



DDP-YD/ETD (2020) 100

Budapest 8 June 2020

Council of Europe Youth Work Portfolio

Evaluative Study

2019

by Gulesin Nemutlu Unal

Table of Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| 1. Background | 3 |
| 2. Purposes and methodology | 3 |
| 3. Main findings | 4 |
| 4. Recommendations | 6 |
| I. About the Study | 8 |
| 1. Background | 8 |
| 2. Purpose | 9 |
| 3. Methodology | 9 |
| 4. Limitations | 10 |
| II. About the Youth Work Portfolio | 11 |
| 1. The contents of the Youth Work Portfolio | 11 |
| 2. In a nutshell: How does the online Portfolio work? | 11 |
| 3. Competence areas of the Youth Work Portfolio | 12 |
| III. Overall Picture of the Youth Work Portfolios Online | 13 |
| 1. Countries | 13 |
| 2. Gender | 15 |
| 3. Age | 16 |
| 4. Professions | 16 |
| 5. Competence responses | 17 |
| IV. Purposeful Portfolios | 20 |
| 1. Countries | 20 |
| 2. Gender | 21 |
| 3. Age | 21 |
| 4. Professions | 22 |
| 5. Competence responses | 22 |
| 6. Analysis of the competence areas: relevance and competence | 24 |
| V. Results of the Survey | 28 |
| VI. Recommendations | 31 |
| 1. Content related recommendations | 31 |
| 1. Methodological recommendations | 31 |
| 1. Technical recommendations | 31 |
| List of Tables | 33 |

Executive Summary

1. Background

Youth work is one of the programme orientations of the Youth for Democracy Programme of the Council of Europe. The Youth Work Portfolio has been developed to assist young people with the youth work in which they are involved, through self-assessment and recognition of competences they gained as a youth worker.

The Council of Europe Youth Work Portfolio was revised and made available online to help youth workers and youth leaders to assess and plan further development of the youth work competences.

Since 2017, more than 500 online portfolios have been published, and many more organisations reported use of the offline brochure of Portfolio during different educational activities.

2. Purposes and Methodology

In 2019 the Council of Europe decided to invest in a study that would provide a basis for the upcoming revision and update of the Youth Work Portfolio to increase its potential outreach and reflect the developments in the field, notably those resulting from the adoption by the Committee of Ministers of the Recommendation on Youth Work – CM/Rec(2017)4.

The study has the following objectives:

1. To provide an analysis of the overall profile of users including age, occupation, role in their organisation and their purpose of using the Portfolio.
2. To provide a statistical analysis on the Portfolio website: number of users, portfolios created etc.
3. To provide insight into : how the Portfolio is promoted and disseminated; which circumstances and for which purpose the Portfolio is used in youth work activities; to what extent the Portfolio serves its key functions such as analysing the current state of youth work competency, gathering evidence and explaining youth work to others; what the main challenges and obstacles are in using the online portfolio; the potential for further development and dissemination; how the portfolio is used inside and outside youth work activities and how helpful is the proposed competency framework for users.

Keeping in mind the vast variety of practices of youth work in Europe¹ while taking into consideration the wide scope of the Youth Work Portfolio's target group, in order to be in line with the objectives set for the Study; the data collection is kept limited to;

- the statistics provided by the Youth Department,
- a survey among online Youth Work Portfolio users and

¹ Council of Europe, the Committee of Ministers. (2017). Recommendation CM/Rec(2017)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member States on youth work.

- a desk research about the use of Youth Work Portfolio within the youth field.

The statistics were analysed for two sets: the entire group and a so-called 'Purposeful Portfolio' group, consisting of Portfolios which have been developed to a 'sufficient' extent. The threshold for this differentiation is set based on two factors; the users who have responded to at least 4 of the 8 competence fields and again at least in 10 of the 32 competences were considered to be 'sufficient'.

3. Main findings

Demographics

In the scope of this study a total number of 579 portfolios were analysed.

A vast majority of the users are from Council of Europe member states (86%). The United Kingdom, Spain and Croatia have the highest number of users whereas there are no users from Liechtenstein, Denmark, Andorra, Monaco and San Marino. When looking at non-CoE countries, Belarus has the highest number of users. The Youth Department of the Council of Europe also works with youth workers from the following countries, yet there is no user from these countries in the Portfolio database (listed in alphabetical order): Algeria, Israel, Jordan, Kosovo*, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Syria, Tunisia. The distribution of countries in the Purposeful Portfolio group shows a similar trend.

The percentage of female users (60%) is almost twice the number of male users (33%). The distribution of countries in the Purposeful Portfolio group shows a similar trend.

One third of the users are aged between 25 to 30 years old. Around 80% of all users are aged between 19 to 40 years old. Yet, when we look at the Purposeful Portfolio group, we see that the highest percentage (34%) of users is between the age of 19 to 24. This difference shows us that the users who used the Portfolio website to a meaningful extent are in general younger than the ones who have only registered and responded to a few competence fields.

Analysing the age distribution together with gender information provided; 19% of the users are female between 25 to 30 years of age. If we enlarge the age interval to 19 to 40 years, the percentage of female users becomes 50% of all users within this age range.

In terms of professions, the percentage of volunteers is relatively high with being 19% of all users. Yet the leading group in professions is full time youth workers with 34%. Here again, when we look at the data from the Purposeful Portfolio group, we see that the volunteers (with 30%) are higher in percentage than the full-time youth workers (23%). So once more, the volunteers (who are demographically younger) responded to the Youth Work Portfolio more 'sufficiently' than the full-time youth workers.

Responses to competence fields

The Youth Work Portfolio has 8 competence areas. In the course of the online assessment, the user is invited to reflect and self-assess their skills from 1 to 8. When the rate of responses analysed, the percentage of responses decrease in both groups (all users and the Purposeful Portfolios sets). Yet when we look at the all users set, the drop of number of responses from the first competence area (71%) to the second one (26%) is drastic. Only by the third competence area, the responses catch an average of 17% of response. It also needs to be mentioned that 26% of the users did not respond to any of the competences.

When looking at the responses to competences in the Purposeful Portfolios set, we again see a decrease from the first competence area (100%) to the second one (98%), but not as drastic as in the case of the entire group. By the fourth competence area, the number of responses reaches an average of 90%.

These analyses give us two findings: first, the users either go through the whole self-assessment process or drop the cause already in the first part. Second, the contents of the competency framework is, as a whole, 'good-enough' for those users who decide to dedicate time and effort to the process.

The study also includes the rankings of the competences by the Purposeful Portfolios users in terms of relevance and competence responses (Tables 19-24).

