MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE EQF ADVISORY GROUP
LEUVEN (BE), 31 MARCH - 01 APRIL 2014

INTRODUCTION

The twenty-fourth meeting of the EQF AG was attended by representatives of 25 countries, and by representatives of social partners and stakeholder organisations. In addition, representatives from the European Commission, Cedefop, the European Training Foundation, the Council of Europe and external experts to the Commission also attended.

COM chaired and opened the meeting. The agenda was accepted without further comment. The minutes and the action points of the twenty-third meeting of the EQF Advisory Group of 26-27 February 2014 were also adopted without comment.

1. RELEVANT DEVELOPMENTS IN EUROPEAN COOPERATION IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

COM referred to the latest developments and follow-up to the meeting of the EQF AG of 26-27 February 2014 (cf. Note AG24-1).

COM informed participants that both the proposal for exploring the role of the EQF in cooperating with third party countries, and the mandate of the sub-group on International Sectoral Qualifications have been revised based on country feedback. These documents were considered final.

COM also informed the EQF AG that the first meeting of the sub-group on International Sectoral Qualifications would be held after current meeting, starting at 2 p.m. on 1 April 2014.

1 Please note: all meeting documents and Power Point presentations have been uploaded to the e-community of the EQF Advisory Group: http://europa.eu/sinapse/directaccess/qualification_framework
Note summarising the comments of the EQF AG on the referencing report of Iceland

No further comments.

Information on the EQF NCP grants 2014 (cf. ppt)

EACEA, provided an overview of the current developments related to the EQF NCP grants. She informed the group that a newly established unit within EACEA is now taking responsibility for these matters.

The final reports for the 2013 grants have been submitted by all but one country. The reports are currently being evaluated. Final payment can be expected within 60 days.

The maximum EU co-financing rate for the 2014 call (Restricted call EACEA 9/2014) is 85%. The deadline for the submission of applications was 31 March 2014. Since only 17 applications had been received by 30 March 2014, countries were granted two more weeks to submit their applications by e-mail.

In addition, there is an upcoming call which is restricted to national qualifications databases, i.e. to activities related to establishing and implementing databases of qualifications that will be connected with the joint EQF/Ploteus portal. The maximum grant awarded will be EUR 100,000. The deadline for the submission of applications is June 2014; countries will receive notification of the award of grants in September, and activities can begin in October 2014.

EACEA invited delegates to contact EACEA with any administrative or financial questions they may have on NCP grants. A new helpdesk has been established for this purpose.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BG, DE, LV, MT, SE):

- Delegates appreciated the extension of the deadline for the submission of applications for the 2014 grants. It was pointed out that EACEA informed the relevant parties about the extension too late for some of them to prepare their application.
  - EACEA stated that if countries needed more time, this could still be negotiated, maintaining equal opportunities for all countries.

- Participants commented that the new system (e-form) was not easy to manage. Some countries had to submit their application by e-mail instead.
  - EACEA thanked the EQF AG for the feedback received. Several technical bugs were identified which were responsible for the malfunction. Countries that experience any technical problems with the e-form may submit their applications by e-mail. EACEA would welcome any feedback on the procedure, particularly recommendations for improvement.

- How much time will be allowed for the use of the grant on national databases?
  - EACEA: Two years, starting from the date of the grant agreement.

- Some participants expressed surprise that the total budget for NCP grants has been reduced in comparison to last year.
  - COM pointed out that in previous years a large proportion of the budget had remained unused. As a result, the decision was taken to allocate a smaller amount to NCP grants this year.

Information on developments in the Bologna Process

Council of Europe informed the EQF AG about recent developments in the Bologna Process. The Bologna process currently faces several issues. Firstly, the attendance of
ministers at Bologna conferences is continuously decreasing. Some countries are systematically absent from all meetings. Secondly, as the working group now has a multitude of issues to address, working methods need to be discussed.

These issues were at the centre of discussions at the BFUG (Bologna Follow-up Group) Board meeting in February, and they will also be addressed at the upcoming meeting of the BFUG to be held in the second week of April in Athens, EL.

Council of Europe pointed out that the ‘external dimension’ of the EQF is of significant importance for facilitating the process of recognition, e.g. the development of regional recognition conventions.

2. **VALIDATION OF NON-FORMAL AND INFORMAL LEARNING (VNIL)**

Proposal for peer learning activities

COM presented the suggestions received for peer learning activities (PLAs) on topics related to validation of non-formal learning. Based on these suggestions, COM suggested the following topics:

- PLA on ‘writing and assessing learning outcomes: programme-based qualifications vs. NFIL’, to be held in autumn 2014. This PLA will focus on the challenges related to the definition of learning outcomes and on how to ensure that the description and the structure of LOs in traditional programme-based qualifications allow for LOs based on NFIL to be assessed and recognised for the purposes of the qualification.
- PLA on ‘costs and benefits of validation’, to be held in 2015. This PLA will focus on the estimation of the costs of validation (costs of development vs. permanent costs), on the funding methods, and on the benefits of validation (economic, social, etc.)
- PLA on ‘skills audits’, to be held in 2015. This PLA will examine how skills audits are understood in different countries – in terms of target groups, objectives (e.g. validation, guidance, motivation), approaches used, and cost implications.

COM invited EQF AG members to comment on these suggestions. The programme for the October 2014 PLA will be developed further at the 25th meeting of the EQF AG.

