

Volume 33 Issue 1

cjsae

the canadian journal for the study of adult education

la revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes

rcééa

LESSONS LEARNED FROM PROGRAM
EVALUATIONS OF COACH DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

John Lyle

*The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education/
La revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes*
Editor-in-Chief: Robert Mizzi
French Language Editor: Jean-Pierre Mercier
www.cjsae-rceea.ca

33,1 March/mars 2021, 35–50
ISSN1925-993X (online)

© Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education/
L'Association canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes
www.casae-aceea.ca

LESSONS LEARNED FROM PROGRAM EVALUATIONS OF COACH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

John Lyle

Leeds Beckett University

Abstract

Coach development programs (CDPs) are important, but significantly under-researched and poorly understood, elements in the preparation of sport coaches. This paper draws on the author's experience of carrying out five program evaluations of CDPs in the United Kingdom. Each program evaluation was based on an evaluation model that focused on relevance, fidelity, and intermediate outcomes; logic models incorporating each program's intentions were devised and informed the evaluation. Evidence was gathered from interviews with participant coaches, coach developers, mentors, and other stakeholders, supplemented by questionnaires to coaches. Issues discussed include the relevance and impact of particular delivery modes, the incorporation of coaches' practice, the enhancement of future capacity versus current performance, the emphasis on personal development and interpersonal skills, the degree of embeddedness in coaches' practice, and the degree of alignment between program elements and personnel. The lessons learned have implications for similar mid-career adult education, both formal and non-formal, in Canada and more widely.

Résumé

Les programmes de développement d'entraîneuses et entraîneurs (PDE) sont un élément important, mais insuffisamment recherché et mal compris, de la formation des entraîneuses et entraîneurs de sport. Cet article s'appuie sur les expériences de l'auteur lors de l'évaluation de cinq PDE au Royaume-Uni. L'évaluation de chaque programme était basée sur un modèle d'évaluation axé sur la pertinence, la fidélité et les résultats immédiats; des modèles intégrant les intentions de chaque programme ont été élaborés et ont informé l'évaluation. Les données ont été recueillies d'entrevues avec les entraîneuses et entraîneurs, le personnel formateur, les mentors et les autres parties prenantes ayant participé et enrichies par des questionnaires remplis par les entraîneuses et entraîneurs. L'article aborde la pertinence et l'impact de certains modes de prestation; l'intégration de la pratique des entraîneuses et entraîneurs; l'amélioration de la capacité future relative au rendement actuel; l'accent mis sur le

*The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education/
La revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes
33,1 March/mars 2021, 35–50
ISSN1925-993X (online)*

© Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education/
L'Association canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes

développement personnel et les compétences interpersonnelles; le niveau d'intégration dans la pratique; et le degré d'alignement entre les éléments du programme et le personnel. Les leçons tirées ont des implications pour les programmes similaires d'éducation formelle et informelle des adultes à la mi-carrière, et ce, au Canada et ailleurs.

A Need for Program Evaluations

Education for sport coaches is normally delivered at a post-school stage and with a blend of formal certificated qualifications and non-formal experiential or workshop-type opportunities (Lyle & Cushion, 2017). A significant body of research suggests that sport coaches value initial certificated training but learn much more from mediated experience and workshop-type programs (Cushion, 2011; Lyle & Cushion, 2017; Morgan et al., 2013; Purdy, 2018). Partly as a result of the perceived inadequacies of formal coach education programs and recognition of the very varied educational experiences and qualifications of adult coaches, sport regulatory bodies in the United Kingdom have established structured development programs for experienced mid-career coaches. Over the past 10 years, I have conducted program evaluations on five such coach development programs (CDPs). This paper offers reflections on the lessons learned from conducting these evaluations. A number of initial challenges had to be overcome, including the absence of a suitable program evaluation model, the absence of an extensive supporting literature on which to base expectations or comparative outcomes, and, in all cases, the fact that the invitation to evaluate the programs came after the programs had begun. An appropriate evaluation model was devised, but the evaluation options were limited to post-event studies.

Although there is recognition that coach education and development falls within the adult education domain (Mallett, 2011; Stodter & Cushion, 2019), the literature base that supports the evaluations is fairly modest and fails to situate the findings within an appropriate appreciation of the purpose and scope of formal coach education and less formal coach development (Lyle & Cushion, 2017; Mallett et al., 2009). We might reasonably speculate that in an occupational grouping such as sport coaching with a fragmented and often limited professional preparation, post-experience CDPs assume a greater significance. The process of acculturation and occupational socialization is eased by recruiting coaches from elite athletes in their sport, but this has potential limitations of taken-for-granted assumptions about practice and perhaps devaluing the development process (Blackett et al., 2018). Put another way, the balance of formal and informal learning that is a constituent element of occupational socialization and the development of expertise for coaches (Chambers, 2018) is tilted toward the informal in the case of performance coaches (Rynne & Mallett, 2014). Structured post-experience CDPs help to remedy that balance, in addition to their professional upskilling role for individuals.

