



The Coaching Task Force – Final Report

July 2002

Contents

	Page No.
Foreword by Richard Caborn MP	2
The Coaching Task Force – Final Report	3
Introduction	3
The Context	4
The Need for Investment in Coaching	4
Coach Development	4
Coach Employment and Deployment	5
Conclusion from the International Benchmarking Exercise	5
Coaching Task Force – Areas of Work	6
International Benchmarking Exercise	6
National Coaching Certificate – Employment of NGB National Directors of Coach Education	8
The Employment of NGB Regional Talent Development Coaches	9
Local Coach Employment Scheme (Coachmatch)	11
Establishing 45 Sub-Regional Coach Development Officers	12
Come Into Coaching Recruitment Campaign	13
Review of sports coach UK	14
Funding and Phasing of Proposals	16
Impact on the Wider Aspects of Coaching, Participation and Performance	18
Implications for Sports Equity	19
Implications for the Wider Policy Agenda	20
Consultation and Detailed Implementation	21
Recommendations	21
Outputs	23
Appendix 1 – Coaching Task Force Members	25
Appendix 2 – Benchmarking Report	26
Appendix 3 – National Coaching Certificate	45
Appendix 4 – Regional Talent Development Coaching	49
Appendix 5 – Local Coach Employment (Coachmatch)	51
Appendix 6 – Establishing 45 sub-regional Coach Development Officers	54
Appendix 7 – Come into Coaching	58
Appendix 8 – Review of sports coach UK	60
Appendix 9 – Taking Forward the Recommendations	84

Foreword by Richard Caborn MP



Sport is an invaluable tool for promoting a whole range of Government objectives including health, education and social inclusion. The issue of coaching and coach education is key to achieving these aims. It is coaches that make things happen and who make a real difference at every level, whether in the school playground or at major international events.

My vision for coaching is to see a coaching system that makes the most of and recognises the enthusiasm and self sacrifice of the many committed individuals on whom we depend to provide the first tier of coaching. For those employed in coaching at higher levels, a system that recognises coaching as a profession, with accredited qualifications and a real career development structure.

Much good work has been done on coach education in the United Kingdom, but there is a need for a concerted effort to improve the quality and quantity of coaches in all sports. The coaching Task Force in conjunction with a number of key partners, have produced this report which outlines a number of recommendations that I believe are challenging. They provide an exciting opportunity to develop coach education and coach deployment in England. By 2006 we will have invested a minimum of £25 million to create 3,000 full-time qualified Community Coaches to help develop sports skills across the country.

My thanks go to all the members of the Coaching Task Force for the commitment, energy and expertise they brought to this work. They have made a real and lasting contribution in shaping the role of coach deployment and education to transform the sporting life of our country.

Richard Caborn

The Coaching Task Force – Final Report

Introduction

1. The Government Plan for Sport made a number of recommendations about the future strategic direction of coaching and coach education. It was agreed that a Coaching Task Force (CTF) should be established to move forward key areas of work. The members of the Task Force are set out in **Appendix 1**.
2. The recommendations that the Coaching Task Force was asked to examine were:
 - An international benchmarking exercise be undertaken to compare the preparation of coaches in England with other countries who were deemed to have successful systems in place – and to identify good practice.
 - The implementation of a National Coaching Certificate at 5 levels. This would be set against the national standards and be a requirement for all National Governing Bodies (NGBs). The feasibility of linking this to a Licence to practice.
 - The feasibility of employing an additional 3,000 full time and part time coaches nationwide.
 - A review of sports coach UK, to establish its role in relation to emerging recommendations.
3. This report provides a summary of the conclusions and recommendations of the Coaching Task Force. Detailed working papers on the recommendations are contained in the Appendices. The final section of the report provides estimates of the funding required to implement the recommendations.
4. Responsibility for sport in the UK is delegated to each of the devolved administrations. This report was commissioned by the Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport whose responsibility for sport is restricted to England. The proposals in this report, therefore, relate to England only. However, a number of bodies involved in coaching have a UK dimension and where necessary the report has taken this into account. The Coaching Task Force believes that the changes recommended in the report have validity in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and it is hoped that UK Sport in conjunction with the home countries will give serious consideration to whether any of the proposals are appropriate to be progressed on a UK wide basis.

The Context

5. Coaching is central to the development of sport at every level. The issues that will influence the development of coaching over the next ten years are:
- A massive increase in after-school sport and inter-school competition (school sport co-ordinators, specialist sports colleges) creating an increased demand for ‘sessional’ coaches on school sites.
 - A growing demand for more volunteer coaches at the grassroots level of sport (clubs, summer activity programmes) to work with young people.
 - A growing number of NGBs with clearly defined talent development pathways requiring increased commitment and skills from coaches at local, regional and national level to work with talented and gifted young people.
 - A more structured approach to elite sport, creating the need for full time coaches working alongside full time athletes.
 - A growing pressure to improve access to the ‘coaching profession’ from groups that are significantly under represented at the present time.
 - An increase in sports programmes designed to tackle wider social issues (crime and disorder, health, youth engagement and social exclusion) that require coaches with specific ‘people’ skills.

The Need for Investment in Coaching

6. Through discussion in the CTF it became evident that there were two distinct areas that required investment if we are to move coaching forward. These are **coach development** (initial education, training, continuing professional development, assessment and qualification of coaches) and **coach employment and deployment** (the recruitment and deployment of coaches).

Coach Development

7. Coach development in the UK is variable in quantity and quality. Each National Governing Body of sport is responsible for the development of training courses, the assessment of their coaches and the issuing of qualifications. Through the Sport and Recreation Industry Training Organisation (SPRITO) a national qualifications framework has been developed but there has been no consistent, funded implementation strategy, so it has been implemented in a piecemeal way. Since 1984 sports coach UK (formerly the National Coaching Foundation) has developed and made

available core (generic) coach education courses and resources for coaches from all sports at all levels. They have advocated the adoption of generic material (sports science, sports medicine and sports pedagogy) but there has been no requirement for NGBs to adopt this material.

8. All this has resulted in an inconsistent coach education and qualification programme that is confusing to coaches, employers and ‘customers’. There is no equivalence of qualifications across sports and no consistency in assessment procedures. This in turn has resulted in the lack of a recognisable professional framework and poor public recognition of the value of coaches. Other countries (Germany, Holland, France, Sweden, Romania, Canada, Australia and others) have a much more clearly defined set of standards (5 levels) to which all sports work and many have a central licensing scheme that provides a nationally monitored system.

Coach Employment and Deployment

9. Coach deployment is poor and well behind other countries in the world. There are very limited opportunities for coaches to be employed on a full time basis at local, regional or national level. Local authorities have been one of the biggest employers of coaches at community level but many of these are part time or sessional. The new ‘World Class’ programmes, led by NGBs, have meant greater employment opportunities at national level over the last four years. In a few sports (rugby, soccer, cricket), coaches are employed by professional clubs and in others coaches are largely self employed (swimming, gymnastics). However, there is no consistent pattern of employment and no clearly defined career pathway for coaches.
10. The vast majority of sports coaches are volunteers and many are lost to sport as the requirement to earn a living from another occupation takes precedence. Also, as the demands of performance sport have increased the pressure on volunteer coaches has also increased, causing many of them to drop out of coaching at the higher levels. Recruiting volunteers to come into coaching is difficult as the profile and remuneration of coaches is not high and people do not know how to access the information and qualifications to get started.

Conclusion from the International Benchmarking Exercise

11. The international benchmarking exercise compared coach education and deployment with four countries: Australia, France, Germany and Sweden. Its overall concluding paragraphs reinforce the view taken by the CTF to focus on these areas for future investment and development:

‘This study has compared the coach education and coaching system of the UK with four leading countries in the world. Much progress has been made in the development of coaching

to date, with extensive numbers of coaches involved at different levels of UK Sport. Coach education opportunities have been widely promoted and provided. It is evident, however, that there is a need to strengthen and harmonise existing structures for the education and deployment of coaches.

A unified and integrated coach education system is recommended, operating across all sports; all of the home countries and across the UK, co-ordinated by a central agency. More paid coaches are needed at all levels of the system, supported by paid professionals within their sport and from the central agency. The goal should be to further enhance the quality of coaching within an ever-improving, continuous and sustainable coaching system, in which non-paid and paid coaches work in synergy. More participants; more athletes; clearer pathways and better performances are just some of the benefits which are likely to accrue from such initiatives.'

Coaching Task Force – Areas of Work

12. As the Task Force considered these contextual issues it reviewed its priorities and expanded its brief to focus attention on the following detailed work areas.
 - The International Benchmarking Exercise (**Appendix 2**).
 - The National Coaching Certificate and Licence to Practice (**Appendix 3**).
 - The Employment of NGB National Coach Education Directors (**Appendix 3**).
 - The Employment of NGB Regional Talent Development Coaches (**Appendix 4**).
 - The Local Coach Employment Scheme ('Coachmatch') (**Appendix 5**).
 - The Establishment of 45 Sub Regional Coach Development Officers (**Appendix 6**).
 - The 'Come into Coaching' Recruitment Campaign (**Appendix 7**).
 - The Review of the role of sports coach UK (**Appendix 8**).
13. Each of these will now be considered separately and the recommendations summarised. The detail related to each area is contained in the Appendices.

International Benchmarking Exercise

14. This was commissioned as part of the evidence base to underpin the work of the CTF. The object of this exercise was to establish comparative data from other countries, which are perceived to have successful processes in place for the development of coaches and coaching. It would provide a benchmark to which the work and the proposals of the CTF might be related.

It would also ensure that the work of CTF was not being conducted in isolation of what was developing internationally.

15. The study was conducted by Patrick Duffy, Director of the National Coaching and Training Centre, University of Limerick Ireland with a tight brief and limited focus to coaching, coach education and deployment in the countries of Australia, France, Germany and Sweden. The author acknowledges that direct comparisons are difficult due to the fact that systems are culturally specific. However, there are common characteristics across all four systems. The full report is attached as in **Appendix 2**.
16. It was asked to report on the following:
 - *the structure of coach education within the four countries* – to include broad structure and coaching levels; content; relationship to talent development framework; qualification framework and employment guidelines; relative standing against the proposed European framework for the qualification of coaches; role of federations and state agencies.
 - *existing employment and deployment of coaches in the four countries* – policies concerning the employment of coaches at national, regional and local levels and at different stages of the pathway; use of volunteers; and status of coaching within the country.
 - *Statistical indicators* – such as world rating; participation data at the different stages of the talent development framework; coaches qualified at each level; data on coaches in volunteer, part-time and full time roles and the employing agencies; payment rates, supports and rewards for coaches; and coach to participant ratios.

Key Findings – Coaching and Coach Education

- Sporting performances in UK have fallen behind France and Australia where they have cohesive and well-established structures in place. Central agencies and systems are established in the other countries.
- In Europe there is a move towards the professionalisation of coaching. A five level structure is proposed with level 3 likely to be an important benchmark.
- By comparison, there is an absence of an integrated or unified system in UK and coaching as a profession is undeveloped. There is an absence of reliable data limiting tracking and future planning. The absence of ‘internal harmonisation’ within the UK is a limitation.
- The UK system needs re-alignment to compete against best international practice and to harmonise between sports, between home countries and across the UK.

Key Findings – Coach Deployment

- In the four countries studied there is a culture of employing coaches at all stages of the athlete pathway along with a trend towards the employment of coach education managers. There is a move towards professionalisation/regulation and the development of coaching expertise is recognised.
- Although data is limited indications are that significantly more full time coaches are employed in other countries than in the UK (up to 80,000 for example in France in paid roles – a recent study for the CTF by Sport England identified 3,418 in 27 sports responding, 3,000 of which were in tennis/football).
- In the UK there is a need for more coaches in paid or part time paid roles along with a common and professionally recognised coaching qualification. There is a need for systematic research and data gathering to evaluate the progress of coaches and to plan for the future.

National Coaching Certificate – Employment of NGB National Directors of Coach Education

17. These two priorities for consideration by the CTF are clearly inextricably linked and are therefore treated together in this section of the report. Again the detail can be found in **Appendix 3**.
18. Coach development in the UK is variable in quantity and quality. Whilst a great deal of good work relating to the education and development of coaches can be identified there is no overall leadership, direction and quality assurance and the whole area is under-resourced. As a result the UK has an *ad hoc* system that allows organisations and individuals to choose whether to opt in or out. Consequently coach education and qualification schemes vary enormously in terms of the quality of content, delivery and assessment both within sports and across sports. This creates a confusing picture for employers of coaches and the end consumers of coaching services.
19. This has resulted in an inconsistent coach education and qualification programme as reported in the benchmarking exercise. As outlined earlier in the report there is no equivalence of qualifications across sports and no consistency in assessment procedures. This in turn has resulted in the lack of a recognisable professional framework and poor public recognition of the value of coaches. Other countries (Germany, Holland, France, Sweden, Romania, Canada, Australia and others) have a much more clearly defined set of standards (5 levels) to which all sports work and many have a central licensing scheme that provides a nationally monitored system.

20. With a more professional approach, which involves the employment of more coaches and a consistent and coherent coach education framework, it will be necessary to build the capacity of NGBs and enable them to transform their materials and tutor training programmes to fit with the new system. In order to make this possible NGBs will require a dedicated National Director of Coach Education who can modernise and update their qualifications and assessment procedures against the new national certificate. They would also provide the vital leadership for the cadre of additional coaches at regional and local level, which are part of the CTF proposals.

Key Proposals

- It is proposed that a national certificate of coaching is developed at 5 levels. This will be set against the national standards and in due course within an agreed timescale would be adopted by all NGBs in order to continue to be eligible for receipt of public funds.
- The implementation of this should be undertaken by a single organisation (sports coach UK) that will support NGBs to develop their systems in line with the national standards and quality assure the process. The delivery of training will be through NGBs, further education, higher education and the University for Industry.
- The NCC framework will be centrally driven but will allow NGBs ownership and control of technical content and a range of options in relation to management and delivery.
- NGBs would be provided with a dedicated National Director of Coach Education and a ring-fenced budget to provide leadership, to enable NGBs to make a step change in their coach education system and to meet the requirements of the proposed NCC.
- The CTF has considered in some detail the proposal to take a further step and establish a licence to practice linked to the NCC. It is still intended that this should be the longer term aim but believes that initial priority should be given to establishing the NCC. Once in place it would be sensible to then work up detailed proposals for the future implementation of a licence to practice. Although reference is made in the **Appendix 3** to the licence to practice it is not meant for implementation immediately.

The Employment of NGB Regional Talent Development Coaches

21. As world class performance standards have increased, sports have had to define the rungs on their talent development ladders more clearly to ensure that they provide a linked pathway from participation to excellence. Talented young performers are often 'lost' to sport because they are not identified effectively, are poorly coached and are provided with few support

services. Greater investment is needed to provide sports with the capacity to improve the quality of coaching for talented young performers at regional level.

22. This investment will need to be part of the NGB long term athlete development plans with clearly identified links into their world class performance programmes. It will also link effectively with the CTF proposals for investment in additional coaches at local level, the ‘coachmatch’ scheme being delivered through the county sports partnerships to identify and support coaches working with talented sports performers.
23. This investment would be used by NGBs in a number of ways including:
- Employing regional talent development coaches (full time or part time) as required.
 - Implementing high quality training for coaches of talented performers.
 - Providing scholarships for coaches of talented performers to undertake apprenticeships and attend intensive short courses at home and overseas.
 - Inviting overseas coaches to work alongside English coaches to improve performance standards.

More detail is contained in **Appendix 4**.

Key Proposals

- It is proposed that a selected number of sports (10 in the first instance) are funded to support their regional talent development coaching programmes as part of their overall talent development framework by the employment of regional talent development coaches. This investment will focus on improving performance standards of both talented coaches and their performers.
- The lead agencies to develop this proposal should be UK Sport/Sport England working in close consultation with the NGBs. This regional investment in coaching should be identified as part of the NGBs ‘one stop plan’ to ensure there is an integrated approach.
- sports coach UK should also be involved to ensure that there is an appropriate education and training programme to support all coaches working with talented young people.
- NGBs will need to be supported to build the capacity of their structures and systems to manage this investment. The ‘modernisation’ programme of investment in NGBs will need to be effectively linked to the delivery of this programme to ensure that these new resources can be maximised.

