



SOLITY FRAMEWORK VALIDATION REPORT (D10)

Table of Contents

The Validation Process	2
National Workshops in Italy, Germany, France and Belgium.....	2
The International Workshop.....	3
The Online Consultation	4
Testing of the Framework.....	9
Recommendations for Improvements.....	9
Validated Changes.....	18
Summary.....	32
Annex: Updated List of SOLITY Indicators	33
Axis 1 Indicators of activities in favour of return to employment.....	33
Axis 2 Indicators of activities in favour of human development	36
Axis 3 Indicators of activities in favour of social inclusion	39
Axis 4 Indicators in territorial and regional development.....	42
Axis 5 Internal Practices.....	43

The Validation Process

The validation process of the SOLITY project aimed to involve a large number of stakeholders, in order to make sure that the framework can be shared and transferable to all EU countries and answers the needs of the target groups.

The validation involved four steps:

1. National workshops in Italy, Germany, France and Belgium
2. The international workshop
3. The online consultation
4. Testing of the framework

This chapter will briefly describe each step and the outcomes. For more detailed reading on the national and international workshops, please also refer to the SOLITY Stakeholders Report.

National Workshops in Italy, Germany, France and Belgium

Three target groups were identified for the national workshops: (1) VET trainers, (2) entrepreneurs and (3) policy and decision makers, as well as other parties involved in vocational training (e.g. chambers of commerce etc.).

The workshops asked and discussed the following main points with the target groups:

- Are the areas covered by the indicators relevant to you?
- Do you think the indicators are clear, easy to understand?
- Are there indicators that you find useless or, on the contrary, are there indicators that you consider crucial but are not included in the framework?
- How relevant are the results for your purposes? What is the benefit in using the tool for you?
- Do you consider it useful/relevant for your professional activities that VET providers are able to measure their social utility? In other words, whether or not a VET provider is committed to measure its social utility (and possibly performs well) would it have an impact on your professional choices? (e.g. trainers: would you prefer working in such a VET provider? Entrepreneurs: would you prefer cooperating with such a VET provider? Policymakers/stakeholders: would you prefer funding such a VET provider?)

A total of 14 workshops took place between June and December 2019: 3 in Italy, 3 in Germany, 5 in France and 3 in Belgium.

In Italy a total of 30 participants took part in the workshops, 36 in France, 39 in Belgium and 26 in Germany.

The main outcomes of the national workshops were some suggestions on new indicators as well as propositions on a further development of the tool, and comments on the online consultation. These will be discussed in detail in the chapter "Recommendations for Improvements" of this report.

The International Workshop

The international workshop was conceived as a means to summarise the results of the national workshops and discuss them with representatives of all four partner countries. 2 participants per national workshops were to take part in the international workshop. The international workshop took place on September 26th, 2019 in Berlin. In the end, a total of 15 participants took part: 6 from Italy, 5 from Belgium, 3 from France and 1 person from Germany. With regards to Belgium, a sixth person was set to take part but had to cancel at the last minute for health reasons.

In total, there were 5 participants representing the entrepreneurs target group, 5 representing VET trainers and VET centres, and 5 stakeholders.

During the international workshop, 3 working groups took place; one for VET trainers, one for entrepreneurs and one for stakeholders.

The following questions were discussed:

- 1) Do you think that the adoption of the SOLITY framework at EU level is feasible?
- 2) If looking at the 2030 scenario of the VET in Europe, an urgent need to develop a monitoring framework against a set of indicators to benchmark VET performances has been expressed. According to you and your role within society, can the SOLITY Tool represent a first step towards the development of a more transparent and European model? What do you think can be any hindrances and relative solutions to ensure a diffusion of the model at all levels?
- 3) Taking into account the UN SD goals and the ongoing and upcoming challenges of the labour market as seen in the video before, how do you perceive the link between social responsibility and vocational education? A necessity, an added value, a non-priority, etc.
- 4) Thinking about the European socio-economical context (Brexit, tensions on immigration policies, increase of anti-EU feelings, etc.), how much do you think it's necessary to invest on the promotion and implementation of international projects focusing on social responsibility and on the development of common frameworks and practices?
- 5) In order to strengthen the capacity of VET actors to act in all type of partnerships (from local to international ones) and thus facilitate the adoption of best practices for the final benefit of their society, the proposal to create a LABEL linked to the concept of valorisation of best performers in Europe can be seen as an added value for you in a medium/long-term view? Does it make sense to link the label to the wider concept of SOCIAL UTILITY and ensure it is understood/valued by all stakeholders? Do you think it would influence your willingness to cooperate with the VET centres/strengthen the collaboration you might already have in place?
- 6) A sustainable development cannot take place without a strong cooperation among different actors. However, cooperation is not always easy (see difficulties we had sometimes encountered in the SOLITY project in engaging external actors in active cooperation), so how can we make cooperation among different actors easier and more regular?

- 7) If you were to create a European framework to measure the social utility of a VET Centre, what would you have done? Where would you have started from? What would have prioritized? Would you have done something differently? What exactly?

The main outcomes of the discussions were a set of recommendations that can be summarised as follows:

- Users of the tool should be given the opportunity to supplement their answers with qualitative comments or subsidiary questions should be provided in the case of very low scores on an indicator to explain why and give the possibility to identify measures for improvement.
- To be more accurate, the setting up of such a model would require having a list of European training centres classified by sector typology, size, etc., though it is clear that this would imply the endorsement of this initiative by EU bodies.
- The next phase of this project could be the development of a label, which could also be a good tool for promotion and a guarantee of sustainability, but a label needs audit, control and a high dedicated budget, all of which would again require the endorsement of the initiative by EU bodies.
- Once the tool is finalized, its dissemination would probably require the EU to launch a new call for proposal to provide a substantial budget to foster its adoption throughout Europe. The success of a widespread use in all EU Member States, despite the differences among national VET system, would probably require the setting-up of incentives (e.g., a label recognized at EU level).
- Indicators may be quite difficult to measure because the requested data may not always be directly available to VET centres. Data collection may be the critical point of this tool because of the lack of standardization at EU level among VET systems.

The Online Consultation

The online consultation was a tool to get as many stakeholders as possible involved in weighting of the developed indicators and axes. As a matter of fact, in the process of calculating the social utility score, indicators and axes need to be weighted, i.e. need to be given a relative importance.

Thousands of invitations were sent out to stakeholders (VET centres, employment agencies, companies, learners and jobseekers, decision-makers and various other stakeholders) in each partner country (Italy, Germany, Belgium, France) with the request to take part in the survey. EVTA and EVBB also tried to involve stakeholders from EU countries not directly involved in the project in order to possibly have all European countries represented in this important activity.

The online consultation started in May 2019 and was hosted at the following link: <https://questionnaires.hebergement-afpa.fr/index.php/927361>.

Its first results, which made up an initial weighting necessary for the testing phase, were published in September 2019.

