



4. Validation of not formal and informal learning outcomes in practice¹²

This chapter describes:

- A. the choices and practical steps in developing a tool for validating not formal and informal learning outcomes and
- B. the Professional Checkup, a tool for validating not formal and informal learning used in the pilot of the European Project IMPROVE.

For a glossary of the terms used in this chapter (*validation, personal features, key activities, etc.*) please see the Glossary contained in the *IMPROVE Guidelines*. For an in depth description of some existing frameworks for validation used in the career guidance field see Evangelista 2011.

A. Developing a tool for validating not formal and informal learning outcomes

When validating not formal and informal learning outcomes, several choices have to be made. We list them one by one.

1. The goal of validation

From the outset, we have to decide the goal of validation. There are three main possibilities:

1. to shorten the length of a study path in order to gain an educational title or a vocational qualification
2. recruitment or potential appraisal: to hire people or to assign existing workers to higher or diverse positions and responsibilities
3. to be sure current workers perform their tasks up to a predetermined standard.

In case 2 we want to foresee what the future performance will be. It is worth pointing out that in both case 2 and 3 the outcomes of learning that are validated come from all forms of learning, including formal learning.

2. What is recognized or granted at the end of the procedure of validation

The second step is to decide what will be recognized or granted at the end of the procedure of validation. It can be (Evangelista 2011) a title (for example *Education and Vocational Guidance Practitioner*, as in the IAEVG's framework), a vocational qualification, an educational

¹ Author Leonardo Evangelista ASEV contatto@orientamento.it, version finalized on the 15th October 2012. Editing courtesy of Rachel Nelson. I thank project partners and especially Zuzana Freibergová for their comments on a previous version of the chapter.

² CEDEFOP (2008) defines *Learning* as *A process by which an individual assimilates information, ideas and values and thus acquires knowledge, know-how, skills and/or competences*. The results of learning are instead called *Learning outcomes*, defined as *The set of knowledge, skills and/or competences an individual has acquired and/or is able to demonstrate after completion of a learning process, either formal, non-formal or informal*. If we agree the term *learning* refers to the process and not to the result of learning, when referring to the results (as in *validation of not formal and informal learning* or *recognition of prior learning*) we should always add the term *outcomes*.



qualification, an attribute to a qualification (as in *Registered EuroPsy Psychologist*), a certificate (such as MEVOC's *European Certificate for Career Guidance Counselors*) or academic credits.

3. The list of elements the successful Candidate has to possess or master, their level and scoring system

The third step is to draw up a list of elements the successful Candidate has to possess or master to achieve validation and a specification of the desired level of attainment of each element. The elements are the learning outcomes we want to validate. Depending on the goal of validation the elements assessed can be knowledge and cognitive skills (goal 1), personal features in general (goal 2), or main tasks, tasks and subtasks carried out at work (goal 3) (see table 1). In the case of goals 2 and 3, the list of elements can also be referred to as a competence framework or a competence profile.

Goal	Learning outcomes assessed
1. to shorten the length of the study path in order to gain an educational title or a vocational qualification	Usually general or specialist knowledge and some cognitive skills (reading, writing, calculating, etc.)
2. recruitment or potential appraisal (to hire people or to assign existing workers to higher or diverse positions and responsibilities)	Personal features which result in good performance on the job, such as knowledge, skills (usually interpersonal and cognitive), attitudes, motives, etc, depending on the target job
3. to be sure workers perform their tasks up to a predetermined optimum standard	Performance on the job (observed and/or reconstructed)

The lists of elements can be defined by different means.

When the goal is to shorten the length of the study path to gain an educational title or a vocational qualification, the requested knowledge (and sometimes cognitive skills) and their respective levels are listed in the syllabus of the course.

