1. **Welcome and Introduction**

   Mr. BOUCHARD provided opening remarks on behalf of the Honorable Gary LUNN welcoming the new Committee Members (Sultan AL BUSAIDI, Leslie BUCHANAN, Jean LARUE and Igor ZAGORSKIY) and thanked Members for the expertise and commitment they provide to WADA in assisting with the development of anti-doping education.

   Mr. BOUCHARD explained that this would be the last meeting chaired by the Canadian Government. The Chair would be handed over to the United States.

   Mr. BOUCHARD thanked WADA’s Education Department for their work in the last 12 months and mentioned that anti-doping education is now gaining interest within the media, public in general and with stakeholders.

   Mr. KOEHLER welcomed the Committee Members on behalf of WADA Director General, Mr. David HOWMAN.

2. **Review of October 2009 Meeting Minutes**

   With the Committee Meeting occurring only once a year, it was agreed that the minutes would continue to be circulated by e-mail for approval between meetings.
Mr. KOEHLER provided an overview and update on action items from the 2009 Meeting Minutes.

- The Committee had suggested a continued effort to foster a partnership with UNESCO. Continued efforts to establish an education partnership with UNESCO have not been successful to date. We have encountered difficulties in getting commitment for projects, which in some cases can take up to 6 months for approval. Furthermore we have not been able, as agreed by UNESCO in 2008, to advance the Chooseco Project with the ASPNET.

- In 2010 the research program was amended to focus on coaches, youth and the effect policy making has on developing education programs.

- The Young Investigator’s award was launched. Four applications were accepted for the process.

- Two target research projects were commissioned - Web 2.0 and the creation of an evaluation tool for anti-doping education and awareness programs. Ms CLÉRET will provide an update under Agenda Item 4.2.2.

- The University Project, which was approved by the Committee in 2009, was launched. The International University Sport Federation (FISU) has been engaged to assist in moving the Project forward. Mr. JULIEN will provide a report under Agenda Item 5.3.

Mr. BOUCHARD asked if there were ways that the Committee could assist, perhaps through representatives at the UNESCO Conference of Parties. Mr. KOEHLER suggested that any assistance in concretizing a partnership with UNESCO would be positive, especially with regards to the Associated Schools Project Network.

**ACTION:** The Committee Members agreed to promote and encourage a partnership between UNESCO and WADA, specifically through their representatives on the Conference of Parties.

3. Committee Membership

3.1 Terms of Reference

In accordance with the Education Committee Terms of Reference, Mr. BOUCHARD provided a general overview of the role of the Education Committee. Committee Members were reminded that the position is voluntary and were thanked for taking time to contribute to the work of WADA’s Education Program. Mr. BOUCHARD highlighted the following functions of the Committee –

- To recommend and provide expert opinions on disseminating education/information;
- To recommend effective partnerships, approaches and strategies for anti-doping education;
- To make recommendations for the funding of social science research projects, to be considered and approved by the WADA Executive Committee in November 2010; and
- To recommend long-term anti-doping education strategies from a global perspective.

3.2 Committee Composition

The 2010 Committee is composed of fourteen (14) members. At the end of 2010 the terms of four (4) Members will come to an end, including, Mr. Fernando CACERES, Mr. Bréhima COULIBALY, Mr. Rob DONOVAN, and Mr. Robin MITCHELL. Members can re-apply should they wish to. Call for nominations for new Committee Members was sent out in July 2010.
and will close on 15 October 2010.

4. **Social Science Research**

4.1 **Strategic Plan (Review)**

Mr. **BOUCHARD** thanked the Committee for their contributions to the development of the Social Science Research Strategic Plan, which was approved by the Executive Committee and Foundation Board in November 2009 and presented at the Finance Committee Meeting. As a result, an additional US$100,000 was provided for the 2010 Program (bringing the total to US$300,000) and an additional US$100,000 is proposed for the 2011 Program (bringing the total to US$400,000).

Mr. **KOEHLER** explained that when the Strategic Plan was drafted, it was meant to be a living document. After review of the practical application of the Plan, the Department proposed shifting US$31,000 from the Target Research Grant Program to “Open” Grant Program for 2011. The Committee agreed with the proposal, bringing the Open Grant Program to US$257,000 (from US$226,000) and the Target Research Grant Program to US$100,000 (from US$131,000).