Local Coach Employment Scheme (Coachmatch)

24. The International Benchmarking Exercise confirmed the CTF view that there are too few professional coaches active in the country. There are limited employment opportunities for coaches to develop coaching as a career. The limited numbers result in limited capacity to provide the quantity and quality of coaching necessary. Lack of employment opportunities leads to lack of professional development of coaching and consequently major loss of opportunity to raise coaching levels.
25. The statistics on current coaching deployment are also poor. We know that coaches are employed by agencies such as local authorities, individual clubs, national governing bodies, private fitness centres etc. However, there is no single agency that has the task of collecting national statistics on the number of coaches employed part time and full time and we do not have good data on current deployment patterns. To support the work of the CTF a limited survey was conducted by Sport England **Appendix 2 (4.4)** with responses from 27 NGBs, which indicated that some 3,418 were engaged in paid roles and of these some 3,000 were in two sports – tennis and football. Despite the incomplete nature of this work it is unlikely that paid opportunities in UK would in any way compare with the 80,000 reported in France for example. Continuing research in this area is needed.
26. The Task Force believes there is a need significantly to increase the national pool of professional quality coaches. This need goes hand in hand with the need to stimulate career development for coaches and coaching. As part of a structured approach to coaching there is a need to increase massively local employment opportunities for coaches. In line with the recommendations of the Government Plan for Sport the following proposals provide a model for the employment locally of an additional 3,000 full time or part time coaches. Other details are contained in **Appendix 5**.

Key Proposals

- The establishment of a network of local coach employment ‘franchises’ covering the whole of England and phased in over three years. They would have the task of providing the local infrastructure to recruit, employ and deploy professional coaches in their area. The franchise could act as the employing agency or may designate other appropriate bodies to undertake that function.
- Sport England should be the lead organisation and through regional offices establish a network of coaching franchises covering their respective regions. Sport England is best placed to identify the most appropriate franchisee in any particular area based on local

factors. It is important that the franchisee is in a position to take a strategic view of coaching needs based on local knowledge of the geographical area concerned.

- The regional offices should secure preferred franchisees. Potential franchisees would be (but not exclusively):
 - County Sports Partnerships.
 - Local Authorities.
 - Sports Colleges.
 - Sports Action Zones.
- Franchisees would need to demonstrate how they would link with NGBs and their coach education and development plans together with their talent development programmes.
- Each franchise would be required to work with sports coach UK (**scUK**) locally to deliver effective coach education and development programmes. Similarly **scUK** should be resourced to provide technical advice and support to franchises, including the appointment of 45 generic Coaching Development Officers.
- The franchisee needs to receive financial assistance to operate the franchise. They would be required as part of the bidding process and within the business plan to identify how additional funds can be drawn down to match central funding hence the choice of the title ‘**Coachmatch**’ for the scheme. It may be possible to develop a scheme, which results in a phased reduction in subsidy over say a three-year period although some franchisees may require greater long-term support because of special local needs. It is anticipated that some ongoing subsidy would be necessary over the long term to support administration of the scheme.

Establishing 45 Sub-Regional Coach Development Officers (Appendix 6)

27. The proposals above to increase radically the numbers of coaches operating at local and regional level highlights the need to focus attention on the local recruitment, education, qualification, employment, deployment, training and management and development of coaches. At present the support mechanisms to address these key issues are limited through the lack of an effective and co-ordinated structure at local level.
28. To assist in the delivery of the CTF proposals and particularly to improve the initial training and continuing professional development of coaches it is necessary to create a sub-regional network of Coaching Development Officers (CDOs) employed nationally but deployed locally to provide a greater and consistent focus on coaching development at regional and

sub-regional level and to assist and support regional and sub-regional partners with strategic planning, implementation and management of coach development.

29. The role of the CDOs will essentially be generic rather than sports specific. They would work with local 'Coachmatch' franchises and other agencies to co-ordinate a programme of training and development across their area working closely with NGBs, FE, HE and the UFI. sports coach UK already has a small network of CDOs. The proposal is to build on and expand this existing network, extending it broadly speaking on a county basis, rather than create a new structure.

Key Proposals

- It is proposed that a network of some 45 CDOs is employed by **scUK** and deployed locally through appropriate sub regional agencies to assist in the strategic planning, implementation and management of coach development.
- They would be based in the emerging county sports partnerships, any of the potential 'Coachmatch' franchisees outlined in paragraph 25 or in sports focused HE or FE Institutes.
- Their role would be to focus on the generic elements of coach education and development working with all key partners to develop and co-ordinate regional coaching development strategies and the delivery of a programme of coach education and continuous professional development opportunities.

Come Into Coaching Recruitment Campaign (Appendix 7)

30. The Government Plan for Sport recognised that there was a need for a high profile recruitment campaign to encourage greater numbers of people to enter into coaching.
31. The conclusions of the CTF supported by the report of the benchmarking exercise clearly argue for a more professional career structure for coaching. Many of the proposals in this report seek to provide that with more opportunities for part time and full time coaching employment. However, the vast majority of coaching opportunities will inevitably continue to be of a voluntary nature and it is from the voluntary base that those ultimately seeking a career in coaching will come.
32. Come into Coaching aims to recruit more people into coaching at beginner level. It has as its focus, parents of children involved at participation level of the sport development continuum. A sustained national recruitment programme, using television, on line interactive learning and local 'taster' opportunities will also serve to raise the profile of coaches and coaching.

33. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the decline in volunteering in sport is exacerbated in coaching and officiating by the need to gain a qualification. This programme aims to break down some of the perceived barriers to qualification as a coach and to make the first steps into coaching accessible and attractive.

Key Proposals

- There should be a major recruitment drive '**Come Into Coaching**' to attract more people to enter coaching. This will be undertaken through a partnership between University for Industry (Learndirect), BBC Sport and Education, Sport England, sports coach UK and the NGBs
- It will target adults and specifically parents of children who are already participants. It will seek to break down some of the barriers to qualification and make the first step into coaching accessible and attractive.
- The long-term leadership of the programme will rest with sports coach UK working through local infrastructures and in partnership with those organisations listed above.
- Target for implementation is March 2003.

Review of sports coach UK

34. As part of the work of the Coaching Task Force it was recommended that a review be conducted of the work of **sports coach UK**, formerly known as the National Coaching Foundation. Given the fundamental recommendations, which are emerging from the Coaching Task Force, it was vital that a review of **scUK** was undertaken to establish whether it should continue to be the lead body for the development of coaching in this country and if so to confirm what the future role should be. The full report of the review and its recommendations are contained in the **Appendix 8**.
35. The review was undertaken in two stages; the first a desk exercise to undertake a fundamental review of the services of **scUK** along lines similar to those used in 'best value' reviews of public sector bodies considering services and operation under the four headings of:
- Challenge:** to examine the need for these services and the rationale for their provision.
- Compare:** to outline the performance management processes employed and to provide a basis for evaluating performance.
- Consult:** to examine how the organisation consults with clients and stakeholders and gains the feedback necessary to respond to customer needs.

Compete: to consider whether there were other ways in which the services could be delivered through another provider(s).

36. The second part of the review involved a series of interviews with a range of clients and stakeholders. Interviewees included representatives of NGBs, Active Sports Partnerships, Sport England, UK Sport, English Institute of Sport, Local Authorities, CCPR, Institute of Sport and Recreation, SPRITO, English Federation of Disability Sport and the Women's Sports Foundation. Discussions were also conducted with senior staff of **scUK**.

Key Findings

- **scUK** should continue as the key national agency to take the strategic lead in co-ordinating the development of coaching and coach education across the UK.
- **scUK** to shift its approach from a predominantly direct delivery role to one of enabling and facilitating partners to deliver.
- **scUK** to seek a much closer relationship in support of the work of NGBs, providing technical support and guidance and assisting them to integrate scUK resources and advice into their own programmes.
- **scUK** to review its services in the light of the recommendations of the CTF and with a view to focusing on a narrower range of priorities centred around coaching development and coach education and development.
- **scUK** should have responsibility for the overall strategic and co-ordinated development of coaching from the school playground to the Olympic arena even though aspects of delivery will be undertaken by a variety of partners and methods. In the world class and high performance environments **scUK** should continue to align its work with that of UKSI so that both organisations together provide quality and mutually supportive services for the development of coaches working at or aiming to work at this level.
- **scUK** to take responsibility for the development and operation of Quality Assurance of the proposed National Coaching Certificate and supporting the work of NGBs in preparing for its implementation.
- **scUK** to place a higher priority on co-ordinating and undertaking research into all aspects of coaching to provide a more robust evidence base for future developments.

Funding and Phasing of Proposals

37. The CTF has made an initial broad estimate of the funding required to underpin the proposals in the report and these are set out below. However, the detailed requirements will need to be identified as part of the development of detailed implementation plans which will be drawn up in consultation with key stakeholders.
38. Also the proposals will need to be phased in over a period of time and this again will be subject to greater clarification at the detailed implementation planning stage. Selection of sports will need to take account of NGBs' current capacity to implement the changes recommended. For illustrative purposes the funding estimates have assumed where appropriate numbers and phasing which the CTF believe are feasible.
39. The investment required to implement these proposals is likely to be as follows:

National Coaching Certificate

The development of the 5 level coaching certificate and the support work to assist NGBs to implement the new programme. This funding would replace and enhance the funding presently received by sports coach UK to carry out this kind of service.

1.5 million annually

NGB National Directors of Coaching Education

NGB national directors of coaching development – funding for 10 NGBs in year one, 15 in year two and 20 in year three. This should be linked to the existing modernisation programme for NGBs.

1 million year one

1.5 million year two

2 million year three

NGB Regional Talent Development Coaches

NGB Regional Talent Development coaches for 10 NGBs in year one, 15 in year two, 20 in year three. This should be linked into the talent development funding of NGBs.

4 million year one

6 million year two

8 million year three

Local Coach Employment – (Coachmatch)

Coachmatch scheme – employment of a pool of coaches at local level.

5 million year one
10 million year two
15 million year three

45 County Coach Development Officers

45 Coach Development Officers at county/sports partnership level. This would replace and enhance the funding received by sports coach UK, who presently have seven coach development officers.

1.5 million annually

Come into Coaching

Recruitment drive ‘come into coaching’ campaign to be funded through UFI, BBC and (possibly) a commercial partner.

No cost to Exchequer

Review of sports coach UK

Review of sports coach UK to refocus the organisation’s activities.

2 million annually

Total Cost

15 million year one, **22.5 million** year two, **30 million** year three.

40. Thus, the investment required to create a ‘step change’ in coaching will need to be significant. Some of this resource is already in place (for example, through the funding of sports coach UK, the Active sports programmes and NGB grant in aid) but has not been directed in this way. A considerable amount of this money will need to be new money provided by Government but could over time be ‘picked up’ by others.
41. This investment in human capital working in constructive and purposeful activity particularly with young people has enormous potential to contribute to many of the Government’s policy objectives of improving health, youth engagement, community safety and regeneration. It is feasible then that justification could be made for additional supporting funding to be provided through sports action zones, community safety projects, neighbourhood renewal funds and other local authority regeneration programmes where coaches could be employed to work with young people and schemes addressing the broader Government agendas.

42. Such an approach would help to make sure that any funding for coaching is mainstreamed into other Government priorities and, thus, help to ensure sustainability. The figures above, therefore, are headline figures and further work will need to be done, once Ministers have approved the work programme, to cost out more fully the financial implications of these proposals.

Impact on the Wider Aspects of Coaching, Participation and Performance

43. The UK Vision for Coaching was published in late 2000 and was endorsed by all the five Sports Councils, sports coach UK, the British Olympic Association and SPRITO. It was the result of a detailed process of consultation and analysis with all the key agencies and its overriding aim was that *'the practice of coaching in the UK will be elevated to a profession acknowledged as central to the development of sport and the fulfilment of individual potential'*. It provides an agreed vision as to where coaching in the UK should ideally be by 2012. The work of the Coaching Task Force has been very much in line with the UK Vision and signifies a major step in taking it forward. The proposals will do much to satisfy the main aspiration of establishing coaching as an acknowledged profession with:
- a coherent and unified education and qualification system,
 - identifiable career pathway with attractive employment opportunities,
 - quality assured processes which are valued by employers,
 - more systematic approach to the identification and fostering of talented coaches.
44. The proposals should be viewed as a whole and not as a series of independent initiatives. In terms of the progression pathway for coaches, entry level to a career in coaching would be through the local 'coachmatch' franchise opportunities with further progression through the regional talent development coach positions or as sub regional coach development officers. Ultimately they might aspire to the national directors of coach education posts. The NCC would provide the quality assured education framework which gives professional credibility to coaches in the system.
45. Volunteer coaches will clearly remain a vital part of the overall structure of coaching and would continue to provide a fertile recruitment ground for the professional ranks. The 'Come into Coaching' recruitment campaign will be targeted here. The professional coaches within the local set up will also spend time supporting, mentoring and encouraging those operating as volunteers.
46. The radical enhancement of coaching as envisaged through these proposals is expected also to have a major impact on overall levels of participation and standards of performance in sport.

For the first time we will have in place the right kind of resources to effectively identify, nurture and develop talent. It should enable our performers to compete on even terms with those from other countries with integrated coach development systems, which are perceived to be more successful and where the centrality of full time or part time paid coaching has long been established. The deployment of skilled coaches to work with schools and young people as part of a progression model which is mapped out by and across sports is a key requirement if we are to create a physically literate population which both participates and performs to the highest levels.

Implications for Sports Equity

47. Current evidence shows that women, disabled people and those from ethnic minority communities are significantly under represented within coaching, particularly at the performance and elite levels (Women's Sports Federation research 2001). With the majority of coaches currently being recruited from a relatively small base, the Coaching Task Force proposals represent a significant opportunity to change the culture of coaching.
48. Equity is at the heart of the modernisation of sport and the development of coaching must reflect this. Women, disabled people and ethnic minority coaches are important role models for young people, not only in inspiring them to achieve as athletes, but also as a reminder that coaching can be a viable career for all, regardless of gender, race or disability. Not only will this benefit all sectors of the community, particularly under represented groups, but more importantly it will benefit sport.
49. In order to reflect government policy on social inclusion it is important that implementation of the Coaching Task Force proposals should include transparent recruitment policies for those appointed to deliver the Coaching Task Force recommendations. In addition, the recruitment and development of coaches must be linked to governing body equity targets, with positive action schemes initiated to engage and support women, disabled people and those from ethnic minority communities from grass roots to elite coaching.
50. Adopting a five level National Coaching Certificate should provide consistency, quality assurance and credibility for coaches. It is recommended that all coaches receive equity training from Level I with more specific performance related training on priority groups delivered to coaches working at Level III and above. All coaches are expected to deliver a quality sporting experience and a greater understanding of relevant physiological and sociological factors affecting diverse athletes will contribute to the achievement of optimum athletic performance.

51. As each of the Coaching Task Force proposals takes shape and becomes a reality, each element should pay due regard to women, disabled and ethnic minority people. This will be reflected in action planning, resource allocation, information materials, recruitment and monitoring plans. All monitoring information on coaching, including coaches, coach educators and coach education programmes, needs to be collected taking account of gender, disability and ethnicity in order to assess progress effectively against identified aims.

The Women's Sports Foundation, English Federation of Disability Sport and Sport Equals have agreed to develop generic equity standards to support the work of DCMS and sports councils in achieving equity. These standards will include guidance and outline a strategy with regard to all leadership roles including coaching.

Implications for the Wider Policy Agenda

52. It is anticipated that the investment proposal will generate in the region of 3,000 part time and full time posts, which is a rich dividend in itself. A good proportion of these may attract women returning to work, young graduates entering the industry for the first time and those aged 50+ who are active already in sport and keen to apply knowledge and experience in a new setting. It would also include young unemployed people who have developed sporting expertise but who previously have not been able to use their skills in seeking employment. Programmes could be promoted specifically to encourage and support the development of coaches from amongst this section of the community.
53. The proactive deployment in the right locations of skilled coaches and role models will provide key resources through which capacity can be built in communities suffering from multiple disadvantages where the latest Sport England research illustrates participation rates are lowest, health inequalities greatest and the waste of talent and loss of potential the most obvious. Locally employed coaches in these communities will provide the opportunity to reach people when they have the time and availability to participate. This will be most true of the young unemployed, people with disabilities, the elderly and those living in isolated communities for whom travel and cost is the biggest single barrier to participation. This approach could have a major impact in areas where crime and community cohesion concerns dominate and where long term sustainable development opportunities are often lacking.

