

POROČILO S SLUŽBENE POTI:

37. sestanek *Stalne skupine za kazalnike in ciljne vrednosti (SGIB)* pri Evropski komisiji

I. IME IN PRIIMEK

mag. Zvonka Pangerc Pahernik

II. KRAJ, DRŽAVA IN TRAJANJE

Bruselj, Belgija, 12. (in 13.) maj 2014

III. ORGANIZATOR(JA)

Direktorat za izobraževanje in kulturo (DG EAC, Enota A4 'Statistika, študije in raziskave') pri Evropski komisiji

IV. KRATEK OPIS

Avtorica poročila sem se zaradi nujnih drugih službenih obveznosti udeležila le prvega dne dvodnevne srečanja SGIB. Poročilu je zato dodan osnutek zapisnika sestanka SGIB, ki ga je pripravila Evropska komisija.

Sestanek je odprl vodja Enote A4 in hkrati predsedujoči Stalne skupine za kazalnike in ciljne vrednosti (SGIB), Jan Pakulski. Zapisnik 36. sestanka SGIB, ki je bil novembra v Bruslju (glej dokument **2B**), smo sprejeli brez pripomb, prav tako predlagani dnevni red (dokument **2A**).

1. Jan Pakulski nas je obvestil o aktualnih dogajanjih na evropski ravni ter na področju dela enote A4, za katero je pristojen:
 - Teče prvo leto uveljavljanja novega programa sofinanciranja, Erasmus+, pojavljajo se začetne države, a jih EK v sodelovanju z državami članicami uspešno premaguje.
 - Evropske volitve bodo 25. maja prinesle precejšnje spremembe na političnem vrhu EK; ena prvih velikih nalog nove zasedbe evropskih politikov bo sprejetje Skupnega poročila (ET 2020 Joint Report).
 - Po razglasitvi rezultatov raziskave PIAAC teče v državah članicah, ki so sodelovale v prvem krogu, podrobnejša, tematsko usmerjena obdelava podatkov.
 - Teče revizija programa dela Stalne skupine za kazalnike in ciljne vrednosti ter strokovnih delovnih skupin; slednje so v letu 2014 pričele z intenzivnim delom.
 - Teme prihodnjih raziskav na ravni EU bodo izbrane skrbno, v skladu s spoznanji aktualnega vmesnega zajetja spoznanj in pobud (t.i. ET 2020 Mid-term Stocktaking).
 - Oživili bodo spletni portal za medsebojno komunikacijo delovnih skupin EK, tj. CircaBC, in v ta namen v jesenskem času odprli spletno razpravo o naših pričakovanjih.
 - 25. junija bodo objavljeni rezultati raziskave TALIS, v enoti A.4 in CRELL jih že obdelujejo.
 - Zamenjali se bodo nacionalni eksperti, ki delajo v enoti, o odprtju razpisa nas bodo obvestili, saj od nas pričakujejo predloge za nove sodelavce.

2. Poročila evropskih ustanov CEDEFOP, CRELL, Eurostat, Eurydice:

- **CEDEFOP:** pomen agencije CEDEFOP narašča premo-sorazmerno s pomembnostjo poklicnega izobraževanja in usposabljanja (VET) v Evropi; podrobneje analizirajo statistične podatke in razvijajo kazalnike za področje poklicnega izobraževanja in usposabljanja: redno objavljajo publikacije Statistical Overviews na temelju 31 kazalnikov za različne uporabnike ter Statistical Highlights za politike in medije; podrobneje analizirajo rezultate raziskav CVTS in AES pa tudi PIAAC s poudarkom na zmožnostih; za metodologijo JAF bodo pripravili seznam kvalitativnih kazalnikov s področja VET, pripravljajo pa tudi prispevek za letošnji Monitor izobraževanja in usposabljanja; posebno pozornost

namenjajo problematiki razlogov za neuskklajenost ponudbe in povpraševanja po zmožnostih ter vprašanju, kako z začetnim in nadaljevalnim poklicnim izobraževanjem in usposabljanjem (IVET in CVET) izboljšati situacijo (raziskava 'eu-SKILLS') – po pilotu bodo v glavni raziskavi zajeli 50.000 zaposlenih iz vseh držav članic; poročilo bo na voljo v naslednjem letu; več na njihovi [spletni strani](#) in v PP predstavitvi **3A**.

