UDC 377.091.26(410+417):378.014.61(477)
ISSN: 2707-3092 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32835/2707-3092.2026.33.3-17

IVE Institute of Vocational Education of NAES of Ukraine

Professional Pedagogics/2(33)'2026, pp. 3-17

To cite this article: Radkevych, V. (2026). INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF VOCATIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES: UK AND IRISH EXPERIENCES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF QUALIFICATION CENTRES IN UKRAINE. *Professional Pedagogics*, *2*(33), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.32835/2707-3092.2026.33.3-17

The article was prepared within the framework of the basic research project *"Quality Assurance Systems in Vocational Education and Training in Western and Northern European Countries"* (State Registration No. 0125U000275; 2025–2026).

INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF VOCATIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES: UK AND IRISH EXPERIENCES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF QUALIFICATION CENTRES IN UKRAINE

Valentyna Radkevych

[1] Chief Research Fellow, Department of Foreign Vocational Education Systems, Institute of Vocational Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9233-5718, mrs.radkevich@gmail.com

Abstract

Relevance. This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the British and Irish models of independent assessment of learning outcomes and validation of occupational qualifications, aiming to develop actionable mechanisms for their adaptation within the qualification centre network in Ukraine. It identifies key operational challenges within the domestic assessment landscape: methodological heterogeneity of assessment tools, low levels of procedural standardisation for evidence verification, and assessor bias. Based on a synthesis of British and Irish practices, the paper substantiates the deployment of a phased operational model for qualification centres that encompasses diagnostic guidance, two-stage assessment, internal verification, and final certification.

Purpose. To conduct a comparative analysis of independent assessment procedures for vocational learning outcomes in the United Kingdom and Ireland, identify institutional quality assurance mechanisms, and delineate pathways for adapting European best practices to enhance the performance of Ukrainian qualification centres and the broader national system for validating occupational qualifications.

Methods. The study employs: *literature and document analysis and synthesis* (scholarly sources, regulatory frameworks, and methodological guidelines) to establish the statutory foundations and methodological principles underpinning independent assessment systems; *comparative analysis* to contrast the UK and Irish assessment frameworks, identifying commonalities, divergences, and operational merits; *systems and structural-functional analysis* to examine the interaction between regulatory bodies, qualification centres, and quality assurance workflows as an integrated whole; *modelling* to design an adaptive, phased operational framework for Ukrainian qualification centres; and *synthesis* to generate evidence-based recommendations for implementing internal and external verification mechanisms and digitalising assessment and recognition pipelines.

Results. Drawing on European best practices, an adaptive operational framework tailored for Ukrainian qualification centres is articulated and substantiated. A core strategic component of the proposed framework is the rollout of an "E-Qualification Centre" module within the National Qualifications Agency (NQA) Register of

Qualifications, incorporating e-Portfolio management, automated risk assessment, and mandatory video recording of assessment sessions. Actionable recommendations are formulated to enhance assessment objectivity, harmonise national occupational standards with European benchmarks, and facilitate the mutual recognition of occupational qualifications.

Conclusions. The study demonstrates that mitigating systemic bottlenecks within Ukraine's qualification centre infrastructure requires adopting an adaptive framework that integrates British and Irish quality verification standards. Digitalising assessment workflows, automating risk management, and deploying video-recorded evidence are identified as decisive instruments for safeguarding objectivity. Implementing these regulatory, institutional, and digital interventions establishes a robust foundation for curtailing corruption risks and aligning the Ukrainian qualification validation system with European labour market requirements.

Keywords: *qualification centres, National Qualifications Agency, Register of Qualifications, validation of occupational qualifications, independent assessment of learning outcomes, British model (Ofqual/CASS), Irish model (QQI/CAS), internal monitoring matrix, e-Portfolio.*

Introduction. The independent assessment of vocational learning outcomes serves as a strategic instrument for modernising the National Qualifications System amid structural labour market transformations and Ukraine's post-war reconstruction. The relevance of this institution is driven by the imperative for objective recognition of competencies acquired through non-formal and informal education or directly in workplace settings. Systematic efforts by the National Qualifications Agency (NQA) have established an initial regulatory framework, enabling the expansion of the accredited independent assessment network to over 260 qualification centres across all regions. The primary practical achievement of this institution lies in establishing a viable mechanism for the formal confirmation of occupational competencies and the validation of non-formal and informal learning outcomes. Qualification centres play a critical operational role in mitigating workforce deficits, accelerating adult reskilling, and addressing labour market demands without requiring candidates to undergo prolonged formal educational programmes. Furthermore, decoupling assessment procedures from the instructional process guarantees high impartiality, eliminates conflicts of interest, enhances transparency in awarding occupational qualifications, and fosters strong employer trust in issued certificates, as certified skills strictly align with approved occupational standards.

Concurrently, the rapid evolution of this domain necessitates the deployment of standardised diagnostic tools and the mitigation of subjectivity in summative decision-making. An analysis of the practical implementation of regulatory requirements reveals a substantial divergence between statutory provisions and the operational reality of assessment bodies. First, despite the regulatory mandate requiring assessment materials to reflect occupational standards, Ukraine still lacks a centralised, validated item bank of test items and practical case studies. The autonomous development of assessment tools by individual qualification centres leads to methodological heterogeneity, disparate examination difficulty levels across centres, and persistent assessor bias. Second, while the Regulation on the Register of Qualifications outlines the overarching pathway for validating non-formal and informal learning outcomes (application, preliminary interview, portfolio development, and practical examination), the comparative mapping of prior experiential learning against occupational standards during evidence evaluation remains insufficiently regulated, and the procedural verification of evidence lacks statutory formalisation. Third, although the NQA Accreditation Procedure requires applicant bodies to maintain an internal quality assurance system, key procedural roles, notably internal verifiers and assessment moderators–are not formally codified in domestic legislation. Consequently, internal quality systems in many qualification centres operate merely as formal compliance mechanisms during initial accreditation.

Bridging this gap between policy and practice requires the evidence-based adaptation of progressive European models–principally the vocational assessment systems of the United Kingdom (Ofqual) and Ireland (QQI). Integrating their established quality assurance mechanisms,

including internal and external verification frameworks, validity evidence matrices, and standardised validation instruments, will enable the transition of the domestic qualification centre network from nominal NQA compliance to robust, quality-driven assessment delivery. Advancing this assessment methodology will further accelerate the integration of the Ukrainian labour market into the European educational space and facilitate the mutual recognition of occupational qualifications.

