



Financováno
Evropskou unií
NextGenerationEU



Národní
plán
obnovy



MINISTERSTVO ŠKOLSTVÍ,
MLÁDEŽE A TĚLOVÝCHOVY

THE NATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT STATE in evidence of completion of CVT courses and lifelong learning programmes

**Project Output No. 1 - SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE C1 -
Improving access to education at university level through
micro-credentials of the NATIONAL RENEWAL PLAN**



This work is licensed under the Creative
Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0
International License

Project

The National Recovery Plan (NRP) of the Czech Republic is built on six priorities, namely digital transformation, physical infrastructure and green transition, education and labour market, institutions and regulation and support for entrepreneurship, research, development and innovation, and health and resilience. These priorities are implemented through 27 components. Funding for the implementation of the NPOs will be provided to the Czech Republic by the European Union through the Recovery and Resilience Facility over the period 2021-2026. The project - Specific Objective C1 - Improve the accessibility of education at the university level through the promotion of micro-credentials of the National Recovery Plan for Higher Education in years of 2022 - 2024 is part of the objectives set out in reform 3.2.1 Transform universities to adapt to new forms of learning and in response to changing labour market needs under Component 3. 2 Adaptation of the capacity and focus of the school programmes of the National Renewal Plan set up under Regulation (EU) 2021/241 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 February 2021. The project brought together 26 Czech public universities to share experiences and work systematically on the development of an analytical and methodological framework and background information systems for the implementation of the micro-credentials concept in the environment of public universities in the Czech Republic and their connection to the broader European framework.

Project partners

The submitted materials were produced with the support of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports and the National Renewal Plan within the framework of the project Transformation of the University of Applied Sciences (reg. no. NPO_UK_MSMT-16602/2022) and are intended for educational and methodological purposes.

Coordinating University

Charles University



UNIVERZITA
KARLOVA

Main Project Coordinators

Doc. RNDr. Markéta Martínková, Ph.D., Vice-Rector for Student Affairs of Charles University
Mgr. Jaroslav Švec, OSZS UK; Mgr. Anna Malá, OPP UK

Czech public universities cooperating in the project according to the alphabetical list

- ▶ Akademie múzických umění v Praze (AMU)
- ▶ Akademie výtvarných umění v Praze (AVU)
- ▶ České vysoké učení technické v Praze (ČVUT)
- ▶ Česká zemědělská univerzita v Praze (ČZU)
- ▶ Janáčkova akademie múzických umění (JAMU)
- ▶ Jihočeská univerzita v Českých Budějovicích (JU)
- ▶ Masarykova univerzita (MU)
- ▶ Mendelova univerzita v Brně (MENDELU)
- ▶ Ostravská univerzita (OU)
- ▶ Slezská univerzita v Opavě (SU)
- ▶ Technická univerzita v Liberci (TUL)
- ▶ Univerzita Hradec Králové (UHK)
- ▶ Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Ústí nad Labem (UJEP)
- ▶ Univerzita Karlova (UK)
- ▶ Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci (UPOL)
- ▶ Univerzita Pardubice (UPCE)
- ▶ Univerzita Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně (UTB, zkrácený název: UTB ve Zlíně)
- ▶ Veterinární univerzita Brno (VETUNI)
- ▶ Vysoká škola báňská – Technická univerzita Ostrava (VŠB-TUO, zkrácený název: VŠB – Technická univerzita Ostrava)
- ▶ Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze (VŠE)
- ▶ Vysoká škola chemicko-technologická v Praze (VŠCHT Praha)
- ▶ Vysoká škola polytechnická Jihlava (VŠPJ či VŠP Jihlava)
- ▶ Vysoká škola technická a ekonomická v Českých Budějovicích (VŠTE)
- ▶ Vysoká škola uměleckopřemyslová v Praze (UMPRUM)
- ▶ Vysoké učení technické v Brně (VUT)
- ▶ Západočeská univerzita v Plzni (ZČU)

Project Output No. 1: Analytical report and results of a national analysis of the current state in the field of evidence of completion of CVT courses and lifelong learning programmes

Coordinating university of the Output n. 1 of the project

Charles University



UNIVERZITA
KARLOVA

Submitting coordinator for 1st working group

- ▶ PhDr. Jana Kočí, Ph.D. (*Charles University*)

Completed (based on an alphabetic sorting)

- ▶ Mgr. Tatiana Ďuricová (*Charles University*)
- ▶ Ing. Martin Hammerbauer (*Charles University*)
- ▶ Mgr. Jakub Homolka, Ph.D. (*Charles University*)
- ▶ Mgr. Svatava Kalná (*Masaryk University*)
- ▶ PhDr. Jana Kočí, Ph.D. (*Charles University*)
- ▶ Mgr. Jana Nováková (*University Palackého in Olomouc*)
- ▶ Mgr. Pavla Satrapová (*Charles University*)
- ▶ Mgr. Radka Štruncová (*West Bohemia University*)

