EQARF indicators, reviewing and agreeing definitions

Results of the work undertaken by the thematic group on Indicators

ENQA-VET

European Network for Quality Assurance
in Vocational Education and Training

Report drafted by Maria Emília Galvão

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD

The work undertaken in the context of the ENQA-VET work programme (2008-2009) which has been funded by the European Commission within the framework of the Lifelong Learning Programme, has had a two-fold character. At one level it has sought to produce policy-useful material to support Member States in developing the instruments and tools which will be important for the implementation of the EQARF Recommendation. At a second level, the intensive cooperation between countries in areas of shared policy concern, has contributed to a greater level of understanding of each others systems, mutual learning, and an increased culture of quality assurance in Member States.

This process has involved policymakers and VET providers as well as the social partners as key players in developing appropriate responses to policy implementation issues in regional and national contexts within the Member States.

The work of the thematic groups has provided an opportunity to mobilise policymakers and specialists in areas of key policy interest for improving the quality of VET, such as the common understanding of indicators, peer review the development of guidelines to support quality, and how to make VET more attractive. The outcomes of this work will play a significant role in supporting Member States in developing their national plans for the implementation of EQARF, as well as informing the policymaking process at Member State and European levels.

The results of the thematic groups will also be of particular interest to the European Commission as it addresses the issue of how to best support the successful implementation of EQARF in the coming years.

The reports of the thematic groups are not designed to be static however. They represent best thinking at a particular moment in time. They will now be used at a more general level, involving actors and countries who are at different stages of development, as they reflect on what effective implementation of the EQARF will mean in their context. This material will feed into this process and in turn support the development of the incremental policy learning which is a key part of the open method of coordination as applied to education and training.

Sean Feerick
Director
European Network for Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training (ENQA-VET)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of transforming Education and Training systems in the European Union, as a result of the general recognition that the principle of lifelong learning should underpin all education and training policies, has led to European initiatives to re-conceptualize and re-position the Vocational Education and Training(VET) in the educational landscape in Europe. This challenge called for a creative period of vision, leadership and ongoing dialogue of the European Ministers of Education, the European Social Partners and the European Commission who set up the **Copenhagen process** in 2002. Since then, a review of this process has been taking place every two years, whereby decisions are taken to enable sustainable cooperation among partners and to support the implementation of the strategy.

This overarching strategic objective is embodied in a significant number of tools, for example, in the *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of a European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and Training (EQARF)*, which is one of the stepping stones in the VET quality road and which has been one of the dimensions of the work-programme of the European Network for Quality Assurance in VET (ENQA-VET) for the period 2008-2009.

ENQA-VET set up Thematic Groups (TG) in mid-2008 to assist the Network in developing this work- programme. The Thematic Group on Indicators (TGI) is one of these groups and it was specifically mandated to focus on *Annex II (*A Reference set of selected quality indicators for assessing quality in VE*)* of the *Recommendation on EQARF* and arrive at **a) a clear understanding of concepts/ terms used in the indicators b) a shared/joint definition for each one of the ten indicators by July 2009**.

Taking this mandate and its related objectives as well as the preconditions (e.g. time-frame, number of meetings) as defined by ENQA-VET, the TGI started its work in late June 2008 and finalized it in June 2009. The development of the work revolved around a central axis, i.e. the set of ten indicators, and the methodology adopted was based on a spiral approach to be performed around two main pillars, i.e. a) plenary and subgroup work in the four allocated meetings and b) internet -based cooperative work between meetings.

In reporting on this Thematic Group, it is significant to see how it progressed in defining the set of ten indicators. Firstly, by organizing themselves into three working Subgroups and keeping an on- going cooperation at a distance between meetings, the TGI explored new avenues and improved their definitions which were reported and

updated in the sequence of four meetings that were held in Prague and were generously hosted by the Czech authorities. Finally, definitions were revisited and validated by the members of the TGI in the final meeting in July 2009.

As a final note it should be said that the aim of this report is twofold, i.e. a) to map the journey that the TGI made to achieve the objectives that were set in the ENQA-VET's Mandate, namely by presenting the core of the TGI's work in point 3.3 (**Indicators' definitions**) of this Report and b) to contribute to the incremental work on indicators and benchmarks that is being developed within the implementation of the *Education and Training 2010* work programme, particularly the ongoing work by the Standing Groups on Indicators and Benchmarks (SGIB).

1. POLICY CONTEXT: from Copenhagen to Helsinki

Globalization is a multi-dimensional and complex phenomenon which has brought competition and, more recently, the related issue of regulation to the international arena. In the European Union (EU), competition is generally seen as the key factor that defines Europe's role in a globalized open market where ever-evolving technologies, increasing internationalisation and demographic changes are taking place at a very fast pace. In seeking to adapt to these imperatives, the EU and the Member States (MS) have been taking initiatives to relate education and training policy more closely to the social and economic objectives of the global knowledge society and economy.

A significant shift in the policy goals of the EU took place when the Heads of State and Government gathered in Lisbon for the European Council in March 2000, acknowledging these challenges and emphasising the need to work together in order to take steps towards a common goal: the EU would become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion by 2010 (the so called Lisbon Strategy).[1]

The European Council further stated that, in order to achieve this ambitious goal, the European economy, social welfare and education and training systems needed to be modernized and a new working method -the Open Method of Coordination (OMC)-would be put in place. These reforms should be driven forward by deepening the political cooperation at European level, and Ministers of Education were invited to reflect on the concrete future objectives of education systems and to present a broader report in the spring 2001. This mandate was further reinforced when the European Council in Barcelona (2002) set the goal of making Europe's education and training systems a world quality reference by 2010.

As a result of this mandate, the work progarmme *Education and Training 2010* (*E&T2010*) was adopted in February 2002. This policy framework addresses the complex issues involved in the transition to a successful 21st century knowledge- based society and calls for a systemic and holistic approach to education and training policy by bringing it to the forefront of the EU policy arena focusing on the issues of quality improvement, broadening access and opening up of European education and training systems. In addition, MS agreed to monitor its progress through the OMC by using

---

[1] http://www.ena.lu/conclusions_lisbon_extraordinary_european_council_2324_march_2000-020007798.html

indicators and benchmarks to support evidence-based policy making and, to that end a) *National* and *Joint reports* have been prepared biannually by the Council and the Commission and b) *Reports on Indicators and Benchmarks* have been prepared by the Commission, assisted by the Standing Group on Benchmarks and Indicators (SGBI).

