



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Education and vocational training; Coordination of Erasmus+
Vocational training and adult education; Erasmus+

ET 2020 Working Group on Adult Learning

Report on an in-depth country workshop on effective policies for increasing the participation of adults in basic skills provision

Stuttgart, 26-29 October 2014

This note summarises the main conclusions of an in-depth country workshop organised by the ET 2020 Working Group on Adult Learning . In this workshop, experts from 12 European countries discussed what factors make for effective policies for increasing the participation of adults in basic skills provision.

Process

The learning process underpinning this workshop included extensive preparations on behalf of participants. Prior to the workshop, 14 Working Group countries (including some not participating in this workshop) submitted country reports describing regional or national policies aimed at increasing adults' participation in basic skills provision. These country reports looked at a range of factors: policy objectives, target groups, policy mechanisms, policy owners and partners, policy context, and evaluation. In addition to these descriptive elements, country reports also included an analytical component: each country was asked to comment on what policies (or elements of policies) had been successful, and why. Countries were also asked to comment on policies or policy elements that had not been successful. Based on these submissions, a synthetic report was compiled by the Commission. This report is available on Yammer.

Building on these country reports, each workshop participant was asked to make a 10 minute presentation on effective policies in their own nation/region, focusing on what worked and why. These presentations also looked at what did not work (and why). Over the course of the workshop, three separate sessions of presentations occurred, each session including 3-4 country presentations. (These presentations are

available on Yammer.) Following each block of presentations, workshop participants broke into small groups for discussion. These group discussions were expressly analytical, and were driven by a closely related set of what/why/who/how questions. Plenary sessions then brought the groups together for the sharing of knowledge. (The objectives and outcomes of this process are discussed in greater detail in the “Policy effectiveness” section of this report.)

Policy context

The Europe 2020 strategy identified education as an essential driver for growth and a key instrument for addressing issues such as unemployment, globalisation and the knowledge economy. The European Council conclusions on supporting the 2014 European Semester state that education and training have a strategic role to play in supporting economic recovery in Europe.ⁱ

Adult learning can help Europe to meet the need for new skills, and keep its ageing workforce productive. Adult learning is also essential for social inclusion and active citizenship.ⁱⁱ However, Member States are still to tackle underlying structural problems, which are partly linked to the lack of relevant skills. Among EU countries, the participation of adults in learning varies from 1.4% to 31.6% and the overall trend is that numbers are stagnating. Participation rates are especially poor for low-skilled and older adults.ⁱⁱⁱ In the European Union as a whole, females are more likely than males to participate in adult education and training: Eurostat survey figures for the rate of “participation in education and training (last 4 weeks)” show that 11.4% of females had participated, compared to 9.6% of males.^{iv}

In 2014, 17 countries received a Country Specific Recommendation on Lifelong Learning / Adult skills. Due to the fact that “the share of early school leavers, particularly for people with a disadvantaged or migrant background, remains unacceptably high in several Member States and the provision of lifelong learning opportunities is sub-optimal”^v, the recommendations are mostly concerned with the situation of low-skilled people, migrants, older people and the overall functioning of the LLL systems.

10 Member States received CSRs specifically to improve adult learning provision or participation.

The Working Group on Adult Learning, established in March 2014, is focusing on the particular problems of low-skilled adults and those in need of basic skills. It is also working on cross-cutting policy challenges, in particular those related to issues raised within the European Semester process such as lifelong learning and up-skilling.^{vi}

The Renewed European Agenda on Adult Learning, adopted in 2011, aims to “promote a balanced allocation of education and training resources throughout the life cycle on the basis of shared responsibilities and strong public commitment, particularly to second-chance opportunities and the development of basic skills.”^{vii}

The 2014 European Semester will focus on the “equipment of people in all age groups with better and more relevant skills”. To enable this, Member States should promote the acquisition of basic skills, as well as the adoption of re-skilling and up-skilling measures through strengthened lifelong learning, with a focus on the low skilled.^{viii}

As expressed in its mandate, the primary focus for the ET 2020 Working Group on Adult Learning is to benefit the Member States in their work of furthering policy development on adult learning through mutual learning and the identification of good practices. In-depth country workshops are intended to examine specific approaches to policy development and implementation by several countries, with the aim of identifying key factors for policy success.

