

**(First working group session)****Working Group 2****The case of CNC Machine operation****Question 1: Target groups**

- There must be a hierarchy of translation of LO. The initial formulation and writing should depart from a labour market perspective which includes not only employers, but also labour market experts (biased representations of labour market should be carefully avoided). The initial formulation should then be translated into educational and training contexts and needs and at the end to the needs and perceptions of the learner.
- LO must be clearly communicated to different actors (= need to describe LO in such a way as to make them more understandable for different groups). Issues at stake: terminology, level of detail.
- Certain groups of users are strategic users which should be prioritised in terms of an adjusted presentation of the LO: assessors, guidance practitioners and teachers/trainers.
- Learners are potentially important users, especially in what concerns self-assessment activities. Career skills development and guidance are important activities to assure appropriate and autonomous use.

One of the groups suggested a three tier organization of user groups:

- Employers, employees, learners, parents (=Clients, focused on activities)
- Teachers, assessors, LO writers
- Policy makers, training providers (=Suppliers, focused on KSC)

Question 3: Standardisation

- The possibility of creating a comprehensive LO database was mentioned, but its usefulness was questioned. Participants emphasised that any such a work must have very clear objective from the onset, linked to the support of specific issues.

Question 6: Specificity / Openness:

- Specificity and flexibility of LO can be achieved for example through creating a matrix of activity profile, learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Need for a clear vision for the whole process of writing learning outcomes (during all phases: writing, proof reading, editing and approval) and a clear allocation of responsibilities.



- Creating a matrix (at national level) which would compare and combine the way KSC are described in distinct contexts/activities which use LO would allow for an internal harmonisation of descriptions and an increased consistency between systems and frameworks which might be disconnected (e.g. NQF and assessment).
- Stakeholder participation in definition and writing and uptake of LO should be based on a clear vision of the purpose of the LO and their link to specific activities

Question 7: Research

- A cross comparison systematic studies of ways of writing LO constitutes, in itself an important research programme. Issues as the identification of competences should be treated in this research.

Other points mentioned:

- What are the different models for developing standards?
- What are the different models for reviewing the standards?
- While assessment criteria are necessary to make LO complete, the risk of putting too much emphasis on assessing rather than learning should be avoided
- Level of detail of description of LO may depend on the field and level of learning
- Is there interest in having more standardised way of describing LO at European level? What are the problems with applying the KSC approach? Should there be any other model?
- Terminological issues – the same terms may have different meaning
- How to involve more learners in the process?