Implementing a holistic approach to lifelong learning:

Community Lifelong Learning Centres as a gateway to multidisciplinary support teams

CEDEFOP
European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training

LIFELONG LEARNING PLATFORM
EUROPEAN CIVIL SOCIETY FOR EDUCATION

"Implementing a holistic approach to lifelong learning"
Briefing Paper - August 2019

Authors:
Lifelong Learning Platform and Cedefop

This briefing paper was written in partnership with the Educational Disadvantage Centre, Institute of Education, Dublin City University as co-authors, and in consultation with LLLP Members

Acknowledgements:
Brikena Xhomaqi, Director, LLLP
Dr Irene Psifidou, Expert, Department for Learning and Employability, Cedefop
Dr Paul Downes, Associate Professor of Education, Director, Educational Disadvantage Centre, Institute of Education, Dublin City University
LLLP Working Group on Wider Benefits of Learning

With the financial support of the European Union

PURPOSE

This briefing paper aims to inform European Institutions as well as national policy and decision makers on the issue of integrated and holistic approach to lifelong learning. It also provides the context at a high level and share a few recommendations on ways to establish lifelong learning systems at local, regional and national level. This briefing paper helps raising awareness about the main highlights and existing practice in order to make any necessary decisions or complete any similar ongoing work in this respect. The paper elaborates on the current context of learning in Europe, bringing a few examples of recent developments of community based services in education.

This paper builds on the roundtable discussion hosted by the Educational Disadvantage Centre, Institute of Education, Dublin City University in September 2017 and attended by the EU Commission and Cedefop. It was taken up by the Lifelong Learning Platform and further developed in the framework of the LLLP Working Group on Wider Benefits of Learning. This paper has been further enriched by the Policy Forum **"What role for community lifelong learning centres? The potential of one-stop shop for preventing youth at risk from disconnecting"** that Cedefop jointly organised with LLLP on 29 May 2019[1]. The event was hosted by the Romanian Presidency of the European Council in its permanent representation to the EU in Brussels.

Cedefop, within its broader mission to promote lifelong learning through vocational education and training in Europe, furnished new evidence on the role of VET for tackling early leaving from education and training and helping young people attain at least an upper secondary qualification (Cedefop, 2016). From a lifelong perspective, tackling early leaving from education and training (ELET) is an ongoing process, which requires a multidisciplinary and whole community approach. To support policy makers and learning providers, Cedefop launched in 2017 a Europe-wide VET toolkit for tackling early leaving. The toolkit offers practical guidance, tips, good practices and tools drawn from successful interventions in VET. New toolkit resources including Reflection tools for policy makers and VET providers as well as evaluation plans and guidelines to monitor and evaluate ongoing policies facilitate a more comprehensive approach to tackle early leaving in Europe. These new tools and the enriched resources of Cedefop VET toolkit for tackling early leaving were launched in the above-mentioned Policy Forum.

1 Event website: https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/events-and-projects/events/policy-forum-what-role-community-lifelong-learning-centres

CURRENT SITUATION

2019 is destined to be a year of thinking ahead and making strategic plans for the period of the next European Multi Financial Framework. The European Union has declared the Sustainable Development Goals as their guiding principles when formulating EU policies for the next decade, and thus there is a need to aim at offering equitable, high-quality education for all, and to do so with a holistic lifelong learning approach (SDG 4). There has been a wide consensus of research and practice communities that building bridges between formal, non-formal and informal education is a requisite for this kind of approach - with a balanced emphasis on academic achievements, skills and competences, and social-emotional development, education for future jobs, citizenship education and well-being - and policy is also following this lead. Rethinking education is not only crucial to recognise and validate all forms of learning, but also to offer them the necessary physical space, as well as access to professional support to bring those spaces closer to the community. In a holistic approach, this means that a certain need - be it educational or related - should be tackled as easily as possible. A possible and highly beneficial way could be to reinforce or set up community lifelong learning centres (offering learning opportunities from cradle to grave) that act as gateways to more specialised services and multidisciplinary teams.