**Comments, questions and answers** (reactions from Cedefop, ETUC, EUCIS-LLL):

- Participants welcomed the choice of topics.
- Cedefop pointed out that the first PLA should be considered in relation to the learning outcomes work programme and its PLAs. Furthermore, Cedefop is currently working on a project on writing learning outcomes.
- Cedefop recommended that the PLA on the costs and benefits of validation should be based on the PLA held on this topic several years ago.
- Participants commented that the role of social partners in the validation of non-formal and informal learning should also be taken into account in this context.

**Presentation on national approaches to the validation of non-formal and informal learning and linking to the national qualifications framework – France (cf. ppt)**

France presented the French VAE validation system (validation des acquis de l’expérience – ‘validation of acquired experiences’ [http://www.vae.gouv.fr/]).
The VAE system, which was introduced in 2002, enables the award of a full qualification on the basis of the validation of non-formal and informal learning. The 2002 Social Modernisation Act defines VAE as an individual legal right, i.e. anybody with at least three years of work experience, regardless of his or her age or occupation, may apply for VAE. In order be awarded a specific qualification through VAE, work experience must have been gained in the relevant field covered by that qualification. Candidates can draw on work experience obtained through salaried, independent, or volunteer work. Employees are entitled to 24 hours of leave for their VAE.

VAE is linked to the French RNCP (répertoire national des certifications professionnelles – national register of vocational qualifications), i.e. in order to be registered in the RNCP a qualification must allow for VAE. The qualifications awarded through VAE are the same as those awarded through initial or further education and training. In addition, VAE is defined as an activity of further education, which means that sources of funding available for the pursuit of further education can be used for the validation of non-formal and informal learning.

For candidates, the most important and challenging step of the validation procedure is putting their experience into words. Counselling is available to the candidates in order to help them prepare both their written dossier and for their interview with the jury. This counselling is not mandatory, but increases candidates’ chances of success. The composition of the jury differs to that used for traditional exams; it consists of teachers (or professors) and specialists.

The benefits of the VAE system include:

- for the individual: improved professional self-awareness, greater self-esteem, recognition by others, advancement within the company, opportunity to change jobs, reduction of training time.
- for the company: satisfying the demand for qualified workers, more efficient human resource and competence management, reduction of costs of further education.
- for society: responsibility for training is shared between society and the individual; valorisation of certain undervalued jobs (in particular in the social sectors); lower unemployment.

In 2012, almost 64,000 eligible applications were received, which resulted in 28,200 validations for full qualifications and 14,500 validations for partial qualifications. The majority of candidates are women (7 out of 10), with an average age between 30 and 49 years. Since 2002, more than 250,000 individuals have obtained qualifications through VAE. While the number of candidates has been plateauing for some time now, people are becoming increasingly aware of the VAE.

France emphasised that the VAE system cannot solve the problem of unemployment - it is not a universal remedy. It is, however, considered to be a very useful tool for enabling people to become more competitive in the labour market.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BE, DE, BG, EE, IE, IT, CEV, UEAPME):

- Is there a central agency for VAE? Who is responsible for VAE?
  - FR: Responsibility is shared between different ministries. There is no central agency or location which candidates must visit to validate
their work experience. Instead, validation is undertaken by the respective ‘organisme certificateur’ (awarding body). The competent authorities are the same as those for the formal system.

- Do the certificates state whether the qualification was obtained through the formal system or through VAE?
  - FR: No, certificates should not contain any indication that a qualification was obtained through VAE.

- Is volunteer work eligible for VAE? Is VAE only for vocational qualifications?
  - FR: Any work experience is eligible, including volunteer work. VAE covers a very wide range of qualifications, not just vocational but also (for example) all higher education qualifications. Candidates are also able to obtain a Bachelor of Philosophy degree through validation.

- It was noted that there are no qualifications below level 3 in the French qualifications framework.
  - FR: This is correct, but this has always been the case since the establishment of the framework.

- Why is a different jury used for the VAE?
  - FR: ‘Normal’ teachers or professors are often not able to assess the professional experience of the candidate; professionals are needed for this task.

- What is the process after the interview with the jury?
  - FR: The jury may conclude that further training is required (e.g. through attending an additional course) or that the candidate requires additional practical experience. For VET qualifications candidates have a period of five years in which to gain this additional training and/or experience. Candidates have an indefinite amount of time to achieve the experience or training required for the award of higher education qualifications.

- How is quality assurance organised – are there any standards and guidelines? These are legally mandated qualifications, they are quality assured. There are standards which are publicly available.

- There is a significant difference between the number of applications and the number of qualifications awarded. Does this present a problem?
  - FR: Yes, of course, but if candidates do not have the required LO, they cannot be awarded a qualification. When an individual is not awarded any kind of full or partial qualification, it is possible that they have not been properly advised and this is why counselling is important. This kind of setback can be difficult because obtaining a qualification certificate is often viewed as a significant and important achievement, especially by candidates who lack formal qualifications.

- Have ESF funds been used in the development of this project, or has the initiative been supported entirely through the national budget?
  - FR: European funds were used at the beginning of the project - they helped to launch the initiative. The VAE no longer uses any European funds.