Mr. **DONOVAN** commented that this shift is an indicator of the strength of the Open Grant Program – there is less need for the Target Research because we are finding what we need from the Open Program. He asked if the Plan should be revised according for future. Mr. **KOEHLER** suggested evaluating on a yearly basis, in order to assess the need.

**DECISION:** The Committee agreed to move US$31,000 from the Target Research Grant Program to the Open Research Grant Program for 2011. The budget for the 2011 Target Research Grant Program will be US$100,000. The budget for 2011 Open Research Grant Program will be US$257,000.

4.2 **Progress Report**

At its November 2009 meeting, WADA’s Executive Committee was presented with an overview of how the Social Science Research Grant Program (SSRGP) has benefited WADA’s Education Program. The Executive Committee was satisfied with the progress.

4.2.1 **Summary of projects funded to date**

Mr. **BOUCHARD** reminded the Committee that the SSRGP was created in 2005 with the following two objectives:

1) To encourage anti-doping research in the field of social science.
2) To provide evidence-based information for the development of WADA’s Education Program.

WADA has received 165 applications since 2005, with over US$ 1 million being allocated to fund 34 projects (19 completed and 15 in progress). Ms **CLÉRET** provided an overview of projects funded to date, explaining how the projects answer why, who, what, when, where and how of doping prevention. A summary of the findings is included below.

1) Why should we engage in anti-doping education or doping prevention?
   - There is a relationship between the level of knowledge and exposure to anti-doping education, and doping attitudes/behaviors.

2) Who should anti-doping education or doping prevention be targeted at?
   - Athletes who are low task and high ego oriented or who are perfectionist are at the highest risk for doping.
   - Athletes competing in pure strength or pure endurance sports are at a higher risk for doping.
   - Male athletes are more prone to doping than female athletes, however more research is needed.
Coaches need to receive both information and education as athletes often turn to their coach for information. Furthermore, coaches create the motivational climate for athletes and are important in an athlete’s decision-making process. There is evidence suggesting that a coach who adopts a strong anti-doping position has a direct influence on an athlete’s decision not to dope.

Anti-doping education should be targeted at others who may have an influence on athletes (e.g. physicians, the media, peers, parents, managers, sport psychologists, and other support staff).

3) What should be delivered to the target groups?
   - Provision of information is best suited for elite athletes or those who need to know the technical aspect of anti-doping.
   - Anti-doping education, described as activities that will foster anti-doping values and change or develop behaviors, should be targeted primarily at young athletes when the decision to dope or not has yet been made and when attitudes are still being formed.
   - While including health consequences of doping in education/information programs, research has shown that for many age groups health consequences should only be presented as part of a comprehensive program. Furthermore, in some sports, athletes believe performance-enhancing substances are used to protect the body against the negative health consequences of intensive training. They therefore will not believe that negative health consequences come from doping, or that the doping induced negative health consequences are worse than the intensive training induced ones.

4) When should anti-doping education or doping prevention be delivered?
   - The Program has allowed for the identification of “critical moments of vulnerability,” although anti-doping education should not be limited to these moments. Identified “critical moments of vulnerability” include:
     - Return from injury
     - Change in club/training environment
     - Change of level of competition (entering a high performance center or elite-level)
     - Having failed a competitive endeavor

5) Where should anti-doping education be delivered?
   - The following locations have been identified as ideal for providing anti-doping education or information:
     - Events
     - Schools
     - Sports clubs
     - Home (more research is needed)
     - Training centers
     - Over the Internet (more research is needed)
   - Africa was identified as a region where anti-doping education is particularly needed.

6) How?
   - Two different “hows” have been identified:
     - How do we educate/prevent? Programs should be tailored to specific needs/styles of the target population, should be interactive, develop core life-skills, be long-term or at least booster sessions, multimodal (e.g. school and community and family).
     - How do we know we know (research methodology)? Challenges with research methodology (including using self-reported measures) have been identified by researchers, leading to recommendations for research design, including, need for more qualitative research, longitudinal studies, holistic approaches, globalization/greater regional representation and understanding “drug rejection” (why athletes do not use).
In addition to the recommendations for research design, Ms CLÉRET highlighted the need for more research on gender issues, role of peers, on specific age groups, and on cultural/ethnic groups.

