ET2020 Working Group on Transversal Skills (TVS)

8-9 October 2015, Brussels, Conference Centre Albert Borschette and DG EAC

Meeting minutes

On Thursday 8 and Friday 9 October 2015, a meeting of the ET 2020 Working Group took place, focusing on entrepreneurship education, digital skills and language skills.

Participants from the European Commission:
- **DG EAC**: Bodo Richter (Deputy Head of Unit - Innovation in education, EIT and MSCA), Bénédicte Robert, Sophie Beernaerts, Kristina Cunningham, Arya-Marie Ba Trung, Luca Tomasi.
- **DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion**: Lieve Van den Brande
- **DG CONNECT**: Heidi Cigan
- **JRC**: Riina Vuorikari, Yves Punie, Margherita Bacigalupo
- **OECD**: Francesco Avvisati
- **Attendance**: Members of the ET2020 Working Group on Transversal Skills
- **ICF Consulting Services**: Patricia Vale (Deputy Project Manager), Xavier Platteau, Sarah Fleury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>Registration and welcome coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.00</td>
<td>Welcome and introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-13.10</td>
<td>The Commission (DG EAC-B2) and Chair of the Working Group on Transversal Skills (TVS), presented the agenda. This was the last meeting of the ET 2020 Working Group on Transversal Skills and covered 'Entrepreneurship education and competences', 'Digital competences', and 'Language competences'. During the meeting three sub-groups were formed to discuss each of the topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30-14.15</td>
<td>ET 2020 Joint Report presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission (DG EAC-A1) announced the release of the European Commission (EC) proposal for new priorities for European cooperation in education and training (ET2020) for the next four years (2016-2020).¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The ET2020 four strategic objectives remain the same;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Commission has proposed the reduction of priorities from 16 to 6. Each priority is accompanied by a set of 'key issues'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The document is accompanied by a Staff Working Document explaining the rationale, and is now being discussed with Member States. A definitive version will be published as a Joint Report from the EC and Member States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three new priorities are of particular relevance for this group:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Relevant and high-quality skills and competences, focusing on learning outcomes, for employability, innovation and active citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhancing targeted policy action to reduce low achievement in basic competences across Europe, covering literacy, mathematics, science and digital literacy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthening the development of transversal skills and key competences, in line with the Reference Framework on Key Competences for lifelong learning, in particular digital, entrepreneurship and linguistic competences through common EU frameworks and self-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assessment tools such as HEInnovate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Inclusive education, equality, non-discrimination and promotion of civic competences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Facilitating effective acquisition of language for learning and employment by migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Open and innovative education and training, including fully embracing the digital era</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implications for future Working Groups (WG)**

- The proposal establishes that “As of 2016 a new generation of working groups will work in the ET2020 priority areas”. However, there is still no information on what WGs will be created.
- The ET2020 tool box will be strengthened. It will include WGs but also: peer learning activities; peer reviews (linked to the European Semester); tailor-made peer counselling to support a particular national reform agenda; and dissemination of good practice.

**Future developments**

- 12\textsuperscript{th} October – presentation to the Education Committee of the new WG structure.
- 23\textsuperscript{rd} November – Presentation of the key messages emerging from the work of the 2014-2015 ET2020 Working Groups.
- December - A High level group meeting will take place in Amsterdam. There will be a reporting of the work undertaken by this WG in the last two years.
- January 2016 – Beginning of the new work cycle for WGs and tool box activities.

---

**13:30-14:15 EU Digital Competence framework: presentation of results/progress update**

The Commission (DG EMPL-C4) announced the finalisation of the European Reference Framework for Digital Competence for citizens (DIGCOMP) and the Online assessment tool embedded in the Europass.\(^2\)

**Background**

The development of the framework was motivated by:

- Transversal skills are demanded by employers and are essential for inclusive citizenship;
- But many people do not have the skills required for work and other purposes, as shown in the indicators included in the Digital Agenda Scoreboard;\(^3\)
- No common understanding or scientific base to say which competences should be part of every citizen’s digital competence.

**Work undertaken**

- Based on research by the EC Joint Research Centre-Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (JRC IPTS) on behalf of DG EAC and DG EMPL.
- A 2-year process of collaboration and validation involving more than 120 experts and stakeholders across Europe, amongst which the Working Group Transversal Skills members.
- Development of an EU common digital competence framework for all the citizens, with 21 competences with learning outcomes descriptors according to 3 to 8 proficiency levels (complementary to the e-Competence framework for ICT professionals).

**Output**

- The framework presents 5 areas and 21 competences expressed in learning outcomes according to 3 to 8 proficiency levels.\(^4\) It is available online, for free and with open use.
- The self-assessment tool is part of EUROPASS-CV available online in 21 languages.

The Commission (JRC-J3), thanked the group for their contributions to the development of the DIGCOMP, and continued with the second part of the presentation.

**DIGCOMP uptake and use**

- There are several projects in different European countries using the European Reference Framework for Digital Competence for citizens (in BEfl, EE, ES, HR, IT, LT, MT, SI, UK).
- The EC is using it in different initiatives: Europass self-assessment tool; a digital skills indicator

---


to be included in the digital agenda scoreboard; DG EAC will develop in 2016 a framework for teachers that can be used by Member States as a model; DG Justice and Consumers is applying it to the specific use of online consumption.