Table 1 – Number of respondents to the online consultation (September 2019)

	Belgium	France	Germany	Italy	Other	Sum
Active Assets (employee or self-employed)	58	35	2	21	8	124
Employment Centre Representatives					2	2
Job Seekers	188	7			2	197
Representatives of an agency and / or distribution of funds to finance vocational training	3	2				5
Representatives of a professional organization representing companies	11	5	2	11	3	32
Representatives of a region	12	2	2		1	17
Representatives of employment agency	4	1	3	1		9
Training centre managers or trainers	69	132	20	65	12	298
Sum	345	184	29	98	28	684

Table 2 - Overall Weighting of the Axes (September 2019)

Axis 1	Fight against unemployment - Professional integration	32,10
Axis 2	Human, individual and collective development	21,50
Axis 3	Fight against exclusion and inequalities	19,19
Axis 4	Contribution to territorial and regional development	15,04
Axis 5	Involvement and exemplarity internally of training organizations	12,17

Table 3 - Weighting of the indicators (September 2019)

Axis 1		
1.1	Employment rate in the medium-term	18,81
1.2	Long-term employment	12,29
1.3	Training related to skills shortage	9,36
1.4	Job guidance (e.g. coaching, career guidance, etc.)	9,89
1.5	Volume of incoming trainees in CVET	7,35
1.6	Volume of incoming training in IVET	7,99
1.7	Length of internships in courses that lead to a qualification'	7,64
1.8	Involvement of partners entities	8,76

1.9	Weight of apprenticeship	8,99
1.10	Number of interns who were offered a job by their host company	8,92
Axis 2		
2.1	Number of certifications	19,72
2.2	Recognition of competences	19,42
2.3	Number of trainees who completed short courses	13,87
2.4	Number of trainees who completed refresher courses	16,11
2.5	Number of trainees involved in interregional or international mobility experiences	14,30
2.6	Number of training courses related to digital competences	16,58
Axis 3		
3.1	School drop-out youth admitted to vocational training	14,12
3.2	Number of NEETS admitted to training	14,53
3.3	Dropout rate	13,08
3.4	Number of courses tailored to migrants (refugees, asylum seekers)	8,80
3.5	Success rate of courses tailored to migrants	8,39
3.6	Integration of disabled trainees in training	11,17
3.7	Integration of disabled trainees in jobs after training	11,06
3.8	Female participation	10,39
3.9	Senior Participation	8,46
Axis 4		
4.1	Cross-border or inter-regional cooperation	22,64
4.2	Participation in local or regional development	31,35
4.3	Environmental sustainability courses	20,40
4.4	Environmental sustainability initiatives	25,61
Axis 5		
5.1	Women in management	14,98
5.2	Absenteeism rate	13,01
5.3	Employees with disabilities	11,08
5.4	Accident frequency index	8,25

5.5	Job security	13,47
5.6	Access to training	16,80
5.7	Job promotion rate	9,62
5.8	Employee Turnover	12,79

However, since the weight of the axes and indicators is very important for the framework, the partnership decided to re-open the online consultation after the testing, in order to reach an even larger amount of stakeholders.

The consultation has been definitely closed on 25 January 2020, with the following final results.

Table 4 - Number of respondents to the online consultation (January 2020)

	Belgium	France	Germany	Italy	Other	Sum
Active Assets (employee or self-employed)	63	38	2	37	9	149
Employment Centre Representatives					2	2
Job Seekers	195	16			2	213
Representatives of an agency and / or distribution of funds to finance vocational training	4	2	1	1		8
Representatives of a professional organization representing companies	11	5	2	12	3	33
Representatives of a region	12	2	2		1	17
Representatives of employment agency	4	1	3	2		10
Training centre managers or trainers	69	138	24	112	13	356
Sum	358	202	34	164	30	788

The final weights attributed to the axes and indicators of the SOLITY framework are the following:

Table 5 - Overall Weighting of the Axes (January 2020)

Axis 1	Fight against unemployment - Professional integration	31,65
Axis 2	Human, individual and collective development	20,74
Axis 3	Fight against exclusion and inequalities	19,05
Axis 4	Contribution to territorial and regional development	15,37
Axis 5	Involvement and exemplarity internally of training organizations	13,19

Table 6 - Weighting of the indicators (January 2020)

Axis 1		
1.1	Employment rate in the medium-term	18,66
1.2	Long-term employment	11,92
1.3	Training related to skills shortage	9,05
1.4	Job guidance (e.g. coaching, career guidance, etc.)	9,68
1.5	Volume of incoming trainees in CVET	7,46
1.6	Volume of incoming training in IVET	8,04
1.7	Length of internships in courses that lead to a qualification	8,16
1.8	Involvement of partners entities	8,61
1.9	Weight of apprenticeship	9,31
1.10	Number of interns who were offered a job by their host company	9,12
Axis 2		
2.1	Number of certifications	20,16
2.2	Recognition of competences	20,15
2.3	Number of trainees who completed short courses	13,45
2.4	Number of trainees who completed refresher courses	15,99
2.5	Number of trainees involved in interregional or international mobility experiences	14,08
2.6	Number of training courses related to digital competences	16,17
Axis 3		
3.1	School drop-out youth admitted to vocational training	13,71
3.2	Number of NEETS admitted to training	14,60
3.3	Dropout rate	12,44
3.4	Number of courses tailored to migrants (refugees, asylum seekers)	9,03
3.5	Success rate of courses tailored to migrants	9,03
3.6	Integration of disabled trainees in training	11,28
3.7	Integration of disabled trainees in jobs after training	11,13
3.8	Female participation	10,23
3.9	Senior Participation	8,55

Axis 4		
4.1	Cross-border or inter-regional cooperation	23,98
4.2	Participation in local or regional development	30,47
4.3	Environmental sustainability courses	20,74
4.4	Environmental sustainability initiatives	24,81
Axis 5		
5.1	Women in management	14,88
5.2	Absenteeism rate	13,07
5.3	Employees with disabilities	11,28
5.4	Accident frequency index	9,43
5.5	Job security	12,57
5.6	Access to training	16,33
5.7	Job promotion rate	9,98
5.8	Employee Turnover	12,47

Testing of the Framework

In each partner country (Italy, Germany, Belgium, France), the SOLITY framework was tested by at least two VET centres. The aim of the testing was to observe how easily the framework could be used by a VET centre and if there were any further adjustments necessary to the framework. The results of this testing can be further observed in the following chapter where the findings of the testing by all partners are summarised. The testing started in September 2019 and finished in December 2019.

A total of 26 VET centres tested the tool, namely 18 from Italy, 3 from France, 3 from Belgium and 2 from Germany.

Following the testing, some necessary improvements were made to the tool itself as to ensure full comprehension, quick usability and user-friendly functionalities for any VET provider in Europe willing to register and obtain its Social Utility Score.

Recommendations for Improvements

This chapter summarises the changes of indicators suggested by the project partners as a result of the testing phase. The improvements were discussed during a project meeting in Neuenhagen (Germany) on 29 and 30 October 2019 and the recommendations validated in January 2020 (after all VET providers finished the testing).

a. Improvements to the indicators (comments on i.e. phrasing, description of the indicator, formula)

Some general comments were made about the indicators and the axes:

- it was suggested to review the description of the axes and of some indicators in order to ensure they are easily understandable or, alternatively, to add a brief but clear description for each one of them;
- some of the indicators can be interpreted differently and this should be taken into account somehow. For example, the drop-out rate: a high number for this indicator could be interpreted as negative but it could also be considered positive if the reason for dropping-out is because trainees have found a job before the completion of the training course;
- from the national and international workshops, some new indicators were suggested to be added to the framework;
- the initial version of the framework used NUTS¹ classification every time that a territorial dimension was to be taken into account. However, NUTS classification sometimes is not close enough to the real working range of VET centres, as the smallest level of this classification is NUTS-3 which corresponds to small regions or provinces, but the working range of VET centres may sometimes refer to a city or even to a specific district of a city (especially, if it is located in a big city). Consequently, for those indicators with this problem (i.e. 1.5/1.6/1.8, 2.2, etc.), VET centres should be allowed to choose the territorial dimension which is closer to their working range, even though it does not correspond to a NUTS' level.
- there are some indicators that do not apply to the German system, as pointed out by the German partner and the German stakeholders that participated in the workshop. However, this situation may occur in other EU countries for other indicators, therefore it must be clear for users how to proceed in this particular situation. Clear instructions on the matter should be provided.

Recommendations for changes or improvements to specific indicators are summarised in the table below. The indicators that are not included in the table did not receive any recommendation for changes or improvements and were consequently kept as they were.

