

## **IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION: EXPLORING CENTRAL ISSUES**

Aigli Zafeirakou  
Consultant The World Bank,  
Washington, D.C., USA

### **1. Presentation**

This report addresses central organizational issues of in-service teacher training (INSETT), and Teacher Professional Development (TPD), in European Union countries.<sup>1</sup> It shows, in general terms and through case studies (France, Italy and England), how EU countries are reforming their systems of in-service teacher training, both to improve teacher's performances in the classroom, and to contribute to the success of all students. The latter is the more innovative objective, because it considers school failure not as a fatality. Different countries are choosing different strategies to reform their systems of in-service training and Teacher Professional Development. This report is the result of desk research, and is mainly based on analysis of policy papers and other relevant documents published by institutions such as OECD, Eurydice, national governments (on all levels), academia, the network ENTEP, and other relevant sources.

The report analyses the general tendency from a centralized top-down supply-led in-service teacher training, towards a demand-led, decentralized, school-based system, with multiple providers and diversified resource allocation. It also shows that central administrations continue to be responsible for identification of priority areas for training, evaluation of the training system, and on accreditation of providers and training courses. Important challenges remain: (a) transforming schools in a learning environment for teachers as well, and making TPD an integral part of teachers' work inside schools; (b) improving incentives for participation; (c) strengthening evaluation and quality control of INSETT and TPD in terms of impact on students performances; (d)

---

<sup>1</sup> This report is an adapted version of a report originally presented, by the author, as consultancy for the World Bank,...

sustaining a diversified offer of high quality providers; (e) making appropriate use of information technologies to improve quality and decrease costs.

This paper contains four sections, including this presentation (first section). **The second section** presents main characteristics of the evolution of in-service teacher training and professional development in European Union countries over the last years. It shows how during the 1980s and 1990s, conceptions and policies moved from *remedial and supply based* approaches, towards *demand-led and competence-based* approaches. It briefly describes various initiatives launched by the Commission of the EU, related to life-long learning, quality in schools, and E-learning, in terms of their relevance for teacher in-service training. **The third section**, describes general organizational characteristics of in-service teacher training in EU countries, by focusing on general organizational characteristics of in-service teacher training in EU countries, in the context of ongoing processes of modernization of national school systems. It focuses on the organizational framework of in-service activities, without making specific references to pedagogical models for improving and changing teachers' pedagogical practices. It examines questions like: Who formulates the demand for in-service teacher training? Who are the providers? What kind of evaluation and accreditation systems are being used? Who finances in-service training and teacher professional development? **The fourth section**, as a conclusion considers tendencies and challenges for reform of INSETT in EU member and non-member countries. It summarizes two main current tendencies: (a) a movement from supply-led INSETT to demand-led TPD, and (b) decentralization of INSETT with a redefinition of the role of central administrations in terms of evaluation, accreditation and definition of some priority areas for teacher training. This paper also contains **an appendix** with information on think tanks and policy institutes. These institutes are monitoring tendencies in Europe and facilitating dialogue among states concerning new reforms in the field of in-service teacher training.

## 2. Reform of teacher in-service training in the EU context

### 2.1. Introduction and background

During the 1980s, member states of the European Union started to identify a number of important problems in their educational systems (e.g. school failure, drop out, violence at school, difficulties to enter the labor market), and to introduce reforms in order to find solutions for them. These reforms included, among others, changes to the structure and the content of different levels of education and changes in curricula. They also included changes in initial teacher training (ITT) and in-service teacher training (INSETT). It was generally understood, among policy makers in EU countries, that training teachers already at work in schools would be a crucial instrument to consolidate reforms, and make them more sustainable.

During the 1990s, new challenges appeared, such as decentralization in education, increased evaluation and accountability of schools, and a tendency towards more technologically and scientifically oriented schools, due to the information revolution.

While schools, pupils and educators confronted these challenges in a direct way, policy makers developed plans to cope with these challenges through reforms, learning from best practices in other countries. In general, the focus was now more pro-actively oriented on improving *education for excellence (or success) for all*. The new orientation was also promoted by UNESCO and OECD. In this context, in-service teacher training became a major dimension of reform of the educational systems in most EU countries. Important reforms and changes in policies of INSETT and TPD were notably introduced in Portugal (1997), England (1997), France (1998), Italy (1998) and The Netherlands (2001).

The main challenge European countries confront in relation to reform of INSETT and TPD is *how to improve teachers' practices in order to improve performance of all students*, rejecting a vision of school failure in terms of a fatality. This challenge is directly related with important changes in education policy in terms of large decentralization projects of public education, increased autonomy of schools and school boards from central administration, strengthening links between initial and professional development in Universities; and increased attention for evaluation and accreditation.

## **2.2. From In-Service Teacher Training (INSETT) to Teacher Professional Development (TPD)**

EU countries use different terms to describe training given to teachers after their initial training: *continuing training, additional training, in-service training, qualifying training, and advanced training*. These different terms reflect, to a certain extent, national differences in terms of policy priorities, the historical evolution of each national educational system, and conceptual particularities.

Formally the European Union and their data bank Eurydice opted, in the middle of the 1990s, for the term "In-service teacher training", and defined it as "*A variety of activities and practices in which teachers become involved in order to broaden their knowledge, improve their skills and assess and develop their professional approach*" (see Eurydice 1995).

However, during the second part of the 1990s, various EU countries started to replace the term *In-service teacher training* with the term *Teachers Professional Development*. This change reflected the influence of ideas about the importance of *lifelong learning* and of continuous adaptation of teachers to professional and technological innovations. The growing importance of the term Teachers Professional Development also reflects new definitions of the role of schools and teachers, and the arrival on the in-service market of new providers for teacher training. TPD expresses the change of a remedial conception of in-service training of teachers, towards a competency-based approach of continuing professional development (see Buchberger F. et al., 2000). In the OECD study "Staying Ahead: In-service training and teacher professional development" (1998), *professional development* is considered as an all-embracing term, which covers not only activities in which teachers are being "taught", but also those in which they are developing new strategies or approaches with their colleagues and others.