The workshop in Stuttgart corresponded to the Group’s **Policy Challenge 1**: to “analyse participating countries’ policies and effectiveness in addressing adult basic skills”. The workshop’s policy conclusions will contribute to the Group’s **Output 1**: a report assessing participating countries’ performance in delivering basic skills and describing key elements for successful policies.

Research evidence

One key point arising from this workshop was the importance to policy makers of rigorous **research evidence**. The workshop began with an overview of key evidence on policies to improve basic skills motivation and participation. (This evidence is summarised in the Working Group paper, “Improving basic skills in adulthood: participation and motivation”, which is available on Yammer.)

A number of attendees noted that research findings summarised in this presentation confirmed their own **professional experience**. They pointed in particular to the **strategic value of research** findings when making the case for basic skills policies and programmes. In the absence of such evidence, Finance Ministries and other key bodies are less likely to consider funding basic skills policies. Despite the growing recognition of the importance of adult basic skills, this policy area remains on the margins of education and training policy in general. Because adult basic skills are still relatively under-researched as compared to compulsory and higher education, the evidence base is nascent, and many policymakers are not familiar with key research findings. Furthermore, the research base is in **urgent need of expansion**. In bringing together the available evidence on policies to improve basic skills motivation and participation, this Working Group has provided national and regional policy makers with a valuable tool for demonstrating the importance of basic skills and viable routes to improving policies in this sector.

Other potentially valuable tools were presented by colleagues from Eurydice (which **provides information on and analyses of European education systems and policies**), from the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop) and from the European Association for the Education of Adults (EAEA). EAEA presented examples of **successful awareness raising campaigns**. Eurydice will

shortly publish a report on increasing adults' access to learning opportunities. This report will look at a number of factors influencing adult participation in education and training, including: funding, outreach, guidance and progression pathways. Cedefop looked at evidence on ways that key competences and basic skills can be fostered through **vocational education and training** (VET). This included a research tool summarising the degree to which Member States currently incorporate such competences in VET, or into their lifelong learning strategies.

Policy effectiveness

National/regional experiences

Over the course of the Working Group, 10 countries/regions presented findings on their own policy experiences. Instead of summarising policies and policy processes, presenters focused on answering a discrete set of questions:

- **Why?** That is, what is the purpose of the policy and how was that purpose arrived at? For example, was a needs assessment conducted? If the policy focuses on a particular target group, why that group?
- **Who?** Which policy actors and stakeholders were involved in the development and implementation of the policy? Were the beneficiaries of the policy involved in its design and implementation?
- **How?** What were the key mechanisms shaping policy success?
- **How is success assessed?** How do we know that the policy has been successful? What kind of evaluation evidence was collected and how was it used?

Early in the workshop, group discussions focused on what and why questions. As the workshop progressed, the key analytical questions guiding group discussions shifted to a focus on who/how questions – for example, who took the lead on a particular policy, who were the key partners and how were those partners engaged? Questions also focused on how policies worked.

This analytical process was **comparative**: group discussions focused not on one policy in particular, but sought to find common success factors across policies and policy contexts. The process was also **iterative**: rather than focusing on only one type of question at a time, workshop groups were encouraged in later sessions to explore the links between the what, why, who and how questions. For example, when analysing who played key roles in policy development in various countries, participants explored why those particular stakeholders were important to policy development and implementation, both in terms of specific policy/ countries and in terms of adult basic skills policy more generally. The ultimate aim of this process was to create and share knowledge, and to engender shared ownership of this knowledge, which was created collectively by the workshop participants. In particular, the process sought to facilitate the development of a shared understanding of the key success factors associated with effective basic skills policy. The success factors were a key focus of the workshop, and will be discussed in greater detail in the next section of this report.

The issues raised in addressing these four questions provided the thematic structure for the Working Group's three days of investigation and discussion. This section provides a brief summary of key messages from these presentations. The next section builds on those messages by providing an analysis of the success factors highlighted over the course of the workshop.

One key question arising from presentation of national/regional policies was: what happens after **project funding** ends? This was a particular issue for "bottom-up" projects that were not systemically integrated into a broader policy framework. Several countries provided examples of apparently effective and successful projects which, despite their apparent success, were short lived (or were likely to be short-lived) due to this lack of integration, and do to a lack of long-term funding. "Projects" were contrasted with "programmes", which were seen as being integrated with and growing out of policy.

