



**Project Title:** ENhANCE: EuropeaN curriculum for fAmily aNd Community nursE

**Contract No:** 2017 - 2976 / 001 - 001

**EU Programme:** Erasmus plus

**Start of project:** 1 January 2018

**Duration:** 3 years

## **Deliverable No: 8.1.2**

### **Midterm Quality Assessment**

**Due date of deliverable:** 31.08.2019

**Actual submission date:** 28.10.2019

**Version:** 1<sup>st</sup> Version

**Authors:** Lars Oertel, AWV  
Madeleine Diab, AFBB



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect 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.

Project ref. number	591946-EPP-1-2017-1-IT-EPPKA2-SSA
Project title	<b>ENhANCE</b> - EuropeaN curriculum for fAmily aNd Community nursE

Deliverable title	Midterm Quality Assessment
Deliverable number	Deliverable no. 8.1.2
Deliverable version	Version 1
Previous version(s)	
Contractual date of delivery	31.08.2019
Actual date of delivery	28.10.2019
Deliverable filename	ENhANCE_D8.1.2_v20191028.pdf
Type of deliverable	Midterm quality assessment
Language	English
Dissemination level	PU
Number of pages	49
Work package	WP8
Partner responsible	AWV
Author(s)	Lars Oertel, AWV Madeleine Diab, AFBB
EC Project Officer	Urška Primec

Abstract	This report summarizes the activities and results under Task 8.1 (Quality Assessment) in M1-M21. Referring to the “Quality Assessment Plan” (D8.1.1) delivered at M6, it gives an overview of the various roles and their
----------	---

	responsibilities in ENhANCE regarding quality assurance. In chapter 3, the current status of Task 8.1 including the carried out and upcoming activities are described in detail, along with their main results. The report ends with a reflection and self-assessment of WP8 and the conclusions that will have an impact on M22-M36 of the project.
Keywords	Quality, assessment, monitoring, roles, responsibilities, external experts, EQAVET.

**Signatures**

Reviewed by	Role (Organization)	Date
Reviewer 1	Hannele Turunen, Mina Azimirad (UEF)	18/10/2019
Reviewer 2	Francesca Pozzi (CNR-ITD)	24/10/2019
Approved by	Role (Organization)	Date
Francesca Pozzi	Project Coordinator (CNR-ITD)	28/10/2019
Flavio Manganello	Quality Manager (CNR-ITD)	28/10/2019

## Table of Contents

Executive summary .....	6
Definitions and Acronyms.....	7
1. Introduction .....	8
1.1 Brief introduction to this document.....	8
2. Roles and Responsibilities – The Quality Assessment Team in ENhANCE .....	10
2.1 External Experts .....	11
2.2 Steering Committee .....	11
2.3 General Assembly.....	12
2.4 Editorial Board .....	12
3. Activities carried out under T8.1 (M1-M21).....	13
3.1 Detailed description of activities (M1-M21).....	13
3.2 Results of activities (M1-M21).....	18
4. Activities planned under T8.1 (M22-M36) .....	20
4.1 Detailed description of planned activities (M22-M36).....	20
4.2 Report on potential changes to Quality Assessment Plan .....	22
5. Self-evaluation as part of the Quality Assurance .....	23
6. Discussion and Conclusions.....	24
7. References.....	25
Appendix.....	I
I. Overview Activities Task 8.1 (M1-M21).....	I
II. Overview Activities Task 8.1 (M22-M36).....	III
III. Collaborative document for the work with EQAVET .....	IV
IV. Activities and involvement of External Experts.....	XXIV

## Executive summary

This report summarizes the activities and results under Task 8.1 (Quality Assessment) in M1-M21. Referring to the “Quality Assessment Plan” (D8.1.1) delivered at M6, it gives an overview of the various roles and their responsibilities in ENhANCE regarding quality assurance. In chapter 3, the current status of Task 8.1 including the carried out and upcoming activities are described in detail, along with their main results. The report ends with a reflection and self-assessment of WP8 and the conclusions that will have an impact on M22-M36 of the project.

## Definitions and Acronyms

The present section presents the list of acronyms and other specific terms used within the present document.

Alliance .....	The set of partners and affiliated entities involved in the ENhANCE project.
ECVET .....	European Credit system for Vocational Education and Training
EMP .....	Evaluation and Monitoring Plan (D6.1)
EQAVET .....	European Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training
EQF .....	European Qualifications Framework
ESCO.....	multilingual classification of European Skills, Competences, Qualifications and Occupations. It is part of the Europe 2020 strategy.
EU Curriculum.....	an innovative, learning outcome-oriented modular VET European Curriculum for Family and Community Nurses that can be instantiated in national Curricula.
FCN .....	Family and Community Nurse
FHN .....	Family Health Nurse
FCN-PP.....	Professional Profile for Family and Community Nurses
Guidelines .....	instructions for VET designers on how to instantiate the EU Curriculum into a National one.
LO .....	Learning Outcomes
National Curriculum.....	a specific instantiation of the EU Curriculum.
NQF .....	the National Qualifications Framework is a formal system describing qualifications. It is the basis for referencing a country's qualification to the EQF.
PC.....	Project Coordinator
PP .....	Professional Profile
PHC .....	Primary Health Care
VET .....	Vocational Education and Training
WP .....	Work Package

## **1. Introduction**

As described in the “Quality Assessment Plan” (D8.1.1), the main aim of Task 8.1 is the quality assurance of the overall project and its outcomes. To ensure that a close cooperation between WP8 (Quality assurance), WP6 (Evaluation) and WP1 (Project Management) is necessary.

Task 8.1 is mainly carried out by AWV and CNR-ITD. AWV is responsible for ensuring the implementation of the quality plan into all work packages. This process and the results of this work are subject of this report.

Task 8.2, instead, has to do with the compliancy of the main project outcomes with the standards (ECVET, ESCO and EQF). Even if the present document comes out from Task 8.1, nonetheless some updates about Task 8.2 will be provided, as the two tasks are actually very much intertwined.

### **1.1 Brief introduction to this document**

This Midterm Quality Report describes the activities carried out under Task 8.1 from M1-M21 related to the overall project quality, the measures for quality assurance and the results thereof. It refers also to other relevant Deliverables where related information was updated or presented (D8.1.1 “Quality Plan”, D6.1 “Evaluation and Monitoring Plan” and D1.1.1 “Progress Activity Report”).

The updated work scheme below (from D8.1.1) displays the relation of the quality assurance measures to the other WPs and the status of those. It shows that the ENhANCE quality assurance approach does not consist of one but several instances responsible for different aspects of the project and results’ quality. These, however, do not act independently from each other but in a system providing independence to each instance and sub-process but relying also on their close cooperation for holistic quality assurance.



## 2. Roles and Responsibilities – The Quality Assessment Team in ENhANCE

The Quality Assessment Team of ENhANCE consists of several actors, each one with own roles and responsibilities. In the following of this section, we briefly describe all the actors and give an overview of their roles and responsibilities.

Looking at the 'Building Blocks' of the EQAVET approach (<https://www.eqavet.eu/EU-Quality-Assurance/For-VET-Providers/Building-blocks> and Appendix page IX), quality management is something that depends on the strong support and commitment by the management (of a VET provider). With the support of WP6, we discussed the ENhANCE approach and started aligning the current and planned measures and processes with EQAVET.

