

Report EQF PIN Work package 3

The expected outcome of workpackage 3 is an overview of the impact of the EQF and its accompanying measures on the VET system and the consequences for employees. Special attention is asked for identifying good practices and approaches.

Issues addressed by the focus groups:

1. collective bargaining
2. impact of the learning outcome-approach for initial and further training
3. assessment and validation of non-formal and informal learning
4. data protection vs. transparency
5. increase flexibility in training programmes (e.g. EC VET)
6. permeability between general, vocational and tertiary education and training
7. quality assurance within vocational education and training (EQARF)
8. guidance and individual career development
9. standards for developing new skill profiles due to future skill needs
10. mismatching (low and over qualification)

The primary focus in the focus groups is:

1. Identification of good practices in the partner-countries of implementation of the EQF,
2. Creating an overview of the knowledge needs of the stakeholders when 'working' with the EQF.

For an introduction on EQF we refer to the brochure of the European Commission, available in almost any language: http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc44_en.htm

Desk research

Because of the delay in reports, some extra time has been used for desk research. Not only did we familiarize a little with (the differences between) the educational systems of the countries, we also looked into the stadia of developing NQF's, the process and the state of Validating Non-formal and informal learning.

Unavailable report:

It is noted that a very useful document exists in the European buildings, annex 1 and annex 2 to the European Inventory on validation of non-formal and informal learning, **but are not available to researchers**. We tried – even confidentially with a promise not to quote the report- to use the annex via Cedefop, via the researcher (GHK), via OECD contacts, but could not retrieve a copy of *Annex 2 – Country of overview by level of development*. Of course this level of development could be very useful in determining the possible effect of the EQF. For the PIN project, a glance at this document should be very helpful in order to decide what strategy on RNFIL is useful.

Development of national qualifications frameworks in Europe

The role of stakeholders

Although in general, many stakeholders are involved in the design of National Qualification Frameworks, this is not always the case. In the country reports we see a well organized influence in, for example, Lithuania, where influence is absent in The Netherlands. In general, in Europe it is found the development of NQFs requires involvement of a broader set of stakeholders than what is normally the case: these include both the public and the private sector. "While governance of education and training is often carried out within sub-systems (general, vocational and higher education), the concept of a comprehensive framework has forced countries to broaden the approach. This is illustrated by the **German** qualifications framework which includes not only federal and regional (Länder) representatives, those from different parts of education and training, but also representatives of the social partners, particular economic sectors and researchers. This new composition of stakeholders – emphasising the link between education and work – has changed the dynamic of discussions and forced stakeholders to go beyond their own position and look at the interaction and relationship between sectors and institutions. It has brought out into the open a series of tensions and conflicts of interests, thus establishing a realistic basis for moving forward and for meeting agreed objectives". (*Development of national qualifications frameworks in Europe*. Cedefop, October 2011, page 32).

"In February 2007, a national [Austrian] NQF steering group was set up. This is the key decision-making body



and includes 23 members representing all the main stakeholders (all relevant ministries, social partners and Länder). The main task of this group is to coordinate the implementation of the NQF and to make sure that the framework reflects the interests of stakeholders. Since qualifications and validation policies require cross-sector cooperation, ensuring coordination and a sense of ownership is crucial to success. This group will also be the decisionmaking body for the EQF referencing report.” (*Development of national qualifications frameworks in Europe*. Cedefop, October 2011, page 39).

“Seen from the outside the **Dutch** NQF process can be characterised as technically oriented and largely organised as a top-down process. Different from many other countries, the steering group of the project consists only of representatives of the three ministries; other stakeholders, for example social partners, are not directly involved. The Leijnse Committee is four professors recruited for of their expertise in education and training matters, not for their ability to voice different interests and positions. While the consultation has made it possible for all stakeholders to express their position on the developing framework, a key question is whether broad ownership can be developed in the coming period. This is a necessary prerequisite for it to make a difference and add value.” (*Development of national qualifications frameworks in Europe*. Cedefop, October 2011, page 182).

Preliminary results

Based on the arrived reports (most countries had at least a short impression available) a short overview of national reports was presented in Warsaw:

- reports varied widely in size (from 2 up to 68 pages) and form (descriptive vs. analytical);
- most but not all reports followed the structure of the questionnaire;
- some reports didn't highlight the different perspectives of target groups;

Impact of EQF

- is unknown in some countries because they are at the beginning of the process, other countries say there is no impact;

Context

- varies widely;
- no best practices identified directly, some countries could represent examples (Ireland, Spain, Slovenia and Lithuania);

Effect on individuals remains unclear!

