

REFINE: Recognising Formal, Informal and Non-formal Education

Final report from the Norwegian sub-project

**Grethe Haugøy, Vox
Frank Moe, SEVU, University of Bergen
January 2005**

CONTENT

Part 1 Background

- 1.1. **On REFINE**
- 1.2. **The Norwegian project**
- 1.3. **A World of its Own: Non-formal and informal competence and the university/college sector**
- 1.4. **Other actors in the Norwegian *realkompetanse* landscape**

Part 2 The Project

- 1.1. **Overview of project plan**
- 1.2. **The candidates**
- 1.3. **The institutions**
- 1.4. **The partnership**

Part 3 Results

- 1.1. **Introduction**
- 1.2. **Matching tools and targets**
- 1.3. **The process in the institutions**
- 1.4. **Results**

Part 4 Recommendations and further work

Part 5 Dissemination of results

References

Appendix

Part 1 Background

1.0. On REFINE

The project's international co-ordinator is EUCEN (European Universities Continuing Education Network), and several European organizations are active participants. The Norwegian partner is The Centre for Continuing Education (SEVU) at the University of Bergen. Vox, the National Institute for Adult Learning, co-operates with SEVU in conducting the Norwegian study. The Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research is supporting the project.

2.0. The Norwegian Project

The main objective of the Norwegian project was to investigate the practice of granting exemption(s) from a study program or degree in higher education based on documented non-formal and informal learning. One or more tools for documentation of prior learning from different arenas were used to provide a portfolio of documents for assessment. A main objective was to provide a basis for discussing exemption in higher education, as well as investigating the demands such a candidate will meet and how these demands may be met.

The project has evaluated the use of the various tools and recommends modifications to these with regard to the specific purpose of documenting prior learning in the specific setting of higher education. In addition, the project has established a meeting place for candidates, higher education institutions and advisors in the field.

The project conducted case-studies based on actual candidates' competence. The candidates were provided by the project partners and the networks they belong to. The candidate group was kept at a manageable size, striving to include people of different backgrounds and aims. The various educational institutions were asked to assess a maximum of two candidates each. Experts within the institutions evaluated and assessed the candidates' documentation, and the final assessments were to be given in the form of written reports as well as through interview sessions with the project members.

The following persons contributed to the REFINE-project in Norway:
Frank Moe at the Centre for Continuing Education (National co-ordinator Refine)
Inger-Lise Pettersen, Department of Education, Nordland county.
Torild Nilsen Mohn and Grethe Haugøy at Vox, the Norwegian Institute for Adult Learning.

1.3. A World of its Own: Non-formal and informal learning and the university/college sector

Higher education in Norway has the last few years been heavily transformed by the Bologna processes and other political reforms led by the Ministry of Education and Research. In accordance with *Bologna* all universities and most colleges have introduced the common European systems related to academic degrees (the Bachelor and Master programs substituting the endemic Norwegian system) and academic grading (the alphabet grading scale and ECTS).

In addition to these structural changes there are fundamental pedagogical developments in the sector (especially at the universities) transforming student life and challenging deep-set traditions. The Competence Reform and the concept of validation of prior learning (*realkompetanse*) have had an impact with regard to the acceptance of students with non-traditional academic background.

All higher education in Norway is subject to *Act relating to Universities and Colleges*.

Act relating to Universities and university colleges:

No. 22 of 12 May 1995 (with later amendments)

Chapter 9. Student admission. The right to sit examinations. Exclusion from attending courses

Section 37: Educational qualifications for entrance to higher education

1. *The general basis for admission as a student (the general entrance requirement) is successful completion of the Norwegian upper secondary school and fulfilment of the requirements regarding subject combinations and hours of study laid down by the Ministry. The Ministry may stipulate that other suitable education or combinations of education and work experience shall constitute a general basis for admission. The institution shall consider whether applicants hold qualifications corresponding to the stipulated entrance requirements.*
2. *The institutions may grant applicants who are 25 years of age or older in the admission year admission to specific courses if they on the basis of their prior learning (formal and non-formal) are adequate for the course concerned. The Ministry may issue further provisions concerning documentation, procedures and any coordination.*

Chapter 10. Learning environment. Degrees. Examinations.

