



TT - Plus

Minutes from the fifth partner meeting 4th – 5th September 2008, Evora, Portugal

In attendance

Eileen Luebcke	EL	Pontydysgu, Wales
Pekka Kämäräinen	PK	ITB, Germany
Nikitas Patiniotis	NP	Panteion, Greece
Eduardo Figueira	EF	Academus, Portugal
Magda Balica	MB	ISE, Romania
Eva Pomberger	EP	Navreme, Austria

In attendance via Flashmeeting, Friday 5th September

Graham Attwell	GA	Pontydysgu, Wales
Ineke Lam	IL	IVLOS, Netherlands

Tasks / Outcome

Who	What	When
All partners	Send time sheets	30 th October
	Send copies of receipt and bank accounts	30 th October
	Send financial report	30 th October
	Send interim report	30 th October
	Send dissemination plan	30 th October
EF	Distribute dissemination plan to all partners	1 st October
	Send Outcome of focus groups to Navreme and GA	As soon as possible, latest 1 st of October
MB	Send equal opportunity paper to Navreme and GA	As soon as possible, latest 1 st of October
IL	Send roadmap paper to Navreme and GA	As soon as possible. Latest 1 st of October
PK	Send policy paper to Navreme and GA	As soon as possible, latest 1 st of October
	Send EQF paper with final report	30 th of October
EL	Integrate Greek examples into consultation document	15 th of October
	Send Interim report to all partners	7 th of October
	Send revised text for booklet of Navreme publication	15 th of October



GA	Edit incoming documents for navreme publication	15 th of October
	Contact Thomas Garavan again	
	Send sustainability and valorisation report	15 th of October

AGENDA

- Top 1: Discussion of outcome of focus groups
- Top 2: Discussion of policy paper
- Top 3: Discussion of EQF
- Top 4: Discussion of first draft of roadmap
- Top 5: Discussion of Publication strategy

Top 6: Discussion of Final Report

Thursday 4 September 2008

EF and EL welcomed the participants.

Introduction to the agenda

EL introduced the agenda. Main aim of the Thursday was to discuss the outcome of the focus group and gather information with regard to the roadmap how to implement the framework.

TOP 1: Discussion of focus group outcome

EF reported on the outcome of the framework (FW) discussion in the focus groups for Portugal

- ❖ FW might bring a change in the standardized training of trainers
- ❖ FW is considered good for individual trainers
- ❖ FW might increase the mobility of trainers
- ❖ FW is flexible enough: possibilities to extend and alter it
- ❖ FW can become mandatory in public sector, but difficult to implement in SME

EF reported on questions to the focus groups, possible changes, problems

- ❖ trainer definition too limited, does not include HRD people
- ❖ maybe a set of skills / a family of competences is needed, but it is clear that a list of competences has to be avoided
- ❖ question on how to improve the quality of training with this FW

NP reported on the outcome of the focus groups

- ❖ FW was well perceived by focus group
- ❖ Importance of an awarding body for the implementation was stressed
 - Needs the EU policy on this
 - Should be an intergovernmental body with enough rights and enough money
- ❖ Strongest problem is the wording



- Training includes in English the word education, but in Greek training and education are different words
- Also huge problem to understand the word framework, it is not translatable in Greek

EF and MB supported the problems with the word framework. Philipp Grollmann made a couple of wording suggestion that will be discussed after the ECER conference among the project partners.

MB reported on the outcome of the focus groups. She set up two types of focus groups: for training experts and a focus group for the policy level.

- ❖ Experts instantly reflect on their own training level when they discussed the commitments
- ❖ Policy level: interested, but more interest in standardization of qualification
- ❖ Some concepts like e-learning are not well known in Romania
- ❖ There is a problem with the training culture, training is not valued, so the idea of FW is not regarded as important
- ❖ There is no trainer organization for multiplication

NP brought the attention towards the problem of having different trainer types in Europe

1. Full-time trainer
 - ❖ FW is an advantage for them
 - ❖ Gives freedom and is flexible enough
 - ❖ Tool for identity for trainers, will increase the recognition of trainers
2. part-time trainer
 - ❖ young people with university degree that got the offer to teach
 - ❖ no identity as a trainer no willingness to stay as trainer, no interest in continuous professional development (CPD) and in FW
3. part-time / 2nd job trainer
 - ❖ part of their job is training
 - ❖ interested in CPD and in framework
 - ❖ but: FW implementation is difficult because companies do it on their own

NP suggested that detailed analysis is needed in different sectors across Europe to promote a European training policy.