Collective bargaining

- different situation in the countries when it comes to pay being an aspect of bargaining
- different points of view of different target groups, more info needed on discussion of different points of view
- validation – practices should be reported on more clearly

Relevance of the ten themes:

- employers' view: no relevance had collective bargaining, data protection, permeability, standards for new skills, mismatching

Highest scores:

- impact of learning outcome orientation
- Quality assurance

Lowest scores:

- data protection
- mismatching

Information requested:

- examples of implementing EQF in a detailed way
- exchange of experiences and discussions
- assessment and validation of NFIL
- concrete examples of use of competence descriptors
- good practice examples on how to influence the process of developing NQFs

Suggestions for discussion

- could or should one "education"/qualification be rewarded with different levels in different NQF's?
- is there good practice of trade unions influencing the NQFs
- does education determine wages? What is the impact of the EQF in this respect?
- more definitions needed? Like collective bargaining
 - it is clear that collective bargaining in the reports refers to at least three different definitions:
 - bargaining over salaries in collective agreements;
 - bargaining over the right on education in collective agreements;
 - bargaining over the level on which education should be listed in a NQF

Main conclusions - Towards a strategy

The impact analyses from the countries are so different, that a red thread is hardly useful. In effect, none of the countries is actually reporting effect of the implementation of the EQF, partially because a system is already in function (Ireland), partially because implementation is carried out in “low impact modus” (The Netherlands). But the biggest common factor is uncertainty. Almost none of the partners can make an educated guess whether or not EQF will have impact and, if so, what the impact would be. Exception is Germany, where the collective bargaining is also influenced by the level of education, so there is a financial interest in grading education higher (for the employees) or lower (for employers). However, it seems that this is only the case in Germany.

It is generally believed that the adoption of the Slovene NQF will provide greater transparency of learning outcomes of the educational system and enable the enforcement of non-formally acquired knowledge and skills, which will in turn increase the opportunities for employment in the labour market.

What could be very relevant for workers, but is hardly reported in the impact analyses, is the use of NQF for informal education, like sector based training, international diplomas (like “Microsoft certified system engineer”) so that education can easily be interpreted at the right level by (future) employers who don’t know the sector or branch of origin very well. In general, the most important possible impact of the implementation of EQF for employees is that education can be ranked adequate for or by new employers. In this way it might be considered to use the levels of EQF also for indication of the complexity of a job. In country reports the failure to do so is reported as one of the weaknesses in the SWOT.

Almost all the countries want the EQF to help lifelong learning. Especially in countries where the participation in lifelong learning is not very high, but also those who are doing well according to Lisbon strategy, are targeting on improving the actual use of lifelong learning systems and components.

Every adult person has the right to vocational counselling. Vocational orientation is done by the National Employment Offices – they have departments that specialize in career orientation. In the last 10 years Slovenia has developed and opened 14 regional centres for providing information and vocational orientation (this was done within the framework of the European Social Fund). Adults have the right to consult with the counselling service when preparing their own individual educational plans or employment plans.

Another issue might be the rights derived from a certain level of the NQF. For the Netherlands, for example, very explicit is stated that obtaining an education on one level is NOT granting access by definition to education in the next level (so finishing level 5 EQF for example is not entitling you to start education for level 6). For some this means that the usability of NQF is lower than expected. However, it is not clear at the moment whether this is in general the case in Europe or just a local effect.

There is an Open information, advice and guidance system (AIKOS), whose main goal - to provide relevant, quality information about learning opportunities in Lithuania. After modular programs creation, will be more freedom to shape their own learning techniques.

In respect of qualification development or modification is possible state (for certain professions), or individuals funding. Sometimes the training is funded by the companies or organizations which send persons. In AIKOS system works the registry of professional development programs and activities, where are registered non-formal educational programs. The Registry is very popular among employers.

There are possibilities for businesses (employers) to get tax incentives that employees are involved in with workplace related training (including non-formal education).

In some cases reports can bring up other questions. Like in Slovenia the use and design of the “national portfolio”:

Recently, everyone who wants to participate in educational programmes has to organize their own portfolio (a folder with all acquired certificates) – this portfolio was developed by the National Institute for Vocational Education and Training as a useful tool (help) for all the people who decide to participate in the LLL.

