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Executive Summary:

1. The engagement of disabled people through sport in general is a difficult but worthy challenge.

2. UEFA have been developing multiple areas of social responsibility, including disability provision throughout playing, spectating or working opportunities.

3. This report provides a review of what has been achieved.

4. This project aimed to explore how the European football industry engages disabled people (via participation on- and off-the-field). A particular focus was placed upon the management approaches being employed across the region.

5. A mixed-methods, cross-sectional survey design guided this study, using questionnaires and interviews with National Associations and Licensed Clubs across Europe.

6. Results identified a range of areas where organisations felt their performance did not match the importance of their provision.

7. Room for improvement was identified, however respondents noted the general increase in resources to support these engagement activities.

8. Regional differences within the results suggest that pockets of excellence exist within the industry, which contrast with areas where improvements can be made.

9. Interviews with organisations operating best practices suggest that local context is a major factor in the quality of provision. Other factors include financial resources, human resources and competencies (developed through training) as well it being paramount that organisations possess an inclusive philosophy.

10. Resources and managerial competencies are important but organisations should be wary of relying too heavily on individuals, promoting more of a team approach to provision.

11. European football is replete with best practice in its engagement opportunities for disabled people.

12. Opportunities exist for enhanced provision and further research.
Section 1: Introduction

Roughly 10% of people within UEFA’s member countries has direct experience of disability or impairment (Gutt, 2014). CAFE (Centre for Access to Football in Europe) estimate that many thousands of disabled spectators regularly attend matches at European football stadiums (UEFA/CAFE, 2011). In addition, football programmes for disabled people\(^1\) are delivered by transnational disability sport organisations (such as Special Olympics Europe/Eurasia), National Associations and licensed clubs in many countries across Europe (European Club Association, 2012). Many of these activities align with the EU White Paper on Sport (2007);

’all residents should have access to sport. The specific needs and situation of underrepresented groups need to be addressed, and the special role that sport can play for young people, people with disabilities and people from less privileged backgrounds must be taken into account.’

Furthermore, recommendation A5.16 of the ‘Pierre De Coubertin’ Action Plan targets the importance of sport for people with disabilities and encourages support by member countries. With much work going on it is imperative that the best of this work is studied and developed into case studies. To this end, this project aimed to explore best practice across Europe to allow UEFA, National Associations and licensed clubs to understand new ways of engaging disabled people through football.

For a number of years UEFA have been developing multiple areas of social responsibility. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is the strategic development of initiatives that demonstrate an organisation’s centrality to community development. UEFA list a number of priorities for the development of CSR, of relevance to this report is their work engaging disabled people through football.

The engagement of disabled people through sport in general is a difficult but worthy challenge. International sport federations govern across multiple nations who each have their own political and social frameworks that influence the role of disabled people in society. Unfortunately, some nations are better than others in providing best-practice in services for disabled people. To compare one country to another is difficult and can be unfair. Comparisons are best made when context is taken into consideration. In this report, we highlight a range of contextual issues that once established provide a more even playing field for judging where best practice lies.

Engagement can take place in one of three ways; playing, spectating or working. Disability football is international in scope and played in many nations around the globe. As our understanding of disability becomes greater, more opportunities are being provided. Opportunities for disabled people to watch football are not new, however a combination of economic, technological, political and social forces are combining to provide new ways of catering to the vast diversity of disability in order to provide better opportunities for customer satisfaction. Work is ongoing in providing employment (paid and voluntary, full-time, part-time or casual) for many disabled people in football but with increased attention on engagement through football these opportunities are increasing.

Understanding how we can provide best practice is of paramount importance to international sporting federations, UEFA included. This report provides current information and analysis on the state of

---

\(^1\) In this report we use the term disabled people and not people with disabilities. This was recommended by CAFE as per the UEFA & CAFE Good Practice Guide to Creating an Accessible Stadium & Match-day experience.
best practice in the engagement of disabled people in football in 2017. It was found that there is best practice in playing and watching football and work is developing in encouraging more disabled people to seek work in the wider European football industry.

Following this introduction, the report is divided into a series of sections. Section 2 provides an overview of the research questions and aims that guided this research project. A review of current literature follows. This research has gathered a wealth of data and there is much these findings can contribute to this literature. A mixed methods approach to data collection was taken, and section 4 outlines the key elements of this design and analysis. This design is robust and has created a clear baseline in engagement opportunities. The survey can be used on a biannual basis to chart the development of these opportunities. The key elements of the findings are outlined in section 5 before a brief discussion of the research limitations. This report concludes with a series of recommendations. It is envisaged that the recommendations provided from this study will impact upon playing, spectating and working opportunities in European football.
Section 2: Research Background

The Research Questions

In order to explore these issues, the main research question examines;

How is European football engaging disabled people?

In order to address this question the following sub-questions were identified;

- What contextual factors facilitate increased opportunities for disabled people?

- From a managerial perspective, what are the common features of those who display current best practices in this area?

- How can recommendations from these best practices be implemented in a variety of contexts to further promote this engagement?

Aims

This project aimed to explore how the European football industry engages disabled people (via participation on- and off-the-field). A particular focus was placed upon the management approaches being employed across the region.

We sought to address a number of sub-aims:

1. to understand the contextual factors that facilitate best practice (external considerations).

2. to reveal how resources and managerial competencies are entwined to create best practice (internal considerations).

3. to create cases of best practice that can lead to further developments for organisations seeking to develop their services in this area.

4. to foster on-going dialogue about how football can be a place for all, irrespective of ability.
Section 3: Literature Review

Research on disabled people is contextually bound by the consideration of models of disability. Two perspectives present countering approaches to how disability is considered in the management practices of leisure, culture and sport (Buhalis & Darcy, 2011); the medical/individual and social models. The medical view disables people by prioritising a medical perspective on disability that views disability as an individual issue. This view limits a person’s worth in society, places an additional burden on their own impairment, and can be isolating. The social model of disability challenges this perspective and argues that disability is a social construct and a failure to engage disabled people is a societal issue. Current research suggests issues with both of these models but as a starting point for this study we adhere to the social model of disability (as recommended through UEFA/CAFE, 2011) to recommend that sport organisations should scan and analyse potential barriers preventing full inclusion by any member of society in their activities. This theoretical principle is evident in the design of the methodology (section 4).

The study of disability sport has been examined from both therapeutic and sociological perspectives since the mid-1990s. Since the mid-2000s there has been a noted increase in the number of studies that examined the what, how and why of managing disability sport. Critical discussions on the impact of legislation and policy on opportunities for people to engage with tourism (Buhalis & Darcy, 2011) and sporting activities (Paramio-Salcines & Kitchin, 2013; Southby, 2013) has also been joined by greater attention placed on the accessibility of venues for people of all abilities (Garcia & Welford, 2015; Garcia, de Wolff, Welford & Smith, 2017; Kitchin, 2012; Paramio-Salcines, Campos, & Buramio, 2012; Walters & Kitchin, 2009). This research has revealed that despite sometimes-vast improvements in discourse, accessibility barriers remain.

Addressing these barriers requires a concerted effort from across the sport’s stakeholders. Indeed, recent work has highlighted that major concerns still exist in providing accessible facilities for the game’s consumption (Garcia & Welford, 2015; Southby, 2013). The existence of different legislative requirement regarding the rights of disabled persons in different European countries exacerbates these exclusionary practices (2012 Paramio-Salcines, et al., 2012; Paramio-Salcines & Kitchin, 2013). One of the prevailing issues with accessibility research is that it is dominated by studies on wheelchair users. Recent work by Southby (2013) and Paramio-Salcines, Grady and Downs (2016) has examined the needs of spectators with learning disabilities and those of increasing age – both of these groups of ambulant fans highlight the diversity within the disability community. Future research seeks to be cognisant of this diversity.
Section 4: Methodology

In order to ensure pan-European reach, a design was required to ensure an adequate picture of engagement across the region. Consequently a mixed-methods, cross-sectional survey design was deployed, using questionnaires and interviews, each in a corresponding phase. Of the survey respondents, those who claimed good or best practice in the final section were approached for an interview. Where possible, face-to-face interviews were used, but given the scope of the study the majority of the phase 2 interviews were conducted over VOIP. This primary data was complemented with secondary sources to provide a background into the national context of each licensed club or National Association.

The quantitative data was analysed through descriptive statistics. Data were collated to provide a baseline of information and to allow for phase 2 follow-ups. Gaps greater than or equal to 1.5 points on the 5 point Likert scale provided an indication of an area for improvement, or less than or equal to 1.0 points suggested a desirable level of performance. The merits of this descriptive approach are that they allow for replicability from these baseline data to track developments across Europe over time.

The qualitative phase gathered in phase 1 and phase 2 was analysed throughout our interpretive approach.

(right) Figure 4.1 Map of National Association Respondents (Phase 1)

Constructivism suggests that there is no universal objective truth to be found but the meaning that we instil in phenomena (Skinner, Edwards & Corbett, 2015). What that means in the context of this research study is that there is no one-way of engaging disabled people through football. While many
similarities were found, each variance was valid within its own organisational and national context. From the process of analysis, a series of interpretive case studies are presented in section 5 of this report. In addition to this, a further series of descriptive case studies will be produced to highlight best practices.

The population for this study included 55 National Associations and 576 Licensed Clubs. Stretching from Iceland to Portugal, to Israel and Kazakhstan we chose to survey the entire population and as such a sample was not drawn. During the implementation of phase 1 we felt that the letter of recommendation provided by UEFA allowed us to get a ‘foot in the door’ and this ensured our very positive return rates. A total of 38 National Associations completed the survey, with 31 of these being usable (56%) providing a 90% confidence level with a 10% margin of error. Of the 576 licensed clubs, 317 attempted the survey. Of these, 231 were deemed usable\(^2\) (45%) providing a 95% confidence level with 5% margin of error. Figures 4.1 and 4.2 below shows the map of National Association respondents and the map of licensed club respondents respectively.

