

Assessment and Mapping of Projects

Synthesis report

Maria Gutknecht-Gmeiner, IMPULSE
22.11.2011

I. Introduction

Part of the QALLL project is a stocktaking exercise of projects dealing with quality assurance in vocational education and training and adult education. The analysis and mapping of these projects was carried out in two phases: A first set of 80 projects were analysed in autumn 2010 and a second set of 37 projects in autumn 2011. The current final report follows up on the QALLL first analysis of December 2010 extending the report to integrate new findings and superseding the previous report.

II. Aim and scope

II. 1 Aims of assessment and mapping

The analysis of the projects in QALLL comprises a primarily “quantitative analysis” which will be complemented by a qualitative analysis in the next months. In the quantitative analysis projects are collected, mapped, and assessed according to predefined criteria. The aim of this assessment and mapping exercise is to identify high quality projects for further dissemination and transfer and – ultimately – to obtain an overview of the features of these projects and possibly also to deduct recommendations at a later stage. The quantitative assessment also provides the basis for the qualitative analysis.

II. 2 Projects included

Projects included are quality assurance projects of the current lifelong learning programme, i.e. the subprogrammes Leonardo da Vinci and Grundtvig (mainly DOI, TOI; GRU centralised projects), and from previous programmes (LdV II & SOCRATES II; general and special calls).

A special challenge for the QALLL project was to establish a list of quality projects and collect all relevant information (project products, reports) from Adam, the National Agencies, and the project promoters for the assessment and mapping. The expectation that all products of finalised projects would be readily available for such an exercise was not met in all instances leading to delays and in the second phase also to exclusion of projects from the database.

In the first phase, 80 finalised projects were analysed between September and November 2010. At this stage, primarily Leonardo da Vinci decentralised projects (60 res. 75%) were collected for further analysis; a small number of centralised Leonardo da Vinci and Grundtvig projects were also included. The majority of projects (more than 70%) date back to the previous programme generation Leonardo da Vinci II (52 projects res. 65%) and Socrates II (5 projects res. 6% of all projects).

In the second phase, 37 projects were analysed between September and November 2011, 3 of which could not be included in the database since products were not or only partially available in due time. The sample thus comprises 34 projects. The majority (65%) were Leonardo da Vinci TOI projects, 9% were Leonardo da Vinci pilot projects from the previous programme, and 21% Grundtvig projects from the lifelong learning programme.

Overall, almost 3/4 of the assessed projects were decentralised pilot res. innovation transfer projects under Leonardo da Vinci, 12% centralised Leonardo projects and 13% (centralised) Grundtvig projects. Within the centralised projects, Leonardo and Grundtvig are thus evenly represented.

Table 1: Overview of assessed projects by programme/sectoral programme

Programme	Centralised/ decentralised	Project type	No. of Projects	%
LdV 2000-2006	Decentralised	LdV: Pilot project	46	40.4
	Centralised	LdV: CQAF Call 2006	1	0.9
		LdV: Thematic action	3	2.6
		LdV: Network	1	0.9
		LdV: Reference material	4	3.5
LLP Programme/LdV	Decentralised	LdV: TOI	39	34.2
	Centralised	LdV: DOI	4	3.5
		LdV: Network	1	0.9
Socrates/Grundtvig 2000-2006	Centralised	Grundtvig: Centralised Project	5	4.4
LLP Programme/ Grundtvig	Centralised	Grundtvig: Centralised Project	10	8.8
Total			114	100.0

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

In the first phase, 78 of the first 80 projects included in the analysis were from selection years 2005, 2006, and 2007, with only two projects going back to earlier selection rounds. Projects starting in 2008 were left out since they had not been finalised by autumn 2010. They were the focus of the second phase making up almost 65% of the projects at this stage. While the previous programme generation accounted for almost 3/4 of the assessed projects in the first phase, the second phase dealt primarily with projects from the lifelong learning programme (91%).

Table 2: Overview of assessed projects by selection year

Year	Projects	%	cum %
2003	1	0.9	0.9
2004	3	2.6	3.5
2005	28	24.6	28.1
2006	29	25.4	53.5
2007	33	28.9	82.5
2008	20	17.5	100.0
Total	114	100.0	

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

All in all, 54% of the projects dated from the earlier programmes Leonardo da Vinci II and Socrates II and 46% from the lifelong learning programme. Projects from the years 2005, 2006 and 2007 constitute almost 80% of the assessed projects.

26 participating countries provided projects for the mapping and assessment, one project in the sample was a project submitted by a European organisation (EU).

Table 3: Overview of assessed projects by country

Country	Phase1	Phase 2	Total	%
AT – Austria	8	3	11	9.6
BE – Belgium	3	1	4	3.5
BG- Bulgaria	3	0	3	2.6
CZ – Czech Republic	0	1	1	0.9
DE – Germany	29	5	34	29.8
DK – Denmark	0	2	2	1.8
ES – Spain	1	1	2	1.8
EU – European organisation	1	0	1	0.9
FI – Finland	2	1	3	2.6
FR – France	0	3	3	2.6
GR – Greece	1	1	2	1.8
HU – Hungary	1	0	1	0.9
IRL – Ireland	2	0	2	1.8
IS – Iceland	3	0	3	2.6
IT – Italy	3	6	9	7.9
LU – Luxembourg	1	0	1	0.9
LT – Lithuania	0	1	1	0.9
NL – Netherlands	2	1	3	2.6
NO – Norway	1	2	3	2.6
PL – Poland	3	0	3	2.6
PT – Portugal	2	0	2	1.8
RO – Romania	2	0	2	1.8
SI – Slovenia	0	1	1	0.9
SE – Sweden	6	0	6	5.3
SK – Slovak Republic	0	2	2	1.8
TR – Turkey	4	0	4	3.5
UK – United Kingdom	2	3	5	4.4
Total	80	34	114	100.0

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

III. Methods and procedure

III. 1 Experts and tasks

7 experts (see below) contributed to the assessment and mapping in the first phase, 5 of which also conducted the second analysis. The experts were coordinated by Maria Gutknecht-Gmeiner and supported by the Austrian National Agency.

