

International Forum on Elite Sport 2005

EVALUATION OF CENTRE PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY: SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Participants:

Australia:	Wes Battams, Alex Baumann, Paul Kiteley, Steven Lawrence, Frank Pyke
Canada:	John Bales, Claire Buffone-Blair, Donald Dion, Francis Drouin, Julie Duranceau, André Fournier, Marc Gélinas, Kathleen Giguère, Josée Grand'Maitre, Dale Henwood, Mark Lowry, Wendy Pattenden, Éric Pilote, Tom Scrimger, Richard Way
China:	Chi Jian
England:	Matt Hammond, Liz Nicholl, Wilma Shakespear
Finland:	Jukka Lahtinen
France:	Caroline Carpentier, Florian Laborde, Annie Riquet
Ireland:	Shane Keane, Sheelach Quinn
Japan:	Yuichi Hirano, Takashi Kawahara
Mexico:	Patricio Quijano
Morocco:	Said Lamrini
Netherlands:	Ad Roskam, Jochem Schellens
New Zealand:	John Limna, Peter Pfitzinger, Katie Sadleir, Kereyn Smith, Deslee Wrathall
Northern Ireland:	Jo Hopkins
Scotland:	Anne-Marie Harrison
Singapore:	Wayde Clews, Abdul Rhaman Hassan
South Africa:	Bernice Butlion, Gogo Manqoyi, Maurice Robertson, Besaphi Skhosana
Spain:	Frencesc De Puig, Joseph Escoda, Rosa Ma Ortega Pardo
United States:	Tracy Lamb, Patrice Milkovitch
Wales:	Sarah Powell

General comments, reactions or other perspectives on the presentation.

<p>Wes Battams Australia</p> <p>John Bales Canada</p> <p>Wes Battams Australia</p>	<p>It is often difficult to keep in mind the big picture of the sport and not just counting medals. Our mandate is that coaches have to work with developmental athletes as well as monitoring the overall health of sport.</p> <p>What does that mean, in practical terms?</p> <p>For example, in Australia, the key performance areas for an employee that may be a receptionist or a coach are: (1) Results, (2) Leadership, (3) Sustainability - specific guidelines are set to be achieved, (4) Teamwork - in all these areas, and (5) Benchmarks.</p> <p>We also expect accountability both ways; e.g. coaches may be willing to provide leadership to the youth development level, but not willing to accept the leadership of meeting three times annually with national governing bodies (NGBs), the Australia Institute of Sport (AIS) and state associations.</p>
<p>Paul Kiteley Australia</p>	<p>Obviously, we need to be able to identify what services are key. However, thinking back to Dale Henwood's presentation, he spoke about how he's not sure it would be possible to determine which service is most important, given the individuality of each athlete. For example, the most important or critical service for one might be nutrition, where it could be sport psychology for another. In reality, in the delivery of services we often respond to the athletes' needs and we respond as</p>

	quickly as we can rather than being fixed on the plan that was initially submitted.
England	<p>It's difficult to define responsibility/accountability of a centre - if the program succeeds, the centre succeeds, etc.</p> <p>"Gold Dust" - An athlete reaching a podium acknowledges that you (centre) have been there to support him or her to get there. Also, such evaluation must be done very much in partnership.</p> <p>There are also subtle measurements in the community. When [sport med] staff are seconded to international games teams [by some sport(s)], this is an important evaluation element. It shows a high level of staff credibility because sports want them. Staff get one month off to do this.</p> <p>Time actually spent by service providers with athletes helps dictate the needs in a service area. In England, the distribution of time is approximately 60/40, hands-on versus administration.</p>
Liz Nicholl England, UK Sport	National Sport Organization (NSO) Plan versus Athlete Plan - It all depends on the sport and how advanced they are. So some plans might be institute driven whereas others are sport driven.
Said Lamrini Morocco	Before evaluating, we need to know what the guidelines for creating a training centre are. We also need to understand what is needed to promote the establishment of other training centres around the world. As far as centre evaluation, two elements need to be assessed: performance and administration of the centre.
Katie Sadleir New Zealand	<p>This is a difficult discussion without context - role of the centre in the system, etc. Some centres are accountable for results for some programs/sports.</p> <p>Our model is a sport-driven model, funded primarily by government: 70%, government (though SPARC)/30% private.</p> <p>It is hard to prioritize sports. Public support is important, so every two years we survey the public about improvement of results/sports, etc. Dollars from government to centres are then negotiated with NSOs re service support and a contract is entered into with each sport.</p> <p>A value is determined for each sport-credit system. This credit system allows centre athletes to get services from any of the centres.</p>
John Limna New Zealand	Once the plan is put in place to give the regional offices (centres) the direction to work with the athletes. Whether it is mostly governed by their NSOs or by the athletes themselves depends on the set-up within the NSO.
Wayde Clews Singapore	Would like more discussion around tools and methods regarding assessment.