Sub-objective 1 of the project, output

Sub-objective 1 of the project in the specific objective C1 of the National Renewal Plan for the Higher Education Sector 2022 2024 with the aim of improving the accessibility of education at university level through micro-credentials:

Analysis of the current status of documents (certificates, attestations, etc.) of completion of upskilling courses, reskilling courses, lifelong learning courses, etc. issued by individual colleges in order to identify best practices in the form and content of documents of completion of this type of education.

Output: National Analysis



The legislative framework of the target

In particular, the following regulations were taken into account in the work of the working group:

Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education Institutions and on Amendments and Additions to Other Acts, as amended.

Act No. 563/2004 Coll., on Teaching Staff and on Amendments to Certain Acts, as amended.

Decree No 317/2005 Coll., on further education of teaching staff, accreditation commission and career system for teaching staff, as amended.

Act No 108/2006 Coll., on Social Services, as amended.

Glossary of used terms

Lifelong Learning Programme / LLP - for the purposes of our questionnaire, we understand lifelong learning to be those types of learning that complement, deepen, renew or extend the knowledge, skills and qualifications of its participants. It is a further form of education provided by universities as the highest link of the educational system according to Section 1(c) of Act No. 111/1998 Coll. It is a term based on Section 60, paragraph 1 of the Act on Higher Education No. 111/1998 Coll., which states ... Within the framework of its educational activities, a higher education institution may provide free of charge or for a fee lifelong learning programmes oriented towards the pursuit of a profession or an interest.

Accredited professional LLL programme - for the purposes of our questionnaire, we understand such LLL programmes that are professionally oriented and accredited by an accreditation body (e.g. the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports within the system of further education of teaching staff)

Non-accredited professional CVT programme - for the purposes of our questionnaire, we mean CVT programmes that are professionally oriented but not accredited by an accreditation body.

Interest-based CVT programme - for the purposes of our questionnaire, we understand such CVT programmes whose orientation is of an interest-based nature.

Micro-credential (~s pl.) or micro-certificate - is an electronic record - a certificate - of the completion of a small-scale learning unit expressed in ECTS credits and the achievement of clearly defined and coherent learning outcomes, i.e. a set of knowledge, skills and competences.

These learning units are included in the European Qualifications Framework (EQF), are subject to a system of standardised quality assurance processes and are assessed against transparent and clearly defined criteria. A unit of learning can typically be a CVT programme within the meaning of Section 60(1) of Act No 111/1998 Coll., the Higher Education Act, or a set of programmes (several concurrent or related CVT programmes).



Upskilling - this term is the Czech translation of extending skills.

Reskilling - this term is the Czech translation of requalification.



Table of Content

- 1 Questionnaire development: 6
- 2 Methodology and evaluation of the survey 6
- 3 Recommendations for practice 22
- Recommendation No. 3..... 23
- Recommendation No. 4..... 23
- Recommendation No. 5..... 24
- Recommendation No. 6..... 24
- Recommendation No. 7..... 24
- Recommendation No. 9..... 25



1 The questionnaire design (description of the development, working group number 1, and all involved professionals)

1 Phases of the questionnaire development:

- ▶ Completion of the first draft of the questionnaire by the sub-objective 1 working group (sub-objective 1 working group*)
- ▶ Expert reviews: by prof. PhDr. Martin Bílek, Ph.D. (Vice Dean for Lifelong and Distance Education), and by Mgr. Izabela Noveská, MBA (Head of the Centre for Lifelong Learning, Faculty of Education, Charles University)
- ▶ Expert assessment: by Mgr. Filip Machart (Department of Analyses and Strategies, RUK)
- ▶ Completion of the second draft of the questionnaire by the working group of sub-objective 1
- ▶ Expert assessment by the members of the other working groups of the Improving access to education at university level through micro-credentials project
- ▶ Expert assessment: doc. Mgr. Miroslav Dopita, Ph.D. (expert, Palacký University in Olomouc) and Mgr. Bc. Klára Tesaříková Čermáková (expert, Palacký University in Olomouc)
- ▶ Completion of the final draft of the questionnaire by the working group of sub-objective 1

