



# The Mobility of Young People in Vocational Training

*January 2015*



Policy paper requested by MEP Ernest Maragall i Mira

Policy paper



# The Mobility of Young People in Vocational Training

COORDINATOR  
**Francesc Colomé**  
RAPORTEURS:  
**Xavier Farriols**  
**Josep Francí**

*January 2015*



# Index

- 1.** Presentation
- 2.** The state of affairs
- 3.** Proposals and key elements for future studies
- 4.** The FCE policy papers and the team

# 1. Presentation

Youth mobility is an important factor in the European Union construction. The advantages that this mobility brings to the progress of the Union, such as improving qualified workers' employability is described in a multitude of studies, in particular those focussed on the mobility of university students.

Since 1987 more than three million young people have participated in European mobility programmes. The success of the initiative has led the EU to propose a doubling of the number of students in movement by the year 2020. Nevertheless, this paper draws attention to a group that may suffer from discrimination in their mobility due to various causes that already appear in the analyses that have been carried out for university students: we refer to the group of young people in vocational training.

To the analysis made of the elements that can pose obstacles to this mobility, whether of university students or young people in vocational training, another element that the authors consider to be strategic is added: the characteristics of the institutions in charge of organising the mobility in a more direct sense. For university students, it is the universities themselves that organise the movement, while for students in vocational training it is their education centres.

The size of these institutions and their resultant organisational outreach capacity is much less than that of the universities, meaning that to the specific barriers outlined for young people in vocational training another must be added that derives from the very nature of the institutions that organise their mobility.

The proposal that is presented is based on facilitating the mobility of young people in vocational training through the promotion of intermediary institutions that can take on the duties that, in the case of the university students, would be taken on by the university.

The kind of institution able to take on such a role would, essentially, be regional or city councils, although the possibility of other kinds being suitable of institution is not dismissed.

The paper attempts to establish the foundations that will encourage subsequent studies to determine European policies to facilitate and increase the mobility of young people in vocational training.

# 2.

## The state of affairs

Since its beginnings, the European edifice has posed challenges of great magnitude that derive from the economic, social and cultural diversity that characterises the states and regions that have joined the EU. Indeed, the process of convergence towards political and economic union is built on the foundations of societies with strong cultural identities and an extremely rich melting-pot of languages that has made notable contributions to the history of civilisation. Europe still has economies that, by themselves, occupy prominent places in the global economic order and which, in consequence, will move cautiously towards the full constitution of an economic space capable of competing with the current players in the global economy. Ultimately, Europe's main potential becomes, in its process of full constitution, a set of obstacles to be overcome.

Looking at the immediate future of the EU, a series of problematic situations arise that create uncertainty about the future. But fields in which notable securities can be detected also appear. In the area of encouraging joint policies of vocational training and the mobility of workers and young people in training, though we may not, in any sense, consider the challenge overcome, the evidence shows notably superior advances, and, despite the turbulent setting, it is possible—and necessary—to continue advancing.

The implementation of the freedom of movement of workers was a large step forward in a process that, because of the factors that condition it, is necessarily slow and gradual. In due course, legal and regulatory obstacles to freedom of movement between the member states were eliminated. There can be no doubt that this was a necessary step that has given positive results. But no legal or political measure is able to eliminate, even in the medium term, barriers such as the multiplicity of languages and the existing socioeconomic differences between European countries, though they may be reduced.

It is for all these reasons that the European institutions simultaneously promoted initiatives and programmes to stimulate the movement of people in the EU area. The preferred targets of these policies were young people in training, which was a definite commitment to the generations that may make the most significant contribution to European citizenship, taken in the strongest sense of the expression.

### **The mobility of university students**

Erasmus has been the most significant of the schemes to promote the movement of young people in training. Its impact on the mobility of students between European universities, its pervasiveness in the university systems and even its presence in the media has made it an emblematic programme that enjoys significant social recognition.

The general mobility of European students hovers, for the moment, at around 20% of total students; of those, the programme now covers the movement of about 10%. The quantitative target for the EU is to reach 20% mobility by 2020 in the Erasmus programme framework, which is now integrated into the Erasmus+ programme.

