

Final Report

Torino Process Interim Evaluation

SKS-12-05

submitted to the
European Training Foundation, Turin

September 2013

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	6
1.1 Main findings of the evaluation	6
1.2 Recommendations	9
2 Introduction	11
2.1 Purpose of the evaluation	11
2.2 Context: The Torino Process	11
2.3 Evaluation questions	12
3 Methodology	14
3.1 Interviews with ETF staff	14
3.2 Document analysis	14
3.3 Stakeholder survey	16
3.4 Case studies	16
4 Findings	18
4.1 Question 1	18
4.2 Question 2	20
4.3 Question 3	22
4.4 Question 4	22
4.5 Question 5	24
4.6 Question 6	25
4.7 Question 7	26
4.8 Question 8	27
4.9 Question 9	27
4.10 Question 10	29
5 Conclusions and recommendations	30
5.1 Conclusions	30
5.1.1 Support provided by ETF	30
5.1.2 Processes within the countries	31
5.1.3 Country and regional reports	31
5.1.4 Regional / corporate events to promote policy learning between countries	32
5.1.5 Current and potential added value / impact of the Torino Process	34

5.1.6	Conclusions in relation to the evaluation criteria	35
5.2	Recommendations	38
Annex 1: TOR	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
Annex 2: Stakeholder Survey results	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
A.2.1	Respondents' profile	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.2.2	Analytical framework	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.2.3	Effectiveness and benefits of the Torino Process	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.2.4	ETF events and web-site dedicated to Torino Process	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.2.5	Results of the stakeholders survey on Review of Human Resources reports....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 3: Case study reports	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
A.3.1	Case study report Jordan	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.3.2	Case study report Montenegro	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.3.3	Case study report Tajikistan	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.3.4	Case study report Moldova	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 4: Other country summaries	Error! Bookmark not defined.	
A.4.1	Countries in Central Asia	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.1.1	Kazakhstan	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.1.2	Kyrgyz Republic	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.1.3	Republic of Tajikistan	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.1.4	Uzbekistan	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.2	Countries in Eastern Europe	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.2.1	Armenia	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.2.2	Azerbaijan	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.2.3	Belarus	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.2.4	Georgia	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.2.5	Moldova	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.2.6	Russia	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.2.7	Ukraine	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.3	Countries in Western Balkans and Turkey	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.3.1	Albania	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.3.2	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.3.3	Kosovo	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.5.3.4	Montenegro	Error! Bookmark not defined.

A.4.3.5 Serbia	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.3.6 Croatia (HRD Review)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.3.7 Albania (HRD Review)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4 Countries in the South East Mediterranean (SEMED)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4.1 Egypt.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4.2 Israel.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4.3 Jordan.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4.4: Lebanon.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4.5 Morocco	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4.6 Palestine.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4.7 Syria.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.4.8 Tunisia	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.5 Summary of analysis at country level	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.5.1 Current state and development since 2010.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.5.2 Main use of Torino Process.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.4.5.3 Challenges	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 6: Assessment of Torino Process Indicators.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.6.1 Insinuation of a challenge	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.6.2 Qualitative assessment of selected indicators.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.6.2.1 Demographic Indicators	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.6.2.2 Economic Indicators	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.6.2.3 Labour Market Indicators.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.6.2.4 Indicators on Educational Provision.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.6.3 Conclusions drawn from the assessment of the recommended indicators	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 7: Evaluation Indicators.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 8: List of people met	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 9: List of documents consulted	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.9.1 Process documents:	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.9.2 Torino Process Country Reports:	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.9.3 Review of human resources development	Error! Bookmark not defined.
A.9.4 Regional reports.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 10: The STDs are in Bruges Communiqué	Error! Bookmark not defined.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CVET	Continuing education and training
ENPI	European Neighbourhood Partnership Instrument
EQAVET	European quality assurance in vocational education and training
ETF	European Training Foundation
EU	European Union
HDI	Human Development Index
HRD	Review of Human Resource Development
I-VET	Initial vocational education and training
LFS	Labour Force Survey
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PPP	public-private Partnership
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study
TOR	Terms of Reference
TP	Torino Process ³³
SEMED	Southern and Eastern Mediterranean
STD	Short-term deliverable
SWOT	Study of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats
VET	Vocational Education and Training

Executive Summary

The Torino Process is a participatory process leading to an evidence-based analysis of VET policies in a given country. The objective of this evaluation was to assess to what extent the overall objectives of the Torino Process have been achieved

The evaluation consisted of an extensive document analysis, interviews with ETF staff, a stakeholder survey covering all countries which have participated in the Torino Process, and case studies in four selected countries.

This executive summary briefly presents the key findings and derives evidence based conclusions and recommendations from this.

1.1 Main findings of the evaluation

In general, the analysis shows that the Torino Process has facilitated VET reforms in most countries and that the main stakeholders are usually involved in the process. The Torino Process provides countries with a good instrument for evidence-based policy-making; however, the capacity to actually conduct evidence-based policy and to use empirical data is varied. Future ETF support should focus on increasing the countries capacities to actually apply statistical data and to use evidence to further improve the reviews of the national VET systems.

In this paragraph, the key findings of the evaluation based on the key questions raised in the evaluation are being presented:

Undoubtedly the Torino Process contributes to **facilitating ownership and stakeholder participation in policy analysis**. It can be confirmed from the country visits (i.e. Montenegro, Armenia, Jordan, and to the least extend Tajikistan) that the number of consultations for each round have increased from the 2010 to the 2012 rounds.

The result merely stipulates the increased ownership or at least the understanding of the general ideas and benefits from a participatory approach to VET. In that respect the country visits again showed a significant increased ownership to the exercise, which will only increase as a larger pool of countries expects to do the exercise as self-assessment in 2014.

Regarding the effectiveness of the process as a methodology for holistic, evidence based policy analysis in partner countries the national stakeholders learn Good Practices from using the Analytical Framework. However, the capability of stakeholders to live up to the requirements, both when it comes to availability of documentation (here mainly data to support the evidence) and when it comes to analytical capacity is varied/ remains a challenge. The process has just started to some extent, but nevertheless there is a real and vital need for capacity building in making constructive analyses; providing raw data is hardly enough (see the review of the country reports in annex 4). Methods are seriously needed and not just data.

In all the countries visited the key stakeholders involved in the process are equally satisfied about the support received from the ETF in building up the capacity in policy formulation through evidence-based reporting and on proposals for new initiatives.

The Torino Process has provided the partner countries sufficient **tools to define a national vision** for VET policy. In all cases the reports have documented solid improvements in establishing new strategies for the VET system, in the institutional framework for VET, in development of new curricula and qualification frameworks, and in the legislative framework for VET. The point is further accentuated by the outcome of the stakeholder survey. The challenge comes in terms of monitoring and evaluation of the policy and progress. There is need for capacity building in making constructive analyses, which can yield results as a basis to formulate VET policies.

The Torino Process serves as **a tool for policy learning** and stakeholders appreciate the benefits from meeting colleagues from neighbouring countries during regional events which stimulates the policy learning at national level. Learning occurs

- via participation in ETF organised workshops;
- during the process of collecting data for the reports;
- for individuals when reading reports, who have not participated in the drafting of the reports;

the TP can be seen as a tool for VET SWOT analysis, thus identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for the VET, inside and outside the VET system.

The ETF is encouraged to continue facilitating these events. The regional Torino Process reports could be used as inspiration on how to make a critical assessment of the VET system, the labour market needs, and the ways to forward a message to decision makers on the national level.

It appears very clear that the Torino Process has kick-started the understanding of ensuring participation, quality, new learning methods, new and updated curricula, and notably the entire work in setting up a workable log-framed vision with measurable indicators for the entire VET system.

Regarding the complementarity between the Bruges and Torino Processes, from a methodological and analytical point of view, the Bruges and the Torino Processes are not congruent. The two processes operate from different angles of the same VET system; while the Torino Process focusses on creating a VET provision that may meet the demand of the labour market, the Bruges Process' short-term deliverables to measure how well the systems are able to do exactly that, implicitly assuming that the Member States already have a demand-driven VET system. It should be noted that the key pillars of the VET system are assessed by both reporting approaches.

The evaluation shows that the initiatives of different donor agencies are not fully coordinated and harmonised yet. The empowerment of partner countries in the **coordination of external assistance** from donors remains an important issue. There is no doubt that a critical analysis based on a solid study of data will help addressing the needs of the country and henceforth provide a powerful tool for coordination of external assistance for further build-up the capacity of the VET system.

The ETF should provide additional assistance for these critical analyses and further support in policy formulation, both for the benefit of establishing a workable strategy and to facilitate the coordination of the external assistance to meet the real demands of the system.

The **conferences and events** organised by the ETF in the context of providing support to partner countries during the Torino Process, are well received and useful for the participants. The participants understand these initiatives as strengthening their knowledge, skills and competences for evidence-based policy making.

The existing **two year cycle** of the Torino Process is well determined by the ETF and is of benefit for partner countries. There is rather need for more frequent analysis than for less frequent analysis.

When it comes to human and financial resources of the ETF, the ETF has allocated a lot of human resources in support of and facilitating the build-up of capacity in the partner countries to make the assessments which should justify the strategy and planning process for the on-going reforms of the VET systems. However judging from the country reports, training and support to the national caretakers of the country reports needs to be accentuated, perhaps also in participatory processes.

The Torino Process has facilitated a **far more accentuated approach** to involvement of external stakeholders, and perhaps even accentuated a stronger and more direct dialogue between the Ministries of Labour and Ministries of Education.

In addition, the country studies clearly document that the process itself has accentuated the need for reforms of the VET systems in almost all countries, and hence speeded up the process of a more demand-driven and flexible VET sector.

The main additional outcome may perhaps be the acknowledgement of using data and analysis for planning purposes, which in some countries appear to have inspired other line ministries.

There is a **high potential of measuring the impact** of the ETF, through the implementation of the Torino Process because the Torino Process is not a "one-shot" action or a project, it is aimed at becoming a continuous process. Since the changes in the educational system can be monitored/observed after a certain time, the Torino Process could foster the changes because it is "in the system" and it comes from the system actors.