Table 4: Overview of projects assessed by expert

Experts/Projects	Projects	LdV Decentralised	LdV Centralised	Grundtvig (Centralised)
Kim Faurschou (DK)	25	14	3	8
Katalin Molnar-Stadler (HU)	19	18	0	1
Michael Fitzgerald (IRE)	14	14	0	0
Anu Räisänen (FI)	11	3	8	0
Franz Gramlinger (AT)	11	11	0	0
Holger Bienzle (AT)	26	20	0	6
Maria Gutknecht-Gmeiner (AT)	8	5	3	0
Total	114	85	14	15

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

The following tasks were part of the exercise:

1. an expert assessment whether the projects actually dealt with “quality assurance”
2. an expert assessment of the products and provision of information on the products from an expert’s point of view
3. a mapping of the projects based on the products
4. an expert assessment of the quality of the products and their suitability for dissemination and transfer
5. a consolidation of the assessments and the mapping.

Basic data on the projects (programme, year, number, title, project summary, summary of products) was provided to the experts along with reports and products. If possible, Adam was used. The pre-test of spring 2010 had shown that if Adam had been duly “filled in”, all relevant project information for the assessment and mapping would have been available from this source. Unfortunately, especially for “older” projects and Grundtvig projects, Adam could not be used and information was provided directly or via an online workspace for the experts on the QALLL webpage.

The assessment and mapping was filled into the QALLL Database, an excel-spreadsheet containing the basic data on the projects and the assessment and mapping criteria. In an output-oriented approach, the assessment and mapping exercise was very much focused on the products. An assessment of other project quality criteria like dissemination and transfer has been carried out separately by the project coordinator.

III. 2 Definitions and criteria for the assessment and mapping

III.2.1 Definition of “quality assurance”

The selection of quality projects was based on a definition of “quality assurance” developed in the QALLL project (cf. Luxemburg meeting, March 12, 2010) and further specified in the document “Selection and Mapping of Projects” of June 2, 2010:

“Quality assurance is a systematic process of assuring/improving quality in VET and AE using the quality cycle and appropriate methods/methodologies, procedures, tools and indicators.”

To further delineate what quality assurance projects are, keywords were listed which indicate that a project in fact deals with quality assurance:

“Quality assurance, quality management, quality development, quality evaluation, quality audits, certification, quality improvement, ISO, EFQM, BSC, quality indicators, quality standards, accreditation, efficiency, monitoring system, quality cycle, self assessment, self evaluation, (lean) six sigma, continuous improvement, (linked to ECVET and/or EQF for mapping), quality culture, improvement culture, change culture, change management, quality approach, CQAF, EQAVET, CQF, process management, benchmarking”.

These definitions were the basis for the selection of quality assurance projects by the agencies involved. The self-assessment in Adam on whether the project deals with “quality” has not proven to be a very reliable indicator for quality assurance projects since the term is obviously interpreted in different ways by project promoters.

III.2.2 Mapping categories and criteria

Detailed definitions of the mapping criteria were developed in a pre-test in spring 2010 and consolidated with the QALLL project members in June 2010. They comprise the following categories (which were subject to multiple choices and not mutually exclusive):

The level(s) of the education and training system targeted: i.e. the system level (macro level), the provider level (meso level), and learning and teaching (micro level).

Educational sectors and activities: Vocational education and training, in-service training, school education, adult education, higher education, guidance and counselling, e-learning/blended learning.

Product content criteria and categories:

- Models and tools: i.e. quality management systems; quality standards; quality criteria/indicators/benchmarks; quality tools/instruments
- Methodologies: Self-assessment/self-evaluation; external assessment/ evaluation, accreditation; certification
- Support: training in quality management/evaluation; good practices

The quality criteria (phases) of the EQAVET: Planning, Implementation, Evaluation, Review.

All mapping criteria can be found in the document “Selection and Mapping of Projects” of June 2, 2010, for convenience’s sake, they are also annexed to this report (cf. AnnexVII.1)

III.2.3 Criteria for quality of products

The quality of the products was assessed according to the following criteria:

Quality = Intrinsic quality of products:

- Project results (content) represent **state of the art** in the field (meet technical, academic/professional, management standards, whatever is applicable)
- The results of the project must be **usable** and **appropriate** for users and **provide an additional benefit**.

Formal quality = presentable products

- **Project results are in a presentable form:** understandable, good language, layout etc.
- **Little or no further editing** is necessary.

Transferability

The results of the project must be transferable to other countries, sectors, etc.

Indicators:

- a need for the results, products of the project is existent in other countries, sectors, etc.
- the project results are readily usable in or adaptable to other contexts

A further “must” criterion was that all products of the project had to be available to the public either free of charge or payable.

Based on these criteria, an overall assessment on whether the project products should be further disseminated and transferred was made.

III. 3 Quality assurance of the process and consolidation

It was of highest importance for the quality of the assessment and mapping that the group of experts has a shared understanding of the tasks at hand and carried out the work according to common standards. The coordination of the experts concerning the tasks (not their deployment or contractual relations) was carried out by Maria Gutknecht-Gmeiner.

Quality assurance in terms of coherence of approach and consistency of assessment in a transnational team were ensured through

- a document on selection and mapping of projects (cf. Annex),
- a detailed guideline for experts prepared by the coordinator,
- the preparation of an assessment and mapping grid in a spread-sheet,
- a briefing of experts carried out at the beginning of September 2010 via videoconference at the beginning of phase 1,
- individual clarification of questions and discussions of “difficult cases”
- data cleaning, analysis and comparison of all assessments by the coordinator
- feedback to experts
- review and consolidation between coordinator and experts conducted after the expert assessments.

Apart from the information in the supporting documentation and the briefing, the spreadsheet used for the mapping contained all assessment and mapping criteria and marks. As suggested during the briefing, a “model” project assessment completed by the coordinator was included in the spreadsheet in order to enhance a common understanding among the experts on how to fill out the spreadsheet. Three experts also made use of the opportunity to receive detailed feedback on their first assessed projects at the beginning of their assessment work; others had lengthy discussions with the coordinator at a later stage. In the second phase, only experts who already had experience were included and no further briefing was necessary. Incomplete information on projects and missing products remained a challenge for both the Austrian National Agency – as the project coordinator – and the experts throughout both mapping and assessment phases.

In the consolidation of the assessments all projects were assessed a second time by the coordinator based on the information furnished by the experts in the spreadsheet. In both phases, about a third of the projects had to be discussed in detail. The review of projects in the consolidation helped to reach a better understanding of how to define “quality assurance” and apply this definition to the projects. For another half of the projects, assessments and mappings had to be calibrated among the experts (strict and more lenient assessments, dif-

ferent understanding of some concepts). For the consistent use of assessment criteria in general, but especially in the “border cases” where the relation of the projects to quality assurance was doubtful, “two evaluators are needed for every case in this kind of interpretative evaluation”, as one expert put it. For projects in which consolidation results were controversial, a third assessment was conducted.

