

Dear Members,

Thank you for your input and engagement to date in the Operating Model review process. The willingness of member clubs and the broader community to share their views and experiences is greatly appreciated and valued.

The Board met on Tuesday evening and discussed next steps. Importantly, the Board made no decisions regarding the review recommendations.

The recommendations were aimed at addressing the identified pain points and broadly covered areas such as organisational structure, functional responsibilities, athlete pathways, competition standard, the relationships between stakeholders in the community and capability gaps across the eco-system. The report provides a case for change and many aspects were validated at the recent President and Club and Community sessions when presented.

Given the breadth of the report, we now need to undertake discovery work and look in detail at the recommendations, drawing on other available data, to understand the connections, interdependencies, risk, impacts and consequences of the recommendations, both individually and collectively.

To build this level of understanding takes time and input from all stakeholders along the way. As an organisation we are reviewing what the engagement model will look like and will come back to the member clubs with this detailed information.

This discovery piece will inform the Boards decisions and build a roadmap to take work forward. This will dovetail with the Strategic Planning process that will commence next year as we develop the BACT Strategic Plan for 2026 and beyond.

The Board will also apply a financial and governance lens across all elements of this work. In upholding our duties the Board will be the final decision makers on what goes forward and what doesn't. Ensuring the objectives and values of the organisation are at the heart of our decision making. Always acting on behalf, and in the interests of, the Members and Basketball in the ACT.

At this stage, the Board has agreed two areas where we can make a start ahead of any other decisions and the roadmap development. Basketball ACT management has been tasked to progress with the community:

- building capability across the eco-system as identified in the report
- mapping roles and responsibilities across the eco-system to underpin any future proposed functional and/or structural changes.

There are still many decisions for the Board to make. This is the beginning of a substantial and long-term piece of work. There are few quick wins in this and there will be challenges along the way. We need to partner together to land and deliver the best solutions and outcomes for the sport and our community as a whole.

We have a shared responsibility for the health of our sport in the ACT and we each need to play our part, and we will be calling on you to not only engage in the development process but also to play your part in the change process.

Yours sincerely,
Michelle Hocking
President

SHARING THE LOAD

A REVIEW INTO THE BASKETBALL ACT OPERATING MODEL

(ABRIDGED VERSION)

OCTOBER 2024



BASKETBALL ACT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Basketball in the ACT has grown, and is growing, at a rapid pace. And while, from one perspective, this is an enviable position to be in, from another perspective, this growth appears to be unsustainable given Basketball ACT's current operating model. Basketball ACT defines its operating model as: *The systems and structures in place across the basketball ecosystem within the ACT and surrounding region that supports how basketball is delivered to participants and members at all levels.*

The current operating model was implemented approximately 20 years ago, and there have been minimal, if any, changes to the way that this model is used to deliver basketball in the ACT. In the interim, there have been substantial changes across the basketball ecosystem, the population demographics within the ACT, and the sporting landscape more generally.

Given these changes in the basketball ecosystem, that contribute to a complex set of related challenges, in July 2024 Basketball ACT, in partnership with Bluestone Edge, initiated this review of the current operating model.

A high-level of analysis reveals that the current operating model appears to be cumbersome, inefficient and unnecessarily complicated. As basketball within the ACT has grown, the current operating model has been 'adapted' primarily through reactive measures, rather than being built with intention via a focus on purpose, simplicity and future-proofing basketball. As a result, basketball in the ACT is 'bursting at the seams' and this is creating numerous points of tension as the operating model inhibits Basketball ACT's ability to deliver the quality of products and services that the organisation, as well as its stakeholders, would reasonably expect.

Across the basketball ecosystem there are multiple 'pain points' which are discussed below. These areas appear to be relatively consistent throughout various stakeholder groups and across the different geographic regions within the ACT. As such, these challenges should be viewed, at least in part, as *symptomatic* of an operating model that is no longer 'fit for purpose' – where critical components of that model now present barriers to the effective and enjoyable delivery of basketball, rather than being enablers of the outcomes everybody desires.

One of the central findings of the review is the dual role that Basketball ACT occupies – being both the State Sporting Organisation (SSO) as well as the Association for basketball in the ACT – creates confusion in how it services its participants. Furthermore, the demands of working with clubs, and overseeing the local competition, as part of its Association role, frequently results in those responsibilities and functions related to its role as a SSO not getting adequately attended to.

PRESENTED BY



BLUESTONE EDGE
building sound cultures

In its need to be 'all things to all people', Basketball ACT spreads its limited resources too thinly, making it virtually impossible to deliver its key objectives with the degree of excellence and timeliness that it would like to. This approach, therefore, potentially inhibits its own ability to meet the needs and the requirements of its stakeholders. The reality is that the existing operating model, as well as the limited resources available to Basketball ACT, make it exceedingly difficult to provide high-quality service to all its stakeholders.

Therefore, many of the recommendations contained in this review are aimed at 'trimming down' the Basketball ACT operating model. The desired outcomes of this process are to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of Basketball ACT; to decrease the confusion and uncertainty with respect to the roles and responsibilities of Basketball ACT; and therefore, to optimise its ability to deliver basketball to participants and members at all levels.

Finally, many of the cultural challenges within the ecosystem are the result of the 'over-centralisation' of the responsibility for delivering basketball sitting within the purview of Basketball ACT. Hence, the overarching recommendation of this review is to 'decentralise' the responsibility for delivering basketball throughout the broader ecosystem. For this to be successful, each stakeholder group needs to play its respective role and be partially responsible for the effective delivery of the game to members, as well as for the growth of the sport more generally. In other words, to remain sustainable, the 'load' for the delivery of basketball must be shared across the many capable, passionate and experienced individuals and stakeholder groups that inhabit the ACT basketball ecosystem.