For purpose of this paper, we will refer to INSETT and TPD in the following terms:

*In-service teacher training (INSETT)* refers to more traditional teacher training activities, with a strong remedial character, in which teachers are asked (or obliged) to participate based on supply rather than demand-based models. In general INSETT activities are organised outside schools by public entities, from the central, intermediate or local level.

*Teacher Professional Development (TPD)* refers to demand-led teacher training activities, with a competency-based character where schools and/or teachers individually define their training demand according to their needs. TPD activities take place at schools or related places or institutions on the local level. TPD activities can take the form of personal study, thematic group work, networks, and/or accredited courses. INSETT activities can be integrated with TPD activities, as can any activity meant to develop a teacher's skills, knowledge, expertise and professional qualities in general. Multiple providers offer their services for TPD activities.

### **2.3. European Union initiatives and new directions for TPD**

Most EU countries have introduced important reforms over the last years regarding training of teachers during their service at schools. Many of these reforms are at least in part inspired by EU policies and guidelines. In 1995, the European Commission notably published the White Book "Teaching and Learning towards the Learning Society", in which it described consequences for the educational environment of three major processes of societal transformation. These processes were identified as (a) internationalization, (b) the change towards an information society, and (c) an increasingly scientific and technical world. From the White Book resulted a number of important general educational initiatives, particularly "The Lifelong Learning Initiative", "The Quality of Education Program", and the "E-learning Initiative 2000". The EU also launched the program "Comenius", with sub-programs to support school partnerships, training of school education staff, and school education networks. These four initiatives are briefly presented hereafter in their relation to in-service teacher training and professional development of teachers, in order to better understand their impact on policies of in-service teacher training in individual EU countries.

#### **2.3.1. The Lifelong Learning Initiative**

Theories of Lifelong Learning became a major conceptual guideline for EU educational policies during the 1990s. They are also perceived as important in relation to wider EU objectives such as development of active citizenship, employability, adaptability, social inclusion, and individual fulfillment. Recently, a European Commission conference in Brussels (September 2001) confirmed that "*the scale of current economic and social change, the rapid evolution of a knowledge-driven economy and the demographic pressures resulting from an aging population in Europe, demand a new approach to education and training, based on the concept of lifelong learning.*"<sup>2</sup> As

---

<sup>2</sup> See website <http://www.europa/Commission/Education>

the European Commission points out, Lifelong Learning can be defined as “*all purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence*”. The Commission considers that Lifelong Learning should be open to all citizens, although the content of learning, the way learning is being “delivered”, and where it takes place, will depend on who the learner is. The European Commission stressed that Lifelong Learning is as much about providing “second chances” to upgrade basic skills, as it is about offering learning opportunities at more advanced levels.

On a strategic level, the European Commission had already produced a “Memorandum on Lifelong Learning” (October 2000), to help identify coherent strategies and practical ways to foster “Lifelong Learning for All”. At the heart of the Memorandum are six key objectives to be pursued by national governments:

- The gaining and renewing of new basic skills for sustained participation in the knowledge society, which demands a guarantee of universal and continuous access to learning. Particularly important are Information Technology (IT) skills, foreign languages, technological culture, entrepreneurship and social skills.
- Raising levels of investment in human resources.
- Innovation in teaching and learning, to provide for effective teaching and learning methods and contexts for the continuum of lifelong and ‘lifewide’ learning.
- Valuing learning, by stressing the need for understanding and appreciation of participation and outcomes, especially in non-formal and informal learning.
- Guidance and information, to guarantee provision of easy access to good quality information and advice about learning opportunities for all ages.
- Bringing learning closer to home by providing lifelong learning opportunities as close to learners as possible.

The Lifelong Learning Initiative, particularly in terms of these six key objectives, is now starting to have an impact on conceptions, directions and challenges for Teacher Professional Development as being developed in the various EU countries.

### **2.3.2. The Quality of Education Program**

The quality of education and training is considered in all EU countries to be a concern of highest political priority. It is stated in Article 149 of the EC Treaty of 1992 (The Maastricht Treaty) that: “*the Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between Member States, and if, necessary, by supporting and supplementing their actions while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organization of educational systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity*”.

A working group consisting of experts of 26 European countries developed the “European Report on Quality of School Education” (2000). Concerning INSETT and

TPD, the report stresses, in its chapter “Resources and Structures”, that education and training of teachers is an important indicator of the quality of education. In the chapter “Key Policy Issues” of the same report, it is stated that “*The continuing professional development of teachers will be an increasing priority in the immediate and long term future*”. The report also proposes, that each country seriously considers the kind of provisions it should make to ensure that teachers update their knowledge and practice.

The “European Report ...” presents as a good model of teacher training reform the Hungarian “Act on Public Education”, which requires, among other things, that each teacher should participate in at least 120 contact-hours of in-service teacher training during seven years of practice (about 17 hours per year). The course may be supplied by any kind of training organization including HE institutions, pedagogical institutions, schools, training firms, NGOs, or even private individuals. The courses have to go through a two-phase accreditation process of the program, and of the local implementation of the program, so as to allow local providers to implement programs created by others. Each program is required to have an internal quality assurance and quality management system. All educational institutions receive per capita funding from the state budget in relation to the number of teachers employed to cover the costs of the courses (tuition and other expenses).

### **2.3.3. E-learning Initiative 2000 and Information Technology Communication**

The “E-Learning Initiative” of the European Commission, introduced in 2000, seeks to mobilize the educational and cultural communities, as well as the economic and social players in Europe, so as to speed up changes in the education and training systems in order to progress towards knowledge-based societies. This initiative has four components: (a) to equip schools with multimedia computers, (b) to train European teachers in digital technologies, (c) to develop European educational services and software, and (d) to speed up the networking of schools and teachers. Most resources for this program have to come from the national level, but can obtain support from Community instruments such as: education, training and youth programs for innovative actions and exchange of good practice; the Structural Funds for assistance in the eligible regions; and the development of partnerships between public authorities and the private sector.