The circumstances and the purpose of using the Portfolio

The majority of the users get introduced to the Youth Work Portfolio at one of the events of the Youth Department of Council of Europe or through a youth work trainer. There is also use of the Portfolio in the formal education settings and in these cases the users are likely to find the Portfolio when looking for competence frameworks for youth workers online.

Users use the Portfolio for professional development mainly. With the lengthy process needed to work on the self-assessment and the repetitive nature of the methodology, the users can take the best out of the Portfolio process if this work is involved in an educational process and potentially supported by a supervisor.

The extent to which Portfolio serves its key functions

The Youth Work Portfolio mainly has four objectives as key functions:

- To analyse the current state of youth work competence
- To gather evidence on the quality of youth work
- To gather ideas on how to improve youth work
- To explain youth work to others

For the first two objectives, the Portfolio serves its key functions to a satisfactory level, for the users who have gone through the whole process (16%). Even then, it needs to be kept in mind that only 33% of this minority has responded to almost all text questions (the questions where the rationale is asked about the relevance of a given competence to their work and about the concrete indicators supporting their self-assessment) which should provide the basis for analysing and gathering evidence.

As for the third and the fourth objectives, the online Portfolio does not do the work on its own. After the work with the Portfolio, the users have to go 'the extra mile' to transfer their key knowledge about themselves (and their work) into ideas to improve their work and to become able to explain it to others. The limited amount of data which could be collected on the use of the Learning Plan part of the Portfolio is not sufficient to make any conclusions that Portfolio serves these two functions.

4. Recommendations

Content related recommendations

The Youth Work Portfolio contains an extremely important and relevant content for youth workers in Europe. Not only the competence model which the self-assessment is based on, but also the information sections of the Portfolio are valuable, educational and still relevant.

The main recommendation in terms of content is to find better ways in which the information part of the Portfolio and the self-assessment form can complement each other. Bridging the links can also go beyond the Portfolio given that it is an online tool and providing links to relevant readings to expand the horizon of the user before / during self-assessment could also be more engaging.

The second recommendation is to add digital youth work competences to the competence framework.

Methodological recommendations

The main challenge of the Portfolio seems to be the methodological one. In the survey, what the users are referring to as 'too long' is also in line with the fact that 46% of the users stop reflecting with the tool after they have responded to a maximum of 5 competences out of 32. Given the fact that contents are found to be very good, the solution for the problem should be residing in methodological changes.

The main recommendation here is to keep the content of the Portfolio but add elements of gamification to make it more engaging. Gamification does not mean turning the self-assessment process into a game: gamification means using gaming elements to make a process (any process) more engaging. Some concrete suggestions can be: having a completion bar where the user can see their progress in finalising the self-assessment; adding a visual element where the user can see their rankings after each competence (web mapping), making navigation easier between different competence areas; or using short videos at the introduction of each competence area. The online methodology of the

Portfolio is recommended to be reworked by a team of: educators, youth workers, gamification experts and digital experts.

Technical recommendations

The respondents to the survey refer to technical challenges on a wide range of aspects: from the difficulties of logging in to the Portfolio website to the challenges of not being able to reach the contents of the Portfolio through a mobile app. This study itself also experienced various challenges when it came to the technicalities of how the website works. Therefore, it is difficult to recommend anything other than a new website, which is user friendly, easy to navigate and engaging in its design.

The other recommendation is about the way statistics on the website are stored and how they are shown to the administrators. During the set up of the new website, the technical staff should be provided information on the content related data that the institutions involved want to receive and analyse regularly.

The visibility of the Portfolio might also be increased if a 'tailored' version of the self-assessment could be easily provided to the users in a recognised format (such as Europass format). Being able to make the Portfolio visible on networking platforms such as LinkedIn (global) or Salto-Youth (field specific) could also be taken into consideration in the set up of the Portfolio website.

I. About the Study

1. Background

Youth work is one of the programme orientations of the Youth for Democracy Programme of the Council of Europe. By focusing on youth work, the Youth Department:

- supports the dissemination and implementation of the future Committee of Ministers' recommendation on youth work (following the roadmap and mid-term strategy developed in 2017),
- supports the dissemination of the Council of Europe Youth Work Portfolio,
- implements measures to support the quality development and recognition of youth work and non-formal education and learning in the programme of the European Youth Centres and their dissemination to member States (e.g. through training staff of youth centres having been awarded the Council of Europe Quality Label for Youth Centres).

The sustainability of the Council of Europe's core values relies also on the creativity, competencies, social commitment, and contribution of young people as well as on their confidence in the future. Youth policies and youth work practice must support young people to realise their full potential as autonomous members of society, enabling them to develop life plans and exercise their democratic citizenship. Youth work as a social practice makes an important contribution to active citizenship and youth participation by providing opportunities to acquire the values, attitudes, skills, knowledge and critical understanding required for effective civic engagement and social action in democratic culture. The Youth Work Portfolio has been developed to assist young people with the youth work in which they are involved, through self-assessment and recognition of competences they gained as a youth worker.

The Council of Europe Youth Work Portfolio was revised and made available online to help youth workers and youth leaders to assess and plan further development of the youth work competences.

The online Portfolio allows users to participate in a facilitated learning cycle of self-assessment that consists of:

- analysing and identifying the current state of development of youth work competences,
- gathering evidence on the quality of youth work and ideas on how to improve it, explaining youth work to others in a way that is easy to understand.

Since 2017, more than 500 online portfolios have been published, and many more organisations reported use of the offline brochure of Portfolio during different educational activities.

2. Purpose

In 2019, the Youth Department decided to invest in a study that would provide a basis for the upcoming revision and update of the Youth Work Portfolio with the purpose of making it easier to use.

The study has the following objectives:

- To provide an analysis of the overall profile of users including age, occupation, role in their organisation and their purpose of using the Portfolio.
- To provide a statistical analysis on the Portfolio website: number of users, portfolios created etc.
- To provide insight on:
 - o how the Portfolio is promoted and disseminated;
 - o which circumstances and for which purpose the Portfolio is used in youth work activities;
 - o to what extent the Portfolio serves its key functions such as analysing the current state of youth work competency, gathering evidence and explaining youth work to others;
 - o what the main challenges and obstacles are in using the online portfolio;
 - o the potential for further development and dissemination;
 - o how the portfolio is used inside and outside youth work activities and how helpful is the proposed competency framework for users.

Together with the above-mentioned objectives, the study also aims to provide recommendations for the revision and update of the Youth Work Portfolio.