The aim of such centres would be to create a place where education and social life are closely intertwined with the neighborhood and the wider world, wherein school or any other institution is seen as a learning space of shared responsibility for professional educators, other professionals, students, parents, municipalities and civil society organisations (volunteer / youth and solidarity organisations etc). These centres would help the educational institutions become cultural elements and drivers of development for their region for both children and adults (derived from Teacher Manifesto for the 21st Century).

The latest European Commission communication contributing to the Leaders' Meeting in Gothenburg, in November 2017, reaffirms the need to address learning from early ages. According to the European Political Strategy Centre, "the earlier, the better" is the first important step towards modernising our education systems. Numerous studies affirm that learning is understood to be a fundamentally social process, therefore making the case for more social interactions at early ages to develop the full potential of an individual throughout their life.

BACKGROUND - EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT

There is an increasing recognition at EU Policy level of the importance of combining services for marginalised groups in a community-based location as one-stop-shop multidisciplinary teams (Eurochild 2011; Frazer 2017; Downes 2011a; European Commission TWG 2013, European Commission WG 2015). Such a model allows for a more flexible, accessible model which aims to engage socio-economically excluded groups. It helps overcome fragmentation of services, and allows for a continuity of strategic interventions in services familiar to individuals and families, many of whom have found it difficult to trust and engage with other services.

Moreover, the EU Council Conclusions (2017) on 'Inclusion in Diversity to achieve a High Quality Education For All' gives such examples of multiprofessional teams as including, 'social services, youth services, outreach care workers, psychologists, nurses, speech and language therapists…' (see also Council Conclusions on early school leaving 2015).

However, we observe that a number of these models already exists in the European context. For instance, in the Danish experience, there are multidisciplinary teams located in and around every school. A key feature of such one-stop-shop teams is not only the community outreach, but also an individual or family outreach approach. A key rationale for such multidisciplinary teams located in a common location is to acknowledge that complex multifaceted needs require a multidimensional response. Another crucial feature is to avoid disparate services 'passing on bits of the child' (Edwards & Downes 2013). A good example of such community-based one-stop-shop that involves a multidisciplinary team engaged in family outreach and working in and around schools is 'Familibase', in Ballyfermot (Dublin). Moreover, a range of examples of community-based lifelong learning centres exists across Europe and can combine non-formal with formal education options (Downes 2011).

A number of examples of multidisciplinary, community-based family support centres is available in European contexts.

An example is the SPIL centre in Eindhoven. The municipality of Eindhoven has chosen a family support policy based on multifunctional services directly linked to primary schools in these SPIL Centres. This choice had been made based on the principle of the early detection of children at risk as early as possible and as close to the family as possible. The main reason for this approach is that schools, daycare centres and kindergartens are best-placed to 'find' children at risk and their parents (Eurochild 2011, p.21).

Another example is the General Learning Centres (Általános Művelődési Központ, ÁMK) in Hungary. They existed from the 1960's until 2010. A place where usually the local cultural centre, library, sports centre and very often the kindergarten and primary school existed under one roof and under one leader, they

were typical in smaller settlements and strong communities in big cities like living areas of a large factory. They offered services for adults - courses, hobby clubs - often in cooperation with the main employer of the area.

Adult education stakeholders are also exploring the development of such centers as a way to empower citizens through better local engagement. The LQN project (LebensQualität durch Nähe-Quality of life through proximity) presented at the LLLP Working Group on Wider Benefits of Learning, was carried out by five adult education institutions in Austria, Germany and Italy and the European Association for the Education of Adults. The project addresses the needs of municipalities to empower citizens and improve their involvement in participatory projects for civic and social challenges. This prompts us to reflect and discuss the role of education in fostering local and regional development, and how active citizens' participation can benefit the life of the communities.

