

ABSTRACT

IMPLEMENTATION REPORT FOR THE ANNUAL PLAN FOR
THE EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY, IMPACT, EFFECTIVENESS
AND EFFICIENCY OF THE ENTIRE SYSTEM OF VOCATIONAL
TRAINING FOR EMPLOYMENT IN THE LABOUR SPHERE

2017-2018



The Implementation Report for the Annual Plan for the Evaluation of the entire System of Vocational Training for Employment in the labour sphere, 2017-2018 was subject to report by the General Council of National Employment System on September 30rd, 2020.

Index

1	Introduction	3
2	Block I: System of indicators 2017 and 2018	5
2.1	Context.....	5
2.2	Results Indicators 2017-2018.....	5
2.2.1	Quality indicators.....	5
2.2.2	Performance / effectiveness indicators	6
2.2.3	Efficiency indicators	9
2.2.4	Impact indicators.....	10
3	Block II: Non-publicly funded training developed by centres and entities of private initiative, aimed at obtaining professional certificates (Creditable Private Initiative, IPA)	11
3.1	Context.....	11
3.2	Conclusions of the Creditable Private Initiative indicators	12
4	Block III: Analysis of the evaluation systems that generate information on the quality of the training provided by training entities (2018)	13
4.1	Context.....	13
4.2	Conclusions of the qualitative analysis	14
4.2.1	PES planning for training quality assessment	14
4.2.2	Preparation of training centres.....	17
4.2.3	Planning of training by entities.....	18
4.2.4	Provision of training by entities.....	19
4.2.5	Impact of training by entities	21
4.2.6	Other aspects evaluated on the quality of the training provided by the training entities	22
5	Block IV: Evaluation of training scheduled by companies and individual training leaves, 2017-2018 (FUNDAE)	22
5.1	Context and description of the project.....	22
5.2	Conclusions of the evaluation of training scheduled by companies and individual training leaves, 2017- 2018	23
5.2.1	Conclusions on the achievement of the system objectives.....	23
5.2.2	Conclusions on Individual Training Leaves (PIF)	28
5.2.3	Conclusions on efficiency and transparency in resource management	29

1 Introduction

The execution report of the Annual Evaluation Plan for the quality, impact, effectiveness and efficiency of the entire Vocational Training System for Employment 2017-2018, shares basic elements with the previous Annual Evaluation Plans regarding the working method and system of indicators, including at the same time the regulatory changes derived from **Law 30/2015, of 9 September**, which regulates the Vocational Training System for employment in the labour field, developed normatively by the **Royal Decree 694/2017, of 3 July**, whose object is the regulation of the initiatives and programmes of vocational training for employment, the requirements and limits of the training actions, their addressees and the form of accreditation of the competences acquired by the workers, as well as the instruments of the integrated system of information and the regime of operation of the system of vocational training for employment.

Law 30/2015 provides that the **State Public Employment Service is responsible for drawing up an annual plan to evaluate the quality, impact, effectiveness and efficiency of the entire vocational training system for employment in the field of labour, with the participation of the competent bodies or entities of the autonomous communities and the most representative business and trade union organisations.**

The **object of this evaluation is** the vocational training initiatives for employment managed by the different agents of the National Employment System. This evaluation process covers the following areas of application:

- Training scheduled by companies, for their workers.
- Training offer for employed workers.
- Training offer for unemployed workers.
- Other vocational training initiatives for employment.

The 2017-2018 Annual Evaluation Plan has **4** different **blocks of analysis**:

- **Block I:** Analysis and detailed treatment of the results of the 26 measurement indicators included in the 2017 and 2018 indicator system.
- **Block II:** Evaluation of training not financed by public funds developed by centres and private initiative entities aimed at obtaining professional certificates. Accreditable private initiative (IPAs) 2017 and 2018.
- **Block III:** Analysis of the questionnaire of the evaluation systems that generates information on the quality of the training provided by the training entities.
- **Block IV:** Summary of the evaluations of the training programmed by companies in 2017 and 2018 promoted by the State Foundation for Training in Employment.

This report presents certain new features in comparison with previous years, the main ones being as follows:

With respect to Block I, the **system of indicators** in this edition will deal with both the training offer for employed workers and the training offer for unemployed workers in a global way. As for "Other initiatives", these include Individual training leave, Training in alternation with employment, Training for prisoners and Training for military personnel and sailors, as in previous editions.

On the other hand, for the first time, the evaluation of **non-publicly funded training developed by private initiative centres and entities** aimed at obtaining professional certificates is included in a separate chapter of the Implementation Report.

The specific configuration of the implementation, control and monitoring systems of each initiative, as well as their distribution of competences, has been analysed in order to determine the most relevant factors that have been included in the evaluation indicators. Thus, a fundamental variable in the PAE addresses the levels at which the national and regional training model for employment moves, and that of the productive sectors, in terms of the professional family.

Finally, it should be noted that the **Spanish Employment Activation Strategy (EEAE) 2017-2020** includes this annual plan in the first level of evaluation of active employment policies. On the other hand, it is necessary to align the annual plan for the evaluation of the quality, impact, efficacy and efficiency of the entire system of vocational training for employment in the labour sphere (article 21.1 Law 30/2015) and the evaluations carried out by the competent bodies for the management, programming and control of vocational training for employment in their respective fields of competence (article 21.2 Law 30/2015), and in turn, with the evaluation of the training programmed and managed by the companies for their own workers (article 21.3 Law 30/2015), in order to build a system of permanent evaluation of vocational training for employment in the labour field.

In addition, the **experience acquired in previous editions of the SAP** has enabled some relevant aspects to be identified for the consolidation and improvement of the assessment process and these have been taken into account. The following aspects can be highlighted:

- **Progressive improvement of reliability and access to information in order to make** it increasingly complete, combining the criteria used by managers when obtaining data for the construction of indicators. In this sense, the use of the **Common Training Data Repository (CDR)** as a primary source of information is encouraged.
- **Review of indicators**, simplifying or eliminating those that have shown difficulties in measurement or that are not significant in practice.
- **Reinforcement of the SEPE-FUNDAE collaboration with the** aim of aligning the evaluation processes developed by both entities, i.e. the SAP and the evaluation of the training programmed and managed by the companies.
- **Analysis of the territorial evaluation systems that** generate information on the **quality of the training provided by training entities**. This is an ex-ante evaluation exercise that will provide useful information for the construction and definition of the quality elements to be included in the **State Register of Training Entities**, as established in Order TMS/369/2019, of 28 March.
- Analysis of the situation of **non-publicly funded training leading to professional certificates**, in line with the Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 on the establishment of a European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and Training (EQAVET).

2 Block I: System of indicators 2017 and 2018

2.1 Context

In accordance with the provisions of **Article 20 of Law 30/2015**, of 9 September, the integrated information system will collect complete and updated information on the training activities that are carried out throughout the national territory, which will allow for their traceability and the evaluation of their impact on the improvement of the employability of workers, and which will also guarantee the comparability, coherence and permanent updating of all the information on vocational training for employment, whatever the initiative under which it is developed. All this information will be collected in a single file, accessible to all the competent administrations.

The 2017-2018 indicator evaluation system has, as in previous editions, the aim of providing useful information to the National Employment System, in general, and to all the actors and persons responsible for the different initiatives and training modalities. To this end, the following evaluation objectives are established:

- **Quality objectives:** To measure and assess the quality of training.
- **Performance/Effectiveness objectives:** To identify the results obtained by the system in the development of its initiatives, the adequacy of the actions to the needs of its recipients and the labour market.
- **Efficiency objectives:** To determine the degree of optimisation of the result obtained in relation to the economic resources and means used.
- **Impact objectives:** To assess the effects of the development of vocational training initiatives on employment, in terms of access to and maintenance of employment for workers, improvement of the competitiveness of companies and improvement of the qualifications of workers.

These objectives are in line with the indicators assessed below. The codification used in the previous Evaluation Plans is maintained: CAL (quality), REA (performance), ECA (effectiveness), ECI (efficiency), IMP (impact).

These indicators are measured for:

- The training scheduled by companies, for their workers.
- The training offer for employed workers
- The training offer for unemployed workers.
- Other initiatives including Individual Training Leaves, Vocational Training and apprenticeship, Training for prisoners and troop and navy Military Personnel.