IV. Selection of “quality assurance” projects

IV.1.1 Description of sample and reflection on selection process

In the first phase, only about half of the projects in the pre-selected sample were fully-fledged “quality assurance” projects in vocational education and training and/or adult education, in the second phase only 35% of the projects could be assessed thus. In many projects, quality assurance was at best provided as an “add-on”, sometimes only a tenuous relation, if at all, to quality assurance could be established. This made it extremely difficult for the expert team to come to clear decisions on whether the projects should be selected – also given their concern that fewer projects than expected qualified as QA projects in the end. Experts were surprised that not more actual “quality assurance” projects had been included in the pre-selection sample, the discussion of border cases took considerable time and effort.

For those projects in which QA was partly tackled – although the main focus of the project was on a different topic – a special category was created. These 7 projects – 5 (or 6%) in the first phase and 2 (6%) in the second – were included in the mapping but only two of the projects were selected for further dissemination and transfer with a “conditional” recommendation¹. Given the apparent confusion about what constitutes “quality assurance” it was not deemed sensible to disseminate projects that only partly fall under the quality assurance category since this could counteract awareness-raising for the meaning of the term “quality assurance”.

Table 5: Overview of projects and selection as QA projects

Projects	Number			% of total	of which		
	Phase 1	Phase 2	Total		LdV Decentralised	LdV Centralised	Grundtvig (Centralised)
QA projects (full)	37	12	49	43.0	36	6	7
QA projects (partly)	5	2	7	6.1	4	2	1
Subtotal QA projects	42	14	56	49.1	40	8	8
No QA projects	38	20	58	50.9	45	6	7
Total	80	34	114	100.0	85	14	15

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

To give an impression of the challenge involved in sorting out the rating of border cases, two excerpts from the expert feedback in the consolidation are presented. The first concerned a project that was rated a “partly” QA project after a lengthy discussion because at least one product directly dealt with quality assurance:

Project: QualiProSecondHand - New work profiles and qualifications for the professionalisation of the second-hand sector

Expert feedback on questions of coordinator

“Main topic: new work profiles and qualifications

I have interpreted that they haven’t develop a TQM -system for the providers in this second-hand education context but they have developed some aspects and tools which we can understand as QA aspects. They determined qualification profiles for vocational training and further training in the working life context including explanations of competencies. [...] They also developed individual questionnaires to analyse training needs of the employees in Second-

¹ In one case the products also need to be improved.

Hand enterprises. These analyses have been organised in a quite systematic way and the results has been explained by the Excel file.

Add-on: Product 4: Quality standards for qualification concepts with focus on professionalisation of second-hand enterprises and their employees

You are right that the product 4 includes the most important aspects of QA: They developed quality standards and questionnaires for participants of the education process (feedback system/satisfaction of customers/self-evaluation). Different participants can evaluate inputs, process and outputs after the process. Teachers and instructors and institutions who organise this kind of education and training can be target groups. Self-evaluation questionnaires have been developed for participants of this process and it supports customers' feedback to teachers."

Another project which dealt with the assessment of non-formally and informally acquired competences was rated a quality assurance project despite its different primary focus because quality assurance approaches could be found in all parts of the project.

Assessment, Visibility and Exploitation of non/in-formally acquired competencies of EXperienced EMPLOYees in Enterprises

Expert feedback on questions of coordinator

For identifying, assessing, documenting and, where appropriate, certifying learning outcomes – including knowledge, skills and competences acquired via non-formal and informal pathways – new common tools were developed which apply many quality assurance elements, e.g. process descriptions, procedures, checklists, quality methods (self-assessment, external evaluation of competences, documentation, SWOT analysis). Also the e-portfolio approach brings in quality assurance elements by allowing an employee/person to collect, manage, document and publish a selection of learning evidence in order to have one's assets recognised, accredited or plan further learning / training pathways.

Secondly, the overall objective of this project is to provide companies and employees with equally manageable methods for self-assessment and external assessment of the competencies acquired in non/in-formal learning processes. I agree that this suggests this is (again) an „EQF“ type project. Why I thought to propose it as a QA project is that this project contains much more quality assurance elements regarding competence assessment (as I explained in column CB) than the other (merely) „EQF“ type projects. But despite this I could agree to change the status into a borderline case.

While in some instances, the experts were rather dismayed by the poor quality of some of the projects and their products, in quite a number of cases the expert assessment was that these were “good ideas and good projects – but not in QA!”

IV.1.2 Overview of projects not selected as quality assurance projects

What kinds of projects were not assessed as “quality assurance projects”?

Developing qualification/job profiles and pertinent standards

The largest group of projects included in the pre-selected sample but not assessed as a quality assurance project were projects developing qualification/job profiles and standards, sometimes also linked to a certification. 18 projects (or 22.5% of the assessed projects) in phase 1 and 8 (23.5) in phase fell into this category, which amounts to an overall proportion of 23% of all projects and 45% of the projects that were not selected.

These projects usually contributed to EQF/NQF and ECVET policies. In some of these projects, EQF and ECVET policies were also explicitly referred to. The projects were obviously chosen by the National Agencies because of their contribution to enhancing transparency of qualifications – with the corollary that transparent qualifications are an important part of quality assurance in education and training. Yet, these projects did not deal with the implementation of quality assured and transparent education and training programmes within a systematic approach to quality assurance. This is why they were not deemed “quality assurance” projects.

Qualifications, competence standards and training of teachers/trainers

A number of projects focused on qualifications res. training of teachers/trainers, with an emphasis on trainers in work-based learning in phase 2 (three projects). These were not included if there was no direct link to quality assurance on the provider level since projects aimed at this level. An exception to this rule are two projects

concerning adult educators' qualifications and professionalisation on a supra-institutional level (Flexi-Path – Flexible professionalisation pathways for adult educator between the 6th and 7th level of EQF; Becoming Adult educators in the European Area – BAEA). While these two projects do not tackle quality assurance as such they are a valuable contribution to defining adult educator competencies. Due to the high relevance of this theme for establishing quality assurance in adult education in Europe², these projects were assessed quality assurance projects.

Training in quality management in branches/professions other than education and training

Some projects also dealt with training in quality management in branches and professions other than education and training. These projects were also not selected as “quality assurance projects” for VET and adult education (cf. above). This held good for 3 projects (2 in phase 1, 1 in phase 2).

