to review the issues of Canada’s “talent drain” and its subsequent effect on our international sporting performances and recommend solutions. OTP has both funded and driven the process leading to the concept of a High Performance Program within CIS. However, this is only the first step.

The consultation process initiated with the circulation of this discussion paper is intended to gather the insights, information and agreements in principle necessary to fully develop the concept into a detailed proposal for approval by the potential partners. The assignment of responsibilities within the broad program aspects will need to be determined between the partners and is expected to be clarified during the consultation process.

13.1 OTP/CIS will develop and lead a communications initiative to ensure widespread understanding and feedback from within CIS.

The OTP Board of Directors has accepted the concept and committed to OTP continuing to lead the project. Having OTP as an active participant and facilitator in negotiations between potential partners will be critical to success throughout this final consultation and development phase.

OTP will need to work with CIS to develop a proactive communications plan and timeline for an appropriate consultation process to encourage full and frank discussion of
the concept with CIS members in a timely manner. Elements could include meetings, either one-on-one or in small regional groups, to ensure all CIS member institutions and CIS committee members are thoroughly acquainted with the proposal and its merits by an identified target date.

13.2 OTP/CIS will collaborate to consult with and receive input from all CIS member institutions and gather expressions of interest and support.

It is vital that CIS members thoroughly understand the concept of the High Performance Program and its proposed components. As well, several issues have been identified in the course of preparing this paper that will need to be addressed by the membership.

13.2.1 Issues Needing Resolution by CIS Members

- Some prominent universities feel they should participate at the highest level within CIS in any of their programs, yet they are philosophically opposed to high performance sport within an academic environment.

- Some Athletic Directors have expressed fear that their institutions may no longer support those teams that are not in the High Performance Program. For example: an institution may elect to cease having a full-time coach in an existing program, even though it may continue to commit significant resources to programming.

- Concerns have been expressed that there may be greater travel costs to those institutions that are not in the High Performance Program as a result of increased geographical distances between participating institutions.

- Athletic Directors fear losing local sponsors as well as gate revenue if they are not in the High Performance Program. Many Athletic Departments budget for revenue generated by their teams to support department activities and this has the potential to seriously impact their annual operating budget.

- There is concern that participation in the High Performance Program will draw resources away from those teams that do not join the new League.

- Consideration needs to be given other cost-mitigating measures such as pooling travel costs assist in overcoming geographical challenges. This could potentially be either on a conference or country-wide basis.

It is critical that this proposal respect the concerns of those that will not be part of the High Performance Program in sports in which they currently participate. CIS and its member universities must come to understand that the creation of a High Performance Program with its associated Training & Development Academies does not threaten, but will indeed enhance their existing programs as follows:

- In most sports, few of the current athletes will be targeted by the High Performance Program.
• Some individuals on teams that wish to participate in the High Performance Program will be unwilling or unable to meet the high performance criteria and will then be available to other CIS teams. They should be able to transfer without penalty at any time.

• The High Performance Program will target athletes who are either in the NCAA now, or who are most probably destined for the NCAA. It is proposed that, for the first two seasons, these athletes be allowed to transfer back from the NCAA into the CIS Program without penalty.

• In the long-term, the talent level available to non-high performance institutions in CIS will actually increase and may be above the current talent level in CIS programs. This is due to the fact that the High Performance Program will focus on athletes now destined for the NCAA who are currently not on the CIS radar. As a result, there will be a smaller number of institutions competing to recruit from the current CIS athlete pool. National championships will continue to be held and the overall product will be enhanced.

13.3 OTP/CIS will consult with interested CIS member institutions on the overall financial status of their sport programs, including identifying and quantifying third-party contributions.

While the final number of teams participating in a High Performance Program will vary according to sport and be decided through further consultation with CIS and specific NSOs, this proposal in its present form is based on a commitment of at least 12 universities to the concept.

Once OTP has received official expressions of interest and support, it will be necessary to consult widely with the potential partners to refine and detail the budgets and determine available funding assistance. In particular, it will be necessary to establish the current level of third-party funding available to each potential participant since this information had not been collected prior to writing this discussion paper.

It became very obvious while developing this concept that cost considerations will be the major barrier to participation at the institutional level.

• The proposed student athlete assistance awards package represents an immediate and major commitment by a university. It is the single largest cost increase in the proposal, yet is one of the most crucial components for success.