2 Methodology and evaluation of the survey

The national analysis of the all Czech public universities providing lifelong learning programmes was conducted from the 1st of July 2022 to 31st of October 2022. Universities (or designated contact persons at the rectorates) were contacted in July 1, 2022, August 26, 2022, and September 9, 2022; 24 September 2022. In total, 26 universities were contacted whose departments could adequately respond to the questionnaire. Distribution to individual departments was done at the discretion of the approached college. The determining factor was, in particular, whether the school has a strictly uniform system of CVL and the questionnaire only needs to be filled in at one workplace, e.g. at the Rector's Office, or whether each workplace has its own standard and needs to be approached individually. 26 universities participated in the survey and a total of 82 departments responded to the questionnaire. For the evaluation of the designed survey, “the departments” are the defining unit for evaluating responses. The results are thus affected by the fact that some of the colleges may have answered the questionnaire more than once. The largest number of departments participated from Masaryk University (14 - i.e. 17% of the total number of responses received), Charles University (10), Jan Evangelista Purkyně University (9), University of Ostrava (8) and Brno University of Technology (7). The other universities were involved in the survey with a smaller number of departments. Only 12 universities were involved in the survey with one department.

The number of participating departments from a single HEI (higher education institution) may be influenced by the size of the HEI (including the decentralisation of the lifelong learning agenda), the distribution of the questionnaire within the HEI or the way information is

transmitted within the institution. For example, Mendel University in Brno was involved with only one questionnaire, but its respondents declared in advance that the data collection was done centrally for the whole university (a similar situation took place at the University of West Bohemia in Pilsen). This approach makes sense if the college has a centralized lifelong learning agenda or if this agenda is strictly codified. However, for universities where its units have more autonomy, such an approach would mean aggregating information into very general statements that do not reflect reality. Therefore, for the purposes of this investigation, the workplace is viewed as the basic unit of assessment.

In almost half of the cases, the term workplace refers to a lifelong learning or continuing education center at a university (48% of the participating workplaces). In less than a third of the cases (29%), the survey involved study departments, followed by faculties or departments in general (15%), and less than a tenth were other workplaces (mostly other departments or divisions of faculties and the rector's office, or the aforementioned university as a whole).

Departments were asked about the lifelong learning programmes they provide. The division into three sections, where similar questions were asked, greatly facilitated comparison across the questionnaire. The first section was for accredited professional lifelong learning programmes, the second for non-accredited professional programmes.

2.1 Results of the analysis of the current situation at national level

The evaluation of the survey is presented in this report using tables that compare approaches for the three types of lifelong learning across the participating workplaces. As shown in Table 2.1.1a, the majority of participating universities provide all types of lifelong learning (with a predominance of accredited vocational and interest-based programmes).

2.1.1a COLLEGE: What kind of CVET programmes do you provide?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
YES	92 %	81 %	92 %
NO	8 %	19 %	8 %
SUM	26	26	26

A clearer view is provided by table 2.1.1b, where the involved workplaces are shown. It is evident from this that individual types of lifelong education are provided by more than half of workplaces. Most workplaces provide hobby programs (68%), values for professional programs are relatively balanced (55-60%).

*hereinafter referred to as ACCREDITED

**hereinafter referred to as NON-ACCREDITED

2.1.1b WORKPLACE: What kind of CV programs do you provide?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
YES	60 %	55 %	68 %
NO	40 %	45 %	32 %
SUM	82	82	82

As for the hourly range of individual types of programs, they are very different (see table 2.1.2). Accredited professional programs are usually more than 100 hours long. Only 10% of them have a time allowance of up to 15 hours. The situation is different for non-accredited programs and is closer to interest programs. For both types, the range of 16 to 100 hours dominates (51% vs. 67%), and a quarter of these programs are completed within 15 hours. Non-accredited professional programs have a greater representation with a length of over 100 hours (22%), while interest programs are implemented rather exceptionally in this range.

2.1.2 To what extent do you most often offer LLL programs?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
Up to 15 hrs	10 %	27 %	24 %
16–100 hrs	33 %	51 %	67 %
Over 100 hrs	57 %	22 %	9 %
SUM	49	45	54

Participants of accredited professional programs always receive a certificate of completion upon completion (table 2.1.3). To a large extent, this is a certificate in printed form (92% see 2.1.6), other forms of the document are rather exceptional. In most cases, the issuing of documents is based on a central methodology (73%), or this methodology is currently being prepared (12% see table 2.1.4). The situation is different for non-accredited professional and interest programs, although some document is (almost) always issued to graduates, it is not unusual that this is done only after certain conditions have been met.

2.1.3 Do you always provide graduates of LLL programs with proof of graduation?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
YES	100 %	82 %	70 %
NO	0 %	0 %	9 %
It depends	0 %	18 %	20 %
SUM	49	45	54

While a uniform methodology exists for accredited professional and interest programs, it exists to a lesser extent for non-accredited professional and interest programs, but still around two-thirds of workplaces (in total) have a uniform methodology (49% and 57%), or are preparing it (16% and 17 %).