This target poses two questions: the first is how to put sufficient stimulus measures in place to break

the barriers that make it difficult for certain groups of students to use the programme; the second is to evaluate how the employability of the users of the programme increases in such a way that its impact is clearly positive in the context of the EU's employability problems.

The recent study, "Effects of mobility on the skills and employability of students and the internationalisation of higher education institutions", published by the European Commission in 2014, presents data from a survey of students and graduates who have moved within the Erasmus programme framework. One conclusion that we would highlight for what is proposed in this paper is that the majority of the employment skills expected as a result of the movement were already observed in the students wanting to move before they carry out the movement to a markedly greater degree than in students with neither the intention to leave nor the interest in leaving their home country for training. That is to say, those who move show, a priori, a set of skills that, after moving, are notably greater than those of their countrymen who have shown no interest in moving.

In any case, the results presented as an effect of the mobility are good relative to those expected and confirm the value of the programme and the interest in continuing with it and increasing its funding. A larger doubt is whether certain groups of young people have greater difficulties of diverse natures at the time of entering the programme. As an initial hypothesis, we understand that the students in vocational training belong to this group.

The movement of Erasmus students is the clear responsibility of the institution that receives the students in training. It is this institution—generally a university—that is charged with making the various arrangements necessary to receive an Erasmus grant and to provide all the guarantees that are implicit in the programme.

We observe that the application of the mobility measures has worked reasonably well in what we may call the spinal column of the circuit of university student mobility management: the European Commission, the general administration of the member states and the universities. The universities, which are, as a general rule, part of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), are structures of sufficient size to be able to guarantee the adoption of these measures. As we shall see, in the case of vocational training, the definition of this "spinal column" is much more complex.

## **Encouragement of the mobility of young students and workers in vocational training**

The efforts of the European Union to support the mobility of students in vocational training have concentrated on a range of initiatives and programmes. In all probability the one that has enjoyed the greatest visibility (relatively) has been the Leonardo programme. Created in 1994, it brought pre-existing programmes together, among which we would highlight FORCE (focussed on the development of continuing vocational training) for its link to professional training, Eurotecnet (conceived to promote innovation in the field of professional training) and, in particular, PETRA, which centred its activity on the encouragement of vocational training for young people in what was at that time still the European Community. The creation of the Leonardo programme allowed the establishment of a framework to unify the European schemes that focussed on vocational training. Initial training was covered along with continuous training, lifelong learning, career guidance and open and distance learning.

A summary analysis of the data at our disposal shows that, despite the large number of students who take advantage of movement opportunities, the potential users coming from the field of vocational training are, proportionately, much lower than the university students who participate in the Erasmus programme. In fact, in countries such as Spain, young people in vocational training in movement at a medium education level (secondary) are a notable minority in the totality of movements carried out, a minority that we calculate to be around 7% of all movements and which does not correspond to the percentage of students enrolled in studies at each level.

The importance to vocational training mobility of a common framework to recognise the equivalence of certificates should be highlighted. The difficulty of reaching agreement on this subject means that the vast majority of movements made by young people in vocational training (except those of teachers) is in the field of internships related to workplace training, meaning that each country validates, in its own studies, what corresponds to the hours of experience students have in a workplace abroad.

The majority of attempts made to standardise and validate training credits beyond those corresponding to internships in companies have not had tangible results. An idea that has prospered, although only in an incipient form, has been that of defining a general framework with specific requirements for the training of students. Later on, when dealing with the recognition of studies between countries, we will refer in a more detailed way to what the experiments carried out by ECVET have contributed in this respect.

The mobility programmes for young people in vocational training include a wide range of promoting and managing institutions and organisations: vocational training centres, businesses, chambers of commerce and other associations that represent the business network, institutions with legislative and management powers in vocational training and, ultimately, any organisation that has any kind of link to it, such as, for example, private businesses created specifically in order to manage mobility schemes.

This simple list is enough to become aware that the the relative simplicity of the European Commissions-states-universities circuit that works for university students has no parallel in vocational training. While many of these institutions are very powerful in various countries, in others they are not, and, in any case, it seems clear that it is difficult to envisage many of them being suitable for ensuring the necessary operational link between systems of education and the economic and business network. Especially in the case of the large states in territorial or population terms, the need for institutions that have both the necessary capacity and proximity to be able to act as a “kneecap” in the handling and articulation of mobility seems necessary.

