

D5.1 Guidelines for the implementation of MASTERY working groups

WP5| Roll out the policy recommendation
Deliverable 5.1



Co-funded by
the European Union

*MASTERY Micro credentials reliability unleashing green economy project 101132845 ERASMUS-EDU-2023-PI-FORWARD is funded by the European Union, under the Erasmus Plus Program. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

General Information

Document Code	D5.1
Title of Document	Guidelines for the implementation of MASTERY working groups
Reference WP	WP5 – Roll out the policy recommendation
Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Date of Preparation	04/05/2026
Prepared by	CETEM - Technological Centre of Furniture and Wood of the Region of Murcia
Editor(s)	Almudena Muñoz Puche

Copyright



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International

Version History

04/05/2026	Draft version prepared by CETEM
12/05/2026	Revised version by Cleantech Bulgaria, CETEM, PJI, SFC, SSSA
18/05/2026	Updated version by CETEM
25/05/2026	Reviewed and approved version by all partners

Document Summary

This document is a strategic document that outlines how the results and outcomes of Erasmus+ Forward Looking project. MASTERY Micro credentials reliability unleashing green economy (GRANT AGREEMENT Project 101132845 ERASMUS-EDU-2023-PI-FORWARD). will be communicated, shared, and utilized to achieve maximum impact and benefit.

The plan is a fundamental document to be followed by all the partners to ensure that the knowledge and the outputs of this project are effectively disseminated and exploited. Periodic updates to the MASTERY Dissemination and Exploitation Plan may be necessary as the project progresses.

Index

1.	Introduction	4
1.1.	Positioning within WP5 and link to deliverables	4
1.2.	Role of Working Groups in the MASTERY paradigm	5
1.3.	Contribution to green skills micro-credentials (EQF4-6)	6
2.	WP5 Strategic Framework	7
2.1.	Objectives of WP5	7
2.2.	Role of Working Groups	7
2.3.	Link with WP3 (Policy Methodology) and WP4 (Piloting)	8
3.	Concept and Objectives of MASTERY Working Groups	9
4.	Methodological Approach	10
4.1.	Principles of the approach	10
4.2.	Core topics of discussion	10
5.	Stakeholder Engagement and Composition	12
6.	Planning of Working Groups	14
7.	Framework for the Implementation of Kick-start Workshops	16
7.1.	Overall Format and Requirements	16
7.2.	Session 1- Alignment and Context Setting	16
7.3.	Session 2- Co-design of Proposals (Core Session)	17
7.4.	Session 3- Validation and Prioritisation	18
8.	Tools and Facilitation techniques	19
9.	Monitoring and Evaluation of Working Groups	20
10.	Data Collection and Reporting	22
11.	Contribution to Joint Recommendations	24
12.	Impact and Sustainability	25
13.	Success Factors and Risks	26
14.	Conclusions	28
	Annexes	29
	Annex I. Agenda template	29
	Annex II. Attendance list template	30
	Annex III. Invitation emails template	31
	Annex IV. Reporting template	34
	Annex V. Evaluation Questionnaire for Workshops	39

1. Introduction

The present document provides the Guidelines for the Planning and Preparation of MASTERY Working Groups, developed within the framework of Task T5.1 under Work Package 5 (WP5) of the MASTERY project. It is conceived as a practical and strategic reference to support project partners in organising all the preparatory aspects required for the effective deployment of the Kick-start Workshops across participating countries.

More specifically, this document focuses on the design, planning and coordination phase of the Working Groups, ensuring that all necessary elements, such as stakeholder identification and recruitment, definition of workshop objectives, structuring of sessions and preparation of materials, are clearly defined before the implementation phase (T5.2). In this sense, the guidelines establish a common operational framework to guarantee consistency, quality and comparability across different national and regional contexts.

The main purpose of this document is therefore to provide a structured and actionable methodology for the preparation of the Working Groups, enabling partners to:

- Plan the Kick-start Workshops in a coherent and harmonised way
- Identify, approach and recruit relevant stakeholders from VET, policy, industry and ecosystem actors
- Define clear objectives and expected outputs for each Working Group
- Organise the format, timeline and logistics of the workshop sessions
- Prepare the necessary materials related to the MASTERY paradigm, policy visions and green skills micro-credentials

In line with the objectives of WP5, the Working Groups will involve multidisciplinary stakeholders, including VET providers, industrial representatives, public authorities, employment services and other relevant actors. Each partner country is expected to organise a minimum of three Working Groups at regional and national level, while an additional Working Group will be implemented at European level.

By focusing on the planning phase, this document plays a key role in ensuring that the subsequent deployment of the Working Groups is well-structured, stakeholder-driven and results-oriented, creating the necessary conditions for effective co-creation processes and the generation of high-quality inputs for the following tasks of WP5.

To support the practical use of these guidelines, the document is complemented by a set of annexes providing ready-to-use tools for partners. These include an agenda template, attendance list template, invitation email templates, reporting template and evaluation questionnaire. Together, these annexes operationalise the planning framework defined in D5.1 and support a harmonised approach to the future deployment of the Working Groups.

1.1. Positioning within WP5 and link to deliverables

This document constitutes Deliverable D5.1 of WP5 – Roll-out of the Policy Recommendation. WP5 focuses on enabling the uptake, validation and integration of the MASTERY approach through a series of coordinated actions involving stakeholders at regional, national and European levels.

Within this context, D5.1 specifically addresses Task T5.1, providing the methodological and operational framework for the planning and preparation of the Working Groups and Kick-start Workshops. It defines how partners should organise all preparatory aspects, including stakeholder identification and recruitment, definition of objectives, structuring of sessions and preparation of materials, ensuring a consistent and harmonised approach across countries.

While the implementation and execution of the workshops will be carried out under Task T5.2, this document establishes the necessary conditions for their effective deployment, ensuring that all partners follow a shared and structured approach when engaging stakeholders.

The guidelines are closely interconnected with the subsequent WP5 deliverables:

- D5.2 – Working Groups Outcomes Report, which will collect and analyse the results generated through the implementation of the workshops at national and EU level
- D5.3 – MASTERY Joint Recommendations, which will consolidate the proposals emerging from the Working Groups into structured recommendations for VET systems and policy frameworks
- D5.4 – Guidelines for Future MASTERY Application, which will build on the lessons learned to support replicability and long-term sustainability

In this sense, D5.1 represents the starting point of a coherent and sequential process, ensuring that the data, insights and proposals generated during the Working Groups are robust, comparable and suitable for further analysis, policy development and exploitation.

1.2. Role of Working Groups in the MASTERY paradigm

Within the MASTERY project, Working Groups are not conceived as simple consultation platforms, but as dynamic co-creation environments where key stakeholders collaboratively shape the future implementation of green skills micro-credentials.

These Working Groups, operationalised through the Kick-start Workshops, play a pivotal role in:

- Bridging the gap between education and training systems, labour market needs and policy frameworks
- Validating and contextualising the MASTERY approach in different national and regional ecosystems
- Identifying concrete barriers and enablers for the adoption of micro-credentials
- Co-designing realistic and actionable implementation pathways

Their multi-stakeholder nature, bringing together VET providers, policymakers, industry representatives and ecosystem actors, ensures that the outputs generated are grounded in practical experience, institutional knowledge and market realities.

