

Recognition in Europe

**An impact evaluation of the
ENIC-NARIC networks**

February 2018

Recognition in Europe

An impact evaluation of the
ENIC-NARIC networks



Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Testimonial	5
Introduction	6
Summary of recommendations	7
Methodology	8
Scope	8
Objectives and considerations	9
Analysis of the impact evaluation survey	11
Part A The services provided by the eight centres	11
Part B The services received by the centres from the ENIC-NARIC networks	13
Part C The survey of stakeholder bodies operating at European level	14
Recommendations	16
Annexes	20
Annex 1 Results of audit of centres including parts A and B of the questionnaires to centres	21
Annex 2 Impact assessment Parts A and B – composite record of centres' responses	28
Annex 3 Impact assessment Part C – major European stakeholder bodies	52
Annex 4 Responses to client group survey – HEIs	55
Annex 5 Responses to client group survey – employers	59
Annex 6 Responses to client group survey – public and professional bodies	62
Annex 7 Responses to client group survey – individual users	65

Acknowledgements

Since their establishment in 1988, the *National Academic Recognition and Information Centres* (NARIC) provided a European network of national centres promoting smooth and fair recognition in Europe. The network has been a catalyst in information sharing and developing good practice and innovations in the recognition of foreign qualifications. The goal of the current report is to evaluate the impact of the NARIC network.

The rationale to study the impact of the network stems from the ever increasing need from national and European policy makers to show the added value of the NARIC network. Moreover, the study gave the opportunity to provide transparency into a field that is considered highly technical to non-practitioners. Perhaps the most important reason for conducting an impact evaluation has been to systematically reflect on our work as centres and network. To identify strengths, but also to identify areas for improvement in order to smoothen and streamline recognition of foreign qualifications.

The recent European Commission initiative to create a 'European Education Area' gives unexpected relevance to the findings of this report. I invite all those involved in shaping the policy towards recognition in the next decade to read this report, and I hope it will inspire and contribute to improve recognition of foreign qualifications in Europe.

During the project, the IMPACT partners together shaped the research framework and collected data in their centres and national context. I thank them for their teamwork and contributions. In addition, I would like to thank the European Student Union, European University Association and European Consortium for Accreditation for their critical reflections on the outcomes. A special expression of gratitude and appreciation goes to Howard Davies, senior advisor at the European University Association, for his wonderful work in coordinating this study and for writing the report.

Lucie de Bruin

Head of Centre,

ENIC-NARIC The Netherlands

Testimonial

For the purpose of achieving and maintaining quality of Higher Education systems ESU has always stressed the importance of the recognition procedures to be in place. Implementation of recognition principles and procedures outlined in the Lisbon Recognition Convention is of crucial importance for ensuring accessible and flexible education and hence the role of the ENIC-NARIC networks is of great significance both for national and supra-national levels.

The impact evaluation of the ENIC-NARIC networks can serve as an essential measure to constantly track and improve the implementation of recognition procedures, as well as to let all network members to analyze their activities and develop further action plans towards enlarging their impact.

The report 'Evaluating the impact of the ENIC-NARIC networks' developed within the frames of the IMPACT project highlights some of the most important achievements of the ENIC-NARIC networks, as well as underlines the gaps still in place providing also recommendations and advice on actions for overcoming hindrances. As mentioned in the report, a great feature of it is that different types of ENIC-NARIC centres are represented in this evaluation.

Indeed the survey developed within the IMPACT project is very detailed and working areas of centres are efficiently grouped within 6 topics of questions. However it was unexpected to see so many discrepancies around procedures and requirements which seem to be common for recognition issues. As mentioned in the report, the lack of standards for tools and procedures causes major divergence between the centres and make it impossible to have a comparison between the members of the same network targeted to almost the same missions.

It should be positively highlighted that including the feedback from client groups - meaning the other stakeholders of recognition process, drastically increases the value of the report and adds another perspective for the impact evaluation.

Commitment of all centres to the implementation of LRC is of utmost importance and highly essential for the actual application of the convention. ESU finds very efficient the fact that some of the HEIs declared getting support from their ENIC-NARIC centre for familiarizing or using the LRC. It was surprising to see that this is not a general practice for all centres and that HEIs are not sufficiently targeted within the works of centres.

Having this global network of centres from different countries and the expertise in the field of recognition ENIC-NARIC centres may be regarded as delegates for advancing the application of LRC in practice and doing in collaboration with HEIs seems to be one of the best solutions.

Strengthening communication and cooperation with individual HEIs will be of benefit both for the institution as well as the individual learners/students and hence will enlarge the impact that ENIC-NARIC network can bring to the application of recognition procedures.

European Student Union

Introduction

One of the tasks of the IMPACT project was to evaluate the impact of the ENIC-NARIC networks.

Based on surveys of a representative sample of eight ENIC-NARIC centres, their principal user groups, and a selection of sectoral stakeholder bodies operating at European level, the project team formulated a number of recommendations. The European Student Union, European Consortium of Accreditation and European University Association provided feedback on the outcomes and support this publication.

In the following pages these recommendations are set out and supported by data culled from the sets of survey responses. They are intended to help the networks build on their **existing strengths** and respond to the evolving needs of their various client groups. They recognise the quality of service already provided and propose ways in which it can be enhanced.

In order to provide as full a context as possible, it is useful at this stage to spell out exactly where their existing strengths lie:

- The networks derive their authority from the Council of Europe, the European Union, and the governments of the countries in which the national centres are located
- They support and promote the Lisbon Recognition Convention, the international treaty for the recognition of foreign qualifications
- They are bound by a Charter¹ which confers on them a shared set of functions and obligations and on the basis of which the national centres can diversify, according to the needs of the local context
- They enjoy a formal status and are the acknowledged authorities on the recognition of qualifications
- They play a crucial role in facilitating the mobility of students and the access of workers to foreign labour markets
- They facilitate the exchange of good practice and intelligence between national centres
- They make a valuable contribution to policy-making at transnational and national levels – most recently, in the area of migrant integration
- They are active in capacity building and staff development, particularly in the higher education sector
- They strive to uphold values of fairness, consistency, responsiveness and accountability

The IMPACT project is carried out by a team of eight NARICs (Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands and UK), the Hochschulrektorenkonferenz and the European University Association (EUA). The project is co-financed under the European Commission's Erasmus+, Key Action 3, programme.

1) www.enic-naric.net/fileusers/Charter.en.pdf

Summary of recommendations

1. The remit of each ENIC-NARIC centre should be precisely and publicly stated.
2. Centres should ensure that the information they provide is regularly and accurately updated.
3. The NARIC network should provide centres with greater opportunities for peer-to-peer learning and for inter-centre staff mobility.
4. The NARIC network and centres should pay constant attention to the needs of HEIs.
5. The NARIC network should explore a collective reporting and feedback mechanism to enhance the quality of service delivery.
6. Centres should be encouraged to undertake regular customer satisfaction surveys as part of their quality assurance cycle.
7. Centres should engage in specific procedures for evaluating the qualifications of refugees, in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention, but should not distinguish the outcomes from those of other user groups.

Methodology

IMPACT is a two-year EU-co-funded project running from 2016 to 2018. The project coordinator is Nuffic, the Dutch NARIC. There are three action lines, each of which is devolved to a working 'hub' consisting of a sub-set of the eight participating ENIC-NARIC centres.

Hub 3 is made up of four national centres: FR, LT, NL and UK, accompanied by EUA. This report covers the evaluation of the impact of the ENIC-NARIC networks.

The parameters of the evaluation were agreed at the kick-off meeting in June 2015. Hub 3 would seek to identify the principal **impact of the services provided by the networks**. 'Networks' were to be understood as sets of individual centres, rather than the nexus of relationships to which it would not be possible to send survey material. The evaluation would focus on academic, to the exclusion of professional, recognition. It would consider the main tasks of the centres at national level, but would also examine the impact of the networks' services on major European stakeholder bodies.

Scope

Rather than attempting to survey all 55 ENIC-NARIC centres, the Hub would limit its scope to the **eight project participants**, all NARICs, since these were already representative of different types² of centre – expressed in terms of size, legal status, their degree of autonomy to determine policy and procedure, and whether their pronouncements were advisory or legally binding.

- Denmark: a large, partly regulated centre, located in a ministry and delivering a mix of advisory and legally binding evaluations
- France: a large autonomous public agency, delivering advisory evaluations
- Ireland: a medium-sized autonomous public agency, delivering advisory evaluations
- Italy: a medium-sized autonomous non-governmental body, delivering advisory evaluations
- Latvia: a medium-sized autonomous public agency, delivering a mix of advisory and legally binding evaluations
- Lithuania: a large partly regulated public agency, delivering a mix of advisory and legally binding evaluations
- Netherlands: a large autonomous non-governmental body, delivering advisory evaluations
- UK: a large autonomous non-governmental body, delivering advisory evaluations

It was also agreed that **other centres** would be free to take part if they wished. The evaluation would take the dual form of (a) questioning the centres on the range, character and intensity of their activities, and (b) examining the effect of their work on their main target groups.

This was not the first attempt to assess the impact of the ENIC-NARIC networks. The **SQUARE and CHARONA II** projects had recently been completed. IMPACT offered an opportunity to complement their findings: by updating them, by aiming for a high rate of response from a sample of centres, and by strengthening the focus on impact to clients.

2) See the SQUARE typology at www.enic-naric.net/fileusers/SQUARE%20overview%20typology%20FIN.pdf

CHARONA II (The Changing Role of NARICs) reported in 2014, having conducted two network surveys and one consultation. These three strands investigated (a) the core functions, scope and procedures of the ENIC-NARIC centres, (b) specified research themes, including the Bologna Process, qualifications frameworks, EU legislation on professional qualifications and managed migration, and (c) views on the direction of future development. The response rates for the three exercises were 56%, 42% and 52% respectively.

The **SQUARE** (System of Quality Assurance for the Recognition Networks) project ran from 2014 to 2016. It set up a self-evaluation and peer review cycle in which 14 centres participated. While peer review panels were able to make recommendations regarding centres' visibility, SQUARE prioritised compliance with the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) and with established good practice, rather than impact³.

The **IMPACT** project has been conceived as a direct follow-up. It aims to carry the analysis forward in two important respects: first, by measuring the impact of the networks on identified client groups; secondly, by seeking to ensure that customer satisfaction surveys are embedded in a wider and more effective quality cycle.

Objectives and considerations

Hub 3 set out to reach agreement on the detail of **the objectives and the methodology** of the impact evaluation. In particular, it considered:

- ... whether a survey directed at eight centres would be sufficient.

Given the time available, a survey of all 55 centres was not feasible. Consideration was given to a sample of 16 centres, allowing for non-IMPACT centres to join, but ultimately it was judged that this would not enhance the representative nature of the sample and that in fact the time constraint was decisive. The Hub therefore confirmed the figure of eight.

- ... which recognition procedures and tools should feature explicitly in the survey.

It was agreed that these would include comparability statements, statements of recognition of periods of study, databases, central and network websites, the EAR-HEI Manual and the STREAM platform. The use of these procedures and tools would be evaluated on the basis of compliance with the LRC, the quality and relevance of the databases, the training of staff, the level of resource, and feedback from stakeholders.

- ... which were the main client groups.

There was wide agreement that these were HEIs, individual inquirers, and national sectoral stakeholders such as ministries, competent authorities and professional bodies. The Hub also agreed that the exclusion of professional recognition from the scope of the evaluation was no reason to exclude employers as a user group.

3) See the SQUARE protocol at www.enic-naric.net/fileusers/SQUARE%20Protocol%20FIN.pdf

- ... whether there was good reason to evaluate the impact of ENIC-NARIC centres on each other.

It was felt that to focus only on discrete centres would be unduly restrictive and would exclude any measure of the impact that derives from their interaction. Hub members felt that this impact was significant. It was agreed that the survey would explore a) reciprocal impact and b) the impact of inter-centre collaboration on other client groups.

- ... which European-level sectoral bodies to target.

The Hub agreed on two governmental organisations and ten NGOs (see Part C on page 14).

The Hub also concluded that, to assist in designing questionnaires, it would be necessary to conduct an **audit** of the services provided by the eight centres. It was felt that remits and functions had evolved significantly since the CHARONA survey undertaken in 2012.

