

EN



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 5.6.2008  
COM(2008) 337 final

**REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND  
THE COUNCIL**

**on the Final Evaluation of the Community's action programme to promote bodies active  
at European level and support specific activities in the field of Education and Training**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Background to the External Evaluation .....	3
3.	The External Evaluation: terms and methodology.....	4
3.1.	The terms of the evaluation.....	4
3.2.	The methodology .....	4
4.	The Evaluator's Findings and Recommendations on Action 1 – Support for specified Institutions.....	4
4.1.	Specified institutions that specialise in education, training and research with a focus on European integration .....	4
4.1.1.	The Evaluator's findings.....	5
4.1.2.	The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments.....	5
4.2.	The European Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation.....	6
4.2.1.	The Evaluator's findings.....	6
4.2.2.	The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments.....	6
4.3.	The European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education .....	7
4.3.1.	The Evaluator's findings.....	7
4.3.2.	The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments.....	7
5.	The Evaluator's Findings and Recommendations on Action 2 – Support for European Associations active in Education and Training.....	8
5.1.	The Evaluator's findings.....	8
5.2.	The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments.....	8
6.	The Evaluator's Findings and Recommendations on Action 3A – the Jean Monnet Action.....	8
6.1.	The Evaluator's findings.....	9
6.2.	The Evaluator's main recommendation and the Commission's comments .....	9
7.	The Evaluator's Findings and Recommendations on Action 3B – Support for the Open method of Coordination in Education .....	9
7.1.	The Evaluator's findings.....	10
7.2.	The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments.....	10
8.	The Evaluator's Findings and Recommendations on Action 3C – Training for National Judges .....	10
8.1.	The Evaluator's findings.....	10
8.2.	The Evaluator's main recommendation and the Commission's comments .....	11
9.	The Commission's Conclusions .....	11

# REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL

## on the Final Evaluation of the Community's action programme to promote bodies active at European level and support specific activities in the field of Education and Training

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This Report is presented under Article 8 of Decision No 791/2004/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 establishing a Community action programme to promote bodies active at European level and support specific activities in the field of education and training (hereinafter referred to as "the Decision").<sup>1</sup> It requires the Commission to submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the achievement of the programme's objectives. This report must be based, *inter alia*, on an external evaluation. Such an evaluation was conducted in 2007 in the form of the "Final Evaluation of the Community's action programme to promote bodies active at European level and support specific activities in the field of education and training". This Final Evaluation can be obtained via the following link:

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/education/2007/activereport\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/education/2007/activereport_en.pdf).

The present Report sets out the Commission's position on the main conclusions and recommendations of the Final Evaluation.

### 2. BACKGROUND TO THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Between April 2004 and December 2006, the Decision formed the legal basis for a variety of Community activities in the field of education and training. The programme was divided into five separate actions:

- **Action 1:** which provided support to seven named institutions (College of Europe; European University Institute; European Institute of Public Administration; Academy of European Law; European Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation; European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education; and the International Centre for European Training);
- **Action 2:** which supported European associations active at European level in the field of education or training;
- **Action 3A:** which supported teaching, research and debate activities in European integration studies at higher education institutions through the Jean Monnet Action;
- **Action 3B:** which supported activities contributing to the objectives set out in the Education and Training 2010 work programme, using the Open Method of Coordination;
- **Action 3C:** which supported the training of national judges in the field of EU law.

The Decision expired on 31 December 2006. Its actions have been given new legal bases and not all of them still form part of a single programme.

---

<sup>1</sup> O.J. L 138 of 30.4.2004.

### **3. THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION: TERMS AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. The terms of the evaluation**

Following a request for services in the context of the Framework Contract on Evaluation and Impact Assessment Related Services, ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd was commissioned in December 2006 to carry out the final external evaluation of the Decision. The evaluation encompassed all actions covered by the Decision between its start date in 2004 and its expiry at the end of 2006. In view of the diversity of the objectives and beneficiaries in each of the actions under the Decision, the evaluation covered them separately, with conclusions and recommendations devoted to each one.

