

# The AVA national summaries



Action plan for validation and non-formal  
adult education

Authors:

Kirsten Aagaard, National Knowledge Centre for Validation of Prior Learning (NVR)

Bodil Husted, National Knowledge Centre for Validation of Prior Learning (NVR)



Editing:

Aleksandra Kozyra, European Association for the Education of Adults (EAEA)

Coordination:

Antra Carlsen, Nordic Network for Adult Learning (NVL)

Francesca Operti, European Association for the Education of Adults (EAEA)

With the support of the AVA project consortium:

Susana Oliveira, Kerigma

Gerhard Bisovsky, Verband Österreichischer Volkshochschulen (VOEV)

Henk Hijink and Lidwien vos de Wael, Learn for Life

Mariana Matache, Asociatia EUROED

©AVA

Oslo, 2016



*"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."*



## Index

1. Background .....	3
2. National reports summaries.....	4
AUSTRIA.....	5
BULGARIA.....	7
DENMARK .....	8
ESTONIA.....	9
FINLAND.....	10
FRANCE.....	11
GERMANY.....	12
GREECE.....	13
HUNGARY.....	14
ICELAND.....	15
IRELAND.....	16
ITALY .....	18
NETHERLANDS.....	19
NORWAY.....	20
PORTUGAL.....	21
ROMANIA.....	23
SLOVAKIA .....	25
SPAIN.....	26
SWEDEN.....	27
UK.....	28



## 1. Background

The European Inventory published in 2014 by the European Commission presents the following challenges on validation: the access, awareness and social recognition of the potential of validation, its financial sustainability, its coherence, the professionalization of staff and data collection (meaning that no analysis on progression and cost-benefit is available) and fragmentation. These are key challenges which should be better examined to help the further development of the validation systems. The AVA consortium did so through a questionnaire addressed to adult education providers and civil society representatives.

National validation arrangements were examined in order to identify potentials as well as obstacles in order to further develop transparent, coherent and legitimate validation arrangements. Besides of getting grass roots' feedback on the existing systems from organisations and adult education providers, the survey had the purpose to collect interesting experiences and practice as well as to understand their challenges and fears. A special focus was kept on methodologies and innovative approaches to make validation systems more inclusive and allow disadvantaged groups to move vertically and horizontally in their personal lives and careers.

The AVA survey analysis drafting on the bases of the collected results is composed by an horizontal analysis as well as national summaries and four thematic case. It aims at investigating how the EU validation practices for non-formal and informal learning contribute to making validation arrangements and activities inclusive by securing permeability of processes and results and by reducing the risk of fragmentation in validation arrangements. The AVA consortium defined the three above-mentioned key concepts as follows:

### ***Inclusion***

According to the 2012 European Council Recommendation, the validation of non-formal and informal learning could be particularly beneficial for the disadvantaged groups – in reality a much differentiated category – since validation can increase their participation in lifelong learning and their access to labour market. However, too little has been done so far to make the validation activities inclusive.

### ***Permeability of validation processes and results***

In order to secure VPL arrangements especially for the disadvantaged groups, the validation processes must be coherent, transparent and legitimate, i.e. carried out with the use of validation structure, methods, tools, criteria and standards, providing the candidate with the purpose, progress, outcome and benefits as well as results that are recognised as valid and reliable by end-users – both within formal education and by employers.

Fulfilling such requirements is necessary for the results to achieve permeability. Other important factors for achieving permeable results include validation provider's cooperation across sectors and among institutions together with contact and acknowledgement of social partners and stakeholders.

### ***Fragmentation***

Not securing such coherent and permeable processes bears the risk of fragmentation: validation candidates lose orientation and end up with partial results that limit the benefits of prior learning and qualification. The survey considers such benefits to be the validation candidate's potential for moving 'one step up' in terms of education and/or entrance to labour market.



## 2. National summaries

The analysis of survey data are carried out according to the following structure:

### Analysis structure



1. National reports (Available on demand) illustrate data from the country respondents presented in a thematic structure. The aim of the national reports is to provide the detailed and contextualized data as they stand out clearly according to respondents.
2. National summaries present in a condensed form the data from country reports. Information has been grouped following the three AVA key-concepts.
3. The horizontal analysis (Available in a separate document) provides the cross-country and cross-thematic analysis of results. This analytical level comprises the main part of the AVA survey analysis and provides as such the core line for the AVA group's further use of survey results.

---

### National summaries

The national summaries encompass national cross-respondents data, structured in terms of the key concepts above-defined. Respondents' recommendations are also included in the respective national summary. The summaries altogether form on the basis for a horizontal analysis of the key concepts.

The distribution of the more than 50 responses received from the 20 countries differs significantly from country to country. This fact, of course, has implications for the validity of the national summary and recommendations. Other parameters for data quality to be considered include the level of information in the responses, i.e. whether the responses provide detailed information or only tick 'yes' or 'no' to questions.



Austria	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	Two organisations; 1: Adult education provider and 2: Adult education provider, both at Meso level.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 1</u> is following a national validation system, as opposed to <u>organisation 2</u>. <u>Organisation 1</u> provides a full validation process, <u>organisation 2</u>, a partial including only identification and documentation stages.</p> <p>Both organisations assess organisations' validation offers to be well-known by stakeholders.</p> <p>For both organisations the important <b>permeability</b> factors regarding cooperation with stakeholders and cross-sectorial / cross-institutional cooperation are available in order to implement laws and strategies for validation. Likewise, stakeholders are involved in discussions of development and/or for operation of validation arrangement.</p> <p>Types of stakeholders for contact and / or cooperation are as follows: Government association, Ministries of Education, Labour, Social affairs - all relevant and supportive of the organisations' development and operation of validation arrangement for the target groups.</p> <p>The same regards cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation, covering cooperation with the under-privileged, organisations for development of low-threshold tools and cooperation with the labour market administration, companies and schools which are considered by the organisations to have beneficial effects on the labour market.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>For the organisation <i>not</i> providing the stages of assessment and certification the cooperation with stakeholders as well as cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation is crucial, especially taking the disadvantaged groups into consideration.</p> <p>It is impossible to assess from the respondents' data whether this is actually resulting in transferability of validation results.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p>As stated by the respondents, <i>fragmentation risks</i> are met in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- bureaucratic obstacles</li> <li>- insufficient financial resources</li> <li>- insufficient acceptance of the process</li> <li>- resistance towards the recognition of non-formal and informal learning</li> <li>- As stated by <u>organisation 1</u>, "the project is controversial in Austria since some institutions are afraid that the official degree is undermined by this way of accreditation".</li> </ul> <p>These obstacles hinder the inclusion of disadvantaged groups as well as achieving the benefit of validation arrangements.</p> <p>Both organisations deal with target groups of disadvantaged groups characterized as the unemployed, those lacking formal education, immigrants and young people. As for the parameters of <b>transparency and accessibility</b>, both organisations find their validation offers <i>transparent</i> in terms of the goal and structure as well as for the responsibilities of the validation process, while</p>



transparency for the validation arrangement generally speaking is answered no.is generally considered to be insufficient.