- It is also being used in other European level projects, e.g. Carer+, Skillage.

**DIGCOMP governance model**
- Led by DG EMPL and JRC IPTS.
- In cooperation with other DGs (CNECT, EAC, GROW, JUST...).
- Complementary to other actions such as eSkills, Digital Single Market (DSM), ESCO, etc.

**Next steps**
- Continuous update of the descriptions of the competences
- Proficiency levels will be updated and options between 3, 5 or 8 proficiency levels (with accordingly learning outcomes descriptions) can be made.
- There will be one learning outcome per level combining knowledge, skills and attitudes.

A final draft is expected by the end of 2015.

The Working Group on Transversal Skills also build consensus around ‘what it means to be entrepreneurial’. Work has started to develop an EU framework on “Entrepreneurship and sense of initiative” competences (the draft includes 3 areas and 16 different competences).

---

### 14:15-14:30 Coffee break

### 14:30-15:15 Presentation of the OECD study: Students, computers and learning. Making the connection

Francesco Avvisati (OECD) presented the results of the study, that examines how students’ access to and use of information and communication technology (ICT) devices has evolved in recent years, and explores how education systems and schools are integrating ICT into students’ learning experiences. It is based on results from PISA 2012.

- It examines the ability of students to read online, observing that there is a high variability across countries, which mirrors proficiency in reading.
- It analyses the differences between paper reading and online reading. 80% of performance in online reading is explained by competence in print reading; the rest is explained by navigation (task-oriented browsing).
- It looks into digital inequalities. It detects that advantaged students do more activities requiring reading (chat, mail, information, news).

The presentation concluded with a few policy pointers: the need to develop “information” literacy (According to DIGCOMP, competences: 1.1. Browsing, searching and filtering information; and 1.2. Evaluating information); introduce frameworks to help educators develop and locate quality education resources; the ability to read online is strongly related to ‘analogue skills’; today, the socio-economic skills gap is more important than the access gap.

During the Q&A session the following points were made:
- Reading skills and digital skills are intertwined. PISA 2018 will redefine reading literacy to take into account digital environments, including how to recognise credible websites and online documents.
- PISA 2012 could not find links between countries investment in digital technology and results. There are no easy gains from introducing ICT resources in school.
- PISA 2012 did not include tasks involving collaborative problem solving but these have been included in PISA 2015. The framework is available online and the results will be presented during 2017.

---
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The study defined two types of learner with difficulties in task-oriented browsing: the ‘digitally stranded’ (students with no or only limited browsing activity) and the ‘digitally adrift’ (students browsing more irrelevant than relevant pages). A participant in the group suggested that some of the latter may be a result of curiosity. However, this is unlikely since the learners were aware that they were being assessed.

The tests were all computer-based and presented in the language of each participating country.

15:15-16:30 Policy Experimentation Project presentations

Youth Start

Luis Vaz from the Entrepreneurship Education Platform (Portugal)\(^9\) presented the project. The team has finished developing the learning programme, based on the framework ‘TRIO model of entrepreneurship education’.\(^10\) Trainers have been trained already and the training of teachers is about to start. The first stage of implementation will run from September 2015 to June 2016.

During the Q&A session the following points were made:

- The project will be disseminated at the 2015 European Education, Training and Youth Forum (19-20 October 2015). However, the involvement of youth organisations will depend on the arrangements in each country.
- The project will be evaluated by the Danish partner. They will conduct a pre-test and a post-test.

JA Europe Innovation Cluster for Entrepreneurship Education (ICEE)

Implemented by JA Europe, this project aims to measure the effects of increasing the number of students experiencing entrepreneurship education to 50% (that 50% of students will have a practical entrepreneurial experience before leaving upper secondary education), through the ‘mini-company’ experience. The project will involve a 27-month trial in 20 academic and vocational schools in Belgium, Estonia, Finland, Italy and Latvia, in 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. The final objective is to provide policy recommendations on how to increase entrepreneurship education in European schools.

During the Q&A session it was explained that in the entrepreneurial school awards, countries nominate schools against a set of criteria. The first 11 schools will be awarded on October 15, 2015.\(^11\)

Assessment of Transversal Skills 2020 (ATS 2020)\(^12\)

Anastasia Economou, from the Cyprus Pedagogical Institute, presented this project, proposing a comprehensive learning model to enhance students’ transversal skills. At the moment partners are agreeing on the areas for work and the learning model. The project will be implemented in 25 schools in each of the 10 participating countries (2 classes per school, 1 intervention and 1 control), in September 2016-June 2017.