Consultation and Detailed Implementation

54. In order to guide detailed future implementation and to gain important feedback on the proposals a special seminar took place on 21st May at Loughborough University to consult with key stakeholders. It was attended by the Minister for Sport and over 100 delegates, with representatives covering over 30 sports and national bodies.
55. There was general support for the proposals in principle, whilst recognising that the practical details of implementation still needed refinement. The broad view was that the proposals will:
- Help to improve the public perception and profile of coaching.
 - Help to give coaching a professional structure and career pathway.
 - Help to support coaching and sporting progression from grass roots to elite levels.
 - Improve sport's ability to respond to developments.

Concerns centred around the sustainability of the initiatives and the new funding, who will lead and drive the recommendations forward, what support will be available to NGBs to help implement the changes and how the recommendations will fit with existing systems and practices.

56. How the proposals can now be put into practice will now need to rest with a series of groups of key agencies as outlined in **Appendix 9**. It will be their responsibility to consult with the NGBs and other relevant agencies and to take on board the feedback from the Coaching Task Force Seminar, which was summarised on the day as follows for each recommendation:

Recommendation – National Coaching Certificate

Opportunities

- Will provide a good incentive to ensure that NGBs standardise coaching levels and standards.
- Will provide an easier and simpler system for employers.
- Will improve the status of coaches.

Concerns

- Who will set the standards?
- How will this initiative complement and build on any existing sport-specific qualifications?
- What will the cost of this initiative be to both NGBs and to participants?

Recommendation – National Directors of Coach Education*Opportunities*

- Sports will be able to appoint a *professional*.
- Will help NGBs in strategic planning for their sport.
- Will help to create a consistency of approach across sports.

Concerns

- Will this initiative be weighted towards mainstream sport?
- This initiative may reduce the number of volunteers.
- How sustainable will the funding be?

Recommendation – Regional Talent Development*Opportunities*

- Will introduce a much greater consistency of approach across NGBs on talent development.
- Will provide a crucial link in the national pathway for talent development.
- Will help to improve the status of coaches as a genuine profession.

Concerns

- Will there be a clash of interest between local needs and county needs?
- How will this initiative be integrated with existing talent identification structures?
- How will the posts be filled initially?

Recommendation – Coachmatch*Opportunities*

- The concept is right and this measure is needed.
- Will provide a strong incentive to attract people to either enter or stay in coaching and to progress within the profession.
- Will make much better use of the latent talent that is currently being wasted.

Concerns

- How sustainable will the funding be in the long term?
- What happens if a body is unable to raise the necessary match funding?
- Who will lead the franchises – will it be a single national body or a series of regional partners?

Recommendation – Coach Development Officers Network

Opportunities

- Will give NGBs a greater presence and coaching profile.
- Will provide local support to individual coaches.
- Will enhance existing structures and share good practice.

Concerns

- Why 45 CDOs – too many/not enough!
- Who will employ the CDOs and line manage them?
- Which sports will the CDOs cover?

Recommendation – Come Into Coaching

Opportunities

- Will raise public awareness and profile of coaching as a career opportunity.
- Will help to break down barriers, particularly those concerning poor public perception.
- Will help to create a genuine first rung of a career pathway for coaching.

Concerns

- Need to make sure NGBs are geared up and ready for the campaign before it is launched.
- Child protection issues must be considered and dealt with before the campaign is launched.
- Campaign must be sustainable and not simply stopped after a three year period.

Outputs

57. If these recommendations were to be implemented in full the impact on coaching in England is likely to include some of the following:
- A harmonised, unified and integrated coach education and qualification system operating across all sports. Co-ordinated by a central agency but driven by a dedicated Director of Coach Education for each sport.
 - 200 new Regional Talent Development Coaches in 20 sports by 2006.
 - Improved coaching standards and ultimately performances.
 - Clearly defined talent development pathways.
 - Regional/County level clinics/camps for talented performers and their coaches.

- 3,000 new full time and part time professional coaches by 2006.
- 645,000 additional coaching days per annum.
- 3,225,000 additional coaching sessions per annum.
- 45 Coaching Development Officers in place by 2006 impacting on better strategic planning of coach development, generic training and continual professional development.
- Better recruitment and retention of coaches aiming for 95% satisfied demand by 2006.
- A step change in developing a career structure for coaching.

Appendix 1

Membership of the Task Force

Name	Position	Organisation
Andy Worthington	Sport England Council member	Chief Executive of ILAM
Sue Campbell	Chief Executive	Youth Sports Trust
Pauline Harrison	National Technical Director	All England Netball Association
Phil Collier	Head of Education & Training	Sport England
John Mills	Coach Education Director	British Cycling Federation
John Stevens	Chief Executive	sports coach UK
Steven Studd	Chief Executive	SPRITO
Lloyd Readhead	Director of Coaching and Education	British Gymnastics
Emyr Roberts	Performance Service Manager	UK Sport
Steve Evans	Director of County Services	South Gloucestershire District Council
Roger Pontefract	Director of Education and Leisure	Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council
Amanda Bennett		Women's Sports Foundation

Appendix 2

Bench-marking coaching in the United Kingdom against best international practice Report presented to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 18 March 2002

1. Background

- *study commissioned following 'A Sporting Future for All'*
- *bench-marking UK against Australia, France, Germany and Sweden*
- *coach education and coach deployment were the main issues studied*

1.1 Sports strategy: The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) has published a strategy document *A Sporting Future for All*¹. As part of the Sporting Excellence strand of the strategy, a review of coaching and coach education was carried out.

1.2 Bench-marking study: As part of the coaching review, a bench-marking study was commissioned to address the following issues:

- Structure of coach education and coach deployment within four countries (Australia; France; Germany; Sweden).²
- Statistical indicators of the status of coach education and coach deployment in Australia, France, Germany and Sweden.
- Comparative analysis of existing coach education and coach deployment structures in the United Kingdom (UK) against the structures which exist in the four countries studied.
- Comparative analysis of existing coach education and coach deployment structures in the UK against the emerging structure for the qualification of coaches in the European Union.
- Issues and recommendations.

1.3 Timescale: The study was commissioned in December 2001 and carried out between the months of January and March 2002.

¹ Department of Culture, Media and Sport (2000). *A Sporting Future for All*, London.

² It was initially intended that Romania be included in the study. However, within the time available it was not possible to collate sufficient data to merit its inclusion as one of the main countries for comparison. Where appropriate, reference will be made to relevant data from Romania and other countries.

1.4 **Limitations:** The relatively short timescale and the resources available for the project dictated that the study retain a tight focus, with a concentration on selected variables. Extensive fieldwork was not possible, although the existing bank of data and contacts made it possible to collate a number of key indicators for comparison purposes.

2. Methodology

- *project structure agreed with DCMS*
- *desk research; site visits; interviews; literature review*

2.1 **Project structure:** A project structure was agreed with DCMS and is outlined in the sections that follow.

2.2 **Data collection:** Data were collected through the following means:

- Review of existing data on coaching and coach education in the UK.
- Visit to sports coach UK.
- Discussions with members of the DCMS Coaching Task Force.
- Review of existing data on coaching and coach education in Australia, France, Germany, Sweden.
- Visit to the Institute National du Sport et de l'Education Physique (INSEP) in Paris.
- Review of existing data on the proposed European Qualification Structure for Coaches.
- Interviews with key personnel within the identified countries (see **Appendix 1**).
- Review of international literature.
- Review of relevant internet sites.

3. Structure of the report

- *12 main sections*

3.1 **Main headings:** The report is presented in the following main sections:

1. Background.
2. Methodology.
3. Structure of the report.
4. Coaching and coach education in the UK: an overview of the current position.
5. UK performances at Olympic level relative to Australia, France, Germany and Sweden.
6. The role of coaching in achieving results in high performance sport.

7. The emerging scenario in Europe concerning the qualification and employment of coaches.
8. Coach education systems within Australia, France, Germany and Sweden.
9. Coach deployment within Australia, France, Germany and Sweden.
10. Issues arising from the study for the UK coach education and coach deployment systems.
11. Possible lines of development.
12. Conclusion.

4. Coaching and coach education in the UK: an overview of the current position

- *progress has been made*
- *absence of an integrated or unified system*
- *coaching as a profession is under-developed*
- *absence of reliable data limits tracking and future planning*
- *action needed on the UK vision for coaching*

4.1 Progress to date: Since the establishment of the National Coaching Foundation (NCF) in 1983, considerable progress has been made in the development of a comprehensive coach education structure within the UK. These developments have led the way for many other countries, particularly in the generic areas of coaching which can be applied across all sports. However, participation in the programmes of the NCF was voluntary on the part of NGBs and took place in the absence of an overall policy to develop a truly national coach education framework.

4.2 Absence of a unified and integrated system: As a consequence, the UK does not have a unified or integrated system for the education and qualification of coaches. The education of coaches occurs within a sporting context that has recently been described as follows: ‘*The institutional and financial framework for sport in the UK is extremely complicated. Lines of authority are confused and the optimum role of different levels of Government is unclear.*’³ Despite the existence of sports coach UK, there is no central agency that has responsibility for co-ordinating and/or quality assuring coach education on a national and cross-sport basis.

4.3 Difficulty in making direct comparisons: Because of this context, significant differences exist between the coaching qualifications of different sports within the UK. In addition, there are differences in the systems of the four countries that make up the UK. In turn, this context makes the process of direct international comparison somewhat problematic.

³ Cabinet Office: Performance and innovation unit (December, 2001). *PIU Sports Project*. Page 1.

- 4.4 Coaching as a profession:** Coaching in the UK remains primarily an unpaid activity. However, there are increasing expectations that all coaches should obtain and renew appropriate qualifications relevant to the tasks which they carry out. In a recent Sport England study it was concluded that: *‘From the information supplied by the NGBs it is clear that most coaches work on a volunteer basis. A very small percentage of coaches work full-time. Usually full-time workers are employed by the NGB, Schools, Clubs, Local Authorities or Universities. The professional sports such as Tennis and Football have a higher percentage of full-time coaches with around 15% of their coaches working full-time. Only a very small percentage of coaches receive payment, those working full or part-time.’*⁴
- 4.5 Absence of data and research evidence:** There is a notable absence of robust, quantitative and qualitative data concerning the number of coaches qualified in different sports. The levels at which they work; the time they spend coaching; their career paths and motivation; as well as the payment rates which apply have not been recorded in any detailed or reliable way. This absence of data represents a significant limitation in tracking progress and in planning for the future. With up to 500,000 coaches nationally, it is essential that the deployment and education of these coaches is charted in a more systematic way.⁵
- 4.6 Foundations for the future:** While the context outlined at 4.2–4.5 above identifies a number of problem areas, there is no doubt but that much progress has been made in the right direction. Work which has been initiated in coaching development at a strategic level, coach education and coach deployment provides an important foundation for the future.
- 4.7 Vision for Coaching:** *A Vision for Coaching* has already been adopted for the UK⁶. This vision calls for five major lines of development in the areas of ethics; national standards; licensing; recognition and continuous improvement. The vision proposes that *‘the practice of coaching in the UK will be elevated to a profession acknowledged as central to the development of sport and the fulfilment of individual potential.’* The actions required to implement this vision should be re-visited in the light of the current study and the findings of the Coaching Task Force.
- 5. UK Olympic performances relative to Australia, France, Germany and Sweden**
- *performances have fallen behind France and Australia*
 - *cohesive and well established structures evident in the countries of comparison*
 - *central agencies and systems established in the other countries*

⁴ Sport England (2001). Internal study: *Summary of NGB Coaching Information*. Supplied to the author by members of the Coaching Task Force. There appears also to be a small percentage of self-employed coaches working in the system (sports coach UK).

⁵ This figure is based on a *sports coach UK* estimate of the number of coaches operating in club, school and local authority settings.

⁶ UK Sport (2000). *The UK Vision for Coaching*, London.

- 5.1 The relationship between coaching and performance:** The comparative analysis of the coach education and coach deployment systems of different countries can be charted alongside the respective performance records of the countries concerned. This approach provides the opportunity to consider the relationship, if any, between investment in coaching systems and the achievement of success on the international stage.
- 5.2 Measures of performance:** The performances of the four comparator countries in the Olympic Games since 1948 have been charted by the Performance and Innovation Unit (PIU).⁷ Figure 1 provides the detail of this analysis and plots the performances of each of the four countries against those of the UK for the same period. Data for Romania and Canada are also provided.
- 5.3 Key trends:** Notably, the performance of the UK has fallen behind that of countries like Australia and France when the trends of the last twenty years are analysed. It is also notable that both of these countries have experienced a significant and sustained improvement in performance since the 1988 Games, at least 10 years after the commencement of key central initiatives relating to coaching and performance.⁸ Germany, like the UK, has suffered a decline in success levels since the 1988 Games. In the case of the UK, the 2000 Games marked a reversal of this trend. It is too early to say if the results from Sydney are part of a longer term recovery in the nation's success in the Games.
- 5.4 Medals per million:** When Sydney performances are adjusted on a medals per million basis, UK achieves the lowest ratio of medals to population among six selected countries (See Table 1).

Table 1: Performances at the Sydney Olympic Games

Country	Gold	Silver	Bronze	Total	Pop (millions)	GDP, 1998 \$US	Medals per million
Australia	16	25	17	58	19.1	18,664	3.04
Sweden	4	5	3	12	8.9	25,656	1.35
Romania	11	6	9	26	22.3	4,043	1.17
Germany	13	17	26	56	81.9	16,408	0.68
France	13	14	11	38	59.0	19,413	0.64
United Kingdom	11	10	7	28	59.1	18,047	0.47

⁷ Cabinet Office: Performance and innovation unit (December 2001). *PIU Sports Project*. Annex A.

⁸ In the case of France, INSEP has been in existence since 1945. Since the Governmental decree of 28 August 1945, the French sports system has been an integral part of government policy. The Ministry of Youth and Sports plays a key role in the context of the 16 July 1984 law which 'introduces the recognition by the State of the public service mission of all the federations recognised by the State.' In the case of Australia, the 1976 Olympics was a turning point which led to the establishment of the Australian Institute of Sport and the National Coaching Accreditation Scheme (the latter being developed and managed by the Australian Coaching Council from 1978).

There is significant evidence to suggest that a country's willingness to invest in *elite athlete development (EAD) systems* is directly related to the level of success achieved in major games.⁹ A major feature of such systems is the level of investment which is made in supporting athletes and their coaches so that they can focus on the job at hand.

5.5 Participation levels, sports structure and player development pathways: Participation levels are another, albeit crude, measure of the impact of coaching and coach education. Data are variable between countries, but an overview of the key statistics is provided in Table 2. Comments are also made on the overall sports structure within the countries concerned and on relevant issues relating to athlete pathways (the latter being crucial to long term athlete development (LTAD) systems).

Table 2: Participation levels and sports structure

Country	Participation levels	Sports structure/athlete pathways
Australia ¹⁰	4.1m (27.1%) aged over 15 involved in sports clubs/organisations 1.4m (9.5%) involved in non-playing roles, one-third of whom had completed qualifications Government support of £35m; Local authorities £72m	Australian Sports Commission (ASC) co-ordinates Australian Institute of Sport and Active Australia National Coaching Accreditation scheme (developed by the Australian Coaching Council) in place since 1978 Six States, with sports infrastructures and State Institutes of Sport ASC base funding £88m
France ¹¹	1.5m volunteers (2.5%) 70,393 trained in sport related qualifications in 2000	Ministry of Youth and Sports Strong legislative base since 1945 State certification system for coaches in place since 1970's Regional and national centres of excellence £112m State budget in 2001
Germany ¹²	Physical education three hours per week Federal Youth Games (5m participants)	Federal Ministry German Sports Confederation/National Olympic Committee Trainerakademie in place since 1974 16 'lander' (states or regions)

⁹ Whitby (2001:19) concluded that 'to optimise the number of medals that can be won in a given year and over a period straddling two or more Olympic Games, a country must develop, operate and provide funding for an efficient Elite Athlete Development (EAD) system . . . Countries without systems or with inefficient systems still win medals of course. But these countries can never optimise their chances of winning medals in a given year or win medals on a consistent basis.' *Coaches Report*, Summer 2001, Vol 8(1), 18-24.