Focus on related fields like social work, human health & employment services

In phase 2, 4 projects also had to be excluded which did not focus on vocational education and training and/or adult education. They were geared towards related fields like social services and health (social work, supported employment services, residential care homes for the elderly) but links to vocational education and training res. adult education were very weak or non-existent.

Two projects that tackled quality assurance in rehabilitation but made a point that they did concern vocational education and training (although at least one can and is used primarily for quality assurance of in the social sector) were assessed as quality assurance projects within the QALLL definition.

Other project foci

Quite a number of projects did not even explicitly develop qualification profiles but only aimed at designing curricula and training programmes for specific sectors and/or occupations. Other “border cases” included projects on “training needs assessment” and “accreditation of prior learning”.

High quality projects

Other projects on the original lists of 80 (phase 1) res. 33 (phase 2) were obviously included by the National Agencies because they promised some kind of transparency, standards, certification (cf. also above) or because they produced high quality products and received a good rating in the final project evaluation (“high quality” projects in general vs. high quality projects in quality assurance).

² Action Plan on Adult Learning 2007, COM(2007) 558 final, Priority Action 2 to improve the quality of provision: adult learning staff identified as “the key determinants” of quality

V. Results

The results presented here comprise the analysis of the projects along the mapping criteria. A qualitative analysis of the quality assurance projects selected in the assessment and mapping will follow.

Table 6: Selected QA projects by origin (country)

Country	QA projects			% of total
	Phase 1	Phase 2	Total	
AT – Austria	7	0	7	12.5
BE – Belgium	3	0	3	5.4
BG- Bulgaria	3	0	3	5.4
CZ – Czech Republic	0	0	0	0.0
DE – Germany	11	4	15	26.8
DK – Denmark	0	1	1	1.8
ES – Spain	0	1	1	1.8
EU – European organisation	1	0	1	1.8
FI – Finland	2	1	3	5.4
FR – France	0	1	1	1.8
GR – Greece	1	1	2	3.6
HU – Hungary	1	0	1	1.8
IRL – Ireland	1	0	1	1.8
IS – Iceland	2	0	2	3.6
IT – Italy	2	1	3	5.4
LU – Luxembourg	0	0	0	0.0
LT – Lithuania	0	0	0	0.0
NL – Netherlands	2	0	2	3.6
NO – Norway	0	1	1	1.8
PL – Poland	1	0	1	1.8
PT – Portugal	1	0	1	1.8
RO – Romania	0	0	0	0.0
SI – Slovenia	0	1	1	1.8
SE – Sweden	2	0	2	3.6
SK – Slovak Republic	0	1	1	1.8
TR – Turkey	1	0	1	1.8
UK – United Kingdom	1	1	2	3.6
Total	42	14	56	100

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

V. 1 Mapping of “quality assurance” projects

V.1.1 Level of education system targeted

The mapping of “quality assurance” projects was carried out for the fully-fledged quality assurance projects and those which partly deal with quality assurance, i.e. for the 56 projects presented above.

Table 7: Level of education system targeted

Level/ targeted	system level		provider level		Learning and teaching		Total entries
	No. of cases	% of cases	No. of cases	% of cases	No. of cases	% of cases	
targeted	13	23.2	50	89.3	37	66.1	100
not primarily targeted level but also concerned	14	25.0	1	1.8	7	12.5	22
not targeted	29	51.8	5	8.9	12	21.4	46
Total		56		56		56	

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

Institutional level and learning and teaching

As was to be expected, almost all projects (50 of 56 or 89%) directly targeted the institutional level, i.e. the providers of (vocational) education and training. In 37 cases (66%), the key process of “learning and teaching” was also at the core of the project which shows that quality assurance in European projects is not only concerned with organisational and administrative support processes but aims at the heart of the educational process.

System level

Given the institutional structure of promoters of LdV and Grundtvig projects, a surprisingly high number of projects also at least partly endeavoured to target the system level of education and training (27 or 48%, 13 or 23% of which even directly target the system level) – which is an ambitious goal given the bottom-up approach and the conditions under which these projects are carried out. The proportion of projects targeting (also) the system level has risen from 43% (18 of 42) in the first assessment phase to 64% (9 of 14) in the second phase.

The projects usually deal with educational contexts where external stakeholders are important – be it that they have substantial influence on the education and training process, be it that quality assurance is linked to some supra- or inter-institutional networking, evaluation or recognition. More than half of the projects under this category therefore deal with external evaluation, Peer Review, accreditation or certification: 9 of the first phase projects (50% of 18) provide external evaluation and/or accreditation, in the second phase 4 deal with these topics (44% of 9).

Accreditation is sectoral (e.g. accreditation of programmes in veterinary nurse programmes (DASVENT), public health training programmes (PHACRR), fundraising (European Fundraising Accreditation and Training) or of institutions in vocational rehabilitation (EQUASS)) or deals with providers of non-formal or informal learning (RECALL). One project also targets accreditation for outcomes of informal learning processes (Active Citizen Training Network - E-edUcAtED).

In the sectoral approaches one project is included which does not provide accreditation but is part of a “project family” which also includes accreditation (EQABENCH, related to EQUASS see above). The project WBL TOI Manual deals with transfer of best practice in work-based learning between providers and thus works on an

institutional and supra-institutional level. Two projects that tendered to the system level were developing professional competencies for specific fields and only partly dealt with quality assurance (Ko-Transfer, EQF-Code). In addition, the two projects dealing with professionalisation of educational staff in adult education (see above IV.1.2 also aimed at the system level.

Information on the effect these projects actually have on the system level is usually not available. For some projects, information on their further use exists. The Peer Review projects have led to implementation of Peer Review in various countries since 2009; they are also a model for future projects in the area of quality assurance in Leonardo da Vinci (cf. Lifelong Learning Programme, Call for proposals 2012). Other projects – which are usually part of a series of related projects – are making their products and activities available to other providers. One example would be the project “EQUASS”, which is featured on the website of the European Platform for Rehabilitation providing certification, training and consultancy for the quality management system developed, or “EXPERO2EU” which is present on the internet together with its predecessor „Ex.Per.O“.