Literature Review. The academic discourse among Ukrainian and international scholars demonstrates sustained interest in the institutionalisation of qualification centres, the validation of non-formal and informal learning, and the adoption of foreign models for confirming occupational competencies. Theoretical foundations, institutional principles, and strategic development trajectories for qualification centres in Ukraine amid post-war workforce recovery and European integration are examined by D. Antoniuk, K. Antoniuk, and L. Bukharina (2024), as well as O. Azhykovskyi et al. (2023), who substantiate the role of qualification centres in developing enterprise human capital and resolving structural skill shortages. The importance of civic-participatory partnerships and the regional rollout of accredited assessment bodies (specifically for targeted demographics and the pharmaceutical sector) are highlighted by O. Vyshnevska, O. Sharin, and S. Sharina (2022), N. Bilousova, O. Getalo, and O. Yakovleva (2022), and A. Nemchenko et al. (2023). Organisational and legal dimensions of non-formal and dual education, centre accreditation, and entry into the National Register of Qualifications are addressed by M. Viter and O. Derzhuk (2022), T. Kravchenko (2022), and S. Melnyk (2023). Validation mechanisms and accreditation procedures under martial law–including operational launch delays and post-accreditation oversight–are analysed in detail by T. Semigina, Y. Balanyuk, and V. Fedyuk (2023), V. Budashko (2023), and L. Bazyl (2024). The awarding of occupational qualifications by higher education institutions and qualification modelling challenges are explored by T. Semigina and Y. Rashkevych (2023) and A. Shevtsov (2024). A substantial body of research focuses on quality assurance in vocational education, public-private partnerships, and foreign validation practices, including British validation frameworks and employer engagement in quality assurance (Radkevych, 2026), institutional governance of public-private partnerships and contemporary quality assurance practices (Romanova, 2025; Kravets, 2025), and innovative assessment tools in specialized sectors (Kuznetsova, 2022; Mityagin, 2023). V. Ananyin and O. Uvarkina (2024) contextualise qualification centres within the philosophical and educational transformation of cyber education, while L. Lisohor and V. Potapenko (2025) ground their analysis in employment policy and social security frameworks. The economic and reintegration significance of validating migrant workers' skills to repatriate human capital is established by Kh. Zalutska, B. Morklianyk, and V. Fedyuk (2026). Despite these comprehensive contributions, a detailed comparative analysis of operational procedures for the internal and external verification of assessment decisions (exemplified by the British Ofqual/CASS and Irish QQI/CAS frameworks) and their adaptation to Ukrainian qualification centres remains insufficiently explored, establishing the rationale for this study.

The documentary and empirical corpus assembled to address these research objectives comprises Ukrainian legislative and regulatory acts, official documentation and methodological guidelines from UK and Irish regulatory authorities, and administrative data sources governing independent vocational assessment, qualification awarding/confirmation, validation of non-formal and informal learning, and assessment quality assurance systems.

In the Ukrainian legislative framework, the statutory and regulatory foundation governing qualification centres is established by the Laws of Ukraine "On Education" (2017) and "On Vocational Education" (2025), alongside pivotal secondary legislation. In particular, Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 956 of September 15, 2021, regulates the Procedure for Awarding and Confirming Occupational Qualifications by Qualification Centres (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2021a), whereas Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 986 of September 22, 2021, specifies the mechanisms for their accreditation (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2021b). Coordinating and record-keeping functions

are performed by the NQA, which administers the Register of Qualifications–a centralised information system containing data on occupational standards, recognized occupations, assessment bodies, and issued certificates (Unified Register of Qualifications – Classifier of Occupations, n.d.).

A vital source of analytical data is provided by the materials of the NQA and the Register of Qualifications, which detail occupational standards, occupational qualifications, qualification centres, and the operational status of the NQA (Unified Register of Qualifications – Classifier of Occupations, n.d.). The examination of these materials facilitated an in-depth analysis of the regulatory and organisational parameters governing Ukrainian qualification centres and informed pathways for their systematic enhancement.

The foreign source corpus comprises official policy documentation from the British regulatory authority, the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual), including materials on the implementation of the Centre Assessment Standards Scrutiny (CASS) framework, requirements for internal and external quality assurance of assessment (Radkevych, 2023), and regulatory oversight of accredited assessment centres (Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual), 2020, 2025). The critical examination of these documents enabled the investigation of risk-based quality control mechanisms, internal verification of assessment decisions, and external audit protocols for qualification centres.

A distinct group of sources consists of regulatory and methodological materials issued by the state agency Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI), which oversees the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ), the Common Awards System (CAS), and Validation of Prior Learning (VPL) procedures. Analyzing these documents allowed for an investigation into the recognition of learning outcomes, modular qualification structuring, internal and external validation workflows, and the operation of collegial governance bodies responsible for approving assessment outcomes (Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI), n.d.; Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI), 2026).

Furthermore, this evidentiary base is supplemented by policy documents from the European Commission and the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), which highlight European benchmarks for quality assurance in vocational education and training, national qualifications frameworks development, recognition of learning outcomes, and independent competency assessment architectures (European Commission, 2025; ENQA, 2024). The synthesis of these sources enabled a comprehensive comparative analysis of the British and Irish models of independent vocational assessment and supported the formulation of evidence-based recommendations for their contextualised adaptation within Ukrainian qualification centres.

Purpose: To perform a comparative analysis of independent vocational learning outcome assessment procedures in the United Kingdom and Ireland, identify institutional quality assurance mechanisms, and delineate pathways for adapting European best practices to enhance the operational performance of Ukrainian qualification centres and the broader national qualification validation system.

Methods: The study employs: literature and document analysis and synthesis (scholarly sources, regulatory frameworks, and methodological materials) to examine the statutory foundations and methodological principles underpinning independent assessment systems; comparative analysis to contrast the UK and Irish assessment frameworks, identifying commonalities, divergences, and operational merits; systems and structural-functional analysis to investigate the interaction between regulatory authorities, qualification centres, and quality assurance workflows as an integrated whole; modelling to design an adaptive, phased operational framework for Ukrainian qualification centres; and synthesis to articulate evidence-based recommendations for implementing internal and external verification mechanisms, as well as digitalising assessment and recognition pipelines.

