

**The National Tripartite Workshop  
On Lifelong Learning in the Philippines  
ILO Auditorium 19<sup>th</sup> Floor, Yuchengco Tower, RCBC Plaza  
6819 Ayala Avenue, Makati City  
15 – 16 December 2004**

**Executive Summary:**

A national tripartite meeting on Lifelong Learning was held at the ILO-SRO auditorium from December 15 to 16 2004. Seen as an opportune time for ILO constituents to review and discuss lifelong learning policies and practices at the national level, this meeting is sequential to the Regional Tripartite meeting held in Bangkok, Thailand in December 2003, where the Philippines participated together with fourteen (14) other countries.

The National Tripartite Meeting contained the following objectives:

- a) To achieve a common understanding of the concept and practice of Lifelong learning (L3);
- b) To present and disseminate the results of the ILO's regional meeting on L3 held in Bangkok in December 2003;
- c) To review national policies and programmes of L3 in the Philippines with special reference to the tripartite constituents;
- d) To identify existing alliances and forms of collaboration in L3 among organizations and institutions in the Philippines; and
- e) To develop a common action plan for promoting L3 in the Philippines

**Attendees and Resource Persons**

Over fifty (50) participants representing the three main ILO constituents, namely, government, labour groups and employers, and a few more coming from the Academe and Non-government Organisation, attended the two (2) day meeting.

Overall in charge of the meeting was ILO-SRO Deputy Director Ms. Carmela Torres, who also presented the Human Resources Development and Training Recommendation (HRD 195). Ably providing support to Ms. Torres were Ms. Junko Nakayama (presenting the group workshop guidelines); Ms. Lourdes Kathleen Cacho; Ms. Alicia Fernando, Ms. Margarita Simon and Ms. Carmela Fuellas.

Present to formally welcome the participants to the meeting was ILO –SRO Director, Mr. Werner Blenk, while Ms. Teresa Soriano delivered the meeting's keynote address in behalf of Department of Labour and Employment (DOLE) Undersecretary Danilo P. Cruz.

Also invited were resource persons / speakers coming from the Asian Institute of Management (AIM), Ms. Ma. Nieves Confesor, who provided an overview of L3 in the Philippines; Mr. Trevor Riordan, IFP/Skills who gave an international perspective on L3 and

discussed the outcomes of the December 2003 Bangkok Regional Tripartite Meeting; and Mr. Alex Gorham, Manager of the ILO Training Centre in Turin, who talked about issues in L3.

### ***Methodology and Flow of the Meeting***

The resource persons / speakers provided the context with which the meeting ran. Brief discussions and clarifications followed every presentation. Meanwhile, the ILO constituents **Government**, (i.e. the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority or TESDA, the Commission on Higher Education or CHED, and the Department of Education – Bureau of Alternative Learning Systems); **Employers** (i.e. The Employers Confederation of the Philippines or ECOP); and the **Workers** (i.e. the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines or TUCP and Federation of Free Workers or FFW) took turns to talk about their L3 concept and practice, specifically outlined as their organization’s (a) definition of L3; (b) extent of practice; (c) main benefits; (d) Main constraints / challenges; and (e) other observations and opinions about L3.

The workshop on day one synthesized the ILO constituents’ presentation by identifying their respective key points and critical issues as well as their L3 priorities, which were subsequently presented on day two. The second day’s group workshop provided the opportunity for the participants to draft their respective action plans, which will thus, form a big input in the ILO supported Country Programme on Decent contained in the National Plan of Action on Decent Work.

### ***Outputs of the Meeting***

By the end of the two (2)-day meeting, each constituent group presented their respective action plans. Each group first reiterated their identified priority issues on L3, enumerated their plans’ objectives and strategies; and then listed their specific actions.

	<b>Employers</b>	<b>Workers</b>	<b>Government</b>
<b>Priority Issues</b>	Attitude towards lifelong learning  Motivation for lifelong learning	The Basic Educational System is not responsive to the challenges of globalization.  There is a need to accelerate the programs on equivalency, competency-based training, certification and recognition of prior learning.	Lack of common understanding and coherence Paradigm shift Weak NQF Weakness of basic education Accelerate programs for RPL, Equivalency & CBET Capability building Increasing training cost

	<b>Employers</b>	<b>Workers</b>	<b>Government</b>
<b>Objectives</b> / <b>Strategies</b>	<p>To stimulate behavioral change</p> <p>To enhance the capacity of employers in providing learning opportunities for employees</p> <p>To contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for lifelong learning</p> <p>HRD to come up with programs on valuing learning among employees</p> <p>Network with partners (TESDA, DOLE, Trade Unions)</p> <p>Provide employee with incentives (model employee, awards for innovative ideas)</p>	<p>To institute reforms in the Basic Education system geared towards lifelong learning</p> <p>To install mechanisms in Trade Unions (federations, labor centers and locals) to conduct programs on lifelong learning.</p>	<p>Development, production promotion and distribution of IEC Materials</p> <p>Advocate to increase budget and resources</p> <p>Tapping of existing structures and systems i.e. NCCE</p>

<b>Activities</b>	<p>Lifelong learning Orientation for Employers / Executives/ Entrepreneurs</p> <p>Training of trainers on Lifelong Learning</p> <p>IEC at the enterprise level</p> <p>Design of incentive system</p> <p>Conduct M&amp;E</p>	<p>Conduct a tripartite consultation on Basic Education reforms</p> <p>Legislative advocacy on Tripartite representation in CHED and DepEd</p> <p>Promotion/Orientation among TUs on L3</p> <p>Institutionalization of programs (organizational follow-up per month)</p> <p>MOA with TESDA /CHED to build capacity of TUs</p> <p>Capacity building thru training, deputization &amp; certification</p> <p>Testing/certification</p> <p>Evaluation (monitoring every six months)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information dissemination</li> <li>- IEC development and production</li> <li>- Consultative sessions/ meetings with stakeholders</li> <li>- Identify L3 volunteers/ advocates from influence group</li> <li>- Documentation of BPs</li> <li>- Social dialogues for DepEd, TESDA , CHED and other stakeholders</li> <li>- Policy and program review</li> <li>- NCCE regular meeting</li> <li>- Designate a focal person in each agency</li> <li>- NCCE to approve “traditional” QF</li> <li>- Develop QF for life</li> <li>- Continue capability building program</li> <li>- Improve recruitment</li> <li>- Improve teacher education program</li> <li>- Promote best practices</li> <li>- Competency standards for teachers – TQF</li> <li>- Pursue action plan for EO 358</li> <li>- Expand ETEEAP</li> <li>- Involve industry representatives in ETEEAP evaluation</li> <li>- Commence CB assessment system</li> <li>- Accelerate</li> </ul>
-------------------	---	---	---

			<p>codification of competencies for different tertiary programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expand coverage of competency standards &amp; certification</li> <li>- Advocate RPL</li> <li>- Assessors training &amp; accreditation</li> <li>- Implement tax rebates as provided by law</li> <li>- Awards/recognition</li> <li>- Accreditation of companies</li> <li>- Tax rebates</li> <li>- Strengthen industry-TI linkage</li> <li>- Government to keep track of industry trends to be abreast with industry</li> <li>- Create a mechanism for industry to disseminate industry trend information</li> <li>- Rationalization of OJT/ IPT</li> <li>- Standardization of content, guidelines &amp; processes</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

Towards the closing of the tripartite meeting, Ms. Torres acknowledge the efforts of the participants especially on their action plans mentioning that these plans will be of great help in formulating the Country Programme on Decent Work, where ILO will be able to identify priority actions to support in the National Plan of Action on Decent work. Further agreements and commitments were also made between and among the sectors all pointing towards the conscious and vigorous advocacy and promotion of Lifelong Learning in the Philippines.

