



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Gold in Education and Elite Sport

September 21 – 22, NOC*NSF, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Second meeting report

Attendees: Sacha Cecic Erpic (University of Ljubljana), Isabelle Daguin-Caswell (Institut National du Sport, de l'Expertise et de la Performance, INSEP), Koen De Brandt (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, VUB), Nadine Debois (INSEP), Simon Defruyt (VUB), Mojca Doupona Topic (University of Ljubljana), Marek Gracyk* (Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport), Véronique Leseur (INSEP), Kent Lindahl (Swedish Sports Confederation), Donatella Minelli (CONI Servizi Spa), Jean-Luc Patoret* (INSEP), Léonore Perrus (INSEP), Susana Regüela (Centre d'Alt Rendiment de San Cugat), Anne Spitse* (NOC*NSF), Natalia Stambulova (Halmstad University), Kristel Taelman (Bloso), Miquel Torregrossa (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona), Ingrid van Gelder (Netherlands Olympic Committee*Netherlands Sport Confederation, NOC*NSF), Nicolette van Veldhoven (NOC*NSF), Graig Williams (Talented Athlete Scholarship Scheme, TASS). Simon Wombwell (Loughborough University), Paul Wylleman (VUB).

*On September 22

Excused: Susan Elms (SportScotland Institute of Sport), Michel Godard (INSEP), David Lavalée (University of Stirling), Guy Taylor (TASS)

Agenda

Monday 21 September 2015	11:30-12:00	Arrival at meeting venue + preparation for working lunch
	12:00-13:00	Working lunch
		– Welcome - P. WYLLEMAN
		– Administrative and financial management - I. DAGUIN
		– Start Work Package 1 - P. WYLLEMAN
	13:00-16:00	Work Package 1 - P. WYLLEMAN & K. DE BRANDT (including 1 break)
	16:00-16:30	Break
	16:30-18:30	Work Package 2 - P. WYLLEMAN & S. DEFruYT
	19:30	Dinner
Tuesday 22 September 2015	09:00-12:30	Work Package 2 (incl 2 breaks) - P. WYLLEMAN &

S. DEFRUYT

12:30-13:30 Lunch

13:30-17:30 - Presentation of the shared platform J.-L. PATORET

Working groups followed by reports and planning:

– Work Package 5 – Editorial Board, P. WYLLEMAN

– Work Package 6 – Dissemination, S. WOMBWELL

– Work Package 7 – Internal Quality Control, V. LESEUR

– Next meeting: date, place & organization - I. DAGUIN & P. WYLLEMAN

17:30-18:00 Break

18:00-19:00 Final preparation Symposium 'Gold in Education and Elite Sport: A European perspective on competences of elite pupil-athletes and elite student-athletes'

19:30 Dinner

Administrative and financial management

- All the partners have received from INSEP the necessary information: the evaluation report provided by the EACEA, the Grant Agreement INSEP/EACEA and General Conditions, the budget approved by the EACEA.
- The 8 Partners' Agreements between INSEP and its Full Partners (VUB, NOC*NSF, Swedish Sports Confederation, University of Stirling, Gdansk University of Physical Education and Sport, CONI Servizi Spa, UAB, University of Ljubljana) are signed.
- The grant (60% of the expenses) have been transferred to 7 Full Partners (except Gdansk University).
- Staff Costs, Other Costs, Travel & Expenses Costs and Subcontracting Costs must be on budget; for the record, GEES has received the maximum EACEA grant.
- According to the Grant Agreement (General Conditions, Annex III Estimated budget of the action), the Associated Partners have to present to their Full Partners an invoice including supporting documents to be paid for their expenses (mass salary and travel and subsistence).

Work Package 1

1. Data analysis

Remarks and suggestions were formulated on the data analysis of WP1.

The first statistical analyses made on the global European population were presented and discussed by the delegates and proposals were put forward to refine the statistical analysis.

Exploratory Structural Equation Modelling (ESEM) was recommended for further analyses and publications.