The key findings according to the standard evaluation criteria are the following:

The **relevance** of the Torino Process with its Analytical Framework has proven to be highly significant; from all sides the main stakeholders have accentuated the relevance and the additional benefits from having a schedule and a template to follow in the pathway to establish a functional demand-driven VET system. This conclusion is derived from the stakeholder survey and further ratified and supported from the country visits undertaken.

Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results.

The resources having been made available in terms of the workload for the national stakeholders dedicated to the Torino Process is high, in some countries as much as additional 3-4 person months allocated. Nevertheless, the stakeholders support the process and indicate a tendency towards self-assessment, which would increase the workload in the future.

The key recommendation here for the ETF is to ensure solid support in conducting critical studies and notably establish analytical support to the national stakeholders.

Seen in light of the social, economic and political challenges facing most of the ETF partner countries the result of the Interim Evaluation in terms of the **effectiveness** of the Torino Process appears to document a solid pace and a boost in the on-going reforms in the partner countries.

Considering the relatively early stage of the Torino Process, a thorough **impact** assessment is still to be conducted. However, some early signs of impact have been noted. These include a far more devoted approach to participation and involvement of external stakeholders as well as a far better understanding of the need for strengthening VET in all participating countries. Furthermore, Adult Training, cVET, and Lifelong Learning principles are more considered. Another impact is an improved national policy dialogue, more specifically the stronger dialogue between the main stakeholders involved at national level, notably the Ministries of Education and the Ministries of Labour. Moreover, the countries' planning capacity has improved, which here indicates an understanding of the need for documentation of needs but even more an understanding that plans do not have to be rigid and fixed in the short to medium term.

One can be fairly confident that a process has been launched which cannot be set back. The prime national stakeholders have clearly acknowledged the scope for the tools provided by the Torino Process and lessons have spread to line ministries within the countries visited.

There are risks, though, of which the main risk appears to be a new revision of the framework which now appears to be solidly implemented. Altering the framework before the routines mature would impose the risk of losing the audience at a very fragile stage where the principles of good practice have to be based upon real and committed ownership.

In addition, it is rather recommended for the ETF to reinforce the support notably in critical assessment and consistent studies, and ways to find data where the capacity of national statistical offices may be limited.

1.2 Recommendations

The main recommendations from this interim evaluation of the Torino Process are:

1. Share good practices of ETF partner countries in gathering and using evidence for policy
ETF should continue to build on good practice examples of partner countries in terms of gathering and using evidence for policy development. A database or a compendium of good practice examples could be also developed.
2. Use the Torino Process to enhance stakeholder communication and cooperation
Workshops should also allow time and space for self-evaluation on what was achieved from the previous Torino Process. This stakeholder communication dimension of the process should be fostered by organising at least three country workshops related to Torino Process, as well as one regional workshop, each year. In future rounds further stakeholders should be involved, including further line ministries involved in VET policy, social partners, chambers, the business sector and regional VET providers.
3. Support the inclusion of the business sector- SMEs, crafts, manufacturing and agricultural sector
It is recommended to further strengthen the relationships with the representatives from the business sector, SMEs, crafts and especially manufacturing and agricultural sector and develop a dialogue with the representatives from public institutions in order to better understand the needs of the real sector.
4. Use the Torino Process as a tool for change management in VET
Implement the change management approach in the process itself (during the Torino Process). The change management will support the concept of evidence-based policy making because both approaches seek the change of the perception of the reality – in this case – the education and VET – in wider social and economic context.
5. Consider the following suggestions for measuring impact of ETF measures via the Torino Process:
 - a. Regularly list the main ETF actions by country as well as their expected results and impact and group them into the categories B-E as defined by the Analytical Framework. This exercise will show the fields in which a progress can be expected.
 - b. Analyse external policies by other donors (optional)
 - c. Analyse the Torino Process country reports regarding progress made. If progress is made and there has been a corresponding ETF action identified in step 1, then this can at least partially be attributed to the ETF action.
6. Support the shift of the process from ETF driven to becoming solely self-assessment; take a solid precautionous note on the push for ownership and the pathway to self-assessment when it comes to country reports
A recommendation for the ETF is to make a time frame in which the ETF takes the lead or at least to do a qualitative assessment of the country reports (with the legitimacy to reject a country report on objective grounds).
7. Continue providing support through Torinet and the country manager work; make Torinet support available to all Torino Process stakeholders; continue dual support at national and local level
ETF support in partner countries focuses on the national level, especially through the building and support of national VET centres. In addition, the ETF conducts trainings in e.g. school management, NQF, and curricula development. These proved to be vital for the development of VET within the countries. The ETF is therefore encouraged to continue the dual approach.
8. Consider including a “to do” list (action plan) in the country reports

Based on the analysis undertaken within the Torino Process the country report summaries could include a “to do” list, defining the main steps to be taken by who in what period. The Analytical Framework does not have to be changed for this, rather key question 3 in the summary could be used to develop the “to do” list.

9. Eventually, an idea could be to provide the Analytical Framework as an online template, with the data sources needed to complete the template directly available as links (see recommendation 2). If the reports are written online, then the “to do” list would be online as well, making the measures to be undertaken in each country and also the progress transparent. Train the national “reporters” in conducting analyses based upon a critical assessment of needs in reading tables and in monitoring and evaluation of current actions as well. The interpretation capacity could be enhanced by means of a short online course on data analysis and interpretation, conducted by Torinet, which could be made available on the Torinet web-page.

10. Provide strong support to the continuous build-up of statistics in the partner countries, including administrative records

There is a strong need for support of the build-up of the statistical availability not just in the national statistical offices but also in the ministries, perhaps even at regional and at local level. It is perhaps not the main task of the ETF but the Torino Process itself has accentuated the need within the countries to strengthen the statistical production as well as to invest in management information systems in both the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labour. ETF could provide further support; perhaps even inspire donors, to the continuous build-up of the statistical readiness in the countries;

11. Within the Analytical Framework. some indicators should be revised, other indicators should be added to provide better insight as to where the economy is heading, while yet other indicators could be added at least as alternative indicators, e.g.:

12. Consider making templates for good practices in the use of data (from data handling via creation of tables / graphs to final comments in a context)

Focus on developing the regional reports to stand out as good practice examples to follow for the country reports. The regional reports serve the purpose of providing vital background information which if produced and submitted to the participants in due time before the event will allow the participants to discuss the recommendations, conclusions, trends and situations documented.

13. Continue organising national and regional events -

The regional events provide knowledge sharing through but they also support in terms of strengthening the countries in data collection and/or data production.

2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The objective of this evaluation is the assessment of the extent to which the overall objectives of the Torino Process have been achieved and to which extent the Torino Process reports guide enquiry and:

- a) facilitate documenting country intelligence in VET;
- b) facilitate guiding ETF's work in the country in terms of needs assessment;
- c) are tailored to the social and economic context of the country;
- d) the extent to which countries use the Torino Process for their planning, policy development and measurement of mid-term achievements (progress monitoring);
- e) facilitate cooperation and information sharing with other donors.

The evaluation has three main areas of focus:

First Phase: Comparative analysis and assessment

This involved a comparative analysis and assessment of the Torino Process reports 2012 vs 2010 taking into account the Analytical Framework used. Additionally to map and produce a synthesis of how processes were conducted in each participating country, including who was involved in the drafting, consultation and/or verification of the report and an assessment to which extent the reports shape and track the development of VET policy in the countries. This phase included the stakeholder survey with the aim to obtain and analyse feedback and opinions of key stakeholders in all participating partner countries as to the impact of the Torino Process objectives in those countries.

Second Phase: Correlation for coordination, planning and implementation

This involved an analysis of whether the recommendations and priorities of the partner countries stated in the Torino Process country and regional reports are linked to respective implementation plans of the ETF in 2011, 2012 and 2013. Additionally an overall assessment on the impact in policy development and determine whether there is enhanced coordination and complementarity between donors arising from the Torino Process. This phase will include 4 country case studies (country visits and interviews with relevant stakeholders), one from each region.

Torino Process Corporate Conference:

Evaluation and assessment on how the corporate conferences promote policy learning and contribute to the achievement of the objectives of ETF and the Torino Process, and to which extent there are links between the conferences and each phase of the Torino Process, 2012 and 2010.

2.2 Context: The Torino Process

In 2010 the ETF launched the first round of the Torino Process, in which 22 of its 29 partner countries participated. In May 2011 the ETF organised a conference entitled 'The Torino Process – Learning from Evidence', which brought together over 250 stakeholders from all ETF partner countries, EU institutions, EU member states and the international community. In the final declaration, conference participants welcomed the Torino Process approach, endorsed the findings from the first exercise, including a number of common priority areas and short-term actions, and encouraged the ETF to work further to build capacity in evidence-based policy making. In addition, partner countries confirmed their interest in taking part in the next round of the Torino Process which took place in 2012.

The Torino Process is a participatory process leading to an evidence-based analysis of VET policies in a given country. The Torino Process is carried out in order to build consensus on the possible ways forward in VET policy and system development. This includes the determination of the current state and a vision for VET in each country and after a given period, an assessment of the progress that countries are making in achieving the desired results.

The added value of the Torino Process lies in the fact that it embeds VET within the socioeconomic context, and ensures that the analysis is informed by relevant evidence and takes place through structured dialogue. In this respect, the ETF assists countries to gather information from different sources of evidence and fosters policy dialogue.

Overall objectives of the Torino Process

- a) Developing a common understanding of a medium-term vision, priorities and strategy for VET development, exploring possible options for implementing this vision and/or making further progress;
- b) Designing and evaluating home-grown and affordable VET policies, based on evidence or knowledge and collaboration;
- c) Updating the analyses and achievements at regular intervals;
- d) Providing opportunities for capacity development and policy learning within and among partner countries and with the EU;
- a) Empowering countries to better coordinate the contributions of donors to achieving agreed national priorities.

Specific objectives of the 2012 Torino Process

More specifically, during 2012, the ETF set these specific objectives in response to lessons learned from the first round conducted in 2010.

