EUROPEAN ROUND TABLE ON LEARNING MOBILITY IN SPORT

Tuesday 17 November 2015, 14.00-16.30

Délégation Région Rhône-Alpes

Brussels, (BE)
WELCOMING MESSAGES AND INTRODUCTIONS
WELCOMING MESSAGES
OBJECTIVES OF THE ROUND TABLE

- Focus on the **topic of learning mobility** in the sector
- **Discuss** the realities, barriers, successes and challenges towards mobility
- Create **exchanges** and **interactions** on how to **improve** the situation
- **Consult you** to identify **recommendations** and **concrete actions** to be implemented
- Agree a **future common action** plan to make mobility a reality
- Create the conditions for sport to benefit from learning mobility
THE CONCEPT OF LEARNING MOBILITY

Definition of learning mobility:

Learning Mobility occurs when an individual...

“moves to a country other than their country of residence in order to undertake study, training or other learning, including traineeships and non formal learning, or teaching or participating in a transnational professional development activity.

The objective is to allow individuals to acquire new skills that will strengthen future employability as well as personal development.”
DETAILED PROGRAMME

14.00  Welcoming message

14.10  The concept of learning mobility and objectives of the round table

14.20  Presentation of the main findings from the recent EU feasibility study on learning mobility + reaction of participants to the findings and conclusions

14.45  Accessibility to mobility through European and national funding

15.00  Concrete examples and testimonials

15.15  Group discussion: priorities, opportunities and call for actions to make mobility a reality in the sector

16.15  Feedback and conclusions

16.30  Closure and coffee break
THE EU FEASIBILITY STUDY ON LEARNING MOBILITY IN SPORT

Presentation of main findings / discussion
INTRODUCING THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

- Open Call for tender (EAC/20/2012)
- **8 months study** commissioned by the DGEAC Sport Unit

**Consortium:**
- *Olympic Chair in Management of Sports Organisations from the Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL)*
- *European Observatoire of Sport and Employment (EOSE)*
- *Sport and Citizenship (S&C)*

- Develop detailed recommendations for the EC to **assess whether funding for sport learning mobility is needed** within the new program for Education, Training, Youth and Sport - ERASMUS+
TARGETS OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

The study focused on the needs and opportunities of EU funded learning mobility for:

- Non-professional athletes
- Coaches
- Staff (employees)
- Volunteers (other than coaches)
ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT

- **Desk research** for:
  - available data and statistics of past learning mobility in sport
  - good practice of learning mobility experiences

- **Analysis** of learning mobility opportunities within:
  - Lifelong Learning Programme
  - Youth in Action
  - Europe for Citizens
  - Olympic Movement

- **European consultation** – online questionnaire

- **National consultation** (e.g. round tables, interviews)

- **Consultation workshop** (Oct. 2013, Vilnius)- 24 EU Networks
MAPPING EXERCISE ON THE NEEDS AND BENEFITS OF LEARNING MOBILITY IN SPORT

*Online Questionnaire*

Study commissioned by the Sport Unit of the Directorate-General Education and Culture (DG EAC)
THE ONLINE SURVEY CONSULTATION

- **Target:** the overall sport sector / 27 Member States

- **Objectives:**
  - Evaluate level of awareness and participation
  - Obtain views/opinions about the benefits and barriers
  - Assess needs and level of importance for learning mobility
  - Shape future funding for sport within the ERASMUS+

**DATABASE:** 1,000 ORGANISATIONS
447 RESPONSES
BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES PER COUNTRY (n=447)
BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES PER TYPE OF ORGANISATIONS (n=447)

- Ministry responsible for sport: 21 (5%)
- National Olympic / Paralympic Committee: 25 (6%)
- International / EU Sport Federation: 22 (5%)
- Regional / National Sport Federation: 226 (51%)
- University / Vocational Training provider: 61 (14%)
- Social Partner or Trade Union: 19 (4%)
- Other (NGOs, Clubs): 73 (16%)
AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT (n=426)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Not aware (%) / Count</th>
<th>Aware but not been involved (%) / Count</th>
<th>Aware and previously involved (%) / Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo Da Vinci</td>
<td>41.55% / 177</td>
<td>44.13% / 188</td>
<td>14.32% / 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus</td>
<td>17.84% / 76</td>
<td>69.01% / 294</td>
<td>13.15% / 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundtvig</td>
<td>65.49% / 279</td>
<td>29.58% / 126</td>
<td>4.93% / 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comenius</td>
<td>61.74% / 263</td>
<td>36.38% / 155</td>
<td>1.88% / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Action</td>
<td>59.86% / 255</td>
<td>33.33% / 142</td>
<td>6.81% / 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe for Citizens</td>
<td>67.61% / 288</td>
<td>30.52% / 130</td>
<td>1.88% / 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo da Vinci (n=61)</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus (n=45)</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundtvig (n=17)</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comenius (n=5)</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Action (n=26)</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe for Citizens (n=8)</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAIN BARRIERS IDENTIFIED