Evans et al. (2015) used the term *coach development program* in an all-embracing way to capture learning activities, but with assumptions about being focused on specific domains, and to contrast longer-term certification programs with shorter-length non-formal interventions. In a follow-on paper, Lefebvre et al. (2016) classified development programs in sport coaching using domain forms (i.e., content) and organizational context. In a recent publication, Callary and Gearity (2020) adopted a similar conflation of education and

development to that expressed by the International Council for Coaching Excellence (2014) and an inclusive definition of a coach developer. This conflation is evident in the weighting given to tertiary education and formal certification courses (Callary & Gearity, 2019). In my view, these conceptualizations offer too broad a compass for coach developer training and coach development practice, losing, as they do, context, purpose, and specificity for any lessons learned. For the purposes of this paper, CDPs are understood to refer to longer-term development programs with an integrated package of learning activities, usually with a manifest emphasis on the coaches' practice, and most often directed to high-performance coaches. Canadian examples are Own the Podium's Coaching Enhancement Program (<http://www.ownthepodium.org>) and the Coaching Association of Canada's Advanced Coaching Diploma (<http://coach.ca/advanced-coaching-diploma-s13778>). In the United Kingdom, typical examples are UK Sport's Elite Programme, Athlete to Coach, and Elite Coaching Apprenticeship Programme (<https://www.ukssport.gov.uk/our-work/coaching>).

Such programs are characterized by a multi-element series of formalized activities, including residential experiences, observation of experts, workshop programs, and mentoring support, most often incorporating analyses of coaches' practice and interventions designed to address the coaches' particular needs. However, the key feature is an intention to embed the development program in the individual coach's existing practice context, but with recognition of the role demands arising from a particular place within the coaching workforce. The programs are generally oriented toward performance or high-performance coaching. These may be contrasted with research-purposed interventions or episodic workshops. Similarly, they are not normally part of the more limited continuing professional development demands associated with revalidation of coach education qualifications (Nash et al., 2017).

There was a very limited research base on which to scaffold an initial understanding of CDPs. Evaluations of coach development initiatives have tended to focus on research-led interventions, to be targeted on specific, largely interpersonal, aspects of coaches' behaviour, and to be centred on youth sport (Allan et al., 2018; Evans et al., 2015; Langan et al., 2013). There are few, if any, reported evaluations of multi-element, large-scale programs designed to enhance the effectiveness of the coach's practice and no critical analysis of findings in the context of coaches' practice or intervention parameters. There are a number of partially relevant prescriptions for "good" practice in development initiatives (Araya et al., 2015; Jones & Allison, 2014; Paquette & Trudel, 2018). In an earlier paper, Erickson et al. (2008) acknowledged the idiosyncratic nature of coach development, but also found that coaches would prefer more guided and less self-directed learning. Sawiuk et al. (2017, 2018), having interviewed mentors on elite coach mentoring programs in the United Kingdom, questioned the formalization of outcomes and associated evaluation methods in mentoring. Despite recent welcome attention to diverse coach populations and to appropriate andragogical approaches to development (Callary & Gearity, 2019, 2020), the aggregated findings from this literature are too diverse to constitute a solid basis for evaluating the delivery of larger-scale CDPs.

There is, therefore, a fragile literature base within which evaluation findings might be contextualized. Unfortunately, the academic literature has paid little attention to CDPs as defined in this paper. Perhaps not surprisingly, the literature consists of retrospective accounts from high-performance athletes about their learning experiences and preferences (Walker et al., 2018) and research-derived empirical studies largely based in youth sport

(Evans et al., 2015). These studies reflect the relative ease of narrowly focused research in comparison to in situ development programs and the methodological and reporting parameters of acceptable publication in academic journals. The challenges of impact evaluations of complex programs are made evident by their absence.

Conducting the Evaluations

It was necessary to devise an appropriate program evaluation model with which to conduct the evaluations. I had devised an evaluation model for a project for Sports Coach UK (Sports Coach UK, 2007); the model is outlined in Table 1. Following an extensive review of literature on program evaluation, it became evident that the applicability and appropriateness of existing models were related to and restricted by the content and purpose for which their use was intended; the key driver was the purpose for which the evaluation was to be designed and implemented. In the context of coach learning and development, this meant favouring an improvement goal over that of accountability. There were convincing arguments in the literature that the myriad interactions within the program should be emphasized, program fidelity was essential evidence for program evaluation, program theory (e.g., logic models, theory-based evaluation) was a necessary stage in the process, working with gross outcomes rather than net outcomes at the impact stage may be necessary (Chatterji, 2007), and procedures based on multi-method, pragmatic, and participant-based approaches were appropriate. It therefore emerged that an appropriate emphasis would be on the earlier stages of the evaluation process. In the absence of extensive longitudinal studies, the more distant downstream outcomes are difficult to control, have many parallel influences (particularly in complex programs), and are evidenced in gross effects rather than net effects (those outcomes resulting only from the coach development intervention).