¹⁰ Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Involvement in Organised sport and physical activity, Australia*. 15 January, 2002.

¹¹ www.sse-sports.gouv.fr/francais/org-sport.htm and Council of Europe (1997). *Sports structures in Europe*. Brussels, 1997.

¹² Council of Europe (1997). *Sports structures in Europe*. Brussels, 1997.

Country	Participation levels	Sports structure/athlete pathways
Sweden ¹³	Up to 50% of the total population members of sports clubs 600,000 (6.7%) Swedes involved as sports leaders, mainly volunteers Strong culture of volunteerism and of training/education in sport	22,000 clubs/22 districts/64 associations Multi-sport emphasis among young Co-ordination through the Swedish Sports Confederation £42m State budget/£66m local authorities
United Kingdom ¹⁴	20 million involved in sports clubs (38.4%) Decreasing participation trends a cause for concern	UK Sport and home country sports councils co-ordinate No legislative basis to sports infrastructure Department of Culture, Media and Sport

6. The role of coaching in achieving results in high performance sport

- *up to 10 years to become an expert*
- *coaching plays a key role in the development of expert performance*
- *clear pathways mapped out for performers*
- *coaching skills to match the desired athlete capacities at each stage*
- *specialist coaching from the early adolescent years*
- *development of fundamentals crucial at primary school stage*

6.1 Characteristics of expert performers: Recent cross-domain studies have highlighted a number of characteristics among expert performers.¹⁵ An important element of these findings revealed that it takes up to 10 years of deliberate practice to become an expert in most domains. In the region of 10,000 hours of focused practice are needed to achieve this level.

6.2 Characteristics of top sports performers: In a ground-breaking study, Bloom and associates (1985)¹⁶, found that there were a number of key features associated with top sports performers. These included:

- There were broadly three stages of development towards expert performance (classified as the early years, the middle years and the later years).
- The distinguishing features between these stages related to the *skills learned relationships formed*, with coaches playing important and varied roles at each stage.

¹³ Swedish Sports Confederation. *Sports in Sweden*. January, 2002.

¹⁴ Full data concerning recent UK trends can be found in *Participation in sport, past trends and future prospects*. UK Sport (2002), London.

¹⁵ Ericson, K.A., Krampe, R.T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993) The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 3, 363-406.

¹⁶ Bloom, B. S. (Ed) (1985) *Developing talent in young people*. New York: Ballantine.

- The *inter-personal* element of coach-athlete relationships were most significant in the early years.
- The *expertise* of the coach was a key factor in the middle (specialising) and later (achieving) years.

It was evident from Bloom's study that coaches (as well as parents) were critical influencing factors in helping young sports performers achieve excellence in their chosen field. More recently, Balyi¹⁷ has suggested that athletes pass through five major stages of development:

1. Fundamental stage.
2. Train to train.
3. Train to compete.
4. Train to win.
5. Retirement stage.

Balyi¹⁸ has also highlighted the importance of good coaching at the fundamental stage in helping to develop the skills for lifelong participation in sport and/or the achievement of sporting excellence.

6.3 Selected profile of top performers from the Sydney Olympic Games: An analysis of the finalists and medal winners in swimming, athletics and boxing in the Sydney Olympic Games revealed that top performers varied in age from 17 to 40. Table 3 provides an overview of these findings, with an indicative age of specialisation, based on the application of the '10 year rule' (as well as a modified six and eight year period from specialisation to peak). These data provide an indication of the ages at which specialist coaching should be applied if there is to be a realistic chance of winning a medal in the sports of swimming, athletics and boxing.

Table 3: Sydney medal winners: age and indicative age of specialisation¹⁹

Sport	Medal Winners			Indicative age of specialisation		
	Youngest	Oldest	Average age	10 year rule	8 years	6 years
Men's swimming	17	29	22	12	14	16
Women's swimming	15	33	23	13	15	17
Men's athletics	21	37	27	17	19	21
Women's athletics	18	40	27	17	19	21
Boxing	19	31	23	13	15	17

¹⁷ Balyi I. (2001) Sport system building and long-term athlete development in Canada. *Coaches Report*. 8(1), 25-28.

¹⁸ Balyi I. (2000) *Keys to success: long term athlete development*. Presentation to the 6th National Coaching Forum: Pathways to success good coaching makes a difference for children, players and athletes. National Coaching and Training Centre, University of Limerick, Ireland. The education of all coaches in the principles underpinning the fundamental stage was also advocated by Balyi and formally endorsed by the Forum.

¹⁹ These data were drawn from a review of finalists and medalists at the Sydney Olympic Games, compiled by the National Coaching and Training Centre, University of Limerick, Ireland.

The figures do not take into account the need for coaching and instruction prior to specialisation. As noted in section 6.2, Balyi and others²⁰ have argued strongly that the fundamental stage is an essential foundation to later sporting success.

6.4 Coaching and the athlete pathway: It is evident from the above table and foregoing sections that coaching is a critical element in the development of expert performance within sport. The type of coaching, and the skills required, vary according to the different stages of the athlete 'pathway' towards expert performance. Essentially, the skills of the coach need to mirror the demands of each pathway stage.²¹

7. The emerging scenario in Europe concerning the qualification and employment of coaches

- *move towards the professionalisation of coaching*
- *five level structure proposed within Europe*
- *level 3 is likely to be an important bench-mark*
- *absence of internal harmonisation within the UK is a limitation*

7.1 Move towards professionalisation: There is a significant move towards the professionalisation of coaching in Europe.²² The *Vision for Coaching* has also signalled such a move in the UK.²³ The centrality of full-time or part-time paid coaching has been long established in countries such as France and Germany. The former Eastern bloc countries also recognised the importance of having coaches work on a daily basis with athletes. In Sweden, where there is a very strong volunteer input into coaching, the importance of a professional approach is highlighted by a comprehensive range of basic, intermediate and advanced-level training courses.

7.2 European qualifications framework: Since 1995 there has been an agreed *European Structure Comprising Five Training Levels for Coaches*.²⁴ This framework has been developed in the context of two European Union (EU) directives concerning the recognition of vocational training (89/48/EEC and 92/51/EEC)²⁵. The framework outlines the following:

- clearly defined levels of coaching (levels I to V, see **Appendix 3** for a full outline of the framework from levels 3 to 5).

²⁰ Balyi – see note 18. The programmes of the Youth Sport Trust are a practical example of how the fundamentals of movement and sports skills can be developed.

²¹ The key capacities of each stage have been outlined by Balyi (2001 – see note 17) and are outlined in Appendix 2.

²² According to *Sports employment in Europe*, published by the European Observatoire of Sports Employment in 2000, there are 50,000 sports coaches in Europe, working on a professional basis.

²³ UK Vision for Coaching. See note 6.

²⁴ European Network of Sports Sciences in Higher Education. *European Structure Comprising Five Training Levels for Coaches*, 1995.

²⁵ 89/48/EEC covers higher education diplomas which are awarded following a minimum of three years vocational training. 92/51/EEC covers diplomas awarded in shorter higher education courses; holders of secondary level qualifications and non-diploma holders with professional experience.

- minimum guidelines in relation to the education of coaches at each level
- domains of competence.
- fields of knowledge.

7.3 Core objectives: The core objectives of the framework include reference to the educational and deployment aspects of coaching. These are to:

- provide a scheme for the analysis of the coach education systems in each of the EU countries.
- facilitate the harmonisation of the various training systems.
- facilitate the free movement of coaches within the EU.²⁶

7.4 Country and sport specific differences: The framework recognises ‘the unique nature of the coaching and coach education systems of each of the countries of the EU’. In addition, ‘the heterogeneity of sports is recognised’, highlighting the sport specific nature of coach education and its organising systems.

7.5 Emerging scenario: While the full implementation of the *European Structure Comprising Five Training Levels for Coaches* has been slow, there is evidence to suggest that it has had a significant impact on the coach education structures of the EU Member States.²⁷ This momentum is most likely to concentrate on the further definition of Level 3 qualifications and on the provision of higher level professional development opportunities.²⁸ In addition, the recently adopted Bologna declaration has added momentum to the European movement towards the harmonisation of qualifications.²⁹

7.6 Implications: There are a number of key implications arising out of the emerging scenario in Europe:

- The position of coaching as a profession is gaining significant momentum.
- There is an emerging and common framework for the education and qualification of coaches.
- The emerging framework recognises that there are a number of key roles associated with the development of coaching systems. While direct coaching is at the centre of the process,

²⁶ European Network of Sports Sciences in Higher Education. *European structure comprising five training levels for coaches*, 1995, par 4.6.

²⁷ The proceedings of the Coaching Committee of the European Network (now of Sports Science, Education **and** employment, following a change in title in 2001) show that Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Ireland, Spain, Sweden have taken account of the new structure in the further development of their coach education systems.

²⁸ As considered at the latest Coaching Committee meeting of the European Network Sports Science, Education and employment) which was held in January 2002 in Paris. The potential for developing Master’s level programmes on a European-wide basis is receiving increasing attention.

²⁹ Confederation of EU Rectors’ Conferences and the Association of European Universities (June 1999). *The Bologna Declaration on the European Space for Higher Education*. On the basis of the declaration, the European Network of Sports Science, Education and Employment is seeking EU support to further develop the coaching qualifications framework.

there is a recognition of the importance of coach education; management and co-ordination; research and strategic planning roles as they relate to coaching. The employment of coaches alone is recognised by most modern European states as being only part of the picture in developing their coaching systems.

- Level 3 within the European framework would appear to be the level at which coaches are likely to be eligible for paid full-time roles and at which the bench-mark for mobility within the European Union will be set.
- The capability of the UK system to benefit from, and interact with, the emerging European system will be contingent upon the existence of a strong, culturally specific, unified, integrated and quality assured coach education system. This system should meet European bench-marks as a minimum. This points to the need to achieve harmonisation of approach between sports and among the countries which make up the United Kingdom.

7.7 Limitations of the European framework: There are several limitations which should be taken into account when considering the European framework. These include:

- The framework has been slow to develop in a truly European context. Greatest energy continues to be devoted to developing national systems, albeit with an eye to the emerging European framework.³⁰
- The framework has been developed without reference to the increasing role of European and World level federations in the development of coach education structures.
- The framework has yet to fully resolve the relationship between vocationally based coach education and the education of coaches as part of third level qualifications.

8. Coach education systems within Australia, France, Germany and Sweden

- *systems are culturally specific*
- *direct comparisons are difficult due an absence of harmonisation in the UK*
- *there are common characteristics across the four systems*
- *UK system needs re-alignment to compete against best international practice*

8.1 General characteristics: Each of the coach education systems studied bears unique and culturally specific characteristics. There are a number of characteristics, however, which lend themselves to comparison.

³⁰ For example, Friedhelm Kreiss, Head of the Ministerial Department in Germany has noted that 'this five stage consecutive system has been applied in an exemplary way to the training of coaches in Germany.' Paper distributed at European Network of Sports Sciences and Education (Coaching Committee) in Grenada, Spain, October 2000.

8.2 Duration and focus of coaching levels: The title, duration and key focus for each of the coaching levels in each of the countries is identified in Table 4 overleaf. These levels are compared to the levels outlined in the *European Structure Comprising Five Training Levels for Coaches* and to UK National Standards.

Table 4: Coaching levels compared to the European Structure³¹

European levels/ UK national standards ³²	Australia	France ³³	Germany ³⁴	Sweden
Level 1 (UK National Standards: level 1 activity leadership/sports leadership)	<i>Level 1</i> School/junior level 45 hours Preceded by an introductory coaching level	NGB specific training courses	C Basic coaching principles 120 units	General training course delivered by federations. Also a wide range of 3rd level courses, followed by practical experience in coaching
Level 2 (UK National Standards level 2)	<i>Level 2</i> More advanced with sports science 126 hours	Brevet D'Etat d'educateur sportif (BEES) ³⁵ (1st level): general study, combined with sport specific One year	B Talent development 60 units	Not defined
Level 3 (UK National standards level 3)	<i>Level 3</i> Coaches of elite athletes 200 hours	BEES (2nd level) – sport specific; and high performance One year	A High level coaching 90 units	Not defined
Level 4 (UK National standards level 4)	<i>High performance</i> Individualised and sport specific 2-3 years	BEES (3rd level) Higher level study/research with high performance emphasis	Graduate coach or State examined coach Top level sport 1,700 units	Four 3rd level level institutions run two year programmes in sport science and coaching

8.3 Strengths of the French system: The French system of coach education provides a number of notable features. The system is subject to a high level of regulation and delivers two main types of diploma as part of an extensive national sports education programme – professional

³¹ Only four European levels are used for comparison purposes here. There is a divergence of views as to what constitutes level 5 - with some European countries relating this level directly to degree/masters qualifications, while others would see it as more closely related to focused vocational training and experience.

³² Comparison with UK National standards is made on the basis of the existing, industry-wide standards. These standards have not been uniformly applied across sports coaching, however.

³³ In France, there is a dual system of certification. The first involves certification by the Federations and the second involves State certification. Both have been combined within this table for the purposes of comparison.

³⁴ Four different routes of education exist in Germany: NGB based; Trainerakademie; training of coaches as part of professional sports instructor training; academic training of coaches as part of a university degree.

³⁵ Example of a course outline for the Brevet d'Etat d'educateur sportif (BEES), as delivered at INSEP in Paris is provided in Appendix 4.

and non-professional. Table 5 provides an outline of the total numbers involved in this type of sports education since 1994. A total of 69,144 diplomas were awarded in the year 2000, of which 20 per cent fell into the ‘professional’ category. This level of certification represents one certificate to every 842 members of the population in France in the year 2000.

Table 5: Professional and non-professional diplomas in France 1994-2000 (all fields)³⁶

Year	Professional diplomas ³⁷	Non-professional diplomas ³⁸	Total
1994	9,338	55,051	64,389
1999	12,235	55,250	67,485
2000	12,656	56,488	69,144

8.4 State certificates in sport education (coaching): A key element of the French coach education system is the state certificate in sport education (coaching). Appendix 5 provides a detailed analysis of the numbers taking this certificate in 1994 and 2000 according to sport classification.

8.5 Common characteristics: It is possible to identify a number of common characteristics relating to these systems:

- With the exception of Sweden, the systems are **multi-level** (usually 4 or 5).
- The levels are **sequential** and involve an **experiential** component between levels.
- France, Germany and Sweden place a strong emphasis on **general coaching and sports science principles** at an early stage in their structure.
- With the exception of Sweden, **coaching levels are related to (or defined by) the performance level of the athlete.**
- With the exception of Sweden, there is a **centralised structure**, defining curricula, content and standards at each level. In Sweden, there is a central sports education organisation (SISU).
- In all cases, there is a recognition of **sports specificity** and the role of the federation (NGB) in the development and delivery of coach education.
- With the exception of Sweden, there is a **common certification system** in each of the countries.

³⁶ These figures do not include higher level and degree qualifications. Source: *Jeunesse et sports. STAT-INFO, No 1-04, 2001, p3 (translated and adapted).*

³⁷ This heading includes professional diplomas in the areas of sport for all/youth (BEATEP); outdoor pursuits (BAPAAT); animation/leadership (DEFA); Directors of programmes (DEDPAD); state certificates in sport education (BEES). The major proportion of professional diplomas were awarded in the BEES (coaching) category (8,198 out of 12,656).

³⁸ This heading includes animateurs/leaders (BAFA); co-ordinators (BAFD).

- Higher level programmes are accessed by recommendation from the federation and often comprise of **individualised, on-the-job training** with a strong scientific and problem-solving basis.
- Systems have been **established for a considerable time** – in most cases for at least 25 years.
- In all cases, a **combination of vocational and academic based training** of coaches is evident.
- The **scientific basis of coaching** is strongly recognised in all cases

8.6 Implications for the UK: The cohesive, continuous and progressive nature of the coach education structures of the various nations studied highlights a number of key issues. In particular, the need for a robust, harmonised and continuously evolving coach education system is apparent.

9. Coach deployment within Australia, France, Germany and Sweden

- *culture of employing coaches*
- *data are variable between countries*
- *move towards professionalisation/regulation*
- *development of indigenous coaching expertise at all levels is recognised*

9.1 General characteristics: All countries display a spread of non-paid; part-time paid and full time paid coaches. Table 6 outlines the key statistical indicators for each country. Further research on these data is required to establish reliable and comparable measures between countries.