Regarding the roles and responsibilities, if we apply the first Building Block to ENhANCE, we can state that:

- The Project Management (CNR-ITD) values quality assurance highly. Therefore, a closely-knit quality assurance approach that involves various partners, work packages and tasks was already foreseen in the proposal. The involved partners are each responsible for a different aspect of quality assurance and rather independent in their approach if it is in line with what we stated in the proposal.
- In addition to their own involvement in quality assurance, the Project Management (CNR-ITD) supports all quality assurance related work packages and tasks by offering guidance, promoting the quality assurance approach and constantly underlining its importance and by connecting the involved parties for tasks where they see overlap.
- The partners responsible for various aspects of quality assurance (WP1, WP8 and WP6) are strongly supported by CNR-ITD regarding organizational aspects of their work (i.e. reaching an agreement among the Alliance about paying the External Experts).

This very important part of the ENhANCE quality assurance approach is influential to the other partners involved in or responsible for quality assurance.

- **WP8** (Quality Assurance – led by AWV) provides support during the production of the most important project outputs by providing guidelines and guidance, reviewing documents and, supported by AFBB, promoting and implementing the use of EU instruments, namely ECVET, EQAVET, ESCO and EQF, into them. This WP is also responsible for managing the External Experts' evaluation and for implementing the quality assurance approach into all related work packages and processes.
- **WP6** (Evaluation – led by UEF) will integrate the EQAVET principles into their evaluation and will evaluate the Curriculum, pilots, tools, materials and Guidelines from a user's perspective. For this task, they will be supported by WP8.

- **WP1** (led by CNR-ITD) mainly monitors and assesses the aspects of the internal cooperation of the Alliance (respect of deadlines, internal communication, and meeting evaluation) as well as the general quality of the Deliverables and project results (content, relevance, quality and validation of the project results and the respect of timeline). WP1 is also responsible for the risk management of the project.

## 2.1 External Experts

As already explained in D8.1.1, the External Experts complement the quality assessment by both summative and formative statements regarding the main project results and support the use of the EQAVET approach. The panel consists of four nursing professionals<sup>1</sup> with a background in teaching and research in Health care and (Community) Nursing:

- Dr Carol Ann Hall, PhD, RN, United Kingdom
- Athena Kalokerinou-Anagnostopoulou, RN, PhD, Greece
- Bart Geurden, PhD, RN, Belgium
- Dr Susanna Tella, PhD, RN, Finland.

In addition to their professional expertise, they are familiar to the content, goals and organization of the project. They are regularly informed by AWV about the current status of the project and the next steps of their involvement.

Their role is that of an external professional who is able to view and evaluate the main project outputs from their perspective as an end-user. Since all Experts come from different countries, they can bring their national perspective into the evaluation as well.

A regular exchange among them via the mailing list or Skype meetings with the ENhANCE Steering Committee to discuss the evaluations is organized and supported by AWV.

Although familiar to the goals and scope of the project and some of the challenges the Alliances faced in developing the EU Curriculum (such as the differences in Credit Points), they are supposed to evaluate the outputs regarding their (perceived) usefulness, relevance of the content and compliance to the EU standards and reflect on how the Alliance overcame those challenges.

The External Experts provide a benefit to the evaluations organized and carried out by WP8 and WP6 and should complement their findings, such as concerning the differences in Credit Points and educational structures.

## 2.2 Steering Committee

To ensure a high-level scientific and technical coordination, a Steering Committee has been nominated at the beginning of the project. The Steering Committee consists of the eight Work Package Leaders that direct the day-to-day technical

---

<sup>1</sup> Their CVs can be found in the Appendix of the Interim Report.

planning and work within the Work Packages. It supports the project in order to assure the respect of milestones and results achievement by monitoring success indicators. By M21, the Steering Committee has held three Skype meetings (M4, M12 and M18). The minutes of these meetings can be viewed here: <https://bit.ly/2P50Tdr>.

Since AWV is responsible for the flow of information between the Steering Committee and the External Experts, a Skype meeting between them was organized in M13 with the purpose to discuss the External Experts' feedback to the EU Curriculum. The meeting was recorded and uploaded into the ENhANCE shared Drive: <https://bit.ly/2OYrXuH>.

### **2.3 General Assembly**

The General Assembly is the ultimate decision making body of the Alliance. It is composed of one representative of each party duly authorised to deliberate, negotiate and decide on all matters. The parties agree to abide by all decisions of the General Assembly. For further information about the Steering Committee, refer to the ENhANCE Alliance Agreement.

### **2.4 Editorial Board**

With the aim of ensuring the overall quality of deliverables produced within the project, under Task 8.1 and in coordination with WP1 and WP7 (Dissemination), the ENhANCE Project's Alliance has established an Editorial Board (EB) that is the body responsible for the quality of any output produced by the project. As described in the Alliance Agreement (see 6.2.4), the EB is composed of one person from each WP Leader's institution, the Project Coordinator, and the Quality Manager. In particular, in reference to the dissemination activities, the EB aims to ensure that the public outputs (leaflet, contents of the website, project deliverables, etc.) are compliant with the proposal (see Alliance Agreement, 6.7). The EB supports the Alliance in deciding which information is relevant for which channel, being promptly informed of all current developments and available results and eventually arranging for further actions and publications. Moreover, the EB is in charge of the internal review process which takes place for all the project deliverables. Such process, which is described in D1.1.1 "Progress Activity Report", ensures that each deliverable is reviewed and commented by at least two partners; the authors of the deliverable are required to take on board and improve the original document according to the received feedback.

### 3. Activities carried out under T8.1 (M1-M21)

The main activities carried out so far under Task 8.1 were implementing the Quality Plan (M6) and planning, administering and tightening the cooperation with the Panel of External Experts together with WP1 according to the schedule presented in D8.1.1. Appendix

#### 3.1 Detailed description of activities (M1-M21)

##### *a) Ensuring the achievement of results and the respect of timeline*

In ENhANCE, several procedures are in place to ensure the achievement of results. The basis for this is a close collaboration among partners. In particular, a strict coordination and monitoring of the activities is carried out by the PC in WP1 and the support of communication and cooperation during the production of the project results is provided. These ensure that potential threats to a timely delivery or insufficient quality of the deliverables can be recognized and prevented early on.

The PC has therefore defined general communication and cooperation rules, which were already presented in D8.1.1 “Quality Assessment Plan”. Moreover, D1.1.1 also describes the activities carried out to ensure a good cooperation and gives detailed data about the skype and face-to-face meetings and the collaboration via the mailing lists and the monitoring thereof.

Moreover, as already mentioned, an ‘Internal Review Process’ has been set up for ensuring quality of deliverables (described in the D8.1.1 and D1.1.1). The process foresees an internal review of each deliverable by at least two internal reviewers in order to assess the quality of the produced deliverable.

In addition, a thorough Risk Management (Task 1.3) has been put in place by the PC, including a regular participatory review of the detected risks, so that potential threats to the quality of the results can be detected and mitigated early on. Details about this can be found in D1.3.1 and D1.3.2.

##### *b) Ensuring validation of the main project results*

The validation of the main project results is ensured through three main processes, each one involving specific actors. In particular, data for validation will come from the main **users** of our outcomes, the **External Experts**, and the **Supporting Partners**.