All evaluations were commissioned by sport regulatory bodies in the United Kingdom. While acknowledging the tensions deriving from such research (Livingston, 2017; Richter & Hostettler, 2015), the evaluations were carried out in a robust manner and with a common conceptual basis. I have been a central figure in the emergence of sport coaching as a legitimate area for academic study, both in extensive publications and in the development of tertiary education programs in the United Kingdom (Lyle, 2018). I have also conducted over 60 sport and coach education and development projects for national sporting organizations, including 16 program evaluations. I am therefore well placed to conduct such evaluations and to aggregate and synthesize their collective findings.

Table 2 provides a brief overview of each of the CDPs on which the evaluations were conducted.

Table 1: Outline of the Program Evaluation Model on Which the Evaluations Were Based

Program relevance	<i>Establishment:</i> Is the program devised on sound theory, adhering to any regulatory guidelines?
Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance is evident to stakeholders • Expertise and resourcing are available for implementation • Forms part of a coherent evaluation strategy • The design of the program has professional and academic legitimacy • Evident adherence to good practice in coach development design • Relevant to roles within the sport • Program objectives and evaluation themes identified
Program fidelity	<i>Intervention:</i> Is the program being delivered as intended and to identified target audience?
Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program is being delivered as designed • The participant audience is as intended (practice, roles, athletes) • Evidence that coaches are appropriately engaged • Completion rates are acceptable • Multi-site variability is acceptable • Factors influencing fidelity are identified
Program effectiveness	<i>Output:</i> To what extent is the intervention creating the desired change in coaches' capacities?
Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program activities provide appropriate learning opportunities • Adequate time for practice and reinforcement • Feedback and social support available from appropriate practitioners • The learning or change intended by the intervention has taken place • Mechanisms are in place to assess knowledge, skills, attitudes • Changes are evident in practice in the short/medium term
Program transfer	<i>Performance, intermediate outcomes:</i> The practice of coaches within relevant roles reflects the changes derived from coach development
Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coach behaviours identified as outcomes of coach education are evident in sustained coaching practice • Coaches demonstrate the application of changed behaviour in a variety of contexts, circumstances • Coaches can relate their behaviour to athlete outcomes
Strategic impact	<i>Longer-term outcomes:</i> The extent to which changed coaching practice has impacted desired sporting indices
Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurements of sporting indicators (standards, numbers, quality, achievement) are increasing • Coaching learning and development established as a norm in the professional development of coaches

Table 2: Outline of Coach Development Programs

Program	Descriptor	Development activities
1 and 2	A one-to-one intervention program for high-performance coaches from four sports that are preparing athletes for a major event	Face to face with expert facilitator; generic and sport-specific professional practice-related workshops; additional resources/opportunities provided
3	"Emerging" coaches from six sports, working in the high-performance system, but with limited coaching experience; 2-year period	Residential workshop program; apprenticed to a master coach; peer and mentor support
4 and 5	Full-time Olympic program coaches across eight sports, involving over 50 high-performance coaches	Community of practice; breakfast clubs/workshops; one-to-one interaction with a mentor; observation and analysis of practice; individualized programs (apprenticeships, higher-education courses, conferences)

Method

The evidence to populate each evaluation was garnered from documentary analysis, interviews with relevant stakeholders, and questionnaires to participating coaches (see Table 3). From initial discussions with program managers and the scrutiny of associated documentation, logic models were created for each evaluation; these were based on the evaluation model and populated with that program's particular characteristics. The focus points and issues to arise from this modelling were then used to guide the evidence required and the substance of the questionnaires and interviews. A total of 68 interviews were conducted across the five development programs and additional narrative feedback was received from 48 coaches. Although some quantitative responses were obtained from the questionnaires, the open-ended responses provided a rich source of helpful participant insights into context and issues.

The interview themes were specific to the issues identified in the logic model, to the concerns of the program managers, and to the roles of the interviewees (see Table 4 for an example). There was also an attempt to focus on more general development principles and, in the context of an improvement agenda, to identify perceived but remediable shortcomings.

The evidence gathered from each evaluation was subjected to a thematic analysis within a framework based on the evaluation model (e.g., relevance, fidelity, outputs), generic issues (e.g., personnel, resources, organization), and specific issues expressed by program managers. The last of these tended to be program-specific and arose from concerns over, for example, role/impact, sustainability of change, and coach engagement. Each evaluation produced a substantial report and a summary set of recommendations. Although this body of work provides rich evidence of the programs in operation and nuanced insights into the programs, this paper must necessarily be selective. Its purpose is to provide a synthesis of the overall findings, using generic themes that are judged to be helpful and transferable to similar adult education programs.