<p>Patrice Milkovitch United States</p> <p>Tracy Lamb United States</p>	<p>In the United States, we have a measure of performance expectations, e.g. passing grade from health services on food preparation. That is doing things right and also about doing the right things. Services are a priority but they aren't the only element. Evaluation needs to be based on many factors: funding, structure and relationship with NGBs.</p> <p>There are so many different areas of accountability: services, performance and centres. The limits to accountability are defined by the resources. The question as to whom we are all accountable to is interesting; really, the NGBs are accountable for performance.</p> <p>The United States Olympic Committee (USOC) spends approximately \$11 million per year on U.S. Olympic Training Centers (USOTCs). Funds invested don't always equal medals.</p> <p>Plan/sport partners are completely responsible for results. The USOTCs are just tools. We take less successful sports and try to help them learn from more successful sports.</p> <p>The USOTC can touch athletes at any time in their career; perhaps just at the beginning or on the final road to the Olympics.</p> <p>"Gold Dust" - USA women's hockey said upon return to Lake Placid: "It's good to be home."</p> <p>USOTC - Services offered are partly the result of a negotiating process between partners and experts (e.g. sport plus sport med). It's hard to identify what, among all services provided, has the greatest impact.</p>
<p>Sarah Powell Wales</p> <p>Wes Battams Australia</p> <p>Scotland</p>	<p>Funding of coaching - Do you have problems in Australia with an institute funding a coach and the sport also? So, what if the institute feels that the coach is not performing up to expectations but the sport refuses to make the decision to replace the coach?</p> <p>Each institute has a different governance structure. Basically, at the end of the day, you are in a partnership and you need to resolve the problem, communicate and work together. Influence and boards make the difference. Have had to make tough performance-based decisions. Sometimes a catalyst for change.</p> <p>Our centres employ coaches: for some sports of institute it's 95% for some team sports, it's less of a percent. Sports do not control selection for staff.</p> <p>Some staff have to take six to seven weeks off to go to games, may now be getting a bit of a stipend to cover lost wages, etc. (e.g. doctors leaving their practice for six weeks).</p>
<p>Richard Way Canada</p> <p>Wes Battams Australia</p> <p>Sarah Powell Wales</p>	<p>Governance model - Does Australia have a specific governance model (i.e. coach centre) which is better? Is coach performance assessed by the institute or by the sport?</p> <p>Not yet. The question as to which approach should be prioritized has not been addressed.</p> <p>In Wales, we have 20 governance factors to assess the NGB in order to determine whether they are ready to take over coach hiring and performance assessment.</p>

Besaphi Skhosana South Africa	(To Australia.) How do you determine access and funding of athletes?
Wes Battams Australia	Funding allocations to athletes are based on a set of criteria and on the partnerships developed for each training centre (geographical and demographic elements are also considered).
Josée Grand'Maitre Canada	What are the coach evaluation criteria if they are employed by both the centre and the NSO - who does it?
Sarah Powell Wales	We give guidelines to the NGBs about what we think is important; then they follow these guidelines. We agree on the criteria but not always on the perception.

(In one discussion group) Each country was asked to provide some information regarding their centres' structure and whether they are actual facilities or more service oriented.