2.2 Results Indicators 2017-2018

2.2.1 Quality indicators

CAL01	Overall satisfaction level of the participants after finishing the courses
CAL02	% of professional certificates with accredited training centers
CAL03	% of Training actions of complete itinerary over the total of actions aimed at obtaining professional certificates
CAL04	% of Professional certificates Training actions over the total of training actions

In general terms, the degree of overall **satisfaction of the entire Vocational Training for Employment system (CAL01)** has remained relatively stable, obtaining 3.76 in 2017 and 3.8 in 2018. There is a notable increase in satisfaction from 2016 to 2017, the highest ever (0.13).

Disaggregated by the different initiatives and training modalities, the results obtained reveal, in general, high levels of satisfaction of the participants, the lowest value with a score of 3.34 being the programmes aimed at military troop and navy military personnel in 2018.

Regarding the year-on-year increase in the **percentage of accredited entities compared to the number of professional certificates (CAL02)**, while from 2014 to 2016 it was approximately 3 percentage points, in the last two years analysed (2017 and 2018), there is a slight slowdown in this increase, with the percentage being 91.08% and 92.45% respectively. In absolute numbers, the volume of certificates with accredited entities continues to rise, being 531 in 2017 and 539 in 2018.

On the other hand, after the considerable increase in 2016 of the **proportion of complete itinerary actions over the total of training actions aimed at acquiring programmed professional certificates (CAL03)**, in the specific modality of training actions aimed at unemployed people and in the set of training modalities analysed, there is a decrease of approximately 7 percentage points in 2017, followed by a slight decrease in 2018, standing at 29.33% in 2017 and 25.75% in 2018.

The decrease in the percentage of complete itinerary training actions aimed at the unemployed from 2016 to 2017 is much greater, approximately 15 percentage points, 34.19% in 2017.

Finally, regarding the implementation of **training actions aimed at obtaining professional certificates in relation to the total number of training actions given (CAL04)**, there is an increase both in 2017 and 2018, after the decrease in 2016, with their value in 2017 being 2.11% and in 2018 2.26%.

2.2.2 Performance / effectiveness indicators

REA01	Participants in public mixed training and employment programmes
REA02	Volume of participants in training actions
ECA01	Degree of financial execution
ECA02	Average duration of training provided
ECA03	Average duration of individual training leaves
ECA05	Multiparticipation rate
ECA06	Percentage distribution by mode of training delivery
ECA07	Rate of participants carrying out professional internships
ECA08	Drop-out rate due to placement
ECA09	Drop-out rate due to other causes
ECA10	Training success rate
ECA11	Coverage rate of unemployed workers
ECA12	Coverage rate of employed workers
ECA13	Company bonus coverage rate

During the years 2017 and 2018, there is a notable decrease in the **number of participants in Public mixed training and employment programmes (REA01)**, decreasing by 33% from 2016 to 2017 and by 17% from 2017 to 2018, resulting in a total of 7,908 and 6,545 participants.

Furthermore, it is important to point out that only 3 Autonomous Communities show both types of training (Workshop Schools and Trade and Employment Workshops).

On the other hand, considering the **total participation in the whole of vocational training for employment (REA02)**, an increase of 6.5% is observed in 2017 compared to 2016, reaching 4,421,816 participants, increasing again the participation in 2018 by 9.8% (4,854,449 participants).

Among the different types of training, the increase in 2018 of more than 400,000 participants in the training actions programmed by the companies stands out.

From the perspective of the **degree of financial execution (ECA01)**, which refers to the percentage of the budget implemented in relation to that allocated, there has been a decrease of around 1.5 percentage points compared with 2016, reaching 54.50% in 2017 and 51.15% in 2018.

With regard to the budget allocated to the different types of training, there has been a continuous increase in the budget allocated to training actions programmed by companies, rising by more than 50,000,000 euros in the period 2016-2018.

The modality that has suffered the greatest decrease is that of actions aimed at the unemployed, which from 2010 to 2015 has lost more than 394,000,000 euros. In 2016 this modality experienced a slight recovery with respect to 2015 of 10,336,599 euros, increasing again in 2017 (increase of 157,353,342 euros with respect to 2016) and again in 2018, although to a lesser extent.

As regards the budget implemented, as is the case with the allocated budget, the values for 2017 and 2018 show a significant gradual increase compared to previous years in all forms of training, except for training for persons in prison, where the budget implemented decreases in 2017.

With regard to the **average duration of the training actions (ECA02)**, in the modality of training programmed by companies, there is a decrease which begins in 2014, from which it has fallen progressively, decreasing slightly in 2017 with respect to the previous year and in 2018, showing 29.67 hours in 2017 and 28.29 hours in 2018.

As far as the regional call is concerned, in 2017 the average duration of 78.8 (2016) decreases considerably to 59.56 hours, recovering in 2018 but not exceeding 2016, reaching 70.13 hours.

After the progressive decrease of the average duration for actions targeting the unemployed, it increases by approximately 13% from 2016 to 2017 to reach a duration of 292.87 hours, with a very similar duration in 2018. The increase in hours in the specific programmes in 2017 (395.69 hours) is also noteworthy.

On the other hand, with regard to **individual training leaves (ECA03)**, it can be seen that in the period 2017-2018 there is a decrease with respect to previous periods in terms of average duration, with 74.36 hours and 72.05 hours respectively, decreasing by approximately 8 hours from 2016 to 2018.

The number of individual training leaves decreases equally and progressively from 2013 to 6,017 and 5,171 in 2017 and 2018 respectively, assuming a decrease of 15.5% in 2017 compared to 2016.

With regard to the evolution of the **multiparticipation rate (ECA05)**, it should be noted that it has shown a slight increase in 2017 and 2018, compared with previous intervals in practically all training modalities (1.52 in 2017 and 1.56 in 2018).

The rate of multiparticipation in training actions programmed by companies increases by 0.04 in 2017 and increases again by 0.05 in 2018 with respect to the previous year, standing at 1.53 and 1.58 respectively.

Similarly, training actions aimed at the unemployed show a higher rate in 2017 (1.4), exceeding by 0.14 the rate obtained in 2016 and reaching the same rate as in 2015, increasing again in 2018 to reach a rate of 1.42.

On the other hand, the rate of programmes for employed people in state calls for proposals increased in 2018 to 1.32.

With regard to the regional call, after reaching the minimum rate in 2014 since 2010, there is a gradual increase that culminates with rates of 1.51 and 1.5 in 2017 and 2018 respectively.

Finally, it should be noted that the use of the new form of calculation produces results that are consistent with those obtained using the ECA05 calculation form conventionally used in the annual assessment plan and shown above.

Regarding the **percentage distribution of hours by mode of training delivery (ECA06)**, in general, it can be said that there is a fair degree of stability, and in all cases the number of hours delivered face-to-face is greater, with 50.46% in 2017 and 51.42% in 2018.

In the case of the face-to-face mode, with regard to the training actions scheduled by the companies, an increase is observed in 2017 and 2018 with respect to previous years, which responds to the notable increase in 2016 (more than 10 percentage points compared to 2015), reaching an increase of 2 percentage points in 2017 and increasing again slightly in 2018.

The face-to-face modality in training programmes for employed people decreases in regional calls after the increase in 2016 (89.9%), reaching 83.37% in 2017 and a greater decrease in 2018 to 76.68%.

The **percentage of unemployed participants who carry out professional internship (ECA07)** shows higher rates from 2016, standing at between 18% and 21%, increasing in 2017 and decreasing slightly in 2018 and similarly in both sexes, although without reaching the rate of participants carrying out professional internship obtained in 2013 (27%).

The **drop-out rate due to placement in training actions for the unemployed (ECA08)** shows a very balanced trend over the years, with a slight decrease in 2016 but recovering in subsequent years, being 6.60% and 6.02% in 2017 and 2018 respectively.

With regard to the evolution of the **drop-out rate due to other causes (ECA09)**, a slight increase can be seen from 2014 onwards, increasing in the same way in the period 2017-2018 in all training modalities (8.90% and 9.90% in 2017 and 2018), with the exception of training actions for people in a situation of deprivation of liberty, with a

decrease in 2017 increasing again in 2018 to reach the highest rate of the last 5 years analysed.

Since 2013, **the training success rate (ECA10)** has been in a slight but continuous decrease, it is in 2018 when it has increased approximately 1.5 percentage points being in this year at 93.28%.

The training modalities analysed have remained stable over the last few years evaluated, with a notable increase in the success rate for specific programmes in 2017 (approximately 20 percentage points).

The evolution of the indicator of the **coverage rate of training actions for the unemployed according to registered unemployment (ECA11)** shows a slight increase in 2017 (5.66%) with respect to 2016, which decreases again in 2018 (5.75%) to a rate similar to that of 2016 for the different modalities of training, thus accentuating the decrease in the constant coverage rate which has been taking place since 2011.