(right) Figure 4.2
Map of Licensed Club Respondents (Phase 1)

The survey instrument: The survey was designed by the lead researcher and reviewed by a panel of experts, including the Disability Football Managers of the Irish Football Association (IFA) and the Football Association of Ireland (FAI), and the Managing Director and staff of the Centre for Assess to Football in Europe (CAFE). This review aimed to increase the reliability (the consistency of the tool) as well as the validity (the accuracy of the tool). This phase intended to replicate the benefits of a pilot-test, however given the short time-scale of the study a full pilot test was not possible. Feedback from these individuals was used to inform the final version of the survey.

---

\(^2\) Unusable surveys included those that were incomplete or those that were provided in multiples from the one organisation.
The questionnaire consisted of six main parts. An introduction which covered general issues in social responsibility and provided us with details of who the respondent was and their position within the organisation. Parts 2, 3 and 4 addressed each of the focal engagement areas of playing, spectating and employment. The penultimate section examined the resources and competences that supported these engagement activities. The final section was a qualitative section discussing best practice, knowledge of best practice and plans for the next five years.

Each item was created upon the basis of the literature review, or in discussion with the FAI, IFA and CAFE. Apart from the descriptive questions examining job roles, partnerships and best practice the majority of questions were informed by Importance-Performance Analysis (I-PA). I-PA (Martilla & James 1977) is a technique used in services marketing to outline aspects of a business that can be improved to increase customer satisfaction. Each element of a service, for example ease of access to lavatory facilities has a certain level of importance for each customer. After engaging with the service a resultant level of performance is determined in the customer’s mind. Sethna (1982 cited in Hudson & Shephard, 1998) tested the hypothesis that the greater the discrepancy between the importance of an attribute and the performance of a service on that attribute, the greater is the customer’s dissatisfaction with the service (and therefore the greater the need for remedial action). This tool ensures the findings of this research can provide practical recommendations that all of football’s organisational stakeholders could enact. Following the principles of Martilla and James (1977) we used the discussions with stakeholders and previous research to determine the items for the questionnaire. In all there were 59 items in the survey instrument (please see appendix 1). Section 5 provides an overview of their results.

The English language questionnaire was initially translated into French, German and Spanish to provide the greatest level of accessibility and uptake across Europe. As a result of the significant uptake from across Europe we decided to not translate the survey further into additional languages.

(10) Figure 4.3 Follow-Up Cases

Undertaking research in the area of disability can raise a number of ethical issues. The study received ethical approval from the School of Sport’s Filter Committee for the Ulster University Research Ethics Committee (UUREC) prior to the application phase (please see appendix 2). Internally the research was considered a ‘Category A’ study indicating that while on the topic of disability, the instruments used and the tasks undertaken mean an individual’s level of physical ability would have no bearing on their ability to carry out these tasks.
Section 5: Main Results

In order to address the research questions the following results section is divided into a series of parts. Part 1 will address sections 1-5 of the questionnaire data from phase 1 of the research. Part 2 will explore the qualitative findings from the questionnaire before part 3 discusses the phase 2 findings, which will specifically target research questions 1 a and 1 b. The final research question 1c, will be addressed in the conclusions and recommendations section.

Phase 1:

Section 1: Background

Organisations in football (National Associations and Licensed Clubs) have been developing opportunities for engaging disabled people for a number of years. The survey told us that from those who responded, the average years of involvement of a National Association are roughly 10, with some offering three decades of programming, whilst others are only beginning. This diversity of experience is also reflected in the Licensed Clubs who average 9½ years, with a range from 1 year to over 50 years.

In order to develop these areas of activity the organisations require specialist staff to assist their implementation. A variety of job roles were reported but the most common amongst the National Associations were the titles ‘Grassroots/Disability Manager/Coordinator’ or in some other associations a more administrative member such as ‘Corporate Social Responsibility Coordinator’.

Partnerships were central to the development of these opportunities, with most respondents claiming that they are linked with at least one other partner to assist in the implementation of this work. Figure 5.1 and 5.2 outline the partnerships that are deemed most important to these organisations. Nearly three quarters of National Associations say they link with clubs in the delivery of socially responsible programmes, while roughly half state they work with International Disability Football Organisations and Charities for Disabled People. Partnerships between Licensed Clubs and other organisations are spread more evenly between other clubs, National Associations, International Disability Football Organisations and with Disabled Supporter Associations.

(right) Figure 5.1 Partnerships between National Associations and other organisations
The time allocated to the various responsibilities highlight where dedicated time was allocated to manage particular aspects of disability engagement. Just under half (45.1 and 45.4%) the respondents in the National Association and Clubs surveys said that they dedicated 100% of their time to the engagement of disabled people through football.

The Licensed Club data suggest that the majority of staff with responsibilities in this area are more often middle or senior managers. It is assumed that with greater seniority the chances of ensuring adequate provision could be enhanced. Figure 5.3 represents these levels diagrammatically.

(right) **Figure 5.3 Levels of seniority in Licensed Clubs**

The final question in section one was the importance-performance analysis of elements of good practice. These items query the levels of disability awareness training and the role of etiquette training within that process. We examined the extent to which organisations promote, facilitate, monitor and evaluate this type of training that is a cornerstone of developing a greater appreciation of the experiences of disabled people. Table 5.1 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys.
As can be seen in table 5.1 collectively National Associations and Licensed Clubs have performance gaps in the promotion, funding and evaluation of disability awareness training. While many of the gaps are of a similar size the commonalities between the different types of organisation will be discussed in the recommendations.

Section 2: Disability Football

Organisations in football (National Associations and Licensed Clubs) have been developing opportunities to play disability football for a number of years. The survey told us that from those who responded, the average years of involvement of a National Association are roughly 11.1 (STDEV: 11.4, Range 0–48). This diversity of experience is also reflected in the Licensed Clubs who average 5½ years (STDEV: 9.2, Range 0–50).

The final question in section two was the importance-performance analysis of elements of good practice in disability football. These nine items queried the extent to which organisations promote, facilitate, and evaluate their disability football provision. Table 5.2 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys.
Clearly there are a number of overall performance gaps in the provision of disability football. On a European scale, there is an opportunity to develop training courses for coaches while further enhancing football for sensory impairments (blind/partially sighted, Deaf hard of hearing). Gaps also exist in the monitoring and evaluation of programme effectiveness.

Section 3: Disabled Spectatorship

Organisations in football (National Associations and Licensed Clubs) have been developing opportunities for disabled people to watch football for a number of years. The survey told us that from those who responded (40%), the average years of involvement of a National Association are roughly 10.3 (STDEV: 8.26, Range 0-32). This diversity of experience is also reflected in the Licensed Clubs who average 5½ years (STDEV: 7, Range 0-49).

The survey also asked these organisations to estimate the number of home and away disabled supporters at matches. Few National Associations could estimate their spectator numbers, of those that could the average number of home spectators was 53 (STDEV=90.5, range 1:300). Over 85% of Licensed Clubs estimated 70 home fans per match days (STDEV=136, range 0:850) and just under 50% estimated that they each had on average 14 away fans (STDEV=14, range 0:200). While extrapolating an average number of disabled fans across Europe is a blunt measure given the power of the questionnaire results we attempt it. Therefore, we estimate that there are 2915 national spectators who regularly attend matches, while the Licensed Clubs collectively have 40300 disabled spectators at home matches, and 8064 at away matches.

In order to gain a better picture on who attends football matches, fans of national teams and Licensed Clubs were ranked in terms of greatest propensity to attend. The most frequent groups were reflected across both surveys, and the most frequent group included spectators with physical disabilities, then those with intellectual disabilities. Further categories of hidden disabilities (including ADHD, Colour Blindness, Autism and others) and those with sensory impairments Deaf and hard of hearing, and blind and partially sighted were the least frequent attendees. While the most frequent attendees were physically disabled spectators, developing research to examine greater diversity of disabled fans experience is a recommendation from this report.

The final question in section three was the importance-performance analysis of elements of good practice in accessibility. These eight items query the extent to which organisations promote, facilitate, and evaluate their provision. Table 5.3 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys.

---

3 There is no data on National Association away supporters.
Table 5.3: Section 3 Performance Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item -</th>
<th>National Associations</th>
<th>Licensed Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively promoting spectating opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of spectating opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of training courses to make staff aware of spectating opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of Access Appraisals for other clubs wishing to increase their accessibility</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with the establishment of Disability Access Officer roles at other local clubs</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The incorporation of representatives from Disabled Spectator Groups within decision-making bodies</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item -</th>
<th>National Associations</th>
<th>Licensed Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The establishment and facilitation of the NA/Club’s Disabled Spectators’ Group</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working with the NA/Club’s Disabled Spectators’ Group</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working with the Club’s Supporters’ Association</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research into the quality of service for disabled spectators</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with disability NGOs to promote spectating opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In developing spectating opportunities there are differences between the performance gaps faced by National Associations and Licensed Clubs. While both acknowledge that there are opportunities for spectating National Associations highlight that there is a performance gap in their active promotion of these. As seen in other areas there is a performance gap in assessing the quality of provision that could be addressed with further study.

Section 4: Employment Opportunities

Organisations in football (National Associations and Licensed Clubs) have been developing Employment opportunities for disabled people have been provided by some organisations for a number of years. However, of the three elements investigated this is the least established. The survey told us that from those who responded, the average years of involvement of a National Association are roughly 6.5 (STDEV: 9.3, Range 0-33). This diversity of experience is also reflected in the Licensed Clubs who average 5.2 years (STDEV: 6.9, Range 0-35).