Paul Kiteley Australia	Australian Institute of Sport (AIS)—Depending on the tier of the sport, support will come from the national sport organization (NSO) to the AIS based on their plans. Coaches from these top-tier sports are likely hired by both the AIS and the NSO. For Tier 2 sports, the athletes do have links to their service providers, but do not have full access to the AIS. For Tier 3, athletes can apply to the AIS for scholarships to work with them. The NSO might not necessarily be involved at Tier 3 unless the athlete continues to improve and makes it to the top tier, where the NSO is directly involved.
Shane Keane Ireland	Work with sports to develop High Performance Plan and the sports then determine what their needs are and where they need to go to have their needs met, whether it is a university or other. Market-driven.
Yuichi Hirano Japan	The Japan Institute of Sport Sciences (JISS) is very well developed - three parts: Sport Science, Medical Clinic and Sport Information (system details to follow in the afternoon presentation). Research with the JISS is done by an outside source. They do have facilities that have accommodations, food services, etc.
Liz Nicholl England, UK Sport	In 1997, the NSOs were funded through the lottery to hire the very best service providers, coaches, etc. The institutes came along afterwards and therefore have evolved since their inception. Much negotiation occurs between the countries/sports to allow the institutes to provide the services they do today. The English structure is one of service delivery. In the Scottish model, the coaches are hired through the institute. The institutes do not currently have residency available.
Jochem Schellens Netherlands	Medical service centre - Half for Olympic Committee and half for private practice. Focus is on sports that are not currently well developed, and they work with them depending on what the NSOs' needs are.
John Limna New Zealand	Centralized programs dependent on the NSO plan and/or structure. All centres are service oriented.
Jo Hopkins Northern Ireland	New centre - began by servicing their four key sports - employed services managers that worked with the four sports. They now service new sports, and they have to do many of their plans as these NSOs are not as well organized. Not currently residential but linked up with the

	university in hopes of becoming somewhat residential.
Abdul Rhaman Hassan Singapore	The centre develops the policies for HP sport at this stage - still a young organization. NSOs are not really into HP and, although they feel they are HP, they need much assistance to develop their "plans."
Gogo Manqoyi South Africa	Provinces have centres within the academic system.
Joseph Escoda Spain	Service-oriented entity providing accommodations, meals, etc. in one. Athletes are provided resources (dollars) to attend their centres; therefore, they pay for the services they receive once they are there.

**How do you determine the centre/institute part of the overall sport accountability?
How is accountability linked to consequences?**

Australia	<p>In Australia, there is a link of dollars to the performance of the sport and its national sport organization (NSO), but the money is not always linked to the centre. The gap is widening between the sports that perform and those that do not. The money in the pool does not increase: some sports receive larger portions of the funding while others' share is reduced.</p> <p>We want to ensure there is life success after sport success. Gold-medal performances and a gold-medal person - life outside sport is encouraged, but ultimately it is performance that people measure against. If the goal is a balanced life outside of sport, then it should be built into performance measurements.</p> <p>It has happened that some sports have been demoted from Tier 1 down to Tier 3 based on performance measurements, etc. The Australian Institute of Sport (AIS) has ups and downs depending on how athletes are doing.</p>
Donald Dion Canada	The centre has to be held accountable for the services it is providing.
Wendy Pattenden Canada	Yes, training centres can have an impact on performance; we can help them prepare for optimum performance.
Canada and Australia	There is competition among provinces, but ultimately the focus is on performance as a country.
China	In China, every province and every sport is emphasized for overall performance.
Matt Hammond England	What is the big picture, what are the resources available for our vision and our goal? There are controllable and uncontrollable factors; we don't have control over who is selecting athletes.
England	Use versus performance can be used to determine consequences, i.e. sport high use versus low results, so services may change. We conduct an assessment every six months, and each year, we conduct a "customer survey."
France	In France, there is a contract between the NSO and the Ministry of Sport, and an INSEP evaluation. The money is linked to services and medals, in agreement with the NSO. The evaluations look at progress