**The National Tripartite Workshop  
On Lifelong Learning in the Philippines  
ILO Auditorium 19<sup>th</sup> Floor, Yuchengco Tower, RCBC Plaza  
6819 Ayala Avenue, Makati City  
15 – 16 December 2004**

1. The tripartite meeting began with a brief opening ceremonies, emceed By Mr. Mitchell Duran of the ILO-IPEC. Mr. Werner Blenk welcomed the participants, while Ms. Teresa Soriano (executive director of the Department of Labour and Employment – Institute of Labour Studies – ILO-ILS) delivered the Key Note address in behalf of DOLE Undersecretary Danilo P. Cruz.

**Mr. Blenk**

2. Mr. Blenk in his welcome speech noted how Lifelong Learning (L3) has become a very important issue for ILO (and other United Nations Agencies and world bodies) particularly in the light of HRD Recommendation. He did take special notice also about how the Philippines is (again) taking the lead by way of this particular tripartite meeting, right after the ILO Regional Tripartite meeting held in Bangkok, in December 2003.
3. He then talked about how L3 responds to a “changing production cycle” which according to Mr. Blenk challenges the way people / worker do things. Mr. Blenk also enumerated L3 issues, i.e. access, investment by private enterprise, increase in labour market participation, equity, personal and social development, later stressing the important role government plays in addressing these issues.
4. He then emphasized that the important task of the tripartite workshop is to (1) define what L3 means in the Philippine setting; threshing out issues and resolves, with the end-goal of formulating a **national plan of action for promoting lifelong learning in the Philippines**, which in turn becomes a strategy for meeting HRD priorities in the content of the updated Philippine National Plan of Action for Decent work.
5. In closing, Mr. Blenk reminded the participants “ change is almost the only permanent feature in everyone’s lives”, showing the strong link between the emerging global Changes and Lifelong Learning, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**Undersecretary Cruz**

6. Set the tone and tenor of his speech with a Chinese proverb that goes: “If you plan for a year, plant a seed. If you plan for ten years, plant a tree. But, if you plan for a hundred years, teach the people”, stressing the fact that such societal belief and recognition for the importance education dates back to ancient times.
7. Noted that such recognition becomes even more necessary today, as everyone wills to achieve the efficient use and development of capital, technology and natural resources.

Further noting that (a) modern day corporations now recognize people development as a corporate strategy; and that (b) countries look up to human resources as the source of competitive advantage, and (c) that international organizations including ILO, are now pursuing policies and programmes to realize lifelong learning goals.

8. Reminded the participants that as far back as 1996 (under then DOLE Secretary Nieves Confesor); the Philippines has strongly pushed for the inclusion of lifelong learning interventions as one of the major agenda items during the APEC HRD Working Group Meetings and the APEC Leader's Meeting, adding that today, these comprehensive dialogues and concrete actions are now being undertaken in the ambit of APEC as well as in other international organizations like ILO.
9. Offered the scope of Lifelong learning, i.e. from birth to retirement and beyond; as well as what L3 includes, i.e. formal learning, non-formal, on the job training, and informal learning from family members and other people in the community, saying that L3 "allows people access to learning opportunities as they need them and not because they have reached a certain age limit".
10. Differentiated lifelong learning from the traditional concept by stressing that L3: places the learner in the center; caters to a diversity of learner needs; emphasizes motivation to learn; and builds on flexible multiple objectives. As such the importance of L3 as an instrument that addresses a spectrum of socio-economic challenges is recognized.
11. Mentioned that the Philippine government and the private sector have began various initiatives citing an innovative education practice i.e. School on the Air by the Department of Education where 25 mothers who did not finish school would be selected from the pilot areas of Vigan, Laoag, Bacolod, Cebu, Cagayan de Oro, and Davao and learn from their homes via SBN-FM radio. Further mentioning that access to education and training by vulnerable groups (women and youth) is no longer a problem addressed by emerging and continuously upgrading technologies.
12. Stressed the importance of Human Resource Developments not only in national economy and corporate institutions but also to address workers needs to learn, pointing to the need to look into "the interdependence of human development institutions with the physical and macroeconomic sides of development"
13. Posited ideas of partnerships not only among government, enterprise and workers but also including local and international universities and learning institutions, as the way to ensure L3 quality and quantity. In so doing, corporations will be able to look at over-all investment plans to support its manpower needs; consider the long term prospect of economic trends and labor market fluctuations; match the aspects as supply and demand situations. Stressing further that it is important to work on the areas where opportunities present themselves.

14. Concluded that L3 involves the need to (a) complement what exists; (b) innovate to identify what works; (c) link or network for information exchange; and (d) to promote competition among institutions, firms, and individuals.

<i>Session One: Background and Introduction to Lifelong Learning</i>
--

***An Overview of Life Long Learning In the Philippines  
By Ms. Nieves Confesor's Presentation***

15. Ms. Confesor gave an animated overview of L3 in the Philippines, with her presentation aptly titled: LIFELONG LEARNING in the PHILIPPINES: THE ROAD AHEAD. Her presentation consisted of four (4) main discourses, namely, (1) The Changing Needs of the Labor Market; (2) Transforming how People Learn (3) Governing the Lifelong Learning System, and (4) Options for Financing Lifelong Learning.
16. She began by describing the “changing world” enumerating the geographical, technological and sectoral boundaries, and juxtaposing these with the emerging barriers, i.e. generational, digital and the knowledge / education gaps.
17. She however stressed that the world is moving towards the knowledge (BASED) economy citing the 2002 Global Competitiveness report that states: Knowledge is now the most significant factor of production, in addition to capital, labor, and land; and GROWING as a component of production.
18. She then showed comparative tables of countries' standing, i.e. the World Competitiveness Report (2003); Educated and Skilled Population; IT Skills; Knowledge Skills between Universities and Companies; and Technological Cooperation between companies; while asking the workshop participants to take note of where the Philippines stand, concluding that “Investment in knowledge and human capital is an important determinant of economic growth”, thus, for the Philippines to be competitive, we need a labor force that has knowledge and skills comparable with, if not superior to, the rest of the world”.
19. Ms. Confesor then presented the following facts pointing out that these are “not the levels of learning necessary to help our children become productive adults in the new economy”
  - Philippine basic education is NOT equipping our graduates with the competencies needed to be competitive. Competence starts with reading.
  - Philippine basic education is not long enough to cover subject matter other countries now cover as part of basic education. We are cramming too much subject matter into too few years.
  - Philippine basic education has SHORTEST cycle in any Southeast and East Asian country.