Table 7 - Indicators and recommendations received

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation
AXIS 1			
1.1.	Employment rate in the medium-term	Number of graduates who found a job using all or part of the skills acquired	The indicator should not be linked to the skills acquired during the training. The new

¹ Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics - a hierarchical system for dividing up the economic territory of the EU.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation
		during the training course / total number of graduates from a centre	phrasing should be: "Number of graduates who found a job/total number of graduates from a centre". In order for the ratio to represent the real employment rate connected to a centre, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator. (VET Centres deals with different kind of courses, for employees and unemployed).
1.3	Training related to skills shortage	Number of trainees who entered a qualifying training course related to the top-10 most requested job profiles (at the national or regional level)/ Total number of trainees who entered qualifying training courses	In order for the ratio to show how a centre actually provides training courses that are up to date with the market's needs, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator. (VET Centres deals with different kind of courses, for employees and unemployed).
1.4.	Job guidance (e.g. coaching, career guidance, etc.)	Number of hours of guidance and counselling provided / total number of hours of training given by the training provider	The description should better clarify how users are supposed to calculate this data. In order for the ratio to represent the real value of the job guidance services provided by a centre, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator. The proposal is to refer to the "total number of hours of courses for unemployed"

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation
1.5.	Volume of incoming trainees in CVET	Number of people trained in CVET in a given domain / labour force in this domain from the territory	It should be revised as calculated as it is now, it does not provide a ratio representing the real local reality (see also general comment of the geographical level of reference vs NUTS). The domain should also be cut out.
1.6.	Volume of incoming training in IVET	Number of people trained in IVET in a given domain / labour force in this domain from the territory	It should be revised as calculated as it is now, it does not provide a ratio representing the real local reality (see also general comment of the geographical level of reference vs NUTS). The domain should also be cut out.
1.7.	Length of internships in courses that lead to a qualification	Total number of hours of internships / Total number of hours of training	The description should better clarify how users are supposed to calculate this data. In order for the ratio to represent the real value of the job guidance services provided by a centre, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator.
1.8.	Involvement of partners entities	Number of entities on the territory which hosted trainees / total number of entities able to host trainees on the territory.	The word "entities" should be replaced with "enterprises/companies" being more specific; in addition, there is the same problem related to the geographical unit, taken into account in indicators 1.5 and 1.6.
1.9.	Weight of apprenticeship	Number of students who had an apprenticeship / total number of students eligible for an apprenticeship	This indicator does not apply to the German VET system. Apprenticeships are also defined very differently from country to country, therefore the indicator might be difficult to implement.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation
			The word "trainees" should be used instead of "students".
1.10	Number of interns who were offered a job by their host company	Number of trainees who found a job (whatever the type of contract) in their hosting entity for internships / number of trainees who found a job	Again the comment about the word "entity". "Enterprise" should be used instead with reference to the EU definition. The indicator should be renamed as "Post-internship job offer rate".
AXIS 2			
2.1	Number of certifications	Number of graduates / Number of trainees	The name of the indicator should be changed in "Success Rate".
2.2.	Recognition of competences	Number of people who benefited from recognition of competences* activities / labour force (Number of people) from the territory	This indicator might be not relevant/applicable depending on the Member State (MS), as at the moment there is no standardized procedure in all EU MS. In any case, to make it more relevant it should be changed into: "Number of people who [...] / Number of trainees of the VET centre.
2.3.	Number of trainees who completed short courses	Number of trainees who <i>completed</i> short courses / Total number of trainees	The indicator's calculation should always use the verb "complete" – instead of "attend". The indicator should be reformulated as: "Participation rate in short refresher courses" and the numerator should be "Number of trainees who completed short refresher courses".
2.4.	Number of trainees who completed refresher courses	Number of trainees who attended refresher courses / total number of trainees	The indicator's phrasing should always use the verb "complete" – in the previous version the verb "attend" was used instead. The indicator should therefore be reformulated as:

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation
			<p>"Participation rate in medium-long professional courses" and the numerator should be "Number of trainees who completed medium-long professional courses".</p> <p>It should be specified that "medium-long professional courses" are here defined as specialization courses, which allow people to acquire the basic technical skills related to a specific professional sector.</p>
2.5	Number of trainees involved in interregional or international mobility experiences	Number of trainees involved in mobility experiences / total number of trainees	<p>The word "learners" should maybe be used instead of "trainees".</p> <p>The indicator name should be "Students Mobility".</p>
2.6.	Number of training courses related to digital competences	Number of hours dedicated to digital information and communication technologies (ICT) / Total number of hours of training	<p>This indicator poses some problems in its calculation, as it may be difficult to interpret "hours dedicated to ICT in the same way." To clarify it should be pointed out that users should refer to the EU definition of digital competences.</p> <p>The indicator name should be "Volume of training on digital skills".</p>
AXIS 3			
3.1	School drop-out youth admitted to vocational training	Number of school drop-outs admitted to vocational training / total number of trainees	<p>In order for the indicator to evaluate the capacity of training centres to integrate people dropping out from school into qualifying vocational training courses, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET trainees when measuring this indicator.</p>

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation
3.2	Number of NEETS admitted to training	Number of NEETs / total number of trainees	In order for the indicator to assess how VET centres contribute to the reintegration of the public furthest from employment - NEETS in this case, it should be specified that respondents should only considering courses targeting NEETs or unemployed people more in general, when measuring this indicator. The indicator name should be "NEETs admitted to training"
3.4.	Number of Courses tailored to migrants (refugees, asylum seekers)	Number of courses tailored to migrants / total number of courses	The indicator should be re-phrased such as "courses targeting also migrants/refugees" so as to consider the widest training offer available towards this specific target. Usually, courses target more than one group (i.e. unemployed people, migrants, etc.).
3.5.	Success rate of courses tailored to migrants (refugees, asylum seekers)	Number of trainees completing courses tailored to migrants / total number of trainees following those courses	The indicator should be re-phrased such as "courses targeting also migrants/refugees" so as to consider the widest training offer available towards this specific target. Usually, courses target more than one group (i.e. unemployed people, migrants, etc.).
3.6.	Integration of disabled trainees in training	Number of disabled trainees / total number of trainees	The indicator should consider any type of "disability", also those learning difficulties that are certified by an official body. This should be made clear in the indicator's description.
AXIS 4			
4.2.	Participation in local and regional development	Number of local networks- committees in which the organization participates / total	This indicator is complicated to understand. Its description needs to be very clear.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation
		number of networks-committees in which the organization participates	
AXIS 5			
5.1.	Women in management	Number of women in management / Number of women in the organization	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.
5.2.	Absenteeism rate	Number of sick hours / Number of working hours people should have worked	The online framework uses a reverse ratio: it should be clearly explained that an automatic reverse calculation is used here, otherwise users will not be able to understand what is really measured here and how.
5.3.	Employees with disabilities	Number of disabled employees / total number of employees	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.
5.4.	Accident frequency index	(Number of accidents with at least one day of disability * 1.000.000)/ total number of hours worked by all employees	Same problem of indicator 5.2.
5.6.	Access to training	Number of employees who accessed training in a year / total number of employees	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.
5.7.	Job promotion rate	Number of people who were promoted in the last year / total number of employees	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.
5.8.	Employee turnover	Number of years employees work in the VET centre / employees of the VET centre	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation
			medium-sized enterprises) definition.

b. Improvements to the SOLITY online tool (comments on i.e. functionalities, technicalities of the software or web design-related)

- It should be considered to make the INSTRUCTION button available on the Tool clearer than it is now, leaving only the core piece of information related to the filling in of the tool.
- A general check on the "information" button available for each indicator should be done in order to leave there only the very necessary text to support the VET provider filling in the indicator. For some indicators, the description is too long and not necessary.
- The different levels of reliability should also be reviewed; in fact, data coming from purely internal sources does not necessarily have a low reliability.
- The term "territory" (despite the explanation provided) still leads to confusion
- It is currently not possible to leave indicators empty when trying to calculate S.U.
- The log-in process (with the magic link) is currently could be improved.

c. Improvements to the display of the Social Utility Score (comments on i.e. ways to make the SU score more readable and understandable when filling in the framework)

- In the future, the report to be downloaded by the platform can be further implemented with some graphics (e.g. pie chart, etc.) to allow VET providers to read the data they inserted in different ways.
- The current on-line application allows us to have a vision of social utility score and to be able to compare it with other training organizations at a given moment. In the future we can imagine that the system allows users to follow the evolution of their social utility score and that of other organizations through tables and charts.
- It could be considered to have a graphic theme (i.e. 1 to 3 stars that are displayed as a badge) or a traffic light system to explain the final score. This could also help in disseminating more easily the project and encouraging more and more VET centre to get involved.

d. Recommendations for the future "beyond SOLITY" (comments on i.e. mapping of the applicability of the indicators in EU MSs, challenges ahead, suggestions for further testing and tuning)

- The possibility of a two-stage self-assessment process could be foreseen. Being aware that all indicators listed can be differently interpreted and measured, depending on the VET national context of each Member State, a two-stage assessment might ensure to have a first phase with a list of restricted/core indicators, that the European Commission/national public body of reference consider essential for the evaluation of the VET providers and that, therefore, each VET provider must fill in (whatever the results might be).