- (i) improve the visibility and establish the Torino Process as a brand both in the partner countries and vis-a-vis the EC, key donors and other ETF partners,
- (ii) increase in the number of countries selecting to do self-assessments,
- (iii) broader participation and more comprehensive consultation and dialogue processes in the countries,
- (iv) improve the evidence base and analytical quality of the reports, using the (revised) Analytical Framework to the extent possible,
- (v) improve the capacities of country stakeholders to gather and use evidence for policy.

2.3 Evaluation questions

Evaluation Questions according to the TOR:

1. To which extent is the Torino Process facilitating ownership and stakeholder participation in policy analysis? Is the Torino Process an effective methodology for holistic, evidence based policy analysis in partner countries? Is there evidence of improved capacity development in policy analysis within the partner countries deriving from the process? How is Torino Process perceived in the ETF partner countries / in the regions?
2. Has the Torino Process provided partner countries with a helpful tool to define national vision, and /or for the formulation, monitoring and evaluation of VET policy and progress monitoring?
3. Does the Torino Process provide a useful tool for policy learning at a regional level, for example, among the countries of the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean. Has the Torino Process influenced partner country reform, ETF activities and EU assistance?

4. How has the Torino Process contributed to policy learning between the partner countries and the EU? How can complementarity between the Bruges and Torino Processes enhance policy learning for the partner countries?
5. Has the Torino Process shown potential for empowering partner countries in the coordination of external assistance from donors?
6. How do the corporate conferences promote policy learning and contribute to the achievement of the objectives of ETF and the Torino Process? Is there a link between the conferences and each phase of the Torino Process, 2012 and 2010?
7. Currently the Torino Process cycle takes place over two years? Is this the most appropriate rhythm given both its capacity building and policy reporting objectives
8. To what extent are the human and financial resources allocated to the Torino Process adequate?
9. Are there any additional outputs/outcomes that have been achieved that were not foreseen?
10. To which extent is it possible to use the Torino Process to additionally measure the impact of ETF work in the partner countries using contribution/attribution evaluation methods?

3 Methodology

3.1 Interviews with ETF staff

At the initial stage of the evaluation the evaluation team had meetings with ETF staff during a three days' visit in Turin.

The purpose of these meetings was to get a mutual understanding of key issues for the evaluation, to discuss the work and time schedule, to obtain relevant documents, and to get a first insight into the Torino Process as perceived by the ETF staff.

The list of persons interviewed is provided in Annex 8.

3.2 Document analysis

The desk study and document review involved a comparative analysis across the ETF partner countries of the extent to which the Torino Process is developing according to its overall objectives and principles. The evaluation assessed the degree to which the Torino Process is inspiring:

- participatory and country-owned policy analysis through comparative assessment of the policy analysis processes. This implies a map and synthesis of how processes were conducted in each participating country, including who was involved in the information gathering, drafting, consultation and/or validation phases.
- holistic and evidence based analysis, through comparative analysis and assessment of the country reports of the Torino Process reports taking into account the Analytical Framework used.

The desk study and document review contains the following headlines:

- Review of the Process documents, the guidelines and the Analytical Framework;
- Review of the indicators proposed by the Analytical Framework for monitoring and evaluation including their relevance in a country setting;
- Review of ETF internal reports, Torino Process Report evaluation sheet, and Evaluation sheets of events, etc., to obtain feedback and allow the internal feedback to influence and guide the interim evaluation and its direction and proposals;
- Review of the ETF communication material publications/web-page etc. devoted to Torino Process;
- Review of the country reports and their compliance with the guidelines (including the extent they provide reliable and systematic analysis of demand for VET provision)
- Review of the regional reports which summarize the country reports and stipulate progress and actions for the future
- A review of how well the feedback mechanisms, through country reports and regional reports, have an impact on future rounds of the Torino Process itself (are the countries heard in the process and is their stage of development taken into account within ETF annual working programmes?)
- Review of the extent the outcome of the Torino Process, notably the information it generates, inspire and have impact on other donor programmes

The evaluation included a comparative analysis and assessment of the country reports and the regional reports (both 2010 and 2012 rounds) as well as an analysis of the Torino Process documents themselves. Additionally, the Review of Human Resources Development (HRD)

reports were assessed for the Torino Process 2010 round in cases where the Torino Process report was not available. The evaluation team has also consulted EC documents related to the Copenhagen Process and Bruges Process.

The evaluation criteria of the document screening follows the following set of basic questions:

- To what extent is the Analytical Framework used
 - Are the five pillars described?
 - Are the five pillars integrated into a national strategy (institutional, financial / fiscal, and regional)?
 - Is there a work plan?
 - Is the financial system in place (from donors, projects planned, etc.)?
- Are the quantitative indicators used as evidence for the description?
 - Is there a critical analysis based upon the indicators?
 - Is the study evidence-based; are the indicators integrated in the context and used as documentation for needs, for further development, establishment of institutions and frameworks?
 - Are the recommended sources of quantitative and qualitative evidence used?
 - Are data and information used consistently?
- Is the Governance Matrix used?
- Do country reports include key messages and policy recommendations?

The above questions are just basic questions. With respect to the screening of both the regional and national reports the evaluation has in particular looked for the following:

- Consistent and logic build-up of the report (all four regional reports follow the same template)
- Consistent use of sources of quantitative and qualitative evidence
- Logical presentation of the challenges (in a SWOT-structure) of the region
- Objective presentation of the development of the VET sector in each of countries of the region
- Policy gaps and priorities
- Readability and hence usefulness for the readers;
 - Are there logical conclusions and recommendations?
 - Have the recommendations and conclusions been followed up in ETF activities?
 - Do they present the activities in the region, including cross-country activities?

The reports have been compared by the following sub-criteria:

- b) To what extent have the reports used quantitative indicators – from national and international sources – as indicated in the Analytical Framework
- c) Has the structure of the country reports followed the structure of the Analytical Framework?
- d) Was the length of the summary and the five sections as defined in the Analytical Framework guidelines, respected?
- e) To what extent are quantitative indicators explained qualitatively?

- f) To what extent is general, descriptive information provided in the report, qualitatively analysed?
- g) Are there any main issues arising from the Reports, which were not listed in the Analytical Framework?
- h) To what extent do Regional Reports follow the same reporting structure?
- i) To what extent is the structure, consistency of the reports influenced by the authors?
- j) To what extent is the content of the report influenced by the authors and by the way the report was written?
- k) Do the country reports contain recommendations for further actions which are based on the analysis undertaken?
- l) To what extent can developments and changes in VET be traced through Torino Process country documents published in 2010 and 2012?

3.3 Stakeholder survey

The stakeholder survey was launched after approval of the methodology and the questionnaire.

The questionnaire has been submitted to the following list of targeted stakeholders, provided by the ETF:

- participants of the 2011 conference;
- participants of the regional workshops;
- participants of the 3 regional statistic workshops held in March 2012;
- participants from policy leaders' conferences held for SEMED and Eastern Europe in 2012;
- contact details of persons visited during 5 country case studies for the AGORA Evaluation on the ETF Mid-term Perspective period 2010-2013 stakeholder contacts as listed in the Torino Process country reports; and
- participants scheduled for the 2013 conference

The outcome of the stakeholder survey is provided in Annex 2.

3.4 Case studies

Four countries have been visited during the evaluation: Jordan, Montenegro, Tajikistan, and Moldova; one from each region.¹

During the visits the evaluators conducted interviews with central key stakeholders from the following organisations:

- The national “reporter” (the person in charge of writing the country reports (if done by a national));
- The Ministry of Labour (or equivalent), including Head of Department of Labour Market Analysis and Head of CVT / Adult Training (if placed under MoL)
- The Ministry of Education (or equivalent), notably Head of VET (if placed under MoE) and Head of Educational Statistics
- Line ministries, presumably Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture or similar (e.g. Ministry of Health), where it serves a purpose, with the purpose to investigate how

¹ In addition, a visit to Armenia within the framework of a different project was used to meet TP stakeholders.

much the VET sector policy has been integrated into the national agenda (other ministries have taken the issue on board)

- Chambers of industry or commerce
- Employers' associations
- Trade unions
- Donors (e.g. EU / EUD, WB, OECD, UNDP, USAID, GIZ, SIDA, SwissAid, CIDA, ADB, AfDB, etc.)
- School directors if somehow involved in the Torino Process and its outcomes;
- Key employers taking part in NQF and curriculum development

The outcomes of the country visits are provided in Annex 3.

4 Findings

4.1 Question 1

To which extent is the Torino Process facilitating ownership and stakeholder participation in policy analysis? Is the Torino Process an effective methodology for holistic, evidence based policy analysis in partner countries? Is there evidence of improved capacity development in policy analysis within the partner countries deriving from the process?

Undoubtedly, the Torino Process has helped facilitating ownership and stakeholder participation in policy analysis. The stakeholder survey indicated clearly a high degree of involvement, as shown in Table 1 and Figure 1.

Table 1: Level of stakeholder involvement in the Torino Process


	Involved		Not involved		Do not know	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Government	84	17%	2	5%	2	2%
EU Delegation	47	9%	5	12%	16	17%
International organisation	55	11%	4	9%	13	14%
Social partners	73	15%	3	7%	5	5%
Education/training institutions	87	18%	2	5%	3	3%
Civil society organisations	58	12%	6	14%	8	9%
Researchers	43	9%	9	21%	14	15%
Business	40	8%	8	19%	13	14%
Other	8	2%	4	9%	18	20%
Total	495	100%	43	100%	92	100%

Table 1 displays the involvement of stakeholders in relation to other stakeholders.² It can be seen that in comparison to other stakeholders, education/training institutions and governments were more involved, followed by social partners. As the country visits and single comments in the survey showed, the quantitatively high involvement of social partners does not seem to match with the actual involvement in the process, which appears to be lower.

Figure 1 shows the involvement of stakeholders in relation to own stakeholder group, i.e. the sum of “involved”, “not involved” and “do not know” adds up to 100 percent. While the overall picture looks the same as in the table above, the graphic shows that some stakeholders were less involved, among them researchers and the business sector.