As far as the **user’s perspective** is concerned, in WP6, the evaluation tasks assure the validation through a double process of:

- formative evaluation, ‘a judgment of the strengths and weaknesses of instruction in its developing stages, for the purposes of revising the instruction to improve its effectiveness and appeal’ (Tessmer, 1993)
- summative evaluation, also ex-post evaluation, occurs after implementation and gives a final judgment on the efficacy and/or if the defined goals and standards of an intervention were met.

In particular, in **T6.2** the objects under evaluation are:

- Professional Profile
- EU curriculum (Assign 1)
- Guidelines (Assign 2)
- National curricula (Assign 3).

All the indicators have been already defined and can be found here: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1RgWDBaHyxvX4H9fVNPqHKqza9jS5RtU4>

Most of the evaluation means (questionnaires) have already been implemented and almost all of them have also been delivered. All the questionnaires can be found in the same folder. Results of this Task will be delivered at M31.

In **T6.3** the Open Online Tool is evaluated from the user's perspective (students and teachers). A reference model for the evaluation (TAM 3) was chosen and the indicators have been already defined and can be found here: <https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/12dEQ3oFOfrSAOV8PWewxfpf34oOF9y1A>

Data collection with teachers has already started, while data collection from students will happen later on, after the pilots.

The data from this will be integrated with quantitative data derived by logs to the platform. Results of this Task will be delivered at M31.

**T6.3** also envisages the evaluation of the Online Teacher Training; in this case a reference model was chosen [Guskey T.R. (2002). Does It Make a Difference? Evaluating Professional Development. *Redesigning Professional Development*, Vol 59, N 6. Pages 45-51.] and a Teacher Training Evaluation Plan was developed in collaboration with ITD-CNR which defines criteria, indicators, items and tools of the evaluation:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1k9nZmqQ2-PuG-ha6cHRP5hZt3aE7TXoG>

Results of this Task will be delivered at M31.

Last but not least, **T6.4** envisages the evaluation of the pilots from the users' perspective. Criteria and indicators are currently under discussion in WP6 and the results of this task will be delivered at M36.

Moreover, in WP8, the evaluation by the **External Experts** also supports the validation of the results, since the External Experts are not involved in the development and implementation (i.e. of the EU Curriculum or local Curricula) and can offer a different perspective or an additional opinion. So far, they have evaluated the EU Curriculum, the local curricula and the design of the pilot course (see also below for further information about the activities carried out by the External Experts).

Thirdly, the **Supporting Partners** (external stakeholders such as policy makers, regulatory bodies or VET providers) that will be reached through WP7, are also supposed to contribute to the results by giving their opinions about the main project outcomes. The process of finding and involving them started in M17. Criteria and

indicators have already been defined and the questionnaire for data collection was prepared and will be soon sent out to them.

*c) Ensuring the quality of the results and the respect of the EQAVET recommendation*

Regarding EQAVET, the most important activity of T8.1 is the implementation of EQAVET into the other concerned WPs and Tasks.

Generally speaking, the respect of the EQAVET principles falls under the responsibility of Task 8.2. Nonetheless, here we would like to point out some important decisions taken by the partnership and describe some activities carried out between M1-M21.

EQAVET offers a toolbox and guidelines for VET systems and VET providers and the approach is based on three pillars: the EQAVET quality cycle, the indicative descriptors and the indicators. In ENhANCE, we face the specific situation that some responsibilities need to be shared between the project management, quality management, evaluation and the pilot coordinators to plan and carry out a project specific approach that respects the EQAVET recommendation.

In order to agree on this process with the involved partners, especially with regards to the pilot evaluation, WP8 initiated a Skype meeting between WP8, WP6 and WP1 in the beginning of M21. For the preparation of the meeting, a document about EQAVET was shared by WP8, with the aim of choosing the elements of EQAVET that are suitable and applicable for ENhANCE. In the meeting, it was agreed that WP6 will identify aims of the evaluation that focus also on EQAVET indicators. This is to ensure that EQAVET will be implemented wherever possible and appropriate. The preparatory document for the skype is available in Appendix.

In addition, WP6 organized an online Meeting at the end of Month 21 during which the indicators were explored via Tables shared on Google Drive. All partners were effectively involved with commenting on them through Google Drive. The comments were considered and discussed considering the ENhANCE project aims and outlines.

*d) Monitoring internal evaluation process*

The tasks in WP6 are organized with the aim to get feedback and input by all involved users to ensure a high quality of the results. The deliverables and reports produced up until M21 are circulated well in advance so that AWV (in their role as quality assurance leader) and AFBB (in their role as EQAVET expert) can give formative feedback as to the implementation of EQAVET and all partners can agree on the use of suitable indicators.

Since especially Task 6.4 is supposed to respect the EQAVET recommendation (especially the indicators), this task is planned cooperatively between WP6 and WP8 with feedback from CNR-ITD and SI4LIFE.

In addition, the External Experts will give summative feedback on the internal evaluation process.

*e) Recruitment and monitoring of External Experts and external evaluation process*

The selection and recruitment process of the External Experts was described in detail in D8.1.1. All selected experts meet at least three of the four requirements specified for their recruitment.

AFBB briefed the Experts on the type and content of their involvement during an online Kick-off meeting in M11. The detailed plan can be found in Annex IV.

Afterwards, a mailing list was created for them to exchange questions and ideas during the evaluation process<sup>2</sup> and a shared drive was created where AWW continuously uploads information material for them to support them during the evaluation of the various project results. The information material mainly contains thorough guidelines and reading lists on the EU standards (ECVET, EQF, EQAVET). The main purpose is to familiarize them with these standards and tools so they will understand the structure and content of the results they are evaluating, i.e. the FCN Curriculum, which is different to 'conventional' Curricula. The guidelines included a description of the main concept(s) and their relevance for ENhANCE and the Curriculum.

All but one of the External Experts delivered their evaluation results to the first activity (evaluation of the EU Curriculum) in time. After a kind reminder, we received all contributions. Despite the deadlines being set to leave them enough time and announcing the next activity at least three weeks before its start, two of the experts were not able to deliver their evaluation of the Localized Curricula and the design of the pilots in time. One delivered it with a delay of three weeks, the other not at all. Nonetheless, the original risk rating was revised for the Deliverable 1.3.2 Progress Conflict and Risk Report<sup>3</sup> because the External Experts confirmed their general availability and interest in the collaboration regularly.

The main questions to be considered when designing the external evaluation were:

- What is added value of expert evaluation to WP6 evaluation? How does their perspective differ from the internal experts in ENhANCE?
- How can their evaluation complement the WP6 evaluation?
- For the pilot evaluation: What is the focus of the External Experts' evaluation? What can they observe on-site? Which (EQAVET) indicators could be added to the list of indicators?<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> AFBB can access this mailing list but does not receive notifications or emails exchanged on there. This was suggested to the Experts to give them the opportunity of freely expressing their thoughts and views concerning the subject(s) of evaluation.

<sup>3</sup> For details see [https://drive.google.com/open?id=15FalXpbxg4LoClyy1MG\\_zHmegOyeM2fg](https://drive.google.com/open?id=15FalXpbxg4LoClyy1MG_zHmegOyeM2fg), Risk 4.8 Panel of External Reviewers Not Participating Actively

<sup>4</sup> <https://drive.google.com/file/d/186Uswx9Q-3O0Ws71G2A4I4cLABKzOqvx/view?usp=sharing>

The process and results of the external evaluation focusing on the VET quality and EU standards was thoroughly described in D8.2.1. The deadlines for their delivery was set so that changes could still be applied to the Deliverables 3.1 and 3.2. and to support the formative evaluation approach.

