



## Common statement of the AEROVET partners



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



## Common statement of the AEROVET partners after 3 years of developing and testing applicability of European Credit System for Vocational Education and Training (ECVET) to apprentice training in the aerospace industry.

The AEROVET-partners strongly support the approach of formulating Learning Outcomes (LO) as a **transparent** and **coherent set of knowledge, skills and competencies**.

Considering the English experience with a radical LO-approach recommend the AEROVET-partners to mention chosen input or process data too.

**Mutual trust** is a crucial factor for recognising any LO between different institutions (national, transnational, supranational (European Aviation Agency, EASA)) and activities to increase mutual trust should be undertaken, but real confidence must develop in the context of practice and cannot be implemented by technocratic measures only.

From a German perspective the general approach of having **learning-place-independent curricula** (the same field or unit can be studied in the school and the company) can be supported, provided that it should be taken into account that certain LO (e. g. line maintenance) cannot be learnt at school.

The partners agree that all kinds of **transnational mobility** within initial vocational education and training (IVET) should be supported by all stakeholders (schools, companies, facilitators) but not as a mandatory part of the curriculum.

Regarding **permeability** the potential of recognising LO from IVET at HE in aeronautics are rather low (as in all technical subjects). For a better linkage between these two worlds we do recommend the model of “dual studies in IVET and HE” (cp. [www.pilot-aero.net](http://www.pilot-aero.net)).

We, together with the organisers of mobility (Airbus for company-based mobility, Arbeit & Leben HH for the school-based mobility between Saint-Exupery (Toulouse) & G15 (Hamburg)), recommend that talking seriously about recognising LO from abroad in the complex sector of aeronautics should be reserved for **mobility periods lasting one month or longer**.

Regarding the implementation of ECVET we do have the same concerns as written in the statement of the UK expert group: “However, if ECVET is overly **bureaucratic** and difficult for learners to use, it could act as a potential barrier to mobility.”

When talking about units, it is vital to differentiate between “**learning units**” (for structuring curricula) and “**qualification units**” (for assessed parts). While the former approach is supported the latter bears the risk of fragmenting existing qualifications and might lead to collateral damage, including focusing only on learning for the test.

Means of crediting LO in order to avoid learning repetition should be further developed – but allocating a certain amount of **credit points** to a given unit might end up in a lower engagement of small or specialised companies in apprenticeship: The current time-frame (Zeitraumen) approach in Germany allows them to train for a given field/unit for between two and four months, for example, according to their business fields.