In the same sense, if we take into consideration the measures that allow mobility to be enacted with the sufficient guarantees set out in the section dedicated to the movement of university students, it seems clear that there is an imbalance between the normal administrative capacity of, for example, a vocational training centre and the participation requirements of an Erasmus mobility programme. Vocational training institutions with sufficient power and critical mass in terms of student numbers to make the organisation of such mobility possible do exist, but a significant number of centres could not, reasonably, organise it.

The result is a tendency towards unfair discrimination against the young people in vocational training when compared to university students, bearing in mind that the principle of mobility and its advantages, both personal and collective, can be applied in the same way to one group of young people as to another.

## Keys to the mobility of students in vocational training

EU studies abound on the possible difficulties that students pose to mobility. All of them have fed on the data collected by EUROSTUDENT as a general survey of student data. The report on the Bologna process collected in the report on the EHEA also speaks of these effects.

Naturally, the analysis carried out for university students has a direct correlation with the situation in which students in vocational training find themselves. We can even assert that the profile of the students in vocational training is similar to a remarkably precise degree to that described by the indicators used in the studies to identify university students with mobility difficulties. The study assembles data that illustrates these affirmations.

Various authors analyse the elements that affect mobility. We can synthesise them into the following aspects that seem to be the most relevant:

- 1.-** Economic availability.
- 2.-** Recognition of studies between countries, whether via credits or certificates.
- 3.-** Knowledge of the languages.
- 4.-** Organisation of the curriculums or studies.
- 5.-** Legal aspects.
- 6.-** Lack of information or motivation to make the move.
- 7.-** Personal situation of the students.

After analysing these general factors, and, in order to be able to work on the proposal they present, we group into three broader categories the factors that condition the full realisation of the objectives of the mobility schemes: accessibility, contribution to qualifications and employability, and efficiency of the management of the mobility.

### ■ Accessibility

- 1.** The visibility of the offers of practical training placements in other European Union countries to those to whom it is potentially addressed.
- 2.** Measures to compensate for inequalities in socioeconomic level and degree of personal maturity of the recipients. In general terms, due to their social background, students in vocational training, whether at secondary or tertiary level, may have greater difficulty facing the costs of mobility.

As referred to previously in the case of young workers in mixed systems of training and work, it is appropriate to put a scheme in place of specific information and promotion between the businesses, which includes the benefits that mobility programmes bring to their young trainees.

- 3.** The coherence of the stays with the students' training itineraries. The training content of the stays must be approached as a continuum without disruption, when this occurs the stimulus to mobility is significantly increased. As this is a relevant element as a contribution to professional qualifications, it is also worth highlighting it as a facilitator in the access to mobility programmes.
- 4.** Schemes to prevent linguistic and cultural barriers. In the manifestly pluri-lingual reality of the European Union, linguistic obstacles acquire a special prominence. At the same time, knowledge, prior to the internship, of the most significant features of the business and working culture of the destination country itself acts as a facilitator of the success of the internship.

## ■ Contribution to qualifications and employability

1. For the improvement of young people's professional qualifications and, therefore, employability, let us consider two factors: the quality of the traineeship; and how it fits within a coherent training programme (recognition of credits) and subsequent accreditation.
2. We will highlight the aspects that must be guaranteed to preserve the efficiency and quality of the processes of learning in mobility programmes:
  - a. A coherent relationship between the duration of the practical training stays abroad and the development of technical and transversal skills.
  - b. The direct involvement of the vocational training centres in the sending/ hosting of young people in training.
  - c. The participation of businesses who dispose of workplaces that meet the quality and security requirements necessary for the realisation of learning processes, among which the teaching capacity of company tutors acquires its own importance.
  - d. The existence of procedures for evaluating the traineeships that have been established and agreed between businesses and training centres.
  - e. And, ultimately, management procedures and systems of continuous improvement such as those set out in the European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for VET (EQAVET).
3. The capacity to fit the stays into a coherent training programme and the full recognition, at a European level, of the training credits studied. In this sense, the facilities provided by the educational authorities in the countries of origin are crucial for bringing about adaptations to the training curriculum. Therefore, on a large scale, the recourse to systems of mutual recognition such as the European Credit System for Vocational Education and Training (ECVET) is another great facilitator of the definition of professional qualification programmes at a European level because of the flexibility that it provides.
4. Finally, the traineeships must be certified. In this sense, the use of the Europass, especially in reference to the documents issued by the education and training authorities—the European Skills Passport and the Diploma Supplement—adds agility to the beginning of the young people's professional careers and brings transparency to labour markets.