Do you have a uniform methodology for issuing certificates of completion of LLL programs?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
YES	73 %	49 %	57 %
NO	14 %	36 %	26 %
In process	12 %	16 %	17 %
SUM	49	45	54

In terms of issued documents, certificates dominate, the certificate is most represented in non-accredited programs (less than a fifth of cases). The item other often also contains the possibility of a confirmation, or the document is issued by an external entity (ministry), the certificate of graduation is kept directly in the university information system and is thus available for other purposes (study, certificate of graduation), or as proof of graduation, registration in index. However, these are marginal variants, certificates dominate all types of education.

2.1.5 What type of documents do you issue to graduates of LLL programs

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
Document	92 %	89 %	92 %
Certificate	4 %	16 %	8 %
Others	4 %	7 %	6 %
SUM	49	44	51

Note: Lower overall numbers because some respondents indicated for question 3 that they provide proof of graduation, but then indicated here that they do not provide proof.

Totaled more than 100% because multiple responses were possible.

The format of the proof of graduation is mostly provided in hard copy. The electronic document is also used to some extent, but always only as an option to supplement the printed document. Proof of graduation in electronic form alone is rare. Only one site reported this format of documentation.

2.1.6 In what format do you issue evidence of completion of LLL programmes?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
Only printed	92 %	78 %	83 %
Printed & electronic	6 %	20 %	17 %
Only electronic	2 %	2 %	0 %
SUM	49	45	54

The departments were further asked whether there were any restrictions on the issuance of electronic proof of graduation. The majority of workplaces indicated that there were no restrictions. Only two establishments said that there were restrictions (no table was produced for question 2.1.8 due to the low number of responses). This was a restriction in terms of the scope of the programme (the electronic document is only issued for programmes up to 50 hours). Given the low number of responses, Table 2.1.7 should be taken as indicative only.

2.1.7 Do you have any restrictions on the issuance of electronic evidence of completion of LLL programmes?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
NO	100 %	90 %	89 %
YES	0 %	10 %	11 %
SUM	4	10	9

2.1.8 Indicate what restrictions you have for issuing an electronic document

The management and administration of lifelong learning programmes is in most cases carried out in university information systems, be it SIS, STAG, etc. The possibility of administering "electronically outside the IS" means, for example, using an in-house electronic system that has been developed specifically for lifelong learning purposes (and is separate from the university IS), but also, for example, using MS Office tools.

2.1.9 What information system do you use to manage or administer LLL programmes?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
University informational system	90 %	84 %	81 %
Electronic outside of IS	10 %	16 %	13 %
Not recorded	0 %	0 %	6 %
SUM	49	45	52

Note: LLL programmes interest – based: lower number of responses (4 departments did not respond).

Generation of the document on completion of the programme takes place to a large extent in the university's information system or in a custom template outside the information system (using MS Office tools or other software). In a small number of cases, the generation is not carried out, or it is created manually. There are slight differences between the different types of LLP.

2.1.10 What system do you use to generate proof of completion of LLL programmes?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
University Informational System	69 %	69 %	61 %
Our template (outside of the university)	29 %	16 %	30 %
Not generated	2 %	9 %	6 %
Masde by hands	0 %	7 %	4 %
SUM	49	45	54

Credits (ECTS) are not usually awarded for completing lifelong learning programmes. The values are very consistent across the different types (80%-85%). Where credits are awarded, the length of the participants' preparation for and completion of the training in hours, the duration of the programme in hours and, to a lesser extent, the form of completion (submission of a paper, examination, etc.) are usually reflected in the amount of credits. Given the low number of workplaces where credits are awarded for completion, the question is how telling this output is.

2.1.11 Do you award ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) credits for completing programmes or a stand-alone LLL course?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
NO	82 %	80 %	85 %
YES	18 %	20 %	9 %
Sometimes	0 %	0 %	6 %
SUM	49	45	54

Table 2.1.12 provides an overview of the parameters that are taken into account in determining the amount of credits awarded. Given the low number of respondents, the explanatory value of this question is not very high.

2.1.12 Based on what parameters do you determine the number of credits you award? Do you take into account:

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
... hour-long preparation of participants for training and completion	67 %	56 %	63 %
... form of completion (handing in a paper, exam, etc.)	33 %	56 %	63 %
... hourly duration of the LLL programme	56 %	56 %	63 %
Others	11 %	11 %	0 %
SUM	9	9	8

In most cases, certificates of completion are printed on a special type of paper. This is mostly the case for accredited vocational programmes (86%), only 67% for non-accredited programmes and 54% for non-vocational programmes. The more formalized the type of training, the more emphasis is placed on printing the document on a special type of paper. Providing the document electronically is exceptional (see Table 2.1.2 for a comparison).