3. Methodology

The Council of Europe Youth Work Portfolio website defines the online version of the Youth Work Portfolio as follows:

“This is an online tool that helps individuals, teams and organisations doing youth work around Europe to understand their competence and to develop it more effectively. This tool can also be used by trainers, youth work managers and policy makers and generally all those interested in the topic of quality development and recognition of youth work.”

Keeping in mind the vast variety of practices of youth work in Europe² while taking into consideration the wide scope of the Youth Work Portfolio’s target group, in order to be in line with the objectives set for the Study; the data collection is kept limited to;

- the statistics provided by the Youth Department,
- a survey within online Youth Work Portfolio users and
- a desk research about the use of Youth Work Portfolio within the youth field.

² Council of Europe, the Committee of Ministers. (2017). Recommendation CM/Rec(2017)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member States on youth work.

At an early stage, the analysis of the data collection showed two facts very clearly: not every user who starts doing the online self-assessment continues to work online until the end of the Self-Assessment Form and the use of the Learning and Development Plan (as second part of the Youth Work Portfolio) online is very limited.

In response to the first finding, the statistics from the website have been analysed twice: once for all the users and a second time for those who used the online Portfolio to a 'sufficient' extent. The threshold for this differentiation is set based on two factors; the users who have responded to at least 4 of the 8 competence fields and at least in 10 of the 32 competences were considered to be 'sufficient'. This second set of Portfolios is referred to as the 'Purposeful Portfolios' within the study.

As for the second finding about the limited use of the Learning and Development Plan, the study mainly relied on the information collected from the survey as the statistics of the website do not keep data on the Learning and Development Plan.

4. Limitations

This study also has its limitations. Although these limitations are mostly based on technical issues, they need to be mentioned not only for the sake of transparency and accountability of the report but also for providing clarity to its findings.

The statistics that the Youth Work Portfolio site collects are somewhat limited and are not providing all the necessary data for the questions that this study is looking for its answers.

Although the number of users of the website is different from the number of users who are actually working on their portfolios online, there is no data collected about the former – apart from a number provided in the main website. Therefore, it is not possible to do any kind of analysis on the profile of the users. So, in this report, whenever the term 'user' is used; it refers to the people who have actually initiated the process of self-assessment.

As for the data that the website is collecting about the users who are working on their portfolios online, there are also several challenges. It is not possible to see the full names of the users, the country information is missing in some cases and confusing in some others – the only information about half of the users in terms of their country is based on if their country is a member of the Council of Europe or not.

Perhaps the biggest limitation for the study is the fact that the website does not collect data on the learning and development plans.

Finally, during the analysis, 40 out of the 579 portfolios could not be accessed due to technical errors.

As for the survey, the main limitation was the turn out rate from the users. Only 12 users responded to the survey. Although the answers they have provided for the open-ended questions were regarded as highly insightful, the study cannot claim that the results of the survey are representative.

II: Briefly about the Youth Work Portfolio

1. The contents of the Youth Work Portfolio

The online Youth Work Portfolio consists of five sections:

- An information section on the youth work essentials
- An information section on youth work competence
- An information section on ideas for using the portfolio
- A Self-Assessment form
- A learning and development plan

The offline Youth Work Portfolio also has a section on the topic of 'Feedback' which is in its discourse introduced as one of the essential parts of the Portfolio making process; yet this part is not published on the online version at the website.

Both the website and the offline version involves a chapter called 'Further Information' where the history of the Youth Work Portfolio, the process of its development, the European debate on the recognition of youth work and how the Portfolio relates to this debate is presented. This part also involves a list of references, glossary and finally, acknowledgements.

2. In a nutshell: How does the online Portfolio work?

The descriptions in this part of the study are based on the information text provided in the Youth Work Portfolio.

A Youth Work Portfolio includes a self-assessment based on the Portfolio competence framework and a learning development plan that allows the user to set up learning goals.

The self-assessment is a form divided by functions of youth work and, for each function, the competences of youth workers. In the Portfolio, there are 8 functions defined and in total there are 32 competences of which each of them is related with one function.

For each competence of the self-assessment, the user is asked to rate the relevance of that competence for their work on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 = not relevant at all; 5 = highly relevant). Here, the user is also asked to provide (technically to type in) reasons for why they have rated each as relevant or not.

If the user decides that a competence is not relevant for their youth work (i.e. by rating it 1), then the user will not be asked to assess it, but only to provide some reasons why it is not relevant.

Further on, if the user rates the relevance of the competence as more than one, they will be asked to assess their level of competence on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 = not competent at all; 5 = highly competent). After this rating, they will also be asked to justify the level of competence they have assessed by providing examples about and describing how they have acquired it or youth work situations where they have demonstrated it.

The last step of the self-assessment for each competence is to indicate if there are any aspects of that particular competence that the user would like to improve. The answers given in this section by the user, creates the basis for the learning and development plan, which is the second part of the Youth Work Portfolio.

The learning and development plan focuses on the competences that the user wants to improve, develop, learn or acquire within a specific period of time after they have completed their self-assessment. It aims to help the youth worker to organise their learning and development in youth work.

While the self-assessment form is based on those aspects that the youth worker wants to develop or learn more about; the learning and development plan asks the user to identify 'how' they want to develop their competence further. The user can decide what they think is the most adapted approach or method for pursuing their learning and development need according to their own preferences.

Next, the user is asked to set up a timeframe for their learning and a moment when they would like to check their learning progress on that specific competence. The website sends a reminder on the set date to the user.

Finally, the learning and development plan also asks if there is anything else the users want to add about their learning plan in the specific competence.

3. Competence Areas of the Youth Work Portfolio

In the Portfolio there are 32 competences listed under 8 different competence focus areas. The areas are:

1. Address the needs and aspiration of young people
2. Provide learning opportunities for young people
3. Support and empower young people in making sense of the society they live and engaging with it
4. Support young people in actively and constructively addressing intercultural relations
5. Actively practice evaluation to improve the quality of the youth work conducted
6. Support collective learning in the youth workers' team
7. Contribute to the development of their organisation and to making policies / programmes work better for young people
8. Develop, conduct and evaluate projects

III. Overall picture of the Youth Work Portfolios online

In the scope of this study a total number of 579 portfolios were analysed.

To provide an overall picture, two aspects were tackled at the initial stage: the number of versions (of Portfolio) that each user has created and the number of users that worked on a Learning Plan.

As for the first question, the Table 1 below summarises the data. It is clear that a vast majority of the users create only one version of the Portfolio.

Table 1: All Portfolios – Number of versions

| Number of Portfolio versions | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| 3 or more versions | 6 | 1% |
| 2 versions | 51 | 9% |
| 1 version | 522 | 90% |

As for the second question on the number of Learning Plans, as the data is not collected by the website; no conclusions could be made.