The IMPACT **steering group** saw and broadly approved the Hub's plans in October 2016. It suggested including refugees as an emerging client group and recommended that the eight centres be given some guidelines regarding their survey responses. In fact, the audit had already revealed that three of the eight centres provided services relating to immigration; a question was therefore included in the survey. Thanks to the audit and to the frequency of internal communication within the IMPACT project, it was felt that the survey materials would be largely self-explanatory. The overview of the audit and the questionnaire delivered to the centres are attached as Annex 1 on page 21.

Analysis of the impact evaluation survey

The **impact evaluation survey** had three parts:

- Part A questioned the eight centres on the purpose, nature and take-up of the services that they delivered. Forms went out in April 2016, for response in May. Part A responses are analysed in Part A below. An overview is provided in Annex 2 on page 28.
- Part B asked the centres to comment, to the same deadline, on the quality of services received from the ENIC-NARIC networks. See Part B on page 13. See too the overview in Annex 2.
- Parts A and B carried a request for advice on the feasibility of administering client survey questionnaires, addressed to individuals, HEIs, employers, and public bodies. Centres declared varying degrees of feasibility. The client group surveys are covered on page 14.
- Finally, Part C consisted of the questionnaire sent to the 12 sectoral stakeholder bodies operating at European level. See page 14 and Annex 3 on page 52.

Part A The services provided by the eight centres

Part A was the most detailed part of the survey. Questions were arranged in six groups:

1. Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)
2. General information provision
3. Training and conferences
4. Projects and policy
5. Immigration and refugees
6. Feedback on the quality of their service provision

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

Every centre is committed to rapid, consistent and fair recognition, in support of student mobility within the framework of the LRC. Five share the additional objective of facilitating the recruitment of students and employees. Other objectives were cited: the integration of immigrants, capacity building of partners, and consolidation of NQFs.

Most centres give inquirers the guarantee of a maximum turnaround time. Not all were specified in the survey responses; when they were, they displayed a wide discrepancy – from one week to four months. The picture is similar in respect of, for example, mode of access to databases, richness of databases, codes of practice, appeals procedures. Centres made reference to these, but the survey was not sufficiently sensitive to allow comparative analysis.

In general, the demand for credential evaluation is rising. However, not all centres could give figures by client group; not all cater for all client groups. Individual inquiries ranged from below 1,000 to over 60,000 in the year; inquiries from HEIs, from below 1,000 to over 20,000; from competent authorities, between 70 and 1,500.

All centres are committed to the implementation of the LRC. They cited such activities as: participating in the drafting of national legislation; participating in network activities and in projects; staff and client training programmes; disseminating the good practice embodied in the EAR Manuals; operating a dedicated service for refugees. These features were explored in greater detail in subsequent sections of the questionnaire.

General information provision

All centres are active in general information provision, all to the same ends: facilitating mobility and providing individuals and third parties with evaluation of academic credentials. Other information services were cited: QFs, professional recognition, legacy qualifications. Some centres carry details of their own national system only; others have extensive databases with descriptions of many foreign systems. Responding to these needs, all centres rely heavily on online presentation of general information and on email for personal inquiries; telephone and social media contact is less widespread, and drop-in facilities even less. Brochures, conferences, training programmes etc., are also regarded as viable information channels. There are no examples of apps. (The survey did not ask in which languages information is provided. Nor did it ask whether the services are free, subscription-based, or subject to a one-off charge, and to which categories of clients, although some relevant information was supplied.)

In only one country has demand for information declined; in another it is steady, while in the remainder it has risen. Not all countries log the hits on their websites; the figures provided by others revealed a huge range – from below 100,000 to 10 million per annum. The same picture emerges in respect of telephone and email inquiries: not all centres keep account, not all are able to disaggregate; the others had scores in the low thousands rising by a magnitude of ten. Only four centres were able to cite, or estimate, the number of international and cross-border inquiries.

Training and conferences

All eight centres engage in training and conference work, sharing the same objectives: to improve the reliability of their evaluations, to share relevant knowledge and to discuss new developments. Two centres value the additional benefit of being able to publicise their services. The main beneficiaries are HEIs, followed by policy-making bodies and public administrations. Demand for training is rising, but the volume of training programmes varies widely from country to country, from zero to 60. Normal practice is for the quality of provision to be evaluated by the recipient.

Projects and policy

All eight centres engage in project and policy work, sharing the same objectives: to improve their insight into recognition practice, to extend good practice and to help shape national recognition policy. All are able to demonstrate recent and relevant activity, demand for which is either steady or rising. Three strands of activity predominate: advice on drafting legislation; provision of information on recognition practice; providing experts / consultants for events, research, etc. The main policy areas are recognition of foreign qualifications, NQFs and other Bologna instruments, immigration, admissions and credit transfer, and internationalisation. When asked to name a significant policy initiative or intervention within the last five years, all centres were able to volunteer one or more examples.

Immigration and refugees

Six of the eight centres provide an advisory service for refugees and asylum-seekers. They issue background papers to assist refugees' integration into educational institutions and the labour market. They also advise their government; in this function, they were joined by a seventh centre. Not all centres place refugees in a separate category. The limited visibility meant that quantification is unreliable; indicative figures range from zero to nearly 3000 per country. In most

cases, however, it is clear that demand has risen. All eight centres are ready to advise relevant ministries and/or to participate in drafting legislation. In all cases but one, this advice has been requested.

Feedback

Centres were asked whether they had mechanisms for assessing and improving the scope of their activities and the quality of their decisions. The picture is varied. Two centres reported no such formal mechanisms, although one of these received unsolicited (positive) feedback from clients. The remainder undertook client surveys (corporate and individual) on a regular or pilot basis. One was monitored by its ministry; another was inspected annually by ISO.

Part B The services received by the centres from the ENIC-NARIC networks

Part B asked centres to specify, with comment, the impact of the services that they received from the networks. Was this impact major or minor? Was it positive or negative? Nine services were identified and the responses are summarised in the following sub-points. The composite set of responses is presented in Annex 2 on page 28.

Access to information and knowledge exchange about subjects related to credential evaluation and foreign education systems.

The centres were unanimous in their positive view of the networks' information provision and the opportunities for the exchange of good recognition practice.

Training of staff.

Face-to-face training was not universally possible; hence the warm welcome given to online staff development and support.

Information regarding supra-national legislation (e.g. EU Directives, Decisions, Recommendations), policy and good practice.

The centres reported no doubts about the usefulness of the information, but there appeared to be less clarity in matters concerning the transposition and implementation of EU legislation at Member State level.

Advice on how to assure the quality of your own services.

Here the response was unanimously positive, although the centres did not always make clear whether the benefits accrued from project participation or from other forms of interaction.

Peer review mechanisms.

From the centres which had participated in peer review activities, the response was positive.

Publicity for your activities.

The centres reported positive, albeit minor, impact. Their activities were publicised, but there were reservations concerning the extent to which the network website was kept up-to-date.

Facilitation of inter-centre collaboration, including meetings, conferences, online forums, etc.

The dominant view here was positive. The networks were seen as strongly facilitating the exchange of information and good practice as well as – tautologically – networking.

Opportunity to provide feedback on the performance of the networks.

Disparate responses to this question suggest that there is no structured opportunity to provide systematic and regular feedback.

Targeted support for your interface with immigration authorities, refugee and asylum-seeking inquirers.

There were no reports of negative impact. The sparse comments suggest that there is scope for the production of a detailed country-by-country overview of policies and procedures, together with indication of how far the remit of each centre permits effective action.

Part C The survey of stakeholder bodies operating at European level

Hub 3 decided to canvass **12 relevant stakeholder bodies** operating at European level. These were: ECA, ESU, EURASHE, EUA, European Commission, ENQA, EQAR, EAIE, LERU, ACA, IAU, and the Bologna secretariat. Out of 10 NGOs and two governmental organisations, the response rate was 50%.⁴

While non-respondents cannot be assumed to be non-users, the bodies that did respond were all frequent (2) or occasional (4) users of ENIC-NARIC services. They mainly went first to the **www.enic-naric.net** website, in search of national information relevant to their specialist concerns. They usually found the information that they required – with a variable degree of ease. Their principal complaint concerned out-of-date or absent information, prompting recourse to other sources (governmental, NGO) or to personal contacts. All of them had previously collaborated with ENIC-NARIC centres, in project or other frameworks. Here, too, their cooperation reflected their own specialist interests – quality assurance, Bologna Process, accreditation, etc. They were all familiar with the EAR and EAR-HEI Manuals; they recommended them to their contacts, but on the whole did not themselves use them. They were uniformly familiar with the LRC and welcomed further collaboration with the ENIC-NARIC networks.

The client group surveys

Centres were asked in the questionnaire whether they could undertake surveys of their main client groups. All were prepared to canvass HEIs. Five agreed to sound out employers. Seven said they would approach public and professional bodies, while four said that it would be feasible to survey the individual users of their services. The discrepancies were due to differences in remit, as well as to limitations on the resources available (staffing, databases, time).

HEIs

The centres succeeded in securing 78 responses from HEIs (out of just over 100 requested), each of the eight countries being represented. The number would have been greater had the survey not been so close to the summer vacation. All the HEIs were regular (at least monthly) users of ENIC-NARIC services; most used the front rank range of services – online databases, credential evaluations, information on foreign HE systems. Typically, the users fell into two categories: central agencies and devolved Faculty administrators/academics. A strong majority affirmed that access to the services accelerated their own performance, mainly by virtue of specialist information provision. It also brought them consistency of judgement and facilitated the recruitment of international students. In general, HEIs were appreciative of the information services provided; the one area (restricted by remit) in which the centres' predictably scored less high was in relation to professional qualifications and the regulated professions.

On the other hand, 39% of the HEIs (responding 'no' or 'don't know') were unable to declare that the ENIC-NARIC network had familiarised them with the LRC or (49%) helped them use it in their work. In respect of the EQF and NQFs, the figure was 24%. It is possible that these minorities were

4) See the summary tabulation in Annex 3 on page 52

indeed familiar with LRC and QFs, but that they had acquired their familiarity from other sources. 63% were unable to credit ENIC-NARIC networks with help in matters of immigration. This, however, cannot be taken as a clear indication of centres' practical competence: too many factors are involved – the centre's remit, the categorisation of its clientele, the catchment of the HEIs, widely varying national requirements, etc.

How could the networks better meet the needs of the HEIs? Two items stand out: a wider range of specialist information, and more rapid turnaround times.

For the detail of all these considerations, see Annex 4 on page 55.

Employers

The response rate was meagre – six completed survey forms from two of the five centres which deliver services to employers. Some 150 employers had been contacted, giving a response rate of 4%. The salient points which emerged revealed that employers had regular recourse to the centres' websites and generally agreed that the information retrieved helped speed up their work. Set against this was their lack of awareness of the implications for refugees, together with zero gain in terms of familiarity with LRC, EQF and NQFs. See Annex 5 on page 59.

Competent authorities, ministries, sectoral and professional bodies

Five centres were able to secure responses from 26 bodies – far fewer than the number contacted, which was over 500, giving a response rate of approximately 5%. In general, the client bodies were appreciative of the ENIC-NARIC information services, with only five negative reactions. They were nevertheless unable to assert that the networks facilitate mobility. For more detail, see Annex 6 on page 62.

Individuals

Only one centre out of eight was able to provide the number of individual user responses promised. This was disappointing. While each centre can draw its own conclusions, it is difficult to extrapolate meaningful assessments of the situation. The number of responses received was 452, around 13% of those solicited.

The inadequate data suggest that:

- 90% of respondents applied for credential evaluation, the vast majority in 2017
- 76% of these were satisfied with the evaluation
- 49% successfully gained entry to further study or to employment
- 69% were happy with the online information concerning the national education system
- 71% were happy with information on national recognition procedures
- 72% were happy with ENIC-NARIC credential evaluation services
- 52% were happy with information on access to the regulated professions
- 66% concluded that ENIC-NARIC centres help remove obstacles to mobility

For further figures and comments, see Annex 7 on page 65.

Recommendations

At a meeting of the IMPACT consortium in October 2017, the project participants addressed a set of talking points arising from an early draft of this report. The discussion reported below led to agreement on the recommendations set out in summary on page 7.