16:30-17:30 Feasibility study of a Citizen’s Tool for Transversal Skills: outcomes and discussion

\(^9\) http://www.peep.pt/
\(^10\) http://www.youthstartproject.eu/#project/cu4m
\(^12\) http://ats2020.eu/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 9:45</td>
<td>Brief Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission (DG EAC.B2): Schools and educators, multilingualism chaired this group. The Commission (DG EAC.B2) briefly introduced the session by highlighting that languages will continue to be a priority in the next cycle of ET 2020 and then presented the agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 11:45</td>
<td>Panel focusing on work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eurydice: Mapping of national testing and assessment methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission (EACEA-A7) presented the main findings of the report. The aim of the study was to give an overview of existing national tests assessing language competences. The main findings are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ High stake national tests exist in nearly all countries (mainly at upper secondary level, linked to school leaving certificate). Low stake tests exist only in some countries (mainly in lower secondary);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ In the majority of countries tests have been introduced since 2001, but there is a long tradition in some countries of testing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Nearly all countries have at least one national test in English;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Speaking skills are the least evaluated;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The written parts of the tests are externally marked in two thirds of countries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ In the majority of countries national tests are linked to CEFR levels;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Most of the tests cover more than one level, mainly A2 and B1 (in lower secondary) and B1 and B2 (upper secondary).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:30-17:45</td>
<td>Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bodo Richter closed the session and outlined the arrangements for the different sessions on the following day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 9  Parallel Sessions

---
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Esther Eugenio, the Project Coordinator, presented the findings of the study. The study aimed to verify how comparable existing language tests are across EU Member States, and suggest how to improve comparability. It examined 133 language exams in total at ISCED levels 2 and 3. Qualitative data was collected using an online content analysis tool. Quantitative data was collected using Comparative Judgement. Considerable diversity was found across language examinations, which decreases the potential for a straightforward comparison of test results. The study presents a set of proposals on how to increase comparability between national results of language examinations across EU Member States.

The Q&A session focused on whether it is really possible to have comparable national results and on whether this is desirable.

**European Commission: Languages in ET2020 – Country comparisons, recent trends, the limits of indicators, priorities for ET2020 including multilingual classrooms.**

The Commission (DG EAC-B2) presented an overview of the work conducted until now on languages and commented on the following aspects:

- Regarding the comparison of language competency levels tested and reached in different countries, it would be wrong to attribute differences exclusively to the effectiveness of education systems. There are other factors to be taken into account such as the similarity between the foreign language and the native language, the exposure to the foreign language in the media etc.
- The studies show that national data are not comparable since, although countries agree on the importance of the CEFR, they all interpret it differently.
- Linguistic competences are, at the same time, a basic skill, a key competence and a transversal skill.
- The notions of ‘foreign languages’ and ‘mother tongue’ are becoming blurred, and complexity has increased in recent years with students speaking many different languages at home and learning a second language at school.
- Although common tools for describing language competences have clear advantages in terms of transparency, standardised tests have shortcomings as well, in particular the risk of ending up testing only English and only passive competences which are more easily measured. This would contradict the emphasis on linguistic diversity and productive skills. There is also the risk of test-driven education.
- Societies are becoming multilingual but people are not multilingual (many are monolingual). It is important to find creative solutions to use at the workplace, and learn how to use language tools (computer-assisted translation, collaborative language learning websites).

As for the next steps, the Commission (DG EAC-B2) mentioned:

- The need to promote better use of the CEFR, embedding it in curricula development and teacher training.
- The benefits of the use of CEFR in the Online Linguistic Support (Erasmus+), and in the Citizen Tool for Transversal Skills.
- The need to promote self-assessment and formative assessment.
- The need to focus on metalinguistic skills (learning to learn languages), acknowledging that learners do not start from zero when starting to learn a new language and that the competences already acquired in one or more languages can be used to learn new ones.

The discussion covered the following topics:

- Attention should not be exclusively focused on assessment. Assessment needs to be linked to teaching and learning:
  - Using the CEFR for assessment but not for learning and teaching does not make sense.
  - The Council of Europe offers examples of performance in different CEFR competences

---
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levels that can be used in teaching and testing. Shouldn’t languages be assessed simply as part of the curriculum (as maths, etc.)? Or are they so specific that the level should be comparable across countries? Exams need to take account of particular objectives of school systems within a country, region etc.

– Foreign language programmes should be adapted to the different fields of study. For instance, VET students might be less motivated to learn with general programmes and text books. However, this is not reflected in national tests and teachers often need to train students in what will be tested.

– Lack of resources in schools for testing and teaching (e.g. no computers for listening, also no conditions to practice speaking, languages taught in large groups, limited teaching time).

– Peer assessment should also be explored in addition to traditional forms of assessment.

Another issue deserving attention is how to increase the motivation of learners (and teachers) to learn languages beyond what is perceived as ‘enough’. This requires moving away from the belief that a learner only needs a certain level.

– Learning languages other than English should be promoted.

– If only basic communication is envisaged, English may be enough to survive in an international context, affecting the motivation to learn other languages. It is important to make learning languages meaningful and look for other motivators, such as access to culture. Also, it should be acknowledged that individuals have specific needs and interests.

– The learning of other languages could be promoted by introducing them as first foreign languages and starting the learning of English later on. In fact, this is the case for students for whom the language used at school is already a first foreign language. It would be interesting to look into this phenomenon. More generally, foreign languages could be approached as a whole rather than as a list of first, second, third… foreign languages.

– The role of parents in the learning of foreign languages should also be examined.

– There does not seem to be an appropriate return on the investment of countries into language teaching.

– The fact that there is no EU benchmark on foreign language competences does not mean that this topic will not be paid attention to. Although foreign language competences are present in the proposed Joint Report for the next cycle of ET2020, languages are not present in the priorities themselves. The links may not be clear to national policy makers and the WG can have a role in reminding them. Also, multilingual classrooms are clearly in the national agendas.