To get a more general perspective (i.e. not only focused on the VET quality) and feedback on the EU Curriculum, the Experts were also given a form to fill a SWOT Analysis<sup>5</sup>. The purpose was to recognize the strengths that could be fostered in the upcoming months but also to detect potential issues and chances related to the Curriculum that the Alliance was unaware of. Therefore, the following statements will be considered when refining and improving the Curriculum for the second release.

- Strengths:**
- The use of ECVET
  - The curriculum is comprehensive and clear language. It easy to understand.
  - The topic areas are well evaluated as pertinent to this type of role and the size of the program feels about right if each unit were to be award 15-20 ECTS. There is lots of scope for refining the programme and this makes it flexible. The programme encompasses both skills and theoretical learning and this is particularly relevant for the vocational nature of the work
  - The overarching topic are relevant to the subject and cover the scope of the practitioner
- Weaknesses:**
- The structure of the curriculum is not very clear.
  - The relationship between the ECVET and EQF is not articulated strongly and it is hard to see why both elements are needed if the graduate of the programme is to be an advanced practitioner. The EQF identifies skills learning anyway. The determination of learning outcomes for this level of learning needs some considerable thought and the following document may be useful.
- Opportunities**
- Create a new nursing specialty (FCN) in EU.
  - The curriculum has a possibility to unify EU healthcare and enhance the collaboration for families.
  - Huge in terms of offering a recognized qualification to FCNs Work will be needed to prepare faculty though and for quality assurance as there is well known variability in nursing across countries. Locating within universities may assist with this.
- Threats:**
- Non-proper implementation of the curriculum.
  - If the curriculum is not meeting the needs and requirements

---

<sup>5</sup> Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats Analysis

- of the future healthcare, it may not spread across the EU.
- The level is not differentiated sufficiently from those required of any registered practitioner within the EU directive and so does not offer advanced practitioner status meaningfully.
- There needs to be a clearer emphasis on the FCN

### **3.2 Results of activities (M1-M21)**

In this section we briefly report on the main results achieved so far (between M1 and M21) as far as quality assurance in the project is concerned.

#### *a) Ensuring the achievement of results and the respect of timeline*

The results of the activities put in place for the quality of cooperation and quality of deliverables have been presented in D1.1.1. Here it is important to stress the fact that overall, the data collected so far and the monitoring process by the PC, provides evidence of a good and effective collaboration among partners. The monitoring process also helped detecting minor issues, such as delays in contributions and communication that, as a result, could be addressed and resolved without further major implications. The evaluation data regarding meetings, skypes, online interactions shows the partnership is willing to collaborate and is satisfied about the measures put in place. All the deliverables have been duly reviewed, according to the procedure, and all of them have been improved according to the reviewers' feedback.

#### *b) Ensuring validation of the main project results*

As already mentioned above, the data under this heading are being collected in WP6. The work is under way and the results of this validation will be delivered between M31 and M35.

#### *c) Ensuring the respect of the EQAVET recommendation*

As explained above, the partnership is currently working (under T8.2) for the definition and the EQAVET criteria and indicators, especially in view of the pilots. This activity will be continued and the results of it will be delivered at M36.

To be noted that – in respect to the compliancy with the other standards - the compliancy of the FCN Professional Profile with the WHO recommendations has been already checked by AFBB and a certificate has been issued, stating that full compliancy has been achieved. Regarding the compliancy of the European Curriculum to ECVET and EQF, this has also been checked and certified by AFBB, who has also issued some indications from further improvements in view of the second release of the Curriculum. This was reported in D8.2.1.

#### *d) Monitoring internal evaluation process*

The aforementioned information on EQAVET principles and their connection to ENhANCE provided by WP8 raised awareness for EQAVET and the work with it. The work documents described under 4c) created a basis for the implementation and

consideration of EQAVET in the various evaluation processes and the EQAVET indicators that need to be included in the evaluation were discussed.

Secondly, the activities under Task 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 were discussed transparently on the WP6 mailing list and with the coordinators, respectively. The evaluation plans for each of these tasks were shared and therefore, WP8 could provide input and ensure that indicators relevant to WP8 and EQAVET would be included.

Thirdly, as described above, the planning of Task 6.4 is done in collaboration between WP1, WP6 and WP8 so that, as a first step, a common definition of a list of relevant indicators was created that facilitates monitoring of the planned indicators as well as adding relevant indicators.

*e) Recruitment and monitoring of External Experts and external evaluation process*

AWV was able to recruit the planned number of External Experts with the suitable profile. The External Experts used the instructions provided to them to get relevant information on ECVET before the evaluation of the EU Curriculum.

For the two evaluations carried out so far, a good organization and a timely information and involvement of the External Experts helped to detect potential difficulties or delays. For each of the evaluations, the content and schedule were announced a month in advance so that the External Experts could give feedback on their availability during the period that AWV had envisaged. During the assignments, AWV confirmed their availability for further questions. After the end of the given deadline, AWV contacted the Experts who had not yet sent their feedback in order to send them a kind reminder or ask if any problems or difficulties had occurred. This resulted in them sending their contributions afterwards.

Another result of monitoring the External Evaluation process is the transparent work with the feedback received from the External Experts. AWV collected and categorized the feedback in a Continual Improvement Table (included in D8.2.1), which shows and weighs the issues raised by the External Experts. This did not only inform the Alliance about the results of the evaluation but also informed WP6 on possible issues that will need to be checked during Task 6.4.

## 4. Activities planned under T8.1 (M22-M36)

### 4.1 Detailed description of planned activities (M22-M36)

Activities from M1-M21 will be continued in M22-M36. In addition, the cooperation between WP8 and WP6 will be intensified to ensure an EQAVET compliant evaluation of the pilots.

#### *a) Ensuring the achievement of results and the respect of timeline*

The activities described under 3.1.2 a) will be continued in the same manner and modus, as these proved successful so far.

#### *b) Ensuring validation of the main project results*

The validation of the main project results by the three instances (users' perspectives, External Evaluators and supporting Partners) will be continued in the second half of the project.

In WP6, the evaluation tasks will continue under T6.2, T6.3 and T6.4, according to plans.

In WP8, the evaluation by the External Experts will continue with the formal and summative evaluations of the internal evaluation (WP6) and the evaluation of one pilot course complementing the WP6 evaluation and laying the focus on EQAVET requirements.

The Supporting Partners are going to be involved further. In the section of the website dedicated to Supporting partners, they will access the project results and will give their contribution to them through consultation.

#### *c) Ensuring the quality of the results and the respect of the EQAVET recommendation*

In addition to the aforementioned measures, which will be continued, the agreed EQAVET recommendation will be put into practice.

As described above, the document with the aim of intensifying the use of EQAVET shared by WP8 (see Appendix) gives an overview of the different elements of the EQAVET framework and contains tables that will be filled by the concerned WPs to prepare T6.4. With the aim of facilitating the work on these tables, three working documents were created and shared in the Google Drive:

- [01. EQAVET Building Blocks](#)
- [02. EQAVET framework - Quality criteria for data collection](#)
- [03. EQAVET indicative descriptors - indicators - applicability](#)

In the following months the partnership will organize group working sessions, to collaboratively define how to respond to the EQAVET principles, both at the project level, as well as at VET provider level.