1. ADMINISTRATIVE DIFFICULTIES

2. FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS

3. LACK OF CAPACITY FOR MANAGING
IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING MOBILITY TO BE AVAILABLE FOR THE SECTOR (n=358)

- Not important at all: 1% / 4 responses
- Not important: 2% / 8
- Neither important nor unimportant: 11% / 39
- Important: 57% / 205
- Essential: 26% / 102

Total: 85%
HOW BENEFICIAL AND VALUABLE COULD LEARNING MOBILITY BE FOR...

**Volunteers (n=313)**
- Not beneficial at all: 12% / 36
- Not beneficial: 6%
- Neither beneficial nor non beneficial: 20
- Beneficial: 9%
- Very beneficial: 4%
- Do not know: 7%

**Staff (n=318)**
- Not beneficial at all: 6% / 20
- Not beneficial: 40% / 127
- Neither beneficial nor non beneficial: 40%
- Beneficial: 36%
- Very beneficial: 7%
- Do not know: 11%

**Coaches (n=328)**
- Not beneficial at all: 2% / 6
- Not beneficial: 33% / 109
- Neither beneficial nor non beneficial: 40
- Beneficial: 92%
- Very beneficial: 3%
- Do not know: 7%

**Athletes (n=362)**
- Not beneficial at all: 9% / 34
- Not beneficial: 47% / 171
- Neither beneficial nor non beneficial: 82
- Beneficial: 83%
- Very beneficial: 36%
- Do not know: 42%
POTENTIAL OUTCOMES OF LEARNING MOBILITY

1. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT OF INDIVIDUALS (95.1%)

2. ACQUIRING NEW SKILLS (94.8%)

3. EXPERIENCE OF OTHER NATIONAL SPORT SYSTEMS (92.8%)

4. IMPROVE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ACQUIRING NEW SKILLS (90.1%)
WILLINGNESS TO BE INVOLVED (n=375)

- Yes: 266 responses (71%)
- No: 7 responses (2%)
- Do not know: 102 responses (27%)
IDENTIFIED BARRIERS FOR MOBILITY

1. FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS

MAIN BARRIERS (FUTURE)
CONCLUSIONS (1)

- Large percentage of EU funded mobility opportunities are **decentralised through National Agencies**
- Sport is eligible in most of the mobility funded opportunities but **low level of participation**
- **Lack of available data** from previous successful projects in the sport sector at the European and national level
- **Sport sector is convinced of the need** for mobility opportunities and **recognised the benefits** of such activity
CONCLUSIONS (2)

- Low level of awareness of EU funded learning mobility opportunities across the sport sector
- Where sport has participated: strong evidence of success and high level of satisfaction from participants
- Where awareness, sport organisations have been deterred by the perceived resource requirement (human, time and financial) to prepare an application and managed projects
- Failure of many applications from sport because of the lack of expertise in project development
CONCLUSIONS (3)

- Complexity of EU funded programmes: large number of mobility opportunities available but difficult to differentiate (similar criteria of eligibility, objectives and priorities)

- The sport sector is not well understood by National Agencies

- Fruitful partnership not easy to establish (hosting/sending organisations)
OPEN DISCUSSION

► Are you surprised with the main findings and conclusions of the study?

► Would you add any more?

► Has the situation changed (improved/worsened)?

► Have you ever been involved in learning mobility activities?

► If yes, how beneficial it was?

► Are you aware of demand for mobility?
ACCESSIBILITY TO MOBILITY THROUGH EUROPEAN AND NATIONAL FUNDING
### ERASMUS+

#### 3 main types of Key Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning mobility of individuals (KA1)</th>
<th>Cooperation for innovation and exchange of good practices (KA2)</th>
<th>Support for policy reform (KA3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Staff mobility, in particular for teachers, lecturers, school leaders and youth workers</td>
<td>- Strategic partnerships between education/training or youth organisations and other relevant actors</td>
<td>- Open method of Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mobility for higher education students, vocational education and training students</td>
<td>- Large scale partnerships between education and training establishments and business: Knowledge Alliances &amp; Sector Skills alliances</td>
<td>- Prospective initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student loan guarantee</td>
<td>- IT-Platforms including e-Twinning</td>
<td>- EU recognition tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Joint Master degrees</td>
<td>- Cooperation with third countries and focus on neighbourhood countries</td>
<td>- Dissemination &amp; exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mobility for higher education for EU and non-EU beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Policy dialogue with stakeholders, third countries and international organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Volunteering and youth exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Breakdown of Education, Training and Youth budget by Key Action 2014-2020**