The final question in section four was the importance-performance analysis of elements of good practice in the employment of disabled people within football. These eight items queried the extent to which organisations promote and facilitate opportunities for disabled people. Table 5.4 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys.
### Section 4: Performance Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item -</th>
<th>The promotion of employment opportunities for disabled people</th>
<th>The facilitation of opportunities for disabled people to sit on decision-making committees (operational level)</th>
<th>The facilitation of opportunities for disabled people to sit on decision-making boards (senior level)</th>
<th>The facilitation of an employment position for an individual with responsibility for the development of disability football</th>
<th>The facilitation of an employment position for an individual with responsibility for the development of employment opportunities for disabled people</th>
<th>The facilitation of Access Appraisal of the workplace to ensure employment opportunities for disabled people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Associations</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Clubs</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 shows a number of areas where National Associations and Licensed Clubs can focus their attention on increasing the opportunities for disabled people to work in the football industry. While opportunities to play and watch football abound the involvement of disabled people should be extended further into employment roles. Overall the National Association response highlight performance gaps in operational and strategic roles within their organisations, whilst the latter is reflected within the Licensed Clubs. Some strategies for addressing this are discussed in section seven.

### Section 5: Resources and Competences

One of the most important aspects of this research project was to consider the role of context in the determination of best practice. It is unfair to compare National Associations and Licensed Clubs across Europe without doing this. As such a series of resources and competencies were examined to allow us as researchers to

**Financial resources**

Section five was concerned with the resource situation of the organisations involved in disability engagement. This section focused on the traditional resource audit elements of financial, physical, intellectual and human resources, as well as querying the level of competencies in provision. As such four importance-performance items analysed elements of good practice in this area.

Four items queried the financial resources available for supporting the engagement of disabled people through football. Table 5.5 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys.
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Table 5.5: Section 5 Part 1 Performance Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item -</th>
<th>Direct funding of promotional activities</th>
<th>Direct or ‘seed’ funding of disability football programmes</th>
<th>Direct or ‘seed’ funding of spectatorship opportunities for disabled people</th>
<th>Direct or ‘seed’ funding of opportunities to increase the number of disabled people in the workforce (paid or voluntary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Associations</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Clubs</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 reveals some differences between National Associations and Licensed Clubs in financial resources dedicated to the engagement of disabled people. Licensed Clubs reported a performance gap in the direct funding of disability football and employment opportunities. While this was not reflected at the National Association level the broad remit of this latter organisation would cover these activities, thus partially explaining the differences reported.

The survey also determined the short-term (ST) and medium-term (MT) financial resource situation. Overall both National Associations and Licensed Clubs reported increases over both time periods (NA=34% over both short and medium terms; LC=9% ST and 18% MT), while these averages contain some variances the majority of organisations reported increases in this area.

Physical resources
The survey asked respondents about the impact of facility ownership on the provision of physical resources to assist the engagement of disabled fans. Only 18% of National Associations reported that they owned their National Stadium, whilst 48% of Licensed Clubs owned theirs. This meant that a number of organisations had contracts in place to operate the management of these facilities. When asked if they felt this improved or impeded service provision most respondents across all organisations reported that it either had no discernible impact or that it impacted positively.

Ten items queried the physical resources available for supporting the engagement of disabled people through football. Table 5.6 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys.
Table 5.6: Section 5 Part 2 Performance Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item -</th>
<th>The provision of accessible local travel and transport information for disabled spectators at National (home) Team games</th>
<th>The provision of clear and accurate way-finding signage from transport links up to the stadium</th>
<th>The provision of a dedicated ticketing officer for disabled spectators</th>
<th>The provision of a range of accessible seating options for disabled spectators</th>
<th>The provision of good sight lines for each accessible seat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Associations</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Clubs</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item -</td>
<td>The provision of audio descriptive commentary for blind and partially sighted spectators</td>
<td>The provision of induction (hearing loops) for Deaf and hard of hearing spectators</td>
<td>The provision of accessible amenities (toilets, concession stands, Changing Places toilets*) for disabled spectators</td>
<td>The provision of transport for participants in elite disability football</td>
<td>The provision of equitable sports science support for elite disability footballers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Associations</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Clubs</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above it can be seen that whilst there are some performance gaps over the 1.5 differential there are also three items where National Associations have narrow gaps, and one item whereby Licensed Clubs exhibit a narrow gap. Dedicated ticketing officers for disabled fans, good sight lines and the provision of accessible amenities all reflect how some physical resources have been tailored to offer superior provision. The table also highlights areas for improvement.

The survey also determined the short-term (ST) and medium-term (MT) physical resource situation. Overall both National Associations and Licensed Clubs reported increases over both time periods (NA=45%ST and 47.5% MT; LC=14% ST and 21% MT), while these averages contain some variances (less so than financial resources) the majority of organisations reported resources staying the same or increasing.

**Intellectual (brand) Resources**
Seven items queried the intellectual (or brand) resources available for supporting the engagement of disabled people through football. Table 5.7 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys. This table highlights a number of areas for improvement by the National Associations who could use their brand to further enhance engagement opportunities. Both National Associations and Licensed Clubs have wide ranging responsibilities of which engagement with marginalised groups is but one, however some elements to improve are highlighted below.
Table 5.7: Section 5 Part 3 Performance Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item -</th>
<th>National Association</th>
<th>Licensed Clubs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated programme of activity aimed at increasing the engagement of disabled people</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge-bank of good practice for engagement of disabled people</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability football programme managed through the NA/club</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Disabled Supporter Association for disabled spectators</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club supported opportunities to share your best practices with others</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities policies for employment relations</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies devised to increase the percentage of disabled people in employment roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also determined the short-term (ST) and medium-term (MT) physical resource situation. Overall both National Associations and Licensed Clubs reported increases over both time periods (NA=43% ST and 47% MT; LC=11% ST and 15.5% MT), while these averages contain some variances the majority of organisations reported resources staying the same or increasing.

Human Resources
Seven items queried the human resources available for supporting the engagement of disabled people through football. Table 5.8 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys. Of all the sections it was Human Resources that offered the best practice overall. As can be seen below only one element was identified as a performance gap whilst two areas reflected the key position required to enhance these engagement opportunities.

Table 5.8: Section 5 Part 4 Performance Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item -</th>
<th>National Association</th>
<th>Licensed Clubs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A national coordinator responsible for the engagement of disabled people in football</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coordinator should at least be a member of the middle management team</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated staff member responsible for developing participation opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated staff member responsible for developing spectatorship opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A core team of staff (employed) responsible for the delivery of these opportunites</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A core team of staff (voluntary) responsible for the delivery of these opportunites</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also determined the short-term (ST) and medium-term (MT) financial resource situation. Overall both National Associations and Licensed Clubs reported increases over both time periods (NA=29% ST and 42% MT; LC=10% ST and 18% MT), while these averages contain some variances the majority of organisations reported increases in this area.

Competencies
Seven items queried the competences for supporting the engagement of disabled people through football. Table 5.9 highlights the performance gaps in the National Association and Licensed Clubs surveys.

### Table 5.9: Section 5 Part 5 Performance Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item -</th>
<th>Staff training in disability awareness</th>
<th>Staff training on causes of discrimination and social inclusion</th>
<th>Staff training in disability football coaching</th>
<th>Staff training in workplace integration</th>
<th>Staff training in the monitoring of programme effectiveness</th>
<th>Staff training in the evaluation of programme effectiveness</th>
<th>Staff awareness of the UEFA/CAFÉ Good Practices Guide to Creating an Accessible Stadium &amp; Match-Day Experience</th>
<th>Opportunities for specialist staff to present their work at workshops or conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Associations</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Clubs</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite strong results in the human resource component many organisations reported performance gaps in the competencies required to develop engagement opportunities for disabled people. A number of areas were identified, of particular interest are those three elements that both National Associations and Licensed Clubs reported a performance gap; elements such as staff training in disability football coaching, workplace integration and awareness of the UEFA/CAFÉ Good Practices Guide to Creating an Accessible Stadium and Match-Day Experience.

**Section 6: Determining Best Practice**

In section six of the questionnaire respondents were asked to identify elements of best practice within their own organisations, or organisations that they were aware of. This series of three items drew a range of qualitative responses. The thematic discussion below addressed the responses of the National Associations first and then those of the Licensed Clubs. The quality of the responses varied considerably, however sufficient detail was included on the majority of best practice responses. Individual club responses are not limited to single thematic areas.

**Best Practice**

Table 5.10 and 5.11 summarise the key themes emerging from the responses outlining the current best practices (item 57).
Table 5.10: National Associations – Elements of Best Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major thematic areas</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated programmes for engagement</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships aid capacity</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing accessibility</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club development</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized coach development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen by the above table a series of three major themes was identified by the respondents.

The most frequent theme for National Associations was the provision of playing programmes for engagement. These were many and varied but of particular note was the partnerships formed with Special Olympics to provide Unified football. Linked to this theme was club development, the integration of disability football into mainstream clubs seeks to ensure that all mainstream clubs offer disability provision – if clubs are at capacity this requires support. Hence this club development theme is linked to the provision of programmes.

National Associations also reported that ‘Partnerships aid capacity’ indicating that these peak agencies work with a number of sporting and non-sporting groups to deliver programmes and improve services.

The third theme involves increasing accessibility. National associations seek to develop this by facilitating the training and development of staff and DAO is particular.

Table 5.11: Licensed Clubs – Elements of Best Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major thematic areas</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Increased accessibility, additional accessibility, personal touch,</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy, fan input, accessible facilities, Stadium development / facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development / transport, access issues – honest, staff development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability football / dedicated matches / leagues and tournaments / programmes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships / DSA support / UEFA NA Support</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing-led / information and promotions / visits / access / other</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource issues / dedicated resources / individual staff resource / facility bespoke</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program / more resources / lack of capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvements in the accessibility of football was seen as the most common indicator of best practice. Many clubs reported that they had invested in increasing accessibility by developing facilities,
ensuring that additional services were provided above and beyond the physical dimensions of the 
seating space. Adopting an accessible (or inclusive) philosophy was also reported. This implied 
accessibility in the centre of what clubs do, clubs were keen to receive disabled fans’ input into these 
services and develop staff commensurate with this.

The next major theme was the provision of disability football, through ongoing programmes targeted 
at a range of disabilities (the most frequently reported being mental-health), organised leagues and 
tournaments and the provision of dedicated matches to either increase resources for disability football 
or to provide a platform to showcase disability football teams.