*d) Monitoring internal evaluation process*

The internal evaluation<sup>6</sup> will be monitored by WP8 and the External Experts. As for the VET quality assurance processes carried out under T8.2 and described in D8.2.1, this will be done in a formative and summative way. The focus will be on assuring the compliance of the internal evaluation with EQAVET:

- Formative: As described above, for this purpose, AWV with the support of AFBB, shared a document with the key elements of EQAVET and the aim to involve WP6 in the definition of suitable EQAVET indicators. Its purpose is also to support WP6 in the use of EQAVET. Additionally, AWV will read documents shared by WP6 and monitor the implementation of EQAVET as agreed.
- Summative: The summative (meta-)evaluation will be carried out after the evaluation of the pilots and will be carried out by the External Experts and AWV who will each focus on different aspects of the evaluation. Since the evaluation of the pilots will be reported in D6.4 (due M36), AWV and the External Experts will depend on an internal reporting by WP6 in order to review the evaluation plan. Results of the collected and analysed data can therefore not be considered in the meta-evaluation.

Apart from EQAVET, the quality criteria for evaluation<sup>7</sup> were stated in D8.1.1 and will be applied to the meta-evaluation. The aim is to ensure that we reliably measured whether the outputs are in line with the targeted standards and that we reliably documented the project quality.

*e) Recruitment and monitoring of External Experts and external evaluation process*

In the cooperation with the External Experts in the upcoming months, the organization and monitoring of their evaluation of the pilots will be the most prominent activity. Originally, it was planned for the External Experts to evaluate the pilots on-site, thus to travel to the pilot premises. Since most of the pilot activities are carried out online, this might not be necessary and they could carry out their observations directly on the Open Online Tool. This process requires a thorough planning. In a first step, the activities to be carried out on-site need to be defined together with WP6 and WP1, again based on the aforementioned EQAVET document shared by WP8. Then, a suitable period for the External Experts to

---

<sup>6</sup> Clarification: In D8.1.1, chapter 4.5, AWV describes the evaluation of WP6 and the evaluation of WP8 together and refers to the same standards of evaluation for both processes. However, it became clear, that the two should not be confused. Therefore, in this document and in the project, AWV from now on refers to the evaluation of WP6 as 'meta-evaluation'. The evaluation of WP8 will be referred to as 'self-assessment' (see chapter 5).

<sup>7</sup> DeGEval 2008; Stufflebeam 1999, 2007; UNIFEM Evaluation Unit 2009: 1) Description of the Evaluandum, 2) Analysis of the context, 3) Description of purposes and procedure, 4) Indication of information sources, 5) Valid and reliable information, 6) Analysis of qualitative and quantitative information, 7) Well-founded conclusions.

evaluate the pilots needs to be determined. The close cooperation will continue for their upcoming activities (evaluation of the pilots and meta-evaluation).

## **4.2 Report on potential changes to Quality Assessment Plan**

All activities under WP8 related to the quality assurance of the project outputs were carried out as planned in the Quality Assessment Plan.

A modification has been made to the timing of the self-assessment. In D8.1.1 it was planned to carry it out after the delivery of the first release of the Curriculum and the Guidelines (M15). Due to a late delivery of the Experts' feedback and to the fact that only now the processes planned in WP6 and WP8 will be tested (for the evaluation of the pilots), the self-assessment as described in chapter 5 will be postponed to M23 and its results reported in D8.1.3.

## **5. Self-evaluation as part of the Quality Assurance**

As described in Deliverable 8.1.1, a meta-evaluation has been considered in order to increase the credibility of the quality assessment. Since WP8 provided various formative feedback to the other WPs, it is important to know whether the work was perceived as supportive and improving the quality of the outputs.

The comparison with the envisaged goals (at a certain moment) can also be seen as an element of self-evaluation. As already mentioned in Chapter 3.3, most of the activities have been delivered as planned. Differing from the timing announced in Deliverable 8.1.1 the review of the work of WP8 cannot be reported in this deliverable. It is to be expected that the later evaluation can produce more valid results, because only by the practical use of the curricula the value of the input and/or the support will emerge even more clearly. For this purpose, AWV will conduct a survey among the partners in M23 and use the conclusions from the results for the work in the last year of the project. The presumed improvements or adjustments will then benefit the closer cooperation between WP8, WP6 and the External Experts.

For the assessment of project quality, it is also important to find out whether the External Evaluators have been adequately included as a quality assurance measure. As planned, the external experts will be asked to provide feedback on their work with AWV and to assess the handling of the instruments. At the same time, the satisfaction of the partners with the Experts' feedback provided (via AWV) should be assessed.

As explained in chapter 3.1, a close collaboration between the concerned WPs is a key element of the ENhANCE Quality Assessment Plan. Therefore, not based on a survey, but on the experience of M1-M21, it can be stated as an interim conclusion that an intensified coordination of WP8 can help to increase the punctual and accurate delivery of contributions. This will facilitate the involved partners' work and will ultimately lead to an even closer collaboration where challenges can be detected and mitigated early on.

## 6. Discussion and Conclusions

This report gives an overview of the activities carried out under Task 8.1 in M1-M21 and their results, thus how WP8 contributed so far to ensuring the overall project quality. It describes in detail how the work under task 8.1 contributes to the achievement of the goals set for the ENhANCE Quality Assurance. In addition to the activities carried out up until this point, it reports on the planned activities for the upcoming months, considering the results and experiences from M1-M21.

Although it was planned to report here about the results of the self-assessment and about the concrete EQAVET indicators for Tasks 6.2 and 6.4, the timing of this Deliverable does not yet allow to elaborate on those issues. The reason for postponing the self-assessment was given in chapter 4.2. The results will be reported in D8.1.3.

Agreeing on suitable indicators and EQAVET elements proved to take longer than anticipated by AWV due to the amount of involved partners and activities and due to the summer break in M20. Therefore, the goal for M22 is to agree on the next steps together with WP6 and WP1 and put that concrete plan into practice for the upcoming evaluation of the pilots. The results will be reported in D8.1.3 (process of implementing EQAVET into other WPs) and D8.2.2 (results of VET quality assurance).

## 7. References

- [1] DeGEval – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Evaluation. 2008: *Standards für Evaluation*. Mainz: DeGEval
- [2] EQAVET (2019) - <https://www.eqavet.eu/EU-Quality-Assurance/For-VET-System/Monitoring-your-System/Evaluation/Role-of-Indicators>
- [3] EQAVET (N.D.). VET providers' self-monitoring by using the EQAVET toolbox of indicators (*A Guide for National Reference Points*). Dublin: EQAVET Secretariat - Available at: [http://www.skillman.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/EQAVET\\_Indicators\\_Toolkit\\_final.pdf](http://www.skillman.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/EQAVET_Indicators_Toolkit_final.pdf)
- [4] EQAVET Secretariat (2013). Supporting the implementation of the European Quality Assurance. Dublin. EQAVET Secretariat.
- [5] Kvale, S. (1995). *The Social Construction of Validity*. The Social Construction of Validity. In: Qualitative Inquiry, Vol 1, Issue 1, pp. 19 - 40
- [6] Scriven, M. (1967) The methodology of evaluation. In R. Tyler, R. Gagne and M. Scriven (1967). *Perspectives on Curriculum Evaluation* (AERA Monograph Series – Curriculum Evaluation) (Chicago, Rand McNally and Co).
- [7] Tessmer, M. (1993). *Planning and Conducting Formative Evaluations*. Oxon: Routledge.