- **KA1** (at least 63%)
- **KA2** (at least 28%)
- **KA3** (4.2%)
- Funds to be redistributed between KA1 and KA2 (4.80%)
EUROPEAN FUNDING

- Sport can and should actively engage with all strands of Erasmus+

- Mobility under Erasmus+ can take many forms relevant to sport:
  - A placement;
  - A traineeship;
  - An apprenticeship;
  - A formal learning programme of study or course;
  - An informal learning experience like job-shadowing or voluntary activity;
  - A youth exchange

- More Sending Organisations and more Host Organisations in the Sport Sector need to be encouraged, advised and supported.
Who in the sector can take part to Learning Mobility?

- Administrative staff
- Students
- Unpaid staff/volunteers
- Coaches
- Non professional athletes
CONCRETE EXAMPLES AND TESTIMONIALS
CASE STUDY FROM UK

The Advanced Level Apprenticeship in Sporting Excellence (AASE)

- Formal Government recognised apprenticeship for 16-19 year olds
- National Vocational Qualification (competence based) on NQF level 3 (EQF 4)
- Mobility experience of 2 weeks (sometimes 4) built in to 2 year programme at end of first year.
- Scottish Football Association – 1,600 players and 550 coaches over 7 years
  - Under Leonardo Initial Vocational Training and VET PRO (staff involved vocational training)
  - Players are apprentices with Scottish clubs – playing and coached in exchange with European clubs/centres of excellence + culture and language
CASE STUDY FROM UK

The Advanced Level Apprenticeship in Sporting Excellence (AASE)

South Gloucestershire College – 130 athletes per year from AASE programme from boxing (60), judo, golf, fencing, basketball;

- 2 or 4 weeks in Tenerife; high level coaching from UK elite coaches and invited European experts;
- Sport training in mornings training camp environment – at altitude and in heat, away from home;
- Afternoon coaching in community facility with local children;
- Language school partner – lessons morning / evening & before trip;
- Cultural activities – evenings learning Spanish cooking and dancing

- Lawn Tennis Association – 2 week player elite coaching experience at Barcelona Academy
CASE STUDY FROM LITHUANIA

- Lithuanian Union of Sport Federations (LUSF)
  - Centralised application through LUSF
  - 9 mobility projects implemented (*Leonardo da Vinci*)
  - Sport Coaches and Sport Managers
  - 54 federations as partners within LUSF mobility projects
  - More than 200 sport coaches from various federations carried out mobility activities within various EU federations, clubs and other public authorities across Europe
  - 32 sport managers representing 32 federations have implemented their knowledge’s in Scotland.
CASE STUDY FROM FRANCE

- DEUST Outdoors programme - EQF Level 5
- Vocational program delivered by the University of Lyon
- Funding from the Region Rhône-Alpes – EXPLO’RA
- 95 € per week // 380 € per month
- 3 months internship at the Sport Institute of Finland as:
  - High Rope Animator
  - Canoeing Animator
CASE STUDY FROM MALTA

- ESF project - Malta
- Malta Sport Council
- Concept of national visit / placement abroad
- 1 week placement in Europe
- 40 selected students (employees of Malta Sport Council)

WEEK PLACEMENT ABROAD

- DAY 1: INTRODUCTION
- DAY 2: JOB-SHADOWING IN SPORT ORGANISATION
- DAY 4: CONCLUSION
GROUP

DISCUSSION

Priorities, opportunities and activities
OBJECTIVE OF THE DISCUSSION

- TO DISCUSS CONCRETE ACTIVITIES TO INCREASE THE LEVEL OF TAKE UP OF LEARNING MOBILITY IN SPORT

AND

- TO MAXIMISE THE BENEFITS OF LEARNING MOBILITY FOR INDIVIDUALS, ORGANISATIONS AND THE SECTOR
POTENTIAL AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT

► **STEP1:**
SIMPLIFICATION OF THE PRESENTATION OF LEARNING MOBILITY OPPORTUNITIES

► **STEP2:**
SUPPORTING THE APPLICATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES TOWARDS LEARNING MOBILITY

► **STEP3:**
AWARENESS RAINING / PROMOTING LEARNING MOBILITY OPPORTUNITIES AND BENEFITS IN THE SPORT SECTOR
YOUR IDEAS ARE NEEDED

➤ What role should sport stakeholders (e.g. sport federation, Ministries etc) play to maximise the participation in mobility?

➤ What are the key actions that should be considered to raise awareness and support sport to access mobility?
   ➤ Short term
   ➤ Medium/long term
FEEDBACK
AND
CONCLUSIONS
CLOSURE OF THE EVENT