Presentation on national approaches to the validation of non-formal and informal learning and linking to the national qualifications framework – Norway (cf. ppt)

Norway presented the Norwegian validation system, also known as ‘realkompetanse’ concept. Norway has a long tradition of recognising competence, for example through a ‘third access route’ to higher education which existed until the 1990s and was reinvented in 2001. Before the system was formalised, this process was traditionally based upon letters of recommendation.
The Norwegian term ‘realkompetanse’ literally means ‘real competence’, and refers to all formal, non-formal, and informal learning. It effectively corresponds to the English term RPL – recognition of prior learning.

In Norway, legal frameworks have been established to allow for RPL at all levels and in all types of education and training. Students are aware that they can gain access to post-secondary VET and HE on the basis of recognition of prior learning and this practice is quite common (7 percent of all students in postsecondary VET). However, no full qualifications can be awarded on the basis of RPL (i.e. it can only be used to recognise parts of qualifications).

The majority of the demand for RPL is generated by the field of health and social work. The majority of candidates are women.

Responsibility for the realkompetanse system lies with the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. Coordination and oversight is the responsibility of Vox, the Norwegian Agency for Lifelong Learning. Special responsibility for primary and secondary education and training lies with the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. Post-secondary VET and higher education institutions establish their own procedures for RPL (coordination through a council).

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BE-FL, BG, EL, BUSINESSEUROPE, Cedefop)

- Norway refers to recognition of prior ‘learning’, not ‘experience’. EE: you opted for ‘learning’ instead of experience. Does this mean that the focus is on knowledge rather than special skills?
  - NO: Realkompetanse also includes recognition of learning acquired through work, including unpaid and voluntary work. Effectively, any experience an individual has gained that is relevant to what the candidate wishes to have recognised can be validated.

- Can you provide any figures on the impact of this initiative?
  - NO: 20 percent of those who qualify for the craftsman certificate do so through the recognition of prior learning. With regard to access to HE through RPL, the numbers of applicants were quite high in the first two years of the scheme (6,000 applicants per year), until they dropped to a steady 2,000 per year.

- How does the process work for higher education?
  - NO: In order to use RPL to gain access to higher education, the applicant must be at least 25 years old - this is the only condition. Applicants must demonstrate that they will be able to complete their studies - it would be a waste of time and resources to admit people who cannot complete the study programme. Experience has shown that students who access higher education through RPL perform respectably in the first study year but struggle in the second year. NO tried to adjust assessment to take this into consideration.

- After gaining access to higher education based on RPL, is it also possible to have a shortened pathway?
  - NO: Documentation of informal and non-formal learning may also provide a basis for exemption from modules in the study programme.

- Why is it not possible to recognise full qualifications? Is there a maximum share of a qualification that can be recognised through RPL?
  - NO: The law stipulates that only part of a qualification can be recognised through the ‘realkompetanse’ concept. With regard to the craftsman
certificate, for instance, the social partners did not approve of RPL being used to award full qualifications. Perhaps there is an insufficient level of trust in the validation system.

COM thanked France and Norway for their interesting contributions and emphasised that the presentation of examples is invaluable to the development of an understanding of the different forms of validation that are practiced across Europe. The French example, for instance, illustrated that France has a narrower definition of validation than the scope of the Recommendation\(^2\). The European Inventory on validation of non-formal and informal learning, which is currently being prepared, will provide more insight into the different interpretations and approaches used by countries in the validation of non-formal and informal learning.

3. **OVERVIEW OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EQF**

COM presented the updated roadmap on referencing and requested feedback on the referencing plan overview (cf. *Note AG24-2*).

Many countries that have already presented their referencing report to the EQF AG are yet to send their ready-for-publication report to COM. COM requested that the countries concerned account for these delays.

Comments regarding the expected date for the presentation of draft EQF referencing reports:

- SK will present their first draft referencing report in June 2014, as indicated.
- CY and RO will also present their referencing reports in June.
- NO stated that they intend to keep to the scheduled date of June 2014, but could not yet confirm they will meet this deadline.
- HU announced that they would like to present the state of play of their EQF in June, and the referencing report in October 2014.

BE-FL announced that they have prepared an updated referencing report which will be available shortly. The qualifications framework now includes more than 150 vocational qualifications and some 50 qualifications drawn from higher education. The majority of the information is available only in Dutch, although a number of summaries will also be made available in English (full translation is not possible due to financial constraints). The Bologna self-certification report will be added to the annex of the referencing report. BE-FL is willing to present their updated referencing report in more detail at one of the upcoming meetings of the EQF AG.

COM invited countries to provide information on any relevant updates in relation to the 2\(^{nd}\) EQF milestone. COM also invited countries to provide some examples of diplomas and certificates in which reference is made to the EQF level. This will enable a better understanding of how this process is undertaken in different countries.

- LV has introduced a reference to the EQF level on their certificate supplements. An example has been sent to COM.

---

\(^2\) i.e. the Council Recommendation on the validation of non-formal and informal learning.
• DE: EQF levels are not only indicated on diploma supplements (as indicated in Note AG24-2), but also on certificate supplements. The qualifications database will be launched in April 2014.
• MT: Reference to the EQF level is already included in the relevant documents. The qualifications database is already operational although it is not yet linked to the EQF portal. MT intends to use funding from the upcoming call to proceed with connecting the database to the portal.

4. **Follow-up on Presentation and Discussion of the Referencing Report of Greece**

Greece responded to the feedback and comments received from members of the EQF AG following the presentation of the Greek referencing report at the 23rd meeting of the EQF AG in Birmingham, UK.