During the second phase, VET providers might decide whether to assess themselves by also filling in a secondary list of complementary – but not mandatory – indicators, that are considered valuable by the overall society and that might help VET providers identify some development strategies for the future.

- A number of brakes will have to be lifted for the generalization of the SOLITY tool beyond the end of the project:

A European-wide dissemination of the SOLITY tool

Once the tool is finalized, and the project finished, its sustainability will require to continue the communication and dissemination campaign throughout Europe. Organizations such CEDEFOP or ETF could serve as a relay to ensure the promotion of the SOLITY tool.

The difficulty to agree on common language and concepts:

As we have seen, it was challenging for the 4 partner countries of the project to find a common definition of social utility and of all the indicators. And yet, there is no assurance that VET providers all over Europe will interpret the indicators in the same way as there is no standardization on training- and labour market-related terms and systems. The adoption of the tool to all EU countries will require a discussion of the terminology used and the underlying concepts in order to be certain that, whatever the country, there is the same understanding of the indicators.

The desire and willingness to use the tool

To allow the success of the tool and its sustainability, incentives for training organisation will have to be created (e.g. financial aid, label, etc.).

The difficulty to collect data

- Many of the indicators listed in the framework are already used in most European training organizations, but they are not always perceived as usable for the evaluation of social utility. Moreover, the data reliability can vary highly from one country to another, from one organization to another. As a result, European benchmarking can be challenging.
- The differences in national VET systems may also make European benchmarking quite challenging.

Validated Changes

The recommendations for improvement were first discussed at the SOLITY project meeting on October 29 and 30, 2019 in Neuenhagen, Germany with representatives of all partners. All final changes to the SOLITY framework were then finally validated in January 2020, during a skype call. Some of the suggested changes were approved, while others were not accepted. The following chapter details the changes made and why some of the proposed ones were not accepted by the partnership.

Improvements approved following the validation process

The following table is a summary of all the indicators for which changes were recommended. It gives details on the proposed changes and also indicates if they were approved or not (and in the latter case, why).

The indicators that are not included in the table did not receive any recommendation for changes or improvements and were consequently kept the same as they were.

Table 8 – Proposed changes to the indicators and final decisions

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
AXIS 1						
1.1	Employment rate in the medium-term	Number of graduates who found a job using all or part of the skills acquired during the training course / total number of graduates from a centre	The indicator should not be linked to the skills acquired during the training. The new phrasing should be: "Number of graduates who found a job/total number of graduates from a centre". In order for the ratio to represent the real employment rate connected to a centre, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator. (VET Centres deals with different kind of courses, for employees and unemployed).		Number of graduates who found a job / total number of graduates from a centre	Recommendation accepted.
1.3	Training related to skills shortage	Number of trainees who entered a qualifying training course related to the top-10 most requested job profiles (at the national or regional level)/ Total number of trainees who entered qualifying training courses	In order for the ratio to show how a centre actually provides training courses that are up to date with the market's needs, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator. (VET Centres deals with different kind of courses, for employees and unemployed).			Recommendation accepted.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
1.4	Job guidance (e.g. coaching, career guidance, etc.)	Number of hours of guidance and counselling provided / total number of hours of training given by the training provider	The description should better clarify how users are supposed to calculate this data. In order for the ratio to represent the real value of the job guidance services provided by a centre, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator. The proposal is to refer to the "Total number of hours of courses for unemployed."		Total number of hours of guidance and counselling provided / total number of hours of training given by the training provider	Recommendation accepted. The adjective "total" is added to make the formula more accurate.
1.5	Volume of incoming trainees in CVET	Number of people trained in CVET in a given domain / labour force in this domain from the territory	It should be revised as calculated as it is now, it does not provide a ratio representing the real local reality (see also general comment of the geographical level of reference vs NUTS). The domain should also be cut out.		Number of people trained in CVET / labour force from the territory	Both recommendations accepted. VET providers will be allowed to use the territorial unit closer to their real working range.
1.6	Volume of incoming training in IVET	Number of people trained in IVET in a given domain / labour force in this domain from the territory	It should be revised as calculated as it is now, it does not provide a ratio representing the real local reality (see also general comment of the geographical level of reference vs NUTS). The domain should also be cut out.		Number of people trained in IVET / labour force from the territory	Both recommendations accepted. VET providers will be allowed to use the territorial unit closer to their real working range.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
1.7	Length of internships in courses that lead to a qualification	Total number of hours of internships / Total number of hours of training	<p>The description should better clarify how users are supposed to calculate this data.</p> <p>In order for the ratio to represent the real value of the job guidance services provided by a centre, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator.</p>			Recommendation accepted.
1.8	Involvement of partners entities	Number of entities on the territory which hosted trainees / total number of entities able to host trainees on the territory.	The word "entities" should be replaced with "enterprises/companies" being more specific; in addition, there is the same problem related to the geographical unit, taken into account in indicators 1.5 and 1.6.	Involvement of partner enterprises	Number of enterprises on the territory which hosted trainees / total number of enterprises on the territory	<p>Both recommendations accepted.</p> <p>VET providers will be allowed to use the territorial unit closer to their real working range.</p>
1.9	Weight of apprenticeship	Number of students who had an apprenticeship / total number of students eligible for an apprenticeship	<p>This indicator does not apply to the German VET system. Apprenticeships are also defined very differently from country to country, therefore the indicator might be difficult to implement.</p> <p>The word "trainees" should be used instead of "students".</p>		Number of trainees who had an apprenticeship / total number of trainees eligible for an apprenticeship	<p>Recommendation on wording accepted.</p> <p>Though apprenticeship may be different from country to country, this indicator was deemed as too important to leave it out.</p>

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
1.10	Number of interns who were offered a job by their host company	Number of trainees who found a job (whatever the type of contract) in their hosting entity for internships / number of trainees who found a job	Again the comment about the word "entity". "Enterprise" should be used instead with reference to the EU definition. The indicator should be renamed as "Post-internship job offer rate".	Post-internship job offer rate	Number of trainees who found a job (whatever the type of contract) in their hosting enterprises / number of trainees who found a job	Recommendations accepted.
AXIS 2						
2.1	Number of certifications	Number of graduates / Number of trainees	The name of the indicator should be changed in "Success Rate".	Success rate		Recommendation accepted.
2.2	Recognition of competences	Number of people who benefited from recognition of competences activities / labour force (Number of people) from the territory	This indicator might be not relevant/applicable depending on the Member State (MS), as at the moment there is no standardized procedure in all EU MS. In any case, to make it more relevant it should be changed into: "Number of people who [...] / Number of trainees of the VET centre.		Number of people who benefited from recognition of competences service / number of trainees of the VET centre	Recommendation accepted. Though the rules on recognition of competences may be different from country to country, this indicator was deemed as too important to leave it out. Actually, a standardization of this procedure in every EU MS is desirable.
2.3	Number of trainees who completed short courses	Number of trainees who attended short courses/ Total number of trainees	The indicator's calculation should always use the verb "complete" – instead of "attend". The indicator should be reformulated	Participation rate in short refresher courses	Number of trainees who completed short refresher courses/ total number of trainees	Recommendation accepted.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
			as: "Participation rate in short refresher courses" and the numerator should be "Number of trainees who completed short refresher courses".			
2.4	Number of trainees who completed refresher courses	Number of trainees who attended refresher courses /total number of trainees	<p>The indicator's phrasing should always use the verb "complete" – in the previous version the verb "attend" was used instead.</p> <p>The indicator should therefore be reformulated as: "Participation rate in medium-long professional courses" and the numerator should be "Number of trainees who completed medium-long professional courses". It should be specified that "medium-long professional courses" are here defined as specialization courses, which allow people to acquire the basic technical skills related to a specific professional sector.</p>	Participation rate in medium-long professional courses	Number of trainees who completed medium-long professional courses / total number of trainees	Recommendation accepted.
2.5	Number of trainees involved in interregional or international mobility experiences	Number of trainees involved in mobility experiences / total number of trainees	<p>The word "learners" should maybe be used instead of "trainees".</p> <p>The indicator name should be "Students Mobility".</p>		Students mobility	<p>The first recommendation is not taken into consideration as, in VET, learners are usually referred to as "trainees".</p> <p>The second</p>