1. Countries

In terms of demographics of Youth Portfolio users, the first aspect presented here is on the countries that the users were residing in at the time that they worked on their Youth Work Portfolio.

As mentioned earlier, the information collected by the website on the country data is somewhat complex. For almost half of the users, we can only tell if they are from the CoE member states or not. Table 2 provides a summary of the number of users within the CoE and outside the CoE.

Table 2: All Portfolios – Number of users in and out of CoE

| Area | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| CoE countries | 500 | 86% |
| Non-CoE countries | 36 | 6% |
| Not registered | 43 | 8% |

As seen from the table, a vast majority of the users are from CoE member states.

In Table 3, you can see how many users are from which member state of the CoE, based on the data available from the 282 users (out of 500 from the CoE countries). As for the other 218 users, country information is not specified. The table is presented in a descending order of numbers.

The United Kingdom has the highest number of users and perhaps it is not surprising as it has one of the most institutional frameworks for youth workers. Out of the 47 member

states, only 5 of had no youth worker that has used the Portfolio: Liechtenstein, Denmark, Andorra, Monaco and San Marino.

Table 3: All Portfolios – Number of users from the CoE member states

| CoE Member States | Number of Users |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| United Kingdom | 22 |
| Spain | 21 |
| Croatia | 20 |
| Italy | 18 |
| France | 17 |
| Ukraine | 16 |
| Portugal | 12 |
| Armenia | 9 |
| Estonia | 9 |
| Finland | 9 |
| Belgium | 8 |
| Greece | 8 |
| Romania | 8 |
| Serbia | 8 |
| Bulgaria | 7 |
| Germany | 7 |
| Turkey | 6 |
| Norway | 5 |
| Georgia | 5 |
| Austria | 5 |
| Cyprus | 5 |
| Hungary | 5 |
| North Macedonia | 5 |
| Czech Republic | 4 |
| Sweden | 4 |
| Russia | 4 |
| Azerbaijan | 3 |
| Latvia | 3 |
| Lithuania | 3 |
| Netherlands | 3 |
| Montenegro | 3 |
| Iceland | 2 |
| Switzerland | 2 |
| Ireland | 2 |
| Luxembourg | 2 |
| Malta | 2 |
| Poland | 2 |
| Slovakia | 2 |
| Slovenia | 2 |

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 2 |
| Moldova | 1 |
| Albania | 1 |
| Not specified | 218 |

It could also be interesting to have a look at where the users who are not coming from the CoE member states are coming from. Table 4 lists the countries and number of users from the non-CoE countries. Out of 36 such users, the country data is only available for 22 of them as presented in the table below. The table is presented in a descending order of numbers.

Table 4: All Portfolios – Number of users from the non-CoE member states

| Countries outside of CoE | Number of Users |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Belarus | 14 |
| Kazakhstan | 2 |
| Brazil | 1 |
| Egypt | 1 |
| Japan | 1 |
| Mexico | 1 |
| South Korea | 1 |
| Grenada | 1 |
| Not specified | 14 |

The Youth Department of the Council of Europe also works with youth workers from the following countries, yet there are no users from these countries in the database (listed in alphabetical order): Algeria, Israel, Jordan, Kosovo*, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestine, Syria, Tunisia.

2. Gender

The second demographic aspect that has been analysed is based on gender. The findings are summarised in Table 5. The site provides 3 options for gender data: female, male and other. The users do also have the freedom to leave this section blank.

Table 5: All Portfolios – Gender distribution of users

| Gender | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|----------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Female | 349 | 60% |
| Male | 191 | 33% |
| Other | 6 | 1% |
| Not registered | 3 | 6% |

The number of female users is almost twice the number of male users.

The gender distribution of users coming from the CoE and the non-CoE member states were also analysed and the percentages remain close to the overall picture with female users being almost twice as many as the male users.

3. Age

The third demographic aspect analysed was age. During the registration phase, the website asks users to choose an interval for their age. Table 6 presents the age distribution of Youth Work Portfolio users based on the age intervals provided by the website.

Table 6: All Portfolios – Age distribution

| Age interval | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Under 15 | 1 | <1% |
| 15 to 18 years | 8 | 1% |
| 19 to 24 years | 130 | 22% |
| 25 to 30 years | 168 | 29% |
| 31 to 40 years | 152 | 26% |
| 41 to 50 years | 52 | 8% |
| Over 50 years | 35 | 6% |
| Not registered | 33 | 5% |

Looking at the percentages of different age intervals, perhaps it is not surprising to see that around one third of the users are aged between 25 to 30 years old. Around 80% of all users are aged between 19 to 40 years old.

Analysing the age distribution together with gender information provided; 19% of the users are female between 25 to 30 years of age. If we enlarge the age interval to 19 to 40 years, the percentage of female users becomes 50% of all users within this age range.

4. Profession

The final demographic aspect analysed was the profession of the users. Similar to the data used for age distribution, the information on professions are also collected by the site based on six different possibilities for users to select from: full time youth worker, part time youth worker, occasional youth worker, youth worker currently looking for a position, volunteer and other. The users also have the possibility to not provide this information. Table 7 presents the distribution of users' professions based on this categorisation. The table is arranged in a descending order of number of users.

Table 7: All Portfolios – Professions of users

| Profession | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Full time youth worker | 199 | 34% |
| Volunteer | 107 | 19% |
| Part time youth worker | 78 | 14% |
| Other | 70 | 12% |
| Occasional youth worker | 65 | 11% |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|----|----|
| Youth worker currently looking for a position | 19 | 3% |
| Not registered | 41 | 7% |

The percentage of volunteers is relatively high with being 19% of all users. Given the nature of the European youth work field this number might not be considered as 'surprising'. Analysing the data, what looks more interesting is how low the number of youth workers who are looking for a position within all the users, only 3%. Given the fact that Youth Workers Portfolio can actually be a tool for a youth worker who is looking for a position to summarise and present their competences, this finding could be further analysed.

When we cross analyse the data of professions with the age distribution, we see that 75% of all users who are aged between 15 to 18 years of age (typical high school age interval) are volunteers. Yet the largest number of volunteers within the Portfolio users is aged between 18 to 24 years old, with a 52%.

15% of all the users who marked "other" as their profession are over 50 years old. They make up the largest group of profession within people over 50 years of age. Analysing these portfolios and also using the data from the survey, we can conclude that these users are often governing board members of youth organisations or members of youth organisations with senior management roles.

