



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 14.7.2004  
SEC(2004) 971

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING PAPER**

**Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council  
for an integrated action programme in the field of lifelong learning**

**EXTENDED IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**integrating ex ante evaluation requirements**

{COM(2004)474 final}

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	4
1.1.	Purpose of the report.....	4
1.2.	Structure of the report.....	4
1.3.	Sources of evidence.....	4
1.4.	Current Community expenditures in the area.....	5
2.	Problem tackled by the proposal.....	7
2.1.	Problem expression.....	7
2.2.	Underlying motive forces.....	8
2.3.	Concrete target groups.....	10
2.4.	Other parties affected by the proposal.....	11
2.5.	Consequences of a "do nothing" scenario.....	11
2.6.	Consequences of a "no change" scenario.....	12
3.	Objectives that the proposal is expected to achieve.....	12
3.1.	Overall policy objectives.....	13
3.2.	Specific and operational objectives.....	13
3.3.	Indicators.....	14
3.4.	Related Community objectives/initiatives.....	15
4.	Main policy options and alternative delivery mechanisms.....	16
4.1.	Basic approach to reach the overall policy objective.....	16
4.2.	Other policy instruments.....	16
4.3.	Trade-offs.....	19
5.	Risks and assumptions.....	20
5.1.	Risks of the no-policy/no-change options.....	20
5.2.	Assumptions on which the proposal is based.....	21
5.3.	Risks involved in implementing the proposed programme.....	22
6.	Positive and negative impacts expected from the options considered.....	22
6.1.	Positive impacts.....	22
6.2.	Particular social groups on whom the impacts are likely to be felt.....	24

6.3.	Negative impacts.....	24
6.4.	Potential conflicts between impacts.....	25
6.5.	Impacts outside the EU .....	25
6.6.	Impacts over time.....	25
7.	Added value of Community involvement.....	26
7.1.	Subsidiarity and proportionality .....	26
7.2.	Complementarity with other Community interventions .....	26
7.3.	External coherence.....	27
7.4.	Synergy with other interventions.....	28
7.5.	Additional effects.....	28
8.	Stakeholder consultation and lessons learned.....	29
8.1.	Programme evaluations.....	29
8.2.	Public consultation.....	31
9.	Cost effectiveness .....	33
9.1.	Financial and human resource implications of the programme.....	33
9.1.1.	Total financial impact on Part B.....	33
9.1.2.	Impact on staff and administrative expenditure.....	34
9.2.	Cost justification .....	36
10.	Monitoring and evaluation.....	37
10.1.	System to collect monitoring data .....	37
10.2.	Evaluation of the programme .....	38

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1. Purpose of the report**

This report accompanies the legislative proposal for a new integrated programme in education and training, for the period 2007-2013, and assesses the likely impact it is to have on education and training systems and practice in Europe.

### **1.2. Structure of the report**

This report combines the requirements for an impact assessment<sup>1</sup> and for an *ex ante* evaluation<sup>2</sup>. It deals successively with the following questions:

- What problem is the proposal expected to tackle?
- What are the objectives that the proposal is expected to achieve?
- What are the main policy options and alternative delivery mechanisms?
- What are the risks and assumptions associated with the new programmes?
- What positive and negative impacts are expected from the options considered?
- What is the added value of the Community involvement?
- What are the lessons learned from the past and the from the public consultation?
- What is the cost-effectiveness of the proposed programme?
- What are the monitoring and evaluation provisions?
- Summary of the draft proposal and its justification.

### **1.3. Sources of evidence**

The main sources of evidence and information on which this report is based are as follows:

- The 30 national interim reports on the implementation of the current Socrates and those on the Leonardo da Vinci programmes. Though not required by the current Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci programmes Decisions, some of these reports were accompanied by letters from Member States, stating their views on a new generation of programmes.

---

<sup>1</sup> COM(2002)276 .

<sup>2</sup> As specified in the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation (Commission Regulation 2342/2002, article 21)

- The Commission's interim evaluation reports on the implementation of the current Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci programmes.
- The external evaluation report of the Leonardo da Vinci programme.
- The results to date of the various finalised or on-going external evaluations of Socrates actions.
- The analysis of a public consultation launched on the future programmes in the fields of education, vocational training and youth.

#### **1.4. Current Community expenditures in the area**

The major current Community expenditures in the area covered by the present proposal are the Socrates programme (2000-2006) and the Leonardo da Vinci programme (2000-2006); smaller legal bases include the e-learning programme, Europass, and the Community Programme to promote bodies active at European level and to support specific actions in the field of education and training.

##### **Socrates**

The Socrates Community action programme in the field of education was first introduced in 1995; it is now in its second phase (2000-2006) It seeks to consolidate a European co-operation area for education.

The programme supports the lifelong learning policies conducted by the Member States. Its objectives are to contribute to the development of quality education and to strengthen the European dimension in education. It emphasises two key ideas: the promotion of lifelong learning and the building of a Europe of knowledge. It aims to contribute to opening up access to knowledge, irrespective of age or place, in Europe. It takes account of all types of learning - formal and informal - and all levels, from nursery school to higher education and adult education.

The objectives of the programme are pursued by means of: support for the transnational mobility of people, support for the development of transnational cooperation networks facilitating the exchange of experience, promotion of language and ICT skills, support of transnational partnerships designed to develop innovation and quality in education and the development and updating of reference material and data.

##### **Leonardo da Vinci**

The Leonardo da Vinci Community vocational training action programme was first introduced in 1994; it is now in its second phase (2000-2006) It seeks to consolidate a European co-operation area for training.

The programme supports the lifelong learning policies conducted by the Member States. It supports innovative transnational initiatives for promoting the knowledge, aptitudes and skills necessary for successful integration into working life. Broadly, the programme affirms the need to develop quality, innovation and the European

dimension in vocational training systems and practices through transnational co-operation.

The objectives of the programme are pursued by means of a set of measures: support for transnational mobility of people undergoing vocational training, support for pilot projects designed to develop innovation and quality in vocational training, promotion of language competences, support for the development of transnational co-operation networks facilitating the exchange of experience and the development and updating of reference material and data.

## **eLearning**

Following the Maastricht Treaty, there has been increasing emphasis on European co-operation in distance education as a field of Community action as well as within Member States. The focus of action has gradually extended to the educational use of ICT at all levels (“e-learning”).

This was reflected by the Commission adoption of the e-Learning initiative and the eLearning Action Plan, in 2000 and 2001 respectively, leading to the Council Resolution on e-Learning of 13 July 2001<sup>3</sup> and in 2003 the Decision establishing an eLearning programme for the period 2004 to 2006<sup>4</sup>. This programme focuses on the use of e-learning for strengthening social cohesion and personal development, fostering intercultural dialogue, and fighting the digital divide; development of the use of e-learning as an enabling factor for the implementation of the lifelong learning paradigm in Europe; exploiting the potential of e-learning for enhancing the European dimension in education; facilitating a more structured co-operation in the field of e-learning between the diverse Community programmes and instruments and Member States actions; providing mechanisms for encouraging improvement of quality of products and services as well as for their effective dissemination and for exchange of good practice.

## **Europass**

In the last years a number of tools have been developed to improve the transparency of qualifications and competences, including in particular – at European level – the Diploma Supplement, the Europass Training, the common European format for curriculum vitae, the Certificate Supplement, the European Language Portfolio. Drawing on the experience gained in managing these instruments, in particular on the interim evaluation of the Europass Training initiative, and following a request made in the Copenhagen Declaration of 30 November 2002<sup>5</sup>, the Commission adopted a

---

<sup>3</sup> OJ C 204, 20.07.2001

<sup>4</sup> Decision No. 2318/2003/EC of the European Parliament and the Council, OJ L 345/9 of 31.12.2003.

<sup>5</sup> Declaration of the European Ministers of Vocational Education and Training, and the European Commission, convened in Copenhagen on 29 and 30 November 2002, on enhanced European co-operation in vocational education and training. Cf. [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/index_en.html). Cf. Council Resolution of 19 December 2002 on the promotion of enhanced European co-operation in vocational education and training, OJ C 013, 18/01/2003 p. 2.

proposal for a Decision<sup>6</sup> which brings together into a single framework – under the common name Europass – the above mentioned European tools and rationalises the related implementation structures and the relevant networks.

The Europass framework is intended to be permanent. The specific Decision will provide a legal base for the period 2005-06, after which support for the framework will be included in the integrated programme.

### **The Community Programme to support bodies and activities in education and training**

This programme<sup>7</sup> brings together a number of activities which, until 2004, were managed without specific legal bases. They include those supported on former budget line B3-1000, which included activities to support the “Objectives process” as well as a number of other “preparatory activities”; the Jean Monnet Action to support teaching and research in higher education around European Integration (budget lines 15.02.01.01 and 15.02.01.06), support for a number of institutions at European level (most notably the European University Institute in Florence, the college of Europe at Bruges and Natolin, the Academy of European Law at Trier and the European Institute for Public Administration in Maastricht); and support for associations active at European level in the fields of education and training.

## **2. PROBLEM TACKLED BY THE PROPOSAL**

Since 2000, European policy in the areas of education and vocational training has been increasingly focused on the principles and concept of lifelong learning. Whereas the environmental dimension of Community intervention in this area of activity is relatively limited, the economic and social dimensions are overwhelming.

### **2.1. Problem expression**

In demographic terms, it is a generally accepted fact that individual life-pathways are not linear any more. Under the pressure of socio-cultural or socioeconomic conditions, which apply from youth on, people of all ages increasingly have to move from one type of employment to another, from one region or country to another, from education and training to job and back to training. Scientific and technical progresses mean that citizens need constantly to update their skills and knowledge. Modern societies are therefore confronted with the need to offer adequate provisions to face the very diversified demand for education and training supply throughout life.

In economic terms, the basic objective for the European Union is to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world. The Union is confronted with a quantum shift resulting from globalisation and the challenges of a new knowledge-driven economy. These changes affect every aspect of people's lives and require a radical transformation of the European economy. The Union must shape

---

<sup>6</sup> COM(2003) 796 final.

<sup>7</sup> Decision No 791/2004/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 138/31 of 30.04.2004.

these changes in a manner consistent with its values and concepts of a society based on the principle of mutual solidarity and also with a view to future enlargement. High quality education and training systems are an essential and indispensable pre-requisite for a competitive European knowledge-based society. Globalisation and technological and demographic change mean that skills must be constantly updated if the Community is to remain competitive on a world-wide level, and if citizens are to avoid unemployment and ensuing social exclusion. The modernisation of the Community's education and training systems has consequently become a necessity.