Results and Discussion. The British model of independent vocational assessment features a decentralised network of operational assessment delivery operating under strictly centralised regulatory quality mandates. The regulatory landscape across the United Kingdom is divided among Ofqual in England, CCEA Regulation in

Northern Ireland, and SQA Accreditation in Scotland (Smart Awards, 2025). The institutional hierarchy is structured upon a clear delineation of responsibilities: statutory regulators define overarching framework conditions, while accredited Awarding Organisations (AOs)–such as City & Guilds, Pearson, NOCN, and others–are responsible for developing occupational qualifications, assessment strategies, and approving independent training and assessment centres. Direct assessment is executed by centre-based assessors, while quality control procedures are conducted by Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) and External Quality Assurance (EQA) professionals.

The central regulatory mechanism governing the interface between AOs and approved assessment centres is the Centre Assessment Standards Scrutiny (CASS) strategy, introduced by Ofqual pursuant to General Condition of Recognition H2 (AccordAI, 2025). Condition H2 mandates that every AO ensure that marks and grades determined by centre-based assessors/educators are objective, accurate, and standardized. The CASS framework additionally obligates AOs to formulate and execute systematic control measures over centre-assessed outcomes (AccordAI, 2025). Within CASS, a risk-based approach to centre monitoring is deployed using a Red-Amber-Green (RAG) rating system, which governs the intensity and frequency of external audits. Based on this risk profile, AOs determine whether to grant an assessment centre Direct Claims Status (DCS) or require mandatory pre-certification moderation for every candidate portfolio (AccordAI, 2025).

The operational trajectory of independent assessment for a candidate in the British system begins with an initial diagnostic assessment and the candidate's registration in the national database, where they are assigned a Unique Learner Number (ULN) that unlocks their Personal Learning Record (PLR). Subsequently, an Assessment Strategy is formulated to establish the balance between direct and indirect evidence of competence. A pivotal component of the centre-level quality assurance system is the Internal Quality Assurer (IQA Holder), who must possess a relevant Level 4 qualification (CTC Training, n.d.). The IQA conducts risk-based sampling of assessments performed by assessors, who must demonstrate industry-specific competence and hold an approved assessor qualification, such as the Level 3 Certificate in Assessing Vocational Achievement (CAVA) (Smart Awards, 2025).

To construct a representative sample of assessment decisions, the IQA applies the CAMERA sampling methodology (Potential Unearthed, 2016):

- C (Candidates): Accounting for candidate profiles, including ethnic background, gender, employment status, special educational needs, and resubmissions/referrals (Potential Unearthed, 2016);
- A (Assessors): Considering assessor experience levels, probationary/new-hire status, workload capacity, and prior feedback history from external verifiers (Potential Unearthed, 2016);
- M (Methods of Assessment): Covering the full range of deployed evaluation methods, such as direct workplace observation, professional discussions, expert interviews, work-product analysis, and structured testing (Potential Unearthed, 2016);
- E (Evidence): Reviewing various evidence types against the criteria of validity, authenticity, currency, and sufficiency (Potential Unearthed, 2016);
- R (Risks): Evaluating the quality of administrative documentation, assessment checklist completion, and developmental feedback delivery (Educationwise, 2022);
- A (Assessment Sites): Incorporating all physical, workplace, and simulated satellite locations where assessment occurs (Educationwise, 2022).

Sampling within the IQA framework is executed formatively across interim learning stages as well as summatively at final assessment milestones (Educationwise, 2022). The standard minimum sampling volume typically ranges between 20% and 25% of assessment portfolios; however, for novice assessors or upon identifying performance risks, the verification scope scales up to 100% (Potential Unearthed, 2016). All evidence submitted by candidates or compiled by assessors is audited against the VARCS quality criteria (Educationwise, 2022): V – Validity: Evidence must directly align with the specific learning outcomes and assessment criteria defined in the qualification specification; A – Authenticity: Verification that all

submitted work is genuinely produced by the candidate without third-party intervention or fabrication; R – Reliability: Ensuring assessment decisions are consistent, repeatable, and robust across different assessors and operational contexts; C – Currency: Evidence must reflect current occupational knowledge and skills, typically acquired within the preceding 2 to 5 years; S – Sufficiency: The volume and depth of the evidence base must fully cover all prescribed performance standards without gaps.

External oversight is maintained through External Quality Assurance (EQA), wherein an EQA Auditor representing the awarding organisation conducts scheduled and unannounced audit visits, evaluates the operational integrity of the centre's IQA system, conducts second-tier sample checks of evaluated portfolios, and authorises the centre's certification rights (Smart Awards, 2025).

The Irish system for learning outcome assessment and qualification validation operates under the direct governance of Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI) (The Learning Rooms, n.d.). The regulatory and methodological foundation of assessment is anchored in the Common Awards System (CAS), which is linked to the level descriptors of the Irish National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) (The Learning Rooms, n.d.). The CAS architecture allows for the conferral of both full qualifications (Major Awards) and modular certifications (Minor or Component Awards) (The Learning Rooms, n.d.). This structural design renders the Irish model adaptable for the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL/VPL), enabling candidates to accrue modular credits progressively toward full qualification attainment.

The Validation of Prior Learning (VPL/RPL) workflow in Ireland follows a three-stage operational pathway: First – the diagnostic phase: Encompasses initial guidance delivered by a specialized RPL Advisor, candidate identification, an educational and occupational history analysis (a systematized profile of a person's employment trajectory, working conditions, competence progression, and workplace operational influences), and self-assessment against the target CAS module learning outcome descriptors; The assessment phase: Entails portfolio development by the candidate. The Irish VPL methodology places particular emphasis on reflective accounts: the candidate must critically evaluate their experiential practice and demonstrate how their occupational experience meets the prescribed CAS learning outcomes and grading criteria. The diagnostic toolkit also integrates practical performance demonstrations, simulated workplace assignments, and oral portfolio defences; The verification and certification phase: Involves multi-tiered validation of results and the issuance of formal qualification awards (The Learning Rooms, n.d.).