In other reports some observation is made, where influence of the EQF could be of importance, but –apparently– that is not within sight at the moment:

The impact that the implementation and use of the EQF can have in the employment field will also be to recognize and give value to skills, therefore to human resources and improve the meeting of demand and supply. As a consequence, people's professional credibility in the labour market will grow thanks to:

- *the recognition of the knowledge acquired*
- *the certainty that the knowledge acquired can be used*
- *the recognition of courses to enrich the skills of each professional profile*

Eventually, some Italian Regions introduced validation tools for non-formal and informal learning within their "Certification Systems" or on the basis of the recognition of training vouchers within education and vocational training systems or to ease integration or re-integration processes of the unemployed or persons who were made redundant.

Experiment with EQF – NQF - SQF

One of the ((hope) effects of the implementation of the EQF and design of NQF of course is transferability of education and (working) experience. One interesting experiment to use the EQF to express working experience is found in The Netherlands:

In The Netherlands, an interesting experiment is reported. Because education is focussing on learning outcomes of **initial professional education** it is difficult to describe more senior levels of professional behaviour in terms of the existing certificates and diploma's. This is a barrier in using VPL systems to rank professional levels of work, because the difference between a beginner, a good functioning and a senior worker in a certain field of work, all being educated on level 6 EQF. Therefore social partners (Trade Unions and Employers organizations together) worked out a professional standard differentiating the level of experience in the profession. They build certificates stating the level of professional maturity. These certificates are recognized in the entire branch, guaranteed by the presence of the employers in the experiment. Then these sectoral qualifications are levelled against the NQF – EQF and transferred to the Dutch committee scaling education. As soon as these levels are recognized as a Sectoral Qualification Framework within the National Qualification Framework, the EQF can be used to express the level of professional experience of workers in this sector for anyone outside the sector, thus improving transferability.

Of course in many countries there exist (small) initiatives or even options for VPL that are not known nationwide. In Germany for example:

Some federal states have their own system for certifying competences. The 'Qualipass' in Baden-Württemberg for example documents practical experiences and competences of young people (aged 12 to 25 - acquired through voluntary activities, traineeships, time spent abroad etc.). Other examples are the Hamburger Nachweis, Berliner FreiwilligenPass and the EhrenamtsCard in Hessen.

Not only is it questionable whether the EQF will have any impact at all, questioned is whether EQF is in it self able to achieve the goals set.

Kuda/Strauß (2006: 630-634), for example, point out for Germany that originally "questions and problems of the design, practicability and implementation of instruments and procedures" and "vocational education and educational policy considerations" were in the foreground. This means that possible social effects cannot be considered or assessed sufficiently: the companies' perspectives and those of the employees hardly play a role in the debate, in addition possible effects on society (such as that people obtain a certain status or are assigned to a certain social class due to their profession; aspects related to development psychology and learning psychology of currently existing training forms; and also legal aspects like with job advertisements are ignored.

¹ e.g. differentiation of the levels, classification criteria for specific educational programmes, abstract Dublin descriptors lacking in practical relevance, can appropriately portray three times eight descriptors the complexity of individual learning processes, classification of vocational versus HE-based programmes. It is also questionable whether it is at all possible to formulate clear learning outcomes for all available educational programmes.

Meyer's criticism (2006: 5, quoted according to Erler 2009: 24) is also in this direction: "The EQF has been developed isolated from education and qualification research in many working group meetings with national experts. This theory and empirical evidence-free design makes it seem questionable whether this system can appropriately portray the competences and qualifications which the historically and culturally grown national systems produce."

One of the main conclusions that can be derived from the national reports is that on one hand, time has been too short: almost in no country the effect of the EQF can be foreseen, neither be estimated. On the other hand, the sense of urgency is rather big, recognizing the EQF could have big effect on workers, in the positive and negative way. Therefore, trade unions simply need more information. A suggestion might be to use the OECD study "Qualifications systems: bridges to lifelong learning", where also the role and function of a qualification framework for lifelong learning has been explored.

One of the suggestions to do so within a country has been:

The considered "education training" has to be planned, strategic and targeted. To do this, it would be the creation of "counselor in training", whose mission is not simply getting the worker to improve the job search process, but to help in developing a training strategy for each person in their care personal or professional interests

Conclusion

Based on the 19 reports, it is clear that most partners are in search for further information, good practices and detailed information on how EQF works and how a NQF is set up. The general principles are NOT the issue, but detailed description of process, impact, learning outcome description etcetera. By example as stated by Italy:

Information to become familiar with what is happening in other countries to introduce and implement EQF and ECVET, both as regards the overall governance of learning systems (formal, non-formal, informal) as well as the definition of methodologies and tools.

