



IMPLEMENTATION OF EQAVET AT NATIONAL LEVEL: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

FACO & UNIVERSITY OF MALTA

SUZANNE GATT

PATHWAY FROM EQAVET TO NQAVET - PEN (REF: 538730-LLP-1-2013-SE-LEONARDO-LMP)





WORK PACKAGE 2: COMPARATIVE STUDY ON EQAVET

The aims and objectives of the exercise were thus specified to include the following:

- finding out at national level what part of EQAVET and which of its indicators have been successfully implemented in the different partner countries: Malta, Russia, Sweden, Italy and Turkey; and
- what parts or indicators have not been implemented by the VET providers in these countries.



OUTPUT

The result of this exercise will provide knowledge about:

- What level of implementation of EQAVET exists in the different partner countries;
- the lessons learnt by the individual VET providers ; as well as
- the key factors considered essential for successful implementation of good quality assurance practices.



A QUANTITATIVE APPROACH

A common questionnaire was developed and used in the partner countries.

The questionnaire collected information about the following aspects:

- details about the organization;
- general issues related to quality assurance;
- use of the quality cycle;
- use of the QA indicators;
- success stories and
- lessons learn.



DATA COLLECTION

Each of the partner countries data from 15 about different VET institutions.

They decided which VET institutions to contact and whether to collect the data through face to face meetings or over the phone.

The data was thus collected through a mixture of phone calls and face to face meetings.



SAMPLE DETAILS

VET providers participating

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia	TOTAL
Number of Providers	14	17	16	15	23	85

ISCED Level of VET provision

Level of ISCED qualifications offered	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Workbased learning	7	1	0	7	11
ISCED 2	5	0	0	0	1
ISCED 3	7	14	0	6	1
ISCED 4	8	2	16	5	1
ISCED 5 - short tertiary cycle	7	0	0	6	8
Other	5	0	0	4	2

KEY TRENDS OBTAINED: GENERAL ISSUES ABOUT QA



Official commitment to QA in documentation (QA policy etc.)

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Yes	8	17	6	10	16
No	6	0	10	5	7
TOTAL	14	17	16	15	23

Similar trends for Malta, Italy and Russia, different trends for Turkey (all) and Sweden (few)

Awareness of EQAVET

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Yes, we implement EQAVET in our institution	3	2	1	0	1
Yes, I am familiar with it	9	5	2	4	3
I just heard about it	1	4	10	8	15
I have never heard of it	1	6	3	3	4
TOTAL	14	17	16	15	23

Implementation is low, only in Malta are VET providers familiar, others just heard about it.



AWARENESS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AT EUROPEAN LEVEL

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Yes I am familiar and have participated in activities	3	3	1	2	1
Yes, mainly through reading documents	5	2	4	2	4
Yes, but have little knowledge	2	6	7	7	12
No, I do not know anything	0	6	4	4	6
No reply	4	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	14	17	16	15	23

Except for Malta, the majority of VET providers in the other countries have little or no awareness of work on quality assurance at European level.

the work done and tools developed at European level are still not well known to many VET-providers.



USE OF THE QUALITY CYCLE

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
We use the quality cycle officially	2	11	10	8	15
We do not use it officially but we have quality process in each of these phases	6	6	4	6	5
I am not aware of any particular processes for each of these phases	5	0	2	1	3
No reply	1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	14	17	16	15	23

The majority of VET providers accept the quality cycle officially or unofficially as an integral part of quality assurance.

In Malta there is more the unofficial use of the quality cycle than the official recognition.



DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE GIVEN TO QA

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Very significantly	3	4	12	0	4
Significantly	1	12	4	12	10
Leaves it up to each individual	8	0	0	1	8
Infrequently	0	1	0	1	0
Never	0	0	0	0	1
Other – needs improvement	1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	13	17	16	14	23

QA is given importance in many VET organisations.

It is only in Malta and Russia that it is left to individuals in a number of VET providers.



PLANNING

Formal process in design of new courses

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Yes	7	14	16	14	21
No	7	3	0	1	2
TOTAL	14	17	16	15	23

All VET providers in all countries except Malta have a formal process for the design of new courses.

IMPLEMENTATION



Commitment to professional development

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Yes	7	15	9	7	22
No	7	2	7	7	1
TOTAL	14	17	16	14	23

Type of Professional development

Type of Support	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Having official policy on training of VET teaching staff	5	9	6	5	18
Dedicating budget for professional development for VET trainers	4	4	8	2	15
Participating in EU mobility programmes for VET Staff e.g. Leonardo	4	10	1	4	8
Documenting and publishing VET trainers' CPD every year	1	3	2	1	8
Other – in service training	2	12	0	0	2
Number of responding VET institutions	14	17	16	15	23



EVALUATION

Use of student questionnaires

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Yes	10	9	16	12	22
No	3	8	0	2	1
TOTAL	13	17	16	14	23

Use of external evaluation

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Yes	8	9	12	15	13
No	5	8	4	0	9
Other – system is being set up	1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	14	17	16	15	23

Many use student questionnaire, to a lesser degree only in Turkey.

Most VET provider, except in Malta and Turkey use external evaluation.

REVIEW



Use of result of external evaluation

Country	Malta	Turkey	Sweden	Italy	Russia
Yes	13	9	16	14	21
No	1	8	0	0	2
TOTAL	14	17	16	14	23

Most VET providers except half in Turkey do not use the result of external evaluation.

Action is usually taken with respect to updating and the design of courses, and to a lesser extent to take action with individual trainers. It is only in Sweden that attention is also given to the improvement of assessment procedures;



USE OF INDICATORS

The two most commonly indicators are:

- Indicator 3: participation rate in VET and Indicator 5: placement rate in VET programmes;

Indicator 4: completion rate is also commonly used in all countries except Russia;

VET providers still fall short of fulfilling the EQAVET indicators as only a limited number of the QAVET-indicators are used by all the VET-providers;

VET-providers have created their own indicators, e.g. Course evaluation, Self-evaluation, Customer satisfaction level, Staff turnover, transparency of QA system, and Economic indicators;

Nearly all VET providers keep statistics about students except in Russia for drop outs.



LESSONS LEARNT

- Best QA tools include the use of standards and manuals, and to a slightly lesser degree, the sharing of experiences with other VET organizations;
- Very few of the VET providers seem to have used the EQAVET toolbox;
- In the planning phase structured processes are good tools to ensure quality of training courses;
- Learning outcomes are good tools at implementation stage;
- Self-evaluation and external evaluation are good tools at the evaluation phase;
- At review stage processes which ensure that changes take place are crucial.



- Quality assurance does really lead to improved training provision;
- Regulators play an important role in setting and ensuring standards;
- It pays to invest in time and resources when planning courses;
- Training provided needs to be supervised;
- VET staff need to be committed to quality for good evaluation to take place;
- Review needs to be a continuous process;
- It is very important to involve all the key stakeholders in QA;
- Always listen to what the students say.

ADVICE GIVEN

Advice at planning level

- QA system to address individual needs;
- Official processes for course design;
- Transparency in intake of students;
- Time and energy needs to be dedicated to planning

Advice at implementation phase:

- There must be institutional QA processes;
- Ensure internal cooperation and positive student rivalry;





Advice at Evaluation Stage

- Open up to criticism and comments from external players;
- Involve as many key stakeholders as possible;
- Invest in time to carry out quality evaluation;

Advice at review phase:

- Ensure that follow-up does take place;
- Inform students and others of changes made in response to feedback provided;



RECOMMENDATIONS

- There is need for more dissemination about EQAVET and the EQAVET website, as well as the use of the quality cycle at national level;
- Examples of good practice can provide inspiration for other VET providers;
- Links between European level, national level and provider level need to be strengthened;
- There should be more sharing of practices at both national and international level;
- There can be projects which document good practice and used to promote quality assurance processes across the different VET providers;
- The use of student questionnaires can be improved through the sharing of experiences;



- The use and impact of external evaluators on VET providers can be promoted further;
- There should be initiatives which allow VET providers to share the use of indicators and how they use the outcomes to improve their training;
- There should be a review of the type of statistics gathered and analysed by VET providers, identifying good practice in how results are utilised for improving training.
- There should be more initiatives at national and European level to promote dialogue between VET providers;
- Lessons learnt by the VET providers can be compiled and published, and used to promote better practices at National and European level;



THANK YOU