Table 3: Summary of Interviews and Procedures Conducted

	Prog 1	Prog 2	Prog 3	Prog 4	Prog 5
Program manager	1	1	1	1	1
Program developers	1	1	3	5	5
Coaches	5	8	9		
Mentors			4		
Head/master coaches			3		4
Performance directors			2	5	8
Coach questionnaires			9/12	15/18	15/36
Written feedback				9	

Table 4: Sample Interview Frameworks**Coach developers**

- Describe your approach to development. How have you adapted it for this program?
- To what extent have the objectives identified for the program been achieved?
- How was the program evaluated? Is there any documented evidence?
- To what extent was the program delivered as intended?
- Was the intention of the program adequately explained by the program lead?
- Have individual coaches engaged with the program as you would have intended?
- What were the barriers to implementation?
- What has worked well; what has worked less well?
- Have any overall future needs become evident?

Performance directors

- What are your views on the overall success (or otherwise) of the program?
- To what extent was there a “legacy” impact on coach development?
- What were the barriers to successful implementation?
- What changes/improvements would you make to the program?
- How would you revise (if at all) the objectives set for the program?
- Have all coaches taken part as you would have expected? If not, why not?
- How does this program fit in with other developmental programs?
- Were you satisfied with the expertise of the deliverers?
- Have you evaluated the program? What were your criteria?
- Do you perceive any impacts on coach performance at this stage?

Head coaches

- Were you actively involved in the program? What was the extent of your involvement?
- What are your views on the overall success (or otherwise) of the program?
- Comment on the appropriateness of the program content to coaches’ roles.
- What parts of it were most (and least) useful?
- Do you think coaching practice has changed as a result? What evidence do you have?
- How could it have been structured differently?
- What were your views of the coach developers used for your program?

Personal Reflections and Lessons Learned

The evaluations resulted in a body of evidence and experience from which it is possible to synthesize the features perceived to have contributed to successful or less successful coach development practice, as perceived by the participants and the sport's program directors and on the evidence of changes in practice. It is important to appreciate two background factors in reflecting on the findings and considering the implications for adult education programs. First, the majority of participants had existing, usually intensive, coaching commitments on which interventions could be based or that could provide a reference point for reflection and application (indeed, this was an assumption across the programs). Second, as the term program implies, these were multi-element, often multi-deliverer programs in which there was a combination of organizational and personal goals. Although each of the coaches involved could be treated, and evaluated, as an individual case, a program-level ambition, design, and delivery also formed part of the evaluations.

Variability and Control

Program managers attempted to balance the achievement of organizational goals with flexibility, context specificity, and individualization. Development programs, therefore, have an issue of control of the intervention. Where, for example, programs rely on mentor or master coach partnerships with coaches, it is important to ensure, through regular monitoring, that suitable relationships have been put in place and are functioning appropriately. Individual coach outcomes are based on improvements in personal practice, not on predetermined measures of acceptable or desirable practice. The workshop programs can be controlled (implying assured delivery) and therefore tend to be well organized and delivered. Non-contextualized training can be controlled, and this again refers to the workshop programs. In the context of these evaluations, a danger emerges in which program managers emphasize what can be controlled, but the difficult (perhaps crucial) practice-based elements—dynamic, complex relationships and priorities between facilitators, mentors, coaches, master coaches, objectives, and the demands of the coach's role—are less controlled and controllable. This has implications for monitoring procedures and for managing and evaluating appropriate program inputs.

Clarifying Program Goals

The absence of clear expectations for these CDPs was a limiting factor in evaluations. Process evaluation of program fidelity (how they had been conducted) identified some limitations in the way that programs had been delivered, but issues about scheduling, organizational commitment, reporting, and adherence could be relatively easily remedied. However, outcome evaluations were limited by the absence of clear statements of expectations against which outcomes could be judged. For example, had program objectives stated that coaches should be more confident and understand their strengths and weaknesses better, then the evaluation of outcomes was relatively straightforward. However, an understandable expectation that coaches' practice in relation to athlete preparation and performance should be "better," in a number of identifiable ways, is perhaps a much more relevant and desirable outcome—though it is a more challenging prospect for developers, program managers, and evaluators.

Adult education deals with myriad ambitions from basic education and training to extension of professional capacity. Achieving balance between broad program aims and context-specific behaviour change is a difficult exercise, particularly in situations in which evaluation of impact is based on third-party performance (athletes, pupils, patients, learners) rather than the program participants' personal qualities. It is important, therefore, that program goals are clear and accountable.

The Importance of Practice as a Reference Point

There was a very clear intention that the coach's practice should be the constant reference point for CDPs. This would seem to be an important feature of mid-career practitioner education as opposed to initial training. Given the contextual particularity of practice, this meant that individualized and one-to-one intervention activity was preferable. Coaches valued observation and analysis of their practice and wished to have mentors who could comment knowledgeably on their practice. Coaches wanted more informed observation of their practice, with associated feedback, and a particular video-feedback project providing evidence-based feedback and analysis was very well received. This further emphasized the qualities of trust and credibility in mentors, enabling critical analyses of practice to be generated as learning catalysts. It was often the case, particularly in workshop or group meetings, that the coaches' practice was mooted as a focus, but the presentation was not directly related to individuals' circumstances, and application was often left to the coaches. This also highlighted the problematic issue of subsequent follow-up or reinforcement of interventions.