	in the sport and how athletes find their place in society.
Ireland	In Ireland, there is no funding link to performance.
Japan	In Japan, we look at results, improvement and overall fitness of the athletes.
Mexico	In Mexico, there are few sports that are supported, but the level of support is very high.
Said Lamrini Morocco	In Morocco, we have three funding sources: lottery, sport and government. Training centres can be owned in two different ways - by the government or the sport federation - so accountability will be different for each "owner."
New Zealand	<p>In New Zealand, there is regional accountability based upon representation on national teams and improved performance on national teams versus the population of a specific geographical region. There are strong ties between the centres, and the NSO is the key partner when determining performance standards. It is also a service to debrief with athletes and coaches who did not perform. Sometimes a coach may identify mistakes that an athlete will not and vice versa.</p> <p>Centres have control over the coaches with the plan and having scheduled opportunities to review the plan with the coach and athlete. The support services plans are well integrated, and there is a rep working with each sport and coach. In New Zealand, there is strong support for the belief that without strong grassroots programs there will not be high performance results, but the money is not necessarily available at the community level.</p>
Spain	All sports are coming to the centre based on the funding they are getting. Sports have needed to adjust the number of athletes they send based on the fact that they need to keep the numbers at the centre such that they are able to provide quality services.
Besaphi Skhosana South Africa	We need to comply with an act of the government in South Africa.
Tracy Lamb United States	<p>Can we really control performance?</p> <p>In the United States, the evaluation tool is constantly evolving/ changing. Such a tool can use many types of data: usage (days), calibre of the users (e.g. percentage of Olympic users relative to all users) and occupancy rates are examples of data we take a close look at. Other variables affecting centre performance evaluation include who is running the program and what tool is being used to evaluate.</p>
Patrice Milkovitch United States	The U.S. Olympic Training Centers (USOTCs) are the holders of the resources; you can also find resources in a national governing body (NGB), but it is time consuming and costly. Access is influenced by athletic performance. For example, men's field hockey has potential for performance but not medal potential, so there's no money for this sport at the USOTC.

Marc Gélinas Canada	Mentioned Canadian potential funding sources: federal, provincial and sometimes municipal governments, the Canadian Olympic Committee, the corporate sector (sponsors), national and provincial sport federations, private foundations and Canadian sport centres. On the other hand, in some sport federations, athletes may be asked to contribute an annual fee in order to contribute to the costs associated with their training and travel for competitions.
Said Lamrini Morocco	Costs to athletes - Who finances the athletes for travel to competition, sport federations or training centres? Local transportation or pocket money?
Matt Hammond England	The sport federation incurs the travel costs of the athletes.
Patrice Milkovitch United States	In the USOTCs, we develop relationships with the community; e.g. get free baseball tickets and then they provide something back to the community. We provide opportunities, not cash.
Josée Grand'Maître Canada Australia	Who finances service providers travelling with a team? Also, what criteria are used to determine who is responsible for financing? In Australia, two hundred sports science people are employed. If NGBs want to take them to games, we would release the sport science people for two weeks. After that, the NGBs must pay institutes back. But it is difficult in Olympic years. We are developing standards/policies to avoid double-dipping.

How do you determine the centres' role in overall sport accountability?

General comment:

It is very difficult to measure because there are so many variables: coaches, athletes, national sport organizations (NSOs), and different levels and different types of services. There is also a variance between the impact on performance and the satisfaction level of performance. To create individualized athlete performance plans with specific measurements is very time consuming and costly, but does provide improved results. Sometimes, the coach and athlete do not understand the extra service, and sometimes the coach is reluctant to express a lack of knowledge. The coach may be fearful that accessing outside professionals will identify a gap of knowledge for the coach and therefore make the coach look less professional. There is also a challenge of having full-time paid coaches involved in programs versus having volunteer coaches fulfilling the head coaching duties.