Vocational Education and Training (VET) has been judged to be one of the key players in this process and was assigned a pivotal role in the Lisbon strategy by Education Ministers, Social Partners and the European Commission in Copenhagen in 2002. On that occasion they endorsed the Copenhagen Declaration which constituted the founding stone of the Copenhagen process - a strategy which aims to promote mutual trust in training provision, transparency and recognition of competences and qualifications at European level thereby establishing a basis for increasing mobility of workers and trainees across Europe. In highlighting the improvement of the performance, quality and attractiveness of VET as a priority topic for the European cooperation, the Copenhagen Declaration has set the direction for the implementation of the process and has been reviewing it every two years since then. The first review took place in Maastricht in December 2004 and it linked the Copenhagen Process more firmly with the E&T2010 work programme and national priorities were also introduced. In their second review (2006) in Helsinki, Ministers of Education, Social Partners and the Commission issued the Helsinki Communiqué which stated the need to improve the attractiveness and quality of VET, further develop common European tools and strengthen mutual learning, particularly "(…) by using the European Network of Quality Assurance for VET (ENQA-VET) to support the creation of a common understanding on quality assurance and to foster mutual trust."[2].

It is in this context that one needs to see the mission of ENQA-VET[3].

> **To develop, disseminate and promote best European practice and governance in the field of Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training at systems and provider level.**

These goals would be achieved by a number of strategies, particularly by involving relevant stakeholders in developing and promoting common instruments and

---

[2] http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/helsinkicom_en.pdf
[3] http://www.enqavet.eu/mission.html

indicators. In 2008 three Thematic Groups (TG) were set up to contribute to this mission and were given tasks to be developed in accordance with a specific mandate. One of the TG was given the task to focus on the set of ten indicators as they were proposed in *Annex II (A reference set of quality indicators for assessing quality in VET)* of the *Recommendation of the European Parliament and the Council on the establishment of a European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and training (EQARF).*[4]

---

[4] http://ec.europa.eu/prelex/detail_dossier_real.cfm?CL=en&DosId=196900

2. THEMATIC GROUP ON INDICATORS: rationale, methodology and process

Rationale

Quality assurance underpins every policy initiative in Vocational Education and Training and, consequently, reference instruments are of the greatest importance to help authorities in the Member States to promote and monitor the improvement of their VET systems in achieving the Lisbon goals and, notably, the Copenhagen objectives. A number of instruments have been developed to support national reforms and to enhance the transparency, recognition and quality in the provision of competences and qualifications. In 2008, the Commission put forward the proposal for the above mentioned Recommendation on EQARF which was adopted in May 2009. ENQA VET plays a vital role in assisting the Commission in the field of VET, particularly by setting out the expectations of European quality systems in VET, adding value to the development of quality assurance in VET through European cooperation, strengthening its role as a key player in the area of QA and promoting the development of synergies and avoiding duplication of work across Europe. A significant piece of this work are the tasks leading to the implementation of this Recommendation, which accounts for the selection of the following mandate for the TGI:

Advice to the Commission: A shorter term reflection on the feasibility of the indicators proposed in the Commission proposal for a recommendation on the establishment of a common quality assurance reference framework. This reflection would help an internal Task force to assist the network in advising the Commission in the co-decision process with the Council and the Parliament.

Development of the Indicators set: A longer term reflection on the use of indicators to measure progress in quality assurance of VET and in particular an examination of the feasibility of the longer standing VET related indicators developed by the Standing Group in Indicators and Benchmarks (SGIB). It is envisaged that this reflection should feed into the more broadly-based reflection within the context of the Copenhagen follow-up and the ongoing work of the SGIB.

This mandate was conducive to the following specific objective for the short- term period (June 2008- June 2009):

> **The Thematic Group on Indicators will arrive at**
>
> **a) a clear understanding of concepts/ terms used in the ten indicators**
>
> **b) a shared/joint definition for each one of the ten indicators by July 2009.**

The TGI' s work aimed, therefore, to identify what constitutes the quality journey in the VET sector and how indicators can contribute to monitor quality. It was agreed that the ten proposed indicators needed to be interpreted and carefully defined in line with the principle that indicators provide an indication of the performance of the VET sector, both at providers' and systems' level, and not a description of its entirety. Moreover, in view of the experience gained in developing indicators internationally, the TGI was invited to make the best use of literature published on indicators. in particular participants were advised to take good account of available manuals, e.g. UOE, CEDEFOP, OECD. In other words, while exchanging views on the assigned indicators, the participants were expected to make the best use of the existing experiences in their respective countries and to uncover meanings either by offering their interpretation in light of national policies or by referring to existing international definitions. Consensus-building was, consequently, the key principle in achieving agreement on

a) the work methodology: organization and specific objectives for each subgroup; time frame for subgroups' and individual members' contributions;

b) the interpretation of concepts and terms: transversal elements and indicators' specific elements;

c) the definitions for each one of the ten indicators.

Methodology

The methodology adopted in the Thematic Group on Indicators was framed by the following ENQA VET specifications:

Each group has a specific purpose consistent with ENQA-VET's Work Programme and meets up to twice a year. (…) Each of the 4 Thematic Groups involves a

minimum of 10 countries and the work is supported by an external expert in addition to regular input by the Coordinator and the ENQA-VET Board.[5]

Hence, the methodology adopted was based on a spiral approach to be performed around two main pillars, i.e. a) plenary and subgroup work in the four allocated meetings and b) internet-based cooperative work between meetings. Subgroups' reports on the work developed at a distance were due for presentation and discussion in the meetings where decisions were taken on how to proceed with the follow-up work at a distance. The link with the ENQA-VET Board has been assured:

- ✓ through the regular presence of the Board Vice-Chairperson and the ENQA-VET Director at the group meetings;

- ✓ through Thematic Group chairs and experts meetings with the ENQA-VET Board Chair, Vice- Chair and Director.

Process: a bottom up approach towards the indicators' definitions

In charting the course of this Thematic Group, it is significant to see how it progressed in defining the set of ten indicators:

a) by cooperating at a distance, the TGI explored new avenues and improved their definitions;
b) by preparing their reports, the Subgroups were telling why and how they were operationally defining the set of ten indicators;
c) by revising their definitions in the meetings, Subgroups were taking into account dimensions that were perceived as being worth exploring.

The Thematic Group on Indicators met four times in Prague in the course of 2008/2009: the first meeting took place in July 2008, the second meeting was held in November 2008, the third meeting was convened for March 2009 and the last meeting took place in June 2009. Communication at a distance between the members of the TGI, the Secretariat and the expert was an important dimension of the process which ensured cohesion of the group and coherence in achieving the results for the tasks at hand. This model of shared ownership accounts for the time the energy and commitment that the TGI' s participants invested in the task at hand throughout the allocated period of time (July2008-July2009).

---

[5] http://www.enqavet.eu/thematic-groups.html

The above-mentioned dates for the meetings were the reference points in setting up the four phases of the process:

Phase I (June–November 2008): uncovering meanings

The members of the TGI met for the first in Prague in July 2008 and on that occasion three subgroups were formed, a moderator was elected for each one of the subgroups and their assignments were laid:

Subgroup 1 Austria (AU), Italy (IT), Hungary (HU), Sweden (SW) and Portugal (PT) were assigned to work on priority indicators 1 & 5.