Participants also highlighted the fragile nature of policies that are dependent on ESF funding. When such funding is curtailed, countries can find themselves back to square one. For example, a two-year gap in ESF funding can mean that otherwise successful programmes are closed down, or sharply cut back. The experience and expertise of stakeholders in these programmes may be lost forever, as professionals working on these programmes move into other, more stable sectors.

The importance of **teacher quality** was also highlighted. In some countries, primary and /or secondary school teachers are recruited to teach adults basic skills. When this is the case, these teachers must receive specialised training in adult-specific pedagogy (androgogy). Other countries discussed the challenges and opportunities presented by efforts to develop a sector of adult education professionals: teachers/ tutors/ trainers, guidance officers and other staff who are focused specifically on adults' needs. This requires extensive investment in initial teacher education and continuing professional development.

The role of volunteers was debated. One country observed that **volunteers** are not only an efficient way of expanding provision; they can also provide effective education. The key, it was argued, is to ensure that volunteers serve appropriate learners. For example, learners who prefer one-to-one, informal processes may benefit from the attention of volunteers. Volunteers may also be particularly useful when the objectives of participation are focused more on social welfare than on specific educational or economic outcomes. Other countries argued that volunteers are too often used as a substitute for high-quality, professional teachers, and thus may bring more problems than they solve. Given these debates, it is important that, if volunteers are to be incorporated into basic skills policies and programmes, their activities and impacts are rigorously evaluated, in order to ensure that their contribution is a positive one.

Evaluation was also cited as a key consideration, including when studying the success of small, local projects. Can such projects be up-scaled to form the basis of

widespread policy initiatives? To answer this question, rigorous evaluation needs to be regularly incorporated into project design. At the same time, evaluation requirements should not distort small, targeted programmes by consuming too much project time and resource, or by introducing elements that decrease adults' participation or motivation. For example, a programme targeted at adults who have had predominately negative experiences of formal education should not incorporate an evaluation strategy that requires standardised testing. The tail should not wag the dog.

Needs analysis is a partner to evaluation. Efficient policy-making requires intelligent analysis of needs in order to distribute resources appropriately. At the same time, policymakers must understand that many basic skills programmes must be resource intensive if they are to produce benefits. For example, **recruiting hard-to-reach target groups** into programmes may require multiple layers of intensive effort, including community outreach workers to recruit potential learners, and very small-scale, supportive programmes designed to reassure reluctant learners that adult education can be enjoyable as well as effective, even for people with few, if any, positive experiences of formal learning. To some degree, this is about **“rebranding” education** as fun; however, the rebranding exercise is very resource intensive.

Picking up on this notion of rebranding, Working Group participants noted that this process was also required at the policy level. Adult education policymakers need to make greater and more successful efforts to help employers, Finance Ministries, and policy actors in fields as diverse as employment, health and social welfare to understand that adult basic skills are highly relevant to their own efforts, and thus deserving of their support and engagement. One key to this process is to gather and deploy hard evidence and experience to **show potential policy stakeholders the ways in which they could benefit** from improved basic skills. Participation and motivation are not just issues at the level of the individual learner; they are also issues with regard to potential policy stakeholders. In this process, however, it is important to be clear that improving basic skills is a difficult, long-term challenge. While some learners may show quick improvements, there is no quick fix for national- or regional-level skills problems. However, this fact should not discourage potential policy stakeholders from getting involved; rather, it should highlight the need for sustainable investment and steady progress. At the individual level, one Working Group participant summed up the situation as follows: It is not about [the learner] getting work, it is about **shortening the distance** between the current situation and getting work, or whatever objectives the learner has.

On the subject of involving a broad range of policy stakeholders, several countries highlighted the importance of **policy coherence**, both in terms of 1) developing policies that are coherent from the start of the development process through to implementation, evaluation and ongoing work; and 2) ensuring that stakeholders work together in a concerted, coordinated manner. Institutional structures can create powerful and persistent barriers to the latter, but these barriers can be broken down, it was argued, if basic skills policy is well integrated with broader policies in the areas of adult education, employment, health and social services.

However, this is a long-term challenge, which will require extensive effort. That said, countries can learn from examples of relatively successful efforts around Europe. Such efforts require extensive dialogue, and efforts to ensure that all stakeholders benefit from the process. Ideally, this process will not just limit itself to cooperation, but will make the next step into **partnership**. While cooperation does require working together, it does not inherently imply a sense of shared ownership of the process; partnership does.