- **CRELL**: Center za raziskovanje vseživljenjskega učenja pri Skupnem raziskovalnem centru (JRC) zaključuje svoj šesti delovni program in pripravlja sedmega, pri tem zagotavljajo podporo Evropski komisiji pri spremljanju napredka pri uresničevanju strategij 'Evropa 2020' ter 'Izobraževanje in usposabljanje 2020' na šestih delovnih področjih: zmožnosti odraslih ter vseživljenjsko učenje odraslih, praksa učenja in poučevanja, jezikovne zmožnosti, vlaganja v izobraževanje, poklicno izobraževanje in usposabljanje ter proces izobraževanje in usposabljanje 2020. Na [spletni strani](#) so objavljene njihove nedavne nove publikacije, več o aktualnih in prihodnjih dejavnostih pa je na voljo v PP predstavitvi **3B**.
- **Eurostat**: še vedno je aktualna vpeljava klasifikacije ISCED 2011 – leto 2014 je prvo leto njene implementacije, priročniki bodo končani v juniju, klasifikacija ISCED – področja izobraževanja 2013 bo v letu 2016 vpeljana v vseh raziskavah Eurostata; aprila so objavili podatke LFS 2013 za obe krovni ciljni vrednosti (visokošolski diplomanti in mladi, ki zgodaj opustijo šolanje), poteka revizija vprašalnika LFS: del W4 zadeva udeležbo v izobraževanju in usposabljanju v zadnjih štirih tednih – ta del ostaja nespremenjen; del 12M zadeva udeležbo v izobraževanju in usposabljanju v zadnjih 12 mesecih, kar naj bi se zbiralo z anketo LFS vsaki 2 leti, vendar je začetek te prakse odvisen od sprejetja pravnih osnov za LFS; prek spleta so na voljo rezultati AES 2011 in CVTS 2010, mikropodatki so na voljo raziskovalcem, tečejo prizadevanja za izboljšanje diseminacije prek spleta; naslednja izvedba AES bo tekla od julija 2016 do marca 2017; naslednja CVTS bo izpeljana leta 2015 po veljavni metodologiji, po tem pa se obetajo spremembe – oblikovana je posebna delovna skupina, ki bo revidirala obe metodologiji; podatke za zbirko UOE 2012/2013 bodo začeli zbirati oktobra 2014. Več v PP predstavitvi **3C**.
- **Eurydice**: na kratko so predstavili publikacije, ki bodo izšle v juniju: Modernisation of Higher Education in Europe: Access, Retention and employability, Recommended Annual Instruction in Full Time Compulsory Education (2013/2014), Key Data on Early Childhood Education and Care 2014, Funding Mechanisms for schools in Europe (2013/14) ter tiste, ki bodo izšle jeseni: Short comparative analysis on Instruction time, Fees and support in Higher Education ter Teachers and Head teachers' salaries – glej PP predstavitev **3D**.

3. Izpeljava vmesnega zajetja spoznanj in pobud (EU 2020 Mid-term Stocktaking):

Evropska komisija je v procesu vmesnega zajetja spoznanj in pobud o strateškem okviru 'Izobraževanje in usposabljanje 2020' (I&U 2020). Slednji je bil sprejet leta 2009, letos je torej pravi čas za vmesno presojo in spremembe. Primarni namen tega procesa je priprava naslednjega Skupnega poročila (Joint Report) o napredku pri uresničevanju evropskih ciljev na tem področju. EK ga pripravi ob koncu vsakokratnega 3-letnega obdobja (nazadnje leta 2012), služi pregledu opravljenega in opredelitvi usmeritev za naprej.

Skupno poročilo 2015 (Svet ga bo sprejel maja/junija 2015) bo v večji meri kot do zdaj usmerjeno v prihodnost, in sicer je njegov namen:

- opredelitev nove skupine ključnih prednostnih področij in izzivov za naslednje obdobje (2015–2017),
- povečanje dodane vrednosti ter optimizacija učinkovitosti strateškega okvira I&U 2020 (ter z njim povezanega upravljanja, delovanja in poročanja).

Področje I&U 2020 naj bi na ta način ostalo tesno povezano s krovno strategijo vsesplošne rasti in zaposlovanja 'Evropa 2020' in naj bi v še večji meri prispevalo k njenemu uresničevanju, zato bo prav ta vidik eden od ključnih v aktualnem Skupnem poročilu. Proces 'EU 2020 Mid-term Stocktaking' bo služil tudi novim vodjem Evropske komisije, da se z državami članicami dogovorijo o prioritetah in ključnih

aktivnostih ter pobudah, obenem pa zagotovijo tudi večjo skrb za učinkovitost (poenostavljanje, preprečevanje podvajanja, večja dodana vrednost ipd.).