Consequently, the quality assurance and results approval pipeline in Ireland comprises four sequential stages (The Learning Rooms, n.d.): Internal Verification (IV): The provider’s internal verifier audits assessment conduct against established procedures, recalculates final scores, and verifies the administrative completeness of candidate assessment records (The Learning Rooms, n.d.); External Authentication (EA): An independent external authenticator, appointed from the national QQI panel, conducts sample checks of marked portfolios and practical artefacts, benchmarks assessment standards across providers, and compiles an independent evaluation report (The Learning Rooms, n.d.); Results Approval Panel (RAP): A dedicated collegial governance panel within the provider reviews IV and EA reports and makes final determinations regarding mark confirmation, grade adjustments, or referral for re-assessment (The Learning Rooms, n.d.); Data Transmission and Certification: Following formal RAP sign-off, confirmed outcomes are submitted via QQI's centralised Business Management System (BMS), which generates and issues official national qualification certificates (The Learning Rooms, n.d.).

Systematizing and contrasting the operational parameters of the British and Irish vocational assessment models highlights their key structural distinctions and commonalities, providing critical benchmarks for the Ukrainian qualification centre framework (Table 1).

Table 1

Comparative analysis of British and Irish models of independent assessment of vocational learning outcomes

Comparison criterion	**UK model (Ofqual / CASS)**	**Irish model (QQI / CAS)**
Regulatory body	Ofqual, CCEA Regulation, SQA Accreditation	Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI)
Awarding and development bodies	Independent accredited Awarding Organisations (AOs: City & Guilds, Pearson, etc.)	Single state body QQI through approved providers and CAS modules
Regulatory basis of assessment	Qualification specifications and Assessment Strategies of specific AOs	Unified standard of CAS learning outcomes
Internal quality assurance	Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) based on CAMERA matrix sampling	Internal verification (IV) of procedures and calculations
External quality assurance	External Quality Assurance (EQA) by AOs, CASS audit, DCS status monitoring	External Authentication (EA) by an independent expert from the QQI panel
Key RPL/VPL instrument	Portfolio of evidence, workplace observation, witness testimonies	Portfolio with mandatory reflective report, practical demonstration
Final decision-making	Assessor -> IQA -> EQA Audit / DCS Claim	Assessor -> IV -> EA -> Results Approval Panel (RAP)
Centralised digital records	AO databases + Personal Learning Record (PLR) via ULN code	Centralised QQI system (BMS)
Evaluation of evidence base	VARCS standard (Validity, Authenticity, Reliability, Currency, Sufficiency)	Criterion-referenced mapping against CAS component descriptors

The analytical findings demonstrate that the British model provides operational agility through market competition among AOs and the deployment of the risk-based CASS instrument, which balances regulatory pressure on oversight authorities (AccordAI, 2025). Conversely, the Irish model delivers robust procedural standardisation through the unified CAS architecture and the institutionalisation of a collegial governance body (RAP) for final determination (The Learning Rooms, n.d.).

Drawing upon these European benchmarks, a phased operational framework for the functioning of qualification centres has been structured in Ukraine (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2021a):

Stage 1: Candidate Application, Initial Identification, and Registration. The candidate submits an application in paper or electronic form to the qualification centre, accompanied by identity documents, formal educational credentials (if any), and documentation verifying work history or the completion of non-formal/informal learning. The authorised centre officer verifies the submitted records, logs the application into the local management information system, and generates a personal candidate profile within the NQA Register of Qualifications, assigning a unique case registration number.

Stage 2: Diagnostic Guidance and Evidence Portfolio Compilation. For candidates seeking independent recognition of vocational learning outcomes, a dedicated assessment advisor is appointed. The advisor provides methodological support in structuring the evidence portfolio but is strictly prohibited from serving on the assessment panel to avoid conflicts of interest. The candidate conducts a self-assessment against the competency matrix of the relevant occupational standard and compiles an evidentiary base (authentic work artefacts, photographic/video records, employer references, training certificates, etc.). The advisor conducts an initial screening of the submitted evidence to verify compliance with validity, authenticity, reliability, currency, and sufficiency parameters.

Stage 3: Direct Independent Two-Tier Assessment. Pursuant to the provisions of the Procedure approved by Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 956, the assessment procedure is conducted in two sequential stages: theoretical knowledge assessment and practical skills assessment. The evaluation of theoretical learning outcomes is administered by the qualification panel through standardized computer-based testing or a written examination to assess core theoretical knowledge. Practical skills assessment is conducted at an accredited practical training facility (assessment site) of the qualification centre or at an authorized workplace of a partner enterprise. The execution of practical tasks takes place under the direct observation of the assessment panel. The composition of the assessment panel is established in accordance with the regulatory requirements of Resolutions of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 956 and No. 986. The panel comprises at least two certified assessors, each holding a qualification level no lower than that sought by the candidate, alongside at least three years of documented professional experience in the corresponding occupational field. All practical operations are subject to mandatory continuous video recording, and assessors complete detailed observation logs and rubrics.

Stage 4: Internal Verification and Moderation. Prior to the final approval of results, the assessment file is submitted to the qualification centre's internal verifier (equivalent to the British IQA role). The internal verifier conducts monitoring by reviewing the representativeness of assessment methods, the accuracy of applied assessment criteria, and adherence to procedural standards. If discrepancies arise among the evaluation judgments of panel members, a meeting of the appeals committee is convened to safeguard standardisation and objectivity of the findings.

Stage 5: Final Approval Procedure, External Audit, and Certification. Upon successful completion of internal verification, the panel's decision regarding assessment results is submitted for executive approval by the leadership of the qualification centre. The overall procedural timeline from initial application submission to formal candidate notification is strictly regulated and must not exceed 25 working days. Following formal approval, records on the award or confirmation of the occupational qualification are transmitted to the Register of Qualifications. The NQA (Unified Register of Qualifications – Classifier of Occupations, n.d.) conducts risk-based external scrutiny (analogous to EQA/CASS) via sample audits of digital case files and video documentation. In the absence of procedural infractions, a state Certificate on the Award/Confirmation of an Occupational Qualification bearing a unique QR code is generated.

To ensure high measurement accuracy in assessing competencies acquired through non-formal or informal education, the deployment of a four-tier evidence base matrix is proposed for Ukrainian qualification centres. This matrix stratifies evidence according to its degree of objectivity and direct alignment with the candidate's professional practice (Table 2).