Section 49: Exemption from examinations or tests

Exemption from an examination or test shall be granted when it has been shown that a corresponding examination or test has been taken at the same or another institution. Such exemption may also be granted on the basis of another suitable examination or test. Documentation of prior learning (formal and non-formal) may also provide a basis for exemption. The board decides whether the faculty concerned or a special body at the institution shall decide on exemptions. The Ministry may order the institutions to coordinate their practice.

The Act thus states that higher education institutions in Norway must accept *realkompetanse* or competence equivalent to the general secondary school diploma when admitting students of 25 years or older. Such competence may also form a basis for granting exemption(s) from a study program or degree, but the law is vague with regard to the degree and volume of such exemption. However the law also opens for exceptions to the general regulations, based on the nature of the institution, the need for regulations of admission, etc.

With respect to the above matters the proposition for the new law on Universities and colleges contain the same regulations.

Applications are assessed by the individual college or university. The institutions of higher education are free to decide what constitutes the necessary qualifications for admittance, and the admittance procedures are decided locally. Foreign qualifications and documented work experiences are assessed and accredited centrally by NOKUT, The Norwegian Agency of Quality Assurance in Education.

Norwegian universities and colleges have more or less accepted documented non-formal and informal learning as a basis for admission to higher studies, if acceptable documentation proves that the student has competence equivalent to ordinary pre-studies. However, there are variations with regard to

practice between the institutions, and open studies (without competition) have so far been most positive towards *realkompetanse* students. The typical problem that arises when a *realkompetanse* student applies for closed studies is related to the problem of ranging candidates with different kind of background.

The admission and exemption procedures related to *realkompetanse* students in higher education are thinly documented. The Norwegian Refine Project's findings could create a basis for such documentation.

1.4. Other actors in the Norwegian *realkompetanse* landscape

The NIFU report

Håvard Helland and Vibeke Opheim at NIFU (Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education) have published the report *Kartlegging av realkompetansereformen (Mapping the 'Realkompetanse' Reform, 2004)*. The report provides an overview of how higher education institutions have adapted to the reform with regard to the development of local regulations and methods for assessing the candidates. There is also an updated overview of the number of *realkompetanse* students applying for higher studies in 2001 and 2002. Assessing the policies concerning exemption, Helland and Opheim conclude that local regulations do not cover this field. No exemption applications have been accepted by the institutions interviewed. The institutions' main argument is that no *realkompetanse* student possesses the competence necessary to substitute parts of the academic study. Previous exams from higher educational institutions seem to represent the only acceptable basis for exemption from the theoretical parts of the study. Concerning exemption from obligatory trainee arrangements (for instance in nursing or teacher studies) the institutions state that supervised training is qualitatively superior to non-supervised work experience. (It should be noted, though, that questions about exemptions were not a priority of this study)

The NIFU project

NIFU will follow up their report with a project that maps the actual number of applications for exemption based on validation of prior learning in higher education. The project group will conduct interviews with universities and colleges and the result will be an overview of the extent of exemption in higher education in Norway. The project will be carried out in December 2004-January 2005.

The NOKUT project

NOKUT (The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education) runs a project uncovering the problems facing refugees lacking documentation of education and work experience. The project focuses on people with formal, but undocumented, education. Acceptance of foreign education is another factor discussed. The objectives of the refugee project is somewhat different from the REFINE project objectives, because the NOKUT project concerns people who actually possess formal education, but are unable to document it. In addition there may be problems connected to the content and level of the degrees claimed, due to differences in programs in various countries. However, some of the methods and procedures that are used to substantiate claims of competence could well be used for claims based on experiential background.

Secondary school experiences

Competence assessment at upper secondary level is the responsibility of the 19 regional counties. Most counties have a skills centre where documentation, guidance and assessment take place. The actual assessment is done either through dialogue, a practice-based assessment in a working place or through a test. Regional authorities are responsible for issuing public documentation and providing education

which is adapted to suit individuals. At secondary school level there are several examples of exemption, but exemption as such is not common. The exemption experiences are not documented or made available to actors in the field.