Moderator: Austria

Subgroup 2: CEDEFOP, Finland (FI), Ireland (IE), Lithuania (LT) and Norway (NO) were assigned to work on priority indicators 3, 4 & 7.

Moderator: CEDEFOP

Subgroup 3: the Czech Republic (CZ), Romania (RO), Spain (ES) and United Kingdom (UK) were assigned to work on priority indicators 9 & 10.

Moderator: Romania.

Subgroups were asked to exchange ideas on their assigned priority indicators by using internet facilities between the first meeting (July 2008) and the second meeting (November 2008) in order to produce a report of progress. In the period between July and November 2008 some changes took place in the composition of the Subgroups: Sweden dropped out of the TGI; Malta (MT) joined Subgroup 3 in their work at a distance (but did not participate meetings); replacements took place in the representation of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Portugal; Ireland representative replaced CEDEFOP representative as a Moderator for Subgroup 2.

Phase II (November 2008-March 2009): paving the way towards consensus

Reports prepared by the Subgroups' moderators were based on the contributions provided through the exchange of ideas between June and November. These reports constituted a good basis to furthering the discussions in plenary and working group sessions during the second meeting in November.

13

Taking into account the experience gained through the first phase, a comprehensive timetable was organized to frame the follow up work to be developed by Subgroups between November and March. Reports delivered in the 3rd meeting by the Subgroups' moderators gave updated definitions of the indicators, added key points on each indicator and offered supplementary information, i.e. the rationale used in defining each one of the indicators, relevant contextual issues and personal remarks by Subgroups' members.

In addition to the work on indicators assigned in June 2008, it was agreed that Subgroup 1 would also work on indicator 6, while Subgroup 3 would take indicators 2 and 8.

Phase III (March-June 2009): refining the indicators' definitions

To move forward in the consensus building process on the definitions of the ten indicators, and in order to prepare for the last meeting of the TGI in June 2009, it seemed appropriate to adopt a different work methodology. From March onwards it was decided to move from a Subgroup perspective to a TGI perspective, i.e. members of the TGI were invited to share their ideas and suggestions with members of the TGI as a whole. This way, the TGI members were able to cross reference the information provided by each individual member.

Members of the TGI were invited to continue commenting on the updated definitions, bearing in mind that the objective for the Group, from March to June, was to polish up the definitions and, in order to do it, it was recommended that whatever comments members of the TGI wished to make, they should upload them in the ENQA VET website and/ or copy them to all members of the TGI.

In preparation for the last meeting in Prague, where the final discussion on the definitions took place, two documents were prepared: a pre-final version of the indicators' definitions and a draft glossary of terms, which TGI' s participants agreed should be based on the CEDEFOP publication *Terminology of European education and training policy: a selection of 100 key terms (2008).*

Phase IV (June -July 2009): delivering results

In the "*Conclusions on a coherent framework of 16 (sixteen) indicators for monitoring progress towards the Lisbon objectives in the Education and Training 2010"*

(2007), as stated by Badescu (2008)[6], there was no direct reference to indicators to measure progress in the VET sector even though some of the adopted indicators do indirectly relate to VET, e.g. participation of adults, early school leavers. That is why the EQARF is of the greatest importance in profiling VET and indicating the direction in which VET is moving towards the Lisbon objectives.

In responding to its mandate, the TGI was fully aware of the significance of the indicators' definitions and of their contribution to the improvement of quality in VET both at MS and European level. Obtaining agreement on the definitions for the set of indicators, as achieved by the TGI, was thus a crucial step forward in providing support to Member States for the implementation of the Recommendation on EQARF as from May 2009: these definitions offer a common language across countries and sectors and allow for different stakeholders to negotiate processes and outcomes.

---

[6] Badescu, M. (2008) *Improving the scope of indicators for monitoring developments in vocational education and training in Europe,* JCR Scientific and Technical reports, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

3. INDICATORS' DEFINITIONS

3.1 Not an end, but a beginning…

3.1.1 General comments

The information to be produced by the set of ten indicators in the EQARF will be of great relevance for the interested parties (both at system and providers level) to comprehend the current state of VET in the different countries at national, regional and local level) and to report on it to relevant stakeholders. However, an indicator is not a piece of basic information to meet administrative needs nor is it intended for a statistical yearbook. Rather, it is a set of information that has been elaborated and which needs to be refined to suit the context.

Establishing a reasonably robust time- based performance measurement and a reporting system against those definitions will be quite a significant achievement and that is not a task without difficulties, given the variety of data sources and the fact that data gathered are not always aggregated to a systemic level as it is referred in the CEDEFOP publication (page 10)[7].

Unfortunately, there is not a single data source that supplies exhaustive VET data, therefore several sources have to be used. In several instances, the methodologies are not fully harmonised[8].

This problem is meant to be addressed by developing "a concept for a harmonised modular system of statistics and indicators on VET" (p. 15) which may constitute an important stone in paving the avenue towards the improvement of the availability and quality of statistics and indicators on VET. As it is well known, in the last decade considerable effort has been devoted to identifying the most appropriate way to organize data in the international indicator development process but the fact remains that statistics on VET are generally either not available or, if they are available, they are not comparable.

In implementing the *Recommendation EQARF* tensions may be distilled in the process, e. g. the voluntary nature of this document, the definition of quality by the different stakeholders, the role of authorities and providers in assuring quality in VET, the relationship between VET and other sectors of Education and Training, particularly Higher Education.

---

[7] *Evaluation of Eurostat education, training and skills data source*,(2008) Cedefop Panorama series, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities,
[8] http://www.trainingvillage.gr/etv/Upload/Information_resources/Bookshop/510/5185_en.pdf

To discuss quality assurance in VET is particularly relevant for all stakeholders involved at a time when reporting systems are required to evolve in ways which allow individuals to acquire skills and competences beyond formal qualifications. This discussion may bring to the debate the ever-present tension between quantity and quality, for example when reporting on the quantity of individuals having met VET requirements *vs.* reporting on the quality of the respective system.

In any event, the application of the *Recommendation on the EQARF*, in particular the set of ten indicators, will be instrumental for MS systems and providers at national, regional and local level. Stakeholders, however, should be cautioned against collecting data simply because the data are available to be collected. Instead, the indicators should be used to describe organizational performance, direction and accomplishments, to answer to specific policy questions, and mostly to improve VET quality.

In the TGI' s view this product should not be seen as the end of an exercise but rather as a platform for a wide range of beginnings: these definitions will be given life by being shared, debated, and implemented in the context of the diverse organizational realities across Europe. It should be borne in mind, though, that performance measurement systems take time: time to design, time to implement, time to perfect and thus they must be approached as an iterative process in which continuous improvement is a critical and constant objective.

