

**Report on 3<sup>rd</sup> Consultation Workshop**  
**Copenhagen 13-14 November 2008**  
*Prepared by Peter Koudahl and Pekka Kämäräinen*

## 1. Programme

**CONSULTATION WORKSHOP**  
**DANISH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, AARHUS UNIVERSITY. DEPT. OF CURRICULUM,**  
**RESEARCH**  
**13<sup>TH</sup> AND 14<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER**  
**COPENHAGEN, DENMARK**

**Project “VET Teachers and Trainers: Key actors to make lifelong learning a reality in Europe” (Contract No.: 2007-4094/001-001)**

<b>2008 November 13th: Position audit – updating the picture</b>		
9:00 - 9:15	<b>COFFEE / TEA and REGISTRATION</b>	
9:15 - 10:00 - 10.45	<b>Welcome and introduction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome speech and contextualization of the workshop of representative from European Commission, Directorate General for Education and Culture, Lifelong Learning: Policies and Programme <i>Dagmar OUZOUN</i>,</li> <li>• Presentation of participants</li> <li>• Introduction national Teacher education systems (10 min. per presentation).</li> </ul>
10:00 - 10:30	<b>Session 1: Arrival activity</b>	<b>Task 1:</b> Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement by placing stickers along the line in the appropriate place.
10:30 - 11:00 10.45 – 11	<b>COFFEE / TEA / FRUIT</b>	
11:00 – 11:15 11-11.40	<b>Session 1: Arrival activity (continues)</b>	<b>Task 2:</b> Find someone who has placed an arrow at the opposite end to yours on one of the statements and discuss for ten minutes why that is so.
11:15 – 12:15 11.40-	<b>Session 3: Feedback on key Issues</b>	<p>There are 5 topics – titles will be published on posters. You are invited to sign up according to interest. Maximum allowed 8 people.</p> <p>Each group has 60 minutes together to examine one or more of the key issues both in general terms and related to their own country.</p> <p>The group is asked to record comments straight onto a word document. These will be printed out as hard copies before next session.</p>
12:15 - 13:00	<b>Session 4: Rainbow groups</b>	<p>Divide in to rainbow groups.</p> <p>Each person will have paper record of their group discussions.</p> <p>Feedback to each other.</p> <p>Paper output on additional points raised.</p>
13:00 - 14:00	<b>LUNCH</b>	
14:00 - 15:00	<b>Session 5: Identifying additional issues and examples of</b>	<p><b>Country groups</b></p> <p><b>Each group has two tasks:</b></p> <p>1. Are there additional (related to 5 topics discussed in Session 3) issues related to their own country?</p>

	<b>practices</b>	2. Have they any particular examples of good practice in training of VET teachers or trainers?
15:00 - 16:00	<b>Session 6: Expert witness session on the projects</b>	<b>Presentations of the projects (10 min. each):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Klas Tallvid</li> <li>• Maria Kirstin Gylfadottir</li> <li>• Rasmus Frimodt</li> </ul>
16:00 - 16:30	<b>COFFEE / TEA / FRUIT</b>	
16:30 - 17:00	<b>Session 7: Building of the project</b>	In buzz groups – one or more concrete points/ideas coming out of the research projects that could be build on and / or one suggestion they would give to the project team.
17:00 - 18:00	<b>Session 8: Influences, barriers, opportunities</b>	<b>Task 1.</b> Sentences in pre-printed colour coded cards with “barriers”, “influences”, “opportunities” are to be completed.
		Each person takes as many cards as they want to each colour and fills them in.
		<b>Task 2.</b> Groups of 2-3 people take several completed cards and brainstorm responses. So, for “barriers” try to suggest ways how to overcome them, for “opportunities” it may be ways of exploiting them etc.
		Cards are “posted” back on the table when they have been dealt with so that other groups can address the same issue.
19:00	<b>Dinner at the restaurant</b>	
<b>2008 November 14th: Agenda for the future</b>		
9:00 - 9:30	<b>COFFEE / TEA</b>	
9:30 – 10:30	<b>Session 1: Establishing priorities</b>	Groups take “solution” cards and carrying out activity to prioritize.
		Either mapping onto important / urgent grid or card sort under “next steps”, “middle distance” and “back burner”.
10:30 - 11:30	<b>Session 2: Stakeholder action</b>	Trainers, Researchers and Policy makers (institutional representatives, universities)
		3 board activity.
		3 groups representing different stakeholders.
		<b>Task 1:</b> Taking priority lists, each group to address 3 key questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can they do to respond / move the agenda forward</li> <li>• What do they need other stakeholder groups to do.</li> </ul>
		20 minutes at each board. Groups rotate to next board. Facilitator stays with same board. When next group arrives, facilitator summarizes the points on flipchart.
		Next group record: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What they want from previous group</li> <li>• How they can respond to what first group wanted.</li> </ul>
Third group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As for second group.</li> </ul>		
11:30 - 12:00	<b>Session 3: Summing up and evaluation</b>	
<b>LUNCH / DEPARTURES</b>		

## 2. General Information

The third consultation workshop in Copenhagen was organized on the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> November at The Danish School of Education, Aarhus University in Copenhagen. The workshop covered four Nordic Countries (Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Iceland). The vocational education and training systems of these countries are based on similar main frameworks and have gone through similar reforms. However, the institutional context of vocational teacher education differs from country to country and the status of VET teacher education curricula/schemes vis-à-vis the Bologna process varies. Equally, there are differences between individual countries concerning the role of VET teacher education as support for workplace learning and training for trainers.