In recruitment and potential appraisal the list (and sometimes level) of desired personal features can be taken from descriptions of occupation profiles or directly elicited using a BEI Behavioral Event Interview. The BEI can be defined as (*IMPROVE Guidelines*) *a structured interview which elicits personal features. The interviewee describes, in his/her own words, what he/she said, thought, felt, and did in six episodes—three positive and three negative—at work. The interview is recorded, transcribed, and coded for various personal characteristics. Personal characteristics are coded both for frequency of occurrence in the interview and for the level of complexity or scope at which they are displayed.*

The list of main tasks (and sometime levels of performance) can also be taken from descriptions of occupation profiles or produced directly by a job analysis. Job analysis can be defined as (*IMPROVE Guidelines*) *a systematic study of the tasks that are performed in a work role. The actions are identified drawing a flowchart describing how a job is carried out and this way main*



tasks, tasks and sub tasks are described as a tree root, where combination of simpler actions allow to carry out the more complicate. The job analysis allows identifying a hierarchy of tasks, from the most important and general (main tasks) to the minor ones (tasks and sub tasks).

When the levels (of knowledge, personal features or performance) are not already available, they have to be defined.

In some frameworks for validation levels are not listed nor explicitly defined, but nonetheless they are considered met if a specific evidence is possessed. For example possession of a specific educational title or of some year of specific study can be considered enough to prove possession of an adequate body of knowledge in a specific field or mastery of specific cognitive skills.

Most frameworks rely on implicit levels of understanding by the Assessor: the Assessor compares the evidence provided or elicited by the Candidate with his/her own opinion on what the level should be. In these cases, the opinion of the Assessor is often built on experience of evaluation with previous Candidates or, when performance is assessed, in direct previous professional experience of the Assessor in the same main tasks to be assessed. Implicit levels can be misleading because different Assessors can have different ideas about the standard level.

Clearly, to explicit validation levels requires additional work by framework developers and is often elusive, but it is worth the effort because it allows for a more precise and uniform validation.

An implicit level understanding is requested even when some description of levels is provided. For example, IAEVG's Educational and Vocational Guidance Practitioners framework describes the levels of performance of some tasks and some knowledge in terms of (0) *Negligible*, (1) *Inadequate*, (2) *Competent* (3) *Significant* (4) *Outstanding*, but the meaning of each term is not further described (IAEVG, no date).

A more precise description of levels can be taken from the *EQF European Qualification Framework*. The levels for 'competence' are 1. *work or study under direct supervision in a structured context*; 2. *work or study under supervision with some autonomy*; 3. *take responsibility for completion of tasks in work or study*; 4. *manage and transform work or study contexts that are complex, unpredictable and require new strategic approaches and take responsibility for contributing to professional knowledge and practice and/or for reviewing the strategic performance of teams*; etcetera. (Education and Culture DG, no date). However, this is still unsatisfactory, as for example in level 2 it is not clear how *some autonomy* is defined.

The scoring system can be only defined once the elements have been determined and their desired levels defined. There are several options: for example it can be decided that the Candidate has to be assessed and meet the standard in all the elements or only in a sample of them or that every element has to be assessed and scored. Similarly, it can be decided that the scale for scoring has to be yes or no or graduated in a range such as 1 to 5.

4. The evidence that demonstrates possession or mastering of the elements by the successful Candidate

Once a list of elements has been agreed upon, the evidence to be presented must be decided.

In many frameworks for validation whose goal is to permit a shorter study path to an educational title, the evidence can be certifications about previous (interrupted) studies granted by educational authorities or, in the case of a vocational qualification, certifications about length of previous work experiences granted by former employers. More rarely, the Candidate has to pass written, oral or (in the case of vocational qualifications) practical tests.

The tools for collecting evidence related to personal features are numerous (*IMPROVE Guidelines*):

1. Examination of Candidate's CV or narrative of professional biography (the evidence being a declaration by the Candidate of previous experience in work and education)
2. Control of possession of educational qualifications and other educational or training certificates (the evidence being the certificates)
3. Control of possession of proven experience (the evidence being the certificates granted by former employees)
4. Interview or written test about technical knowledge (the evidence being the answers to the question or the results of the test)
5. Tests (skills, personality, interests, etc.) (the evidence being in the scores in each test)
6. Role playing focused on transversal skills (as in the Assessment Center) (the evidence being the results of each role playing)
7. Interview focused on transversal skills (as in BEI Behavioral Event Interview) (the evidence being the assessment of the interview).