3.1.2 The state- of –the- art in European countries: a bird's eye view

CEDEFOP and some of the countries represented in the TGI generously offered elements about the present or foreseen use of the *EQARF* indicators in their respective countries. A brief overview is presented below following an alphabetical order of the countries that have contributed. It is a bird's eye view of the state- of –the- art in some of the European countries concerning the indicators' use and should, therefore, be read as a showcase rather than any kind of reporting exercise by the Member States representatives.

Indicator nº 1. Denmark and Finland have no plans to adopt it as a regular indicator; Italy regularly applies indicator 1b, while uses 1a under some identified constraints, e.g. data on the application of QA systems is episodic; in Lithuania, it is not used yet but there are plans to adopt it; it is not used in Norway; Malta collects data systematically; in Portugal it is partially used, even if under specific constraints (e.g. multiple sources); it is partially used (in IVET) in Romania.

Indicator nº 2. In Denmark, it is partially used, i.e. data is collected about participation in further training but there are no plans to collect data on financial resources used; in Finland 2a)t is considered unnecessary; Italy it is not used at national level but data is collected locally; in Malta, it is used, even if data is not collected systematically; Norway uses it in public funded further training; Lithuania collects data annually; in Portugal data is collected from different sources in relation with public funding; in Romania, it is partially used, e.g. for accredited teacher training programmes in general, not specifically for VET.

Indicator nº 3. It is used in Denmark: data is collected at national level; it is used in Finland; in Italy, data is systematically collected for IVET and also, with some difficulties, for CVET; in Lithuania data is collected annually; in Malta, data is systematically collected; in Norway, data is systematically collected for IVET and unsystematically for CVET; in Portugal it is partially used, data systematically collected in IVET and difficult to collect in CVET; in Romania it is used, covering full data collection for IVET and partial data collection for CVET.

Indicator nº 4. Data is collected at national level in Denmark; it is used in Finland; in Italy, data is collected systematically for IVET but no data is available for CVET; in Lithuania, data is collected annually at national level; in Malta, data is systematically collected; it is used in Norway, where data is systematically collected for IVET and unsystematically collected for CVET; in Portugal, it is partially used: data is systematically collected for IVET but only partially for CVET, i.e. state funded programmes; inn Romania, data is collected for IVET and partially collected for CVET in programmes financed by Unemployment Fund(UF).

Indicator nº 5. In Demark it is partially used: data is systematically collected for 5b) but 5a) is not used and there are no plans to adopt it; it is partially used in Finland; it is used in Italy, particularly VET funded by the European Social Fund; it is not used in Lithuania; it is used in Malta and data is systematically collected; in Norway it is not used but there are plans to adopt it; it is not systematically used in Portugal; it is partially used in Romania, where data for IVET is due to start in 2009 while for CVET it is applied in UF programmes.

Indicator nº 6. It is not used in Denmark, even if statistics are available, and there are no plans to adopt it; Finland does not use it and there are no plans to adopt it; it is used in Italy through regular surveys, particularly for 6a) and unsystematic

surveys for 6b); it is not used in Lithuania ; it is used in Malta; it is not yet used in Norway but there are plans to adopt it; it is not used in Portugal; in Romania , it is partially used (IVET starting in 2009) but not used for CVET.

Indicator nº 7. Indicator is used in all countries and data is collected by National Statistics Offices.

Indicator nº 8. Data is collected in Denmark; in Finland it is not used and there are no plans to adopt it; in Italy, it is not systematically used; in Lithuania data is collected annually; in Malta data is systematically collected; in Norway, the use is unclear for the moment; it is not used in Portugal; partially used in Romania where there are different definitions for vulnerable groups according to type of VET.

Indicator nº 9. Analysis results are collected annually in Denmark; in Finland education provision is planned based on anticipation of skills needs; in Italy workforce needs are annually investigated by the Chambers union; in Lithuania it is used but data is collected unsystematically; in Malta training needs analysis are conducted at local and national level; in Norway it lies with the vocational training councils; it is partially used in Portugal within the Qualification Sector Council; it is partially used in Romania: a development planning mechanism for IVET was set up in 2000.

Indicator nº 10. It is not used in Italy as such; in Norway it is not used and there are no plans to adopt it; Malta indicates materials used in fairs and exhibitions; in Portugal data is collected on the initiative *Novas Oportunidades* (*New Opportunities).*

3.2 Revisiting the indicators' debate: the role of indicators in the quality cycle

The quality of VET is a longstanding concern among stakeholders, which explains and the emerging interest in the development of more and systematic means of monitoring the performance of VET systems. Even though the quality movement, as we know it today, has been developing since the 1980s, and regardless of the factors that are driving reforms, a systemic approach to quality is crucial to underpin the quality assurance of the VET systems. In fact, if VET systems are to address broad societal needs more adequately, it will be essential that they meet today's challenges of striving towards quality and of encompassing all dimensions of VET. In short, it will be the

implementation of quality systems which will determine the nature of the emerging lifelong learner.

The set of ten indicators in Annex II of the *Recommendation on the EQARF* are an organic part of this comprehensive framework and, as such, they address quality systemically under the following types of umbrella indicators: context/input indicators (nº1 and 9), input/process indicator (nº 2), input/process/output indicator (nº 3); process/output/outcome indicator (nº 4); outcome indicators (nº 5 and 6); context indicators (nº 7 and 8); context/input indicator(nº 9); process indicator (nº10).

In the available literature, some issues should be pro-actively considered by stakeholders when implementing a system of indicators among which the following are to be highlighted:

Indicator's value

Indicators are value neutral until they are interpreted against their context, that is to say, value judgements as such are external to measurement and are seen as being assigned during interpretation rather than during collection. In an ERIC/CUE digest on accountability mechanisms one can read "The greatest danger of indicators is the ease with which they can give false impressions because they are misunderstood or interpreted in invalid ways"[9]. That might be the case, for example, if stakeholders improve one indicator value at the expense of another and in the process push a system in one place, thus causing it to expand in another place (the balloon effect).

Data burden

At least two dimensions are generally identified in data burden, i.e.

    a) attitudinal: data providers cannot see any value in collecting and reporting on required data

    b) financial: if data demand significant financial or human resources and are not appropriate as inputs.

Making tradeoffs

In an ideal world indicators are thought out to be timely, reliable, useful and valid but that is an assumption which real life contradicts in a number of ways. In fact, what is useful for one stakeholder is not useful for another or different stakeholders may have differing definitions of what is burdensome or not. Under real life constraints, one needs to be prepared to make tradeoffs between quality, burden and the time available without compromising the indicator's feasibility.

Unintended outcomes

---

[9] Accountability Mechanisms in Big City School systems(ERIC/CUE Digest Nº 71)
http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-9220/big.htm

Indicators are not simply numbers and when, in response to the interpretation of the indicator values, policies are changed, unintended consequences may arise and have a backlash effect on the system. Policy makers are expected to think about the effects of indicators use and policy making.