² Respondents were asked which stakeholders were involved in consultations and discussions. For each stakeholder group it was possible to choose between “involved”, “not involved”, and “do not know”.

Figure 1: Level of stakeholder involvement in the Torino Process



The overall outcome of the stakeholder survey was confirmed by the country visits (see annex 3).

In terms of ownership a solid progress is documented, notably for those countries which have produced reports in both 2010 and 2012. Ownership and stakeholder participation is visible in the higher number of self-assessments in 2012. It appears clear that the countries have taken the Torino Process on-board, and it would only be fair to suggest that still more countries will decide to base the reporting on self-assessment.

When the Torino Process is observed as a process, as the steps which led to drafting the Torino Process Reports, then it can be observed from the country visits, that the countries were very keen to participate in the process because it made it possible for the stakeholders to gather, to talk, to discuss, to consult each other, to develop mutual understanding and ideas on VET and to reach a consensus on what is important concerning VET in the country.

While ownership has increased overall, the country visits demonstrated (and the stakeholder survey provides more insight into this issue) that not all relevant stakeholders were involved in the process. In most cases the Torino Process has been conducted in cooperation between stakeholders from the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Labour / national labour authorities / public employment service. Whereas the policy actors were mainly involved, the actors from the business sector and from adult education (e.g. VET schools) participated to a lesser extent. Representatives from trade unions and donor agencies were also involved in the process, but to a lesser degree. Some stakeholders state that social partners are formally involved but should take a more active role. This could be due to the early stage of the process but also due to a low degree of organisation (particular in Arab countries). In future rounds further stakeholders should be involved, including further line ministries involved in VET policy, social partners, chambers, the business sector and regional VET providers.

Regarding the question of the process effectiveness as a methodology for holistic, evidence based policy analysis in partner countries, almost all countries are able to document the need to take in elements of the socio-economic agenda and make room for social inclusion. However, the reports lack evidence of the effect and impact thereof and in particular the reports lack elements of critical analysis in the description of the further development needs of the VET sector. This goes against the guidelines set out in the Analytical Framework. Without critical analysis it tends to be very difficult for the reader to understand the logic in the substantial activities in the VET sector within the countries. And one might assume that it becomes equally difficult for the decision makers to understand the logic of financing major reforms of the VET sector without a decent attempt to provide some documentation which is both logical and

consistent. There is no doubt that the national stakeholders learn Good Practices from using the Analytical Framework, but it is more doubtful that the stakeholders have the capability to live up to the requirements, both when it comes to availability of documentation (here mainly data to support the evidence) and when it comes to analytical capacity. These two critical points form the main part of the review of the country reports (see annex 4) and the additional assessment of the indicators recommended by the Analytical Framework (in annex 6).

The ETF should emphasize and accentuate its support to build up better statistical sources, but more so ETF should reinforce its support in capacity building in use of the analytical approach within its partner countries.

However, as a process towards better practices in planning and policy formulation the answer is a straight yes; the Torino Process as a learning process, whatever and however the national stakeholders decide to use Good Practice examples, is without any reasonable doubt a solid benefit for the ETF partner countries. Learning occurs

- via participation in ETF organised workshops;
- during the process of collecting data for the reports;
- for individuals when reading reports, who have not participated in the drafting of the reports;
- the TP can be seen as a tool for VET SWOT analysis, thus identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for the VET, inside and outside the VET system.

The question of providing evidence of improved capacity development in policy analysis within the partner countries deriving from the process is a real challenge. In all the countries visited the key stakeholders involved in the process are equally happy about the support received from the ETF in building up the capacity in policy formulation through evidence-based reporting and proposal for new initiatives.

The Montenegrin and Jordanian examples appear to justify this. According to the Ministry of Labour in Montenegro, the methodology has been a major inspiration to the formulation of strategies in Montenegro. In Jordan, the E-TVET Council is developing a monitoring and evaluation matrix and different approaches based on the results and experience of the Torino Process (see Annex 3).


In addition the stakeholder survey clearly appears to document the reinforced capacity amongst the central stakeholders (see tables A2.3 and A2.4 in annex 2). The stakeholders who have participated in the HRD review documenting process, have indicated that the Torino Process did inspire policy analysis to be holistic, evidence-based, country owned (see figure A3.16).

4.2 Question 2

Has the Torino Process provided partner countries with a helpful tool to define national vision, and /or for the formulation, monitoring and evaluation of VET policy and progress monitoring?

The Torino Process has provided the partner countries sufficient tools to define a national vision for VET (and labour market) policy. In all cases the reports have documented solid improvements in establishing new strategies for the VET system, in the institutional framework for VET, in development of new curricula and qualification frameworks, and in the legislative framework for VET. The point is further accentuated by the outcome of the stakeholder survey in annex 2, notably the following figure 2:

Figure 2: Torino Process effectiveness for measuring progress in terms of VET reform (in %)



The opportunity to share different points of view and to openly discuss issues relevant to VET, is regarded by countries as a valuable input in terms of reaching mutual goals at the system level. The process enabled (in some countries) development of a common understanding of a medium-term and long-term vision, priorities and strategy for VET development. However, the options for the implementation of the vision were studied and investigated to a limited extent. The process opened the possibility for making suggestions and recommendations, but the next step – development of action plans and concrete measures was explored to a lesser extent.

Most country reports refer to strategies or laws in education, labour market, etc. which refer to VET as an important part of the development measures for the countries. These strategies and laws are regarded as the documents describing the vision of the VET developments and are, as such, referred to in the country reports. Some countries, e.g. Kyrgyz Republic, developed new educational strategies since the first Torino Process round, which resulted in the acknowledgment of the existence and inclusion of the VET in the educational sector (Education Development Strategy 2012-2020). However, what is evident from the reports, a common vision defined by all stakeholders (government, business/private sector, NGOs, etc.) is missing in ETF partner countries. The participatory dimension of the Torino Process, developed during the process itself (as the stakeholder survey shows), could be used as the foundation for the future Torino Process rounds (and other ETF related activities) for strengthening the stakeholders liaisons built during the process of the Torino Process. This strengthening could result in a common VET vision, facilitated by the ETF.

The challenge comes in terms of monitoring and evaluation of the policy and progress which to some extent hardly can be visible after just two rounds of the Torino Process³. As far as it can be seen from the evaluation the question of teaching and training the stakeholders in critical assessment appears to be the critical point. The process has just started to some extent, but nevertheless – as the key conclusions from this evaluation report will accentuate – there is a real and vital need for capacity building in making constructive analyses; providing raw data is hardly enough (see the review of the country reports in annex 4). Methods are seriously needed and not just data.

And that assessment is a feedback to the ETF, which has launched the Torino Process and supports the countries with backup: According to the national stakeholders in Montenegro, the writing of the country report takes 3-4 months on top of the ordinary work; obviously they would benefit strongly from better know-how in conducting analyses.

³ Additionally, the Analytical Framework was revised from the first to the second round.

4.3 Question 3

Does the Torino Process provide a useful tool for policy learning at a regional level, for example, among the countries of the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean? Has the Torino Process influenced partner country reform, ETF activities and EU assistance?

When it comes to provide inspiration across countries, even for countries which face similar challenges like neighbour countries within one of the four regions, the real effect of the Torino Process may take a longer time to yield the expected results.

Most of the stakeholders interviewed during the country visits appreciate the benefits from meeting colleagues from neighbouring countries during regional events. Furthermore, half of the respondents from the HRD stakeholder survey and participating in HRD reports review, found the Torino Process as a very useful tool for evidence-based policy making.

The regional events act as a platform for knowledge sharing between national stakeholders, where ETF has a vital role to play as mediators and in providing follow up on the discussions and concerns raised by the participants.

4.4 Question 4

How has the Torino Process contributed to policy learning between the partner countries and the EU? How can complementarity between the Bruges and Torino Processes enhance policy learning for the partner countries?

Through the evaluation findings, both through the outcome of the stakeholder survey but notably through country visits, it appears very clear that the Torino Process has kick-started the understanding of ensuring participation, quality, new learning methods, new and updated curricula, and notably the entire work in setting up a workable log-framed vision with measurable indicators for the entire VET-system. The complete framework has inspired the countries to a high degree with the main ministries involved in the process as well as their agencies, but further contributed as inspiration for other ministries as well; perhaps even the establishment of national strategies.

This statement can be difficult to document, of course, since it is a qualitative statement. However, the stakeholder survey clearly insinuated the benefits of the Torino Process for the national VET System (see annex 2, tables A2.3 and A2.4). Furthermore, as the reports from the country visits show, almost all the main stakeholders, involved in the Torino Process, appeared happy about the support in their Ministries' agendas (see Annex 3).

The question of complementarity between the Bruges and Torino Processes was also investigated within this evaluation. In November 2012 ETF has produced a note which clearly shows the similarities and differences between the two processes, in which note the following illustrative table appears:

Function	Bruges exercise	Torino Process
Background	The Bruges reporting exercise builds on the EU experience with the Copenhagen process launched since 2002	The Torino Process was launched in 2010
Purpose	Reporting and knowledge sharing exercise to measure progress against common policy objectives agreed at EU level	Policy learning exercise to enable partner countries to analyse national VET policies through evidence and consultation ; Policy learning tool within countries, between countries and with EU ; Inform ETF's support strategy and its input to EU institutions ; Empowers partners to coordinate donor interventions
Structure	Specific policy objectives and short term deliverables in Bruges Communiqué	Holistic analytical framework covering VET and links with economic and social development, LLL
Process	EU Member States voluntary cooperation enshrined in soft legislation carried out through self assessment. Reporting exercise with Interim report after 2 years and full report after 4 years	ETF proposed process carried out through ETF supported 'self assessment' /or ETF-led process. Process at least as important as report ; Policy learning exercise every 2 years
Domains	Quality, efficiency, attractiveness, excellence, relevance of VET; Access to VET and qualifications Lifelong learning, mobility; Creativity, innovation, Entrepreneurship Equity, social cohesion, active citizenship Communication, cooperation VET-Employment services, data collection	Vision External efficiency: - VET in relation to economic competitiveness - VET in relation to social demand and social inclusion Internal quality & efficiency Governance and financing
Timing	1-10 2012	1-12 2012 leading to conference 5/2013
Scope	National exercise for Member States and opportunity for adjusting strategy and tools at EU level	Used principally at country level. However, also experimented at local level in Russia and Tunisia.