The TRANSFINE project

The European project Transfine (Transfer between formal, informal and non-formal education) was funded by the European Commission through the Joint Action Programme. Transfine's main goal was to research the possibilities of developing a common set of procedures and a common system for valuating non-formal and informal competence in the European Union. The project gave a general overview of the experiences made and policies executed in connection with non-formal learning in Europe. Five national studies, among them a Norwegian study, were undertaken in order to produce specific information and documentation. Obstacles were identified and the need for a common set of procedures was discussed. A member of EUCEN, the Centre for continuing education at the University of Bergen co-ordinated the Norwegian project. The project was actively supported by the Ministry of Education and Research. Vox was responsible for the collection of data and the national report.

Realkompetanseprosjektet (The *Realkompetanse* Project 1999-2002) aimed at establishing a national system for documentation of prior learning. The project was conducted in close co-operation with the social partners, the educational sector, the third sector and private educational organizations. Closely connected to the national Competence Reform, the Ministry of Education and Research was responsible for the project. The project was conducted by Vox. The final report concludes from the experiences made from 50 development projects, research reports, European experiences and co-operation with the public sectors (county level), social partners and the third sector. The conclusions state that documentation of *realkompetanse* in Norway must be beneficial to the individual as well as society. Documentation tools must be flexible in order to cater for multiple experiences. The *Realkompetanse* Project recommends that the right of the individual to document his or her realkompetanse must be secured by law. The result of a voluntary process, the documentation itself belongs to the individual.

A committee on higher education (Mjøsutvalget) was established in 1998 to investigate the field of validation of prior learning in higher education. The committee concluded that institutions in higher education have to make arrangements that are adapted to each student's needs and prior learning, and as such be able to accept exemption based on *realkompetanse*. The committee's conclusions made way for the amendments to the University Law.

Part 2 The Project

2.1. Overview of project plan

Dates 2004	Activity	Outcome
April	Meeting with involved parties: The Ministry, NOKUT, Vox.	Information exchange. Agreement on project goals.
May-June	Contacting institutions. Finding candidates. Discussing tools.	Getting an overview of interested institutions and candidates. Deciding tools to be used.
June	Inviting institutions to participate in project.	Invitations accepted.
August	Meeting with institutions. Presenting project and discussing procedures. Meeting with candidates. Guidance in filling in documentation forms (tools).	Procedures agreed. Documentation provided by candidates.
September	Continued meetings with institutions and candidates.	Documentation sent in to institutions. Assessment.
October	Assessment period. Interviews with institutions.	Assessment.
November	Writing final report. EUCEN conference in Lithuania.	Presenting project results at conference.
December	Finishing final report.	Final report finished.
March 2005	Seminar for sharing project results.	Discussing results with involved parties. Recommendations for further work.

2.2. The candidates

The candidates were selected from the project partners' networks. Nordland county provided by far the largest number of candidates. Most other candidates were provided by the institutions themselves through applications they had previously received.

Candidate profiles

Candidate A has worked as a primary school teacher for 30 years. She has no formal teacher education except from a wide variety of teacher courses offered by the local community and county. Her work experience covers all aspects of teaching and pedagogical experience, including being responsible for pupils with special needs. Candidate A applies for exemption from the professional teacher training study at Nesna College.

Candidate B has a wide work experience including primary school teaching. She has an extensive education and practice in music. She is currently a student at Nesna College and applies for exemption from Music at Nesna College.

Candidate C is a trained teacher, but lacks formal competence in English. He has lived in the USA and had an American girlfriend, and also travelled extensively. He speaks and writes English fluently. Candidate C applies for exemption from English at Nesna College.

Candidate D works as Treasury Associate in one of Norway's petro-geological companies. She has a diploma with 60 ECTS from BI School of Economics and extensive work experience within finance. Candidate D applies for exemption from finance courses in BI's Bachelor program.