Partially this information is available, but very large and a little difficult to access. The *European Inventory on the Validation of Non-Formal and Informal learning* should be mentioned as well as the recent publication on all National Qualification Frameworks. Difficult is that the interest goes out to how things are done, not to what is done. Unfortunately, many descriptions of good practices describe what is done, not –let alone in detail- how things have been carried out.

Furthermore, good practices on actual influence of trade unions on the design of NQF are mentioned. Although those can be found in the Cedefop publication, there is little information on how the influence was realized (initiative by the government, power of unions ...?)

Trade unions hope to gain a good practice or to get specific advice on how we can contribute to or influence the creation and development of a national qualifications framework.

Country	Strong²	Weak³	Opportunity	Threat⁴
Ireland	We already have a fully functioning Framework of Qualifications aligned with many EU countries.	Our current weakness is the multiplicity of organisations offering awards. This is being addressed in legislation currently going through parliament. (Dail)	The opportunity to become the leader in the delivery of high quality training to EU citizens using a framework recognised in each country.	The Multiplicity of organisations and complexity of dealing with RPL
Italy	Richness and diversification of formal and non formal learning courses. Attention to learning by workers' organizations and employers.	Lack of a global and unitary architecture of the system. Strictness of systems and of the organization of courses of formal learning systems (education, university and vocational training). Lack in the definition of reference standards for the various levels of qualification. Lack of a clear and organic credit system, able to enhance personal or acquired competences.	Possibility to increase the number of adults in learning courses (formal, informal and non formal) The formal and institutional learning system is interested by reform and reorganization processes.	For the educational system, difficulty to go from an evaluation of knowledge to and evaluation of skills. Difficulty in the use of a shared language.
United Kingdom	The mapping across of the current QCF to EQF will enhance the country's learning systems and improve transferability among sectors. The cost benefits would be a single vocational qualification system that makes it easier for all social partners to understand.	There is currently a lack of knowledge of EQF both amongst education sectors and also employers. The danger is that it will not get the recognition that employees need to improve their employability. In the different UK countries different qualification systems have been developed that interact with each other, all based on the EQF. However they will have to be able to interact with the EQF.	The main strength is the cross border recognition of qualifications between countries. If the skills developed by workers are recognised then they will enhance their employability and improve the economy.	If the EQF is to be successfully implemented in the UK there will have to be much staff development amongst education providers and complete recognition by employers.
Lithuania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lithuanian vocational education and training curriculum is based learning outcomes; • The legal framework allows for the social partnership in the formation of standards processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite the significant investment in vocational education and training system, there is a lack of quality, training facilities should be improved and practical training base in vocational training schools is poor, there is a lack of methodological tools and textbooks. There is insufficient use of information communication technology tools opportunities for vocational training. This leads the declining prestige of professional training, which is one of the main reasons why young people choose a small part of primary vocational training institutions. • There is not enough cooperation (both horizontal and vertical) between education providers. • Trade union involvement is largely formal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is still insufficient use of the continuing vocational training system between qualifications developing people. • Social partners' opportunities are networking, participation in projects, cooperation between countries and social partners. • Last year, Lithuania has paid special attention to significant changes in vocational education and training sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be very difficult for the people to understand what is developing, implementing, so it is necessary high dissemination of accurate information for public information. • It is envisaged that in future meetings (Lithuanian Tripartite Council of Vocational Training) will be held regularly each quarter. It is hard to say yet whether the Council engaged in real dialogue with the government's social partners, or just an imitation, because the specific solutions was not accepted by the Council - there was only a formal introduction to the vocational training sector developments.
Slovenia	- high level of inclusion of young people in	- A great number of qualifications that can be	- greater transparency of acquired	- Greater fluctuation of qualified work

² In some reports the term "Strong" has been replaced: "advantages"

³ In some reports the term "Weak" has been replaced: "disadvantages"

⁴ In some reports the term "Threat" has been replaced: "risks"