## ■ Management efficiency

Compared to their university equivalent, the mobility programmes for students in vocational training integrate two factors that complicate their management: the participation in them of businesses and the smaller size and inferior financial and organisational “muscle” of the vocational training centres when compared to the universities. In effect, the “remoteness” of the beneficiaries and the relative capacity of the administrations that manage mobility programmes make the whole cycle of the mobility schemes problematic. On the other hand, when the proximity is total—training centres managing mobility in isolation—the structural feebleness makes the relationships with the institutions acting as counterparts even weaker.

All of this confers fundamental importance on the legal instruments and the extent of the financial and human resources of the public authorities that manage mobility programmes. The characteristics of their structure and funding model must permit them to:

- a. Set up the organisation and sustainability of the mobility programmes under public guarantee.
- b. Ensure the awareness and accessibility of the programmes via sufficient public visibility, fully incorporating them into the strategic and operational planning of the educational administration and fitting them into the ordinary activity of the education and training centres.
- c. Design and apply systems of reception, monitoring and evaluation of the mobility schemes.
- d. Count on an operational, efficient network of participating businesses and the involvement of the representative organisations and associations of the business network.
- e. Determine those sectors of economic activity that could offer the best places for internships in each country.
- f. Allocate duties in a coherent, agile, balanced way to the institutions and agencies participating in the management of mobility with the aim of facilitating the monitoring and evaluation of the training schemes and the subsequent introduction of corrective measures where necessary.

# 3.

## Proposals and key elements for future studies

In the Europe 2020 strategy, the European Union has concentrated its efforts on increasing the competitiveness of its economy, generating the jobs that follow from that and, ultimately, strengthening its capacity to compete at a global level in the third decade of the 21st century. To do this, particular emphasis has been placed on research, innovation, the full development of the digital society and energy sustainability as important instruments for an economy with greater added value. This focus on the factors of competitiveness are accompanied by precise objectives with regard to employment rates, the results of educational systems—particularly highlighting the reduction in school dropout rates—and a greater degree of alignment between people’s qualifications and the demands of the labour market.

It is precisely in order to increase the efficiency of the mobility programmes aimed at young people carrying out their traineeships of various kinds and at different levels of professional training—whether secondary or higher—that the measures contained in the following sections are proposed.

### Improve access

1. One of the unquestionable achievements of Erasmus has been to normalise the training mobility schemes in the university sphere. Such a reputation is far from being reached among the collective of beneficiaries at different levels of vocational training. This lower visibility of the opportunity negatively conditions the flows of access to the mobility programmes. Such visibility could be greater through the adoption of measures such as:
  - a. The creation of a framework that identifies with clarity and the greatest possible precision the mobility options for those in vocational training. A specific, complementary denomination for vocational training in the framework of the Erasmus+ programme would have positive effects on the visibility of the mobility directed to their students.
  - b. Cross-platform campaigns launched by public authorities with the coordinated participation of all the stakeholders with an influence on vocational training.
2. The obstacles that derive from the lower than average acquisitive power of the students in vocational training could be compensated with measures such as the following:
  - a. Reinforce the group nature of the mobility schemes. This group nature favours economies of scale that reduce the impact on the finances of each participant.
  - b. Study the possible growth of the financial endowment that the European Commission assigns to each participant in mobility schemes in the area of vocational training.