As a result of the Lisbon European Council (March 2000), the Commission presented the report “E-Learning: designing tomorrow’s education” (May 2000). The report introduces initiatives and objectives in the field of education and training in order to prepare for the information society. The initiatives target all age groups and all areas of society. The three principal objectives behind these initiatives are: (a) to improve infrastructure: investment in new technology, especially in schools, to ensure easy access for all to the necessary tools, particularly the Internet; (b) to increase people’s level of knowledge: in particular via relevant training initiatives for all so that all areas of society can play an active role in the knowledge-based society; (c) to adapt education and training systems to the knowledge-based society to make it easier to acquire the necessary new skills.

The E-Learning Report also stresses that E-learning can contribute to the renovation of in-service teacher training, and that E-learning can create more possibilities for more teachers to participate in professional development activities.

#### **2.3.4. Comenius Program for the quality of teaching and learning**

The EU Comenius program, particularly the sub-program Comenius 2 for *Professional Development of all school staff*, places special emphasis on the key role of the teacher and other school education staff.<sup>3</sup> The objective of Comenius 2 is “to enhance the quality of teaching and learning (...) by stimulating professional development of all types of staff involved in school education; by encouraging training providers in different participating groups to work together; by broadening the supply of training opportunities in areas of particular interest in a European context; and by improving access to training opportunities in countries participating in the Socrates program”. Comenius supports cooperation projects and mobility activities across national borders inside the EU as a means to promote all phases and aspects of professional development of all types of schools, including initial training, induction, and in-service training. The Comenius program has proven to be an important instrument of the Commission to promote and encourage innovative practices on the organizational and content level of every kind of teacher professional development. The participation of candidate countries in this program creates an opportunity for educational professionals on all levels of education, to exchange experience and to cooperate with their colleagues in other countries on issues of teacher professional development. The program, which is now in its second phase (2000-2006) – first phase was from 1995 to 1999 - is an important stimulus for innovation in schools and improvement of teaching and learning processes.

### **3. Organization and tendencies of INSETT and TPD in European Union Countries**

Until now, we have briefly described the larger educational policy context in which policies and practices of in-service teacher training in the EU take place. In this section we will describe main organizational dimensions of in-service training in the European Union. Since EU policy makers do now consider that effective INSETT and TPD must have results in terms of improving the achievement of *all* students, it is important to analyze the organization and reform tendencies of INSETT and TPD in the wider context of modernization of school system, in which all EU countries are involved.

---

<sup>3</sup> “Comenius” is part of the “Socrates” Program and is subdivided in three parts: Comenius 1, for school partnership; Comenius 2, for training of school education staff; Comenius 3, Networks related to school partnerships and to the training of schools education staff. For more on Comenius, see: <http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/education/socrates/comenius>

Table 1 provides a general overview of the organization of in-service teacher training in all EU countries.<sup>4</sup> While, in general, challenges and tendencies for in-service training are increasingly the same in the EU countries, differences among countries remain. Various contextual factors influence the form and nature of in-service teacher training in each country, such as the following:

- a) *Labor market issues.* In countries such as France, UK and the Netherlands, demand for teachers is higher than supply. As a result to shortage of teachers, persons without initial teacher training do not confront mayor obstacles to be recruited as teachers. In such a situation, the in-service teacher is supposed to provide for this lack of initial training. In other EU countries, on the contrary, there are more teachers on the labor market than necessary (Greece).
- b) *Decentralization.* Different degrees of administrative, financial and political decentralization, including different degrees of guidance received from respective Ministries of Education, has led to different forms of providers, and the way in which these are being evaluated by central government (or others).
- c) *Information Communication Technologies.* School based training has become easier to implement due to available Information Communication Technologies (ICT) Programs. Schools have become spaces of learning, not only for students, but also for teachers. Degrees of connectivity vary among countries and have an impact on (a) potential to develop networks between schools, teachers classes and students, notably in the more isolated parts of the country; (b) potential for teacher professional development through web sites supporting pedagogical activities and enriching curricula.

While national systems of teacher training continue to be heterogeneous, there is a series of common issues. These common issues, which will be briefly discussed hereafter, are the following:

- 3.1 Main objectives of INSETT and TPD in EU countries.
- 3.2 Identification of demand for TPD and INSETT.
- 3.3 Public and non-public providers of TPD and INSETT
- 3.4 Links between initial teacher training (ITT) and TPD-INSETT.
- 3.5 Teacher participation rates in training activities.
- 3.6 Resource implication for INSETT and TPD.
- 3.7 Evaluation and accreditation systems.

---

<sup>4</sup> Table 1 is an adapted and updated version of a table taken from Eurydice, *In-Service Training Of Teachers in the European Union and the EFTA/EEA countries*, Brussels, 1995.

### 3.1. Main objectives of INSETT and TPD in EU countries

The following three objectives are central to INSETT and TPD in all EU countries<sup>5</sup>:

- a) *Professional development of teachers*: This includes improving both general and specific teaching methods, and updating knowledge for specific subject areas.
- b) *Improving the quality of education systems, of schools and teachers' teaching techniques*. This includes encouraging inter-disciplinarity, the development of teamwork, and promoting innovation. It also includes the training of teachers on topics of school and class management, on problem solving, and the implementation of pedagogical and educational priorities. It finally includes developing skills in human relation management, which takes on importance especially for those of the teachers who desire to apply for head teacher.
- c) *Knowledge of the social and environmental context in which education is provided*. This refers to themes such as encouraging relations with the private sector; bringing the education and economic systems closer together; encouraging the study of the economic and social factors which influence young people's behavior; and facilitating adaptation to social and cultural change. This has taken different forms in different countries. In some countries, such as France, particular attention is being given to the social aspect of the relation school-community through training activities for teachers in order to develop educational projects in cooperation with the neighborhood community in the area where the school is located.

### 3.2. Identification of demand for INSETT and TPD

The initiative to formulate the demand for INSETT and TPD can be taken on different levels of the educational system.