• As illustrated in the sample budget in Section 12.2, institutions will have to make larger annual investments to participate in the High Performance Program. It will require greater outlay in coaching salaries and in the sport medicine/sport science support area which has yet to be quantified.

• Universities will need to review their operating budgets with the possibility of reallocation to create additional dollars from within their existing budget for the new Program.
13.4 OTP/CIS will consult with the Federal and provincial governments, foundations and other third-party funders of student athletes to share the concept of the CIS High Performance Program discussion paper and to determine the nature and objectives of their funding programs.

13.5 OTP will consult in-depth with the CIS Board to further refine the discussion paper.

It is understood that creating a High Performance Program within CIS represents significant changes in both philosophy and operations. The concept of creating this CIS Program must first be supported by the CIS Board of Directors. After gaining Board support, it must then secure final approval from the CIS General Assembly.

13.6 OTP/CIS will further consult with specific institutions to finalize requisites for potential participation.

13.7 OTP will prepare a final High Performance Program proposal for approval by the Boards of OTP, CIS, NSOs and CIS General Assembly.

13.8 OTP/CIS will develop a work plan for the funding and implementation of the Program.

Clearly, an early funding commitment by the Federal Government to support this initiative will be vital to its success. Indeed, the initiative cannot succeed without some level of Federal Government funding and the universities and NSOs committing to the high performance concept will look to the Federal Government and its provincial counterparts to demonstrate leadership in this area.

Concurrent with the request for Federal Government support, an early approach must also be made to provincial governments for specific resources to assist interested universities within their jurisdiction in meeting the criteria for a high performance athlete development environment. The concept of encouraging the best student athletes to remain in Canada should also in the best interest of the provinces.

14.0 TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE

In the 1970s and 1980s, Canada could compete against the best in the world using Canadian-trained athletes. Since that time, some European and South American nations have stemmed their “talent drain” by creating development systems that are superior to the NCAA. Canada has the same opportunity, yet every month that passes without taking decisive steps to address this issue is another month that our national teams continue to lose ground and our student athletes continue to “go south.”
The graphs of Canada’s Olympic Games team performances in CIS sports in Section 2.3 are a small sample of the overall statistics provided in the Addendum to the Discussion Paper. These statistics provide ample confirmation of the NSOs’ unanimous declaration to John Furlong, OTP Chair, in 2010 that “the ‘talent drain’ of Canadian student athletes to the NCAA has seriously damaged our national teams.”

On December 18, 2011, a Toronto Raptors’ announcer proudly boasted on nation-wide television that there are now 88 Canadian men in NCAA Division One programs alone. This represents a 25-percent increase over the 70 Canadian student athletes in the same programs in 2010. It has taken until 2012 to begin full discussion of creating a CIS High Performance Program. It is incumbent on all stakeholders to approach their participation in this process as a matter of great urgency.

Creating such a program is a huge undertaking for Canadian universities, CIS, NSOs and PSOs, Sport Canada and OTP and must have total commitment for the long term to succeed. Given such institutional commitment and the political will to invest now for future results, Canada can and will reverse the “talent drain” to the NCAA, strengthen our high performance athlete development system, and keep our student athletes at home.
## APPENDIX A

Canadian Student Athletes in NCAA in Sports Offered by CIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPORT</th>
<th>Canadians in NCAA</th>
<th>National Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(numbers available from NSOs as at May 20, 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total in 2008/09</td>
<td>Div 1 only 2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Men</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Hockey</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Men</td>
<td>889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women's 2010 Olympic Team</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women's Under 22 2010 Camp</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women's Under 22 MLP Cup</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Track &amp; Field</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Men's Senior Team</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women's Senior Team</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women's Under 23 Team</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Men</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Senior National Team</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Women</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX B**

**CIS High Performance Program**  
**Budget Parameters - Travel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Size</th>
<th>Match Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Player Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Coach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Travelling Contingent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Season / Playoffs</th>
<th>Match Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Divisions of 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Games vs each opponent – 2 trips to each opponent</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Conference Championship – 6 teams – 2 pools of 3 round robin – 4 days</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 National Championship – 6 team round robin – 7-8 days</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibition Matches</th>
<th>Match Tally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 NCAA (Home)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tournaments (assume 1 East &amp; 1 West)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Matches      | 41          |