In addition, the Bruges Process focuses on instruments to measure the quality of the existing (well-developed) VET system in the EU Member States, through a set of criteria or measures called Short-term Deliverables, STDs (see Annex 10).

The STDs are highly different in nature from the Analytical Framework of the Torino Process and cannot methodologically be compared with the recommended indicators within the Analytical Framework. The STDs try mainly to establish a scope for measuring the quality of the VET system through stakeholder barometer surveys and consultation, while the main point in the Torino Process rather is to establish a basis for creating a VET system which deals with the needs of the labour markets. The indicators recommended for the Torino Process are accordingly based upon administrative records and official statistics which have a significant different nature than the STDs' more opinion-based character.

In that sense, from a methodological and analytical point of view, the Bruges and the Torino Processes are by no means congruent. In fact, it would be far more correct to stipulate that the two processes operate from different angles of the same VET system; while the Torino Process

focusses on creating a VET provision that may meet the demand of the labour market, the Bruges Process' STDs measure how well the system are able to do exactly that, implicitly assuming that the Member States already have a demand-driven VET system. It should be noted that the key pillars of the VET system are assessed by both reporting approaches. The pillars described by STDs 12, 13, 14, 18, 19 and 20 are fairly covered by the Torino Process Analytical Framework.

Accordingly, the Bruges Process with its neatly defined mechanisms to measure quality, impact, contribution and participation of key market stakeholders (both public and private) could easily be seen as a goal to reach sooner or later as part of the on-going reforms of the VET systems in the ETF Partner Countries.

In terms of merging the two processes the evaluation team is cautious. The timing should be fostered with care; most of the non-accession countries have just started to adjust their VET systems in accordance to the recommendations from donor (including ETF and EU) and the ministries lack analytical capacity to make an adequate follow-up even on basic actions (lack of knowledge in M&E). Accordingly, it is doubtful that the ETF partner countries at this stage of the Torino Process are able to live up to the requirements of the Bruges Process.

It is rather suggested to inform the partner countries on how the EU Member States through Cedefop have developed a strategy to evaluate the quality of the VET systems and hence more focus on aspiration and inspiration at least at this stage. In that respect, the Bruges Process indicators also reflect the speed of adjustment in mature Member States which by itself could be of inspiration for more profound M&E instruments when the partner countries are prepared for it.

4.5 Question 5

Has the Torino Process shown potential for empowering partner countries in the coordination of external assistance from donors?

When it comes to empowering partner countries in the coordination of external assistance from donors the conclusions appear to be slightly weak. There is no doubt that a critical analyses which draws upon a solid study of data will help addressing the needs of the country and henceforth provide a powerful tool for coordination of external assistance for further build-up the capacity of the VET system.

However, other indicators appear to document the opposite. Both in Montenegro and in Tajikistan the country visits revealed some fairly solid critical or at least sceptical points towards the Torino Process and the country reports; in Montenegro from the sole donor and in Tajikistan from a non-governmental research agency both pointing at a threat of using the country reports to “furnish a nice picture of the countries’ achievements” for internal purposes.

Montenegro is in serious threat of being able to attract donors when LUX Development leaves the country permanently in about one year.

Accordingly, the ETF should create means for supporting the national stakeholders in conducting critical analysis meant for the purpose of ensuring the right policy, both for the benefit of establishing a workable strategy and to facilitate the coordination of the external assistance to meet the real demands of the system.

It would obviously go too far to suggest ETF to become a censor or evaluator of the country reports. However, some sort of minimum reflexion of the current situation should be contained in the country reports, and perhaps ETF could “force” the country reports to contain minority opinions (e.g. from employers’ associations and trade unions).

See recommendation 14 for concrete ideas.

4.6 Question 6

How do the corporate conferences promote policy learning and contribute to the achievement of the objectives of ETF and the Torino Process? Is there a link between the conferences and each phase of the Torino Process, 2012 and 2010?

According to the stakeholder survey the stakeholders find the corporate conferences useful; see table 2 and figure 3 copied from the outcome of the stakeholder survey in annex 2.


Table 2: Level of usefulness of the ETF organised events as part of the Torino Process

	Very useful		Moderately useful		Slightly useful		Do not know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Torino Process conference 2011	30	46%	18	28%	3	5%	14	22%	65	100%
Regional workshops for the Torino Process 2010	25	43%	14	24%	4	7%	15	26%	58	100%
Regional workshops for the Torino Process 2012	34	52%	9	14%	5	8%	18	27%	66	100%
Regional policy leaders conference	16	33%	7	15%	2	4%	23	48%	48	100%
Focus group meetings per region	22	36%	15	25%	2	3%	22	36%	61	100%

Torino Process focus groups are organised as sessions of knowledge sharing on particular topics relevant to VET and covered by the Torino Process Analytical Framework, as well as by the other ETF activities in the countries. Focus groups provide the opportunity for involving stakeholders more deeply in the discussions on the selected VET topics. Examples of focus groups can be found on the Torino Process web-site, as well as on other web-sites, such as:

- http://www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/EV_2012_Torino_Process_Focus_Group_Astana (Torino Process Focus Group in Astana, Kazakhstan)
- http://www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/EV_2012_Torino_Process_Focus_Group_Atyrau?opendocument (Torino Process Focus Group in Atyrau, Kazakhstan)
- http://www.tempus.ge/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=104&Itemid=79&lang=en (Focus group "Education and Business" in Tbilisi, Georgia).

Figure 3: Level of usefulness of the ETF organised events as part of the Torino Process (in %)



The results demonstrate that the events organised by the ETF in the context of providing support to ETF partner countries during Torino Process, are well received and useful for the participants. The participants understand these initiatives as strengthening their knowledge, skills and competences for evidence-based policy making. As the results from the previous section have shown, the level of knowledge and experience sharing (on recent trends and progress of VET development on policy and strategy level) during those events is on a high level which demonstrates one additional benefit of the Torino Process.

The answers “do not know”, most probably come from those respondents who did not participate in the events.


4.7 Question 7

Currently the Torino Process cycle takes place over two years. Is this the most appropriate rhythm given both its capacity building and policy reporting objectives?

When it comes to the frequency of undertaking Torino Process (Figure 4), the opinions of respondents are shared and indicate the need for more frequent analysis (yearly: 32.5%; every two years: 41.3%). For a less frequent cycle the number of responses was lower (every three years: 21.3%, every four years: 5.0%).

This indicates that the existing two year cycle is well determined by the ETF and is of benefit for partner countries.

Figure 4: Frequency of undertaking Torino Process (in %)



The result was confirmed by all stakeholders met during the four country studies.

4.8 Question 8

To what extent are the human and financial resources allocated to the Torino Process adequate?

It is generally difficult to assess the adequacy of the human resources in place for the Torino Process on behalf of the partner countries. In Montenegro, for instance, two persons were in charge of coordinating the process of the country report, but a fairly large number of other stakeholders were involved as well. In Tajikistan that number of active players appeared fairly limited.

Seen in light of the comparative analysis and assessment of the country reports there is no doubt that more analytical resources are needed in almost all countries. However, that assessment should not be used as an indicator of lack of financial means and manpower resources; it merely justifies a need for training in making assessments, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting.

When it comes to human and financial resources of the ETF, the evaluation makes the following observation: it appears obvious that the ETF has allocated significant human resources in support and facilitating the build-up of capacity in the partner countries to make the assessments which should justify the strategy and planning process for the on-going reforms of the VET systems, but at the same time it appears obvious from the reading of the country reports that training and support to the national caretakers of the country reports need to be accentuated, perhaps also in participatory processes.

4.9 Question 9

Are there any additional outputs/outcomes that have been achieved that were not foreseen?

The Torino Process has facilitated a far more accentuated approach to involvement of external stakeholders, and perhaps even accentuated a stronger and more direct dialogue between Ministry of Labour and Ministry of Education (as seen in Armenia).

In addition, the country studies clearly document that the process itself has accentuated the need for reforms of the VET systems in almost all countries, and hence speeded up the process of a more demand-driven and flexible VET sector. Adult Training and C-VET is still behind in the process, but at least the focus on documentation of the initiatives in that field will eventually create an impact.

The main additional outcome may perhaps be the acknowledgement of using data and analysis for planning purposes, which in some countries appear to have inspired other line ministries (see e.g. the case study of Montenegro).

For documentation we further refer to the tables from the stakeholder survey provided in Annex 2, and notably the following points:

Benefits of the Torino Process for the VET system according to the stakeholder survey grouped around the four main Torino Process dimensions:

- Holistic: close links to private sector, broader view, creating a flexible system, provide macro analyses
- Evidence-based: clear vision of VET system policy, better policies, data collection, ease of access to TVET data, evidence-based policy making, learning from evidence, reliable information from the participated entities
- Participatory: abilities, capacity building, diversification of the ideas, government, independent view, realizing importance of the involvement of stakeholders to the training process, unifying the vision of all stakeholders
- Country owned: clear overview, assessment of VET, defined priorities, develop national system, development of educational policies, experience, focus on VET, increasing efficiency, identify priorities, more consistent measures of the VET system effectiveness in the country's socio-economic development, self-evaluation, self-reflection, setting goals for further development, VET policy improvement, vision for improving VET system
- Other: examples from other countries, learned about VET system in Europe

The section “other” implies the dimension of the Torino Process related to learning and sharing experience possibilities which arose during the process.

The majority of the benefits recognised by stakeholders clearly fall under the “country owned” Torino Process dimension, reflecting that the ownership was recognised and accepted.

The lowest number of benefits which can be ordered under the holistic dimension of the Torino Process reflects further findings from the stakeholder survey that the holistic dimension was recognised by only a few stakeholders. However, the holistic approach is perceived in different ways in the ETF partner countries, and therefore, a systematic description of what the “holistic” dimension of the Torino Process would be beneficial to all stakeholders. In more detail, the holistic approach is perceived as: inclusion of the business sector, creating a flexible system, providing macro analysis. Additionally to that, during the country visits, the holistic dimension was described as inclusion of cVET and adult education in the report, a broader view and perception of VET.