Evidence related to performance on the job can be collected by a combination of the following (*IMPROVE Guidelines*):

1. Direct observation of the person whilst carrying out his/her work (the evidence being observed performance)
2. Professional discussion (the evidence being the answers to the questions of the interviewer)
3. PFI Performance Focused Interview (the evidence being the answers to the questions of the interviewer)
4. Discussion of case studies (the evidence being the answers to the questions of the interviewer)
5. Testimonies from colleagues and supervisors (the evidence being the testimonies)
6. Testimonies from clients (the evidence being the testimonies)
7. Examination of documentation produced by the person whilst carrying out his/her work (the evidence being the documents)
8. Examination of portfolio of work (the evidence being the works presented)
9. Simulation of job tasks (the evidence being observed performance).

5. The procedure of validation

The last step in developing a tool for validating not formal and informal learning outcomes is shaping a procedure (several activities within a certain logical and chronological order, using a combination of the tools for collecting evidence listed in the previous section) to measure possession or mastering of the elements.

In shaping the procedure and choosing the tools it has to be considered that in validation it is necessary to find a good compromise between efficacy and weight of the assessment procedure. A



procedure may be very effective but if it requires significant dedication of time and economic resources it will have minimal possibility to become established and widely implemented (unless it is enforced by a public authority). On the other hand, a procedure which requires little time, but is less effective also presents the weakness of minimal utility (*IMPROVE Guidelines*).

B. The Professional Checkup³

The Professional Checkup (from now on PC) is the methodology for validation of performance used in the pilot of the project IMPROVE. The PC was initially developed by Leonardo Evangelista thanks to a previous European project⁴ and additional individual work⁵, then it was refined, translated and piloted in several European countries thanks to the IMPROVE Project Partners.

Following the pilot results, the initial PC structure has undergone some minor changes; furthermore, in the final structure there are some differences amongst partner countries to take into account national contexts. The following description refers to the structure of the PC produced after the pilot and adapted to the Italian context.

The PC described here refers to practitioners delivering career guidance. However, the PC methodology can also be used in other fields by using a different list of elements (competence frameworks) developed in accordance with the activities carried out in other sectors.

1. The goal of validation

In the PC, the goal of validation is to be sure career guidance practitioners perform their tasks up to a predetermined standard, so validation is focused on their current performance.

2. What is recognized or granted at the end of the procedure of validation

The successful Candidate receives a certificate (*The PC Certificate*) listing the main task (s) and corresponding elements that have been assessed and stating his/her expertise has been valued adequate to the standards:

We declare that [name of Candidate] has carried out the PC for the main task(s) [name of the main task (s) considered]. During the PC the expertise of the Candidate has been assessed in the following elements [names of the elements assessed] and recognized as adequate to the standards in all the elements, with a total score of [score reached].

The unsuccessful Candidate receives a certificate listing the main task (s) and corresponding elements that have been assessed and stating he/she has drawn up a plan for improvement.

³ When not stated differently please refer to Evangelista L.(2012) Information For The Assessors Of The Improve Pilot. Version of 9 July 2012. Mimeo.

⁴ See EAS. European Accreditation Scheme for Careers Guidance Practitioners website. Retrieved on the 10th July 2012 at <http://www.corep.it/eas/uk/>

⁵ See Evangelista L. (no date). EAF Accreditation Framework for the European Career Guidance Practitioners at a Glance. Retrieved on the 10th July 2012 at <http://orientamento.it/orientamento/1e.htm>

We declare that [name of Candidate] has carried out the PC for the main task(s) [name of the main task (s) considered]. During the PC the expertise of the Candidate has been assessed in the following elements[names of the elements assessed]. During the PC the Candidate has set up a plan for improvement.

3. The list of elements the successful Candidate has to possess or master

As the goal of the PC is to assess current performance in work, 3 main tasks were defined then further divided into subtasks (assessed elements) to take into consideration the diversity and character of Career Guidance work activities. The job main tasks are listed and described in Table 2.