In social terms, education and training are prerequisites to promote greater social cohesion and active citizenship and to fight against exclusion. Equal opportunities must be offered to all citizens in Europe, irrespective of any kind of differences between them. Every effort must be made to provide those who have left education without basic qualifications with alternative second chance opportunities of access to education and training suited to their needs.

Society continues to become more culturally diverse and more interlinked with other societies in Europe and around the world, as a result of globalisation and new communication technologies on the one hand, and the impact of the European single market on the other. This puts a premium on the development of intercultural understanding and tolerance, and on the inculcation and reinforcement of habits of active citizenship, in order that the Union is in a position to respond positively to this trend and to secure benefit from it. At the same time, there is an increasing need to deepen understanding among our citizens of the nature of European identity. These are challenges to which Member States are of course responding, but where there is an important role to be fulfilled at European level through the sort of co-operation activities promoted by the proposed new programme.

## **2.2. Underlying motive forces**

The underlying motive forces are many and diverse in nature but they provide a homogeneous set of objectives for the development of lifelong learning in Europe. Most of these objectives blend economic and social dimensions, which in itself is characteristic of the sectors of education and training.

The basic reference is the Treaty establishing the European community, two articles of which are devoted to education and training. Article 149 states that: "The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organisation of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity". Article 150 states that: "The Community shall implement a vocational training policy which shall support and supplement the action of the Member States for the content and organisation of vocational training". Both articles go on with a set of recommendations for action that are duly reflected in the objectives and actions in the present proposal for an integrated programme. These articles provide the basis of legitimacy to Community intervention, within the bounds of subsidiarity.

Several subsequent European Councils have also set binding objectives for the Member States to achieve. The European Council in Lisbon (March 2000) set a strategic goal for the European Union to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy on the world, while respecting national diversity. It stated that every citizen must be equipped with the skills needed to live and work in the new information society and that the fight against illiteracy must be reinforced; the effort to modernise social welfare and education systems must be pursued. The European social model must be modernised through investing in people and combating social exclusion.

Underpinning this political orientation is the principle of lifelong learning, which was highlighted by the European Council at Lisbon and Feira. Following the extensive consultation on the Commission Memorandum<sup>8</sup> a new paradigm of learning emerged placing the learner at the centre of the learning process and emphasising the importance of equal opportunities and the quality and relevance of learning opportunities. The definition as developed in the Commission Communication<sup>9</sup> and Council Resolution<sup>10</sup> includes learning from pre-school to post-retirement, and encompasses the whole lifewide spectrum of formal, non-formal and informal learning. It acknowledges active citizenship, personal fulfilment and social inclusion, as well as the employment-related aspects of employability and adaptability as mutually supporting objectives of lifelong learning.

The period since the Lisbon European Council in March 2000 has seen a number of substantial developments in education and training at EU level and marks the entrance of political co-operation in these areas into a new phase of development marked mainly by: the effort to integrate all initiatives into coherent education and training policies at European and national level; reforms in policies and structures converging towards the main EU goals; and a more balanced attention paid to intra-European and "external" aspects, i.e. the place of European education and training in the world. As requested by Lisbon, the Council (Education) submitted a report in Spring 2001 on the concrete objectives of Education and Training, which identified three main goals for 2010: increasing the quality of education and training provided in Europe; improving access to education and training at all stages of life; and opening up the education and training systems to the wider world, so as to enable them better to prepare people for future life. These three main goals were sub-divided into 13 more detailed objectives - ranging from improving teacher and trainer education to increasing the attractiveness of learning, and from making best use of resources to promoting co-operation and mobility - in the detailed work programme adopted on 12 February 2002 by the Council and the Commission. This work programme (now referred to as "Education and Training 2010") has been implemented jointly by the Commission and Member States. The Council and the Commission presented a joint interim report on progress to the Spring European Council 2004.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> SEC(2000) 1832.

<sup>9</sup> COM (2001) 678 final.

<sup>10</sup> OJ C 163, 09.07.2002, p.1.

<sup>11</sup> All the documents referred to in this paragraph can be found at :  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/2010/et\\_2010\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/2010/et_2010_en.html)

The work jointly undertaken, which has been new at EU level in these fields, has involved attempting to identify good policy practice in the various fields covered by the Objectives Report, and to use this to identify policy changes which may help Member States, and their constituent authorities responsible for education and training, improve the quality of service provided to learners. Alongside this has been the first systematic attempt to identify and collect indicators, which can measure progress towards the various agreed objectives. The Commission has identified 29 such indicators, and the Council in May 2003 agreed five European benchmarks to facilitate assessment of progress up to 2010.

In a parallel development, the Council in November 2002 adopted a resolution on increased co-operation on vocational training, which led to the adoption by education or training Ministers from 31 countries of the “Declaration of Copenhagen”, an agreement to develop co-operation in a number of areas of vocational education and training (VET) such as quality assurance, a system of credit transfer, common principles for the assessment of prior learning and experience in VET, or lifelong guidance. This declaration responded to a request from the Barcelona European Council<sup>12</sup> for action in the field of vocational training similar to that under the Bologna declaration in higher education.

The Bologna declaration<sup>13</sup> itself has also involved the Community more in recent years. Although the text itself is inter-governmental, the Commission has been a member of the Bologna Follow-up Group since the Prague meeting of Ministers responsible for Higher Education in May 2001, and its contribution has become more important since that time. The goals of the Bologna declaration (to which have been added new areas during the subsequent Ministerial meetings in Prague and in Berlin in September 2003) parallel in many ways the objectives of the Union’s own programmes in the field of higher education, so a closer association is to be expected, especially in the areas of quality assurance, the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), the promotion of mobility and the European dimension of higher education.

### **2.3. Concrete target groups**

From an economic point of view, the integrated programme is likely to affect positively all those involved in the productive process: employees and their representative organisations; employers and their representative organisations. It would also affect those striving to be included in the work force: young people aiming at entering the labour market and unemployed persons of all ages aspiring to re-enter it. The vocational training sector would also be directly affected, as would the local, regional and national public authorities in charge of employment and industrial development.

From a social point of view, and considering the philosophy of lifelong learning, the integrated programme, with its holistic approach, potentially addresses the entire European population. Equality between men and women is an overarching priority of Community policy, and education and training are the most relevant areas to raise

---

<sup>12</sup> Presidency conclusions, paragraph 44

<sup>13</sup> See [http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna\\_declaration.pdf](http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna_declaration.pdf)

awareness in the minds and take concrete action in the field towards achieving that goal.

More particularly, all learners in their specific learning environments (schools, universities, adult education, training centres etc.) and teachers, trainers and managers of education organisations are directly concerned. So are NGOs and other associations connected with informal learning. Explicit priorities in the programme single out disadvantaged groups as targeted priorities: socially excluded persons, persons with disabilities, young people excluded from the education and training systems.

#### **2.4. Other parties affected by the proposal**

The target groups being so extended, and the areas of social, cultural and economic activity so universally concerned with education and vocational training, it is vain to try to evoke other parties concerned within the European Union. However, the programme has a potential to involve partners outside the Union, as its predecessors successfully did in the past. Continuing the approach adopted for Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci, provision is made in the new programme proposal for EFTA/EEA countries and candidate countries to participate in the new programme on the basis of financial agreements concluded separately with the Community. This provision is also extended to Switzerland.

#### **2.5. Consequences of a "do nothing" scenario**

Without a programme, it would be impossible to reach the common political objectives evoked in point 2.2 above.

From an economic viewpoint individual Member States would be in a less favourable position to give a European dimension to their pursuit of the economic objectives decided upon in common. Although some bilateral or regionally multilateral programmes exist and are very efficient, none of them has the sufficiently broad basis required to reach the goals of a common European policy. Besides, by supporting concrete activities, the European programme may contribute to bridge the gap that exists in some countries between the authorities in charge of education and those in charge of vocational training, and between the public and private sectors.

From a social viewpoint, a number of problems would remain largely untackled. National initiatives to introduce a European dimension in education and training might differ widely in quantity and in content, not allowing the emergence of a European area of lifelong learning. And even though political agreement was reached on certain issues, the stumbling block would still be the absence of an implementing mechanism that a European programme can provide in support of political decisions. Moreover, disadvantaged categories of citizens that are targeted by the programme might not be equally taken care of in all countries, owing to differing political priorities or available resources.

Considering the importance of mobility, recognized by all stakeholders, it is evident that far fewer people would move within Europe and that, in many instances, the additional funding that is provided by national, regional or local authorities or by

private bodies would stop without the Community contribution. The loss would be great both in terms of European citizenship and in terms of workforce competence.

## **2.6. Consequences of a "no change" scenario**

Despite the efforts made in the design of the second phase to introduce more parallelism between Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci, and to provide for joint actions between them and the Youth programme, the programmes are still viewed by their users and stakeholders as inadequately linked, which militates against the sort of cross-cutting activity between education and training that is likely to become yet more important in the lifelong learning perspective. Evaluators of the current programmes identify this lack of synergy as a major source of reduced effectiveness and impact.

The negative economic consequences of failing to connect formal, informal and non-formal learning would be great. The action plan on skills and mobility and the employment strategy underline the importance of lifelong learning; keeping the programmes separate would have a clearly negative impact. This separation would, among other things, induce greater difficulty to achieve the recognition and transferability of qualifications, and holistic accreditation of prior learning and experience, with costly loss for the individual and for the economy in terms of identification, recognition and use of latent and manifest skills and competences.

In social terms, to keep separate programmes would send a message that would not correspond to what we say in the lifelong learning Communication. The Community would then not be in line with those countries that have started to implement lifelong learning approaches, and would provide no incentive to other countries to do the same thing. It might be felt to confirm the hiatus that still prevails in some countries between general education and vocational education and training, with the social prejudices that go together with it in many circles.

National reports have underlined that the separateness of the current programmes has resulted in lack of legibility and coherence and therefore lesser attraction for the general public. They therefore conclude that closer blending of education and training ought to be sought in the future.

## **3. OBJECTIVES THAT THE PROPOSAL IS EXPECTED TO ACHIEVE**

The objectives of the integrated programme represent a rationalisation of the objectives of the existing Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci programmes, supplemented with new ones that reflect the policy developments in education and training outside these programmes. In view of the criticisms of the evaluators on the formulation of the objectives in the previous generation of programmes, these have been revised to make a clearer distinction between objectives and the means of their achievement, and are presented in this report with a set of proposed indicators for measuring progress towards their achievement<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> See in Annex 1 a detailed table of hierarchised objectives and a list of their related indicators.

### **3.1. Overall policy objectives**

The overall policy objective of the integrated programme is to contribute, through lifelong learning, to the development of the Community as an advanced knowledge society, with sustainable economic development, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. It aims to foster interchange, cooperation and mobility between education and training systems within the Community so that they become a world quality reference.