**Similarities and differences between the countries:** In a nutshell the similarities and differences can be described in the following way:

- Traditionally **Sweden** has developed its educational system with an emphasis on comprehensive educational institutions and integrative models for teacher education. Thus, all teacher education (also for vocational teachers) is given by university departments. The measures of the 1990s for enhancing workplace-based learning and for establishing advanced vocational learning have modified the picture.
- **Norway** introduced a similar overarching framework for upper secondary schools but then took specific measures to combine the traditional apprenticeship model with the school-based vocational education programmes (the 2+2 model). Consequently, Norway has kept vocational teacher education as separate programmes in the non-university sector of higher education. The main provider is the Akershus University College, which was formed as a merger of several colleges (one of which was the National College for Vocational Teacher Education).
- As a contrast to its neighbours, **Denmark** based its policies for developing initial VET on the merger of traditional apprentice training and school-based training schemes (with alternance between school-based and workplace-based learning). Consequently, Denmark has kept the vocational teacher education in a separate college outside the university structures.
- **Iceland** has developed its VET policies with reference to the other Scandinavian reforms but taking into account the scale factor. Regarding vocational teacher education, Iceland used to send students to other Nordic countries and only recently (in the 1990s) has started to establish its own programmes alongside the general teacher education provisions. Thus, the educational system has a closer resemblance to the ones in Sweden and Norway, whilst the arrangements for vocational teacher education have a closer resemblance to the ones in Denmark.

**The preparation of the workshop:** The invitation list for the workshop was prepared with the aim to cover different stakeholders and expert organisations regarding VET policies as well as the areas of vocational teacher education and training of trainers. Moreover, special emphasis was given to reach country-specific stakeholders or experts with insights into specific developmental initiatives:

- The Danish invitation list included different contributors to vocational teacher education and continuing professional development schemes. Also, representatives of Social Partners, teachers' professional associations and regional VET colleges were approached.
- The Icelandic invitation list covered public authorities and the providers of (vocational) teacher education, including the LdV national agency.

- The Norwegian invitation list included national and regional government bodies, Social Partner organisations, university researchers (VET research; research on innovations in working life) and vocational teacher educators.
- The Swedish invitation list included the responsible ministries and government agencies, Social partner organisations and research & development centres.

The organisers had especially the ambition to invite delegates who normally do not participate in such workshops. Therefore, also VET teachers and company representatives were approached. However, the fundamental obstacle was that their organisations were not willing to send them to the workshop without financial compensation for the working hours that they would spend in the event.

**Language issues and lingual support:** The workshop was originally planned as an event with mainly Nordic participants. This would have enabled the participants from Denmark, Norway and Sweden to contribute with their own language and participants from Iceland with their first foreign language (Danish, Norwegian or Swedish). During the preparation the possible participation of the European Focus Group was taken into account. Therefore, the potential participants were asked whether they are willing to participate in an English-speaking workshop without simultaneous interpretation. Because all participants accepted this option, it was decided to carry out the workshop in English. If the organisers had been more successful in getting delegates from VET schools and companies it would have been necessary to organise simultaneous interpretation for the plenary sessions and lingual support for the working groups. However, whilst the plenary sessions were carried out in English, one of the working groups was mainly using Nordic languages but reported back to plenary sessions in English.

### 3. Summary on session outcomes

In the following sub-sections, more detailed reports are given on the main workshop activities:

- 1) Arrival activity (participants' responses to pre-given pairs of mutually conflicting statements);
- 2) Group discussions on key topics;
- 3) Witness session on current projects and reforms;
- 4) Discussions on new projects;
- 5) Establishing the priorities for future measures;
- 6) Reflections on the role of stakeholders;
- 7) Evaluation of the workshop by the participants.

The **arrival activity** has been documented in detail because it provides insights into the contradictions and tensions that the participants have considered when discussing the professional development of VET teachers and trainers.

The **group discussions on key issues** (sessions 3, 4 and 5) were organised in two parallel groups that worked throughout the three sessions. The discussions focused on the following issues:

- a) Similarities/differences between VET teachers and trainers (and consequences for accreditation),
- b) The role of new technologies in education and training (and consequences for pedagogies in VET).

The **expert witness session on projects** (session 6) provided additional information on country-specific reforms in Iceland, on recent Cedefop/TTnet project on defining VET

professionals and on a number of parallel European projects in career guidance and counselling. This reporting was immediately followed by the **discussion on new project ideas** (session 7). Here it is worthwhile to note the criticism of policy- and framework-driven (top-down) approaches in European cooperation and the demand for 'real life' projects that reveal problems and workable solutions in different education and training environments.