- Philippine HS curriculum is not seen as covering enough material nor long is it enough to cover subject matter other countries now include as part of basic education.
  - In July 2002 and 2003, DepEd tested First Year High School (HS I) students on the full elementary school competencies in English, Math and Science. Up to 1.3 million students aged 12-13 years old took the test. With 50% (answered correctly) as passing mark, only: 18% of the incoming HIS passed the competency level for English, 8% passed the math competency level, 10% passed the science competency level. For at least HALF the students entering High School Year 1, the passing grade for English 34%, Math 27%, Science 30-34%.
20. Further illustrating the gap, she then posited the gap between and among basic education, higher education, and employment (readiness for work); citing a DAP (Development Academy of the Philippines) study, and proceeded with describing how L3 can work to address these gaps.
21. She offered that L3 entails CHANGE: learners' to change the way they learn and for teachers to change the way they teach. She mentioned a set of core skills adopted by Singapore and China and offered a list of recommendations thus:
- Urgent reforms to improve basic education and literacy
  - Recognition of learning beyond the formal, initial education to include learning through enterprise training and through life
  - Education must be competency driven rather than age-related
  - New learning outcomes, delivery and recognition
  - New set of skills: learning to learn, analytical and group skills.
  - Multitude of providers and modalities as well as recognition of learning between different providers is critical to facilitate mobility of learners throughout the system
  - Need for incentives for multi-tasking, teaching interpersonal skills, preference for broad-based education, more use of distance education, e-learning, and lifelong learning
  - Need for skills recognition as part of a national qualification framework.
22. The last part of Ms. Confesor's presentation explored how the state can support by changing its way in education governance, stressing the need for public and private partnerships. This she supported by narrating some of the best practices in Education Governance that she herself witnessed as a member of the Galing Pook (exemplary local government) Award.
23. Scaling up these experiences she said, necessitates changes in programmes and policies that make up the Philippine Educational System, including Vocational Education, changes in training policies and programmes within the workplace.
-

***Presentation on the Adopted Human Resource Development and Training Recommendation  
Ms. Carmela Torres' Presentation***

24. Ms. Torres walked the participants through the highlights of R195, emphasising that R195 is a forward-looking and policy-oriented ILO instrument that recognises education, training and lifelong learning as fundamental, but by itself is insufficient to help individuals gain decent jobs.
25. Instead it should (a) form an integral part of comprehensive economic, fiscal, social and labour market policies for sustained economic and job growth and social development, (b) promote equal opportunities for women and men; and (c) should contribute to human development, economic and employment growth, and poverty eradication in developing countries
26. R195 engages state parties to (1) develop a national education and training strategy involving social partners, within a framework for implementation at all levels; (2) develop supportive social and other policies and incentives to encourage enterprises and individuals to invest in education and training; (3) promote access to education, training and lifelong learning for people with special needs. However the recommendation also minds the state parties that the strategy must address the challenge of transforming activities in the informal economy into decent work.
27. R195 recognizes that Governments having the primary responsibility for education, pre-employment training, and training the unemployed and people with special needs; while the other social partners donning significant roles in further training particularly employers in work-place learning and training. R195 also expect individuals to make use of education, training & lifelong learning opportunities
28. R195 calls on member states to (1) stimulate investment and participation in training; (2) promote workplace learning, e.g. by using high-performance work practices that improve skills (3) Recognize workplace learning, and also formal and non-formal learning, and (4) give all workers equal opportunities and access to career guidance, skill upgrading and retraining
29. Specific to Skills recognition and certification, R195 calls on Member States to use a national qualifications framework (NQF) and put in place transparent mechanisms for (1) skills assessment and recognition; (2) recognition of prior learning and work experience, irrespective of source and place of learning; and (3) certification of skills that are portable across sectors, enterprises and education and training institutions
30. Meanwhile, On Career guidance and training support services, RA 195 stipulates the (1) promotion of individuals' participation in career guidance, job placement and job search services; (2) provision of guidance on entrepreneurship and promotion of entrepreneurial skills; and (3) raising awareness of the role of entrepreneurship in creating growth and decent jobs

31. In the area of Research in education, training and lifelong learning, R195 calls on Member States to evaluate the impact of learning policies on the creation of decent jobs and poverty eradication, consultation with the social partners, undertake research on: (1) learning strategies, methodologies, frameworks for HRD and training; (2) identifying, measuring and forecasting the trends in demand and supply of skills, and (3) Investments in training, and their impact and effectiveness.
32. Lastly in the area of International and technical cooperation, the recommendation stress the need for the international community to (1) provide increased support to developing countries to promote policies and programmes which place education and training at the centre of development policies; (2) develop mechanisms that mitigate the adverse impact of the loss of skilled people through migration, e.g. by strengthening HRD systems in sending countries; and creating enabling conditions for growth, investment and job creation that help countries retain skilled labour; and (3) develop innovative approaches to provide additional resources for particularly indebted poor countries.

---

***International Perspective on Lifelong Learning and Outcome4s of the Regional Tripartite Meeting on Lifelong Learning in December 2003***

***Mr. Trevor Riordan***

33. Mr. Riordan brought the participants to an Understanding of the **International and Regional Perspectives on Lifelong Learning**. First positing that a knowledge based economy is about creating a demand for a more highly skilled and adaptable workforce, noting thus that a rising demand for workers with post-secondary education exists. He was quick to say however that many workers do not have the literacy skills needed by the knowledge economy. As a result, this limits both individual employability and future learning prospects. Moreover, there exists a low level of support to workforce skills development in many countries especially in small and medium scale enterprises.
34. Mr. Riordan showed how other countries have increasingly invested in education and training for their workers, after realizing the need for recognizing workers' skills, stressing the consequences of not being able to recognize workers' skills. This he did by presenting a comparative (1971 and 1996) bar graph representing *Knowledge and Management Occupations as a Share of Total Employment in Canada*. Pointing to the dramatic increase especially in the areas of Finance and Trade, and a line graph, illustrating that Labour Market Outcomes are better for Higher Educated, showing that people who have post secondary diploma or degree have much better opportunities for work; more than their counterparts who have high school diplomas (unchanged through the years); and even much better off than their counterparts who did not finish high school (continuously declining chances).
35. Mr. Riordan then offered a list of (international) efforts so that skills recognition can be improved, including (a) Adoption of a single framework for skills recognition or what can be called a national qualifications framework (NQF) e.g. U.K., Australia, New Zealand, Mexico and South Africa; ; (b) Improving traditional linkage of qualifications to courses, e.g. France established a law that entitles people to have skills/experience

assessed (bilans de compétences - 125,000 tested annually); and (c) Norway mapping skills and experience onto educational qualifications and at the moment is considering legislation.