#### **3.2. The methodology**

The ex-post evaluation took place between December 2006 and June 2007. In carrying out their task, the evaluators made use of desk-based research, extensive surveys of stakeholders and in-depth interviews. The method employed in the evaluation reflected the differing levels of budgetary allocation for the programme. Accordingly, data collection was greater for Action 1 than for any of the other actions, and was particularly limited in relation to Action 2.

### **4. THE EVALUATOR'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACTION 1 – SUPPORT FOR SPECIFIED INSTITUTIONS**

Action 1 of the Decision authorised Community grants to support certain operational and administrative costs for seven specified institutions pursuing an aim of general European interest. Among these seven institutions, a distinction can be made between three groups: (1) institutions that specialise in education, training and/or research with a focus on European integration (College of Europe; European University Institute; European Institute of Public Administration; Academy of European Law; the International Centre for European Training); (2) the European Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation; (3) the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.

#### **4.1. Specified institutions that specialise in education, training and research with a focus on European integration**

Among the institutions listed in Action 1, five specialise in education, training and/or research with a focus on European integration:

- the **College of Europe** (with campuses in Bruges and Natolin) focuses on postgraduate-level education and training in European integration at Master's level;
- The **European University Institute** (EUI) in Florence offers doctoral and post-doctoral research opportunities in history, law, economics, political and social science;
- The **European Institute of Public Administration** (EIPA) in Maastricht provides mainly vocational training, applied research and consultancy services for public administrations in the EU Member States, the Candidate Countries and the EU Institutions;
- The **Academy of European Law** (ERA) in Trier promotes awareness, understanding and good practice of EU law through vocational training courses and debate for legal professionals;
- The *Centre International de Formation Européenne* (CIFE) in Nice is an education and training institution running programmes in the field of European studies and federalism in different locations in Europe.

#### 4.1.1. *The Evaluator's findings*

Given the clear need for greater knowledge with respect to European integration, law and policy, the Evaluator underlines the high **relevance** of the educational, training and research activities of the supported institutions. The Evaluator emphasises the particularly successful integration of graduates of the institutions in the labour market and the objective need for institutions delivering continuing training for individuals and authorities involved in the application and implementation of EU law and policy.

With respect to the **effectiveness** of the institutions in delivering results, the Evaluator finds a high degree of satisfaction among former students and trainees, who indicated that the time spent at the institutions greatly enhanced their understanding of European law or policy (as well as their language skills), and that this tended to boost their job prospects and/or led to increased individual performance at work.

The Evaluator is satisfied with the degree of **efficiency** in the functioning of the institutions and notes, in particular, the excellent (very low) failure rate among Masters' students at the College of Europe and the high doctoral completion rate at the European University Institute.

#### 4.1.2. *The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments*

The Evaluator formulates 18 specific recommendations with respect to the five institutions listed above. To allow for systematic treatment, the recommendations were regrouped and reformulated in the following main points. The Commission's comments are in italics.

**(1) The profile of the institutions:** The Evaluator considers it necessary to review the profiles of some of the institutions (ERA in particular) to further develop complementarities between them, build on the particular strengths of each, and avoid overlaps.

*The Commission agrees with this recommendation and it is already giving consideration to the complementarities among the named institutions. The Commission will continue its approach of avoiding the financing of needless duplications between the specified institutions.*

**(2) Internal monitoring and evaluation within the institutions:** The Evaluator recommends encouraging some of the specified institutions (in particular CIFE and EIPA) to develop a more systematic approach to internal monitoring and evaluation of the quality and relevance of their educational and training activities. The Evaluator specifically recommends encouraging CIFE to undertake a more systematic analysis of the objectives and coherence of its different activities, as a basis for more informed consideration of whether some activities could be "streamlined" to increase focus.