During the session on **establishing priorities for future research activities and developmental measures** (session 8 and session 1 of the second day) participants prepared 'issue' cards and corresponding 'solution' cards. The latter ones were used as the basis for mapping priorities in terms of their importance and urgency. Here it is worthwhile to note that the participants were proposing flexible or context-adjusted solutions and were sceptical about measures that were based on European frameworks or general accreditation models.

The final activities were the **group discussions on the role of different stakeholders** (researchers, training practitioners and policy makers) and the **participants' personal assessment of the workshop**. Here it is worthwhile to note that the participants found it important that they were challenged to contribute to a participative and interactive workshop instead of attending a traditional conference. They also found it important that they were challenged to consider the professional position of teachers and trainers and their mutual cooperation in different VET cultures.

### 3.1. Arrival activity

Below the participants' reactions to 10 pairs of mutually conflicting statements are summarised. The participants expressed their positions by placing a sticker between the two poles (the straw-poll activity).

- a) **Statements on "Recognition via reputation" vs. "Recognition via formal accreditation"**: The opinions were highly divided on this matter. 60% to have the very strong opinion that trainers depend on reputation, while 40% feels very strong that accreditation is the only way to secure that the quality of the trainer lives up to standards. There was a large gap in the middle. This reflects a tendency that civil servants who are not directly in teaching and training seem to be more in favour of accreditation, formalisation and control, while practitioners and scholars seem to be more in favour of a practice-based approach to the whole matter of teaching and training.
- b) **"Accreditation based on peer reviews" vs. "Accreditation based on formal qualifications"**: More people felt that if there was accreditation it should be based on peer appraisal. About a third felt this very strongly. Again, there was consistency between those who were in favour of deregulation and were 'anti-university' involvement. Those who did feel that this should be based on formal qualifications did not feel this very strongly.
- c) **"Focus on full-time trainers" vs. "Taking into account part-time trainers"**: There is a strong tendency that the participants think that peer appraisal should be the pivotal point of accreditation. At the same time no one has placed themselves to the extreme in this matter.
- d) **"Convergence between teachers' and trainers' jobs" vs. "Divergence between the skills and competences of VET teachers and VET trainers"**: There is almost consensus on this matter. No one is to the extremes. A small minority seems to turn a little more to the statement that teachers' and trainers' jobs are coming together.

- e) **“Emphasis on expertise in the subject area for teaching/training” vs. “Baseline knowledge in the subject but emphasis on training skills and techniques”**: The largest number thinks that trainers must be experts in their own subject area. However, a large minority tends to stress that training skills and techniques are also very important.
- f) **“Training as regulated profession” vs. “Allowing interested persons to work as trainers”**: All but two participants had placed themselves in the middle concerning this matter. One participant indicated that anyone should be allowed to practice as trainer. One participant felt very strongly that training should be a regulated profession.
- g) **“Professionalization as improvement of the quality” vs. “Professionalization as exclusion of interested practitioners”**: Opinions were divided almost equally. However, those who felt that professionalizing training will improve the quality were more strongly expressing their position.
- h) **“Trainers’ own responsibility for their professional development” vs. “Need for national or European *training the trainer* programmes”**: Two participants had placed themselves in both extremes. Among the others there is almost a consensus on this matter. Most of the participants had placed themselves in the middle. This is probably an indication that both points of view are important.
- i) **“VET researchers are too eager to tell trainers what to do in practice” vs. “VET research can inform trainers but researchers should accept that they are not practitioners”**: All participants except one are of the opinion that there is a close relation between trainers and researchers. Consequently, the practitioners can benefit from research results.
- j) **“Central role for universities in *accreditation and recognition* of training for trainers” vs. “Central role for communities of practice to develop accreditation/ training for trainers”** : The whole spectrum of options is covered in this matter. However, a little more than half of the participants tend to think that the trainers’ communities of practice should develop the arrangements by themselves.

### 3.2. Discussion on key topics (Session 3, 4 and 5)

There were only two groups in these sessions. The participants wanted to group themselves and preferred to decide themselves how many groups were needed in different phases of the workshops. Considering the number of participants it would not have been helpful to split into country groups. The results of the discussion groups are reported below in five sub-sections. The first two sub-sections cover the topic groups on *cooperation between VET teachers and trainers* and on *the impact of new technologies*. The two following sub-sections summarise *discussions across the topics* (one group) and *across the countries* (the other group). The last sub-section summarises *converging or contrastive positions on accreditation systems* and on possible European measures.

#### **Topic 1: Co-operation between VET teachers and trainers**

**Is there a marked distinction between VET teachers in colleges and trainers working outside the education system?**

- The reason they exist is different, therefore they must be different - in schools the purpose is to educate, and in a company it is to earn money. This is reflected in the way teachers work and the way company trainers work.
- We need to get VET teachers to realize they are in the teaching profession i.e. they are not hairdressers but vet teachers. In reality, they think they are hairdressers first, teachers second – even if they have not practiced as hairdressers for 10 years!