2. National analysis/report

Every partner will receive a 'new' data file with reduced 'noise', additional computed variables, and a new syntax. This will help the partners to further explore their data file and to write a national report.

→ Koen will send the new data file and syntax to the delegates before *November 4*.

3. Preparation of the first international GEES symposium

The partners discussed and agreed upon the content, the layout and the set up of the presentation:

- The group discussed and agreed upon the label names of the factors;
- The term "transferable competences" was used for the competences that were chosen the most across all scenarios;
- The results were discussed (in different groups) from an applied perspective.
- The way the results should be presented: presentation of the results by Koen De Brandt and expert reflections on a European level (and on a national level) after each chapter.

Work package 2

1. Definition of a dual career support provider

The definition of a 'dual career support provider' that was agreed upon in Paris, was discussed again in order to be sure that everyone still agreed upon this definition. The term 'certified' was replaced by the term 'officially recognized' as the term 'certified' was deemed too strong & exclusive.

A new definition was formulated:

*"A 'dual career support provider' is a professional consultant, related to an educational institute and/or an elite sport organization – or **officially recognized** by one of those – that provides support to elite athletes in view of optimizing their dual career/combination of elite sport and education."*

In order to be sure that everyone interpreted this definition in the same way, the experts discussed possible interpretations of this definition, as the selection of the Dual career support provider pool depends on this interpretation. The most important conclusions of this discussion were:

- to only include DC support providers that deliver services to elite athletes between 16 and 25 years of age;

- to also include DC support providers who work on employment with athletes 16 to 25 years of age (if this is relevant in light of the combination of elite sport and study e.g. helping elite athletes prepare for the labour market);
- to not include coaches at this point of the project. Coaches may be included later in the project (Work package 4);
- to include full-time AND part-time DC support providers.

2. Pool

Based on the new definition, the pool of DC support providers was revised. The new pool consists of 328 DC support providers:

- Belgium: 18
- France: 70
- Italy: 7
- Poland: 5
- Slovenia: 10
- Spain: 20
- Sweden: 18
- The Netherlands: 90
- UK: 90

3. Content of Work package 2

Original planning and timing WP 2 & WP3 (copied from the project description):

Work package 2	Sep 15	Feb 16	DC support providers	Development of the manual for DC support providers
Work package 3	Mar 16	July 16	Athletes + DC support providers	Development of methods and instruments

As the partners agreed that the manual should also include the instruments and methods that DC support providers can use, it was deemed necessary to change the aforementioned approach. More specifically, the experts agreed that before we can start to make up the manual, we should have enough information from the DC support providers. Following parts of information should therefore be gathered before the manual can be prepared:

- A. The DC provider perspective on elite athletes' competences
- B. The DC support provider's competences
- C. Instrument and methods that DC support providers use.

To gather this information, it was decided that a quantitative approach would be most appropriate. One questionnaire will be used to gather this information. The results of this questionnaire will be the end result of Work package 2.

In work package 3, we will use this information to set up the manual. If necessary, we will include a qualitative approach in WP3 to further explore the findings of WP2. So although the end result will

remain the same and the end deadlines remain respected, the experts decided to change the internal timing slightly with regard to work package 2 and 3.

New planning and timing WP2 & WP3:

Work package 2	Sep 15	Mar 16	DC support providers	A. DC support providers' perspective on elite athletes' competences B. DC support providers' competences C. Instruments and methods
Work package 3	April 16	July 16	DC support providers	D. Integration into a manual

A. DC support providers' perspective on elite athletes' competences

In order to have a clearer overview of the competences that are important for elite athletes, it is essential to include the DC support providers' perspective on the elite athletes' competences. Elite athletes might e.g. underestimate the importance of long-term vision. Besides, the DC support providers' perspective on elite athletes' competences is important as a basis for the manual (WP3).