1 'The remit of each ENIC-NARIC centre should be precisely and publicly stated'

While all centres are bound by the 'Joint ENIC-NARIC Charter of Activities and Services'⁵, in fact they have differing remits. In respect of the recognition of qualifications, the Charter allows centres to 'provide information, advice or formal decision' to 'individual holders of qualifications, higher education institutions, employers, professional organisations, public authorities, ENIC/NARIC partners and other interested parties'.

However, depending on their size, volume of resource, degree of autonomy and location within national or supra-national legal frameworks, not all centres provide formal decision. Some have competence in professional recognition matters, while others do not. Not all centres serve the full range of client groups: three of the IMPACT participant centres, for example, do not work with employers. This, despite the fact that the two principal purposes for which clients seek recognition of their qualifications – for further study and for employment – are enshrined in the LRC.

These divergences limit the transparency of the centres' remits – both within the networks and in the profile presented to the client groups. In other words, it is not possible to predict exactly what any given centre can or will do. The SQUARE typology⁶ is a partial remedy, but is not available to the general public.

All stakeholders would benefit from a shell remit posted at www.enic-naric.net. This might take the form of a grid displaying centres and services listed horizontally and vertically, with ticks or colour coding indicating which services are provided by which centres, in which languages, and whether free or charged to each category of client.

2 'Centres should ensure that the information they provide is regularly and accurately updated'

The portfolios of qualifications in each national framework are in constant evolution. Ensuring that accurate information reaches the client is a huge challenge for centres and for the networks. In their responses to the survey, HEIs indicated that their greatest need was for up-to-date and comprehensive country profiles.

The surveys of all four client groups and the bodies operating at European level show that the two most common complaints concern inaccurate or out-of-date information and failure to meet targeted turnaround times of inquiries.

5) www.enic-naric.net/fileusers/Charter.en.pdf

6) See para.4 above

Target turnaround times vary between one week and four months. A number of factors are involved: labour shortage, the complexity of requests, the need for forensic analysis of documentation, and the constraints of the academic calendar. But there are also instances of slow turnaround caused by the need to double-check information that may no longer be accurate. To some extent, remedies may be found at centre level, but there is also scope for improved network-centre interaction. It would be helpful if the networks were to discuss how best to ensure that all new intelligence can be circulated among all centres.

3 'Networks should provide centres with greater opportunities for peer-to-peer learning and for inter-centre staff mobility'

Networks could also take a stronger lead in promoting peer-to-peer learning. The demand for centres' services is rising; as the European Higher Education Area evolves, new client groups emerge and new services are required. In this context, it should be possible to plot trends at network level and to develop a coordinated policy framework accordingly.

One way of stimulating peer-to-peer learning would be by funding short-term inter-centre staff mobility. This would be one element of a funding system capable of supporting the speedy adaptation of all centres to the evolving recognition environment.

4 'Networks and centres should pay constant attention to the needs of HEIs'

Peer-to-peer learning could usefully be deployed to address the mismatch in perceptions of the LRC between centres and HEIs. All eight IMPACT centres are confident that they comply with the LRC and disseminate its content accurately. They cite staff development events and training programmes. At the same time, when asked whether ENIC-NARIC services had familiarised them with the LRC, 32% of HEI respondents were unable to say yes; 44% were unable to say that the LRC had helped them in their work.

Of 64 HEIs surveyed, 35 reported that training by ENIC-NARIC centres had given them more detailed knowledge of foreign HE systems and greater competence in evaluating credentials. Only 29 said that they had gained knowledge of new developments in recognition. The figures show a maximum positive impact of 55% and suggest that HEIs are not sufficiently well targeted.

Part of the problem may lie in the casualization and rapid turnover of administrative staff in HEIs. It is thus reasonable to assume that training programmes mounted by ENIC-NARIC centres can have no long-term efficacy unless they are delivered regularly and frequently. How best to do this efficiently and cost-effectively is a matter for discussion at network level.

An obvious precondition is that all centres have the same basic capacity for addressing the needs of one of the largest client groups. The evidence of the eight IMPACT centres suggests that this is not yet in place. One centre has no database of inquiries and outcomes; one has no record of its dealings with HEIs; one treats HEIs as if they were individual inquirers. It is hard to see how centres can maintain similar levels of service if they do not have standard equipment and procedures.

5 'The ENIC-NARIC networks should explore a collective reporting and feedback mechanism to enhance the quality of service delivery'

Centres were asked whether the impact of the networks was positive or negative, major or minor. In the main, centres were appreciative, but they noted the lack of opportunity for feedback to the networks.

Many centres regularly report to their national authorities on the relevance and impact of their services, albeit within the framework of their differing remits. Yet there is no procedure for standardising these reports for dissemination within the networks. Peer review reports of centres have been undertaken, but it is not yet common practice to distribute them at network level. A collective reporting and feedback mechanism would provide a framework for enhancing the quality of service delivery in general and – in particular – for articulating the two sets of standards and guidelines operating in the ENIC-NARIC networks⁷ and in the European Higher Education Area⁸.

6 'Centres should be encouraged to undertake regular customer satisfaction surveys as part of their quality assurance cycle'

Centres report that they have put in place mechanisms by which beneficiaries of their training programmes can evaluate the service provided. In contrast, they lack procedures for securing regular feedback from their principal client groups regarding the quality of their provision of information and advice. There is no evidence that networks and centres have standard, regular, published and archived client satisfaction surveys.

The IMPACT surveys were conducted just prior to the summer vacation, but this cannot disguise the fact that response rates from employers and public bodies, in particular, were lamentably low, suggesting that centres do not maintain systematic contact with all their declared principal client groups. No doubt, this is at least in part due to lack of resource. It is therefore a matter that should be addressed with urgency at both centre and system levels. It is clear that routine customer satisfaction surveys should be central to the regular review of all aspects of the centres' activities. Ongoing monitoring of impact would make for more rapid and effective changes to the policy steer at both centre and network levels.

7 'Centres should engage in specific procedures for evaluating the qualifications of refugees, but should not distinguish the outcomes from those of other clients'

Given the recent increase in volume of incoming refugees, the IMPACT steering committee advised that the surveys of centres should pay special attention to refugees' needs. The methodology for evaluating their qualifications is clearly set out in the Council of Europe's 'Recommendation on the Recognition of Refugees' Qualifications under the Lisbon Recognition Convention and explanatory memorandum'⁹.

Nevertheless, centres have different perspectives, according to the legal and political positions prevailing in their countries. In the majority of the eight IMPACT participant centres the demand for refugee-focused services is rising. Accordingly, centres work with immigration authorities, assist in the integration of refugees, and produce the background papers necessary for the evaluation

7) SQUARE Self-evaluation and peer review protocol, op.cit.

8) Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, at www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf

9) <https://rm.coe.int/recommendation-on-recognition-of-qualifications-held-by-refugees-displ/16807688a8>

of their qualifications. Seven of the centres reported activity in general consultancy, drafting legislation, developing targeted recognition procedure and providing free credential evaluations.

While special treatment in the processing of inquiries is wholly justified, the published outcomes should not differ in any way from those of non-refugee clients. To assign them to a visibly separate category could offend sensitivities and make integration more problematic.

Annexes

Annex 1

Results of audit of centres including parts A and B of the questionnaires to centres

Hub 3's audit of IMPACT's eight participating ENIC-NARIC centres gives an overview – per client group – of which services are provided, for which purpose and on what basis.

Client group	Service provided	Service provider	Purpose	Status of provision
Individuals	Recognition decisions	DK, LT	Further study and employment	Legally binding. In DK, legally binding for pay grading decisions within public sector – otherwise not legally binding in terms of employment.
	Grade conversion	LT	Further study	Legally binding when applied for via common admissions system
	Recognition of foreign placement	FR	Further study and employment	Advisory
	Comparability statements	FR, IE, IT, LV, NL, UK	Further study and (LV only) employment	
	Language assessments	UK	Further study, employment, immigration	
	General information	DK, IE, IT, LT, LV, NL	Further study, employment, immigration (IE, NL)	
	Training	FR	Further study and employment	
Employers	Comparability statements	DK, LT, NL	Employment	Advisory
	Language assessments	UK		
	General information	DK, FR, IE, IT, LT, LV (for non-regulated professions), NL, UK		
	Training	FR, LT, UK		
	Conferences	FR, LT, UK		
	Research	UK		

Client group	Service provided	Service provider	Purpose	Status of provision
HEIs	Comparability statements	DK	Access to HE	Legally binding
		DK	Admission to PhD	Advisory
		IE, LT, LV, NL, UK	Further study	
	Language assessments	UK	Further study	
	General information	DK, FR, IE, IT, LT, LV, NL, UK (all online and offline)		
	Training	DK, FR, IT, LT, LV, NL, UK		
	Conferences	DK, IT, LT, LV, NL, UK		
	Research project participation	IE, IT, LV, NL, UK		
Public authorities, NGOs and professional bodies	Comparability statements	LV	Regulated professions	Legally binding
		DK, LT, NL, UK	Further study and employment	Advisory
	General information	DK, FR, IE, IT, LT, LV, NL, UK		
	Training	DK, FR, LT, LV, UK		
	Conferences	FR, IT, LT, UK		
	Research	FR, IT, UK		
	Consultancies	FR		

On the basis of the audit, Hub 3 designed the Part A and B questionnaires

Part A The impact of your services

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

What is the objective of your recognition services?	Please tick as many boxes as appropriate
To ensure fast and fair diploma recognition	
To contribute to the implementation of the LRC	
To ensure consistent decision making	
To support incoming and outgoing student/employment mobility	
To support the recruitment of students/employees	
Other, namely: support HEI to meet the requirements of the immigration authorities	

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

What activities/services are employed to achieve these objectives?

(e.g. making use of guaranteed response times, databases, appeal procedures, etc.)

What is the approximate annual number of assessments that you make for ...

individuals?

HEIs?

competent authorities in the regulated professions?

Has demand for this service in the past three years...

declined?

remained steady?

risen?

General information provision

What is the objective of your information provision?

Please tick as many boxes as appropriate

To remove obstacles to student mobility

To support individuals who are looking for an assessment of their qualifications

To support third parties (HEIs, employers, authorities) who are looking for an assessment of foreign qualifications

Other, namely, ...

What activities/services are employed to achieve these objectives? (e.g. providing country information on website, telephone service, brochures, social media, etc.)

What is the approximate annual number of telephone inquiries and website views

Approximately how many of these inquiries come from clients located outside your country?

Has demand for this service in the past three years...

declined?

remained steady?

risen?

Training and conferences

What is the objective of your training programmes and conferences?	Please tick as many boxes as appropriate
To share knowledge and competences in order to make reliable credential evaluations	
To share knowledge of education systems or other topics (namely...	
To share/discuss new developments in recognition practice and policy	
Other, namely...	

Which are the main beneficiary stakeholder groups?.....
...For sharing knowledge and competences in order to make reliable credential evaluations
...For sharing knowledge of education systems or other topics
...For sharing /discussing new developments in recognition practice and policy
...For other objectives

What is the approximate annual number of training programmes and conferences that you organise?

Has demand for this service in the past three years...
declined?
remained steady?
risen

Is your training provision systematically evaluated by the beneficiaries?

Projects and policy

What is the objective of your projects and policy work?	Please tick as many boxes as appropriate
To improve insight into recognition practice	
To develop/extend good practice in recognition	
To draft and influence national recognition policy	
Other, namely...	

Could you name the two main projects you have been involved in recently?
--

Has demand for this type of activity in the past three years...
declined?
remained steady?
risen

Projects and policy

What role do you play in the national higher education policy making process?

To which main policy fields do you make a contribution?

Give one example of your input to policy development/decision making in the last 5 years? What did you achieve?

Immigration; inquiries from refugees and asylum-seekers

Do you currently provide an advisory service for refugees and asylum seekers?

What is the objective of your service?

Please tick as many boxes as appropriate

To provide information to immigration services

To integrate refugees into education/ the labour market

To issue background papers to refugees who lack documentation of their educational qualifications

Other, namely...

What is the approximate annual number of assessments you make for refugees?

Has demand for this service in the past three years...

declined?

remained steady?

risen

Do you or did you contribute to the elaboration of policy for the integration of refugees/asylum seekers? If yes, please explain.

Feed-back

Do you have mechanisms for assessing and improving the scope of your activities and the quality of your decisions?

Could you undertake client surveys in June 2017?