Table 2

Four-tier evidence base matrix

Evidence level	**Type of evidence base**	**Sources and verification instruments**	**Validity and requirements under VACSR criteria**
Level 1	Direct primary evidence	Direct observation by an assessor of the performance of work functions in the workplace or at the QC assessment site; mandatory continuous video recording of the practical examination	Highest level of validity and authenticity. Requires standardisation of observation instruments (protocols, checklists) to ensure assessment reliability
Level 2	Direct secondary evidence	Authentic products of the candidate's practical activity (design and cost estimation documentation, manufactured components/structures,	Requires rigorous verification of authenticity (confirmation of authorship, absence of third-party attribution/plagiarism) and currency of executed works

		developed software modules, technical calculations)	
Level 3	Indirect evidence	Written third-party testimonies (expert references from employers, direct managers/supervisors, client/customer feedback, professional awards, workplace performance evaluations)	Requires additional verification via telephone or written interviews with expert witnesses to confirm data reliability and objectivity
Level 4	Formalised learning evidence	Certificates, attestations, and diplomas verifying participation in non-formal education programmes, internal corporate training courses, online modules, micro-credentials	Evaluated against currency (timeframes) and sufficiency criteria. Requires mandatory confirmation of practical knowledge during the examination

The operational process of receiving and validating evidence requires strict adherence to formal regulations. If a candidate submits indirect evidence (Level 3), the assessor must ensure that the individual providing testimony (expert witness, employer) possesses appropriate sectoral competence and has no conflict of interest with the candidate. All submitted materials are audited to exclude fabrication and to ensure compliance with authenticity and sufficiency criteria. If the evidentiary base is deemed insufficient following verification, the candidate is referred for supplementary assessment or an interview to verify foundational knowledge and understanding of the theoretical principles underpinning the occupation.

Appeals procedure requirements constitute a critical indicator of systemic transparency. In the event of an adverse determination, the qualification centre is required to provide the candidate with detailed written feedback specifying the precise descriptors and criteria of the occupational standard that were not satisfied. The candidate retains the right to appeal the decision within ten working days of receipt by lodging an application with the qualification centre's appeals panel. If a consensus cannot be reached or if the candidate remains dissatisfied with the qualification centre's decision, the complaint is submitted for review to the appeals body of the NQA, whose determination concludes the administrative pre-trial appeal process and may subsequently be contested in court pursuant to applicable legislation.

Automating assessment workflows and quality control mechanisms represents a vital prerequisite for minimizing corruption risks and enhancing labour market confidence in issued certificates. Drawing upon the British experience of implementing e-Portfolio platforms (notably OneFile, Learning Assistant) and the Irish centralized QQI BMS platform highlights the necessity of establishing a unified digital environment in Ukraine (The Learning Rooms, n.d.). A strategically imperative step involves the development and deployment of a dedicated "E-Qualification Centre" module as an integrated functional block within the Register of Qualifications administered by the NQA (Unified Register of Qualifications – Classifier of Occupations, n.d.). The resulting system must provide end-to-end interoperability across personal candidate user portals, automated workstations for qualification centre assessors and internal verifiers, and a risk-based external monitoring and auditing subsystem for the NQA.

The functional architecture of the "E-Qualification Centre" module comprises the following digital components:

– Candidate Personal User Portal (e-Portfolio): Enables candidates to submit electronic applications, upload photographic, video, and textual evidence of non-formal or informal learning, track dossier review statuses, and receive structured feedback from assessment advisors and assessors;

– Digital Portal for Assessors and Internal Verifiers: Supports the standardized, real-time completion of electronic observation logs and checklists, automated score computation, recording of theoretical examination results, and seamless integration with online proctoring services;

– Video Recording and Timestamping Module: Integrates cloud storage for the automated ingestion of practical examination video feeds, ensuring cryptographic file integrity controls, automated geolocation tagging, and time-stamping to preclude evidence fabrication or substitution;

– Automated Quality Control and Risk Management Subsystem of the NQA: Ingests and processes systemic performance datasets from qualification centres, automatically calculates risk ratings (based on appeal rates, statistically anomalous score distributions, and assessment velocity), and determines representative sample volumes for conducting external audit checks of candidate portfolios;

– Digital Certificate Generation Engine: Automatically issues an electronic Certificate on the Award/Confirmation of an Occupational Qualification bearing the qualified electronic signature (QES) of the qualification centre's authorised signatory, simultaneously assigning a unique registration number, a cryptographic QR code, and entering the record into the public section of the Register of Qualifications (Unified Register of Qualifications – Classifier of Occupations, n.d.).

Conclusions. The comprehensive analysis conducted demonstrates that adapting British and Irish best practices provides an effective trajectory for modernising the national system of independent assessment of vocational learning outcomes. The practical expansion and operational refinement of the qualification centre network in Ukraine require the realisation of the following strategic objectives:

Regulatory Enhancements: Introduce amendments and supplements to the Procedure for Awarding and Confirming Occupational Qualifications by Qualification Centres (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2021a) mandating the institutionalisation of the internal verifier role within qualification centre organisational structures; formalise unified evidence evaluation standards for non-formal and informal learning based on VACSR principles (validity, authenticity, currency, sufficiency, and reliability) (Educationwise, 2022); and establish statutory codification for the 25-working-day procedural timeframe with distinct statutory limits allocated for diagnostic guidance, direct assessment, internal verification, and final certification (Kyiv School of Economics, 2026);

Institutional and Methodological Development: Formulate and approve Regulations on Internal Quality Assurance for Qualification Centres, adapting the CAMERA matrix sampling strategy to oversee assessor performance (Potential Unearthed, 2016); institute mandatory continuing professional development certification programmes for assessors and verifiers benchmarked against British CAVA and IQA qualifications (CTC Training, n.d.); and supplement statutory assessor requirements (a minimum of three years of documented professional experience in the relevant occupational field and corresponding qualification levels) with mandatory participation in inter-provider standardisation sessions at least once annually (NMCPTO in Kharkiv Region, 2023);

Digitalisation and External Quality Oversight: Deploy a specialized "E-Qualification Centre" module within the NQA Register of Qualifications to maintain candidate e-Portfolios and automated cloud storage of assessment video recordings (Unified Register of Qualifications – Classifier of Occupations, n.d.); and implement a risk-based external audit model by the NQA utilizing RAG ratings (benchmarked against the Ofqual CASS framework) (AccordAI, 2025).