When it comes to accessibility, the only aspect described as *not satisfying* for concerns different geographical areas is answered, *not satisfying* (as stated by organisation 2).

It is crucial to combine organisations' validation arrangements, following a national system, with stakeholders' knowledge about the validation arrangement, as it leads to the user's acceptance. However, in the view of the above-mentioned obstacles, the process seems fragile and bears the risk of fragmentation and exclusion.

As proven by the organisations' cooperation, validation arrangements can be beneficial for the disadvantaged groups. According to respondents, the development is largely positive.



## Bulgaria

<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	Two adult education providers, both Micro level respondents.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p>Regarding the correspondence with organisation's validation strategy and policy, <u>organisation 1</u> estimates that laws, regulations and strategies provide a visible and well-known frame for the validation activities, contrary to <u>organisation 2</u>, who has an opposite view.</p> <p>One of the organisations provides the validation offer with a four stage structure including a full validation process. This organisation cooperates with other institutions and stakeholders for assessment and certification.</p> <p>According to the provided information, both organisations use standards and criteria for assessment and certification which are considered transparent for the candidate and recognised as valid and reliable by the labour market and formal education.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>According to <u>organisation 2</u>, laws, regulations and strategies do not provide a visible and well-known frame for the validation activities of the organisation. Guidance material is not available for this organisation. It appears a bit unclear how <u>organisation 2</u> – with an alternative structure, a partial validation process and no cooperation with institutions or stakeholders for assessment and certification – estimates their use of standards and criteria. Methods and tools used for this stage are said to be portfolio and self-assessment.</p> <p>Neither of the organisations makes an internal evaluation and professionals do not take part in validation networks for development of practice.</p> <p>One of the organisations provides a validation offer with an alternative structure and with a partial validation process and does not cooperate with other institutions or stakeholders for assessment and certification stages. For this organisation, learning outcomes of non-formal learning are not distinguished in terms of knowledge, skills and competences.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 1</u> provides no information about the target group, while <u>organisation 2</u> targets its validation offer to career counsellors. Disadvantaged groups do not represent a specific target group for either of the organisations. When it comes to information about validation to target groups, <u>organisation 1</u> does not provide such information, while <u>organisation 2</u> provides information to targeted individuals, social partners and the state.</p> <p><u>Organisation 1</u> describes activities for identification stage as included in the validation process; contrary to <u>organisation 2</u>. Both organisations use EU transparency tools for the documentation stage.</p> <p>Neither of the organisations provides information about guidance resources available for the validation candidate.</p> <p>As for the knowledge of validation offer, <u>organisation 2</u> comments on this when stating that validation is still not well-known by HR and individuals.</p> <p>Furthermore, <u>organisation 2</u> stresses that social partners did quite a lot of work to raise awareness and carried out some projects on the recognition of competences, but still, in general, the knowledge is very low.</p>





Denmark	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	National umbrella organisation for the non-formal education providers in Denmark; Meso level.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p>Validation offers provided by non-formal education providers in Denmark <b>do not follow a national system.</b></p> <p>The strategy and purpose of the organisation’s validation is: “to advocate for our sector’s important contribution in letting people know about the system and to support the individual in pre-phases”.</p> <p>The validation strategy includes <b>cooperation with stakeholders and other institutions.</b> This is an important permeability factor, but – according to the respondent – the cooperation does not always go smoothly.</p> <p>Regarding the potential for cross-sectoral validation, the organisation perceives an open approach and the national competence folder to be more and more used and accepted on the labour market.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>Assessment and certification stages are not included in the validation arrangement, as it covers only identification and documentation stages. The fragmentation risk appears due to the difficult cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation. The respondents describe it as “Uphill”, adding: “we keep advocating for the non-formal sector and the relevance in the field of non-formal sector.”</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p>As for the obstacles met, the respondent mentions “cross-sectorial knowledge, rigid educational standards and decentralised approach.”</p> <p>The organisation provides the following suggestion for improvement: “National projects including our sector.”</p> <p>Inclusion aspects are demonstrated by the respondent in focusing the overall validation strategy on strengthening individuals’ potential for further education or entrance to labour market, (only) for identification and documentation stages.</p> <p>No specific strategy for disadvantaged groups is included.</p> <p>The respondent says they do not know to which extent the organisation’s validation offer help disadvantaged people to move ‘one step up’ in learning or entrance to labour market.</p> <p>As for the umbrella organisation’s validation strategy, the respondent provides the following answer: “To strengthen individuals’ potential for further education or entrance to labour market, there lies a valuable inclusion potential in achieving this type of knowledge as effort of increasing inclusion, also for the disadvantaged groups”.</p>