Frequency of data collection

Data collection may vary according to the specific reporting system, particularly as far as CVET is concerned. In general, the best case is to collect data annually.

3.3 Indicator's definitions

Indicator n°1

Relevance of quality assurance systems for VET providers:

a) Share of providers applying internal quality assurance systems defined by law/at own initiative;

b) Share of accredited VET providers

Definition

Relevance of quality assurance systems for VET providers:

a) Percentage of VET providers showing evidence of applying the EQARF principles within a defined quality assurance system, where the number of registered VET providers =100%;

b) Percentage of VET providers who are accredited, where the number of registered VET providers = 100%.

Requirements

Relevance of quality assurance (QA) systems for VET providers:

Relevance of QA= QA systems that follow the EQARF principles

a) Universe of registered VET providers: VET providers formally registered by Ministry (e.g. Education, Economy, Labour), Chambers, relevant authorities (e.g. regional authorities).

b) Accredited VET providers:

- VET providers under the regulation of educational laws, e.g. schools, colleges;
- VET providers in the field of education/training market who are accredited by a public notified body.

Recommendation

VET providers to demonstrate they apply quality assurance principles as defined by EQARF or similar instruments (e.g ISO, EFQM or other quality models).

Indicator nº 2

Investment in training of teachers and trainers:

a) Share of teachers and trainers participating in further training;

b) Amount of funds invested.

Definition

Investment in training of teachers and trainers:

a) Percentage of teachers and trainers participating at accredited in-service training programmes, from the total number of registered teachers and trainers;

b) Total amount of funds annually invested per teacher and trainer in teachers' and trainers' further education and training.

Proposed Supplementary Indicator: Percentage of total education expenditure.

Requirements

a) Share of teachers and trainers participating in further training:

Universe of teachers and trainers: registered teachers and trainers participating at any formally recognized in-service training programme, which may include the recognition of non- formal learning;

Type of programme: programmes which allow accumulation of a minimum number of credits or hours accepted at national, regional or local level will be taken into account;

Scope: national, regional or sector levels, IVET and CVET, public and private, excluding informal but integrate non formal VET – recognition of prior experience;

Coverage: registered, accredited or certified teachers and trainers (for in-service programmes).

b) Amount of funds invested:

Scope: national, regional, or sector levels, IVET and CVET, public and private, excluding informal but integrate non formal VET, recognition of prior experience;

Coverage: formally recognized in-service training programmes, i.e. accredited or certified programmes that may include the recognition of non-formal learning;

Amount of investment: Annual total expenditure per number of teachers and trainers trained.

Recommendation: Impact analysis of teachers' and trainers' participation in-service programmes on the quality of the teaching and learning process.

> ## Indicator nº 3
>
> **Participation rate in VET programmes:**
>
> **Number of participants in VET programmes (1), according to the type of programme and the individual criteria (2)**
>
> **(1)** For IVT: a period of 6 weeks of training is needed before a learner is counted as a participant For LLL (Lifelong learning): percentage of population admitted to formal VET programmes.
> **(2)** Besides basic information on gender and age, other social criteria might be applied, e.g. early school leavers, highest educational achievement, migrant, handicapped persons, length of unemployment, etc.

Definition

Participation rate in VET programmes:

a) Percentage of annual cohort completing lower secondary school/compulsory education participating in IVET programmes at upper secondary level (which lead to a formal qualification);

b) Percentage of active population (15-74 years old) entering CVET programmes (which lead to recognition).

Proposed supplementary indicators

In view of the variety of VET systems, the following indicators are recommended:

a2) Percentage of entries to IVET not coming directly from compulsory or lower secondary education;

a3) Percentage of annual cohort completing upper secondary school, entering VET programmes at post-secondary or tertiary level (which lead to a formal qualification).

Requirements

Participation rate in VET programmes:

Type of VET programmes: IVET programmes which lead to a qualification and CVET programmes which lead to recognition;

Population in CVET: active/working population (15-74years old);

Participation: total participation, not merely those who receive a qualification;

Social criteria: need to consider i) previous working experience ii) vulnerable groups.

Need to consider different interpretations used by, and different VET systems across Member States, to provide a context.

Indicator nº 4

Completion rate in VET programmes:

Number of successfully completed/abandoned VET programmes, according to the type of programme and the individual criteria.

Definition

Completion rate in VET programmes:

a) Percentage of those completing (i.e. attaining a formal qualification) IVET programme(s) (which lead to a formal qualification), compared to those entering IVET programme(s);

b) Percentage of those completing (i.e. attaining a formal qualification) CVET programme(s) (which lead to recognition), compared to those entering CVET programme(s).

Proposed supplementary indicator

VET Qualification compared to population:

Percentage of those having completed VET programmes (i.e. attained a formal qualification or recognition) compared to active population (15 to 74 years old).

Requirements

Completion rate in VET programmes:

a) Type of VET programmes: VET programmes which lead to a qualification or recognition.

b) Programme completion: those who receive either a qualification (IVET) or recognition (CVET).

Need to consider

- different interpretations used by and different VET systems across Member States, to provide a context;
- supplementary indicator, due to data collection difficulties with the proposed indicator;
- time lag between indicators 3 and 4.
- Vulnerable groups.

Recommendation: Consider the learning activities that are possible to position within the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ).

Indicator nº 5

Placement rate in VET programmes:

a) Destination of VET learners at designated point in time after completion of training, according to the type of programme and the individual criteria (1);

b) Share of employed learners at designated point in time after completion of training, according to the type of programme and the individual criteria.

(1) For IVT: including information on the destination of dropouts.

Definition

Placement rate in VET programmes:

a) Proportion of VET programme completers who are placed either in the labour market, further education or training (including university) or other destination within 12-36 months after the end of programme;

b) Percentage of VET programme completers who are employed one year after the end of training.

Requirements

Placement rate in VET programmes

Destination: labour market, further education and training (including university) and other destinations.

Designated point: 12 - 36 months;

Data collection should contain:

- the position in the labour market: employed –searching employment- not searching employment;
- basic job features: Full time –part time; Permanent – temporary; Dependent-independent;
- the position in the educational and training system: Attending – not attending formal education and training activities.
- vulnerable groups.

Recommendation

Indicator to be exclusively used in IVET.

Indicator nº 6

Utilisation of acquired skills at the workplace:

a) Information on occupation obtained by individuals after completion of training, according to type of training and individual criteria;

b) Satisfaction rate of individuals and employers with acquired skills/competences.

Definition

Utilisation of acquired skills at the workplace:

a) Percentage of VET programme completers working in relevant occupations;

b1) Percentage of employees of a given sector who, within a period of 12-36 months from completing the VET programme, find that their training is relevant for their current occupation**;**

b2) Percentage of employers of a given sector who are satisfied to find VET programme completers with relevant qualifications and competences required for the work place;

b3) Percentage of employers of a given sector who are satisfied with programme completers.