- In contrast, general education teachers see themselves as teachers - as do general education teachers working with VET students (e.g. teaching maths) but VET teachers see themselves as whatever their trade or technical area is first and foremost.
- Is there not a sense of all being part of a single teaching team? No! (Unanimous reaction from the group). We have tried to get joint projects going – but it's not working. Teachers and trainers see themselves as having different tasks; VET teachers and trainers are very different. Training is not seen as an academic profession.
- There is a definition issue. What is a trainer, what is a teacher? It was agreed that trainers were company based, responsible for on-the-job training.
- One core skill if you are working with apprentices is that you need to be able to understand youth – the values and attitudes of young people. Both trainers and teachers have that in common. There are big differences in roles and tasks and competences but they need to have values and attitudes in common.
- In big companies there may be 'schools' which do both on- and off –the-job training but these are more like ordinary VET schools. Although they are company based, the 'school' based component is still taught in the classroom away from the production line.

### **Are their training needs different or similar?**

- One cannot generalize about all teachers or all trainers, but some teachers/trainers have same needs.
- Teachers and trainers have similar roles but very different functions and a different pedagogy. In schools, for example, teachers can set up processes where students learn from mistakes, by trial and error. They are told this is 'good' pedagogy. Trainers cannot afford to do this in industry.
- They have the same needs in terms of understanding young people. It is important that trainers have the will and ability to understand young people and enjoy working together with them.
- They may have to face common social issues e.g. dealing with immigrant workers / trainees who do not speak the language fluently.
- Primary and secondary school systems train students to ask questions, challenge, find their own way of doing things. School based VET continues this approach. In a company there is a very different culture – trainees are told that they have to do things in a particular way and follow instructions exactly. Students often cannot cope with the culture change.
- Problem-based learning is practiced in schools but is difficult in a company. In a company maybe there are real live problems to use as examples but only limited and prescribed solutions. Teachers and trainers could learn a lot from each other.
- A major issue is to integrate general education in vocational education. This is increasingly important. A possible solution: qualification in VET teaching for general education teachers.
- There are continuity issues for trainers in a company i.e. they have apprentices this year but maybe not next year. Or this year they have to supervise apprentices, next year someone else does. So their priorities change. In school there will always be students
- In schools, teachers can implement new ideas about students working at their own pace, how they want to, when they want to – they cannot do this in a company.
- There are big problems with definition of trainers, with language and with cultural differences. Work based trainers are not taught to deliver training but they should be. 'Instructors' exist as an occupation in some sectors in some countries – they usually do not require a qualification – are they more like trainers?

### **Are their paths converging or diverging?**

- At the moment they are divergent but several examples of country legislation are designed to bring them closer together. The question is whether this is desirable or whether we should accept and recognize the differences?

### **Would one accreditation framework meet the needs of both groups?**

Three positions were expressed:

- No way – but more to do with divergences between national VET systems than between trainers and teachers. It would not be good to have all VET teachers and trainers trained in higher education.
- It may be desirable but it is not very feasible. It depends what is included in the framework.
- Values and attitudes are important: you should be able to certify or quality mark these.

### ***Topic 2: New technologies – what impact does / should it have on the practice and training of VET teachers and trainers?***

#### **How will new technologies impact on the work of VET teachers and trainers?**

- **Computerisation – digital literacy:** Iceland example – new computerized welding machines bought for the school last year – teachers could not use it but students could. Teachers would not use the technology. Also problem in Denmark – students can use the technology, teachers cannot.
- **Virtual learning environments, simulators etc.:** Use of virtual environments to train – mistakes are cheaper. E.g. welding, using excavators. Simulated environments opening up new possibilities. Use of simulators will increase. Will replace a lot of the core teaching in technical schools. Already has impact – this will increase. Won't have a teacher standing there demonstrating – will be using video on demand. Students being able to access interactive whiteboards / video from home. Computerised tool making – increasingly common but so many types – schools cannot afford all the types.
- **New pedagogic challenges:** But if we are talking about priorities, the pedagogic skills are the most important, not the technical skills. Experiments with allowing students to use the technology to work at home for example – hope it will decrease drop out rate. Need to organize learning in groups – how do you overcome this? New technology impacts on this – e.g. machine that operates 24 hours a day with 6 people working shifts – they all need to be trained together and to work as a team.
- **Work experience:** Socialisation to work life will be increasingly important role for trainers and teachers as very difficult to simulate this or use computer based learning. Standards for teaching – why are we so defensive? For pilots, dentists, plumbers etc the competences are much the same. Why should teachers be any different?
- **Organisational (learning) culture:** In Germany you are taught to do as you are told, exactly as your boss tells you. To be obedient is valued. In Sweden it is not like that: You are less likely to have a boss. Innovativeness is more highly valued: you have to teach differently. Labour markets are more different than universities ever have been.
- **Internationalisation:** Maybe there are opportunities for joint accreditation between countries with similarly organized labour markets. But although content of VET training may be different, is the pedagogy different? Other point of view is that globalization / growth of multinational companies is demanding increasing standardization: why can't we have standardized accreditation for training VET teachers?