Table 6: Paid coaches and rates of pay³⁹

	Australia	France	Germany ⁴⁰	Sweden	UK
Coach numbers	1.4 million involved in non-player roles 11% receive payment, 19% of coaches receive payment ⁴¹	Up to 80,000 in paid roles ⁴²	Not quantified	4,500 ⁴³	Possibly up to 500,000 in paid and unpaid roles ⁴⁴ Sport England study identified 3,418 full-time coaches in 27 sports ⁴⁵
Payment rates⁴⁶	£10,740-£18,794 ⁴⁷ depending on the level of the coach	£7,500-£22,500 depending on the level of the coach ⁴⁸	Not quantified	£16,326-£40,816 depending on the level of the coach	Not quantified
Existence of payment guidelines	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No formal guidelines or agreements

While the data are variable between countries, a number of key trends emerge in reviewing the different systems:

- There is a **culture of employing coaches** at all stages of the athlete pathway.
- The need for **coaching, coach education and management**/co-ordination roles is recognised.
- The central importance of **sport specific technical and tactical** expertise is recognised.
- All available mechanisms are employed to **maximise knowledge and expertise** in the system: use of research; employment of coaches and experts from other countries.
- While the employment of non-national coaches is a common feature, especially in Australia, there is a strong emphasis in all cases on the development of **indigenous, self sustaining coach education and deployment systems**.

³⁹ Empirical and verifiable data relating to the issues in this table are variable and point to the need for further research. Figures are quoted in Sterling at March 2002 exchange rates.

⁴⁰ Responses are awaited from Germany on a number of requests relating to this table.

⁴¹ Australian Bureau of Statistics (2002). 6285.) *Involvement in organised sport and physical activity, Australia*. Canberra.

⁴² INSEP estimate.

⁴³ Based on a SISU estimate.

⁴⁴ sports coach UK estimate.

⁴⁵ Sport England. *Summary of NGB coaching information*. Internal study, supplied to the author by members of the Coaching Task Force. Notably, data were not available for 11 of the 27 sports.

⁴⁶ Rates of pay vary significantly within and between countries. The rates quoted relate to coaches who are working in the mainstream sporting system. Higher level professional coaching rates are not included.

⁴⁷ Figures are from a 1995 dated collective agreement at the AIS. Further detail has been requested concerning current rates.

⁴⁸ Data from INSEP.

- There are increasing signs of the full **emergence of coaching as a profession**, with the existence of guidelines and collective pay scales which are linked to the level of qualification of the coach.
- There is an increasing move towards **licensing; professional codes of conduct and overall regulation** within coaching.

10. Issues arising from the study for the UK coach education and coach deployment systems

- *need for a coherent system*
- *need to harmonise: between sports; between home countries and across the UK*
- *need to foster UK coaching talent*
- *need for more coaches in paid or part-time paid roles*
- *need for systematic research and data gathering*

10.1 Key issues: The following key issues arise for the UK coaching and coach education systems as a result of this bench-marking study:

- Absence of a national coaching structure, which provides continuity in system development and progression for coaches.
- Need for greater cross-sport and within sport definitions of athlete capacities and related coach competencies at each stage of the athlete pathway/coaching ladder, respectively.
- Absence of harmonisation between sports.
- Absence of harmonisation between the home countries of the UK.
- Absence of a common and professionally recognised coaching qualification.
- Low levels of employment of coaches.
- Need for guidelines for the employment and payment of coaches.
- Need for expertise within NGBs to develop high level, sport specific coach education programmes.
- Trend towards the employment of coaches and coach education/managers from other countries. Experiential and employment pathways should be planned for UK coaches so that more of them can aspire to coach at the highest level.
- Need for a system of registration/licensing for coaches, linked to monitored continuing professional development opportunities.

- Need for a system of information-gathering and a research programme which is strategically driven and which will provides reliable data on the current position of coaching and coach education. Such a programme will provide a sound basis for evaluating progress and planning for the future.

11. Possible lines of development

11.1 Role of coaching as part of national strategy: The central role of coaching at all levels of sport needs to be fully acknowledged and supported within existing and emerging national sports strategies.

11.2 Coaching development: The following measures might be considered in the area of coach development:

- A common philosophy and structure for athlete development should be further refined and defined.
- The model for athlete development should form the basis for defining a common system for the education of coaches.
- The common education system for coaches should consist of four or five levels, in line with the emerging European framework and consistent with the culturally specific requirements of the UK.⁴⁹
- A central agency should be charged with the responsibility of developing the common coach education system and a national coaching certification process in partnership with NGBs and other agencies. This agency should provide leadership and strategic direction for coaching and work with the most appropriate bodies to deliver coach education.⁵⁰
- Coach education and qualification systems should be harmonised across the four home countries and at UK level.
- UK-wide developments should seek to capitalise on, and contribute to, the emerging European context.
- The central agency and the NGBs will need to be adequately resourced to research, develop, implement and quality assure the new coach education system.

⁴⁹ There is a case to be made for the inclusion of a common training component at the base level, perhaps with links to sports leadership type training which currently does not fall within the national qualifications framework.

⁵⁰ A clear set of terms of reference for such an agency would need to be developed and might include: development of a harmonised national certification and licensing structure across the UK; providing strategic leadership in coaching; working in partnership with NGBs and other agencies; quality assurance; tutor training and development; research and development relating to coaching. Such an agency should have a key role in defining the national standards for coaching, which should be based primarily on the capacities which coaches need to help their athletes at each stage of development. Wider, leisure and sport industry standards should be carefully vetted for relevance to the nature of coaching.

- Structured and mentored opportunities should be provided for talented UK coaches who wish to become world class in their field.
- The selection and training of coach educators, assessors and mentors should be the subject of special attention such that sport specific expertise; sports science and coaching principles; course delivery and adult learning principles are applied to high standards at all levels of coach education. Qualifications for coaches, assessors and mentors should be developed and quality assured.

11.3 Coaching deployment: The following measures might be considered in the area of coach deployment:

- The capacity of NGBs to plan, develop and manage their coach development and deployment systems should be enhanced by the employment of coaching administrators and coach education managers, as appropriate. The central agency should be resourced to provide support to NGBs in these areas, pooling the collective learning and knowledge across sports.
- Coaches should be employed on a much wider basis throughout UK on significant part-time paid (e.g. 15-20 hours) and full-time paid basis. There is a significant deficit in the availability of coaches with the time to devote to developing athletes at each stage of the pathway at the times when they are needed.
- There should be stronger guidelines governing the employment of coaches covering such issues as contractual rights; salary levels; terms and conditions.
- Focused research and information gathering should occur on an on-going basis relating to the education and employment of coaches.

12. Conclusion

This study has compared the coach education and coaching system of the UK with four leading countries in the world. Much progress has been made in the development of coaching to date, with extensive numbers of coaches involved at different levels of UK sport. Coach education opportunities have been widely promoted and provided. It is evident, however, that there is a need to strengthen and harmonise existing structures for the education and deployment of coaches.

A unified and integrated coach education system is recommended, operating across all sports; all of the home countries and across the UK, co-ordinated by a central agency. More paid coaches are needed at all levels of the system, supported by paid professionals within their sport and from the central agency. The goal should be to further enhance the quality of coaching within an ever-improving, continuous and sustainable coaching system, in which non-paid and paid coaches work in synergy. More participants; more athletes; clearer pathways and better performances are just some of the benefits, which are likely to accrue from such initiatives.

Appendix 3

National Coaching Certificate and NGB Directors of Coach Education

Proposal

- The proposal is to:

establish a 5 level cross sport and UK wide National Coaching certificate based on the national standards for coaching, teaching and instructing and which all NGBs must adopt within a given time-scale if they are to continue to be eligible for receipt of public funds (lottery and exchequer);

provide NGBs with a dedicated Director of Coach Education and a ring fenced budget to enable NGBs to make a step change in their coach education system, meet the requirements of both the proposed NCC and the proposed Licence to Practice scheme.

Full consideration was given to the introduction of a UK wide Licence to Practice coaching scheme linked to the proposed NCC as a means of driving continuous professional development and introducing and maintaining quality assured standards and regulation. Indeed this should be a long term aim. However, it is believed that attention initially should be focused on establishing the NCC and that proposals in relation to a Licence to Practice should follow on naturally from that as part of the detailed implementation planning.
- The Task Force believes effective coaching is at the heart of the development of sport from the school playground to the Olympic arena. Whilst a great deal of good work relating to the education and development of coaches can be identified there is no overall leadership, direction and quality assurance and the whole area is under-resourced. As a result the UK has a *laissez-faire* system that allows organisations and individuals to choose whether to opt in or out. Consequently coach education and qualification schemes vary enormously in terms of the quality of content, delivery and assessment both within sports and across sports. This creates a confusing picture for employers of coaches and the end consumers of coaching services. Data collection and maintenance of coaching records within individual NGBs is neither standardised nor well maintained and many NGBs cannot provide basic data in response to questions about their coaching workforce. This raises fundamental questions about management of the coaching workforce whether paid or unpaid. Many coaches undergo no further training and development once qualified and there are often no requirements for coaches to maintain the currency of their qualification over time post qualification.

3. The three arms to the proposal will make a significant step towards establishing coaching as a profession and provide a unified but flexible and streamlined approach to a coach education and qualification framework. This will produce coaches that are competent to deliver appropriate coaching to the particular needs of their players (i.e. coach development will be matched to player development). It will introduce:
 - (a) a coherent approach to quality assurance;
 - (b) the NCC and in due course Licence as a mandatory requirement in order to benefit from future investment from public funds;
 - (c) the human and financial resources required to make the necessary “step change”;
 - (d) a central body with responsibility for quality assuring and supporting the development, delivery methods and maintenance of the NCC and Licence.

4. National Coaching Directors – to maximise the opportunities presented by the Task Force recommendations NGBs will need to build their human capacity and transform their materials and Coach Education programmes. In order to make this possible NGBs will require a dedicated National Director of Coaching who can modernise and update their qualifications and assessment procedures against the new National Coaching Certificate.

Delivery

5. The lead agency for developing and implementing the three proposals should be sports coach UK (**scUK**). This should include:
 - (a) responsibility for the development and maintenance of the NCC;
 - (b) responsibility for working with the sector NTO (Sector Skills Council once established) on the development of national standards for coaching, teaching and instructing (and sports officiating);

responsibility for the internal quality assurance of all NCC qualifications including endorsing individual NGB proposals/arrangements for delivering the NCC within their sport (see figure one);

responsibility in due course for the development and maintenance of a Licence to Practice scheme including endorsing individual NGB proposals/arrangements for delivering the Licence within their sport;

responsibility for providing a range of services to enable NGBs to meet the requirements of the NCC according to their specific needs. Some of these should be “free at the point of delivery” and some on a cost recovery basis;

working with the funding agencies to undertake a fundamental coach education review of individual NGBs and producing a costed and agreed action plan. This should then be used as the basis for future decisions about investment in coaching by the funding agencies including support for a dedicated Director of Coach Education with a ring fenced budget.

6. Delivering these proposals will require support from:
 - (a) the NTO or its successor as a Sector Skills Council;
 - (b) UK and Home Country NGBs;
 - (c) UK and Home Country funding agencies;
 - (d) Government/DCMS in relation to establishing mandatory requirements, timescales for completion and directing resources to effect the changes required.
7. A clear but realistic timetable for all NGBs to have met the requirements of the NCC (e.g. by 1 April 2007). Timescales in relation to the Licence scheme would be determined later.

Outputs

8. **scUK** should be required to gather data to enable it to report against these key outputs:
 - (a) 100% of UK/British NGBs should have met 80% of the requirements of the NCC by 1 April 2007 and be working towards achieving the outstanding requirements;
 - (b) 50% of Home Country NGBs should have met 80% of the requirements of the NCC by 1 April 2007 and be working towards achieving the outstanding requirements;
 - (c) All UK/British/Home Country NGBs should have met all the requirements of the NCC by 1 April 2009;

On a sport by sport basis outputs could also be measured by requiring **scUK** to report annually against the following output indicators for UK/British and Home Country NGBs:

- (d) Number of NCCs issued at Level 1;
- (e) Number of NCCs issued at Level 2;
- (f) Number of NCCs issued at Level 3;
- (g) Number of NCCs issued at Level 4;
- (h) Number of NCCs issued at Level 5;

Wider Context

9. The proposals build on existing work but introduce greater rigour and mandatory requirements that currently do not exist. They will also bring the UK system for educating and qualifying coaches in line with established best practice in both Europe and further afield (Australia, Canada and New Zealand) and enhance the ability of individual coaches to access funds for their personal development via local Learning and Skills Councils.
10. The basic components of the system needed to deliver the desired outputs exist already. What is required is:
 - (a) confirmation of the proposed NCC, and the lead agency role and responsibility for **scUK**;
 - (b) making the NCC a mandatory requirement for future public funding to NGBs after an appropriate time-scale;
 - (c) establishing clear time-scales and priorities and identifying and meeting the resource requirements of **scUK** and NGBs.

Conclusion

11. The developments initiated by Government in school physical education and sport will increase demand for the provision of effective and quality sports opportunities in the community. Coaching will be a key factor in this provision and at present is not able to respond effectively in terms of numbers of available coaches and the quality and appropriateness of their qualification and practice. Put more simply Government's wider aspirations for sport to contribute to health, social inclusion, lifelong learning, community and personal development will be jeopardised without a significant change in the way in which coaches are educated, qualified, developed and managed.
12. Historically coaching and coach education has been the poor relation within NGBs. Responsibility often falls to an individual with a much wider remit and the area is a low priority within internal NGB budgets. This contrasts sharply with the situation in other countries where both participation rates in sport and achievements in international competition are perceived to be better than in the UK and where central leadership and appropriate investment in coaching are well established.

Appendix 4

Regional Talent Development Coaching

Purpose

In order to support the growing emphasis on talent development it is proposed that a selected number of sports (10 in year one/20 by year three) are funded to support their regional talent development coaching programmes as part of their overall talent development framework. This investment will focus on improving performance standards of both talented coaches and their performers.

As world class performance standards have increased sports have had to define the rungs on their talent development ladders more clearly to ensure that they provide a linked pathway from participation to excellence. Talented young performers are often 'lost' to sport because they are not identified effectively, are poorly coached and are provided with few support services. This investment will seek to provide 10 sports in the first instance with the capacity to improve the quality of coaching for talented young performers at regional level.

Delivery

The lead agencies to develop this proposal should be UK Sport/Sport England working in close consultation with the National Governing Bodies of sport. This regional investment in coaching should be identified as part of the NGB,s 'one stop plan' to ensure there is an integrated approach. sports coach UK should also be involved to ensure that there is an appropriate education and training programme to support all coaches working with talented young people. The investment will be used by NGBs in a number of ways including:

- Employing regional talent development coaches (full time or part time) as required.
- Implementing high quality training for coaches of talented performers.
- Providing scholarships for coaches of talented performers to undertake apprenticeships and attend intensive short courses at home and overseas.
- Inviting overseas coaches to work alongside English coaches to improve performance standards

It is important to stress that NGBs will need to be supported to build the capacity of their structures and systems to manage this investment. The 'modernisation' programme of investment in NGBs will need to be effectively linked to the delivery of this programme so ensure that these new resources can be maximised.

Outputs for each sport will include:

More and better coaches working with talented performers in all 10 sports.

10 regional camps for talented performers and their coaches in each sport annually.

Clinics for coaches of talented performers in each county for each sport.

Improved talent identification and development structures in all 10 sports.

Scholarships for coaches of talented young performers in each sport to study at home or overseas.

Improved performance standards.

Less drop out of talented young performers from their chosen sport.

Clearly defined talent development pathway for coaches in each of the 10 sports.

Wider context

This investment will need to be part of the NGB long term athlete development plans with clearly identified links into their world class performance programmes. It will also need to link effectively with the ‘coachmatch’ scheme being delivered through the county sports partnerships to identify and support coaches working with talented sports performers.

There are no other options to deliver this investment in coaches working with talented performers.

