

EQF Referencing Process – Examples and Proposals

EQF-Ref Project

Sigrid Nindl

3s (project coordinator)

Malta

18th of February 2011



Agenda

__EQF-Ref project – Overview

__Structure of the EQF referencing reports – proposed by the EQF-Ref partnership

__Referencing NQFs to the EQF – Criteria and Procedures – some considerations from the EQF-Ref project



EQF-Ref – Project

Duration: 01.02.2009 – 30.04.2011

Context

Referencing levels of qualifications systems / NQF levels to the EQF

Aims

- __to facilitate communication, discussions and exchange of experiences between the partner countries (Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany and the Netherlands)
- __to enhance learning from each other and to develop “mutual trust” in referencing qualifications levels to the EQF.
- __to develop a proposal for the structure and content of the EQF referencing reports as well as further recommendations related to the EQF referencing process

Website

www.EQF-Ref.eu



EQF-Ref – Partnership

Coordinator: 3s Unternehmensberatung GmbH, AT

Partner

__NAVET, BG

__NUOV, CZ

__BIBB, DE

__MBO Raad, NL

__NBE, FI

Supporting partner

__Austrian Federal Ministry for Education, Arts and Culture, AT

__Ministry of Education and Science, BG

__Ministry of Science, Economic Affairs and Transport of Land
Schleswig-Holstein, DE

__Association of German Chambers of Industry and Commerce, DE

__Ministry of Education, FI

__Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, NL



EQF-Ref – Final seminar

“EQF referencing: process and reports – challenges
and open questions”

Peer Learning Seminar
organised by the EQF-Ref project
30.-31.3.2011
Sofia, BG

Contact:

Karin Luomi-Messerer
luomi-messerer@3s.co.at



Results & target groups of the project

Results

1. National Case Studies
2. Comparative / Evaluation report
3. Proposal for the structure of the "referencing report"

Target groups

Public authorities and stakeholders involved in these processes in the partner countries / policy makers on the EU level



Structure of the EQF referencing reports – proposed by the EQF-Ref partnership

- 1. Executive summary:** results of referencing
- 2. Description of the national qualifications system:** national system (including pathways, access to programmes etc.) and framework might need to be communicated together – but: stick to the information that is relevant for understanding the addressing/answering the 10 criteria
- 3. Background information:** process for preparing the report, quality assurance of the referencing process
- 4. Main part of the report: addressing the “10 criteria”**
- 5. Further information:** e.g. next steps regarding the NQF; challenges, plans for implementation; the expected impact of the EQF implementation
- 6. Annex:** e.g. examples of qualifications, statements from stakeholders/experts, legislation



Criterion 2

There is a clear and demonstrable link between the qualifications levels in the national qualifications framework or system and the level descriptors of the European Qualifications Framework.



Criterion 2

Number of levels in the NQF equals the number of levels in the EQF

Linking of levels already fixed ex-ante?

What does it actually mean:

__pragmatic approach (“for the sake of comparability”)?

__fits reality?

__countries are planning to change their national systems to a 8 level structure?

(Example FI: some levels might stay empty for the time being; one level might only include “old qualifications”)



Criterion 2

”Best fit” principle – evidence

- ___ Technical analysis: textual/linguistic comparison of descriptors
- ___ Social approach: how are qualifications regarded in a country – current practice in relation to implicit levels; stakeholder consensus/consultation; empirical research, analyses

How to conceptualize “best fit” and balance these different approaches in case of different outcomes – final decision?

Evidence/reason for decision has to be made explicit – transparency!



Criterion 4

The procedures for inclusion of qualifications in the national qualifications framework or system for describing the place of qualifications in the national qualification system are transparent.



Criterion 4

Methodology – Challenge

How did countries come to their decisions (technical analysis; social approach – consulting, research; testing)?

(How) are qualifications allocated that currently are only partly oriented towards learning outcomes (see also criterion 3)?

Are qualifications of the same types allocated to the same levels?

“Best fit” principle – common understanding?

Levels have to be understood as corridors and not as exact lines.

Qualifications might include learning outcomes from different levels – the “centre of gravity” has to be identified.

Different dimensions of learning outcomes may be emphasized in qualifications placed at the same level.



Criterion 4 – Evidence

Technical analysis:

- __ Difficult when qualifications are only partly described based on learning outcomes or when different categories are used.
- __ Differences between descriptions and reality?

Social approach – consulting, testing:

- __ Who should be involved?
- __ Role of experts from a certain domain/sector?
- __ Common understanding of national and/or international stakeholders?



Criterion 4 - Evidence

Social approach – empirical evidence/further indicators

Of particular relevance when LO descriptions are not available or the existing documents are not sufficient.

What kind of information is relevant and can be accepted?

Additional information:

- ___assessment/evaluation procedures;
- ___input-factors, such as duration/workload, admission requirements etc.;
- ___entitlements connected to this qualification (labour market or qualifications system);
- ___planned reforms (e.g. related to learning outcomes orientation, changes of training programmes/qualifications)



Arguments and evidence – open questions

To what extent will evidence actually be included in the referencing process that is up to a certain extent based on political decisions?

What kind of evidence is given when applying the “best fit” principle?

How and in what detail are the arguments presented?



Thank you very much for your attention!

Further information

EQF-Ref: www.EQF-Ref.eu

Contact:

Sigrid Nindl
nindl@3s.co.at

Karin Luomi-Messerer
luomi-messerer@3s.co.at

3s Wiedner Hauptstraße 18
1040 Vienna
Austria