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
						recommendation is accepted.
2.6	Number of training courses related to digital competences	Number of hours dedicated to digital information and communication technologies (ICT) / Total number of hours of training	<p>This indicator poses some problems in its calculation, as it may be difficult to interpret "hours dedicated to ICT in the same way." To clarify it should be pointed out that users should refer to the EU definition of digital competences.</p> <p>The indicator name should be "Volume of training on digital skills".</p>	Volume of training on digital skills		The indicator will not be changed even though it may be difficult to collect the data as digital skills are crucial nowadays. The framework will refer to the EU definition of digital competences. The partnership also debated on the possibility to include an indicator on soft skills, but this was indeed considered as too difficult at the moment.
AXIS 3						
3.1	School drop-out youth admitted to vocational training	Number of school drop-outs admitted to vocational training / total number of trainees	In order for the indicator to evaluate the capacity of training centres to integrate people dropping out from school into qualifying vocational training courses, it should be specified that respondents should only consider iVET trainees when measuring this indicator.			Recommendation accepted.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
3.2	Number of NEETS admitted to training	Number of NEETS / total number of trainees	<p>In order for the indicator to assess how VET centres contribute to the reintegration of the public furthest from employment - NEETS in this case, it should be specified that respondents should only considering courses targeting NEETs or unemployed people more in general, when measuring this indicator.</p> <p>The indicator name should be "NEETs admitted to training".</p>	NEETs admitted to training		Recommendations accepted.
3.4	Number of courses tailored to migrants (refugees, asylum seekers)	Number of courses tailored to migrants / total number of courses	The indicator should be re-phrased such as "courses targeting also migrants/refugees" so as to consider the widest training offer available towards this specific target. Usually, courses target more than one group (i.e. unemployed people, migrants, etc.).	Indicator removed	Indicator removed	After a long discussion, the partnership decided to remove this indicator and keep only the following (3.5) on migrants.
3.5	Success rate of courses tailored to migrants (refugees, asylum seekers)	Number of trainees completing courses tailored to migrants / total number of trainees following those courses	The indicator should be re-phrased such as "courses targeting also migrants/refugees" so as to consider the widest training offer available towards this specific target. Usually, courses target more than one group (i.e. unemployed people, migrants, etc.).			This indicator is kept as it is, as it was deemed important to have at least one indicator (success rate) on courses for migrants.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
3.6	Integration of disabled trainees in training	Number of disabled trainees / total number of trainees	The indicator should consider any type of "disability", also those learning difficulties that are certified by an official body. This should be made clear in the indicator's description.			Recommendation accepted. The meaning of disability will be clarified to include learning difficulties.
AXIS 4						
4.2	Participation in local and regional development	Number of local networks-committees in which the organization participates / total number of networks-committees in which the organization participates.	This indicator is complicated to understand. Its description needs to be very clear.			Recommendation accepted. The description will be improved.
AXIS 5						
5.1	Women in management	Number of women in management / Number of women in the organization	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.		Number of women in management / number of managers	<p>The partnership decides to update the indicator, following the suggestions of the colleagues who collected the data for the testing.</p> <p>The recommendation of using AWU was not taken into account, as this concept was not familiar to all partners.</p>

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
5.2	Absenteeism rate	Number of sick hours / Number of working hours people should have worked	The online framework uses a reverse ratio: it should be clearly explained that an automatic reverse calculation is used here, otherwise users will not be able to understand what is really measured here and how.			Recommendation accepted. The description will better explain how this indicator is calculated in the framework.
5.3	Employees with disabilities	Number of disabled employees / total number of employees	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.			The recommendation of using AWU was not taken into account as this concept was not familiar to all partners.
5.4	Accident frequency index	(Number of accidents with at least one day of disability * 1.000.000)/ total number of hours worked by all employees	Same problem of indicator 5.2.			Recommendation accepted. The description will better explain how this indicator is calculated in the framework.
5.6	Access to training	Number of employees who accessed training in a year / total number of employees	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.			The recommendation of using AWU was not taken into account, as this concept was not familiar to all partners.
5.7	Job promotion rate	Number of people who were promoted in the last year / total number of employees	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.			The recommendation of using AWU was not taken into account, as this concept was not familiar to all partners.

Indicator Number	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Recommendation	New Indicator Name	New Indicator Calculation	Comment by the partnership
5.8	Employee turnover	Number of years employees work in the VET centre / employees of the VET centre	The indicator should use the Annual Work Unit (AWU) with the same meaning in the European SME (Small and medium-sized enterprises) definition.	Average length of time at a job		<p>The recommendation of using AWU was not taken into account, as this concept was not familiar to all partners.</p> <p>The partnership decided to change the name of the indicator to make it clearer as employee turnover could be ambiguous.</p>

Table 9 - Proposed new indicators

PROPOSED NEW INDICATORS				
Axis	Recommendation	Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Outcome
2	Recommendation to add indicator	Training on entrepreneurial skills	Number of hours dedicated to entrepreneurial skills / Total number of hours of training	Added (Indicator 2.7)
2	Recommendation to add indicator	Satisfaction rate of trainees	Average result on satisfaction questionnaires / Highest possible satisfaction score (according to the used scale)	Added (Indicator 2.8)
3	Recommendation to add indicator	Indicator on the amount of training carried-out at a distance		Not added, as for many VET providers it would not be very useful since training is done in great part in laboratories or through internships/ apprenticeships, etc.
3	Recommendation to add indicator	Long-term unemployed people admitted to training	Number of long-term unemployed people admitted to training / total number of trainees	Added (Indicator 3.9)

As for the other recommendations that were collected during the validation phase:

Table 10 - Further recommendations and subsequent decisions of the partnership

Recommendation	Decision of the partnership
<i>a. Improvements to the indicators</i>	
Review the description of the axes and of some indicators in order to ensure they are easily understandable or, alternatively, add a brief but clear description for each one of them.	Recommendation accepted. See Annex.
Some of the indicators can be interpreted differently. No solution was proposed for this issue but it was made several time as a risk factor for benchmarking.	Whenever possible the partnership used terms and definition internationally accepted and standardised as defined by international organisation or European bodies.
Suggestion to add some indicators.	Recommendation partly accepted. See table 9.
The use of NUTS classification suggested by the framework is not always consistent with the real working range of the VET centres.	Recommendation accepted. See table 8.
Some indicators may not apply to some national VET systems. It's not clear how VET centres should proceed in that case.	Recommendation accepted. Specific instructions are to be provided for users to deal with this issue.
<i>b. Improvements to the SOLITY online tool</i>	
The INSTRUCTION button available on the tool should be clearer.	Recommendation accepted.
The "information" button available for each indicator should be shortened.	Recommendation accepted.
The different levels of reliability should also be reviewed; in fact, data coming from purely internal sources does not necessarily have a low reliability.	Recommendation not accepted, as levels of reliability must be set and internal data not checked or approved by external bodies are by definition less reliable than those that are certified by external bodies.
The term "territory" (despite the explanation provided) still leads to confusion.	Recommendation accepted. A better definition is to be provided.
It is currently not possible to leave indicators empty when trying to calculate S.U.	Recommendation not accepted. This is a decision of the partnership in order to make benchmarking possible and to encourage VET providers to make the effort of collecting all the data requested. If some indicators are not applicable to a certain VET national system, instructions on how to proceed are to be provided by the partnership.
The log-in process (with the magic link) as it is currently could be improved.	Recommendation not accepted. It is not possible to change the log-in process at the moment.
The possibility to add qualitative comments	It is not possible to do it now because of time and