*The Commission agrees with this recommendation. Improving the quality of monitoring and evaluation is a main concern of the Commission. During 2007, the first efforts were made in this field and it is the intention of the Commission to continue working with CIFE and EIPA on these issues during 2008.*

**(3) Broadening participation in the activities of the institutions:** The Evaluator recommends getting the institutions (in particular EIPA and EUI) to take measures encouraging applications and participation from countries with low representation.

*The Commission is willing to participate in the analysis of the reasons for the possible under-representation of certain nationalities in the activities of the institutions. The Commission is in favour of the widest possible dissemination of information to remedy the situation.*

**(4) Personnel policy of the institutions:** The Evaluator recommends encouraging the College of Europe in its policy of strengthening its permanent teaching staff and the EUI in taking

additional measures for recruitment and retention of key staff, in particular in the area of economics.

*The Commission points out that strategic decisions relating to personnel policy are taken by the beneficiaries and that the Commission does not intend to interfere. Within the limits of its role, the Commission agrees to discuss these questions with the specified institutions, whenever appropriate.*

**(5) Financing of the institutions:** The Evaluator recommends, especially with respect to CIFE, that alternative financing be explored for some of its non-core activities. With respect to ERA, the Evaluator recommends exploring the viability of alternative financing arrangements more conducive to entrepreneurial activity.

*The Commission has underlined the importance of this issue to CIFE on several occasions and CIFE is aware of it. The Commission is also willing to explore alternative financing arrangements more conducive to entrepreneurial activity of ERA.*

#### **4.2. The European Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation**

The European Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation (EIUC) is an interdisciplinary centre formed by 41 universities from all EU Member States, with a central unit based in Venice. Its flagship programme is the uniquely transnational European Master course in human rights and democratisation (EMA).

##### *4.2.1. The Evaluator's findings*

The Evaluator underlines the great **relevance** of the EIUC as a unique network that draws together Europe's leading human rights experts from a large number of academic organisations and offers a variety of perspectives that no single faculty can provide. The relevance of the EMA resides in its interdisciplinary character, unique combination of theory and practice and extensive networking in this crucial policy field for Europe and the world.

With respect to the EIUC's **effectiveness**, the Evaluator notes the high degree of student satisfaction and the increase in commissioned research and high-level academic publications related to human rights. A majority of the participants reported a definite career-enhancement effect of the EMA. This comes in addition to the impact in terms of raising awareness about European human rights and democratisation issues among national politicians, policy-makers and NGOs.

In terms of **efficiency**, the EIUC's new management structure is reported to be working well. Management arrangements, however, are complex given the structure of the EIUC and the EMA programme, with the result that EIUC staff has to deal with staff in 41 other institutions. One of the main problems faced by the EIUC in the past has been the lack of financial stability, but this has recently been solved, in the framework of the financial perspectives 2007-2013.

##### *4.2.2. The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments*

The Evaluator formulates seven specific recommendations with respect to the EIUC. To allow for systematic treatment, the recommendations were regrouped and reformulated in the following main points. The Commission's comments are in italics.

**(1) The profile, structure and budget of the EIUC:** The Evaluator recommends exploring the value of simplification of the network involved in the delivery of the EMA and encouraging the EIUC to seek a clearer profile outside the EMA.

*Simplification of the network is a particular challenge given the 41 universities involved in the EMA programme, but efforts have recently been made to create a more workable*

*management structure. The Commission agrees that the EIUC could further explore ways of expanding its activities outside the EMA. The Commission has also encouraged the EIUC to look for more diversified external funding so as to make it less dependent on EU funding.*

**(2) EIUC personnel policy:** The Evaluator recommends the possibility of enhancing the EIUC's research capacity through permanent staff.

*The Commission agrees with this recommendation; however, external stable sources of funding will be required to achieve this.*

**(3) EIUC policy towards graduates:** The Evaluator recommends ensuring that selection for the Fellowship Programme takes place at an earlier date and that the EIUC undertakes closer monitoring of employment of graduates.