Mr. AL BUSAIDI asked whether the gap identified in Project Kiawi (Cameroon) was due to a weakness in the formal education system (they weren’t well educated in general) or from an anti-doping perspective (simply a lack of anti-doping education). Ms CLÉRET said that it was not specified, however there was a reported lack of anti-doping knowledge on the part of coaches and support staff in general.

Mr. CÁCERES asked for a breakdown of which countries the ten (10) projects from the Americas were from. Ms CLÉRET said that nine (9) projects were from North America with one (1) project from Latin America.

Ms EVERS mentioned that a Japanese Anti-Doping Agency (JADA) study of Japanese athletes attending the 2010 Youth Olympic Games found that health consequences was the most important area to cover in anti-doping education. These comments were echoed by Ms MESTRE. Ms CLÉRET clarified that the WADA-funded project suggested that health consequences were not effective when used alone. Ms CHIN BHATT suggested that it may depend on the region.

Mr. LARUE asked if any study looked at educating politicians. Mr. KOEHLER explained that there have been projects looking at the need to educated policy makers, which was a priority for the 2010 Program, however there have not been any projects specifically looking at politicians.

Mr. BOUCHARD indicated that the manner in which the information was presented was excellent and reinforced the need to find a way to share this with others. Mr. ZAGORSKIY echoed Mr. BOUCHARD’s comments and the usefulness of the results for ADOs. Mr. KOEHLER agreed that while the results are available on WADA’s Web site, there is a need to present the contents in a more readable and useable way. Mr. STALDER offered to share information on the IOC’s knowledge transfer program, which could be useful for transferring knowledge from the research programs.

In terms of regional representation, Mr. STALDER asked whether the lower number of submissions from areas outside of North America and Europe was due to a lack of interest or lack of communication. Ms CLÉRET suspected that for Latin America it is a question of language. One of the outcomes of the forthcoming Research Symposium in Korea will be to identify ways of overcoming the gap in regional applications. Mr. KOEHLER noted that it was found that, unlike research in the hard sciences, social science research is conducted/published in the national language, not necessarily in English. Mr. STALDER reported that the IOC found in the research conducted with youth populations that results were not always transferable across countries, even in the same region.

Mr. CÁCERES noted that only four (4) projects from the southern hemisphere were funded. He asked if this was proportionate to the number of applications received. He suggested that while language is a factor, it is probably not the only one since in other areas of research groups are investing in translation. Mr. CÁCERES suggested that Committee Members, with the support of the WADA Regional Offices, help mobilize researchers in their regions, not only to raise the number of submissions but also to assist with the quality of the applications.

4.2.2 Status report of target research

Mr. BOUCHARD reminded the Committee that the purpose of the program is to select topics for target research that we believe will further assist the development of education programs. Ms CLÉRET provided an update on the Target Research Projects recommended last year.
Web 2.0 Project

The goal of the Web 2.0 Project was to explore how to use social media in the field of doping prevention. The project included a literature review on the potential for using Web 2.0 for prevention, interviews with ADOs and interviews with young athletes. The Project outlines 10 steps for the successful implementation of a social media strategy for ADOs. A draft report has been submitted to WADA for approval.

Evaluation Tool

The goal of the Evaluation Project was to create an evaluation tool that could be used by stakeholders to evaluate their anti-doping education activities. This project details how theory-based evaluation, by which organizations can map out each small step between assumption and action, can be used to assist them in asking the right questions and adjusting their programs or evaluate their effectiveness.

Projects in Progress

The project examining the negative health consequences of doping, which was approved at the 2009 Meeting, is still in progress. The goal of this international study is to determine whether the knowledge of the negative health consequences of doping have an impact on behavior. Finally, a project examining social desirability and the use of self-reported measures is also in progress.

Ms BUCHANAN asked about the process for Target Research Program, is there a formal process where stakeholders would submit suggestions? Mr. KOEHLER explained that while there is no formal process stakeholders are welcome to make recommendations. Currently the topics for the Target Research Program are suggested by the Education Department or the Education Committee. Ms BUCHANAN wondered if the Houlihan (program evaluation) project could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Outreach Program.