5. Competence responses

The statistical data which the Portfolio website collects, keeps track if a user have reacted to a certain competence or not. In other words, if the user has put in any data about a particular competence (rating its relevance, explaining their reasoning or rated their self-perceived competence level) the statistical data table would show a '1' and if the user did not react to any of the fields under a competence, the table would show a '0'. Therefore, it is possible to analyse, which competence areas were reacted to by the users and which were left blank. Table 8 gives an overview of how many users have reacted to each competence area.

Here you can find the 8 competence areas listed once more, for better understanding of the Table 8.

Competence Areas

1. Address the needs and aspiration of young people
2. Provide learning opportunities for young people
3. Support and empower young people in making sense of the society they live and engaging with it
4. Support young people in actively and constructively addressing intercultural relations
5. Actively practice evaluation to improve the quality of the youth work conducted
6. Support collective learning in the youth workers' team
7. Contribute to the development of their organisation and to making policies / programmes work better for young people

8. Develop, conduct and evaluate projects

Table 8: All Portfolios – Competence areas reacted by users

| Number of the Competence area | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Competence area 1 | 412 | 71% |
| Competence area 2 | 153 | 26% |
| Competence area 3 | 111 | 19% |
| Competence area 4 | 107 | 18% |
| Competence area 5 | 91 | 16% |
| Competence area 6 | 97 | 17% |
| Competence area 7 | 91 | 16% |
| Competence area 8 | 106 | 18% |
| Registered but not reacted to any competence area | 151 | 26% |

Analysing the data presented in Table 8, there is a clear decrease in the number of users responding to competence areas as the users move from competence area 1 to competence area 2 and also from competence area 2 to competence area 3. After that, there seems to be stability (around 18%). It is also found to be striking that 26% of all users have registered but they have not reacted to any of the competences.

Clearly (and also suggested by the information sections of the Portfolio), users do not have to react to every competence area; simply because they might not be valid for their work or they might not be interested in self-assessment in a given area. To better understand if this changing number of responses is due to the relevance of competence area number 1 (namely; Address the needs and aspirations of young people) or simply because this area happens to be the first one that the users encounter when they start to use the Portfolio, further analysis on the data has been made.

As expressed earlier, in the Youth Work Portfolio there are a total number of 32 competences and these 32 competences are listed in 8 different areas. The first competence area has 6 competences listed underneath; and it is the one with the highest number of competences.

Table 9 presents the number of users who have reacted to a certain number of competences.

Table 9: All Portfolios – Number of competences reacted by the users

| Number of competences reacted (out of 32) | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Between 1 to 5 | 267 | 46% |
| Between 6 to 10 | 60 | 10% |
| Between 11 to 20 | 21 | 4% |
| Between 21 to 30 | 10 | 2% |
| Between 31 to 32 | 70 | 12% |

| | | |
|------|-----|-----|
| None | 151 | 26% |
|------|-----|-----|

Analysing the data provided in Table 9, it is important to notice that almost half of the users (46%) have responded to less than 6 competences. Having a closer look at the data of these users, all of them reacted to only the first competences in the first competence area.

Analysing the two tables presented above together, the study set a criteria for users that had responded to minimum of 11 to 20 competences (out of 32) in at least 4 different competence areas (out of 8); and ended up with 92 users, which is 16% of the overall number of users. These Portfolios are considered to be meaningful enough to further analyse and, in the study, they are referred as the 'Purposeful Portfolios'.

Analyses in the Chapter IV are based on this group.

IV. Purposeful Portfolios

As explained in the methodology section of this study, a total number of 92 Portfolios were identified as 'Purposeful Portfolios' (PP users) and are further analysed. In order to be able to compare with the group of all users, same list of analyses have been made and presented in this chapter.

Table 10 below shows how many versions the PP users have created as they worked with the Portfolio. The findings are in line with the findings about the group of all users.

Table 10: Purposeful Portfolios – Number of versions

| Number of Portfolio versions | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2 versions | 6 | 7% |
| 1 version | 86 | 93% |

1. Country

In terms of demographics of PP users, the first aspect presented here is on the countries where the users were residing in at the time that they had worked on their Youth Work Portfolio.

Table 11 below provides a summary of the number of PP users within the CoE and outside the CoE.

Table 11: Purposeful Portfolios – Number of users in and out of CoE

| Area | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| CoE countries | 69 | 75% |
| Non-CoE countries | 11 | 12% |
| Not registered | 12 | 13% |

As seen from the table, three out of four PP users were coming from CoE countries.

In Table 12, shows how many PP users are from which member state of the CoE. The table is presented in a descending order of numbers.

Table 12: Purposeful Portfolios – Number of users from the CoE member states

| CoE Member States | Number of Users |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Spain | 7 |
| Italy | 5 |
| Portugal | 4 |
| Croatia | 3 |
| Finland | 3 |
| Estonia | 2 |
| France | 2 |

| | |
|--------------------|----|
| Bulgaria | 1 |
| Germany | 1 |
| Greece | 1 |
| Netherlands | 1 |
| Russian Federation | 1 |
| Sweden | 1 |
| Turkey | 1 |
| United Kingdom | 1 |
| Not specified | 35 |

Table 13 below lists the countries and the number of PP users from the non-CoE countries.

Table 13: Purposeful Portfolios – Number of users from the non-CoE member states

| Countries outside of CoE | Number of Users |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Belarus | 5 |
| Kazakhstan | 1 |
| Not specified | 5 |

2. Gender

The second demographic aspect that has been analysed is based on gender. The findings are summarised in Table 14. The site provides 3 options for gender data: female, male and other. The users do also have freedom to leave this section blank.

Table 14: Purposeful Portfolios – Gender distribution of users

| Gender | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Female | 58 | 63% |
| Male | 29 | 32% |
| Not registered | 5 | 5% |

Here again, similar to the analysis of all users, the number of female PP users is almost twice the number of male PP users.

3. Age

The third demographic aspect analysed was age. At the registration phase, the website asks users to choose an interval for their age. Table 15 presents the age distribution of PP users based on the age intervals provided by the website.

Table 15: Purposeful Portfolios – Age distribution

| Age interval | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Under 15 | 0 | 0% |
| 15 to 18 years | 4 | 4% |

| | | |
|----------------|----|-----|
| 19 to 24 years | 32 | 35% |
| 25 to 30 years | 23 | 25% |
| 31 to 40 years | 19 | 21% |
| 41 to 50 years | 8 | 9% |
| Over 50 years | 1 | 1% |
| Not registered | 5 | 5% |

Different than the age distribution of all Youth Work Portfolio users, the number of PP users aged between 19 to 24 years of age is the highest of the entire PP users group. This fact shows us that the users who used the Portfolio website to a meaningful extent are in general younger than the ones who have only registered and responded to a few competence fields.