Conclusion

Government investment is required as NGBs already have stretched resources and this ‘middle ground’ is critical to the identification and development of talented young performers. Without this intervention through quality coaching many young people will not achieve their potential and standards at International level will decline.

Appendix 5

Local Coach Employment (Coachmatch)

Purpose

There are too few professional coaches active in the country. There are limited employment opportunities for coaches to develop coaching as a career. The limited numbers results in limited capacity to provide the quantity and quality of coaching necessary. Lack of employment opportunities leads to lack of professional development of coaching and consequently major loss of opportunity.

The Task Force believes there is a need to significantly increase the national pool of professional quality coaches. This need goes hand in hand with the need to stimulate career development for coaches and coaching.

As part of a structured approach to coaching there is a need to massively increase local employment opportunities for coaches across all levels but particularly at levels 1 and 2.

To assist this, and to meet local potential for coach deployment, the Task Force recommends the establishment of a network of local coach employment ‘franchises’ covering the whole of England. The franchise could be the employing agency itself or could designate other partner agencies to undertake this function.

The franchises network is to be developed by Sport England and phased in over three years.

Delivery

Sport England should be the lead organisation and through regional offices establish a network of coaching franchises covering their respective regions. Sport England is the only organisation with enough regional experience and knowledge capable of identifying the best franchisee and any particular area.

The regional offices should secure preferred franchisees. Potential franchisees would be:

- Sports Colleges.
- Sports Partnerships.
- Local Authorities.
- Sports Actions Zones.

Local factors would determine the most appropriate franchisee. It would be the regional offices of Sport England, which would determine the most appropriate body based on local factors.

Sport England would need to develop the model for employment. Some standardised requirements and some local flexibility around local needs in such areas as terms and conditions, pensions, sickness, personal performances and links to the National Coaching Certificate. National guidance on rate of pay (allowing for local variation).

Franchisees would need to provide operational support and the following key components;

- Management arrangements.
- Office accommodation.
- Business plan.
- Performance within accepted margins.

The Task Force believes that the Franchisee need receive financial assistance to operate the franchise. The franchisee would also be required to demonstrate through the bidding process how additional funds can be drawn down to match or augment central funding hence the choice of the title ‘**Coachmatch**’. It may be possible to develop a scheme which results in a phased reduction in subsidy over say a three year period although some franchisees may require greater long term support because of special local needs. It is anticipated that some ongoing subsidy would be necessary over the long term to support administration of the scheme.

Franchise Task

The franchise would have the task of providing the local infrastructure to recruit, employ and deploy professional coaches in their area. The franchise is likely to have a need for employing coaches as part of its work. However, the franchise should also establish the needs of other potential clients. They can include:

- Local Clubs
- Schools
- Colleges/Universities
- Active Sport
- Youth Service
- Leisure Centres
- Parish Councils
- Uniformed organisations
- Playgroups
- Private companies

The development of a pool of employed coaches’ will not only contributes to existing coaching activity but it provides the opportunity to generate substantial new activity. In addition scope to develop now multi sports clubs for young people via schools, sports clubs and local authority facilities.

Outputs

Quantitative

- The establishment of 3,000 professional coaches within the franchise scheme would generate the following targets when fully operational.
- 645,000 coaching days per annum (based on 215 days per annum per coach).
- 3,225,000 coaching sessions (based on five coaching sessions per day).
- 32,250,000 individual coaching sessions per annum (based on five sessions in a day and a minimum of 10 individuals per session).

Qualitative

- A step change in developing a career structure for coaching.
- Significant opportunity for massive development of an experience pool of practising coaches.
- Wider context.

There are a range of schemes developing sport which are initiated by a range of providers. Coach employment has therefore been dissipated at best. The franchise offers a local pooling of coaching talent and the scope to develop full or significant part time employment to coaches.

Such a programme also enables coach development and training at a local level.

The scheme would also enable paid coaches to work along side and mentor part-time and voluntary coaches again at local level where support is needed early.

Currently there is no evidence that alternatives exist, unless an agency is prepared to take the risk of employing coaches without guaranteed work. Alternatives are programme funding which often operate on short-term basis. This provides little incentive for individuals to enter coaching as a career.

Conclusion

Government funding is needed to provide the infrastructure and stimulate new opportunities in communities. There is scope to reduce subsidy levels once schemes are operational although few schemes will be fully self-financing. Local activity will already be employing some coaches on a part time basis and there is great opportunity to build on these arrangements.

Appendix 6

Establishing 45 sub-regional Coach Development Officers (CDOs)

Purpose

1. There is a need to focus attention on the local recruitment, education, qualification, employment, deployment, training and management and development of coaches. At present the support mechanisms to address these key issues are limited through the lack of an effective and co-ordinated structure at local level. This holds true for both the paid and the unpaid coach but it is particularly important to provide a much greater degree of support to the unpaid coach than is currently the case.
2. The proposal is to:
 - (a) create a sub-regional network of 45 CDO's employed nationally but deployed locally to establish a co-ordinated framework providing a greater and consistent focus on coaching development at regional and sub-regional level and to encourage, assist and support regional and sub-regional partners with strategic planning, implementation and management of coach development;
 - (b) create a sub-regional infrastructure to provide and manage effective coach development systems to recruit, train and retain coaches and aimed at supporting coaches to reach their full potential. This will include:
 - improved structures to identify, support and manage the initial qualification and continuous professional development needs of coaches post qualification;
 - support the development and implementation of coach recruitment strategies matched to player pathways.

They would have an important role in supporting the implementation of the proposals of the Coaching Task Force by providing generic rather than sports specific coach education opportunities. They would work with local 'Coachmatch' franchises and other agencies to co-ordinate a programme of training and development across their area working closely with NGBs, FE, HE and the UFI.

3. Other key tasks undertaken by this network would include:
 - (a) co-ordinating the strategic development of coaching and coaches with Regional Sports Boards/Regional Sport England;
 - (b) working with all key partners to develop and co-ordinate regional Coaching Development Strategies that will deliver the UK Vision for Coaching;
 - (c) co-ordinating the implementation of coaching development policies to meet the needs of the player pathway within sports Partnerships, school Partnerships, Higher and Further Education and NGBs;
 - (d) establishing coach management and development systems within partner organisations based upon a structured approach to implementing the National Coaching Certificate and providing continuous professional development opportunities and programmes;
 - (e) establishing a structure of coach mentors and co-ordinating with NGBs, school partnerships, sports partnerships etc;
 - (f) co-ordinating the provision and delivery of a programme of coach education and continuous professional development opportunities to meet the needs of school partnerships, sports partnerships, NGBs and Higher and Further education institutions;
 - (g) developing, co-ordinating and implementing coach recruitment plans as required.

Delivery

4. **sports coach UK (scUK)** currently employs and deploys seven regional staff with expertise in local coaching development. Staff operate to clearly defined forward plans linked to the implementation of the UK Vision for Coaching. These staff work in partnership with local authority and NGB sports development officer posts that may have some responsibility for coaching development within their broader work objectives. The extent of this responsibility varies from on the one hand a very clear and almost total focus on aspects of coach education to on the other inclusion as just one of a number of broader sports development tasks. Individual sports development officer appointments also vary significantly in terms of salary levels and therefore experience and expertise. The overall sports development officer network is also volatile with high turnover and many posts in local government being deleted as a consequence of local government reorganisation and financial pressures. As a result coverage across the country is increasingly haphazard. Consequently **scUK**'s ability to establish a consistent approach and to reach a wide audience of coaches is constrained and the work undertaken by the **scUK** CDOs is limited in its effect due to the need to work with a wide range of partners over whom they have no or limited direct influence. This leads to dilution and different

interpretation of national policy; inconsistencies in approach between one local area and another and a fragmented and uncoordinated system for developing coaches locally. Direct employment of the proposed 45 CDO posts would enhance the ability to provide a consistent, focussed and coherent programme to support coach recruitment, education and development and would have the capability of reaching a much wider audience of active coaches.

5. Alternative employment options do exist and include local sports partnerships and local authorities. However this approach would not resolve and indeed would exacerbate the issues of dilution of policy, fragmentation and inconsistency in provision referred to earlier.
6. At regional and sub-regional level there are a number of agencies that will be involved in the delivery of the work and outputs of the CDOs. These agencies include local sports partnerships; local authorities; specialist sports colleges; school sport co-ordinators and regional/sub-regional NGBs and their sports clubs. All of these employ and deploy both paid and unpaid coaches.

Outputs

7. **scUK** should be required to gather data to enable it to report against these key outputs:
 - (i) Number of regional and sub-regional partners with effective coach development strategies in place and being actively implemented;
 - (j) Number of regional/sub-regional continuous professional development opportunities provided;
 - (k) Number of individual coaches accessing regional/sub-regional continuous professional development opportunities provided;
 - (l) Number of Licensed coaches per sport per region;
 - (m) Number of new coaches recruited per sport per region;

Providing this data will be dependent upon partner organisations being required to link in to the national Coach Management Information System developed by **scUK** for Sport England's Active Sports programme.

Wider Context

8. The proposals build on existing work but will introduce greater consistency and rigour and will reach far more coaches than currently is the case. They will also enhance the local provision of opportunities for initial qualification based on the proposed National Coaching Certificate and tailored continuous professional development opportunities for coaches and increase the ability of individual coaches to access funds for their personal development via local Learning and Skills Councils.

Conclusion

9. The developments initiated by Government in school physical education and sport will increase demand for the provision of effective and quality sports opportunities in the community. Coaching will be a key factor in this provision and at present is not able to respond effectively in terms of numbers of available coaches and the quality and appropriateness of their qualifications and practice. Put more simply Government's wider aspirations for sport to contribute to health, social inclusion, lifelong learning, community and personal development will be jeopardised without a significant change in the way in which coaches are educated, qualified, developed and managed.

Appendix 7

Come into Coaching

Purpose

Come into Coaching aims to recruit more people into coaching at beginner level. It has as its focus, parents of children involved at participation level of the sport development continuum. A sustained national recruitment programme, using television, on line interactive learning and local ‘taster’ opportunities will also serve to raise the profile of coaches and coaching.

The success of school sport programmes and other initiatives will result in increased participation amongst young people in sport, creating a demand for more coaches and leaders. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the decline in volunteering in sport is exacerbated in coaching and officiating by the need to gain a qualification. This programme aims to break down some of the perceived barriers to qualification as a coach and to make the first steps into coaching accessible and attractive.

Delivery

The Department for Culture Media and Sport is supporting the establishment of this programme to a point at which a number of delivery agencies can take on their responsibility to lead on elements of the programme. This will happen when the programme framework is agreed and roles and responsibilities clearly defined.

The key partners, initially, will be:

- sports coach UK.
- BBC Sport and Education.
- University for Industry – Learndirect.
- Sport England.
- National Governing Bodies of Sport.

The long-term leadership of the programme will rest with sports coach UK working through local infrastructures and in partnership with those organisations listed above.

Outputs

- More people with the skill, confidence and ability to support sport activity for young people
- Easier access to ‘introduction to coaching’ programmes.
- Better informed sports parents.
- Higher profile for coaches and coaching.
- Integrated information systems that link potential coaches to their chosen sport.

Wider context

One element of The Volunteering Strategy arising from the Government’s Plan for Sport is to promote the recruitment, retention, recognition and reward of young people as volunteers in sport. The main focus of this initiative is around sport leadership. The local recruitment, deployment and support mechanisms being established to support new volunteers will link to those required by the Come into Coaching programme and will be supported by the network of 45 Coach Development Officers.

Funding

Government investment is required at the design and development stage of this programme. Once this initial work is complete, Come into Coaching should be able to access funding through existing structures and existing sport development initiatives.

Appendix 8

Review of sports coach UK

Introduction

As part of the work of the Coaching Task Force it was recommended that a review be conducted of the work of **sports coach UK**, formerly known as the National Coaching Foundation. The CTF is preparing fundamental recommendations which will affect the whole future of coaching in this country. It is vital that a review of **scUK** be undertaken to establish whether it should continue to be the lead body for the development of coaching in this country and if so to confirm what the future role should be.

Background – sports coach UK

sports coach UK was established originally in 1983 as the National Coaching Foundation, a sub-committee of the then GB Sports Council. Its brief, when it was formed, was to provide non sports specific information for all coaches throughout all levels from beginner to national coach.

In 1989 the service was externalised from the GB Sports Council and the NCF was established as an independent charity governed by the Charities and Companies Act. Amongst other benefits, it was believed at the time that charitable status would provide significant advantages in terms of raising revenue through tax concessions and through earned income from services and trading activities. Shortly after setting up as a charity NCF formed a wholly owned trading subsidiary, 'Coachwise', all profits from which are covenanted back to the charity to support its charitable objectives.

Originally envisaged as the coaching arm of the GB Sports Council NCF/**scUK** was assigned the responsibility for the co-ordination of coaching and coach education 'from the school playground to the Olympic Arena'.

It has grown extensively since those early days and to illustrate:

In 1986 it employed eight staff with a total expenditure of £164,079;

In 2001 it employed 54 staff with a total expenditure of £3,132,950;

In 2001 The NCF Board took the decision to rebrand the organisation as **sports coach UK**.

sports coach UK is governed by a board of directors and the organisational management structure is led by a chief executive operating through four operational directorates as follows:

Professional Development – responsible for the development of the core products of the organisation e.g. course and resource development, tutor training, national standards work, coach education reviews with NGBs, high performance coaching and CPD programmes within NGBs.

Local Coaching Development – responsible for the delivery of **scUK** programmes in England throughout a network of regionally based coaching development officers.

Special Projects – responsible for projects of national or company wide significance, including support to Active Sports, Coaching for Teachers, Adults Other Than Teachers and Equity in Coaching.

Management Services – responsible for providing administrative, marketing and business support to Coachwise and **scUK**.

scUK receives its core funding from Sport England and UK Sport. In 2001/02 this amounted to £1,435,000 and £745,000 respectively.

Method of Review

The first part of the review involved **scUK** undertaking a fundamental review of its services along lines similar to those used in best value reviews. As part of this process, **scUK** was asked to consider its services and operation under the four headings of:

Challenge: to examine the need for these services and the rationale for their provision

Compare: to outline the performance management processes employed and to provide a basis for evaluating performance

Consult: to examine how the organisation consults with clients and stakeholders and gains the feedback necessary to respond to customer needs

Compete: to consider whether there were other ways in which the services could be delivered through another provider/s.

The second part of the review involved a series of interviews with a range of clients and stakeholders using the questionnaire contained in Appendix A. Interviewees included representatives of NGBs, Active Sports Partnerships, Sport England, UK Sport, Local Authorities, CCPR, Institute of Sport and Recreation Management, SPRITO, English Federation of Disability Sport and the Womens' Sports Foundation. Discussions were also conducted with senior staff of **scUK**.

The outcome of both elements of the review process is set out below.

Service Review

The following contains key extracts from the service review:

Challenge

Is there a need for the services?

The case for the service is made in the review by stating that coaching and the practice of coaching is at the heart of the development of sport from the school playground to the Olympic arena. This is recognised by the UK Vision for Coaching, the Government's Action Plan for Sport and, more recently, the Cunningham Review. These three documents all identify a number of leading roles for **scUK**.

The UK Vision for Coaching now underpins the whole thrust of the work of **scUK**. It has established the strategic direction for the future development of coaching in the United Kingdom for the next ten years. It has been endorsed by UK Sport, sportscotland, the Sports Council for Wales, the Sports Council for Northern Ireland, Sport England, the British Olympic Association and SPRITO the national training organisation for sport and recreation.

A number of overseas countries with mature or developing sports systems also recognise the importance of coaching and have created specific organisations to lead the development of coaching and coaches in their countries.

What is the rationale for the provision of services?

In order to fulfil the Government's aspirations for sport there is a need to service:

1. **Coaching Development.** Work to develop and support the infrastructure in which coaching and individual coaches operate at national, regional and local level.
2. **Coach Development.** Work to support the initial and continuous development of an individual coach.
3. **Coach Education.** Work to provide quality assured opportunities, learning and development of individual coaches.

As a result and consistent with its history and record, **scUK's mission statement**, which was adopted 1st April 2001, reflects the UK Vision for Coaching and the belief that **scUK** has a key role to play and contribution to make in delivering the Vision. It states:

sports coach UK is dedicated to guiding the development and implementation of a coaching system, recognised as a world leader, for all coaches at every level.