Mr. STALDER mentioned that using the Web 2.0 for educational content is something the IOC is also looking into. It will be interesting to see what is can be done with the content from an educational perspective. Is Web 2.0 only useful at communicating a message or could it be used for actual pedagogy? He suggested having athlete role models providing the message so that the message is not coming from a “faceless” organization. Mr. BOUCHARD mentioned that these issues related to targeting messages, monitoring posts, etc were brought up at the Think-Tank last year. Ms CLÉRET said that research suggests a need to differentiate between using these tools for institutional communication and education.

4.3 2011 Projects for funding

4.3.1 Target research

Mr. BOUCHARD reminded the Committee that it had recommended continuing to identify areas where there was a perceived gap in the literature to support program development. This year the Education Department indentified the following two areas for the 2011 Target Research Program – Team Dynamics and Doping in Sport: A risk or protective factor and Prevalence of Doping in Sport (a joint project with the Science Department). Ms CLÉRET provided an overview of the suggested topics.

Ms BUCHANAN asked whether the Prevalence of Doping in Sport Project has already been accepted by the Science Department. Mr. KOEHLER explained that the Science Department will go forward with the project whether Education is part of the project or not, but felt that social science had an important role to play.

Ms EVERS commented that there is already a feeling of inequality between team and individual sports with regards to anti-doping rules. Funding a project of the nature
suggested could do more to increase this gap. **Ms MESTRE** supported the comments. **Mr. KOEHLER** explained that this could be something that is revealed from this project.

**DECISION:** The Committee agreed to fund target research projects on the following topics:
1) Team Dynamics and Doping in Sport: A risk or protective factor
2) Prevalence of Doping in Sport (joint project with WADA’s Science Department)

### 4.3.2 Review of applications (Peer Reviewed)

**Mr. BOUCHARD** reported that twenty-five (25) submissions from twenty-one (21) countries. Last year it was recommended that an effort be made to ensure that peer review scores be more stringent. This was reflected in this year’s scores.

### 4.3.3 Recommendation for funding approval

Committee Members were provided all applications for review prior to the meeting. **Ms CLÉRET** provided an overview of the ten (10) projects that received the highest peer review scores and explained how the projects as well as suggested which projects the Department felt would be most useful to their work.

**DECISION:** The Committee agreed to make the following recommendations for funding to the Executive Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator (Country) – Project Title</th>
<th>Recommended Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bodin (France) – Preventing doping among young athletes in Spain and France: Multidimensional approach to the processes of doping behaviour</td>
<td>US$90,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pfister (Denmark) – Anti-doping policies and reasons (not) to dope: A need for diversified prevention strategies?</td>
<td>US$19,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tsorbatzoudis (Greece) – Determinants of intentions for doping in sports in youth: Empirical study and prevention intervention in adolescent athletes (DIDIS-Youth)</td>
<td>US$30,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Boardley (UK) – A national investigation of psychosocial factors facilitating doping in body builders</td>
<td>US$30,397.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Connor (Australia) – Death for performance: What would athletes trade-off for success?</td>
<td>US$17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Woolf (US) – “If everyone is using, shouldn’t I?”: Perceived norms of anabolic androgenic steroid use among high school athletes</td>
<td>US$16,159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dimeo (UK) – Doping behavior, causes and prevention in elite level Kenyan athletes: An empirical investigation</td>
<td>US$40,029.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Guissou (Burkina Faso) – Doping in sports in Burkina Faso: Causes, knowledge, attitudes and practices of the main sporting communities</td>
<td>US$17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Moran (Ireland) – Preventing doping in sport: An investigation of the attitudes and perceived role of high performance coaches</td>
<td>US$21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Manfredini (Italy) – Global evaluation of the anti-doping program: Proposed by an International Federation</td>
<td>US$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL US$307,000**

Funding for some projects is conditional upon meeting requirements outlined by the Committee.
4.4 Online directory

Mr. Bouchard reminded the Committee that it was recommended that WADA find a way to support the creation of a network of social science researchers exploring anti-doping topics.

Ms. Cléret presented the online directory that has been added to WADA’s Web site, explaining that there are currently 40 entries, without having promoted it. One challenge with the current format of the directory is that it takes about an hour to create a new entry (in English and French). Mr. Stalder suggested that a solution could be to create an extranet that will also allow for more interaction among those in the system. Mr. Zagorskiy suggested that should such a forum be created it would be beneficial for ADOs to also have access to the discussions.