The HQF (Hellenic Qualifications Framework) is a framework for the classification of qualifications. It has the potential to be developed into a reforming instrument. The implementation of the HQF is an ongoing process. The general upper secondary school certificate (level 4) is the key transition point: holders of this qualification may access any of the level 5 qualifications. Graduates of general upper-secondary schools receive a leaving certificate based on a final internal school examination. They are eligible to take entrance examinations for university and technological educational institutions. There are no direct progression channels from vocational qualifications into higher education.

In an initial step, the HQF will include qualifications from the formal system only. The intention is to introduce non-formal and informal learning into the framework at a later stage. The learning outcomes approach has only recently been introduced and therefore still requires testing. It will possibly require revision at some point in the future.

Following the feedback received from the EQF AG, Greece described the participation of different stakeholders in the referencing process in more detail. The point was also made that the two relevant bodies for the referencing process – the Advisory Committee and the Referencing Committee – will remain active. The Presidential Decree which will establish the legal basis for the implementation of the HQF is expected to be adopted in the first half of 2015.

With regard to the 2nd milestone of EQF implementation, Greece informed the AG that starting in 2015 the EQF level will be indicated on certificates and diplomas. Also in 2015, Greece will begin to work on developing arrangements for the validation of non-formal and informal learning.

Greece confirmed its intention to present an updated EQF referencing report in approximately one year.

**Comments, questions and answers (reaction from CR):**

• It was acknowledged that Greece has made significant progress with the current version of their referencing report, particularly when compared to the first draft presented in December 2013.

COM thanked Greece for their presentation and the amount of information provided, emphasising that this kind of detail helps others to better understand a foreign qualifications framework. COM also pointed out that there is much work still to do on
the HQF and hoped that the feedback received from the EQF AG would provide Greece with the impetus to continue their work on the HQF.

COM also reacted to a letter written by a representative of Greek stakeholders (employee representative) which questioned the quality of the EQF referencing process in Greece. The letter ended with the resignation of the author from the Greek Referencing Committee. This letter was sent by e-mail to the members of the EQF AG only shortly before the current meeting, although several EQF AG members declared that they had not received it.

To resolve this issue, COM offered to hold bilateral discussions with Greece and to present the results of these discussions to the EQF AG. ETUC offered to act as a mediator between the relevant parties. Greece specifically requested an approval for its referencing report. COM issued an approval which is conditional on the resolution of the matter mentioned above.

5. FOLLOW-UP TO THE EVALUATION OF THE EQF

Proposal for a roadmap for the EQF Advisory Group to follow-up the evaluation of the EQF (cf. Note AG24-3; ppt)

At the EQF AG meeting in February, the request was made to prioritise the follow-up activities to the evaluation of the EQF. COM thus presented a revised roadmap which identified the following four priorities for follow-up activities:

- Accelerate referencing and develop a comprehensive strategy for following up referencing reports;
- Promote the coherent implementation of the 2nd milestone of EQF implementation;
- Make the EQF a reference point for international qualifications;
- Explore the role of the EQF in cooperation with third countries.

For each priority the proposal distinguishes between activities to be undertaken by the Commission, by the EQF Advisory Group, and by the countries at national level.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BE-FL, DE, FR, IE, LU, LV, SE, UK, Cedefop, Council of Europe, UEAPME):

1st priority: accelerating referencing and developing a comprehensive strategy for following up referencing reports

- Review of referencing reports by the end of 2015: Several countries reacted cautiously to this proposal, indicating that the revision of referencing reports requires a lot of work.
  It was also suggested that a revision of the referencing criteria might be needed. Furthermore, it was suggested that the 2nd rounds of referencing should provide a more comprehensive perspective, e.g. by providing related labour market statistics, as this could help promote overall credibility.
  It was pointed out that one of the main challenges with NQFs is for them to become a ‘living tool’. In particular, further work on the learning outcomes approach would be needed. In many countries, the learning outcomes approach has not reached the level of learners yet.
COM summarised that the 2nd round of referencing should in particular focus on reflection on the lessons learned from the first round of referencing. The EQF evaluation suggested that referencing criteria 3 and 4 need further guidance; therefore, work will start with these. The external evaluation did not point to issues with further criteria.

- Clustering of countries: It was suggested to cluster countries according to their progress in EQF implementation. Countries that have not completed the first milestone of EQF implementation will not be able to engage in the second milestone.
  - COM took note of this proposal, pointing out that the group seemed to have objections towards clustering when it had been suggested in the past. COM also emphasised that any clustering of countries would not be about ‘separating good students from bad students’.

- Peer learning activity on the referencing of master craftsman qualifications: The proposal for a PLA on this topic was welcomed by the group. However, it was also pointed out that one PLA would certainly not be sufficient. A strategy for ‘consistency checks on referencing’ would be needed before studying specific qualifications.
  - COM agreed that a strategy would be needed but also pointed out that this should not be done in theory only. It should be accompanied by practical case studies, such as the suggested PLA.

- Further guidance on referencing criteria 3 and 4: The group welcomed this suggestion.

- Bilateral meetings with all countries that have not presented their first referencing report: COM clarified that it would only engage in bilateral discussions if this is specifically requested by the country.

- Strengthen the monitoring of EQF implementation at national level – including through the European Semester and Cedefop’s annual mapping of NQFs: Several participants warned that the monitoring the EQF implementation through the European Semester has risks for policy implementation.
  - COM acknowledged countries’ concerns but also reminded that the European Semester is of significant importance, also in terms of financing.