V.1.2 Educational activity targeted

Table 8: Educational activity targeted

Educational sector/ activity targeted	No. of cases			% of total
	Phase 1	Phase 2	Total	
VET	34	11	45	80.4
In-service training	11	3	14	25.0
School education	13	2	15	26.8
Adult education	7	4	11	19.6
Higher education	6	2	8	14.3
Guidance and counselling	10	1	11	19.6
E-Learning /Blended Learning	7	2	9	16.1
Total	42	14	56	201.8

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

Four fifths of the projects (45 of 56) target VET, which is a slight under-representation since all 48 LdV projects could be subsumed under this generic category. The other categories therefore are of higher informative value. A fourth of the projects (14 of 56, only Leonardo da Vinci projects) (also) dealt with in-service training, 15 (or 27%, 14 Leonardo da Vinci projects and one Grundtvig project) projects aimed at improving education and training in schools.

Almost one fifth of the projects (11 of 56) targeted the adult education sector – seven of which were Grundtvig projects, the remaining four were Leonardo da Vinci projects which had also become active in adult education. The eighth Grundtvig project targeted higher education (see below).

Eight projects (seven Leonardo da Vinci and one Grundtvig project) targeted higher education, five of which took a cross-sectoral approach (i.e. working across different educational sectors and levels).

Eleven projects (10 in phase 1 and only 1 in phase 2) dealt with guidance and counselling – all exclusively Leonardo da Vinci projects. Quality assurance in e-Learning/blended learning was tackled in nine projects, all but one were Leonardo da Vinci projects.

V.1.3 Product categories

On average more than 4 different categories of products were developed per project. The most common products were “tools and instruments” which were developed in almost all projects (51 res. 91%). This category is also the most generic category used in the mapping since it encompasses a multitude of products like questionnaires, checklists, guidelines, recommendations, electronic tools for data collections and analysis, databases etc.

Table 9: Product categories

Product categories and subcategories		No. of cases			% of cases	% of entries
		Phase 1	Phase 2	Total		
Models and tools	QM/QA systems	20	4	24	42.9	10.6
	Standards	17	3	20	35.7	8.8
	Criteria/indicators/benchmarks	17	5	22	39.3	9.7
	Tools and instruments	38	13	51	91.1	22.5
Methodologies and procedures	Self-evaluation	22	5	27	48.2	11.9
	External evaluation	14	4	18	32.1	7.9
	Accreditation (institutions)	9	4	13	23.2	5.7
	Certification (individuals)	9	1	10	17.9	4.4
Support	Training	13	4	17	30.4	7.5
	Good practices	20	5	25	44.6	11.0
Total of cases		42	14	56	405.4	100.0
Total of entries		179	48	227		

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

Products that supported self-evaluation/self-assessment were developed in a little less than half of the projects (27 or 48%), which means that a strong focus was laid on these kind of quality assurance activities. Given the omnipresence of self-assessment/self-evaluation as a priority in LdV calls over the years, one could, however, also have expected a higher representation of these kinds of results. Yet, in the case of self-assessment/self-evaluation, the term itself is often not defined concisely encompassing different activities on different levels and leaving a high degree of interpretative leeway. In the expert mapping only self-assessment/self-evaluation procedures at institutional level were considered, while all activities on the personal level (self-assessment of one’s competences e.g.) were not included here (and were mostly related to projects dealing with transparency of qualifications and thus had to be omitted anyway).

In one third of the projects also external evaluation was tackled. Products supporting accreditation were the outcome of 23%, certification of 18% of the projects. This is in line with many national and also the European policies which for a long period of time have put a primary emphasis on self-assessment (cf. above), in quite a number of countries external evaluation and assessment have only gained ground in the past years. External evaluation, moreover, is more closely related with regulations on the system level which again make it less

likely to be chosen as a topic for a bottom-up development project. In this light, the number of projects targeting external evaluation, accreditation and certification actually seems quite high.

The relative proportion of projects dealing with accreditation is slightly higher in phase 2 (29% of the projects vs. 21% in the first phase). Certification has gone down considerably with only one project dealing with certification in phase 2 compared with nine in phase 1. Concerning the certification of individuals, it must also be taken into account that projects dealing with qualification standards were excluded if they did not have a strong tie to quality assurance procedures.

A little less than one third of the projects developed some kind of training in quality assurance; in 45% of the projects good practices were described.

V.1.4 EQAVET cycle

Concerning the phase of the EQAVET quality cycle targeted, the majority of the projects dealt with “evaluation” (42 projects res. 75%) and “planning” (39 projects res. 70%). “Implementation” was tackled by 28 projects (40%). The fourth phase “review” was targeted by 41% of the projects (23 projects). A further analysis will be necessary to determine how strong the emphasis on the different phases actually is, in particular when phase 4 is concerned which has traditionally been the weakest link in the quality cycle.

Table 10: EQAVET cycle - quality criteria

EQAVET Quality cycle	No. of cases			% of cases	% of entries
	Phase 1	Phase 2	Total		
Planning	31	8	39	69.6	18.5
Implementation	25	3	28	50.0	13.3
Evaluation	32	10	42	75.0	19.9
Review	19	4	23	41.1	10.9
Cycle as a whole used	19	4	23	41.1	10.9
Total of cases	42	14	56		
Total of entries	168	43	211	276.7	100.0

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

V. 2 Projects recommended for further dissemination

Of the 56 projects dealing with quality assurance, 39 (or about 70% of the projects) are recommended for further dissemination and transfer. For 9 projects, dissemination and transfer is recommended conditionally or partly: their products must undergo improvements before they are put to further use or need to be translated into more languages (esp. English as the “lingua franca” in Europe today). In a number of projects only a small proportion of the products actually deals with quality assurance (“partly” quality assurance projects see above).

Table 11: Overview of projects selected for further dissemination and transfer

Selection of projects	No. of cases			% of cases	Cum. %
	Phase 1	Phase 2	Total		
Selected for dissemination and transfer	30	9	39	69.6	69.6
Selected for dissemination and transfer only partly or after improvement of products	6	3	9	16.1	85.7
not selected	6	2	8	14.3	100.0
Total	42	14	56	100.0	

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

Of these recommended projects, 33 are Leonardo da Vinci and 6 are Grundtvig projects. If only centralised projects are compared, the ratio between Leonardo da Vinci and Grundtvig projects is 5:6, the majority of projects (28 projects res. 72%) come from Leonardo da Vinci decentralised strands (pilot project, Transfer of innovation project).