Latvia has another interesting example on ways to transforming schools into Multifunctional Community Learning Centres (Aija Tuna 2014). The goal of this initiative is to prevent threatening social disintegration by supporting revival and development of (small) schools and multifunctional community centres in economically and socially depressed areas. Demographic decline, growing migration and other factors resulted in small rural schools to be put under threat of closing: as the number of students was decreasing, schools received fewer funds for sustaining education processes. At the same time the quality of education in these schools in general, as measured according to the formal learning outcomes, was questioned. The solution was to open up schools, and while maintaining and expanding the typical functions of schools, they added adult education activities, specific services for young children and their families, activities supporting entrepreneurship and increasing employability potential through partnerships and civic participation.

In Sweden, European Social Funds have been used with similar objectives to develop multi-skilled teams who support youth with complex needs. UngKOMP was co-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF) and the Swedish Public Employment Service (PES) to reduce and prevent long-term unemployment of young people. The practice grew out of the realization that even though youth unemployment is low in Sweden, this is not true for all groups and that no single agency could solve the problem alone. The multi-skilled teams work together to help young people face their needs across multiple areas of life such as housing, health, and education. An impact evaluation shows that 70% of participants continue to employment or education.

We observe other trends towards such community centers also in the scout movements. For instance, in Lithuania there has been regular usage of school facilities during weekends for extracurricular activities or just as a space for youth organisations to run their activities, to assembly and design new strategies. Similar examples are taking place in Malta where volunteering weeks are organised in schools on a regular basis to provide young people with a space for non-formal and informal learning.

This approach resonates strongly with the European Commission Recommendation 'Investing in children: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage' (2013), which explicitly seeks to 'enhance family support' and 'promote quality, community-based care' as part of a common challenge to fight the abject effects of poverty and social exclusion. Basically, such a centre is a 'one-stop shop' where a range of vital services across health and education are available in an accessible location to engage marginalised families.

For example, Nordrhein-Westfalen state programme 'Familienzentrum' has been launched by the government in order to turn up to 3,000 children's daycare facilities into family centres by 2012. It is an evidence-informed joint project of the state government, local authorities (youth welfare offices) and non-governmental organisations. An ever-increasing number of parents benefit from the family centres because they offer excellent care and education, on top of counselling and support to children and parents. Family centres are designed to strengthen parenting skills as well as to improve compatibility of working life and family life. Acting as the hub of a network of family and child-welfare services, the family centres offer parents and their children advice, information, and assistance in all phases of life and especially at an early stage (Eurochild 2011, p.6).

Between 2006 and 2012 approximately 3,000 of the total 9,000 child-care centres in the German federal state of North Rhine-Westphalia (NRW) are being developed into certified "Familienzentren" (family centres). Family and adult centres are designed to bundle services for families in the local community. The concept of the state programme "Familienzentrum NRW" acknowledges the significance of early support and intervention for children and families (Eurochild 2011, p.44). It can even be argued for such family support centres to be universally available (Eurochild 2011, p.10).

In a climate of scarcity of resources, there is also a compelling argument to target such centres to areas of highest need. Be it early childhood services in diverse forms, parental empowerment for early school leaving prevention, provision of non-formal learning opportunities, engagement with the community through volunteering, widening the extracurricular to offer better support and more diverse learning outcomes, they support local communities' needs for better employment or recreation. It is to be recognised that such local communities and multidisciplinary 'one-stop-shop' centres require substantial investment but also that a lot can be done with existing infrastructures, steadily adapting them to these new ways. A further reason for a targeted approach is to be sensitive to issues of location and territory for families in areas that are experiencing high levels of socio-economic marginalisation. There is also a strong acknowledgement that unless active efforts are made to ensure that such community centres relate to the needs, experiences and lives of those in socio-economic exclusion, then those groups at highest levels of need for support will not attend such services.

There is a need to examine the strategic potential for establishing a number of such one-stop-shop community-based

multidisciplinary teams on the basis of lifelong learning centres across European contexts of high poverty. We should also address the potential of combining community lifelong learning centres with multidisciplinary teams as part of a community-based one-stop-shop to meet the needs of communities experiencing high levels of socio-economic exclusion.