To get an overview of the DC support providers' perspective on elite athletes' competences, the use of the scenarios is essential. It was suggested that the same 7 scenarios and the 38 competences would be presented in a similar way as they were presented for the elite athletes.

After differences of opinion and discussions, it was agreed that the delegates will include in the DC providers' questionnaire a first part involving the 38 competences used in the athletes' questionnaire, asking them to evaluate their importance in their DC pathway. The evaluation of the most important competences for the 7 athletes' scenarios will not be included in order not to make the DC providers' questionnaire too long. Still, there will be a/some basic question(s) included for the DC support providers concerning the 7 elite athlete scenarios (e.g. how do elite athletes manage this scenario?).

B. DC support providers' competences

The experts decided to use a similar procedure as in Work Package 1. Concretely, this part of the questionnaire will consist of following parts:

- a) A list of competences for DC supports providers.
- b) Specific scenarios for DC support providers.
- c) General questions on the most important characteristics of the DC support providers.

a. List of competences for DC support providers

At the meeting, Nadine Debois presented the qualitative research of INSEP that was conducted on DC support providers' competences. This research, combined with the available literature and the knowledge of the expert group, should enable the experts to formulate a list of (generic and specific) competences (attitudes, knowledge and skills) for DC support providers.

Additional points were discussed during the meeting:

- We should have a framework with higher order categories to structure the list of competences. A decent framework should be used from the research literature or from the field of practice. This would be interesting from a theoretical and a methodological point of view, as this will enable us to formulate factors a priori rather than post hoc via an exploratory factor analysis.
- It would be much easier to start from a task analysis and formulate the competences in light of this task analysis. However, it does not seem possible to create one clear task analysis of a DC support provider, as this function encompasses a broad scope of possible different roles. As an alternative, a question on their main roles and their mission/philosophy as a DC support provider can be included. The scenarios will also be a way of addressing this problem, as the competences will be viewed in light of different possible challenges/roles that DC support provider (may) encounter.

b. Scenarios for DC support providers

The experts decided to use a similar methodology as in WP1 concerning the scenarios. 'Dual career support' is a comprehensive term as it can include a lot of different challenges, roles and responsibilities. In order to be able to differentiate between those different challenges and responsibilities, we decided to relate competences to specific challenging 'dual career support' situations, called SCENARIOS. During the meeting, we discussed the most important DC Support scenarios in different groups. Based on this work conducted by the expert groups (and the available literature), the most important scenarios for DC support providers will be put together.

As in WP1, the list of scenarios has to be general/recognizable for a) every country and b) every age category AND should include a description of the situation and a specific aim.

The different levels of the Holistic Athletic Career model should be represented in the different scenarios.

Although it was decided to use a similar procedure as in WP1, it's still to be decided which questions should accompany these scenarios.

Example:

- Did you already experience this scenario? (+How often?)
- How did you manage this scenario?
- Choose the 5 most important competences you need in order to manage this scenario successfully.

c. General questions

General questions are needed to gather information on the most important characteristics of the DC support providers. During the meeting, the experts discussed the most important general questions that should be addressed:

- ✓ Educational background & qualifications
- ✓ Athletic background
- ✓ Experience as DC support providers (in years)
- ✓ Working regime (FT/PT)
- ✓ Type of employer (educational institute, governmental organisation...)
- ✓ Level/type/age of athletes they work with
- ✓ Use of a network
- ✓ Interdisciplinary system
- ✓ Amount of hours they spend with elite athletes per week or month.
- ✓ Number of sessions per athlete
- ✓ ...

C. Instruments and methods

Additionally, we need to gather information on the instruments and methods DC support providers already use (in specific situations). During the meeting, the experts proposed to have a list of possible instruments and methods from which the DC support providers can select the tools they use.

4. Software and server

Limesurvey will be used for the questionnaire. The central server of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel will be used to gather all the data in one place.

Work Package 3: Integration into a manual

Based on work package 2, a manual for DC support providers will be designed. This manual will integrate the findings of work package 2 and provide the DC support providers with instruments and tools. If necessary, we will include a qualitative approach in work package 3.

