

2027 CODE & IS UPDATE PROCESS

International Standard for Education

Concepts for Consideration and Feedback

Executive Summary

The International Standard for Education (ISE) was first introduced in January 2021 following a three-year development and consultation period in partnership with anti-doping organizations. The impact of the ISE is currently being reviewed and analyzed through the Code Compliance Questionnaire (CCQ) exercise. The initial findings indicate that there has been an increase in both financial and human resources which has led to a significant increase in education activities by anti-doping organizations.

The ISE introduced new definitions and concepts to the anti-doping field. As part of the wider initiative to update the World Anti-Doping Code (Code) and International Standards (IS) by 2027, WADA is soliciting input from anti-doping stakeholders on concepts related to the ISE during the first phase of the 2027 Code & IS Update Process, the 'Stakeholder Engagement Phase'.

Concepts will be explained and context for their intended purpose will be provided where necessary. Feedback is sought on the concept itself rather than on specific wording of articles within the ISE. This feedback will help to inform the subsequent phase, the 'First Drafting Phase' following which stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide input directly related to the text and wording of each article.

In providing feedback on each of the concepts please consider the following questions as thinking tools:

- Is it fit for purpose?
- Does it translate into practice as intended?
- Should it be more or less emphasized within the ISE?
- Should it have increased or decreased requirements?
- Does it need to be explained in clearer terms?

Concept #1 – Recognition of Education Programs

Given that resources available for education have traditionally been very limited within anti-doping, the goal of 'Recognition' (ISE Article 8.2) was for Code Signatories to identify athletes who may come under the jurisdiction of another signatory. Following this, the intention was to examine whether the education of these

athletes was sufficient from the other Signatory, and if so, to recognize this activity. This would minimize duplication for the athlete and free up resources for the Signatory to increase its education pool and/or increase focus on their existing education pool.

Emerging Challenges:

Too much energy being focused on setting up ‘Recognition Programs’. It is not feasible for each Signatory to establish a recognition program where they assess the merits of every Signatory where there may exist an overlap with their education pool, particularly for International Federations (IFs) who may have close to 200 National Federations (or equivalent member associations). It is clear from communication with stakeholders and analyses from the CCQ that considerable energy is being expended by a relatively small number of organizations in establishing criteria and systems for evaluating other Signatories’ programs. If more energy is directed to this activity than would be otherwise used for educating those athletes who are under dual jurisdiction, this may effectively undermine the original principle of this concept (as outlined above).

Many Signatories are automatically recognizing other programs. As resources are not widely available to establish “Recognition Programs”, particularly for IFs with a global reach, many Signatories understandably accept other Signatories’ programs (unless they are judged to be non-compliant by WADA).

The ISE Drafting Team proposes to review:

- Whether the concept of “Recognition” is currently fit for purpose, given that there may be a misalignment between its intention (guiding principle), its interpretation, and its application in the field.
- Given the ISE is a new IS and new concepts like ‘Recognition’ may require ‘bedding-in’ time, it may conversely be more appropriate to make no changes or perhaps even refine the wording to be more appropriate.

Concept #2 – Educators

Before the introduction of the ISE, there was no expectation on those who deliver education in terms of their qualifications, competencies, or behaviors. Education is a technical profession that requires knowledge and skills related to pedagogical and andragogical methods, specifically for those planning and delivering education activities. ISE Article 5.8 sets out expectations for Signatories in relation to educators and the term “Educators” is also a defined term in the ISE.

Emerging Challenges:

Expectations on what constitutes ‘trained’ educators. The objective of the first ISE was to introduce the concept and definition of an “Educator” where it specifies that a person should be trained and assigned by a Signatory. However, there is currently no mandate as to the type, level, or contours of the training that is required, beyond an implicit expectation that there should be some formal training for educators before they plan and deliver education sessions.

The ISE Drafting Team proposes to review:

- The requirement for educators to demonstrate particular knowledge and competencies as part of their role in planning, implementing, and evaluating education sessions and programs. Consideration will be given to what these competencies and this knowledge entail.
- As well as defining the nature and scope of an educator's profile, there may be a wider umbrella of professionals working within the education sector that need to be considered in order to have their role acknowledged and/ or described (e.g., facilitators, trainers, ambassadors, athlete educators, etc.). This would also include education staff who are responsible for managing, planning, evaluating, and overseeing education programs.

Concept #3 – Monitoring and Evaluation

Education is one of the only areas within anti-doping that does not generate published data by default (e.g., testing figures and anti-doping rules violations). This has traditionally led to a lack of information on the scope of activities within education and the subsequent effectiveness of education in supporting athletes. In turn, this has created a challenge in assessing the effectiveness of education programs.

Emerging Challenges:

Establishing monitoring and evaluation procedures. Monitoring and evaluation have generated the most non-conformities in the education section of the CCQ. Accordingly, there appears to be a challenge in establishing recording mechanisms (i.e., monitoring) whereby the scope of education activities is being captured. This is particularly true at the individual level where some organizations face challenges in recording the participation of individual athletes or athlete support personnel (ASP) in certain education activities. This has also led to challenges in determining whether objectives set in the education plan have been achieved.