2.1.13 Do you print any of the evidence of completion of LLL programmes on a special type of paper?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
YES	86 %	67 %	54 %
NO, print on a regular paper	10 %	29 %	44 %
NO, it is electronized	4 %	4 %	2 %
SUM	49	45	54

The results show that 30% - 48% of respondents said that they print their graduation certificate on watermarked paper and 23% - 36% of respondents use specially formulated paper for diploma printing. Among the types of paper mentioned, price papers, handmade papers, higher weight papers and glossy or laminated papers were also mentioned.

2.1.14 If you print any of the evidence of completion of LLL programmes on a special type of paper, please indicate on which type.

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
Watermarked paper	48 %	43 %	30 %
Special paper for diploma printing	36 %	23 %	23 %
Valuation paper	10 %	7 %	7 %
Handmade paper	7 %	13 %	10 %
Others	10 %	13 %	30 %
SUM	42	30	30

Note: Only those who print on special paper are eligible.

The total is more than 100% because more than one answer was possible.

In the majority of cases, the dean of the faculty (61%-69%), or the programme supervisor (37%-38%), the rector (20%-25%) or another person (29%-31%) signs the certificate of completion of lifelong learning programmes. The term other person often refers to the vice-rector or the director or head of the department. According to the results of the study, the vice-dean rarely signs the graduation certificate, often on behalf of the dean. There are no major differences between the different types of programmes, the values are very balanced.

2.1.15 Which responsible persons (or proxy responsible persons) must sign (electronically sign) proof of completion of the LLL programmes?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
Dean	69 %	60 %	61 %
Garant of the programme	37 %	38 %	37 %
Someone else	29 %	29 %	31 %
Rector	20 %	24 %	25 %
Vice-dean	10 %	7 %	10 %
SUM	49	45	51

Note: More than 100% in total because more than one answer could have been selected.

A stamp is printed on the proof of completion in most cases. Again, the more formalised the form of education, the more emphasis is placed on the use of the stamp and a variant with the national emblem is used. This is particularly true for accredited vocational programmes where proof of completion without a stamp is almost non-existent (only one institute reported this).

2.1.16 Please indicate which stamp you use to stamp your proof of completion of the LLL programmes:

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
Official stamp with small state emblem	69 %	44 %	43 %
Other stamp without national emblem	29 %	40 %	35 %
No Stamp	2 %	16 %	22 %
SUM	49	45	54

In the majority of cases, the certificate of completion of a lifelong learning programme is issued only in the Czech language. In the case of accredited vocational programmes, the foreign language version is almost non-existent. Non-accredited and leisure programmes

more often have a different language version of the document, but this is only the case in the stronger fifth of workplaces. If a foreign language version of the document is issued, it is the English version. Only one institute stated that it issues the certificate of completion in the language that is recorded in the information system (this applies to extra-curricular programmes and it is no longer stated whether this means the language of instruction or the student's mother language).

2.1.17 Do you also issue proof of completion of the LLL programme in a foreign language?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
NO	90 %	80 %	76 %
YES	10 %	20 %	24 %
SUM	49	45	54

Table 2.1.18 below gives an overview of the language in which the certificates of completion are issued. The predominant language is the aforementioned English. Given the very limited number of respondents, the results should be taken as an illustration of the situation.

2.1.18 Indicate in which foreign language you issue evidence of completion of LLL programmes

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
English	100 %	100 %	92 %
Based on the language in Informational System	0 %	0 %	8 %
SUM	5	9	13

An addendum to the graduation certificate with a list of completed courses is issued for accredited vocational lifelong learning programmes by the majority of workplaces (57%), similarly for non-accredited vocational programmes (51%), for leisure programmes it is not so frequent, but even here there is a large proportion of workplaces that attach a list to the addendum (41%). For non-accredited vocational programmes it is more often directly included in the graduation certificate, unlike for accredited vocational programmes and leisure programmes.

2.1.19 Do you have the option for LLL programmes where this is relevant to issue a supplement to the certificate of completion listing the courses taken (similar to a Diploma Supplement)?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
NO	43 %	49 %	59 %
YES	45 %	29 %	37 %
YES, it is a part of the supplement	12 %	22 %	4 %
SUM	49	45	54

The situation between accredited professional programs, programs of interest and non-accredited professional programs in the area of language mutation of the list of completed subjects is very different. While for non-accredited professional programs, a list of subjects in a foreign language is not provided (57%), the opposite is true for accredited professional and interest programs (71% and 68% of workplaces, respectively, issue a foreign language supplement). Foreign language versions of the list of completed subjects are made in English.