36. Mr. Riordan reminded the participants that investment in L3 is a shared responsibility, citing the HRD Recommendation of 2004 that spells out specific roles of Government, Enterprise, and workers.
37. Mr. Riordan offered actions made by other countries that encourage enterprises to invest in L3, among these are; Levies, revenue generating & incentives -based payroll taxes; Training agreements; training funds; Training awards; Investors in People (UK); People Developer Award (Singapore); Partnerships e.g. TUC Partnership Institute – UK
38. On the other hand for individuals to invest in L3, other countries: issue training vouchers (although this may not be as effective e.g. people who have resources are the only ones who can have access); offer student loans and Individual learning accounts; i.e. UK and the European Learning Account Project which includes Sweden, Netherlands & Switzerland, further saying that investments in L3 (as percentage in payroll) are highest in Europe, Australia and New Zealand.
39. Mr. Riordan however also stressed that with L3 investments come the need FOR NEW APPROACHES TO LEARNING. Learning systems need to reflect and accommodate the need for lifelong learning and a need to develop institutions and services which support and enable skills development throughout working life
40. The major challenges are (1) to make the necessary policy and institutional reforms and find ways to (2) finance lifelong learning Mr. Riordan than showed a line graph illustrating the decline in participation in adult learning, congruent to a decline in enrollment to formal education.
41. Following this idea, Mr. Riordan provided a framework for discussion, by listing down the major challenges, to wit;
  - An increasing number of adult learners are encouraged and enabled to further their skills
  - An increasing number of firms become more actively engaged in workforce skills development;
  - All adults acquire the literacy, numeracy and technology skills needed for full participation in the knowledge economy and society;
  - Programmes and policies are put in place which support worker mobility - geographic, economic and occupational
42. Mr. Riordan also presented key issues from the Asia and Pacific Tripartite Regional Meeting on Lifelong Learning (15 countries – December 2003), these include (a) common understanding, i.e. lifelong learning policy issues and challenges; skills recognition and employability skills and investment in lifelong learning

43. Mr. Riordan echoed Ms. Torres' presentation where issues, critical roles of sectors and the parameters of an ideal L3 environment were spelled out.

---

***An overview of Key Issues in Lifelong Learning***

***Mr. Alex Gorham***

44. Mr. Gorham's presentation (Lifelong Learning: Everyone's Invited) came in two (2) parts. Part one, focused on the (1) Definition and scope of Lifelong Learning, its economic and social context; its relevance to the ILO; key issues in the provision of L3 and the areas of ILO Support for Lifelong Learning. Part two meanwhile dealt on the Role of Technology in Promoting L3.
45. He presented definitions and attributes of L3, thus the EU defines L3 as "*a deliberate progression throughout the life of an individual, where the initial acquisition of knowledge and skills is reviewed and upgraded continuously, to meet challenges set by an ever changing society*". Or simply put: *The continuous up-grading of existing knowledge and skills to meet changing needs and opportunities*. Mr. Gorham was quick to stress though that L3 is an approach to learning and not a modality itself; it is a logical response to current economic and social priorities; and moreover L3 is an HRD tool to promote both equity and efficiency objectives i.e. a win-win proposition
46. The Economic context of L3 is best illustrated in the (1) steady change in the size and structure of economic sectors as a result of global competition, and (2) the need for workers to be more adaptable to new forms of work organization, new jobs and new careers. Meanwhile, The Social dimension of L3 on the other hand, contextualizes L3 by its recognition of the increased vulnerability to social exclusion as a result of low levels of knowledge and skill acquisition, as well as the need to compensate for unequal access to education and training opportunities in the formal school system.
47. Lifelong learning covers a wide range of (horizontal) time that begins in the pre-school system and continues throughout an individual's active life in both formal and non-formal programmes. Vertically, L3 includes economic and employment imperatives that embraces democratic participation, personal fulfilment and recreational learning.
48. Like the previous presenters, Mr. Gorham expounded on the concepts of L3, presenting its key features, as spelled out in Recommendation 195, illustrating this through graph noting that "for lifelong learning to be a reality the two triangles need to be brought closer together so individuals can move seamlessly along the hypothetical lifelong learning line. Thus, interventions are needed along the "learning gap" in order to close it. This (of course) requires investment from all parties, employers, individuals and government.
49. On L3's relevance to ILO, Mr. Gorham explains that (1) L3 offers potential benefits to each of the ILO's tripartite partners; (2) that L3 is a tool for achieving the equity objectives of the ILO's Decent Work Agenda and that L3 is closely associated with the

social dialogue process. He then presented a list of benefits of L3 to ILO's constituents, thus;

- Employers that invest in the skills of their employees will be rewarded with higher labour productivity and, probably, healthier profits;
- Workers who capitalize on opportunities to learn valued skills will benefit from greater job security and, probably, higher earnings.
- Governments which promote L3 through appropriate policy and financial means reduce the negative social costs of globalization

50. Mr. Gorham pointed out 3 main L3 issues namely, (1) its development and sustainability; which implies *changing the way we think about education, training and learning* that puts premium on learning experiences, emphasizes professional and managerial competencies, individualized learning; recognition of prior learning and more flexible and multiple entry and exit points, noting that many are still excluded from the formal education process, especially women and children; (2) ensuring equal access to L3, which implies increased participation of women and girls; and (3) L3 financing, which implies continuous and more vigorous advocacy for countries to increase investment in L3, i.e. 6 % of gross domestic product (GDP); for increased investment by employers as well as the workers themselves, i.e. Direct Investment by Enterprises (Australia, Denmark); Cost-Sharing: Employers and Gov't (New Zealand); Employer-Trade Union Training Funds (Sweden); Employment Insurance-Funded Training (Korea); Reimbursable HRD Funds (Malaysia); Payroll Levies (Latin America); Voucher Systems (U.S.); Employer-funded training leave (Belgium) and Individual Learning Accounts (Canada, Scotland)
51. He also pointed out other ways to encourage L3 investments, including a list of Government Incentives; and influencing funding institutions to achieve national L3 policies, noting the experience of European Learning Account Partners Network (ELAP) as an example.
52. In summary, Part One of Mr. Gorham's presentation tells us that L3 is not a slogan: it is a new way of viewing education & training i.e. "recurrent learning"; that the rationale for L3 is both economic and social; that Access and equity are key L3 issues; that Everybody stands to win from L3; that Financing L3 is a shared responsibility, and that L3 is being driven by technology but it relies on an effective system of social dialogue
53. Part two of Mr. Riordan's presentation deals with the role of Technology in L3. he first posited the fact that the concept of Lifelong Learning has existed for decades (if not centuries!). However, it is only with the use of advanced information and communications technologies to create new learning modalities that the concept of L3 has become a practical possibility.
54. Learning technology, Mr. Gorham stressed is the hardware and software used to design, develop and deliver learning materials and programmes – either in a conventional classroom context or at a distance.

55. He then presented the following table as point of reference for discussion:

A decade (or two) ago the main technologies used to support learning were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- transparencies</li><li>- whiteboards</li><li>- overhead projectors,</li><li>- television and radio</li><li>- correspondence materials</li><li>- - video tapes</li></ul>	Today, digital technology has replaced these with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- computers</li><li>- e-learning platforms</li><li>- application programmes</li><li>- multimedia design packages</li><li>- Inter/Intranets</li><li>- e-mail</li><li>- communication protocols</li></ul>
--	--

56. Stressing the key role of technology in L3, he listed the Impact of Technology on Delivery of L3 as the implications in utilizing technology in delivering L3.

- On Access and Equity: through the internet and E-Learning platforms it is now possible to deliver comprehensive training programmes and support materials to (almost) anyone, (almost) anywhere at (almost) any time.
- On Content: Technology offers a broader scope which is much more comprehensive, detailed, relevant, and replicable.
- On the benefit for Learners and Training Providers: Technology transforms training from a largely passive one-way process to a dynamic and highly participatory learning experience.
- On Technology and The training Market – Technology has created a growing training market, which is serviced by many different training providers. It has become a cost-effective alternative to institution-based programmes and has facilitated its increased acceptance and recognition as an alternative learning pathway.
- On Accessing E-learning Opportunities – there are more than 800 million people who have access to the Internet (Mid-2004); and from 2000 to 2004, Global Internet Access has more than doubled. To further illustrate this, Mr. Gorham showed tables of graphs showing The Global On Line Market for Higher Education, increasing from less than a 10 billion US dollars in 1996 to almost 40 billion dollars today.