When it comes to the benefits of the Torino Process for stakeholders who participated in the process, the following findings were grouped across four dimensions of the Torino Process:

- Holistic: getting the clear picture, increased awareness for different segments of VET, raising awareness
- Evidence-based: ease of access to data, information availability, information system,
- Participatory: better coordination, capacity building for social partners, collaboration, contribution from neutral partners, exchanging information with other stakeholders, less duplication, local NGOs, mapping cooperation, more coordination, more participation, partnership, provoke discussion, realizing the importance of involvement of stakeholders to the training process, shared information on VET achievements,
- Country owned: assessment, clear vision of economic development of the region, higher quality of services, review of full VET system, TVET SWOT, vision for VET policy

- Other: competent workforce, more qualified workforce, skilled workers, cost effectiveness, exchange of experience, knowledge,

Stakeholders recognised the participatory dimension as the most beneficial, whereas the evidence-based dimension was less recognised.

4.10 Question 10

To which extent is it possible to use the Torino Process to additionally measure the impact of ETF work in the partner countries using contribution/attribution evaluation methods?

There is a high potential of measuring the impact of the ETF, through the implementation of the Torino Process because the TP is not a "one-shot" action or a project, it is aimed at becoming a continuous process. Since the changes in the educational system can be monitored/observed after a certain time, the TP could foster the changes because it is "in the system" and it comes from the system actors. A concrete suggestion on how to measure impact of ETF work via the Torino Process can be found in recommendation 13.

In general, the country visits documented a very clear signal of the benefit of ETF from all stakeholders met. Perhaps there were some sceptical points towards the self-assessment strategy, but the work of the ETF, the country managers, or the Torino Process declarations itself were never questioned.

The stakeholder survey mainly focuses on the Torino Process, but since the Torino Process is put forward by and facilitated by the ETF the credit to the Torino Process, given by the respondents, shows an obvious signal of the credibility of the ETF as a prime partner for national stakeholders. In that respect, almost all feedback from the stakeholder survey should be seen as a feedback to the ETF itself; see Annex 2.

5 Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

5.1.1 Support provided by ETF

Including the Torino Process package of Analytical Framework, indicators, website, Country Manager Support, regional workshops

ETF support could be described as a mentoring, feedback and monitoring mechanism during the Torino Process. Mentoring support refers to guidance in drafting the country reports and data gathering, either as organised support through workshops or either as individual support through country managers and Torinet experts. Feedback mechanism refers to providing feedback on the level of understanding of the Torino Process objectives and Analytical Framework; inclusion of stakeholders into the process itself; usage of qualitative and quantitative data; analytical feedback of the written report. Monitoring mechanism refers to the monitoring of the activities organised at the country level for the purpose of drafting the country report. It also refers to the monitoring of the agreed deadlines in the national context and in reference to the ETF.

The general impression from the country studies, heavily supported by the stakeholder survey, is that the Torino Process, the Analytical Framework and notably the support provided by the ETF and the ETF country managers is acknowledged and very well received in all ETF Partner Countries.

The stakeholder survey, which was purely based upon self-assessment⁴, clearly documents the benefits which accrue to the key national stakeholders. The country visits further accentuated the reinforced encouragement to increase the effort in the on-going reforms of the VET system, perhaps even the reforms of the complete educational sector.

The part of the ETF official web-site dedicated to the Torino Process was rated as (Table 3): “user friendly” by 61 respondent (89.7%), “easy to use and navigate” by 56 respondents (87.5%), “easy to search for reports” by 49 respondents (80.3%), “easy to search for up-to-date information” by 42 respondents (68.9%) and “easy to download documents” by 48 respondents (76.2%). This indicated that the web-site dedicated to Torino Process has a well-structured content and is easy to use for the most of the survey respondents.

Table 3: Rating of the ETF official web-site dedicated to the Torino Process

	Yes		No		Do not know		Total	
	n	%	No	%	n	%	n	%
User friendly	61	90%	1	1%	6	9%	68	100%
Easy to use/navigate	56	88%	2	3%	6	9%	64	100%
Easy to search for reports	49	80%	4	7%	8	13%	61	100%
Easy to download documents	48	76%	5	8%	10	16%	63	100%
Easy to search for up-to-date information	42	69%	6	10%	13	21%	61	100%

The EU is involved in building VET centres in countries receiving EU assistance. The main platform and rationale for building modular (multifunctional) regional VET Centres relies partly

⁴ Please note that the respondents were directly involved in the Torino Process and basically all were participants in the ETF Corporate Conferences, which might be seen as a biased population of stakeholders from a pure scientific point of view.

in the hope that a regional resource could be of benefit to all schools in the region, and partly that the EU could focus its donor support to a limited number of schools. In other words, the VET centres become anchors in the development of curricula as well as a platform of cascade learning processes which almost all EU projects is based upon.

The ETF mainly coordinates its support with central level stakeholders, but also conducts trainings in e.g. school management, NQF, and curricula development. For instance, the country visits revealed that there are school directors who have taken part in ETF training seminars.

Accordingly, ETF support, even within the Torino Process itself, may contain a certain dual approach both towards central level (supporting QA instruments and institutional capacity) and local (school) level where the latter refer to good practices in learning methods, school management principles, PPP, adult training, Lifelong Learning (including opening up for enterprises to buy training courses and hence allow VET schools to operate on a private market), etc.

The latter (support at local school level) has not been evaluated during the interim evaluation. However, the country visits revealed ETF support at local level which appeared to be vital for the role of the ETF within the countries. Accordingly, it is considered vital for the ETF to continue the dual approach of support at national and local level.

5.1.2 Processes within the countries

Mapping the processes, increased ownership, broader stakeholder involvement, number of consultations compared to 2010 round, timing and intervals of the exercise

The overall conclusion, both from the country visits as well as the stakeholder survey, is that the timing and intervals of the reporting exercise is generally accepted, perhaps even appreciated. One could have questioned the 2-year interval of the reporting process in relation to the manpower the reporting process actually takes, but in none of the countries visited it was possible to withdraw just a single tiny little fragment of complaint. Accordingly, it is concluded that the ETF partner countries, perhaps due to the stage of development in particular in the process of developing an approach to labour market assessment and M&E, have a solid need to be trained in critical assessment and establishment of evidence-based strategies and plans for active labour market measures and education planning.

It can be confirmed from the country visits (i.e. Montenegro, Armenia, Jordan, and to the least extend Tajikistan) that the number of consultations for each round have increased from the 2010 to the 2012 rounds.

The result merely stipulates the increased ownership or at least the understanding of the general ideas and benefits from a participatory approach to VET. In that respect the country visits again showed a significant increased ownership to the exercise, which will only increase as a larger pool of countries expects to do the exercise as self-assessment in 2014.

The stakeholder survey indicated that only 11.8% of stakeholder survey participants provided comments on their own country reports. This result might open the question of the actual level of stakeholder involvement during the process of drafting the country documents. Further results of the stakeholder survey show that the level of stakeholder involvement was higher when looking at the participation rates at different Torino Process related workshops organised by the ETF, and was getting lower when the process of drafting the country reports once started. This indicates different level of stakeholder involvement at different stages of the Torino Process.

5.1.3 Country and regional reports

Adherence to analytical framework, analytical quality, use of evidence

Particular issues by region, which has to be taken into account both in the evaluation and in the Torino Process itself;

When it comes to the adherence to the Analytical Framework and in particular the analytical quality and the use of evidence the analysis revealed room for improvement. The critical analytic approach within the country reports needs to be further developed as at times there is limited use of time-series and cross-section studies even though approximately half of the recommended indicators accentuate the need for both time-series and cross-section studies of the data. In some reports cross-section studies are missing even when it comes to defragmentation of the profile of the unemployed, the total population (e.g. age-groups, gender, ethnicity), and economic variables.

In general, the country reports need solid improvement in two different aspects:

- Is the analytical capacity adequate for reliable evidence-based self-assessed country reports (and hence to use the evidence to formulate strategies for VET)?
- Is a fear of “furnish a nice picture” justified? And if so, the country reports may imply that Donor projects are founded on wrong grounds.

In general country reports lack data support (evidence) that is not only attributed to a lack of data from the national statistical offices and ministries. The regional reports have been reviewed from the perspective that they could stand out as examples to follow for the national stakeholders, both as inspiration to the exercise of making country reports and as a tool for knowledge sharing.

5.1.4 Regional / corporate events to promote policy learning between countries

Identify recent trends and progress of VET development in the ETF partner countries;

Reflect on the analytical framework and ‘processes’ in the Torino Process;

Share and discuss practical challenges and cases in elected thematic policy areas covering the analytical framework;

Identify objectives and the agenda for the future work of the ETF and the next steps in the Torino Process;

It can be observed from the country reports, the HRD reports and the regional reports that the recent trends and progress of VET development is being achieved in the following major areas/segments of the VET:

- Development of national qualification frameworks
- Development of approaches for matching the labour market needs with output skills from the VET
- Involvement of several Ministries (education, labour, social welfare,...) and other national institutions in consultation process of drafting national VET strategies
- Development of measures for increasing employment opportunities for vulnerable groups through VET
- Development of approaches for raising the level of VET attractiveness
- Raising the awareness of quality assurance in VET
- Finding methods and approaches for smoother school to work transition (as one of the approaches to tackle youth unemployment)

The review of the process documents and the Analytical Framework within the comparative analysis and assessment of the country reports (and to some extent the regional reports as well) revealed a need for an assessment of the recommended indicators, which appear to be the Achilles heel in the process, as emphasised in the comparative analysis and assessment of the country reports.

The evidence placed in the country reports can be considerably improved. The country reports lack a vital critical assessment through a solid study of the indicators to provide support for the further development of the economies, but mainly in support to strategic build-up of the VET sector both in Initial VET and in Adult learning.