Developers and Mentors

Interviewees placed considerable emphasis on the perceived quality of the coach developers and mentors involved in the programs. The coach developers who led the program interventions were generally well respected, albeit with distinctive approaches to their roles. Nevertheless, a common approach was evident in which conversation and/or analysis, along with the coach's self-reflection, was employed to identify priorities for development. Coach developers then introduced ideas or supporting materials to improve practice, acting as mentors or relying on other mentors for reinforcement. Mentors could be classified in two categories: either advisers and sounding boards or learning support mentors, the latter having less direct involvement with the participant's practice but ensuring adherence, completion of learning tasks, and monitoring of progress. Each had a role to play, but it was important for program managers to ensure that mentors were exercising the anticipated and appropriate role. Where mentors acted as sounding boards, an external mentor who was not associated with the participant coach's organization or employment was an advantage. This created a safe, risk-free, neutral relationship in which the coach could explore relationships and practice. The second type of mentor, the learning support mentor, normally evidenced a more structured intervention and played the role of reinforcing the interventions of the coach developer. In one-to-one relationships, of course, the roles of developer and mentor were most often combined.

The crucial role of developers and mentors highlighted the need to ensure that there was a sound working relationship with the coach. It was important that they were compatible, and programs in which coaches had a choice of developer and/or mentor reduced the

need for changes of personnel. Professional expertise was generally valued above internal volunteers from within the sport, despite evidence of mentor training for the latter. Coaches valued mentors who had empathy for and insight into their particular coaching role and circumstances and who were able to offer informed opinions about their practice—and were able to challenge coaches' practice in relation to progression, climate, and learning. The key factor was a positive alignment between the personnel, the coach's needs and goals, and the goals of the development program. This was not always evident in the evaluations. From the comments of coaches, an effective coach-master coach relationship is more likely when they come from the same discipline within their sport, operate largely in the same location, and have an existing relationship, and where there is evident commitment from the master coach, a structured intervention process, and a shared understanding about intended development goals.

Delivery Structure and Program Goals

The particular emphasis within development programs tended to highlight the differences between one-to-one development and workshop-type programs. This is underpinned by a distinction between capacity and performance; capacity is a generalized expertise, which is developed in the practitioner and can be called upon or applied when and as necessary. Performance refers to the application of expertise to a particular athlete or athletes and in a particular context and set of circumstances. CDPs that are couched in personal-development terms are generally directed to the former (that is, generic capacity). This is evident in workshop programs based on what might be termed facilitating elements of practice, including examples such as reflective practice, problem solving, conflict resolution, or coaching philosophies. In the evaluations conducted, coaches reported that they were aware of the challenge for workshop presenters in demonstrating relevance and applicability on such occasions.

On the other hand, one-to-one interventions were more likely to focus on core elements of the coaching process—planning, competition management, skill development, tactical decision making, and so on. The important message is that development programs should, at some stage, include coaches and athletes operating in their usual environment (and this would apply to other adult practitioners). In the evaluations conducted, there was very limited attention to sport-specific technical elements of expertise and a much greater emphasis on interpersonal relationships. In the one-to-one programs, this may well have been identified as the most significant area for development (and this may be understandable in high-performance sport). Workshop programs also focused largely on interpersonal relationships and personal development, but it is not clear if this was an identifiable and generalizable need or intended to be complementary to other practice-based elements.

Workshops are a ubiquitous element in adult education (de Grip & Pleijers, 2019) and serve a particular purpose in raising awareness, orientating attention, or transmitting information. However, the often one-off nature of workshops and the difficulty of individualizing practice-related feedback explain why workshops are often directed to generic and facilitating elements of performance. In these evaluations, program managers viewed the workshop programs as an opportunity for practitioners to be made aware of recent developments in the field and to engage with experts. They acknowledged that there was often limited immediate applicability to practitioners' practice.

Development Models

Evaluations identified the need for clear, and to some extent consensual among deliverers, models of both development and coaching expertise with which to underpin programs. The need was based on a desire not to impose or regulate approaches to development, but to understand the implications of different approaches across multi-deliverer programs. Coach developers will have different ways of facilitating learning and development. It is likely that the social element in learning, the role of feedback, the means of consolidating and reinforcing learning, and building on previous learning will be subject to an emergent blend of theory and practice for each developer. This variety is perhaps to be welcomed, but its assumptions should be made clear as this impacts the structuring of interventions and the follow-up by mentors. There were instances in which learning was assumed to be taking place (for example, within apprenticeship relationships or observation of experts), but without any specific responsibility on the expert or mediation of the learning by other mentors. It was a similar picture with interpretations of coaching expertise. It did seem likely that alignment of objectives, resources, activity, and priorities would be eased somewhat by a clearly stated approach to coaches' expertise and its development. In each of these cases—development and expertise—there was no suggestion that there was a right and wrong approach; merely that clear statements about each were an important part of program design, forming a basis for a shared language, understanding needs, facilitating communication and feedback, managing expectations about impact, and illustrating possibilities for change.