We will work with our partners to achieve this by promoting:

- *Professional and ethical values and inclusive and equitable practice.*
- *Agreed national standards of competence as a benchmark at all levels.*
- *A regulated and licensed structure.*
- *Recognition, value and appropriate funding and reward.*
- *A culture and structure of innovation, constant renewal and continuous professional development.*

scUK maintains that currently its unique contribution can be summed up as coach focused. No other organisation has this focus. As a result, **scUK** can claim to know coaching and coaches from the top to the bottom – the playground to the Olympic Arena.

scUK currently provides the following services:

Coaching Development (including Coach Development)

- Expert Advice on coaching development – consultation service at international, national, regional and local level.
- Leadership and direction re implementation of UK Vision.
- Policy development and lobbying.
- Guidance on employment and recruitment.
- Initial training and in-service training provision for SDOs in relation to coaching development.
- Model for integrated coaching development.
- Mentoring framework/model.
- CPD framework/model (coach and Group XL, Coach Developer).
- Direction for research.
- Co-ordination of good practice and information.
- Guidance upon interpretation of policy for the impact of issues such as child protection/employment/equity on coaching and the practice of individual coaches.

- Advocate for the development of coaches and coaching (acting as a champion for coaches and coaching).
- Strategic planning guidance.

Coach Education

- **scUK** Workshop Delivery mechanisms.
- Tutor Training and Assessor Training.
- Continuous Professional Development opportunities e.g. workshops, resources.
- Co-ordination of new resource development.
- Quality Assurance mechanisms and guidance.
- Regularly updated resources based upon the latest thinking in coaching within the UK and from overseas.
- Expert advice on the development and implementation of National Standards.

Commentary

There would appear to be a *prima facie* case for the existence of an independent organisation to lead the development of coaching and this is borne out by the national statements alluded to in the opening paragraph from the various published reports and the fact that other successful sporting countries have followed a similar pathway. Further confirmation of this is contained in the International Benchmarking Exercise commissioned by the CTF. The UK Vision, endorsed by all the relevant national agencies, indicates support for this fact.

scUK have listed the services that they undertake in this part of the review. They appear to be comprehensive and again it would not be difficult to argue that they have evolved in response to demand and need. **scUK** have not attempted to critically review the need for all of these services and to some extent this will be tested through the consultations with clients and stakeholders. The issue being perhaps whether there is a need to be delivering in all of these areas.

Compare

Performance management

There are no obvious organisations with which **scUK** might be compared, although it acknowledges that aspects of the work could be compared with organisations not involved in sport. However, this would require investigation and research that would not be a current priority.

scUK is, however, developing a range of headline performance indicators for use in its new business plan and some examples are provided below. Each of these has a number of supporting measures and scUK is currently testing the practicality and reliability of data collection systems. Figures should be available for some of these measures in the New Year.

- Number of partners with coach development and management policies with supporting action plans meeting national standards.
- Number of coaches accessing CPD opportunities.
- Number of CPD opportunities established.
- Percentage Revenue spends on coaching development by partners.
- Number of partners with employment and deployment strategies that meet national standards.
- Percentage Number of tutors/partners satisfied with service from scUK.
- Cost/head/workshop.

All these PIs will be underpinned by a series of more detailed PIs which will significantly improve the overall management information available for the determining of performance.

Commentary

Internally, scUK have a management by objectives scheme in place based on annual work programmes, an annual operating plan, a five-year business plan and a six monthly staff appraisal scheme. They are also introducing the European Business Excellence Model as a means of focusing on continuous improvement. In theory then, adequate management processes are in place if they are applied appropriately.

Performance measurement to date has been relatively unsophisticated but the introduction of the new Performance Indicators will enhance their processes in this area markedly. It will need to be accompanied by a regular system of reporting to the management team and ultimately the board on a monthly/six monthly cycle.

The measures employed to date and a large proportion of those proposed for the future are input/output based. There is also a need to devise indicators which will require a greater degree of monitoring of performance of coaches themselves to arrive at more outcome based measures.

There is also a need to consider a broader range of indicators which will provide objective data about the cost of operation of the organisation. The last of those identified above, i.e. cost/head/workshop, are along the right lines and could be expanded. scUK have rightly suggested that this could provide the basis of comparison, for example with the delivery of workshops through HE/FE or NGBs or compare with Running Sport and BST.

Figures are available for this indicator for 2000/2001. They are based on England only and include direct cost, resources, tutor fee and expenses. They are:

- £178.80 per workshop.
- £12.70 per coach.

Consult

Obtaining feedback to refine products and services

scUK are thorough in the extent to which they seek to gain feedback from those attending workshops and in the evaluation of their products.

Feedback is constantly evaluated from workshops and courses, focused on delivery (in particular the workshop programmes) and these provide consistently good ratings. Results are reviewed by the Board on a regular basis (usually twice a year). Summary results for 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 are detailed in Appendix B.

Results like these are used to help refine aspects of workshop design, planning and delivery. In addition, if feedback forms show a significant dissatisfaction with a particular workshop, then staff will undertake a follow up interview with the site organiser, delegates and tutor as appropriate.

Other evaluation takes a lower priority to ensure that resources are distributed to the work programme areas that give the greatest benefit to the coach. As a result, scUK acknowledges that they have never been able to undertake broad longitudinal studies into the long-term impact of the work on a regular basis. They have, however, undertaken follow up evaluation on specific topics when appropriate.

Detailed evaluations in the following areas were made available to the Task Force as examples:

- Coaching for Teachers.
- Impact of Child Protection Work.
- Independent Review of Child Protection Resources and Training.
- Consultation and Review of Tutor Training.
- Review of the Introductory Study Pack.

Consultation with clients

scUK use a range of formal and informal mechanisms. At the simplest level all of the technical staff on a daily basis, as part of their work, meet with coaches and organisations that train, qualify, recruit, employ and deploy coaches.

A wide range of more formal mechanisms are also in place including:

- scUK Council for Coaching.
- Coach Education Forums with NGBs.
- Local Coaching Development Forums at a regional and sub-regional level.
- Product Review Groups.
- In-Service Tutor Training.
- Membership Newsletter.
- Programme Specific Questionnaires.
- Topic specific consultation exercises.
- Active Sports Coaching Development Group.
- Coaching For Teachers Steering Group with YST; SE; PEAUK; BAALPE, NGBs and LEAs.
- Inviting comments through our website.
- Conferences and seminars.
- One to one meetings with key clients.
- Continuous programme evaluations.

They also participate as members of specific forums with key partners such as:

- SPRITO.
- Sports Councils.
- ISRM.
- UKSI coaching clusters.

Consultation with funders

scUK consults with its funders (Sport England and UK Sport) on work programmes (both national and regional) and when planning new initiatives. **scUK** reports that the outcome of these efforts is variable and consultation is often limited and time pressured. Often it takes the form of reporting progress in relation to managing the annual grant settlements and regular, in-depth, planned and specific consultation is rare.

Commentary

Given the resources that are available to the organisation efforts to collect data from courses and workshops and events are commendable and there is a varied and comprehensive range of other formal and informal mechanisms to consult with clients and funders.

Feedback from the courses shows consistently good responses. Measures in terms of relevance and satisfaction regularly reach 95% levels and above. This suggests that courses and workshops are among the elements of the work of **scUK** which are most highly rated.

However, there needs to be greater focus on more systematic and longitudinal studies of their activities as they acknowledge in their own review. Alongside this, there needs to be a more regular and strategic approach to ongoing review of activities with funding partners and key stakeholders.

Compete

Are there other ways of delivering the service?

Typically the reason for asking this sort of question is to ascertain with a public body whether there are any gains to be made in efficiency and effectiveness by externalising the overall management function or elements of it. It also considers the extent to which the organisation externally tests its services through its procurement procedures.

At the outset, it is important to recognise that the organisation originally was created in response to a decision by the (GB) Sports Council to outsource the coaching development functions that it had made the responsibility of the National Coaching Foundation when it was established.

The NCF/**scUK** has had to take a commercial view of its operations and at an early stage, following establishment as a charity, took advantage of this status by setting up the trading subsidiary, Coachwise, which covenants profits back to the charity. **scUK** now also takes advantage of the treatment of charities for tax purposes by purchasing a range of services from Coachwise under a number of service level agreements. These are reviewed on a regular basis by the Board and tested

externally when appropriate. Services in this category include:

- Incoming post collection, opening and delivery.
- Outgoing post collection.
- Postal distribution services.
- **scUK** membership services.
- Design, production and distribution.
- Workshop administration.
- Photocopying.

The public relations function has been outsourced to a PR company on an annual contract and they make use of specialist advice, consultancies and other services as required particularly in the ICT field.

Corporate governance rules require **scUK** to always obtain three quotations and for larger items to go through a tendering process.

Alternative Approaches

scUK have considered this and their views can be summarised as follows:

First of all a range of organisations and institutions can and do offer some elements of their work (some in formal partnership agreements; others in complete isolation). Other agencies could and should play a significant role but this must be quality assured by a central body in order to ensure consistency and standards in meeting the UK Vision.

The key possibilities would be the ones outlined below although none have the single focus on coaching that **scUK** does as they currently undertake a variety of functions in and across sport:

1. **Through the NGBs directly** – However, only a few of the larger NGB's will have the resources to deliver all the elements and they would need significant investment to develop their capacity and capability to undertake the role. This could lead to a duplication of resources and also lose the co-ordinated strategic implementation and delivery of the UK Vision for Coaching.
2. **The CCPR** – Theoretically the CCPR could undertake this function but it currently lacks the capability in terms of staff numbers and experience and the capacity in terms of organisational structure, business support and quality assurance systems.
3. **UK Sport** – It could be argued that it could devolve responsibility for delivery to the home country Sports Councils and just retain the UK co-ordination and product/resource development roles. However this would seem to be a reversal of the original decision to

externalise the service in the first place in 1989 and would be inconsistent with UK Sport's stated focus on world class performance and events.

4. **SPRITO** – The National Training Organisation for the Sport and Recreation Industry could undertake the role though this would be a significant departure from its current role and SPRITO has no track record in relation to the provision and delivery of training. Indeed it is arguable that such a move would be inconsistent with its overall role as a National Training Organisation (and potentially a Sector Skills Council from 1st April 2002).

Commentary

Another alternative would be the concept of a single national training agency delivering in all related areas of leadership, coaching, sports development administration, officiating and so on as suggested in the Government Strategy for Sport. **scUK** could, in fact, form the basis of such an agency. Again, however, the criticism might be that the focus on coaching alone might be dissipated.

Consultations from the second part of the review seem to indicate that clients and stakeholders do not appear to have much stomach for a major restructuring and the establishment of a new agency to deliver on coaching. There was, however, a consistent view that **scUK** should endeavour to integrate much of its generic work into the work of the NGBs and to work much more through them.

Similarly, there was strong support for a shift in delivery strategy by withdrawing from direct hands on delivery, particularly of workshop programmes, and to enable and support other organisations to deliver as long as they meet and maintain quality standards in terms of content, delivery style and, if appropriate, any assessment processes. An example of this would be increased links with Higher and Further Education to provide a delivery infrastructure that can be accessed equitably across the country. This is a direction that **scUK** are already embarking on with approval of its board in July 2001.

Clients and Stakeholders Interviews

As indicated earlier interviews were conducted with client and stakeholder representatives from a range of bodies who either materially make use of the services of **scUK** or are funding agencies. Others consulted included national agencies, e.g. WSE, CCPR and ISRM who represent bodies some of whom make use of the services or can give a wider strategic view of it.

The questionnaire in Appendix A sets out the questions that served as the basis of the interview but questions were grouped under five main headings:

- Purpose and Role.
- Relationships and Responsiveness.
- Service and Products.
- Effectiveness/Efficiency.
- General Issues

Purpose and Role

Consultees were asked to give their views in the context of the most recent mission statement (see questionnaire in Appendix A).

The emphasis and the role of **scUK** has changed over the years and it has generally performed well as a central resource funded by Sport England and UK Sport to support the development of coaching.

In relation to the specific statements in the mission statement the broad view would be that they have achieved about 50% of what is stated. The coaching system is not regarded as a 'world leader'. Indeed, as yet there is not a 'coaching system' in place. **scUK** have not been entirely successful in fully engaging the NGBs and particularly the more powerful ones who tend to see this work as their own preserve. There were three recurring themes from respondents:

- that **scUK** have been too focused on generating income.
- that **scUK** should focus on priorities which are their strengths.
- that **scUK** should channel more of its work through the NGBs.

In relation to the five bullet points in the mission statement (see Appendix A) this would be a summary of observations:

- Professional values – codes of conduct and ethical values in coaching were strong and well promoted, providing a good understanding of ethical values and equity.
- National standards – have not been able to achieve agreement across the NGBs but this will be assisted with the new proposals from the CTF.
- Licensed structure – again this is not yet in place but new proposals will be significant.
- Recognition – have worked hard to promote this through its programmes and events like Coach of the Year/ Coaching Hall of Fame.
- Culture of innovation etc. – have not yet achieved this and it should be a focus for future priority.

Areas of scUK's work considered to be most successful by clients were:

- In the basic coach education and the generic areas **scUK** (and previously NCF) has raised the knowledge base throughout the 80s and 90s substantially which has been absolutely necessary. Materials are of good quality and workshops too. They have made a major impact through the development of generic coach education resources and these are widely known and respected, both within the UK and overseas. One comment was that the resource materials were the 'best in the world and the staff of the highest quality'.
- They have been particularly successful at sharing this information at regional and local level through its regional networks.
- In the co-ordination of courses – regionally and nationally there was a good range of courses and **scUK** reviewed these regularly in consultation with clients. Courses and other products were regularly revised on the basis of feedback from consultation.
- They have been effective in representing the voice of coaching at the national level and in raising the profile of coaching in the wider public through events such as Coach of the Year and Coaching Hall of Fame.

The list of core **scUK** services and products that most agencies relate to and have benefited from include:

- coach workshop programmes.
- product and resource development.
- tutor training (including coach educator training for NGBs).
- work with NGBs and SPRITO on national standards.
- coach education reviews with NGBs.
- integration of **scUK** resources/workshops with NGB awards.
- high performance coaching – Coach XL/HP workshops.
- **scUK** membership services.
- promotion of CPD courses with NGBs.
- advice and consultancy support to national, regional and local partners from **scUK** Coaching Development Officers.

Areas of work in which scUK were seen to have been least successful were:

- It has not achieved the objective of professionalising coaching as originally perceived. It has not been able to engage, excite and motivate the wider coaching constituency in the larger NGBs in particular.
- Coach education has been effective but coach development, mentoring and other continuing support has not had the same priority. It was suggested that the need to measure for example the number of coach education courses and to raise income from them has taken precedence over this type of work.
- Products should be designed with more tangible links to the practical needs of the sport specific coach. ‘The portfolio of courses are not related to the end product.’ was one typical comment. **scUK** have not been effective in working with NGB partners to encourage them to integrate generic products into their coach education programmes. The situation has improved markedly in the last couple of years but more work could be done in this area to position the work of **scUK** as a genuine support service to NGBs.
- Work at the elite end of the coaching field has been difficult. The quality of the products is not questioned but gaining a track record and the necessary respect in the face of competition from the BOA and the Institute developments has been problematic. The Cunningham review has posted the way forward, with UKSI leading on the provision of services and support to those coaches within UKSI programmes. **scUK** will lead on the educational and development of the next generation of coaches for the world class environment. **scUK** will continue to have responsibility for the overall strategic and co-ordinated development of coaching throughout the spectrum.
- The QA process is effective as far as the generic courses are concerned but does not impact on the greater area of coaching in general. The **scUK** role needs to be strengthened to support the assurance of overall coaching quality.
- Devolution has not helped the UK role of **scUK** with limited investment in its work from the other Home Country Sports Councils (65% of its income comes from grants from Sport England – 45% and UK Sport – 22%). The other home countries have, in fact, established their own coaching unit to implement coaching development. This role, then, as stated earlier needs reviewing.
- Data collection on coaching – evidence and statistics on the status of coaching and practicing coaches throughout the country was virtually non-existent. **scUK** was well placed to undertake this role but claims that resources do not allow for it. It should be given higher priority in order to support the case for further investment.