- c. A possible increase in the contribution made by regional and local administrations (intermediate administrations), whether charged to their own budgets or through the coordinated capture of funds from the stakeholders—businesses, foundations and organisations—that collaborate in the system of qualification and vocational training in their territorial area.
3. As a general rule, young people of below adult age enrolled in secondary-level studies in vocational training normally have greater difficulties in moving, due to less-developed personal maturity. This is why it might be useful to add some complementary measures to those set out in the previous section:
    - a. Make stays abroad a prolongation of the training period (that is to say, once most of the training cycle is completed).
    - b. A greater degree of mentoring and accompaniment by their training centres or the centre that receives them.
    - c. Full support for teaching staff from the responsible administrations in everything that their greater participation in this accompaniment involves.
  4. The possibility that the mobility programmes are included, from the beginning, as an integrated, inseparable part of the training cycle. For this, logically, the support of the educational administrations with the power to make adaptations to the training curriculum is essential and should be provided for in the funding of the programme.
  5. Finally, the anticipated schemes to reduce linguistic and cultural barriers should form part of the organisation of the mobility programmes:
    - a. Verification (and subsequent actions to be taken) of the dominance of English among students as well as among those who will mentor their traineeship in the company.
    - b. Support for the learning of basic elements of the language of the destination or receiver country.
    - c. Design, by the reception authorities in the mobility schemes, of a basic training model that promotes knowledge of the prominent features of the business and working culture of the destination country.
    - d. Promotion and provision of specific programmes for the training of teaching staff about training mobility, its benefits to young people in training and the necessary elements for its management by the training centres.
    - e. Develop the various learning options that e-learning offers due to its capacity to adapt to the differences in participant availability.

## **Greater contribution to employability and professional qualifications**

Mobility schemes that do not manage to deepen the professional qualifications of their beneficiaries fall short of the mark, to say the least. Logically, this fact adds ambition to the commitment and complexity of their management and, at the same time, justifies the proposals that are formulated:

1. Longer average duration of the vocational training stays is recommendable. Especially if the goal is to improve professional qualifications, with all that that involves.
2. Active involvement of the vocational training centres that send their students abroad, and, in turn, receive young people in training in the setting up of associations to promote and manage mobility schemes. For this, it is recommendable to:
  - a. Count principally on centres of sufficient size to enable a team to manage the mobility.
  - b. Adapt the training programmes to the curricular demands of each project.

- c. Adopt the teaching methodologies that best serve the training of the young people they receive (and manage the same kind of adaptations of the destination centres of their own students).
3. Incorporation of the procedures defined by the European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for VET (EQAVET) into the mechanisms of approval of the businesses that receive students in training (ex post, so as not to restrict the agility of the processes). In this respect, indicators that should be taken into consideration relate to the facilities, the teaching capacities of the staff who will be active in the practical training and their linguistic competence, which should be of a minimum level of fluency for communication with the students, as well as their full acceptance of the processes of evaluating the traineeships, as previously agreed with the training centres.
4. In relation to the recognition of the training credits studied, the European Credit System for Vocational Education and Training (ECVET) should be the key to significant advances in this field. In this sense, European funding of mobility projects should be linked to the gradual adoption of the system by the authorities.
5. In the certification of the traineeship, the generalisation and systematic use of Europass should be sufficient to guarantee it.

## **A stable network of intermediate institutions for more efficient management**

1. The viability of the proposals contained in the previous sections brings us to a key point: the definition of the structures and institutions that are best suited to promoting and managing vocational training mobility schemes. The type of organisation or institution that can perform the equivalent role to that played by the universities in the movement of university students should be defined.

In this sense, we lean towards regional and local authorities (depending on the structures of each member state and taking into account those bodies that have the legislative capacity and competences in this area) as the most suitable administrations to efficiently manage the mobility schemes and improve their impact.

The configuration of local and regional administrations in the member states of the European Union is—as it is in the rest of the world—enormously diverse. It depends on the confluence of variables such as geography, history, demography and the cultures of each of the states. It is for this reason that it is necessary to define the basic parameters that the administrations should fulfil to soundly exercise their leadership role in the organisation and management of mobility schemes for vocational training:

- a. Have the sufficient budgetary resources to enable structures of mobility organisation and management.
- b. Have the capacity to influence the arrangement and planning of the provision of vocational training with the purpose of introducing mobility schemes to it.
- c. Be in a position to secure the involvement of the network of vocational training centres (and, logically, of their teaching staff) in their area of management.
- d. To be able to demonstrate their capacity to formulate comprehensive operational agreements with business networks as a whole: companies, business associations of various types, chambers of commerce and social partners.
- e. Dispose of the powers and capacities to establish operational alliances and agreements with potential partners among the participating states in the mobility programmes.