The implementation of these interventions will establish a transparent, objective, and European-standard-aligned assessment framework for candidate occupational competencies. This will substantially elevate employer trust in state certificates, accelerate the integration of the Ukrainian labour market into the single European space, and create necessary institutional prerequisites for the mutual recognition of occupational qualifications between Ukraine and European Union Member States.

Conflict of Interest

The author certifies that no conflict of interest (financial, professional, or personal) exists that could have influenced the objectivity of the research results or conclusions. The integrity of the double-blind peer review process was ensured through a mandatory declaration of the absence of conflict of interest submitted via the journal's editorial system. This protocol guaranteed complete author anonymity and the independence of the expert evaluation throughout the entire editorial cycle.

Declaration on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence.

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used Google Gemini for bibliographic data retrieval and verification, material organization, table preparation, as well as language editing and text formatting. All conceptualization, empirical data collection and analysis, scientific conclusions, and interpretation of the findings were conducted exclusively by the authors. After the use of this tool, the entire manuscript was carefully reviewed and edited by the authors, who bear full responsibility for its content, scholarly integrity, and accuracy. Artificial intelligence does not qualify for authorship and is not a co-author of this publication.

List of references

AccordAI. (2025). *Centre Assessment Standards Scrutiny (CASS) Strategy*, https://accord.ac/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/CASS-AccordAI-V1.0-2025.pdf [in English].

Ananyin, V., & Uvarkina, O. (2024). Transformatsiya, transhresiya chy intentsiya? (sotsialno-filosofska refleksiya kiberosvity) [Transformation, transgression or intention? (Social and philosophical reflection of cyber education)]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriya filosofsko-politolohichni studii*, (52), 11–17. https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2024.52.1 [in Ukrainian].

Antoniuk, D. A., Antoniuk, K. I., & Bukharina, L. M. (2024). Rozvytok kvalifikatsiinykh tsentriv v Ukraini dlia povoyennoho vidnovlennya kadrovoho potentsialu pidpryiemstv [Development of qualification centers in Ukraine for the post-war recovery of the human resource potential of enterprises]. *Economy of Ukraine*, 67(3), 54–68. https://doi.org/10.15407/economyukr.2024.03.054 [in Ukrainian].

Azyukovskyi, O. O., Pavlychenko, A. V., Trehub, M. V., Pashchenko, O. A., & Medvedovska, T. P. (2023). Kvalifikatsiini tsentry yak zasib rozvytku trudovoho potentsialu personalu pidpryiemstv za umov yevrointehratsii [Qualification centers as a means of developing the labor potential of enterprise personnel under conditions of European integration]. *Grail of Science*, (28), 57–63. https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.09.06.2023.57 [in Ukrainian].

Bazyl, L. O. (2024). Populyaryzatsiya naukovykh здобутків u voyennykh realiyakh: Naukovo-praktychni zakhody Instytutu profesiinoi osvity Natsionalnoi akademii pedahohichnykh nauk Ukrainy, Do Vseukrainskoho festyvalyu nauky [Popularization of scientific achievements in wartime realities: Scientific and practical events of the Institute of Vocational Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, for the All-Ukrainian Science Festival]. *Herald of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine*, 6(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.37472/v.naes.2024.6132 [in Ukrainian].

Bilousova, N. A., Getalo, O. V., & Yakovleva, O. S. (2022). Training of specialists of Health Technology Assessment: experience of foreign countries. *Farmatsevtychnyi Zhurnal*, 1, 63–73. https://doi.org/10.32352/0367-3057.1.22.06 [in English].

Budashko, V. V. (2023). Zabezpechennya protsesiv za osvitno-profesiinymy prohramamy v postakredytatsiinyi period [Ensuring processes under educational and professional programs in the post-accreditation period]. In *XIII Mizhnarodna naukovo-tekhnichna konferentsiya "Sudnova elektroinzheneriya, elektronika i avtomatyka" 22.11.2023 – 23.11.2023* [13th International Scientific and Technical Conference "Ship Electrical Engineering, Electronics and Automation"] (pp. 13–18). NUOMA. https://doi.org/10.31653/2706-7874.SEEEA-2023.11.1-256 [in Ukrainian].

CENTRE ASSESSMENT STANDARDS SCRUTINY (CASS) POLICY | Smart Awards, https://www.smartawards.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/CASS-Strategy-Policy.pdf [in English].

Centre Assessment Standards Scrutiny (CASS) Strategy. (n.d.). - iPET Network, https://ipetnetwork.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Centre-Assessment-Standards-Scrutiny-CASS-Strategy.pdf [in English].

CTC Training. (n.d.). *What is an IQA Qualification?*, https://ctccourses.org/help-advice/what-is-an-iqa-qualification/ [in English].

Educationwise. (2022). *Quality Assurance Strategy*.. https://educationwisegroup.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/EA-Internal-Quality-Assurance-IQA-Strategy-V.pdf [in English].

European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). (2024). QQI: Quality and Qualifications Ireland. https://www.enqa.eu/membership-database/qqi-quality-and-qualifications-ireland/ [in English].

European Commission. (2025). *Quality assurance in higher education: Ireland*. Eurydice. https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/ireland/quality-assurance-higher-education [in English]

Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy. (2021a). *Pro zatverdzhennya Poryadku prysvoyennya ta pidtverdzhennya profesiinykh kvalifikatsii kvalifikatsiinymy tsentramy: Postanova vid 15 veresnya 2021 r. No. 956* [On approval of the Procedure for assigning and confirming professional qualifications by qualification centers: Resolution dated September 15, 2021 No. 956]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/956-2021-п [in Ukrainian]

Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy. (2021b). *Deyaki pytannya akredytatsii kvalifikatsiinykh tsentriv: Postanova vid 22 veresnya 2021 r. No. 986* [Certain issues of accreditation of qualification centers: Resolution dated September 22, 2021 No. 986]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/986-2021-п [in Ukrainian]

Kravchenko, T. V. (2022). Napryamy udoskonalennya orhanizatsiino-pravovoho mekhanizmu derzhavnoho rehulyuvannya profesiinoi (profesiino-tekhnichnoi) osvity [Directions for improving the organizational and legal mechanism of state regulation of vocational (vocational-technical) education]. *Colloquium-journal*, 18(141), 20–25. https://doi.org/10.24412/2520-6990-2022-18141-19-24 [in Ukrainian].