Many respondents talked about how effective partnerships with myriad organisations enabled the 
successful provision of football and/or accessible services. A series of clubs from Scotland remarked 
on their close relationship with their Disability Supporters Associations, whilst others commented on 
partnerships with disabled people’s charities and other not for profits that assisted programme 
provision.

For many of the Licensed Clubs the use of their playing resources (access to the first team) to either 
visit, or be visited by disabled people and related charities provided a cost-effective way of engaging 
the community. The use of marketing and promotions to raise awareness of disabled football, 
spectators and employment opportunities was noteworthy.

A number of respondents commented on their effective use of human, brand, financial and physical 
resources to engage disabled people. A number of clubs identified certain individuals who 
demonstrated leadership in this area. Some respondents did mention that capacity issues in this area 
could prevent best practice form being achieved.

The final major theme that emerged was that of increasing employment opportunities for disabled 
people. The nature of these positions was reported as mainly voluntary but include a variety of roles.

Future Plans

Item 58 explored the proposed organisational activities in order to continue the further engagement of 
disabled people through football. Table 5.12 and 5.13 summarize the key themes emerging from the 
responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase organisational capacity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation or maintenance of programmes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing, communication and promotion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue and create partnerships</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None planned - No - NA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing accessibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Association survey revealed 25 responses for item 58. Of these, National Association 
plans for the next 5 years focus on three major themes; increasing organization capacity, programme 
development and marketing, communications and promotion. Common mechanisms for increasing 
organisational capacity includes the creation and launch of disability football strategies, the
appointment of dedicated human resources to champion the area (such as DAOs and specialised coaches) – and employing disabled persons where appropriate.

The second theme involves the further development of disability football programmes, such as frame football in the Netherlands. The third theme involves increasing the marketing and promotion of disability football, spectatorship and employment opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.13: Licensed Clubs: Future Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - NA - None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing accessibility (improve accessibility, transport access, additional Accessibility, Stadium development, Facilities for deaf or hard of hearing fans - audio description services - dedicated facilities, inclusion training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability football - community programmes - tournaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing, promotion and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question asked respondents to comment on their plans to develop engagement opportunities for disabled people over the next 5 years. This question yielded 113 responses of varying quality. From these responses, a series of 6 themes were drawn.

The most frequent response from the respondents was no/na/none and while this is not a theme it does represent a significant minority of respondents highlighting that they had no plans to develop initiatives to engage disabled people over the next 5 years. This could be linked to the resource capacity issues evident below and in responses in Q57 and Q59.

Increasing accessibility was the most frequent theme involving some form of planning. This theme is comprised of a series of codes including, additional aspects of accessibility, stadium developments, specific facilities and staff training. These aspects focus on the experience of disabled fans attending football matches and on improving the quality of services provided.

Increased opportunities to play football was the second most frequent theme. Increasing the number and range of playing opportunities, particularly at the grassroots level is a common, and (compared to facility upgrades) inexpensive approach for clubs to engage in the community. Some clubs even bring community people (including aged populations) into the facility to deliver healthy activity programmes.

A number of clubs are seeking to develop new partnerships or improve their existing partnerships over the next 5 years. A number of respondents identified developing better relationships with disabled supporters groups was a priority. A similar number of clubs sought to increase the awareness of their programmes and services to disabled people and potential partners. Plans are to use marketing, promotion and communication tactics to achieve this.

A small number of clubs offered capacity issues as the reason as to why they are not planning much over the next 5 years. Although this category could be read as no, the context provided by respondents highlighted aspects of where partnerships and examples of best practice would suit. One respondent stated; “we are a very small community and generally the club does not have a lot of financial resources that would be personally invested in more serious projects. We are very aware of
the importance of implementation and expansion of consciousness to the involvement of persons with disabilities in the field of sport, if someone or competent organization provide us intellectually and financially support, we would be very pleased that the program of people with disabilities become more significant and to become more implemented.”

The final major theme was the number of respondents (n=8) seeking to create employment opportunities for disabled people within football. These opportunities are part-time/casual roles and organisations are planning them with little previous experience.

Assistance Required

The final item in the survey (added for CAFE) asked what sort of assistance could be required in order to support the pursuit of best practice. While the response rate dropped significantly – which may have been a factor of a very long questionnaire, both National Associations and Licensed Clubs outlined that they would require assistance in acquiring extra resources, and also assistance in developing existing resources. Suggestions for how this could occur was explored in phase 2 and informs the recommendations of this report.

From the National Association survey, only 6 responses were received for this item. Of these requests for greater resource support created the only theme, elements of this theme include the creation of more networking opportunities to facilitate partnerships would provide a step toward further assistance.

Of the three themes two (acquiring resources and developing resources) could be seen as sub categories of organizational capacity. Acquiring resources can be summarised as Licensed Clubs attempt to gather the resources that they feel they need to deliver better engagement opportunities. These include gaining more resources, in particular the human and physical resources (new DAOs, new facilities). Clubs requested information and examples from other organisations that they could use as templates for action – these are a form of intellectual capital.

(right) Figure 5.4 Pockets of engagement across Europe

Developing resources can be seen as Licensed Clubs attempt to do more, or make more of its current offering (training and workshops, develop coaching competence, gain experience). 8 clubs were seeking to do this. The final theme was a minor theme – partnerships were seen by some to be a way of gaining capacity in order to further engage disabled people.
Again, a frequent response was no/NA (n=23) potentially indicating that further assistance is not required.

Regional Differences

Distinct regions formed in analysing the clubs. Figure 5.4 outlines pockets of engagement that share similarities between their responses. These pockets were targeted for phase two and provide opportunities for further research. Table 5.14 outlines the total number of performance gaps for each area.

There are resource commonalities between these countries that differentiate themselves from easy comparisons but the data reveal that Licensed Clubs in Poland, Germany, Belgium and to a lesser extent Italy are where best practice should lie. It also shows where improvements can be focused. Section seven will outline the specific recommendations to increase good practice however rather than examining the entire UEFA market as areas for improvement the results of this survey allow us to target specific areas, such as the Balkan states (Croatia, Bosnia & Herz., Serbia, Slovenia, FYR Macedonia and Bulgaria), Eastern-Europe (Poland, Slovakia, Belarus, Estonia), the Celtic group (Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales), the Caucasus (Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia) and Israel and Cyprus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.14: Summary of regional differences between Licensed Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong> (n=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland (20 - red)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (18 - blue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (16 - green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (16 - green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (14 - orange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (12 - orange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic Group (21 - red)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic states (29 - pink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus (19 - teal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel &amp; Cyprus (16 - yellow)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*minimum club responses per country of 10  
**groups formed based on geography and similarity of responses

Concluding comments on phase 1.

A significant amount of data has been gathered through both the National Association and Licensed Club surveys. As a starting point this data provides a baseline demonstrating the engagement of disabled people through football. From the tables presented above a clear outline of the overall strengths and weaknesses in engaging disabled people through football are clear. Further analysis of this information reveals that these strengths and weaknesses are localised into pockets where further action can be targeted. The qualitative data from section six also informed the second phase of the research study. While the data suggest many areas for improvement phase 2 reports on where best practice lies. These cases are predominantly concerned with the provision of disability football or accessible facilities.
Phase 2:

The following section provides a series of case studies drawn from the cases of best practice identified in phase 1. These 13 cases provide an overview of the situation and are interspersed with relevant quotes from the interviewee. At this stage the individuals who provided data on the case and who may be the focus of the case remain anonymous, in accordance with our ethical considerations in section 4.

Royal Belgian Football Association, the professional clubs and G Football: Belgium

The growth of G-Football in Belgium, a collaboration between the FA and the League, is one of the success stories in European disability football. Its centrepiece is the annual tournament which is now entering its eighth year; in 2016 the tournament hosted over 70 teams for adults and children. Each year the event is hosted by a different football team. The event is supported by a strong communications campaign comprising a promotional movie, TV and press, VIPs, and a social media campaign, all of which is described as ‘landslide coverage’ which makes the tournament very well known.

‘The unique selling point is that it is a tournament promoted by the presence of professional football players, coaches, and professional referees. We are working together on this policy’

Though originally designed for people with an intellectual disability, it has expanded to include physical disability, cerebral palsy and blind people. The majority of players, with the exception of the cerebral palsy teams, are part of professional or lower division football teams. Many of Belgium’s professional football teams now have a disability team to the point where growth in disability football matches the fast growing women’s game. However what characterises the growth in G-Football in Belgium is its growth in amateur clubs, the success of which is down the level of publicity around G-Football which promoted the notion that setting up a G-Football team is feasible. The ‘bottom-up’ growth of the game has seen the establishment of a number of active regional hubs where new teams can get involved.

Allied to this bottom up growth, Belgian cities have actively promoted G Football, with cities and local government actively promoting the formation of new teams. There is also an international component to the development of the game. With only three blind teams in Belgium, additional competitive matches are played with their French counterparts.

‘I have an opinion on it, and it is not the average opinion. The bottom-up story of G-football. That is one of the key factors of its success. The difficulty with international or pan-national structures [is that] many of the ideas and propositions are top-down, not fitting in with local structures, systems and ideas. The best approach is to promote and exchange best practice and ideas, which is the best UEFA can do’

FC Utrecht: Holland

FC Utrecht provides an interesting example of how a club crisis was turned into an opportunity to develop, when government stepped in to save the club from escalating debts. A condition of the aid was that the club increased its engagement with the local community. Key early progress was seen in the development of programmes for blind people, a re-design of aspects of the stadium for people in a wheelchair, work with the elderly, and a range of schools-based programmes.

‘It is important now to the club because we can see the value of it in the area, the province and the region’
Though Utrecht has a team of six which is responsible for a range of programmes, there is a clear belief that the value of the club’s 300 volunteers in many aspects of the club’s activities is the key to success. Consequently, in addition to a prize for the best volunteer, there is an annual event organised for the volunteers which provides an opportunity for the volunteers to engage and meet the players.