### **3.2. Specific and operational objectives**

The integrated programme is to be made up of:

- Four sectoral programmes, each broadly corresponding to a life stage, namely Comenius for pre-school and school education, up to the level of the end of upper secondary education; Erasmus, for education and training at higher education level; Leonardo da Vinci for vocational education, training, including initial and continuing training and other than advanced vocational training at tertiary level, including all forms of adult education, and Grundtvig for adult education.
- A transversal programme addressing activities related with policy priorities cutting across age group categories, in the spirit of Lifelong Learning.
- The Jean Monnet programme focusing on support for teaching, research and reflection in European integration studies, and on support for European institutions and associations in the field of education and training.

Nine specific objectives are common to all six specific programmes. They are primarily derived from the concrete definitions given of lifelong learning in the Commission's documents. They relate to the contribution the programme is intended to make to quality, innovation and accessibility of education and training provisions; they set goals in terms of creativity, competitiveness, employability, personal fulfilment, social inclusion and European citizenship; they highlight priorities in the area of language learning and equal access for citizens of all ages and all conditions.

Other specific objectives have been identified for each of the six programmes, all aiming at contributing to the overall objectives of the integrated programme. Within these programmes, operational objectives have also been set, some of which being similar, although applied to different learning environments. These similarities underline the general consistency of the integrated programme as a whole.

In order to achieve the objectives of the integrated programme, and in particular the more concrete objectives of the specific programmes, eight types of action will be implemented: transnational mobility of people in Europe; bilateral and multilateral partnerships; multilateral projects and networks; specialised multilateral projects designed to improve national education and training systems; unilateral and national projects; observation and analysis of policies and systems in the field of lifelong learning and related activities; operating grants; other initiatives in line with the

objectives of the programme. These actions will apply, whenever relevant, to all six specific programmes.

The formulation of the objectives contains in itself an indication of the results that are expected; for some of them, quantified targets have been set, in order to ensure a significant, identifiable and measurable impact for the programme. These targets are as follows:

For Comenius:

- To involve at least one pupil in twenty in joint educational activities, for the period of the programme;

For Erasmus:

- To contribute to the achievement by 2011 of 3 million individual participants in student mobility under the present programme and its predecessors;

For Leonardo da Vinci:

- To increase placements in enterprises to 150,000 per year by the end of the programme.

For Grundtvig

- To support the mobility of 25,000 individuals involved in adult education per year, by 2013.

These targets represent a considerable stepping up of our ambitions, as compared with the previous programmes. This ambition relates as a logical consequence to the heightened emphasis laid by Ministers of Education and Employment on lifelong learning as a basic prerequisite for improved European economic competitiveness, and to the targets that they are in the process of fixing. The targets of the programme will be reached only if the appropriate funding for the programme is granted.

### **3.3. Indicators**

In order to measure the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the programme, a set of quantitative and qualitative indicators has been identified. These are presented in detail in *Annex 1*, in relation to each of the objectives. However, a proper assessment of the effectiveness and especially of the impact of the programme cannot be made unless the programme indicators are related to context indicators, in order to know what effects can be specifically ascribed to the programme within the broader political context. These will be provided by system related indicators that are being defined within the frame of the open method of coordination and in relation with the *Detailed Work-programme on the Follow-up of the Objectives of Education and Training Systems in Europe*. Twenty-nine of these have been identified and endorsed by the Standing group on indicators and benchmarks, a working group set up as part of the "objectives process", launched as a follow-up of the conclusions of the Lisbon Council. The indicators will revolve around the following eight themes, all

of which are present in the objectives of the integrated programme in education and training: improving the quality of teachers and trainers; developing skills for the knowledge society; increasing recruitment to scientific and technical studies; making best use of resources; creating an open learning environment; making learning more attractive; improving foreign language learning; increasing mobility and exchange. For information, the list of the 29 proposed indicators is given in *Annex 2*. The convergence between them and the programme indicators demonstrate unequivocally the congruence of the programme with major European political priorities in the areas of education and training.

### **3.4. Related Community objectives/initiatives**

Given the centrality of education and training to social, cultural and economic policies, and its importance in reinforcing active European citizenship, there are many connections between this programme proposal and other Community policies. Therefore, in the reflection leading to the present proposal, due account has been taken of other related Community programmes and/or objectives. In view of bringing together related Community objectives and policies, the current proposal contains an expanded Joint Actions provision, designed to strengthen collaboration.

Closest to the lifelong learning programme, the objectives of the Youth programme were taken into consideration, especially as its target groups are similar to some of those for whom the integrated programme is intended. The potential synergy with this programme will have to be exploited. As far as Culture and Media are concerned, the Commission proposes new programmes in these fields too, building on the experience of the existing programmes. A number of aspects of these programmes have clear links to the lifelong learning fields (eg the professional training activity in Media) and the Joint Actions will provide a way of making the connection between the programmes as necessary.

The ambition to create a European area of lifelong learning parallels and complements that of creating a European area of research: the complementarity between education and training and research is evident, but the operational objectives and the scales of intervention are different. In all those cases, the intention is to keep an on-going flow of information with the relevant Community structures to avoid duplication and draw the best profit from the existing complementarity.

The current proposal is also designed to be complementary to the support for Member States education and training activities allocated through the Structural Funds. One major difference between them is that this programme focuses primarily on transnational co-operation, so bringing a specifically European dimension to work in the field, whereas the impact of Structural Funds grants remains essentially national.

By the nature of its activities, the present programme is capable of contributing to the educational dimension of other DGs' policies, in so far as they are compatible with its objectives and modalities of intervention. With the farther reaching scope of the new integrated programme, this capacity will be expanded.

## **4. MAIN POLICY OPTIONS AND ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY MECHANISMS**

### **4.1. Basic approach to reach the overall policy objective**

In order to attain the overall policy objectives described in the previous sections of this document, the Commission proposes to create an integrated programme. The proposed new Community programme in lifelong learning is designed to build on and supersedes the second phases of the Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci programmes, which support European co-operation in the fields of education and vocational training respectively; the eLearning programme, on the integration of ICT into education and training systems; the Europass initiative, which provides a single framework for the transparency of qualifications and competences; and the new programme to support bodies and activities in education and training, including the Jean Monnet Action. The programme will also be the prime vehicle for taking forward the Commission's Language Action Plan from 2007 onwards<sup>15</sup>.

The legal basis for this proposal is Articles 149 (4) and 150 (4) of the Treaty establishing the European Community.

### **4.2. Other policy instruments**

No other policy instruments, besides an expenditure programme, can be considered in the areas of education and training, largely owing to the restrictions to Community intervention induced by the principle of subsidiarity. The only alternative therefore is no programme at all, with the many risks evoked in section 2.5 above. Consequently, this option has been eliminated.

However, other designs for the expenditure programme were considered. The first evident option was to keep the existing separate programmes, with a simple cosmetic amendment to introduce some of the recent developments in lifelong learning policy. The advantage of that would have been to keep the brand names associated with the same things as in the past; such names as Erasmus, Comenius, Grundtvig, Leonardo da Vinci or Jean Monnet have been known for quite some time and come to be associated with success. The consultation shows that this particular argument is important for users of the previous programmes; this opinion reflects the general approval that the objectives and activities met with the users and indeed stakeholders. It also reflects the fear to lose something that is both familiar and useful. But the consultation also reveals what could at first sight be considered as a contradiction, namely that there is a majority desire to see greater account taken of the connection between education and training. The contradiction is only apparent: users want a legible structure but they acknowledge that, in their experience, there is interdependence of the two areas. For this reason, and also for those listed in section 2.6 above, the no change scenario could not be retained.

Another option was initially considered. In view of the fact that the target groups of the present Youth programme were also concerned by the education and training programmes, and that the objectives of the programmes were very complementary, with even some overlap (eg on issues such as citizenship), serious consideration was

---

<sup>15</sup> COM(2003) 449 final

given to a single programme for education, training and youth. However, strong objection to this possibility came from the Youth sector, confirmed by the European consultation. It was feared that the specificities of informal learning and youth activities would be lost, and that many active or potential participants from the voluntary sector would be put off by the "formalisation" that might be entailed by an absorption within a wide integrated programme. The risk was considered as sufficiently material and the arguments sufficiently strong to justify a decision not to integrate youth into a single programme.

Once the idea of an integrated programme for education and training was retained, two options in terms of design were considered. One option was based on a horizontal structure, with four parts corresponding to four types of action: mobility, partnerships, large projects/networks and studies, analyses and other activities dealing with education and training systems and policies. This solution would have had the merit of fully blending the education and training dimensions in the offer of activities to the general public. However, the advantage derived from the existing high visibility and reputation of the former programmes might have been lost. Besides, the clear message sent by the majority of respondents to the public consultation did not encourage such a radical change.

The other option was therefore preferred. The chosen structure of the integrated programme is still different from its predecessors. It takes the form of a lifelong learning integrated programme composed of four sectoral programmes focusing on school education, higher education, vocational training and adult education; a transversal programme targeted on four cross-cutting areas: support for policy co-operation, language learning, new technologies, and dissemination and exploitation of results; and a programme to support teaching, research and reflection around European integration and key European institutions. It is proposed that the four sectoral programmes bear brand names that became associated with success in the previous programmes: Comenius, Erasmus, Grundtvig and Leonardo da Vinci. One sub-option was envisaged, namely to have three sectoral programmes, with only one devoted to adult education and vocational training together. This line of reflection was based on the fact that adult education and adult vocational training or retraining had something in common, in terms of target groups. However, the differences were felt to be important enough, especially as the employment dimension in adult education is only one among many distinguishing features, to justify separate Leonardo da Vinci and Grundtvig programmes. However, great care will need to be taken to prevent high quality projects from being rejected on the ground that they neither perfectly fit one nor the other programme. In respect of the programme to support for teaching, research and reflection in European integration studies, the prestigious Jean Monnet brand name will also be maintained.

This restructuring responds in particular to three factors:

- to the changes outlined above that are taking place across the EU whereby education and training systems are becoming increasingly integrated in a lifelong learning context, in order to respond to the new challenges of the knowledge society and the new demands of demographic change,

- to the increasingly important role fulfilled by education and training in creating a competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in Europe, notably in the follow-up to the 2000 Lisbon European Council, in the Bologna and Copenhagen processes, and in the range of accompanying policy development in education and training that has taken place at European level since Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci came into effect,
- to the need to reinforce the strengths and address the perceived discontinuities and lack of synergy resulting from the current more fragmented programme design, as revealed by interim evaluations of Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci, the public consultation on the options for the new generation of programmes, and lastly to contribute to the simplification and rationalisation of Community legislative instruments.