*Central Educational Administration*. In most countries exist one or various specialized agencies for delivery of in-service training, which operate in general under the authority of the respective Ministry of Education. In some countries, these agencies are the same as those that provide initial training. During the 1990s, in the context of decentralization, the role of these central agencies has become less important. Demand for most teacher training courses is now formulated on the local level and on the school level. However, in most countries, central administrations have maintained responsibility for definition of priority areas for training, which are subsequently taken into account by local authorities, networks of schools, schools or by teachers individually. In many countries, the central administration finances professional development activities, at least when the latter obey to the centrally designed priority areas.

*Decentralized Educational Authorities*. In most countries, one can distinguish three specific responsibilities of decentralized educational authorities in formulating demand for professional development activities: (a) analysis of needs and demands for

---

<sup>5</sup> See Eurydice (1995).

teachers training; (b) provide support to schools and teachers to formulate schools' developing plans and professional training plans; (c) implement training priorities established by central authorities.

*Schools and School Boards.* Increasingly, schools – both in terms of teachers individually and through school boards - take the responsibility for professional development activities for their teachers. Schools in these cases formulate the demand, find providers and procure the place where professional development activities will take place. In Germany the movement is towards school-based in-service education (SchILF) but schools do not have a specific budget for professional development. In some other countries, the central administration facilitates this new role of schools by creating special budget lines for this kind of activity. Such is the case in the Netherlands, Italy, and England and Wales.

Schools are also becoming the site where training courses for teachers proposed by outside providers are delivered, and the place where continuing learning for teachers takes place. This is generally referred to as *Professional Development in Schools*. The latter can take place in various forms, e.g. through projects developed by schools, in the form of small groups of teachers involved in the same learning area, or in the form of participation of schools in national and European Networks. Networks of schools with a focus on ecological, cultural, technological or multi-disciplinary themes exist now in nearly all the EU countries. In these cases schools become a learning environment not only for students, but also for teachers.

***The Netherlands: schools are responsible for TPD***

“In the Netherlands, schools are responsible for TPD of their personnel, and they receive funding from the central government for these activities. The school administration has a formal obligation to make a plan for TPD/in-service training, but is up to the schools to determine where and how the budget for this purpose will be spend. TPD courses can be followed both at public teacher training institutions and at courses offered by commercial providers. The duration and frequency of in-service training are not predefined. The school decides, in consultation with the training institution which operate as providers, how long a particular course will be. The supply of in-service training courses is determined according to the demand of particular schools. Courses are geared to a particular target group, which may vary from an individual teacher to a small group of teachers from one or various schools”.<sup>6</sup>

Thus, two general tendencies can be identified:

a) The function of the central government administrations is increasingly restricted to a regulatory task in terms of evaluation and accreditation. At the same time, central

<sup>6</sup> Information provided to the author by the National Agency of Eurydice in The Netherlands.

authorities propose some thematic priority areas for teacher training according to national strategies in education and establish criteria for providers' funding.

b) Increasingly, schools have taken the responsibility for training and a special budget is allowed to schools for that reason. Schools and individual teachers have increasingly the opportunity to formulate the demand for training and develop plans for Professional Development. Therefore, decentralization seems to be the stronger trend.

### **3.3. Public and non-public providers of INSETT and TPD**

In general, in the EU countries, providers of INSETT and TPD can be divided in two categories: public and non-public institutions. In most European Union countries, special *public* centers for in-service teacher training, universities, or local inspection services continue to be the main providers of teacher training. The creation or re-organization of public centers for in-service teacher training has lately become a major trend of INSETT in most EU countries. They were created during the 1990s, mainly through national reforms, for example in France (creation of IUFM), Italy (creation of IRSAE), and Spain (creation of teacher training centers on the regional level). These public centers for in-service teacher training are either institutions of higher education or institutions directly dependent on decentralized education authorities. Other public institutions that provide INSETT/TPD services are local inspection services and universities. By the end of the 1990s, parallel to the trend from central administration to school-based formulation of demand-led in-service activities, there is a process of increased importance of non-public providers. These newly valued providers may be teachers professional unions, pedagogical movements, cultural organizations (museums and organizations of performing arts), civil society organizations, or private organizations with expertise in teacher development issues and private experts.

Three final remarks on this issue: (i) Decentralization is a very strong trend in the field of providers. (ii) The general EU tendency seems to be towards a large variety of new providers located near schools and teachers. (See the example of Italy, in the section on "Lessons learned" below). (iii) Even if during the 1990s the Centers for In-Service Teacher Training appeared as important institutions for delivery of in-service teacher training, the tendency is towards an increasingly important role for Universities as providers, in addition to other local public and non public providers.

### **3.4. Links between INSETT / TPD and research**

Initially, in most EU countries, there was no connection between providers of initial training and in-service teacher training (Buchberger et alli, 2000). However, since the need for high quality and intensified INSETT and TPD is now a reality in most countries, better links between initial and in-service training is a new challenge for all countries in order to obtain a certain coherence of the system in terms of objectives, content, methods and results. At the same time, the increasingly frequent situation of INSETT and TPD as demand-led and school based activities, leads to a new role for Higher Education and Research Centers, as providers of training and evaluators of teachers professional activities. In some countries, due to recent reforms, initial train-

ing and in-service training of teachers are now provided by the same organization. Such is the case in France, where both are centered, since 1998, in the University Institute for Training of Teachers (IUFM). This arrangement also provides for more opportunities to connect in-service teacher training with relevant research, particularly on issues of training methods and content.

In other countries (e.g. England and Wales) the administration intends to increase the link between applied research and training innovations through a *Best Practice Research Scholarships Program*, which enables teachers to carry out small-scale classroom-based research in key areas.

Most countries have established rules which enable them to provide individual teachers with the opportunity to study for a masters degree or a Ph.D. related to their professional activity (Greece, Finland). Policies vary wildly here, and it takes in general place on a very limited basis.