Estonia	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	Two organisations, 1: National Umbrella organisation, Meso level and 2: Adult education provider, Micro level.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 1</u> describes <b>the strategy and purpose of the organisation’s validation arrangement</b> as follows: to raise awareness of AE providers, educators and learners, i.e. to have “negotiations with policy makers in the topic and explain the need of validation system for disadvantaged groups; to explain the value of non-formal learning and informal learning for the RPL.”</p> <p><u>Organization 2</u> describes the structure of validation arrangement as including four stages. According to the respondent, standards and criteria used for assessment are regarded <b>transparent</b> for the candidate and recognised as <b>valid and reliable within the formal education system</b>.</p> <p>As for <b>guidance resources</b>, <u>organisation 2</u> describes them as available for validation professionals. Competence requirements have been agreed on in Estonia.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 2</u> has monitored the process from applicant’s, counsellor’s and assessor’s perspective and describes it as working well after some years of mistrust. <u>Organisation 2</u> has contacts with social partners.</p> <p>When listing <b>obstacles and suggestions for improvements</b>, <u>organisation 1</u> specifically mentions transparency parameters.</p> <p>When describing the structure of the validation arrangement, <u>organisation 1</u> reports that only the identification stage is offered; “learning in non-formal education sector is built up so that it supports and encourages the learner to use the acquired knowledge and skills for RPL processes.” The organisation stresses that in the case of a validation arrangement consisting of the identification stage, there is a fragmentation risk for the further validation process, if other inclusive aspects are not available for the candidate – especially for disadvantaged groups. On the other hand, in view of the argument below, the organisation stresses that there is an inclusion aspect in the identification stage by itself in terms of the approach applied to the identification stage.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p>The <b>target group</b> of <u>organisation 1</u> includes adult people with lower education who are not qualified for the labour market. <u>Organisation 1</u> reports that only the identification stage is offered, but it has a special benefit for the disadvantaged groups, as “learning in non-formal education sector is built up so that it supports and encourages learner to use the acquired knowledge and skills for RPL processes.”</p> <p>As for the <b>information about validation</b>, <u>organisation 2</u> considers it to be well distributed, reporting that “due to the university’s RPL policy, current and prospective students are informed about RPL (target group is current and prospective students)”. However, information about validation is not properly addressed to disadvantaged groups.</p> <p>Guidance &amp; counselling resources are available for the validation candidate. As for accessibility, there is a special need for development of disadvantaged groups and those with primary or middle school education.</p>



Finland	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	Three organisations, organisation 1: national umbrella organisation, Meso level; organisation 2: national organisation for adult education, Meso level; Adult education provider, Micro level.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<u>Organisation 1</u> <b>does not follow a national validation system</b> nor has it regulations for validation at sectorial or regional level implemented in the validation arrangements. <u>Organisation 2</u> <b>follows a national validation system</b> and has regulations implemented in the validation arrangements (EQF-levels in the courses) and for the standards of validation of prior learning. <u>Organisation 3</u> offers a four stage validation structure and uses EU transparency tools for documentation. Tools and methods used for the assessment stage are national assessment criteria, linked to NQF. EU credit systems are regarded applicable also for validation of non-formal learning outcomes: “ECVET system actually improves the modularity of the training and thus makes it easier to recognise non-formal and informal learning outcomes. In Finland, non-formal training is well established and works as supplementary training for formal training, especially in VET.”
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	Both <u>organisation 1 and 2</u> <b>cooperate with stakeholders</b> for discussions and development of validation practice.  <u>Organisation 2</u> has an alternative <b>validation structure</b> – it uses its own models and forms and does not cooperate with other institutions for assessment and certification. No specific tools for disadvantaged groups are used in the validation process. For standards and criteria it uses the benchmark certification model and Open Badges.
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	According to <u>organisation 1 and 2</u> , lack of common language, common criteria and mistrust in the cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation provide fragmentation risks for validation arrangements.  All the three organisations are open to validation for disadvantaged groups, but without a special strategy for these groups. <u>Organisation 3</u> provided <b>information about validation</b> for “adults, in working life, but who wish to upskill”; these sometimes included disadvantaged groups, but they were not specifically targeted. <u>Organisation 1</u> considers <b>transparency</b> regarding the <i>Goal</i> as unclear for the non-formal adult education, whilst both organisations regard all accessibility parameters as satisfying. According to <u>Organisation 3</u> , “ <b>Guidance and counselling</b> resources are embedded in each phase of the validation. Form of guidance procedures is always described in the validation plan”. Guidance & counselling <b>support the individual in making the validation purpose clear</b> thanks to the following methods: “Draft of individual validation plan described the stage for the individual, including guidance needs. The individual plan is carried out together with the candidate. This makes the candidates more aware of the focus and helps them take responsibility for making their own competence visible.”



## France

<p><b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b></p>	<p>Two organisations; organisation 1: Adult education provider, micro level and organisation 2: adult education provider, micro level.</p>
<p><b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b></p>	<p>Both organisations say that laws and regulations provide a visible and well-known frame for the validation arrangements provided. They indicated that the 4 stage process as the most common in their organisations as well as that activities are offered in the identification phase.</p> <p><u>Organisation 2</u> uses EU transparency tools for the documentation stage and description of the diploma for the assessment stage.</p> <p>Both organisations distinguish non-formal learning outcomes in terms of knowledge, skills and competences and believe that the standards and criteria used are transparent for the candidate and recognised as valid and reliable within the formal educational system. Both organisations regard EU credit systems to be applicable also for the validation of non-formal learning.</p> <p>Both organisation declare that guidance material is available for validation professionals.</p>
<p><b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b></p>	<p><u>Organisation 2</u> cooperates with stakeholders and social partners, specifically: “the government, the cities where we work and the regional council.” However, they do not have cross-sectorial or cross-institutional cooperation. <u>Organisation 1</u> cooperates with professionals from the sector in different fields, but not with social partners.</p>
<p><b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b></p>	<p><u>Organisation 1</u> declares to use an internal assessment tool.</p> <p><u>Organisation 2</u> is concerned by the fact that they are not independent in working on the validation process. It considers the decrease in interest perceived in the last years as a consequence of the fact that the promotional activities are not done internally.</p> <p><u>Organisation 2</u> states that there is a correspondence with the organisation’s strategy and the national policy.</p> <p>The organisations list the following resources for guidance and counselling for the validation candidate:</p> <p><u>Organisation 1</u>: website, flyers, specific meetings with candidates;</p> <p><u>Organisation 2</u>: individual support and guidance tools for evaluation of prior learning.</p> <p>In both cases the organisations consider it useful for the candidate to understand the benefits of the process and her/his interests and needs.</p>