– Some participants expressed dissatisfaction with the running of the WG in the last year. The Commission explained that the new WG (starting in 2016) will involve more peer learning and peer counselling.

12:30-14:00 Lunch

14:00-15:00 CEFR: a personal interpretation of its origins, early development, current role and future prospects
Sauli Takala presented the Council of Europe and the development of work on languages since the 1950’s, up to the development of the CEFR. The future work on the framework will include:

– Making better use of the whole conceptual scheme, consulting and using the horizontal descriptive scheme more actively.

– The conceptual basis does not need to be reassessed as it is still a good framework. It needs however to take into account developments in our societies.

– There needs to be more emphasis on the learner.

– The framework development work is based on the following basic concepts: communities, mobility, otherness and mediation.

– Developing and validating descriptors for different types of mediation*, including for written online interaction.

* Mediation is defined as any procedure, arrangement or action in a given social context to reduce the distance between two (or more) poles of otherness between which there is tension. Mediation activities make communication possible between persons unable for whatever reason to communicate with each other directly.

– Filling gaps on the existing scales, especially in levels A and C.

---

Adapt descriptors for young learners.

**European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe: the RELANG project — past, present and future**

Sarah Breslin and José Noijons from the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe presented the RELANG project. This project aims to support Member States in relating language examinations to the levels of proficiency defined in the CEFR for Languages in a valid and equitable way. The process followed includes working on the ground with the professionals responsible for the design of examinations. Relang offers peer counselling through the following training modules:

- Developing valid language tests, related to the CEFR, for use in the classroom;
- Constructing valid language tests and examinations based on the CEFR;
- Relating existing tests and examinations to the CEFR;
- Screening existing tests and examinations for their relations to the CEFR;
- Relating foreign language curricula to the CEFR.

**Interactive session**

Participants were invited to discuss in small groups the use of the CEFR in testing and learning in different countries.

**Relevant sources on languages from the European Commission**

The Commission (DG EAC-B2) suggested a few links of interest to the participants in the WG:


**Study on languages and employability**

The Commission (DG EMPL-C4) presented the methodology and preliminary results of this ongoing study being completed by ICF. Data is being collected through semi-structured interviews, desk research on online job vacancies, and a small survey. Preliminary findings include:

- English is the most useful foreign language, followed by German and Russian.
- For the most useful language, employers demand high (C1-C2) and medium level (B1-B2) proficiency.
- Lower proficiency (B1-B2) to (A2-A2) for the second most useful language.
- Level of skills demanded is higher for oral than for written skills.
- Professional, scientific and technical sector is distinct from the other sectors.
- Within the sectors, there are differences depending on the tasks.
- A higher level of competences is demanded for higher positions.
- Employers prefer to hire directly people with the right skills. One third report having difficulties in finding candidates with the needed language skills.
- Employers rarely use formal standards or CEFR levels to indicate the level of language.
- Employers most often test applicants’ foreign language proficiency during the job interview.
- Foreign language competences alone are not sufficient for businesses to be successful, but can be an advantage.
- For individuals language skills are a competitive advantage if part of a broader set of skills.

---
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The study will be finalised by the end of November.

Group participants commented on other related studies and projects:
- Study by CRELL study on languages and employability. Secondary analysis of the Adult education survey.\(^{21}\)
- The Project Lincq of the European Centre for Modern Languages\(^{22}\) involved 30 interviews with representatives of employers and found similar trends: low interest in certificates, no knowledge of CEFR, use of interviews to test language knowledge (or even social events to test how they interact).
- Lemp study.\(^{23}\) One of the most interesting findings is that a higher language level is expected from older workers. This means that they need to improve their competences throughout their lives. As such, it is important to give autonomy in the learning process. Self-study seems to be a key issue. Also, being open to another language is seen as being intellectually open, even if the level is not very high.
- The Czech German Chamber analysed the language profile of Czech workers in German speaking companies. They observed that the level was not very high, often B1 and sometimes B2.
- Study on the best languages to learn to get ahead in your career.\(^{24}\)

16:30 – 17:15 Closure
The Commission observed that while there were no clear cut conclusions there were relevant ideas to be carried forward to the next cycle of the Working Group. A document gathering key messages will be drafted in the following weeks.
Participants were invited to send to the Commission any comments on the Eurydice study, on what has been discussed in small groups, on how the CEFR is being used in their countries, and on any new initiatives in the field of language learning.

Session: EU Digital Competence Framework for citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30-09.45</td>
<td>Welcome and agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission (JRC-J3) welcomed working group members and presented the agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.45-10.45</td>
<td>JRC presentation - From DIGCOMP 1.0 to 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission (JRC-J3) presented the new proposal for the EU Digital Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Framework version 2.0 and the work undertaken by the JRC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**
- Feedback was received from previous WG meetings.
- The initial proposal with 8 levels of learning outcomes in the array of skills, knowledge and competences (discussed in WG in February and June 2015) was found to be too long (about 500 descriptors) and a number of concepts were outdated.
- The conceptual reference framework was updated and revised.
- DIGCOMP has defined 8 levels – instead of initial 3 levels – of learning outcomes (from the more basic levels (1&2) to the most specialised levels (7&8). Each level is defined in terms of one learning outcome combining knowledge, skills and attitudes.