V procesu 'EU 2020 Mid-term Stocktaking' gre za zajetje mnenj, spoznanj in pobud na treh področjih:

- **Strateški cilji in prednostna področja I&U 2020** – ali (v luči ekonomske in zaposlitvene krize) obstajajo razlogi za njihove vsebinske spremembe in njihovo drugačno operativno naravnost?
- **Povezava med I&U 2020 in strategijo Evropa 2020 (rast in zaposlitve)** – kako v večji meri z izobraževanjem in usposabljanjem prispevati k uresničevanju strategije za rast in zaposlovanje (Evropa 2020)?
- **Upravljanje in uresničevanje I&U 2020** – kako optimizirati in po potrebi poenostaviti postopke, delovne metode, orodja in poročanje (vključno z dejavnostmi v delovnih skupinah)? Ali obstajajo alternativni, inovativni instrumenti za večjo učinkovitost in uspešnost okvira I&U 2020 pri spodbujanju političnih reform?

Podatki, mnenja, spoznanja in pobude bodo zbrali na več načinov: z rednimi nacionalnimi poročili, ki jih bodo države oddale 30. junija – z njimi ne zbirajo več podatkov, temveč vsebinske poglede. Merodajni bodo tudi: razprave v delovnih skupinah in mrežah EK na različnih ravneh (povabljeni smo tudi člani SGIB), razprave z evropskimi socialnimi partnerji, deležniki in civilno družbo (npr. na konferenci '2014 Education, Training and Youth Forum', od 9. do 10. oktobra 2020), neodvisna vmesna evalvacija, ki jo izpeljuje ECORYS – mednarodna ustanova za raziskovanje, primerjalna študija o Odprti metodi koordinacije na različnih področjih izobraževalne politike, ki jo izvaja konzultantsko podjetje GHK, ter nekateri drugi viri.

Zaključki posvetovanja z zgoraj omenjenimi deležniki bodo osnova za usmeritve politike, predlagane v Skupnem poročilu. Zbrani bodo v t.i. 'Staff Working Document on the ET 2020 Mid-term Stocktaking', ki bo priloga k Skupnemu poročilu.

4. Razprava o postopku priprave in vsebinah Monitorja izobraževanja in usposabljanja 2014:

Predstavili so nam strukturo naslednjega Monitorja, ki bo nasledil tiskano publikacijo ter on-line izvedbo, ki so ju vpeljali v letu 2013. Nova publikacija se bo naslonila na druge aktualne procese, med njimi še zlasti na 'EU 2020 Mid-term Stock-taking' in bo sledila strukturi: Input – Drivers – Outcomes – Impacts. Upoštevali bodo tudi rezultate dela strokovnih skupin, še zlasti skupine za investicije v izobraževanje.

Predvideno zaporedje poglavij bo takšno:

Input:

- CH. 1 – Education investment
- CH. 2 – Raising employability
- CH. 3 – Levelling the playing field

Outcomes:

- CH. 4 – Early school leaving
- CH. 5 – Tertiary education attainment
- CH. 6 – Basic skills (PISA/PIAAC)
- CH. 7 – Transversal competences

Drivers:

CH. 8 – Quality ECEC

CH. 9 – Teaching profession (TALIS)

CH. 10 – Work-based learning, adult learning

CH. 11 – Modernisation + internationalisation HE

CH. 12 – Skills relevance, learning mobility, EASQ

CH. 13 – New pedagogies, technologies

Osnutek letošnjega Monitorja bomo člani SGIB prejeli v presojo od 1. do 18. septembra. Več informacij o Monitorju je na voljo na <http://ec.europa.eu/education/monitor>.

Podrobneje o opisanih ter drugih točkah dnevnega reda z dne 13. maja glej v prilogi, tj. zapisniku Evropske komisije.

III. GRADIVO

Delovno gradivo za 37. sestanek SGIB je na voljo v elektronski obliki pri avtorici poročila:

Dokument	Naziv
2A	Final agenda of the 37th SGIB meeting
2B	Final minutes of the 36th SGIB meeting
3A-D	PP presentations on recent developments at CEDEFOP, CRELL, Eurostat, Eurydice
5	EU 2020 Mid-term Stocktaking
6	Education and Training Monitor 2014 – draft structure
7	The Joint Assessment Framework
8A-C	Participation in international surveys PL presentation PISA-PIAAC ES presentation ESLC
9	Multilingualism and the development of language competencies
10	Revision of the Adult participation in LL
11	Tertiary education projects
12	Final recommendations for entrepreneurship indicators and expected follow-up
13	Indicator expert groups: progress of work

Poročilo pripravila:

mag. Zvonka Pangerc Pahernik (zvonka.pangerc@acs.si)
Andragoški center Slovenije

30. junij 2014



Brussels, 10.07.2014

37TH MEETING OF THE STANDING GROUP ON INDICATORS AND BENCHMARKS
12-13 MAY, 2014
SALLE JEAN REY, BERLAYMONT, BRUSSELS

Draft minutes

Monday 12 May

1. Opening by the Commission

The Chairman, Mr. Jan Pakulski, Head of DG EAC Unit A4 'Statistics, Studies and Surveys', opened the meeting by welcoming the participants. Delegates from Member States (except BG, LV and RO) were present as well as a NO delegate. CEDEFOP, CRELL, ETF, Eurostat and Eurydice also participated as did OECD for the last half day of the meeting. Two invited experts from ES and PL made presentations under point 8 of the agenda.