## Germany

<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	3 organisations; organisation 1: Umbrella organisation for adult education, Meso level; organisation 2: adult education provider, Micro level; organisation 3: Youth and adult education provider, Micro level.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	Nationally recognized <b>criteria and standards</b> are used; KØDE, NQF together with EU transparency tools are used by both <u>organisation 2 and 3</u> ; Europass and Youthpass are also used. <u>Organisation 2</u> develops assessment tools based on ECVET are developed for specific profiles such as guidance counsellors, geriatric nurses. <u>Organisation 3</u> develops a <b>cooperation with other institutions and stakeholders</b> such as companies, VET schools, city administration (social departments).
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<u>Organisations 2 and 3</u> claim that <b>laws and regulations</b> do not form a visible and well-known frame for the validation arrangements. Both of them use an alternative <b>structure of validation arrangement</b> that includes only two stages: Identification and Documentation. <u>Organisations 2 and 3</u> use a variety of <b>activities for the identification</b> stage. Both organisations report a lack of clear procedures implemented at the policy level. <u>Organisation 3</u> states that the discussion on what can should be recognised as learning outcomes is still highly controversial among validation stakeholders, especially when talking about soft skills (i.e. citizenship competences). <u>Organisation 3</u> reports that they are implementing a project focusing competence-orientation in training and qualification for teaching staff.
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<u>Organisation 1</u> says they have no <b>specific strategy for disadvantaged groups</b> . <b>The knowledge about validation</b> is generally quite low, with little understanding of it among employers. <u>Organisation 2</u> stresses the need for introducing more visibility of this subject. It is the impression that <b>information about validation</b> is not properly addressed towards the disadvantaged groups. Although the interest for validation is growing, the communication between different stakeholders and users is still inadequate.  <u>In the case of organisation 3</u> , the target group includes people from different age groups, many of them in risk of unemployment. The information is properly addressed for these groups and disseminated directly to them, individually in connection with their education process.



Greece	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	Two organisations; organisation 1: Adult education provider, Micro level; organisation 2: Adult education provider (mainly providing English courses and language related services), Micro level.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	There is no <b>legislative framework for validation</b> in Greece. <b>The regulations</b> are provided by the provision of tools identified by European and global standards, for instance: Open Badges, YouthPass, profilPASS, FACTS. Information on foreign language validation – FACTS or OPEN BADGES, in ICT, BRANDING, TEAM WORKING or profilPASS is spread step by step by <u>organisation 1</u> . <b>EU transparency tools</b> are used, though considered too technical and not flexible enough. Non-formal learning outcomes are distinguished in terms of knowledge, skills and competences.
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<u>Organisation 2</u> uses a full validation process; it cooperates with other institutions or stakeholders for assessment and certification. <u>Organisation 1</u> uses an alternative <b>structure for the validation</b> arrangement with all four stages included. EU credit systems could be applicable with more information and training required for the experts – guides and counsellors, AE and VET providers. NQF is not fully developed and not ready to respond to EQF. <u>Organisation 1</u> makes use of “the models provided through global and European perspectives and by that they prepare for the expected official changes to be occurred in the Greek system.”
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 1</u> stresses the needs for development in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The issue of (lack of) standards and quality</li> <li>● Resistance in the formal education system – lack of trust.</li> </ul> <p><b>Information</b> about validation is addressed to the groups of disadvantaged, but needs to be made more specific. As stated by one organisation, “we just recently got the information on free possibilities – especially from other European countries, still not applied in the Greek context, step by step we carefully spread the information on foreign language validation – FACTS or OPEN BADGES, in ICT, BRANDING, TEAM WORKING or profilPASS.” The organisation also held free information sessions for the disadvantaged groups.</p> <p><b>The following activities are included in the identification stage:</b> information, guidance and counselling also for clarification of validation purpose. <b>Resources for guidance and counselling</b> are available for the validation candidate.</p>



## Hungary

<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	<p>One organisation, Adult education provider, Micro level.</p> <p>The respondent does not respond to the question on validation of non-formal and informal learning outcomes, only stating that “candidates can only sign up for having their formerly passed courses recognised through a formal validation process”.</p>
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><b>Standards and criteria for assessment</b> used are recognised as valid and reliable within the formal education system – through providing any details about them (<i>see also below on fragmentation risks</i>).</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p><b>Validation structure</b> is an alternative structure; no activities for identification are included, there is no use of EU transparency tools for documentation. Tools for assessment consist of formulas to be filled in by the students to be assessed. As for the methods used for assessment, these are said to be: “formal assessment of student’s prior learning performance.”</p> <p>Non-formal learning outcomes are not distinguished in terms of knowledge, skills and competences.</p> <p>It is the assessment of the organisation that the VPL system ought to be developed in a more complex form.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p>The organisation does not provide any specific <b>information about validation</b>, though it describes it as a significant issue. Information is not properly addressed to the target disadvantaged groups.</p> <p><b>Guidance and counselling resources</b> are available for the candidate; they make the benefits of validation clear for the individual as well as support the understanding of his or her own interests and particular needs.</p> <p>This is done thanks to personal, face-to-face dialogue and other communication methods.</p>





Iceland	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	<p>One organisation; Other organisation, Education and Training Service Centre, ETSC, Meso level. ETSC does not conduct validation but makes contracts with LLL centres around the country, oversees quality issues and collects statistics.</p>
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><b>The laws and regulations from 2011</b> emphasized the stages of validation and training of staff. With regard to the recognition of non-formal and informal learning, there is a law which states that <b>validation results are equal to formal education</b>. Validation offer is well-known among stakeholders.</p> <p>All parameters were present <b>for transparency and accessibility</b>, except for accessibility for different target groups. The identification stage is <b>coordinated with</b> other stages. <b>Standards and criteria used</b> vary from curricula and specific jobs. Several projects have developed job standards.</p> <p>The validation strategy of the organisation includes <b>cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation</b>. The organisation cooperates with stakeholders in order to implement laws and strategies for validation. Stakeholders are highly involved in discussions for development and for operation of validation practice and arrangements. Moreover, the organisation keeps contacts with social partners.</p> <p>“The experience in Iceland is that in the beginning many would not accept the notion of validating non-formal skills, but as we have taken one step at a time in cooperation, this has changed through the cooperation in specific pilot projects and developments.”</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p><b>Obstacles for cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation</b> are described as “often related to the lack of knowledge of the validation concept and the understanding of opportunities within it.”</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p>The organisation lists the following <b>target groups</b>: disadvantaged groups, low qualified adults, unemployed; also migrants, but to a lesser extent.</p> <p>According to the assessment of the organisation, validation arrangement helps more than 50 % of the disadvantaged individuals <b>to move one step up</b>.</p> <p>However, the organisation provides a negative answer for <b>accessibility for different target groups</b>, admitting that “rural areas can be difficult in terms of reaching individuals and linking them to education following validation”. According to the laws, rights for validation are not included for Greece.</p>