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Country	Strong²	Weak³	Opportunity	Threat⁴
	general and vocational education - integration of social partners in the decision-making process on occupational standards and the EQF - existence of a classification system of learning results – KLASIUS - inclusion of national vocational qualifications into the NQF - possibility of acquisition of qualification either formally or non-formally	acquired in companies but cannot be validated at the national level (NQF level) - Impermeability of the system of vocational education – there are no direct transitions into higher education, successful completion of the Matura Exam is required - Collective agreements do not include the right to education and training and the employer is not bound to acknowledge an acquired qualification	qualifications in the European area - Comparability with other qualifications in EU - Greater employment opportunities with EU employers - Higher status of vocational qualifications - Possibility of acquiring a qualification part by part	force into better paid environments - More pressure on the employees to acquire qualifications that are in the employer's best interest - Certain qualifications may be placed into lower levels of the EQF in the process of classification

Country	Strong²	Weak³	Opportunity	Threat⁴
Germany	<p>The occupational profiles for IVET and CVET qualifications are formulated in a way that allows relatively easy adaptation to a learning outcome-oriented qualifications framework. They include clearly defined learning outcomes in the assessment regulations. With regard to work and business processes as a starting point for formulating learning outcomes, this has been part of the tradition in regulating professions in Germany since the mid-90's and is unlikely to change through NQF development.</p>	<p>It remains unclear whether EQF adaptation (NQF development) will lead to better recognition of competencies acquired in informal and non-formal learning contexts.</p> <p>Although it can be argued that Germany does have a certain level of outcome orientation prevalent through the assessment criteria provided in the assessment regulations (Prüfungsverordnungen), it must be noted that Germany, traditionally, has a highly input-oriented VET system. The German VET system and its actors have long defined the quality and status of a qualification based on the form of education which provided it (e.g. in case of the dual training system). This tradition represents a barrier to EQF adaptation and has also been the basis of the major issues that have arisen in the development of the German Qualifications Framework. This factor applies to true learning outcome orientation in the recognition of informal and non-formal learning as well as the major debate about permeability and equality of tertiary and non-tertiary education (e.g. the proposition to “reserve” levels 6 to 8 for university degrees).</p> <p>Another limitation might be the different taxonomies used by all different instruments / frameworks. The taxonomy used in the new competence-based Ausbildungsordnungen does neither mirror that of the GQF nor that of the EQF.</p> <p>Together with many other European countries, Germany shares problems in the area of recognition of non-formal and informal learning. The interviewees highlighted strong orientation towards formal learning and a lack of mutual trust between different educational sub-systems and education providers as possible reasons for this. Even more so, and this should not be underestimated, reasons of political, social and historical-cultural nature are important obstacles to improving this situation.</p>	<p>The shift towards outcome-orientation in occupational profiles is now in progress. Limitations exist in so far as there is still no consistent use of terminology between occupational profiles, the German Qualifications Framework and the EQF.</p> <p>Occupational profiles allow for informal and non-formal learning through the “Externenprüfung”, however, overall the system is very exclusive in terms of recognition of prior, informal and non-formal learning.</p>	<p>The fragmentation of “professions” through outcome-orientation is one of the major worries in Germany. Finding possibilities of defining holistic learning outcomes could be a chance to overcome this challenge. Learning outcome orientation also offers a number of positive impacts (better recognition of qualifications achieved outside the formal qualification system) but the risks should not be lost sight of.</p> <p>It is a major worry – which appears to be prevalent in a number of European countries – that the EQF, in spite of being designed as a mere translation instrument and not as an instrument for educational reform it works as such de facto. The impact of the EQF and adaptation hereto should thus not be underestimated and examined more closely.</p>