As for the **coverage rate of employed workers (ECA12)**, in 2017 there is a decrease in the rate from 2016 of approximately 5 percentage points to 12.75%, however, in 2018 there is an increase in the rate, 13.27%. In spite of having suffered a considerable decrease in the rate in these years, it is not as low as in 2015, which was 7.47%, although it is true that before 2015 the rates remained close to 19%.

The **overall company bonus coverage rate (ECA13)** has decreased in the last two years assessed (17.70% and 17.71% in 2017 and 2018 respectively) in line with the negative trend previously observed, reaching a similar rate for 2017 and 2018 for each of the sectors analysed.

Likewise, the rate decreases for both years in all the typologies of company analysed (according to size), reaching a similar rate, again, for each of these two years.

2.2.3 Efficiency indicators

ECI01	Average cost per completed participant and hour of training in the training offer
ECI02	Average cost per completed participant and hour of training in the training scheduled by the companies

The upward trend since 2016 for the **Average Cost per participant completed and hour of training (ECI01)** continues during 2018. By training modality, the decrease in 2018 in the training offer for the unemployed, in training programmes for the employed in regional calls, stands out, decreasing from 5.80 euros to 0.40 euros in 2018. In 2018, the average cost of training for persons deprived of their liberty has increased to 4.68 euros; in 2017 it was 3.90 euros, a cost which had fallen by approximately 1 euro compared to the previous year.

With regard to the **average cost per participant completed and hour of training in the training scheduled by the companies, (ECI02)**, the increase in the average disbursement since 2016 is maintained, observing an increase in 2017 of 3% over the previous year, standing at 19.17 euros and continuing the increase in 2018 to reach 19.55 euros. Training in companies without private co-financing has also seen its values rise, from 7.82 euros per hour per participant in 2017 to 7.89 euros in 2018.

2.2.4 Impact indicators

IMP01	Job retention rate
IMP02	Rate of labour market insertion of employees in non-accreditable training
IMP03	Rate of labour market insertion of employees in accreditable training
IMP04	Percentage of participants in accreditable training
IMP05	Percentage of employed labour insertion in public mixed training and employment programmes at the end of the project
IMP06	Labour insertion rate according to Social Security affiliation

The **job retention rate (IMP01)** has increased by approximately one percentage point in 2017 to 92.21%, which has been maintained in 2018, increasing slightly to 92.51%.

By training modality, growth has been similar. In training activities in companies, the rate of job retention is around 94%, increasing slightly in 2018 compared to 2017 (93.73%).

In the training plans for state-employed workers, the year-on-year increase is 5 percentage points, reaching 90.09%. In regional calls, the increase of 18 percentage points from 2016 to 2017 is reinforced by another increase of almost 2 points for 2018, reaching a rate of 37.13%.

With regard to the **labour market insertion of employees obtained in non-accreditable training (IMP02)**, lower overall average values are observed in 2018 (34.73%) for the labour market insertion rate in non-accreditable training with respect to 2017 (35.77%). It should be remembered that this number rose to 40.82% by 2016, which means a negative trend of 14.91% in 2 years. If we analyse this indicator by sex, in 2018 women had a higher rate of 2.38 percentage points: 35.75% compared to 33.37%.

In the case of the **rate of labour market insertion of employees in accreditable training (IMP03)** after the increase of more than 3 points from 2016 to 2017, a slight decrease is observed in 2018 (44.56%) with respect to 2017 (45.81%). By pathway, training actions aimed at the unemployed and specific programmes show a slightly higher rate of labour market insertion in full pathway training than in partial pathway actions. In 2018, the former account for 51.01%, compared with 49.3% for training with a partial pathway.

Analyzing the **percentage of participants in training actions aimed at obtaining professional certificates in relation to the total number of participants who complete training actions (IMP04)**, it can be seen how the global average increases from 48.95% in 2017 to 51.77% in 2018. With regard to training for the employed on a regional level, a decrease can be observed in comparison with 2016, although the rate is higher than in previous years, reaching 29.2% in 2017 and 31.41% in 2018. Specific programmes increase considerably in 2017. However, in the programmes for people in a situation of deprivation of liberty, the participants in accreditable training have decreased 14.6 percentage points from 2016 to 2018, obtaining 76%.

In the **public mixed training and employment programmes (IMP05)**, the rate of labour market insertion for employees in 2017 continues to increase progressively since 2014, reaching 44.55%, while in 2018 (39.59%) there is a decrease of 5 percentage points, reaching levels below those of 2016. By type of training programme, in 2018 it is the workshop schools and trade houses that show the best insertion rate, with 50.79% compared to 34.7% for employment workshops.

Finally, the **percentage of participants who have completed the training with a positive evaluation and have signed up for Social Security, during the 6 months following its completion (IMP06)** increased in 2017 by approximately 3 percentage points compared to the previous year to reach 42.2%, maintaining a very similar rate in 2018 (42.69%). When analysing the insertion rate by type of speciality, it can be seen that training linked to obtaining a professional certificate is still the option that shows the best results in 2018.

3 Block II: Non-publicly funded training developed by centres and entities of private initiative, aimed at obtaining professional certificates (Accreditable Private Initiative, *Iniciativa Privada Acreditable, IPA*)

3.1 Context

This is the first time that information on non-publicly funded training developed by private initiative centres and entities has been collected and analysed and included in the Annual Evaluation and Training Plan. The aim of this analysis is to understand the territorial reality based on the information available as a result of the accreditation, monitoring and control actions carried out by the competent administrations.

It is therefore an **evaluative process with a limited scope, which will contribute to a greater understanding of the implementation of this training initiative**, both at the territorial and national level, facilitating the processes of systematization of the information generated and its input into the integrated information system of vocational training for employment.

The **main objectives** of this evaluation were

- Test a system for collecting primary data on the supply of accredited private initiative training.
- Analyse the availability and quality of the information obtained.
- To select indicators that allow comparability between creditable training financed by public funds and that of private initiative.
- To know the degree of implementation of this training initiative.

On the basis of these objectives, the following **procedure** has been carried out for the **elaboration of the analysis**:

- Definition of indicators.
- Preparation, sending and forwarding of templates to the Autonomous Regions for data collection.
- Data analysis and correction.
- Drawing up conclusions.

The definition of indicators began on the basis of the proposal sent by the Autonomous Community of La Rioja, based on the use of the same system of indicators as the SAP 2017-2018, including the PPI as a further training initiative and maintaining the four objective blocks of the evaluation: quality, effectiveness, efficiency and impact.

On the basis of this proposal, a comparison was made with the **Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009** on the establishment of a European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and Training (EQAVET), which includes the quality assurance and improvement cycle based on a selection of quality criteria, descriptors and indicators applicable to quality management at both VET system and provider levels, as shown below.

3.2 Conclusions of the Creditable Private Initiative indicators

This is the first time this information has been collected on training not financed by public funds and developed by private entities and centres (IPA, Creditable Private Initiative) in order to understand the territorial reality.

All data by territory are declaratory and have therefore been provided by the autonomous communities. This fact, added to the fact that this is the first time this information has been provided, and that not all the Communities have all the figures required, means that it is not possible to completely represent the real situation of the Creditable Private Initiative in Spain. The SEPE data correspond to teletraining and have been obtained from the corresponding database.

Looking specifically at the data, the **IPA01** referring to the **percentage of full itinerary training actions over the total of actions aimed at obtaining professional certificates through private initiative**, shows a positive trend towards full itinerary training actions although the percentages are very close to 50%, (49.39% in 2017 and 58.89% in 2018).

In relation to the **IPA02 Volume of participants in training actions**, it can be stated that the number of participants increases from 2017 to 2018 by 2.85% which in volume of execution is an increase of 989 participants in one year, being 34,631 in 2017 and 35,620 in 2018. It is important to highlight that the training activity carried out by the SEPE accounted for 37.2% and 24.7% of the total number of participants in 2017 and 2018, respectively.

The **IPA03** analyses the **percentage distribution of training actions by mode of delivery** face-to-face or teletraining. As commented in section 3.1 on the context of accreditable private initiative, the SEPE is in the process of transferring the competences of the teletraining modality to the Autonomous Communities, so it is expected that the latter will increase their percentage of accreditable private initiative training through this modality. Finally, in global terms, attendance-based training predominates with 91.33% in 2017 and 90.28% in 2018.

With regard to the **IPA04**, the **rate of participants in accreditable private initiative who take the practical training in the workplace module (MFPCT)**, it should be noted that it shows a high growth from one year to the next, with 38.87% of participants taking the practical training in the workplace module in 2017 and 47.61% in 2018.