The client surveys will consist of a standardised questionnaire to be developed by the IMPACT project team. For the purpose of the IMPACT assessment, four client groups have been identified. Please indicate, for each client group, if you are able to send out a client survey as well as the possible scale of the survey.

HEIs

Yes, more than 10

Yes, fewer than 10

No, not at all. If no, please say why

Employers

Yes, more than 10

Yes, fewer than 10

No, not at all. If no, please say why

Public authorities (including ministries, immigration authorities and other competent authorities)

Yes. Which authorities?

No, not at all. If no, please say why

Individuals

Yes, 2% of the annual applications is feasible (in real numbers that corresponds to surveys)

Yes, less than 2% of the annual applications (in real numbers surveys)

No, not at all. If no, please say why

Part B The impact of the ENIC-NARIC networks on your centre

What services does your agency receive from the networks and with what impact (positive/negative, major/minor)? Please explain your answer.

Access to information and knowledge exchange about subjects related to credential evaluation and foreign education systems

Positive impact

Major impact

Negative impact

Minor impact

access to information and knowledge exchange about subjects related to credential evaluation and foreign education systems

Positive impact

Major impact

Negative impact

Minor impact

training of staff

Positive impact

Major impact

Negative impact

Minor impact

What services does your agency receive from the networks and with what impact (positive/negative, major/minor)? Please explain your answer.

information regarding supra-national legislation (e.g. EU Directives, Decisions, Recommendations), policy and good practice

Positive impact	Major impact
Negative impact	Minor impact

advice on how to assure the quality of your own services

Positive impact	Major impact
Negative impact	Minor impact

peer review mechanisms

Positive impact	Major impact
Negative impact	Minor impact

publicity for your activities

Positive impact	Major impact
Negative impact	Minor impact

facilitation of inter-centre collaboration, including meetings, conferences, online forums, etc.

Positive impact	Major impact
Negative impact	Minor impact

opportunity to provide feedback on the performance of the networks ?

Positive impact	Major impact
Negative impact	Minor impact

targeted support for your interface with immigration authorities, refugee and asylum-seeking inquirers

Positive impact	Major impact
Negative impact	Minor impact

Other, namely...

Positive impact	Major impact
Negative impact	Minor impact

Annex 2

Impact assessment Parts A and B – Composite record of centres' responses

Part A The impact of your services

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

What is the objective of your recognition services?	Please tick as many boxes as appropriate
To ensure fast and fair diploma recognition	All eight centres
To contribute to the implementation of the LRC	All eight centres
To ensure consistent decision making	All eight centres
To support incoming and outgoing student/employment mobility	All eight centres
To support the recruitment of students/employees	Five centres
Other, namely ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to improve the integration of refugees and immigrants' integration into the labour market/education system • to enhance cooperation on capacity building among the network and external partners • to advise on the context of foreign qualifications only • to promote the understanding of and referencing to the National Framework of Qualifications in the context of education and training and employment • to implement national recognition policy • to improve the opportunities for holders of foreign qualifications of accessing the labour market and/or further study • to support competent bodies for regulated professions 	

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

What activities/services are employed to achieve these objectives... (e.g. making use of guaranteed response times, databases, appeal procedures, etc.) ...

...to ensure fast and fair diploma recognition?

Centre A:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping response time low (normally max. 2 months for individuals and less than 5 working days for others). • Providing information online on recognition, incl. databases with our general assessment standards for some of the best-represented countries among applicants.
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of guaranteed response times: more than 95% of the applications are treated in less than a month, the maximum delay being 4 months • Use of international databases • Development and implementation of an online fee paying request platform • Development of an online fee paying database for HEIs, public administrations and employers, which contains more than 2000 diplomas and a list of 6000 HEIs. First database in French. • Appeal procedures applied
Centre C:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On line open website with downloadable comparability statements free of charge for more than 900 qualifications worldwide • Service provided on request by members of the public responding to individuals by email or phone calls
Centre D:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • making use of guaranteed response times, databases, appeal procedures
Centre E:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal standards for provision of services (encompassing processing times, information provision, etc.). • Development of internal methodological guidelines and information tools (country profiles, assessment checklists, etc.). • Decision making processes, which ensure that methodology and practice are followed (a special decision-making procedure in difficult cases). • The possibility of external appeal in pre-court institutions (and courts as well). • Review and improvement of services and methodology (quality management system in place; voluntary external evaluation by SQUARE methodology and standards). • Internal organisation of work (new staff training, mentoring, sharing of responsibilities, document management system etc.)
Centre F:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Information Centre (AIC) database, patterns of statements • Decisions in most cases are made within 2 weeks. Patterns are used to avoid different decisions in the same situations. Staff is sent to different training seminars, webinars etc.
Centre G:	<p>We offer free of charge services to HEI. Turnaround time is 5 working days. In addition HEI have access to our online Diploma Wizard, where they can find over 10,000 examples of foreign qualifications and where they can generate their own credential evaluation (within a few minutes). Our services to HEI are advisory and the final admission decision is made by the HEI. If the student has a complaint about the admissions decision (s)he can file a complaint/make an appeal at the HEI.</p>
Centre H:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Every enquiry will be dealt with within 10-15 working days 2. The International Comparisons database catalogues all recognition decisions 3. A bespoke CRM [customer relationship management] system to monitor, track and record all enquiries 4. There is a published code of practice for our enquiry service 5. There is an established appeals procedure 6. We have an external monitoring group comprised of stakeholders from the HE, VET, employers and professional bodies sector, as well as the appropriate government department.

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

... to contribute to the implementation of the LRC?

Centre A:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the LRC in national legislation, including the possibility of issuing a background report for refugees without documentation. • Annual information seminars for HEI's about recognition and admission, including good practice in recognition based on LRC and the EAR manuals.
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborating with the HEIs to disseminate the good practices in the diploma recognition field • Use of the LRC criteria and apply it to qualifications assessments • Use of qualifications frameworks (NQF and EQF) in the recognition statement • Enhance the use of QFs, LCR criteria and other mobility tools among HEIs, employers and public administrations
Centre C:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researching and evaluating new qualifications and adding them to our website/ database as efficiently as possible so that they are available publicly. • Prioritising countries of interest/demand for researching of qualifications • Keeping informed of relevant new developments which might impact on the services. Arrival of groups of refugees • Reporting to senior management on statistics
Centre D:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making use of guaranteed response times, databases, appeal procedures, recognition of refugees qualifications
Centre E:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting of national legislation and internal standards, which are in line with the LRC • Participation in development and testing common tools within the ENIC/NARIC community (co-development of EAR Manual, EAR-HEI Manual, STREAM platform, SQUARE typology and methodology, approaches to automatic recognition etc.; input into development of recommendations adopted by LRC Committee) • Incorporating international tools developed within the framework of the LRC, such as the EAR manual, into national practices. • Common methodological guidelines, which are followed by our office and HEI • Quality assurance of recognition activities of HEIs (updated external QA methodologies on study programme evaluations and institutional reviews implemented by the national QA agency; monitoring of recognition decisions taken by HEIs).
Centre F:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation in ENIC/NARIC meetings, workshops, projects • Information of broader public about LRC • Following LRC principles when evaluating degrees outside LRC area
Centre G:	<p>We evaluate foreign qualifications along the principles of the LRC. New credential evaluators are trained in the principles of the LRC by their peers and through the online training course. In 2012 our procedures were peer-reviewed, along the principles of the LRC.</p>
Centre H:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our code of practice is in line with the LRC • We work with the HE and VET sectors, professional bodies, and regulatory authorities to ensure the principles of the LRC are upheld. • We have provided capacity building for emerging ENIC and NARIC centres to ensure the principles of the LRC are implemented.

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

... to ensure consistent decision making?

Centre A:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Databases. Providing information online on recognition incl. databases with our general assessment standards for some of the best-represented countries among applicants. Standards of assessment based on the principles in the LRC and implemented in national legislation. Internal quality system among case processors.
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participating in meetings, working groups, PLA on policy making (LRC implementation, development and use of Qualifications Frameworks, Europass, Diploma Supplement, etc.); Taking part in an advisory group for ministerial meetings on bilateral recognition agreements; Taking part in national working groups for ministerial meetings to develop and implement: QFs, DS, LRC
Centre C:	Using reliable reference tools such as National Frameworks and well established sources of authoritative information
Centre D:	internal database of all evaluated cases, consultation with colleagues in other countries, training for HEI admission officers
Centre E:	<p>In our office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal office process, including tools and decision making procedures, which support consistent decision making Deviations in practice have to be explained and approved by a special internal staff meeting <p>On national level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common methodological guidelines, which are followed by our office and HEI General recommendations regarding assessment of individual qualifications by country available on our website Recommendations issued to HEI upon request.
Centre F:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic information centre evaluations as basis for decision-making Patterns are used to avoid different decisions in the same situation Internal check of decisions for qualifications evaluated firstly
Centre G:	To support consistent decision making, our (internal) database keeps a record of previous credential evaluations and allows for easy comparison. HEI can make use of the Diploma Wizard and have free access to 86 country modules, with detailed descriptions of foreign education systems and a comparison to national qualifications at system level. The country modules are regularly updated and new (additional) country modules are developed every year.
Centre H:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation of new qualifications is submitted to a committee for review and agreement on a final decision. The evaluation of qualifications is documented and the precedent is then recorded for future use within the International Comparisons database. The International Comparisons database is available to the ENIC-NARIC network, and all national universities and admissions system, to ensure a consistent message is relayed to individuals

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

... to support incoming and outgoing student/employment mobility?

Centre A:	Information targeted towards the particular target groups published on the website
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving information about the national procedures for the recognition of qualifications • Establishing a comparability statement to individuals applying for an assessment of their qualifications (giving an NQF level and EQF level when possible)
Centre C:	Promotion of ENIC-NARIC services via communications to HEI and relevant stakeholders
Centre D:	training for HEI admission officers, information and consulting service for HEIs
Centre E:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issuance of information letters to holders of national qualifications, which do not have a Diploma Supplement providing information on the level and function of the qualification • Recommendations regarding assessment of qualifications to HEIs and employers • Information on the national education and recognition systems available on our website • Information on foreign systems of education in a restricted area of our website available to HEIs • Consultations regarding national qualifications to ENIC/NARICs and other bodies
Centre F:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information seminars on most popular countries for HEIs • Cooperation with immigration office • Giving information about national qualifications to ENIC/NARIC members, individuals, foreign HEIs
Centre G:	Incoming mobility: In addition to the free service for HEI (see above), we offer a paid service for individuals. This is often used for the purpose of entering the national labour market. Costs are €149 and turnaround time is 4 weeks. An internal appeal procedure is available, in case of complaints. For home students who want to study abroad we check the quality of foreign higher education programmes (necessary if they want to make use of a national scholarship/student loan while studying abroad).
Centre H:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The centre provides a number of services to individuals including statements of comparability for employment and progression to further study to individuals with overseas qualifications, career path reports, and tailored statements for employment or training in specific sectors. 2. The centre provides a membership service providing advice and guidance on overseas qualifications to admitting institutions and employers receiving applications from individuals with overseas qualifications. 3. The centre provides information on the national education system to external ENIC-NARIC agencies, employers and institutions on request. 4. The centre directs individuals to the relevant foreign ENIC-NARIC centre for outgoing purposes

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

... to support the recruitment of students/employees?