Furthermore, Working Groups act as a key mechanism to foster a mindset shift among stakeholders, promoting more flexible, modular and outcome-oriented approaches to skills development, in line with evolving labour market demands and sustainability challenges.

1.3. Contribution to green skills micro-credentials (EQF4-6)

A central objective of the MASTERY project is to support the development, validation and uptake of green skills micro-credentials aligned with the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) levels 4 to 6. These micro-credentials represent a flexible and transparent way of recognising learning outcomes, enabling individuals to acquire and demonstrate targeted competences relevant to the green transition.

In this context, the Working Groups contribute directly to:

- Validating the relevance and applicability of the 12 MASTERY enabling green skills in real labour market contexts
- Supporting the integration of micro-credentials into VET systems and active labour market policies
- Ensuring alignment between training provision and industry needs and sustainability priorities
- Identifying conditions for the recognition, portability and scalability of micro-credentials

By engaging stakeholders in structured co-creation processes, the Working Groups help transform micro-credentials from a conceptual innovation into a practical and implementable solution, capable of addressing skills gaps and supporting inclusive, sustainable economic development.

Ultimately, this contribution reinforces the role of micro-credentials as a key instrument for lifelong learning, upskilling and reskilling, empowering individuals and organisations to actively participate in the green and digital transition.

2. WP5 Strategic Framework

Work Package 5 (WP5) represents a critical phase within the MASTERY project, as it moves from the design and piloting of green skills training towards systemic integration, policy uptake and long-term impact. While previous work packages focus on defining skills (WP2) and testing training programmes (WP4), WP5 is dedicated to ensuring that the MASTERY approach is embedded within real ecosystems, including VET systems, labour market structures and policy frameworks.

Within this broader framework, the present deliverable (D5.1) contributes specifically to the planning and preparation phase of the Working Groups (T5.1), while remaining aligned with the overall objectives and logic of WP5.

2.1. Objectives of WP5

The overarching objective of WP5 is to facilitate the adoption and scaling-up of MASTERY green skills micro-credentials, ensuring their relevance, usability and recognition across different contexts. This is achieved through a structured process of stakeholder engagement, co-creation and validation.

More specifically, WP5 aims to:

- Enable the implementation of Kick-start Workshops and Working Groups at regional, national and European levels
- Support the integration of micro-credentials into VET systems and active labour market policies
- Adapt MASTERY outputs to specific territorial needs and labour market priorities
- Promote a mindset shift among VET providers, policymakers and industry stakeholders, encouraging more flexible and modular learning pathways
- Generate evidence of impact in the short term, while strengthening medium- and long-term sustainability
- Develop joint recommendations to support the adoption of micro-credentials at both VET and policy levels

While these objectives are addressed across different tasks within WP5, D5.1 specifically supports their achievement by ensuring that the Working Groups are properly planned and structured from the outset.

2.2. Role of Working Groups

Within this strategic framework, Working Groups play a central and operational role as multi-stakeholder platforms supporting the transition from project results to practical implementation.

In the context of T5.1, their role is primarily framed in terms of preparation and structuring, ensuring that the necessary conditions are in place for effective stakeholder engagement and co-creation during the implementation phase (T5.2).

At a broader level within WP5, Working Groups contribute to:

- Identifying priority areas for intervention
- Analysing barriers and enabling factors for micro-credentials adoption
- Supporting the validation of green skills and their relevance for labour market needs
- Generating inputs for policy and VET recommendations

This dual perspective, operational in T5.1 and strategic across WP5, ensures that the planning phase is closely aligned with the expected outcomes of the project.

2.3. Link with WP3 (Policy Methodology) and WP4 (Piloting)

WP5 builds upon and connects the results of previous work packages, acting as a bridge between theoretical framework, experimentation and systemic adoption.

On the one hand, it is closely linked to WP3 – Policy Methodology, which provides the conceptual and strategic framework for the development of recommendations. The planning of the Working Groups under T5.1 must therefore ensure that relevant WP3 elements, such as policy visions and national priorities, are properly integrated into the workshop design.

On the other hand, WP5 is connected to WP4 – Piloting, where the green skills training programmes are designed and tested. The planning phase should anticipate how the experiences and evidence generated in WP4 can be incorporated into the discussions of the Working Groups, ensuring continuity and coherence across the project.

In this way, D5.1 contributes to establishing the necessary conditions for a structured and coherent flow of knowledge, from piloting to stakeholder engagement and, ultimately, to policy recommendations.

3. Concept and Objectives of MASTERY Working Groups

Within the MASTERY project, Working Groups are conceived as structured, multi-stakeholder collaboration spaces designed to bridge the gap between project results and their practical implementation in real-world contexts. They are operationalised through the so-called Kick-start Workshops, which function as the core mechanism to engage relevant actors, facilitate dialogue and, most importantly, co-create solutions. These workshops go beyond traditional consultation formats: while they incorporate elements of focus groups, their primary purpose is not only to discuss challenges but to actively generate concrete, actionable proposals that can support the integration of micro-credentials into VET systems, labour market policies and green transition strategies. In this sense, Kick-start Workshops act as a dynamic interface between education, policy and industry, enabling the MASTERY paradigm to be tested, adapted and validated in diverse national and regional environments.

The main objectives of the Working Groups are closely aligned with this solution-oriented approach. First, they aim to support the co-design and validation of recommendations, both at VET and policy level. By bringing together stakeholders with practical experience and decision-making capacity, the process ensures that the resulting proposals are not only theoretically sound but also feasible, relevant and aligned with existing systems. This collaborative dimension is essential to foster ownership and increase the likelihood of future adoption. At the same time, the workshops provide a structured environment to identify barriers and enabling factors that may influence the implementation of micro-credentials. These can range from regulatory and institutional constraints to capacity gaps or, conversely, existing good practices and favourable conditions.

Building on this analysis, Working Groups are designed to support the identification of potential implementation pathways, translating broad policy visions into concrete actions, timelines and stakeholder responsibilities during the subsequent implementation phase. This contributes to ensuring that discussions are oriented towards operational planning and practical deployment of the MASTERY approach.

As a result of this process, the Working Groups are expected to generate a series of tangible outputs that directly feed into the subsequent phases of WP5. These include, first and foremost, a set of structured proposals describing specific actions for the implementation of micro-credentials, including their scope, responsible actors and potential timelines. In addition, participants are invited to prioritise these proposals, distinguishing between short-term opportunities and more structural, long-term interventions, based on criteria such as impact, feasibility and strategic relevance. This prioritisation step is crucial to ensure that the outcomes of the workshops are not only comprehensive but also actionable. Finally, the insights generated throughout the process provide essential input for the development of joint recommendations and for the overall assessment of the project's impact.

In this way, the Working Groups contribute to building a solid evidence base that supports the introduction, scaling and sustainability of green skills micro-credentials across different contexts, starting from a well-structured and coherent planning phase as defined in this deliverable (D5.1).