Table 12: Project types of projects selected for further dissemination and transfer

Project type		Phase 1	Phase 2	Total	% of cases	Cum. %
LdV	Decentralised	22	6	28	71.8	71.8
	Centralised	5	0	5	12.8	84.6
Grundtvig		3	3	6	15.4	100.0
Total		30	9	39	100.0	

Source: QALLL Database (Phase 1 and 2)

VI. Conclusions, recommendations and outlook

VI.1 Raising awareness for “quality assurance”

Reaching a common understanding of “quality assurance” remains a challenge in the QALLL project. Despite discussions and attempts to come up with a clear definition of “quality assurance”, there still seems to be a fair amount of confusion about the term; this can be deduced from the fact that half the projects in the pre-selection sample in both phases had nothing to do with quality assurance in education and training as such. These findings also corroborate observations made in the pre-test. In the second phase, 4 projects dealing with quality assurance in sectors other than education had to be excluded (see above IV.1.2), the boundaries of “vocational education and training” thus seem to have been unclear in some instances.

The most important pitfall seems to be the confusion of a) projects and initiatives contributing to overall educational goals (i.e. all publicly funded projects) with b) quality assurance projects – with the latter also contributing to these overall goals but in a distinct manner.

Especially the “reference set of selected quality indicators for assessing quality in VET” of the EQAVET can be misleading if interpreted in such a way that all projects which in some way may contribute to an improvement in the areas the indicators cover are automatically “quality assurance” projects. As a corollary of this misinterpretation all projects somehow related to one of the indicators become quality assurance projects. So for instance all projects focusing on disadvantaged groups – say a street-work based VET orientation/induction project for young offenders – somehow will contribute to indicator 8 “prevalence of disadvantaged groups” or indicator 10 “schemes used to promote better access to VET” – which would lead to an attribution to projects dealing with “quality assurance”.³

Essentially, “quality” as a goal of publicly funded programmes is so generic that any project trying to bring about some kind of improvement can fall under this category.⁴ This is also what partially happened in the pre-selection of projects in QALLL where projects were included which e.g. developed new and innovative training programmes but had no relation to quality assurance as a systematic process. The most common misunderstanding, however, concerned projects developing job profiles and qualification standards (cf. below) which were mistaken for quality assurance projects. Another pitfall is a lack of distinction between good quality projects (which can be on any topic) and good quality projects in quality assurance.

Enhancing a precise and shared understanding of “quality assurance” among all stakeholders involved and in the public can be considered one of the “side-aims” and challenges of the QALLL project.

³ It could be argued that such an automatic attribution only holds good for indicator 1 “Relevance of quality assurance systems for VET providers” ((a) share of VET providers applying internal quality assurance systems defined by law/at own initiative, (b) share of accredited VET providers).

⁴ The inclusion of all kinds of projects aiming at improvement of VET quality was also the approach taken by a previous thematic monitoring activity “Quality of Training. Quality of VET systems and practices, training of teachers and trainers”. In the database projects dealing with any of 4 related themes were collected: integration into the labour market; developing skills within companies; transparency, assessment and validation knowledge; e-learning. Of the 4 “cluster groups” – training programmes relevant to labour market; flexible training content relevant to learners’ needs; innovative partnerships; quality of training and assessment methods – only the fourth directly target quality assurance.

<http://www.leonardo.ecotec.co.uk/thematicgroup3/>, (20.12.2010)

VI.1.1 “EQF” projects

A particularly interesting finding was how often projects developing common qualifications res. qualification standards were mistaken for quality assurance projects: in phase 1, more than a fifth of all projects (18) fell into this category; in phase 2, 8 projects could be mapped as “EQF” projects (two of whom were actually marked as ECVET projects by the thematic network NetECVET), overall (phase 1 and 2) this concerns 26 of 114 projects (or 23%). In the second phase, 4 of these projects were also assessed as quality assurance projects, among them the two projects mentioned earlier that were only “partly” QA projects (cf. V.1.1) and one of the projects on adult educator competencies.⁵

VI. 2 Other observations

VI.2.1 Provision of information on projects

A major challenge was the provision of the main products and some basic information on the projects. For further assessment and mapping exercises it can be strongly recommended to ensure that all project information, including the products (and not only their description) is stored in a way which ensures immediate retrieval on the programme level. As has been stated before, any effort to assess, disseminate and exploit projects on a larger scale could benefit substantially by a rigorous and comprehensive use of Adam for Leonardo da Vinci projects and an extension of this database to other sub-programmes. If filled in correctly – i.e. also including project products res. the information where and how products can be obtained – all information necessary for the valorisation of projects could be obtained from Adam.

VI.2.2 Product quality

Product quality was not always satisfactory even though the projects were pre-selected according to high ratings (70% plus) in the final evaluations. Good ideas were not always turned into excellent products.⁶ As one expert put it: “Finally I would like to say the same as I said of the first project: the products are innovative and there are new ideas, but the final products are not of high quality.”

VI. 3 Further products and next steps

VI.3.1 Project compendium

Concise information on the projects selected for further dissemination including their main projects and the mapping categories and criteria they tender to can be found in the project compendium.

If needed, the QALLL database with the mapped projects and products can also be developed into a web-based database which allows searching along the different categories and criteria, i.e. practical categories like educational activities or product types or more analytical ones like the EQAVET descriptive criteria.

VI.3.2 Key issues and guiding questions for expert panel discussions

Key issues for expert panel discussion were developed based on the first mapping and consolidated with the QALLL partners. They are: 1) the quality criteria of the EQAVET, 2) QA “methodologies” and approaches (i.e. self-evaluation, external evaluation, and accreditation), 3) quality management systems, standards and indica-

⁵ In one case, it is not clear why the project was included in the ECVET thematic monitoring since from the information provided the project does not seem to include common qualifications/competencies.

⁶ This could also lead to a reflection of the conditions and restraints under which such projects are carried out like: inclusion of institutions in the partnerships according to criteria which are not relevant to or even detrimental to product quality as for instance geographical and institutional variety; expected “even” distribution of funding which usually does not reflect actual contributions; high responsibility of project promoter coupled with little competence to steer the project or even to enforce rules and regulations; high administrative burden which deducts energy from the development process; too little time to bring products to market maturity (which, however, is expected); problems in the partnership if partners do not know each other etc.

tors, and 4) quality assurance in special areas (i.e. in-service training and work-based learning and guidance and counselling).

The QALLL “Guiding Questions” ask for experiences, state of the art and good practice, challenges, and recommendations concerning the key issues. They will serve to conduct expert panels in all QALLL countries to develop recommendations for future QA policies on European and national levels as well as for the successor programme to the current Lifelong Learning Programme.