### ***Topic 3: Discussion across both topics (one discussion group)***

#### **Cooperation between VET teachers and trainers.**

- There is no marked distinction between teachers and trainers – but they represent different contexts.
- The learning process is different – the learning process in the work place is inherently individual while schools are mass educational systems.
- We need more meeting places where teachers and trainers can meet in a professional context to develop both vocational and pedagogical competences.
- Schools have to open themselves to the life of work and trainers.

#### **Impact of new technologies**

- You need to have a system where VET teachers can update vocational knowledge continuously.
- The need for general knowledge is also rising as most vocations get more complex.
- To enhance continuing professional development you have to create an interactive platform where VET institutions and working life can meet.

#### **Emerging approaches and initiatives towards recognition of VET teachers.**

- A central (national and international) accreditation or recognition scheme is not something to strive for.
- Education providers should have the responsibility to set up their own standards for trainer qualifications in cooperation with the work place – and arrange necessary training programs for future trainers.

### ***Topic 4: Discussion on differences and similarities between the countries (other discussion group)***

#### **How do the positions vary from country to country?**

- **Cultural differences:** Need to clarify difference between instructors, trainers, teachers, tutors etc – not just a language issue but a cultural issue. In Sweden / Norway /Denmark there is no qualification for trainers in industry other than they should be master craftsmen. Contrast this with NL .Also, in NL movement between VET system and university is common but not in Sweden. In Iceland VET education is more and more concentrated to schools: students' time in work based learning is reduced vis-à-vis the time at school.
- **Dualisation:** Dual systems vary across countries – the issue, who is responsible for theory or practice is solved differently. Again this makes needs of trainers and teachers different depending on country.
- **Distribution of training functions:** In Sweden we don't have many people who could be defined as trainers – more instructors or tutors. Have people with that function – task is the same, function the same but job is different. They are more like tutors than professional trainers. We (Sweden) don't have professional trainers but people who have training competences. In Iceland you can be accredited as a teacher not as a trainer, so teachers look down on work based trainer. This is not the same in Sweden – it is the opposite. Trainers in industry look down on teachers and think they should improve.
- **Factory schools:** E.g. in the case of Volvo these have been very successful. However, they have to follow same syllabus as public schools. Problem is low transferability of learning between different companies. Technology is very specific and

not general. This cannot be in the interests of the labour market in general. Yet, these schools are very successful and have low drop-out rates.

- **Time for training/learning:** There is an increasing problem with releasing people from production line for training. Provision for teachers to spend time in companies is important. Have been pilot studies in this. This needs to be part of collective bargaining. The trade union perspective: there will never be room for full time trainers in companies but there should be a right for those with training responsibilities to get release to attend courses to learn about training others.
- **Learning opportunities at workplace:** In many occupations / small companies there is no time to train apprentices in the company: therefore the VET school is the only option. In Germany they have regulated that a trainer has to have a certain amount of education. But this has had the effect – especially in economic bad times – that companies don't send trainers to education which makes this regulation meaningless. In Sweden there are a no quality incentives for schools to find the best work place learning company. Since the school must give economic compensation to the work place for accepting an apprentice, expensive (but good) placing is often turned down for more economical alternatives.
- **Status of VET teachers:** A common problem in Scandinavia is that teachers have generally a low status – especially VET teachers. The low status of VET among students is a big problem and it is reflected in the status of VET teachers. This is not the case in Finland where all teachers have a high general status.

***Topic 5: Controversies and converging positions: For an accreditation system – who shall be the drivers and should there be a common European system?***

- **Complex question and contrastive views:** In Denmark it would be through the tripartite committees for each trade sector. In other countries it would more likely be the universities. Companies should be included in the process.
- **Alternative approach:** Every education/training provider should be responsible to set the quality criteria or standards for qualifications of trainers and do this in a transparent and open way so that stakeholders can assess their implementation.
- **Mobility between training/teaching positions:** Qualification frameworks exist for teachers in most countries – should we be looking for an overarching European framework? For trainers the situation is totally different. What happens if there is an individual who has been a trainer in industry then moves into teaching – do they need a new qualification? We need flexibility to deal with exceptions. In Sweden only the universities can award qualifications in teaching. Scope for APL – in Sweden the length of the qualification programme for VET teachers is less for those with more experience. If trainers have a basic qualification as a journeyman in their own technical subject area, the additional skills they need to be a teacher or a trainer are much the same.
- **The role of pedagogic know-how:** One of the differences is that VET teachers will often have specialist skills or experience of, for example, working with special needs or disabled young people. Trainers in the workplace will be unlikely to have these skills – but do they need them? Trainers cannot replace nor do the same job as VET teachers. Teachers are preoccupied with the needs of all the students in their in order to meet government targets in terms of completion rates, progression rates etc. Company trainers do not have this problem.
- **The specific pedagogic role of VET schools:** There are a lot of students in VET school following a vocational course but without a work placement or an apprenticeship contract. They are guaranteed a place in a school but cannot be guaranteed a place in a company in exactly the occupation that they have trained in i.e. they must be prepared to be flexible. So teachers have to be more flexible as they have to teach not

only the 'theory' but also much of the practice and often to the least able students. Should training contract be between school and company or between student and company? If a student is not learning enough they will go to see their teacher in a school more often than their boss on work.