Discussing the potential of a community-based one-stop-shop also requires reflection on its impact on all aspects of European education systems. Psifidou (2017) acknowledges from Cedefop's research on early leaving from VET (2016) that:

- An active outreach approach is needed to reach early leavers from education and training;
- Multidisciplinary teams have been key to address potential early leavers with complex multifaceted kinds of needs;
- Intergenerational learning is an untapped human capital;
- Complementarity between formal and non-formal education systems allows for a holistic approach of personal development.

Potentially, the added value of the one-shop-stop includes (Psifidou 2017):

- Stopping the fragmentation of services;
- Preventing individuals "falling through the net";
- Helping individuals in need to build up trust;
- Strengthening families and communities' role and contribution to education;
- Ensuring accessibility (e.g. for minority groups);
- Providing flexibility (to select support services needed);
- Placing ECEC, compulsory education, and VET within a lifelong learning framework to support the development of soft skills;
- Combining informal, non-formal and formal education including VET;
- Making use of shared public infrastructures to their best potential.

Combining community-based lifelong learning centres with community-based multidisciplinary teams (linked with schools) in 'one-stop shops' offers a range of potential benefits for quality and inclusive education for all. It combines the welcoming and non-threatening approach of community lifelong learning centres, with co-located multidisciplinary teams built around those with high complex needs. The community lifelong learning centre dimension can act as a gateway service within co-located teams, where some attending the lifelong learning sessions may receive additional support if needed, such as emotional, social and multicultural counselling, family support, volunteering opportunities etc. Other key features of a combined model as a one-stop-shop are:

- Continuity of support over time; flexibility of levels of support, tailored to levels of need and not simply prepackaged programmes;
- Outreach: reaches groups missed by prepackaged programmes, including through home visiting family support outreach;

- Drop-in dimensions;
- Peer supports over time;
- Go beyond 'passing on bits of the child' (Edwards & Downes 2013) so that referrals of families and children can take place within a team-based approach in a common location to help address the fragmentation of the existing support services.

An outreach approach to parental and community (society) involvement for schools and municipalities requires active efforts to engage with groups in contexts where they feel most comfortable with, such as in their homes and local community based contexts. This requires a sensitivity to location and territory (Downes & Maunsell 2007; Downes 2011a) which ensures that the physical location of outreach efforts is not in places alien to the parents who are experiencing structural and systematic socio-economic marginalisation. In communities experiencing high levels of social and economic exclusion, there need to be neutral spaces where a range of groups can feel comfortable and professionals may not often be aware of local mindsets, territories and divisions with regard to location.

It has already been highlighted that the report of the EU Commission Thematic Working Group on Early School Leaving (2013) explicitly refers to the need for schools and services to engage in outreach to marginalised parents. An individual outreach approach is especially relevant to those parents and families at the highest level of need (indicated prevention). In the words of Carpentieri et al., (2011):

As a method of providing services to families, home visiting has an extensive pedigree, not only in health and social services but also in education (Bryant and Wasik, 2004). Advantages of home visiting include the fact that is family focused, meeting parents on their own terms in their own homes at times suitable for their 30 own schedules. Home visitors can gain a great deal of information about the child's home learning environment and cultural and/or socio-economic issues that may impact on the child's literacy development. Home visitors can identify and potentially build on family strengths uncovered on visits that may not be evident in classrooms or centres, particularly if parents lack confidence in educational settings (p.103).

A community-based outreach approach may also be needed for groups of parents at moderate risk (selected prevention). Outreach must also be firmly distinguished from mere information-based efforts to reach socio-economically marginalised adults.

For example, the Munich municipality has established community education centres, a Bildungslokale, as part of an outreach approach to engaging migrant groups, with approximately 90% of attendees being from migrant background. There are currently 6 BildungsLokale running with 4 more are accepted to be opened in the next 2 years. The age profile is mainly between 20 - 40 years. These offer a range of courses. For therapy, family support services are offered through special social and youth services, which work together with the Bildungslokale to cooperate in a close way.