Overall there was, however, a view that the current mission as a general statement of principle was clearly the appropriate one for the future. To date **scUK** has not really had the mandate to fully deliver

it. **scUK** needs to be given the authority to drive it forward with a commitment from its partners to deliver that vision. The current mission is perhaps now closer to achievement than ever before, in the light of the UK coaching review and vision and the work of the DCMS Coaching Task Force.

In a practical and more detailed sense there was a need for some greater clarity as to the nature of its role and the expectations of the organisation. Key issues for consideration are:

1. Is it to be a national agency funded on a UK basis or a home country basis? There are serious questions about whether **scUK** is delivering on a UK basis. The Government's devolution agenda and the lack of support for **scUK** work in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales suggest that its remit will be regarded as an English one only if the benefits to the other Home Country Sports Councils are not more transparent.
2. Many consultees suggested that there was a strong case for a shift in the method of operation away from the traditional delivery of courses and programmes towards a greater focus on providing a support service to NGBs in particular. This would lead to a role more along lines of a development agency originating generic coaching resources for incorporation into NGB programmes. This would in any case be in line with a growing trend for NGBs to incorporate and adapt **scUK** material into their courses and for an increased tendency towards sport specific delivery, possibly reducing the demand for multi sport or generic workshops.
3. The proposal for a National Coaching Certificate argues for a quality assurance/licensing role for **scUK**. This is clearly a logical role for the organisation to assume but it needs to consider whether such a remit could produce conflict in its relationship with NGBs.

Relationships and Responsiveness

Generally most respondents reported that they had good relationships with **scUK** and that they believed they genuinely worked hard to establish clients' views of the products and to revise them in the light of those comments. Active Sport Partnerships were particularly complimentary about the level of support received. There were several frustrations, however, often but not always arising from the perception that direction and responsiveness is conditioned by the need to raise income to sustain activity.

There was some criticism of what was perceived as the inflexibility of the reporting process. Requests for change from the local level have to go through three layers – Coaching Development Officer, Head of Coaching Development and Professional Development Director. Liaison at the local level is through the CDOs who seem to understand the needs but are not able to persuade the centre to take these on board. Consequently, the Corporate Management Team ends up making decisions that do not coincide with local needs.

An example of this was mentoring, where HQ offer packages at £600 and would not agree instead to getting alongside one region and designing something that they wanted to reflect their needs. They perhaps need to be more developmental suggested this respondent.

Some of the observations in relation to **scUK's responsiveness to customer needs in developing services** included the following comment:

'As far as the people and the organisation are concerned they try hard to match priorities with expressed need. Financial issues remain the main bone of contention. The need to generate income can militate against relationships and customer care. They are responsive to all sorts of requests except reducing costs.'

'Relationships with NGBs are varied – and will depend upon personalities and the NGBs resources and current level of sophistication regarding coaching and coach education. Again there was a request that **scUK** should work more closely in tandem with the NGBs to reflect their differing needs. Generic courses by definition have generic applications and cannot always take account of differing levels in specialism. For example base levels of exercise physiology knowledge in cycling are clearly much more sophisticated than in many other team games. **scUK** will need to take account of this in designing courses particularly at the higher levels rather than promoting more generic products.

With **complaints** there was a general view that **scUK** was sensitive to them and makes every effort to respond to them positively. Few consultees were able to refer to any examples of complaints from their experience. The Sport England consultee reported that he had not had any complaints drawn to his attention in two years as liaison officer.

Again the only negative reference was where complaints were about cost – **scUK** were not considered to be very responsive. 'They try to respond on cost but do not appear to be able to. In other areas of criticism on policy, direction, course content etc they were much more responsive and willing to change.' Many respondents said that they would like to see a recommendation that **scUK** should be freed from the constraints of generating income.

Service and Products

Views on the **quality of the services and products** of **scUK** were in the main positive. All respondents reported that they provided a good range of basic coach education courses with some good examples of more advanced and generic work.

Clients are satisfied in the main with the tutors. The quality of courses is largely dependent on the quality of the tutors. Content is well thought through and planned. Tutor quality ranges from fair to

excellent with the major proportion in the good to excellent category. **scUK**'s own quality control procedures through the monitoring and evaluation of courses tends to weed out the poorer tutors.

There were a number of **services currently offered which consultees questioned**.

Notably several references were made to the need generally to focus on the work for which they are highly regarded, for example, education courses, workshops and resource materials, and resist the temptation to 'have an involvement in anything and everything from a sports development perspective' as one respondent saw it.

As stated earlier the responsibility for High Performance Coaching Programme should be clarified. The more recent involvement of the Institutes together with the BOA argues for **scUK** to take a more strategic role in relation to coaching at this level. This view was shared by a majority of respondents.

There were reservations about performance courses e.g. skill, strength, speed, which should be reviewed. **scUK** do not seem to be clear at whom they are targeting these courses.

The cost of attendance on courses could be a barrier to participation. This was seen as a problem certainly when individuals were responsible for the fees but also where governing bodies were paying. Some increases in prices in recent times have been perceived as unreasonable (e.g. Body in Action 35% and some tutor training from £690 to £1,000) and can be prohibitive. Some governing bodies have not been able to sustain this type of increase and have had to withdraw despite valuing the product.

There were a number of **services that consultees wished to see that were currently not offered**.

This tended to be the section where most respondents articulated the view that **scUK** should provide more tangible support to NGBs. They could work alongside them to refine and develop their own programmes and review courses. They could assist in brokering discussions with SPRITO regarding national standards. They could take world class material and make sure it was in the hands of those who need it in the NGBs and help them to deliver it through their own courses.

Many would like to see more ongoing support to practicing coaches through mentoring and CPD. This is happening in some areas but there was a need to develop this further as part of the redefinition of **scUK**'s future role.

In relation to the courses themselves there was a criticism that that perhaps the courses themselves were not of sufficient length. Three hours often was not enough. There needs to be longer term follow up. There was a need for more local underpinning if not with longer or additional courses possibly more effectively through mentoring identified above.

Finally **scUK might improve the quality of its services** through the following:

They could perhaps be even more selective about tutors by weeding out the ‘fair’ ones to maintain an even higher standard. There should be more follow up evaluation to courses with a view to identifying how coaches may have changed in the longer term as a result of the courses.

In short by being more focused and targeting resources to deliver an appropriate range of activities. By being more developmental, working closer with the NGBs and meeting their needs.

Effectiveness/Efficiency

Inevitably interviewees tended to revisit points made earlier in relation to quality and strengths and weaknesses of service when considering effectiveness and efficiency. Such repetition, however serves to lend emphasis to the observation.

In order to make **scUK more effective** a general view was that there needed to be a re-clarification of its role following the implementation of the Task Force recommendations together with the provision of an adequate level of core resource to enable it to deliver a role which is accessible to NGBs and other clients equally. This may need to be accompanied by some radical restructuring of staffing and financial resources, refocusing on a narrower range of activities.

The new branding does not appear to have universal approval. Clients are not sure that the message has penetrated and is clearly recognised. ‘It is like FcUK’ one interviewee observed. The new branding is now more than six months old and consumers may still be confused as to what it stands for.

The main observations from service consumers in relation to **value for money** concentrated more on cost rather than value for money itself. Cost to individuals is perceived as high and cost appears to be a bone of contention to course organisers.

The perception was that although **scUK** is not fully satisfying all in its current mission statement by and large it is providing good value for money – nationally and politically but particularly at the regional level.

scUK are effectively in a monopoly situation. Unfortunately this does lead to a perception amongst some consumers that they are being ‘fleeced’. This was a frequent observation and again is related to the priority that is placed on the generation of income. Some observers stressed that the CTF needed to highlight funding as a major issue. Either better funding should be provided or activities would need to be refocused sharply in line with available budgets.

Predictably, funders had a slightly different view on the issue of value for money. Generally they agreed that the principle of a central agency to work across the UK in support of the NGBs remains a sensible

use of public money and avoids ‘re-inventing the wheel in each sport’. However, they felt that value for money is clearly related to the achievement of results. There needs to be a sharper focus to the work of **scUK** and clear performance measures linked to outcomes so that progress (and value for money) can be tracked effectively and celebrated where appropriate.

UK Sport acknowledge that whilst it is a subjective view it is difficult to determine whether the return on their investment reflects real value for money without direct evidence of performance impact. They have recently commissioned their own review of **scUK** to help them in this quest.

On the issue of the **extent to which services offered by scUK could be delivered differently or by other organisations** views could be summarised as follows:

There was general agreement that there was a definite need for a national organisation to co-ordinate coach education and development. They believed that the independent role and the expertise that **scUK** had built up over the years argues for delivery through the same vehicle. Most respondents did not believe there was a case for wholesale transfer to other organisations. We should persevere, refine and improve tended to be the view. ‘Coaching is too important. The key issue is that there should be one organisation, with the right remit and properly funded.’ was a typical comment.

As reported earlier there were consistent references to the need to clarify role in relation to the UK involvement, the channelling of support to elite level coaches through the UK/English Institute and concentrating on its core activity alongside and in support of NGBs and coach development. A key relationship in the future will be with the new Sector Skills Council.

General Comments

Few additional comments were made other than those that related to views about ‘Coachwise’, **scUK**’s trading arm. All such references were positive and supportive.

Coachwise has developed a good range of services that bring a return to **scUK** and provides good value for NGBs and other bodies. They seem to have managed any potential conflicts of interest well. The development of 1st for Sport is viewed as an excellent step which has considerable potential in relation to the National Coaching Certificate.

Recommendations

This review coincides with the process whereby **scUK** are currently preparing a new corporate plan for the period 2002 – 2007. The draft plan has attempted to take account of the emerging recommendations of the CTF and has anticipated some of the feedback outlined in this report to inform the guiding principles of its future operation. The following recommendations should help to confirm this course of action but also provide additional issues for consideration.

It is recommended that:

1. **scUK** continues as the key national agency to take the strategic lead in co-ordinating the development of coaching and coach education across the UK.
2. **scUK** takes a lead role on co-ordinating the implementation of the UK Vision for Coaching and servicing the review group established by UK Sport to monitor progress and implementation on the long term vision.
3. In the light of recommendations 1 and 2 **scUK** should enter into discussions with Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland to establish transparent and accountable service level agreements with these Councils as a means of clarifying the services and roles required.
4. **scUK** to shift its approach from a predominantly direct delivery role to one of enabling and facilitating partners to deliver.
5. **scUK** to seek a much closer relationship in support of the work of NGBs, providing technical support and guidance and assisting them to integrate **scUK** resources and advice into their own programmes.
6. **scUK** to review its services in the light of the recommendations of the CTF and with a view to focusing on a narrower range of priorities centred around coaching development and coach education and development.
7. As recommended in the Cunningham Review **scUK** will have responsibility for the overall strategic and co-ordinated development of coaching from the school playground to the Olympic arena even though aspects of delivery will be undertaken via a variety of partners and methods. In the world class and high performance environments **scUK** should continue to align its work with that of the UKSI so that both organisations together provide quality and mutually supportive services for the development of coaches working at or aiming to work at this level.
8. **scUK** takes responsibility for the development and operation of Quality Assurance of the proposed National Coaching Certificate and supporting the work of NGBs in preparing for its implementation.
9. **scUK** places a higher priority on co-ordinating and undertaking research into all aspects of coaching to provide a more robust evidence base for future developments.
10. **scUK** develops a series of performance indicators that are more outcome based, capable of tracking coach performance more accurately and of assessing value for money.

11. The DCMS in conjunction with Sport England and UK Sport and **scUK** undertake a detailed financial review to determine the resources that **scUK** will need to deliver the requirements of its revised role. The object is to remove the clear current perception from clients that policy and direction of the organisation is driven by the need to raise income.

Review of sports coach UK – Client & Stakeholder Survey

QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose and Role

The purpose or role of **sports coach UK** is currently expressed through its mission statement as follows:

sports coach UK is dedicated to guiding the development and implementation of a coaching system, recognised as a world leader, for all coaches at every level in the UK.

We will work with our partners to achieve this by promoting:

- professional and ethical values and inclusive and equitable practice.
- agreed national standards of competence as a benchmark at all levels.
- a regulated and licensed structure.
- recognition, value and appropriate funding and reward.
- a culture and structure of innovation, constant renewal and continuous professional development.

1. How well do you believe **scUK** fulfils that purpose or role?
2. In which areas have they been most successful? Please give reasons.
3. In which areas have they been least successful? Please give reasons.
4. To what extent do you believe the current purpose or role of **scUK** is the most appropriate one?
5. If you have a different view, please outline what you believe that role should be?

Relationships and Responsiveness

6. How would you describe your organisation's relationship with **scUK**?
7. To what extent do you believe the programmes and services of **scUK** coincide with your own priorities?

8. To what extent do you believe **scUK** takes account of its customers needs when developing its services and programmes?
9. How responsive is **scUK** to complaints?

Service and Products

10. What experience do you or your organisation have of the work of **scUK**?
11. Please give your views on the services offered by **scUK**.
12. Which products and services are currently offered by **scUK** which perhaps should not be?
13. Which products and services would you like to see that are currently not offered by **scUK**?
14. How would you rate the quality of the services provided?
15. How do you believe **scUK** could improve the quality of its services?

Effectiveness/Efficiency

16. What do you believe **scUK** needs to do to make it more effective?
17. To what extent do you believe **scUK** provides value for money?
18. To what extent do you believe the services offered by **scUK** could be delivered differently or by other organisations?

General

19. Are there any other comments you would like to make about **scUK**. Please use this section to express any views you may have about **scUK**'s trading arm, Coachwise.

Feedback from Workshops

Coach Workshops		
Factor	1999-2000 %	2001-2001
Ethnicity	5% black and ethnic minority	9% black and ethnic minority
Disability	2% with a disability	2% with a disability
How relevant was the material to you?	96% very or reasonably 3% slightly 1% not at all	96% very or reasonably 4% no at all
Was the material pitched at the right level?	97% very or reasonably 3% slightly	97% very or reasonably 3% slightly
How well did the tutor deliver the workshop?	99% very or reasonably 1% slightly	100% very or reasonably
How did you hear about the workshop?	21% Governing Body 18% Workshop organiser 11% Regional Training Unit 10% direct scUK marketing 5% Local Authorities 3% PCCs 32% Other	17% Governing Body 14% Workshop organiser 25% Regional Training Unit 21% direct scUK marketing 9% Local Authorities 5% PCC 9% Other
How many scUK workshops have you attended previously?	29% none 53% one or two 13% three to five 5% more than five	47% none 39% one or two 10% three to five 4% more than five
Are you likely to attend another scUK workshop?	95% said yes	95% said yes
High Performance Coach Workshops		
Was the workshop at the expected level?	96% said yes	93% said yes
Are you able to meet your outcomes for attending the workshop?	97% said yes	93% said yes
Are you likely to attend another workshop?	99% said yes	96% said yes
Did you enjoy the workshop?	99% said yes	99% said yes
How did you hear about the workshop?	82% direct from scUK 14% from Performance Director 4% Other	84% direct from scUK 13% from Performance Director 3% Other

Appendix 9

Taking Forward the Recommendations

Detailed Implementation of the proposals will need to be carried out by separate groups of agencies who have clear responsibilities in respect of each recommendation. Other stakeholders will also need to be consulted and involved as necessary. The table below indicates who the CTF believes should form the main delivery group and suggests other interested stakeholders. Responsibility for the co-ordination of the delivery of all the recommendations should rest with Sport England.

Recommendation	Main Deliverer	Stakeholders
1. National Coaching Certificate	scUK and NGBs	Coaches, Clubs, NGBs, schools
2. National Coaching Directors	Sport England & UK Sport	NGBs, coach educators, coaches
3. Coaching Development Officers	Sport England and scUK	Clubs, LAs, FE, HE, coaches
4. Review of scUK	scUK, Sport England and UK Sport	scUK, coaches, coach educators
5. 'Come into Coaching' campaign	scUK, UFI, BBC	Coaches, schools, volunteers, parents
6. Coachmatch scheme	Sport England, LAs, clubs and schools	Coaches, LAs, clubs, SSCs, NGBs
7. Regional Talent Development Coaches	Sport England and UK Sport	NGBs
8. International Benchmarking Exercise	N/A	N/A
9. National data gathering	Sport England	NGBs, LAs



**Department for Culture,
Media and Sport**
2-4 Cockspur Street
London SW1Y 5DH
PP 499 July 2002