The Chairman informed that the SGIB membership is being reviewed, - particularly to get more attendance from EEA and Candidate countries.

2. Agenda and administrative points

The agenda was adopted without changes as were the final minutes of the 36th SGIB meeting in November 2013. The final minutes of that meeting were sent on 28th March to the delegates together with the invitations to the 37th meeting.

3. News from the Commission

The Commission (Jan Pakulski) updated the group on the general news from the Commission (upcoming EP elections and the expected new Commission from November 2014) as well as on specific DG EAC news: the Erasmus+ programme has started, the preparation of the Joint Report for spring 2015, as well as the on-going European Semester 2014.

Unit A4 is in the initial planning stage regarding a PISA/PIAAC conference (SGIB will be further informed) – the exact timing is still to be decided. In 2014 around 3,5 mill € will be spent on studies. Finally, unit A4 plan to implement CircaBC (or a similar collaborative platform) for early autumn. The SGIB will be contacted on this later during the summer.

Specifically on the SGIB Work Programme 2014-2015, it was recalled that:

1. SGIB was further consulted on two occasions during the first months of 2014. Mainly due to updating of the ET2020 process.
2. Last consultation: no changes suggested.
3. The WP as it stands now is suggested to be sent to the High Level Group for information. The SGIB will be informed accordingly.

DG EAC also announced the launch of TALIS on 25 June. The specific Commission analysis paper will be shared with the Education Committee just before the release.

4. Recent developments at CEDEFOP, CRELL, Eurostat, Eurydice.

CEDEFOP, CRELL, Eurostat, Eurydice as well as the European Training Foundation (ETF) presented recent developments of relevance for the SGIB within their working areas.

CEDEFOP: Updated VET indicators have just been published on CEDEFOP's website; they mainly use of AES and CVTS as data sources. The Skills Mismatch Survey is underway surveying employers (50.000 observations across EU Member States) – the data analysis will be done during the summer with findings to be presented in early 2015.

CRELL: The areas of activity under the CRELL VII programme are: Europe and ET 2020 benchmarks (JAF and projections), occupational mismatch in Europe (technical report), skills report based on PIAAC data, Reading literacy – based on PIRLS, secondary analysis of TALIS as well as a report on education investment.

Eurostat: ISCED 2011 implementation is in full progress and integrated ISCED mappings will be finalised this summer. Checks for possible break in series in LFS quarter 1 data (2014) will be done as soon as data are available; no breaks have been indicated from Member States. AES 2011 is online including anonymised data available for researchers; next round will be in 2016. The AES draft regulation will be approved by European Statistical System Committee in mid-May. CVTS 2010 data for 27 countries (minus IE and NO) are also available. The draft regulation for the 2015 survey is also to be voted on now; it has been simplified slightly. A further simplification is expected for the survey afterwards. For the administrative data collection (UOE) the main focus is on implementing ISCED 2011 through manuals and updated questionnaires.

Eurydice: Several Eurydice reports will be published during the coming weeks: on Modernisation of Higher Education and Early Childhood Education and Care. The facts and figures on 'Instruction time' has, for the first time, been done with the OECD. This is evaluated as a positive experience which will be repeated annually as foreseen. The report on Education Funding Mechanisms is scheduled to be published on 30th of June; this should be seen as a pilot exercise.

ETF: The European Training Foundation works with capacity building projects for candidate countries. Part of these also concern monitoring evidence and therefore the work of SGIB is relevant for the ETF and vice-versa. The ETF delegate pointed out that more data are available from candidate countries regarding ET2020 benchmarks.

There were no further comments to these presentations by the SGIB delegates.

5. Mid-term stock taking of the ET2020 strategy

Mr. Devuyt (DG EAC unit A1) presented the mid-term stock-taking exercise of the ET2020 strategy. The evaluation is done through more exercises with Member States, including an independent evaluation by an external consultancy firm which have sent questionnaires to national DG EAC committee members including some from the SGIB.

The SGIB members asked a number of questions after the presentation concerning the nature of the stock-taking, the need for it as well as the broader emphasis of DG EAC's education policies.