Centre A:	Hotline services for higher education institutions (help with admission) and for employers (facilitate recruitment).
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving information about diploma recognition and the regulated professions • Establishing a comparability statement to individuals applying for an assessment of their qualifications (giving an NQF level and EQF level when possible) • Proposing an online fee paying database for HIEs, public administrations and employers, containing more than 2000 diplomas and a list of 6000 HEIs. First database in national language
Centre C:	Promotions.... Mailing, emailing and development of web based materials and availing of opportunities to promote the services to stakeholders at public events and stakeholders events
Centre D:	transparency with individuals and employers, databases that are available for employers and individuals, information service
Centre E:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information seminars on most popular countries for HEIs • Prepare statements for competent bodies, etc.
Centre F:	Incoming mobility: In addition to the free service for HEI (see above), we offer a paid service for individuals. This is often used for the purpose of entering the national labour market. Costs are €149 and turnaround time is 4 weeks. An internal appeal procedure is available, in case of complaints. For home students who want to study abroad we check the quality of foreign higher education programmes (necessary if they want to make use of a national scholarship/student loan while studying abroad).
Centre G:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The centre has provided research studies on particular sectors and occupations to inform recruitment strategies for national and international government departments, professional bodies and employers. 2. The centre provides training on specific regional education systems to inform employers and admitting institutions as to the similarities and differences of education systems 3. The centre provides access on a membership basis to a database of overseas qualification from over 200 countries, territories and former territories worldwide. 4. The centre provides statements of comparability for individuals looking for employment or further study opportunities

Recognition decisions (including grade conversions and comparability statements)

Other	<p>Centre A: To improve the integration of refugees and immigrants' integration into the labour market/ education:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Obligation for local communities to inform about the possibility of recognition (revised integration act from June 2016) 2. Hotline established by ENIC/NARIC targeted at asylum centres and local integration authorities: 3. Wide range of information activities by ENIC/NARIC targeted towards asylum and job centres responsible for integration <p>Centre B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To contribute to the drafting of bilateral agreements • To participate in the inter-ministerial committees for diploma recognition <p>Centre C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive following up where issues regarding understanding of our services when required. • Translation into other languages if required. • Reporting quarterly on activity within parent organisation <p>Centre D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve the opportunities for holders of foreign qualifications of accessing the labour market and/or further study • A variety of services offered to individuals that can apply to our office for recognition, information, or guidance. <p>Centre E:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information on recognition of regulated professions • Prepare statements for competent bodies of foreign qualification in regulated professions <p>Centre F:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support HEIs to meet the requirements of immigration authorities through the validation of Chinese qualifications.
-------	---

What is the approximate annual number of assessments that you make for ...

individuals?	HEIs?	competent authorities in the regulated professions?
Centre A: 3,100	Centre A: 770	Centre A: 70
Centre B:	Centre B: Unfortunately, we don't have any statistical data regarding the number of assessments for HEIs.	Centre B: The national ENIC NARIC does not assess qualifications for regulated professions
In 2016, we had:	Centre C: not done directly	Centre C: not our role
• 23717 application files submitted	Centre D: n/a	Centre D: n/a
• 15240 application files for paid assessment	Centre E: Most of them are handled as assessments for individuals	Centre E: Most of them are handled as assessments for individuals
• 2228 free assessments (for refugees)	Centre F: ~7,000	Centre F: ~100
In all, 17626 requests assessed	Centre G: 20,166 in 2016	Centre G: 513 in 2016
Centre C: nil response	Centre H: 18,761	Centre H: 1,509
Centre D: not applicable		
Centre E: 3,500		
Centre F: ~ 800		
Centre G: 6,250 in 2016		
Centre H: 64,026		

Has demand for this service in the past three years...

declined?	In no centre has demand declined
remained steady?	Centre X: Yes, at the very least, but hard to know as our services changed radically in this period.
risen?	Centre Y: The demand has risen the last three years. For example, in 2016 the demand has risen at a rate of 14% since 2015 (15,198 requests assessed)
	Six centres reported rising demand, without comment

General information provision

What is the objective of your information provision?	Please tick as many boxes as appropriate
To remove obstacles to student mobility	All eight centres
To support individuals who are looking for an assessment of their qualifications	All eight centres
To support third parties (HEIs, employers, authorities) who are looking for an assessment of foreign qualifications	All eight centres
<p>Other, namely, ...</p> <p>Centre A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about national qualifications framework and EQF and EHEA-framework. Supporting all types of national educational institutions in relation to admission of individuals with foreign qualifications. Supporting integration initiatives. <p>Centre B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To inform about the regulated professions and orientate the individuals to the authority in charge (and the right procedures to follow) To inform the ENIC-NARIC networks or other stakeholders on the national education system <p>Centre C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide advisory historical information contextualising a qualification which may not be on a framework at all To implement national policy <p>Centre D: To support third parties (HEIs, employers, authorities), which require information on various aspects of foreign systems of education in their international and other activities.</p>	

General information provision

What activities/services are employed to achieve these objectives... (e.g. providing country information on website, telephone service, brochures, social media, etc.)

... to remove obstacles to student mobility?

Centre A:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing general information on recognition online. • Providing country information on website - incl. our general assessment standards for some of the countries from which we receive the most educational qualifications • Telephone service; brochures; providing LinkedIn news; hotline services to HEIs.
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call centre / mail service (the responses are sent by the latest in 24 hours) • Brochures; social media; website (that we improved in 2015)
Centre C:	Website, web mail and phone, some drop in services but this is not the preferred option
Centre D:	providing clear and transparent information on website, information service via e-mail
Centre E:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing as much information as possible is currently feasible on our website, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on the national system of education • Database of foreign systems of education (for registered users, in the national language) • General recommendations regarding assessment to HEIs • Information on the recognition system • Tools for conversion of grades, etc. • Providing answers to specific requests regarding various aspects of systems of education upon request, such as regarding grading systems, recognition status, degree structure, etc. • Issuing recommendations regarding assessment to higher education institutions • Issuing recognition decisions to individuals who want to study
Centre F:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general country information on website • Telephone service, e-mails for individual questions • Statements on national qualifications on request
Centre G:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We offer online information about the national education system and on credential evaluation services. • Our information centre is available during working hours for telephone queries. • 86 country modules with detailed descriptions of foreign education systems and a comparison to the national education system are freely accessible both in the national language and in English. The country modules contain a reference to the NQF and to the EQF. • A related department specialises in removing social and legal obstacles to student mobility. For instance by providing English language information on immigration procedures and by training student support officers at HEI on immigration procedures.
Centre H:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training is provided to VET and HE admissions staff, employers and professional bodies on a variety of topics relating to recognition. The centre has developed an online database: International Comparisons database providing information on different countries' education systems and qualifications

General information provision

... to support individuals who are looking for an assessment of their qualifications?	
Centre A:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing general information on recognition online. • Providing country information on website - incl. our general assessment standards for some of the countries from which we receive the most educational qualifications from. • Telephone service; brochures.
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call centre / mail service • Social media • Website
Centre C:	website, web mail and phone, some drop in services but this is not the preferred option
Centre D:	providing clear and transparent information on website, information service via e-mail
Centre E:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issuing recognition decisions to individuals who want to study; • Providing general information and advice on recognition on our website, in brochures, over the phone, by e-mail, etc. • Issuance of information letters to holders of national qualifications, which do not have a Diploma Supplement providing information on the level and function of the qualification.
Centre F:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • individual descriptions of concrete qualification • providing information on ENIC/NARIC website and other information tools
Centre G:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We offer online information about the national education system and on credential evaluation services. • Our information centre is available during working hours for telephone queries. • 86 country modules with detailed descriptions of foreign education systems and a comparison to the national education system are freely accessible both in the national language and in English. The country modules contain a reference to the NQF and to the EQF. <p>A related department specialises in removing social and legal obstacles to student mobility. For instance by providing English language information on immigration procedures and by training student support officers at HEI on immigration procedures.</p>
Centre H:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We provide an individual assessment service online; individuals can apply for Statements of Comparability. • The National Careers Service has access to our International Comparisons database to inform any advice they provide to international job seekers. • We direct home citizens to the relevant ENIC-NARIC centre in the destination country.

General information provision

... to support third parties (HEIs, employers, authorities) who are looking for an assessment of foreign qualifications?	
Centre A:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing general information on recognition online. • Providing country information on website - incl. our general assessment standards for some of the countries from which we receive the most educational qualifications. • Telephone service; brochures. • Providing hotline services with general statements on qualifications presented (labour market and integration perspective).
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call centre/mail service • Online fee paying database • Trainings • Website and ad hoc interventions
Centre C:	Website, web mail and phone, some drop in services but this is not the preferred option
Centre D:	providing country information on website, providing clear and transparent information on website, information service via e-mail
Centre E:	Issuing recommendations regarding assessment to higher education institutions, employers, or other authorities;
Centre F:	Academic information centre statements serve as a basis for recognition decision
Centre G:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We offer online information about the national education system and on credential evaluation services. • Our information centre is available during working hours for telephone queries. • 86 country modules with detailed descriptions of foreign education systems and a comparison to the national education system are freely accessible both in the national language and in English. The country modules contain a reference to the NQF and to the EQF. <p>A related department specialises in removing social and legal obstacles to student mobility. For instance by providing English language information on immigration procedures and by training student support officers at HEI on immigration procedures. see above</p>
Centre H:	We support particular sectors providing tailored systems to provide individual recognition of appropriate qualifications leading to employment in a specific occupation, or access to a training pathway.
Other:	<p>Centre A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing general information on recognition online directed towards refugees with educational qualifications. Hotline services to all kind of educational institutions in relation to admission and municipality jobcentres working with integration <p>Centre B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual reports, newsletters, information on conferences, meetings, workshops <p>Centre C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding bodies which award funds on the basis of individual applications with lower levels of qualifications. Visa granting authorities for residency permits. <p>Centre D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To support third parties (HEIs, employers, authorities), which require information on various aspects of foreign systems of education in their international and other activities: • Providing answers to specific requests regarding various aspects of systems of education upon request, such as regarding grading systems, recognition status, degree structure, etc.

General information provision

What is the approximate annual number of telephone inquiries and website views?

Centre A:	Telephone inquiries: no data available. Website views: 740,000.
Centre B:	41,242 calls received in 2016 (70,130 calls received in 2015); 1,237,664 website views in 2016 *We have also answered to 19,907 email information inquiries (18,961 in 2015).
Centre C:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2016 figs - In 2016 we responded to approx. 2,800 requests for academic recognition advice via email, post and our on-line help services. • Our website is now the main source of recognition advice where individuals can access comparability statements for their foreign academic qualifications which compare their qualifications in the context of the National Framework of Qualifications. The number of qualifications listed in the database increased from 700 to 870 by year end. • Website analytics for 2016 indicate that there were almost 46,000 individual visits to the relevant country pages of listed qualifications. • The top 5 country website pages accessed were Brazil, UK, Poland, Spain, and Croatia. • The Information Services unit also provides a significant amount of advice regarding national qualifications and their recognition status as a member of the ENIC-NARIC network and in a general information context.
Centre D:	website views: 386,693 (exactly one year); no telephone service
Centre E:	Approx. 6,400 individual specific queries over the phone and e-mail; approx. 78,000 individual website views
Centre F:	~ 20 telephone consultations per day; web-site views – no info
Centre G:	78,649 phone calls, 8,666 email enquiries, 52,615 web enquiries and 10,538,027 page views of the website

Approximately how many of these inquiries come from clients located outside your country?

Centre A:	Website views: 45 %
Centre B:	Unfortunately, we don't have any statistical data regarding this question.
Centre C:	We don't know the origins. The top 5 country website pages accessed were Brazil, UK, Poland, Spain, and Croatia.
Centre D:	40%
Centre E:	34%
Centre F:	~7 per day
Centre G:	Telephone inquiries app. 6,000 per year (this is a rough estimation as we don't keep records). Our online country modules receive the largest number of views: 241,657 views in 2016
Centre H:	We do not distinguish between inquiries.

Has demand for this service in the past three years...

declined?	One centre
remained steady?	One centre
risen?	Six centres

Training and conferences

What is the objective of your training programmes and conferences?		Please tick as many boxes as appropriate
To share knowledge and competences in order to make reliable credential evaluations		All eight centres
To share knowledge of education systems or other topics (namely...		All eight centres
To share/discuss new developments in recognition practice and policy		All eight centres
Other, namely...	<p>Centre A: The policy of the centre is mostly to participate in conferences, training seminar and workshops organised of other stakeholders in order to reach as far out as possible and overcome a wide range of information and sharing of knowledge activities</p> <p>Centre B: to share/discuss procedures of assessments (e.g. refugees' qualifications' assessments, automatic recognition, recognition of non-formal training or unaccomplished studies....) to enhance the use of mobility tools, and the implementation of the LCR</p> <p>Centre C: to raise awareness about our services</p> <p>Centre D: to familiarise national HEIs with the LRC and its principles</p>	

Which are the main beneficiary stakeholder groups...	
... for sharing knowledge and competences in order to make reliable credential evaluations?	
Centre A:	HEIs, public administrations, foreign ministries, employers (private)
Centre B:	Where appropriate we share our expertise with relevant bodies
Centre C:	HEI admission officers and policy makers
Centre D:	HEIs and other bodies involved in recognition (such as the national research council)
Centre E:	HEI administration staff, policy makers
Centre F:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NARIC online course – for credential evaluators in the ENIC-NARIC networks • Credential Evaluation Course (CEC) – online course for credential evaluation professionals (admissions officers at HEI or working at other recognition authorities/ employers) • Training 'credential evaluation in 10 steps' – one day face to face training programme for national HEIs (admissions officers, staff of international department, HR managers)
Centre G:	HEIs and VET colleges admissions staff

Training and conferences

... for sharing knowledge of education systems or other topics?