The proposed structure also contains provisions in two priority areas:

### **Foreign Language Learning**

Following the European Year of Languages in 2001, the Commission organised a public consultation on “Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity”, on the basis of which it presented its action plan on language learning. This action plan concentrates on three main areas: extending the benefits of life-long language learning to all citizens, improving language teaching, and creating a more language-friendly environment. While the majority of actions under the programmes which contribute to language learning are “mainstreamed”, that is, they form part of more general activities such as mobility and partnerships, the Commission believes that there is still a need for transversal activities, which may either concern language learning as a whole (for example, promotion of language learning) or which may exceed the specific areas of individual programmes (for example, the development of materials need not be specific to one target audience; or training courses may be open to teachers/trainers in more than one sector).

The Commission therefore considers it appropriate to make specific and separate provision in the decision to support such work. This will underpin both the policy work being done through the Languages Action Plan or appropriate aspects of the Objectives Work Programme, and also transversal activities, which are not covered by any of the specific programmes.

### **Information and Communication Technologies**

The Community has supported the development of pedagogy linked to information and communication technologies over many years and in a number of ways. As with language learning, many aspects will, under the Commission’s proposal, be “mainstreamed” into the specific programmes, or will automatically form part of the means of delivering them. For example, all school partnerships under Comenius use e-mail as a means of communication between classes involved in their joint project; thematic networks under Erasmus are built around the use of web technology; and some 30% of Leonardo projects in the first four years of Leonardo II concern developments involving ICT.

However, again as with languages, there is need for a transversal action enabling support for work that goes beyond the specific programmes. This might include supporting work on developing new learning environments, new types of material, new pedagogies – which need not be targeted at specific sectors of education and training even if, in practice, they would be applied sector by sector. Specific and identifiable provision has therefore been made in the draft decision.

In comparison to the present programmes, the Commission proposes that a greater proportion of activities should be managed at national level, through the network of national agencies, within a coordinated framework agreed at European level. There has in the past been some criticism of this, on the basis that it reduces the European dimension – and as noted above, this view was also expressed in the public consultation - and as there have also been significant weaknesses in terms of provision of management information by National Agencies. Nevertheless, the Commission does not consider that “national” and “European” are antonyms. As the Union has developed, more and more of its activities have been managed through Member States and through regions (most notably the common agricultural policy and the Structural Funds); and the result has generally been an improvement in delivery and no diminution in the understanding of citizens that these actions represent a contribution by “Europe” to improving their daily lives. The advantages which national agencies provide, of understanding of the national context (and, indeed, the national language), together with the more user-friendly environment they are able to create, provide adequate guarantees within the reinforced control framework that increased decentralisation is the best way forward.

### **4.3. Trade-offs**

The trade-offs associated with the proposed option are few. Initially, the risk is that the general public, being used to associating a type of content and objectives with the old brand names retained for the constitutive programmes, will fail to recognise the fundamental change in policy orientation in the new lifelong learning programme. It will be important not to convey the mistaken impression that the disappearance of other names connected with the current programmes (Socrates, Lingua and Minerva) mean the loss or downgrading of the fields they currently represent. This will call for a very active information campaign when the programme is launched, both centrally from the Commission and from the national management structures for the programme. One can be confident that this trade-off will be only short-lived. The proposed significant increase in scale of the new programme will also need careful targeted preparation through a prior information and publicity campaign, if potential users are to take best advantage of these new opportunities from the start of the programme. This preparation phase underlines the absolute necessity of adoption of this Decision by the European Parliament and Council before the end of 2005, as the March 2004 Brussels European Council conclusions state.

Another much more significant trade-off is the general complexity and heaviness of the administrative and financial management provisions imposed on often small scale, low-budget projects and activities. This was by far the weaker point in the previous programmes, one that has been unanimously denounced in the national reports and external evaluations. The present proposal attempts to take on board the principle of proportionality, and proposes a number of interpretations of the Financial Regulation

and to its Implementing Rules to achieve this, where the existing regulations permit. Further provisions, within the general financial legislation or within this programme Decision, will be necessary to achieve the required procedural simplifications. The Commission is undertaking a parallel process to identify the fields where such amendments should be made. In addition, the Commission will have to devise user-friendly tools to alleviate as much as possible the difficulties for users, in order to avoid the emergence of a category of "usual customers", well trained in the art of writing applications and producing reports for the Commission.

## **5. RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

### **5.1. Risks of the no-policy/no-change options**

This needs to be envisaged from two angles, according to whether the "no policy" option is considered, or whether the "no change" option is retained.

In the first case, the risks are great in economic as well as in social terms. The largest single market in the world will indeed never become the basis for the most competitive knowledge-based society if it remains composed of 25 incompatible education and training systems, where qualifications and skills are not recognised across borders and where methodological excellence in one country remains unknown in others. The necessary complement to the single market and the common currency is a workforce empowered to make use of professional and geographical mobility. What is needed is a coherent strategy, whereby Member States learn from each other. This does not imply that the Union needs to take responsibility for running education and training systems; on the contrary, full responsibility for the organisation, content and financing of education and training must remain within the Member States. In this, they will have the full support of the Structural Funds, particularly in less-developed regions, which are the main Community financial instruments in this field. In this context, the ESF will provide support for improving the quality and responsiveness of education and training systems, as well as for investing in human capital. Member States will also be able to take advantage of the next generation of Community Initiatives. However, action more directly supported by the EU can also complement activities throughout Member States in the field of education and training, and can achieve results only available through Community action and at Community level. Enabling the mobility not only of students, trainees, adult learners, teachers, trainers, and academics, but also of practices and ideas, is an important area where Member States' own actions will not produce the necessary results; and it is crucial to the development of the knowledge society, since it entails the direct transmission and experience of new approaches and skills and, equally importantly, promotes networks of institutions that co-operate at a European level. Such a dimension would be lost were Community policy at this level not to exist.

In the second case, namely the "no-change" option, the above mentioned risks would be greatly reduced; indeed, the current programmes provide effective possibilities of transnational co-operation and exchange of experience. However, the identified weaknesses of the watertight separation between the programmes create obstacles to the full realisation of the potential benefits to be got from the implementation of a lifelong learning policy at European level. In particular, the connection between

formal, non-formal and informal learning for recognition and transfer purposes would be harder to establish, with the economic and social negative consequences that the absence of an integrated programme would entail.

## **5.2. Assumptions on which the proposal is based**

The proposed expenditure programme is based on several assumptions.

- The first, and by far the most important, is that a significant level of simplification can be achieved, relative to the current level of administrative and financial complexity imposed on applicants and beneficiaries. As the evaluations of the existing programmes made clear, the 2002 Financial Regulation and its Implementing Rules set out a number of obligations which are inappropriately heavy for the recipients of the small grants which characterise this programme; and further definitions and specifications are required to adapt these to the circumstances of the programme. If this significant simplification cannot be achieved, the targets set out in the draft decision will be unattainable, and will need to be revised substantially downwards.
- The needs listed under section 2 of this document are real and common throughout Europe. Sufficient evidence is provided by the various political statements and decisions made by Member States, mentioned in the same section of this document.
- There also needs to be assumed that the programme will receive support from national authorities, that its objectives will be approved and shared in each Member State, and that the management structures at national level will be available and sufficient. The requirements for Member States listed in the proposed Decision will guarantee that these conditions will be met<sup>16</sup>.
- Beyond and above that, the assumption is that a coherent approach and a coherent strategy for lifelong learning, as well as the adoption of a process whereby Member States learn from each other will be further developed. Those ambitions can best be achieved at Community level and through Community action.
- The efficient implementation of the integrated programme will largely be determined by the quality of the collaboration, at national level, of the public authorities in charge of education and those in charge of vocational training. The principle of subsidiarity leaves very little scope for direct Community intervention on this particular issue, in case that collaboration was felt to be inadequate in Member States. This is a risk that has to be accepted.
- Another assumption is that, when relevant, local and regional authorities and actors will be fully associated in the programme activities. The support of social and economic partners, and whenever possible their active participation would also be essential. The latter will be guaranteed by the possibility for the Commission to consult representatives of the social partners, who may be invited to participate in

---

<sup>16</sup> See article 6

the work of the programme Committee as observers. Regional authorities and social partners are also eligible to participate in some of the programme activities.

### **5.3. Risks involved in implementing the proposed programme**

There are few direct risks involved in implementing the proposed programme. Considering the increased proportion of activity management that will be handled by National Agencies under the proposed programme, the concern exists among users that this might be attended with some loss in European visibility and dimension. This was underlined in the national reports on the current programmes, even though the demand for more decentralisation was unanimous. It will be necessary to ensure that the framework within which National Agencies operate is designed to reinforce the European character of the actions they handle. Another possible risk is connected with the unequal quality or means of these national agencies; that might have negative consequences in terms of management of the part of the programme administered by these bodies. The risk exists already with the present programmes and cannot entirely be eliminated, but a strengthening of the audit and monitoring activities on the part of the Commission can effectively reduce it.

## **6. POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE IMPACTS EXPECTED FROM THE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

### **6.1. Positive impacts**

The two major possible options (integrated programme and status quo) have similar positive impacts, in so far as their objectives would be very similar. The main positive impacts of the new programme, some of which are directly related to the attainment of the targets presented in section 3 of this report, are expected to be the following:

1. More extensive and better quality co-operation between education and training systems, institutions and actors in the Community. The target of involving at least one pupil in twenty in joint educational activities in European cooperation activities during the programme will strongly contribute to achieving this impact.
2. Development of a European dimension in education and training in the Community. Transnational comparison at system level is recognised as an effective means of promoting change, and the programme is intended to provide facilities to make that comparison, through a number of means, be they studies or exchanges of experience.
3. Improved quality of education and training systems and of learning provision, notably of teaching and training. In this respect, exchange and mobility provide a response to one of the key challenges facing education and training systems: how to motivate learning facilitators to review and upgrade their professional practice.
4. Increased volume and better quality of mobility of individual learners, teachers and trainers. The corollary of the single market is a workforce empowered to make use of professional and geographical mobility. A

European education and training programme is a powerful means to contribute to the satisfaction of that need. In the past already, evaluations have revealed that Erasmus students considered that their mobility experience had been the most significant new experience in their lives; mobile teachers made similar remarks. The present programme aims at stepping up the effort in favour of mobility, to spread the benefit to a greater number of European citizens. A spin off impact is that, because mobility entails direct transmission and experience of new approaches and skills, it promotes the creation of formal or informal networks of people and institutions that cooperate on a European level. Several quantitative targets will permit to assess the attainment of this impact: to involve in mobility at least one school teacher in ten and one in twenty of higher education teaching staff; to support the mobility of 25,000 individuals involved in adult education per year; to contribute to the achievement by 2011 of 3 million individual participants in Erasmus mobility.