### **3.5. Teacher participation in training activities**

In most EU countries, in-service teacher training is voluntary and not compulsory (Eurydice 2000). The central educational administration generally defines its voluntary character in terms of the right to receive a limited number of hours or days of training per period of time per teacher.

The rate of participation of teachers in INSETT seems to vary significantly among EU countries, although viable statistical data are difficult to find. Eurydice (2000) indicates a participation in INSETT of 20% for teachers in Greece, 35% for France, and 92% for Italy. However, since Eurydice does not provide information on duration of courses in each country, there is no ground for a serious comparison. In Italy, the rate of participation increased rapidly during the 1990s, apparently as a result of the introduction of an allowance of 100 hours of training per 6 years period per teacher, and subsequent regulation of the market of providers through the introduction of rules for accreditation (See case study Italy hereafter.) Other countries that allow a particular amount of days per year per teacher for Teacher Professional Development, also seem to have a higher participation rate than those who do not. In countries where career advancement is linked to in-service training (as is the case in Spain and Portugal), the rate of participation also seems to be higher than in countries where this is not the case, reaching 70% of teachers in Portugal in pre-primary education. Other forms of incentives, such as additional vacation days for training followed, can also play a stimulating role. In Ireland, teacher participation in in-service training activities is provided on a voluntary basis during vacation, but teachers receive additional vacation days for it. During the summer vacation, 60% of the country's 20,000 primary teachers follow a week of training (4 hours per day). In return they obtain three additional vacation days, which can be taken during school period. Secondary teachers do not have a similar entitlement but also attend summer courses in large number.

### 3.6. Resources for INSETT and TPD

The budget for in-service teacher training rarely amounts to more than 1% of the total national education budget (Eurydice 1995, 2000), and the budget for in-service teacher training amounts, in general, to about 10% of the budget for initial teacher training. However, country comparisons regarding financial data for INSETT/TPD are difficult to make, due to varying degrees of decentralization of in-service training and the fact that funds come from different sources and budgets. Funding can come from various sources, including central administration, local taxes, private sources, non profit organization and from the personal teacher contributions. Most countries increasingly provide schools with the opportunity to raise money from private sources.

In a comparative overview of financing and management systems, Eurydice (2001) elaborates country diagrams showing the financial flow paths along which resources reach schools.<sup>7</sup> Among EU member countries, only in the diagrams for Italy, Portugal, The Netherlands and United Kingdom (Scotland) appear specific allocations for in-service training. All other EU member country diagrams have these funds incorporated in other budget lines. Interestingly, the diagrams of most of the candidate EU countries, in particular Slovenia, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Czech Republic, do show separate budget lines for in-service teacher training.

The structure of the budget varies from country to country, depending on the organizational structure of the education sector. In some countries, it includes issues such as *travelling costs and course fees for teachers and trainers' salaries*, as well as the *costs for replacement of teachers* attending courses. In other cases, it only covers the funds allocated for the *organization of training* (Eurydice 1995).

Often, teachers continue to pay for their in-service training and Professional Development in money (teacher contribution) and time (time investment), when they follow training outside their normal working hours. In some countries, schools close certain days during the year so that teachers can attend training courses. In other countries, schools or others pay for the time of training through hiring substitute teachers. There are also cases where the private sector contributes by mentoring a teacher on work placement.

In general, since demand for life-long training is increasing, there is a tendency among all stakeholders (individuals, schools, central and decentralized educational authorities, universities, profit and non profit organisations) towards allocating more resources for INSETT and TPD.

### 3.7. Evaluation and accreditation systems

The tendency in most European countries is towards increasing responsibilities for central administrations (Ministries of Education) in establishing priorities and control for the quality of the national system of education. For in-service training, this means: i) Design of priority areas for in-service training; ii) Evaluation of activities of in-

---

<sup>7</sup> See Eurydice, "*Diagrams showing financial flows in compulsory education in Europe*" 2001.

service training and; iii) Quality assurance of providers: accreditation of providers, so that the latter meet criteria defined by central authorities.

In countries with an important intermediate level of government, as in Germany or Spain, the above mentioned functions are partly or entirely the responsibility of the intermediate level.

In most EU countries, central (or intermediate) administrations have introduced some kind of evaluation process in order to determine how successful training courses are in terms of teaching practices and students performances. Often, the evaluation consists mainly of having teachers participating in training activities fill out a questionnaire. Evaluation systems thus continue to be rather weak and lack a more systematic approach. Even if it is clear that quantifying and qualifying the outcome of in-service training and professional development in terms of teaching practices and student performances is far from easy, countries have started to introduce more systematic evaluations through qualitative surveys, field observations, video-recording, and case studies (OECD 1997).

With multiple providers of TPD activities, central educational authorities are increasingly concerned with quality assurance of providers and courses offered by providers. Course accreditation introduced by the central administration tries to guarantee that the system of multiple providers will be efficient in terms of impact on career and professional practices. Teachers who participate with success in accredited courses, receive a formal kind of certificate, contrary to those participating in non-accredited courses. Many European countries, including England, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, have started to introduce accreditation systems.

An accreditation system of providers and courses linked with teachers' career advancement, can result in a situation where teachers mainly participate in accredited courses in order to obtain career advancement, and less for reasons of teaching practices and improving all pupils' performances.

**Portugal.**

In Portugal, the Higher Education Scientific and Pedagogical Council is responsible for the accreditation procedure of providers of in-service teacher training (Campos, 2001). Providers must be accredited to receive public funding. Accredited training activities in Portugal have a minimum duration of 15 hours. Teachers receive one credit point for 25 hours of training. These credit points play a role in their career advancement.