Country	Strong²	Weak³	Opportunity	Threat⁴
Spain	<p>Focusing on issues of sustainability, cost-benefit issues, ethical issues, transferability between sectors and issues related to the NQS. A high commitment of the governments and social partners to promote the professional training, using the Social Dialogue, amount of training and credits made available to citizens and businesses/enterprises in order to have an effect immediately on the skills of the workforce. Moreover, this commitment would be expanded to promote improved access to training areas over qualification problems within companies. Among the priority groups should be also include the immigrant population. The new model FPE's main positive elements of assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Values the social partnership in VET. b) Bankruptcy of traditional boundaries. c) Relationship to National Vocational Qualifications. d) Linking Training Centers to quality. e) Validity and legal and social recognition of VET 	<p>Focusing on issues of sustainability, cost-benefit issues, ethical issues, transferability between sectors and aspects of the MEC. The renewal of the training system requires clear and measurable commitments on the skill levels of the adult population, with improved equity in access to training from the areas and groups with lower system development training. To reach the goals they set, it will be necessary to modify the entire system to facilitate access and movement within the system, including subsystems and levels. The use of fiscal policy could be an instrument to facilitate and encourage investment forming part of the population. The population's access to training would be easier if the training centers were more open to their environment, with strong guidance devices for the population young and old, and territory offers coordinated and integrated among the different subsystems. These centers would have to have some updated equipment and specialized in the various occupational groups, with a modular offering that recognizes skills acquired in other ways. A lack of definition of measurable objectives and operational performance to guide the different actors, both state and regional and local involved in the system. Urgent, therefore, the adoption of a consistent agreement that promotes a new stage of evolution training system to meet the challenges of education in society knowledge, as the current model has already given all he could give. This agreement improvements should address both system organization and its ability to provide skilled labor and generate higher demand and attractive skills by the workforce, both private and public. The involvement of the four major players in the Spanish system (trade unions, business organizations, state governments and administrations regional) is a necessary condition to ensure its effective impact.</p>	<p>Focusing on sustainability issues, cost-benefit issues, ethical issues, transferability between sectors and issues related to the CNS. The promotion of alternating between school and work and training strategy facilitate the relationship between training and employment. Zoom in and open more centers to companies is a prerequisite for which is should provide greater autonomy to identity and vocational training centers. For its part, the ultimate development of a system of recognition of experience professional would be an incentive to facilitate access to training for all groups who have not followed a formal training process, thus completing their qualification.</p>	<p>Focus on sustainability issues, issues of cost-benefit, ethical issues, transferability between sectors and aspects of the MEC. The budget and finance and a lack of development of complementary roles important system needed to address future challenges, such as functions of orientation, innovation, quality, evaluation and observation.</p>

Country	Strong²	Weak³	Opportunity	Threat⁴
Poland	<p>The initiative showed its potential to make a contribution to the national VET reform, the development of the NQF and new VET curricula in Poland by offering new insights from the pilot initiatives and providing a general framework for piloting further initiatives as part of these developments. The trans-European dimension of this initiative also provided new insights that could help other similar initiatives across Europe, but most importantly to Europe as a whole to achieve its goals already set out in the Education and Training 2010 work programme, the Lifelong Learning strategy (2001) and ultimately the Europe 2020 Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.</p> <p>The initiative showed that validation of non-formal learning outcomes is relevant for workers in the construction sector and especially for the low-qualified. Anecdotal evidence indicate that validation can generate more opportunities in the labour market, reduce the sense of insecurity and risk of unemployment, but also boost the participants' self-esteem. Moreover, the pilots suggest that formally named as low-skilled, or low-qualified (because they do not possess formal vocational qualifications) workers are actually able to develop and demonstrate high levels of competence and skills acquired through non-formal and informal learning (i.e. work experience).</p> <p>As the project findings suggest, there are substantial, hidden obstacles to migrant workers to acquire qualifications and / or to get them recognised in a foreign country, especially those acquired through non-formal or informal learning. Even when a system for validation exists, it is difficult to find information about it, the process is unnecessarily complex and variable over time and place, not to mention about being sympathetic to migrant workers. The project showed that there is a lot to learn from the systems already implemented elsewhere (such as Romania, Belgium, Italy and the UK), but also delivered new insights to these already established systems to make them more accessible for migrant workers.</p> <p>The project showed that a lot of joint efforts are required for the development of an internationally recognised certificate, but the requirement for these efforts is not lower at the national level.</p> <p>Another important aspect to make such initiatives successful is to address the lack of concrete motivation for APL both for workers and for their employers. Workers and employers both need to be targeted with better information about the opportunities available and the benefits and incentives: improved conditions of employment (not only financial gains, but also level, status, formalization, responsibility) for workers, improved competitiveness for employers.</p> <p>In an interview conducted for this case study, a number of key points were identified that need to be considered in order to design a validation procedure and set up an awarding body to make the process worthwhile and corresponding to contemporary labour market needs etc., such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a strong link with the EQF; a strong link with the European guidelines for validation; a strong link with ECVET (which basically means an independence of the certifying body, an independence of the evaluation and free access to assessment); emphasis on real benefits and added value for the members of a potential target group. <p>In this context it is necessary to underpin and understand the challenges, opportunities and links that the project faces. It is important to learn from the experience and be able to build and sustain strong commitment from all actors involved (such as social partners, policy and decision-makers and VET providers and employers), which is a key for every project or initiative to succeed.</p>			



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.