5. Improvement of innovation, economic competitiveness and entrepreneurial spirit. Several activities aim at achieving this impact, mainly (but not exclusively) in the Leonardo da Vinci programme.
6. Better adaptation of citizens to social change, and of the workforce to industrial change. More flexibility being needed in the labour market (as both the Employment Guidelines and the Broad Economic Policy Guidelines recommend)<sup>17</sup>, both in terms of legislation and in terms of market demand, it is expected that mobility for trainees and exchange of experience for trainers at European level, are likely to contribute to that desirable flexibility. The target to increase placement in enterprises to 150,000 per year by the end of the programme will strongly contribute to the attainment of this impact.
7. Improvement of transparency, recognition and portability of qualifications throughout the Community.
8. Improvement of language skills among European citizens. In accordance with the Commission's action plan on language learning, benefits derived from the programme are to be the improvement of life-long language learning for a large number of citizens and of language teaching, and the creation of a more language-friendly environment.
9. Improvement of ICT skills and reduction of the digital divide. The impacts will mainly be on the development of new learning environments, new types of material, new pedagogies.
10. Enhanced equality between men and women and equal opportunities for disabled persons. The implementing rules will include provisions to encourage and support actions focusing on the gender issue and to increase material support in favour of disabled persons.

---

<sup>17</sup> cf Thessaloniki European Council, Presidency Conclusions para 45

11. Reduction of xenophobia and racism. Thanks to the many activities directly aiming at or indirectly achieving intercultural awareness and understanding, the programme is likely to have an impact on that socially vital problem.
12. Preparation of candidate countries for accession to the EU. The recognition of the impact of the precedent programmes towards that goal is an inducement to continue in that direction.
13. Enhanced knowledge and awareness among specialist academics and citizens generally of issues relating to European integration.

Although the other alternative (no change option) would permit to obtain most of these impacts, it would do so incompletely, by failing to connect the areas of education and vocational training and to include informal learning.

## **6.2. Particular social groups on whom the impacts are likely to be felt**

The above mentioned list of impacts applies to all categories of citizens, irrespective of their gender, social or professional status, physical or intellectual ability, race or geographical origin. However, considering some transversal stated priorities, the programme might more heavily impact on the more disadvantaged categories of people, Community support being used in order to restore some kind of balance where social imbalance is to be deplored. It is also attentive to check that the principle of gender equality is duly taken into consideration, not simply in terms of numbers of participants, but also in terms of project content and design. From the economic point of view, the vocational part of the programme aims at attracting an increased number of SMEs.

## **6.3. Negative impacts**

The negative impact of the no-change option would also be to formalise a kind of divide between the areas of education and of vocational training, which still lingers in many circles in Europe with the social and economic cost of such attitudes. Besides, in practical terms, it would not hinder the achievement of the objectives of the European lifelong learning policy.

Since the programme focuses on European added value in education and training, and is therefore additional to existing activity at Member State level, likely negative impacts are necessarily limited. The chief risk is of diversion of effort if the administrative procedures are disproportionately burdensome in relation to the size of the projects and to the level of funds involved. As a corollary of this risk, a large number of beneficiaries would be confirmed in a preconception that the Commission is a heavily bureaucratic administration, imposing unreasonable demands in terms of management and financial procedures. That was the unanimous criticism levelled at the previous programmes. The next negative impact, following logically, is that a number of potential actors, especially from the more disadvantaged target groups, might be put off from participating out of discouragement, not with the programme content and objectives, but with its modalities. In order to avoid that negative impact, the implementing provisions must take the greatest account of the principle of proportionality.

#### **6.4. Potential conflicts between impacts**

The social and economic impacts are so closely interwoven that no major potential conflict between them can be envisaged.

#### **6.5. Impacts outside the EU**

Although the new integrated programme is a Community initiative, its impacts are to be felt outside the limits of the European Union. Since the adoption of the first education and training programmes in the late 1980s, the question of how they should relate to third countries has been posed. Over the years, access has become more and more open to associate partners. First, some EEA/EFTA countries were able to participate, then, from the middle of the 1990's several former communist countries were associated, with a recognised very positive impact. In parallel, since 1989 the Tempus programme has provided support to universities, thus contributing to the process of development in the former Communist countries. It now covers three groups of countries: the former Soviet Union countries, the Western Balkans and the Mediterranean countries. It is proposed that the next generation of the Tempus programme should have a wider scope, including schools and the vocational training sector, thus creating a parallelism with the proposed EU integrated programme.

Under the new integrated programme, up to 1% of credits may be used to support the participation of partners for outside the participating countries, where the project benefit justifies this. The programme may also be opened to the EEA/EFTA countries, the candidate countries for accession to the European Union, and the Swiss Federation in accordance with the relevant provisions in the instruments governing relations between the European Community and these countries, and to the Western Balkans as and when these countries opt out of Tempus. Besides, the Commission may also cooperate with third countries and with the competent international organisations, in particular the Council of Europe, the OECD and the UNESCO. These possibilities considerably broaden the geographical scope of impact for the proposed programme.

The Jean Monnet Action has been open to universities around the world since 2001. Currently, the Jean Monnet Action is already active in 50 countries.

#### **6.6. Impacts over time**

In the areas of education and training, impacts are by definition to be judged in the long term, even though some programme impacts can be assessed over a reasonably short period of time. However, Member States have agreed on precise goals to be attained by the 2010 deadline. Progress is to be monitored and measured. The integrated programme being attuned to these European objectives, it is logical that at least some impacts relating with operational objectives must be assessed by the same deadline, that is half-way through its whole duration, bearing in mind that the farther reaching impacts cannot be judged before the end of the programme, and even beyond that.

## **7. ADDED VALUE OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

### **7.1. Subsidiarity and proportionality**

The current proposal has been designed to respect the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality set out in Article 5 of the EC Treaty and its accompanying Protocol. As far as subsidiarity is concerned, the new programme continues, as with the past generations of Community action, to focus on promoting and optimising co-operation between Member States in all the fields of lifelong learning. It does not attempt to intervene in the structure and content of education and training systems, but focuses on areas where European added value can be engendered. To this extent, the great majority of the activity supported by the programme can be viewed as additional to what would have taken place without it.

As far as proportionality is concerned, the new programme proposal has been designed to incorporate the maximum possible simplification in terms not only of the form of the action – the definitions of actions in the legislative text are kept as generic as possible – but also in terms of the administrative and financial requirements that will apply to their implementation. The Commission has sought to find the right balance between flexibility and ease of use on the one hand, and clarity of purpose and appropriate financial and procedural safeguards on the other.

In the spirit of the Protocol on subsidiarity and proportionality, which requires Community measures to leave as much scope for national decision as possible consistent with securing the aim of the measure, the Commission proposes that under the new programme a still greater volume of activity – indeed the bulk of the increases compared with the current generation – should be administered by the National Agencies in the Member States.

### **7.2. Complementarity with other Community interventions**

Education being the foundation of all human activity and vocational training being a corner stone of the dynamic development of economy, an integrated programme in these two areas is, by definition, complementary to practically all other Community interventions. It is the only programme based on a wide range of actions, in all fields and for all categories of people, translated into a large number of small or medium size projects and mobility activities directly involving citizens and institutions; thus a Community policy is relayed in the field, without significant mediation, making the European dimension "palpable" to the beneficiaries. An integrated programme of that sort is thus capable of complementing other Community policies that do not have the same kind of capacity to penetrate societies, owing to their different operating modalities. Therefore to provide a complete list of areas where this complementarity can be exercised is impossible; however, the following areas of convergence can be mentioned:

#### **Youth, Culture and Media**

There are clearly strong links between European co-operation in the field of youth, and the education and training activities covered by the present proposal. As already mentioned in section 4.3 of this report, the Commission considered at the design stage

whether the integrated programme should cover all three fields of activity. However, it was concluded that youth co-operation warranted a dedicated programme.

As far as Culture and Media are concerned, the Commission proposes new programmes in these fields also, building on the experience of the existing programmes. A number of aspects of these programmes have clear links to the lifelong learning field (eg the professional training activity in Media), and the Joint Actions will provide a way of making the connection between the programmes as necessary.

## **Research**

The current proposal is complementary to the actions under the research and development Framework Programme. The co-operation achieved in the last years between some scientific Erasmus Thematic Networks and Networks financed by the Framework Programme will in particular be further strengthened. There is a small potential overlap between Erasmus and the Framework Programme at doctoral level, but the specificities of these initiatives ensure that it remains theoretical.

## **Structural Funds**

The current proposal is designed to be complementary to the support for Member State education and training activities allocated through the structural funds. While the structural funds aim to support social cohesion and employment, mainly through the direct training and retraining of beneficiaries, the integrated programme aims to improve the quality and transparency of systems, and to support trans-national placements in enterprises, which could for example be combined with participation in training programmes supported by the European Social Fund (ESF). The Structural Funds are almost entirely national in their orientation (particularly since the Commission proposes no human resources Community Initiative post 2006), which will also increase the complementarity.

What is important is that the programme is to be flexible enough to react to and prefigure any new priority in Community policy where education and training can contribute to reach overall goals, in a diversity of sectors.

### **7.3. External coherence**

In a number of instances, the external coherence of the programme is evident, and the European added value is both concrete and visible, even though in some cases that visibility will have to be more highlighted than it was in the past. Most significant is the complementarity of the proposed intervention with national policies, in the true spirit of subsidiarity, as underlined in other parts of this document. The complementarity with the action of other international organisations acting in the field of education and training, such as UNESCO, the Council of Europe or OECD, is also worth mentioning, although none of these has the same intervention capacity as the proposed programme.

- OECD shares the same preoccupation with quality in education and training systems; however, its work focuses on policy analysis and empirical assessment of outcomes; the proposed integrated programme

would complement OECD's studies by providing possibilities of intervention in the field. Indicators and benchmarking for education and training are another area of convergence with some of the operational objectives of the transversal programme.

- UNESCO has similar objectives in the areas of basic education for all and equal opportunities. Considering its different geographical coverage, there is a degree of complementarity with the proposed Community intervention.
- The Council of Europe produces work on educational contents, with particular emphasis on languages, history teaching, citizenship and human rights. Where appropriate, such work is and will be taken into account in EU activities.

A tripartite co-operation exists between the Commission, UNESCO and the Council of Europe on tools to promote mutual recognition of higher education qualifications and study periods. It will be all the more relevant, considering the considerable importance of that issue in the future programme.