The **IPA05** and **IPA06**, show the **drop-out rate due to placement and due to other causes**, respectively. Thus in 2017 the drop-out rate due to placement was 0.95% while the drop-out rate due to other causes was 10.45%. In 2018 the drop-out rate increases, specifically the drop-out rate due to placement which is 1.18% and the other causes drop-out rate which increases to 11.38%.

In relation to the **training success rate (IPA07)** the data obtained in this indicator is high and therefore very positive, despite the fact that from 2017 to 2018 there has been a slight decrease in the rate: in 2017 a training success rate of 92.70% was obtained, while in 2018 it was 89.90%.

With regard to the indicators, **average cost per participant (IPA08)**, **rate of labour market insertion of employees in accreditable training (IPA09)**, **rate of labour market insertion according to Social Security affiliation (IPA10)**, it is not possible to carry out a complete analysis since very few autonomous communities have this information.

For the **IPA08** referring to the **average cost per participant**, information was only available for three Autonomous Communities, which prevents a detailed analysis on a national level.

With regard to the **IPA09 Rate of labour market insertion of employees in accreditable training**, nine autonomous communities have sent in the data; from this it can be seen that the insertion rate in 2017 is 42.48% and in 2018 49.92%. Finally, the **IPA10 Rate of labour market insertion according to Social Security affiliation** shows very similar data to IPA09, with 44.24% of the rate obtained in 2017 and 42.03% in 2018.

As a general conclusion, it should be pointed out that the information available to the Public Employment Services on the private initiative of accredited training, carried out by training entities and centres, is quite preliminary and needs to be more systematic in the collection of data.

Finally, it should be pointed out that if the total number of participants in all accreditable training is taken into account, that is, both publicly funded training (see indicator IMP04) and private training, private initiative represented **16.1% in 2017** (34,631 versus 214,525) and **15.4% in 2018** (35,620 versus 231,682).

4 Block III: Analysis of the evaluation systems that generate information on the quality of the training provided by training entities (2018)

4.1 Context

The Law 30/2015, of 9 September, which regulates the Vocational Training System for employment in the labour field, establishes in its article 21 that the vocational training system for employment will have permanent evaluation mechanisms that allow to know the impact of the training carried out.

Specifically, the impact of training on access to and maintenance of employment, improvement of the competitiveness of companies, improvement of the qualifications of workers, adaptation of training actions to the needs of the labour market and efficiency of the economic resources and means used will be evaluated.

Training entities, as providers of vocational training within the system of vocational training for employment and with the aim of ensuring compliance with the conditions that motivate the implementation of training actions, may be subject to certain evaluation mechanisms.

In addition, there are regulations regarding the requirements for accreditation and registration of these training entities that are also associated with quality assessment. The Law 30/2015, in article 15.1, requires training entities to be accredited by the competent public administration. This accreditation is also associated with registration in the corresponding authorised administrative register.

The State Register will incorporate information on the quality and results of the training provided by the training entities included in it, by means of objective and transparent indicators. This information will also be included in the registers set up by the competent administrations and will reflect the situation in which the training entities find themselves, as a result of the permanent evaluation actions carried out by the competent bodies for the management, programming and control of vocational training for employment in their respective fields

The information on the situation of the centres that have the spaces (presential and virtual) in which vocational training for employment is given will include the strategic planning of the training offer, infrastructure and equipment, learning materials, management of the teaching activity, evaluation of the learning, documentary and administrative management and orientation and improvement of the employability.

4.2 Conclusions of the qualitative analysis

4.2.1 PES planning for training quality assessment

35% of the Autonomous Communities (5 Autonomous Regions) have a **training quality assessment plan**. These assessment plans are aimed at all entities that provide training, but in no case are they aimed exclusively at accredited entities. Moreover, all these Autonomous Communities have a legal regulation that supports evaluation.

The state of affairs of these plans is different in these 5 Autonomous Communities: in one of them it is in the process of being drawn up, while two of them have an indefinite plan subject to periodic review and the other two draw up the plan annually.

The periodicity with which the plans are implemented is therefore continuous, permanent, or annual, in some cases with occasional evaluations during the year.

As for the timing of evaluation activities, this varies, depending on the Autonomous Community, between a combination of *ex-ante*, during and *ex-post* evaluations.

The plans are structured in main areas or domains, which vary from one community to another, so the approach of each of the Autonomous Regions with an Evaluation Plan is presented below:

1. INAEM's plan for Aragon focuses on the resources available and the characteristics of the centres to be registered. In addition, if a grant is awarded, an evaluation of the operation is carried out through the monitoring and control procedures.
2. The quality evaluation plan of the Public Employment Service of Castilla-La Mancha has two main lines:
 - o A line of action with the training entities referred to the implementation of a quality model of entities with which it works focused on: the design of the training offer, the development of the training offer and the responsibility and social presence of the training entities.
 - o Likewise, in the monitoring of the training actions with their non-working practice modules, work is done on the fulfilment of the profile of the trainers,

satisfaction, the training project and the contributions of the managers or directors of the strong and weak points of the course delivery.

3. The SOC of Catalonia includes different tools used to carry out the Training Quality Assessment Plan, such as

- The centre management report, which evaluates the delivery of training, management of training actions and internships in companies.
- The minutes of the visit, evaluating the corporate image and advertising; the certificate of quality and solidity of the facilities; the previous information to the students; the procedure of selection of the students; the student's card, documentation and didactic material; the control of the attendance of the students; the state of the facilities, equipment, endowments and materials; the training personnel; the fulfillment of the formative program and evaluation of students; and, in the case of the practices, the execution of the practical training in the workplace module.
- The participant satisfaction questionnaire with which the areas of the standard model are evaluated.
- Ex-post evaluations of training that analyse quality through qualitative (focus groups, questionnaires) and quantitative (insertion) methods of analysis.

4. The Canarian Employment Service with its plan for the evaluation of the quality of training aims to fulfil the following objectives:

- To verify compliance by training centres and entities with the requirements applicable to them by virtue of legal or regulatory provisions, including the obligation to provide training in the spaces with accredited training means.
- To determine the effectiveness of activities carried out in the field of planning, implementation and evaluation.
- To detect any incidents or failures to comply with the training actions, proposing the necessary corrective measures.
- To obtain information by collecting physical evidence and testimonies that make it possible to evaluate the specific conditions of delivery and the results of the training actions.
- Verify the maintenance of technical-pedagogical requirements, installations, equipment and human resources.
- To gather information that will allow the evaluation and updating of the Training and Qualification Service for Employment, included in the Common Portfolio of Services, as well as the elaboration of the annual plan for the evaluation of the quality, impact, effectiveness and efficiency of the whole training system for employment in the labour field.

5. The last case analysed, the Navarre Employment Service Nafar-Lansare, includes in the evaluation plan the definition of the training policy, the design and programming, the implementation of the training actions and the evaluation.

The storage of plan data is, in almost all cases, telematic.

As regards the use of the results of the evaluations, they are focused on: continuous improvement, help in decision-making in programming, use of the same for the assessment criteria in calls for public subsidies, monitoring and control of the training

entities, evaluation of satisfaction, assessment of the insertion of the participants, or compliance with regulatory requirements. All the plans have corrective actions.

As regards the existence of different evaluations for different modes of delivery in the same plan, none of the PES differentiates between face-to-face, telematic or mixed evaluation. The same is true of accredited or registered entities, since only in the case of the Canary Islands Employment Service is assessment differentiated between entities accredited for obtaining professional certificates and those registered for the other training specialities in the Catalogue.

The other 9 autonomous communities that do not have a specific plan for evaluating the quality of training carry out **information gathering activities**. This means that although they do not have a plan they do carry out an evaluation of the training entities.

This group of SPE addresses its actions to all entities that provide training not exclusively for those that provide accredited training.

The frequency with which the actions are carried out varies from annual information collection actions, on an ad hoc basis subject to calls for subsidies, on a permanent basis or based on the duration of the training action.

The predominant time of evaluation in these 9 Public Employment Services are the *ex-post* and mid-term evaluations. In the case of La Rioja and the Valencian Community, in certain evaluations they carry out an evaluation prior to the start of the training action.

The list of specific fields or **areas of evaluation** of the information collection actions varies in each case. In general, they refer to the following: facilities, equipment, teaching resources, technical resources, implementation and evaluation of training actions, trainers and tutors, guidance, improvement of student employability, user coverage, student satisfaction, course coordination, general assessment of the course and documentary and administrative management. In most cases, corrective actions are carried out.