2.1.20 Do you have the possibility to issue a supplement to the graduation certificate with a list of completed courses (similar to a Diploma Supplement) also in a foreign language?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
NO	29 %	57 %	32 %
YES	71 %	43 %	68 %
SUM	28	23	22

2.1.1 Note: Only those who issue a supplement listing courses taken are responsible.

Table 2.1.21 below provides an overview of the foreign language versions of the transcript of completed courses. If the transcript is in a foreign language, it is in English. One department determines the language of the transcript according to the information system (again, it is not specified whether this means the language of instruction or the student's mother language).

2.1.21 In which foreign language are you able to issue a supplement with a list of completed courses (similar to a Diploma Supplement)

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
English	100 %	100 %	93 %
Based on Language in Informational System	0 %	0 %	7 %
SUM	20	10	15

Note: Only those who issue a supplement listing courses taken in a foreign language are eligible.

While for accredited vocational programmes the mandatory items on the certificate of completion are very often specified (84%), for non-accredited and interest-based programmes this is only slightly above the majority (58%).

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
Name of educational institution	100 %	100 %	100 %
Name and Surname of Absolvent	100 %	100 %	100 %
Name of training programme	98 %	100 %	100 %
Date of issue of the certificate	100 %	96 %	100 %
Absolvents date of birth	98 %	96 %	97 %
Signature of authorised officer	93 %	92 %	97 %
Serial number of the certificate issued	95 %	92 %	90 %
Stamp of the educational institution (if you have one)	93 %	81 %	87 %
Accreditation number of the educational programme	78 %	8 %*	X
Citation: The educational programme was accredited by the Ministry of Education within the system of further education of pedagogical staff under no:	76 %	X	X
Graduate's place of birth	73 %	65 %	71 %
Amount of hours	85 %	58 %	55 %
Seat of the educational institution	X	62 %	61 %
Accreditation number of the educational institution	59 %	X	X

Indication of the type of further education according to Section 1 of Decree No 317/2005 Coll., on further education of teaching staff, accreditation commission and career system for teaching staff	51 %	X	X
ID number of the educational institution	59 %	35 %	45 %
Start date and end date of the event	59 %	46 %	32 %
Place of the venue	56 %	31 %	35 %
Method of ending the event	54 %	35 %	10 %
Name of lecturer(s)	2 %	8 %	X
Others	10 %	15 %	13 %
SUM	41	26	31

2.1.22 Do you have designated mandatory items on your evidence of completion of LLL programmes?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL *	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL **	INTEREST-BASED
YES	84 %	58 %	58 %
NO	16 %	42 %	42 %
SUM	49	45	53

There is a relatively broad consensus on what is mandatory on the evidence of completion of a lifelong learning programme. These are the name of the educational institution, the name of the educational programme, the serial number of the certificate issued, the name of the graduate, his/her date of birth, the date of issue of the certificate, the stamp of the educational institution and the signature of the authorized official. To a lesser extent, the required items include the graduate's place of birth, the number of hours completed, the location of the educational institution, its ID number, the location of the event, the method of completion of the event, and the start and end dates of the event. The name of the lecturer is rarely among the mandatory items.

In the case of accredited professional programmes, among the mandatory items, the accreditation number of the educational programme and the quotation The educational

programme was accredited by the Ministry of Education and Science within the system of further education of pedagogical staff under no. (78% and 76%, respectively), and to a lesser extent the accreditation number of the educational institution and the indication of the type of further education according to Section 1 of Decree No.317/2005 Coll., on further education of pedagogical staff, the accreditation commission and the career system of pedagogical staff (59% and 51%, respectively).

In general, the selected mandatory items are more frequently listed for accredited professional programmes than for non-accredited professional and interest programmes, with smaller differences between them (see Table 2.1.23).

2.1.23 Please select which mandatory items you indicate on the evidence of completion of LLL programmes:

*There should be no answer for non-accredited programs, yet there was. This is explained by possible confusion with the registration number of the programme at the institution or by a simple "click" by the respondent.

Rather, there is no central methodology or guidelines for numbering evidence of completion of lifelong learning programmes at most institutions, although the proportion of institutions is very balanced across all types of programmes.

2.1.24 Do you have a central methodology (guidelines) for numbering evidence of completion of LLL programmes?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL *	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL **	INTEREST-BASED
NO	51 %	58 %	59 %
YES	49 %	42 %	41 %
SUM	49	45	27

Note: In the case of the interest-based courses, a larger proportion of respondents did not respond. Only 27 respondents answered instead of 56. A possible reason for this is that the question was not displayed.