## Appendix

### I. Overview Activities Task 8.1 (M1-M21)

Date	Output	Carried out	Comments
M3-M6	Contribution to and review of EMP (D6.1)	AWV in M7	<b>Formative</b> quality assurance: AWV reviewed all previous versions of D6.1, participated in WP6-WP8 Skype meetings and sent the commented the final version Deliverable along with an explanatory email about the integration and reference to EQAVET principles to WP6 leader.
01.06.2018	Quality Assessment Plan (D8.1.1)	AWV and CNR-ITD in M5-M7	The Quality Assessment Plan was written in cooperation with WP1 since it covered the EU quality standards relevant for the project as well as quality assurance related to the project coordination.
15.06.2018	Providing references/literature/guidelines to WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5 regarding ECVET, EQAVET and ESCO and offer Skype meetings for clarification	AFBB in M6-M7	Under the guidance of AWV, AFBB provided material, guidelines and guidance regarding the EU standards to the partners involved in the WPs mentioned. A summative statement about the compliance with the named standards was provided (see D8.2.1 and D1.1.1).
29.06.2018	Quality Assessment Plan (D8.1.1) with corrections and input after review phase	AWV in M7	Delivered after integration of feedback from Internal Review Process.
15.06.- 30.07.2018	Quality Assurance of FCN PP with final assessment	AFBB in M7	see D8.2.1 and D1.1.1
30.07.2018	Recruitment of External Experts completed	AFBB in M8	Due to the need to clarify the payment of the External Experts, the final contracting of four External Experts was carried out in M8.
M7-M12	Assuring VET quality of FCN EU curriculum	AFBB in M7-M13	<b>Formative:</b> Under the guidance of AWV, AFBB provided material, guidelines and guidance regarding the EU standards to WP3 during

			<p>the development of the EU Curriculum. The External Experts gave their feedback before the first release so that minor changes could be integrated.</p> <p><b>Summative:</b> A summative statement about the compliance with the named standards was provided. In addition, a Continual Improvement Process was implemented to monitor the feedback and its integration into the development of the EU Curriculum (see D8.2.1 and D1.1.1).</p>
M7-M15	Assuring VET quality of Guidelines supporting the design of local Curricula	AFBB in M7-M15	<b>Formative:</b> Under the guidance of AWV, AFBB provided material, guidelines and guidance regarding the EU standards to WP3 during the development of the Guidelines.
30.03.2019	VET Quality: Interim Report (D8.2.1)	AFBB in M1-M15	Collection of VET quality related activities for D8.2.1
30.04.2019	VET Quality: Interim Report (D8.2.1) with corrections and input after review phase	AFBB in M15	Delivered after integration of feedback from Internal Review Process.
M13-M18	Assuring VET quality of local curricula	AFBB in M13-M20	<b>Formative:</b> Under the guidance of AWV and together with WP3 leader, AFBB provided material, guidelines and guidance regarding the EU standards before and during the development of the local curricula.

**II. Overview Activities Task 8.1 (M22-M36)**

The upcoming activities will be carried out as follows:

31.07.2019	Midterm quality assessment (D8.1.2) – Report	AWV in M1-M21	Collection of project quality related activities for D8.1.2
31.08.2019	Midterm quality assessment (D8.1.2) – Report with corrections and input after review phase	AWV in M21	The delivery of this report was postponed to M21 because of the holiday season. A close cooperation and agreement about the upcoming activities of WP6 and WP8 as well as a thorough Internal Review were necessary and could only be carried out in M21 when all involved partners were available.
15.11.2020	VET Quality: Final report and recommendations (D8.2.2)	AFBB M22-M36	Collection of VET quality related activities for D8.2.2.
15.11.2020	Final quality assessment (D8.1.3) – Report	AWV in M22-M36	Collection of project quality related activities for D8.1.3
15.12.2020	VET Quality: Final report and recommendations (D8.2.2) with corrections and input after review phase	AFBB in M35	Delivery after integration of feedback from Internal Review Process.
15.12.2020	Final quality assessment (D8.1.3) – Report with corrections and input after review phase	AWV in M36	Delivery after integration of feedback from Internal Review Process.

### III. Collaborative document for the work with EQAVET



**Project Title:** **ENhANCE:** EuropeaN curriculum for fAmily aNd Community nurseE

**Contract No:** 2017 - 2976 / 001 - 001

## Considerations on the work with EQAVET in ENhANCE

**Version 1 – 12.08.2019**



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect 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.

## Premises

The information in this document is mainly based on the information on the EQAVET website and on the EQAVET toolkit. It is supposed to provide a short overview and summary of the main principles of EQAVET and how they **could be implemented** in ENhANCE.

Therefore, under a short description of each of the three principles (Quality cycle, indicative descriptors and indicators), we are suggesting an implementation strategy for ENhANCE.

According to the proposal, EQAVET is supposed to be used for the following project outputs and results:

- Positive evaluation of pilots following the evaluation plan indicators and the EQAVET indicators.
- The quality of VET (training materials, presence/distance/informal learning) will be assured through the constant reference to EQAVET principles (T8.2).
- External evaluators will perform a monitoring and evaluation activity on the base of the characteristic cycle of four phases (planning, implementation, evaluation and review).
- Guidelines supporting VET designers in the instantiation of local curricula for FCN need to be compliant with EQAVET.
- The evaluation process will be carried out in accordance with T8.2 and EQAVET principles.
- Ensure the training content is based on EQAVET.

The purpose of this document is to give some input in order to organise this process among the Work Packages involved in the Quality Assurance in ENhANCE (WP1 and mainly WP6 and WP8). WP8 will be responsible for implementing and describing the EQAVET approach and results (in D8.2.2).

## **1. What is EQAVET?**

EQAVET is a voluntary system to be used by public authorities and other bodies involved in quality assurance. According to the website of the EC, the “European Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training” (EQAVET) Framework is a reference instrument designed to help EU countries promote and monitor the continuous improvement of their vocational education and training systems on the basis of commonly agreed references. The framework should not only contribute to quality improvement in VET but also, by building mutual trust between the VET systems, make it easier for a country to accept and recognise the skills and competencies acquired by learners in different countries and learning environments.

Between 2015 and 2017, the EQAVET+ approach was suggested and complements the EQAVET Recommendation and mainly the indicative descriptors.

EQAVET offers a toolbox and guidelines for VET systems and VET providers to build their quality approach and is based on three pillars: the EQAVET quality cycle, the indicative descriptors and the indicators.

## 2. What are the key elements and actions?

### 2.1. The EQAVET quality cycle

The EQAVET quality model is based on the plan-do-check-act (PDCA) cycle and describes four stages: planning, implementation, evaluation/assessment and review/revision of VET



which are interrelated.

Figure 2: The EQAVET Quality Cycle

In ENHANCE, on one hand, we use the quality cycle as overall quality principle. Meaning, that after the planning phase (starting with the proposal and ending with the pilot design) we are now, with the beginning of the pilots, entering the ‘**implementation**’ phase. WP6 and WP8 are therefore responsible now to define how we are going to collect and analyse data for phase 3. In each phase, **indicative descriptors** (see 0) can support the decision whether the current practice is and identify what more can be achieved.



The quality cycle is also being used to ensure the overall project quality by constantly

**Figure 3: The PDCA Cycle: cyclical processes, testing and accumulation of knowledge, which will then inform the main, process (Windolph & Blumenau 2019)**

The quality cycle is also being used to ensure the overall project quality by constantly reviewing and improving the planned and implemented activities so that there are constant small feedback loops. For example, the EU Curriculum feedback given by the External Experts will be implemented and (re-)tested during the pilots.