VI.3.3 Qualitative analysis

The next step in the analysis of Leonardo da Vinci and Grundtvig projects will be to conduct a qualitative analysis from the QALLL database. An analytical framework and a reporting format that follows the “key issues” have been developed by an expert team, most of the good practice examples have already been described.

The qualitative analysis will provide introductions to the “key issues”, showcase good/best practice products from the projects selected for dissemination and investigate their specific contribution to the development of quality assurance in Europe. An overall analysis of the project products presented will identify cutting-edge innovation and trends and, if possible and meaningful, deduct recommendations.

VII. Documents and sources

Project website: www.qalll.eu

EQA-VET website: <http://www.eqavet.eu/gns/home.aspx>

EQAVET: http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc1134_en.htm

ALPINE – Adult Learning Professions in Europe. A study of the current situation, trends and issues, Final report, Zoetermeer 2008

Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Action Plan on Adult learning. It is always a good time to learn. Brussels, 27.9.2007 COM (2007) 558 final

QALLL Database

QALLL Project Compendium

Paper “Selection and Mapping of Projects” of June 2, 2010, prepared by Maria Gutknecht-Gmeiner for the QALLL project following a pretest of quality projects.

“Guidelines for experts” of September 1, 2010, prepared by Maria Gutknecht-Gmeiner

Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 on the establishment of a European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and Training (2009/C 155/01).

VIII. Annex

VIII. 1 List of 30 QA projects selected for further dissemination and transfer in Phase 1

The following list comprises the 30 projects that were selected for immediate dissemination and transfer (cf. IV.2).

Project Type*	Project Number (LLP-Link Number and National ID)	Project Title and Acronym	Year	Country of coordinating organisation
LdV: Pilot project	A/03/B/F/PP/158.015	MEVOC	2003	AT
LdV Thematic action	A/04/C/F/TH-82000	Peer Review in initial VET	2004	AT
LdV: Pilot project	A/05/B/F/PP-158.201	QUINORA	2005	AT
LdV: CQAF Call 2006	EAC/32/06/13	Peer Review Extended	2006	AT
LdV: TOI	LLP-LDV-TOI-07-AT-0011	Peer Review Extended II	2007	AT
Grundtvig: Centralised Project	225293-CP-1-2005-1-BE-GRUNDTVIG-G1	Self Evaluation in Adult Life Long Learning - SEALLL	2005	BE
LdV: Thematic action	BG/05/C/F/TH-83300	Development of a validation framework for mentoring: evaluating the achievements of disabled and disadvantaged people	2005	BG
LdV: Pilot project	BG/06/B/F/PP-166.013	Quality Assurance in Youth Career Consultancy (QA in YCC)	2006	BG
LdV: TOI	LLP-LDV-TOI-07-BG-166007	Validating Mentoring 2	2007	BG
LdV: Pilot project	146274	Quality development and quality assurance with labour market reference / QUALIVET	2005	DE
LdV: Pilot project	146281	CM ProWork	2005	DE

Project Type*	Project Number (LLP-Link Number and National ID)	Project Title and Acronym	Year	Country of coordinating organisation
LdV: Pilot project	146307	Guiding From School to Job – Professionalism in the Work With Young People at Risk of Social Exclusion / Guiding from School to job	2005	DE
LdV: Pilot project	146490	europass+ /Europass+	2006	DE
LdV: Pilot project	146525	A Dialog Approach to Developing E-Learning Courses /DELID	2006	DE
LdV: Pilot project	146579	Transnational Quality Project - Quality Guidelines for Providers of Vocational Education and Training /TQP-EU	2006	DE
LdV: Pilot project	EUR/05/C/F/PP-84711	European Fundraising Accreditation and Training	2005	EU
LdV: DOI	134009-LLP-1-2007-1-FI-LEONARDO-LMP	Quality management of Peer Production of eLearning	2007	FI
Grundtvig: Centralised Project	225251 GR2005-044-022	„EQUAL – Evaluation and Quality Assurance in Adult Education“	2005	GR
LdV: Pilot project	IRL/05/B/F/PP-153103	Quality Assurance Framework for Guidance in Initial Training EGUIDE	2005	IRL
LdV: Pilot project	IS/06/B/F/PP/164005	GEMS - Guidance for educators, mentors and students	2006	IS
LdV: Pilot project	IS/06/B/F/PP/164004	RECALL – Recognition of Quality in Life-long Learning	2006	IS
LdV: Pilot project	I/05/B/F/PP-154007	Pratiche riflessive per la formazione dei formatori = Reflective Practices for Professional Guidance Practitioners (Reflect OR)	2005	IT
LdV: Pilot project	I/06/B/F/PP-154160	European Melting Pot Wide Range Quality System EMPOWER	2005	IT
LdV: Pilot project	NL/05/B/F/PP/157527	REVIMP - From Review to Improvement in European Vocational Education and Training	2005	NL
LdV: Pilot project	NL/05/B/F/PP/157528	DASVENT - Development of an accreditation system for veterinary nurse trainers in Europe	2005	NL

Project Type*	Project Number (LLP-Link Number and National ID)	Project Title and Acronym	Year	Country of coordinating organisation
LdV: DOI	134049-LLP-1-2007-1-PT-LEONARDO-LMP	REFERENCE SYSTEM FOR FACILITATORS OF LEARNING	2007	PT
LdV: TOI	LLP-LdV/TOI/2007/SE/1291	i2i - Internship to industry	2007	SE
Grundtvig: Centralised Project	134388-LLP-1-2007-1-SE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP	QUALC - Quality assurance network for adult learning centres	2007	SE
LdV: TOI	LLP-LdV-TOI-2007-TR-051	Assessment, Visibility and Exploitation of non/in-formally acquired competencies of EXperienced EMPLOYees in Enterprises	2007	TR
LdV: Pilot project	UK/06/B/F/PP-162_577	Quality Workplace Training for Unemployed Young People (QWVET)	2006	UK

- Grundtvig: Centralised Project;
LdV: TOI, LdV: DOI,
LdV: Pilot Project, LdV Thematic Action, LdV Network, LdV: Language Project

VIII. 2 List of 9 QA projects selected for further dissemination and transfer in Phase 2

The following list comprises the 9 projects that were selected for immediate dissemination and transfer (cf. IV.2).