Analysing age distribution together with gender information provided; the users who used the site to its full extent are mainly young female youth workers.

4. Profession

The final demographic aspect analysed was the profession of the users. Similar to the data used for age distribution, the information on professions are also collected by the site based on six different possibilities for users to select from: full time youth worker, part time youth worker, occasional youth worker, youth worker currently looking for a position, volunteer and other. The users also have the possibility to not to provide this information. Table 16 presents the distribution of users' professions based on this categorisation. The table is arranged in a descending order of numbers.

Table 16: Purposeful Portfolios – Professions of users

| Profession | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Volunteer | 28 | 30% |
| Full time youth worker | 21 | 23% |
| Part time youth worker | 11 | 12% |
| Occasional youth worker | 8 | 9% |
| Youth worker currently looking for a position | 8 | 9% |
| Other | 7 | 7% |
| Not registered | 9 | 10% |

Looking at the percentages presented, the number of volunteers who have used the Portfolio to a meaningful extent are more than the full-time professionals – which is the leading professional group in the overall users analysis. Therefore, the full-time youth workers show an interest (or are invited to) use the Portfolio but they do not necessarily make a sufficient use of it.

5. Competences responded

In line with the analysis done with the whole group of users, the competence areas that PP users group have responded to have also been looked at. Table 17 shows how many

users (and their respective percentage within the PP users group) have responded to which competence area.

Here you can find the 8 competence areas listed once more, for better understanding of the Table 17.

Competence Areas

1. Address the needs and aspiration of young people
2. Provide learning opportunities for young people
3. Support and empower young people in making sense of the society they live and engaging with it
4. Support young people in actively and constructively addressing intercultural relations
5. Actively practice evaluation to improve the quality of the youth work conducted
6. Support collective learning in the youth workers' team
7. Contribute to the development of their organisation and to making policies / programmes work better for young people
8. Develop, conduct and evaluate projects

Table 17: Purposeful Portfolios – Competence areas reacted by PP users

| Number of the Competence area | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Competence area 1 | 92 | 100% |
| Competence area 2 | 90 | 98% |
| Competence area 3 | 89 | 97% |
| Competence area 4 | 86 | 93% |
| Competence area 5 | 80 | 87% |
| Competence area 6 | 80 | 87% |
| Competence area 7 | 79 | 86% |
| Competence area 8 | 80 | 87% |

We can see the same tendency in this group as we have seen in Table 8, which lists the competence areas that have been responded to by the data from all the users. The first three competence areas have been responded to more than the rest of the competence areas. Although the trend somewhat stays similar, the percentages stay much higher all through the competence framework, as this has been one of the basis of forming the PP users group.

As all PP users responded to competence areas to a meaningful degree, Table 17 can also be used as an indicator on measuring the relevance of different competence areas to the youth workers. From this perspective, the first three competence areas seem to be the most relevant fields.

In order to understand how far these users used the different aspects of the self-assessment, the 92 selected portfolios were looked at more in more detail. Table 18 summarises the percentages of how many users have responded to the text questions under a particular competence and also how many of them have just did the ranking.

Table 18: Purposeful Portfolios – Various uses of ranking and open questions

| Type of responses | Number of Users | Percentage of Users |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Only did ranking | 40 | 44% |
| Responded to few text questions | 16 | 17% |
| Responded to almost all the text questions | 33 | 36% |
| Data could not be accessed | 3 | 3% |

Looking at Table 18, it is clear that almost half of the PP users only did the ranking and have not responded to any of the open questions.

While working on this data, the use of different languages could also be analysed. Out of the 33 users who have responded to the open questions; 22 of them used English language. Spanish and Russian are the most common languages used by the rest of the users.

6. Analysis of the competence areas – relevance and competence

The statistics kept by the website of the Youth Work Portfolio also provides information on the responses of the users in their ranking. Following tables between 19 and 24 are presented to provide some insights on the rankings of the PP users.

Table 19: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 most relevant competences for users' work

| | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1.1. | Build positive, non-judgemental relationships with young people | 4,46 |
| 2.4. | Provide young people with appropriate guidance and feedback | 4,33 |
| 1.4. | Relate to young people as equals | 4,30 |
| 2.2. | Create safe, motivating and inclusive learning environments for individuals and groups | 4,30 |
| 2.5. | Inform young people about learning opportunities and support them to use them effectively | 4,23 |
| 6.1. | Actively evaluate teamwork with colleagues and use the results to improve effectiveness | 4,23 |
| 1.3. | Involve young people in the planning, delivery and evaluation of youth work using participatory methods, as suitable | 4,21 |
| 4.1. | Support young people in acquiring intercultural competences | 4,20 |
| 6.3. | Share relevant information and practices in youth work with colleagues | 4,18 |
| 1.2. | Understand the social context of young people | 4,16 |

Table 20: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 least relevant competences for users' work

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 8.3. | Give visibility to projects, write reports and make presentations, for a variety of audiences | 3,73 |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 8.4. | Use information and communication technology tools when necessary | 3,73 |
| 5.3. | Use the results of evaluation for the improvement of youth work practice | 3,65 |
| 7.2. | Co-operate with others to shape youth policies | 3,64 |
| 7.1. | Actively involve young people in shaping organisation's policies and programmes | 3,63 |
| 8.1. | Apply project management approaches | 3,57 |
| 5.4. | Stay up-to-date on the latest youth research on the situation and needs of the young people | 3,51 |
| 8.2. | Seek and manage resources | 3,51 |
| 5.1. | Involve young people in planning and organising evaluation | 3,41 |
| 5.2. | Plan and apply a range of participatory methods for evaluation | 3,38 |

Table 19 and Table 20 shows that for the users, the most relevant competence areas for their youth work are:

CA 1: Address the needs and aspiration of young people

CA 2: Provide learning opportunities for young people

CA 6: Support collective learning in the youth workers' team

Whereas the least relevant competence areas for their youth work are:

CA 5: Actively practice evaluation to improve the quality of the youth work conducted

CA 7: Contribute to the development of their organisation and to making policies programmes work better for young people

CA 8: Develop, conduct and evaluate projects

It has been interesting to see that almost none of the competences in the following two competence areas are not ranked either highest or lowest in terms of their relevance for youth work.