Success factors

The culmination of the Group's work was the identification of the success factors associated with effective policies focused on adult participation in learning basic skills. These factors – which the group categorised under the headings of:

- 1) Policy Design,
- 2) Policy Implementation and
- 3) Policy Governance – were the factors that arose out of the 10 regional/country policy presentations and the group discussions that followed.

The Group observed that while the final list was extensive it was neither exhaustive nor prescriptive – there is no requirement, for example, that a successful policy be associated with all the factors included below. Rather, the list is considered indicative, as is the organisation of individual items under the headings. Many success factors span multiple categories: for example, a factor listed under “Policy design” might just as accurately be listed under “Implementation” as well.

Policy Design

A number of success factors can be placed under the heading of policy design.

External triggers for change were discussed by several countries, with PIAAC findings being cited as a strong influence on policy makers' own motivations for seeking to increase participation in adult basic skills courses.

Following such a trigger, there is a need for **analysis**, including an investigation of the nature of the problem and the needs/demands of target groups. One challenge – or indeed opportunity – for policymakers is the heterogeneity of adults with low levels of basic skills: there is a need for attention to differences in local situations, and for the development of policies targeted at particular groups. In developing such policies, the chances of success are likely to be improved if member states build on research evidence and previous or current examples of relevant good practices, whether at home or abroad.

Efficiency may be improved if policy makes use of currently **existing tools and networks**, such as the European Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training (EQAVET) initiative. In addition to increasing and improving the supply of basic skills provision, governments must also stimulate demand for skills improvements, on behalf of target groups and employers. One particularly strong conclusion from the workshop was **the importance of workplace learning**. Norway has a well developed workplace basic skills policy, known as “The Basic Competence

in Working Life Programme” (BCWL). Several participants concluded that their countries have not invested sufficient energy and effort into developing workplace-focused basic skills policies, and resolved to make such policies a centrepiece of future efforts. One key success factor in the BCWL programme is the high level of **cooperation** across different stakeholder groups: employers, unions and central government had moved beyond mere cooperation to a sense of partnership and shared ownership of the programme. This partnership has been developed over time through coordinated, collaborative efforts aimed at ensuring that all stakeholders see benefits from the programme. This partnership aspect of successful policy-making has impacts on other areas of policy: in particular, the high degree of cross-stakeholder **trust** developed through the programme has allowed the government to adopt evaluation strategies which focus on participation and satisfaction rather than short-term literacy and numeracy improvements. As shown by research, a focus on short-term skills gains tends to produce a limited and overly negative impression of programme effects. However, Norway’s relatively “light touch” evaluation strategy for BCWL is complemented by a rigorous monitoring programme; thus, while employers and providers have a great deal of autonomy in developing and implementing courses, thus increasing efficiency and participation, they must be prepared for stringent auditing of their activities. This “autonomy with audit” culture facilitates a sense of joint responsibility and ownership.

Adult basic skills is a complex policy area: poor basic skills have a multiplicity of causes and negative impacts. It became clear through discussions that this policy complexity increases the need for cross-ministerial and cross-sectoral **cooperation**. However, it also increases the likelihood that policies will be “scattergun”, having too many aims and too broad a focus to succeed once they make the challenging transition from paper (“policy in intent”) to the real world (“policy in practice”). There is a need for **clear policy purposes**, agreed by all relevant stakeholders. This includes a clear **definition of the target groups** that will benefit from the policy, and efforts to ensure that all policy partners have a **shared understanding of the policy’s aims** and how it seeks to achieve them.

While a focus on basic skills is a sound investment for the future, it is also an expensive proposition, particularly in times of **funding** constraints. Policy developers with limited resources available to them need to resist the temptation to seek to solve all aspects of the problem with one grand effort. If a Member State has limited means, it is more likely to achieve at least some success by being selective and focusing on a **limited range of clients and objectives**. Such objectives should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-related). It is also important that funding be **sustainable**. For example, policies should not be overly reliant on ESF funding. Nor should programmes be asked to devote too many resources towards fundraising, thereby detracting from programme quality.

Modern accountability regimes have increased the emphasis on rigorous monitoring and evaluation of initiatives in all sectors. One key to improving the **quality of monitoring and evaluation** is to ensure that these tasks are not “bolted on” to policy, but integrated into it from the start of the process. By doing so, developers

can increase the likelihood that evaluation (whether quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods) will support all levels of programme development, implementation and sustainability, and that evaluation will be both formative and summative.