The involvement of volunteers helps to achieve a situation in which wheelchair fans feel they are a part of the club, regular supporters rather than a special group. Following an adjustment programme, the wheelchair fans can sit anywhere in the stadium, a unique feature. One limitation on expanding attendance in the stadium for wheelchair fans is the lack of suitable transport for fans.

Plans are focussed on generating this experience for the Utrecht fans in ‘away’ stadiums. The club also ensures that supporter views are evaluated and fed back into the development programme. Utrecht’s ‘Business Club’, through its social responsibility mandate, is also recognised as a key partner in developing programmes. An employment programme, open to anyone in a wheelchair or with a disability, is also organised annually in the stadium. The event offers on internships and employment opportunities in the club, as well as providing information from a range of government and business organisations in the area. The stadium in this respect is viewed as an inclusive stadium, able to attract fans who might not usually engage with government.

Olympiacos FC: Greece

There are a number of interesting aspects to the philanthropic work engaged in by Olympiacos as part of its corporate social responsibility (CSR) programme, driven from the top by club President, Evangelos Marinakis. The club’s focus is on social integration and anti-discrimination.

Olympiacos decided to create a new team for its academy which would not be branded as a ‘disability team’, but instead would be referred to in all club communications as ‘the new team of the academy’. The team was designed to boost the self-confidence of young people with a learning difficulty, to embrace participants as athletes. The philosophy was not about winning, but rather a desire to engage with the local community in Piraeus. Participants are drawn from two special training schools in Piraeus near the stadium, selected by Olympiacos working in collaboration with the headmaster. Specialist trainers were hired to work with the new team which was given full access to the stadium, its facilities and the medical team. The club has a close relationship with local Metropolitan Hospital which treats kids with cancer.

Training Monday and Thursday at Olympiacos’ ground, the participants are ‘treated as part of the sporting family’. Furthermore, the bus used to bring the athletes to training is also used to collect the kids to attend home matches in the Karaiskakis Stadium.

‘It’s not theatre for us, it is actual training, training in the academy’ [and] this is transmitted to athletes and parents’

The next stage of the integration of the new team is the development of Unified Training sessions wherein the U16 team ‘adopts’ the team as friends/team mates, to create unified teams. This phase forms a part of the ‘Life Outside the Box’ philosophy which emphasises the role of the club and all its players inside and outside the stadium. By late spring 2017, Olympiacos plans to get the team involved in competitions run by Special Olympics organisation in Athens, as Team Olympiacos. Feedback from parents indicates that the programme is benefiting children. Parents see the club as partners in a programme delivering increased self-confidence, demonstrable changes beyond sport, and children better integrated in social life. The success of the programme means it will probably be expanded.
Also within the CSR programme the club has also developed dedicated provision inside the stadium for people with a disability, including two different spectator sections (20 seats; 40 in total) for people with wheelchairs and their partners, and modified toilets. Attendance at the game for disabled supporters is free and can be arranged through a dedicated phone line to register for attendance, which also makes available disability-parking access.

The club also played an important role responding to the refugee crisis in the area in February and March 2016, engaging with 3,000 to 4,000 refugees who arrived in Piraeus. Under the direction of the club’s President, the club opened up the stadium restaurants to ensure refugees were fed and sheltered. Players, staff and local NGOs worked together for six weeks, offering 5,000 rations of food per day.

Football Association of Finland
In developing the model for Finnish disability football provision, the Scottish model was influential in the early stages, and the Scottish FA ran a number of sessions for Finnish coaches. The ‘tutoring’ role played by the Scottish FA is viewed as a model that could be replicated across Europe to promote best practice and knowledge exchange. Knowledge exchange also occurs during the three tournaments organised in Finnish football, which is attended by coaches from a range of countries. The event serves as an informal forum for exchanging ideas.

The Finnish model is based on a rejection of the notion that separate disability teams should be formed. Instead, people with a disability come straight into current club provision. Power chair football was successfully introduced in 2015 and is now embedded in a number of the premiership teams. All aspects of disability football, including deaf, blind and power chair football are part of the FA’s integration process due to be completed in 2020.

‘We want everything to be under football’, led by football. It has been easy for us. People with disabilities come straight into football, straight into clubs’

Disability football in Finland covers around 40 clubs and 60 teams, located within football clubs which cover a range of disabilities. Some clubs provide for power chair football, some have Cerebral Palsy football. As new teams or clubs are started, the FA offers support and guidance on a range of issues including integration and coach education.

Whilst the leadership role performed by the Finnish FA is important, the partnership approach is also valuable. In Finland local communities take the lead in organising sports for adults and children with a disability. The FA’s role is to provide support and to work alongside NGOs, including the Finnish Sports Association for Persons with Disabilities, the lead umbrella sports organisation for people with a disability.

The Football Federation of Macedonia
From 2015 under the ‘Captains of Change’ banner the Federation has collaborated with a range of partners including Mobility Macedonia and CAFE to increase disability awareness amongst Macedonian players, Federation employees and stakeholders. Within the Federation the initiative is support within a number of departments, including Disability Football Development and Disability Access.

The project “Captains of Change” is a UEFA initiative which aims to create equal opportunities in football, regardless of sex, religion, nationality or physical competency. The initiative is supported by the Football Federation of Macedonia which aims to deliver the programme across different levels, starting with stadium infrastructure, education initiatives and activities both within the Federation and for football clubs. Within the Federation, as part of the Captains of Change project, a seminar with its
48 employees, has been delivered followed by engagement with those involved in Captains of Change project. Six events organised between the Federation and Mobility Macedonia. Overall the aim is for football to act as a leader in a change process, and to reduce barriers to disabled people in football. In order to produce change, the Federation addresses two key aspects, architectural barriers and barriers to public awareness.

Stadium infrastructure is challenging in Macedonia. Only one stadium, the national stadium which provides 35 seats, is partially accessible for disabled fans. Following the recent visit from CAFÉ, a report will be produced outlining how to progress a range of issues including service improvement, a new platform for selling tickets, accessible parking spaces, proper signage, and more accessible seats. This work will enhance the current general physical improvements being made to the stadium. The newly developed stadium will then operate as a model of best practice. Within the last year, the national stadium has hosted training opportunities for disabled players (not in a wheelchair) to train with the second team. All clubs competing at UEFA level must now appoint a licensing officer for disability access and the Federation is now taking the lead in planning developments beyond the national stadium.

The Federation made available coaching and equipment as part of its support for the development of a disability football team. Plans for the team will see it become the national team for Macedonia.

Irish Football Association: Northern Ireland

In the Northern Irish context one key individual with the Irish Football Association (IFA) has driven disability football provision for over 13 years, a role which benefits from a close working partnership with Disability Sport Northern Ireland. Recently the IFA’s new strategic documents have facilitated the mainstreaming of disability football provision, in effect producing structures which have enabled the IFA to focus strategic direction on enabling local semi-professional clubs to broaden engagement with their local communities, a needs-driven agenda.

‘We need to move, rather than the IFA as a governing body of sport, to actually organising and delivering clubs. We should be supporting clubs to provide for people with disabilities. We should be empowering clubs to do it. Clubs have the capacity across their local area to deliver for disability’

In this evolving environment the IFA’s role is seen as providing operational support with a view to empowering local clubs. Clubs are seen as the key vehicle to deliver initiatives on a range of issues including mental health. A key output from the mainstreaming programme has been the increase in participation levels.

The IFA is now a leader in terms of providing a Level 2 Disability Football coaching award, which is delivered annually, and which includes both theory and practice, plus 10 hours coaching engagement in the area of disability. It is a model which the IFA is keen to share with football and other sports internationally.

There are a number of constraints on developments. These include for example, a relatively limited budget, and the ever-increasing demands on football clubs to deliver a range of community initiatives whilst simultaneously expanding football provision for all ages and genders, and the constant demand for more trained coaches.

Bristol Rovers: England

The Bristol Rovers case study provides a number of interesting elements, including playing host to a Prisoner Rehabilitation Project, which was conceived of and introduced by the club Chairman. The programme, a partnership with a local open prison, provides a working environment for participants as a step towards full reintegration into society. A number of roles are offered by the programme,
from cleaning and painting. Plans are being developed to offer roles which involve customer service and potentially engagement with the disability programme.

Rovers’ disability programme has been driven both by Football League compliance requirements, and by an opportunity to work with Level Playing Field (LPF) to focus on addressing accessibility issues. The club also works in partnership with the local South West Disabled Supporters Association. LPF has been instrumental in working with the club to provide enhanced commentaries, for home and away fans during matches, building on the current provision of hospital radio commentary. The club has also piloted the provision of a Mobiloo (accessible mobile toilet) service, developing a potential partnership with a number of sports clubs in the area. Initial indications suggest that there is insufficient demand for the service to make it economically viable.

‘One other thing just in terms of our community trusts, it’s not a disability side, they’ve called it Bristol Rovers Ability football team and they play in a local league and they sometimes come and play at half time. You’ve got people with all sorts of learning difficulties. It’s brilliant, they came a few weeks ago and when they scored they do what professional footballers do, they run to the crowd, slide across the ground, put the shirts over their heads and everyone was cheering them and standing up’

The challenge for the club is to address accessibility issues within an old stadium which was not designed for wheelchair access. Additionally on match days the stadium fills to near capacity, limiting options for development.

Sepp Herberger Foundation: Germany

The key message from the German case study is the importance of ensuring the correct infrastructure is in place to facilitate the promotion and development of disability football. The Sepp Herberger Foundation, motivated by the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, 2009) introduced in 2012 an inclusion initiative which established 21 co-ordinators in disability football in every region. The co-ordinators in turn work with 25,000 local clubs to establish local disability teams. In parallel they work towards the provision of appropriate training qualifications. The initiative is seen as a ‘win-win’ for clubs, and the inclusion of disabled players is viewed as strengthening Germany’s already strong club structure. The Foundation provides support in terms of setting programme goals and through providing publicity and communications.