- 2.** An administration of these characteristics would have the sufficient size and capacity to:
  - a. Exercise a positive intermediary role between European and state institutions and the beneficiaries of the mobility, being the public guarantor of the organisation and the sustainability of the mobility projects.
  - b. Give visibility and guarantees of accessibility to the provision of mobility through communication campaigns via the conventional communication media, social networks and other options from the digital world and, fundamentally, through the fit of the mobility with the ordinary activity of the vocational training centres.
  - c. Develop close dialogue (through subsidiary networks of public bodies or those subsidised for those purposes) with people, training centres and businesses.
  - d. Systematise the operation of receiving students including both purely logistical arrangements and the more far-reaching issues such as linguistic reception and the introduction to the company in which the internship is carried out.
  - e. Carry out studies on the productive sectors that guarantee a better provision of internship placements in their area of management, as well as studies on the sectors and companies in other countries that are most suitable as destinations for their own students.
  - f. Organise an operational, efficient network of collaborating companies through direct dialogue with them and the involvement of all the organisations and associations that represent the business network.
  - g. Establish an efficient distribution of duties between the institutions and agencies that manage the mobility to facilitate the systematisation of its evaluation and avoid distortions such as, for example, language academies elevating their contribution to the category of “mobility agency”.
  
- 3.** The determination of which authorities—regional or local—are best suited to the purposes described will depend directly on the administrative structure of each of the states. As a first approximation, the proposal that is formulated here may appear to be irrelevant for small states in terms of population or territory. However, aside from its possible importance to other countries, the methodology that is proposed and the recommended characteristics of these institutions may be significant for any country and relevant to any administrative structure.

## Key elements for future analysis

The target set by the European Commission in the field of mobility policies is clear and explicit: based on the data available, everything indicates that the mobility of students within the European Union is a positive objective as much when considering the economic development of the member states as the quality of employment and the employability of recently-trained young people in various EU countries. The goal has been quantified as the desire to double the number of students in movement, rising from 10% now to 20% in six years time.

In this study the hypothesis has been developed that students in vocational training present greater mobility difficulties than students in university studies. In the paper, the importance of facilitating the access of students in vocational training to international mobility has been described along with the possible evidence that the existence of intermediary institutions is a key factor in implementing policies to stimulate student mobility. In this sense, it is important to have up-to-date studies on the impact that mobility barriers present to students in vocational training, distinguishing those studying at a higher level from those at a medium level.

Ultimately, the proposal made in this paper consists of posing the hypothesis of the importance of intermediary institutions for favouring mobility in general and the mobility of students in vocational training in particular. As has already been stated, these institutions may be diverse in nature and

organised in different ways. In this sense, an analysis is proposed of the most frequent forms that already-existing institutions have taken in order to attempt to recommend specific organisations that may favour the movement of students, especially in the field of vocational training.

The EACEA/Eurydice 2013 study, *Towards a Mobility Scoreboard: Conditions for Learning Abroad in Europe*, provides general information on various issues that should be taken into account with regard to student mobility. It analyses how each country has articulated solutions or facilitated these conditions, giving a general vision of how the same problems are faced in different situations. The aspects analysed in the study are:

- Information and guidance.
- Foreign language preparation.
- Portability of grants and loans and financial support for mobile students.
- Quality of learning mobility.
- Recognition of studies.
- Special treatment for disadvantaged students.

For each section the study provides a classification of countries based on a number of variables that may appear in each of the features analysed.

Using databases such as those provided by this report, fieldwork should be undertaken with the goal of determining those elements that are necessary to encourage the existence and development of intermediary organisations to permit greater participation of students in vocational training in movement in Europe.