The **information collection** actions for the evaluation of the quality of training are carried out for all the training entities except in the case of the Community of Madrid, which in the case of entities that provide accredited training is addressed to all, but collects information from a sample of 5% of the entities.

For **data storage**, most have a computer support, although in some cases they also use the paper format as in the case of La Rioja.

Most of the information collection actions (9 of the 9 Public Employment Services) are supported by a **legal framework**: decrees, orders, regulatory bases and calls for public subsidies.

Once the evaluations have been carried out, they have **different uses**, although mainly, they are used for the assessment of calls for public subsidies, and improvements in the planning and execution of training.

As far as the **modes of delivery** are concerned, none of the administrations referred to differentiate between the evaluation of face-to-face, teletraining or mixed training. Nor does it differentiate between assessment depending on whether the training entity is **accredited or registered**.

4.2.2 Preparation of training centres

This section analyses the training infrastructure and equipment, the learning materials, the documentary and administrative management of the entities and the quality certification.

All the Autonomous Regions that have sent in the questionnaire carry out **evaluations of the training infrastructure and equipment of the training entities**, mainly reviewing aspects such as accessibility, location, teaching and non-teaching facilities, equipment and machinery, consumer material, student satisfaction with the facilities and health and safety. The vast majority take as a reference the aspects defined in the applicable regulations.

To carry out the evaluation, 8 out of the 15 autonomous communities that have sent in the questionnaires use measurement indicators (quality and improvement indicators, indicators of compliance with established requirements, and indicators of satisfaction and suitability of the aspects reviewed).

As an example of indicators, one can take the Cantabrian Employment Service which differentiates between the modes of delivery. In the case of entities that provide classroom training, it assesses whether

- The classroom, workshop or facilities have been appropriate for the development of the course.
- The technical means have been adequate to develop the course content (computers, blackboard, projector, TV, machines).

While for entities that provide mixed training or teletraining:

- Tutorial guides and teaching materials have made it easy to follow the course (printed, telematic applications).
- Sufficient support has been provided (individualized tutoring, mailing and distribution lists, teleconferencing, virtual library, search engines, etc.).

The main mechanism used by the Autonomous Communities for evaluating the infrastructure is face-to-face visits; the information gathered during these visits is compiled in a report or transferred to a platform. In some cases questionnaires and surveys are used.

Regarding the **learning materials**, 12 out of the 14 Autonomous Communities that have sent in the questionnaire for the evaluation of the quality of the training entities carry out evaluations of the learning materials, reviewing mainly the following specific aspects: comprehensibility, adequacy, updating, quality and quantity of the documentation and materials and use of new technologies.

Not all Public Employment Services use indicators to measure learning materials. Autonomous Communities such as Aragon, Cantabria, Castile-La Mancha, Catalonia, Castile-La Mancha or the Basque Country do have indicators for improvement, quality and compliance with previously established requirements.

Castilla-La Mancha has a model of measurement indicators that has 72 indicators distributed in 24 acceptable levels of quality (NAC) and 48 levels of improvement (NM), distributed in 7 areas: design and planning of the training offer, material resources and infrastructures, didactic resources at the service of training, quality management of the trainer and tutor, evaluation of professional competences, administrative management of subsidies and link between training and employment.

The main instruments used by these 12 Public Employment Services for the evaluation of learning materials are face-to-face visits and telematic or face-to-face surveys or questionnaires. Some of them also carry out virtual visits.

With regard to the carrying out of different evaluations according to the methods of delivery, four autonomous communities make some differentiation, as for example in the Community of Madrid and in the Basque Country that the questionnaires have additional or differentiated questions if it is a question of mixed training or e-learning.

As regards the planning of different evaluations based on whether the entity is accredited or registered, no Public Employment Service carries out this differentiation.

The evaluation of **documentary and administrative management by training entities** is carried out by 12 Public Employment Services, through the review of some specific aspects such as the process of selection of students, attendance data, the evaluation procedure of students, compliance with deadlines, accreditation of teachers or teaching hours per course.

To carry out the evaluation, five autonomous communities use measurement indicators, such as INAEM, which has a list of indicators relating to the selection of students, the preparation of conditions sheets, the start of the course, the presentation of student and teacher files, attendance checks, the preparation of diplomas, notification of incidents, the processing of grants, the management of advances and economic justification.

The information from the evaluation of the documentary and administrative management is collected through *on-site* visits and surveys and residually, they use instruments such as documentation sent by the training entity, telematic platforms or the complaints and suggestions sent by the students.

Public Employment Services such as the SOIB, INAEM, Nafar-Lansare, Emple@ Cantabria and the Public Employment Service of the Community of Madrid make a differentiation in the evaluation according to the mode of delivery of training, making *on-site* visits in the case of the face-to-face modality and monitoring through platforms in the teletraining modality, or positively evaluating the centres that give face-to-face training that have some kind of quality assurance system.

Finally, regarding **quality certification**, nine of the Public Employment Services analysed evaluate the provision of quality certificates, four of them evaluating them only for the granting of public subsidies to training centres.

The main **instruments** used by the Autonomous Communities for quality assessment are document review and the provision of the quality certificate.

With regard to quality certification, the Autonomous Communities do not carry out different evaluations depending on the type of teaching or whether they are registered or accredited entities.

4.2.3 Planning of training by entities

This section analyses whether the Employment Services evaluate the training planning carried out by the training entities, specifically the strategic planning of the training offer and the scope, degree of knowledge and ways of disseminating information about the training offer.

The evaluation of the **strategic planning of the training offer in the training entities** is carried out by 6 Public Employment Services, however in some autonomous communities such as Asturias, it is the same PES that elaborates the strategic planning of the training offer.

In other cases, they analyse the coverage of the training needs with the training offer of the entity, the coverage with the teaching staff and trainers, the fulfilment of the access requirements of the students or the planning of the training. This analysis is carried out by means of face-to-face visits, the requirement for documentation or the data provided by the management platforms.

None of the Autonomous Communities has an evaluation system for this area that is differentiated in terms of the type of course taught or on the basis of the registration or accreditation of the entities.

Regarding the **scope, degree of knowledge and means of dissemination of information on the training offer**, 4 autonomous communities evaluate the scope, degree of knowledge and means of dissemination of information on the training offer carried out by the training entities (Principality of Asturias, Balearic Islands, Cantabria and Catalonia). Aspects such as the analysis of the scope and degree of knowledge of each call, the training centres' own websites or the satisfaction of users with regard to the dissemination of the training offer are the specific areas evaluated.

To carry out this type of evaluation, the Autonomous Communities use measurement **indicators** such as the frequency of information on the offer, the degree of satisfaction with the offer, the reception of information or the number of web visits.

The main **instruments** used by the Autonomous Communities for the evaluation are supporting documents, web queries, information dumped into databases and questionnaires by face-to-face and telephone means.

In no case is a differentiation made according to the mode of delivery of the training or whether the entity is accredited or only registered.

4.2.4 Provision of training by entities

This section analyses aspects such as the management of the teaching activity of trainers and tutor-trainers, the management of learning assessment and guidance and employability improvement actions.

The **management of the teaching activity of the training entities**, specifically aspects such as the performance of the trainers and their tutorial work, the satisfaction of the students with the teaching team, the professional references of the teaching staff, the application of the methodologies that facilitate learning or the knowledge of the teaching staff, are evaluated by 11 Public Employment Services.

Certain public services use measurement indicators for the evaluation of the management of the teaching activity of the entities, specifically 8 PES. The most widely used indicator is student satisfaction with the teaching staff in areas such as the way in which they are taught or their knowledge of the subject. While the indicators used to measure the management of teaching staff are indicators such as compliance with the required specialisation or the number of human resources in the centre.

As an example of measurement indicators, INAEM has indicators relating to trainers such as accreditation of training and compliance with the specialisation required for the provision of the planned training and indicators relating to professional references

such as: exclusive training activity in the company name, experience of the entity in training (years), experience of the entity in type of training (regulated, private), human resources it has (director, secretary/administration, managers, permanent teachers, temporary teachers).

The main **instruments** used by the Autonomous Communities for evaluation are mainly face-to-face visits and questionnaires to students. Complementarily, in some cases, a platform is used to record the data or documentation requirements.

Two Autonomous Communities carry out different actions for the evaluations based on the way they are given, for example the monitoring for the e-learning modality is carried out from the platform.