Germany has developed a strong Blind Football League with around eight clubs participating. The league enjoys strong financial and communications support. Professional clubs, including Borussia Dortmund are also involved, whilst more clubs are in training and aim to join the league.

‘What is also special with our blind football league, we have 4 game days per year where they play in a kind of tournament. Two of the game days are played in the middle of the city. It is so spectacular and it has lots of values and lots of people standing there watching who can’t believe the blind football. We bring blind football to the population by the game days playing in public spaces. It’s a great atmosphere. [Blind Football] is like the lighthouse of disability football’

To support the development of disability football, a number of qualification tools are being developed with a view to integrating these qualifications with mainstream qualifications delivered by the German FA.
Football Association of Ireland: Republic of Ireland

A key theme evident in the Irish case study is the positive attitude to change at club level, wherein community clubs are focussed on serving local communities. This attitude is based on a view that people with a disability have the right to participate. For the FAI, the additional value of coaching volunteers cannot be over-estimated. There has also been strong support from the FAI Board and Council. The Board is also working with Sport Ireland and CARA, a national organisation which provides a collaborative and partnership platform which aims to enhance sport and physical activity opportunities for people with disabilities. In parallel, media exposure covering the Paralympic Games and Special Olympics, has raised public awareness and levels of support.

‘Clubs now focus on servicing a community, it’s not all about winning, not just about servicing our trophy cabinet. In Ireland over the last 10 years there has been a shift in attitude, in sport, that people with a disability have a right to access sport’

Structures are also regarded as an important aspect of success. FAI staff work with 60 development officers liaise with coaches/ volunteers and clubs. Clubs are now expected to produce Annual Plans outlining their goals, objectives and costings, all of which helps to inform better the FAI and to produce a better evidence base. The FAI also draws on best experience from a number of its European counterparts, including Belgium (match-day experience) and Wales (Stakeholder model; planning and evidence gathering).

‘Resources and volunteers-it’s a winning combination’

Two current initiatives being developed in Ireland include Power Chair football which has benefitted from the support of highly motivated individuals, and Blind Football which is a relatively new initiative. More broadly football is part of a general trend in Ireland which has seen a number of sports, including rugby, hockey, tennis, cricket, and the GAA all become involved in disability sport, reflecting the cultural and attitudinal changes in society to disability sport, and a growing role for sport in other agendas including social inclusion, health and inter-cultural activities.

Tottenham Hotspur: England

The Dedicated Access Team is a relatively unique feature provided by the club, with a dedicated Disability Access Officer supported by a Disability Liaison Officer, and a team of 15 Access Stewards, some of whom have disabilities or impairments themselves. In each of the stadium’s accessible areas, a Supervisor operates with a number of people working as part of the team. The engagement with visiting supporters begins in the days leading up to a match, with the DAO liaising with the visiting club to ensure he knows how many disabled fans are travelling, whether they are in wheelchairs, generally gathering information of fans’ requirements. One of the stewards will meet the coach, and show the away fans into the ground.

In the ground some of the team perform the role of ‘Connectors’, who are tasked to do the ‘meet and greet’ with away fans and get them to their seats. The preliminary work with away fans ensures the Team knows who is visually impaired, who needs headsets, and whether they are in a wheelchair or ambulant. The Team will have been briefed two hours before the game. The Access Stewards are available throughout the match to assist at all time, also acting as a liaison point for the DAO and the DLO. Post-game a steward will meet the away fans again and take them back to the coach. A point of contact is available to away fans at all times. One of the stewards also travels with fans to all away games, whether in the UK or Europe.
Scottish Football Association: Scotland
In Scotland, football is the main sport for over 70% of disabled athletes. Following the publication of their previous strategic document, the SFA’s disability programme created two distinct club development programmes around disabled players. The ‘Inclusive Disability Club’ is designed to facilitate clubs to incorporate a disabled player e.g. for deaf players or cerebral palsy, into mainstream football provision. The second aspect, the ‘Disability Club’ involves clubs creating a different section within the club for players with a disability to play together. In the latter the creation of a standalone disability section is considered the most appropriate way for the club to serve best the local community.

‘A player becomes part of a community, not just a football club’

Both programmes are regarded as successful in promoting the game, and in increasing participation and opportunities, at a time when decreasing public expenditure budgets were negatively impacting disability budgets. Success is tangible; participant numbers increased from a base of around 1,000 to 7,000 unique players, new competitions and new leagues were created including new-based school leagues, leagues covering pan disability, mental health, power chair, deaf teams, and visual impairment.

The SFA has adopted a proactive approach when and where appropriate, for example taking the lead in developing bespoke opportunities in a geographical areas where participation numbers are low, which might involve working with interested clubs, disability groups and NGOs, and local authorities. At other times it is content to support initiatives deriving from clubs. The SFA has long-standing partnerships with Disability Sport NI and Scottish Disability Sport. Internationally, close working relationships have been developed with counterparts in Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland and Finland.

In overall terms the recent strategy is viewed as successful in terms of increasing participation, whilst the new strategy (due spring 2017) will focus of professionalising structures, governance and registration procedures, in effect replicating procedures from professional game.

Georgian Football Federation: Georgia
The impetus for change in Georgia came with new management in the Federation in 2015 which moved decisively to establish the first National Amputee League. The league, covering most of the major cities, now hosts seven teams, with the majority of players being war veterans. Clubs are also encouraged to register younger players. Whilst one of the teams is linked to a football club, the majority were created in partnership with the Georgian Amputee Football Association. The Federation has provided funding to develop the sport’s infrastructure, it provides financial support, the stadiums, and equipment. This season a cup competition is being organised. The creation and development of an autism team which caters for 33 children aged 6-15 has been particularly successful. The team has benefited from Federation support in terms of stadium access, coaching and full medical staff support.

Disability football receives limited support from local municipalities, but like other aspects of football development including the women’s game, progress is hampered by limited funds. Plans are being develop to maximise the coverage of disability football to include participants whether they identify as Georgian, Armenian or Azerbaijani. This year also saw the signing of a new partnership agreement between the Federation and Special Olympics Georgia. Finally as part of the licensing procedures, every stadium is working to ensure improved accessibility for people with a disability, with the aim to make all stadiums accessible.
**TW Braga: Northern Ireland**

The club, which has links to FC Braga in Portugal, has for a number of years offered a range of football opportunities at all age groups, from toddlers and mini-soccer up to an Under 16 team. The long-held desire to develop disability provision came to fruition following a meeting with Richard Seedhouse, designed to investigate potential of bringing Frame Football to Northern Ireland. With support from the IFA and Disability Sport NI (DSNI), Braga now has two Frame Football clubs, operating in Lisburn and Coleraine. The teams play under the TW Braga banner, ensuring that the new teams feel included in the overall programme. The kids from the mainstream teams have been involved with the new teams, helping on a Saturday.

‘It has been a really positive experience for everyone involved. With the IFA support, it just worked perfect’

Over the last few years, the relationship with the IFA has proved beneficial to TW Braga. IFA staff have helped to develop the project and six Braga staff members have been awarded the IFA Disability Coaching Award. The IFA and DSNI also help with facility costs, whilst the IFA has helped with funding to ensure the Frame Football teams have the same kits as the TW teams. The Disability Football Development Officer at the IFA has played a key mentoring role in the development of the project. For TW Braga, future prospects include extending the age range for participants, introducing walking football, developing young people as coaches, and then extending into developing a girls’ team. The long-term goal is to develop the club’s own facility.

**Concluding comments on phase 2.**

As can be seen by the above 13 cases there is a fantastic array of engagement activities taking place across Europe. The diversity of opportunities reflect the local context in which they are developed, whilst this makes them remarkable it does make them difficult to emulate in other environments, for example the social context in Finland differs to that in Portugal. That said, these cases have been developed by organisations with very different resource bases – which implies it does not take financial resources alone to provide best practice – it is a combination of resources that is key, many can be developed and if needed some can be acquired. The importance of strategy and a philosophy of inclusion remains vital. The integration of disabled people through football is different than assimilation – effective integration requires the acceptance of shared values. However, if this is mastered, the case of Olympiacos and their work with refugees demonstrates competence in integration can be extended to assist any group at risk of marginalisation.

**Summary of Main Results**

Given the wealth of data collected a summary of the above section is challenging. However, the following information aims to achieve this in light of the research questions. The main research question asked: **how is European football engaging disabled people within their industry?**

It is abundantly clear that there are myriad opportunities for the engagement of disabled people in European football. That many respondents were able to address so many of an extensive survey’s items demonstrates that even if performance is not where organisations may wish it to be, there is clearly much work being undertaken. Certain pockets of excellence exist across the region, as the phase 2 case studies have highlighted. Attempts now should be undertaken to encourage other nations and clubs to adopt these practices – not by mimicking provision but by using it as inspiration for tailoring bespoke provision to the national or local context.
The contextual factors that facilitate increased opportunities for disabled people include the legislative context that the National Association or Licensed Club operates within. Every country in Europe has legislation outlining non-discrimination in the workplace and accessibility principles in the design and development of facilities, however it is the willingness of footballing organisations to offer services not just to confirm with legislation but to demonstrate their links with, and attention of the diverse needs of their local communities. The barriers discussed in the phase 2 cases were lowered by the appropriate mix of organisational resources (human, financial, physical and intellectual) but there are also examples of work being done with moderate resource support.

While context plays an important part in the provision of engagement opportunities, common managerial principles are required to develop engagement opportunities. One theme that arose through the phase 2 cases was the importance of the right philosophical approach to inclusion. Those organisations who excel do not do so because they feel obliged to offer engagement opportunities but do so because they have ‘the right attitude’. Even with the right attitude National Associations and Licensed Clubs remain competitive with each other, this healthy competition drives development further. In addition to this management competence in planning, implementing, communication facilitate good opportunities. If the skills of monitoring and evaluation are enhanced across the industry then more opportunities for learning will arise. Currently, staff are networked by their role and on occasion meet to share information and good practice, a more effective evaluation system would be an important learning tool for practitioners in these areas.