Requirements

Utilisation of acquired skills at the workplace:

Programme coverage: formal programmes, schemes for the recognition of prior learning, particular awards;

Relevance of programme and occupation: can be investigated by checking whether the qualification is adequate to perform that occupation;

Need to consider vulnerable groups.

Recommendation

Indicators b1), b2), b3) should be assessed by a survey on a given sector within a representative sample.

Indicator nº 7

Unemployment rate (3) according to individual criteria

(3) Definition according to ILO and OECD: individuals 15-74 without work, actively seeking employment and ready to start work.

Definition

Unemployment rate: the number of people unemployed as a percentage of the labour force. The labour force is the total number of people employed plus unemployed.

Requirements

Need to consider vulnerable groups.

Indicator nº 8

Prevalence of vulnerable groups:

a) Percentage of participants in VET classified as disadvantaged groups (in a defined region or catchment area) according to age and gender;

b) Success rate of disadvantaged groups according to age and gender.

Definition

Prevalence of vulnerable groups:

a) Percentage of participants and of programme completers from disadvantaged groups, defined at European and national level, from the total number of participants and VET programme completers;

b) Percentage of programme completers, from disadvantaged groups defined at European and national level, compared to the number of those entering.

Requirements

Prevalence of vulnerable groups:

Scope: national level, IVET and CVET, excluding informal but integrating non -formal VET;

Coverage: disadvantaged groups as defined at European and national level, including gender and age disadvantaged groups.

Need to correlate with indicators nº 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Possible link with indicator nº 10.

Indicator nº 9

Mechanisms to identify training needs in the labour market:

a) Information on mechanisms set up to identify changing demands at different levels;

b) Evidence of their effectiveness

Definition

Mechanisms to identify training needs in the labour market:

a) Type of mechanisms used to update the VET offer to the future labour market needs;

b) Information on mechanisms used to provide stakeholders with the most recent information on the future needs of the labour market.

Requirements

Mechanisms to identify training needs in the labour market:

a) Type of mechanism (e.g. methods, procedures, processes) set up to identify changing demands at different levels: Planning, implementing, evaluating and informed decision making in order to update the VET offer to the future labour market needs.

Scope: national level, IVET and CVET, excluding informal but integrate non -formal VET;

Recognizing the future needs: the existence of forecasts on short, medium and long term.

b) Evidence of their effectiveness: in order to measure effectiveness, this indicator/descriptor refers not only to the mechanisms themselves (how they are planned and implemented) but also to the capacity of the VET system to respond (by evaluating them and by deciding further action) to the labour market.

Suitability of training offer for the future needs identified in the forecasts, for specific occupations;

Flexibility: how fast can education change a qualification content (standards, competencies, curriculum);

Need to correlate with indicators 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (as a "proxy"), but with a time lag in order to measure the effects.

Recommendation

Provide evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the used mechanisms.

Indicator nº 10

Schemes used to promote better access to VET:

a) Information on existing schemes at different levels;

b) Evidence of their effectiveness.

Definition

Schemes used to promote better access to VET:

a) Type of schemes used to improve access to VET

b) Information demonstrating the capacity of the VET system to increase access to VET.

Requirements

Schemes used to promote better access to VET:

a) Type of scheme (e.g**.** plans, policies, programmes): planning, implementing, evaluating and informed decision making put in place in order to promote, better access to VET, especially for disadvantaged groups.

Scope: policies, processes, procedures; medium or long term interventions; national and European levels, IVET and CVET, excluding informal but integrate non formal VET;

Coverage: disadvantaged groups – as defined at European and national level;

Suitability of training for the demands for actual and future needs of specific disadvantaged groups and individuals;

Flexibility: how fast education can respond to group and individual specific needs.

b) Evidence of their effectiveness: in order to measure the effectiveness, this indicator/descriptor refers not only to the schemes themselves (how they are planned and implemented) but also to the capacity of the VET system to increase the access by evaluating them and by deciding further action.

Share of the population from disadvantaged group entering VET related with the majority share;

Need to correlate with indicator 4 and 8;

Employability: effects on unemployment by disadvantaged groups and employability after the introduction of a specific scheme;

Individual and group satisfaction related with the access to VET system.

Recommendation: Provide data to demonstrate the effectiveness of the used schemes.

4. CONCLUSIONS: What next?

While there is broad agreement in the available literature about the identification of issues and challenges that stakeholders may have to face when choosing and using indicators, it is a fact of life that they may feel themselves locked into an unhappy relationship with this kind of measurement tool. It may be relevant to voice them once again in the context of the implementation of this particular set of indicators given. The following think- pieces are not meant, however, to be taken as solutions but rather as suggestions to policy makers, quality assurance managers in VET institutions, information officers and others in the National Quality Assurance Reference Points established as part of the *Recommendation on EQARF*.

Indicators are decisive for any improvement process in VET but it is important to remind that they only indicate, i.e. they are only one form of measurement. A lot of people still mistrust them and indicators by themselves will not motivate these people to change. There is therefore a need to bring stakeholders to the point where they understand the role measurement has in the process of improvement and to demonstrate that the risk of not changing out- weights the risk of changing.

Indicators, however, need to be presented in ways that are easy to understand: if used appropriately, they will help better to understand how systems can be improved and then changes to the systems are seen as possible and compelling. It is crucial, to that end, that the gap between measurement, understanding and improvement is bridged. A good communication plan at national level is advisable in order to debate, interpret and implement the set of ten indicators in the context of the diverse organizational realities, bearing in mind that indicators must be used in a way that relates very specifically to the objectives of the provider or the system in question.

There are two other dimensions to be taken into account when implementing indicators, which are

a) to approach the use of indicators, both at system and providers' level, as an **iterative process** in order to improve the national measurement system, including statistics;

b) to promote the **active ownership** of the indicators with stakeholders.

These two dimensions will be vital to make and support any subsequent improvements in the system.

Finally, it is suggested that at European level a) the set of ten indicators are streamlined by **organically integrating** them into the *E&T2010* and *ET2020* work programmes b) **synergies** between ENQA-VET and SGBI are further strengthened.

ANNEX 1: Glossary of Terms

> The following document served as a resource during the preparation of this Glossary:
> ***Terminology of education and training policy: a selection of 100 terms.*** *CEDEFOP.*
> *Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2008.*
> When that is not the case, the source is individually identified below the respective term.
> To limit the length of this annex, only terms and concepts referred to in the definitions are
> included.