CA 3: Support and empower young people in making sense of the society they live and engaging with it

CA 4: Support young people in actively and constructively addressing intercultural relations

Table 21: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 highly rates competences

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1.4. | Relate to young people as equals | 3,99 |
| 1.1. | Build positive, non-judgemental relationships with young people | 3,89 |

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 6.3. | Share relevant information and practices in youth work with colleagues | 3,82 |
| 1.5. | Demonstrate openness in discussing young people's personal and emotional issues when raised in the youth work context | 3,72 |
| 6.1. | Actively evaluate teamwork with colleagues and use the results to improve effectiveness | 3,69 |
| 6.2. | Seek and give feedback about teamwork | 3,67 |
| 4.1. | Support young people in acquiring intercultural competences | 3,65 |
| 1.2. | Understand the social context of young people | 3,63 |
| 2.2. | Create safe, motivating and inclusive learning environments for individuals and groups | 3,61 |
| 2.4. | Provide young people with appropriate guidance and feedback | 3,54 |

Table 22: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 least rates competences

| | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 3.2. | Support young people to identify goals, develop strategies and organise individual and collective action for social change | 3,17 |
| 3.1. | Assist young people to identify and take responsibility for the role they want to have in their community and society | 3,11 |
| 8.1. | Apply project management approaches | 2,97 |
| 5.3. | Use the results of evaluation for the improvement of youth work practice | 2,93 |
| 7.2. | Co-operate with others to shape youth policies | 2,92 |
| 8.2. | Seek and manage resources | 2,88 |
| 5.1. | Involve young people in planning and organising evaluation | 2,88 |
| 7.1. | Actively involve young people in shaping organisation's policies and programmes | 2,84 |
| 5.2. | Plan and apply a range of participatory methods for evaluation | 2,78 |
| 5.4. | Stay up-to-date on the latest youth research on the situation and needs of the young people | 2,73 |

Reading through Table 21 and 22, it is interesting to see that all of the competences in competence area 6 (CA 6: Support collective learning in the youth workers' team) are ranked highly by the users compared to other competences.

There is also an accumulation of low ranking in the competence areas number 3 and 5 but as these are also the areas where the users do not rank the relevance of these competences highly, the low rating could mean simply that these are not relevant areas for the work of the users who have responded.

Table 23: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 competences with biggest difference between relevance to work and the users self-assessed competence level

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 3.1. | Assist young people to identify and take responsibility for the role they want to have in their community and society | 1,00 |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|

| | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 3.2. | Support young people to identify goals, develop strategies and organise individual and collective action for social change | 0,93 |
| 2.5. | Inform young people about learning opportunities and support them to use them effectively | 0,80 |
| 1.3. | Involve young people in the planning, delivery and evaluation of youth work using participatory methods, as suitable | 0,80 |
| 2.4. | Provide young people with appropriate guidance and feedback | 0,79 |
| 7.1. | Actively involve young people in shaping organisation's policies and programmes | 0,79 |
| 5.4. | Stay up-to-date on the latest youth research on the situation and needs of the young people | 0,78 |
| 2.3. | Use a range of educational methods including ones that develop creativity and foster motivation for learning | 0,75 |
| 3.4. | Support the competence and confidence development of young people | 0,74 |
| 2.1. | Support young people in identifying their learning needs, wishes and styles, taking any special needs into consideration | 0,74 |

Table 24: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 competences with smallest difference between relevance to work and the users self-assessed competence level

| | | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 6.1. | Actively evaluate teamwork with colleagues and use the results to improve effectiveness | 0,54 |
| 1.2. | Understand the social context of young people | 0,53 |
| 5.1. | Involve young people in planning and organising evaluation | 0,53 |
| 4.3. | Work creatively on and with conflicts with a view to transforming them constructively | 0,52 |
| 6.2. | Seek and give feedback about teamwork | 0,45 |
| 1.6. | Demonstrate that youth work practice reflects the needs and aspirations of young people | 0,39 |
| 8.4. | Use information and communication technology tools when necessary | 0,37 |
| 6.3. | Share relevant information and practices in youth work with colleagues | 0,36 |
| 1.5. | Demonstrate openness in discussing young people's personal and emotional issues when raised in the youth work context | 0,34 |
| 1.4. | Relate to young people as equals | 0,31 |

The biggest gap between relevance and competence are in the competence areas 2 (provide learning opportunities for young people) and 3 (support and empower young people in making sense of the society they live and engaging with it). So it could be concluded that these are also the areas where users want to further develop their practices.

The users also rate their competences considerably low in the competence field 5 (stay up-to-date on the latest youth research on the situation and needs of the young people; involve young people in planning and organising evaluation) and still consider it relevant. Therefore, it can be concluded that the relationship between the quality development in

youth work and the policy development does not reflect on the self-assessment of the youth workers.

V. Results of the Survey

A survey aiming to deepen the understanding on the use and dissemination of the Portfolio has been sent to the entire user emails registered on the platform. Despite the efforts put, the response rate was as low as 2%. As mentioned in the limitations part of this Study, the findings from the Survey cannot be referred as representative conclusions given the limited response rate. Yet the survey still gives out a new set of data that becomes meaningful in relation with the other sources of data; especially when it comes to the use and dissemination of the Portfolio.

Source of knowledge of the Portfolio

More than half of the users responded to the survey found about the Youth Work Portfolio either during a CoE Youth Department's activity or through a youth work trainer. The rest of the users mainly found it online while they were specifically looking for a competency model for youth workers.

The context in which the Portfolio is used

Majority of the users used the Youth Work Portfolio in the context of training where they were participants. Some of the users also used it on their personal initiative (the ones that found about the Portfolio after web research). There are also users, which use the Portfolio in their formal studies.

Purpose of using the Portfolio

The Portfolio has been used as a professional self-assessment tool and also for personal development. It has also been used as a model to develop competence frameworks for youth workers or for professions with close competence spectrums (such as social work). It is also mentioned that users use it to demonstrate their professional capacities during job interviews. The main field of use mentioned is the training / education of youth workers.

Portfolio in its key functions

The users were asked to rate the helpfulness of the Portfolio competency framework. When asked in general, the users rated the helpfulness of the competency model 68 out of 100. When asked for the helpfulness of each one of the objectives of the Portfolio, the results are as follows:

- To analyse the current state of youth work competency – 68/100
- To gather evidence on the quality of youth work – 68/100
- To gather ideas on how to improve youth work – 66/100
- To explain youth work to others – 63/100

Although (as mentioned earlier) the survey results should not be perceived as definitive or representative; the ratings make sense as the first two objectives could be based on self-assessment rather easier while the last two objectives might require an extra effort to work on the findings that come from the self-assessment.

Challenges with using the Portfolio

During the survey, the users were also asked about the challenges they have faced during their work with the online Youth Work Portfolio on three aspects: technical, content-related and methodological challenges.