The recommendations from this research project are outlined in the following section, however it is important to remember that this is the first time this survey has been completed and the first time such a comprehensive approach has been take to understand these experiences, as such now a benchmark has been provided it can be expected that developments will occur.
Section 6: Limitations

From the research undertaken there were a range of limitations in our design and implementation. In retrospect these limitations are easy to identify but were difficult to control for or avoid during the research period. Each limitation is an opportunity to enhance further research in the future;

The primary limitation of the research was that it was conducted by two non-disabled researchers (project leader and research assistant). The principle of Nothing About Us, Without Us (Charlton, 1998) was in part covered by consulting with CAFE so that we could ‘ground’ the research instruments to those with personal experience of disability, however our approach and perspective is influenced by are non-disabled status.

- There are many organisations operating throughout Europe that assist in the engagement of disabled people in sport including, Disabled Supporters’ Associations, International Sports Federations and a range of non-governmental organisations. Our research focused primarily on National Associations and Licensed Clubs, therefore a limitation would be the scope of our study. While respondents in the current study commented on the partnerships they had with many of these organisations, further opportunities exist in working directly with these partners to examine their perspective on engagement.

- A number of operational issues limited the scope of our study;
  - While we were extremely satisfied with the uptake of the National Association and Licensed Club survey (particularly given the survey instrument’s size) there remain unexplored markets including Spain, France, Turkey and Russia.
  - Interviews carried out through VOIP did not allow us as researchers to achieve the same engagement as the interviews we were able to perform face-to-face. While the phase 2 data is robust and VOIP could provide non-verbal cues face-to-face interviews would have been preferable.

The positives that come from each of our limitations is that each can be avoided when we seek to repeat the survey instrument in 2-4 years’ time. By widening the geographical and organisational scope we plan to provide one of the most comprehensive surveys on the organisation and management disability sport, accessibility and employment in the world.
Section 7: Conclusion and Recommendations

This project set out to explore how the European football industry engaged with disabled people through a variety of on- and off-field opportunities. From the results provided from our dual phase approach it is clear that this aim has been achieved.

In the engagement of disabled people through football we conclude the context is king. Despite a wealth of best practice existing, at this stage many of these developments have sprung up from the grassroots level. Therefore the ability to take a successful programme from one National Association and Licensed Club and drop it into another context is limited. This implies that further research on a topic like integrated football (which is common in many countries) will need to be cognizant of the context in which the observed version was created.

The methodology chosen in this research project was the correct one. Our survey instrument was able to draw comparable responses from football staff from across the vast UEFA region. The fact that it exists in four languages, and has the opportunity to be translated further means that when replicated it will continue to provide valid and reliable information.

The findings as they currently stand will contribute to two primary academic outputs and one industry publication. The former publications would address current gaps in the supply-side provision of disability engagement opportunities in sport management. Although some work has been done nationally (Wicker & Breuer, 2014) as yet a gap exists for international data.

The major recommendations from our study suggest;

- Underpinning best practice is the ‘champion’ efforts of an individual staff member. While this has worked well to raise provision there is great risk if their individual human resource is lost. Greater efforts need to be made to support further human resources in disability provision.

- An appropriate, inclusive organisation is required to get the most out of integration activities. Without this philosophy engagement activities will remain mundane, best practice is a product of passion.

- Grassroots (from the ground up) development is in most cases the appropriate approach to engaging disabled people through football. With the exception of the Sepp Herberger Foundation top-down initiatives may not meet local needs.

- Encouraging partnerships to continue the work already done and build important capacity for further development in these areas.

- To boost the profile of these initiatives, UEFA could champion an annual award for best practice in disability engagement, with one award for each National Association and Licensed Club for the best playing, spectating and working initiatives. A partnership award could also be offered.
• UEFA could seek to develop a bespoke disability awareness and etiquette training programme for the football industry covering each aspect of engagement; playing, spectating and working.

• Our final recommendation is for UEFA to work with CAFE, National Associations and Licensed Clubs (and their Disabled Supporters’ Associations) to become the world’ premier sporting competition for accessibility and inclusion. A solid footing has already been established but consultation with partners and promotion of initiatives can further enhance what exists.

While these recommendations will appear to many readers as logical suggestions that may have been known prior to this study, we argue that this study now offers significant support to practitioners willing to develop these areas.

**Tangible outputs:**

In order to add extra value to UEFA and the wider football community a range of tangible outputs are to be provided from this study.

• A database of Disability Access Officers/Supporter Liaison Officers with particular competence in engaging disabled people through football. This will be in addition to the National Association Social Responsibility and Licensed Club Managers databases that UEFA already possess and were of great assistance in conducting this research.
• A case book of European best practice, available in English, French, German and Spanish by the end of May 2017.
• A valid, reliable and replicable survey instrument that can be used by UEFA to map the development of provision across Europe.
• Contributions to the academic literature on the integration of disabled people through sport.
• An online module offered by Ulster University focusing on the engagement of disabled people through football, available 2018.
• Possible spin-off products that could assist the facilitation of accessible experiences.
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Appendices
Appendix 1: Survey Instrument
(Example provided: National Association Survey)

General Introduction

Welcome to a UEFA and Ulster University research project examining the engagement of disabled people* in European football. This research seeks to draw out the best practices of those organisations that engage disabled people through active involvement in the game, through the fulfilment of either playing, spectating or working opportunities.

Central to this study is this questionnaire. It aims to build a board picture of engagement across Europe, hence your Association’s selection.

This questionnaire contains 6 sections (section 5 being the largest) and will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Throughout the questionnaire we will use a tool called importance and performance analysis. This is a common service research tool that seeks to understand how much an organisation believes an element of service is important and then how they rate their own performance against that factor. As such the questions seem very similar.

The identity of the respondent and the National Association remains anonymous and confidential. No response can be tracked backed to an individual, the aim here is to evaluate the engagement of disabled people in European football as a whole.

A second phase of the study will examine best practice and in that circumstance respondents can contacted again for further study and be identified if they wish.

*In this survey we use the term disabled people and not people with disabilities. This was recommended by CAFE as per the UEFA/CAFE Good Practice Guide to Creating an Accessible Stadium & Match-day experience.
Section 1: The engagement of disabled people

The following sections 1-4 examine the elements of good practice.

**Good practice** are those things that we currently do well but as yet have not been measured in relation to other organisations within the sector.

**Question 1.1**
For how many years has your National Association delivered programmes aimed at disabled people?

0-2  2-4  4-9  9+

**Question 1.2**
Of the following organisations, select the ones you regularly work with to deliver social responsibility programmes aimed at disabled people; *(it is possible to select more than one)*

- Clubs
- Disabled Supporters Associations of Clubs
- Leagues
- National Associations
- National Disabled Supporters Association (umbrella organisation of Disabled Supporters Associations of clubs)
- National Disabled Supporters Association (Disabled Supporters Association of National Team)
- Centre for Access to Football in Europe (CAFE)
- International Disability Football Organisations (e.g. European Deaf Sports Organization)
- Charities for disabled people (e.g. MENCAP, Scope)

**Question 1.3**

a) What is the job title of the individual who manages disability engagement for your National Association?

b) Could you please provide a percentage breakdown of the time spent on each engagement responsibility, for instance;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example response</th>
<th>Playing %</th>
<th>Spectating %</th>
<th>Employment %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1.4**
The following are elements of good practice.
Please state how **IMPORTANT** each is to your National Association.
In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of importance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The promotion of disability awareness training for individuals or groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of disability awareness training for individuals or groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding of another’s provision of disability awareness training for individuals or groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of etiquette training as part of disability awareness training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring the impact of disability awareness training on services.

Evaluating the impact of disability awareness training on services.

Question 1.5
The following are elements of good practice.
Please rate your National Association’s **PERFORMANCE** against these areas.
In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of performance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The promotion of disability awareness training for individuals or groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of disability awareness training for individuals or groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding of another’s provision of disability awareness training for individuals or groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of etiquette training as part of disability awareness training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the impact of disability awareness training on services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the impact of disability awareness training on services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Disability Football

Question 2.1
For how many years has your National Association delivered disability football programmes?
0-2
2-4
4-9
9+

Question 2.2
The following are elements of good practice.
Please state how **IMPORTANT** each is to your National Association.
In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of importance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The promotion of football for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of training courses to make coaches and athletes aware of football for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of football for people with learning difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of football for people with physical disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of football for people who are blind or partially sighted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of football for people who are Deaf or hard of hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of football for people with mental ill health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research into effectiveness of training courses on football for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research into effectiveness of playing programs for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2.3
The following are elements of good practice.
Please rate your National Association’s **PERFORMANCE** against these areas.
In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of performance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The promotion of football for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of training courses to make coaches and athletes aware of football for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Spectatorship for Disabled people

Question 3.1.
For how many years has your National Association focused initiatives on increasing accessibility in spectatorship for disabled people?

0-2
2-4
4-9
9+

Question 3.2
The following are elements of good practice.
Please state how **IMPORTANT** each is to your National Association.
In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of importance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively promoting spectating opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of spectating opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of training courses to make staff aware of spectating opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of Access Appraisals for licensed clubs wishing to increase their accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with the establishment of Disability Access Officer roles for local clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The incorporation of representatives from Disabled Spectators Groups for disabled people within decision-making bodies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of the development of a National Disabled Spectators Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working with a National Disabled Spectators Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research into the quality of service for disabled spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with national disability NGOs to promote spectating opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition of an Access Appraisal:** is an assessment of a building, an environment or a service against best practice standards to benchmark its accessibility for disabled people.