4. Methodological Approach

The methodological approach underpinning the MASTERY Working Groups is designed to ensure that stakeholder engagement goes beyond consultation and leads to the generation of concrete, actionable and context-sensitive outcomes. It builds on participatory methodologies while incorporating a strong focus on co-creation, solution development and policy alignment. This approach enables stakeholders not only to reflect on challenges related to the implementation of micro-credentials, but also to actively contribute to the identification and design of practical pathways for their adoption within VET systems, labour markets and green transition strategies.

4.1. Principles of the approach

The methodology adopted for the Kick-start Workshops is grounded in a set of key principles that shape both the structure of the sessions and the expected outputs. At its core, the approach is based on co-creation rather than traditional consultation. While conventional stakeholder engagement often focuses on collecting opinions or validating predefined ideas, the MASTERY Working Groups are designed as collaborative environments where participants actively contribute to shaping solutions. This implies a shift from passive participation to shared ownership of the outcomes, ensuring that the proposals generated reflect the perspectives, needs and expertise of all actors involved.

Closely linked to this is the emphasis on solution-oriented workshops. The methodology deliberately moves beyond problem identification and encourages participants to work towards the development of concrete proposals. Discussions are structured in such a way that they progressively lead from the analysis of current situations to the formulation of actionable recommendations, including indicative implementation steps, responsible stakeholders and potential timelines. This ensures that the outputs of the workshops are directly usable within policy and VET contexts.

Another defining element of the approach is the promotion of multi-stakeholder collaboration. The composition of the Working Groups brings together actors from different domains (VET providers, policymakers, industry representatives and ecosystem organisations), each contributing complementary perspectives. This diversity is essential to capture the complexity of skills ecosystems and to ensure that proposed solutions are both realistic and broadly supported. The interaction between these stakeholders fosters mutual understanding, aligns expectations and strengthens the relevance of the outputs.

Finally, the methodology is aligned with a policy cycle logic (PLAN–DO–CHECK–ACT), which provides a structured framework for the co-creation process. In particular, the core workshop session focuses on the "PLAN" phase, where stakeholders collectively design potential implementation pathways based on identified priorities and policy visions. This alignment ensures that the outputs of the Working Groups are not isolated ideas, but part of a broader, iterative process of policy development, implementation and evaluation. It also facilitates the integration of results into existing policy frameworks and supports long-term sustainability.

4.2. Core topics of discussion

The discussions within the Working Groups are structured around a set of core topics that reflect the central elements of the MASTERY paradigm and its objectives. These topics are not

treated as fixed or prescriptive models, but rather as flexible working hypotheses that can be adapted to different national and regional contexts.

A first key focus is on the 12 enabling green skills identified by the MASTERY project. These skills represent a combination of sector-specific and transversal competences that are considered essential for supporting the transition towards more sustainable and circular economic models. Within the workshops, stakeholders are invited to assess their relevance, applicability and potential for implementation, considering sectoral needs and local priorities.

A second central topic concerns the development and implementation of micro-credentials aligned with EQF levels 4 to 6. These micro-credentials are explored as innovative tools for recognising learning outcomes in a flexible and transparent way, supporting upskilling, reskilling and lifelong learning. Discussions focus on how these micro-credentials can be integrated into existing education and training systems, how they can be recognised by employers and how they can contribute to more agile and responsive skills ecosystems.

Finally, the methodology places strong emphasis on the alignment between education and training systems, labour market needs and green transition priorities. This alignment is essential to ensure that micro-credentials are not developed in isolation but are directly connected to real economic and societal demands. Through the interaction of stakeholders from different domains, the workshops aim to identify synergies, address mismatches and define strategies that support a more coherent and integrated approach to skills development.

5. Stakeholder Engagement and Composition

The effectiveness and relevance of the MASTERY Working Groups largely depend on the quality, diversity and balance of stakeholder participation. Within the framework of Task T5.1, particular attention is given to the identification, selection and engagement of stakeholders, ensuring that the Working Groups are properly structured from the outset. The methodological approach places strong emphasis on engaging actors who not only represent different parts of the skills ecosystem, but who also bring practical experience, decision-making capacity and a clear understanding of the challenges and opportunities linked to micro-credentials and the green transition.

The Working Groups are therefore composed of a multi-actor mix of profiles, ensuring that discussions reflect the complexity of real implementation contexts. This includes, first, representatives from the VET sector, such as teachers, trainers and curriculum designers, who contribute insights on training provision, learning outcomes and pedagogical feasibility. Their role is essential to ensure that proposed solutions are aligned with educational realities and can be effectively integrated into existing training systems.

In parallel, the involvement of public authorities and policymakers, particularly those working in education, employment and skills policies at regional or national level, ensures that discussions are grounded in regulatory frameworks and institutional priorities. These actors play a key role in assessing the feasibility of proposals from a governance perspective and in identifying opportunities for policy integration.

The participation of industry and labour market representatives, including companies, clusters and employer organisations, is equally critical. These stakeholders provide direct input on current and emerging skills needs, helping to align micro-credentials with labour market demand and ensuring that the proposed solutions are relevant from an economic and employment perspective.

Finally, the Working Groups include ecosystem actors, such as employment services, career guidance professionals and intermediary organisations. These actors contribute with a cross-cutting perspective, supporting the connection between training systems, labour market access and broader social inclusion objectives.

The selection of participants prioritises expertise, practical experience and the ability to contribute meaningfully to the co-creation process, rather than formal representation alone. Attention is given to ensuring that participants have sufficient knowledge of the topic and, where possible, a certain level of influence or decision-making capacity within their organisations. This approach helps to maximise the relevance and applicability of the outputs generated.

In terms of structure, each Working Group is designed to include a manageable number of participants, 10 per workshop, allowing for effective interaction, in-depth discussion and active engagement of all participants. At the same time, the methodology allows for a degree of flexibility across sessions, enabling partners to adapt the composition of participants depending on the specific objectives of each phase of the process. For example, initial sessions may involve a stronger presence of VET actors to explore educational perspectives, while later sessions may prioritise policymakers and industry representatives to support

validation and prioritisation of proposals. Despite this flexibility, it is essential that the overall process maintains a balanced representation of all stakeholder categories, particularly during the core co-creation session.

In addition, the composition of the Working Groups takes into account inclusion and diversity aspects, aiming to reflect the variety of profiles affected by the green transition and skills transformation. This may include attention to gender balance, representation of different age groups or inclusion of actors working with vulnerable or underrepresented populations. Such considerations contribute to ensuring that the outcomes of the workshops are not only technically sound, but also socially relevant and inclusive.

6. Planning of Working Groups

The planning phase of the Working Groups is a critical step to ensure the effectiveness, coherence and impact of the Kick-start Workshops. This phase, corresponding to Task T5.1, lays the operational foundations for the entire process, defining not only the organisational aspects of the workshops but also the strategic orientation that will guide stakeholder engagement and co-creation activities. A well-structured planning process is essential to guarantee that the workshops generate meaningful outputs aligned with the objectives of WP5 and the broader MASTERY framework.

The first step in this phase consists of clearly defining the objectives and expected outputs of each Working Group. These objectives must be consistent with the overall goals of WP5, particularly the development of actionable recommendations, the validation of micro-credentials and the alignment with labour market needs. At the same time, they should be adapted to the specific national or regional context in which the workshops are implemented. Establishing clear expectations from the outset helps to focus discussions, guide facilitation and ensure that participants understand the purpose of their contribution. Expected outputs typically include structured proposals, prioritised actions and inputs for policy and VET recommendations, which will later feed into subsequent deliverables.