Just as evaluation should be integrated into policy design from the start, so too should other success factors, including **capacity building measures**. These include the initial professional development and ongoing training of teachers and counsellors. Many adults with basic skills needs will benefit from counselling that takes account of the complex antecedents and impacts of basic skills difficulties, and thus includes an understanding of other policy areas. For courses, appropriate teaching materials and curricula will need to be developed. Some target groups may benefit from the appropriate use of volunteers. Participation and policy efficiency are likely to be increased if there is an understanding of the ways in which basic skills courses may open up further **educational or employment-related pathways** for adult learners. Such pathways should be built into policy.

Policy Implementation

Participants cited a range of policy implementation success factors, including the establishment of **sustainable policy structures**. Because basic skills spans a broad range of policy areas, effective implementation and sustainability requires well thought out integration with other sectors of the education and training system, and with other public services, including employment, welfare, family services, health and prisons.

Reflecting on the challenges to increasing motivation to improve basic skills and participation in courses, the Workshop participants strongly agreed on the need for **effective outreach**, including ongoing awareness campaigns. Such campaigns have the potential to increase the participation of target groups, while simultaneously increasing the broader public's awareness of basic skills as an important policy issue.

In terms of programme implementation, there is a need for appropriate, high quality teaching materials and methods. Depending on their objectives, programmes may benefit from providing clear links to working life. As demonstrated by presentations from Baden-Württemberg, programmes which help participants to develop a self-concept as a learner are an important part of the policy mix, as are new approaches to learning.

Policy Governance

Effective governance requires cooperation and coordination across a broad range of stakeholders. These include within-programme stakeholders, such as teachers, counsellors and learners, and cross-organisational stakeholders, such as government ministries, NGOs and employers. Policies are more likely to succeed if all stakeholders see the benefits to themselves. They are also more likely to succeed if **"joined-up policy making"** is reality rather than rhetoric. While there are numerous

barriers to effective cross organisational collaboration, there are success factors which make such collaboration more feasible. These include vertical and horizontal cooperation, coordinated steering at all levels of government, and ensuring that all stakeholders are clear about their particular responsibilities. Networks and partnerships should focus on trust, consensus building and cultivating a sense of policy ownership across the full range of stakeholders and organisations.

Analysis of policy strengths and weaknesses

Working in country pairs, workshop participants conducted SWOT (**Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats**) analyses of their own national/ regional basic skills policies. These analyses were then shared with all workshop participants in a poster session. This session engendered a large amount of discussion, comparison and learning. Key conclusions from the session included the understanding that **policy strengths can also be weaknesses**. For example, participants noted that some regions benefit from a diversity of basic skills providers and provider types, potentially enhancing the region's ability to meet the diverse needs of different target groups. However, it was also noted that such a multiplicity of providers makes it more challenging to ensure cross-stakeholder cooperation and the quality of provision. It was also noted that **policy strengths can be fragile**, particularly given the still relatively marginal nature of adult basic skills policy: a government change or the ending of ESF funding could bring a successful policy to an abrupt end.

Just as policy strengths and weaknesses can be two sides of the same coin, so too can weaknesses be seen as **opportunities**. One country pointed to **tensions** between policy/ practice on the one hand and politics on the other. In this country, adult education policymakers and practitioners tend to have a rich understanding of the field, and to be aware of the complex nature of the policy problems that need to be addressed. Politicians, however, tend to have only recent awareness of adult basic skills as an important issue, and sometimes have a very limited understanding of the issue's complexities. The resultant tension between the experience of policymakers/practitioners and the inexperience of many politicians was seen as a weakness; however, in the resulting discussion, participants agreed that it also presented a clear **opportunity for policy learning**, particularly if interested parties could draw on research evidence and other countries/regions' experiences.

Another example of the weakness/opportunity dichotomy was highlighted in discussions of the OECD's 2012 Survey of Adult Skills (**PIAAC**). A number of participating regions/nations noted that PIAAC results show that basic skills needs are much greater than the resources available to address them. It was further noted that PIAAC findings can serve a valuable function, not just in highlighting basic skills needs, but also in illustrating the inability of **traditional measures**, e.g. educational qualifications, to accurately represent national basic skills levels.