Evaluation as a concept that only large organizations have implemented. A lack of evaluation reports submitted to the CCQ and subsequent rationale for this (i.e., lack of expertise and resources), indicate that evaluation is not seen as an integral part of an education program, but rather as something that can only be properly implemented with professional academic support. The lack of evaluation also stems from a disconnect between the education plan and subsequent monitoring of its implementation. This makes it challenging to write an evaluation report when there is no evidence to support whether objectives have been achieved or not. An over ambitious education plan, which is not achieved, is also seen as a reason not to submit an evaluation report. However, determining that an education plan was overly ambitious is part of the evaluation process and should feed into the planning process for the following year to help drive improvement and progress.

The ISE Drafting Group proposes to review:

- The role of monitoring and evaluation as an integral part of education, which helps Signatories to further understand and deliver this concept in practice.
- The mechanisms by which this can be achieved through the ISE and other support mechanisms such as resources in the Code Implementation Support Program (CISP).

Concept #4 – Athlete Support Personnel

Research continually demonstrates that ASP wield enormous influence on athlete attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, it is important to recognize this influence when it comes to clean sport education to ensure ASP are sufficiently educated.

Emerging Challenges:

ASP are not mandated to be included in education pools and are not as widely included as athletes. There are two cohorts of athletes who are mandated to be included in an Education Pool: those returning from sanction; and those in a Registered Testing Pool (RTP). Conversely, there are no mandated cohorts of ASP which may lead to a reduced focus in terms of targeted education activities.

Expansive definition of ASP. The broad Code definition of ASP¹ has created a challenge in identifying and including certain target groups in education programs, particularly those that are most influential to athlete behavior.

The ISE Drafting Group proposes to review:

- Examining whether further guidance and instruction should be provided on certain groups of ASP being included in an education pool by using the Code definition as a starting point.
- Whether guidance or direction should be provided to ensure that the most influential ASP specific to a given sport or country are identified so that they are included in an education pool.

Concept #5 – Signatories Overseeing other Organizations' Education Programs

The ISE is focused on requirements and expectations of Signatories who plan and deliver education programs directly. Nevertheless, an increasing number of anti-doping organizations are recognizing that they can further increase the reach of a program via stakeholders and partners such as National Federations or third-party service providers, considering that such stakeholders and partners may be even closer to athletes and ASP. Moreover, they may also have more specific expertise and are thus even better placed to deliver education programs.

Emerging Challenges:

Overseeing other organizations programs is outside the remit of the ISE. Developing and implementing a framework for the accountability of National Federations (or third-party service providers) is not articulated in the ISE. However, a number of Signatories have nonetheless established this oversight role, for example, certain National Anti-Doping Organizations (NADOs) and IFs require the submission of National Federations' education plans. Considered holistically, this may potentially lead to some emerging challenges, specifically in circumstances where both an IF and NADO mandate different education requirements for the same National Federations.

¹ Any coach, trainer, manager, agent, team staff, official, medical, paramedical personnel, parent, or any other Person working with, treating or assisting an Athlete participating in or preparing for sports competition.

Expansive definition of ASP. The broad definition of ASP has created a challenge in identifying and including certain target groups in education programs, particularly those that are most influential to athlete behavior.

The ISE Drafting Group proposes to review:

- Whether the ISE can effectively articulate the role of implementing an oversight or accountability framework to be implemented by Signatories as it relates to National Federations’ or third-party service providers’ education requirements.
-

Concept #6 – National Coordination of Organizations

ISE Article 7 establishes clear roles and responsibilities related to education for the different Signatories. ISE Article 8 also requires that Signatories coordinate their activities and cooperate where necessary.

Emerging Challenges:

Operationalizing coordination effectively and implementing roles of Signatories. Although established in the ISE, coordinating activities at an operational level has proved more complex when implementing education programs, particularly at a national level, to ensure that quality education experiences are provided along the athlete pathway.

The ISE Drafting Group proposes to review:

- Whether further guidance should be provided as to how and when transition along the athlete pathway should be coordinated at the national level between NADOs, government agencies, National Federations, and other bodies.
-

Concept #7 – Broadening of the Education Pool

In looking to establish the first policy that could be regulated in line with the above principle, it was decided to focus on athletes who would have the most contact with the anti-doping system (i.e., athletes in a RTP and athletes returning from a sanction).

Emerging Challenges:

Accessing athletes outside RTP and sanctioning process. There is a much wider population of athletes (and ASP) who are subject to testing but are less accessible from a system perspective, in so much that they are not in contact with anti-doping outside of their testing experiences. Positively, since the introduction of the ISE, the increase of education activities has expanded the reach to larger populations. However, if certain athletes and ASP are not mandated to be educated by the ISE in circumstances where Signatories choose not to include them in their Education Pool, such athletes and ASP may be disregarded even if they may otherwise be deemed as high risk to doping.

The ISE Drafting Group proposes to review:

- Whether the populations that are mandated to be included in the education pool should be broadened to include more categories of athletes and ASP.
-