- Cedefop’s annual mapping of NQFs: Cedefop informed about the fifth edition of this publication, which is expected this summer/autumn. This year, the information will be presented in a new way, including more details on which qualifications are included in a specific level.

**2nd priority: 2nd milestone of EQF implementation**

- There was some confusion on what is meant by a ‘common approach’ to indicate the EQF levels in certificates, diplomas and databases (cf. Note AG24-3, p.4).
  - COM clarified that this refers to the visual identity of the EQF and to the way it will appear in certificates, diplomas, supplements and databases. Currently, some countries indicate the EQF level on certificates, others only on the certificate supplements. ‘Common approach’ does not mean that every country must do it in the same way, but possibly follow a similar approach.

- Participants stated that the proposal for the licensing of the visual emblem that was presented last year was too complicated.

**3rd priority: making the EQF a reference point for international qualifications**

No additional comments.
4th priority: exploring the role of the EQF in cooperation with third countries.

- Participants commented that several countries already had experience in linking their qualifications frameworks to others. It would be interesting for the group to hear more about their experience (e.g. Ireland – New Zealand in higher education).
  - COM welcomed the idea of sharing existing experience in linking frameworks within the group. COM however also reminded the group to keep in mind that the linking of a meta-framework such as the EQF is different than linking a national framework.

6. State of Play of EQF Implementation in Slovakia

Slovakia presented the state of play of the process of EQF implementation in their country. The development of the Slovak National Qualifications Framework has experienced several delays in the past and at one point even came to a complete halt.

The Slovak NQF is intended to have a normative role and will be comprehensive in scope, including qualifications from general education, VET, and HE, as well as qualifications gained outside the formal system of education. It has an 8-level structure; level descriptors are defined as knowledge, skills, and competence. Level descriptors are currently being revised and this process should soon be finalised.

The learning outcomes approach is an important element for the reform of the education and training system. However, the Slovakian representatives acknowledged that the implementation of this approach is still very much work in progress, and that currently the learning outcomes approach exists only on paper in many fields.

The Slovak Lifelong Learning Act stipulates that the National System of Occupations serves as a basis for the National System of Qualifications.

The following challenges have been identified in the process:

- Drawing from experience and knowledge developed in previous and currently implemented projects (in the attempt to ‘not do anything twice’):
- Integrating all existing databases;
- Intensifying cooperation with stakeholders;
- Consulting with Sector Boards.

The preliminary referencing report is currently scheduled for presentation in June 2014 - the final referencing report will be completed by 2015. Slovakia intends to present their EQF referencing report as an integrated report alongside the QF-EHEA self-certification report.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from Cedefop, Council of Europe):

- Participants complimented SK on the very clear and honest presentation of the state of play of EQF implementation in the country.
- The presentation mentioned stakeholder involvement as an important challenge in the process. Are there any other ministries (besides the Ministry of Education) involved in the process? Any quality assurance bodies?
SK: National boards have been established which include all relevant stakeholders, even ministries that do not offer qualifications directly. These boards also include employers (‘big players’) and higher education representatives. The responsibility for quality assurance very much lies with the Ministry of Education: there is currently no independent body responsible for quality assurance.

- The presentation mentioned three types of standards, embedded in different documents. How are these linked?
  - SK: There are three types of standards: national curricula; qualification and assessment standards; and occupational/professional standards. The basis for the qualifications system is the occupations system. The qualifications standards must derive from the occupations system.

- How have stakeholders from HE been included in developing the QF-EHEA self-certification report?
  - SK: 20 university representatives and associations of students have been involved in this process.

- The presentation mentions ‘validation outside the formal system’. What this means in the Slovakian context should be clarified.

COM thanked Slovakia for their clear and concise presentation and stated that they looked forward to their draft referencing report presentation in June 2014. COM highlighted that other countries were particularly interested in receiving more detailed information on the type and extent of the involvement of stakeholders in the process and advised Slovakia to elaborate on this in their referencing report. Furthermore, COM recommended that SK pay particular attention to clarifying the terminology used in order to prevent misunderstanding.


Cedefop presented a brief reflection on the results of the PISA and PIAAC survey in the context of NQF and EQF implementation (cf. ppt).

A graph was based on PIAAC data and displayed the relationship between levels of proficiency and attainment levels in different countries. It highlighted significant differences between countries, indicating a certain inconsistency between qualification levels and proficiency. For example, it showed that Dutch upper secondary graduates outperform UK higher education graduates in literacy, numeracy, and ICT. And Estonian lower secondary graduates (EQF level 2) outperform Irish upper secondary graduates (EQF level 4).

Both PISA and PIAAC display certain discrepancies between attainment/qualifications levels and actual outcomes, thus raising the question of the signalling power of qualifications levels. This needs to be discussed, as the relevance – and indeed credibility – of frameworks may suffer as a result of such comparisons.