PIAAC's finding that there are widespread basic skills needs presents a challenge for policymakers, who must seek the most **efficient and effective strategies** for

addressing these needs, and who may need to focus more on some target groups than others. It was agreed that policies can only be effective if their ambitions are realistic. Overly ambitious policies that sacrifice quality for quantity are likely to fail, even if they are otherwise well designed. While PIAAC offers policymakers and politicians a clear imperative to improve basic skills, policymakers must be **rational and realistic** in the steps they take to do so, particularly in times of financial difficulty.

What next? Actions for the future

Following participants' analyses of policy effectiveness, policy success factors and their own national/regional policy strengths and weaknesses, each participating country/region informed the Workshop about 2-3 policy steps that they would take in the near future. These steps are based on the knowledge that was developed and shared during the workshop. Participants also detailed how they would act on these objectives, when they would act, and who would be involved.

In some cases, the proposed actions are relatively straightforward to achieve – e.g., sharing the research evidence presented at this workshop was regional and national policy stakeholders. In other cases, objectives are more long term – e.g. developing a legislative framework for adult education, with that framework containing a well integrated focus on basic skills. In terms of achieving the more long term objectives, participants agreed that a key was to share the knowledge acquired in this workshop with colleagues, and to use that knowledge as a stepping stone towards improved policy development. This section provides an overview of the actions presented in this discussion. Some proposed actions were mentioned by two or more countries.

- *Develop legislative frameworks for adult education, with these frameworks including a specific focus on basic skills.* One country proposed to do this in 2015.
- *Improve inter-ministerial (horizontal) coordination.* For example, one country said that it would strive to make such coordination a key focus of policy efforts over the next year. Mechanisms for improving coordination included the use of policy events, and the sharing of relevant evidence across ministries. The latter strategy builds on discussions in the workshop about the numerous cross-ministerial benefits of an increased focus on adult basic skills.
- *Improve vertical coordination between central, regional and local government bodies.* A related objective was the stimulation of increased regional interest and involvement in basic skills improvements.
- *Develop structures and systems so that PIAAC results can be acted upon in a coordinated, coherent manner, rather than in an uncoordinated, unstructured way.* A number of countries said that PIAAC would serve as an important policy level in stimulating stakeholder interest in adult basic skills. These countries indicated that this use of PIAAC to stimulate policy interest was a task they would continue or begin as soon as possible.
- *Share the research evidence presented at this workshop with regional and national policy stakeholders.* Just as PIAAC was seen as an effective tool for

stimulating policy interest, so too was the research evidence presented at the workshop. Workshop participants indicated that this research evidence could be presented along with PIAAC results: the latter would highlight the scope of the problem, while the former would help point the way to policy solutions.

- *Develop regional and national evidence bases* – both for the sake of developing evidence-based policies and programmes, and to highlight the basic skills issue to Finance Ministries, politicians and other key policy actors. Participants agreed that while the available evidence was useful as a policy tool, more evidence was required, particularly at regional and national levels. Ideally, such evidence could be developed over the 2015-16 period.
- *Improve administrative structures*. Improved structures such as online monitoring tools would contribute to better policy governance. One country suggested that this could be a focus for 2016 .
- *Build capacity, both at policy and programme level*. Participants saw this as an ongoing process, one that would be facilitated by many of the strategies discussed above, e.g. the use of PIAAC as a policy awareness tool.
- *Use pilot projects to test policy approaches and build the national evidence base*. This would be an ongoing process, with the ground work commencing in 2015.
- *Focus on increasing project sustainability*. Projects should not be isolated, short-term “flowers in the desert”, but should instead be integrated into broader policy strategies and objectives.
- *Develop policy funding models that are less reliant on ESF*. For example, one country suggested that it would seek to use ESF funding to expand policy and programme capacity over the next few years, and then develop internal funding strategies to maintain or expand that capacity.
- *Develop and utilise efficient and effective evaluation strategies*. This was seen as an ongoing strategy, which, in the near term, could build on research evidence showed at the workshop.

