



KOPERNIKUSZ

NETWORK FOR EUROPEAN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

COMMET – DE 07/LLP LdV/TOI/147036



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

**Putting vocational competences to a test in the
Metal and Electrical Sector
as illustrated by two vocations
Mechatronics technician and Metal cutting worker**



Results of the questionnaire on competence profiles



Participants from the companies

Plant Managers

Production Managers

Quality Assurance Managers

1. The spheres of activity :

are they defined and outlined appropriately ?

- + The spheres outlined in these profiles cover the main duties of the technicians.
Maybe the duties could be outlined differently, but the definitions are appropriate
- + The outline and definition of the spheres of activity seems to be appropriate.
The illustrated profiles reflect the requirements of an imaginary job.
From this point of view all the spheres are necessary despite some of them is not necessary in our jobs.
- More spheres of activity have to be outlined in both vocations, and within them more complete action have to be defined.
 - The spheres of activity are sometimes too vague.
More consultation with the experts of the profession is needed.

2. The phases of a complete action : are they described to the point ?

- + The phases of the actions are described well enough.
In some spheres of activity each of the phases are relevant, but in some spheres they are not. The spheres could be divided into more activities and for each activity the competences would be defined according the phases.
- + The division of the complete actions into phases is right, most of actions need analysis, planning, performing, etc. The phases of the actions are described well. Each of the phases are relevant.
- The phases are relevant. However, sometimes more detailed description would be needed for the various activities.

3. The competence dimensions : are they plausible / feasible ? Which distinctions do you prefer : SQF or competence profiles ?

- + The competence dimensions are defined well both in SQF and the competence profiles they are plausible. Both distinctions are useful in case of skill management. The SQF dimensions are adequate to EQF recommendation, however this distinction is more favorable
- + The distinctions of the SQF are better in terms of levelling, while the definitions are better in competence profiles.
- The competence dimensions applied in the profiles differs from the EQF, and are not usual. The definition of knowledge is missing . Can be difficultly compared or measured for levelling.

3. The competence dimensions : are they plausible / feasible ? Which distinctions do you prefer : SQF or competence profiles ?

- + The distinctions of the SQF are better in terms of leveling, while the definitions are better in competence profiles.
- Competence dimensions are sometimes unclear. Knowledge is missing from the grid. The competence dimensions differ in the case of SQF and EQF. This could cause problems, as the same approach should be used for both for the sake of comparability.

4. The competence profiles : are they applicable e.g as certificate supplement to Europass ?

+ Competence profiles are applicable as the base of certifications, described in a supplement, or also can be used as the base of a job description. It would be preferable to change the competence dimensions like applied in SQF model.

-These competence profiles seem to be overextended for being applicable as certificate supplement. Besides these dimensions of competence are not unified enough for using them for this purpose.

- The competence profile is too detailed for the Europass. For the Europass CS concise description of competences is needed, for this purpose the grid contains too many details

5. Between the competence profiles and the SQF, can you imagine to apply these or a combination between them in your HR department? If it were a combination, what should it look like?

- + Both SQF and competence profiles are very useful and efficient tools for HR management. I prefer the dimensions and leveling of SQF, but the definitions, descriptions have to be described according to the approach of the competence profiles.
- + The SQF model would be applicable, especially because of its leveling system.
- + I can imagine the application of each of them. The choice or preference depends on the application, the practice of other companies. The more companies apply one or the other tool the stronger its comparability is.

5. Between the competence profiles and the SQF, can you imagine to apply these or a combination between them in your HR department? If it were a combination, what should it look like?

- + I could imagine taking over the positive features of both and using them in combination, the levels of the SQF make comparison easier, while the detailed descriptions of the competence profiles, after testing could be used in all fields of HRM.
- + The SQF model as well as the competence profiles are very useful in HR work. I would definitely use both of them in my work, though for different purposes. The combination would contain the dimensions and leveling of the SQF, but the system would take over the definitions from competence profiles, though in a more specific manner