The Public Employment Service of the Canary Islands indicates that there are differences in the aspects to be evaluated and the criteria between the training actions aimed at obtaining professional certificates and the other specialities and that, therefore, the Plan for the Monitoring and Control of the Quality of Training Actions published establishes differentiated evaluation instruments (questionnaires).

Regarding the **management of learning assessment**, thirteen of the autonomous communities that have answered the questionnaire evaluate the **management of learning assessment** that training entities make for the different training modalities. Aspects such as the assessment tests of each training action, the documentation of the student assessment process, the planning of the learning assessment, the individualised assessment reports or the assessment of the student in terms of the learning assessment mechanisms.

To carry out this evaluation some of the Public Employment Services use measurement **indicators** such as the number of professional certificates issued, the level of learning achieved and the satisfaction of the students with regard to the evaluation of the learning.

The main **instruments** used by the Autonomous Communities for evaluation are face-to-face visits, questionnaires and documentary review. The SOC carries out *focus groups* with students and teachers for assessment.

There are five autonomous communities that differentiate the evaluation of learning management according to the **mode of delivery**, checking on the platform the evaluations of the participants in teletraining.

Likewise, three Autonomous Communities differentiate their assessments on the basis of whether the training entities are accredited or registered, having different questionnaires or only carrying out this type of assessment if the entity is accredited, as in the case of Navarre.

With regard to **guidance and employability improvement** actions, five Public Employment Services evaluate the advice and guidance actions to students carried out by training entities and, in some cases, the improvement of employability constitutes an improvement in the technical assessment for subsidies. Some of the aspects which are checked are: the qualification of the entity as an employment agency and the complementary services which the entities offer.

The main **measurement indicator** used is the existence of services such as an integration service, a placement agency, an orientation service, a job centre, a student lounge or an information point.

The main **instruments** used by the Autonomous Communities for evaluation are documentary review and the use of computer applications. The questionnaires and the review of approved grant application forms are used on a regular basis.

INAEM is the only Public Employment Service that carries out a differentiated assessment according to the **mode of delivery**. The same applies to the **differentiation between registered and accredited entities**, the only PES which carries out this differentiated assessment is Lanbide (Basque Country).

4.2.5 Impact of training provided by entities

Aspects such as user coverage, the impact of training on employability and user satisfaction are analysed.

With regard to **user coverage**, 11 of the Public Employment Services that have answered the questionnaire evaluate the user coverage of the training provided by the training centres, although in many cases this analysis is carried out at a general level and not by training entity.

To carry out the evaluation, the Autonomous Communities use measurement **indicators** such as the rate of coverage of unemployed and employed users, the level of concentration of the training offer by professional families, the level of concentration of accredited centres for the delivery of professional certificates by professional families or the rate of multiparticipation of workers.

The main **instrument** used for evaluation is computer tools. For example, INAEM carries out surveys, makes statistical use of the management database and reports on evaluation results. In the case of the SOC, they use the official registers of applicants, Contrat@ and the data of the Social Security, while the Canary Islands Employment Service uses the data of Merlin Data Warehouse and the Public Employment Service of Asturias uses its data from the application of the management of training for employment Sigfe-Evafor.

No Autonomous Community has declared that it carries out evaluations differentiated according to the modality of teaching, or based on the registration and accreditation of the training entities.

Regarding the **impact of training on the employability** of the Public Employment Services that have answered the questionnaire, 12 carry out an evaluation of the impact on the employability of training in training entities.

Some of these Public Employment Services use **indicators** to measure the impact on employability, the predominant indicator being the rate of labour insertion with its different modalities.

The main **instrument** used for the evaluation is the analysis of the data obtained from computer tools, such as the LanF and Business Intelligence application in Lanbide (Basque Country), Merlin data warehouse, Contrat@. The Public Employment Service of Castilla-La Mancha stands out for having developed a statistical model based on logistic regression; to facilitate the understanding and interpretation of the results, two complementary statisticians have been used.

In no case are evaluations differentiated by the modality of training delivery, or by the status of the entity as registered or accredited. All the Autonomous Communities that

have sent in the questionnaire measure satisfaction, mainly that of the user, and some also measure the satisfaction of the trainers, tutors and technicians responsible for follow-up. This satisfaction is measured on the basis of different aspects such as the organisation of the course, content, duration and timetable, trainers, means, facilities or mechanisms for assessing learning and impact.

In order to carry out the evaluation in general, **questionnaires** are used which may be face-to-face, telephone or telematic, and based on the specific aspects, the questionnaire includes a grading from 1 to 4 generally for measuring satisfaction, in accordance with the Resolution of 27 April 2009, of the State Employment Service, which publishes the quality evaluation questionnaires for employment training actions.

La Rioja carries out different satisfaction evaluations based on the method of teaching, differentiating between the didactic means in e-learning or mixed training. No differentiation is made according to whether the entities are accredited or registered.

4.2.6 Other aspects evaluated on the quality of the training provided by the training entities

Some autonomous communities have pointed out other aspects that they evaluate in addition to those already indicated. The most significant of these are listed below:

- The **Aragonese Institute of Employment** evaluates the specialisation of the centre by concentrating or dispersing the specialities registered in the same family, or in families related to the same sector.
- The **Public Employment Service of Castilla-La Mancha** is in a process of improvement of the Quality Model of Entities of Castilla-La Mancha, with the aim of perfecting it through a complete renewal of the repertoire of Quality Criteria.
- The **Catalan Public Employment Service** points out that internal analysis of all the results of the quality assessment is very important for the improvement of training policies.
- The **Canarian Employment Service** highlights other aspects that are evaluated such as the fulfilment of requirements of the teaching staff, the possession by the centre of the international symbol of accessibility, the certificates of environmental management systems and the distinctions of equality in the company.
- The **Public Employment Service of the Basque Country** points out that training entities are obliged to send a report on the functioning of the course before the first month of the action, verifying that the conditions of registration/accreditation are fulfilled and what is reflected in the communication of the beginning of the course, as well as quality surveys applied to the students together with the observations they make.

5 Block IV: Evaluation of training scheduled by companies and individual training leaves, 2017-2018 (FUNDAE)

5.1 Context and description of the project

The evaluation of the Vocational Training System for Employment, set out in Article 21 of Law 30/2015, provides for a permanent evaluation mechanism that makes it possible to

ascertain the impact of the training carried out on access to and maintenance of employment, the improvement of the competitiveness of companies, the improvement of the qualifications of workers, the adaptation of training actions to the needs of the labour market and the efficiency of the economic resources and means used, The State Public Employment Service, with the participation of the competent bodies or entities of the Autonomous Communities and the most representative business and trade union organisations, is responsible for drawing up, on an annual basis, a plan to evaluate the quality, impact, effectiveness and efficiency of the entire vocational training system for employment in the field of labour, the conclusions and recommendations of which must lead to the incorporation of improvements in its operation.

Likewise, Article 21 establishes that in the training initiative scheduled by the companies, an evaluation of the initiative as a whole will be carried out to find out if it responds to the needs previously detected, incorporating the results and conclusions of this evaluation in the Annual Evaluation Plan (PAE) of the National Employment System.

Adapting to this regulation, the Annual Evaluation Plan 2017-2018 includes the main results of the Evaluation of the training initiative scheduled by companies and the Individual Training Leaves (financial years 2017 and 2018), extracted from the report prepared by the entity Instituto de Estudios de Economía, Evaluación y Empleo, S.L., within the framework of the public contracting of an external consultancy service, coordinated by the State Foundation for Employment Training (FUNDAE), as a collaborating entity of the State Public Employment Service.

5.2 Conclusions of the evaluation of the training scheduled by companies and individual training leaves, 2017- 2018

5.2.1 Conclusions on the achievement of the system's objectives

To evaluate to what extent the initiatives of the Training scheduled by the companies and of the Individual Training Leaves (PIF) contribute to the fulfilment of the aims of the system.

One of the main limitations of the System at this time, which in addition to other difficulties detected, is due to the lack of regulatory development of Law 30/2015, of 9 September and Royal Decree 694/2017, of 3 July, in their corresponding Ministerial Orders. As a direct consequence of this, a wide variety of discrepancies and differences in interpretation of the Law have arisen, which are mainly exemplified by the tasks of Inspection and Control.

This situation has particularly affected the mode of teletraining and Individual Training Leaves (PIF). E-training has been used to a lesser extent within the initiative because of doubts about its use and also the PIFs, both in smaller and larger companies. In the classroom training, the reflections collected are oriented towards the need to introduce flexibility in the procedure and guidelines in the quality of the actions.