Ireland	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	<p>Eight organisations; org 1: other organisation, Meso level; org 2: Adult education provider, Micro level. Org 3: other organisation, Meso level, org 4: Adult education provider, Micro level. Org 5: Adult education provider, Micro level. Org 6: Adult education provider, Micro level. Org 7: Adult education provider, Micro level. Org 8: Other organisation, Micro level</p>
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p>When it comes to the <b>implementation of laws and regulations in validation arrangements / national system</b>, <u>organisation 1</u> describes some of its networks as working directly with QQI and other award bodies, including industry-led certification and regulations at sectorial or regional level. Individual institutes of technology work with individual networks and QQI is the next most structured. Few of the organisations practice a four stage <b>structure</b> with a full validation process. Four organisations said they included <b>activities in the identification stage of the validation process</b>; the remaining respondents said no activities were included or did not provide any answer.</p> <p>Two organisations use EU Transparency tools, like Europass and Youthpass. Two organisations use <b>transparent standards and criteria</b> linked to the NQF and recognised within the formal education system and the labour market. Most organisations (5 out of 7) use the EU credit systems or find them applicable for assessment of non-formal learning. Most organisations (5 out of 7) <b>distinguish in the assessment stage</b> non-formal learning outcomes in terms of knowledge, skills and competences.</p> <p><b>Validation purpose</b> is described by the majority of respondents in terms of employment (training) rather than education.</p> <p>All organisations describe <b>guidance material</b> as <b>available for the professionals</b>. All organisations also say they are involved in <b>cooperation with stakeholders, contacts with social partners / cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation</b>, with minor exceptions.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p><b>The structure of validation arrangements</b> is mostly alternative, including partial validation.</p> <p>Most organisations do not use any transparency tools for documentation. When it comes to the use of the <b>EU credit systems</b>, one organisation admits: <i>“there is a lot of work to be done in the validation of experiential learning. Current models that I have seen are too complex, and it is often easier for learners to simply do the award rather than gather the extensive evidence often requested to demonstrate they have met learning”</i>.</p> <p>Two organisations do not <b>cooperate with stakeholders, other institutions cooperate for assessment or have contact with social partners</b>.</p> <p>When listing <b>the obstacles and suggestions</b>, the general consensus is that the process could be organised more effectively. The respondents expressed the following opinions:</p> <p><i>“The obstacles usually result from the lack of knowledge of the system. There is more publicity needed”</i>.</p> <p><i>“Our validation arrangements could be improved. In the current Irish system, the language of certification does not match with that used in Europe and this can lead to issues. Suggestion: more learning, commitment of the benefits of these arrangements, leadership of a rigorous approach to be put in place in the interest of learners”</i>.</p>



*“The linear structure of NQF’s is problematic given that the learning process itself is not linear. The relegation of more mundane functions to the lower levels of NQF’s (define, describe, etc.) also pose a problem when applied in adult learning contexts. This is elitist and contributes to the binary division of educational opportunity along class lines”.*

*“The Irish NQF is too subjective, too rigid and discouraging for those adults who should be entering at levels 7 and up, but due to socio economic circumstances are only able to access levels 1-6. The NQF is not neutral, it is elitist”.*

*“We should make suggestions to the Department of Education regarding provision of such a service within ETB structure. Personnel must be employed to deliver the service.*

According to organisation 7, *“More improvements are needed. We still have not implemented RPL. It would be a good idea to develop a national agreed database that would include personal outcomes. CEFA has developed a tool in Ireland. Wider benefits of learning should be adopted by SOLAS and used nationally”.*

Information about validation, generally for all organisations – not a specific purpose, information is primarily given as part of education/study programmes; apart from organisation 7, whose target groups include the long-term unemployed, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and members of the Irish Traveller Community.

## INCLUSION ASPECTS

**Knowledge, motivation and interest for validation** differ depending on the target group and on whether validation is combined with study programmes or to learning programmes: from very low to fair. Motivation for education and labour market and with a growing interest, because of increased awareness of benefits. For most of the organisations, the information seems not properly addressed to disadvantaged groups.

There seem to be conflicting views as to **the effectiveness of guidance and counselling**, with approximately one half of the respondents claiming it **makes the benefit clear for the individual**, and the other half having an opposite opinion.



Italy	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	Two organisations; organisation 1: Adult education provider, Micro level, Organisation 2: Adult education provider, Micro level (many questions are skipped by organisation 2).
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p>While <u>organisation 1</u> considers <b>laws and regulations to provide a visible and well-known structure for validation arrangements</b>, <u>organisation 2</u> has an opposite view.</p> <p>As for <b>the structure of the validation arrangement</b>, <u>organisation 1</u> has a four stage structure, with documentation being most commonly used. <u>Organisation 1</u> includes <b>activities for identification stage</b> in the validation process.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>None of the organisations' validation arrangements refer to regulations for the validation activities.</p> <p><u>Organisation 2</u> provides a validation arrangement with an alternative <b>structure</b>: <i>"Our system is related to individual project activities by Italian and European models, applied to non-formal competences"</i>. It is not involved in any cooperation with other institutions or stakeholders for assessment and certification.</p> <p>In the case of <u>organisation 1</u>, no <b>guidance material</b> is available for validation professionals.</p> <p>Both organisations mention significant <b>obstacles</b>. Organisation 1 complains about having <i>"too few resources to fully apply validation arrangements for volunteers"</i>, while <u>organisation 2</u> reports: <i>"We have encountered difficulties in the validation systems because often there are no systems internationally recognised and valid for each European country. Moreover, it is not easy to find the choice of systems for the validation of skills and results, as relevant information is not widespread and disseminated effectively"</i>.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p>The organisations do not specifically mention disadvantaged groups as target groups for validation.</p> <p><u>Organisation 2</u> believes that generally speaking, there is little knowledge about validation, in spite of a growing interest for mainly education and labour market as well as soft skills acquired during non-formal and informal learning.</p> <p>As for <b>guidance and counselling resources</b>, it is believed that the benefits of validation are generally made clear and help the individuals understand their own interests and particular needs.</p>