57. Given these figures, he pointed out that the existence of a market of this size encourages more and more producers of training materials, packages and supporting software, and that through the Internet people, are able to access learning material that was previously not only inaccessible, but completely unknown

58. Mr. Gorham's enumerated the following issues for the L3 Practitioners:

- Identifying and selecting the most appropriate learning technologies in different environments;
- Providing adequate support services and trained staff to sustain the introduction of new learning technologies
- Meeting and managing the new challenges that the introduction of learning technologies present: e.g. computer literacy levels, individual learning styles, privacy, surveillance, data protection etc.

- Ensuring that differential access to, and use of, new learning technologies does not itself become the basis of additional divisions.

59. In conclusion, Mr. Gorham offered the following ILO support to its constituents than include: (A) Advice to Governments and the Social Partners on L3 Policies and Strategies (based on ILO Standards and comparative experiences); (B) Development of open and flexible learning methods, materials and technologies and (C) Training and technical assistance to promote L3 and support its implementation.

---

***Discussion Highlights of the morning session:***

60. The over all intention of the morning session was to engaged the participants in exploring the different facets (concepts and practices) of Lifelong Learning. The participants practically agreed with these facets specifically raising more issues and narrating actual incidents illustrating examples of how L3 can help.

Among these are:

- **A particular need to create reforms in the formal basic education in the Philippines, i.e.:**
  - Basic education in the Philippines does not match and meet the demands of employers; citing a specific example where and when in August 2004, 20,000 people came to a job fair with some 26, 500 jobs are available, but less than a thousand were hired on the spot;
  - Reforms / exemplary practice in basic education are happening more in the cities in provinces than in Metro Manila.
  - Reforms in Education requires National Government’s political will as it did in the local government practices;
  - The Department of Education for introduced the “much needed” High School Bridge Programme but as it is, was poorly communicated to the public and thus it became controversial and deemed unnecessary;
- **Lifelong Learning’s Timeline, i.e.**
  - Investments in Early Childhood Education ensures a better foundation for L3 to be sustained as a **way of life**
  - L3 is a “womb to tomb” process, and thus L3 programming need to extend beyond school, gender and age;
  - L3 thus is best planned and implemented within the context of a particular target learners
- **Stakeholders’ Investments**
  - Education is everybody’s business – and Lifelong learning is a culture where one is expected to consciously exert effort to learn not only for employment but also for a person to continue to improve him / herself.
  - The private sector and government investments are needed to make L3 work; i.e. academic institutions such as the Asian Institute of Management may consider coming up its own L3 programme

- Partnerships (bilateral and Multilateral) can be explored to lessen systematize L3 programmes as well as advocate for L3 policies.

These discussion and reflections from among the participants made the backdrop for the each constituent’s presentations later in the afternoon.

**Session Two: Tripartite Constituents’ Presentations**

- Prior to the national workshop the presenters were asked to prepare a 15 minute i.e. 6-8 power point slides, specifically addressing the following points: (a) Organisational definition of Lifelong Learning; The extent which L3 is practiced in the organisation; What the organisation regards as main benefits of L3; Changes in the institution; Main Constraints; Additional Observations and opinions. The Government’s presentations were delivered by **TESDA, CHED and DepEd,**

**2. GOVERNMENT’S PRESENTATION**

**A. DEFINITIONS**

**Note:** **TESDA** defined L3 in the context of their Technical Vocational Education and Training Programme or TVET; Meanwhile **CHED** Offered the definitions of two of their programmes, namely Distance Education and the Expanded Tertiary Education Equivalency Accreditation or ETTEAP, to approximate their organizational definition of L3, Lastly **DEPED BALS** defines L3 in the context of the bureaus core programme on ALS.

<b>TESDA</b>	<b>CHED</b>	<b>DEPED</b>
<p><b>TESDA</b> defines L3 as giving an opportunity (for all people) to pursue the process of learning throughout life and this entails “aspiring all the necessary technical, educational, entrepreneurial and social skills as well as personal qualifications needed to hasten the process of development from below”.</p>	<p><i><b>Distance Education</b> a mode of educational delivery whereby the learning facilitator and the learner are separated in time and space and instruction is delivered through specially designed self-learning materials and methods and supported by organizational and administrative delivery mode.</i></p> <p><i><b>ETTEAP</b> (is a modality that provides for lifelong learning in higher education institutions in the country is the Expanded Tertiary Education Equivalency Accreditation Program instituted through Executive Order 330 issued by former Pres. Fidel V. Ramos on May 10, 1996.</i></p>	<p>Defines L3 as a learning process beginning at birth and ending only with death (formal, informal and non formal alternative) which allows individual to continue learning and developing knowledge and competencies, necessary for the effective participation in solving real life problems and in functioning effectively in the society.</p>

## B. EXTENT OF PRACTICE

TESDA	CHED	DEPED BALS
<p>TVET in practice is the <b>Qualification and Certification System</b>. The Philippine National Qualification Framework or PNQF recommends a new structure within which quality of Philippine Educational Institutions can be developed. In the PNQF a range of competencies and competency standards are identified in particular vocational skills, i.e. baker, etc, carpenter etc.</p>	<p>- 86 higher education institutions in the 15 Regions of the country have been deputized as ETEEAP implementing institutions</p> <p>- 65 are private and 21 are state universities and colleges.</p> <p>- 24 are colleges and 62 are universities. Regional distribution shows that Region V and I have the most number of ETEEAP institutions with 10 each, followed by NCR, Region II and VII with 9 each. CARAGA and ARMM have no deputized ETEEAP institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basic Literacy Program</li> <li>- Literacy Service Contracting Scheme (BLP-LSCS);</li> <li>- Non formal Education Accreditation and Equivalency (NFE A&amp;E) System</li> <li>- The Balik-Paaralan (back to school) para for Out-of-School Adults (BP-OSA)</li> <li>- Indigenous Peoples Education;</li> <li>- Community Learning Centers (CLC);</li> <li>- Learning Resource Centers (LRC)</li> <li>- Presidential Commission on Educational Reform (PCER) - PCER created to define a comprehensive and a budget feasible program in education proposed as part of the medium and long term perspectives, reform that must: (a) ensure a system that guarantees access and improves retention; (b) provide this access with equity and pro-poor bias; and (c) ensure quality and relevance of the educational process</li> </ul>

## C. MAIN BENEFITS OF L3

TESDA	CHED	DEPED BALS
<p><b>Greater access to a bigger number</b> of out of school youth, unemployed adults and the economically marginalized sector is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanded and improved its previous pioneering efforts in assessing KSAVs learned outside the formal schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased in participation by more people especially those in hard to reach, far flung and economically disadvantaged areas;</li> </ul>