Candidate E has management responsibilities in one of Norway's biggest firms. She has extensive management and project experience and applies for exemption from BI School of Economics' Management program.

Candidate F has a long practice both as a musician and a teacher, but did not finish his education some years back. He seeks exemption from certain modules at the Norwegian Academy of Music.

Candidate G sent an application for exemption into the Bachelor Program in Art History at the University of Bergen based on his practice in museum work and as a practising artist (pottery). It was evident that this background was not suitable for any exemptions in that program, so it was decided to try the case in another adjacent area, Cultural Science.

Candidate H has a formal education as teacher (primary school) and during his close to 30 years of practice he has undertaken several projects within local history, included two major papers. He seeks validation of prior learning and wants to check out his chances of exemption in History (Social sciences) at Bodø College.

Candidate I applies for exemption from the professional teacher training study at Bodø College.

Candidate J has documented nursing education from another country, as well as two years study in medicine. He has relevant working experience and applies for exemption from the profession nursing study at Narvik College.

2.3 The institutions

The following institutions participated in the project:

Nesna College (Nordland county)
Narvik College (Nordland county)
Bodø College (Nordland county)
University of Bergen
Norwegian Acedemy of Music
BI Norwegian School of Management
BI Norwegian School of Economics

In August 2004 the project co-ordinator invited the Nordland county actors to a meeting in Bodø. The actors included representatives from the social partners and the educational sector, as well as representatives from the colleges of Bodø, Narvik and Nesna. Following the presentations of the project and experiences with assessing *realkompetanse* in secondary school and higher education, the participants discussed the challenges related to the granting of exemption based on *realkompetanse*.

The discussions revealed uncertainty with regard to the college procedures of granting exemption based on *realkompetanse*. The following questions were debated:

- How can the colleges make a framework for assessment?

- Do the colleges need additional tests? Should there be individual testing with regard to gaps in the documentation?
- Candidate interviews are important – how to conduct such interviews?
- The candidates need access to advisors – where do we find them?
- The importance of acceptance of the idea of exemption – the candidates are not to be considered as secondary candidates.

The objective of the co-operation with the colleges and universities is to investigate the premise for exemption. The institutions have to clarify the expectations they have towards an applicant and how he or she is assessed. Only by making an argument for a reflection process in the individual institutions may the premise for exemption be revealed.

The project made clear to the colleges that we are not a competence police or a body of inspectors who check that the law is followed by the institutions. Our role is to observe the processes and report the results. The candidates' exemption result is fictive and will not apply in a regular application process.

2.4. The partnership

The Norwegian partnership includes a number of institutions and organizations on the political and educational level. These partners include the Ministry of Education and Research, the counties, the social partners, the colleges and universities, and NOKUT.

Norway has long traditions in including regional actors and social partners in discussions and projects in education. The social partners have been active in the educational reforms introducing the concept of validation of prior learning, especially on secondary school level.

In this project we found it somewhat difficult to include other partners actively, with the exception of Nordland county which was active in connecting the project with the colleges in that county and also in providing the project with candidates.

Part 3 Results

3.1. Introduction

The project was right from the start intended as a pilot study, with a limited number of candidates and a few institutions. Our intention was to initiate a process in the institutions that would address the general problem areas connected to exemption in addition to a concrete evaluation of the individual candidate and an evaluation of the documentation tools used.

The intention was to make the candidates use a specific tool for documentation, in order to evaluate this tool in the process. This was done for the candidates in Nordland and the candidate at BI School of Economics.

With regard to the other institutions the process was based on applications already received by the institutions. As such they differed much in form and format, and we cannot speak of specific tools being used.

It must be admitted that we have not succeeded in attaining the goals of the project in accordance with our ambitions. With some exceptions the processes in the institutions have been strongly delayed, with the result that most of the candidates have not yet been evaluated. Neither have we been able to instigate thorough processes on the more general questions.