## Netherlands

<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	Four organisations; organisation 1: other organisation, Meso level. Organisation 2, Micro level. Organisation 3: Adult education provider, Micro level. Organisation 4: Adult education provider, Micro level.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 1</u> follows a <b>national validation system</b>, namely: “promotes RPL and NLQF in NL. It was commissioned by the Ministry of Education to implement the labour market instruments – <a href="http://www.nplll.nl">http://www.nplll.nl</a>” <b>Regulations at sectorial and regional</b> level are said to be implemented in the validation arrangements: “A quality code is developed for RPL procedures. For the NLQF system, there are procedures to assess validity of organisation and experts who are analysing the qualifications”. The organisation’s <b>strategy for validation / purpose of validation within organisation</b> is to “develop ECVET pilots to validate micro-units for disadvantaged groups. This makes validation more accessible/ to strengthen individual’s potential for further education or entrance to labour market”.</p> <p>One organisation report having a validation arrangement with <b>four stage structure</b>. According to all organisations, there were <b>activities included in identification stage</b> of the validation process. Two organisations use EU transparency tools for documentation, ECVET and Europass – the other do not. Three organisations perceive a <b>correspondence with organisation’s strategy and policy</b>. The organisations report that <b>guidance material is available for professionals and there are clear competence requirements</b> “The assessors need to be trained and certified. Rockwool works with only accredited learning organisations like a VET school and its validation professionals are linked to the Dutch Foundation for Validation of Prior Learning (EC-VPL)”.</p> <p>All of the respondents also said that they are involved in <b>cooperation with stakeholders, cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation</b> and had <b>contacts with social partners</b>.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>One organisation reported using transparent standards and criteria, but claimed they were not always accepted. One organisation does not distinguish non-formal learning outcomes in terms of knowledge, skills and competences. The organisations listed the following <b>obstacles</b>: “Different collective labour market agreements, regional differences, sectors want to keep employees in own sector”, “No acceptance of RPL report, trust, no collaboration industry”.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p><b>Target groups</b> were described as people with learning disabilities, autism, early school leavers, volunteers and migrant women.</p> <p>With regard to <b>knowledge, motivation and interest</b>, the respondents mentioned low interest and described information as not properly addressed. Problems lie in raising awareness. However, the respondents consider the <b>knowledge about validation</b> to be fair, provided there is enough interest among candidates.</p> <p>All organisations say that <b>guidance and counselling make the benefits of validation clear for the individual and support understanding of own interests and particular needs</b>.</p>



## Norway

<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	<p>One organisation; Umbrella organisation, Meso level.</p>
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p>The organisation does not follow a national validation system, nor are regulations for validation at sectorial or regional level implemented. The <b>structure of validation</b> arrangement is described as including all four stages.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>As for the <b>strategy and purpose of validation</b>, the organisation reports project coordination with other European stakeholders to develop existing tools, e.g. validation of non-formal providers.</p> <p>As for the validation offer, it is reported to be <b>well-known</b> among stakeholders. The organisation cooperates with stakeholders for the implementation of laws and strategies for validation (Ministry of Education, The National Agency for Adult Education (VOX)).</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p><b>Standards and criteria</b> for assessment and certification stage are not fully implemented.</p> <p>As for the <b>obstacles</b> that were encountered, the organisation singles out the lack of knowledge among partners and providers.</p> <p>The organisation <b>suggests</b> improving the marketing strategy and promoting a better understanding of the non-formal sector among the policy-makers and on the labour market.</p> <p>The strategy does not include a specific strategy for disadvantaged groups, though disabled people are part of the organisation's agenda.</p> <p>The answer for <b>transparency and accessibility</b> is negative, particularly with regard to financial costs and geographical accessibility.</p> <p>The organisation's validation offer helps between 25- 50 % to move one step up for access to education or entrance to labour market – among others, <i>"thanks to cooperation with the organisation's relevant member organisation"</i>.</p>



Portugal	
GENERAL INFORMATION	<p>Four organisations; Organisation 1: Umbrella organisation, Meso level. Organisation 2: Adult education provider, Micro level. Organisation 3: Adult education provider, Micro level. Organisation 4: Adult education provider, Micro level.</p>
PERMEABILITY FACTORS	<p>One organisation’s validation arrangement follows a national validation system, stating that individuals over the age of 18 are allowed to ask for recognition of experience and competences acquired in formal, non-formal and informal contexts and ask for a diploma similar to a school level.</p> <p><u>Organisations 1 and 3</u> have a four stage <b>structure of validation arrangement</b>. <u>Organisation 1</u> reported the validation agreement to be generally <b>transparent and accessible with regard to all parameters</b>. The same organisation also claimed that the <b>identification stage was coordinated with other stages</b>. All organisations said that there were <b>activities included in the identification stage</b> of the validation process.</p> <p><u>Organisation 2</u> reported using <b>EU transparency tools for documentation stage</b>. Most organisations reported to be involved in <b>cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation, cooperation with stakeholders and contacts with social partners</b>.</p> <p>All organisations also reported to be using the <b>EU credit systems</b> as well as <b>transparent standards and criteria for assessment linked to NQF and recognised as valid and reliable</b>. Regarding <b>EU transparency tools for documentation stage</b>, organisation 4 declined using them.</p> <p><u>Organisations 2 and 3</u> said that <b>guidance material was made available for validation professionals</b>, which they described as follows: <i>“According to legislation available to the tasks of structure”, “By continuing education”, “the formation is promoted by ANQEP and our institution”, “there is a regional network of validation centres. Promote training for technicians through informal meeting that allow you to share doubts and promote adjustment strategies”</i>. On the contrary, organisation 4 reported that <b>guidance material was not made available for validation professionals</b>.</p>
FRAGMENTATION RISKS	<p><u>Both organisation 1 and 2</u> reports that the <b>correspondence of validation arrangement with organisation’s strategy and policy is visible and well-known among stakeholders and among individuals</b>. <u>Organisations 3 and 4</u> did not consider <b>correspondence of validation arrangement with organisation’s strategy and policy as visible and well-known frame by stakeholders and among individuals</b>.</p> <p>In terms of <b>financing</b>, the organisations reported insufficient financing for validation of non-formal and informal learning in Portugal since September 2013.</p> <p>The respondents list a number of <b>obstacles</b>, most importantly regarding excessive bureaucracy. The proof of certification is also criticized, as it modifies the validation methodology and increases the anxiety of candidates. Another</p>