Centre A:	HEIs
Centre B:	HEIs, public administrations, NGOs involved in higher education, foreign ministries
Centre C:	Where appropriate we share our knowledge to advise on these topics
Centre D:	HEI admission officers and policy makers
Centre E:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEIs and other bodies involved in recognition (such as the national research council) • high school graduates aiming to study abroad
Centre F:	HEI administration staff, competent authorities for regulated professions
Centre G:	Tailor made training programmes are offered upon request. For instance on foreign education systems or recognition of refugee qualifications.
Centre H:	HEIs and FE colleges admissions staff, compliance staff, course leaders, marketing and recruitment staff, credential evaluators and staff from professional and occupational bodies

... for sharing /discussing new developments in recognition practice and policy?

Centre A:	HEIs, domestic and foreign ministries, QA agencies
Centre B:	Where opportunities arise we take them to ensure our materials are up to date and are disseminated to stakeholders
Centre C:	HEI admission officers and policy makers
Centre D:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEIs and other bodies involved in recognition (such as the national research council) • Ministry of Education and Science
Centre E:	HEI administration staff
Centre F:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An annual meeting day is organised for admissions officers at HEIs. During the meeting day workshops are organised on topical issues (last year e.g. the Syrian education system) • We participate in the National Admissions Officers meeting of research universities and universities of applied sciences. Meetings are every 3 months and are intended to support information sharing/knowledge exchange between HEI/Admissions offices. • We organise meetings and conferences as part of the EU-funded NARIC projects. Often these have an international scope and allow for information sharing/knowledge exchange with partners at home and abroad. Topics of meetings in 2016/2017 were: automatic recognition of foreign qualifications, recognition of MOOCs and other new forms of learning.
Centre G:	HEIs and VET colleges admissions staff, credential evaluators and staff from professional and occupational bodies

Training and conferences

... for other objectives?	
Centre A:	Jobcentres, integration stakeholders
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To share/discuss procedures of assessments (e.g. refugees' qualifications' assessments, automatic recognition, recognition of non-formal training or unaccomplished studies....) HEIs, public administrations, NGOs involved in higher education, foreign ministries To enhance the use of mobility tools, and the implementation of the LCR HEIs, public administrations, foreign ministries, employers (private), QA agencies
Centre C:	To raise awareness about our services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employers Students Public authorities
Centre D:	To familiarise home HEIs with the LRC and its principles. The LRC and its principles are actively promoted in and form the basis of all our (online) training courses.
Centre E:	HEIs and VET colleges admissions staff, compliance staff, course leaders, marketing and recruitment staff, credential evaluators and staff from professional and occupational bodies

What is the approximate annual number of training programmes and conferences that you organise?	
Centre A:	2
Centre B:	Around 10 trainings a year and an annual conference
Centre C:	0
Centre D:	5-10
Centre E:	2 to 3 per year
Centre F:	1-2 per year
Centre G:	About 10 face to face trainings and 10 meetings/conferences in 2016. The online trainings courses are offered continually.
Centre H:	50-60

Has demand for this service in the past three years...	
declined?	Nowhere has demand declined
remained steady?	Two centres
risen?	Five centres

Is your training provision systematically evaluated by the beneficiaries?	
Yes:	Six centres
No:	One centre
Not applicable:	One centre

Projects and policy

What is the objective of your projects and policy work?		Please tick as many boxes as appropriate
To improve insight into recognition practice		All eight centres
To develop/extend good practice in recognition		All eight centres
To draft and influence national recognition policy		All eight centres
Other, namely...	Centre A: support integration of refugees and migrants Centre B: add value to our role in generals	

Could you name the two main projects you have been involved in recently?	
All centres were able to name projects, including:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New legislation on integration of refugees and migrants • EAR-projects • Refugees and Recognition, Paradigms, SCAN-D, SCAN-D II, MERIC-NET, RecoLATIN, EU-MTR, Reconow, RENSA, LIREQA, ISOBAC, IMPACT, AURBELL, FAIR, SQUARE, ED2VET • a national project aimed at decentralisation and cohesion of the recognition system • Toolkit for Recognition of Qualifications for refugees or displaced people in a refugee-like situation

Has demand for this type of activity in the past three years...	
declined?	In no centre had demand declined
remained steady?	Three centres
risen?	Four centres

Projects and policy

What role do you play in the national higher education policy making process?

Centre A:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafting of recognition legislation. • Providing knowledge regarding structure and reforms of higher education in other countries
Centre B:	Coordinators and co-coordinators, Associated experts
Centre C:	Our agency is a key player in the education and training sector as an awarding body, quality assurance agency and qualifications authority. Foreign Qualifications recognition is a feature of its activity and policy framework.
Centre D:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice and information to Ministries • Spread culture of recognition and LRC methodology
Centre B:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We usually draft national legislation or its provisions, which is related to recognition of foreign qualifications, and participate in the general development of the system of recognition; • Provide advice and comments regarding the general aspects of higher education policy; • Collect and analyse information regarding relevant policies in other countries, aiding the policy making bodies in their decisions • Contribute to identifying policy goals and implementation mechanisms
Centre C:	Advisory, Academic Information Centre advises on bilateral agreements, legislative proposals to MES
Centre D:	An advisory role. We provide expertise on credential evaluation and act as a sparring partner for the responsible ministry.
Centre E:	<p>We provide consultation as required, this can be in any of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at a stakeholder group • Research paper • Response to a public consultation

To which main policy fields do you make a contribution?

Centre A:	Integration of refugees. Recognition legislation.
Centre B:	Recognition / bilateral agreements, ministerial committees (boards).
Centre C:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of qualifications • New qualifications development • NQF review
Centre D:	education and research
Centre E:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic recognition • Higher education • Transfer of credits • Admission policies • Internationalisation policies • Implementation of Bologna tools • Development of the qualifications framework
Centre F:	HE policy, NQF, recognition of foreign qualifications in regulated professions
Centre G:	Recognition of foreign qualifications, Bologna process/integration of the EHEA, recognition and admission of refugees
Centre H:	education, immigration

Projects and policy

Give one example of your input to policy development/decision making in the last 5 years? What did you achieve?

All eight centres provided examples of input to policy- and decision-making. These included:

- Contributing to the improvement of integration of refugees and immigrants' integration into the labour market/education (including language assessment of refugees)
- New legislation implementing the EU-directive on recognition of professional qualifications
- Use of Qualifications frameworks and LRC criteria for establishing bilateral recognition agreements
- Use of Qualifications frameworks and LRC criteria during the ministerial committee's work on access to civil service employment
- Guidelines for University admission officers in the admission of foreign students; decentralisation of the national academic recognition system
- New national legislation on Science and Higher Education
- Contribution to development of international instruments, such as EAR family manuals, SQUARE standards, database of diplomas (SCAN-D), exploration of automatic recognition concept
- Drafts of regional agreements on mutual automatic recognition
- Report on automatic recognition in teacher training

Immigration; inquiries from refugees and asylum-seekers

Do you currently provide an advisory service for refugees and asylum seekers?

Yes: seven centres

No: one centre (refugees may be clients, but do not constitute a discrete category)

What is the objective of your service?

Please tick as many boxes as appropriate

To provide information to immigration services Six centres

To integrate refugees into education / the labour market Six centres

To issue background papers to refugees who lack documentation of their educational qualifications Six centres

What is the approximate annual number of assessments you make for refugees?

Centre A: 1000

Centre B: 2228 assessments (in 2016); 47% more than 2015 (1481 assessments)

Centre C: Very small numbers. Google analytics indicate some website traffic and we have had a handful of calls regarding Syrian qualifications recognition. We have ensured that we have information available if needed.

Centre D: around 100 comparability statements (for free); about 400 requests helping universities to evaluate refugees qualifications

Centre E: 10-15

Centre F: 1-2

Centre G: 2,847 in 2016

Centre H: We don't distinguish between individuals

Immigration; inquiries from refugees and asylum-seekers

Has demand for this service in the past three years...

declined? In no centre has demand declined

remained steady? One centre

risen? Five centres

Do you or did you contribute to the elaboration of policy for the integration of refugees/asylum seekers? If yes, please explain.

Seven centres had been active: in general consultancy, in drafting legislation, in developing targeted recognition procedure and providing free credential evaluations.

Feedback

Do you have mechanisms for assessing and improving the scope of your activities and the quality of your decisions?

Centre A: Client surveys carried out by the office.

Centre B: Not for the moment

Centre C: We initiated a survey monkey feedback survey in 2016 to gather some basic feedback from end users. It was a small survey but overall a positive indicator. Some areas for improvement have been identified.

Centre D: not formally established, but we receive lots of positive feedback on the procedures

Centre E:

- Client surveys
- External appeals
- General feedback from the beneficiaries
- Internal thematic events to discuss our practice and its adherence to the good practice

Centre F: Academic information centre is supervised by MES

Centre G:

- The centre is ISO-certified and therefore our procedures are externally reviewed every year. This means that we have a quality assurance system based on plan-do-check-act cycles, feedback from clients, and management reviews.
- We have regular meetings with HEI through the national admissions officers meetings (see above) and at the annual meeting day. Where possible, feed-back received during these meetings is used to make improvements
- Trainings are evaluated structurally
- The client survey asks about our credential evaluation services, but has a much wider scope (covering all activities of the organisation)

Centre H:

- Yes, we invite each individual applicant to provide feedback about the whole service, including the quality of the decisions that we have made. The surveys are sent out on a rolling basis throughout the year.
- We also survey users of the service within our member organisations. This is an annual survey sent out in May. It includes questions about the quality of our decisions. The responses are used to help us further develop our services.

Could you undertake client surveys in June 2017?

The client surveys will consist of a standardised questionnaire to be developed by the IMPACT project team. For the purpose of the IMPACT assessment, four client groups have been identified. Please indicate, for each client group, if you are able to send out a client survey as well as the possible scale of the survey.

HEIs	
Yes, more than 10	Six centres
Yes, fewer than 10	Two centres
No, not at all. If no, please say why	
Employers	
Yes, more than 10	Four centres
Yes, fewer than 10	One centre
No, not at all. If no, please say why	Centre X: because we don't have direct contact with employers Centre Y: Academic information centre does not work with concrete employers Centre Z: We have no direct contact with employers. Applications are submitted by individuals
Public authorities (including ministries, immigration authorities and other competent authorities)	
Yes. Which authorities?	Centre A: Yes - a number of competent authorities that we cooperate with in relation to regulated professions. Centre B: Ministries, Immigration authorities, Chambers of Crafts, ministerial committees Centre C: Public jobs; competent authorities; relevant ministries/sectoral bodies Centre D: Three ministries Centre E: Two ministries and one public insurance fund Centre F: One ministry and its executive agency Centre G: All competent authorities, two ministries
No, not at all. If no, please say why	Centre X: Academic information centre does not work directly with public authorities only on case by case basis
Individuals	
Yes, 2% of the annual applications is feasible	Four centres
Yes, less than 2% of the annual applications (in real numbers surveys)	Nil response
No, not at all. If no, please say why	Centre A: We have a very busy schedule in 2017 - it would demand too many resources Centre B: we don't have a database of individuals who asked for our service Centre C: It is not possible due to procedure Centre D: Not possible as a result of privacy regulations

Part B The impact of the ENIC-NARIC networks on your centre

What services does your agency receive from the networks and with what impact (positive/negative, major/minor)? Please explain your answer.

Access to information and knowledge exchange about subjects related to credential evaluation and foreign education systems

<i>Positive impact</i>	<p>Centre A: 'exchanges on the network server on recognition related issues worldwide; databases, colleagues' experience shared by mail'</p> <p>Centre B: 'we learn from the other ENIC-NARICs on a daily basis'</p> <p>Centre C: project participation and 'good use of the List serve, to inform and develop our capacity in credential evaluation'</p> <p>A further five centres reported positive impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Negative impact</i>	Nil response
<i>Major impact</i>	<p>Centre X: 'exchange of good practice to reorganise and improve our activities: the development of our online request platform'</p> <p>Centre Y: 'the network is one of the most important tools in knowledge exchange.'</p> <p>One another centre reported major impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Minor impact</i>	One centre reported: 'inspiration to implement new practices and processes in our processing of cases.'