The rationale for each program was that enhanced coaching expertise would impact positively on the quality of the coaching on offer and result in a situation in which the athlete's performance was more likely to be maximized. The factors that influence athlete performance are too complex to single out particular instances of specific coach development being a factor in improved athlete performance. Nevertheless, there were many instances of a sport's performance director identifying perceived weaknesses in coaching performance that had been remedied. The question of impact was one that overshadowed each evaluation. In the absence of longitudinal studies, it was not possible to make strong statements about sustained improvements in practice. Coaches gave guarded responses about sustained changes to practice but were almost unanimous that they had benefited from the interventions and could identify improvements in their personal development or coaching expertise. Although there were many examples of specific technical or process insights into coaching practice, benefits centred on the opportunity for guided reflection and informed feedback on individuals' practice.

Creating a Positive Learning Environment

The evaluations identified a number of features of intervention delivery and structure as significant for facilitating positive learning and development. There was a very strong message that the social element in interventions is valued very highly. Within workshop programs, the social interaction accompanying the formal program was a time for coaching-related interchange and building networks. In less formal settings, coaches valued breakfast clubs or meeting as small groups. This was partly to share ideas, but also to receive some validation of practice through peer evaluation. Although the term *community of practice* was used in program documentation, these occasions were more likely to produce

small, active networks of coaches than true communities of practice. It was also the case that coaches preferred a structured series of interventions, perhaps despite, or because of, their busy schedules. There was some evidence of program drift where there was a less intensive or structured program.

Although there was an ethos of self-direction and critical questioning by coaches as part of developers' approaches to learning, it was also clear that coaches valued a sense of direction from developers and mentors. Coaches were comfortable with a guided learning approach, but when based on an informed insight into their practice, wished to have more direction. This may have been more evident with the less experienced coaches. Another strong reaction from coaches was to the issue of follow-up. This was less evident in one-to-one partnerships, but in workshop programs, for example, coaches felt that ideas were presented to them, often by visiting external experts, with limited, if any, subsequent follow-up. Workshop presenters may engage in exercises to familiarize coaches with their ideas, but this was a very limited means of translation into practice. In some programs, it was intended that mentors would reinforce these messages, but there was evidence of poor practice in this kind of learning support. The notion that coaches on development programs would be revisited at the end of the interventions for some form of summary performance evaluation did not arise.

Participation by coaches was normally on a voluntary basis; coaches were able to make judgments about the anticipated benefit of the program. However, there were a number of coaches for whom participation was a required part of their contracts. This produced some variable buy-in to the program. The factors at play in these instances were age, attitude to collective activity, previous lack of development opportunity, previous poor experiences, different short- and long-term perspectives, internal competition, and perceptions of "what's in it for me?" For these coaches, and, indeed, for all others, a needs analysis was a necessary first step in helping to identify development priorities. This was more appreciated when it involved observation of practice, but it was also important to present this as a self-appraisal rather than external evaluation. Typically, this led to a personal development plan. It was relatively rare for this to be used as an active instrument of development, and there was potential for it to be used more productively.

The principle of embeddedness arose across the programs. This referred to the extent that coach developers were either isolated from or integral to the sport's coaching activities (remembering that on the majority of occasions, the coaches were working with some of the best athletes in the sport). It was rare for developers to work entirely at arm's-length from the sport's infrastructure, but it was also rare for developers to be completely integrated. For this to happen, developers would be present at coaching strategy meetings, active players in strategy formulation, in communication with performance directors and head coaches, and aware of objectives and policy on athlete selection and progression. In practice, developers held a middle position. Nevertheless, there was very strong support for an element of embeddedness, particularly with one-to-one and small group development activity.

Summary and Recommendations

The scope of adult education is wide-reaching and reflects policy imperatives on issues such as adult literacy, workforce mobility, health and well-being, and social and cultural integration (Rubenson & Elfert, 2015, 2019). Coach education and development in sport

is one field that has not traditionally been conceptualized within the adult education domain, although the programs are designed for an adult population with varying previous educational experience, are post-experience, and combine employment with an additional mediated learning experiences, and adult learning principles are well established in its practice (Cushion et al., 2010; Race, 2014). Nevertheless, the lessons learned from the evaluation of the CDPs in this paper have a wider application. This applies to mid-career workplace learning (Fergusson et al., 2018) in which organizations are unable to provide experienced practitioners with sufficient individualized development opportunities for career enhancement and have recourse to external development programs. This may be characteristic of the voluntary and leisure sector, but, more generally, the good practice described in this paper will have particular resonance for mid-career practitioner development in occupations in which formal entry qualifications are acknowledged to provide limited domain-specific extension of professional expertise.