Steven Lawrence Australia	We create individualized performance plans involving the athlete, coach, and sport medicine and science professionals. The system still requires the athlete and coach to want to access the program.
Paul Kiteley Australia	It is important to open up your organization to get someone from outside to come in and provide you with feedback. No biases.
Liz Nicholl England, UK Sport	Quantitative versus qualitative - Athlete/coach feedback is highly regarded and centres still look to this for their feedback. They do regular athlete surveys, but need to get better at asking the right questions of athletes to get the proper feedback. They do include the survey as a requirement for athletes to get funding, to ensure the surveys do get filled out. A coach survey has not yet been done, but is

	in the development phase.
John Limna New Zealand	New Zealand looked at the questions they were asking, and they were similar to the questions asked by the Scottish Institute of Sport.
Bernice Butlion South Africa	In South Africa, we have targeted our services to specific athletes and have noticed a huge difference in performance.

Who does the assessments?

Australia	Australia contracts a university to conduct staff satisfaction surveys.
Wilma Shakespear England	Olympic Committee assessment is used. "Medal mapping" can be very useful in terms of predicting results (AOC did it) at all Olympic events. Russia started it and lots of European countries do it now. The person assessing must have a lot of knowledge about using a medal map because not all major countries are at all world cups, etc.
Ireland	In Ireland, the centres create a lot of reports but do not receive feedback on the reports or how to implement recommendations once there are elements identified that require attention.
New Zealand	In New Zealand, partners each assess levels and then compare results.
Wayde Clews Singapore	Sixteen Olympians in Athens (fourth + two top eights). We interviewed each athlete. What did we do with this info? Three to six key issues were identified, and recommendations were developed and passed on to the ministry.
South Africa	In South Africa, there are external audits for financial accountability only. Some centres have used others to evaluate levels of services, but it is difficult and helpful to have another organization to look at structures for ways to improve.

Who sets the parameters for evaluation?

General comment:

Sometimes, it is the centres themselves who set their parameters for evaluations with the assistance of the board of directors, their partners and sometimes government. Things to consider are what parts of the service are being evaluated, identifying barriers to performance and working to eliminate them, and key performance indications. There are many different funders for the centres' services throughout the world, including professional teams and their sponsors, pub charities, golf tournaments, corporate sponsorship, user fees for services provided and government support.

Josée Grand'Maître Canada	In Canada, there are different funding partners so different parameters are used for evaluation by each partner.
Said Lamrini Morocco	Criteria are established by the ministry and federations, and affected by the level of sport and performance.

Richard Way Canada	In Canada, the Canadian Sport Review Panel asked each sport what training centre they would like to go to. This gives an indication of how well the training centres are doing. Provides true value.
Josée Grand'Maître Canada	Don't you think that it also has something to do with demographic factors? In Canada, the only bobsleigh track is in Calgary, so bobsleigh athletes aren't going to move to Montreal no matter how good services are in Montreal.
Patrice Milkovitch United States	But isn't this similar to asking your kids where they want to go to dinner? Reflection of the day, coach of the day is in Montreal. But it should be the Sport Review Panel directing the sport to the training centre that can best provide the services and resources.

How frequently are assessments done?

Steven Lawrence Australia	In Australia, evaluations are done on a six-month basis, looking at how sports are doing compared with their performance indicators.
Frank Pyke Australia and Peter Pfitzinger New Zealand	There is a four-year budget given to Australia and New Zealand, so planning and program delivery are through a full quadrennial. Australia presents to government reps on boards six times per year and a larger semi-annual report is provided. It is very similar in New Zealand. In most countries, there are government reps on each board for the centres.
Mark Lowry Canada	In Canada, reports are given three to four times per year through centre board meetings.
Peter Pfitzinger New Zealand	In New Zealand, it is every six months based on the service provider contract and annually through their annual report. Pre-briefing and debriefing - Go through process beforehand for a good understanding of what might come from debriefing. - Debriefing - Meet with the New Zealand Olympic Committee (NZOC); NZOC focuses on environment during games. - New Zealand training centre focuses on performance of everyone: athlete, coaches, providers and staff. Independent Satisfaction Survey - Annually re games (results) but other assessments. Trying to eliminate the "we didn't have enough dollars" excuse. Pre-briefing - What more do you need?
Bernice Butlion South Africa	In South Africa, performance is evaluated on an annual basis.
Tracy Lamb United States	Quadrennial Planning Process - Was done last year leading up to Beijing. Coaches - They have first focused on the post-Athens analysis, and then they will focus on the next games.