KEY TERM	DEFINITION
Accreditation of an education or training programme	A process of quality assurance through which accredited status is granted to a programme of education or training, showing it has been approved by the relevant legislative or professional authorities by having met predetermined standards. *Source*: adapted from Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials. *Related term*: accreditation of an education or training provider
Accreditation of an education or training provider	A process of quality assurance through which accredited status is granted to an education or training provider, showing it has been approved by the relevant legislative or professional authorities by having met predetermined standards. *Source*: adapted from Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials. *Related terms*: accreditation of an education or training programme, education or training provider
Adult education	General or vocational education provided for adults after initial education and training for professional and/or personal purposes, and which aims to: – provide general education for adults in topics of particular interest to them (e. g. in open universities); – provide compensatory learning in basic skills which individuals may not have acquired earlier in their initial education or training (such as literacy, numeracy) and thus to; – give access to qualifications not gained, for various reasons, in the initial education and training system; – acquire, improve or update knowledge, skills or competences in a specific field: this is continuing education and training. *Comment*: adult education is close to, but not synonymous with, continuing education and training.

	Source: adapted from European Training Foundation 1997; Cedefop, 2004.
	Related terms: compensatory learning, continuing education and training, lifelong learning
Awarding body	Body issuing qualifications (certificates, diplomas or titles) formally recognising the learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and/or competences) of an individual, following a assessment and validation procedure. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004.
Certificate / diploma / title	An official document, issued by an awarding body, which records the achievements of an individual following an assessment and validation against a predefined standard. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004.
Certification of learning outcomes	The process of issuing a certificate, diploma or title formally attesting that a set of learning outcomes (knowledge, knowhow, skills and/or competences) acquired by an individual have been assessed and validated by a competent body against a predefined standard. *Comment*: certification may validate the outcome of learning acquired in formal, non-formal or informal settings. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004.
Competence	The ability to apply learning outcomes adequately in a defined context (education, work, personal or professional development). Comment: competence is not limited to cognitive elements (involving the use of theory, concepts or tacit knowledge); it also encompasses functional aspects (involving technical skills) as well as interpersonal attributes (e.g. social or organisational skills) and ethical values. *Source*: Cedefop, 2004, European Commission, 2006a. *Related terms*: know-how, knowledge, skills
Continuing education and training	Education or training after initial education and training – or after entry into working life aimed at helping individuals to: – improve or update their knowledge and/or skills; – acquire new skills for a career move or retraining; – continue their personal or professional development.

	Comment: continuing education and training is part of lifelong learning and may encompass any kind of education (general, specialised or vocational, formal or non-formal, etc.). It is crucial for the employability of individuals. *Source*: Cedefop, 2004.
Graduation/Successful completion	Successful completion should involve the demonstration by student of the expected skills and knowledge of someone at the level of education of the programme completed. In all cases, a successful outcome should result in certification which is recognised within the educational system and the labour market. *Education at a glance 2008: OECD indicators*, Paris, 2008 http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/7/41274044.pdf (accessed June 3, 2009)
Dropout	Withdrawal from an education or training programme before its completion. *Comments*: (a) this term designates both the process (early school leaving) and the persons (early school leavers) who fail to complete a course; (b) besides early school leavers, dropouts may also include learners who have completed education or training but failed the examinations. *Source*: based on Ohlsson, 1994.
Education or training provider	Any organisation or individual providing education or training services. Comment: education and training providers may be organisations specifically set up for this purpose, or they may be other, such as employers, who provide training as a part of their business activities. Training providers also include independent individuals who offer services. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004.mber of course hours have been
Formal learning	Learning that occurs in an organised and structured environment (e.g. in an education or training institution or on the job) and is explicitly designated as learning (in terms of objectives, time or resources). Formal learning is intentional from the learner's point of view. It typically leads to validation and certification. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004.
Informal learning	Learning resulting from daily activities related to work, family or leisure. It is not organised or structured in terms of objectives, time or learning support. Informal learning is in most cases unintentional from the learner's perspective.

	Comments: – informal learning outcomes do not usually lead to certification but may be validated and certified in the framework of recognition of prior learning schemes; – informal learning is also referred to as experiential or incidental/ random learning. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004.
Initial education and training	General or vocational education and training carried out in the initial education system, usually before entering working life. *Comments*: (a) some training undertaken after entry into working life may be considered as initial training (e.g. retraining); (b) initial education and training can be carried out at any level in general or vocational education (full-time school-based or alternance training) pathways or apprenticeship. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004. *Related terms*: compulsory education, continuing education and Training.
Learning	A process by which an individual assimilates information, ideas and values and thus acquires knowledge, know-how, skills and/or competences. *Comment*: Learning occurs through personal reflection, reconstruction and social interaction. Learning may take place in formal, non-formal or informal settings. *Source*: Cedefop, 2004; European Commission, 2006a
Lifelong learning	All learning activity undertaken throughout life, with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competences, within a personal, civic, social and or employment related perspective. Communication from the Commission "Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality", 2001a
Non-formal learning	Learning which is embedded in planned activities not explicitly designated as learning (in terms of learning objectives, learning time or learning support). Non-formal learning is intentional from the learner's point of view. Comments: – non-formal learning outcomes may be validated and lead to certification; – non-formal learning is sometimes described as semi-structured

	learning. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004.
Programme of education or training	An inventory of activities, content and/or methods implemented to achieve education or training objectives (acquiring knowledge, skills and/or competences), organised in a logical sequence over a specified period of time. *Comment*: the term programme of education of training refers to the implementation of learning activities whereas curriculum refers to the design, organisation and planning of these activities. *Source*: based on Cedefop, 2004.
Qualification	The term qualification covers different aspects: (a) formal qualification: the formal outcome (certificate, diploma or title) of an assessment and validation process which is obtained when a competent body determines that an individual has achieved learning outcomes to given standards and/or possesses the necessary competence to do a job in a specific area of work. A qualification confers official recognition of the value of learning outcomes in the labour market and in education and training. A qualification can be a legal entitlement to practice a trade (OECD); (b) job requirements: the knowledge, aptitudes and skills required to perform the specific tasks attached to a particular work position (ILO). *Source*: based on Eurydice, 2006; European Training Foundation, 1997; OECD, 2007; ILO, 1998. *Related terms*: certification of learning outcomes, competence, European qualification framework, formal learning, informal learning, learning outcomes, non-formal learning, regulated profession, skill
Recognition of learning outcomes	(a) Formal recognition: the process of granting official status to skills and competences either through the: – award of qualifications (certificates, diploma or titles); or – grant of equivalence, credit units or waivers, validation of gained skills and/or competences; and/or (b) Social recognition: the acknowledgement of the value of skills and/or competences by economic and social stakeholders. *Source*: Cedefop, 2004.
Sector	A group of companies with the same main economic activity (e.g. chemicals). Or A category of transversal professional activities (e.g. marketing) common to a variety of companies.