In parallel, partners are responsible for organising a targeted and strategic recruitment process. This involves identifying and engaging stakeholders who meet the criteria defined in the previous section, ensuring a balanced representation of VET providers, policymakers, industry representatives and ecosystem actors. Recruitment should be carried out proactively, with clear communication about the objectives of the workshops, the expected level of engagement and the value of participation. Establishing a core group of participants that can follow the full process is recommended, as it supports continuity and coherence across sessions, although some flexibility can be maintained to adapt expertise to specific workshop phases.

Another key aspect of the planning phase is the organisation of the workshop sessions in terms of timeline, format and logistics. Partners must define a realistic schedule for the three sessions, ensuring sufficient time between them for reflection, preparation and consolidation of results. In line with the common implementation framework defined in Section 7, each session is designed as a full-day workshop. The format of each session—whether online, hybrid or in-person—should be selected based on contextual factors. Logistical considerations, such as venue selection, digital tools, participant availability and technical support, must also be carefully addressed to ensure smooth future implementation and active participation. To facilitate this process, partners are provided with practical templates, including an agenda template (Annex I), an attendance list template (Annex II) and invitation email templates (Annex III), supporting a harmonised and efficient preparation of the Working Groups.

Finally, particular attention must be given to the preparation of materials, which play a crucial role in guiding discussions and ensuring a shared understanding among participants. These materials should include a clear presentation of the MASTERY paradigm, explaining the objectives of the project, the role of micro-credentials and their contribution to the green transition. In addition, partners must prepare content related to the policy visions developed in WP3, including national prioritisation results, as these will serve as a key reference point for the co-creation process. The 12 enabling green skills and their associated micro-credentials

should also be presented in a clear and accessible way, allowing participants to understand their relevance and application. Well-prepared materials not only facilitate discussions but also contribute to aligning stakeholders around a common framework, which is essential for the success of the Working Groups.

At the time of submission of this deliverable, the planning phase of the Working Groups is already underway across partner countries. Partners have initiated the identification of relevant stakeholders, preliminary mapping of potential participants and internal definition of timelines and organisational aspects of the workshops.

However, the formal launch of the Kick-start Workshops, including the sending of invitations and confirmation of participants, is scheduled to take place in the following phase (T5.2), ensuring alignment with the overall WP5 timeline. This approach allows partners to complete the planning process in a structured and coordinated manner before engaging external stakeholders.

Particular attention is being paid to the coordination of timelines across countries, taking into account differences in national calendars, including holiday periods and institutional schedules, which may affect stakeholder availability. This will ensure that the workshops are organised at the most appropriate time to maximise participation and engagement.

7. Framework for the Implementation of Kick-start Workshops

While the present deliverable focuses on the planning phase (T5.1), it is essential to define a clear and harmonised implementation framework to guide partners during the subsequent deployment phase (T5.2). This section therefore outlines the recommended structure, format and sequence of the Kick-start Workshops, ensuring consistency across countries while allowing for contextual adaptation.

This framework is not intended to describe the actual implementation of the workshops, but rather to provide a common reference model that partners will follow during the execution phase.

7.1. Overall Format and Requirements

The Kick-start Workshops are designed as a multi-session process, combining flexibility with a set of minimum requirements to ensure effectiveness and comparability.

Workshops may be delivered in online, hybrid or in-person formats, depending on national contexts and logistical considerations. However, to ensure the quality of interaction and co-creation, it is recommended that sessions are organised in person whenever possible, particularly for the core co-design activities.

Each Working Group is structured across three sessions:

- Session 1: Alignment and context setting
- Session 2: Co-design of proposals (core session)
- Session 3: Validation and prioritisation

Each session is designed as a full-day workshop, allowing sufficient time for in-depth discussion, stakeholder interaction and structured co-creation. This extended format ensures that participants can move beyond surface-level exchanges and engage meaningfully in the process.

7.2. Session 1- Alignment and Context Setting

The first session is designed to establish a shared understanding among participants and to prepare the ground for the co-creation process. Given its full-day format, this session enables a comprehensive introduction to the MASTERY framework and a deeper engagement with key concepts.

The session is expected to include:

- A detailed introduction to the MASTERY project, its objectives and the role of WP5
- A comprehensive presentation of green skills micro-credentials (EQF 4–6), including their relevance for the green transition and lifelong learning
- An overview of the WP3 policy methodology, including policy visions and national prioritisation results

In addition to these input-oriented components, the session should incorporate interactive and participatory activities, such as guided discussions, group work or facilitated reflections. These activities allow participants to:

- Identify key challenges related to micro-credentials implementation
- Reflect on the relevance of policy visions in their context
- Share initial perspectives and expectations

The full-day format enables a balanced combination of information sharing, stakeholder engagement and initial co-reflection, ensuring that participants are not only informed but also actively involved from the outset.

The expected outcome of this session is the establishment of a shared conceptual baseline, together with initial insights that will inform the co-creation process in the following session.

7.3. Session 2- Co-design of Proposals (Core Session)

The second session represents the central moment of the Working Group process and is dedicated to structured co-creation. As a full-day workshop, it provides sufficient time to move from analysis to the development of concrete proposals.

Aligned with the "PLAN" phase of the policy cycle (PLAN-DO-CHECK-ACT), this session focuses on:

- Analysing the current state of micro-credentials implementation
- Identifying key barriers and enabling factors
- Exploring potential implementation pathways

The session is structured around guided co-creation activities, combining plenary discussions and smaller working groups. Participants are expected to collaboratively develop structured proposals, including:

- Description of proposed actions
- Identification of responsible stakeholders
- Indicative timelines
- Initial reflections on feasibility and implementation conditions

The use of co-creation tools (digital or physical) is encouraged to facilitate interaction, structure inputs and document results.

The full-day format allows for iterative discussion, refinement of ideas and deeper engagement among stakeholders, ensuring that proposals are both evidence-based and practically grounded.

The expected outputs of this session include:

- A set of structured proposals
- Identification of barriers and enablers
- Initial mapping of stakeholder roles
- Preliminary considerations on monitoring (KPIs)

7.4. Session 3- Validation and Prioritisation

The third session is dedicated to the refinement, validation and prioritisation of proposals developed during the co-design phase. Its full-day format allows for a comprehensive review and structured decision-making process.

The session typically includes:

- Presentation and consolidation of proposals developed in Session 2
- Structured discussion on feasibility, relevance and alignment with national contexts
- Prioritisation exercises based on criteria such as impact, feasibility and strategic relevance

Participants are encouraged to engage in collective assessment and decision-making, ensuring that the most relevant and actionable proposals are clearly identified.

In addition, the session may include a reflection on initial monitoring and evaluation aspects, such as:

- What success would look like
- Which indicators could be used to track implementation
- Key elements to be considered in future impact assessment

The full-day format supports deeper reflection, consensus-building and alignment among stakeholders.