**DIGCOMP governance model**
- Led by DG EMPL and JRC IPTS

---


In cooperation with other DGs (CNECT, EAC, GROW, JUST...)

Complementary to other actions such as eSkills, Digital Single Market (DSM), ESCO, etc.

**Work undertaken**

- The 5 areas remain the same with minor changes to the areas (e.g. ‘information became ‘information and data processing’)
- The vocabulary of the 21 competences was updated (e.g. ‘online’ became ‘digital environments’) and the new concepts of the field were added (e.g. data protection and right to be forgotten)
- The vocabulary was streamlined according to ESCO’s ICT Transversal skills terminology
- The descriptions of the competences were revised to avoid redundancy
- The competence of ‘3.4. Programming’ was modified to take into account the trend of including “computation” and “coding” in school curriculum

*The changes made to each competence are presented in the JRC Power Point document.*

**Future developments**

- The DIGCOMP 2.0 will go through a validation process / stakeholders consultation later in 2016.
- A self-assessment questionnaire of digital competences is under preparation taking into account that it will not be possible to assess 8 levels in 21 competences. The JRC will define an appropriate way to assess it.
- A glossary with the terminology of DIGCOMP will be prepared by the JRC.

**Discussion**

- One member suggested adding the word ‘active’ in the description of competence ‘2.3 Engaging in citizenship’.
- Referring to competence 2.5. Netiquette, members drew attention to the fact that young people might not be aware of legal consequences of their virtual/online actions (see the Dutch case of hacking by teenagers). The DIGCOMP framework could make reference to the legal implication of some illegal virtual activities.
- Referring to 3.4. Programming, members discussed the differences between the concepts of programming and computing. One member pointed out that the concept of visual programming (creating) was perhaps missing from DIGCOMP.

10.45-11.00 Coffee break

11:00-11:30 **The Digital Agenda Digital Skills Indicator and Scoreboard**

The Commission (DG CONNECT-F4) presented EU Digital Agenda and the Digital Skills Indicator and Scoreboard.

- Digital skills are high on the EU political agenda (e.g. President Juncker’s mission letter to Commissioner Oettinger, Digital Single Market Strategy, Digitising European Industry Strategy (planned adoption 2016), ET2020 draft Joint report.

Reasons evoked for this agenda:

- Rapid spread of technologies in our lives.
- Increased demand from the labour market for digital skills.
- Every citizen should have digital skills to avoid social exclusion.
- Growing need for digital technology experts (Predicted gap of 825,000 by 2020).
- Evidence of skills gaps. Skills adapt very slowly. Digital skills are not yet part of all educational curricula.

Consequently, the EC launched the Grand Coalition for Digital skills and Jobs – a Multi-stakeholder partnership. Sixty pledges from 100 stakeholder organisations were made to reduce skills gaps.

In order to develop relevant policies, good indicators are needed. Indicators were developed at EU-level as part of the Digital Scoreboard and the DESI index.
Topics discussed

- Existing indicators on computer and Internet skills were found inadequate – too basic scale of activities.
- There was a Digital Agenda ‘action 62’ to propose EU-wide indicators of Digital Competence.\(^\text{25}\)
- The ESSIE study looked at competences of pupils and teachers and their attitudes towards digital transformations (previous studies only looked at infrastructures).\(^\text{26}\)
- The new ESSIE study is under preparation and will take into account the updated DIGCOMP.
- A conceptual framework of indicators was chosen based on DIGCOMP and on the previous Digital Scoreboard of 2012.
- A Eurostat Survey on ICT usage in households and by individuals was launched in 2012. DG CONNECT made a pilot testing the data from 2012 against the DIGCOMP framework and they concluded that 4 out of 5 DIGCOMP areas were reflected in Eurostat data from 2012. There were no clear indicators on the topic of ‘safety’.

Future developments

- The Eurostat survey questions were updated in 2015 (see Power Point document). The indicators used to assess what people do rather than the skills they have. The 2016 Digital skills indicator survey will include some modified questions.
- Indicators will be developed for the DIGCOMP area: safety.
- DIGCOMP will be taken into account in the new study on skills for work and the ESSIE study.


Discussion

WG members discussed in groups how the Scoreboard could be used in their work at the national and regional level. Participants found the tool very relevant and useful with some considerable caveats though.

11.30-12.00 DIGCOMP take-up mutual learning among Member States – DIGCOMP in adult education in the Flemish Community - Monique De Ridder

Monique De Ridder presented how DIGCOMP is used in the context of adult education in Flanders:

Background

- Adult Education in Flanders encompasses basic education, secondary education, VET, higher education and specific teacher training.
- About 400,000 adults/year enrol in adult education.
- The programmes for ICT in adult education dated from the 1990s.
- A cross-sectoral commission of education providers proposed a set of basic competences and a modular structure for adult education (all levels, i.e. basic education, secondary education, etc.).
- The government gave the green light to update the programmes and build a new set of adult education curricula in a modular form.

Work undertaken for the ICT programme for adult education

- A cross sectoral commission in ICT with teachers, head of schools, ICT experts from government and other organisations was gathered. There were 20 full days of meetings with 15/20 experts over a year.
- DIGCOMP was used as a reference and was translated into Dutch.
- The list of potential learning outcomes was updated from very generic to very specific competences, following the structure of DIGCOMP.