**Table 1:** Main features of in-service training (2001)

| Country            | Agencies responsible for formulating the demand   | Type of Organizations                            | Providers  | Accredit. of providers | Training compulsory/voluntary                           |
|--------------------|---|--|--|------------------------|---|
| BELGIUM (Walonia)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Central Administration</li> </ul>  | Centralized then decentralized by networks       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CAF/Self-training and in-service training centres</li> <li>- Higher institutes of teacher training</li> <li>- Universities</li> </ul>   | YES                    | Voluntary: right to 10 days                             |
| BELGIUM (Flanders) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Educational authorities</li> <li>- Non-profit associations</li> </ul>  | Centralized then decentralized by networks       | In-service training centers  |                        | Voluntary   |
| DENMARK            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Royal Danish School of Educational Studies for the <i>Folkeshole</i></li> <li>- Ministry of Education for upper secondary education</li> <li>- Training centres</li> </ul> | Centralized and decentralized at local level     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Royal Danish School</li> <li>- Specialized institutions</li> </ul>  | NO                     | Voluntary   |
| GERMANY            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Land</i> Ministry</li> <li>- In-service training centers in each <i>Land</i> (except Berlin)</li> </ul>   | Centralized (by <i>Land</i> )                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Central and <i>Länder</i> institutions</li> <li>- Non state institutions</li> <li>- Universities</li> </ul>   | NO                     | Obligatory in exceptional cases                         |
| GREECE             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ministry of Education</li> <li>- Marasleio Teacher Training College</li> <li>- Training centres</li> </ul>   | Centralized then decentralized at regional level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutes of Higher Education</li> <li>- Regional centers for in-service training</li> <li>- Marasleio Teacher Training College</li> <li>- Museums, other private providers</li> </ul> | NO                     | Obligatory for new teachers (updating of basic studies) |
| SPAIN              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Educational administrative bodies</li> <li>- Teacher centers (pre-primary, primary and secondary)</li> </ul>   | Centralized then decentralized at regional level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In-service Teacher training centers</li> <li>- Institution of Higher education</li> <li>- Private institutions</li> <li>- Associations</li> </ul>                                       | YES                    | Obligatory for promotion and salary increase            |

| Country         | Agencies responsible for formulating the demand   | Type of Organization   | Providers   | Accredit. of providers | Training compulsory/voluntary  |
|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
| FRANCE          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ministry of Education</li> <li>- <i>Rectorat</i></li> </ul>  | Centralized at <i>Academic level</i>                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IUFM (Institutes Universitaires de Formation des Maitres)</li> <li>- Academic inspection – Universities</li> <li>- Other providers</li> </ul>                          | NO                     | Voluntary, in- and outside schools.<br>Obligatory in some cases, for programs organized by inspectorates |
| IRELAND         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ministry of Education: In-career Development Unit I.C.D.U.</li> </ul>  | Centralized  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Specific central support services</li> <li>- Education Support Centers</li> <li>- Education Partners</li> </ul>  | YES                    | For obtaining high education qualifications  |
| ITALY           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ministry of Education, National Strategy Unit – P.N.A.</li> <li>- P.R.A. – <i>Provveditorati</i></li> </ul>    | Centralized at national, regional, then at provincial and school level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple accredited providers: <i>IRRSAE</i></li> </ul>  | YES                    | Voluntary, 100 hours/year  |
| LUXEMBOURG      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dept. for the coordination of research and educational and technological innovation (<i>SCRIFT</i>)</li> </ul> | Centralized  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>ISERP (Institut supérieur d'études et de recherches pédagogiques)</i></li> <li>- Universities, training centres of the region on the basis of agreements</li> </ul> |                        | Voluntary  |
| THE NETHERLANDS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ministry of Education</li> <li>- School Boards</li> </ul>  | Decentralized  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>HBO</i> – colleges</li> <li>- Universities</li> <li>- Other establishments</li> <li>- Experts</li> </ul>  | NO                     | Voluntary  |
| AUSTRIA         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Federal Ministry</li> <li>- Regional school authorities</li> <li>- Schools</li> </ul>                          | Decentralized at provincial level, then decentralized at school level  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teacher training establishments in each province</li> </ul>  | NO                     | Optional within and outside school time<br>Obligatory for major innovation, during school time           |

A. Zafeirakou: In-Service Training of Teachers ...

| Country                   | Agencies responsible for formulating the demand   | Type of Organization                                      | Providers   | Accredit. of providers | Training compulsory/voluntary  |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| PORTUGAL                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ministry of Educ.- INSETT coord. council</li> <li>- Gen. education inspectorate</li> <li>- Regional directorates of education</li> </ul>                                       | Centralized and decentralized at regional and local level | <p>Accredited establishments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Higher Education Institutions</li> <li>- Training centres at school</li> <li>- Training centers of teachers' associations</li> </ul> | YES                    | <p>Optional out side school time</p> <p>Obligatory for promotion</p>   |
| UK<br>Scotland            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scottish Office Education Department</li> <li>- Local authorities</li> <li>- Schools</li> </ul>  | Mainly decentralized at regional/school level             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Higher education institutions</li> <li>- Centres run by local authorities</li> </ul>   |                        | 5 days plus 50 hours in the school or education authorities' centres   |
| UK *<br>England and Wales | <p>Department for Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local Education Authorities, authorities</li> <li>- School governing bodies</li> <li>- Head teachers</li> <li>- Individual teachers</li> </ul> | Decentralized at local level                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Higher education institutions</li> <li>- Universities</li> <li>- Centres run by local education authorities</li> <li>- Schools</li> <li>- Other providers</li> </ul>   | YES                    | <p>Optional, but Dep. Edu. expects teachers to undertake INSET on at least three of the five non-teaching days each year</p> |
| FINLAND                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Board of Education</li> <li>- Municipalities</li> <li>- Other school management bodies</li> </ul>   | Decentralized at municipal, school level                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School bodies</li> <li>- State in-service training centres</li> <li>- University further education units</li> <li>- Teacher education units</li> </ul>                 | NO                     | <p>Optional</p> <p>Three to five days in school **</p>   |
| SWEDEN                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Municipalities</li> <li>- National Agency for Education</li> </ul>   | Decentralized   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Centers run by local authorities</li> <li>- Universities and university colleges</li> <li>- Other establishments</li> </ul>  | NO                     | <p>Optional, Five days/year ***</p>  |

#### 4. Conclusion

The system of in-service teacher training and Teacher Professional Development in EU countries is still rather heterogeneous. There is, however, a general tendency away from the traditional formula, in which the central level institutions define conditions of training, towards a formula where the local level, and even every single school, is involved in needs analysis, develops a Professional Development Plan for its teachers, and calls on public or private providers to propose courses corresponding to the demand. This tendency from supply-led INSETT to demand-led TPD also implies that schools are increasingly making use of special funding for in-service teacher training. While a process towards a more decentralized system of teacher training in terms of organization, decision making, and funding is evident in most EU countries, each country seems to follow its own model.