*The Commission agrees that the selection process for the Fellowship Programme should take place at an earlier date; however, this is dependent on a number of stakeholders (including the EU Presidencies) and their decision-making process. An alumni association exists, which should make the task of monitoring of employment of graduates easier for the EIUC. The alumni association is in a development phase; a questionnaire has recently been sent to all EMA graduates in order to gather a wide range of information, including on their employment.*

**(4) Broadening participation in the activities of the EIUC:** The Evaluator recommends the organisation of EIUC events in new Member States and participation by new universities from these countries in the programme.

*The Commission confirms that this has already been taken on board by the EIUC in the framework of the 2007-2008 grant, mainly through a re-allocation of funds inside this grant.*

### **4.3. The European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education**

The Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (AED) in Odense aims to improve educational policy and practice for learners with special needs. It focuses on issues such as equal opportunities, accessibility, inclusive education and the promotion of quality of education.

#### *4.3.1. The Evaluator's findings*

As regards **relevance**, the Evaluator emphasises the AED's important contribution to enhancing collaboration between Ministries of Education in its member countries and acting as their platform in the sensitive field of special needs education. The AED's **effectiveness** lies particularly in raising awareness of European issues in special needs education among national politicians, policy makers, NGOs and the public. Furthermore, the AED has made a significant contribution to improvements in special needs education policy at the national, regional and local level. The AED acts as a unique common European frame of reference for the inclusion of pupils with special needs.

#### *4.3.2. The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments*

The Evaluator formulates five specific recommendations with respect to the AED. To allow for systematic treatment, the recommendations were regrouped and reformulated in the following main points. The Commission's comments are in italics.

**(1) AED cooperation with other partners:** The Evaluator recommends encouraging the AED to explore closer cooperation with professionals in its core areas of interest as well as collaborative projects with external agencies.



*The Commission wishes to obtain the maximum of synergies from the amounts allocated and intends to promote AED cooperation with professionals and external agencies.*

**(2) AED communication and dissemination:** The Evaluator recommends that the AED enhance dissemination of its activities, outputs and results at national level, making use of its membership and new dissemination methods, and improve its communication with the Commission.

*It is the intention of the Commission to collaborate with the AED to improve the dissemination methods, including at national level, as from 2008. Communication with the Commission improved dramatically during 2007, after the period covered by the evaluation (2004-2006) elapsed.*

## **5. THE EVALUATOR'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACTION 2 – SUPPORT FOR EUROPEAN ASSOCIATIONS ACTIVE IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

Action 2 of the Decision authorised Community grants to support certain operational and administrative costs of European associations active in the field of education and training that have members in at least 12 EU Member States. Grants were awarded following annual calls for proposals.

### **5.1. The Evaluator's findings**

The Evaluator finds Action 2 *relevant* because all strategic priorities of the Education and Training Work Programme were addressed by at least one of the supported European associations. The *effectiveness* of Action 2 is seen in the creation of lasting networks and structures between various stakeholder groups across the EU, long-term profile raising and shaping of policy. With one exception, the Evaluator concludes that the support provided created added value and was *efficient*.

### **5.2. The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments**

The Evaluator formulates two specific recommendations with respect to Action 2. The Commission's comments are in italics.

**(1) Strategic objectives:** The Evaluator recommends reassessing what strategic objectives of the education and training work programme are addressed by associations funded through this action.

*The Commission takes good note of the recommendation with a view to reformulating the priorities and award criteria in the call for proposals.*

**(2) Results:** The Evaluator recommends that greater emphasis should be put on enhancing the impact of the activities developed through the supported associations. The Evaluator believes that Action 2 has focused too strongly on establishing, maintaining and expanding networks at the expense of other tangible outputs.