#### **7.4. Synergy with other interventions**

Synergy with the other types of intervention can be increased by stepping up the exchange of information and active collaboration around projects under other Community programmes, in order to improve and capitalise upon internal coherence, and between the Commission and other national and international authorities/organisations, to improve external coherence. The actions supported under this programme may be implemented as joint actions with other related Community programmes and actions, particularly in the fields of culture, the media, youth, research and development, employment and enterprise. Furthermore, the co-operation with the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP) and with the European Training Foundation will be maintained.

As far as national policies are concerned, the normal channel for this exchange of information is the Council (Education), with the already mentioned contribution the Commission can make in relation to the open method of coordination. In particular, in implementing actions under this programme, the Commission and Member States will have regard to the priorities set out under the employment guidelines adopted by the Council, as part of a coordinated employment strategy.

#### **7.5. Additional effects**

The additional effects that it will be possible to attribute to the programme will be hard to measure, in so far as the overall objective aims at contributing to the Lisbon objectives, and in so far as the Community's intervention takes place within the bounds of subsidiarity. However, some elements that were not present in the previous programmes offer a better possibility to assess the impact that can specifically be ascribed to this intervention. Some of the indicators that have been chosen can be related to the context indicators agreed on by the Member States; the existence of

these reference instruments can help evaluators better to identify the marginal effects that can be attributed to the programme.

The evaluations of the current programmes and of their predecessors have consistently emphasised one additional effect that a large majority of beneficiaries have recognised: through their participation, they have experienced Europe at first hand, by getting together with other citizens, in other contexts, thus gaining a better understanding of each other and greater tolerance for differences. This impact is one of the major effects that will be maintained and quantitatively extended with the present proposal.

In any case, these effects will depend on the quality and quantitative extent of the implemented activities. Quality needs will be taken care of by the Commission and the management structures that will monitor the implementation of the programme. The quantitative element will be largely dependant on the budget devoted to the European intervention in these key areas. In such a wide intervention sector (education and training systems) the additional effects are bound to be relative, but with a sufficient number of funded activities and, even more potently, with a well thought-out targeting of projects, the programme may play a crucial role as a "release mechanism" for action or as a "research and testing laboratory" for innovation. Thus, the European added value of the Community involvement can be high and recognised.

## **8. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION AND LESSONS LEARNED**

In designing this programme, the Commission took into account conclusions and proposals resulting from several evaluations of the current programmes in education, vocational training and youth and from a public European consultation on their continuation.

### **8.1. Programme evaluations**

The Commission is publishing simultaneously with this draft programme proposal two interim evaluation reports on the second phases of the Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci programmes. These reports synthesise the outcomes available to date of a comprehensive evaluation strategy consisting of a sequence of external evaluations, which focus on particular aspects or sub-actions of the Socrates programme and on the whole of the Leonardo da Vinci programme, of a set of reports on the implementation of the current programmes prepared by the national authorities of all participating countries, and of surveys of those within the Commission and the Technical Assistance Office responsible for the administration of both programmes.

The key findings of the interim reports are as follows:

- Coverage and focus of the programme actions generally regarded as valuable and appropriate. In contrast to the first phase of the programmes, there are no actions in the second phase that are felt to be of very limited worth. Indeed, the response of users to the existence and nature of European co-operation support in the field is almost universally positive.

- Administrative and financial procedures improved since the first phase, but still perceived as disproportionately burdensome and slow. The greater degree of decentralisation of the second phase of the programmes has been a success in overall terms. However, both in the centralised and decentralised actions, the level of financial and administrative detail required of participants in relation to relatively low levels of grant, the near-constant change of these requirements imposed by the Commission, and the complexity and slowness of the contractual and financial procedures, all constitute a barrier to participation in our programmes.
- Need for more synergy and coherence between actions and programmes. Despite the efforts made in the design of the second phase to introduce more parallelism between Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci, and to provide for joint actions between them and the Youth programme, the programmes are still viewed by their users as inadequately linked, which militates against the sort of cross-cutting activity between education and training that is likely to become yet more important in the lifelong learning perspective. The current structure is frequently seen as an obstacle to providing the right level of support for policy developments in the fields of education and training.
- The good results under the programmes are not well disseminated. Disseminating the outcomes of actions supported under the programmes, whether these be products or co-operation processes, and spreading good practice is a hard task made more difficult by the need to overcome national cultural and structural barriers. Again, progress has been made in this area compared with the first phase, with the establishment of a team within the administration of Leonardo da Vinci dedicated to dissemination and utilisation of results, and with the inception of specialised dissemination projects within Socrates. But the evaluation clearly demonstrates that these efforts do not go far enough and that there remains substantial potential resulting from the actions supported under the programmes that is not widely known or acted on.
- Flaws in legislative design of the programmes. The evaluators found a number of flaws in the Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci Decisions. The most important of these was the excessive detail included in the annexes concerning the implementation of the programme actions. These reflected the best attempt of the legislator in 1998/99 to provide in detail for projected needs and requirements up to 2007. However experience has showed the impossibility of predicting accurately in such detail, with the result that the legislative requirements have increasingly stood in the way of adaptations to the programmes to cater for developments in the field of education and training. In one case the requirements were found to be so misconceived as to risk eliminating thousands of participants from Socrates, and necessitated an amendment to the Decision adopted by the Parliament and the Council to remove the problem.

## 8.2. Public consultation

The public consultation process was launched in early November 2002, and closed at the end of February 2003. A total of 641 exploitable responses were received, online or in paper form. A great diversity of types of respondents took part in the consultation, representing the education, vocational training and youth sectors. The main categories are as follows:

- Public authorities, including ministries as well as regional or local authorities;
- Education and training institutions, including all levels and all types of learning providers; some research institutes also participated;
- Social partners;
- Enterprises and the economic sector (eg Chambers of Commerce)
- Associations (national or European), NGOs;
- Individual European citizens. These are almost in totality people who are engaged, or have a direct interest in European co-operation activities in the fields of education, training and youth. We can assume that they wished to singularise themselves and express a view that might not reflect that of the institution to which they belonged.
- Other types of organisations (among which European agencies, such as the Turin Foundation or National Agencies)

The results of this consultation are analysed in an external study.<sup>18</sup> The main messages are:

- Great enthusiasm for the programmes. Although there may be difficulties with their operation, the vast majority of respondents underline their commitment to the programmes and the trans-national work they enable.
- A belief that the programmes should contribute both to the development of European citizenship, and to the teaching of languages. Many respondents believed that the issues of citizenship, of inter-culturality, of the European dimension represented a need which the programmes were well placed to respond to; several respondents believed that strengthening language learning and the regional dimension was an important need at European level.
- A very strong feeling that the programmes are bureaucratic, inflexible, and over-complicated, particularly in regard to the very small amount of most grants. Many respondents regarded this as the worst aspect of the programmes. There is a clear message about increased flexibility, about

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/newprogconsult/report.pdf>

proportionality in the relationship between the size of grants and the application and reporting procedures involved, and about the need for a sense of trust between those awarding the grants and those entrusted with carrying out the work.

- A view that decentralised procedures (ie. those handled by National Agencies) were simpler and more user-friendly than those handled directly by the Commission. A significant number of respondents expressed this view. A smaller majority considered that decentralised administration reduced the European dimension of the activity, and was also less equitable in its effects.
- Keep the existing sectoral programmes and actions, but also relate education and training much more closely. This apparent contradiction illustrates the tension between a desire to keep familiar identified programme definitions and the realisation that aims of education and training are not to be dissociated. It is to be noted that this contradiction did not come from different sets of people or organisations, each reflecting one coherent opinion, but were inherent to many individual responses.
- Keep the youth programme entirely separate. This was a unanimous wish, people involved in the informal sector seeing no advantage in losing their "identity", as they thought, by being included within an integrated programme, where formal structures might discourage the enthusiasm of a lot of actors within the voluntary sector.

Although the public consultation process enabled the Commission to have a more precise view of public reaction to these (and other) issues, they are for the most part not new. The Commission has been aware, for example, of the complexities of the application and financial administration of the programmes, and of the fact that these have constituted barriers to access for a number of potential partners.

The Commission has sought to respond to the various messages which come through from the public consultation and the evaluations in the drafting of its current proposal. In particular, the integrated programme reconciles the desire of continuity with the previous programmes with the necessity to be innovative to face the challenges of the lifelong learning policy; it will also seek to simplify the application and reporting systems involved, and has included provisions to that effect within the draft decision.

## 9. COST EFFECTIVENESS

### 9.1. Financial and human resource implications of the programme

#### 9.1.1. Total financial impact on Part B

Operational credits (commitment appropriations)

€ million (cash prices)

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Comenius	142.357	159.506	182.706	221.048	269.569	308.225	328.633	1,612.044
Erasmus	468.093	668.976	744.683	850.031	935.474	1,043.472	1,088.098	5,798.826
Leonardo	336.306	401.597	463.714	523.675	587.259	670.775	766.951	3,750.275
Grundtvig	48.285	50.658	67.459	83.449	98.557	114.237	130.504	593.149
Transversal	101.644	115.938	123.187	124.889	122.335	120.611	122.135	830.739
Jean Monnet	34.116	35.608	37.972	38.732	40.652	41.465	42.295	270.840
Operational	41.387	53.580	61.829	69.259	76.962	84.359	92.022	479.399
Total	1,203.600	1,518.840	1,718.080	1,948.400	2,168.870	2,421.970	2,610.240	13,590.000

Technical and administrative assistance, support expenditure and IT expenditure

€ million (cash prices)

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Commitments	31.413	32.978	36.530	37.317	38.062	38.826	39.603	254.729

In carrying out the programme the Commission will have recourse to an executive agency, to which it will delegate the administration of certain “Commission procedure” actions.

In designing the programme proposal, the Commission has sought to transfer as much of the activity as possible to the national level. The advantages which National Agencies provide, of understanding of the national context and priority needs, together with the more user-friendly environment they are able to create, provide adequate guarantees within the reinforced control framework that increased decentralisation is the best way forward. Moreover, National Agencies are often able to monitor activities more effectively than a central institution at European level, because of their proximity to those involved in them, and because of their superior local knowledge.

The Commission considers that it is appropriate for National Agencies to administer actions where one or more of the following conditions apply:

- It can reasonably be assumed that a rational method of distributing budgetary resources between Member States can be identified that will match the rate of occurrence of the activity across Member States.
- The actions themselves are small-scale or addressed to individuals, so that the full panoply of application and selection at European level is not warranted.
- The actions address needs specific to individual Member States, and should therefore respond to priorities set within that Member State if they are to have an appropriate impact on national policy and practice.