How can the relationship between intentions and actual outcomes be addressed? For the EQF to gain and maintain the trust of stakeholders the transformation from intentions into actual skills and competences must be monitored in a systematic and transparent way.
Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BE-FL, EE, FR, IE, IT, SK, UK, PES, UEAPME):

- There was widespread agreement that the issues presented need to be discussed in detail because they may have a significant impact on the credibility of the EQF.
- Participants did comment, however, that while these discrepancies must certainly be discussed, they do not in themselves necessarily indicate that the qualifications frameworks are failing. This may very well be primarily an issue of measurement.
- The graph on the relationship between levels of proficiency and qualification levels: Participants pointed out that if age groups were introduced into the graph, some of these discrepancies could probably be explained.
- Participants also commented that the EQF is a framework which compares qualifications, not individuals. There is a difference between standards, qualifications, and the individual.
- Relevance of PIAAC and PISA for vocational competences: Participants argued that these two surveys examined a very limited set of competences, and did not address vocational competences at all.
- Learning outcomes approach: The learning outcomes approach remains a long way from broad implementation across Europe. Therefore, we are dealing with ‘old’ and ‘new’ qualifications at the same time.
- General education: General education was considered to be a sort of ‘black box’. This is also underlined by the fact that several countries did not include general education qualifications in their frameworks (e.g. AT, DE, UK).
- It was pointed out that the figures and benchmarks used in education focus too little on achievement. More emphasis should be placed on the relationship between intention and outcomes of learning (i.e. focusing on the real competences of individuals).

COM acknowledged the need to develop a better understanding of the reasons behind these discrepancies. COM agreed to investigate the possibility of launching a study examining the relationship between EQF levels and proficiency. COM also announced that they would distribute the PowerPoint slides and that countries will have the opportunity to comment in writing.

8. LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN ESCO

COM presented an update on the latest developments in ESCO (cf. Note AG24-4). One important challenge of ESCO is to avoid future terminological inconsistencies between ESCO and EQF. The ESCO Board therefore agreed last year to enrich the skills and competences pillar with learning outcomes terminology. Following up on this decision, two workshops to investigate practical implications were held in February 2014..

During the workshops participants developed ideas on how learning outcomes could be used within ESCO. Participants compared occupational profiles with learning outcomes descriptions of qualifications that were related to these occupations. Based on the feedback from the workshops, six main conclusions were formulate. (cf. Note AG24-4).

The EQF AG was asked to reflect on
• the outcomes of the workshops on learning outcomes in ESCO
• how the group could be involved in process of using learning outcomes terminology for ESCO.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BE-FL, FR, PL, NO, PES):

• The keyword approach and the level of granularity were considered to be the two primary challenges for integrating learning outcomes terminology into ESCO.
• There was disagreement between participants on some aspects raised in the workshop conclusions: The purpose of a clear distinction between ‘skills’ and ‘competences’ was questioned. With regard to the second conclusion and the differences in ‘jargon’, it was pointed out that the problems which result from using two different semantic approaches should not be solved by using them both.
• It was also pointed out that ESCO and the EQF are two processes operating at different speeds; this might exacerbate the challenges of cooperation.
• One participant questioned whether the EQF AG should be consulted on this issue (the use of LO in ESCO) at all. Others disagreed, emphasising that there were many reasons for the group to be involved in the development of ESCO.
  o COM also pointed out that the intention is to keep the EQF informed about and involved in this process, rather than asking the group for approval. The main decision-making body is after all the ESCO Board.
• The group requested that they be continuously informed about ESCO developments, and receive all relevant documentation (e.g. the documents distributed to the workshop participants).
  o Cedefop: The materials and documentation produced for the workshops are not confidential; they will be happy to share them with the group.

COM acknowledged that it is not easy for the EQF AG, with the number of meetings it has, to keep up with the tempo of ESCO developments. Nevertheless, ESCO is an important topic for this group. The question is how to make sure that the EQF AG is fully informed about current ESCO developments for it to be able to provide input. COM also announced that the EQF AG will be informed on the new mandate of the ESCO Board.

9. EXTERNAL DIMENSIONS OF THE EQF

Exchange of views on the National Qualifications Framework of Australia and possible relationship between the AQF and the EQF

Di Booker, Director of the AQF Council, presented the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) (cf. ppt).

The AQF was first introduced in 1995 to underpin the national system of qualifications in Australia, encompassing higher education, vocational education and training, and schools. The AQF has since been revised: the main objective of this revision was to develop consistency and make Australian qualifications more comprehensible.

The AQF is governed by the AQF Council, which is comprised of 12 members with expertise and experience in the following areas: higher education, vocational education and training, schools, employers, unions and government. The AQF does not have a regulatory role per se, but it sets the standards. The AQF does not include actual qualifications, but qualification types are allocated to the AQF levels. Some AQF levels
include more than one qualification type. The AQF is embedded not only in Australia’s education and training system but also into the labour market.

Importance of the AQF:

- ensuring that qualifications are recognised across Australia;
- ensuring consistency in outcomes for each qualification type;
- supporting national standards in education and training;
- ensuring that qualifications will enable learners to meet the standards expected by the labour market;
- communicating what Australian qualifications mean.

Structure of the AQF

The AQF is comprised of:

- 10 levels described in terms of learning outcomes;
- 14 qualification types described in terms of learning outcomes;
- qualification type specifications, including the rules for development, accreditation, and delivery. Qualifications must be designed to ensure that graduates achieve the learning outcomes specified for both level and qualification type by the completion of the qualification. Professionals must be involved in developing a qualification if it leads to a professional outcome.

The AQF taxonomy of learning outcomes distinguishes knowledge, skills, and application of knowledge and skills. ‘Application of knowledge and skills’ corresponds to the ‘competence’ category used in the EQF. Australia previously also used ‘competence’ but was forced to adopt another term, as employers and other stakeholders found the use of ‘competence’ too confusing (as the VET sector very much uses the term ‘competency’ in another context).