The expected outputs of this session include:

- A prioritised list of proposals
- Identification of strategic priorities
- Initial input for monitoring and evaluation frameworks

8. Tools and Facilitation techniques

Within the framework of Task T5.1, the planning phase of the Working Groups includes the identification, selection and preparation of appropriate tools and facilitation approaches that will support the effective implementation of the Kick-start Workshops. The successful deployment of the methodology relies not only on its conceptual design, but also on the availability of suitable instruments to support interaction, structure discussions and ensure the collection of high-quality outputs.

A key component of the methodology is the selection of co-creation tools, which enable interactive and collaborative engagement among participants. Digital platforms such as Miro, Mentimeter, Slido or similar tools should be considered and prepared in advance to facilitate brainstorming, collect inputs in real time, support voting and prioritisation exercises, and visualise ideas in a structured way. These tools are particularly relevant for the co-design and validation phases, as they allow all participants to contribute actively, including those who may be less inclined to speak in group discussions. In addition, they help to capture inputs systematically, reducing the risk of losing valuable information and facilitating later analysis. While digital tools are highly recommended, especially in hybrid or online formats, they can also be complemented with analogue methods (e.g. sticky notes, flipcharts) in fully in-person settings, ensuring flexibility depending on the context.

Equally important is the planning of facilitation methods to be applied during the workshops. The role of the facilitator should be clearly defined in advance, ensuring that discussions are guided effectively, objectives are maintained and balanced participation among stakeholders is achieved. Facilitation approaches should aim to create an open and inclusive environment where participants feel comfortable sharing their perspectives, while also ensuring that discussions remain structured and oriented towards results. Techniques such as guided questioning, small group work, moderated plenary discussions and step-by-step co-creation exercises should be planned beforehand to progressively lead participants from reflection to action.

To support the structuring of inputs, the use of templates for data collection and proposal development is strongly recommended and should be prepared during the planning phase. These templates provide a common framework for capturing information in a consistent and comparable way across different workshops and countries. For example, templates may include predefined fields for describing proposals (e.g. action, stakeholders involved, timeline, expected impact), identifying barriers and enablers, or outlining initial monitoring indicators. By guiding participants through a structured format, templates help to transform qualitative discussions into clear, organised and actionable outputs, facilitating their later consolidation into reports and recommendations.

Finally, appropriate documentation tools and practices should be defined in advance to ensure that all relevant information generated during the workshops can be properly recorded, organised and made available for further analysis. This includes planning how notes will be taken, how outputs from digital platforms will be collected, how attendance will be tracked and how materials will be stored in a centralised and accessible format. When possible, collaborative documents or shared folders should be prepared in advance to support both real-time input and post-session consolidation.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation of Working Groups

Within the framework of Task T5.1, the planning phase of the Working Groups includes the definition of a structured monitoring and evaluation approach, ensuring that the implementation phase (T5.2) can be effectively assessed under Task T5.4. This preparatory work is essential to guarantee that relevant data will be collected in a consistent and comparable way across all participating countries.

Rather than conducting the evaluation itself, this phase focuses on defining the criteria, tools and processes that will guide monitoring and evaluation during the implementation of the Kick-start Workshops.

The planned evaluation framework pursues several complementary objectives. It aims to assess the effectiveness of the methodology, the quality and usefulness of the outputs generated, and the level of stakeholder engagement achieved during the workshops. In addition, it supports the identification of strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement, while contributing to the overall impact assessment of WP5.

To support this process, a set of common evaluation criteria has been defined during the planning phase, covering the core dimensions of the Working Groups:

- Participation (stakeholder engagement, balance and continuity)
- Quality of discussion (depth, relevance and interaction)
- Outputs generated (number, quality, feasibility and strategic relevance of proposals)
- Perceived impact and usefulness for participants

In parallel, a standardised evaluation questionnaire has been developed (see Annex V) as the main tool for collecting structured feedback from participants during the implementation phase. This questionnaire is designed to ensure comparability across countries and to capture both quantitative and qualitative data.

The questionnaire includes:

- Closed questions based on Likert scales to assess key dimensions such as organisation, participation, quality of discussion, outputs and impact
- Participant profiling to analyse stakeholder representation
- Open questions to gather qualitative insights and suggestions for improvement

This tool will be complemented, where relevant, by additional methods such as facilitator observations and qualitative notes collected during the sessions, ensuring a more comprehensive understanding of the workshop dynamics and outcomes.

Furthermore, the planning phase includes defining how the information collected will be organised, analysed and linked to subsequent deliverables, particularly D5.2 (Working Groups Outcomes Report) and D5.3 (Joint Recommendations). This ensures that monitoring and evaluation are fully integrated into the WP5 workflow and contribute to evidence-based decision-making.

By establishing a clear evaluation framework and preparing concrete tools during T5.1, partners ensure that the Working Groups can be assessed in a consistent, transparent and impact-oriented manner, supporting both short-term learning and long-term project sustainability.

10. Data Collection and Reporting

Within the framework of Task T5.1, the planning phase of the Working Groups includes the definition of a structured data collection and reporting approach, ensuring that all relevant information generated during the implementation phase (T5.2) can be systematically captured, organised and used for subsequent analysis and decision-making.

This process is essential to support transparency and accountability, while ensuring that the outputs of the workshops can effectively feed into the development of project deliverables, particularly D5.2 (Working Groups Outcomes Report) and D5.3 (Joint Recommendations).

A key requirement of this approach is the definition of a set of core data elements to be collected across all Working Groups. These include, first, detailed information on participants, such as their profiles, organisations and stakeholder category (VET, policy, industry or ecosystem actors). This will allow the assessment of participation levels, stakeholder balance and overall representativeness.

In addition, partners will collect structured notes from all sessions, capturing the main discussion points, key insights, identified challenges and relevant contextual information. These qualitative data are essential to understand the rationale behind the proposals and to provide depth to the analysis.

Another central element concerns the documentation of proposals generated during the workshops. These will be recorded in a structured way, including information such as the description of the action, the stakeholders involved, the proposed timeline and any relevant contextual details. Where applicable, partners will also record the results of the prioritisation process, including rankings, voting outcomes or other mechanisms used to identify the most relevant and feasible proposals.

To ensure consistency and comparability, all partners are expected to follow a standardised reporting approach, based on common templates and guidelines prepared during the planning phase. These templates will support consistent data collection and documentation, allowing information from different countries and Working Groups to be aggregated and analysed in a coherent way.

A standardised reporting template has been developed to support this process (see Annex IV – Reporting Template). This template will guide partners in documenting the outcomes of the Working Groups in a structured and consistent manner, covering key aspects such as the scope and objectives of the workshops, methodology and implementation approach, stakeholder participation, workshop-by-workshop results, proposals generated, cross-workshop analysis and identification of priority actions.

The template also supports the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, ensuring that results are comparable across countries while allowing partners to capture national or EU-level specificities. As a tool prepared under T5.1, it will be used during the implementation phase (T5.2) and will constitute one of the main inputs for the consolidation of Deliverable D5.2.

The data collected at national level will be consolidated into National Working Groups Outcomes Reports, which will constitute the main input for Deliverable D5.2. These reports will provide a comprehensive overview of the workshops implemented in each country, including

stakeholder participation, key discussion outcomes, the list of proposals generated and an initial analysis of results.