*The specific purpose of Action 2 is – and will remain – to support the operational and administrative aspects of European network associations. The Commission is nevertheless also in favour of enhancing the impact of the activities developed by beneficiaries and will explore ways to increase such tangible outputs.*

## **6. THE EVALUATOR'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACTION 3A – THE JEAN MONNET ACTION**

Action 3A of the Decision authorised Community support for higher education activities in the field of European integration. It has taken the form of the Jean Monnet Action whose

purpose is to enhance knowledge and awareness of issues relating to European integration by stimulating teaching, research and reflection in the field at university-level establishments throughout the world. The Jean Monnet Action, launched in 1990, promotes academic excellence by awarding prestigious titles such as Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence and Jean Monnet Chair to successful applications in the annual call for proposals. Jean Monnet professors are now present in 60 countries on five continents and reach an audience of 250 000 students every year.

### **6.1. The Evaluator's findings<sup>2</sup>**

The Evaluator underlines the high *relevance* of the Jean Monnet Action in promoting understanding and debate about the EU (in line with the Commission's priority in the field of Communication and Plan D) and in boosting the EU's visibility in candidate and third countries, while helping educational capacity-building in the field.

With respect to *effectiveness*, the Evaluator reports that the Jean Monnet connection is a powerful tool in raising awareness of European studies, in improving the teaching quality and reputation of participating universities and in creating new EU-related teaching activities. The effects are found to be particularly pronounced in non-EU countries. The Evaluator also points out that Jean Monnet academic staff are widely involved in dissemination and exchange, reflecting the "multiplier effects" of activities supported by the Jean Monnet Action.

According to the Evaluator, the added value of the Jean Monnet Action lies in its dual function as both a source of much-needed revenue for academic departments active in the field of EU studies and a "label" of quality, which helps to boost the reputation of the department where Jean Monnet activities are located and the individuals who lead them. According to the Evaluator, this dual function allows the Action to achieve a particularly impressive range of results and impacts with comparatively little money, making the Action very *efficient*. In addition, the Jean Monnet Action is one of the few EU programmes which is open to participants from across the world. This contributes positively to the visibility of the EU outside Europe.

### **6.2. The Evaluator's main recommendation and the Commission's comments**

The Evaluator recommends that mechanisms should be explored to **publicise the Jean Monnet brand** more widely both within and outside the EU, as a means to increase student and public recognition. The Commission's comments are in italics.

*The Commission agrees with this recommendation. New Jean Monnet publications and a new Jean Monnet website that are being prepared should help to publicise the Jean Monnet brand. Contacts with DG External Relations and DG Communication are taking place to further spread information on Jean Monnet as an essential instrument in the framework of bringing citizens closer to the EU and to improve the visibility of the EU in the world.*

## **7. THE EVALUATOR'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACTION 3B – SUPPORT FOR THE OPEN METHOD OF COORDINATION IN EDUCATION**

Action 3B of the Decision authorised Community support for activities contributing to the achievement of future objectives of education and training systems in Europe. It has taken the

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the Evaluator's findings relate only to the Jean Monnet projects resulting from the annual call for proposals. The Evaluator did not study the impact and quality of the high-level Jean Monnet Conferences and reflection activities that bring together top-level academics, policy makers and civil society representatives.

form of calls for proposals for studies, meetings of experts and information activities with the purpose of supporting the Member States in the implementation of "Education and Training 2010" objectives via the Open Method of Coordination (OMC).

### **7.1. The Evaluator's findings**

The Evaluator considers Action 3B as *relevant* and consistent with the goals of the Education and Training 2010 work programme. As regards its *effectiveness*, the Evaluator states that the outputs of the supported activities (mostly seminars, conferences and publications) are expected to contribute positively to achieving the intended results in the longer run, notably by creating lasting networks between national stakeholders. In terms of *efficiency*, the Evaluator reports that Commission funding is viewed by all authorities as very helpful.

### **7.2. The Evaluator's main recommendations and the Commission's comments**

The Evaluator makes two main recommendations. The Commission's comments are in italics.