Programme

Sunday October 26th

Alte Kanzlei Stuttgart GmbH

	Arrivals	
19.00	Welcome from the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports Alte Kanzlei Stuttgart (snacks and drinks) Introduction Participants' expectations	
20.30	(Rest of evening free) [Meeting of the preparatory group]	

Monday October 27th

Ministerium für Kultus, Jugend und Sport Baden-Württemberg

09:15	Official Welcome: Sabine Frömke, Head of Department 5 - Youth, Sports and Continuing Education Practical Information: Dr. Norbert Lurz, Head of Unit 55 - Continuing Education	Plenary
09:30	Brief introduction - ET 2020 - Purpose of Peer learning / Peer review in ET 2020 (Paul Holdsworth, European Commission)	Plenary
09.50	Introduction to the topic: - What research tells us about adult participation in learning - What WG members tell us about their policies (JD Carpentieri, Consultant) Discussion	Plenary Groups
10.50	First session of country examples - Germany	Plenary
	German point of view: Norbert Lurz (States' view) 3 x 10 min presentation of local German projects focusing on "What worked and why" Schools and Basic Education (Mannheim) GISO (Stuttgart) Everyday Mosaic (VHS Buchen) Questions for clarification	Plenary
11.50	Discussion Policy analysis	Groups
12.30	Lunch in the Ministry's canteen	
13.30	Start listing of success factors	Plenary
14.00	Second session of country examples	
	3 x 10 min presentation of policy and impact, focusing on "What worked and why" Austria Belgium (NI),	Plenary
14.30	Questions for clarification	Plenary
14.45	Discussion - Policy analysis	Groups
15.30	Building on list of success factors. Impact on country policy	Plenary
16.00	Learning reflection	
16.30	Reflections on the Day Preparation for tomorrow	Plenary
	[Meeting of the preparatory group]	

19.00	Guided tour through the city of Stuttgart (optional)	
20.00	Informal dinner at Brauhaus Schönbuch, Bolzstrasse 10, hosted by the Ministry for Culture, Youth and Sport, Baden-Württemberg	

Tuesday October 28th

Ministerium für Kultus, Jugend und Sport Baden-Württemberg

09:15	Opening Recap of what we are doing and where we have got to	Plenary
09.45	Presentation from Eurydice (Ana Sofia de Almeida Coutinho)	
10.00	Presentation from Cedefop (Alexandra Dehmel)	
10.15	Q&A with stakeholders	
11.00	Third session of country examples	Plenary
	3 x 10 min presentation of policy and impact, focusing on “What worked and why” Italy Latvia The Netherlands	
11.30	Questions for clarification	Plenary
11.45	Discussion Policy analysis Refinement of success factors	Groups
12.15	Lunch	
13.15	Refining list of success factors Summing up factors and evidence	Plenary
13.45	Fourth session of country examples	Plenary
	4 x 10 min presentation of policy and impact, focusing on “What worked and why” Norway Serbia Slovenia Belgium (Fr)	
14.15	Questions for clarification	Plenary
14.30	Discussion Policy analysis	Groups
15.00	Refinement of success factors Summing up	
15.30	The national perspective Country analysis	Country pairs
16.30	Country pairs	Country pairs x 2
17.00	Perspectives from country reflections	Plenary
17.15	Reflections on the Day Preparation for tomorrow [Meeting of the preparatory group]	

Wednesday October 29th

Ministerium für Kultus, Jugend und Sport Baden-Württemberg

09:30	Opening	Plenary
	Preparation of poster session “Lessons learned for my country” by country pairs	Country pairs
10.30	Poster session “Lessons learned for my country” Comments by other participants	Plenary
	Drawing conclusions for each country	Country pairs

12.30	Lunch	
13.30	Seeking connections Report to WG Towards policy conclusions	Plenary
14.30	Evaluation of the workshop process	Plenary
15.15	Closing remarks	Plenary
16.00	End of workshop	Plenary
	[Meeting of the preparatory group]	

-
- ⁱ European Council. 2014. Council conclusions. Efficient and innovative education and training to invest in skills - Supporting the 2014 European Semester. (2014/C 62/05)
- ⁱⁱ European Commission. Promoting Adult Learning. http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/adult-learning/adult_en.htm, assessed on 14.4.2014
- ⁱⁱⁱ European Commission. Promoting Adult Learning. http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/adult-learning/adult_en.htm, assessed on 14.4.2014
- ^{iv} http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_social_policy_equality/equality/indicators_gender
- ^v European Commission. 2013. European Semester: Country Specific Recommendations. http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/2013eccomm_en.pdf, assessed on 14.4.2014
- ^{vi} European Commission. Directorate-General for Education and Culture. 2014. ET 2020 Working Group. WG on Adult Learning. Mandate.
- ^{vii} European Council. 2011. Council resolution on a renewed European agenda of adult learning.
- ^{viii} European Council. 2014. Council conclusions - Efficient and innovative education and training to invest in skills - Supporting the 2014 European Semester. (2014/C 62/05)