Finally, the adoption of a standardised approach will enable cross-country comparability, which is essential for identifying common patterns, shared challenges and transferable solutions. By analysing similarities and differences across national contexts, the project will generate more robust and generalisable insights, supporting the development of joint recommendations and enhancing the overall impact of WP5.

11. Contribution to Joint Recommendations

Within the framework of WP5, the contribution of the Working Groups to the development of joint recommendations represents a central objective, ensuring that the insights, proposals and evidence generated during the Kick-start Workshops can be translated into structured, policy-relevant outputs.

In the context of Task T5.1, this deliverable defines the conceptual and methodological pathway through which the outputs of the Working Groups will contribute to the development of joint recommendations under Task T5.3. In this sense, the planning phase establishes the foundations for a structured transition from co-created inputs at national and regional level to consolidated recommendations with European relevance.

The process is expected to build on the proposals generated and prioritised during the Working Groups, which will provide a rich and context-sensitive evidence base. These proposals will later be analysed, refined and synthesised into more strategic recommendations, moving from individual actions towards coherent frameworks and guidelines that can support decision-making and implementation at different levels.

In line with the WP5 approach, the future development of recommendations is structured around a dual perspective, addressing both the education and training system and the broader policy environment. On the one hand, VET recommendations are expected to support education and training providers in integrating micro-credentials into their systems, addressing aspects such as curriculum design, learning outcomes, assessment methods and certification processes. On the other hand, policy recommendations will focus on creating the enabling conditions for the adoption and recognition of micro-credentials, including regulatory frameworks, funding mechanisms and alignment with labour market strategies.

The planning phase also anticipates a progressive consolidation process at European level, whereby inputs collected through the Working Groups and documented in national reports (D5.2) will be analysed collectively. This process is expected to identify common trends, shared challenges and priority areas for action across countries, enabling the development of recommendations that are both robust and transferable.

During this consolidation process, particular attention will be given to:

- Identifying areas of convergence between national experiences
- Highlighting innovative practices and successful approaches
- Addressing structural barriers that require coordinated action
- Ensuring alignment with European frameworks and policy priorities

The outcome of this process will be the development of joint recommendations (D5.3), designed to be actionable, evidence-based and adaptable. By defining this pathway during the planning phase, the present deliverable ensures that the contribution of the Working Groups to WP5 is structured, coherent and aligned with the overall objectives of the MASTERY project.

12. Impact and Sustainability

The MASTERY Working Groups are designed not only to generate immediate outputs, but also to contribute to lasting structural changes in the way green skills are developed, recognised and integrated into education and labour market systems. Within the framework of Task T5.1, this deliverable defines the expected impact and sustainability potential of the Working Groups, based on the planned methodology and implementation framework.

The impact of these activities can be understood across different time horizons, ranging from short-term results linked to stakeholder engagement and validation processes, to medium- and long-term effects related to policy uptake, VET transformation and replicability.

In the short term, the Working Groups are expected to generate impact primarily through stakeholder engagement and validation of the MASTERY approach. By bringing together key actors from VET, policy and industry, the workshops are designed to create a space for dialogue, mutual learning and alignment of perspectives. This process is expected to contribute to increasing awareness and understanding of micro-credentials, as well as their potential role in supporting the green transition. At the same time, the co-creation activities are expected to support the validation of the 12 enabling green skills and their associated micro-credentials, ensuring that they are relevant, applicable and aligned with real needs. The anticipated outputs, such as proposals, prioritised actions and identified barriers, will provide a foundation for further development within WP5.

Beyond these initial results, the Working Groups are expected to contribute to medium- and long-term impact by supporting the integration of micro-credentials into broader systems and strategies. One of the key dimensions of this impact is policy integration. The recommendations to be generated through the workshops will provide input for policymakers, facilitating the incorporation of micro-credentials into regulatory frameworks, active labour market policies and skills development strategies. This is expected to contribute to creating an enabling environment where micro-credentials can be recognised, valued and effectively used across different sectors.

Another important dimension concerns the potential transformation of VET systems. By promoting more flexible, modular and outcome-oriented approaches to learning, the MASTERY paradigm encourages VET providers to adapt their training offers to better respond to evolving labour market needs. The Working Groups are expected to support this transformation by generating stakeholder-validated insights on how to design, deliver and assess micro-credentials aligned with EQF levels 4 to 6. Over time, this may contribute to more responsive and inclusive training systems, better equipped to support upskilling, reskilling and lifelong learning.

Finally, a key objective of WP5 is to ensure the replicability and scalability of the MASTERY approach in other contexts. The methodology defined for the Working Groups, together with the expected lessons learned and recommendations, is intended to provide a transferable model that can be applied beyond the project. By adapting the approach to different national, regional or sectoral environments, stakeholders may replicate the process to support the implementation of micro-credentials in a wide range of settings. This contributes to extending the potential impact of the project and supporting a broader transition towards more flexible and sustainable skills ecosystems.

13. Success Factors and Risks

Within the framework of Task T5.1, the planning of the MASTERY Working Groups includes the identification of key success factors and potential risks, in order to ensure a robust and effective implementation during the subsequent phase (T5.2).

While the methodology defined in this deliverable provides a structured and harmonised framework, its successful application will depend on a number of critical elements that need to be anticipated and addressed during the planning phase.

A first key success factor is the achievement of a balanced and representative stakeholder composition. The multi-stakeholder nature of the Working Groups is essential to ensure that discussions reflect the complexity of real implementation contexts. During the planning phase, particular attention is therefore given to stakeholder mapping and recruitment strategies that ensure adequate representation of VET, policy, industry and ecosystem actors.

Another critical factor is the planning of effective facilitation. Given the co-creation and solution-oriented nature of the workshops, it is essential to define in advance the facilitation approach, including roles, methods and tools to be used. Well-prepared facilitation is expected to support structured discussions, balanced participation and the generation of actionable outputs.

A third success factor concerns the design of clear and structured outputs. The planning phase includes the preparation of templates and guidance to ensure that discussions are translated into concrete proposals, including defined actions, stakeholders and indicative timelines. This helps to ensure that outputs are usable and can effectively feed into subsequent WP5 deliverables.

In parallel, the planning phase allows for the identification of potential risks that may affect the implementation of the Working Groups. One key risk is related to low or unbalanced stakeholder participation, which may limit the diversity of perspectives. To mitigate this, partners are expected to implement proactive recruitment strategies and ensure clear communication of the value of participation.

Another potential risk concerns limited engagement during workshops, which may affect the quality of the co-creation process. This can be anticipated by planning the use of interactive tools and participatory facilitation techniques that encourage active contribution.

A further challenge relates to the risk of generating overly general or non-actionable outputs. To address this, the methodology includes structured templates and guidance to support the formulation of concrete and feasible proposals.

Finally, differences in national contexts may lead to variability in results across countries. The use of a standardised methodological framework, tools and reporting templates, as defined in this deliverable, is expected to mitigate this risk and ensure overall coherence and comparability.

Overall, the guidelines and annexed tools presented in this deliverable provide partners with a common planning framework for the preparation of the MASTERY Working Groups. By defining the methodological approach, stakeholder engagement strategy, workshop

structure, monitoring tools and reporting templates in advance, D5.1 ensures readiness for the subsequent deployment phase and supports a coherent, comparable and evidence-based implementation across the consortium.