At this point we do not want to investigate the possible reasons for this situation. The reasons for the delays are in most cases given as combinations of illness and general workload, which in effect have resulted in this project being postponed, as it has been regarded as being of less importance than other pressing business in the institutions. Thus we have received only three reports and are still awaiting three more.

The reports however, together with the discussions we have had with the representatives of the institutions, give us some background for drawing preliminary conclusions. As the indications are fairly consistent we feel that it is possible to make some statements.

3.2. Matching tools and targets

In order to be able to describe their competence to the colleges and universities, the candidates needed tools with which to document their competence. In addition most candidates needed guidance in the application process. In Nordland county an advisor from the skills center informed the candidates about the county's *realkompetanse* documentation tools. The candidates filled out the forms *Kompetanseattest* (Competence Card from Workplace) and CV (see appendix). The BI School of Economics candidate used the Nordland county tools, while the other candidates applying for exemption didn't use a specific tool but were able to describe their competence more or less extensively in a CV.

The Nordland county tools are now adopted by Vox and will be further developed as a tool that may be used nationally for describing a person's competence from the working life. The Competence Card is a tool for helping individuals to map and describe their professional competence such as branch knowledge, work responsibilities, working methods and personal skills. A degree system is used, from level A (may perform under supervision) to level D (may instruct others and develop the area further). Vox recommends the companies to only use the degree system internally in the company because competence is considered to be contextually bounded. The document is signed by the individual and the manager of the firm the person works in. Other competence is described in the CV.

One important aspect that arose during the documentation process was the need for streamlining the application for exemption with the actual study plan of the colleges and universities. The candidate needed to check the study plan in detail in order to match his or her own competence with the outcome goals of the various study plans. The tool used had to be flexible enough to be able to convey the competence the candidate asked exemption for.

3.3. The process in the institutions

The institutions were asked to submit reports where the following aspects were discussed:

- What are the actual positions or attitudes of the institutions (in this respect, the various departments) what regards the possibilities of exemption based on *realkompetanse*? Are the institutions positive to the idea of exemption?
- What requirements need to be met by the candidates in order for exemption to be granted?
- What requirements need to be met by the documentation the candidates present to the institutions?
- In which ways or by way of which methods, beside written documentation, is it possible for a candidate to document *realkompetanse*?
- In practice, how can the exemption take place? By substituting modules for modules? By admitting exemption in the so-called 'free credits'? By making a total competence assessment? By conducting special tests?
- What is the maximum number of credits a candidate may get exemption for in a Bachelor degree?
- Are there any special reasons why exemption would be impossible or difficult within a given field?
- How suitable are the CV and Competence Card from the Workplace as documentation tools?

In addition, the institutions were asked to estimate the time costs for the administrative process of assessing the exemption candidates in the institutions. Finally, they were asked to assess the actual candidates.

Most institutions have, due to lack of time and resources, contributed with brief, general reports with few and careful recommendations.

3.4. Results

The Norwegian REFINE sub-project had two main objectives: achieve insight in the processes concerning assessment of *realkompetanse* candidates who apply for exemption in higher education, and conduct case studies of a limited number of candidates using recently developed tools for documentation of prior learning.

As outlined in the introduction to this chapter, the project has been unable to fully document the processes or conclude the case studies. On the other hand, we have had meetings with all the institutions and gathered insight into the field as well as being able to provide an overview of the exemption topic based on their reflections.

Our findings show that the institutions lack procedures for the assessment of exemption candidates. None of the institutions had a recognized procedure, and consequently dealt with our candidates in an ad hoc manner. This doesn't mean that the institutions are negative to the idea of exemption. The

Norwegian Academy of Music, for instance, has always practised a form of validation of prior learning with regard to admission as potential students have to document specific skills within the special musical discipline they want to study. The academy compared our candidate's previous education, documentation of skills and practice to the contents of the present study program and missing elements were identified. Where these elements constituted a complete existing subject he would be required to undertake these subjects, but a special program was also designed for him, consisting of elements from various subject fields.

Other institutions made preliminary decisions and concluded that exemption might be granted, but that the documentation of skills were not sufficient and that the candidates would have to produce documentation of actual competence rather than just a description of practise, however relevant this might seem.