Question 3.3
The following are elements of good practice.
Please rate your National Association’s **PERFORMANCE** against these areas.
In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of performance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actively promoting spectating opportunities for disabled people
The facilitation of spectating opportunities for disabled people
The facilitation of training courses to make staff aware of spectating opportunities for disabled people
The facilitation of **Access Appraisals** for licensed clubs wishing to increase their accessibility
Support with the establishment of Disability Access Officer roles for local clubs
The incorporation of representatives from Spectator Groups for disabled people within decision-making bodies.
The facilitation of the development of a National Spectator Group for disabled spectators
Partnership working with a National Spectator Group for disabled spectators
Conducting research into the quality of service for disabled spectators
Engagement with national disability NGOs to promote spectating opportunities for disabled people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4: Employment in Football</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.1. For how many years has your National Association focused initiatives on increasing the employment opportunities (paid or voluntary) for disabled people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.2 The following are elements of good practice. Please state how <strong>IMPORTANT</strong> each is to your National Association. In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of importance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The promotion of employment opportunities for disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of employment opportunities for disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of opportunities for disabled people to sit on decision-making committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of opportunities for disabled people to sit on decision-making boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of an employment position for an individual with responsibility for the development of disability football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of an employment position for an individual with responsibility for the development of spectating opportunities for people with a disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of an employment position for an individual with responsibility for the development of employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of <strong>Access Appraisals</strong> of the workplace to ensure employment opportunities for disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.3 The following are elements of good practice. Please rate your National Association’s <strong>PERFORMANCE</strong> against these areas. In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of importance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The promotion of employment opportunities for disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of employment opportunities for disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of opportunities for disabled people to sit on decision-making committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of opportunities for disabled people to sit on decision-making boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of an employment position for an individual with responsibility for the development of disability football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of an employment position for an individual with responsibility for the development of spectating opportunities for people with a disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of an employment position for an individual with responsibility for the development of employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitation of <strong>Access Appraisals</strong> of the workplace to ensure employment opportunities for disabled people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5: Resources and Competences

This section seeks to understand how your National Association’s engagement strategies are resourced and if any changes have occurred to this resource in recent times.

Resources

Resources are defined as a stock or supply of money, materials, staff, and other assets that can be drawn on by an organization in order to function effectively. There are four types of resource; financial, physical, intellectual (brand and communications), and human. Each is addressed below;

Financial

Question 5.1

The following are elements of good practice.

Please state how IMPORTANT each is to your National Association.

In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of importance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct funding of promotional activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct or ‘seed’ funding of disability football programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct or ‘seed’ funding of spectatorship opportunities for people with a disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct or ‘seed’ funding of opportunities to increase the number of disabled people in the workforce (paid or voluntary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seed funds are defined as contributions to cover part of the cost of a program or initiative

Question 5.2

The following are elements of good practice.

Please rate your National Association’s PERFORMANCE against these areas.

In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of performance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct funding of promotional activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct or ‘seed’ funding of disability football programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direct or ‘seed’ funding of spectatorship opportunities for people with a disability
Direct or ‘seed’ funding of opportunities to increase the number of disabled people in the workforce (paid or voluntary)

Question 5.3
Thinking about this resource over the past 12 months, the amount of financial support offered is;
- More than a year ago
- The same as a year ago
- Less than a year ago

If more or less, by what percentage has this increased or decreased?
- 10, 20, 50, 75, 100, 200, more than 250

Thinking about this resource over the past 4 years, the amount of financial support offered is;
- More than 4 years ago
- The same as 4 years ago
- Less than 4 years ago

If more or less, by what percentage has this increased or decreased?
- 10, 20, 50, 75, 100, 200, more than 250

Physical

Question 5.4
Do your National Association operate the management of your own stadium? (Yes/No)
If yes continue to question 5.5, if no please provide the details of the management company that maintains the contract

Question 5.5
The following are elements of good practice.
Please state how IMPORTANT each is to your National Association.
In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of importance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The provision of accessible local travel and transport information for Disabled spectators at National (home) Team games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of a dedicated ticketing officer for Disabled spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of a range of accessible seating options for Disabled spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of good sightlines from each accessible seat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of audio descriptive commentary for blind and partially sighted spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of induction (hearing loops) for Deaf and hard of hearing spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of accessible amenities (toilets, concession stands, Changing Places toilets*) for Disabled spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of transport for participants in elite disability football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of equitable sports science support for elite disability footballers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Changing Places or peninsular toilets offer a larger space with special lifting equipment that can be used by disabled people with complex and multiple needs often requiring the help of up to two assistants.

Question 5.6
The following are elements of good practice.
Please rate your National Association’s **PERFORMANCE** against these areas.
In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of performance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The provision of local travel and transport information for Disabled spectators at National (home) Team games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of a dedicated ticketing officer for Disabled spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of a range of accessible seating options for Disabled spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of good sight lines for each accessible seat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of audio-commentary for blind and partially sighted spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of induction (hearing loops) for deaf and hard of hearing spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of accessible amenities (toilets, concession stands, Changing Places toilets) for Disabled spectators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of transport for participants in elite disability football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of equitable sports science support for elite disability footballers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about this resource over the past 12 months, the amount of physical resource offered is;
- More than a year ago
- The same as a year ago
- Less than a year ago

If more or less, by what percentage has this increased or decreased?
- 10, 20, 50, 75, 100, 200, more than 250

Thinking about this resource over the past 4 years, the amount of physical resource offered is;
- More than 4 years ago
- The same as 4 years ago
- Less than 4 years ago

If more or less, by what percentage has this increased or decreased?
- 10, 20, 50, 75, 100, 200, more than 250

Intellectual = Brand and communications

Question 5.7
The following are elements of good practice.
Please state how **IMPORTANT** each is to your National Association.
In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of importance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated program of activity aimed at increasing the engagement of disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge-bank of good practice for engagement of disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A disability football programme managed at National Level
A Disabled Supporters Association for National Team
Equal opportunities policies for employment relations
Strategies devised to increase the percentage of disabled people in employment roles

Question 5.8
The following are elements of good practice.
Please rate your National Association’s PERFORMANCE against these areas.
In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of performance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated program of activity aimed at increasing the engagement of disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge-bank of good practice for engagement of disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A disability football programme managed at National Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Disabled Supporters Association for National Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities policies for employment relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies devised to increase the percentage of disabled people in employment roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about this resource over the past 12 months, the amount of brand support offered is;
- More than a year ago
- The same as a year ago
- Less than a year ago

If more or less, by what percentage has this increased or decreased?
- 10, 20, 50, 75, 100, 200, more than 250

Thinking about this resource over the past 4 years, the amount of brand support offered is;
- More than 4 years ago
- The same as 4 years ago
- Less than 4 years ago

If more or less, by what percentage has this increased or decreased?
- 10, 20, 50, 75, 100, 200, more than 250

Human

Question 5.9
The following are elements of good practice.
Please state how IMPORTANT each is to your National Association.
In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of importance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A national coordinator responsible for the engagement of disabled people in football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coordinator should at least be a member of the middle management team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A dedicated staff member responsible for developing participation opportunities for disabled people

A dedicated staff member responsible for developing spectatorship opportunities for disabled people

A dedicated staff member responsible for developing employment opportunities for disabled people

A core team of staff (employed) responsible for the coordination of these opportunities

A core team of staff (voluntary) responsible for the delivery of these opportunities

Question 5.10
The following are elements of good practice.
Please rate your National Association’s PERFORMANCE against these areas.
In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of performance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A national coordinator responsible for the engagement of disabled people in football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coordinator should be a member of the middle management team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated staff member responsible for developing participation opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated staff member responsible for developing spectatorship opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated staff member responsible for developing employment opportunities for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A core team of staff (employed) responsible for the coordination of these opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A core team of staff (voluntary) responsible for the delivery of these opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about this resource over the past 12 months, the amount of human resource support offered is;
- More than a year ago
- The same as a year ago
- Less than a year ago

If more or less, by what percentage has this increased or decreased?
- 10, 20, 50, 75, 100, 200, more than 250

Thinking about this resource over the past 4 years, the amount of human resource support offered is;
- More than 4 years ago
- The same as 4 years ago
- Less than 4 years ago

If more or less, by what percentage has this increased or decreased?
- 10, 20, 50, 75, 100, 200, more than 250

Question 5.11
Are there any other ways in which you use resources that have not been covered in the list above?
Competences

A competence is defined as the ability to implement a program of activity successfully.

Question 5.12
The following are elements of good practice. Please state how important each is to your National Association. In this scale 1 is definitely unimportant and 5 is definitely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of importance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in disability awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training on causes of discrimination and social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in disability football coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in workplace integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in the monitoring of programme effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in the evaluation of programme effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff awareness of the UEFA &amp; CAFE Good Practice Guide to Creating an Accessible Stadium &amp; Matchday experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5.13
The following are elements of good practice. Please rate your National Association’s performance against these areas. In this scale 1 is ‘we could do better’, 3 is satisfactory and 5 is ‘we excel’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of performance;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in disability awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training on causes of discrimination and social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in disability football coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in workplace integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in the monitoring of programme effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in the evaluation of programme effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff awareness of the UEFA &amp; CAFE Good Practice Guide to Creating an Accessible Stadium &amp; Matchday experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5.14
Are there any other ways in which you develop and sustain competence in this area that have not been covered?

Section 6: Seeking Best Practice
This final section seeks to draw out examples of where you feel outstanding practice exists within your National Association and the partners that you work with. In addition to a good practice, an outstanding practice is one that is engages disabled people above and beyond the achievements of other programmes within the region.

Question 6.1
If you had to select 2 examples of outstanding work in the engagement of disabled people, who would they be and what is it about their delivery that best exhibits this outstanding practice.

1. Why?
   Contact details:

2.

51
Why?
Contact details:

It is hoped that with further analysis these examples could be our examples of best practice. **Best practice is defined as** a method or technique that has been generally accepted as superior to any alternatives because it produces results that are superior to those achieved by other means. The results would be viewed as outstanding example of engagement.

Question 6.2
Over the next 5 years do you have any new programmes planned to increase the engagement of disabled people in your country? If so, could you provide us with some brief details

Question 6.3
Is there anything that would assist you further in following best practice examples? If so, please provide details

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey,
Once the results are in we will share with each of you the Europe-wide results.
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