## INCLUSION ASPECTS

source of concern is the lack of financing for validation of non-formal and informal learning since September 2013, which has effectively crushed the system. As a result, half of the centres, mainly based in the civil society structures, are functioning without funding. As the centres are not allowed to charge its end user, in practice they are left completely without funding sources. Another reported **obstacles** included the necessity to pass a full formal examination.

As for the **suggestions**, the respondents would like to see a simplification of the administrative process and a general shift in the understanding of the sector.

**Target groups** for information include: young adults who have not completed mandatory education as well as adults who want and need to improve their knowledge.

The respondents describe the general level of **knowledge** as low to medium, while the **interest** is said to be stagnating if not directly falling due to economic reasons. The information is not properly addressed for the groups of disadvantaged.

The **information about validation** of non-formal learning is said to be disseminated through the web-site, newsletters, among citizens, guardians of students, in a national database on centres called CQEP, on the website of the provider's institution, on Facebook, leaflets and through direct contact with people.

Organisations 2 and 4 claim that **guidance and counselling for the individual make the benefits of validation clear and support the understanding of own interests and particular needs.**

As for the **tools and methods especially developed or adapted for the disadvantaged**, they are used by organisation 2 "identify life experience, temporal location and the organisation of the candidate's idea".





Romania	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	<p>Six organisations; Organisation 1: Other organisation, Meso level. Organisation 2: Other organisation, Micro level. Organisation 3: Adult education provider, Micro level. Organisation 4: Adult education provider, Micro level. Organisation 5: Adult education provider, Micro level. Organisation 6: Adult education provider, Micro level.</p>
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 1</u> reports to be <b>following a national validation system</b>, and claims its <b>purpose of validation</b> is to authorize the centre for assessment of professional competences.</p> <p><b>The structure of validation arrangement</b> contains four stages.</p> <p>The validation process is generally considered to be <b>transparent</b>, particularly with regard to basic competences.</p> <p>The validation process is also considered <b>accessible</b>, especially as it provides financial incitements for unemployed people who request a validation process. All organisations report to include <b>activities for the identification stage</b>. Also all organisations, except for <u>organisation 3</u>, claim that there is a <b>correspondence with organisation’s strategy and policy, a visible and well-known frame for validation due to laws, regulations and strategies by stakeholders and individuals</b>.</p> <p><u>Organisations 4 and 6</u> report using <b>EU transparency tools for documentation</b>, namely Europass CV, which instead are not used by <u>organisations 2, 3 and 5</u>. All organisations see <b>transparent credit standards and criteria linked to NQF and recognised as valid and reliable</b>. Also all organisations, except for <u>organisation 4</u>, perceive the <b>EU credit systems to be applicable</b>.</p> <p><u>Organisations 3, 4, and 5</u> say that there is <b>guidance material available for validation professionals</b>, whilst organisation 2 believes the opposite.</p> <p><u>Organisations 1, 3, 4 and 5</u> mostly report that they are not engaged in <b>cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation, cooperation with other institutions and stakeholders or contacts with social partner</b>, which is instead the case for <u>organisations 2 and 4</u>.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>The structure of validation arrangement is described by some respondents as alternative.</p> <p><u>Organisation 1</u> also perceives there is a lack of financial accessibility, as every centre for assessment of professional competences establishes its own fee.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p>The procedure for validation in the country does not contain a strategy for disadvantaged groups. As for the <b>organisation’s strategy for disadvantaged groups</b>, <u>organisation 1</u> reports having no such strategy in the validation agreement.</p> <p>As <b>target groups</b>, <u>organisation 2</u> lists adults between 20 and 80, from rural and urban areas who are looking for their skills to be certified. The information is said to be disseminated through families, at work places of the candidates, in other institutions.</p> <p>In the case of <u>organisation 3</u>, the target group includes students with previous work experience.</p> <p>The general impression is that individuals should be better <b>addressed about</b></p>





**validation** and its advantages through awareness and counselling campaigns. The number of candidates is expected to grow, but re-authorisation turns out to be problematic in terms of the length of the procedure. One organisation considers information is properly addressed, with the exception of the disadvantaged groups. The interest seems to be falling, the number of validations have decreased. This can be explained by the lack of financing, which requires the candidates to pay for the validation process. Another organisation claims that “participants are very interested in validation and recognition of organized courses and their options are heading towards recognised professional training in EU”. This organization believes that information is properly addressed, also for the disadvantaged groups. Interest, however, is falling, expected to decrease by 40% next year. Yet another organisation has another view, claiming that: “the interest is growing, but a new regulation of Romanian Authority for Qualifications (RAQ) excludes all candidates with a level greater than 4; in IRC sector, more than 65% of occupations are the level higher than 4; the number of disadvantaged will increase”.

All organisations believe that **guidance and counselling make the benefits of validation clear for the individual**, but organisations 2, 3 and 5 do not perceive it as **supporting the understanding of own interests and particular needs**.