Putting the concept of Community Lifelong Learning Centres into operation also requires reflection on the physical spaces and infrastructures that can be used to fulfill such a purpose. The discussion of how to upgrade and make the best use of education infrastructures has recently come to the fore at the EU level, notably in the 2018 report by the High-Level Task Force on 'Investing in Social Infrastructure in Europe'. This report refers to the scenario of "broaden[ing] the concept of education infrastructure to encompass a range of more flexible options" where the school becomes a "learning centre of a local community" making the space and resources available to all potential learners, and bringing important social returns on investment (p42). Similar spaces can be found in universities too. There are examples and increasing initiatives of universities connecting to local communities.

An example presented during the Policy Forum May 2019 (Cedefop and LLLP) is one of the Creative Communities Group (CCG), from the UK, initiated by Russell Hogarth working on empowering people and communities through volunteering opportunities in the arts and promoting active citizenship in a variety of creativity activities such as film festivals, art exhibitions, dance marathons, creative writing groups, etc. The CCG is a Pan-European network connecting universities with communities, specialising in creative teaching as a pathway to inclusion and accessible education. Advising on, and delivering health and social care into the local and wider community, the CCG helps break down barriers to university and helps universities with student recruitment and retention. The Creative Communities Group UK is based at the University of Central Lancashire.

At EU level, a number of EU funded projects is also addressing the community engagement in higher education. An example is the project TEFCE, which dwells into a European framework for community engagement in higher education.

Thus, investing in CLLCs as an innovative solution for integrated community-based service provision and learning opportunities is also underpinned by an economic rationale. In fact, the same infrastructure may be adapted and used to cater for the needs of several target groups. Backed by the findings of the report by the High-Level Task Force, the concept of CLLCs should therefore be treated as an opportune target for EU funding programmes, including the InvestEU programme 2021-2027, succeedly the Investment Plan for Europe or "Juncker Plan", which will seek to place greater priority on social infrastructure investment than is currently the case - although, evidently, this should not decline the possibility of pilot funding for such centres before 2021.

EXEMPLIFYING «LEARNING FOR WELL-BEING»

The life-long, life-broad, equitable and community-wide approach to education advocated in this paper invokes the 'Learning for Well-being' paradigm (O'Toole 2016). 'Learning for well-being' principles will - as described below - enable lifelong learning community centres to achieve a number of goals with long-lasting and multifaceted impact on society.

1. A **living systems** perspective encompasses humans within all elements of their environments and strives for a dynamic wholeness which ensures true well-being along the life course – in contrast to the mechanistic fragmentation that now challenges individuals, families, schools, communities and societies.

2. The **unique potential of each individual** can be nurtured within a specific community context where the life of each member can unfold with purpose, meaning and direction.

3. Generative **diversity** - within and across the communities that compose a society -- encourages richly plural perspectives and multiple expressions that offer ways to address the difference between people and communities with respectful awareness.

4. Emphasis on r**elationships and processes**, as well as on outcomes, stimulates engagement and negotiation with others in mutually respectful and rewarding ways that enhance the ability to see from others' perspectives, and affirms that children and adults can work as competent partners.

5. The **engaged participation** of everyone concerned involves people in decisions that have various impacts on their lives, especially within marginalised communities and among vulnerable individuals.

6. **Nested systems** recognised as influencing one another will provide opportunities for different sectors and disciplines to work together across 'silos,' notably in education, health and welfare. Individuals, groups, organisations, communities and institutions will be stimulated to develop their capacities within competent systems, building continuity from early childhood through school education (Gordon and Ionescu 2018) to the education of adults.

7. Feedback and **self-organization** will ensure measuring what matters for the well-being and sustainability of people, communities and societies.