Australia has a great deal of experience in working with learning outcomes. The first generation of the AQF also used the learning outcomes approach, but this specific taxonomy was only introduced with the second generation of the AQF. Learning outcomes descriptions are not discipline-specific, they are generic. The discipline is applied at the stage of qualification development.

AQF Qualification Type Descriptors are tables which describe each qualification type according to the following five dimensions:

- Purpose
- Knowledge
- Skills
- Application of knowledge and skills
- Volume of learning:
The AQF does not use a credit-based structure; but it does indicate the volume of learning (this does not apply to the levels, but to the qualification types). This is only an indication of the typical volume of work the learner would need to undertake to achieve the qualification.
Australia concluded by emphasising that they had anticipated the opportunity to cooperate with the EQF for some time, and that they looked forward to commencing a partnership.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from EL, IE, NO, SE, Council of Europe):

- Participants expressed their support for establishing more formal links between the EQF and qualifications frameworks of other countries.
- Is the AQF used in the recognition process? If yes, how?
  - AUS: Australian NARIC relies very much on the AQF when assessing qualifications. The framework is only one component of the recognition process, but it is an important one.
- What is the relationship between the AQF and recognition of non-formal and informal learning?
  - AUS: Australia has a good understanding of recognition of prior learning. There is a policy that stipulates that institutions must recognise learning regardless of whether it is acquired formally, non-formally or informally, as long as it has been achieved. There is still room for improvement in higher education, although progress has been made here as well.
- Does Australia have a long or more recent tradition in the use of the learning outcomes approach?
  - AUS: Australia is very experienced in using learning outcomes. There was no level structure in the ‘first generation’ AQF but the descriptions were already based on learning outcomes, although they were not as well structured (i.e. not based on a taxonomy) as they are now.
- The presentation mentioned that the AQF is linked to the labour market. Does the AQF account for the possibility that education might also have a purpose besides employability?
  - AUS recognises that there are many reasons why people undertake learning, not just for employability. This is also taken into account in the AQF: the level descriptors, for instance, refer to both work and learning.
- Has the approach of allocating qualification types (rather than qualifications) led to any challenges?
  - AUS: People often have difficulty understanding how and why more than one qualification type can be allocated to the same level. It is important to explain that the two qualification types are not the same but that they both (only) fulfil the requirements of the same level. Also, just because a qualification is larger in size, this does not necessarily mean that it is more complex.
- In 2010 Irish and Australian authorities undertook an alignment exercise between their two frameworks, during which a number of similarities were identified between those two frameworks (e.g. in terms of levels, learning outcomes, quality assurance). This helped to develop a mutual understanding between the two qualifications systems. A report is available on this alignment exercise.

COM thanked Australia for their willingness to travel to Europe and present their qualifications framework to this group. COM explained that 21 countries had already referenced their National Qualifications Frameworks to the EQF, and that therefore the diversity in this endeavour must not be underestimated. COM also emphasised that this represents an experiment for the EQF Advisory Group. COM explained that the next step in the process of developing cooperation between the AQF and the EQF would be a more technical exchange between experts from the EQF Advisory Group and Australia, undertaken to perform an analysis of the potential benefits and risks of further
cooperation. Austria, France, and the UK had already signalled their interest in participating in these discussions and would take part in the first meeting.

If a common understanding can be reached between the two parties the results will be presented to the EQF AG. Following this, a discussion could be held on whether a technical alignment between the AQF and the EQF would be the desired outcome for both parties.

COM also emphasised that the current EQF Recommendation does not give the AG the mandate to undertake any formal cooperation with a third party country. Therefore, any such cooperation would ultimately require an amendment of the EQF Recommendation.

10. **STATE OF PLAY OF EQF IMPLEMENTATION IN SWEDEN**

Sweden presented the state of play of EQF implementation in their country (cf. ppt). Due to delays at national level, the information presented is still considered preliminary.

The Swedish Qualifications Framework (SEQF) is based on an eight-level structure where each level is described through knowledge, skills and competence. For the inclusion of qualifications into the SEQF, Sweden will follow a two-step procedure. In the first step, formal qualifications which fulfil certain requirements will be included. In the second step, qualifications will be included upon application. I.e. there will be the possibility to submit an application for qualification levels 1 to 7 to the Swedish Agency for Higher Vocational Education (which acts as EQF-NCP). Level 8 is reserved for higher education qualifications. Requirements for inclusion into the SEQF include the adoption of the learning outcomes approach and systematic quality assurance. An advisory board, consisting of 13 members, will assist the Agency in deciding on the appropriate SEQF level for a qualification.

These two steps will be based on different legislation. The Ordinance related to the first step is scheduled to come into force in October 2014; the second Ordinance is scheduled to come into force in January 2015.

Compared to earlier drafts presented, compulsory education, which used to be on SEQF level 3, is now on level 2.

The EQF referencing process has been conducted with broad stakeholder involvement, and included international experts from Germany and Denmark. Self-certification to the QF-EHEA was carried out in a separate process.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BE-FL, CZ, NO, Cedefop, Council of Europe, UEAPME):

- Sweden was asked to provide more information to the group on why compulsory education was moved to level 3. It would be interesting for other countries to know about the considerations and the process that led to this decision.
- Process of opening up the framework to ‘external’ qualifications: This is both a matter of resources and of monitoring. What kind of resources will be invested into this? Will training providers have to pay for this?
  - SE: The costs of including a qualification into the framework and the cost for engaging the advisory board will be borne by the Agency. Providers will not have to pay for this, as they will have to pay for own their arrangements anyway.
• The SEQF is obviously a transparency framework. Does Sweden have any ambitions beyond this, e.g. with regard to validation?
  
  o SE: There are possibilities for validation within the subsystems.