Mr. Devuyt replied that countries/delegates are not obliged to answer to the requests: the joint report is to be done every three years and because the next one falls in the middle of the Europe/ET 2020 execution then the work has been defined to include a more thorough evaluation.

The Swedish delegate indicated that their autumn election makes it difficult to answer at present and the Dutch delegate questioned the added value of the Joint report and suggested that it could be part of the simplification process.

Particularly the French and Italian delegates discussed the legitimacy of the present benchmarks and indicators; their advice would be to have a reasonable number with a sound quality. They also warned against the overemphasis on the economic crisis and its consequences for education. They underlined that it is important to take stock but that education is only moved slowly due to the long time it takes to do structural changes. The UK delegate also wished for a better analysis and presentation; policy developments should be done at national level according to national circumstances. The Estonian delegate agreed that there should not be too many indicators, - but particularly the Early School Leaving one had initiated positive developments in Estonia.

DG EAC acknowledged that streamlining and simplifications are important. In DG EAC's view further steps regarding developing ET2020 are absolutely needed and the feedback from the Member States on this will be essential.

6. Outline of the 2014 Education and Training Monitor; process and content

DG EAC (Mr. Stan van Alphen) presented the outline for the third edition of the Education and Training Monitor. He underlined that the aim is to come forward with a coherent storyline.

The SGIB consultation will this year be done from 1-18 September to avoid the summer period; the deadline of submitting comments by 18th of September is non-flexible.

The French delegate asked to include links to the tables when available or send the tables for verification of data. The Commission replied on questions from FR and IT regarding the inclusion of the work of the education investment group, that it would be included but that there would also be a chapter focussing on equity.

The purpose and coherence of part three were also questioned (IT and UK). The Commission underlined that the focus in these parts is to go beyond technical data analysis and link to the policy issues and instruments available at EU level. The third part would, for example, include sections on the EU promoted recognition tools as the European Qualification Framework and the Diploma supplement.

The Commission regretted that the use of OECD data (particularly from the skill surveys as PIAAC) would not allow including all Member States in the analysis (this was prompted by a question from the MT delegate). Furthermore, it was underlined that the skills mismatch analysis is seen to be important as well as the general discussion around competences versus educational attainment. The Commission also underlined that it would welcome country specific examples and that SGIB members are invited to react.

Tuesday 13 May

7. The Joint Assessment Framework (JAF)

The outcome of the SGIB consultation regarding the first qualitative check lists were presented for discussion. It was underlined that some source data are outdated; these would be updated once there is agreement on the indicators. The choice of dichotomous variables was justified in terms of simplicity and clearness of presentation. The JAF qualitative indicators presented at the meeting are based on Eurydice material.

The Commission thanked the SGIB for the good and constructive comments received.

For the chosen ECEC indicators it was underlined to:

- improve definitions;
- to mark central level measures in decentralised systems (ex. DE and ES);
- to treat home-based ECEC (important for approximately 10 countries (under 3 years old));
- that, to add job-satisfaction and well-being at school would not be possible because it would probably require new data (a survey).

The IT, CY and EL delegates asked clarifying questions to distinguish better regarding autonomy of educational levels to make decisions, to capture the well-being of children (introduce 'readiness for school') as well as to clarify the dimensions of the CPD indicator (Continuous Professional development).

The BE delegate requested to consider the dichotomy of variables which were considered to be too simplistic and thereby hiding real life complexity.

Eurydice, in answering the technical questions, acknowledged that 'job satisfaction' could be developed. The 'professional duty' indicator captures the aspect of it being obligatory as well as the 'rights' issue. For the CPD issue, it had been difficult to restrict the number of hours as this would also exclude some countries.

For the chosen indicators on basic skills:

The general issues raised in the consultation were how indicators will cover all three basic skills as well as the data being outdated. A better distinction between genuine school indicators and basic skills' indicators were also requested.

The specific comments on the indicators were: Indicator 3. Specialist teachers: clarify definition. Indicator 4. Induction programs: no specific focus on low achievement (now generic indicator). Indicator 5. CPD for teachers: replace with compulsory CPD (Commission agrees). Indicator 6: align with future Council Conclusions on Effective Teacher Education. Indicator 7: delete (Commission agrees). Indicator 8: to be developed further the link with basic skills. Indicator 9: the whole school approach: still to be developed.

Some additional proposals were received: school leaders' role in tackling low achievement. The Commission reaction was that this would be difficult for the qualitative part (available in quantitative surveys like PIRLS). Indicator B10 from Key Data on Education 2012 could be considered for focus on school evaluation. Efforts should be done for monitoring achievement in basic skills (TIMSS and now TALIS).