**(1) The "non participation" of certain Member States:** The Evaluator recommends exploring the reasons for the "non participation" of certain Member States and taking steps to remove any barriers, if practical.

*This issue was discussed in the Education and Training 2010 Coordination Group. One major reason put forward to explain the "non participation" of certain Member States was that these countries felt that they had to go through time-consuming application procedures for relatively small amounts of financial support. In the latest Call for proposals 27/07 "Establishment and Implementation of National Lifelong Learning Strategies – Education and Training 2010", the maximum amount has been increased to 100 000 euro.*

**(2) Attracting new stakeholders:** The Evaluator recommends that in future calls for proposals, greater emphasis should be placed on attracting a wider range of actors into the events and other projects organised within the scope of projects. This would address a current perception by some that such events often fail to involve new stakeholders.

*This issue was discussed in the Education and Training 2010 Coordination Group. There was no majority for making other organisations besides national ministries eligible under such calls. In the latest Call for proposals 27/07 "Establishment and Implementation of National Lifelong Learning Strategies – Education and Training 2010", one of the selection criteria is that all activities should involve a wide range of key stakeholders at all levels concerned with or participating in the establishment and implementation of lifelong learning strategies, including policy and decision makers, practitioners, providers, social partners, representatives of civil society and learners.*

## **8. THE EVALUATOR'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACTION 3C – TRAINING FOR NATIONAL JUDGES**

Action 3C of the Decision authorised Community support to promote training in European law, primarily for national judges. It took the form of calls for proposals to support training for judges in the specific field of EU competition law.

### **8.1. The Evaluator's findings**

The Evaluator considers Action 3C as highly *relevant* in view of the modernisation of EU competition law under Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 that gives national courts the power to apply Articles 81 and 82 of the EC Treaty in full. In this context, supporting projects to strengthen judicial cooperation between national judges and provide training linked to the

implementation of Articles 81 and 82 of the EC Treaty is found to be particularly necessary and coherent with the objectives of the programme.

In terms of *effectiveness*, the Evaluator reports that the available evidence suggests that the programme has created the intended impact, notably a better knowledge of and greater consistency in the application of EC competition law and in particular the application of Articles 81 and 82 EC by national judges. The Evaluator also believes that Action 3C has raised awareness among the judges about the need to upgrade their skills and knowledge in the field of EC competition law and that the Action has a multiplier effect. Networking and the creation of better links between national judges were also highlighted as added value. The Evaluator concludes that the resources committed (allocated to grants) were used *efficiently*.

## **8.2. The Evaluator's main recommendation and the Commission's comments**

The Evaluator makes the recommendation that, given the importance of EC competition law in ensuring a level playing field in the EU Internal Market, the Commission should consider the possibility of providing **more structured support in the field of cooperation between national competition law judges, namely in the form of a network at EU level**. Such a network could be open to judges in the field of competition law as well as all those who are interested in this field and would provide necessary information on the relevant judgments taken at national level. Since the application of EC competition law has been decentralised for some time, information on the judgments to date has been dispersed or even unavailable. Therefore, a single tool that would enable judges and other legal practitioners to access information and exchange views, as well as make new contacts with judges from other countries, would be desirable. Due to the increased influence of economics on EC competition law such a resource would also be useful for exchanging views and experience in this field. The Commission's comments on this recommendation are in italics.

*The Commission welcomes this recommendation. The creation of cooperation networks between national judges, which also offers the possibility of an exchange of views between judges, has been one of the main objectives of the training programme from the start (2002) and has as such been promoted on an equal footing with the objective of training of national judges. Very few proposals for the financing of such a cooperation network have been submitted, though. Nevertheless, it has to be pointed out that the training projects that have been co-financed also entail - as one of their aims - the creation of networks between the participating judges and the support of existing networks. The best example of an existing network whose activities have been supported is the "Association of European Competition Law Judges (AECLJ)", which administers a network of competition law judges from its seat in London.*

*With regard to information on judgments, the Commission refers to its website (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/elojade/antitrust/nationalcourts/>) where all judgments by national courts on the application of Art. 81/82 EC are published. The website is constantly updated and provides key data in respect of the judgments rendered as well as the non-confidential version of the judgments.*

## **9. THE COMMISSION'S CONCLUSIONS**

In view of the Commission's priorities and in line with the evaluation results, the Commission draws the following conclusions from the implementation of the Community action programme to promote bodies active at European level and support specific activities in the field of education and training.