Kravets, S. (2025). Modern Practices of Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training of Future Service Sector Specialists. *Adaptive Management: Theory and Practice. Series Pedagogics*, 21(41). https://doi.org/10.33296/2707-0255-21(41)-18 [in English].

Kuznetsova, N. B. (2022). Mikrokvalifikatsii yak innovatsiinyi instrument suchasnoi vyshchoi osvity [Micro-credentials as an innovative tool of modern higher education]. In *International scientific conference "Information technologies and management in higher education and sciences": Conference proceedings* (Part 2, pp. 171–175). Baltija Publishing. https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-277-7-132 [in Ukrainian].

Kyivska shkola ekonomiky. (2026). *Protsedura prysvoyennya/pidtverdzhennya profesiinoi kvalifikatsii* [Procedure for assigning/confirming professional qualifications]. https://kse.ua/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/Protsedura-CHPK.pdf [in Ukrainian]

Lisohor, L., & Potapenko, V. (2025). Transformatsiini zminy u sferi zainyatosti Ukrainy u konteksti zabezpechennya sotsialnoi bezpeky [Transformational changes in Ukraine's employment sector in the context of ensuring social security]. *Ekonomika i orhanizatsiya upravlinnya*, (3), 72–79. https://doi.org/10.31558/2307-2318.2024.3.8 [in Ukrainian].

Melnyk, S. V. (2023). Zarubizhnyi i vitchyznyanyi dosvid rehulyuvannya profesiinoi diyalnosti pratsivnykiv ta ikh profilnoi pidhotovky [Foreign and domestic experience in regulating the professional activity of employees and their specialized training]. *Educational Analytics of Ukraine*, 4(25), 40–57. https://doi.org/10.32987/2617-8532-2023-4-40-57 [in Ukrainian].

Mityahin, O. (2023). Systema zabezpechennya yakosti viiskovoi osvity v Ukraini [Quality assurance system of military education in Ukraine]. *Military Education*, 2(48), 176–185. https://doi.org/10.33099/2617-1775/2023-02/176-185 [in Ukrainian].

Nemchenko, A. S., Nazarkina, A. S., Kosyachenko, K. L., & Babenko, M. M. (2023). Problemy formuvannya profesiinoho seredovyshcha z otsinky medychnykh tekhnolohii v Ukraini [Problems of forming a professional environment for health technology assessment in Ukraine]. *Health & Education*, (2), 28–36. https://doi.org/10.32782/health-2023.2.5 [in Ukrainian].

NMTs PTO u Kharkivskii oblasti. (2023). *Metodychni rekomendatsii shchodo stvorennya kvalifikatsiinykh tsentriv* [Methodological recommendations for the creation of qualification centers]. http://nmc.ptu.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/metodychni-rekomendacziyi-shhodo-stvorennya-kvalifikaczijnyh-czentriv-2.pdf [in Ukrainian]

Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual). (2020). *Rules confirmed to improve awarding organisation centre controls*. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/rules-confirmed-to-improve-awarding-organisation-centre-controls [in English]

Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual). (2025). *Ofqual Handbook: General Conditions of Recognition. Section H: From marking to issuing results*. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ofqual-handbook/section-h-from-marking-to-issuing-results [in English]

Potential Unearthed. (2016). Appendix 5 Internal Quality Assurance Sampling Strategy – Potential Unearthed, https://www.potentialunearthed.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Appendix-5.pdf [in English].

Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI). (2026). Quality and Qualifications Ireland. https://www.qqi.ie [in English].

Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI). (б. д.). The Common Awards System (CAS). https://www.qqi.ie/what-we-do/qqi-awards/qqi-awards-standards/the-common-awards-system [in English].

Radkevych, O. (2023). Adaptive testing in the context of using electronic learning tools: essence, development and assessment. *Professional Pedagogics*, *1*(26), 58-73. https://doi.org/10.32835/2707-3092.2023.26.58-73

Radkevych, V. (2026). Rol robotodavtsiv u zabezpechenni yakosti profesiinoi osvity i pidhotovky: brytanskyi dosvid validatsii kvalifikatsii [The role of employers in ensuring the quality of vocational education and training: British experience of qualification validation]. In *Transformatsiya profesiinoi osvity v konteksti suchasnykh tsyvilizatsiynykh i natsionalnykh vyklykiv: materialy metodolohichnoho seminaru, 2 kvitnya 2026 r., m. Kyiv, Ukraina* [Transformation of vocational education in the context of modern civilizational and national challenges: Materials of the methodological seminar, April 2, 2026, Kyiv, Ukraine] (pp. 297–305). IPO NAPN Ukrainy. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20331810 [in Ukrainian].

Romanova, H. (2025). Efektyvnist menedzhmentu derzhavno-pryvatnoho partnerstva yak chynnyk zabezpechennya yakosti profesiinoi osvity [Effectiveness of public-private partnership management as a factor in ensuring the quality of vocational education]. *Pedahohichni nauky: teoriya, istoriya, innovatsiini tekhnolohii*, 2(142), 429–443. https://doi.org/10.24139/2312-5993/2025.02/429-443 [in Ukrainian].

Semigina, T., Balanyuk, Y., & Fedyuk, V. (2023). Bridging the qualification gaps: setting up qualification centres in Ukraine. *Economy and Society*, 51. https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2023-51-26 [in English].

Semigina, T.., & Rashkevych, Y. (2023). Problem Issues and Models of Professional Qualifications Assignment by Higher Education Institutions. *International Scientific Journal of Universities and Leadership*, 15, 5–16. https://doi.org/10.31874/2520-6702-2023-15-5-16 [in English].

Shevtsov, A. (2024). Modelyuvannya profesiinykh kvalifikatsii likariv metodom ekspertnoho analizu trudovykh funktsii [Modeling of doctors' professional qualifications using the method of expert analysis of work functions]. *Scientific Journal of Khortytsia National Academy*, 1(10), 47–65. https://doi.org/10.51706/2707-3076-2023-10-19 [in Ukrainian].