4.5 Young Investigator’s Award

Mr. Bouchard reminded the Committee that they had recommended the establishment of a Young Investigator’s Award to encourage masters students to focus their area of research on anti-doping issues. Ms. Cléret presented the process for selecting recipients and provided an update for the first year of the Award.

Mr. Stalder recommended promoting the award within the network of “Youth Olympic Games” Organizing Committees as they interact with Universities. Mr. Larue commented on the diversity of the applicants.

Mr. Sultan suggested that rather than having students submit project ideas, WADA selects the topics and have students apply. Mr. Koehler suggested that it could be a consideration for the future, however currently the Program is trying to bring the students to us.

4.6 2012 research priorities

Mr. Bouchard explained that as the Social Science Research Grant Program continues to develop, there is a need to continue to review the Program priorities. Mr. Koehler reminded Committee Members of the three research categories, namely,

1) Increase knowledge of causes of doping behavior and of risk and protective factors;
2) Evaluating anti-doping intervention
3) Improving social science research on doping prevention.

Within these research categories, researchers are asked to focus on identified target groups. For the current year, priority was given to projects that explored issues related to coaches, youth and policy-makers.

Finally, Mr. Koehler reported that the Department will develop a document outlining minimal standards for application submission.

DECISION: The Committee recommended keeping the current research categories and priority target groups for the 2012 Social Science Research Program.

4.7 Social Science Research Symposium

Mr. Bouchard explained to the Committee that given that one of the goals of the Social Science Research Strategic is to increase the visibility and quality of the Social Science Research Program. For this reason, the Education Department, in partnership with the Korean Anti-Doping Agency (KADA) will host a Social Science Research Symposium in Seoul, Korea, on 3-4 November 2010.
Mr. KOEHLER explained that there are sixty (60) registered participants from twenty-six (26) countries. During the first day of the Symposium, presentations by researchers and ADOs currently working in the area of anti-doping social science research will provide presentations to contextualize the field. During the second day, brainstorming sessions will help identify research priorities, provide ideas on how to expand the network and how WADA can more effectively share research to benefit the anti-doping community and the field of research.

Ms MESTRE suggested that there is a need to have a dissemination plan/mechanism so findings/results trickle down. Mr. KOEHLER explained that invitations to the 2010 Social Science Research Symposium were sent out to researchers and ADOs to keep this first conference small. There is a recommendation to hold several Education Symposia in the regions allowing for us to disseminate results to other groups. Mr. BOUCHARD asked if the media will be present at the Symposium. Mr. KOEHLER mentioned that the media had not been invited but that the Education Department would work with the Communications Department with this regard.

5. **WADA Activities**

5.1 **General Tool Kit update**

Mr. JULIEN provided an overview and update on WADA’s five (5) Tool Kits, namely, Program Officer’s Tool Kit, Teacher’s Tool Kit, Coach’s Tool Kit, Doping Control Officer Training Tool Kit, and Sport Physician’s Tool Kit (which is currently being finalized in partnership with WADA’s Medical Director).

Ms BUCHANAN reported to making use of all Tool Kits. A challenge that she faces is facilitating interactive sessions when the participants do not speak the same language. Recommendations on how to overcome this challenge could be included. Mr. ALI also believes that these are excellent tools and is looking forward to the completion of the Physician’s Tool Kit. Mr. STALDER suggested sending the Teacher’s Tool Kit to Youth Olympic Games Organizers to be incorporated into their pre-Games and school-based programs.

5.2 **Ministry of Education Pilot Project**

Mr. JULIEN provided an update and outcomes of the Ministry of Education Project that was piloted in Mexico, Oman, Province of Quebec (Canada), Singapore, and Uganda. To conclude the pilot-phase of the Project, WADA will draft a Model of Best Practice that will facilitate the integration of an anti-doping component in formal education systems.

Mr. CÁCERES highlighted the importance of integrating values-based education into the education system. Social inclusion and shaping future citizens is done through the education system, specifically the primary schools. He suggests that we work more with Ministries of Education. WADA should try to attend regional meetings and Conferences of Ministers of Education to present initiatives. The Committee supported the need to work with Ministers of Education.

Ms BUCHANAN suggested the need for teacher professional development so that teachers are comfortable with the material. Ms MESTRE suggested having an “anti-doping” day in schools. This was done with great success within the Paralympic Movement.