• What is the relationship to higher education? Will there be two separate frameworks (EQF, EHEA) or is Sweden moving towards one comprehensive framework?
  
  o They are two parallel frameworks, but the ESQF is considered more comprehensive. There are no plans to make a comprehensive framework. Only ESQF level 8 is reserved for higher education qualifications, levels 6 and 7 are open to applications for inclusion into the ESQF. Higher education qualifications will not require an application for inclusion, as they will be directly included by the government.

• For the presentation of their referencing report to the EQF AG, it was recommended that Sweden should provide more detailed information about the link to the QF-EHEA.
  
  o SE agreed and informed that even if there are two different processes, there is intense cooperation and dialogue between the two sides.

COM thanked Sweden for their clear and interesting presentation.

11. Developing a Communication Strategy for the EQF

Discussion on the proposal for the visual emblem of the EQF (cf. ppt)

COM presented several different proposals for the new visual emblem of the EQF, which should be used for promotional and branding purposes. The main objective was to create an emblem that is both simple and easily identifiable. The proposed emblem is in line with the visual identity policy of the Commission. This suggests that the European flag should be used as the visual element together with the name of the EQF in the emblem.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BE-FL, BG, DE, FR, LV, NO, Council of Europe):

• Several participants appreciated the proposal, in particular the use of the European flag, as they felt this would make the EQF easier to promote.

• Others, however, did not see the need for a new emblem and expressed their desire to continue using the existing one.
  
  o COM: The existing emblem is known only to a small circle of people. A great deal of communication and marketing effort would be required to promote it more broadly. The use of the European flag can help here.

• AG members commented that that the most relevant question is not which logo to use but whether to use one at all. Some countries may take the position that certificates are important national documents and should not bear any form of logo.

• Will it be possible to use a translated acronym for the EQF, given that in many countries it is not referred to as ‘EQF’ in the national language?

• Council of Europe pointed out that the Bologna process should be informed about the choice of emblem. Gaining an understanding of the views of non-EU countries on the use of the European flag is important.

• NO raised concerns about the use of the flag but also commented that they would first need to discuss the matter at national level.
COM acknowledged the national concerns about the use of the European flag but also pointed out that the use of an emblem which is both widespread and recognisable across Europe may contribute to strengthening the process of EQF implementation.

COM invited the group to consider the proposal and provide their feedback/comments by 30 April. COM reminded the AG to revisit the discussion notes on branding that were tabled to the AG in February 2013.

12. LEARNING OUTCOMES WORK PROGRAMME 2013-2014

Proposal for a peer learning activity on national approaches to linking master craftsman qualifications to national qualifications frameworks and referencing to the EQF (cf. Note AG24-5)

COM presented the proposal for this peer learning activity (PLA) on master craftsman qualifications to be held at the end of June or the first week of July 2014.

This PLA should address the following topics:

- the content, characteristics, role, and purpose of these master craftsman qualifications;
- how these qualifications are embedded into the national education and training system (e.g. part of formal education and training?; awarding body; types of stakeholders involved);
- the methodologies used to relate these qualifications to the NQFs;
- whether the referencing of these qualifications to different EQF levels is based on actual differences in learning outcomes.

Comments, questions and answers (reactions from BE-FL, DE, FR, HU, LV, UEAPME):

Reactions to this proposal were rather mixed.

- Several participants clearly welcomed the proposal for organising a PLA on master craftsman qualifications – both from countries offering this type of qualification and from countries that do not.
- Some participants welcomed the proposal for organising a PLA but were skeptical whether master craftsman qualifications would be the best choice of qualification for such a ‘comparison exercise’. It was highlighted that there would be other qualifications as well for which this would be an interesting exercise.
- The point was also made that it might be too early to start this type of comparison exercise. The group would first need to develop some sort of strategy before focusing on specific qualifications.
- The group also discussed that the reasons for level inconsistencies were not obvious – they could be based on different learning outcomes, different methods applied, different descriptors used or on a combination of these.
- HU suggested organising a peer learning activity on the methodologies used for linking qualifications to NQFs. This PLA could complement the PLA on the master craftsman qualifications. HU offered to prepare a written proposal for the suggested PLA.
COM pointed out that this PLA is an opportunity to learn from each other, to get a better understanding of this type of qualifications and how they differ from each other, rather than undertaking an elaborate consistency analysis. If the AG does not wish to work on the master craftsman qualifications, PLAs could also focus on another type of qualifications.

COM invited countries to signal their interest in participating in the PLA within one week; the PLA will be organised if there is interest for peer learning. COM invited countries to signal their interest in hosting this PLA.

**CONCLUSIONS AND AOB**

Upcoming dates:

- 5-6 June 2014, 25th meeting of the EQF Advisory Group, in Brussels
- 17 June 2014, European EASQ conference
- 1-2 October 2014, 26th meeting of the EQF Advisory Group
- 2-3 October 2014, peer learning activity on ‘writing and assessing learning outcomes: programme-based qualifications vs. VNIL’ (tbc)
- 2-3 December 2014, 27th meeting of the EQF Advisory Group
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