The importance of the question for the purpose of achieving better results from the funds dedicated to the movement of young people in training recommends the carrying out of an in-depth study that could be approached in the following terms:

- It would not necessarily be a systematic evaluation, given the complexity and a certain “inorganic” character of the tools of promotion and management of the movement of students in vocational training.
- The profile of the most suitable intermediary administrations for the management of mobility programmes, based on:
  - The exploitation of statistical data and documentary analysis of the evolution of the European programmes and initiatives of support for student mobility, focussed on the characteristics of the public administrations that have taken action on them.
  - Fieldwork with a sample of stakeholders and participants from those countries which, because of the characteristics of their state structures and their contribution to the mobility programmes, are considered to be the most adequate for the formulation of recommendations. The fieldwork will be based on surveys, focus groups and in-depth interviews.
  - The conclusions and recommendations of the study should include a precise determination of the profile (the size and scope of budgets and human and organisational resources available, etc.) of the intermediary administrations that are most suitable for the management of mobility, a specific proposal for each EU member state, as well as proposals for measures to guarantee the exercise of their roles.

# 4.

## The FCE policy papers and the team

Fundació Catalunya Europa (FCE) is a private, not-for-profit foundation that is ideologically plural, independent and financed by contributions from businesses and individuals. FCE was founded according to the will of President Pasqual Maragall, with the mission of promoting debate generating knowledge about Europe in Catalonia based upon four main axes of analysis: Economy and Welfare, Governance and Democracy, Society and Culture, and Cities and Territories.

Within the framework of FCE's lines of work, the Foundation provides political and consultation analysis services, among which the new editorial line of the European Policy Papers (EPP) stands out.

### A. Objectives of the EPPs

The EPPs have the objective of encouraging debate starting from informed, updated positioning on specific areas of sector-specific European policy and provide recommendations oriented to the taking of policy decisions, with particular attention given to the effects of European policies within the territory.

They are executive documents addressed to political decision-makers, activists, the media, etc., with a vocation that is more proposal-based than analytical.

The authorship of the EPPs may be individual or collective and always relies on an expert rapporteur who is responsible for guaranteeing that the EPP is a rigorous and relevant contribution, and a coordinator in the case that a collaborative work is concerned. With regard to authorship, the EPPs seek to combine expert knowledge from academia with expert knowledge from political action and praxis.

### B. Thematic axes:

The EPPs have sector-specific focuses and prioritise the following thematic axes:

- i) Poverty and social exclusion
- ii) Unemployment, youth and lifelong learning
- iii) Sustainable development and energy debates
- iv) European cities
- v) Europe-Mediterranean: security, cooperation, migration.

### **The team:**

The coordination of the project will be led by the FCE research and technical team, under the supervision of its Advisory Council. The team will include two experts on education and training issues:

**Francesc Colomé:** Inspector of Education in the Catalan Government, he has held various positions in different administrations: Secretary on Education Policy, Education Secretary and Director of Educational Planning in the Catalan Government; Head of the Education Division in the Barcelona Provincial Council; General Director for Regulated Vocational Training and Educational Promotion in the Spanish Government. He has vast experience in international cooperation in the field of vocational training and has participated in international workshops on education. As well as having taught on various university Master's courses, he is the author of several papers and publications on education and educational planning.

**Xavier Fariols:** Degree in Contemporary History from the University of Barcelona. He has worked as Head of border relations (with France) to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs and the European Union, to the Presidency Department of the Catalan Government. He has also served as Secretary of the Catalan Vocational Training Council and Deputy Director of Vocational Training programs, coordinating European projects in the field of training. He also served as senior consultant in vocational training affairs to the European Commission (DG Employment and DG Education and Culture) between 1993 and 2000.

**Josep Francí:** Head of Delegation, Chamber of Commerce of Barcelona and member of its Management Committee. From 2004-2011 he was, successively, General Director of Training, General Manager of Training and Continuing Education and Director of the Vocational, Artistic and Specialized Education Department in the Catalan Government. From 1999-2004 he was Director of Business Education of the Chamber of Commerce of Barcelona. From 1994-1999 he worked as a training consultant for different firms and coordinated several European Projects in the field of education and training. From 1990-1994 he worked as Head of Training and Continuing Education Programs of ICE, at the University of Barcelona. From 1982-1990 he was Professor of Vocational Training. He is the author of numerous articles and publications in this field.