Similarly, the question on the central record of documents issued for programmes completed is similarly balanced, with slightly more documents being recorded for accredited vocational programmes, but these are minimal differences.

2.1.25 Do you have a central record of documents issued for the completion of LLL programmes?

	ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL*	NON-ACCREDITED PROFESSIONAL**	INTEREST-BASED
NO	43 %	53 %	59 %
YES	57 %	47 %	41 %
SUM	49	45	27

Note: In the case of the interest-based courses, a larger proportion of respondents did not respond. Only 27 respondents responded instead of 56. A possible reason for this is that the question was not displayed.

3 Recommendations for practice

In order to identify best practice in terms of the form and content of the documents, we have selected the most important points from our perspective that emerged from the national analysis. We respond to these key findings by proposing recommendations that may ultimately prove to be the most acceptable and appropriate for the majority of schools involved. However, we would also like to mention the individuality of each school, what may appear to be best practice for one school may not be best practice for another.

Recommendation No. 1


Implement all types of lifelong learning programmes, with no preference for any one of them.

Rationale: The survey showed that most of the participating universities provide all types of lifelong learning (with a greater predominance of accredited vocational and interest-based programmes). Individual types of lifelong learning are provided only by a majority of institutions. The majority of institutions provide leisure programmes (68%), while the figures for vocational programmes are relatively balanced (55-60%).

In our opinion, it is advisable to focus on the development of all types of CVL, not to prefer or neglect any of them, because then it is possible to reach different target groups with an offer corresponding to their requirements and thus compare, for example, possible differences between the acquired education and the requirements of the employer, to strengthen the employability and competitiveness of the trainees on the labour market, to enable them to acquire new qualifications, or to offer the possibility of spending leisure time in a meaningful way and at the same time to acquire new knowledge, skills, competences.

Recommendation No. 2

Promote the introduction of a central methodology at individual universities, as well as the possibility of numbering documents of completion of lifelong learning programmes.



Rationale: The survey showed that participants in accredited vocational programmes always receive a certificate of completion upon completion, while participants in non-accredited vocational and interest programmes almost always receive a certificate of completion. The issuance of documents is in most cases based on a central methodology (again, this is most common in accredited programmes). A central methodology, like the guidelines for numbering documents of completion for lifelong learning programmes, exists in only half of the centers, and the same is true for the central register of documents issued.

In our view, the introduction of a central methodology can provide organisers with or implementers the support needed for the smooth preparation and implementation of lifelong learning programmes, especially in terms of compliance with legislative, content and formal requirements. Given that the certificate is issued as proof of completion of a lifelong learning programme and the reason for keeping copies of it is in particular the possibility of issuing a second copy of the certificate to graduates on request, the possibility of numbering these documents is particularly useful in relation to the clear registration of participants in lifelong learning programmes.

Recommendation No. 3

Support the functionality of the University's central information system for efficient document generation, record keeping of evidence of completion, management and administration of LLL programmes.


Rationale: The survey revealed that certificates dominate the documents issued, with the certificate being the most represented among non-accredited programmes. Proof of completion is maintained directly in the University's information system and is thus available for other purposes. The management and administration of lifelong learning programmes is also conducted in most cases through university information systems (SIS, STAG) or through the university's own electronic system, which has been developed specifically for lifelong learning purposes and is separate from the university IS, but in some schools, e.g. MS Office tools are also used. The generation of the programme completion document is largely done in the university's information system or in a custom template outside the information system.

In our view, supporting the functionality of the university's central information system for efficient document generation, record keeping of graduation documents, management of and administration of lifelong learning programmes is essential.

Recommendation No. 4

Promote a uniform type and appearance of the certificate of completion, i.e. unify the basic elements of the electronic document as the main evidence of completion of the lifelong learning programme in the future.

Rationale: The survey has shown that the format of the certificate of completion is mostly issued in hard copy. The electronic document (without restrictions on issuance) is also used to some extent, but always only as a possible complement to the printed document. In most cases, graduation certificates are printed on a special type of paper, which very often means watermarked paper or paper designed specifically and only for printing the diploma. This is most often the case for accredited vocational programmes. Despite the fact that the results of the analysis show that at present universities most often issue graduation documents only in



printed form, in our opinion, given the increase in computerisation, the unification of the basic elements of the electronic document as the main proof of graduation from a lifelong learning programme is inevitable in the future. The reason for this is greater flexibility in terms of its portability, e.g. when it is issued, presented to potential employers, and inserted into the Europass digital wallet.

Recommendation No. 5

Establish rules for the creation of the content, issuance and validation of electronic documents on the completion of LLL programme.