Do all participants feel that they have a system that is accountable?

Canada	We do have an accountability framework that is already in place for the national sport organizations (NSOs). We are currently looking at identifying one for the CSCs, but it is difficult given that accountability for performance currently lies with the NSOs. Therefore, other targets must be set up.
England, UK Sport	Accountability is very clear, but there are different directions. For UK Sport, they are accountable to the government where the NSOs are accountable to UK Sport. Performance indicators are currently linked to medals, but aiming towards getting performance indicators linked to performance improvement. Each of the institutes is accountable to its own country's sport councils. Since their funding comes from lottery or directly from government, there is a direct line for accountability as they do not get other types of funding.
Ireland	Trying to manage the expectations of the media and work with the sports in terms of the development of their performance plans including benchmarks for performance for competitions and their accountability is based on these targets. Not necessarily just about winning the medals but reaching their own performance targets. In trying to evaluate the centres' services, they work with their NSOs and service providers, and base the evaluation on their agreements. It is difficult to get the service providers to fill in the paperwork as they are not working full time with the centres. When money is given out to organizations, they are accountable to the centre based on the plan that they have submitted. They are now looking at whether these plans are actually good and perhaps getting someone to come in to evaluate the plans.
Japan	We have internal accountability.
New Zealand and Netherlands	Yes, they are accountable to the government.
Northern Ireland	Targets are identified by sports and within the institute they have to be met. With the individual athletes that are not part of the four major sports, targets are not identified by sports; therefore, the institute tries to help the athletes identify targets.
Singapore	Accountability is currently based on the number of medals, but they are trying to develop other targets or indicators as they are in the development phase.
South Africa	Funding is from various partners, including the government, therefore they are accountable. The accountability is related to the service that is provided.
Spain	We are now in the process of getting the sports involved to identify different targets.
New Zealand	Commented on the difficulty of finding methods to evaluate whether or not the services are having a positive impact on athletes' performances.
Liz Nicholl England, UK Sport	Individual athletes' goals versus NSOs' goals. Since you are providing services to individual athletes, it is important to link it back to the athletes' goals as well.

Athletes being satisfied versus athletes performing.

Paul Kiteley Australia	Athlete-driven - Performance is a big issue because if you don't perform you don't get a scholarship, as there are so many applicants. Those that are just happy and are not performing eventually drop off and are replaced by someone who is performing.
Jochem Schellens Netherlands	If athletes are not happy they cannot perform. On the flip side, if you go with everything the athletes want it will not be better. But you need to find a balance that relates to their performance.
Joseph Escoda Spain	Follow-up is done through team meetings, which include performance issues. But since medals go to the sport, not to the centres, their main indication of success is through the coach's feedback.

Questions asked by the participants.

New Zealand	It takes 10 years to develop an athlete, but centres are evaluated every four years or so. How can that work?
Singapore	When an NSA [NSO, or national sport organization] doesn't perform, are we really addressing it? It is hard to address this issue with frequent changes in staff within the NSA. Small country (40 kilometres x 20 kilometres) so residency is nearly impossible.
Tracy Lamb United States	<p>The United States has an 84% success rate (U.S. Olympic Training Centre (USOTC). What rate in eight years? Residency programs are not always successful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 14% of Lake Placid are residents, others are "short term." - One program (Post-Athens) didn't produce any qualified athletes, but still in residency. <p>The rich get richer and the poor disappear - We want to avoid that. The Olympic movement is also about participation, not just medals. We want to help some sports who aren't qualifying for the Olympics. Some sports don't need OTC support (tennis/figure skating).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close to saturation now. - One hit on computer (i.e. day in the USOTC) = in the system and this can be very misleading.