Of course, the UK programs that provide the basis for this paper are similar to advanced CDPs in place across the globe (Callary et al., 2014); these may be certificated or non-certificated but exhibit similar characteristics. Trudel et al. (2016) commented on the similarities between Canada and others in the “global village.” Callary et al. (2014) examined programs in Canada, France, Germany, Netherlands, New Zealand, and Switzerland. They identified common characteristics of experiential learning, mentoring, peer support, and ongoing deployment. These programs also mirror the characteristics of the higher levels of formal certificated programs, but are relevant in countries and systems in which there is significant investment in elite-level sport—particularly Olympic sport—in which appointments are rarely based solely, if at all, on formal qualifications. CDPs are viewed as a mechanism for ensuring a level of accountability of expertise for coaches who may have been recruited in an accelerated fashion into senior posts.

Canada provides examples of CDPs whose similarity to the programs reported in this paper emphasize the generality and applicability of the implementation lessons that emerged. The Coaching Association of Canada’s Advanced Coaching Diploma is described as an “adult learning experience” (see <http://coach.ca/advanced-coaching-diploma-s13778>). It is an extended multi-sport program with peer support, mentoring, multiple delivery modes, and a structured learning community. Another non-certificated program in Canadian sport is Own the Podium’s Coaching Enhancement Program (see <http://www.ownthepodium.org>). Own the Podium was established to ensure adequate levels of support for Team Canada’s high-performance Olympic athletes. The Coaching Enhancement Program is an “upskilling” program and is concerned to ensure that the “quality of the development experience is very high.” The program has flexible development options, an intensive short program, a workshop program, and mentoring and peer support. These examples demonstrate that the lessons learned from the evaluations in this paper have a much wider resonance.

Based on this experience of evaluating CDPs, and reflecting on both singular and aggregated findings, it is recommended that particular attention should be paid to (a) the strategic role of programs in relation to purpose, role, expertise, complementary qualifications, and targeted developmental pathways; (b) placing the practitioner’s practice at the heart of interventions; (c) coach developers operating with an element of embeddedness within the sport; (d) alignment of purpose between developers, mentors, program managers, performance directors, and coaching directors; and (e) clearly stated

learning outcomes. With the benefit of experience, evaluation strategies for individual programs should emphasize robust rationales and closely monitored fidelity of delivery. This can be sited within a more strategic periodic evaluation of effective coaching and a cumulative assessment of coaching workforce capital within sports.

The evidence from the evaluations conducted on these CDPs suggests that effective programs were characterized by strong practitioner commitment, purposeful facilitation, structured engagement in practice, timely feedback and reinforcement, and social scaffolding. Well-received programs were needs-led, role-specific, and individualized. There was a place for both workshop programs and one-to-one evidence-based interventions, each of which are complemented by a social dimension in which informal peer support was important. It is crucial that the learning expectations from all elements of the programs are clearly stated and understood by all concerned. Although derived from a specific educational and developmental context, the evaluations have provided insights into features of good practice in adult education that can be applied to the sport system in Canada, but also more widely to mid-career educational development programs in other spheres.

References

- Allan, V., Vierimaa, M., Gainforth, H. L., & Côté, J. (2018). The use of behaviour change theories and techniques in research-informed coach development programmes: A systematic review. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(1), 47–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1286514>
- Araya, J., Bennie, A., & O'Connor, D. (2015). Understanding performance coach development: Perceptions about a postgraduate coach education programme. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 2, 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2013-0036>
- Blackett, A. D., Evans, A. B., & Piggott, D. (2018). "They have to toe the line": A Foucauldian analysis of the socialisation of former elite athletes into academy coaching roles. *Sports Coaching Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21640629.2018.1436502>
- Callary, B., Culver, D., Werthner, P., & Bales, J. (2014). An overview of seven national high-performance coach education programmes. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 1, 152–164. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2014-0094>
- Callary, B., & Gearity, B. (2019). Coach developer special issue: Global perspectives in coach education for the coach developer. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 6(3), 261–262. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsc.2019-0067>
- Callary, B., & Gearity, B. (2020). *Coach education and development in sport: Instructional strategies*. Routledge.
- Chambers, F. (Ed.). (2018). *Learning to mentor in sports coaching: A design thinking approach*. Routledge.
- Chatterji, M. (2007). Grades of evidence: Variability in quality of findings in effectiveness studies of complex field interventions. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(3), 239–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214007304884>
- Cushion, C. (2011). Coach and athlete learning. In R. L. Jones, P. Potrac, C. Cushion, & L. T. Ronglan (Eds.), *The sociology of sports coaching* (pp. 166–178). Routledge.
- Cushion, C. J., Nelson, L., Armour, K., Lyle, J., Jones, R. L., Sandford, R., & O'Callaghan, C. (2010). *Coach learning and development: A review of literature*. Sport Coach UK.