- **Partnership notion:** In Sweden no real tradition of co-operation - you produce students, we'll produce cars. In Denmark the factories are very proud of 'their' schools. Will always be some organisations which cannot take apprentices e.g. architects, courts – do they pay? Yes (in Denmark) – they get their qualified workers from the universities so they are publicly funded anyway. Also it is compulsory for every public sector organization has to take on apprentices or they lose money – in excess of that they pay into the fund.
- **Issues of examination:** Some countries have exams, some have professional assessment. Where there is an assessment system it is the teachers that give the grades. Not allowed to have student in the workplace if there is no teacher with the skills to assess.
- **Common standards:** In some contexts national standards are important – otherwise you get 5,000 different qualifications. Would be nice to have national or European systems for some teaching areas (e.g. for ICT teachers). There will be significant sectoral differences. E.g. in Health Care sector there will be only a few large employers and existing regional or national structures so there will be mechanisms for getting agreement. This is quite different for plumbing for example.
- **Case for joint/separate accreditation:** In the original discussion we said we could not see that single system would work for teachers and trainers so do we need to consider two frameworks whether at national or international level? In Sweden there are many trainers who work outside the formal system – the private providers – how do we deal with them? Should any framework cater from them too?

### 3.3. Witness session (Session 6)

Three expert witnesses presented during this session: María Kristín Gylfadóttir from Iceland gave a presentation on the Icelandic National Teacher Education System; Rasmus Frimodt from Denmark gave a presentation on the Cedefop/ TTnet project "Defining VET Professions" (PowerPoint presentations are available for both inputs). In addition, Klas Tallvid from Sweden presented a number of projects he had been involved in:

- Euroguide VAL ([www.euroguideval.org](http://www.euroguideval.org) )
- Guidance in the Workplace ([www.guidanceintheworkplace.eu](http://www.guidanceintheworkplace.eu) )
- Enabler ([www.eu-enabler.eu](http://www.eu-enabler.eu) )
- Winkit ([www.winkit.eu](http://www.winkit.eu) )
- Guidancemerger ([www.guidancemerger.org](http://www.guidancemerger.org) )
- UNEVOC ([www.unevoc.unesco.org](http://www.unevoc.unesco.org) )

The discussions were mostly focusing on questions of understanding.

### 3.4. Discussion on new project ideas (Session 7)

#### a) General reflections on the needs for research

Most research projects in VET are based on top-down approaches. Thus, the point of departure typically derives from

- existing laws and regulations *or* from
- policy-based questions concerning the implementation of reforms *or* from

- prior studies that have been carried out on the basis of a top-down approach.

In the current situation there is a need to reverse the approach. That means that there is a need to look into what is actually done in different practical settings concerning teaching and training in VET. In addition, there is a need to involve a more qualitative approach to the research in VET.

Another proposed guideline for research in VET is (emerging the discussions of the workshop) is that studies must focus on *real problems* with (eventually) low quality of VET. Thus, it is not enough to focus on apparent differences in national VET-systems. In other words: We need “real life studies”.

#### **b) Topics and methodological recommendations for future research (not prioritised)**

- **Mapping of *different* kinds of learning environments in VET across Europe:** The participants emphasised that learning environments in VET vary a lot across Europe. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse the preconditions and obstacles to common VET policies.
- **Studies of *practice-based learning* in different European VET systems:** The participants of the workshop emphasised most European educational research has been carried out from a school-centred perspective - not taking into account that in VET the practical workplace learning (mostly) is central and the school-based learning has a supporting role.
- **More *empirical* interviews and observations:** These are needed to clarify how teaching/ training/ learning actually takes place in different educational settings in VET and in different European countries.
- **Support for learning in working life:** What are the infrastructures for supporting learning in working life? What is the role of training and how do the existing support structures function?
- **Focus on trainers’ needs and interests:** What support arrangements for learning are needed? What kinds of collective patterns to promote learning are taking shape?
- **Pre-conditions for the professionalization of trainers:** In order to make transparent the idea of a common professionalization of trainers it is crucial to identify the tasks and roles of trainers and their variation across European countries.
- **Different role of supporting policies:** Since VET-systems in Europe are so different, the trend towards European regulation of input (qualification of teachers and trainers) can be positive in some systems but very counter-productive in others. A project focussing on the possible effects on different European VET systems is therefore needed.

### **3.5. Identifying important areas that require action / Establishing priorities**

The session 8 of the first day was carried out as a preparation for the session 1 on the second day. The result of the first phase was a pack of ‘issue’ cards, which were then used as a basis for preparing the corresponding ‘solution’ cards. These were used as the inputs for the session “Establishing priorities” that is reported in the tables below.