<p>provided through <b>RPL</b> as the National Qualifications System</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Provides the building blocks</b> of competencies for a vertical/horizontal career movement</li> <li>• <b>increases equity</b> as it provides opportunities for education and training in alternative modes and systems</li> <li>• <b>opens opportunities for movement</b> even in the global labor market;</li> <li>• <b>increases</b> productivity, labor mobility and ensure that workers' skills are always in demand in the labor market, and</li> <li>• <b>enables</b> workers to cope with the constant flow of information and knowledge to make him relevant and useful in the world of work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases the human capital of certain persons who are disenfranchised in the development process due their being displaced by natural and man-made calamities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opening more livelihood opportunities for recipients especially the out of school and unemployed;</li> </ul>
--	---	---

#### D. MAIN CONSTRAINTS

TESDA	CHED	DEDPED BALS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absence of appreciation of Life long Learning as a model for grassroots development for rural population</li> <li>• The absence of integration at program levels of the various sectors of the total educational system to facilitate identification of competencies continuum in learning contents.</li> <li>• Capability of educators, instructors, trainers to plan</li> </ul>	<p>Lack of monitoring and evaluation as its major challenge in implementing both Distance Education and the ETEEAP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial</li> <li>• Technical</li> <li>• Legislative support</li> <li>• Fragmentation of efforts</li> <li>• Lack of continuity in their learning environments</li> </ul>

and deliver TVET using alternative modes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding for the development and deployment of a Philippine National Qualifications System</li> </ul>		
--	--	--

**E. OTHER OBSERVATIONS / OPINIONS**

<b>TESDA</b>	<b>CHED</b>	<b>DEDPED BALS</b>
<p>There is a lack of monitoring of implementation of Life long learning in the country.</p> <p>Monitoring is important for a Life long Learning policy review within the context of changing nature of work and employment, education and training.</p>	<p>Considering more robust and innovative approaches to technology-enhanced learning opportunities that fit their own situations</p> <p>Its conviction that while the school remains the dominant institutions, it is no longer the only path that individuals can take to pursue lifelong learning;</p> <p>A wide range of lifelong learning possibilities have developed outside the school and are expanding rapidly</p>	<p>There may be a need for integration and a revitalize action to advocate L3.</p>

3. The Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP) and the Trade Union congress of the Philippines (TUCP) and Federation of Free Workers (FFW) next took turns to deliver their presentations.

**A. DEFINITIONS**

<b>Employers</b>	<b>Workers</b>
<p>All the learning that people learn during their entire life. These include the Knowledge, skills and attitudes for personal, civic, social and employment purposes through formal and non-formal processes.</p>	<p>Defined by its Programme Goal, TUCP defines L3 as a process “To <b><u>develop workers’ knowledge, skills, values and attitudes</u></b> which they can effectively use to improve their quality of life and that of their families, strengthen the TUCP and its affiliates as well as to actively participate in securing quality, political and <b><u>economic democracy, social justice</u></b> and environmentally sustainable development.”</p>

## B. EXTENT OF PRACTICE

<b>Employers:</b>	<b>Workers:</b>
L3 may be directed to achieve specific task (competency based; job related, career development) or non task objectives (i.e. work life programmes, Corporate social responsibility).	<p><b><u>Workers in Formal Employment</u></b>            ICT Training            Occupational Safety and Health            Trade Union Leadership            Productivity improvement            Preparing for call center employment</p> <p><b><u>Workers in Informal Employment</u></b>            Training on <b>leaderpreneurship</b>            Business management and Marketing            Access to resources, credits, technology, social security, medicare and insurance;</p> <p><b><u>Programs in coordination with TESDA</u></b>            Tie-up with the TESDA Women’s Center for vocational courses for women            Training for displaced workers in selected areas</p>

## C. MAIN BENEFITS OF L3

<b>Employers</b>	<b>Workers</b>
<p><b>For Employees</b></p> <p>3.1.1 Having wider, transferable key skills</p> <p>3.1.2 Greater career development opportunities</p> <p>3.1.3 Better employability</p> <p>3.1.4 Personal development</p> <p><b>For Employers</b></p> <p>3.1.5 Productivity improvement</p> <p>3.1.6 Enhanced economic competitiveness</p>	Achieving programme goals

## D. MAIN CONSTRAINTS AND CHALLENGES

<b>Employers</b>	<b>Workers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New target groups – expand geographic coverage, include SME</li> <li>• Variety in medium and delivery of learning opportunities</li> <li>• Newer and more creative subjects and programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bias of workers’ education activities towards providing basic trade union-related skills;</li> <li>• Structure inherent among unions has not been harnessed to the fullest;</li> <li>• Economic survival remains as the</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building learning organizations as viable blueprint for integrated approach</li> <li>• Marketing learning internally</li> <li>• Evaluating role and effectiveness of learning champion</li> <li>• Developing a wider learning culture</li> <li>• Scope and Scale</li> <li>• Cohesion and continuity of efforts from education to learning</li> <li>• Link between skills supply and skills deployment</li> <li>• Mismatch between skills supply and demand</li> <li>• Need for quicker response in revising and implementing national learning strategies</li> <li>• Access</li> <li>• Delivery of learning opportunities</li> <li>• ICT-based learning methods are harder to adapt to by learners without proper ICT training</li> <li>• Attitude of both workers and employers</li> <li>• Passivity and indifference at lower ranks</li> <li>• Slow response in curriculum adjustments at national level</li> </ul>	<p>foremost consideration over other choices (trainings, etc.) not only among individual workers but also companies;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investments in HRDs and training programs is not a priority for companies in coping with Globalization;</li> <li>• Tendency of many enterprises to engage in contracting and subcontracting arrangements.</li> <li>• Partnerships between government and unions in addressing workers' education needs have not been maximized.</li> </ul>
--	--

### E. OTHER OBSERVATIONS / OPNIONS

<b>Employers</b>	<b>Workers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional Observations and opinions</li> <li>• Lifelong learning as policy, strategy and culture</li> <li>• Recognition that suitability for employment should not be limited to having formal education</li> <li>• Greater responsiveness of educational system to changing market requirements</li> </ul> <p><i>The moment you stop learning, you stop ... ”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen existing workers' education programs and structures among unions;</li> <li>• More efforts on technological and vocational skills training.</li> <li>• Union education officers should be given further training.</li> <li>• Build on or upscale existing initiatives;</li> <li>• Develop an employment agenda that gives priority attention to sustainable jobs;</li> <li>• Encourage greater investments in human capital with a lifelong learning component;</li> <li>• Greater advocacy for companies to give priority to HRD as part of CSR.</li> </ul>

***Discussion Highlights of the afternoon session:***

4. Most of the participants voiced out the urgency of working together and providing systems for them to communicate, as all are in agreement that the essential L3 definition is not just a programme but a way of life.
5. The afternoon presentation (Session 2) gave the participants the opportunity to listen and compare their respective practices that would approximate L3. The clarifications were made after each presentation were mostly questions regarding areas of operations or where these (specific) programmes, are found and how they are accessed by the potential and target learners. Among these are a) accessing the DepEd Accreditation and Equivalency Programme; locating the CHED accredited colleges and Universities; and an update on the TESDA RPL as well as the TESDA's TVET content and process in relation to the tenets of L3.
6. While the participants particularly those from the employers and workers groups, commended the government presentations. However, they also registered and reiterated their concern on how content geared towards building competencies for learners (who are potential workers) do not match the needs of employers. The DepEd participants in turn responded with the initial idea of the private sector actively engaging them (government) exactly how they may be able to create the necessary reforms.
7. Floated during the discussion too, were a number of suggestions to promote L3, i.e. government increasing budget in education (for reforms) most particularly increasing the budget of the Bureau of Alternative Learning Systems; recognizing workers' efforts to continuously upgrade their skills and competencies not only in work but in their over all human development; and government providing tax incentives for the business community who engage in L3.
8. Lastly, the idea of working together, including the ILO as an institution was reiterated. Realizing that one sector is not an "island" and therefore has a lot to do with the other's pursuit of lifelong learning. Ms. Torres particularly mentioned about how better coordination among the stakeholders could best benefit L3 initiatives in the country.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Session Three: Group Workshop: Identifying Key Points Critical Issues and Constituent Priorities in Lifelong Learning</b></p>
---