The comparative analysis and assessment of the country reports is found in annex 4 of this report. However, after the reading of HRD-reports and the regional reports as well the country reports, which neither provided a more solid entrance to the subject of providing evidence for further development of the VET sector in the countries in question, one can start to question the Analytical Framework, the process documents and hence the indicators themselves: Perhaps it is not just a matter of data availability but also related to the analytical process.

In that respect a qualitative assessment of the indicators which should provide the basis for the critical national assessment has been made. In general, the evaluators do not question the justification of the indicators, but rather the use of them for time-series and cross-section studies, but also for the apparent logic in using the recommended indicators when data is available; often the reports come up with conclusions (turning arguments into postulates without any “proof”) or alternatively the authors simply skip the use of the indicators and just refer to something which could be termed as “common sense”.

Insofar the point in the Analytical Framework and not least the Torino Process itself is to create a basis for providing support to strengthen the VET sector in ETF partner countries through solid argumentation the two last mentioned ways of documenting a need appear less profound; the recommendation of using indicators has to rely on a logic.

The evaluation has accordingly tried to describe the logic in the use of selected indicators through a causal chain which links the indicators with statements about educational provision. The main point is to illustrate a general need to explain how the recommended indicators should be read and hence used as argumentation within the national agenda, and hence stipulate a need for the ETF to reinforce the support in building up of the analytical capacity in the ETF partner countries. The need for know-how is wide-spread, which the four country studies also showed; it is not just a matter of supporting the methodological and technical guidance for the National Statistical Institution in the countries to provide better and more consolidated statistics – a relatively large fraction of the recommended indicators can only be obtained through administrative records within the ministries themselves (which again demonstrate not just a need for a management information system, MIS, but also a need for technical expertise in using the information a MIS will generate).

Some indicators appeal more to the regional reports than to country reports. That goes in particular for some of the more complex indicators and indices (e.g. Competitive Index, Small Business Act Entrepreneurial Learning (EL) Index, and PISA, PIRLS and TIMSS) which all just are one annual indicator made for international comparisons. Other indicators follow the same logic (e.g. Poverty Measure via the Gini coefficient). The rationale is that the evaluators would see the country reports rather focus on inter-regional diversity (cross-section) within the country than international cross-country studies which may be of inferior political priority.

The additional review of the recommended Indicators (see annex 6) contains a list of additional or alternative indicators recommended by the evaluation. Most of these indicators have been used in studies conducted in ETF partner countries on a previous account and are accordingly available (though perhaps not particular easy to withdraw from the national statistical offices).

In general, and withdrawn from the overall interim evaluation, the following recommendations can be made:

- There is a strong need for support of the build-up of the statistical availability not just in the national statistical offices but also in the ministries, perhaps even on regional and very local level. It is perhaps not the main task of the ETF but the Torino Process itself has accentuated the need within the countries to strengthen the statistical production as well as invest in management information systems in both Ministry of Education and

Ministry of Labour. ETF could provide further support, perhaps even inspire Donors, to the continuous build-up of the statistical readiness in the countries;

- There is a very strong and urgent need in further capacity building in conducting critical studies. The evaluation team fully acknowledges the work done by the country managers in the national context, but further support is needed as still more countries start a process of self-assessment as well as tools for M&E.
- Continue organising national and regional events during which support in drafting reports is provided in terms of strengthening the countries in data collection and/or data production. When necessary support the countries in methodology developments for data gathering.
- Continue providing support through Torinet and country manager work
- Bring closer the holistic dimension of the Torino Process to the ETF partner countries
- Support partner countries in the implementation of the recommendations identified in the Torino Process reports
- Support partner countries in the implementation of the Torino Process reports' findings in the national policies, strategies and for the donor interventions
- Support partner countries in the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data gathered in the first two rounds of the Torino Process
- Support partner countries in developing new methodologies in research approaches for collecting and gathering data of interest for the country reports

5.1.5 Current and potential added value / impact of the Torino Process

incl. recognition of the Torino Process as a policy analysis tool both in the partner countries and vis-à-vis the EC, impact on partner country reform, ETF activities, and EU assistance, and any additional outputs / effects achieved but not foreseen using the Torino Process to measure the impact of ETF

In general, the Torino Process is a process and processes take time. The Torino Process has without doubt boosted the understanding of evidence-principles, the need for consistent thinking and strategies, log-frame approaches, and flexible planning within ETF partner countries.

Still it takes time and the countries involved also faces the challenges of transition. It is highly recommended not to anticipate too fast evolution in just a few rounds of the Torino Process; in that respect it is recommended for the ETF to focus on the build-up of the capacity to deal with the existing Analytical Framework.

The evaluation has revealed a certain silent fear for the self-assessment element in the country report exercise. In Montenegro there is a silent fear that donors might flee before the process of the on-going reform has reach the local implementation level notably due to a report which tends to highlight the successes achieved rather than the challenges which remain within the current institutional setting. And in Tajikistan the same fear has been noted towards a certain, perhaps political, incentive to “furnish a nice picture of the current situation” rather than pinpoint the challenges which remain to be solved. If so, the self-assessment routine is a potential threat to further development in the countries which so obviously need all the support they can obtain to facilitate a transition to a far more active and inclusive approach to human resource strategies.

Perhaps the strategy should be to slow down encouraging the countries to do self-assessment reports and accentuate the capacity building and support in conducting evidence-based policy formulation through critical studies through mentor-programmes.

The evaluation found the current added value:

- Development of a new mindset and holistic way of thinking for VET development.
- Strengthening national human resources and authorities in the concept of evidence-based policy making
- Strengthening national human resources in gathering data for evidence-based policy making

In addition, the evaluation foresees the following potential added value:

- Demonstrate, by using measurable outputs (indicators, i.e. evidence) that VET (iVET and cVET) can influence social dimension of one society, by raising the employment possibilities for all age groups, vulnerable groups and both gender.
- Development of new methodologies and approaches in data gathering and analysis
- Transferring the concept of evidence-based policy making to other national sectors (e.g. health, transport, etc.)

5.1.6 Conclusions in relation to the evaluation criteria

1. *Relevance, whether the design of the process targets the needs of beneficiaries;*
2. *Efficiency, whether the same results could have been achieved with more balanced usage of resources (financial, human, technical), i.e. whether there is an optimum relationship between the resources used and outputs produced;*
3. *Effectiveness, whether the objectives have been achieved and the planned benefits were delivered;*
4. *Impact, the extent to which the benefits received by the beneficiaries had a wider overall socio-economic effect on the sector or in the country as a whole;*
5. *Sustainability, whether the flow of benefits of the process is likely*

Re 1. Relevance

The relevance of the Torino Process with its Analytical Framework has proven to be highly significant; from all sides the main stakeholders have accentuated the relevance and the additional benefits from having a schedule and a template to follow in the pathway to establish a functional demand-driven VET system. This conclusion is derived from the stakeholder survey and further ratified and supported from the country visits undertaken.

Of course, there are details which could be subject for discussion which have been the prime focus for the evaluation within the Interim Report as well as the Final Report, but seen as a cross-country process the relevance of the design stands out as a success.

The details are a matter of fine-tuning and not alterations of the core design or the framework. In particular the evaluation has focused on:

- Data availability to support the reporting system
- A solid need for know-how in conducting critical analyses using time-series and cross-section studies to document current and coming needs and challenges within the countries would be a solid added value to the relevance of the country reports;
- Some indicators should be revised, others could be added at least as alternative indicators, e.g.:
 - In particular the recommended main economic indicators cannot stand alone (if so they are too aggregated to make any sense for VET) and it is recommended to apply an additional set of indicators which integrate the very crude and aggregated indicators recommended by ETF and which indicators are far more relevant for education planning

- Some highly complex indexes created by supranational organisations are hardly relevant for country reports (but could be relevant for regional reports), partly since they are very difficult and complex to understand (“consume”) and partly since the indexes provide one single figure per year per country (which is hardly indicative and dynamic)
- The regional reports should be given far more priority since they may constitute a platform for knowledge sharing across countries which face more or less the same challenges in terms of development paths and economic situation
- ETF should take a special note on the self-assessment in country reports in as much some stakeholders have indicated some concerns that country reports might not mirror the true situation (the real needs) of the country in question

Re 2. Efficiency

Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results.

The question of efficiency was directed towards to the key national stakeholders involved in the process and mainly those involved in drafting the country reports. In Montenegro, as an example, the drafting of the report has taken the main national stakeholders an additional workload of up to 3-4 months, which appear rather massive; the workload comes in as an addition to the ordinary daily work within the Ministry and – to make things more demanding – Montenegro has agreed to participate in the Bruges Process as well⁵.

Nevertheless, the stakeholders had no complaints whatsoever. And much the same conclusion was provided by the Armenian stakeholders, which appeared to look forward to make the report as self-assessment.

In that respect, the evaluation team has decided to acknowledge the process itself; obviously, the start-up phase involves some additional requirements but as soon as the process of obtaining updates of data and in general making reporting becomes a routine the burden becomes less. And in that, the evaluation again raises the recommendation for the ETF to ensure solid support in conducting critical studies and notably establish analytical support to the national stakeholders as mentioned above; as soon as the stakeholders have superior experience in conducting analyses the routine of making country reports would decrease.

Furthermore, it could be recommended for the ETF to have a critical screening of the Analytical Framework. Basically, the country reports do not have to be lengthy and neither do they have to be based upon long descriptions stuffed with references to external documents; the ideal would be to ensure that the context of country reports relates to data and documentation (“evidence”) available and ready and otherwise only provide light updates of the reform programme since the last round, preferably using some indicative overview-tables (perhaps supported with text boxes with cases of where something was a success or where a lesson was learned). In that respect we refer to the conclusions of the Interim Report.

And finally, the need for support to the production of data in most ETF partner countries should be stressed. The ETF can do only little in that sense, but the message to the partner countries should be fairly clear; often it is simply a matter of partly allocating resources to the national statistical offices but more so of asking the ministries to start cooperating; e.g. it cannot be true

⁵ It may be worth noting that the administration of Montenegro, due to size of the country, obviously is relatively limited; making a country report for Montenegro must consume more or less the manpower resources as in larger countries.

that neither the ministry nor the single VET schools do not know how many students are enrolled⁶.