The suitability of the CV and Competence Card from the Workplace as documentation tools was discussed in most institutions. The University of Bergen describes the CV and the Competence Card as a good starting point for documentation of competence since these tools specify different competence aspects. The Competence Card certifies that an assessment process has been conducted in the company where the individual works. The tools are however inadequate since they do not specifically relate to the field of study the candidate wants exemption from. Nesna College also considers the tools inadequate when it comes to describing the candidates' specific competence in relation to the fields of study.

Due to the lack of national or even local procedures, the institutions had different views and conclusions about the nature of exemption. When asked what the institutions maintain as the maximum number of credits a candidate may get exemption from in a Bachelor degree, the answers varied from a possible exemption of 10 per cent from each level – i.e. six credits yearly or 18 credits in total in a Bachelor degree – to a possible 30 credits in total in a Bachelor degree.

The institutions also discussed how exemption may take place. Several institutions found that *realkompetanse* may substitute the 'free' credits or electives that make up parts of a bachelor degree. Many institutions find it difficult to make exemptions in obligatory modules. One college is willing to substitute the actual modules, but only by maximum six credits per year. This makes it impossible to get exemption for larger modules of six+ credits.

The institutions mainly agreed with the conclusions in the NIFU report what regards exemption in training. Supervised training is considered superior to general work experience, even when such experience is directly related to the field of study. However, some institutions opened up for a potential procedure of observing and testing the candidate in his or her work place, in order to gain documentation of competence.

All institutions indicated that such processes would be time consuming and thereby fairly costly affairs, but as 'real' processes have not been tried out there are no estimates of the actual level of costs.

Part 4 Recommendations and further work

The amendment to the law that stipulates the right to exemption based on validation of prior learning took effect in 2002. As the experiences reflected in this project show, this right may be characterized as a 'dormant' right, and that exemption as such is not a priority in Norwegian higher education. This fact aside, this project discovered that the institutions are familiar with the law, and that they without exception *in principle* are positive to the right to exemption. Lack of procedures and guidelines have kept the institutions from taking an active stand. In addition, the right to exemption is not well known to the public. This may explain why the institutions have received few applications so far.

Procedures

This project demonstrates that Norwegian colleges and universities have inadequate procedures when receiving exemption applications from prospective students. This lack of procedures may be one of the main reasons for the passiveness of the institutions in this matter. Inadequate procedures may account for the fact that none of the institutions interviewed by NIFU had accepted any exemption applications.

Tools

There are no existing tools that are specifically developed for exemption purposes in higher education. The existing tools are developed for secondary school level. The committee investigating *realkompetanse* in higher education (*Mjøsutvalget*) provided an exemption form proposal in their report to the Ministry, but this form has not gained wide acceptance. Our project demonstrates that these tools are inadequate when it comes to documenting prior learning in higher education in order to achieve exemption. The institutions have communicated that they need a documentation tool that to a larger extent documents skills and competences that are specifically related to the field of study the candidates ask exemption from.

Costs

The cost problem was one of the objectives that were raised in connection with the introduction of *realkompetanse* as basis for admission to higher education in Norway. The process of assessing prior learning with regard to exemption may well be even more expensive. This calls for special attention to the stipulation of costs and how these costs may be covered.

New project ideas/follow-up

We recommend setting up a new project where the Ministry of Education and Research and some of the colleges and universities, as well as the student organizations and the social partners, work together to establish accepted procedures for applications from *realkompetanse* candidates seeking exemption in higher education. One main objective for introducing accepted procedures is to ensure that the right to exemption is recognized by the institutions and that fair treatment is given to students seeking exemption. We believe it is important to challenge the institutions on the question of exemption in concrete subjects. From the statements made in this project, one may fear that the institutions may be tempted to choose an 'easy' solution – i.e. accepting experiential learning only in 'free' subjects and electives.