Work package 5: Scientific and Editorial Group

In the absence of David Lavalée, the Scientific and Editorial Group, composed of Nadine Debois, David Lavalée, Natalia Stambulova, Miquel Torregrossa and Paul Wylleman did not meet.

The possibility of disseminating the results was checked with both the EACEA and the Sport Unit. The EU allows the consortium to disseminate the national and European results at both national and international level.

The Group will discuss the reporting of the European results in publications (e.g., scientific articles, journal articles).

Shared Platform

The shared platform was presented by Jean-Luc Patoret who gave each delegate his/her log in and password.

Work Package 6 – Dissemination

Dissemination plan stage 2 will be designed on the basis of the data captured in the survey relating to athletes' competences required for a successful dual career.

Three key results will be emphasized:

1/ A completion rate of 43% (3 252 athletes)

2/ The most experienced scenarios (3 and 6)

- Scenario #3: "Your competition and training schedule means that you will miss significant days of study and (group) assignments. You need to catch up during and/or after competition/training camp."
- Scenario #6: "The combination of sport and study makes it challenging to have a rich social life outside of sport (e.g. time with friends, going out...). You need to find a balance between your dual career and social activities outside of sport."

3/ The three most important competences

1. Perseverance during challenging times and in the face of setbacks
2. Understanding the importance of rest and recuperation
3. Ability to cope with stress in sport and study.

Three priorities are defined: update of GEES website – update of institutional websites – contacts with EOC to publish a presentation of GEES in the EOC-EU monthly report (Ms Minelli).

Work Package 7 – Internal Quality Control

During the Internal Quality Control session of Amsterdam meeting, a recap of the first actions engaged by the group was made:

1. A post-meeting questionnaire was sent to each delegate on February 13th to conduct a satisfaction survey on : logistics, agenda, progress of the project during the Kick-off meeting held in Paris (INSEP) on January 2015, the 26th and 27th.
2. A pre-meeting questionnaire was sent to each delegate on June 24th, to assess the first six months of the project and evaluate communication, management and progress in the work.
3. A spreadsheet monitoring procedures and deadlines the shared platform was postponed to the second step of the project due to technical constraints.

The analysis of the questionnaires sent to the delegates by the AHWG before the meeting was summarized during the session and suggestions for improvement underlined.

Strengths

- The kick-off meeting seems to have fairly reached its main objectives. Most attendees were satisfied with: logistics, the information and explanation given, the friendly and productive atmosphere, the decision making process and the involvement of the partners.
- Scientific work: punctuality of tasks delivered, development of the questionnaire, innovativeness of work, speed of scientific work
- Dissemination : website development and design, translation of the website, promotion of the project during the European Congress of Sport Psychology, FEPSAC - July 2015
- Communication and Project Management: responsiveness of the coordinators of the project to questions and concerns & productivity of electronic communication.

Suggestions for improvement

- Dissemination
 - To clarify the roles between the administrative leader (INSEP) and the Dissemination group.
 - To improve communication between the members of the Dissemination Group and within the consortium
 - To enrich the website content
 - To clarify dissemination activities and planning
- Project Management
 - To develop and use a shared platform (improved collaborative work).
 - To clarify the roles between the administrative leader (INSEP) and the partners organizing GEES meetings & symposium.

The Internal Quality Ad hoc Working Group ended the session presenting the actions to be done by the AHWG group and by each delegate during the second phase of the project:

- update the shared platform (schedule)
- take the 'suggestions for improvement' into account
- fill in the questionnaires sent by the Internal Quality Ad hoc Working Group
- use the shared platform

Next meeting: date, place & organization

The next meeting & workshop will be organized by VUB and CAR San Cugat between April 5 to 8 2016.

Report finalized by Isabelle Daguin-Caswell (Paris, October 27th 2015), Simon Defruyt and Paul Wylleman (Brussels, October 26th 2015).