The Learning Rooms. (n.d.). QQI Assessment Procedures / QQI Awards Information, https://support.thelearningrooms.com/knowledgebase.php?article=13

Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. (2017). *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro osvitu" vid 05 veresnya 2017 r. No. 2145-VIII* [Law of Ukraine "On Education" dated September 05, 2017 No. 2145-VIII]. Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy, (38–39), Article 380. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19#Text [in Ukrainian]

Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. (2025). *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro profesiinu osvitu"* [Law of Ukraine "On Vocational Education"]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4574-20#Text [in Ukrainian]

Viter, M., & Derzhuk, O. (2022). Neformalna ta dualna osvita v Ukraini [Non-formal and dual education in Ukraine]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriya pedahohichna*, (36), 24–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.30970/vpe.2022.36.11497 [in Ukrainian].

Vyshnevska, O., Sharin, O., & Sharina, S. (2022). Global priorities in formation of the educational environment. *Modern Economics*, 33(2022), 19-27. https://doi.org/10.31521/modecon.V33(2022)-03. [in English].

Yedynyi reestr kvalifikatsii – klasyfikator profesii. (n.d.). *Natsionalne ahentstvo kvalifikatsii* [Unified Register of Qualifications – Classification of Occupations. National Qualifications Agency]. https://register.nqa.gov.ua/uk [in Ukrainian]

Zalutska, Kh., Morklyanyk, B., & Fedyuk, V. (2026). Protses vyznannya navychok trudovykh mahrantiv yak instrument ekonomichnoi reintehratsii ta povernennya v Ukrainu [The process of skill recognition for labor migrants as a tool for economic reintegration and return to Ukraine]. *Stalyi rozvytok ekonomiky*, 2(59), 131–142. https://doi.org/10.32782/2308-1988/2026-59-18 [in Ukrainian].

DOI: https://doi.org/10.32835/2707-3092.2026.33.3-17

НЕЗАЛЕЖНЕ ОЦІНЮВАННЯ РЕЗУЛЬТАТІВ ПРОФЕСІЙНОГО НАВЧАННЯ: ДОСВІД ВЕЛИКОЇ БРИТАНІЇ ТА ІРЛАНДІЇ ДЛЯ РОЗБУДОВИ КВАЛІФІКАЦІЙНИХ ЦЕНТРІВ В УКРАЇНІ

Валентина Радкевич

1 головний науковий співробітник відділу зарубіжних систем професійної освіти Інституту професійної освіти Національної академії педагогічних наук України, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9233-5718, mrs.radkevich@gmail.com

Реферат:

Актуальність. У статті здійснено комплексний аналіз британської та ірландської моделей незалежного оцінювання результатів навчання й валідації професійних кваліфікацій з метою розроблення практичних механізмів їх адаптації в систему кваліфікаційних центрів України. Виявлено ключові операційні виклики вітчизняного сегмента оцінювання: методичну неоднорідність інструментарію, низький рівень стандартизації процедур перевірки доказів та суб'єктивізм оцінювачів. На основі синтезу британського та ірландського досвіду обґрунтовано впровадження поетапної операційної моделі функціонування кваліфікаційних центрів, що охоплює діагностичне консультування, двоетапне оцінювання, внутрішню верифікацію та підсумкову сертифікацію.

Мета: здійснення порівняльного аналізу процедур незалежного оцінювання результатів професійного навчання у Великій Британії та Ірландії, виявлення інституційних механізмів забезпечення його якості та обґрунтування шляхів адаптації європейського досвіду для вдосконалення діяльності українських кваліфікаційних центрів і національної системи підтвердження професійних кваліфікацій.

Методи: *аналіз і узагальнення наукової літератури, нормативно-правових документів та методичних матеріалів* – для з'ясування нормативно-правового підґрунтя та методичних засад функціонування систем незалежного оцінювання результатів навчання; порівняльний аналіз – для зіставлення британської та ірландської моделей оцінювання результатів навчання, виявлення їхніх спільних рис, відмінностей та конструктивних переваг; *системний та структурно-функціональний аналіз* – для дослідження діяльності регуляторних органів, кваліфікаційних центрів та процедур забезпечення якості як єдиної цілісної системи; *моделювання* – для розроблення адаптивної поетапної операційної моделі функціонування українських кваліфікаційних центрів; *синтезу* – для формування науково обґрунтованих рекомендацій щодо імплементації інструментів внутрішньої та зовнішньої верифікації, а також цифровізації процесів оцінювання й визнання результатів професійного навчання.

Результати: на основі аналізу європейських практик сформульовано та обґрунтовано адаптивну модель для українських кваліфікаційних центрів. Стратегічним елементом пропонованої структури є розгортання модуля «Електронний кваліфікаційний центр» у межах Реєстру кваліфікацій Національного агенства кваліфікацій (НАК) із функціоналом «e-Portfolio», автоматизованого ризик-менеджменту та відеофіксації. Розроблено практичні рекомендації щодо підвищення об'єктивності оцінювання результатів навчання, гармонізації професійних стандартів з європейськими та забезпечення взаємного визнання професійних кваліфікацій.

Висновки: доведено, що подолання системних бар'єрів вітчизняної мережі кваліфікаційних центрів можливе шляхом імплементації адаптивної моделі, яка інтегрує британські та ірландські стандарти верифікації якості. Ключовим інструментом забезпечення об'єктивності незалежного оцінювання результатів навчання визначено цифровізацію процесів оцінювання, автоматизований ризик-менеджмент та відеофіксації. Упровадження запропонованих нормативно-правових, інституційних і цифрових рішень створить підґрунтя для мінімізації корупційних чинників та забезпечить відповідність української системи підтвердження кваліфікацій вимогам європейського ринку праці.

Ключові слова: *кваліфікаційні центри, Національне агентство кваліфікацій, Реєстр кваліфікацій, валідація професійних кваліфікацій, незалежне оцінювання результатів навчання, британська модель (Ofqual/CASS), ірландська модель (QQI/CAS), матриця внутрішнього моніторингу, e-Portfolio.*

Manuscript received 12.03.2026
Accepted for publication after peer review 21.05.2026
Published 02.07.2026