### **Action 1 – Support for the specified Institutions**

### *Institutions specialising in European Integration Studies*

The Commission considers that continuing support for the College of Europe, the European University Institute, the European Institute of Public Administration and the Academy of European Law is essential to provide the European population as well as the administrations and policy makers of the Member States and the EU with the benefit of high-quality education, vocational training, research and/or policy-relevant reflection that is the result of cooperation in a truly trans-European framework and environment. For the period between 2007 and 2013, support for these institutions has been integrated into the Jean Monnet programme of the Lifelong Learning Programme.<sup>3</sup>

### *The European Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation*

In light of the priority attached by the EU to the promotion of democracy and human rights worldwide, the Commission considers that it is essential to continue supporting the uniquely transnational European Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation, in particular for the European Master's degree Programme in Human Rights and Democratisation. For the period between 2007 and 2013, support for the EIUC is integrated into the financing instrument for the promotion of democracy and human rights worldwide.<sup>4</sup>

### *The European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education*

The Commission considers that the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education fulfils a highly relevant task as a European platform for collaboration and innovation on special needs education and finds that continuing support for this institution is essential. For the period between 2007 and 2013, support for the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education has been integrated into the Jean Monnet programme of the Lifelong Learning Programme.

### **Action 2 – Support for European Associations active in Education and Training**

The Commission considers it useful to continue support for the creation and consolidation of lasting networks and structures between various stakeholder groups in education and training with a view to promoting the EU's education and training priorities. For the period between 2007 and 2013, such support is integrated into the Jean Monnet programme of the Lifelong Learning Programme. In light of the priority to bring citizens closer to the EU, the Commission considers it useful to extend the scope of the call for proposals under this heading, in particular to European associations active in education and training on the topic of European integration.

### **Action 3A – The Jean Monnet Action**

The Commission considers it essential to continue support for teaching, research, debate and reflection on European integration at higher education institutions worldwide with the aim of increasing awareness and knowledge of the EU among European citizens, increasing the EU's visibility in the world, and allowing policymakers and civil society to benefit from academic reflection on current topics of European integration. For the period between 2007 and 2013, such support is integrated into the Jean Monnet programme of the Lifelong Learning Programme. The Commission considers that the Jean Monnet network of experts in European integration should continue to grow, both within and outside the EU.

---

<sup>3</sup> Decision No 1720/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing an action programme in the field of lifelong learning, O.J. L 327 of 24.11.2006

<sup>4</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on establishing a financing instrument for the promotion of democracy and human rights worldwide, O.J. L 386 of 29.12.2006.

### **Action 3B – Support for the Open method of Coordination in Education**

The Commission considers it useful to continue support for cooperation activities between national authorities at European level, including the open method of coordination, with a view to promoting the EU's education and training priorities. For the period between 2007 and 2013, such support is integrated into the transversal programme of the Lifelong Learning Programme.

### **Action 3C – Training for National Judges**

Given the important role that national judges are playing in the enforcement of EU law in general and EU competition law in particular, and the objective need for further training and networking among national judges in these fields, the Commission considers it essential to continue support for the training of national judges in competition policy. For the period between 2007 and 2013, such support is integrated into the specific programme 'Civil Justice' as part of the general programme 'Fundamental Rights and Justice'.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Decision No 1149/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme 'Civil Justice' as part of the General Programme 'Fundamental Rights and Justice', O.J. L 257 of 3.10.2007