In most countries, the central authority of public education (the Ministry) continues to be involved in defining specific priority areas in which teachers must be trained, in order to implant a national plan or a more ample reform. In accordance with the form of decentralization in place in each country, the respective Ministry can transfer responsibility for implementation of these centrally defined priority areas for training directly to the decentralized agencies, or directly finance specific providers to do so. In some countries decentralization takes place from Ministries towards more decentralized entities as peripheries, departments or municipalities. In other countries, the decentralization involves a transfer of functions from the Ministry to schools. Finally, in some countries, decentralization takes place towards local institutions of higher education and/or universities.

Even in the most decentralized systems of education, and where there are both public and private providers (profit and non-profit), the Ministry of Education always continues to finance a certain part of activities related to INSETT. As a counterpart of the processes of decentralization, the central administration has indeed strengthened its authority on evaluation and accreditation of activities of in-service training and Teacher Professional Development. Financing, evaluation and accreditation operate as central government instruments to help guarantee a certain degree of unity, quality and equality between schools inside the system of INSETT and TPD.

Main challenges for further building national systems of teacher training in Europe are (a) how to cover all teachers (b) how to develop national systems of multiple high quality providers (c) how to make TPD part of professional activities of teachers inside schools (d) how to best use information technologies to improve quality and decrease costs (e) how to maintain a flexible, non overly bureaucratic system of accreditation (f) how to impact on student results.

**Contact address:** Aigli Zafeirakou, The World Bank, Europe and Central Asia Region, 1818 Hst, Washington, D.C., USA.  
e-mail: [Zafeirakou@aol.com](mailto:Zafeirakou@aol.com)

## References

- Broadfoot, P. (2000). Un nouveau mode de regulation dans un systeme decentralise: L'Etat evaluateur. In: *Revue Francaise de Pedagogie*, pp 43-55, No 130.
- Buchberger, F. (2000). Teacher education policies in the European Union: Critical analysis and identification of main issues. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Buchberger, F., B. P. Campos, D. Kallos, J. Stephenson (2000). Green paper on teacher education in Europe.
- Campos, B. P., 2001. Teacher education policies in Portugal. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Cochran-Smith, M., 2001. The outcomes question in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 17, 5, pp. 527-546.
- Couso Tapia, I. (2000). Initial and permanent training of teachers. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. and Sykes, G., Editors, 1999. *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000b). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8 (1) ([www.epaa.edu](http://www.epaa.edu))
- Delhaxhe, A (2000). L'information sur les enseignants au niveau europeen: l'apport d'Eurydice, le reseau d'information sur l'education en Europe. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Delpit, L. (1988). "The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children", in *Harvard Education Review*, 58, 280-298.
- Department for Education and Employment, (2001). *Good Value CPD, A code of Practice for Providers of Professional Development for Teachers*, Nottingham.
- Department for Education and Employment, (2001). *Schools-Building on success*, Department for Education and Employment Publications, Nottingham.

- Department for Education and Employment (2001). *Learning and teaching-A strategy for professional development*, Department for Education and Employment Publications, Nottingham.
- Dutto, M. (2000). "Reinventing in-service training and teacher professional development: the Italian case" In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Dilworth, M. E., & Imig, D. G. (1995) "Professional teacher development", in *The ERIC Review*, 3(3), 5-11.
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, (2001). *European Report on Quality of School Education, Sixteen Quality Educators*, ed. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, (2000). *E-Learning: designing tomorrow's education*, ed. Commission of the European Communities, Brussels.
- Eurydice (1995). In-service training of teachers in the European Union and the EFTA/EEA Countries, ed. Eurydice, Brussels.
- Eurydice. (1997) Teaching staff. In: *A decade of reforms at compulsory level in the European Union (1984-94)*.
- Eurydice (1997). Secondary teacher training. In: *Study on secondary education in European Union: Structures, organisation and administration*, Brussels.
- Eurydice (2000). Teachers. In: Indicators. Key Data on Education in Europe, Brussels.
- Eurydice (2001). *Professional qualifications and training of teachers*. In: *Foreign language teaching schools in Europe*, Brussels.
- Eurydice (2001). Diagrams showing financial flows in compulsory education in Europe.
- Eurydice (2001). *Information and Communication Technology in the education systems in Europe, National education policies, Teacher Training*. In: Indicators. Key Data on Education in Europe, Brussels.
- Formosinho, J. (2000). *Teacher education in Portugal: Teacher training and teacher professionalism*. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Gassner, O., Schratz, M. Austrian teacher education system. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the Euro-*

- pean Union, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Hargreaves, D. (2000). How to design and implement a revolution in teacher education and training: some lessons from England. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Holcroft C. (2000) Teacher education in England and Wales. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Jansen, F. (2000). Teacher training in the Netherlands. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Krueger, M. (2000) . Teacher education in Germany. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Lietaer, D. (2000). Systeme de formation des enseignants en Communaute Francaise de Belgique. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Little, J. W. (1993). "Teachers' professional development in a climate of education reform", in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(2), 129-151.
- Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale (2001). Orientations sur la renovation de la formation des maitres, Point de press, 27 Fevrier 2001, <http://www.education.gouv.fr/discours/2001>
- Mullen, C. (2000). Teacher education in the Republic of Ireland. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Neplaz J. (2001). Les strategies de development des competences des personnels de l'Éducation nationale en formation continue. In: *Les politiques documentaires des établissements scolaires*, Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale
- Niemi, H. (2000). Teacher education in Finland: Current trends and future scenarios. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- O.E.C.D., (1998) *Staying ahead, In-service Training and Teacher Professional Development*, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation

- O.E.C.D., (2001). *Teachers for Tomorrow's schools, Analysis of the World Education Indicators*, OECD, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, World Education Indicators Program, Paris.
- O.E.C.D., (2001), *What schools for the future?* C.E.R.I., Paris.
- Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), (2001), "*In-service Postgraduate Training Courses for Teachers: an overview report of inspections of courses funded by the Teacher Training Agency*", Office for Standards in Education, London.
- Romano, M. (2000). Teacher education in the Community Programs. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Smitt, M. (2000). Teacher education policies in Sweden. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Terhart, E. (2000). Conflicting concepts of modernization in teacher education: education policies in Germany. In: Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2000) *Teacher education policies in the European Union*, ed. Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union-Ministry of Education, Lisbon.
- Willems G.M., J.H.J. Stakenborg & W. Veugelers (Eds) (2000). "Trends in Dutch teacher education", in *Leuven-Apeldoorn: Garant*.

## Appendix 1.

### EU Think Tanks, Networks and Data Banks for INSETT and TPD

In the European Union, various think tanks, networks and data banks have been created in order to study, monitor and disseminate information and lessons learned on school education, including teacher training. In this section we provide brief information on four institutions that monitor tendencies and facilitate dialogue among countries regarding new reforms in the field of in-service teacher training and Teacher Professional Development in Europe, including EU candidate countries.

#### 1. The European Network on Teacher Education Policies (ENTEPE)

Mr. Bartolo Campos  
ENTEPE Coordination  
Av. Duque de Loule, no 95, 1o Dto  
1050-089 Lisboa, PORUGAL  
Phone: 35- 1 – 213.56.54.00  
E.mail: entep@inafop.pt  
WEBSITE : <http://www.inafop/entep>

The European Network on Teacher Education Policies (ENTEPE) was launched during the Portuguese Presidency of the Council of the European Union, at a conference in Algarve (22-23 May 2000). The central objective of ENTEPE is to promote cooperation among European Union countries regarding their teacher education policies in relation to initial, in-service and continuous professional development programs in order to:

- a) Develop opportunities to learn from each other by analyzing and comparing policies and issues, as well as by sharing good practices.
- b) Promote the discussion and analysis of teacher education policies initiatives taken at national and European level.
- c) Contribute to: (i) Raising teacher education quality, (ii) Developing a European dimension of education, (iii) Improving the public image of the teaching profession, (iv) Improving mutual trust in the teaching qualifications awarded by Member States, (v) Improving teacher mobility in the European Union.

ENTEPE organizes every 6 months a meeting with representatives from national Ministries of Education responsible for in-service teacher training. Candidate countries can be invited. It publishes relevant documents, which can mostly also be ob-

tained through their web site. Currently, the ENTEP network and seminars are mainly interested in the following issues:

- a) Building good and sustainable national systems of continuous teacher education, including (i) promotion of the lifelong learning perspective in professional teacher education and development, (ii) articulation in a coherent system of initial, induction, in-service and further teacher education, and (iii) linking continuous teacher professional development with school improvement and quality assurance and with school based educational research.
- b) Promoting teacher education and teacher career advancement, in order to help teachers handle new challenges and overcome gaps between learning goals and student achievement.

## **2. EURYDICE: The information network on Education in Europe.**

EURYDICE (European Unit).  
Rue d'Arlon 15  
B-1050 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
Tel.: 32-2-238.38.11  
Fax: 32-2-230.65.62  
E-mail: [info@230.65.62](mailto:info@230.65.62)  
<http://www.eurydice.org>

Eurydice, the main education information network in Europe, is an EU agency established in 1980, with offices in Brussels, and country units in each member country. Its main objective is to produce reliable, readily comparable information on national education systems and policies in the European Union and on candidate countries. Eurydice also acts as an observatory, monitoring the diversity and common features of education systems in the European Union. By circulating the results of its work, Eurydice intends to promote better mutual understanding among countries about their education systems and their challenges.

On the Eurydice web site, one can, in particular, find the following:

- a) Database on national EU education systems (EURYBASE)
- b) Descriptive and comparative analysis.
- c) Indicators and surveys
- d) Publications.

Since 1995, Eurydice is an integral part of the Socrates program, the EU Community action program in education.

### **3. The European Center for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP)**

CEDEFOP  
Evropis 123  
GR-57001 Thessaloniki (Pylea)  
GREECE  
Tel: 30 31 490 111  
Fax: 30 31 490 020  
Web site: <http://www.cedefop.eu.int>

CEDEFOP is an EU agency established in 1975 and based in Thessaloniki (Greece). The central objective of CEDEFOP is to contribute to the development of vocational training in the European Union through research, publications, and technical assistance, including training. CEDEFOP executes a range of programs for the European Union on vocational training.

### **4. European Training Foundation (ETF)**

EUROPEAN TRAINING FOUNDATION (ETF)  
Villa Gualino  
Viale Settimio Severo 65  
I-10133 Torino  
ITALY  
Tel: 39 011 630 22 22  
Fax: 39 011 630 22 00  
Email: [info@etf.eu.int](mailto:info@etf.eu.int)  
Web site: <http://www.etf.eu.int>

The European Training Foundation is a European Union agency that began its activities in January 1995. It is based in Turin (Italy). Its central objective is to contribute to the process of reform of vocational education and training in so called “partner countries and territories”, in particular:

- EU candidate countries
- South-Eastern European countries
- New Independent States and Mongolia
- Non-EU Mediterranean countries and territories.

Additional objectives are:

- a) To harness, mobilize, develop and disseminate European expertise and good practice in the field of vocational education and training;

- b) To promote effective cooperation in vocational education and training between the European Union and the partner countries and territories.

The Foundation works together with EU institutions, countries and international development agencies. ETF also provides technical assistance to the EU Tempus Program, a program of inter-university cooperation with East and Central European countries.