The Dutch delegate pointed out the dilemma of showing these indicators for decentralised systems where the situation would often differ from one school/commune/region to another. The UK delegate pointed out that some of the indicators do not specifically focus on basic skills and suggested that autonomy/accountability would be a good dimension to look at on its own in regard to centralised/decentralised systems.

Eurydice answered the technically based questions by indicating that the basic skills' indicators are well defined; so the 'marche of manoeuvre' would not be great. The proposal on autonomy and accountability was well received and there is more material on this.

For the chosen indicators regarding tertiary attainment: The used indicators had been taken from the publication on Modernisation of Higher Education: Access, Retention and Employability (published 22/5) as well as from the 2012 Bologna Implementation report. Eurydice pointed out that more complex indicators might be preferable in some cases. Dichotomy does not always mean 'positive/negative' and the scope of indicators could at times be clarified in relation to private/public, academic/professional dimensions. -In general the focus is on public funded higher education.

The specific comments on the indicators were: Prior learning: use more broadly alternative entrance routes. To show national definitions of 'part time studies' as additional notes. For completion rate data: should be important to look at policy (not if the indicator exists or not.) Career guidance: should be for all students. Indicators 8: fees, and 9: student support: not suitable for dichotomy variables.

Some additional proposals were suggested in the consultation: guidance to school students, levels of fees/support, quality assurance (in relation to completion rates/drop out). Comments received were perceived to be very helpful.

As a general comment, the SGIB requested to see the concrete follow up to their comments. The SE delegate also indicated that it was at present not easy to get the full overview and that the exact selection should be clarified. The Commission agreed but indicated that how this will be done is still to be discussed. The Commission also indicated that the next domains to be treated would be mobility and employability.

In general the Commission concluded that the presented work constitutes a big step forward and that a continuous consultation with the SGIB would be important.

8. Use of international surveys for policy development

This point of the agenda was mainly dedicated to a presentation of how results of international surveys are used at national level for policy purposes. This follows the SGIB's emphasis on focussing on international surveys.

The Commission gave a brief up-date on the overview of which international surveys countries participate (and plan to participate) in. Some countries still need to submit their information in the excel sheet that has previously been circulated.

Secondly, OECD gave a brief update on PIAAC developments. Countries are now encouraged to sign

up for the third round (in the 1st cycle) of PIAAC. The Commission supports this with the aim that as many Member States as possible should participate in the 1st cycle of PIAAC. In this regard, DG EAC is still pursuing further the use of European Social Funds for funding participation in international surveys. SGIB were invited to get in contact with Mr. Fischer-Kottenstede regarding more information on this issue.

Mr Jerzy Wisniewski from the Polish Ministry of Education presented the PISA / PIAAC lessons for Polish education policies. In fact, Poland has been increasing its PISA scores during the 00s and is now among the best-performing EU countries. In Poland this is widely seen as the effect of prolonging the duration of obligatory education to encompass 16 years old; a reform which took place in early 2000. In particular, avoiding early tracking of students had resulted in a significant lower percentage of low achievers.

Mrs. Carmen Tovar Sanchez from the Spanish Ministry of education presented the policy implications of the Spanish European Survey on Language Competences. Spain had a large ESLC sample which allowed for regional level (autonomous regions) analysis. The survey results showed a high proportion of low performers. The policy follow up concentrated on why English is not 'learned' better and there was widespread consensus that 'something had to be done'.

At national level, reports and studies were commissioned (translated into EN). New educational law promoted CLIL and use of CEFR (compulsory). The recommendation is to study 2 further languages and more emphasis on speaking and listening skills (not only reading). Many efforts were made in disseminating results to the education community so they could use them in their daily work. For example, students can now assess themselves on-line (in EN); there are guidelines on how to interpret results and the regional results are compared to average national results. The actual implementation of policy changes is left to the regional level.

The SGIB welcomed these two presentations and found them highly interesting. The French delegate noted that if international survey results are validated by national ones then the results are often seen to be more acceptable. The Commission also underlined the role of the public debate around the international survey results and how this could generate positive outcomes (impetus for change) at national and regional levels.

9. Multilingualism and the development of language competences

The Commission (Mrs. Francesca Crippa) informed the SGIB about the compromise reached for the May 2014 Council Conclusions on Multilingualism. While the countries decided not to adopt a European benchmark, they committed themselves to promoting multilingualism in the Council Conclusions as well as conducting further work on assessment of language competences (national skill surveys as well as further co-operation with Eurostat for improving UOE data on language learning).