On the technical challenges majority of the respondents mention that the website is technically working fine, except some difficulties with access at times. Yet all the respondents mention that it would make a positive difference if the website will be easier to surf, become more user-friendly for logging-in and accessible from mobile devices. Several respondents also mention that they would rather use the offline version than the online one to overcome technical challenges – but they did not define what the challenges were.

On the content- related challenges, several respondents mention that the self-assessment is rather long and takes a long time to go through it all. The ones that are using the Portfolio in formal education setting are looking for developments to relate the contents of the Portfolio and the curriculum of youth workers education in different countries. There were no challenges mentioned regarding the informative chapters or the structure of the competence framework.

When it comes to the methodological challenges, the main difficulty mentioned is the length of the self-assessment. Some of the respondents are also making suggestions to diversify (increase the methods) of how one rates or describes their competences in the Portfolio; in order to keep the content as it is but change the methodology so the whole journey of self-assessment can take shorter time or can stay engaging.

Learning Plan

When asked, the majority of the respondents mentioned that they either did not do the second part of the Portfolio (Learning Plan) or mention that they did it and only used it during the training course. One of the respondents mentions that they used it as a part of the job application.

Suggestions for further development and dissemination

The survey also asked for suggestions for further development and dissemination of the Youth Work Portfolio. Here you can find the list of responses:

- Development of a mobile app,
- Making the language more user-friendly,
- Adding guidelines on how to use the Portfolio in CVs or directly connect with your CV (e.g. Europass format),
- Development of information on how to use the Portfolio as a recognition tool to be better hired as a youth worker,
- Further work on promoting the Youth Work Portfolio in formal education processes,
- Including competences for digital youth work,
- Translation in different languages,

- Giving more visibility to the Portfolio at the CoE events related with youth work,
- As the Portfolio is on the Youth Work recommendation, perhaps it would be good to send it to member states' youth ministries and departments and ask for a translation, ask for using it as an award criterion for your youth workers, to use it for the recognition of youth work,
- Connecting the Portfolio to relevant professional networking media such as LinkedIn.
- Making the benefits of having a Portfolio more explicit.
- Providing more training related to the Portfolio.

VI. Recommendations

In this section, the recommendations about the Youth Work Portfolio have been presented.

1. Content related recommendations

The Youth Work Portfolio has extremely important and relevant content for youth workers in Europe. Not only the competence model on which the self-assessment is based on, but also the information sections of the Portfolio are valuable, educational and still relevant.

The main recommendation in terms of content is to find better ways in which the information part of the Portfolio and the self-assessment form can better correspond with each other. Bridging the links can also go beyond the Portfolio given that it is an online tool and providing links to relevant readings to expand the horizon of the user before / during self-assessment could also be more engaging.

The second recommendation is to add digital youth work competences to the competence framework.

2. Methodological recommendations

The main challenge of the Portfolio seems to be the methodological one. In the survey, what the users are referring to as 'too long' is also in line with the fact that 46% of the users stop reflecting with the tool after they responded to maximum 5 competences out of 32. Given the fact that the contents are found to be very good, the solution for this problem should be residing in methodological changes.

The main recommendation here is to keep the content of the Portfolio but add elements of gamification to make it more engaging. Gamification does not mean turning the self-assessment process into a game: gamification means using gaming elements to make a process (any process) more engaging. Some concrete suggestions can be: having a completion bar where the user can see their progress in finalising the self-assessment; adding a visual element where the user can see their rankings after each competence (web mapping), making navigation easier between different competence areas, using short videos at the introduction of each competence area. The online methodology of the Portfolio is recommended to be reworked by a team of: educators, youth workers, gamification experts and digital experts.

3. Technical recommendations

The respondents to the survey refer to technical challenges on a wide range of aspects: from the difficulties of logging in to the Portfolio website to the challenges of not being able to reach the contents of the Portfolio through a mobile app. This study itself also experienced various challenges when it came to the technicalities of how the website works. Therefore, it is difficult to recommend anything other than a new website, which is user friendly, easy to navigate and engaging in its design.

The other recommendation is about the way statistics on the website is stored and how it is shown to the administrators. During the set up of the new website, the technical staff should be provided information on the content related data that the institutions involved want to receive and analyse regularly.

The visibility of the Portfolio might also be increased if a 'tailored' version of the self-assessment could be easily provided to the users in a recognised format (such as the Europass format). Being able to make the Portfolio visible on networking platforms such as LinkedIn (global) or Salto-Youth (field specific) could also be taken into consideration in the set up of the Portfolio website.

*All references to Kosovo, whether the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nation's Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

List of Tables

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <u>Table 1: All Portfolios – Number of versions</u> | 13 |
| <u>Table 2: All Portfolios – Number of users in and out of CoE</u> | 13 |
| <u>Table 3: All Portfolios – Number of users from CoE member states</u> | 14 |
| <u>Table 4: All Portfolios – Number of users from non-CoE member states</u> | 15 |
| <u>Table 5: All Portfolios – Gender distribution of users</u> | 15 |
| <u>Table 6: All Portfolios – Age distribution</u> | 16 |
| <u>Table 7: All Portfolios – Professions of users</u> | 16 |
| <u>Table 8: All Portfolios – Competence areas reacted by users</u> | 18 |
| <u>Table 9: All Portfolios – Number of competences reacted by the users</u> | 18 |
| <u>Table 10: Purposeful Portfolios – Number of versions</u> | 20 |
| <u>Table 11: Purposeful Portfolios – Number of users in and out of CoE</u> | 20 |
| <u>Table 12: Purposeful Portfolios – Number of users from CoE member states</u> | 20 |
| <u>Table 13: Purposeful Portfolios – Number of users from non-CoE member states</u> | 21 |
| <u>Table 14: Purposeful Portfolios – Gender distribution of users</u> | 21 |
| <u>Table 15: Purposeful Portfolios – Age distribution</u> | 21 |
| <u>Table 16: Purposeful Portfolios – Professions of users</u> | 22 |
| <u>Table 17: Purposeful Portfolios – Competence areas reacted by PP users</u> | 23 |
| <u>Table 18: Purposeful Portfolios – Various uses of ranking and open questions</u> | 23 |
| <u>Table 19: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 most relevant competences for users' work</u> | 24 |
| <u>Table 20: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 least relevant competences for users' work</u> | 24 |
| <u>Table 21: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 highly rates competences</u> | 25 |
| <u>Table 22: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 least rates competences</u> | 26 |
| <u>Table 23: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 competences with biggest difference between relevance to work and the users self-assessed competence level</u> | 26 |

Table 24: Purposeful Portfolios – Top 10 competences with smallest difference
between relevance to work and the users self-assessed competence level 27