If data availability is an Achilles heel it is suggested for the ETF to recommend alternative indicators from alternative sources (see Annex 6). The evaluation team has conducted similar documentation in a variety of countries where data from the national statistical offices were limited (and of very poor quality).

Re 3. Effectiveness

As mentioned above, processes take time. Seen in light of the social, economic and political challenges facing most of the ETF partner countries the result of the interim evaluation appears to document a solid pace and a boost in the on-going reforms in the partner countries. And that is a worthy achievement by itself notably since it documents that the tools and the means provided by the support by the ETF as well as the Torino Process and its declaration has been taken on board by the partner countries.

Perhaps the objectives were not completely met, perhaps not all countries have equally met the terms and recommendations, and perhaps the interim evaluation has found some details which need to be addressed, but still the overall assessment cannot forfeit that the ETF, and perhaps even the EU, have achieved far more than ever realistically anticipated.

The stakeholder survey as documented in annex 2 speaks for itself. The result of the survey is overwhelming positive.

Re 4. Impact

Considering the relatively early stage of the Torino Process, a thorough impact assessment is still to be conducted. Obviously, the Torino Process is still in its infant stage and besides interim evaluations hardly ever provides qualitative impact assessment for methodological reasons.

However, the early signs of impact should be noted, which includes:

- Far more devoted approach to participation and involvement of external stakeholders and PPP
- A far more subtle understanding of the need for strengthening VET in all participating countries
- A far more readiness to start considering issues of Adult Training, cVET, and Lifelong Learning principles
- Better (more concise and direct, practical) dialogue between the Ministries of Labour and the Ministries of Education (e.g. Montenegro, Jordan and Armenia); e.g. notes do not necessarily have to circle around at the director's or minister's levels
- Better planning; which here indicates an understanding of the need for documentation of needs but even more an understanding that plans do not have to be rigid and fixed for the coming five years

Other points could easily be mentioned. For obvious reasons it cannot be postulated that the Torino Process (or the support from ETF) is the only contributor and hence the only part to be credited, but in all countries visited the stakeholders acknowledged the framework provided to facilitate the work in the mentioned dimensions.

In that sense, an additional benefit for donor projects can be seen; implementation of donor projects always contain certain elements of introduction to good practices with the risk of being neglected (or just overheard) due to a lack of background knowledge in the client organisation.

⁶ And of course data on public spending on Education and hence VET is available; it is just a matter of forcing the Ministry of Finance to be a little more cooperative, which, according to the Evaluation Team's experience in exactly that, hardly can be considered as difficult.

Insofar the ETF and the Torino Process have established a reference for good practices the donor projects' teams can work far more targeted towards the core tasks.

However, the note is repeated on taking care that more self-assessment does not lead to the production of less reliable assessments of the countries' needs.

Re 5. Sustainability

One can be fairly confident that a process has been launched which cannot be set back. The prime national stakeholders have clearly acknowledged the scope for the tools provided by the Torino Process and lessons have spread to line ministries within the countries visited.

There are risks, though, of which the main risk appears to be a new revision of the framework which now appears to be solidly implemented. Altering the framework before the routines mature would impose the risk of losing the audience in a very fragile stage where the principles of good practices have to be based upon real and devoted ownership.

In addition, it is rather recommended for the ETF to reinforce the support notably in critical assessment and consistent studies, and ways to find data where the national statistical offices may be of limited assistance. It appears evident that the national stakeholders (the national caretakers of the country reports and hence proposal for the on-going reforms of the VET systems) have a real need to obtain better know-how in the most fundamentals principles in good analyses.

Data, and even more consistent official statistics, are obviously a serious need in most of the ETF Partner Countries but should not be a dead end for conducting a trustworthy analysis of needs. In that respect the Evaluation Team refers to the recommendations in Annex 6.

5.2 Recommendations

The interim evaluation of Torino Process has generated the following major points. Each recommendation has a set of subordinate recommendations provided in the right context through the report (references are provided here). The recommendations have been boldly prioritized as follows:

1. Share good practices of ETF partner countries in gathering and using evidence for policy

ETF should continue to build on good practice examples of partner countries in terms of gathering and using evidence for policy development. A database or a compendium of good practice examples could be also developed.

2. Use the Torino Process to enhance stakeholder communication and cooperation

Workshops should also allow time and space for self-evaluation on what was achieved from the previous Torino Process. This stakeholder communication dimension of the process should be fostered by organising at least three country workshops related to Torino Process, as well as one regional workshop, each year. In future rounds further stakeholders should be involved, including further line ministries involved in VET policy, social partners, chambers, the business sector and regional VET providers.

3. Support the inclusion of the business sector- SMEs, crafts, manufacturing and agricultural sector

It is recommended to further strengthen the relationships with the representatives from the business sector, SMEs, crafts and especially manufacturing and agricultural sector and develop a dialogue with the representatives from public institutions in order to better understand the needs of the real sector.

4. Use the Torino Process as a tool for change management in VET

Implement the change management approach in the process itself (during the Torino Process). The change management will support the concept of evidence-based policy making because both

approaches seek the change of the perception of the reality – in this case – the education and VET – in wider social and economic context.

5. Consider the following suggestions for measuring impact of ETF measures via the Torino Process:
 - a. Regularly list the main ETF actions by country as well as their expected results and impact and group them into the categories B-E as defined by the Analytical Framework. This exercise will show the fields in which a progress can be expected.
 - b. Analyse external policies by other donors (optional)
 - c. Analyse the Torino Process country reports regarding progress made. If progress is made and there has been a corresponding ETF action identified in step 1, then this can at least partially be attributed to the ETF action.
6. Support the shift of the process from ETF driven to becoming solely self-assessment; take a solid precautionous note on the push for ownership and the pathway to self-assessment when it comes to country reports

In the 2012 round, the majority of participating countries performed a self-assessment which represents an evident increase in capacity building of the stakeholders involved in drafting the reports. This fact also reflects the shift of the process itself from being solely ETF driven to becoming more owned by the countries (which is also one of the specific objectives of the 2012 Torino Process). This practice should be continued in order to achieve the final stage when all countries are doing self-assessments.

A recommendation for the ETF is to make a time frame in which the ETF takes the lead or at least to do a qualitative assessment of the country reports (with the legitimacy to reject a country report on objective grounds).

As there are differences between the countries in terms of administrative culture and traditions, planning, and even technical knowhow, is hard to define criteria for the application of self-assessment, ownership needs to be based upon the needs of the single country which should also reflect the stage of development of the VET sector.

Normative ideas for criteria could be:

In case ownership is vital for the Torino Process and ETF it is highly recommended to adapt a generic log-frame for the complete process and specific log-frames for each of the countries taking part. The log-frame should as a minimum consider the following elements:

- What is ownership for ETF / how is it defined when met?
- What is the objective for ETF in terms of ownership for country A to Z?
- What are the risks and assumptions involved in the process towards ownership?
- What steps should be taken, perhaps even in prioritized order (see suggestions below)?
- What indicators could be used (by ETF) to monitor progress towards increased ownership?
 - Define baselines (strongly needed for the Torino Process in general) (recall process indicators can be used and will be highly relevant here)
 - Define milestones
 - Define both qualitative and quantitative indicators (take a look at Bruges Process for inspiration as well)
- Who is responsible for each step? Who is responsible for follow up / monitoring?

With respect to indicators the following short list is merely meant as inspiration:

- The Analytical Framework (evidence based upon indicators) is used for planning and strategy (policy formulation) within the relevant Ministry for VET, Adult Learning, CVET, and perhaps Lifelong Learning
 - The strategy for VET is integrated in National Plan and ratified at a political level
 - The Analytical Framework (evidence based upon indicators) is transposed (used as inspiration) for planning in other line ministries (with limited support from ETF)
 - Data collection is conducted by national stakeholders only and the country reports contains more tables and studies
 - A strategy for follow-up (M&E) is established, including a set of indicators with appointed responsibilities (involving Social Partners)
7. Continue providing support through Torinet and the country manager work; make Torinet support available to all Torino Process stakeholders; continue dual support at national and local level
- ETF support in partner countries focuses on the national level, especially through the building and support of national VET centres. In addition, the ETF conducts trainings in e.g. school management, NQF, and curricula development. These proved to be vital for the development of VET within the countries. The ETF is therefore encouraged to continue the dual approach.
8. Consider including a “to do” list (action plan) in the country reports
- Based on the analysis undertaken within the Torino Process the country report summaries could include a “to do” list, defining the main steps to be taken by who in what period. The Analytical Framework does not have to be changed for this, rather key question 3 in the summary could be used to develop the “to do” list.
9. Eventually, an idea could be to provide the Analytical Framework as an online template, with the data sources needed to complete the template directly available as links (see recommendation 2). If the reports are written online, then the “to do” list would be online as well, making the measures to be undertaken in each country and also the progress transparent. Train the national “reporters” in conducting analyses based upon a critical assessment of needs in reading tables and in monitoring and evaluation of current actions as well. The interpretation capacity could be enhanced by means of a short online course on data analysis and interpretation, conducted by Torinet, which could be made available on the Torinet web-page.
10. Provide strong support to the continuous build-up of statistics in the partner countries, including administrative records
- There is a strong need for support of the build-up of the statistical availability not just in the national statistical offices but also in the ministries, perhaps even at regional and at local level. It is perhaps not the main task of the ETF but the Torino Process itself has accentuated the need within the countries to strengthen the statistical production as well as to invest in management information systems in both the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labour. ETF could provide further support; perhaps even inspire donors, to the continuous build-up of the statistical readiness in the countries.
11. Within the Analytical Framework some indicators should be revised, other indicators should be added to provide better insight as to where the economy is heading, while yet other indicators could be added at least as alternative indicators.
12. Consider making templates for good practices in the use of data (from data handling via creation of tables / graphs to final comments in a context)
- Focus on developing the regional reports to stand out as good practice examples to follow for the country reports. The regional reports serve the purpose of providing vital background information which will allow the participants to discuss the recommendations, conclusions, trends and situations documented.

13. Continue organising national and regional events

The regional events provide knowledge sharing through but they also support in terms of strengthening the countries in data collection and/or data production.