Mrs. Kristina Cunningham from DG EAC's unit A3 (multilingualism section) conveyed the feeling of disappointment in not succeeding to establish a benchmark. However, there are 3 strong initiatives underway under the newly adopted Erasmus+ programme. Firstly, there will be an assessment of language capabilities of Erasmus mobility students (this will also generate quite a lot of quantitative data); secondly, the Commission will step up efforts to co-operate with the Council of Europe regarding promoting the CEFR as a practical tool. Finally, the DG EAC Thematic Working Group on transversal skills will also look at assessment of language skills.

The PT and CZ delegates expressed their opinions on the process of negotiating the Council Conclusions. Some frustrations have been apparent in the process because of lack of taking into account national circumstances as well as the limited data basis for judging the feasibility (the first European language skills survey was only carried out in 14 Member States.)

The Commission underlined that the technical issues were thoroughly assessed and dealt with by the Commission during the process. The general feeling is that the Member States did not want to commit politically to yet another benchmark and the goal of furthering language policies were lost in the detailed discussions of technical issues. This could be related to the more generally perceived survey fatigue.

However, the Commission underlined that it is committed to the multilingualism dossier and that given the wording of the Council Conclusions it is expected that the Advisory Board would be turned into an IEG which would advise the Commission on the further developments in the area.

10. Revision of the 'Adult participation in lifelong learning' benchmark

The Commission (Mr. Luca Pappalardo) presented the ideas for revising the Adult Lifelong Learning benchmark given the future availability of improved Labour Force Survey data (participation in adult learning in the 12 months prior to the survey). This presentation was complemented with additional information from Eurostat regarding the on-going process for modernising social statistics which should clarify the timing of ALL questions and surveys (respectively the LFS and the Adult Education Survey). Eurostat underlined that there will always be differences in methodology between the LFS and AES because of the more narrow and detailed focus of the latter (guided on-the-job training cannot be covered in the LFS for example).

SGIB delegates welcomed the developments in improving the data sources (IT, AT, NL, SK and ES). It was underlined that careful study of the consequences of the methodological changes would be necessary. A further possible combination of LFS and AES information should be thoroughly studied.

The Commission underlined that the timeframe for the change in surveys is not settled yet because of the overall major revision of the legal framework for social statistics. For the Adult Lifelong Learning benchmark it was concluded that its possible revision need to be reflected on time-wise. More generally, there are also issues around the Europe 2020 education benchmark (early school leaving and tertiary attainment) given that both are set to be reached by 2020. This discussion is in all likelihood going to be taken within the context of the Joint Report.

11. Tertiary education projects

The Commission (Mrs. Lene Mejer) shortly presented progress on three activities linked to tertiary education. Firstly, DG EAC is running, in co-operation with DG RTD and Eurostat, a project for creating a European Tertiary Education Register. The first part of the project is expected to come to a successful end by end of June where the methodological handbook and the data collected will be put on-line. DG EAC is running a Task Force with Member States to follow the development of this work closely. A second data collection is expected to take place in autumn 2014 and the final results of ETER will be discussed in a Task Force meeting foreseen for spring 2015.

A project under development with ICDE (International Council for Open and Distance Education) for measuring scope of distance education (including MOOCs) as well as strategies for developing distance education at institutional level is under development. The first part of the project is expected to be implemented in 2014.

Finally, the next Bologna implementation report is underway (to be published May 2015 in relation to the next Bologna Ministerial Conference). This co-operation is led by Eurydice with the involvement of Eurostat and Eurostudent. DG EAC is supporting the project.

There were no comments to this short presentation.

12. Presentation of the final recommendations for entrepreneurship indicators and expected follow up

The Commission (Mr. Kjartan Steffensen) presented the final recommendation of the IEG on entrepreneurship indicators. There is one set of indicators recommended with one main indicator defined on entrepreneurial learning activity but data collection for this indicator is to be piloted. Regarding qualitative analysis; there will be a new edition of Eurydice work on entrepreneurship education (for 2016).

The next steps in 2014-2015 will be a pilot survey module in up to 6 Member States. DG EAC will come back to SGIB once the pilot data collection and indicator values are available.

The IT delegate underlined that it would be important to capture also latent entrepreneurship activities and that subject categories should be flexible: entrepreneurship is a cross-cutting – transversal subject. This should be clear to respondents in the survey.

The NL delegate mentioned that care should be taken of not making the definition of entrepreneurship too broad. A specific issue in NL (and potentially in other countries) is that entrepreneurship education is largely defined and implemented at a decentralised level, - therefore wide variation in entrepreneurship education would be plausible in the Netherlands.

The Commission thanked for the useful comments and noted that entrepreneurship education in

higher education is a specific challenge (it is not clear yet if Eurydice will cover this).