## Slovakia

<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	One organisation; Organisation 1: Adult education provider, Micro level
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><b>Laws and regulations do not provide a visible and well-known frame for the validation arrangement.</b> Regulations exist in terms of the organisation's own internal rules and practices.</p> <p><b>Activities for identification stage</b> are not included.</p> <p>EU transparency tools for documentation are used, particularly Youthpass. EU credit systems are not regarded applicable.</p> <p>The <b>general knowledge</b> about validation is low. Most candidates are said to participate in the process to increase employability and for personal purposes, but the interest is growing, <i>"thanks to a relevant validation system which would be respected in our country"</i>.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>Organisation 1 reports no cooperation with social partners.</p> <p>The validation structure is described as alternative, with no concrete structure.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p>The result of validation process is partial validation.</p> <p><b>Guidance resources</b> for the validation candidate are said to <b>make the benefit of validation clear for the individual and support the understanding of own interests and particular needs.</b></p>



Spain	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	Two organisations; organisation 1: Adult education provider, Micro level. Organisation 2: Adult education provider, Micro level.
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><b>The structure of the validation arrangement</b> described by <u>organisation 2</u> has four stages. <b>Activities for identification</b> are not included in the arrangement by <u>organisation 1</u>, but they are by <u>organisation 2</u>.</p> <p>The organisation also uses <b>EU transparency tools</b> for documentation, contrary to <u>organisation 1</u>.</p> <p><b>EU credit systems</b> are regarded applicable for the validation of non-formal learning outcomes by <u>organisation 2</u>, but not by <u>organisation 1</u>, who explains that “<i>they obey labour market</i>”.</p> <p>For both organisations, <b>the standards and criteria</b> used for the assessment stage are linked to the national QF, and recognised as valid and reliable by the labour market.</p> <p>Both organisations <b>distinguish non-formal learning outcomes</b> – in the assessment – in terms of knowledge, skills and competences.</p> <p>One organisation <b>cooperates with other institutions and stakeholders</b> for the assessment and certification stages (schools and universities). Both organisations have <b>contacts with social partners</b>.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 2</u> does not consider <b>laws and regulations</b> to provide a visible and well-known frame for the organisation’s validation arrangement. The same organisation also reports that the validation arrangement is not <b>structured</b> at the moment.</p> <p>As for the <b>obstacles</b>, <u>organisation 1</u> mentions insufficient access to training, particularly for volunteers, while <u>organisation 2</u> notes the problem with recognizing the skills of the Romani community, which are often undocumented. Regarding the <b>suggestions</b>, one organisation points out that unifying the validation at the European level must have the idiosyncrasies of each country and each culture.</p> <p>It is also believed necessary to recognise the non-formal and informal learning validation through several channels and also in the cases where the documental proof of learning or previous life’s experiences does not exist.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p><u>Organisation 1</u>, who targets volunteers in adult education institutions, trainers and adult education schools, believes that the <b>information is properly addressed</b>. <u>Organisation 2</u>, who targets Romani women, has an opposite view. <b>The knowledge about validation</b> is described as very low, but one organisation has noted a slight increase in participation levels. Most candidates are motivated by employability and <b>the general interest</b> seems to be growing.</p> <p>For both organisations <b>guidance and counselling</b> make the benefit of validation clear for the individual and support the understanding of interests and particular needs of the validation candidate. Both organisations use a process-based and dialogue-oriented approach and relevant methods.</p>



## Sweden

<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	One organisation; organisation 1: Umbrella organisation, Meso level
<b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b>	<p><b>The organisation's strategy of validation</b> is to implement the first national system for validating general competences for the labour market.</p> <p>The organisation <b>cooperates with stakeholders</b> in order to implement laws and regulations, and also for discussion, development of validation arrangement and for operation.</p> <p><b>Cross-sectorial and cross-institutional cooperation</b> is included – HEI's National Board of Education, National Labour Agency, National Board of Vocational Training and several organisations within the voluntary sector. The assessment stage is carried out by certified trainers.</p> <p>All modules for assessment have been approved by a panel of key organisations on the labour market.</p>
<b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b>	<p>Validation arrangements are not <b>following a national validation system or regulations</b>.</p> <p><b>The structure of the validation system</b> is alternative – influenced by the OCN, but owned and implemented by the organisation. The validation offer is not well-known by stakeholders, but among individuals. The implementation process of the model has started in 2015 and is not well-known or widespread yet.</p> <p>Among the <b>obstacles</b>, the organisation mentions struggling with insufficient financial resources and sometimes negative attitudes.</p>
<b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b>	<p><b>Disadvantaged groups</b> (young people with a lack of formal education and work experience, migrants, young unemployed and school drop-outs) are included in the strategy of validation as a main focus for the 3 years implementation project.</p> <p>The validation process is described as fully <b>transparent and accessible</b>. There is also additional funding for the making the arrangement accessible for about 3000 individuals in the period 2015-2018.</p> <p>According to <u>organisation 1</u> 50 % of the candidates are moving <b>one-step up</b> due to the validation arrangement.</p>



## UK

<p><b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b></p>	<p>One organisation: National umbrella organisation, Meso level.</p>
<p><b>PERMEABILITY FACTORS</b></p>	<p>The organisation reported the validation process to be largely <b>transparent</b>, with the exception of the transparency of the standards used - as indicated by the respondent; the validity of assessment is left to learning providers to choose how they assess.</p> <p>When discussing the purpose, the organisation reported they did not undertake validation directly, but they have conducted research on recognition of prior achievement.</p> <p>The organisation also claims to be <b>cooperating with other partners for assessment according to education and labour market perspectives</b>, as the provider staff undertaking validation is made aware of skills needs described to them by local employers.</p> <p>The system is also described as permeable, as the organisation states that <i>“because validation leads to recognition of the award of QCF units, from regulated qualifications the outcome is indistinguishable from the learners who have completed a qualification by studying towards every part of it”</i>.</p>
<p><b>FRAGMENTATION RISKS</b></p>	<p>The respondent said the organisation <b>did not follow a national validation system</b>, nor did it implement <b>regulations for validation at sectorial or regional level</b>.</p>
<p><b>INCLUSION ASPECTS</b></p>	<p>When discussing <b>the extent to which the organisation’s validation offer helps disadvantaged people to move ‘one step up’ in learning or entrance to labour market</b>, the organisation provided the following answer:  <i>“We don’t undertake validation directly, but we believe that because it is undertaken by an individual on an individual basis that a high proportion will benefit in moving one step up.</i></p> <p>The validation process is also described as <b>accessible</b>, except for the accessibility in different geographical areas. This largely depends on whether the local providers have the expertise to undertake the assessment.</p>