14. Conclusions

This document has established a comprehensive and structured framework for the planning and preparation of the MASTERY Working Groups within Task T5.1. By defining a common methodological approach, stakeholder engagement strategy, workshop structure and supporting tools, it ensures that all partners are equipped to organise the Kick-start Workshops in a coherent, consistent and high-quality manner across different national and regional contexts.

A key added value of this deliverable lies in its focus on preparation as a critical success factor. By addressing in advance aspects such as stakeholder identification, definition of objectives, session design, facilitation approaches and data collection methods, the document creates the necessary conditions for effective implementation in the subsequent phase (T5.2). This proactive approach reduces operational risks, enhances stakeholder engagement and increases the likelihood of generating meaningful and actionable outcomes.

In addition, the integration of practical tools through the annexes—including templates for agendas, invitations, attendance lists, reporting and evaluation—translates the methodological framework into operational guidance. These tools support partners in applying a harmonised approach, while maintaining the flexibility needed to adapt to specific national and institutional contexts.

The guidelines also ensure strong alignment with the broader objectives of WP5, particularly in terms of supporting the uptake, validation and integration of green skills micro-credentials (EQF 4–6). By structuring the Working Groups as co-creation environments, the planning framework facilitates meaningful stakeholder participation and lays the foundation for the generation of evidence-based proposals that will feed into subsequent deliverables, including D5.2 and D5.3.

Overall, D5.1 represents a key starting point in the WP5 process, bridging the transition from project design and piloting phases towards stakeholder-driven implementation and policy uptake. By ensuring methodological coherence, operational readiness and cross-country comparability, this deliverable contributes to strengthening the impact, scalability and long-term sustainability of the MASTERY approach.

Annexes

Annex I. Agenda template



MASTERY WP5 Kick-start Workshop n°X: title of the session (country)

Date: XX/XX/2026

Location: XXX (presential) & online (link)

Start time: XXh

Duration: X hours

AGENDA

Links of interest:



MASTERY Micro credentials reliability unleashing green economy project 101132845 ERASMUS-EDU-2023-PI-FORWARD is funded by the European Union, under the Erasmus Plus Program. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.



Annex II. Attendance list template



MASTERY WP5 Kick-start Workshop n° X (Country)

Project: MASTERY

Date: XX/XX/2026

Venue: City (Country)

Nº	Name and Surname	Organisation	E-mail	Signature	Consent
1					☐ YES ☐ NO
2					☐ YES ☐ NO
3					☐ YES ☐ NO
4					☐ YES ☐ NO
5					☐ YES ☐ NO

Please, be informed that the data you provide in this register will be used only for the purposes of the project, according to GDPR.

Annex III. Invitation emails template



Invitation email session 1

Object: Invitation to MASTERY Kick-start Workshop – Session 1 (Alignment & Context Setting)

Dear [Name],

I hope this message finds you well.

We are pleased to invite you to participate in the first session of the MASTERY Kick-start Workshops, organised within the European project MASTERY – Micro-credentials Empowering Sustainable Skills.

This initiative focuses on supporting the implementation of green skills micro-credentials (EQF levels 4-6), contributing to the green transition and strengthening the link between education, labour market needs and public policies.

This first session aims to:

- Introduce the MASTERY framework and green micro-credentials
- Present the MASTERY Policy Methodology (WP3) and national priority visions
- Create a shared understanding of the current challenges and opportunities
- Identify initial priorities to guide the co-creation process
- What to expect

During the session, we will:

- Present key project results and policy approaches
- Explore the role of micro-credentials in supporting the green transition
- Facilitate a short interactive reflection on:
 - key challenges in your context
 - priority areas for action

I will take on [insert date], at [insert time] and it will be [online/in-person/hybrid].

If you are available, please confirm your participation by [date].

We look forward to your valuable contribution.

Best regards,

[Your Name]

[Organisation]



Invitation email session 2

Object: Invitation to MASTERY Kick-start Workshop – Session 2 (Co-design of Proposals)

Dear [Name],

I hope this message finds you well.

We are pleased to invite you to participate in Session 2 – Co-design of Proposals, the core session of the MASTERY co-creation process.

This session will focus on co-creating concrete and actionable proposals for the implementation of green skills micro-credentials (EQF levels 4–6).

Building on the MASTERY Policy Methodology and the priority visions identified at national level, participants will work collaboratively to define:

- implementation pathways
- roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders
- short-term actions (1–2 years)
- initial ideas for monitoring and evaluation (KPIs)

This interactive session will include:

- Structured group discussions
- Identification of barriers and enabling factors
- Co-creation of realistic and implementable solutions

The session will take place on [insert date], at [insert time] and it will be [specify the address of the facilities where it will be celebrated].

We strongly encourage your participation in this in-person session, as it enables effective collaboration and co-creation.

Please confirm your attendance by [date].

We look forward to working together.

Best regards,

[Your Name]

[Organisation]

Invitation email session 3

Object: Invitation to MASTERY Kick-start Workshop – Session 3 (Validation & Prioritisation)

Dear [Name],

We are pleased to invite you to the final session of the MASTERY Kick-start Workshops, focusing on the validation and prioritisation of proposals developed during the co-creation process.

This session aims to:

- Review and refine the proposals developed in Session 2
- Assess their feasibility, impact and policy relevance
- Prioritise the most relevant actions
- Identify initial monitoring indicators (KPIs)

During the session, participants will:

- Analyse and discuss the proposed actions
- Evaluate alignment with national context, policy frameworks, labour market needs
- Prioritise proposals using interactive tools
- Reflect on how to measure success and track implementation

This session represents the final step in shaping impact-oriented outcomes of the MASTERY project.

The session will take place on [insert date], at [insert time] and it will be [online/in-person/hybrid].

Please confirm your attendance by [date].

Thank you very much for your valuable contribution throughout this process.

Best regards,

[Your Name]

[Organisation]

Annex IV. Reporting template

National Workshops Outcomes Report Template

General instructions

This template is intended to report the outcomes of the WP5 Kick-start Workshops implemented under Task 5.2.

Reporting scope

- All partner countries: report on the 3 workshops / working groups implemented at regional and national level.
- Belgium / Brussels: report on the 1 EU-level workshop / working group.

Reporting objective

The report should:

- document how the workshops were implemented,
- summarise the main discussions and results,
- capture the concrete proposals generated,
- identify common and country-specific insights,
- provide evidence for CETEM to consolidate D5.2 – Working Groups Outcomes Report.

1. Basic information

1.1 Country / Level

- Country:
- Reporting partner:
- Contact person:
- Email:
- Reporting period:

1.2 Type of report

☐ National report covering **3 workshops / working groups**

☐ EU-level report covering **1 workshop / working group** (Belgium / Brussels)

2. Scope and Objective of the Working Groups (*approx. 0.5–1 page*)

Briefly explain:

- why the workshops were organised in the context of WP5,
- how they contribute to the roll-out of the MASTERY policy recommendation,
- how they support the implementation and uptake of EQF 5–6 green micro-credentials,
- what the national / EU-level objective of the workshops was.