### Time | Topics discussed
--- | ---

- A wide range of competences was clustered into educational programmes.
- In total, 8 educational programmes were developed with different set of modules for each programme. E.g. ICT and administration, ICT in education content, ICT in social media, web content, ICT operating systems and networks, ICT programming.
- Some programmes only have two modules; others have more according to the scope of the programme.
- Some modules appear in various programmes. E.g. ‘To start with ICT’ and ‘E communication’. Learners move from the most basic modules to more complex ones.
- Each module includes a set of competences derived from DIGCOMP:
  - 5 ‘generic’ competences, namely:
    - to solve conceptual problems through digital means;
    - to solve technical problems;
    - to update one’s own competences;
    - safe and sustainable use of ICT;
    - to judge and critically evaluate information and media content.
  - 5 - 10 ‘specific’ competences from DIGCOMP, which only apply to one specific module, for instance:
    - use basic tools to protect devices;
    - to install a pre-installed device;
    - to manipulate efficiently his/her own device.

- DIGCOMP was found very useful. Without it, it would have been very difficult to find consensus between experts on what competences to use.

### Future developments

- The new programmes/modules developed were sent to the government for formal approval.
- Adult centres will be able to use the new programmes from September 2016.
- Entry tests will be developed for assessing learners competences before they enrol on courses. It will enable learners to ‘skip’ modules for which they already have all the competences.

### Discussion

- Participants asked who were the target groups of the ICT courses and why would they be interested in it (e.g. financial benefits for attending the course?).
- Monique De Ridder mentioned that they found that teachers lack digital competences. To start with, the courses will therefore be promoted among teachers in the field of adult education, but also beyond that.
- Trainers will be responsible for updating their teaching to the new programmes.

---

### 12.00-12.45 DIGCOMP take-up mutual learning among Member States – How DIGCOMP framework is involved in teachers’ and students’ digital competences model in Estonia - Egle Kampus from the Information Technology Foundation for Education (HITSA)

Egle Kampus presented how DIGCOMP is used in the Estonian context.

**The Digital Competence framework for teachers**

- Digital competences framework in Estonia is based on International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) models²⁷ (since 2012).
- A self-assessment matrix for teachers was developed. It is used by professionals to assess teachers’ competences and map lack of digital competences and training needs.

**Why choose an ISTE model?**

- The focus is on students’ learning and creativity;

---

### It sees the teacher as a partner in the learning process;
### It is designed for a teaching and learning context;
### It is general enough to still be up to date within 5 years;
### It describes attitudes and values.

ISTE has 5 areas for digital competence, namely:

1. Facilitate and Inspire Student Learning and Creativity
2. Design and Develop Digital Age Learning Experiences and Assessments
3. Model Digital Age Work and Learning
4. Promote and Model Digital Citizenship and Responsibility
5. Engage in Professional Growth and Leadership

- The ISTE model was compared and mapped to DIGCOMP. It was concluded that all components of DIGCOMP were present in ISTE’s standards. There was only one exception:
  - 4.4 Protecting the environment

### The Digital Competence framework for students

#### Background
- ICT was first made part of curriculum themes in 1996.
- In 2011, specific optional informatics courses were developed in secondary education, e.g. 'Mechatronics & Robotics', '3D Modelling', etc.
- In 2014, 'digital competence' was added to the national curriculum.
- In 2015, there was a political decision to develop a new digital competence framework and assessment model for students.

#### Work under development
- DIGCOMP is used as a reference for developing the digital competence framework for students.
- There will be an agreement on how it will be used next year.
- Descriptors of the 5 areas of DIGCOMP were translated.
- Every descriptor of proficiency level determines the minimum required competence.
- The HITSA’s competence framework for students is based on DIGCOMP’s levels, but related to the national curriculum.
- An assessment model is being developed which is different to the DIGCOMP one.

#### Future developments
- The assessment matrix is being evaluated by the teachers and experts.
- There will be a first assessment of 9th grade students in 2017.
- The web-based assessment tool for students is being developed.

#### 12.45–13:00 Closure
The Commission observed that since 2010/2011 the working group has done a lot. It has helped define the learning outcomes which are now updated and used. There is still the need to disseminate DIGCOMP further, and perhaps translate it into various languages.

DG EMPL has worked closely with the working group and also with other DGs on the topic of digital skills for many years. The Commission promises to go into detailed actions in the field once the digital skills agenda is communicated.

In the future, the Commission finally could analyse how training materials on DIGCOMP could be developed and re-used, e.g. via Erasmus+ or ESF.

### Session: EU Entrepreneurship Competence Framework for citizens and Entrepreneurship Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30-10.10</td>
<td>Sense of Initiative and Entrepreneurship: a Reference Framework for all citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The Commission (DG EMPL-C4) introduced the presentation, which aimed to inform participants...
about what happened over summer regarding the Competence Framework on Entrepreneurship Education (EntreComp), what changes have been introduced (a trend to simplification) and how the comments of the group have been picked up (elements people were uneasy about).