Part 5 Dissemination

The EUCEN conference in Kaunas

In November 2004 EUCEN held their annual conference in Kaunas, Lithuania. The various subprojects included in the REFINE project were presented and discussed among the international participants. Frank Moe and Grethe Haugøy presented the Norwegian project, and described the Nordland county tool.

Article in *Forum for Fjernundervisning* (Magazine on distance learning)

Frank Moe has written an article titled *Master-tittel basert på realkompetanse? (Master title based on validation of prior learning?)*, which was published in a magazine on distance learning in 2004. The article presented the Norwegian REFINE project and outlined the Norwegian experiences in the field of exemption based on validation of prior learning.

Article in Norwegian magazine on learning in the workplace

In February 2005 Grethe Haugøy will publish an article in the Norwegian magazine *Kompetanse og arbeidsliv (Competence and working life)*, presenting the project to a wider Norwegian audience (the working life).

Dissemination seminar in Oslo

In March 2005 the project will host a dissemination seminar at Vox in Oslo, Norway. All colleges and universities will be invited, as well as the Ministry of Education and Research and other actors in the field. The objectives of this seminar are to spread the results from the project and discuss the consequences with the relevant actors.

The EUCEN conference in Bergen

In April 2005 EUCEN will host their annual conference in Bergen, Norway (From Bologna to Bergen and Beyond). The international REFINE project partners will meet and discuss the results of the project.

The final report

This final report will be sent to all Norwegian colleges and universities, as well as other actors in the field, including the Ministry of Education and Research, NOKUT, NIFU and the social partners.

References

Helland, Håvard and Vibeke Oppheim, *Kartlegging av realkompetansereformen*, NIFU (Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education), 2004

NOKUT (The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education), www.nokut.no, 2004

Lov om universiteter og høyskoler (Act No. 22 of 12 May 1995)

McHenry, Joyce Hartog and Torild Nilsen Mohn, *Transfine – National Study Norway*, Vox, 2003.
<http://www.transfine.net/Results/CountryReports/RevisedNorwayReport.doc>

Appendix

CV - Curriculum Vitae

Personal data:			
Surname	First name:	Gender:	
Address:		Mother tongue:	
Post code:	Town/community:	E-mail :	
Date of birth:	Tel. work:	Tel. private:	Mobile:
Present job/position:	Present employer:	1 st year in position	% of full time employment

Work experience					
Employer	Position	Period from - to	%	Areas of responsibility	Encl No..
		-	%		
		-	%		
		-	%		
		-	%		
		-	%		
		-	%		
		-	%		
		-	%		
		-	%		

Education				
School/course	Trade/profession	Completed year	Encl No.	

Valid licences – publicly approved certificates:			
Name of licence	Specification of what the licence contains	Valid from - to	Encl no

Additional information

--

Place	Date	Signature
-------	------	-----------

Competence card from workplace

Personal data			
Surname:		First name:	Date of birth:
Job/Position	Employer	Of full-time employment	1 st year in position
		%	

Main areas of work responsibility	Closer description of responsibilities

Specification of professional skills needed to carry out main responsibilities		Level
Knowledge of trade		
Skills within trade/ profession/areas of responsibility		
Organizing of work		

Level A = Carries out elementary tasks under supervision	Level C = May hold professional responsibility, may council and advise
Level B = Works independently within own area of responsibility	Level D = Has a very good insight in subject area of profession, may be in charge of development on own workplace

Specification of professional capability , ctd.		Level
Marketing skills		
Technical skills		
Other professional skills		

Specification of social and personal skills		Level
Cooperation and communication		
Effort and quality of work		
Customer service		
Initiative -flexibility – creativity		
Work related to restructuring – acquisition/use of new knowledge		

Specification of management skills in position		Level
Staff and labour management		
Training and instruction		
Goal and result-oriented work – making decisions		
Motivating skills		
Level A = Carries out elementary tasks under supervision Level B = Works independently within own area of responsibility		Level C = May hold professional responsibility, may council and advise Level D = Has a very good insight in subject area of profession, may be in charge of development on own workplace

Additional information – other skills

Place:	Date:	Signature of employee:
Place:	Date:	Signature on behalf of business/company: