

WG3. What is achieved by recognition schemes?

What is achieved with a recognition scheme?

- Formal recognition is a stamp of approval
- It ensures a certain standard of the professional
- A mutual recognition scheme sets a consistent approach, an understanding of what the person is capable of.
- Improving, but not completely removing the obstacles of mobility.

What is achieved with a recognition scheme?

- Formal recognition is a stamp of approval
- It ensures a certain standard of the professional
- A mutual recognition scheme sets a consistent approach, an understanding of what the person is capable of.
- Improving, but not completely removing the obstacles of mobility.

However...

- It is time consuming
- Expensive
- And is subject of interpretation

1. Recognition of a persons competence (RPE)
2. Recognition of training provider (RPO)
3. Mutual recognition between member states

Personal recognition scheme (RPE)

- Should Recognition be Sector Specific for RPE ?
 - Yes because:
 - Major differences between sectors
 - Easier to manage the competences
 - No because:
 - No resources / recognition is time consuming
 - It will be the role of the employer to recruit the suitable RPE
 - Need for continuous professional improvement specific to the sector
 - If not fixed to a sector, this can also prevent the missing of RPE in some sectors

Personal recognition scheme (RPE)

- Should Recognition be Sector Specific for RPE ?
 - No single answer – (specially when you calculate the differences between countries in terms of numbers of sectors)

Personal recognition scheme (RPE)

But apart from the traditional qualifications an RPE must have:

➤ Communication skills

- Effective communication skills should be included in the RPE approval process
- He /she is an advisor. But if the advise doesn't get through it will be lost

➤ How to assess communication skills?

- Does not have to be complicated, could be quite simple
- See for example tests used by recruiters
- Could also be done through the references from actual (previous) employer

➤ Recognition of RPO's ?

- Need for a system to be sure the RPO is well trained, but maybe system less binding and less resource consuming than accreditation. How many RPOs do we have as apposed to RPEs
- However there is a need for some quality control of RPO's
- Could have graded approach according to the level of risk / sector of activity:
 - Individual bases
 - Recognition of the Course
 - Accreditation of Training Center by specific organisation or by authority
 - Accreditation by Professional Associations,
 - Sector specification process (eg NDT)
 - Control from authority for example through inspections of training plan of the employers for their RPOs

Mutual recognition

➤ *Mutual recognition between Member States*

- *Not only based on academic qualification*
- *Need to speak the local language?*
 - *In countries like Sweden, Finland,... few people from other countries would know the local language, and English is the usual language for foreign*
 - *RPE, as adviser, one common language could be sufficient*
 - *Depend on the circumstances*
 - *Need for the Employer to agree on a common language (could be “company language”)*
 - *Suitability issue : the employer to decide which language should speak the RPE*
- *Need to know the local legislation => additional test*

Mutual recognition

- Mutual recognition
 - Helpful
 - Recognition based on a “reference scheme”,
 - basic common background satisfying the EC BSS recommendations and let then the country decide for additional country specific requirements (knowledge of language, knowledge of national legislation, ...)
 - Need for clear and transparent system of recognition
- Difficulties in applying EQF as a criteria in the recognition scheme as it prevent to have the benefits of some very good RPE which do not have high level academic qualification as basic education
- ECVET could be a way to move forward
 - Need to define the knowledge, skill, competence matrix

Grading of competence?

➤ *EQF?*

- *Not necessarily useful for RP*
- *Not to be used as a “black box”. The level of the degree obtained does not give indication on the field of activity the person has been trained*

➤ *Difficulties in applying EQF as it prevents to have the benefits of some very good RPE which do not have high level academic qualification as basic education*

➤ *ECVET could be a way to move forward*

- *Need to define the knowledge, skill, competence matrix*

➤ *On the workfloor, ECVET is sometimes seen as implying more administrative work, and might be abandoned due to that.*

Harmonisation?

- *Shall we ever come to harmonisation?*
 - *ENETRAP conclusion: it is not an objective to standardize. Each country as its own valuable training system*
 - *Objective would be to come to sort of a “equivalency” system via a “minimum reference scheme”*
 - *Need to limit the amount of training to redo when arriving in another country*

- **Recommendations for ENETRAP**
 - To develop best practice guidelines for national and mutual recognition schemes
 - The schemes should provide a baseline level of recognition, not based on academic qualification, but incorporating other criteria (knowledge, skills, experience, competences,...)
 - Investigate the application of ECVET principles
- **Recommendation for HERCA**
 - To actively disseminate and promote the above approach
- **Recommendation for Member States**
 - Need for clear and transparent system of recognition