



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Education and Culture

Youth and Sport

Sport

EU Working Group "Education and Training in Sport" 3rd meeting, 19 - 20 May 2010

SUMMARY REPORT

Venue:	Regardz Zilveren Toren Conference Centre, Stationsplein 51-53, Amsterdam
Participants:	Representatives from AT, BE, DE, FR, GR, HU, LT, LU, NL, PL, SK, UK DG EAC: M. Krejza, B. Ooijen, A. Greis
Observers:	EOC EU Office, EOSE, EAS network, European Coach Council (ECC)
Chaired by:	Michal Krejza, Head of the Sport Unit, European Commission

1. Introduction

The Working Group (hereinafter WG) thanked the Netherlands for the organisation of the first day of the meeting at the Frans Otten Stadium in Amsterdam on 19 May, and for the excellent presentations on talent programmes and the position of coaches.

The Commission (hereinafter COM) informed the WG that:

- All projects in the field of dual careers, which were being implemented in the framework of the call for proposals 2009 under the 2009 Preparatory Action in the field of sport, had been successfully launched: international meetings and seminars were taking place, websites were developed and in September 2010 a mid-term meeting with all educational projects would take place in the framework of the EAS network meeting in Lisbon.
- After the meeting of the Group of Coordinators for Directive 36/2005 held on 18 March 2010, all national coordinators had been requested to contact their competent authorities in the area of sport and ask them to check the accuracy of the database on Regulated professions as well as the level of qualifications. The results of the questionnaire which COM had sent to Member States and the contacts with the coordination points would be discussed in the next WG meeting.

2. Sectoral qualifications in sport and their relation to National Qualification Frameworks with reference to EQF

The sectoral coach education system of the sport federations and the general coaching education systems of universities and vocational institutes are linked in most of the Member States participating in the WG. However, the way this relation is defined varies strongly. In some MS the discussion about the relation is still in progress because of the restructuring of the National Qualification Structure and the question how to make reference to EQF. Examples from different MS proved that qualifications in sport could be somehow recognised and linked to NQF. Funding only courses which lead to qualifications in line with NQF has proven to be a strong tool to change the set-up of qualifications.

The invited European Coach Council (ECC) made reference to the different types of coaches and the four levels presented in the ENSSEE/ECC study and the Rio Maior Convention. A distinction was made between a sport-specific coach and a general sport coach. The Rio Maior Convention was signed by national and international sport organisations and government agencies for the period of 2008-2011. ECC asked for mechanisms to ensure comparability and suggested to have common reference points for both sectoral and formal education qualifications. ECC also announced an ECC/ICCE conference which would take place in December 2010 in the Netherlands to discuss the qualifications of the different coach education systems.

WG concluded that for MS with regulated and registered professions in sport EQF was an additional tool to describe the learning outcomes or educational diplomas. For other MS, EQF was an important reference point for students and professionals, educational institutes and employers. Although EQF could sound complex it was essential for MS to make sure that the sport sector was taken on board in NQF/EQF discussions. The professionalization of sport was progressing and sport clubs wanted qualified coaches more and more. Because of the different systems and the diversity of MS, it was difficult to say how the relation between the sectoral education and professional education systems would develop.

COM indicated that at EU level, the starting point for sectoral education systems to link to EQF was through national structures. At the moment there were real doubts whether it should be possible for international enterprises, and for example international sport federations, to make a direct link to EQF. There were still too many questions about quality standards and monitoring of these systems. CEDEFOP conducted a study whether a direct link between qualifications of international sectoral organisations or enterprises to EQF would be possible under certain circumstances.

COM proposed to investigate opinions of the international federations active in the field of coach education regarding their sectoral qualification systems and the link to National Qualifications and EQF to collect more information on the developments regarding sectoral qualifications outside the world of sport.

3. EU Physical Activity Guidelines in the field of education and school environment

The subject of health-enhancing physical activity (HEPA) related to school and education received a lot of attention in MS and all sorts of actions and programmes had been developed including in PE. Examples of programmes were Fit for Austria, Sport Strategy for Young People in the UK, School Olympics and Manger Bouger in Belgium, and the Get Moving Hungary programme. In a number of MS PE teachers more frequently had a dual job partly at school for curriculum activities and partly in after-school activities.

MS had indicated that evaluation of projects and campaigns should be included more often. An evaluation whether actions were successful and, for example, whether they reached the indicated target groups could be very useful. Success finally depended on how schools, PE teachers and sport trainers used all the information in practice. Interesting subject at governmental level could be barriers between the sectors of education, health and sport (ministries, agencies, NGOs).

WG concluded that MS had different concepts and an exchange of good practices and learning experiences could be promoted in the future. It was agreed that further information was needed on the role of PE teachers in PA outside the curriculum and the involvement of sport clubs and that a questionnaire would be sent out on this subject.

4. Quality standards at schools and educational institutes from the sport perspective

The WG discussed action no 8 of the Plan "Pierre de Coubertin": the award of a European label to schools actively supporting physical activities in a school environment. COM indicated that the introduction of a European label would be complex. If action should be taken in this field it preferred to develop with MS a common framework of quality standards at EU level. Such a framework could be used by those MS which had or would like to establish a national label or would like to have a European competition as it was organized in 2004. COM concluded that most of the MS present had no national label and most of those which had a label, or wanted to develop a label, had shown no interest in a common EU approach. COM would therefore reconsider the implementation of action 8 of the Action Plan "Pierre de Coubertin".

The WG started a first discussion on quality standards for National Sport Centres and sport schools for talented youth. COM indicated not to focus anymore on the recommendation of the 2008 EU study on training of professional sportsmen and sportswomen to promote a European label for international sport centres and educational institutes for talented young sports people. It preferred to discuss the proposal to develop a European reference point or quality framework for MS and sport organisations for these centres. The discussion in the WG clarified that the dual career was more than only a difficult combination of education and training. There were crucial moments of transfer for the athlete (end of compulsory education and the qualification for the labour market) where specific guidance was needed. Orientation on the job after the sport career, the quality standards and the different positions of athletes in specific sports (Olympic, professional sport, winter sports) and the position and qualification of coaches were of great importance as well. The position of smaller MS with a lack of facilities and the need in some sports to let talented young sportspersons train for a longer period abroad (in combination with a study) asked for international cooperation.

The WG concluded that there was not much support for a European label as such and that quality standards of educational institutes and training centres for talented young sportspeople and other different factors including the role of the EU in this perspective would be discussed in the framework of the results of the supported dual career projects in March 2011.

5. Conclusions and next steps

The following **conclusions** were agreed in the course of the meeting:

- MS had different views on how the sectoral coach education systems of sport federations (non-formal education) should be linked to the formal coach education system and NQF. MS would contact their EQF coordination points to ask attention for the position of the sectoral sport education system. COM would collect further information about the state of play regarding the discussions and research about sectoral qualification systems and NQF and EQF and would take the initiative to contact international sport federations about their opinion on a reference to EQF.
- A questionnaire on PE and PA in schools would be sent out to WG as a basis for a more informed exchange of views.
- Most of the MS represented in the WG showed no interest in a common approach on a label for sport-minded schools and did not support the implementation of action no. 8 of the Action Plan Pierre de Coubertin.
- MS would like to discuss different factors including quality standards for educational institutes and training centres for talented young sportspeople and the role of the EU in this perspective, in the framework of the results of the supported dual career projects, in March 2011.