Training of staff

<i>Positive impact</i>	<p>Three centres cited the online training course and the annual meeting of ENIC NARIC Networks for new credential evaluators. The listserve and ONREQ were also mentioned.</p> <p>A further three centres reported positive impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Negative impact</i>	Nil response
<i>Major impact</i>	<p>Centre A cited 'information exchange/quality assurance'</p> <p>Centre B reported: 'annual meeting: treat new subjects of common interest, find common solutions, draft common guidelines'</p>
<i>Minor impact</i>	<p>Centre C commented that 'the primary responsibility for training of staff lies with our own centre; network meetings complement these.'</p> <p>Two centres mentioned the online training programme.</p>

What services does your agency receive from the networks and with what impact (positive/negative, major/minor)? Please explain your answer.

Information regarding supra-national legislation (e.g. EU Directives, Decisions, Recommendations), policy and good practice

<i>Positive impact</i>	Centre A cited 'the implementation of the LRC and EU directives' A further four centres reported positive impact, without specifying.
<i>Negative impact</i>	Nil response
<i>Major impact</i>	Centre B commented that 'our recognition policy and practice is in line with the LRC.' Centre C pointed to the 'clear legal framework which helps to enhance their use and awareness at national level'
<i>Minor impact</i>	Centre X commented that 'the exchange with other centres is valuable, but legislation concerning recognition is a national responsibility' Centre Y: 'consultations in drafting legislation and developing guidance on good practice, as well information provision on them are essential.' Centre Z: 'This information is provided by the government, to ensure appropriate understanding and implementation of the various directives, decisions and recommendations. The networks provide an opportunity to discuss implementation.' One other centre reported minor impact, without specifying.

Advice on how to assure the quality of your own services

<i>Positive impact</i>	Five centres reported positive impact, without specifying.
<i>Negative impact</i>	Nil response
<i>Major impact</i>	Centre A cited the 'inspiration to implement new practices and processes in our case processing' Centre B cited 'the development of our online request platform' One other centre reported major impact, without specifying.
<i>Minor impact</i>	Centre X mentioned 'projects like SQUARE or IMPACT [which] help to evaluate the quality of our centres.' Centre Y noted that 'the topic of quality assurance of recognition services is only starting to be developed within the network, but it has great potential.' Centre Z pointed to its 'long established code of practice and accountab[ility] to an external monitoring group which ensures [...] the relevance [...] quality, consistency and robustness of the service [...].' It added that projects such as SQUARE and IMPACT have little influence on existing practice; instead they provide a forum for sharing experiences centres.

What services does your agency receive from the networks and with what impact (positive/negative, major/minor)? Please explain your answer.

Peer review mechanisms	
<i>Positive impact</i>	<p>Centre A commented: 'very interesting to self-evaluate our work and understand how our colleagues work. The feedback from our colleagues was very helpful.'</p> <p>A further two centres reported positive impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Negative impact</i>	<p>Nil response</p>
<i>Major impact</i>	<p>Centre B valued 'having a point of view of a peer who works in the same field'</p> <p>A further three centres reported major impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Minor impact</i>	<p>There were two comments. One centre noted that 'the peer reviews within the network have started only recently, but it has great potential and should be developed further.'</p> <p>Another indicated that 'we participate in study visits, and partnership projects which provide an opportunity for each centre involved to reflect on their own practices and context and to consider potential improvements or efficiencies.'</p>

Publicity for your activities	
<i>Positive impact</i>	<p>Centre A confirmed: 'communication of our activities on social media and network website'</p> <p>A second centre commented positively on the listserve.</p> <p>A further two centres reported positive impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Negative impact</i>	<p>Nil response</p>
<i>Major impact</i>	<p>Two centres reported major impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Minor impact</i>	<p>Centre Y commented that 'the update of the information needs to be improved'.</p> <p>Centre Z noted that 'the network provides the opportunity to disseminate quickly and widely regarding activities but also reforms in-country that can impact recognition practices.'</p> <p>A further two centres reported minor impact, without specifying.</p>

Facilitation of inter-centre collaboration, including meetings, conferences, online forums, etc.	
<i>Positive impact</i>	<p>Centre A: 'it's really easy to get in contact with the colleagues and collaborate online'</p> <p>Centre B confirmed that 'the ENIC NARIC conference, meetings and project call provides ample opportunity to develop and take forward new and innovative ideas and practice within an appropriate and relevant forum.'</p> <p>A further five centres reported positive impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Negative impact</i>	<p>Nil response</p>
<i>Major impact</i>	<p>Three centres pointed to the scope for exchanging good practice.</p> <p>Another centre reported major impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Minor impact</i>	<p>Nil response</p>

What services does your agency receive from the networks and with what impact (positive/negative, major/minor)? Please explain your answer.

Opportunity to provide feedback on the performance of the networks

<i>Positive impact</i>	Three centres reported positive impact, without specifying.
<i>Negative impact</i>	One centre registered negative impact, without specifying.
<i>Major impact</i>	Nil response
<i>Minor impact</i>	<p>Centre X: 'From our point of view, there is not enough visibility of the impact of the network at an international level (another region).'</p> <p>Centre Y added that 'there is no performance of the network; it could not be evaluated'</p> <p>Centre Z, however, reported that it 'regularly provide[s] feedback to the commission and the network'</p> <p>A further two centres reported minor impact, without specifying.</p>

Targeted support for your interface with immigration authorities, refugee and asylum-seeking inquirers

<i>Positive impact</i>	<p>Centre A: 'it gives a legal and regional framework'</p> <p>Centre B: 'The meetings with the other ENIC-NARICs on this topic help to get an idea of what can be done'</p> <p>A further two centres reported positive impact, without specifying.</p>
<i>Negative impact</i>	Nil response
<i>Major impact</i>	One centre reported major impact, without specifying.
<i>Minor impact</i>	<p>Centre X explained that 'the procedures are national and different from country to country'</p> <p>A further two centres reported minor impact, without specifying.</p>

Annex 3

Impact assessment Part C – Major European stakeholder bodies

The request to participate in this survey was addressed to twelve bodies operating at European level in the fields of higher education and research. They included one EU institution, one inter-governmental organisation, the four Bologna consultative bodies and other NGOs. Six responses were received, the contents of which are set out below.

Do you consult ENIC-NARIC websites for information and with what frequency?

Frequently	2
Occasionally	4
Not at all	zero

Do you normally go first to the www.enic-naric.net site or to the website of the agency of the country in which you are based?

To www.enic-naric.net	4
To the national site	1

What types of information do you look for on the ENIC-NARIC website?

Respondents listed the following:

- Current news and details of relevant future events
- Contact details of ENIC-NARIC centres
- ENIC-NARIC conference documentation
- Information on national qualification frameworks, on the LRC and on accredited HEIs and degree mills

One respondent reported that it referred incoming inquiries to ENIC-NARIC sites whenever appropriate.

Do you find on the websites the information that you require?

Always	zero
Usually	6
Never	zero

How easy is it to obtain what you require from the websites?

Easy	1
Variable	5
Difficult	zero

If it is difficult, please say in what way

Two respondents cited outdated contacts and hyperlinks. One pointed to the lack of information on the ENIC Bureau and the NARIC Advisory Board.

If you cannot find what you require, which alternative information source do you turn to?

Respondents turn to personal contacts, national websites (governmental, quality assurance agencies, competent authorities, associations of HEIs, etc.)

Did you or do you participate in EU-funded ENIC-NARIC projects?

Yes	3
No	3

If yes, please indicate which projects. What was your role in the project? With what objective did you participate? What were, in your view, the main results of the project?

Three respondents have been active in numerous projects – as partner or as expert consultant. Seven recognition-focused projects were named in the responses. Their principal outcomes are considered to be: raising the profile of recognition issues; enhancing cooperation between stakeholders; building capacity in the HE sector; promoting and facilitating particular measures (such as joint programmes).

Did you or do you cooperate with ENIC-NARIC bodies in other ways?

Yes	5
No	1

If yes, please explain.

Respondents mentioned reciprocal consultative activities, mutual provision of conference speakers, collaboration in non-ENIC-NARIC projects and working groups, and membership of the ENIC-NARIC listserv network.

Are you familiar with...

the EAR Manual?

Yes	6
No	zero

the EAR-HEI Manual?

Yes	6
No	zero

Do you use...

the EAR Manual?

Yes 2

No 4

the EAR-HEI Manual?

Yes 1

No 5

Do you recommend to clients...

the EAR Manual?

Yes 5

No 1 (response of 'non-applicable')

the EAR-HEI Manual?

Yes 5

No 1 (response of 'non-applicable')

Are you and your colleagues familiar with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and its subsidiary texts?

Yes 6

No zero

Do you have any additional comment to make on your expectations and your experience of the ENIC-NARIC networks?

Responses included 'Keep up the good work!', hopes of further productive collaboration, and a note that 'more promotional work is needed and more cooperation between the worlds of recognition and QA.'

Annex 4

Responses to client group survey – HEIs

Part A of the questionnaire to centres asked about the feasibility of conducting surveys of the main client groups. All eight centres provide services to HEIs. All but one agreed to survey more than 10. Responses came from all eight countries, in cohorts ranging from 2 to 16; the total number was 77.

Which ENIC/NARIC services do you make use of?

a) Information about foreign education systems	48
b) Online database (which provides examples of foreign qualifications and their assessment)	50
c) Credential evaluation service	42
d) Other services, namely...	

HEIs pointed specifically to: the availability of a hotline inquiry service; information on joint programme possibilities, training programmes, and EU-funded projects; grade conversions; and the expertise of country specialists. Some indicated that they used foreign ENIC-NARIC websites in addition to their national service.

When was the last time you consulted the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country?

All within the current year.

Approximately how many administrative units / academic departments in your institution make use of ENIC/NARIC services?

The norm is between one and three central administrators, with number rising to 50 if Faculty and departmental staff are involved in recognition procedures.

How often do you make use of services offered by the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country?

Weekly	42 (some HEIs specifying peak periods)
Monthly	26
Annually	8

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help you to speed up your work?

YES	64
NO	7
DON'T KNOW	5

In what way?

The majority of responses were positive, citing rapid access to relevant information, online databases, comparability statements, training provision, and the facilitation of recognition. Two reservations were expressed: the absence of information on online programmes, and slow turnaround.

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help you to make consistent recognition decisions?

YES	65
NO	3
DON'T KNOW	7

In what way? ...

All comments were positive. They stressed the provision of clear, reliable and consistent information, generating shared good practice; access to training.

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country facilitate international student recruitment?

YES	50
NO	10
DON'T KNOW	15

In what way? ...

HEIs pointed to the extent to which their recognition procedures were facilitated, generating economies of time and labour. They also cited the provision of workshops, marketing and national promotion initiatives.

Have the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country helped you to become familiar with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention?

YES	46
NO	17
DON'T KNOW	13

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help you to apply the LRC in your daily work?

YES	38
NO	11
DON'T KNOW	26

In what way? ...

HEIs emphasised the clarity of information, the prioritisation of fairness, the relevance to refugees, and the opportunity actively to align institutional practice with the LRC.

Have the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country helped you to become familiar with the National and European Qualification Frameworks?

YES	55
NO	11
DON'T KNOW	5

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help you to meet the requirements of the immigration authorities?

YES	27
NO	22
DON'T KNOW	24

In what way? ...

The HEIs responding 'yes' cited their ability to navigate academic and migration requirements, thanks to the information and assistance received. While one commented that ENIC-NARIC information is not always consistent with other national information sources, the bulk of the 'no' and 'don't know' responses came from HEIs with no direct involvement in immigration matters.