PK presented the results of interviews from Germany

- ❖ The German situation is firstly characterized by the decision on the re-introduction of the mandatory certificate of trainers (AEVO). Secondly, the government is preparing the establishment of an intermediate qualification of training specialists in enterprises to be certified by the chambers (IHK-Berufspädagoge) and to be recognised under the VET legislation (BBiG). Thirdly, there is an ongoing lobbying process to launch a nation-wide pilot project for a bridging scheme that would lead from the intermediate qualification to BA-qualification (given by one of the participating universities).
- ❖ All discussion of the TTplus FW (and of related follow-up initiatives) needs to be linked to these developments. Therefore, a working document was prepared to stimulate discussion on the above mentioned changes and to link the conclusions to the TTplus framework (the set of commitments, the role of accreditation).
- ❖ The TTplus FW was perceived as collection of well-thought statements of commitment (which correspond to the present-date practice interesting in some



big enterprises with special interest in training. However, the commitments alone do not push the approach forward. For effective follow-up there is a need to address specific subject areas & contexts of work-related learning and related curricula & learning arrangements.

EL presented the results of UK and Netherlands

- ❖ The UK perceived the framework as interesting
- ❖ The danger was seen that interests groups will get hold on the FW, so that FW becomes not acceptable for other groups
- ❖ The word of “trainer” ignores the big group of facilitator, that needs a framework as well
- ❖ In clear contrast to the Greek outcome, the UK focus group stated that the awarding body must be based on professional credibility instead of governmental power, government should be left out
- ❖ Again the issue of the quality of a trainer came up. The focus group emphasized that the FW has to make sure that not a bad trainer might be awarded because he could show evidences on his CPD
- ❖ For the Dutch interviews there exist mainly 2 issues
 - a. What is missing is a checklist of competences and a toolbox of instruments how to improve the quality of training to make sure that a trainer is a good trainer
 - b. This quality of a trainer should be certified

The TTplus members stated that: The quality of trainers is not the topic of this project. The TTplus project does not want to provide a competence framework and does not want to certify the quality of training /trainer. However the FW can be used to improve the quality of training by stimulating the self-reflection on CPD on every level of organisation that is involved with training (individual trainer, team level, organizational level, governmental level). It is one instrument among others that improve the quality of training.

TOP2: Discussion of policy analyses

PK presented his draft paper for the ECER conference (the main contribution to the work package ‘policy analyses’). The main points of the paper were outlined in the following way:

- ❖ Insights into the European policy background of the TTplus project (& parallel projects): Lisbon follow-up, priority ‘teachers and trainers’; loss of ‘trainers’ from the picture;
- ❖ Critique of traditional analyses of policies ‘as such’ and policy processes as ‘self-movers’: change of perspective to ‘grounded policy analyses’ (analyses of the *mutual relations* between training contexts and policy measures that try to influence training & trainers);
- ❖ Detailed examination of the German policy context (based on original materials) and nutshell pictures of policy contexts in other countries (based on secondary analyses);
- ❖ Effort to draw conclusions that highlight both differences and common issues between the participating countries and their policy processes.

Discussion: *The paper was widely discussed. On the whole the approach was found appropriate and compatible with the methodological approach for the case studies and with the developmental approach that was used in preparing the framework. However, several sections of the paper got criticism. Firstly, the justification of the grounded policy analyses’ was too abstract (the working concepts ‘terrain’, ‘arena’ and ‘regime’ were felt as diversions). The use of the working concepts when describing country-specific policy contexts led to over-*



conceptualisation that blurs the message instead of making it clear. The grouping of countries under different policy scenarios led to artificial clusters instead of outlining the relative vicinity and relative differences between several countries.

Follow-up: *The paper has been reworked after the meeting and the ECER conference. The justification of the 'grounded policy analyses' is based more closely on the observations of TTplus partners and on key questions raised in the expert meetings. The policy contexts are presented as 'stories that speak for themselves'. The policy contexts are presented as a continuum of instead of grouping them under categories. The European group picture is presented as a comparative table that draws attention to tensions & dynamic contradictions. In addition to this a list of common issues (and related tensions) has been prepared.*

TOP3: Discussion on the work package 'articulation with the EQF'

PK presented an outline for a discussion paper that serves as the main contribution to the work package 'articulation with the EQF'. The main points of the paper are the following:

- ❖ Analysis of the Lisbon follow-up: the role framework-shaping processes (Bologna process – EQF for HE; Copenhagen process – EQF for LLL) and the special priority area 'promoting the qualifications and competences of teachers and trainers';
- ❖ Characteristics of and progress with the Bologna process; Consequence: polarisation between the positions of teacher education (included in the European HE Area) and training of trainers (not included);
- ❖ Characteristics of and tensions with the Copenhagen process; Consequence: neutralisation of the European framework – pushing the contradictions to the NQFs; no coherent shape for upgrading the training of trainers;
- ❖ Combined effect of the to framework processes: Structural gaps; Conceptual tensions; no developmental movement for shaping trainers' professional development – justification of the TTplus approach to "European area for learning and professional development".
- ❖ Open or unsettled issues: from the perspective of framework processes and from the perspective of preparing TTplus follow-up.