Table 2. Job main tasks used in the PC and their description	
I. Deliver information related to career guidance as a separate activity	This is usually carried out by interactions lasting a few minutes at the counters of career guidance services or by telephone or electronic mail. In this main task the practitioner doesn't examine in depth the situation of the client, and only information is delivered.
II. Perform career guidance interviews (with adults, with young students or with both)	This is usually carried out by appointment in a reserved space. During the interview the practitioner carries out an in depth analysis of the situation of the client and assists him/her in drawing up a realistic and effective action plan.
III. Carry out career guidance activities in small groups (with adults, with young students or with both)	This is usually carried out with students (often focused on improving knowledge of self, of educational opportunities and on improving decision skills) and adult unemployed (often focused on improving job search skills).

Main tasks II and III are differentiated by kind of clients, depending on if the Candidate works mainly with adults or with young students (<18 years of age) or with both.

The PC has a mosaic structure: the Candidate can choose on what main tasks (and for main tasks II and III what kind of clients too) he/she wants to be assessed. Differentiation by main tasks and clients allows the process to take into consideration the different contexts and specialization in which career guidance is delivered. For example in many Italian schools career guidance delivery is entrusted to ordinary teachers that work only inside the school within single classes. They can choose to be assessed (and receive a PC Certificate) only on main task III. *Carry out career guidance activities in small groups with young students.*

This way there are 7 different kinds of the PC Certificate that can be granted: 3 each for main task II. *Perform career guidance interviews*: with adults, with young students or with both and III. *Carry out career guidance activities in small groups*: with adults, with young students or for both plus 1 for main task I. *Deliver information related to career guidance as a separate activity.*

For every main task the PC lists the tasks and subtasks that make it possible. These elements are assessed and are those that must be mastered by the successful Candidate. It is worth pointing out

that in the PC the main tasks are not assessed directly, but indirectly by evaluating the performance of the Candidate in tasks and some subtasks that make each main task possible.

Table 3 below lists all the elements referred to within main tasks II and III (first column) and (other columns) which elements are assessed depending on main task and type of client.

Table 3. List of tasks and subtasks to be assessed (elements) for main tasks II and III

List of tasks and subtasks to be assessed (elements) for main tasks II and III	Job main task II. with adults	Job main task II. with young clients	Job main task III. with adults	Job main task III. with young clients
1. Use appropriate <u>interview</u> techniques to manage the interview	X	X		
2. Use appropriate <u>group facilitation</u> techniques to manage small groups			X	X
3. Assist <u>adult</u> clients to identify their professional goals	X			
4. Assist <u>young</u> clients in their educational and training choices		X		X
5. Assist clients to determine and implement action plans related to work or learning	X	X	X	X
6. Assist <u>adult</u> clients in their job search	X		X	
7. Working relationships of the Candidate with practitioner belonging to external organizations	X	X	X	X
8. Deliver updated and reliable career guidance information	X	X	X	X
9. Develop clients' career skills	X	X	X	X
10. Develop and apply ethical practice	X	X	X	X
11. Continuously improve own knowledge and skills and the service	X	X	X	X

Elements 7 to 11 are transversal sub tasks embedded in job tasks that make optimum performance of main tasks II and III possible, therefore they are always assessed.

The elements underlined in left column of Table 3 must be combined depending upon the main task and type of clients chosen by the Candidate. For example, element 1. *Use appropriate interview techniques to manage the interview* (whatever clients' typology) will be assessed only when a Candidate requests to have his/her performance validated on main task II. *Perform career guidance interviews* and element 2. *Use appropriate group facilitation techniques to manage small groups* only when a Candidate requests to have his/her performance validated on main task III. *Carry out career guidance activities in small groups* (whatever clients' typology).

A Candidate requesting to have his/her performance validated in main task II. *Perform career guidance interviews with adults* will be assessed on elements 1, 3, and from 5 to 12. A Candidate requesting to have his/her performance validated in main task II. *Perform career guidance interviews with young students* will be assessed on elements 1, 4, 5 and from 7 to 12.



For the description of the levels of each element and of the scoring system of the PC see the next section.

4. The evidence that demonstrates possession or mastering of the elements

One must keep in mind that in validation a compromise has to be found between efficacy and the weight of the assessment procedure, in the PC the main tool chosen for collecting evidence is the PFI Performance Focused Interview. Element 1. *Use appropriate interview techniques to manage the interview* is also assessed by examining the quality of interaction of the Candidate with the Assessor during the PFI (see table 6).

The PFI can be defined as (The *IMPROVE Guidelines*): *a standardized structured professional discussion, that is to say an interview conducted between an Assessor and Candidate (assessed person), in which the Candidate describes his/her job tasks and how his/her performance achieves requirements set by standards. In PFI the questions are mostly focused on specific predetermined aspects of performance and all the Candidates are asked the same list of questions. However the Assessor may ask additional questions for clarification or a better understanding.*

In the PFI, the evidence for determining validation is the answers given by the Candidate to the interview questions. For example the questions used to collect evidence about element 11. *Continuously improve own knowledge and skills and the service* are the following:

Questions	Criteria to be considered under the required standard (cut off)
1. Could you please list resources / tools you can you use to improve your own skills and knowledge related to Career Guidance?	<i>For question 1: Candidate doesn't know most of the resources listed in the document Informative for Candidates.</i>
2. What have you done in the last year to improve your knowledge and skills?	<i>For questions 2, 3: in the last 12 months Candidate has not carried out any activity to improve knowledge or skills (read books, articles, websites, specialized mailing lists, attended conferences, shared cases with colleagues, etc.) or has no plans for the future</i> <i>For questions 4,5: in the last 12 months Candidate has not carried out nor planned any activity except in case this depends by strict procedures and not space given to suggestions of employees</i>
3. What will you do in the next 12 months?	
4. What have you done in the last year to improve the service where you work?	
5. What will you do in the next 12 months?	

In the right hand column the criteria or level considered as under the required standard are listed. For example, if in question 2 the Candidate affirms he/she has not carried out any activity to improve knowledge or skills in the last 12 months, he/she is considered to have performed under the standard in element 11.

To be successfully validated in the PC the Candidate must give answers above the cut off levels for all the questions within all elements, that is to say that if in one question of one element the



response is under the cut off point, then the validation of the related main task is considered unsuccessful. The reason for this policy is that all the elements of the PC are considered fundamental and compulsory for satisfactory performance each main task. In the case of an unsuccessful PC, a new PC focused only on the elements not previously passed can be requested after 6 months, but no later than 12 months after the first PC.

In order to have a more precise description of the general expertise of Candidate, every element is scored using a 4 point scale (see table 6 below), this, however, does not alter the general rule that the successful Candidate must perform above the cut off levels in his/her answers to all questions. The total score, in the case of successful validation, is listed in the *PC Certificate*.

Score	Meaning and criteria
1	fully not met: the Candidate under the cut off in more than 1 question of the same element
2	not met: the Candidate under the cut off in 1 question of the element
3	met: when the Candidate is convincing about performance but cannot explain clearly embedded theory and principles
4	very good: when the Candidate is convincing about performance and can explain clearly embedded theory and principles

Table 6 below shows the Assessment log that both the Assessor and the Candidate (see point 5 of the procedure described later) have to fill out.

<p>1. ID of Assessor.....</p> <p>2. ID of Candidate</p> <p>3. Main task(s) and kind of clients chosen by the Candidate</p> <p>4. Date of assessment interview 2</p> <p>Please give your marks to the elements that follows according to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 fully not met: fully under the standard • 2 not met: slightly under the standard • 3 met: when the Candidate is convincing about performance but cannot explain clearly embedded theory or principles • 4 very good: when the Candidate is convincing about performance and can explain clearly embedded theory or principles <p>Please score only the elements according to the combination of main task(s) and type of clients chosen by the Candidate for validation.</p> <p>When an element is scored with 2 or 1, under <i>Reasons for the score</i> the number of the question(s) where the standards were not met has to be listed.</p>

⁶For the sake of brevity, the elements of Main Task 1 are not listed here.

Elements	Scoring
1.A. Use appropriate <u>interview</u> techniques to manage the interview (evaluation to be based on the answers to the questions of the PFI for element 1) Reasons for the score	
1.B. Use appropriate <u>interview</u> techniques to manage the interview (evaluation to be based on the quality of interaction of Candidate with Assessor during the overall PFI) Reasons for the score	
2. Use appropriate <u>group facilitation</u> techniques to manage small groups Reasons for the score	
3. Assist <u>adult</u> clients to identify professional goals Reasons for the score	
4. Assist <u>young</u> clients in their educational and training choices Reasons for the score	
5. Assist clients to determine and implement action plans related to work or learning Reasons for the score	
6. Assist <u>adult</u> clients in their job search Reasons for the score	
7. Working relationships of the participant with practitioner belonging to external organizations Reasons for the score	
8. Deliver updated and reliable career guidance information Reasons for the score	
9. Develop clients' career skills Reasons for the score	
10. Develop and apply ethical practice Reasons for the score	
11. Continuously improve own knowledge and skills and the service Reasons for the score	
Total score	
Final result (performance in the combination of main task(s) and kind of clients chosen by the Candidate) Validated / not validated	

5. The procedure of validation

In the PC procedure there are two distinct roles: the Process Manager and the Assessor.

The Process Manager:

- Receives requests for information by potential Candidates and if necessary directs them to the document *Informative for Candidates to the PC* available on PC website.
- Receives from Candidates requests to undergo the PC, as well as their CVs and their written authorization about privacy of data collected, including an authorization to record interviews
- Assigns Candidates to an Assessor
- Checks that the process is carried out according to the set procedure
- Carries out sample checks on the activity of the Assessors by reviewing the videos of interviews



- Examines the feedbacks of the Candidates on the PC (including evaluations of the Assessors' behavior and expertise)
- Prints and sends to PC Certificate to the Candidates
- Keeps the registry of Candidates and the PC results of every Candidate
- Invoices the Candidates
- Studies and gives suggestions about improvements to the PC procedure
- Writes periodical accounts about the diffusion and popularity of the PC.

The Assessor:

- Carries out the PC according to the procedure
- Gives periodical suggestions about improvements to the PC procedure

It is worth pointing out that external assessment (assessment carried out by a third party, the Assessor) is only one component of the PC. Once the Candidate has been assessed he/she is requested to self-assess him/herself using the same grid (Assessment log) used by the Assessor (see point 5 of the procedure described below). Then the Candidate and the Assessor compare and discuss their grids. Finally the Assessor helps the Candidate to draw up a Plan for Improvement.

For each of his/her assigned Candidates, the Assessor will carry out 3 interviews in 1-3 weeks' time. To spare costs of travel, the PC is usually carried out using a videoconferencing software such as Skype. In any event, it can also be carried out face to face in person. To make the interview for assessment more manageable, some elements are assessed through written responses. To allow for sample checks of the Assessor's activity, interviews 2 and 3 are recorded and stored in a restricted area of the PC website. To avoid halo effects, the Assessor receives the Candidate's CV only after the interview for assessment (interview 2) has been carried out.

The detailed procedure of the PC is the following:

1. The Assessor contacts the Candidate in order to agree upon the timing of the PC.
2. Interview 1: the Assessor checks the Skype functioning of the Candidate in case Skype is going to be used for the next interviews and gives the Candidates additional information on the PC if needed. Interview 1 is brief (15-20 minutes).
3. The Assessor sends to the Candidate the questions related to the elements 7 to 11 to which the Candidate answers in writing.
4. The Assessor receives the answers by electronic mail and examines the answers related to the elements 7-11.
5. Interview 2: the Assessor interviews the Candidate on the remaining elements following a Blueprint of questions. Interview 2 takes about 1 hour. At the end of Interview 2 the Assessor sends the Candidate an empty Assessment Log and the Blueprint of questions and asks the Candidate to assess him/herself within one day of completing the assessment interview. As soon as the Interview is finished the Assessor also fills out the Assessment Log.
6. The Candidate sends to the Assessor the Assessment Log and his/her CV.



