



(Second working group session)

## Working Group 2

### Content and profile of LO

**Finland and Spain**, presented their national approaches to writing the learning outcomes (LO).

Small groups did not have a lot of time to discuss so they were invited to choose one question. The following were discussed:

- (1) At what level of detail should learning outcomes be described?
- (2) How prescriptive are learning outcomes; to what extent do they open to local adaptation?
- (3) How can different levels of learning outcomes best be described?

### The key points can be summarised as follows:

- The presentations demonstrated a number of similarities at qualification and curricula design stage of qualifications and LO. In most countries, the process of LO starts with analysing work tasks and assigning LO; next steps of translation of occupational standard into training programmes are less obvious.
- LO for curricula should not be too specific not too detailed while for assessment more detail is needed. Broader approaches can lead to better results.
- LO should be sustainable for some time; they should not change every year but on the other hand, they should have room for accommodating quick change if needed. Curricula can be updated more frequently than standards.
- It was agreed that action verbs in combination with the content and the context should be used.
- The word 'level' when used in discussions is very misleading as many different things can be understood: for example, NQF or EQF level; level of performance; level of each unit of LO. Some further reflection and clarification from EQF/NQF side can be useful on how the level of units of LO within qualifications should be set. Is it really understood that if a qualification is at Level 3 of QF, then all units of LO are at Level 3? Or is there a keystone unit that would be decisive in assigning the QF level? LO can be similar in a unit but the level can vary for different qualifications. However, it was unclear how it happens in practice.
- Sometimes employers have difficulty in describing what they need and especially what they will need in the future. Is it really the case or is it the perceived by ET challenge? Who should take care of describing LO for future needs?
- Translation of LO into teaching and especially training in enterprises remains a challenge.
- Investment in teacher and trainer professional development and in developing assessment mechanisms is needed; however, the question of who should pay is open.