1. Ms. Junko Nakayama gave the workshop instructions and assigned each group a particular area to work on.
2. The body agreed to finish the workshop but decided to make the presentations of outputs the following day.
3. They were invited to an early evening reception at the ILO office pantry

## DAY TWO 16 DECEMBER 2004

1. Day Two began with the a short synthesis by Bing Baguioro. Using the Content Process Output Framework the following transpired on Day 01.
  2. Content: People, Groups and Experiences, points of view and perceptions make up the sessions of Day one. Shared and heard yesterday were: Organisational / Institutional Definitions; Practices and extent of practices (Programme and Policies); Global and local Concrete Examples; Reflections on Realities of the changing times; Programme Gains and Benefits; Changes and Developments; Constraints, Challenges and Issues on L3; Philosophies and Theses; and Observations and Opinions.
  3. Process: Yesterday's sessions were spent listening, speaking, reacting, replying, responding, writing, learning, relearning, unlearning, reflecting, deflecting, grouping and ungrouping.
  4. Output: Common Understanding of L3, its processes, **strategies; approaches, and seemingly agreeing that L3 is more than these, a way of life or a culture in itself.**
  5. Further, L3 is about acquiring the necessary knowledge, skills and Values / attitudes that equip a PERSON (INDIVIDUAL) or GROUP OF PERSONS (TEAM) with a specific set of COMPETENCIES ENABLING THE person or group of persons to meet the demands of CHANGE
  6. We were left with Issues / Questions / reflections, that include:
    - When does L3 begin and end?
    - Are education reforms enough?
    - What are the enabling and disabling environments?
    - Where is L3 located or situated in our everyday professional, organizational and personal lives?
    - What policy and programme directions can we adopt to consciously infuse L3 in what we do as workers, employers, educators, planners and policy makers?
    - Over-all and considering L3 as the way to go in the 21st century what do we do that worked – and what do we do that do not work at all?
    - How do we enhance and sustain what worked and
    - Just how do we effect change to what do not work?
    - **What are our priority issues on L3?**
-

## **Outputs of Workshop One:**

### **EMPLOYERS:**

#### **1. Learning Investment**

- ✔ Increasing cost of learning programs
- ✔ Compensating learners for lost time
- ✔ Incentive for employers for learning opportunities provided
- ✔ Risk of losing trained employees to competitors
- ✔ Lack of clear ROI on training

#### **2. Learners' motivation to learn**

- ✔ Passivity & indifference
- ✔ Incentives for attending learning programs
- ✔ Compensating learners for lost income
- ✔ Job descriptions limit learning opportunities

#### **3. Learning programs**

- ✔ Need updating due to changing market demands
- ✔ Need to customize programs to meet specific learner groups
- ✔ Mismatch between applied programs vs. actual learning needs

#### **4. Institutional mechanism**

- ✔ Need for wider apprenticeship & internship learning programs
- ✔ Mismatch between academe & industry

### **GOVERNMENT**

#### **1. Concept Level**

- Lack of Common Understanding of the Concept of Lifelong Learning (COGNITIVE LEVEL)
- The need for a paradigm shift from traditional orientation of education among educational planners, implementers and all other educational stakeholders – AFFECTIVE and BEHAVIORAL LEVELS

#### **2. POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

- Lack of coherence at implementation level
- Institutional mechanisms i.e. in most organizations, lack of operating unit mandated to plan and implement programs for lifelong learning

#### **3. Definition and Development of a National Qualifications Framework**

- Given the womb to tomb recommendation as the scope of Lifelong Learning, there is an absence of a qualifications framework that would determine the Knowledge, Skill and Attitude (KSA) at different stages of life of those belonging to the different economic strata or the competencies of life or life scales of people from womb to tomb.
- A national qualifications framework that spans the 3 sub- systems of education (TESDA, DepEd, & CHED) for greater mobility within the sub-systems

## **WORKERS**

### **1. Reform/Strengthen the Basic Education**

- Literacy skills
- Numeracy skills
- Communication skills
- Critical thinking
- Employability

### **2. Accelerate Programs on**

- Equivalency
- Competency-based training and certification
- Recognition of prior learning

### **3. Strengthen capacity/expertise of unions to engage in these three aspects**

## **ACADEME / NGO AND OTHERS:**

1. The Filipino Learners' Learning Motivation is too External
2. Concept of Learning is too limited in terms of time, space and form
3. The gap between Life and Learning is too wide – between home and school; between home and workplace etc.

## Comments and Discussion:

1. When identifying issues, we might need to take a **look those that are more realistic / concrete and therefore easier to address** when we finally craft our action plans;
2. We may need to **prioritize issues and identify those** which we are able to address within our organisations; together with other organisations of the same nature; with organizations of different nature; with ILO and other international bodies;
3. We also need to come up with a common framework in addressing these issues; i.e. advocacy and networking level; education and training; policy formulation etc.

<b>Session Four: Presentation of Guidelines for Action Planning and Expected Outcomes</b>
---

### ***Workshop Two:***

### ***Action Planning for Lifelong Learning in the Philippines***

1. Again Ms. Junko Nakayama gave out the instructions / structure for workshop two;

<b>Session Five: Presentation of Action Plans</b>
---

**A. EMPLOYERS:**

1. **Issues:**
  - Attitude towards lifelong learning**  
Psyche of “just enough” for survival limits the motivation for further learning
  - Motivation for lifelong learning**  
Limited enabling environment  
Unclear ROIs for employers  
Lack of opportunities for some employees
  
2. **Objectives:**
  - To stimulate behavioral change
  - To enhance the capacity of employers in providing learning opportunities for employees
  - To contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for lifelong learning
  
3. **Strategies**
  - HRD to come up with programs on valuing learning among employees
  - Network with partners (TESDA, DOLE, Trade Unions)
  - Provide employee with incentives (model employee, awards for innovative ideas)
  
4. **Activities**
  - Lifelong Learning Orientation for employers / executives / entrepreneurs
  - Training of trainers on Lifelong Learning
  - IEC at the enterprise level
  - Design of incentive system
  - Conduct M&E

Activity	Budget (PhP)	Resources	Timeline
Orientation for employers	500K	Trainers (ILO, ECOP)	1st Q - 2005
Training of HRD	1M	Trainers (ILO, ECOP)	2nd-3rd Q - 2005
IEC	300K	Technical (ILO, ECOP, TUs)	1st Q – 2005
Design of incentive system	100K	Criteria	4th Q - 2005
M&E	200K	ILO, ECOP	4th Q –2005