Recommendation	Decision of the partnership
should be provided.	budget constraints. The recommendation is noted and accepted in case of a further development of the SOLITY project (e.g. SOLITY 2.0)
The framework would be more accurate if it allowed the categorisation of VET providers by size, sector and other categories.	It is not possible to do it now because of time and budget constraints. The recommendation is noted and accepted in case of a further development of the SOLITY project (e.g. SOLITY 2.0).
<i>c. Improvements to the display of the Social Utility Score</i>	
In the future, the report to be downloaded from the platform can be further implemented with some graphics. Graphics could also be used to further help users follow their progress over time.	It is not possible to do it now because of time and budget constraints. The recommendation is noted and accepted in case of a further development of the SOLITY project (e.g. SOLITY 2.0)
The final Social Utility Score could be also represented graphically (e.g. a star system or a traffic light system) in order to improve its efficacy and communication potential.	It is not possible to do it now because of time and budget constraints. The recommendation is noted and accepted in case of a further development of the SOLITY project (e.g. SOLITY 2.0).
<i>d. Recommendations on the dissemination of SOLITY</i>	
The main message around the SOLITY tool should be that it is a self-assessment tool, in order to avoid from the very beginning any risk of competition among VET providers and/or an improper use of the tool from them. This should be very clear in the dissemination activities.	Recommendation accepted.
It should be stressed more that the tool allows VET providers to enter their data annually so as to record their progress.	Recommendation accepted.
<i>e. Recommendations on the dissemination of SOLITY for the future "beyond SOLITY"</i>	
All the recommendations listed under this point ² were already made thinking about a further development of the SOLITY project. They are in fact not applicable to the current project because of budget, time and/or other constraints.	

² See page no. 17-18 for more information.

Summary

The validation process involved approximately 120 VET trainers, entrepreneurs, decision-makers and stakeholders in national and international workshops, almost 800 VET stakeholders in the online survey as well as 26 VET centres that tested the framework and tool. This allowed a comprehensive feedback from various sources and, since many of the recommendations were adopted, also brought to a general improvement of the SOLITY framework.

Only a few recommendations were not adopted, mainly because they would require a further development of the SOLITY framework, that goes beyond the scope of this project.

Annex: Updated List of SOLITY Indicators

Axis 1 Indicators of activities in favour of return to employment

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ³
1.1. Employment rate in the medium term (*)	<i>Number of graduates who found a job / total number of graduates from a centre</i>	(*) Medium term means not less than 3 months and more than 1 year.	(*) Medium term means not less than 3 months and more than 1 year. Please consider only IVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator.	0,19
1.2 Long-term employment	<i>Number of graduates who had a long-term contract / total number of graduates who found a job</i>	This indicator measures the employability of the graduates, with a special focus on job security, i.e. the possibility to have a stable job.	A long-term contract is here to understand as a contract of at least more than 5 years in duration or even with no limit as far as duration is concerned.	0,12
1.3 Training related to skills shortage	<i>Number of trainees who entered a qualifying training course related to the top-10 most requested job profiles (at the national or regional level) / total number of trainees who entered qualifying training courses</i>	This indicator wants to measure the adequacy of the training offer with the needs of the labour market.	Usually, the top-10 most requested profiles are listed year by year by official sources (e.g. regional or national bodies). Please consider only IVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator.	0,09
1.4 Job guidance (e.g. coaching, career guidance, etc.)	<i>Total number of hours of guidance and counselling provided / total number of hours of training given by the training provider</i>	This indicator aims at measuring the degree of support to trainees, both at the outset of the training course (career guidance for example) and during the training course (e.g. counselling).	The indicator should be calculated as follows: (total number of hours of guidance provided to a trainee) x total number of trainees / (total number of hours of training provided to a trainee) x total number of trainees. Please consider only IVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people	0,1

³ As used in the SOLITY online tool

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ³
			when measuring this indicator.	
1.5 Volume of incoming trainees in CVET	<i>Number of people trained in CVET / labour force in the territory⁴</i>	The interest of indicators no. 1.5 and 1.6 is to measure the capacity of training providers to position themselves in a specific area and adapt their qualifications offer to the economic environment of that area. The more people are employed in a specific area, the more we imagine a need for training.	The notion of territory refers to the working range of the VET centre. It can be the region, department/province, a city, or even a smaller geographical area, if necessary. The most important thing is that VET providers considers the geographical action field of their training centre, when measuring this indicator.	0,07
1.6 Volume of incoming training in IVET	<i>Number of people trained in IVET / labour force in the territory</i>		The notion of territory refers to the working range of the VET centre. It can be the region, department/province, a city, or even a smaller geographical area, if necessary. The most important thing is that VET providers considers the geographical action field of their training centre, when measuring this indicator.	0,08
1.7 Length of internships in courses that lead to a qualification	<i>Total number of hours of internships / total number of hours of training</i>	It is a matter of measuring the weight of internships in the training path; Internships make it possible for trainees to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase the chance of success by working in companies - become more professional and refine their professional project - compare acquired skills in a training centre with the realities of the company - learn how to look for a job (doing a resume, etc.) - improve access to employment opportunities. 	The indicator should be calculated as follows: (total number of hours of internship provided to a trainee) x total number of trainees / (total number of hours of training provided to a trainee) x total number of trainees. Please consider only IVET courses and/or courses for unemployed people when measuring this indicator.	0,08

⁴ The notion of territory refers to the official organization of the country. It can be the region, department, governorate, etc. and it corresponds to the geographical action field of the training center.

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ³
1.8 Involvement of partner enterprises	<i>Number of enterprises in the territory which hosted trainees / total number of enterprises in the territory</i> ⁵	<p>It is a matter of evaluating the involvement of companies in vocational training in a given territory and the strength of the partnership between VET providers and companies.</p> <p>The word "Enterprise" is used according to the terminology defined by the European Court of Justice, where an enterprise is 'any entity engaged in an economic activity, irrespective of its legal form'⁶.</p>	<p>The definition of territory is interpreted here as the geographical area that the VET provider manages to cover with its activities.</p> <p>According to the EU definition, an enterprise is 'any entity engaged in an economic activity, irrespective of its legal form'.</p>	0,09
1.9 Weight of apprenticeship	<i>Number of trainees who had an apprenticeship / total number of trainees eligible for an apprenticeship</i>	<p>There are different definitions of the term apprenticeship. In this context, apprenticeship is characterized by a work contract involving two parties (the apprentice master and the young apprentice). Within an apprenticeship contract, the person benefits from vocational training partly provided in a company and partly in the training centre.</p>	<p>If this indicator does not apply to your national system, please see FAQ "What should I do if an indicator does not apply to my national VET system?" to know how to proceed.</p>	0,09
1.10 Post-internship job offer rate	<i>Number of trainees who found a job (whatever the type of contract) in the enterprises that hosted them for internships / number of trainees who found a job</i>	<p>This indicator measures the impact of internships or apprenticeships on job placement.</p> <p>It is a question of measuring the number of trainees who have found a job (whatever the type of contract) in the company which hosted them for the internship or following an apprenticeship contract, in relation to the total number of trainees having found a job.</p> <p>The word "Enterprise" is used according to the terminology defined by the European Court of Justice, where an enterprise is 'any entity engaged in an economic activity, irrespective of its legal form'⁷.</p>	<p>You can consider internships or apprenticeship, according to the peculiarities of your national VET system.</p> <p>According to the EU definition, an enterprise is 'any entity engaged in an economic activity, irrespective of its legal form'.</p>	0,09

⁵ Ibid. pag. 2

⁶ Judgment of the Court (Sixth Chamber) of 23 April 1991. Klaus Höfner and Fritz Elser v Macrotron GmbH.