#### **a) What to do?**

<b>Important and urgent</b>	<b>Important but not urgent</b>
New vocabulary on competences must be developed; the old one does not allow us to think outside a competence framework	Teachers must get out of school and participate in the production of the companies
Teachers/trainers must take consequences	Unions must arrange opportunities for VET teachers

of being professional: behave accordingly	to learn from each other: peer learning
VET schools must offer short courses to trainers	Teachers' role as facilitator requires new competences – and the teachers must start defining them and share them
Teachers and trainers must start to get familiar with – and use new technologies	Teachers and trainers must enter in continuing professional development – NOW
VET schools must be a meeting place for teachers and trainers	
	<b>Not important and not urgent</b>
	Training of teachers and trainers must be more formalized and well-defined

### b) Dealing with influences...?

<b>Important and urgent</b>	<b>Important but not urgent</b>
Teachers must be given time and money to update their qualifications	More trans-national projects involving teachers and trainers must be funded and started
More (research)funding	Demands from the companies must define the role and activities of trainers
	<b>Not important and not urgent</b>
	Practical skills must be given higher status than academic skills e.g. through different salaries for different kind of teachers
	Research in VET must be taken away from universities
	Teachers and trainers participating in training should have a raise in salary

### c) Overcoming barriers

<b>Important and urgent</b>	<b>Important but not urgent</b>
MORE FUNDING	Companies must be forced to send trainers to training
Schools and companies must share communities of practice	Companies must be forced to train their trainers
Schools and companies must share their knowledge/create better communication	
New teachers must be given time to find his/her teacher role	<b>Not important and not urgent</b>
Researchers must present results in a way that is relevant/useful to teachers/trainers	Training of trainers must be based on European standard
	The profile(s) of trainers must be clearly defined
	All expenses that companies have regarding training of trainers must be reimbursed
	Training needs for trainers must be clearly defined

## 3.6. The role of different stakeholders

Participants then were challenged to consider the roles of different stakeholders (and how they can support each others' activities). In this workshop activity the groups were simulating the roles of different stakeholders and setting their goals. Then, in the next phase they were formulating related expectations on the other stakeholders' matching activities.

### a) Research community

#### a1) What goal-settings for future research activities?

- Research with a teacher perspective and a student perspective, based on qualitative methods,

- Incorporate the economic dimension – show the “Investment possibilities” of VET,
  - Relate general and contextual dimensions/problems.
- a2) What can researchers expect from trainers?**
- Participation and sharing of experiences
  - Dialogue
- a3) What can researchers expect from policy makers?**
- More attention on the lack of funding, new initiatives for funding relevant research
  - Dialogue
- a4) How do we make this happen?**
- Securing VET teachers'/trainers' status, training opportunities and financial incentives
  - Securing information and communication (the role of research networks)
  - Securing the continuity of interest-based dialogue
- b) Training practitioners**
- b1) What goal-settings for training practitioners?**
- Engagement and basic understanding of their mission,
  - Commitment to the related developmental activities,
  - To behave like a professional.
- b2) What trainers want from the research community?**
- Contribute to the understanding of the learning processes and environments (and the institutional contexts),
  - Contribute to better understanding of their roles in the learning process.
- b3) What trainers want from policy makers?**
- Set the agenda and support with funding and structure
  - Recognition of the importance of trainers for the whole educational system
- b4) How do we make this happen?**
- Develop trainers' and teachers' communities of practice,
  - Establish teachers' and trainers' research networks
  - Develop communication channels between the different groups – trainers, researchers, policy makers and employers and the medias.
- c) Policy makers**
- c1) What goal-settings for policy makers?**
- Recognition of the importance of VET – a raising of status,
  - Support, funding and infrastructure – networks, research etc.
- c2) What do policy makers want from trainers?**
- Contribution to the supply of a qualified work force
  - Contribution to the supply of qualified and competent citizens
- c3) What do policy makers want from researchers?**
- Deliver information of VET – in order to improve it.
  - Give understanding of institutional relations in society
  - Improve knowledge baseline
- c4) How are we going to make it happen?**
- Develop strategies to research “the ears” of policymakers
  - Make the results of research more transparent,
  - Strengthen the research network(s), and secure longstanding public engagement.

### 3.7. Evaluation

The participants valued the interactive methods, which had a great leaning impact at a personal level and stipulated constructive collaboration at the team level. Everybody could broaden their knowledge about the situation of VET teachers and trainers in other countries. The various inputs from experts, researchers, politicians and practitioners allowed for gaining insight into different perspectives, also fostering communication and

exchange between the different stakeholder groups. New questions were put on the table and new answers were developed and generated in the discussions.

There should be less emphasis on mere mobility schemes, but efforts on bottom-up strategies should be strengthened.

### 3.8. Key outcomes of sessions and activities

- **The opening activity** made transparent different starting positions for discussion and created a readiness to reflect on conflicting positions and on alternative approaches. The documentation of this activity shows the readiness of the groups to make a compromise on the initial differences.
- **The discussions on the key topics** (sessions 3, 4 and 5) provided an opportunity to explore more closely two major topics (*Cooperation between VET teachers and trainers and Impact of new technologies*). Furthermore these sessions provided a possibility to examine the *mutual dependence of the given key topics* and the *relative differences between the participating countries*. This provided the background for *converging and contrastive views on accreditation* and on possible European measures. Here, the participants highlighted the different developments regarding *the status of VET teachers and trainers, workplace learning partnerships and support for professional development*. At the same time they emphasised common challenges regarding *induction of young people into working life, familiarising teachers and trainers with young people's learning culture and incorporation of new technologies and new media into vocational learning*. Based on these topical discussions the two groups worked further and considered the possibilities to learn from different countries.
- **The expert witness session** provided further information on current reforms and on the involvement of the participants in major European projects (e.g. the Cedefop project on defining VET professionals and European projects on guidance or on validation of non-formal learning).
- **The discussion on new project ideas** provided an opportunity to formulate critical feedback for the policy-supporting projects (based on top-down approaches) and to express the relative value of 'real life projects' that focus more closely on obstacles and barriers for successful policy development (bottom-up approaches).
- **The session on establishing priorities** led to joint maps with the help of which the participants expressed their views on the importance and urgency of proposed developmental measures. In the light of the previous sessions it was clear that the participants were pleading for more flexible and context-adjusted measures and were more reserved about overarching regulations and/or accreditation frameworks.
- **The stakeholder activity** led to an effort to express mutual expectations between three groups (researchers, training practitioners, policy makers) regarding future developmental cooperation.
- **The preliminary assessment** by the participants favoured the interactive and action-oriented mode of working in the workshop.

## **4. Workshop results against the project objectives**

### **Objective 1: To explore the national strategies and national contexts relevant for VET teachers and trainers and the training of trainers**

The topic groups discussed the national policies and different patterns for using trainers, tutors or instructors in the companies. This discussion was related more closely to cooperation between teachers and trainers and to initiatives for promoting use of new technologies. The differences between teachers' and trainers' career patterns were discussed from the perspective of learning pathways and from the perspective of common/separate recognition models. The main point is that the teachers are more or less perceived as an (academic) profession whereas the status of trainers is less transparent. This has a negative impact on efforts to develop cooperation projects.

### **Objective 2: To determine the impact that these strategies have on the training and practice of VET teachers and trainers**

The discussions drew attention to the relative stability of the institutional duties of teachers (in schools) and the changing organisation-specific tasks of trainers (in companies). These differences start from the stability vs. discontinuity of teaching/training activities and from the continuity vs. discontinuity of the same persons in teaching/training activities. Furthermore, the institutional or organisational factors have an impact on the pedagogies and learning cultures (room for self-organised learning vs. necessity to eliminate mistakes and fatal errors).

### **Objective 3: To identify other factors that influence the work and training of VET teachers and trainers**

The discussions drew attention to the introduction of new technologies and to the changing roles of teachers/trainers vs. learners in piloting with new technologies. Here the main point was to promote new pedagogies and a reorientation in the learning culture: How to support VET teachers and trainers in adopting the role of a facilitator of learning instead of sticking to mere delivery of pre-defined learning contents. Also the discussion drew attention to the role of VET teachers and trainers in supporting the socialisation of young people (and people with migrant background) into working life.

### **Objective 4: To discuss key findings, conclusions and recommendations of reports initiated/supported by the European Commission and CEDEFOP and related European and national projects**

The workshop had inputs from the European projects in which some participants were involved (the Cedefop/ TTnet project on Defining VET professionals and several European projects on Validation of non-formal learning and on career guidance). However, the participants drew attention to the general shortcomings of such policy-supporting projects that start from given systems, policies and frameworks and focus on policy processes and policy implementation in the field. The participants were concerned that such projects

create general pictures of the average functioning of given systems and of the feasibility of new regulative frameworks or new mechanisms of steering, assessment or recognition. The participants complained that such projects do not confront themselves with different training contexts. Thus, the projects are not immediately dealing with critical factors that are decisive for the success or failure of training (and of related policies).

**Objective 5: To identify any additional issues or challenges not covered by these reports**

The participants emphasised that the policy-focused country studies or concept studies alone are not enough for evidence-based policy development *or* for evidence-based practice in teacher education and the training of trainers. Therefore, the participants stressed the need to analyse the organisational boundary conditions for developing the work of teachers and trainers. Equally, the participants emphasised the necessity to analyse the many aspects of internationalisation in education, VET and working life. It is essential to note that instead of focusing on single policy issues the participants tried to create pictures of problem constellations that require combined efforts from different actors.

**Objective 6: To consider what directions and strategies might be appropriate in the area of VET teachers and trainers in the future, both at a national and European level**

The participants were not looking for one overarching solution to cover the training needs and professional development prospects of VET teachers and trainers. Instead, they drew attention to different boundary conditions for promoting teachers' and trainers' professional development – even in the Nordic countries. Therefore, the assessment of current policies and single measures (e.g. accreditation) was characterised by reflection on 'pros and cons' (see above section 3.2, point (e) *Controversies and converging positions*). Instead of recommending directly a general accreditation framework the participants drew attention to the sectoral differences and to different country-specific patterns of recognising qualifications. Furthermore, the participants emphasised the importance of such change agendas that start from the working with the desired changes in education/training and develop the related schemes for VET teacher education and training for trainers on the basis of successful piloting (bottom-up approaches). Moreover, the participants were critical on the innovative potential of transnational mobility schemes unless they are connected with joint developmental projects.