## **B. WORKERS:**

### **WORKERS/TRADE UNIONS**

#### **DRAFT ACTION PLAN FOR LIFELONG LEARNING IN THE PHILIPPINES**

##### **PREMISES**

**A TWG on L3 for labor is constituted**

**Term: 3 years**

**Composition:**

**Duties/responsibilities:**

- 1) To coordinate, oversee, and monitor implementation
- 2) To evaluate program

##### **Problem 1**

**The present Basic Educational System is not responsive to the challenges of globalization in terms of preparing the students:**

1. To be competitive workers
2. To become entrepreneurs
3. To be economically productive

##### **Intended Result**

**Reforms are instituted in the Basic Education system geared towards lifelong learning**

ACTIVITIES	WHO	WHEN	RESOURCES	COSTS
1. Conduct a tripartite consultation on Basic Education reforms	TWG-L3, Labor reps, government, employees	First quarter of 2005	Venue Materials Resource persons	TU: 100,000 ILO: 200,000
2. Legislative advocacy on tripartite representation in CHED and DepEd	TWG – L4	2005-2007	Meetings Research Lobbying Media work	TU: 100,000 ILO: 200,000  TU: 200,000 ILO: 400,000

**Problem 2**

**There is a need to accelerate the programs on equivalency, competency-based training, certification and recognition of prior learning.**

**Intended Result**

Mechanisms are installed in TUs (federations, labor centers and locals) to conduct programs on lifelong learning.

ACTIVITIES	WHO	WHEN	RESOURCES	COSTS
1. Promotion/Orientation among TUs on L3	All TU Partners	2005-2007	FFW: 600,000 TUCP: 800,000 Others: 100,000 Total: 1,500,000	TU Partners 600,000 ILO: 900,000
2. Institutionalization of programs (organizational follow-up per month)	Specific TU partner by organization	2005-2007	335,000	TU Partners 335,000
3. MOA with TESDA /CHED to build capacity of TUs	TWG, TESDA All TU partners	2006	150,000	TU: 75,000 ILO: 75,000
4. Capacity building thru training, deputization & certification	TWG, TESDA All TU partners	2006-2007	6 batches in 2 yrs @75T – 25 pax @ 450,000 (TESDA	TU: 150,000 ILO: 300,000
5. Testing/certification	-	2007-2008	50T, TU 100T)	-
6. Evaluation (monitoring every six months)	-	2008	-	ILO: 100,000
			-	

**TOTAL COST**

**TU Partners: Php 1,160,000**

**ILO: Php 1,375,000**

**C. GOVERNMENT**

ISSUE	RESPONSE	INPUT	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	TIMETABLE		
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Lack of common understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information dissemination</li> <li>▪ IEC development and production</li> <li>▪ Consultative sessions/meetings with stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Identify L3 volunteers/advocates from influence groups</li> <li>▪ Documentation of BPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Media/PR, info offices of agencies</li> <li>▪ Budget allocation</li> <li>▪ Manpower</li> <li>▪ Data, success stories, basic office materials/supplies</li> </ul>	CHED, DepEd, TESDA			
Paradigm shift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Social dialogues for DepEd, TESDA, CHED and other stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ IE C Materials</li> <li>▪ Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>▪ Manpower</li> </ul>	TESDA, DepEd, CHED			
Lack of coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Policy and program review</li> <li>▪ NCC E regular meeting</li> <li>▪ Designate a focal person in each agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ IE C Materials</li> <li>▪ Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>▪ Manpower</li> </ul>				
NQF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NCC E to approve “traditional” QF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ IE C Materials</li> <li>▪ Basic</li> </ul>	TESDA,			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop QF for life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IC office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CHED, DepEd, SUC, Industry</li> </ul>				
Weakness of basic education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue capability building program</li> <li>Improve recruitment</li> <li>Improve teacher education program</li> <li>Promote best practices</li> <li>Competency standards for teachers – TQF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DepEd, CHED, SUCs, (TESDA – cooperating agency)</li> </ul>				
Accelerate programs for RPL, Equivalency & CBET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pursue action plan for EO 358</li> <li>Expand ETEEAP</li> <li>Involve industry representatives in ETEEAP evaluation</li> <li>Commence CB assessment system</li> <li>Accelerate codification of competencies for different tertiary programs</li> <li>Expand coverage of competency standards &amp; certification</li> <li>Advocate RPL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CHED, TESDA, DepEd, SUCs</li> </ul>				
Capability building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessors training &amp; accreditation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CHED, TESDA, DepEd</li> <li>Partner agencies – Labor groups, DA,</li> </ul>				

			DOST, DTI			
Increasing training cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement tax rebates as provided by law</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>	TESDA, DOLE, ECOP Cooperating agencies: BIR, TIs & HEIs			
Incentive for employers for providing HRD opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awards/recognition</li> <li>Accreditation of companies</li> <li>Tax rebates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>	TESDA Partner - Industry			
Mismatch of graduates & industry needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen industry-TI linkage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>	CHED, TESDA, DepED Partner - Industry			
Industry trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government to keep track of industry trends to be abreast with industry</li> <li>Create a mechanism for industry to disseminate industry trend information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>	Industry, BOI, BSP Partner – NEDA, DOLE, DBM			
Overlapping of On-the-Job OJT)/ In-Plant-Training (IPT) programs of TESDA, CHED and DOLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rationalization of OJT/ IPT</li> <li>Standardization of content, guidelines &amp; processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IEC</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>Basic office materials/supplies</li> <li>Manpower</li> </ul>				

***Discussion after the presentations:***

1. Almost after each presentation, the groups were reminded to further examine their regular programmes and take time to locate L3 opportunities within their regular programmes;
2. The idea of mainstreaming L3 in the regular programme could be viable if it maximizes resources, i.e. promotion of L3 in the Workers' Education Programme of the workers' unions.
3. It was also at this point where / when the participants were asked whether a direct L3 practice or any practice that fully approximates L3 exist in the Philippines. The body noted that except for some existing educational programmes, genuine L3 initiatives and concepts are fairly new and open in the Philippine setting, thus leaving a larger room for advocating at both policy and programme levels;
4. But the body also took note that L3 can flourish as the concept of continuing education is embodied in the Philippine Constitution and as a further statement of policy, the Philippine Plan of Action for Education for All respects the right of individuals (adult and children alike) to access quality education "*in all forms and at all times*".
5. The idea of a close coordination between and among learning institutions (private and public) and the employers and workers unions was revisited and DepEd representative Ms. Ocampo mentioned about exploring / proposing the expansion of the Education Council inviting employers and workers groups to sit and provide inputs;
6. In closing, Ms. Torres and Mr. Gorham thanked the groups for their active participation, and the time they spend in drafting their respective action plans. Ms. Torres then enumerated the next steps for ILO.
7. In particular, Ms. Torres made mention of how the participants' action plans will become integral parts of the National Plan of Action for Decent work.
8. She then talked about how further consultations will be made as the Technical Working Group (TWG) on Decent Work tasked to formulate the Decent Work Country Programme will need to engage the participants in putting the document together and (perhaps) hiring a consultant to write the final document.
9. The Decent Work Country Programme henceforth will identify priority areas which ILO can support contained in the National Plan of Action on Decent Work.
10. After having thanked the participants as well as the others who were involved in the organization and management of this workshop; Ms. Torres formally announced the workshop-meeting's adjournment.

**END OF TWO DAY WORKSHOP**