	Source: Cedefop; European Commission, 2006a.
Skill	The ability to perform tasks and solve problems. *Source*: Cedefop; European Commission, 2006a.
Teacher	A person whose function is to impart knowledge, know-how or skills to learners in an education or training institution. *Comment*: a teacher may fulfil several tasks such as organising and carrying out training programmes/courses and transmitting knowledge, whether generic or specific, theoretical or practical. A teacher in a vocationally-oriented institution may be referred to as a 'trainer'. *Source*: Cedefop, 2004; AFPA 1992.
Trainer	Anyone who fulfils one or more activities linked to the (theoretical or practical) training function, either in an institution for education or training, or at the workplace. *Comment*: (a) two categories of trainer can be distinguished: – professional trainers are training specialists whose job may coincide with that of the teacher in a vocational training establishment; – part-time or occasional trainers are professionals in various fields who take on, in their normal duties, part-time training activity, either in-company (as mentors and tutors of recruits and apprentices or as training providers) or externally (by occasionally offering their services at a training establishment); (b) trainers may carry out various tasks: – design training activities; – organise and implement these activities; – provide the actual training, i.e. transfer knowledge, know-how and skills; – help apprentices develop their skills by providing advice, instructions and comments throughout the apprenticeship. *Source*: Cedefop, 2004; AFPA,, 1992. *Related terms*: learning facilitator, teacher
Unemployed persons	Unemployed persons comprise persons aged 15 to 74 who were: a. without work during the reference week, b. currently available for work, i.e. were available for paid employment or self-employment before the end of the two weeks following the reference week, c. actively seeking work, i.e. had taken specific steps in the four weeks period ending with the reference week to seek paid employment or self-employment or who found a job to start later, i.e. within a period of, at most, three months.

	Source: Data collection, Eurostat http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=tsiem1 10 (accessed June 3, 2009)
Vocational education and training (VET)	Education and training which aims to equip people with knowledge, know-how, skills and/or competences required in particular occupations or more broadly on the labour market. *Source*: adapted from European Training Foundation, 1997.
Vulnerable groups	Groups that experience a higher risk of poverty and social exclusion than the general population. Ethnic minorities, migrants, disabled people, the homeless, those struggling with substance abuse, isolated elderly people and children all often face difficulties that can lead to further social exclusion, such as low levels of education and unemployment or underemployment. *Source:* Social protection; Social inclusion Glossary http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/spsi/vulnerable_groups_en.htm (accessed June 3,2009)

ANNEX 2: Bibliography and References

References

WEBSITES

http://www.ena.lu/conclusions_lisbon_extraordinary_european_council_2324_march_2000-020007798.html.

http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/helsinkicom_en.pdf.

http://www.enqavet.eu/mission.html.

http://ec.europa.eu/prelex/detail_dossier_real.cfm?CL=en&DosId=196900.

http://www.enqavet.eu/thematic-groups.html.

http://www.trainingvillage.gr/etv/Upload/Information_resources/Bookshop/510/5185_en.pdf.

http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-9220/big.htm.

- Badescu, M. (2008) *Improving the scope of indicators for monitoring developments in vocational education and training in Europe,* JCR Scientific and Technical reports, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- *Evaluation of Eurostat education, training and skills data source*, (2008) Cedefop Panorama series, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
-*Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of a European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and Training* OJEU 2009/C155/01.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:155:SOM:en:HTML.

Bibliography

- *Classification of learning activities-Manual (2006).*Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: an updated strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training*

COM (2008) 865 final.

http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/com865_pt.pdf

- Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: new Skills for New Jobs. Anticipating and matching labour market and skills needs COM(2008) 868/3

http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=568&langId=pt

- Continuity, consolidation and change: towards a European era of vocational education and training. CEDEFOP(2009). Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

- Council conclusions on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training (ET 2020).

http://ue.eu.int/Newsroom

- Evaluation of Eurostat education, training and skills data sources, CEDEFOP (2008). Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

- OECD Handbook for internationally comparative education statistics: concepts, standards, definitions and classifications. (2004*)* Paris: OECD.

- Participation in formal technical and vocational education and training programmes worldwide: an initial statistical study. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2006). Bonn: UNESCO –UNEVOC International Centre.

- Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning. OJEU 2008/C111/01.

- Terminology of European education and training policy: a selection of 100 terms. CEDEFOP. (2008). Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

- UOE data collection on education systems- Manual: concepts, definitions and classifications (2005).Montreal, Paris, Luxembourg**.**

ANNEX 3: List of Participants

Title	Name	Country	Organisation name
Mr	Wilhelm König	Austria	Provincial School Council for Lower Austria
Mr	Vladimír Hulík	Czech Republic **Chairperson**	Institute for Information on Education
Ms	Gunvor Krarup Vedstesen	Denmark	Ministry of Education
Ms	Maie Kitsing	Estonia	Ministry of Education and Research
Mr	Mika Tammilehto	Finland	Ministry of Education
Ms	Tarja Riihimäki	Finland	Ministry of Education
Mr	István Kiszter	Hungary	National Institute of Vocational and Adult Education
Ms	Rhona Dempsey	Ireland	Further Education and Training Awards Council
Mr	Giorgio Allulli	Italy	Institute for the Development of Vocational Training of Workers (ISFOL)
Ms	Giedre Beleckiene	Lithuania	Methodological Centre for VET
Ms	Lina Vaitkute	Lithuania	Methodological Centre for VET
Ms	Doris Mangion	Malta	Malta Qualifications Council
Mr	Roy Tjoa	The Netherlands	Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
Ms	Anne Katerine Kaels (present at 1st meeting)	Norway	Norwegian Directorate For Education and Training
Mr	Olav Reiersen	Norway	Norwegian Directorate For Education and Training
Ms	Fernanda Ferreira (present at 1st meeting)	Portugal	Directorate General for Employment and Industrial Relations
Ms	Margarida Abreu	Portugal	Directorate General for Employment and Industrial Relations
Mr	Serban Iosifescu	Romania	Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Pre-university Education
Mr	Javier Molina Tornero	Spain	Ministry of Education, Social Policy and Sport
Mr	Ignacio Laguens García (present at 1st meeting)	Spain	Ministry of Education, Social Policy and Sport
Mr	Ismael Gómez Escalonilla Martín Caro	Spain	Ministry of Education, Social Policy and Sport
Mr	Shawn Mendes (present at 1st meeting)	Sweden	Swedish National Agency for Education
Ms	Alison Rowland	UK	LSIS – Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Mr	Hermann Nehls	Social Partners	DGB- Bundesvorstand
Mr	Thomas Mayr	Social Partners	Institut für Bildungsforschung der Wirtschaft
Ms	Tina Bertzeletou	CEDEFOP	European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training
Ms	Sophie Weisswange	European Commission	Directorate General for Education and Culture
Ms	Maria Emília Galvão	**TG Expert**	

ENQA-VET

European Network for Quality Assurance
in Vocational Education and Training

Contact Details

For further information please visit www.enqavet.eu or contact the ENQA-VET Secreteriat.

FETAC, East Point Plaza,
East Point Business Park,
Dublin 3, Ireland.

T: 00353 1 865 9546
F: 00353 1 865 0072
E-mail: info@enqavet.eu
Website: www.enqavet.eu