The "well-being" dimension of learning is becoming key in today's society. Learning plays an important role in improving the quality of people's lives, in particular for the most deprived. Research shows that countries that invested in health and education decades ago have reached outstanding progress in social mobility (OECD 2016). This adds further weight to the argument for investing in CLLCs as holistic spaces that promote well-being and as a compelling example of how to modernise education systems for the benefit of all.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

In the current EU landscape with ongoing discussions and negotiations for the next EU budget Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027, LLLP seizes the opportunity to **call for an early intervention in people's lives by investing in Community-based Lifelong Learning Centers with multidisciplinary teams.**

Following the launch of a new European Commission led Thematic Working Group in the framework of the current ET2020 on Early Childhood Education and Care, the Lifelong Learning Platform wishes to **draw attention to the need for a European response to early intervention in people's development using the potential of all learning opportunities and environments.** Such a call is fully in line with recent developments across Europe and the need to deliver on a Social Europe, as proclaimed in 2017 by Member States. EU policies and initiatives support this ambition but haven't yet thought of concrete enough solutions. This is why we propose the community lifelong learning centers with multidisciplinary teams as one of the many possible solutions to truly encompass the social dimension.

There is a need for coordinated actions at EU level to support Member States in establishing lifelong learning systems. The ILO report on Future of Work 2018 states that investment in learning at an early age facilitates learning at later stages in life and is in turn linked to intergenerational social mobility, expanding the choices of future generations.

As highlighted by the multitude of stakeholders and policy makers present at the joint Policy Forum (Cedefop and LLLP 2019), the role of such community lifelong learning centers in tackling early leaving from education and training is key. They valued the awareness raised by existing good practices that early leaving is better addressed on wider contexts such as CLLCs, providing proximity, multidisciplinary services but also intergenerational and intercultural learning environments.

The key messages of the Policy Forum May 2019 by Cedefop and LLLP draw attention on the following aspects.

1. CLLCs as welcoming, non-threatening education environment, centred around the learner's needs, and typically focused on non-formal education. To be effective, CLLCs should be located at the heart of the community and have flexible and extended opening hours to be widely accessible; they should collect and analyse the services that the community seeks and needs, and integrate **multidisciplinary teams** and services at the local level. CLLCs allow for a more efficient engagement with marginalised groups minimising the current fragmentation of services provided by different agencies, professionals, and education and training providers.

2. The need to create an assertive outreach approach that is able to **attract the wider community to the CLLCs** where they can engage with others and also receive access

to further specialized services and support.

3. The **importance of trans-sectoral cooperation** (e.g. between different ministries – education, culture, defence, employment and interior affairs, agencies, NGOs and ECEC providers), **capacity building at the local level in impoverished areas**, and the need to ensure **quality transitions** (e.g. from education to work) **to avoid educational dead ends and decrease early leaving from education and training.** Early intervention to identify learners at risk and reach early leavers timely; highly-qualified teachers; strong cooperation between schools and municipalities; as well as, the inclusion of students in curriculum design and development are some of the key ingredients to a successful strategy to tackle early leaving from education and training.

4. 30% of NEETs are short-term unemployed and improving basic skills, decreasing early leaving, and providing apprenticeships could help solve this problem. However, apprenticeships should be fair and of high quality to deliver on the promises.

5. The resurrection of **VET as a valid, first-choice pathway** (the excellence dimension of VET), with an emphasis on providing quality education is key to prevent and counter early leaving. More work-place learning in general education is needed to **overcome the division between VET and general education** and to eliminate the hierarchy between the two pathways. Quality apprenticeships may help smooth the transition between education and work.

6. The cost of non-education in the long-term is very high. Despite achieving the 2020 target of reducing the early leaving to below 10%, the problem still exists because the remaining 10% are the hardest to eliminate. Moreover, still one in two young people does not have a very good chance in life. **Tackling early leaving will remain a strategic priority in the post-2020 agenda.**

Cedefop and LLLP will continue work in this field. The **new Cedefop online resources on 'VET for social inclusion and labour market integration'** currently under development will offer additional support to countries in tackling early leaving, raising youth employment and implementing upskilling pathways. LLLP will continue its work in identifying and collecting good practices across Europe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carpentieri, J., Fairfax-Cholmeley, K., Litster, J., Vorhaus, J. (2011). *Family literacy in Europe: using parental support initiatives to enhance early literacy development.* London: NRDC, Institute of Education. Report for European Commission, DG EAC.