Discussion: *There was little time to discuss the proposal. In general the approach was found appropriate and compatible with the other work packages of the project. Special attention should be given on contradictions related to 'competence-orientation' which is considered as a major unsettled issue. Also, the usability of EQF from the perspective of domain-competences and from the perspective of reference levels needs special attention.*

Follow-up: *After the meeting a 20 page discussion paper and a related compendium for follow-up workshops has been prepared. The discussion paper covers the above mentioned points. The compendium outlines six thematic workshops that deal with unsettled issues (firstly from the perspective of linking the frameworks to the development of trainers, secondly from the perspective of using the TTplus approach).*



Friday, 5th of September



TOP4: Discussion of the roadmap

MB raised the question whom the roadmap is addressing: The European commission, the policy level or organisations?. The partners agreed that the roadmap should be oriented towards the European commission. The roadmap will not be a step-by-step instruction on how to implement the FW, rather a paper indicating areas of further research, areas of further thinking and recommendations of next steps.

EF emphasized that the roadmap should be broad enough to become a "highway" instead of a roadmap, FW has to be adapted for different situations, thus, at the current state of the project, only broad recommendation in strategic sense can be made.

The naming of FW is considered by all partners as problematic because the translation of framework into national language often creates an image of a somewhat more strict and fixed structure than it is true for the English language. EF suggested the name "referential". Other language aspects of the FW are also relevant, thus one of the steps in the roadmap would be the professional translation of the framework from English in other language, and, if possible, with a retranslation into English again to double check the meaning.

The adaption of FW not only to national level but also to sector level is a crucial element. The TTplus members suggest that there should be further research oriented in sector based training to understand better the challenges, obstacles and possibilities of professionalization of trainers in certain sectors across countries.

Further thinking should also be done with regard to the infrastructure of FW. The importance of an awarding body for the implementation of the FW was stressed by NP. He brought the attention to the importance of the European commission. In response GA stated that for the UK the awarding body needs professional credibility related to professional training associations and should not be that much linked to governmental bodies. One part of the roadmap should contain those integrative concerns with regard to the Greek situation and suggestions that further thinking in this area is needed.

One of the strong aspects that came up within the focus group was the question with regard to the competences. GA stated that a competence approach comes close to a qualification framework and this is not what is intended within this project. PK suggested the idea of competence clusters that are overlapping.

The roadmap will contain suggestion for further development of the FW itself with regard to the question of competences and infrastructure.

The TTplus partner agreed that pilot testing will be the key element for the improvement of the FW. EF suggested that it should be done in each country but as a start it is possible to begin in certain countries. He suggested Portugal as one of those pilot project hosts. MB suggested to relate the piloting with ESF programmes in Romania. GA also suggested Leonardo da Vinci pilot projects for piloting the FW.

The partners agreed to find a combination of projects to ensure the transnational perspective.



GA will work in close cooperation with IL at a valorisation and sustainability report that will address the questions whom to integrate in the future development of FW, how to support FW and who might be interested.

Top 5: Publication and Dissemination

GA presented the Eurotrainer II project and the workshop projects. He emphasized the importance to involve TTplus partners to present the FW in those two projects.

An online conference is announced as part of the 2nd Eurotrainernetwork. EL and EF are participating with input on the issue of professional development of trainers, MB has interested in moderating one of the session.

The structure for the navreme publication is as follows

1. Introduction on why and what the project is about (GA)
2. Background on systems etc (PK)
3. Equal opportunity (MB)
4. Principles
5. Consultation (EL)
6. The focus groups (EF)
7. Road map (IL)

GA will do the editing in terms of English. Each partner should send his / her document to GA as soon as possible but not later than the 1st of October. Navreme will need the documents not later than the 15th of October, to do the final editing.

EL will extend the consultation document through the integration of more instances of change examples.

The schedule for the publication of the special issue of "Journal for Industrial Training" will be send around by GA. GA is in contact with Thomas Garavan, the editor of the journal, but needs answer from the editorial board.

Topic 6 Final report

The deadline for all partners with regard to the final report is the 30th of October.

All partners need to hand in:

- ❖ Time sheets
- ❖ Copies of receipt
- ❖ Copies of invoices of received money
- ❖ Dissemination plan
- ❖ Filled in final reports

EL will send around the needed documents.

Additional documents needed by single partners are listed above, in the beginning of the minutes.

Written by Eileen Lübcke, 10th of October 2008, Gothenburg