PRESENTED BY



BLUESTONE EDGE
building sound cultures

'PAIN POINTS' DISCOVERED THROUGH STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION AND DATA COLLECTION



The following pain points should not only be thought of as areas of frustration and concern, but also areas where there are inefficiencies, inequities and cultural tension points. These are all attributable, at least in part, to the current operating model. More specifically, these pain points are almost always a combination of structural (the operating model itself); functional (the roles and responsibilities associated with the operating model); and cultural (how we do things around here, particularly, the relationships between key stakeholder groups) dynamics. And it is the interplay of these dynamics that have resulted the following list.

Therefore, none of these pain points should be viewed in isolation. Rather, they are a series of interrelated findings and experiences that have causal relationships with other findings and experiences. Thus, in constructing this list, we also have attempted to link where the various pain points may have synergistic relationships with other dynamics and pain points.

Pain point #1: The resources available to Basketball ACT are unable to meet the demands of its role/s and the expectations of its stakeholders.

Pain point #2: Basketball ACT has varying levels of experience and is still developing expertise, making it challenging for the organisation to fulfil the obligations of its role/s.

Pain point #3: The quality, frequency and transparency of communication between Basketball ACT and its stakeholders is inconsistent.

Pain point #4: There are insufficient facilities to effectively run basketball in the ACT.

Pain point #5: The culture within the basketball ecosystem in the ACT is often hostile and adversarial; this frequently manifests as an 'us and them' dynamic between Basketball ACT and its stakeholders.

Pain point #6: The current membership model of clubs and schools does not support the core business of Basketball ACT.

Pain point #7: There are no established developmental pathways for coaches, leading to inconsistent coaching standards and an unreliable pipeline of emerging coaches.

Pain point #8: The standard of referees is inconsistent and there are frequently insufficient numbers of referees to cover games.

PRESENTED BY



BLUESTONE EDGE
building sound cultures

Pain point #9: Running basketball clubs frequently requires administrators to have expertise that is not related to 'core business'.

Pain point #10: There are significant discrepancies in the talent and skill level between various teams.

Pain point #11: Issues and challenges related to inclusion, such as racism, homophobia and classism, are experienced within the Basketball ACT community.

Pain point #12: There is a low capability within and between key stakeholder groups to resolve conflict and difference in effective and timely ways.

Pain point #13: The cost of basketball, particularly rep basketball, is prohibitive to some families.

PRESENTED BY



BLUESTONE EDGE
building sound cultures

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN THE OPERATING MODEL



In outlining these recommendations, the potential changes to the Basketball ACT Constitution and/or the bylaws that govern basketball in the ACT have not been fully considered.

We have been mindful of the financial impact of the following recommendations insofar as they have been made with the intention of increasing the financial viability of the basketball ecosystem. However, without detailed knowledge of the financial positions of Basketball ACT or basketball clubs, we are unable to accurately ascertain the financial implications of these recommendations on Basketball ACT and clubs.

These recommendations have been informed by what we believe is the most effective and efficient operating model for basketball in the ACT going forward and which also addresses many of the pain points discussed by those who participated in the review process.

These recommendations fall into three categories – structural, functional and cultural. Obviously, these three categories should not be viewed in isolation. While we have listed these recommendations separately, readers should be aware that there are high degrees of interrelatedness and causality between and within each category of recommendations.

Recommendations for changes in the structure of the operating model

Recommendation #1: Basketball ACT needs to devolve its role as an Association and support the formation of a separate Association to fulfil these responsibilities.

Recommendation #2: Change the structure of the Basketball ACT organisational chart.

Recommendation #3: Change the bylaws so that to be able to enter a JPL team, clubs must be able to offer athletes consistent and stable pathways of development from juniors all the way through to seniors.

PRESENTED BY



BLUESTONE EDGE
building sound cultures

Recommendations for changes in the function of the operating model

Recommendation #4: Change the responsibilities and functions of Basketball ACT to those specifically connected with its role as a SSO.

Recommendation #5: Ensure Basketball ACT has the capability to deliver those responsibilities it has as a SSO.

Recommendation #6: As part of its SSO function, Basketball ACT needs to have a strategic focus on the attraction, retention and perhaps more importantly, the development of personnel that are critical for the basketball ecosystem to function effectively.

Recommendation #7: The responsibilities and functions of the Association need to be clarified.

Recommendation #8: Clarify the function and the purpose of the JPL competition and limit each JPL competition to a maximum of eight teams.

Recommendation #9: Centralise critical financial and operational components of clubs with Basketball ACT e.g. financial management, insurance, HR functions, workforce management etc.

Recommendations for changes in the culture of the operating model

Recommendation #10: Basketball ACT needs to change its mindset of trying to be 'all things to all people'.

Recommendation #11: Implement initiatives that support the basketball community to address discrimination and unconscious bias.

Recommendation #12: Initiate a process to repair the relationship between Basketball ACT and key stakeholder groups, in particular clubs.

PRESENTED BY



BLUESTONE EDGE
building sound cultures

RECOMMENDATION VERSUS PAIN POINT MATRIX



The following matrix specifies how each of the above recommendations contributes, directly or indirectly, to addressing the pain points and frustrations highlighted by review participants. Matrix cells highlighted in blue indicate which recommendations have been put in place to address each pain point.

	R#1	R#2	R#3	R#4	R#5	R#6	R#7	R#8	R#9	R#10	R#11	R#12
PP #1												
PP #2												
PP #3												
PP #4												
PP #5												
PP #6												
PP #7												
PP #8												
PP #9												
PP #10												
PP #11												
PP #12												
PP #13												

PRESENTED BY



BLUESTONE EDGE
building sound cultures