Cedefop-LLLP (2019). *Concept Note: Policy Forum: What role for community lifelong learning centres? The potential of one-stop shops for preventing youth at risk from disconnecting.* 29 May 2019, Brussels.

Cedefop-LLLP (2019). *Conclusions: Policy Forum: What role for community lifelong learning centres? The potential of one-stop shops for preventing youth at risk from disconnecting.* 29 May 2019, Brussels.

Cedefop (2016). *Leaving education early: putting vocational education and training centre stage. Volume I: investigating causes and extent, and Volume II: evaluating policy impact.* Luxembourg: Publications Office. Cedefop research paper; No 57.

Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on Inclusion in Diversity to achieve a High Quality Education For All (2017/C 62/02)

Downes, P. (2011). *Multi/Interdisciplinary Teams for Early School Leaving Prevention: Developing a European Strategy Informed by International Evidence and Research.* NESET (Network of Experts on Social Aspects of Education and Training), Brussels: European Commission

Downes, P. (2011). *Community Based Lifelong Learning Centres: Developing a European Strategy Informed by International Evidence and Research*. NESET (Network of Experts on Social Aspects of Education and Training), Brussels: European Commission

Downes, P. & Maunsell, C. (2007). *Count us in: Tackling early school leaving in South West Inner City Dublin, An integrated response.* Dublin: South Inner City Community Development Association (SICCDA) & South Inner City Drugs Task Force

Edwards, A. & Downes, P., *Alliances for Inclusion: Developing Cross-sector Synergies and Inter-Professional Collaboration in and around Education*. EU Commission NESET (Network of Experts on Social Aspects of Education and Training) Report, 2013

Eurochild (2011). *The role of local authorities in parenting support. Family and Parenting Support Thematic Working Group Round Table Report*. Brussels: Eurochild.

European Commission Recommendation (2013). I*nvesting in children: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage.* 20.2.2013 C (2013) 778 final.

European Commission, *'Reducing early school leaving: Key messages and policy support', Final Report of the Thematic Working Group on Early School Leaving*, 2013.

European Commission, *'A whole school approach to tackling early school leaving. Policy messages'*, Education & Training ET 2020, Brussels, 2015.

EU COUNCIL, *Council Conclusions of 23 November 2015 on reducing early school leaving and promoting success in school* (14441/15).

Fransen, L., del Bufalo, G. & Reviglio, E. (2018) *Boosting Investment in Social Infrastructure in Europe: Report of the High-Level Task Force on Investing in Social Infrastructure in Europe.* Luxembourg: Publications Office. Discussion Paper 074. January 2018.

Frazer, H. (2017). *Invited Presentation. Better Outcomes Brighter Futures, National Advisory Council Roundtable on Child Poverty,* Dublin, June 22, 2017.

Gordon, J., Ionescu, M. (2018), *Towards systems competent for nurturing children's holistic development from birth through school: Coherence and Continuity.* Brussels: Learning for Well-being Foundation.

O'Toole, L. (2016) '*Cultivating capacities: A description of the Learning for Well-being Approach to Core Practices,'* Chapter 2 in Improving the Quality of Childhood in Europe: Volume 6, Alliance for Childhood, Brussels.

Psifidou, I. (2017) *Invited Presentation, Roundtable on 'One Stop Shop' Community based Services Combining Multidisciplinary Teams and Community Lifelong Learning Centres*, Educational Disadvantage Centre, Institute of Education, Dublin City University, September 20, 2017.

Aija Tūna Initiative "*Change Opportunities for Schools*", Soros Foundation – Latvia (SFL)

For further information please contact
policy@lllplatform.eu and rena.psifidou@cedefop.europa.eu

Implementing a holistic approach to lifelong learning:

Community Lifelong Learning Centres as a gateway to multidisciplinary support teams

A joint publication by

CEDEFOP
European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training

LIFELONG LEARNING PLATFORM
EUROPEAN CIVIL SOCIETY FOR EDUCATION