13. Indicator Expert Groups: progress of work.

The Commission updated the SGIB delegates on progress of work of three indicator expert groups functioning under the auspices of the SGIB.

Mr. Steffensen informed that the IEG on ICT in education could be reactivated given the publication of Communication on Open Educational Resources. The next meeting is foreseen for the end of the year; by that time it is expected that results of the ICILS would be available. He also mentioned that DG EAC together with DG CNECT had participated actively in the Eurostat Task Force regarding the Community Survey on the usage of ICT in households and by individuals. This participation had given concrete results in terms of introduction of variables in the format required by the users (better coverage of online learning and digital competences).

Mrs. Mejer updated the group of the work of the IEG on education investment. The first meeting had agreed on the scope and the methodology to be used for the work. Some SGIB delegates (FR, IT and EE) expressed concerns on the validity of the chosen method (JAF) and wanted to be kept up-to-date on the work. DG EAC responded that the chosen method using macro-level analysis was the only possible method given the nature of the input data from the UOE data collection. It was underlined that the IEG would look at correlations; no causal relations could be stipulated using the chosen approach. The IEG draft report (recommendations) should ideally be available for the SGIB meeting in autumn 2014.

The work of the Adults Skills IEG was presented by Mr. Fischer-Kottenstede. A second meeting of the group will be held just after the SGIB meeting on 23 May; the necessity of a third meeting will be decided following that discussion. A two-fold approach has been proposed by the Commission for the adult skills indicator: one indicator to look at medium- to high skills, focusing on the productivity dimension of skills, and one to look at low levels of skills, with a focus on the employability and inclusiveness dimension. Relevant background documents from DG EMPL and OECD will be distributed to SGIB delegates after the meeting.

14. AOB

The Chairman raised the issue of carrying out an evaluation of the SGIB, its functions and utility and how SGIB delegates could give input to this. The Commission will further reflect on the issue and come back to the SGIB on a possible approach. This is expected to happen already during the autumn.

The 38th meeting of the SGIB is expected to take place in Brussels during late autumn 2014. Exact data and place will be announced later.

The Commission thanked the delegates for their active participation in the meeting and wished them a safe return.

Participant list of the 37th SGIB meeting:

Belgique/België	Ms	Isabelle	ERAUW
Ceska Republica	Mr	Vladimir	HULIK
Croatia	Ms	Jasminka	BULJAN CULEJ
Denmark	Mr	Jens	ANDERSEN
Deutschland	Ms	Iris	GÖNSCH
Deutschland (Länder)	Mr	Rainer	WILHELM
Deutschland	Ms	Susanne	ZIEMEK
Eesti	Ms	Tiina	ANNUS
Éire – Ireland	Mr	Diarmuid	REIDY
Ellada	Ms	Despina	KARANTINOY
Espana	Mr	Jesús	IBAÑEZ MILLA
Espana	Mr	David	CERVERA
France	Mr	Robert	RAKOCEVIC
Island	Mr	Gunnar Jóhna	ÁRNASON
Italia	Ms	Francesca	BROTTO
Kypros	Ms	Athena	MICHAELIDOU
Lietuva	Mr	Ričardas	ALIŠAUSKAS
Luxembourg	Ms	Charlotte	MAHON
Magyarország	Ms	Katalin	BANDER
Malta	Mr	Louis	SCERRI
Nederland	Ms	Pauline	THOOLEN
Norge	Mr	Niclas Lindahl	TROSDAHL
Österreich	Mr	Mark	NÉMET
Polska	Ms	Renata	KORZENIOWSKA-PUCULEK
Portugal	Mr	Nuño	RODRIGUES
Slovenija	Ms	Zvonka	PANGERC PAHERNIK
Slovenska Republika	Mr	Matej	SISKOVIC
Suomi	Mr	Jukka	HAAPAMÄKI
Sverige	Ms	Nina	WALDENSTRÖM
United Kingdom	Ms	Emily	KNOWLES
Cedefop	Mr	Mircea	BADESCU
CRELL	Ms	Elena	MERONI
DG EAC	Mr	Jan	PAKULSKI
DG EAC	Ms	Lene	MEJER
DG EAC	Mr	Luca	PAPPALARDO
DG EAC	Mr	Stan	VAN ALPHEN
DG EAC	Mr	Kjartan	STEFFENSEN
DG EAC	Mr	Jens	FISCHER-KOTTENSTEDE
DG EAC	Ms	Francesca	CRIPPA
EACEA - Eurydice	Ms	Nathalie	BAIDAK
ETF	Ms	Lucia	VERGANO
Eurostat	Ms	Sabine	GAGEL
OECD	Ms	Marta	ENCINAS-MARTIN