Did you participate in a training activity/workshop or conference organised by the ENIC/NARIC centre? Please indicate:

Name of conference / training event / workshop	Multiple responses from a range of HEIs
Date:	Between 2015 and 2017
Topic:	<p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • national ENIC-NARIC conferences • ENQA conference • refugee issues • presentations on foreign HE systems • internationalisation strategies • fraudulent documentation • International Baccalaureate • immigration requirements • training of admissions officers

What were the main results of these conferences/trainings/workshops for you and HEI that you represent?

a) Gained knowledge and competencies in order to make reliable credential evaluations	39
b) Gained knowledge of foreign education systems or other topics, namely...	38
c) Gained knowledge about new developments in recognition practice and policy	33
d) Other, namely...	9

Among the other benefits accruing were:

the opportunity to meet relevant third parties such as the immigration authorities; networking; enhanced knowledge of foreign HE systems; better understanding of procedures for refugees and of the recognition of informal and non-formal qualifications; greater familiarity with European quality assurance procedures.

What is your appreciation of the ENIC/NARIC centre's general information services?

a) (online) Information about the national education system	informative	62
	not very informative	5
	don't know /not applicable	5
b) (online) information about national recognition procedures	informative	54
	not very informative	5
	don't know /not applicable	8
c) (online) information about the ENIC/NARIC centre's credential evaluation services	informative	58
	not very informative	2
	don't know /not applicable	9
d) (online) information about foreign education systems	informative	50
	not very informative	10
	don't know /not applicable	9
e) (online) information about access to regulated professions	informative	26
	not very informative	9
	don't know /not applicable	33

In your view, does the work of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help to remove obstacles to student mobility?

YES	55
NO	3
DON'T KNOW	15

Please explain...

HEIs applauded the clarity of information and procedures, as well as the centres' contribution to the facilitation of mobility – from the points of view of both institutions and applicants. The only reservations concerned lack of information regarding grade conversion and the legal status of foreign HEIs.

In what way could your national ENIC/NARIC centre better respond to your needs?

Here there were two groups of comments.

The first expressed broad satisfaction, while urging constant updating of information and better adherence to turnaround times.

The second listed specific shortcomings which they wished to see remedied.

These related to:

- the provision of grade comparisons and of information on the evaluation of foreign language competence and on postgraduate qualifications;
- a database of fraudulent applicants;
- more country-specific information (i.e. 'secondary school programmes, grade tables and distributions, national exams, entry exams for universities, quality of universities, national rankings, accreditation systems and accreditation organisations');
- and more opportunities for staff training.

Annex 5

Responses to client group survey – employers

Part A of the questionnaire to centres asked about the feasibility of conducting surveys of the main client groups. Three centres were statutorily unable to survey employers. Results from the remaining five were disappointing, with only six responses forthcoming from over one hundred employers contacted.

Which ENIC/NARIC services do you make use of?

i) Information about foreign education systems	2
ii) Online database (which provides examples of foreign qualifications and their assessment)	2
iii) Credential evaluation service	2
iv) Other services:	one employer receiving comparability statements

When was the last time you consulted the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country?

All within the last two months, with one employer using ENIC-NARIC services on a daily basis.

How often do you make use of services offered by the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country?

Weekly	1
Monthly	3
Annually	2

Do the services of your national ENIC/NARIC centre facilitate the recruitment and/or selection of staff?

YES	3
NO	2
DON'T KNOW	1

In what way?

Three employers mentioned the ability to assess the level and value of foreign qualifications.

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help you to meet the requirements of the immigration authorities?

YES	1
NO	2
DON'T KNOW	3

In what way? No comments were recorded.

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help you to speed up your work?

YES	6
NO	
DON'T KNOW	

In what way? ...

By providing information on foreign higher education systems, thereby facilitating the assessment of foreign employees' competences and salary level.

Have the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country helped you to become familiar with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention?

YES	zero
NO	4
DON'T KNOW	2

Have the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country helped you to become familiar with the National and European Qualification Frameworks?

YES	1
NO	3
DON'T KNOW	2

Did you participate in a training activity/workshop or conference organised by the ENIC/NARIC centre? Please indicate:

YES	1
NO	5

Name of conference: National NARIC conference

Date: November 2016

Topic:

What were the main results of these conferences/trainings/workshops for you and the employer or employment agency that you represent?

i) Gained knowledge and competencies in order to assess foreign qualifications	1
ii) Gained knowledge of foreign education systems or other topics	1
iii) Gained knowledge about new developments in recognition practice and policy	1
iv) Gained knowledge about EU legislation on the recognition of professional qualifications	1

What is your appreciation of the ENIC/NARIC centre's general information services?

i) (online) Information about the national education system	informative	4
	not very informative	zero
	don't know /not applicable	1
ii) (online) information about national recognition procedures	informative	5
	not very informative	zero
	don't know /not applicable	zero
iii) (online) information about the ENIC/NARIC centre's credential evaluation services	informative	5
	not very informative	Zero
	don't know /not applicable	zero
iv) (online) information about foreign education systems	informative	5
	not very informative	zero
	don't know /not applicable	zero
v) (online) information about access to regulated professions	informative	3
	not very informative	zero
	don't know /not applicable	2

In your view, does the work of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help to remove obstacles to employment mobility?

YES	3
NO	Zero
DON'T KNOW	2

Please explain...

One employer commented that 'we would not have the resources to research diplomas from all over the world and might need to discard candidates or involuntarily decide to discard candidates because of missing information.' Another noted that ENIC-NARIC statements 'appear authoritative and accepted by administration, unions, auditing and other public authorities.'

In what way could your national ENIC/NARIC centre better respond to your needs?

Two comments were received: one expressing complete satisfaction; another requesting more finely calibrated indications of comparability of national and foreign qualifications.

Annex 6

Responses to client group survey – public and professional bodies

Part A of the questionnaire to centres asked about the feasibility of conducting surveys of the main client groups. Seven of the eight centres deal with government departments, competent authorities and professional bodies; six were able to supply responses. The timing of the survey – in the period immediately prior to the summer vacation – depressed the response rate. A total of 26 were received, from over 500 requests.

Which ENIC/NARIC services do you make use of?

i. Information about foreign education systems	5
ii. Online database (which provides examples of foreign qualifications and their assessment)	11
iii. Credential evaluation service	6
iv. Other services named:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of general information • Information on the recognition of professional qualifications • Information on national internationalisation strategies 	

When was the last time you consulted the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country?

All respondents indicated that they had used ENIC-NARIC services recently, some on a daily basis and certainly within the last six months.

How often do you use the services offered by the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country?

Weekly	12
Monthly	6
Annually	7

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help to speed up your work?

YES	22
NO	1
DON'T KNOW	2

In what way?

Bodies answering 'yes' commented that ENIC-NARIC services:

- a) provide rapid response to queries and requests in specialist areas such as the recognition of professional qualifications
- b) facilitate communication between the bodies and their individual clients, accelerating turnaround times
- c) constitute an information channel between discrete public bodies, allowing administrative procedures to be better aligned

Do the services of the ENIC/NARIC centre in your country help you to make consistent recognition decisions?

YES	16
NO	3
DON'T KNOW	5

In what way? ...

Bodies answering 'yes' commented that ENIC-NARIC services:

- a) expedite the evaluation of foreign professionals
- b) provide assistance on individual cases
- c) provide a framework for assessing comparability

What is your appreciation of the ENIC/NARIC centre's general information provision?

a) (online) Information about the national education system	informative	17
	not very informative	zero
	don't know / not applicable	6
b) (online) information about national recognition procedures	informative	11
	not very informative	zero
	don't know / not applicable	9
c) (online) information about the ENIC/NARIC's credential evaluation services	informative	11
	not very informative	zero
	don't know / not applicable	8
d) (online) information about foreign education systems	informative	13
	not very informative	3
	don't know / not applicable	4
e) (online) information about access to the regulated professions	informative	9
	not very informative	2
	don't know / not applicable	11

In your view, does the work of the ENIC/NARIC centre help to remove obstacles to employment mobility?

YES	8
NO	2
DON'T KNOW	15

Please explain...

There were very few comments: those responding in the affirmative cited the support provided to decision-making processes and the facilitation of dialogue between stakeholders. One of the 'don't-knows' noted that 'We only have little knowledge about how the ENIC/NARIC centre works.'

Did you participate in a training activity/workshop or conference organised by the ENIC/NARIC centre? Please indicate:

Name of conference / training event / workshop	Respondents cited events covering: the Directive on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications; national guidelines on the enrolment of foreign students; the use of databases; evaluating foreign qualifications; and identifying fraudulent documentation.
--	--

Date:	Between 2013 and 2017
-------	-----------------------

What were the main results of these conferences/trainings/workshops for you and the organisation you represent?

A. Gained knowledge and competencies in order to make reliable credential evaluations	5
B. Gained knowledge of foreign education systems or other topics	3
C. Gained knowledge about new developments in recognition practice and policy	6
D. Others, specifically	2

Understanding of the implementation of the Directive on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications
Knowledge of how to identify fraudulent documentation

In what way could your national ENIC/NARIC centre better respond to your needs?

Some respondents indicated complete satisfaction. Others cited more extensive training provision, more detailed information, more rapid turnaround of queries, and a telephone inquiry service. One respondent stressed that ENIC-NARIC centres should 'state explicitly that a Statement of Comparability gives no guarantee that an inquirer will satisfy discipline-specific requirements'.

Annex 7

Responses to client group survey – individual users

Part A of the questionnaire to centres asked about the feasibility of conducting surveys of the main client groups. Although all eight centres invite and receive inquiries from individuals, only four reported that they were in a position to undertake satisfaction surveys of $\pm 2\%$ of their annual totals. A fifth centre cited pressure of work and lack of resources; others cited 'procedural difficulties' and privacy laws; yet another had no database of individual inquiries. In the event, three centres were able to generate 452 responses, as detailed in the table below.

How did you hear about (the services of) the national ENIC/NARIC centre?	
i) Via online search	171
ii) Via a higher education institution	154
iii) Via an employment agency	56
iv) Via your social network	46
v) By other means: 16 respondents cited friends or family, while at least nine were visa-related	

Did you apply for a credential evaluation/assessment of your foreign qualification?	
YES	402
NO	47

If you answered YES to question 2, in what year did you apply for a credential evaluation/assessment of your foreign qualification?

345 in 2017, the remainder tapering back to 2013

If you answered YES to question 2, for what purpose did you apply for a credential evaluation/assessment of your foreign qualification?	
Further study	213
Employment	149
Other	33 (of which at least 13 were visa-related)

Were you satisfied with the way your qualification was assessed and compared to the national education system?

YES	294
NO	54
DON'T KNOW	40

Please explain...

'No' and 'don't know' comments were dominated by complaints about turnaround times and/or failed communications, in one case leading to financial loss. Some responses queried the centres' approach to the comparability of national qualifications and specific foreign systems or qualifications (such as the International Baccalaureate).

Did the services of the ENIC/NARIC help you to find a job or access further study?

YES	182
NO	97
DON'T KNOW	91

Please explain...

The large number of 'no' and 'don't know' responses was partially explained by the fact that recognition processes were still ongoing, with the final outcomes unknown.

What is your appreciation of the ENIC/NARIC centre's general information provision?

f) (online) Information about the national education system	informative	272
	not very informative	63
	don't know / not applicable	61
g) (online) information about national recognition procedures	informative	279
	not very informative	67
	don't know / not applicable	48
h) (online) information about the ENIC/NARIC's credential evaluation services	informative	282
	not very informative	54
	don't know / not applicable	58
i) (online) information about access to the regulated professions	informative	206
	not very informative	72
	don't know / not applicable	116

In your view, does the work of the ENIC/NARIC centre help to remove obstacles to student mobility and to employment?

YES	264
NO	44
DON'T KNOW	95

Please explain...

Comments were not numerous: they were a mix of positive appreciation and complaints about turnaround time.

Colofon

This publication is part of the **IMPACT** project.
Its partners are:

- Nuffic (coordinator)
- Akademiskas Informācijas Centrs (AIC)
- CIEP
- CIMEA
- Danish Agency for Higher Education
- European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA)
- European University Association (EUA)
- Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (HRK)
- Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI)
- Studijų Kokybės Vertinimo Centras (SKVC)
- UK NARIC



This publication, with the exception of images and illustrations, is subject to the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 3.0 Unported Licence. Please visit www.nuffic.nl/ccl for the rules for reuse of this publication.

Published in The Hague, The Netherlands,
February 2018



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

"The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."



Nuffic Kortenaerkade 11 2518 AX Den Haag
Postbus 29777 2502 LT Den Haag
T 070 4260 260 www.nuffic.nl