Project Type*	Project Number (LLP-Link Number and National ID)	Project Title and Acronym	Year	Country of coordinating organisation
Grundtvig: Centralised Project	142207-LLP-1-2008-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP	Active Citizen Training Network - E-edUcAtED	2008	DE
LdV: TOI	2008-1-DE2-LEO05-00151 DE/08/LLP-LdV/TOI/147187	Flexible professionalisation pathways for adult educator between the 6th and 7th level of EQF / Flexi-Path	2008	DE
Grundtvig: Centralised Project	142405-LLP-1-2008-1-DK-GRUNDTVIG-GMP	Becoming Adult educators in the European Area - BAEA	2008	DK
LdV: TOI	ES/07/LLP-LDV/TOI/149036	TRAINING IN QUALITY: VET AND ENTREPRISES	2007	ES
LdV: TOI	LLP-LdV-TOI-2007-FR-037	Améliorer la qualité de l'orientation – AQOR	2007	FR
Grundtvig: Centralised Project	142008-LLP-1-2008-1-GR-GRUNDTVIG-GMP	Engage trainers in learning Modules and Material creation - E-MODE	2008	GR
LdV: TOI	LLP Link No.: 2008-1-IT1-LEO05-00034 National ID: LLP-LDV/TOI/2008/IT/518	Expero in European Union: Focus on Mechatronics - EXPERO2EU	2008	IT
LdV: TOI	NO/08/LLP-LdV/TOI/131003	EQUASS in practice. Implementation of quality assurance for VET-providers in vocational rehabilitation according to the EQUASS Assurance standard, (European Quality in Services), in some selected EU-countries	2008	NO
LdV: TOI	UK/08/LLP/LdV/TOI-163_167	EQUABENCH - Benchmarking European Excellence - UK	2008	UK

* Grundtvig: Centralized Project;

LdV: TOI, LdV: DOI,

LdV: Pilot Project, LdV Thematic Action, LdV Network, LdV: Language Project

VIII. 3 Mapping categories and criteria

VIII.3.1 Levels of education system

Levels		Explanation/key words
System (VET, AE)	macro level	All actors on a suprainstitutional level like national/regional/local/sectoral authorities, associations, bodies etc. including the social partners
Provider	meso level	The providers of education: institutions, organisations, centres, schools etc.
Learning and teaching	micro level	All learning and teaching activities, usually in a structured and organised form (formal and non formal learning) in the above mentioned institutions but also in a self-organised way (informal learning with no intentional teaching activities)

VIII.3.2 Educational sectors and activities

These categories are about the educational sector or activity targeted, not about types of products. Meaningful categories for both target groups seem (no logical taxonomy, multiple choices possible):

- Vocational education and training
- In-service training
- School education
- Adult education
- Higher education
- Guidance and counselling
- E-learning/blended learning

VIII.3.3 Product content criteria and categories

	Category	Explanatory notes	Synonyms: other key words to look for
Models and tools	Quality management systems	Products which describe what a quality system can/should look like including information and guidelines on how to implement it	quality assurance/ improvement systems/models
	Quality standards	Sets of descriptive/prescriptive general statements about what quality constitutes in a certain context	Quality areas, quality frameworks, quality dimensions – if rather abstract
	Quality criteria/ indicators/ benchmarks	Lists of descriptive/prescriptive criteria/indicators/benchmarks Usually more detailed and operational than quality standards Also include recommendations/ guidelines on how to develop indicators/ benchmarks etc.	Quality areas, quality frameworks, quality dimensions – if further specified by criteria/ indicators/ benchmarks
	Quality tools/ instruments	Just what the terms imply: products which can be directly used to assure and improve quality, they have a procedural quality, they may target measurement (data collection, indicators, analysis), but they can also be geared towards supporting implementation of quality management and evaluation	Examples: feedback questionnaires, guidelines on how to implement quality activities, recommendations or electronic tools for data collection and analysis etc.
Methodologies	Self-assessment/ self-evaluation	All activities carried out within the VET Providers to collect and assess data on the quality of the provisions	Internal evaluation/ internal assessment
	External assessment/ evaluation	All activities carried out by persons external to the VET Provider to collect and assess data on the quality of the provisions	Audit, review, peer review
	Accreditation	Accreditation of Providers: recognition of the quality of a provider, usually by authorities but also possible through other institutions (then usually rather called certification)	Certification of VET Providers Awarding bodies, procedures for accreditation Quality seals, quality signets
	Certification	Certification of Individuals Only activities on the meta-level: how to quality assure the process of certification of individuals/ the award procedures (development of job and qualifications profiles and standards is an EQF topic)	Accreditation Awarding bodies, procedures for accreditation

	Category	Explanatory notes	Synonyms: other key words to look for
Support	Training in quality management/ evaluation	Any kind of training in the area of quality assurance/ management/ evaluation	Training/Teaching programmes/curricula/modules/sessions/workshops/materials, e-learning
	Good practices	Definition and description of examples of good practices in quality assurance, usually geared towards a specific topic (i.e. how to set up a quality management system, how to introduce self-evaluation, what benchmarks to use etc.)	Best practices, case studies

VIII.3.4 Key words for attributing projects/products to quality criteria (phases) of the EQAVET

Criterion/ Phase	VET Provider level	System level
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets/goals of VET Providers set • Identification of training needs (of learners) • Quality management/assurance system in place and responsibilities allocated • Planning of cooperation with other Providers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals/objectives of VET set • Targets established and monitored through indicators/criteria • Identification of training needs (of learners) • Policy for disclosure of quality results/outcomes • Standards and guidelines for recognition, validation and certification of competences of individuals defined
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources for achieving targets assigned • Relevant partnerships supported • Staff competence development plan • Training of staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation plans exist including guidelines and standards • Resources considered, capacity of users, necessary tools and guidelines • Support for training of staff (teachers and trainers) • VET Providers' responsibilities clear • National/regional quality assurance framework defined*
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-assessment carried out • Areas covered by evaluation: processes, outcomes incl. staff and learner satisfaction and staff performance • Early warning systems implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology for evaluation exists • Combination of internal and external evaluation • Early warning systems • Performance indicators applied • Relevant, regular, coherent data collection • Systems are themselves subject to evaluation
Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from learners and teachers is used for further action • Information on outcomes of review is publicly available • Feedback and review part of strategic learning process • Appropriate action plans implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures, mechanisms, instruments for review defined at all levels • Action plans devised and carried out • Information on outcomes of review is publicly available