- de Grip, A., & Pleijers, A. (2019). Workshop attendance as a mode of learning: Evidence from the Netherlands. *Vocations and Learning*, 12, 361–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-019-09219-y>
- Erickson, K., Bruner, M. W., MacDonald, D., & Côté, J. (2008). Gaining insight into actual and preferred sources of coaching knowledge. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 3(4), 527–538.
- Evans, M. B., McGuckin, M., Gainforth, H. L., Bruner, M. W., & Côté, J. (2015). Coach development programmes to improve interpersonal coach behaviours: A systematic review using the re-aim framework. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 49(13), 871–877. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-094634>
- Fergusson, L., Allred, T., & Dux, T. (2018). Work-based learning and research for mid-career professionals: Professional studies in Australia. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Skills and Lifelong Learning*, 14, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.28945/3930>
- International Council for Coaching Excellence. (2014). *International coach developer framework* (Version 1.1). Retrieved from https://www.icce.ws/_assets/files/documents/PC_ICDF_Booklet_Amended%20Sep%2014.pdf
- Jones, R. L., & Allison, W. (2014). Candidates' experiences of elite coach education: A longitudinal study (tracking the journey). *European Journal of Human Movement*, 33, 110–122.
- Langan, E., Blake, C., Lonsdale, C. (2013). Systematic review of the effectiveness of interpersonal coach education interventions on athlete outcomes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 14(1), 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.06.007>
- Lefebvre, J. S., Evans, M. B., Turnidge, J., Gainforth, H. L., & Côté, J. (2016). Describing and classifying coach development programmes: A synthesis of empirical research and applied practice. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 11(6), 887–899. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954116676116>
- Livingston, K. (2017). Undertaking commissioned research in education: Do research paradigms matter? In L. Ling & P. Ling (Eds.), *Methods and paradigms in education research* (pp. 206–219). IGI Global.
- Lyle, J. (2018). Reflecting on the development of a conceptual framework for sport coaching. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 5(1), 90–98. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2017-0085>
- Lyle, J., & Cushion, C. (2017). *Sport coaching concepts: A framework for coaching practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Mallett, C. (2011). Quality coaching, learning and coach development. *Japanese Journal of Sport Educational Studies*, 30(2), 51–62. https://doi.org/10.7219/jjses.30.2_51
- Mallett, C., Trudel, P., Lyle, J., & Rynne, S. (2009). Formal vs informal coach education. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4(3), 325–334.
- Morgan, K., Jones, R. L., Gilbourne, D., & Llewellyn, D. (2013). Innovative approaches in coach education pedagogy. In P. Potrac, W. Gilbert, & J. Denison (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of sports coaching* (pp. 486–496). Routledge.
- Nash, C., Sproule, J., & Horton, P. (2017). Continuing professional development for sports coaches: A road less travelled. *Sport in Society*, 20(12), 1902–1916. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2017.1232414>

- Paquette, K., & Trudel, P. (2018). Learner-centred coach education: Practical recommendations for coach development administrators. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 5(2), 169–175. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2017-0084>
- Purdy, L. (2018). *Sports coaching: The basics*. Routledge.
- Race, P. (2014). *Making learning happen: A guide for post-compulsory education* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Richter, M., & Hostettler, U. (2015). Conducting commissioned research in neoliberal academia: The conditions evaluations impose on research practice. *Current Sociology*, 63(4), 493–510. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114562497>
- Rubenson, K., & Elfert, M. (2015). Adult education research: Exploring an increasingly fragmented map. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 6(2), 125–138. <https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.rela9066>
- Rubenson, K., & Elfert, M. (2019). Examining the “weak field” of adult education. In A. Fejes & E. Nylander (Eds.), *Mapping out the research field of adult education and learning*. Springer.
- Rynne, S., & Mallett, C. (2014). Coach learning and sustainability in high performance sport. *Reflective Practice*, 15(1), 12–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2013.868798>
- Sawiuk, R., Taylor, W. G., & Groom, R. (2017). An analysis of the value of multiple mentors in formalised elite coach mentoring programmes. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 22(4), 403–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2016.1268587>
- Sawiuk, R., Taylor, W. G., & Groom, R. (2018). Exploring formalised elite coach mentoring programmes in the UK: “We’ve had to play the game.” *Sport, Education and Society*, 23(6), 619–631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1248386>
- Sports Coach UK (2007). *UKCC impact study: Definitional, conceptual and methodological review*. http://issuu.com/scukres/docs/ukcc_impact_study
- Stodter, A., & Cushion, C. J. (2019). Layers of learning in coach developers’ practice-theories, preparation and delivery. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 6(3), 307–316. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2018-0067>
- Trudel, P., Culver, D., & Richard, J.-P. (2016). Peter Jarvis: Lifelong coach learning. In L. Nelson, R. Groom, & P. Potrac (Eds.), *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application* (pp. 203–214). Routledge.
- Walker, L. F., Thomas, R., & Driska, A. P. (2018). Informal and nonformal learning for sport coaches: A systematic review. *International Journal of Sport Sciences & Coaching*, 13(5), 694–707. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954118791522>