

National Sports Governance Observer

Standardised data gathering and approval processes



Arnout Geeraert

6 February 2018

Standardised data gathering process

All researchers should use the standardised Excel sheets for data gathering. They should adhere to the following standardised data gathering process.

Phase 1: Selecting and contacting

Make a selection of the federations to be reviewed.

Contact the federations and explain the process (outline, time frame, benefits for federations, confidentiality).

Establish a contact point, i.e. a federation representative who can assist with data gathering.

In case of refusal, explain that scoring will take place on the basis of publicly available data and give the opportunity to give feedback on the data gathered (phases 3 and 5).

Phase 2: Data gathering and first preliminary scoring

Conduct desktop research: analyse the federations' websites, statutes, internal regulations, and any other relevant available documents.

Apply the indicators and **conduct a preliminary scoring** to get a clear view of the completeness of the collected data.

Fill in the standardized scoring sheets: fill in the "evidence" field for every indicator. Briefly mention where data was found.

Provide comments in the appropriate field in case of uncertainty so that you (or an external party) can review the scores later.

Phase 3: Feedback

Send a questionnaire to the federations in which you ask to provide missing data.

If necessary, conduct an interview and ask for additional evidence (e.g. official documents, emails, newsletters, etc.).

Phase 4: Second preliminary scoring

Conduct a second preliminary scoring on the basis of the feedback received.

Be strict so that the burden of proof lies with the federations.

Fill in the standardized scoring sheets: fill in the “evidence” field for every indicator. Briefly mention where data was found. In case the data was obtained from the interview/ questionnaire, this should be indicated.

Provide comments in the appropriate field in case of uncertainty so that you (or an external party) can review the scores later.

Phase 5: Final feedback

Send the scores to federations and ask for their feedback and additional evidence in case of disagreement.

Conduct a second interview in case of any uncertainties.

Phase 6: Final scoring

Conduct the final scoring and inform the federations.

Standardised data approval process

In order for the standardised approval process to be conducted adequately, researchers should submit the following documents:

- The completed standardised scoring sheets.
- An Excel file wherein the federations' scores are displayed side-by-side and averages are calculated per indicator.
- A list of uncertain scores including an explanation of the researcher's uncertainties.
- The federations' individual scores.
- The contact letters that have been sent to the federations.
- The questionnaires / interview request that have been sent to the federations.

These document should be kept in a register.

The data approval process should ideally be completed before the country report is finalised. The process should be completed by Play the Game. It comprises the following four steps.

1. Review all contact letters and questionnaires / interview requests

Review all contact letters and questionnaires.

Verify whether all federations that are included in the research have been invited to participate in the research and that they had the opportunity to respond to questions.

2. Review all standardised scoring sheets

Review all completed standardised scoring sheets.

Verify whether the "evidence" fields are filled in for every indicator.

Randomly select at least two indicators per dimension. Consult the original data source and verify whether the indicator has been scored correctly. If it is not possible to consult the original data source, randomly select another indicator or contact the researcher and request relevant evidence.

Request information for all the indicators with empty evidence fields.

3. Request information on uncertain scores

Review the list of uncertain scores. Consult the detailed scoring criteria and make sure the issues are resolved in a standardised manner. Keep track of all decisions in order to make sure subsequent researchers apply the same criteria for assessment.

4. Check for systematic measurement errors

Verify whether cumulative criteria were correctly assessed. Randomly select three indicators from the following list: 1.2; 1.4; 1.6; 1.8; 2.3; 2.4; 2.6; 3.3; 3.4; 6.3; 22.1; 23.1; 35.3; 36.3; 38.4; 42.3. Verify if the indicators are scored correctly, taking into account that relevant criteria are automatically fulfilled if those of the related indicators are fulfilled. If one or more indicators have been scored incorrectly, contact the researchers and request a revision of the scores. Repeat this process until the indicators have been scored correctly.

Review all the indicators with “NA” scores. Assess (prima facie) whether the organisation indeed cannot reasonably be expected to implement the criteria. In case the federation scores “NA” on an indicator and “0” on the previous related indicator, request that researcher revises the score (see the Figure below).

Indicator	Category	Detailed evaluation criteria	Data source	Score
26.1 Do the organisation's statutes establish an independent financial or audit committee whose members are appointed by the general assembly?	Advanced	Do the organisation's statutes and/or internal regulations establish unambiguously that the tasks of one of the standing committees relate to overseeing the organisation's finances and/or internal audit? Do the organisation's statutes establish that the majority of the members of the financial or audit committee do not serve as board members? Do the organisation's statutes and/or internal regulations establish unambiguously that the members of the financial or audit committee are appointed by the general assembly? <i>Note: the members may be nominated (but not appointed) by another body. If one independent person (i.e., not a board member) with a financial background is appointed by the general assembly to supervise the organisation's financial policy and information, s/he only qualifies as 'audit committee' within the meaning of the indicator when the organisation has also appointed an external auditor (see Principle 29) and when this person does not fulfil the role of treasurer.</i>	Organisation's statutes	0
26.2 Do the organisation's statutes and/or internal regulations determine the tasks, operation, and composition of the committee?	Advanced	Do the organisation's statutes and/or internal regulations establish unambiguously that the tasks of one of the standing committees relate to overseeing the organisation's finances and/or internal audit? Do the organisation's statutes and/or internal regulations unambiguously determine the tasks, operation, and composition of the committee?	Organisation's statutes and internal regulations	0



Assess whether the criteria of indicator 26.1 have been applied correctly. Note in particular that an “external auditor” does not necessarily qualify as an “internal audit committee”.

Assess whether the criteria of indicator 6.6 have been applied correctly. Note in particular that financial reports must be published on the organisation’s website.

Review the Excel file wherein the federations’ scores are presented side-by-side. Perform a general review of odd scores (i.e. scores that stand out). For instance, when federations score generally low

on a certain dimension but very good on a specific indicator (or vice versa), verify if criteria have been applied correctly (contact the researcher if needed).