7. In no more than one week the Assessor examines the Assessment Log filled by the Candidate, adding his/her scores and comments together with a grid where the Candidate is requested to draw up a Plan for Improvement.
8. The Candidate examines the feedback by the Assessor, fills out the grid of the Plan for Improvement and sends it to the Assessor.
9. Interview 3: the Assessor and the Candidate discuss the results of Interview 2 and finalize the Plan for Improvement. Interview 3 takes about 1 hour.
10. The Assessor transmits to the Candidate a link of an online questionnaire where the Candidate expresses his/her feedback on the PC procedure and the Assessor's behavior and expertise.
11. The validation process is finished by sending the PC Certificate to the Candidate.



Table 8. Plan for Improvement (for main tasks 2 and 3)

1. ID of Assessor
2. ID of Candidate
3. Main task(s) and kind of clients chosen by the Candidate
4. Date of interview 3

For every element, please write how you can improve or keep updated your performance or professional behavior and when you can do it. In doing this exercise, please keep in mind there are several ways to learn:

1. By attending a class based course, in the traditional way
2. Cooperating with other colleagues, through community of practice based on websites or mailing lists.
3. On your own through websites, books, journals
4. On your own reflecting on your practice
5. On your workplace, under mentoring by a colleague or supervisor.

In your Plan for Improvement it can be useful:

- A. to define what you would like to learn or improve, possibly defining clearly the level of knowledge or performance you want to reach
- B. to define what kind of help you want to get by a community of practice, a colleague or a supervisor
- C. to decide how much time and when you want to reserve for learning
- D. to keep a learning log describing your learning (it can be shared with other learners using social websites such as Facebook)
- E. to verify periodically how your learning is going by talking with a friend, a colleague, a supervisor
- F. to use grids for self-observation
- G. to write one or more papers based on what you have learned

Element	Score (self-assessment)	Score (Evaluator)	How I can improve	When I wantdo it
1. Use appropriate <u>interview</u> techniques to				



manage the interview				
2. Use appropriate <u>group facilitation</u> techniques to manage small groups				
3. Assist <u>adult</u> clients to identify professional goals				
4. Assist <u>young</u> clients in their educational and training choices				
5. Assist clients to determine and implement action plans related to work or learning				
6. Assist <u>adult</u> clients in their job search				
7. Working relationships of the participant with practitioner belonging to external organizations				
8. Deliver updated and reliable career guidance information				
9. Develop clients' career skills				
10. Develop and apply ethical practice				
11. Continuously				



improve own knowledge and skills and the service				
12. Communication				

Bibliography

CEDEFOP (2008) *Terminology of European education and training policy. A selection of 100 key terms*. Retrieved on the 26th June 2012 at http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/Files/4064_EN.PDF

EAS. European Accreditation Scheme for Careers Guidance Practitioners website. Retrieved on the 10th July 2012 at <http://www.corep.it/eas/uk/>

Education and Culture DG (no date) *The European Qualifications framework for lifelong learning*. Retrieved on the 26th June 2012 at http://ec.europa.eu/education/pub/pdf/general/eqf/leaflet_en.pdf

Evangelista L. (2011) *Study on Existing Frameworks to Validate Competence of Career Guidance Practitioners*. Retrieved on the 26th June 2012 at http://www.improveguidance.eu/sites/default/files/Evangelista_2.pdf

Evangelista L.(2012) Information For The Assessors Of The Improve Pilot. Version of 9 July 2012. Mimeo.

Evangelista L. (no date). EAF Accreditation Framework for the European Career Guidance Practitioners at a Glance. Retrieved on the 10th July 2012 at <http://orientamento.it/orientamento/1e.htm>

IAEVG International Association for Educational and Vocational Guidance (no date) *Application for Educational and Vocational Guidance Practitioner EVGP offered by International Association for Educational and Vocational Guidance (IAEVG)*. Retrieved on the 26th June 2012 at <http://www.cce-global.org/Downloads/EVGP/app-en.pdf>