The table below shows how the expenditure of the integrated programme is divided between the Commission (either acting directly or through the Executive Agency) and the National Agencies.

€ million (cash prices)

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Commission	254.971	299.428	328.662	350.675	368.765	383.935	399.660	2,386.096
National Agencies	917.216	1,186.434	1,352.888	1,560.408	1,762.043	1,999.209	2,170.977	10,949.175
Total	1,172.187	1,485.862	1,681.550	1,911.083	2,130.808	2,383.144	2,570.637	13,335.271

### 9.1.2. *Impact on staff and administrative expenditure*

### Impact on human resources

Types of post		Staff to be assigned to management of the action using existing and/or additional resources		Total	Description of tasks deriving from the action
		Number of permanent posts 2007 (2013)	Number of temporary posts 2007(2013)		
Officials or temporary staff	A	85.2 (97.6)	0	85.2 (97.6)	<i>Programme implementation</i>
	B	35.7 (40.0)	0	35.7 (40.0)	
	C	62.8 (70.4)	0	62.8 (70.4)	
Other human resources DNE/AUX			AUX A 2.2 (2.6) AUX B 17.6(20.8) AUX C 9.9 (11.7) DNE 17.6(20.8)	2.2 (2.6) 17.6 (20.8) 9.9 (11.7) 17.6 (20.8)	<i>Programme implementation</i>
Total		183.7 (208.0)	47.3 (55.9)	231.0 (263.9)	

### Overall financial impact of human resources – 2004 prices

Type of human resources	Amount (€ million) 2007(2013)	Method of calculation
Officials	19.840 (22.464)	€ 108,000 * 183.7 (208.0) officials
Temporary staff		N/A
Other human resources (specify budget line)	0.238 (0.281) 1.901 (2.246) 1.069 (1.264) 0.792 (0.936)	A € 108,000 * 2.2 (2.6) staff B € 108,000 * 17.6 (20.8)staff C € 108,000 * 9.9 (11.7) staff DNE € 45,000 * 17.6 (20.8) staff
Total	23.836 (27.191)	

The amounts are total expenditure for twelve months.

Other administrative expenditure deriving from the action – 2004 prices

Budget line (number and heading)	Amount € million 2007(2013)	Method of calculation
<b>Overall allocation (Title A7)</b>		
A0701 – Missions	1.000 (1.000)	1,230 missions of up to 2 days at €650 + 200 missions of 1 week at €1,000
A07030 – Meetings	1.000 (2.000)	€1,160 per participant (€860 travel + €150 per diem * 2 days) = 860 participants
A07031 – Compulsory committees <sup>1</sup>	1.000 (1.000)	€860 per participant = 1,160 participants
A07032 – Non-compulsory committees	0	
A07040 – Conferences	0.500 (0.500)	
A0705 – Studies and consultations	0	
Other expenditure (specify)	0	
<b>Information systems (A-5001/A-4300)</b>		
<b>Other expenditure - Part A (specify)</b>		
Total	3.500 (4.500)	

The amounts are total expenditure for twelve months.

## 9.2. Cost justification

As no other means than an integrated programme based on direct support of field activities could be envisaged to reach the set goals, as explained above, the same or better results could not be achieved at the same costs using other means.

The expected results could not be expected to be achieved at lower cost, either, for several reasons:

- The level of intervention could not be lowered without running the risk of reducing the programme's impact to such a low level that the European added value would be entirely lost. The targeted ambitions are measured so as to make it possible to influence educational and training systems in a credible way and so as to meet the citizens' expectations. The past experience has shown that retaining the rhetoric of education and training programmes announcing targets without providing adequate resources to reach them proved to be a weakness and resulted in a failure to achieve the announced quantified impact. The present proposal has carefully estimated the cost of reaching its objectives.

- Considering the central importance of mobility activities to facilitate the development of lasting links between people and of an improved sense of European citizenship among young people and among those who are their teachers or trainers, the level of the grants needs to be raised to be more attractive to more people than it is at present, and to help ensure access to European experience to socially disadvantaged students and trainees. In addition to individual mobility for learning or training purposes, projects also involve the mobility of key participants of projects and networks. That implies a higher cost in the budgets of the projects, which is well justified by the European added value that is to be derived from the exchange of practices and experience that is gained in the process.
- The potential for participating organisations to raise the level of co-financing is limited, considering that, for the most part, they are schools or institutions with limited or no own resources.
- The level of human resources required for the management of the programme is necessarily relatively high, since the Community intervention primarily consists of a large number of small or medium size projects and of individual mobility, which imply a substantial administrative load in relation to the amount of funding involved. However, the Integrated Programme represents a significant increase in efficiency compared with the existing generation. Compared with a budget increase of some three times, the level of Commission human resources is projected to rise by only some 30 per cent.
- The average individual cost for each project is proportionately low, in view of the expected results and impact; the cost efficiency of the programme, considered as good by all the evaluations of predecessor programmes had, will be maintained and enhanced.

## **10. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

### **10.1. System to collect monitoring data**

The Commission will regularly monitor the programme. The development of a monitoring and evaluation culture among all those engaged in its implementation will be introduced or reinforced, involving both the management level (Commission and National Agencies) and the project level. Actors will be requested to assess their progress during the whole lifetime of the projects and their reporting will be mainly centred on providing the quantitative and qualitative data useful for the Commission's own monitoring of the programme.

In the past, data collection for evaluation purposes had sometimes been a problem. The Commission is at present finalising an electronic management tool (SYMMETRY) for the totality of the present programmes of DG EAC, intended to collect, store and process all the relevant data in a thorough and timely fashion. This will be a very efficient tool for the monitoring of the programme and for subsequent evaluations. Being already intended to cover the separate programmes in education

and training, the same tool could be used for the proposed programme, with the required adaptations.

Some implementing arrangements for the integrated programme will also be used as reference for monitoring purposes, namely the annual work plan and the annual budget sheets.

Regular monitoring and audit visits will be made to National Agencies.

## **10.2. Evaluation of the programme**

The proposal also contains provisions for the evaluation of the programme. Member States, on the one hand, the Commission on the other will provide a series of evaluation reports, spread out over the whole duration of the programme.

Member States will submit an interim report on the implementation of the programme by 30 June 2010 and a report on its impact by 30 June 2015.

The Commission commits itself to proceed to the following evaluation exercises:

- A series of independent external evaluations of various aspects of the integrated programme; a workplan will be proposed for agreement to the integrated programme Committee.
- An interim evaluation report on the qualitative and quantitative implementation of the programme and on the results so far achieved by 31 March 2011.
- A communication on the continuation of the programme by 31 December 2011.
- An *ex post* evaluation report by 31 March 2016.
- On the accession of new Member States, a report on the financial consequences of these accessions, followed, if appropriate by financial proposals to deal with the financial consequences of these accessions.

The effort under the current programmes to coordinate and improve the quality of evaluation activities and products will be continued, in line with Commission's policy in this matter.

## Annex 1

### Examples of Possible Indicators for LLL programme (2007-2013)

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<p>❖ <b>FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME</b></p> <p><b>Overall objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To contribute through lifelong learning to the development of the Community as an advanced knowledge society, with sustainable economic development, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion, while ensuring good protection of the environment for future generations.</p>	<p>- <i>Distribution of participation in the specific programmes, by Member State.</i></p> <p>- <i>Degree of coherence between programme priorities and Member State system developments.</i></p>
<p>➤ To foster interchange, cooperation and mobility between education and training systems within the Community so that they become a world quality reference.</p>	<p><i>Data on number, type and sustainability of changes to education and training systems introduced by lifelong learning providers as a result of programme activities.</i></p>
<p>❖ <b>SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES</b></p> <p><b>Common specific objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To contribute to the development of quality lifelong learning and promote innovation and a European dimension in systems and practices in the field.</p>	<p>- <i>Data on number, type and sustainability of changes made by Member States to their lifelong learning systems in line with programme priorities.</i></p>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To help improve the quality, attractiveness and accessibility of the opportunities for lifelong learning available within Member States.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Data on measures taken by Member States to promote opportunities for lifelong learning in line with programme priorities.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To reinforce the contribution of lifelong learning to personal fulfilment, social cohesion, active citizenship, gender equality and the participation of people with special needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Rate of participation in the programme, by age group and gender.</i></li> <li>- <i>Proportion of programme participants who think that their participation in the programme has had a positive impact on their personal development.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To help promote creativity, competitiveness, employability and the growth of an entrepreneurial spirit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Proportion of participants whose careers have benefited from their participation in the programme.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To contribute to increased participation in lifelong learning by people of all ages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Number of learners/trainees engaged in learning activities and taking part in the programme, by age groups, gender and types of learning pursuits.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To promote language learning and linguistic diversity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Number of language-related projects launched; proportion of such projects with respect to total number of projects launched.</i></li> <li>- <i>Number of individuals involved in linguistic preparation courses for mobility actions, by language.</i></li> <li>- <i>Number of participants who have improved their language skills as a result of their participation in the programme.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To reinforce the role of lifelong learning in creating a sense of European citizenship and encourage tolerance and respect for other people and cultures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Data on measures, resulting from programme activities, undertaken by lifelong learning providers with a view to creating a sense of European citizenship and encouraging tolerance and respect for other cultures.</i></li> </ul>