The Commission (JRC-J3) began the presentation by saying that throughout the online consultation run over summer loads of comments have been received. Many were targeted to improve the knowledge, skills and attitudes examples contained in the draft for comments. She explained that such comments will be considered at a later stage: the conceptual reference framework only covers areas, competence constituents and relative descriptors, whereas learning outcomes will be developed in the next phase of the research. Many comments collected helped in refining the wording of competences, the scope of some of them and especially to rearrange the competence constituents into three competence areas that are now more robust than in the previous proposal. She explained that what she was going to present what is the result of a very long process and that she was going to take the final suggestions today.

A consolidated version of the full reference framework EntreComp including the learning outcomes should be available by March 2016. It will be based on the 3 competence areas and 16 constituents defined so far. Also in 2016, JRC will develop a self-assessment questionnaire, which is meant as an internal tool that will feed into the citizens’ self-assessment.

- The scope of the EntreComp and the intended use is now clear. The different purposes could be: strategy definition, curricula and learning outcomes design, curricular activity/programme design, teachers’ training and continuous professional development, self-assessment, and self-directed learning. It is a reference document for support measures to be designed.
- It is not intended to be mandatory to anyone. Some people were afraid that it was aimed at becoming part of the national curriculum, but it is not the case: it is a free, open framework to be taken up by those actors that see a benefit in doing so.
- A background report discussing literature and case studies dealing with entrepreneurship competence will be available for download in a matter of days at the URL: https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/entrecomp.

The JRC presented the details of the summer consultation:
- Target group: approximately 200 people received the draft EntreComp for comments with a 30% response rate. The feedback allowed for a thorough revision of the framework.
- Most of the comments were related to knowledge, skills and attitudes statements and were detailed.

The framework was widely endorsed.

There is consensus on what the framework should include:
- A working definition of entrepreneurship.
- A clear statement of the intended use (and users) of the framework.
- Descriptors for each constituent.
- A clarification of the link between areas and constituents (otherwise there is no point of having areas. However, clarification of the link between them is tricky as it has to be adopted by various stakeholders).
- Stricter boundaries across constituents to avoid fragmentation (to make it easier for people to work with the EntreComp).
- Examples of skills, knowledge and attitudes (KSA) phrased as learning outcomes.
- Greater emphasis on 2.0 modes of entering (entrepreneurship as a collective output rather than an individual achievement).
- Valuing ideas is NOT about intellectual property and entrepreneurs are not just analysts.

Some issues are still unresolved:
- Although the sample is not statistically relevant, people from the business world more or less endorse it and are more enthusiastic about it. People from the education world seem to approve it but wonder how to implement it. For example, they asked “how do you translate that into a course?”, “How do you do it in practice in a country?” (especially when there is no entrepreneurship education strategy or entrepreneurship is not part of the curriculum).
- There was no consensus on the name of the framework. Some people believe there is no need
The Commission (DG EMPL-C4) proposed that the discussion after the coffee break would focus on how the framework can be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.10-10.25</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.25-12.00 | **Discussion**<br>The Commission (DG EMPL-C4) mentioned that even if this was the last meeting, the group will keep in contact, to help link the conceptual framework to the learning outcomes.  
Then, participants were then invited to pose questions. The following topics were discussed:  
- The reasons for the selection of only 3 areas and the exclusion of leadership/drive:  
  - Originally there were four areas, but they encountered problems with the area on ‘vision’ as it was too abstract and difficult to translate.  
  - Regarding leadership, although it was easy to describe, in practice it does not represent the majority of entrepreneurs, who usually work more collaboratively. However, leadership did not disappear from the framework.  
  - Also, the way competences are grouped is a matter of communication: it is not the most important aspect.  
- One of the participants welcomed that the new EntreComp is more synthetic and documented, but observed that some of the terminology still needs some tidying-up.  
- He also observed that there was an ideological issue: the discourse around entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship as a competence is of great interest to the “right-wing” and to the “left-wing” of politics. The EntreComp takes care of social issue, but does not fully capture the message that “anyone should be able to buy-in, no matter their ideology”. JRC answered that the focus on social economy stemmed from the fact, that the creation of social value is as important as the creation of economic value in the definition of entrepreneurship adopted and that people in the social economy sector were very reactive in the process and that a focus on specific sectors was not sought since the framework should be transversal to any sector.  
- Involvement of employers and close cooperation with other DGs. DG EMPL is keeping a close eye on the EntreComp in order to have businesses on board. DG Connect/MARKT would also like to be on board.  
- A third participant discussed the element of “coping with risk”. He said he recognises that they do not need to portray the entrepreneur as the hero, but right now, the way “coping with risk” is formulated, seems that it is for people already in business, and yet, how do you encourage people to start something is crucial. The JRC explained that elements such as “identifying opportunities” are also included. Other aspects are reflected in the self-awareness part.  
- There is still room to simplify the EntreComp (e.g. In Wales, they have 7 skills). |
Topics discussed

- “Problem solving” is now included under “problem shaping” and “developing solutions to problems”. A participant suggested that it could possibly fit under initiative taking.
- It is not the role of the Commission to create an assessment tool; its development would be long and difficult. The focus will be on self-assessment. However, the learning outcomes can be used for any tool.