**2.2. Quality Assurance for VET Providers. Building blocks.**

The Building blocks are a tool to develop a quality approach for VET providers:

<https://www.eqavet.eu/EU-Quality-Assurance/For-VET-Providers/Building-blocks>

They can use the 6 blocks to build or compare/improve their existing quality approach.

In ENhANCE, we are facing a specific situation since we are using the EQAVET approach for the project and not only on VET provider level. Thus, some of the blocks relate rather to the project's quality management, others directly to the VET providers.

We suggest to use the guiding questions to reflect on our quality approach and link our approach to EQAVET. We can use them to holistic approach, we will make transparent, make our all's approach 'visible'/transparent and use it to see our blind spots.

Building Block	Guiding questions	ENhANCE Project	3 pilots (FI / GR / IT)
<b>1. Ensure there is a management culture which is committed to quality assurance</b>	Does the management team value quality assurance?		
	Are all managers involved in ensuring high quality VET?		
	Does the management team take responsibility for quality assurance?		
<b>2. Develop approaches which reflect the provider's circumstances</b>	How can VET providers use the EQAVET Recommendation to improve their approach to quality assurance?		
	Is the approach to quality assurance manageable and realistic?		
<b>3. Develop a culture of self-assessment</b>	Are all those involved in VET participating in self-assessment?		
	Does the management team support self-assessment?		
<b>4. Support staff training in relation to quality assurance</b>	Is there support and training in quality assurance for all those involved in VET?		
<b>5. Use data and feedback to improve VET</b>	Is data and feedback analysed and used to improve VET provision?		
	Do the EQAVET indicators and indicative descriptors help to identify areas for development?		
<b>6. Ensure VET is based on the involvement of external and internal stakeholders</b>	Is the quality of provision improving as a result of stakeholders' feedback?		
	How are the internal and external views taken		

	into account?		
	Is there a systematic approach to collecting and meeting the needs of stakeholders?		

**Table 1: EQAVET Building Blocks**

For the evaluation of the pilots, we deem it might be helpful, to collect the QA initiatives and approaches related to quality assurance that

- a) are planned and already implemented in ENhANCE.
- b) are carried out generally at the VET providers UEF, UNIGE and UTH.

This way, we could link our approach to EQAVET. In addition, it might help us to define some strategies or collect best practice examples that we can then, after reflecting on them in the review phase, include in the second version of D3.2 as a sustainable way to promote the EQAVET approach.

### 2.3. Data collection:

In D6.1, it is mentioned that the data collection in ENhANCE will be done according to EQAVET standards:

Quality criteria	Suggested questions	WP6 (answers/feedback)
<b>Accuracy</b>	Is the data collected correct and complete? Are the data entry procedures reliable?	
<b>Efficiency</b>	Are the resources used to collect data the most economical manner to achieve its objectives?	
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Have the objectives been achieved? Have the specific results planned been achieved? To what extent are partners maximizing their comparative advantage?	
<b>Feasibility and timeliness</b>	Can data be collected and analysed cost-effectively? Can it provide current information in a timely manner?	
<b>Relevance</b>	What is the relevance of the data/information/evidence in relation to other primary stakeholders' needs, e.g. national authorities, VET provider's strategic objectives, employers' needs, trainees' needs and satisfaction? Is it compatible with other efforts? Does it complement, duplicate or compete?	
<b>Security</b>	Is the confidentiality of learners' and staff records ensured?	
<b>Utility</b>	Does data provide the right information to answer the question that is asked?	

**Table 2: EQAVET framework, Quality criteria for data collection**

Just like with the guiding questions for the Building Blocks, we could use these as way to show that our data collection is EQAVET compliant by showing how we respected those principles.

#### 2.4. What are the EQAVET and EQAVET+ indicative descriptors?

The indicative descriptors support building a quality assurance approach. There are descriptors for all phases of the quality cycle, which help to determine whether the existing quality management system of the VET provider is EQAVET compliant and to determine its overall status.

In ENhANCE, they can support us by helping to outline measures for quality assurance that we already use. In addition, we can decide which steps the quality team needs to take in order to complete the approach.

During the IMPLEMENTATION and EVALUATION phases, the descriptors can help us decide which aspects could be covered by collecting feedback under T6.4 and which ones would be suitable for T8.2.

We suggest the following steps:

1. We collect what we all are already doing in terms of quality assurance and reflect on it. In this step, it is important to collect also what quality assurance procedures our VET providers (UEF, UTH and UNIGE) are generally implementing for their programmes.
2. In a second step, we can think about how WP6 and WP8 can complete those approaches.
3. In a third step, we need to take a look at the role of our External Experts (who will 'bridge' our evaluation and EQAVET) and how they can complement our approach. Which aspects could they focus on during their evaluation of the pilots (planned on-site visits)? What will they observe there? Whom do they need to talk to?

Phase	Indicative Descriptors (including EQAVET+)	EQAVET indicator(s)	Applicable in ENhANCE	Applicable in Pilots	Responsible
<p><b>PLANNING</b> reflects a strategic vision shared by the relevant stakeholders and includes explicit goals/objectives, actions and indicators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- European, national and regional VET policy goals/objectives are reflected in the local targets set by the VET providers</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explicit goals/objectives and targets are set and monitored, and programmes are designed to meet them</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ongoing consultation with social partners and all other relevant stakeholders takes place to identify specific local/ individual needs</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsibilities in quality management and development have been explicitly allocated</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is an early involvement of staff in planning, including with regard to quality development</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providers plan cooperative initiatives with other VET providers and all other relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The relevant stakeholders participate in the process of analysing local needs</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- VET providers have an explicit and transparent quality assurance system in</li> </ul>				

	place				
<b>IMPLEMENTATION</b> plans are devised in consultation with stakeholders and include explicit principles	- Resources are appropriately internally aligned/ assigned with a view to achieving the targets set in the implementation plans				
	- Relevant and inclusive partnerships, including those between teachers and trainers, are explicitly supported to implement the actions planned				
	- The strategic plan for staff competence development specifies the need for training for teachers and trainers				
	- Staff undertake regular training and develop cooperation with relevant external stakeholders to support capacity building and quality improvement, and to enhance performance				
	- VET providers' programmes enable learners to meet the expected learning outcomes and become involved in the learning process				
	- VET providers respond to the learning needs of individuals by using approaches to pedagogy and assessment which enable learners to achieve the expected learning outcomes				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- VET providers use valid, accurate and reliable methods to assess individuals' learning outcomes</li> </ul>				
EVALUATION of outcomes and processes is regularly carried out and supported by measurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-assessment/self-evaluation is periodically carried out under national and regional regulations/frameworks or at the initiative of VET providers</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluation and review covers processes and results/outcomes of education including the assessment of learner satisfaction as well as staff performance and satisfaction</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluation and review include the collection and use of data, and adequate and effective mechanisms to involve internal and external stakeholders</li> </ul>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Early warning systems are implemented</li> </ul>				
REVIEW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Learners' feedback is gathered on their individual learning experience and on the learning and teaching environment. Together with teachers', trainers' and all other relevant stakeholders' feedback this is used to inform further actions</li> </ul>				
-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information on the outcomes of the review is widely and publicly available</li> </ul>				

-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Procedures on feedback and review are part of a strategic learning process in the organisation, support the development of high quality provision, and improve opportunities for learners</li> </ul>				
-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Results/outcomes of the evaluation process are discussed with relevant stakeholders and appropriate action plans are put in place</li> </ul>				

### 3. What are the 10 EQAVET indicators?

In addition, the 10 EQAVET indicators (see 0) can be used as a toolbox in order to complete the approach.

