



Introductory notes AGORA/ Carina Lindén

1 a) the most important result of the process to be achieved by 2020

It is quite difficult to point out one or two results as the most important because I would like to regard the process as a package deal and I do feel we need all the major ingredients in order to achieve the vision countries and social partners agreed to in Bruges.

But for that vision to become reality I would most certainly point to the importance of implementation. The political decisions have been taken at EU-level and we all agree on their importance. But for political decisions to become reality the actual work has to be carried out at national level.

The CPH process has been a very productive process indeed - but it does take time to implement changes within E and T. Work has only begun and we still have a long way to go. So the first important – overarching - result of the process I would like to highlight would be ***a clear focus on implementation in countries so that by 2020 we can experience the benefits of the tools we all agreed to.***

If I was to identify the most important result of the process it would be the learning outcomes approach - because this approach lays the very foundation for the different tools to work efficiently. If we take LO seriously it can help break borders between different educational subsystems and increase permeability as well as the recognition of learning outside the formal systems. So, the second important feature of the process I would like to highlight would be for MS to incorporate ***the Learning Outcomes Approach*** so that it forms a natural part of our systems by 2020.

Thirdly, we must never forget why we do this work. We do this work to provide opportunities for the citizens. It is therefore very important that we implement the tools taking the individual as the starting point, making our training systems accessible and the tools userfriendly.

If Europe's current workforce is to ***"update, upgrade and broaden"*** its knowledge, skills and competence, as highlighted in the Cedefop report, countries need to provide the possibilities. People will engage in different training opportunities in various settings – with very different

learning outcomes. Our formal qualification systems needs to be responsive to these individual pathways and allow people to go in and out of formal education and training in a flexible way. Validation should be a natural part of the system. So, the third result I would like to see by 2020 is ***accessible VET that caters to the needs of our citizens in a flexible way, recognizing previous learning experiences.***

The CPH process and the various tools involves very many different actors and it is a challenge to successfully work together in such broad partnerships. In order for the KPH process to be a success we need better co-ordination and co-operation at all levels. This is true at the policy level where the Commission and the Ministries from different policy areas or - even within policy areas - needs to work closer together. This is also true for the co-operation between VET and working life at all levels, because when it comes to implementation of VET the co-operation with social partners and working life is essential if we are to achieve training with high labour market relevance.

We also need to remember that the structures may be built at national, or European, level – but they are built for implementation at local and regional level. In order to reach the overarching goals of the KPH process the different tools and principles has to be known, understood and trusted where implemented. The forth result I would like to point to is a comprehensive and holistic approach by 2020 built on ***advanced co-ordination and co-operation at all levels.***

Finally, I would like to point out that the professional development of teachers and trainers is key. ***Highly competent VET teachers with up-to-date knowledge from working life*** is crucial for both the Q and attractiveness of VET, two of the vey important overarching goals of the CPH process.

1 b) the approach and support to the process from the view of your institution/organization

When it comes to the approach and support to the process I would ay that countries are very committed to the process. The fact that the KPH process has been so productive and that MS now are working on the implementation shows strong commitment.

As do the willingness to continue and to deepen the cooperation until 2020. The new framework agreed in Bruges is of course a continuation of the process but in many ways more ambitious. We all want to reach the goals – realizing at the same time we have a lot of work a head of us.

But there is really no alternative if we are to be competitive in a global world, there is fierce competition out there and we need to turn the vision into reality by 2020. I believe we all have realized that and are giving strong support to the process.

2) What is the value of the European dimension of the KPH process for MS and how can it be ensured that MS progress will be consistent?

The fact that the Bruges communiqué defines both the long term perspective as well as short term actions is very helpful. The long term perspective sets the course while the short term actions helps countries to concentrate efforts on specific actions agreed upon.

Even if reporting processes sometimes are perceived as burdensome by us - the countries - they will be an important instrument to measure the impact at national level and compare different solutions for implementation.

Another tool to stimulate implementation in a consistent way is the different arenas provided by the European dimension. We meet in various forums such as PLA, conferences, different working groups, advisory groups, implementation groups etc. In these different groups we learn from each other and we discuss our different approaches.

Yet another helpful tool in order to achieve consistency is the different overviews on national implementation and tools and reports addressing strategic issues provided by Cedefop and ETF. These are very useful to support implementation in countries.

Finally, I would like to stress that the implementation of these tools that are changing fundamental parts of the VET systems can not be expected to be consistent throughout the MS from the start. This must be perceived as a learning process that allows for continuous calibration towards common goals.