You may refer to:

- co-development of policy and VET recommendations,
- stakeholder dialogue,
- identification of barriers and enabling factors,
- development of concrete implementation proposals.

3. Methodology and Implementation Approach (*approx. 1 page*)

3.1 Overall workshop design

Describe briefly:

- the workshop process followed,
- number of sessions held,
- whether sessions were online / hybrid / in-person,
- how the agreed WP5 design principles were applied.

3.2 Facilitation and tools

Indicate:

- who moderated / facilitated the workshops,
- whether a rapporteur or note-taker was involved,
- which tools were used (PPT, videos, guided discussion, templates, etc.)
- which digital participation tools were used (e.g. Mentimeter, Slido, collaborative boards)

3.3 Stakeholder engagement approach

Explain briefly:

- how stakeholders were identified and recruited,
- how the multi-actor approach was ensured,
- any challenges faced in recruitment or attendance.

4. Participant Profile (*approx. 0.5–1 page*)

4.1 Total number of participants

- Total number of participants involved:
- Number of participants per workshop (if applicable):

4.2 Stakeholder categories represented

Indicate the number of participants from each category:

- VET professionals (trainers, teachers, curriculum designers)
- Public authorities / policymakers
- Industry / labour market representatives
- Ecosystem actors (employment, guidance, intermediaries)

4.3 Brief qualitative description

Briefly describe:

- the relevance of the stakeholders involved,
- whether the composition was balanced,
- any gaps or particularly valuable stakeholder profiles.

5. Workshop-by-Workshop Summary (*core section; repeat for each workshop*)

Each workshop should be understood as part of a progressive co-creation process, where:

Session 1 → alignment and identification of priorities

Session 2 → co-design of proposals based on priority visions

Session 3 → validation, prioritisation and initial monitoring reflection

5A. Workshop 1

5A.1 Basic information

- Title / name of the workshop:
- Date:
- Duration:
- Format (online / hybrid / in-person):

- Level (regional / national / EU):
- Location (if applicable):

5A.2 Objective of this workshop

Describe the specific purpose of this workshop within the national / EU-level process.

5A.3 Main discussion points

Summarise the main themes discussed, for example:

- barriers to implementing micro-credentials,
- role of VET providers,
- policy and regulatory issues,
- labour market relevance,
- cooperation mechanisms,
- discussion of priority visions (WP3) and their relevance in the national context.
- assessment of the current status of selected visions.
- identification of stakeholders involved and missing actors.
- sustainability and uptake conditions.

5A.4 Main outcomes

Summarise the key outcomes and conclusions reached.

5A.5 Concrete proposals generated

List the concrete proposals produced in this workshop.

For each proposal, include:

- Title of proposal
- Short description
- Target area: VET / Policy / Labour market / Cross-sectoral
- Responsible actor(s)
- Related MASTERY priority vision(s) (WP3) and micro-credentials
- Feasibility: short-term / medium-term
- Priority level: high / medium / low
- Proposed indicators (KPIs) or monitoring elements (if identified)

5A.6 Lessons learned

Briefly indicate:

- what worked well,
- what could be improved,
- any facilitation or participation issues.

6. Cross-Workshop Analysis and National / EU-level Synthesis

(approx. 2–3 pages)

This section is especially important because CETEM will use it to consolidate D5.2.

6.1 Common barriers and challenges identified

Summarise the barriers that appeared repeatedly across the workshops, such as:

- limited awareness or understanding of micro-credentials,
- institutional resistance,
- lack of policy frameworks,
- lack of recognition by employers,
- insufficient coordination between actors,

- implementation or resource constraints.

6.2 Common enabling factors

Summarise the main enabling conditions identified, such as:

- strong stakeholder cooperation,
- flexible VET provision,
- labour market relevance,
- policy incentives,
- recognition mechanisms,
- alignment with green transition needs.

6.3 Main priority areas for action

Identify the main areas where action is needed at:

- VET level
- Policy level
- Labour market / ecosystem level

6.4 National / EU-level specificities

Highlight any contextual elements that are especially important in your country / at EU level:

- governance structure,
- maturity of the VET system,
- stakeholder readiness,
- labour market needs,
- policy opportunities or constraints.

6.5 Initial insights on monitoring and KPIs

Summarise:

- common ideas regarding how to measure implementation success.
- types of indicators proposed (qualitative / quantitative),
- gaps or challenges in defining KPIs

7. Consolidated List of Priority Proposals (*approx. 1–2 pages*)

From all workshops, identify the most relevant and feasible proposals to be considered in the joint WP5 recommendations.

Please select and summarise the top 5–10 proposals.

For each proposal include:

- Proposal title
- Short description
- Why it is important
- Who should lead it
- Feasibility (short / medium term)
- Relevance for:
 - VET recommendations
 - Policy recommendations
 - Both

8. Conclusions (*approx. 0.5 page*)

Provide a concise synthesis including:

- Key overall findings
- Most relevant proposals
- Key challenges and opportunities

- Implications for:
 - VET systems
 - Policy frameworks
 - Labour market actors

Contribution to:

- MASTERY policy recommendations (D5.3)
- Future application and scalability (D5.4)

9. Annexes / Evidence of Implementation

To put in Google Drive:

- workshop agendas,
- attendance lists
- photos/screenshots,
- completed voting results,
- facilitation materials,
- other relevant evidence.

Annex V. Evaluation Questionnaire for Workshops

Purpose

This questionnaire aims to collect feedback from participants in order to assess the quality, effectiveness and impact of the MASTERY Working Groups. The results will contribute to the monitoring and evaluation process (T5.4) and support continuous improvement.

Instructions

Please answer the following questions based on your experience in the workshop(s). The questionnaire is anonymous and will take approximately 3–5 minutes.

1. Participant Profile

Stakeholder category:

- ☐ VET provider (teacher/trainer)
- ☐ Policymaker / Public authority
- ☐ Industry / Company representative
- ☐ Ecosystem actor (employment services, guidance, etc.)
- ☐ Other: _____

2. Overall Evaluation of the Workshop

Please rate the following statements: (1 = Strongly disagree | 5 = Strongly agree)

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
The objectives of the workshop were clear	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The workshop was well organised	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The duration and pace were appropriate	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I am satisfied with the overall experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Participation and Engagement

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
I had enough opportunities to contribute	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Different stakeholder perspectives were well represented	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The discussions were interactive and engaging	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. Quality of Discussion

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
The discussions were relevant to my context	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The workshop helped identify key challenges (barriers)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The workshop helped identify possible solutions (enablers)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The discussions led to concrete and actionable ideas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. Outputs and Results

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
The proposals developed are relevant	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The proposals are feasible in practice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The prioritisation process was clear and useful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The workshop contributes to improving micro-credentials implementation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Impact and Usefulness

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
I have a better understanding of MASTERY micro-credentials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The workshop is relevant for my professional context	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I see potential for applying the results in my organisation/context	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. Open Questions

- What was the most valuable aspect of the workshop?

- What could be improved in future sessions?

- Do you have any suggestions for implementing micro-credentials in your context? -----

8. Final Feedback

- Would you participate in similar activities in the future?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Maybe



Co-funded by
the European Union