In our view, the indicators are more suited to the quality assurance of VET systems than VET providers. Yet, we think four of them could (at least) be partly applied.

Indicator No.		Applicable in ENhANCE	Applicable in Pilots
1	<p>Relevance of quality assurance systems for VET providers:</p> <p>(a) share of VET providers applying internal quality assurance systems defined by law/at own initiative</p> <p>(b) share of accredited VET providers.</p>		
2	<p>Investment in training of teachers and trainers:</p> <p>(a) share of teachers and trainers participating in further training</p> <p>(b) amount of funds invested</p>	a)	
3	<p>Participation rate in VET programmes:</p> <p>Number of participants in VET programmes (1), according to the type of programme and the individual criteria (2)</p> <p>(1) For IVT: a period of 6 weeks of training is needed before a learner is counted as a participant. For lifelong learning: percentage of population admitted to formal VET programmes.</p> <p>(2) Besides basic information on gender and age, other social criteria might be applied, e.g. early school leavers, highest educational achievement, migrants, persons with disabilities, length of unemployment</p>	yes	
4	<p>Completion rate in VET programmes:</p> <p>Number of successfully completed/abandoned VET</p>	yes	

	programmes, according to the type of programme and the individual criteria		
5	<p>Placement rate in VET programmes:</p> <p>a) destination of VET learners at a designated point in time after completion of training, according to the type of programme and the individual criteria (3)</p> <p>b) Share of employed learners at a designated point in time after completion of training, according to the type of programme and the individual criteria.</p> <p>(3) For IVT: including information on the destination of learners who have dropped out.</p>		
6	<p>Utilisation of acquired skills at the workplace:</p> <p>a) information on occupation obtained by individuals after completion of training, according to type of training and individual criteria</p> <p>b) satisfaction rate of individuals and employers with acquired skills/competences</p>	b)	
7	<p>Unemployment rate</p> <p>(4) according to individual criteria</p> <p>(4) Definition according to ILO and OECD: individuals aged 15-74 without work, actively seeking employment and ready to start work.</p>		
8	<p>Prevalence of vulnerable groups:</p> <p>a) percentage of participants in VET classified as disadvantaged groups (in a defined region or catchments area) according to age and gender;</p> <p>b) success rate of disadvantaged groups according to age and gender</p>	yes	
9	Mechanisms to identify training		

	<p>needs in the labour market:</p> <p>a) Information on mechanisms set up to identify changing demands at different levels;</p> <p>b) Evidence of their effectiveness.</p>		
10	<p>Schemes used to promote better access to VET:</p> <p>a) Information on existing schemes at different levels;</p> <p>b) Evidence of their effectiveness</p>		

#### 4. How to use EQAVET in ENhANCE - Summary

As presented above, several aspects of EQAVET need to be implemented in EnhANCE:

Result/Activity	Implementation strategy – ideas and questions	Responsible
Positive evaluation of pilots following the evaluation plan indicators and the EQAVET indicators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using the descriptors and indicators as suggested/agreed</li> <li>- Results from Continual Improvement Table as input for aspects to be evaluated</li> <li>- What can be evaluated by external experts (in addition to WP6)?</li> </ul>	
The quality of VET (training materials, presence/distance/informal learning) will be assured through the constant reference to EQAVET principles (T8.2).	In our view, this can be done through the description of the EQAVET principles used in ENhANCE (quality cycle, building blocks, and indicative descriptors), thus to state that the VET materials and processes were designed applying the EQAVET principles.	
External evaluators will perform a monitoring and evaluation activity on the base of the characteristic cycle of four phases (planning, implementation, evaluation and review).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, but details need to be defined regarding the focus of their evaluation in order to complement and/or support the aspects covered by WP6 (see 0).</li> </ul>	
Guidelines supporting VET designers in the instantiation of local curricula for FCN need to be compliant with EQAVET.	As mentioned above (page XI), the guidelines themselves cannot be compliant with EQAVET. However, we can suggest and implement strategies that we used successfully in ENhANCE for Quality Assurance and that are compliant with EQAVET and create a tool/chapter for the final release the Guidelines.	

<p>A European e-learning path for VET teachers in the field of nursing, evaluated considering EQAVET indicators.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Which indicators can be implemented in T6.3? The only ones suitable seem to be no. 2, 6b and 10b.</li> <li>- The feedback collection from the first OOT evaluation (T6.3) should be aligned with those indicators .</li> <li>- The indicators should be used in the upcoming feedback collections.</li> </ul>	
<p>The evaluation process will be carried out in accordance with T8.2 and EQAVET principles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AWV will describe the process of defining and implementing the suitable EQAVET principles in their Deliverables 8.1.2 and 8.2.2.</li> </ul>	
<p>Ensure the training content is based on EQAVET.</p>	<p>EQAVET is not applicable for 'training content' but for VET systems and providers and their quality assurance. The only way we see a possibility for applying EQAVET to the 'training content' is, again, to refer to the quality cycle and how we assured the quality of the content by following the four phases and constantly refining our results (for example by re-testing the results of the External Experts' feedback on the EU Curriculum).</p>	

## 5. Further Reading

- [1] EQAVET (2018) - <https://www.eqavet.eu/EU-Quality-Assurance/For-VET-System/Monitoring-your-System/Evaluation/Role-of-Indicators>
- [2] EQAVET (N.D.). VET providers' self-monitoring by using the EQAVET toolbox of *indicators (A Guide for National Reference Points)*. Dublin: EQAVET Secretariat - Available at: [http://www.skillman.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/EQAVET\\_Indicators\\_Toolkit\\_final.pdf](http://www.skillman.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/EQAVET_Indicators_Toolkit_final.pdf)
- [3] EQAVET Secretariat (2013). Supporting the implementation of the European *Quality Assurance*. Dublin. EQAVET Secretariat.
- [4] EQAVET Secretariat (N.D.). EQAVET Indicators' Toolkit. → [link](#)

## 6. References

- [1] <https://projekte-leicht-gemacht.de/blog/pm-methoden-erklaert/pdca-zyklus/> → [link](#)

#### IV. Activities and involvement of External Experts

<b>Task/Action</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Work days</b>	<b>Time<sup>8</sup></b>
Kick-off with AWV	Skype meeting	0,5	Sep 18
Evaluation EU-Curriculum	Tools developed by AFBB, questionnaire, checklist	0,5	Jan 19
Evaluation local Curricula + Design pilot course	Tools developed by AFBB, questionnaire, checklist	1	Jun 19
Meta evaluation (of internal evaluation – WP6)	Tools developed by AWV and AFBB, questionnaire, checklist Document analysis, tools developed by AWV and AFBB	1	Feb 20
Evaluation of one pilot course	Document analysis, tools developed by AWV	1,5	May 20
Consulting and meetings (with AWV and other experts)	Skype meeting, Email	1	01.09.2018-31.12.2020
<i>Buffer</i>		1	
<b>Total</b>		<b>6,5 days</b>	

---

<sup>8</sup> The exact deadlines will be specified during the kick-off meeting.