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Examples of Possible Indicators</b>
<p>➤ To promote co-operation in quality assurance in all sectors of education and training in Europe.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of projects/partnerships in quality assurance, by sector of education and training, by subject area and by country.</i></p> <p>- <i>Data on the successful introduction of quality assurance mechanisms in participating organisations/institutions and by country.</i></p>
<p>➤ To exploit results, innovative products and processes and to exchange good practice in the fields covered by the Integrated Programme.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of dissemination activities undertaken.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number/proportion of products transferred.</i></p>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<p>❖ <b>Comenius</b></p> <p><b>Specific objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To develop understanding among young people and educational staff of the diversity of the diversity of European cultures and its value.</p>	<p>- <i>Proportion of educational staff and pupils who are beneficiaries of the programme whose understanding of the diversity of European cultures has improved.</i></p>
<p>➤ To help young people acquire the basic life-skills and competences necessary for their personal development, for future employment and for active European citizenship.</p>	<p>- <i>Number/percentage of projects concerned with the acquisition of basic skills..</i></p>
<p><b>Operational objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To increase the volume and improve the quality of exchanges involving pupils and educational staff in different Member States.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of projects/networks.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number of sustainable projects/networks.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number and percentage of pupils/staff involved in transnational activities.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number and percentage of mobile pupils/staff.</i></p>
<p>➤ To increase the volume and improve the quality of partnerships between schools in different Member States, so as to involve at least one pupil in twenty in joint educational activities during the period of the programme.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of partnerships.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number of sustainable partnerships..</i></p>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
➤ To encourage the learning of a second foreign language.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Number of pupils learning a second foreign language involved in the programme.</i></li> <li>- <i>Number of participating schools offering their pupils non-language courses in one/several foreign language(s).</i></li> </ul>
➤ To reinforce the quality and European dimension of teacher training.	- <i>Number/percentage of teachers/students participating in European teacher training activities.</i>
➤ To improve pedagogical approaches and school management.	- <i>Number of participating schools having introduced new pedagogical approaches or management methods.</i>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<p>❖ <b>Erasmus</b></p> <p><b>Specific objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To support the realisation of a European Higher Education Area.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of HEIs introducing European convergence mechanisms.</i></p>
<p>➤ To reinforce the contribution of higher education and advanced vocational education to the process of innovation.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of projects focusing on innovation.</i></p>
<p><b>Operational objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To increase the volume and improve the quality of student and teaching staff mobility throughout Europe, so as to contribute to the achievement by 2011 of at least 3 million individual participants in student mobility under the Erasmus and its predecessor programmes.</p>	<p>- <i>Number/percentage of mobile students/staff, by gender.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number/percentage of HEIs with an Erasmus University Charter, by type of institution.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number of Erasmus language courses (ILPC)</i></p>
<p>➤ To increase the volume and improve the quality of multilateral cooperation between higher education institutions in Europe.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of transnational curricular co-operation projects, by subject area.</i></p>
<p>➤ To increase the degree of convergence of higher education and advanced vocational education qualifications gained in Europe.</p>	<p>- <i>Number/percentage of HEIs using the ECTS and/or Diploma Supplement and/or Europass or other European recognition tools..</i></p>

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Examples of Possible Indicators</b>
<p>➤ To foster co-operation between higher education institutions and enterprises.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of projects aimed at staff exchanges between HEIs and enterprises.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number/percentage of transnational projects and/or networks in which enterprises are involved.</i></p>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<p>❖ <b>Leonardo da Vinci</b></p> <p><b>Specific objective</b></p> <p>➤ To facilitate adaptation to labour market changes and to the evolution of skills needs.</p>	<p><i>Number of participants in Leonardo da Vinci mobility and projects.</i></p>
<p><b>Operational objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To increase and improve the quality of mobility throughout Europe of people involved in initial vocational education and training and in continuing training, so as to increase placement in enterprises to at least 150,000 per year by the end of the Integrated Programme.</p>	<p><i>- Number of mobile trainees/trainers/educators, by gender. .</i></p>
<p>➤ To increase the volume and to improve the quality of co-operation between learning providers, enterprises, social partners and other relevant bodies throughout Europe.</p>	<p><i>- Number of projects/partnerships, by country, by sector of activity and type of participants.</i></p> <p><i>- Number of dissemination activities undertaken.</i></p> <p><i>- Number/proportion of products transferred.</i></p>
<p>➤ To facilitate the development of innovative practices in the fields of initial and continuing training and their transfer, including from one participating country to others.</p>	<p><i>- Number of participating training organisations having introduced new pedagogical/training approaches.</i></p>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<p>➤ To improve the transparency and recognition of qualifications and competences, including those acquired through non-formal and informal learning.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of participant organisations using measures and systems for validation of non-formal and informal learning.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number of participating individuals benefiting from recognition measures, by gender.</i></p>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<p>❖ <b>Grundtvig</b></p> <p><b>Specific objective</b></p> <p>➤ To respond to the education and training challenge of an ageing population in Europe</p>	<p>- <i>Number of participants, by type of activity, age group, country and gender.</i></p>
<p>➤ To help provide adults with alternative pathways to improving their knowledge and competences.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of participants, by type of activity, age group, country and gender.</i></p>
<p><b>Operational objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To increase the volume and to improve the quality of mobility throughout Europe of people involved in adult education, so as to support the mobility of at least 25,000 such individuals per year by 2013.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of mobile people involved in adult education activities, by age group and gender.</i></p>
<p>➤ To increase the volume and improve the quality of co-operation between adult education providers throughout Europe.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of structured adult education providers involved.</i></p>
<p>➤ To facilitate the development of innovative practices in adult education and their transfer, including from one participating country to others.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of participating adult education organisations having introduced new pedagogical approaches.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number/proportion of products transferred</i></p>

➤ To ensure that people from vulnerable social groups and in marginal social contexts, in particular those who have left education without basic qualifications, are given alternative opportunities to access adult education.	- <i>Number of persons without basic qualifications benefiting from alternative opportunities to access education through programme activities, by gender and age group.</i>
➤ To improve pedagogical approaches and the management of adult education organisations.	- <i>Number of transnational projects in the field.</i>

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Examples of Possible Indicators</b>
<b>❖ Transversal programme</b>  <b>Specific objectives</b>  ➤ To promote European co-operation in fields covering two or more sectoral programmes.	- <i>Number of transversal activities launched, by type of activity..</i>
➤ To promote the convergence of Member States' education and training systems.	- <i>Number of projects focused on the promotion of convergence in lifelong learning systems.</i>
<b>Operational objectives</b>  ➤ To support policy development at European level in lifelong learning, notably in the context of the Lisbon, Bologna and Copenhagen processes and their successors.	- <i>Number of projects by type of activity.</i>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To ensure an adequate supply of comparable data, statistics and analyses to underpin lifelong learning policy development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Number of projects in the field of data collection and analysis.</i></li> <li>- <i>Number of statistics and data analyses effectively taken into consideration for national policy developments.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To monitor progress towards objectives and targets in lifelong learning and to identify areas for particular attention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Number of progress reports issued in timely fashion.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To promote language learning and to support linguistic diversity in the Member States.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Number of projects by type of activity.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To support the development of innovative ICT-based content, services pedagogies and practice for lifelong learning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Number of projects by type of activity.</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To ensure that the results of the Integrated Programme are appropriately recognised, demonstrated and implemented on a wide scale.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Number of successful projects/products identified.</i></li> <li>- <i>Proportion of identified successful products that have benefited from support measures for demonstration and implementation.</i></li> </ul>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
------------	---------------------------------

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<p>❖ <b>Jean Monnet programme</b></p> <p><b>Specific objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To stimulate teaching, research and reflection activities in the field of European integration studies.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of projects supported by the Commission, by type of activity...</i></p>
<p>➤ To support the existence of an appropriate range of institutions and associations focusing on issues relating to European integration and on education and training in a European perspective.</p>	<p>- <i>Number and range of institutions and associations focusing on issues relating to European integration and to education and training in a European perspective.</i></p>
<p><b>Operational objectives</b></p> <p>➤ To stimulate excellence in teaching, research and reflection in European integration studies in higher education institutions within and outside the Community.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of Jean Monnet Centres of Excellence, Jean Monnet Chairs and Jean Monnet Modules.</i></p> <p>- <i>Number of centralised and decentralised Jean Monnet reflection activities.</i></p>
<p>➤ To enhance knowledge and awareness among specialists academics and among European citizens generally of issues relating to European integration.</p>	<p>- <i>Number of universities and students participating in the Jean Monnet teaching/research/reflection activities.</i></p>
<p>➤ To support key European institutions dealing with issues relating to European integration.</p>	<p>- <i>Consolidation of the College of Europe, the European University Institute, the European Institute of Public administration and the Academy of European Law.</i></p>

Objectives	Examples of Possible Indicators
<p>➤ To support the existence of high-quality European associations active in the fields of education and training.</p>	<p>- <i>Number and range of high-quality European associations active in the fields of education and training, including European studies.</i></p>

## Annex 2

### **Context indicators for the new integrated programme in education and training**

#### **29 INDICATORS FOR MONITORING PERFORMANCE AND PROGRESS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS IN EUROPE**

##### **(Technical definitions)**

##### Teachers and Trainers

- Age distribution of teachers together with upper and lower retirement age.
- Number of young people in the 0-14 and 15-19 age groups and as percentage of total population.
- Ratio of pupils to teaching staff by education level.

##### Skills for the Knowledge Society

- Percentage of those aged 22 who have successfully completed at least upper secondary education (Isced 3).
- Percentage of pupils with reading literacy proficiency “level 1” and lower on the PISA reading literacy scale.
- Distribution and mean performance of students, per country, on the PISA reading literacy scale.
- Distribution and mean performance of students, per country, on the PISA mathematical literacy scale.
- Distribution and mean performance of students, per country, on the PISA science literacy scale.
- Percentage of adults with less than upper secondary education who have participated in any form of education or training, in the last 4 weeks by age group (25-34, 35-54 and 55-64).

##### Mathematics, Science and Technology

- Students enrolled in mathematics, science and technology as a proportion of all students in tertiary education (ISCED 5A, 5B and 6).
- Graduates in mathematics, science and technology (ISCED 5A, 5B and 6) as percentage of all graduates (ISCED 5A, 5B and 6).
- Total number of tertiary (ISCED 5A, 5B and 6) graduates from mathematics, science and technology fields.

- Share of tertiary graduates in mathematics, science and technology per 1000 inhabitants aged 20-29 - Broken down by ISCED levels 5A, 5B and 6.

#### Investments in Education and Training

- Public expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP
- Private expenditure on educational institutions as a percentage of GDP
- Enterprise expenditure on continuing vocational training courses as a percentage of total labour costs.
- Total expenditure on education per pupil/student (PPS), by level of education
- Total expenditure on education per pupil/student (GDP per capita).

#### Open Learning Environment

- Percentage of population aged 25-64 participating in education and training in 4 weeks prior to the survey by level of educational attainment.

#### Making Learning more Attractive

- Hours in continuing vocational training (CVT) courses per 1000 working hours worked (only enterprises with CVT courses), by NACE.
- Hours in continuing vocational training (CVT) courses per 1000 working hours (all enterprises), by NACE.
- Participation rates in education by age and by level of education.
- Share of the population aged 18-24 with only lower secondary education and not in education or training.

#### Foreign Language Learning

- Distribution of lower / upper secondary pupils learning foreign languages.
- Average number of foreign languages learned per pupil in upper secondary education.

#### Mobility

- Inward and outward mobility of teachers and trainers within the Socrates (Erasmus, Comenius, Lingua and Grundtvig) and Leonardo da Vinci programmes.
- Inward and outward mobility of Erasmus students and Leonardo da Vinci trainees.
- Foreign students enrolled in tertiary education (ISCED 5 and 6) as a percentage of all students enrolled in the country of destination, by nationality (European country or other countries).

- Percentage of students (ISCED 5-6) of the country of origin enrolled abroad (in a European country or other countries).