Evaluation of Purpose 1 (article 2.a of Law 30/2015)

"To promote lifelong learning for workers to improve their professional skills, employment and training pathways, as well as their professional and personal development".

The evaluation of the effectiveness of the Training scheduled by the companies in this first purpose pursued by the Vocational Training for Employment System shows positive results in quantitative terms, as it continues to register growth in the access of workers and in the progression of population and training coverage.

However, attention must be paid to the segment of small and medium-sized enterprises as the participants working in these companies have been declining in relative terms since 2013, increasing the participants working in larger companies, reducing the equity of the initiative and showing the disadvantage in which the workers of microenterprises are found in the system, with these differences increasing in the years to be evaluated, 2017-2018. There are also differences in the possibilities of participating in the training initiative in some sectors, such as agriculture, which continues to have very low coverage rates.

As for the degree of awareness of the initiative on the part of the workers, it is very low (37.9%) and (12.3%) PIF and not always correct, taking into account that they are participants in the system. The changes in name (continuous, subsidised, company-programmed training) have affected the degree of awareness of the initiative. Less than 35% know about Fundae.

There are notable results in improving the transversal and sectoral skills of workers, achieving a much lower impact on digital or language skills. With regard to professional qualifications, the improvement was of one third among workers, who declared that this training had allowed them to obtain a qualification recognised in the sector - mostly those with a lower level of education or who are younger. Professional certificates continue to be little known and residual in the initiative.

However, there is a significant direct effect on personal development and less on professional development, with no effect on the development of training and employment itineraries, which are not appreciated at the System level, although they could be occurring at the company level within their own training plans.

Evaluation of Purpose 2 (article 2.b of Law 30/2015)

"To contribute to the improvement of the productivity and competitiveness of enterprises".

On the part of the participating companies, there is a low awareness of the initiative and of the system as a whole, and deficiencies in existing knowledge, which shows a positive correlation with the size of the companies and the services sector (the larger the company, the greater and better the knowledge).

Mainly the registered companies, but also to a lesser extent the training companies, show a decrease in their access, concentrating on micro-SMEs with 1 to 5 workers. The continuous loss of micro-SMEs is related, on the one hand, to bad practices by external entities, which led to greater rigour in their legislation with Law 30/2015 (joint and several liability or direct contracting and invoicing of training, among other changes) which meant a large fall in access by micro-SMEs in 2016 as these external entities were their gateway to the system. In addition, other micro-SMEs had lost interest due to the low quality of the courses or because they had received non-compliant work-life balance and delayed requests for refunds. Although there has been a certain recovery in overall access in 2017 and 2018, which can be explained in full, by the balance between the loss of companies concentrated exclusively in micro-SMEs (1 to 5 employees), as

opposed to the rest of the units with the highest volume of workers (6 or more) which increased their participation in all the sections

Therefore, the largest companies have the best access and loyalty rates. The percentage of companies that carry out group training compared to their own also increases in general. The coverage rate of training companies in the Spanish business fabric has fallen slightly compared to 2016, indicating that 1 in 5 Spanish companies are carrying out training within the initiative.

There are notable impacts on worker productivity mainly because it allows them to keep their knowledge of the regulatory and technical changes specific to each sector up to date, fostering a better working climate and allowing the level of production to be maintained. However, the impact of training on competitiveness was more limited, especially when specific dimensions such as the optimisation of processes, innovation, product development or access to new markets are identified. Therefore, there is also less association between training and its return in terms of economic results. The initiative is debating whether to adapt its aims and objectives to the training currently being provided or to change its incentives and instruments so that another training profile is provided on which other effects more linked to competitiveness can be expected.

Evaluation of Purpose 3 (article 2.c of Law 30/2015)

"To meet the requirements of the labour market and the needs of enterprises by providing workers with appropriate skills, knowledge and practices".

Organization. The evaluation shows two main models of training organisation depending on the size of the companies that access the initiative:

- At one end are large companies that each year program their training carefully and systematically, detecting needs with systematic protocols, with the existence of a training plan (with the involvement of the company's HR department), which carries out its own training or alternates it with the group's; it carries out at least 4 actions, has at least 20 trained participants and has at least 2,000 euros of credit allocated, whose majority sector is Industry and Services.

- At the opposite end of the spectrum, whether or not they carry out annual training, SMEs with less than 9 employees, although to a lesser extent those with 10 to 49 workers. These companies do not have internal procedures for detecting needs, nor do they have a training plan, but usually choose training from catalogues or proposals from external entities (group training), on which they are very dependent in order to find the satisfaction of their needs and the adequacy of the training; they mostly carry out a training action by a single participant and have less than 1,000 euros of credit allocated; they mostly belong to the Agriculture, Commerce and Hotel and Catering sectors.

Adequacy. The assessment shows a high degree of adaptation of the training carried out to the needs of the companies and the requirements of their activity sectors, insofar as it responds to the profile of operational training, technical and regulatory updating on a regular basis, training directly related to their activity and which responds to the priorities of their sector (all these elements correlate directly with the size of the companies), which provides professional recycling and also makes it possible to cover the transversal training needs required by the companies (it also correlates with size). However, it does not respond to the general pattern of strategically oriented training or

training aimed at generating innovations in processes or new activities or markets, as it is perceived that this profile may be objected to and may not be rewarded, especially if it is offered in the mode of teletraining, which is why it mostly avoids communicating this type of training.

The participants' assessment is along the same lines and only 19% of them believe that the training should be designed more specifically and more related to their activity.

Profile and role of external entities. External entities play an important role in extending the initiative, especially among SMEs, by facilitating access. If between 2009 and 2015 the number of registered external entities doubled, by 2016 the number of those with training has fallen by 30% and almost 20%, as a result of the changes introduced by Law 30/2015. The evaluation of the Training Initiative programmed by companies in 2017 and 2018 shows a recovery of registered external entities which almost compensates for their large fall in 2016, although those registered with training carried out continued the contraction which began in 2016 but in a more relaxed manner in 2017 (-6.3%) and 2018 (-3.8%).

Furthermore, since 2016 there has been a gradual change in the profile of the entities, so that by 2018 accredited or registered training entities account for almost 9 out of 10, while Business Organisations are the other type of external entity which has increased proportionally to over 11%. In terms of the functions they carry out, the number of entities which only organise continued to increase, reaching 60% of the total. Company groups also grew timidly since their appearance following Law 30/2015, placing the rate of company groups at 0.21% of the trainers.

In 2017 and 2018, the participating companies surveyed clearly show their confidence in the work of external entities, contrasting with the perceptions of the initiative's managers, and consider that compulsory registration/ accreditation and joint responsibility are factors that have a positive influence on the quality of training.

However, external entities consider that the joint and several liability is excessive as part of the system is beyond their control. They also believe that the accreditation or registration is not associated with the quality of the training but with its control, and furthermore it is disproportionate as the organisation and management costs are related to the amount of the subsidy and not to the real cost of the training for the external entity to invoice.

This has led to external entities, even though they are training entities, performing the functions of managers with an administrative profile in the system or acting as technical offices to manage the bonus, so that their remuneration is limited to the indirect costs for that concept which the management of the initiative allows.

Initiative management process. A last important aspect to see if the initiative meets the requirements of the labour market is the initiative management process and its orientation towards satisfying or not the training requirements presented by companies and workers.

An aspect valued and shared by the agents consulted is that through the initiative, companies are helped to give value to training and have funds available to develop it. However, **the rigidity introduced by the regulations on procedures means that the formal requirements** demanded do not favour more creative training or training which meets the real and current needs of companies, such as that demanded by the new digital context, or more agile training, such as that required by certain sectors at

production peaks or stoppages which cannot be foreseen and where training is usually carried out.

For large companies, the system and its requirements lack the necessary flexibility, which leads them to communicate only the training that is easy to reward, usually more transversal training. In some cases, the initiative has also been abandoned for this reason. SMEs find that they depend on external entities to carry out the subsidy procedure, which they find complex and difficult, and when it is carried out by external entities, the training actions respond more to their criteria than to their own.

In addition, another of the main problems for managers, external entities and training companies is the lack of updating, development and specification of the regulations governing the system following Law 30/2015 and RD 694/2017 mentioned above. Therefore, in many aspects the regulations **have become obsolete and do** not respond to the situation in which companies and workers find themselves, leaving out of the system the most innovative actions or those with the greatest incorporation of ICT and most related to productivity and competitiveness.