⁷ Judgment of the Court (Sixth Chamber) of 23 April 1991. Klaus Höfner and Fritz Elser v Macrotron GmbH.

Axis 2 Indicators of activities in favour of human development

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ⁸
2.1 Success Rate	<i>Number of graduates / number of trainees</i>	All types of trainees are included, job seekers as well as workers. This indicator measures the capacity of VET providers to propose a satisfactory rate of graduates for the work market in relation to with the needs of the territory.	The number of graduates is the number of trainees who successfully pass the exam to get their qualification.	0,16
2.2 Recognition of competences (*)	<i>Number of people who benefited from recognition of competences service / number of trainees of the VET centre</i>	<p>(*) The recognition of competences is the certification of competences acquired in an informal context (for example through professional experience) proven and approved by an external body, in this case a VET provider.</p> <p>The ratio measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the capacity of the training centre to support companies and employees in a process of certification - the ability of people to become involved in an evolution process through a certification - the willingness of companies to support their employees in a process of evolution and recognition of skills. 	<p>(*) The recognition of competences is the certification of competences acquired in an informal context (for example through professional experience) proven and approved by an external body, in this case a VET provider.</p> <p>If this indicator does not apply to your national system, please see FAQ "What should I do if an indicator does not apply to my national VET system?" to know how to proceed.</p>	0,15
2.3 Participation rate in short refresher courses (*)	<i>Number of trainees who completed short refresher courses / total number of trainees</i>	<p>(*) Short refresher courses are here defined as courses of a short duration which do not lead to a qualification, but to the updating of skills in a LLL perspective. These short courses have the advantage of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improving employees' work and salary without interrupting their professional activity for too long. - updating jobseekers' skills in a short time, by identifying the 	<p>(*) Short refresher courses are here defined as courses of a short duration which do not lead to a qualification but to the updating of skills in a LLL perspective.</p>	0,09

⁸ As used in the SOLITY online tool

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ⁸
		training elements required to be competitive in the labour market.		
2.4 Participation rate in medium-long professional courses (*)	<i>Number of trainees who completed medium-long professional courses / total number of trainees</i>	<p>(*) Medium-long professional courses are here defined as specialization courses that allow people to acquire the basic technical skills related to a specific professional sector.</p> <p>The advantage of these courses is that they prepare a person to access a profession and obtain the necessary qualification / certification to work (and/or open a business) on that professional sector.</p>	(*) Medium-long professional courses are here defined as specialization courses that allow people to acquire the basic technical skills related to a specific professional sector.	0,13
2.5 Students mobility	<i>Number of trainees involved in mobility experiences / total number of trainees</i>	This indicator measures the level of awareness of training centres of the need to introduce their trainees to new horizons and their capacity to give an international experience to those who often have little experience of mobility.	If you need more information on this indicator, please refer to the "Framework model: Axes and Indicators" file on the Project Documents section of the website.	0,1
2.6 Volume of training on digital skills	<i>Number of hours dedicated to digital information and communication technologies (ICT) / total number of hours of training</i>	The indicator measures the time spent on the training of digital skills, in order for trainees to master the means of communication and to use the media responsibly. Teaching digital skills in training programs helps solve the issue of the digital divide and increases employability.	Here we ask to identify all the hours of training devoted to improve the digital skills of trainees. For a definition of digital skills, please go to: https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/digcomp/digital-competence-framework	0,12
2.7 Training on entrepreneurial skills	<i>Number of hours dedicated to entrepreneurial skills / total number of hours of training</i>	Entrepreneurial skills are identified by the EU as a priority because of their impact on people's economic, personal and social lives. This indicator aims at measuring how much training on entrepreneurial skills is provided to trainees by VET providers. Though the general number might still be low now, we expect it to grow in the next few years.	Here we ask to identify all the hours of training devoted to improve the entrepreneurial skills of trainees. For a definition of entrepreneurial skills, please go to: https://skillspanorama.cedefop.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EUSP_AH_Entrepreneurial_0.pdf	0,11

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ⁸
2.8 Satisfaction rate of trainees	<p><i>Average result on satisfaction questionnaires / highest possible satisfaction score</i></p> <p><i>(according to the used scale)</i></p>	<p>This indicator is usually always measured by VET providers as a way to collect the feedback of trainees on the training course they have attended.</p> <p>It is an important one to measure the quality of the training offer of a VET provider.</p>	<p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if you use a scale from 1 to 10 and the average of your satisfaction questionnaires is 7.2, you should put 7.2 as first number (numerator), then 10 as second number (divisor), so that the system will give you a percentage of 72% • if you use a scale from 1 to 5 and the average of your satisfaction questionnaires is 3.3, you should put 3.3 as first number (numerator), then 5 as second number (divisor), so that the system will give you a percentage of 66% • if you use a scale from 1 to 100 and the average of your satisfaction questionnaires is 77, you should put 77 as first number (numerator), then 100 as second number (divisor), so that the system will give you a percentage of 77%. 	0,14

Axis 3 Indicators of activities in favour of social inclusion

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ⁹
3.1 School drop-out youth admitted to vocational training	<i>Number of school dropouts admitted to vocational training / total number of trainees</i>	This indicator evaluates the capacity of training centres to integrate people dropping out from school into qualifying vocational training courses. School drop-out is the discontinuation of school before obtaining any qualification or diploma. For these young people, vocational training is often a second (sometimes the last) chance to get a qualification and find a job in the future.	School drop-outs are young people who have dropped out of school (high school, technical school, etc.) and are intercepted by the vocational system. Please consider only IVET for this indicator. Please only consider iVET trainees when measuring this indicator.	0,14
3.2 NEETs admitted to training	<i>Number of NEETs / total number of trainees</i>	NEETs are young people aged (15–29) not in employment, education or training. One of the priorities of vocational training is to contribute to the reintegration of the public furthest from employment and NEETS are among this target.	NEETS are young people aged (15–29) not in employment, education or training. Please consider only courses targeting NEETs or unemployed people more in general, when measuring this indicator.	0,15
3.3 Drop-out rate	<i>Number of trainees who leave the training before the end / total number of trainees</i>	Dropping out means leaving the training program. Training centres must aim to reduce the drop-out rate because dropping-out is a failure for the individual, the training centre and the community. Depending on the causes of the drop-out, this indicator allows to address the relevance of the career guidance at the outset of the training course and the efficacy of the tailored support and assistance provided to the trainee during the training course.	This indicator measures the trainees dropping out of the courses of the VET provider, regardless of the reason for dropping-out. When entering the data, you will see that the system will then reverse the final result. For example, if your drop-out rate, according to your data, is equal to 5%, a 95% rate will be displayed in the framework. This happens because the system is using a reverse calculation for this indicator, in order to calculate the final Social Utility Score. You should read that 95% as a 95% of students that complete the training, as does the system.	0,12

