

Summary of day 3 of the e-discussion on the VSD typology tool

Summary of the **7 contributions** on day 3 (15.11.2018). This summary includes both contributions on the discussion topics of day 2 (extension to private sector collaboration) and day 3 (extension to governance)

(I) Contributions referring to the discussion topics of day 2 (collaborating with the private sector – add-on tool 3/3)

(a) Value of this add-on to the tool

- ❖ Explanation of the different functions of the private sector in VSD

(b) Clarification needed

- ❖ Quadrant 3 / Industry Solutions: it is not clear why the private sector is mentioned as stakeholder in VET governance in industry solutions which focuses on typical instruments that have a direct impact in employability and less in the education system.

(c) Dual VET in development cooperation (Good Practice Case)

- ❖ The following experiences from initiating dual education in the Kosovo VET system were shared (EYE project):
 - Growing industries with skills shortage served as the entry point.
 - The following new elements were introduced: 1) compulsory implementation of the practical curricula in the company, 2) in-company instructor, 3) financial compensation of the students, 4) development of in-company training plan by the teacher responsible for the practical part in close cooperation with the in-company instructor
 - At the same time, the Ministry of Education was supported in developing the administrative instruction for implementation of the work-based learning.
 - To work simultaneously at the local level (school – company relationship) and central level (Ministry of Education) is key to achieve systemic change in the VET system.

(II) Discussion topics of day 3 (governance in VSD – add-on tool 2/3) as per guiding questions

(1) Are the governance principles helpful in planning and managing your VSD interventions? Where do you see opportunities and/or challenges with regard to your project context?

- ❖ Participants generally find the governance principles useful to check if a project tackles comprehensively the governance challenge. Having a good framework for addressing governance helps guiding the projects to better position themselves within the VET system in various contexts.
- ❖ Yet, the internationally agreed good governance criteria are found abstract and might not address VSD-specific aspects enough:
 - how you best steer and develop a VET and LMI system, to what end and how you can control it;
 - functions and roles of actors in governing (and financing) VET (e.g. something closer to a functional analysis)
 - how the actors would best cooperate for governing a VET and/or LMI systems;
 - good legislative frameworks including the issue of decentralisation and/or actors autonomy;
 - financial governance.
- ❖ Further questions:
 - Should we address governance for two main outcomes: empowerment and sustainability? (Effectiveness and Efficiency can tackle empowerment, but what about sustainability?)

- How can governance tackle such reality as “project-driven parallel VSD systems”?
 - The development landscape is more diverse than initially considered in this tool. Comment from the developers: So far, the focus was on public development cooperation projects but we also need to take a look at NGOs.
 - Does the governance aspect and the need for cooperation with the public / formal VET system differ, depending on whether we are talking about an SDC/ODA-funded project or an 'own' project of an NGO like Helvetas?
- How can we generate systemic change when the VSD systems are often jeopardized by (donor-funded) free training and a flooding with certificates without credibility and recognition (*Why to pay for skills development if one can get it for free?*)
- ❖ Way forward:
 - Is the typology tool the right place to tackle these governance dimensions? Or do we need a bit more room for this, going into VET governance (including Access and Inclusion dimension) and, separately, into LMI-systems governance?

(2) Do you have any suggestions to improve this draft version of tool 2/3 “Governance in VSD” (content-wise or related to its structure, e.g. unclear or missing aspects)?

- ❖ Quadrant 3 / Industry solutions: reference to private VSD system is missing. Governance is not only about meso or macro level, but governance can be a private sector issue, too. Hence, it is proposed to add “business dialogue” beside “policy dialogue”, e.g. business dialogue leading to collective business strategies that includes all the six governance principles.
- ❖ The accountability, as a governance principle may be relevant to the 4th quadrant too. In this case it can be related with formalization of the continuous monitoring and measurement of the impact of approaches/financing instruments used.

Authors: Katharina Walker, Annett Hilpert