**ACTION:** WADA will explore the possibility of working with regional Ministers of Education forums.

5.3 **University Pilot Project**

Mr. BOUCHARD explained that following the Committee’s recommendation from last year, WADA’s Education Department explored possibilities of partnering with universities. Mr. JULIEN explained that the Department began working with the International University Sports Federation (FISU) to develop a mechanism to introduce teaching material and best
practices to integrate anti-doping messages at the university level, with a focus on sport and teacher education.
5.4 Online Coaching Program (CoachTrue)

Mr. BOUCHARD announced that CoachTrue, WADA’s computer-based learning tool for coaches, was awarded a runner-up prize (first prize being awarded to a program created for Nintendo) at the International e-Learning Awards ceremony in Brussels in September 2010. Ms CLÉRET provided an overview of the tool, which was designed to cater to the various learning styles and demanding schedules of coaches, providing them with the necessary anti-doping information and education.

Mr. DONOVAN asked whether CoachTrue will replace the Coach’s Tool Kit. Ms CLÉRET explained that the Coach’s Tool Kit will continue to be updated to facilitate face-to-face workshops or presentations.

Mr. ALI asked what languages CoachTrue is available in. Mr. SULTAN asked if there was the possibility of stakeholders translating. Ms CLÉRET said that it is available in English, French and Spanish. Stakeholders are invited to translate the content.

Mr. SULTAN suggested that CoachTrue could be incorporated into the certification of sport teachers.

5.5 Say No! to Doping Campaign

Mr. BOUCHARD highlighted the importance of the Campaign in increasing visibility of the issues related to doping in sport. No longer simply a youth program, the Campaign is evolving to an organization-wide Campaign that can be adopted by WADA’s stakeholders. Ms SCLATER provided an overview of the Say NO! to Doping Campaign and presented how stakeholders have already gotten involved, including the International Ice Hockey Federation (IIHF), FIFA and the International Federation for Archery (FITA).

6. Youth Program

6.1 Play True Generation Program

Ms SCLATER provided an overview of the Play True Generation Program, a global program that provides a framework for young athletes, their coaches and entourage to be leaders in promoting and ensuring clean sport. Through the Program, the anti-doping community is challenge young athletes to a generation that completely rejects doping in sport.

6.2 Play True Challenge

Ms SCLATER explained that Play True Challenge, a computer-based simulation, was created to allow athletes to explore the challenges and pressures of being an elite athlete, without having to suffer the real-life outcomes. In the game, targeted at young people 14-18 years of age, players have to make choices about how they will succeed at their sport, JumpCross. Players see the direct impact of their decision making about training, nutrition and doping on their ability to compete. Play True Challenge was pilot tested at the African Youth Games (July 2010) and launched during the Youth Olympic Games (August 2010).

Play True Challenge is currently available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Spanish, and Russian.

6.3 African Youth Games

Ms SCLATER reported that WADA brought the Play True Generation Program to the first African Youth Games, held in Morocco in July 2010. The Play True Generation Center was staffed by three (3) anti-doping experts (Indian Ocean RADO, Tunisian Anti-Doping Organization and Portuguese National Anti-Doping Organization), in addition to WADA Education Department staff and Director of WADA’s Africa Regional Office.
6.4 Singapore Youth Olympic Games

Ms SCLATER reported that over 2,300 athletes, coaches and officials visited the Play True Generation Center during the Youth Olympic Games, held in Singapore in August 2010. The Play True Generation Center was staffed by seven (7) anti-doping experts including two WADA Education Department Staff Members, a representative from Africa (NOC Zimbabwe), Asia (Oman), International Federation (International Ski Federation), Oceania (Australian Anti-Doping Organization), and WADA’s Athlete Committee. The team was able to interact with athletes in eight (8) languages.

Mr. STALDER reported that WADA had the most visitors of all Global Issues educational booths present at the Youth Olympic Games in Singapore and was identified by athletes as the most successful program.

6.5 Future youth activities

Ms SCLATER explained that WADA planned to continue to create and refine tools to support its activities for young people and will bring the Play True Generation Program to two (2) multi-sport, multi-national events per year. In 2011 WADA has plans to attend the European Youth Olympic Winter Festival and the Commonwealth Youth Games.

7. WADA Partnerships

Mr. BOUCHARD highlighted the importance of fostering partnerships for the development and implementation of anti-doping education programs. Mr. KOEHLER provided an update on partnership activities that fall outside of WADA’s normal program activities. Organizations included,

- International Council for Coach Education
- IOC (Youth Olympic Games)
- Olympic Solidarity
- International University Sports Federation (FISU)
- International Association for High Performance Sport Training Centers
- International Support Program to the African and Caribbean Sport
- National Institute for Coach Education (Quebec, Canada)

Ms MESTRE indicated that she would like to see WADA work more closely with the International Paralympic Committee.

ACTION: WADA to explore potential opportunities for partnership with IPC.

FRIDAY 15 OCTOBER 2010

8. Committee Member Update

Mr. BOUCHARD invited Committee Members to provide an update on their anti-doping education initiatives.

Presentation by Mr. SULTAN (Oman)

Mr. SULTAN explained that Oman’s education initiatives have focused on school-based activities. They have identified a need for “experts” to speak to the teachers and therefore working on material. The teachers are currently involved in the creation of teaching material which will be implemented during the 2010-2011 school year with further integration in 2011-2012.
Presentation by Ms MESTRE (Spain/IPC)

Ms MESTRE highlighted the need for coaches to be educated about anti-doping. She is working on having anti-doping included in the curriculum for coach recertification. She further explained that the IPC would like to work with WADA to identify areas for collaboration and inviting WADA to be present at major events (including Asian Games, Para-Pan-American Games).

Presentation by Mr. DONOVAN (Australia)

Mr. DONOVAN provided an update on the research he presented at last year’s meeting. He is now looking at how information about personality profiles can be used to shape anti-doping prevention activities.

Presentation by Mr. STALDER (IOC)

Mr. STALDER provided a presentation of the Culture and Education Activities at the Youth Olympic Games.

Presentation by Mr. CÁCERES (Uruguay)

Mr. CÁCERES provided an update on their UNESCO funded project “Values at Play.” The project involves making physical education mandatory in schools and provides all school children a laptop computer. They have use sport values as a way of promoting anti-doping education. They are currently looking to extend the project to the rest of the country. They have also collaborated with WADA’s Latin American Regional Office to train pre-service teachers.

Presentation by Mr. MITCHELL (FIJI)

Mr. MITCHELL spoke about the Oceania RADO’s education activities. Since there is a lack of resources they rely heavily on WADA’s materials and resources. They take a top-down approach working with ministries. Anti-doping has been included in the “healthy living” theme for schools. They make a lot of use of their athlete commission for the “Voices of the Athletes” (Outreach) Program. They are currently applying for a UNESCO grant.

Presentation by Ms BUCHANAN (International Triathlon Union)

Ms BUCHANAN reported that ITU hosted its first Athlete Outreach event in partnership with the Australian Sport Anti-Doping Authority (ASADA) in 2009 and will do the same in partnership with the Hungarian Anti-Doping Agency in 2010. Through-out the course of the season, they give presentations to athletes. A challenge she sees is that they work with athletes of all levels and the Play True Quiz does not work for everyone. She is looking forward to incorporating the Say NO! to Doping Campaign, using green swim caps for warm-up, green tape on bikes and green shoe-laces. The ITU media department is on board to create a video. As an active teacher, she has given presentations at three different school districts and left class sets of Chooseco books.

Presentation by Mr. ZAGORSKIY (Russia)

Mr. ZAGORSKIY reported that RUSADA targets education at a broad audience – athletes, coaches, politicians, physicians, and sport officers. They have provided education, including Outreach, in almost all regions of the country. They are currently exploring training teachers. He sees evaluating programs as a great challenge. They have used questionnaires but feel it is important reevaluate every 2 years to ensure things are being done well.
Presentation by Mr. LARUE (Seychelles)

Mr. LARUE provided an overview of education initiatives conducted nationally as well as through the Indian Ocean RADO. Nationally, the NADO is working to get politicians on board. They began with anti-drug (marijuana) initiatives before they could focus on anti-doping. All primary and secondary schools competed in a public speaking contest with anti-doping as the theme. They would like to extend to include post-secondary so that it is done at all levels. From a RADO perspective the challenge is that two (2) countries are doing a lot and three (3) are lagging behind. They plan to have an Outreach Program at the Indian Ocean games. Once all countries have ratified the UNESCO Convention, they will submit an application to UNESCO.