⁹ As used in the SOLITY online tool

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ⁹
3.4 Success rate of courses tailored to migrants (economic migrants, refugees, asylum seekers)	<i>Number of trainees completing courses tailored to migrants / total number of trainees following these courses</i>	Depending on the reasons why some people choose to leave their country, the success of the adaptation process may differ. Some migrants are disadvantaged in access to employment for reasons of lack of mastering the language, misreading the job market and/or skills required by companies. In the frame of their social utility VET providers must contribute to the integration in the labour market of this category, which is often one of the furthest from employment opportunities.	The term "migrant" is used according to the definition given by the IOM (International Organization for Migration): any person who moves or is moving across an international border or within a state, moving away from his usual place of residence, regardless of (1) his legal status; (2) whether the move is voluntary or involuntary; (3) by the causes of its displacement; (4) the length of your stay (in the country of arrival or transition).	0,1
3.5 Integration of disabled trainees in training	<i>Number of disabled trainees / total number of trainees</i>	The term "disabled" is used in accordance with the World Health Organization (WHO) definition: "disabilities" is an umbrella term, covering impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. An impairment is a problem in body function or structure; an activity limitation is a difficulty encountered by an individual in executing a task or action; while a participation restriction is a problem experienced by an individual in involvement in life situations. Disabled persons are more exposed to unemployment than others for different reasons: Depending on their disability, companies are not always equipped to integrate them The disabled are sometimes less qualified than others in the labour market, because of previous integration difficulties at school In the frame of their social utility VET providers must contribute to the insertion of this category of people, who is furthest from employment.	According to the World Health Organization (WHO), "disability" is an umbrella term, covering impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. Learning difficulties or problems, certified by an official authority, are here also considered as "disability".	0,11
3.6 Integration of disabled trainees in jobs after training	<i>Number of disabled trainees getting a job after training / total number of disabled trainees</i>		According to the World Health Organization (WHO), "disability" is an umbrella term, covering impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. Learning difficulties or problems, certified by an official authority, are here also considered as "disability".	0,1

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ⁹
3.7 Female participation	<i>Number of female trainees / total number of trainees</i>	Many official bodies noted that vocational training does not benefit women as much as men, where instead it should become a "tool for equality at work between women and men". The monitoring of this indicator makes it possible to understand, among other things, the efforts made by the training provider to promote the diversity of its training as well as those made to facilitate access to the training of working parents (training hours, ease of access, on-site childcare, possibility of taking distance-learning courses).	If you need more information on this indicator, please refer to the "Framework model: Axes and Indicators" file on the Project Documents section of the website.	0,1
3.8 Senior participation	<i>Number of people aged of 55 and over admitted to training courses / total number of trainees</i>	Many reports at national and EU level highlight that people over 55 encounter specific difficulties in re-entering the labour market, after losing their job. Indeed, job recovery prospects decline sharply with age, and a reduced access to life-long learning and vocational training is one of the main reasons of this problem. Integrating more and more this category into vocational training programs is an important contribution to social utility.	If you need more information on this indicator, please refer to the "Framework model: Axes and Indicators" file on the Project Documents section of the website.	0,09
3.9 Long-term unemployed people admitted to training	<i>Number of long-term unemployed people admitted to training / total number of trainees</i>	Here the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) definition is used, i.e. long-term unemployed people are people who have been unemployed for 12 months or more. Long-term unemployed people have a great difficulty in re-entering the labour market and VET providers often play a major role in helping these people re-training and re-gaining motivation and self-confidence.	According to the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) definition, long-term unemployed people are people who have been unemployed for 12 months or more.	0,09

Axis 4 Indicators in territorial and regional development

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ¹⁰
4.1 Cross-border or interregional cooperation	<i>Number of projects dealing with cross-border or inter-regional cooperation in the last 5 years / total number of projects in the last 5 years</i>	Interregional and international cooperation allows us to measure the contribution of vocational training as a unifying institution between the people.	If you need more information on this indicator, please refer to the "Framework model: Axes and Indicators" file on the Project Documents section of the website.	0,24
4.2 Participation in local and regional development	<i>Number of local networks or committees in which the organization participates / total number of networks or committees in which the organization participates</i>	It is a matter of measuring how the VET provider is embedded in the local and regional development to support its social role.	Here you need to identify all the committees/ consortia/ networks in which your VET provider takes part and then identify those that operate only at local level.	0,3
4.3 Environmental sustainability courses	<i>Number of hours dedicated to environmental sustainability / total number of hours of training</i>	According to the European Commission, Sustainable Development means meeting the needs of present generations without jeopardizing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It offers a vision of progress that integrates immediate and longer-term objectives, local and global action.	Please consider all the hours of training devoted to environmental sustainability or green skills. CEDEFOP defines green skills as "the knowledge, abilities, values and attitudes needed to live in, develop and support a sustainable and resource-efficient society."	0,21
4.4 Environmental sustainability initiatives	<i>Number of projects dealing with environmental sustainability in the last 5 years / total number of projects in the last 5 years</i>	Sustainable development must be taken up by society as a principle guiding the choices that each citizen makes every day. Vocational training is, and must be, a vehicle for disseminating values and sustainability must be one of them.	Please consider all the local, national or international projects where the topic of sustainability was targeted.	0,25

¹⁰ As used in the SOLITY online tool

Axis 5 Internal Practices

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ¹¹
5.1 Women in management	<i>Number of women in management / number of managers</i>	This indicator measures the ability of companies to integrate and / or promote women in management positions. Indeed, job promotion appears to be the one of the topics that characterize the most women / men inequalities within companies: two thirds of companies recognize that the highest positions are occupied by men rather than by women.	If you need more information on this indicator, please refer to the "Framework model: Axes and Indicators" file on the Project Documents section of the website.	0,15
5.2 Absenteeism rate	<i>Number of sick hours / number of working hours people should have worked</i>	This indicator aims at understanding working conditions through absences. Absenteeism is a one of the main factors taken into account when assessing the atmosphere within a company and the capacity of workers to adapt to the constraints linked to working situations (workload, hierarchical relations, etc.)	When entering the data, you will see that the system will then reverse the final result. For example, if your absenteeism rate, according to your data, is equal to 5%, a 95% rate will be displayed in the framework. This happens because the system is using a reverse calculation for this indicator, in order to calculate the final Social Utility Score. You should read that 95% as a 95% of presence rate, as does the system.	0,13
5.3 Employees with disabilities	<i>Number of disabled employees / total number of employees</i>	This indicator measures the social utility of a training provider through its ability to integrate a specific category of people in its human resources, in order to combat exclusion of individuals and inequalities.	If you need more information on this indicator, please refer to the "Framework model: Axes and Indicators" file on the Project Documents section of the website.	0,11
5.4 Accident frequency index	<i>(Number of accidents with at least one day of disability * 1.000.000) / total number of hours worked by all employees</i>	Regular monitoring of this indicator makes it possible to assess the ability of companies to protect their employees by preventing and / or correcting risks.	When entering the data, you will see that the system will then reverse the final result. For example, if your absenteeism rate, according to your data, is equal to 5%, a 95% rate will be displayed in the framework. This happens because the system is using a reverse calculation for this indicator, in	0,09

¹¹ As used in the SOLITY online tool

			order to calculate the final	
--	--	--	------------------------------	--

¹² As used in the SOLITY online tool

Indicator	Calculation	Description	Information displayed online (i)	Weight ¹¹
			Social Utility Score. You should read that 95% as a 95% of "safety" rate, as does the system.	
5.5 Job Security	<i>Number of long-term contracts / total number of contracts</i>	This indicator highlights the ability and sensitivity of the company to provide job security to its employees, thereby facilitating social integration (acquisition or rental of housing, involvement in local life, etc.).	A long-term contract is understood here as a contract of at least more than 5 years in duration or even with no limit as far as duration is concerned.	0,14
5.6 Access to training	<i>Number of employees who accessed training in a year / total number of employees</i>	The aim here is to measure social utility through the capacity of the training provider to organize and support the increase in skills of its employees.	If you need more information on this indicator, please refer to the "Framework model: Axes and Indicators" file on the Project Documents section of the website.	0,16
5.7 Job promotion rate	<i>Number of people who were promoted in the last year / Total number of employees</i>	This indicator measures the company's ability to value and recognize the skills of its employees. The notion of promotion can be understood as obtaining a new and higher position with new responsibilities, with a salary increase and/or other benefits.	The notion of promotion can be understood as obtaining a new and higher position with new responsibilities, with a salary increase and/or other benefits.	0,1
5.8 Average length of time at a job	<i>Number of years employees have been working in the VET centre / total number of employees</i>	This indicator assesses the company's ability to retain its employees (either through the use of long-term contracts or the establishment of good working conditions).	If you need more information on this indicator, please refer to the "Framework model: Axes and Indicators" file on the Project Documents section of the website.	0,12