The JRC announced that they had launched the EntreComp website that day and invited participants to follow-up on the work on the EntreComp. Any additional questions or comments can be sent by e-mail. Also, everything is published on Yammer and that it was there to get feedback.

The discussion then focused on three main competence areas:

- **‘Ideas and opportunities’:**
  - Regarding the competence ‘Valuing ideas’, the JRC put emphasis on what value is, with a distinction between public and private interests. A participant mentioned that the word “valuing” is confusing, ambiguous.
- **‘Resources’:**
  - Participants discussed the competence “self-awareness and self-efficacy”. One mentioned that self-awareness is part of self-efficacy, so the competence could be only self-efficacy, because simplification is key to selling the EntreComp. Another commented that self-awareness and self-efficacy should not be together, as the two concepts are more complex than that. It was suggested to move “self-awareness” to the first competence area while “self-efficacy” could stay in the resources competence area. The use of the word “resources” seemed problematic for at least one participant, as, in some languages, it appears the meaning of the word could be too narrow. Other suggestions were to make the difference between “personal” and “external” resources or to use “mobilise resources” instead.
- **‘Into action’:**
  - A suggestion was made to merge “working with others” with “mobilising others”. The JRC was against this as mobilising others and working with them are different. But “Mobilising others” means inspiring them, and that this concept was very important and therefore should not be merged.

The Commission (DG EMPL-C4) concluded the discussion by mentioning that the EntreComp was still work in progress and invited participants to keep on commenting outside the group’s meetings. On that topic, a participant asked for all potential comments to be made through Yammer in order to enable everyone to follow the progress.

JRC added that in December they will start developing the learning outcomes and invited participants to continue to contribute.

---

### 12.00 - 12.30

**Entrepreneurship360 Building entrepreneurial competencies & skills for entrepreneurship through the education system, Jonathan Potter, OECD**

Jonathan Potter presented the Entrepreneurship360 project and what had happened in the last 18 months since he last presented the project to the group.

He began the presentation with the two aims of the project, which are:

- To enhance activities in schools and VET that build entrepreneurial competencies and skills for entrepreneurship; and
- To provide guidance to school managers, teachers and policy makers to introduce new activities and to overcome existing barriers.

And the three focus areas of the project:

- The entrepreneurial institution (leadership, flexibility, resources):
- Entrepreneurial education in practice (objectives, teaching, organisation):
- The outward looking institution (integrating institutions in their environment, outward-looking

---

Time | Topics discussed
--- | ---

He then presented the different outputs (see slides). The E360 website contains papers, videos, case studies, etc.\footnote{29 http://www.oecd.org/site/entrepreneurship360/}

**Discussion**

A participant was wondering what the target area of the E360 project was. Jonathan Potter explained that it was the EU-28, with several countries, such as Germany and the UK, showing more interest.

A self-assessment tool was not included in the project and one participant asked if there were reasons for that. The Commission (DG EAC-B3) explained that they lacked resources to introduce a self-assessment tool. Indeed, such a tool would only have been useful if it were translated in the different local languages, but they did not have the resources to do so.

The issue of the differences between VET schools and general schools was raised by one of the participants. Jonathan Potter felt that there were not so many differences between the two types of school and that, actually, there were more commonalities than differences. The participant insisted that the following differences were important: VET schools are more in tune with businesses, students “learn by doing” and are much more engaged with the teacher/instructor, and career guidance and the elements of entrepreneurship are better addressed in the curricula of VET schools.

**12:30 - 13:00** Draft Eurydice Report on Entrepreneurship Education at school in Europe 2015 - (EACEA-A7)

The Commission (EACEA-A7) first presented the two sources used for their study, which were: the Eurydice national units and international surveys.

Regarding the coverage of the study, most members of the Eurydice Network were involved (a total of 33 countries with three not participating: Ireland, Germany, Liechtenstein). It covered school education, i.e. primary and secondary education (general and school-based initial vocational education).

The following topics were addressed by the study (for the full results, see slides):

- Definitions of entrepreneurship education used, shared and agreed by most stakeholders at national/regional level;
- Overview of strategies related to entrepreneurship education in Europe;
- Analysis of strategy topics and corresponding action;
- Financial means (national and European) allocated to entrepreneurship;
- Entrepreneurship education and strategy context;
- Approaches to entrepreneurship education in the curriculum, Primary education;
- Approaches to entrepreneurship education in the curriculum, Upper secondary education;
- Central guidelines for teaching methods in entrepreneurship education;
- Practical entrepreneurial experience in the curricula of upper secondary;
- Education and school-based IVET;
- Learning outcomes for entrepreneurship education in ISCED 1 and 2;
- Learning outcomes for entrepreneurship education in ISCED 3 and school-based IVET;
- Assessment of learning outcomes related to entrepreneurship education at school;
- Entrepreneurship education as a compulsory topic in the initial education of teachers in primary and secondary general education, as well as in school-based IVET, according to central level recommendations/guidelines;
- Availability of CPD courses specifically related to entrepreneurial education for teachers in primary and secondary education;
- Types of support for teachers provided (or supported) by central level authorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topics discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following a comment from a participant that something was potentially wrong for Italy, the Commission (EACEA-A7) invited all participants who thought something was missing or wrong to contact their national unit. She added that, for the study, they only looked at curricula and not at guidelines or initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td><strong>Closure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>