Presentation by Ms CHIN BHATT (Malaysia)

Ms CHIN BHATT reported that anti-drug education is included in the physical education curriculum. They are promoting the use of the Teacher Tool Kit material but cannot make it mandatory. She uses the Chooseco books at her school.

Presentation by Mr. ALI (Kuwait/OCA)

Mr. ALI reported that they have booklets and information material that have been translated into Arabic that is distrusted.

9. Brainstorming Sessions (Developing a 5-year plan)

Mr. BOUCHARD explained that the purpose of the brainstorming session is to see how WADA can further develop its prevention program and find ways to continue to improve its activities. In this session, Committee Members were asked to consider how WADA’s tools are used by stakeholders and identify gaps in material available. Below are the outcomes of the discussions.

- The Committee believed the tools and programs were of the highest quality and would be of great use to stakeholders when developing and implementing their education programs.

- The Department needs to continual spread the message about the tools and programs offered by WADA. They indicated that it is stakeholders’ responsibility to implement the programs and WADA’s job to make them available. The department was encouraged to develop a marketing strategy for the tools.

- The Committee encouraged the Department to find the most effective way to be culturally relevant when implementing the programs.

- The Committee encouraged the Department to survey stakeholders on their education needs.

10. Brainstorming Sessions (Cont.)

For this brainstorming session, Mr. BOUCHARD asked Committee Members to consider how the Department can assist stakeholders in the development of their education programs, how social science research can be used to improve education initiatives and provide recommendations for setting priorities and a way forward.

- It was suggested that WADA consider partnering with regional and global education ministry forums to obtain buy-in and support for anti-doping education.

- Develop a mechanism to effectively share results of social science research with Anti-Doping Organizations.

- Explore the possibility of developing a learning tool to facilitate easy access to education materials and presentations for stakeholders.
Host regional education symposia to better understand the needs of stakeholders and further train education experts.

Continue to utilize the Say No! to Doping Campaign as a springboard for substantive education.

11. 2011 Priorities

Mr. KOEHLER provided an overview of the priorities set for 2011 and requested feedback from the Committee. Mr. STALDER asked how the outcomes of the brainstorming sessions relate to the 2011 Plan. Mr. KOEHLER said that it doesn’t really, but there is flexibility to add to the activities. Mr. DONOVAN believed that it had been discussed that WADA follows up with researchers one to two years following the completion of their projects to know how they have disseminated the results.

12. Other Business

Mr. KOEHLER suggested moving the Committee Meeting so that the Committee can have more input on the priorities. He presented the following options:

Option 1 – To change the meeting date to May. This change will enable the Department to discuss with the Education Committee priorities to be set for the coming year. These priorities can therefore be tabled at the Finance Committee in July and then to the Executive Committee in September. Should Committee Members be in favor of the change, a small working group will need to be established to evaluate and review the applications for the Social Science Research Program. The proposed working group would be comprised of two members of the Education Committee and two external experts. In line with the Social Science Research Grant Program timelines, this working group would meet in October and make recommendations on selected projects to the Education Committee via teleconference.

Option 2 – Keep the meeting as is (in October).

Ms MESTRE and Ms BUCHANAN supported Option 1, however expressed challenges for “sports” to meet in May.

Mr. ALI and Mr. CÁCERES also supported Option 1 since most are not experts in social science research so it would be best for the recommendations to come from experts. Furthermore it would allow Committee Members to provide more input for framing the Department’s activities. Mr. CÁCERES suggested ensuring regional representation on the working committee.

DECISION: The Committee supports moving the Education Committee Meeting to May, appointing a Working Group that will meet in October to review applications for the Social Science Research Grant Program. The Working Group will make recommendations to the Education Committee.

13. Next Meeting

The next meeting is tentatively set for 6 May, 2011. WADA will send the date to Committee Members for confirmation.

14. Summary/Closing Remarks

Mr. BOUCHARD provided a summary of the discussions and recommendation made during the meeting. In his closing remarks, Mr. BOUCHARD thanks all Committee Members for their participation and to everyone for their time.

Committee Members expressed their gratitude to Mr. BOUCHARD for chairing the Committee with professionalism and excellence.