Rationale: Although the national analysis shows that the majority of universities issue a paper certificate of completion, given the increasing trend towards computerization, we recommend that clear rules be established for the creation of the content, issue and validation of electronic documents. In view of the current practice, where in most cases the dean or the programme guarantor signs the document of completion of lifelong learning programmes, the rector or another person, we recommend to consider establishing rules for a uniform confirmation of the document (e.g. with the electronic seal of the university). In most cases, a stamp is printed on the printed document of graduation and, again, the more formalized the form of education, the greater the emphasis on the use of the stamp and the use of a variant with the state emblem.

Recommendation No. 6

Develop a strategy for awarding ECTS credits for completion of accredited lifelong learning programmes or micro-certificates.

Rationale: Despite the fact that ECTS credits are not usually awarded for completing lifelong learning programmes in Czech universities, this topic is very important for universities. A unified, clearly defined strategy for awarding ECTS credits could be a useful tool for quantified assessment of the course of study, which is used in the preparation and specification of programmes. It could be applied to all types of educational programmes, to all types of studies and to all types of learning. It would increase the transparency of training programmes and facilitate their recognition, which could be adequately applied to C-Level training programmes and help inter-university recognition of certificates.

Recommendation No. 7

Develop recommendations for the content of the certificate supplement, both in hard copy and electronic form.

Rationale: The survey found that a certificate supplement is routinely issued in half of the universities. In the majority of cases, the certificate of completion of a lifelong learning programme is issued only in the Czech language and in about half of the cases including a supplement to the certificate of completion. In view of the increasing trend towards computerisation, as already mentioned above, we recommend that the supplement to the certificate be standardised, in both printed and electronic versions. This is in an effort to promote the effective implementation of the electronic document. There is also a need for traditional education systems to be redesigned to be more open and flexible, and to be tailored to the needs of the participants in the CJV.

Recommendation No. 8

Standardize the foreign language format of the certificate of completion and the supplement to the certificate of completion (primarily English)

Rationale: The survey found that when the foreign language version of the transcript of completion is issued with the addendum, it is in English (most often for accredited vocational and occupational programs) and as the most common foreign language version of the transcript of completion and the primary secondary language for issuing documents, we recommend that English be the language of choice.

Recommendation No. 9

We recommend that rules be established for the inclusion of compulsory and optional items on the certificate of completion and the supplement to the certificate of completion of the lifelong learning programme.

Rationale: The analysis showed that the majority of Czech universities agree on the items currently included on the certificate of completion of the lifelong learning programme. It is now important to identify which items will in future be included on the graduation document on a compulsory basis and which only on an optional basis (with regard to legislation or the Council Recommendation of 16 June 2022 on a European approach to micro-credentials for lifelong learning and employability - 2022/C 243/02), especially with regard to demonstrating the quality of individual courses. The aim of unifying the documents issued across Czech universities so that the certificates of micro-credentials are easily and unambiguously identifiable is addressed by Working Group 3 of the whole project.

4 Conclusion

In the second half of last year, an analysis of the current state of documents (certificates, etc.) on the completion of upskilling, reskilling, LLL, etc. issued by individual HEIs was carried out with a 100% return rate at all public HEIs in the Czech Republic (26 schools/82 departments) in order to identify the best practice of the form and content of documents on the completion of this type of training. A partial interest was also to replicate the analysis in private HEIs, here we unfortunately, we encountered a negative response, which may have been due to the non-inclusion of these schools in the project.

Based on the outputs from the questionnaire survey, the above recommendations were defined, however, it is possible that these may not be applicable/usable for all participating educational institutions. It is entirely up to them whether and how they use/implement these recommendations into practice/rules relating to the preparation and delivery of C.V.E.

Contact

Coordinator of Working Group 1

- ▶ **PhDr. Jana Kočí, Ph.D.**
- ▶ Center for Lifelong Learning
Charles University
- ▶ email: jana.koci@pedf.cuni.cz

Acknowledgements:

"The coordinator of Working Group 1 thanks all the participating public universities for their helpful participation. In particular, my heartfelt thanks go to all the esteemed members of the Task Force, the overall project coordinators and the sub-group coordinators for their valuable cooperation and dedication in realizing the common output."

Main coordinator of the NPO project Transformation of HEIs - SC C1 - micro-credentials

- ▶ **Doc. RNDr. Markéta Martínková, Ph.D.**
- ▶ Vice-Rector for Student Affairs of
Charles University
- ▶ email: studijni@prorektor.cuni.cz

Acknowledgements:

"The main coordinators of the project for Charles University would like to thank all the public universities involved - only their willing and effective cooperation made this output possible."