This is the paradigmatic case of the **teletraining modality**, since there are no clear guidelines or instructions, but there are greater requirements in some aspects than for face-to-face training. This leads to the avoidance of communicating teletraining. Added to this is the debate that has arisen about the nature of **virtual classrooms** - which was revived during the confinement caused by the Covid-19 epidemic - as it was pointed out that they are a complement to face-to-face training which is also particularly relevant in a context in which the distance mode, which was the training route for certain workers, sectors and territories, has disappeared. Therefore, the lack of normative development and clear instructions leads either to the assumption of risks with negative consequences for companies and external entities, or to the avoidance of everything about which there is doubt and possible discrepancy in management.

In relation to the monitoring and control tasks by the initiative managers, there is a clear assessment of the orientation of the system towards control through inspection, as opposed to quality-oriented monitoring and the facilitation of evaluation as a process of continuous improvement. This position is reaffirmed by the insecurity that is produced in the face of inspections, by not knowing the criteria and parameters, on which there is heterogeneity and margin for interpretation, depending on the territorial area in which it operates. This fact has even led to external entities offering another service to companies, which is the management of incidents even in the judicial sphere.

Finally, there is criticism of the lack of mechanisms for measuring the "real" impact of training as one of the weaknesses of the initiative. And at the level of training action, companies tend to complement the application of the quality questionnaire with their own tools, which they consider necessary to be flexible in the case that there are several actions of very short duration but which are related to each other, so that a single questionnaire is carried out to assess all of them together.

Evaluation of Purpose 4 (article 2.d of Law 30/2015)

"To improve the employability of workers, especially those who have greater difficulties in maintaining employment or in entering the labour market".

The contribution of training received on the employability of employed workers can be assessed in terms of facilitating their adaptability, to new jobs or tasks, or directly in terms of helping them to maintain their employment. For 60% of respondents, training has a positive impact on their employability, slightly more so in terms of job retention

than in terms of promotion or adaptability to new jobs or tasks. This is consistent with the perspective of enterprises in considering such training as an important determinant of job adaptation.

It has been found that it is the younger workers who most value the impact of this training on their employability, considering it to be a key element in maintaining employment and developing their capacity to adapt to changing working environments.

If we look at the general level of participation of the population groups that experience greater difficulties in employability in the labour market, we see that the participation of women continued to grow among the trained participants. The coverage rate is slightly lower than that of men, although the gap continues to narrow. The participation of workers with low qualifications has lost its representativeness, with four consecutive years of decline. And, workers over 45 continued to increase their participation, maintaining the upward trend since 2007 and recording the highest value as a series in 2018. Finally, it should be noted that analysis of the coverage rate by age group shows that the least represented groups are young people, under 24 years of age, followed by those over 55, both with rates below the annual averages.

Evaluation of Purpose 5 (article 2.f of Law 30/2015)

"Bringing the benefits of information and communication technologies closer to and involving workers, promoting the reduction of the digital divide and ensuring their accessibility".

The contribution of programmed training on the reduction of the digital divide was highly valued by the companies surveyed, to a greater extent in large companies and within the Services and Construction sectors. While the impact of training on the digitalisation of companies' management processes was less appreciated.

Likewise, the perceptions of achievement on the effects of the training programmed by the companies on a first level of approach and accessibility to these advantages of the ICTs and on the reduction of the gap are noteworthy, since in relation to the development of competences and above all to the certification of the qualification, the results indicated by the workers were around 5 out of 10.

5.2.2 Conclusions on Individual Training Leaves (PIF)

Assess the extent to which the Individual Training Leaves initiative contributes to the fulfilment of the system's goals and analysis in a context of regulatory change.

The number of PIFs continues to decrease in quantitative terms, as do the number of companies with completed PIFs. Low and deficient knowledge of this initiative is detected among workers and companies (exacerbated in micro-SMEs), which explains its low use in the vocational training system for employment.

The profile of the worker who carries out a PIF is the following: a greater proportion of men, between 25 and 44 years of age, with years of experience and extensive work experience, with stability in the company in terms of both years and type of contract (indefinite) and working day (full); with the category of technician, manager or person in charge. In addition, the majority of the initiative came from the worker himself and not from the company.

Most of the PIFs are classroom-based and regulated training, with access to university degrees and official master's degrees, developed in Catalonia, Madrid, the Valencian

Community and Andalusia within large companies in the service sector and with an average duration of around 95 hours. Other regulated training courses that are taken, although to a lesser extent, are Escuela Oficial de Idiomas y Formación Profesional de grado medio y superior.

The evaluation shows a lack of explicit definition of the purpose of the PIFs. On the one hand, it is an initiative in which the worker is given the possibility of improving his or her qualification in the area of knowledge desired, independently of the needs of his or her company, since the training required for the job cannot be financed in this way. However, this implies that this training is more in a sphere of personal than professional interest, so that it does not receive the valuation it deserves from the company, and, on the other hand, if the company were to propose this training, it would be interpreted as a move from a worker-centred initiative to another type of initiative such as training programmed by companies.

One of the aspects that need to be improved in order to make the initiative more effective is to improve the information on the whole process, by better defining the purpose of the PIF (qualifications admitted and excluded), as well as clarifying the documentation and the procedure to be followed for its application and development, for example, by providing information on how to manage the incidents that occur during its implementation. Likewise, the same insecurity and uncertainty has been detected as that caused by the monitoring and control tasks in the training programmed by the companies (lack of knowledge and heterogeneity of criteria and parameters).

With regard to the contribution of the PIFs, there is an outstanding impact on the personal and professional development of workers, with their contribution to combining studies and work occupying a prominent place; the perception of the effects of the PIF on specific dimensions of professional development (adaptability to new technologies or new jobs) or on the very maintenance of employment is also very notable; and, to a lesser extent, effects on aspects such as an improvement in salaries, the obtaining of a professional certificate or certificate or on the change of sector.

The determining role played by the PIFs is shown by the fact that most workers request it before starting the studies and indicate that without the PIF they would not have been able to carry them out or, in any case, at a very high personal cost. In this sense, there is a notable impact on improving the qualifications of the workers, who have a very low drop-out rate and a high impact on obtaining the qualification.

5.2.3 Conclusions on efficiency and transparency in resource management

In this evaluation, the second criterion of analysis is focused on assessing the efficiency and transparency in the management of public resources. In this sense, the Training initiative scheduled by companies and the PIFs in 2017 and 2018 shows slight losses in efficiency, showing drops in the indicators of use and credit utilization of the training companies, in the absence of knowledge about work-life balance in 2018.

Although there was a slight decrease in the credit available over that allocated by companies for training actions and individual training leaves in the two years under assessment, with the rate standing at around 65% in 2018, almost all the credit available to companies for training was subsidised (95%), although this was not always reconciled (88.48%).

The distribution of funds by sector of economic activity is as follows: the Services sector is where the largest amount of credit is concentrated over the time series, showing growth in the years under assessment of 40.72% in 2018. Next in importance are commerce (23.54% in 2018) and industry (20.67% in 2018), with agriculture being the sector which has the least credit available for training its workers (1.42% and 1.31% in the reference years of this assessment).

According to the territorial analysis, Madrid is the Autonomous Community with the highest concentration of available credit throughout the time series, followed by Catalonia and Andalusia. In the years under assessment, these three regions accumulated 6 out of every 10 euros of credit available, with the Community of Madrid itself accounting for approximately 30% of total credit.

On the other hand, the cost analysis shows that the average cost of public aid remains relatively stable (between 7.21 euros/h in 2004 and 8.18 euros/h in 2018) although the real average cost maintains its growth since 2016 (19.44 in 2017 and 20.0 in 2018) after a period of stability in 2010-2015 (between 15-16 euros/h). On the other hand, investment in training grows in the years under assessment by just over 95 million euros, reversing the downward trend that began in 2014.

The cost/hour of training admitted has been increasing in the years under evaluation, following the trend of previous years. However, the cost per participant has been decreasing in the same period. And this indicator presents higher values in the smaller companies, given that the training carried out by these companies has a longer average duration.

In 2017 and 2018, the costs of providing training fell slightly (5.22%), and remained the majority of eligible costs, with indirect costs falling by 20.19%. Wage costs grew by 7.53%. In this period, both the subsidised cost and the private contribution showed increases of 3.94% and 6.99%, respectively.

Finally, it can be concluded that there is a trend towards a loss of efficiency resulting from the lower take-up of credit allocated to enterprises for these initiatives. It should also be noted that the distribution of funds is not homogeneous and that there are differences both by sector and by territory.

In relation to costs, the real increase in training costs stands out, while the cost of public aid remains stable, which translates into a greater investment effort by companies, linked to an increase in wage costs. Equally noteworthy is the decrease in training costs.