

Levels, Credits & Progression Policy

Part 4 | Methodology Layer

Version History

Version	Date	Change Summary	Owner / Approval
v0.9 (Draft)	2026-01-31	Initial draft: unified definitions for levels, credit calculation, evidence thresholds, progression and remediation rules.	SVOCF Secretariat
v1.0 (Release)	—	Release: aligned with all subsystems (SVOS / CP- SSASH / Youth); added examples and templates.	—
v1.1+	—	Iterated per regional policies and partner universities/industry requirements (ECTS / micro- credentials compatibility).	—

Table of Contents

(Pre-release draft. To generate an automatic table of contents, use Word: References → Table of Contents.)

1. Policy Objectives and Scope

This policy standardizes the definitions and operational rules for “Levels — Credits/Learning Hours — Progression” across the SVOCF system, ensuring that learning outcomes achieved in different subsystems, institutions, and learning contexts can be recorded consistently, traced for audit, and supported for mutual recognition and mapping (see Section 4.3).

Scope: Applies to the whole SVOCF ecosystem (SVOS, CP- SSASH, Youth, etc.) and partner institutions’ course recognition and micro- credential alignment.

Core principle: Learning outcomes and evidence chains are central; learning volume (hours) must be bound to evidence quality.

Limit note: This is an internal SVOCF policy for unified definitions. When mapping to national NQFs / ECTS / local credit systems, the mutual-recognition mapping documents shall prevail.

2. Key Concepts and Measurement Units

2.1 Level

Levels represent maturity of competence and degree of responsibility. They are not equivalent to age, seniority, or job title. Level decisions are based on “observable performance + auditable evidence chain + reflective/explanatory capability (where applicable).”

2.2 Credit / Learning Hours

SVOCF uses Learning Hours as the base unit and provides recommendations for aligning with credit/ECTS systems. Learning Hours refer to the total time a learner invests in completing a learning unit (task/project/module), including learning, practice, project execution, reflection, and evidence organization.

Default internal conversion (adjustable): 1 Credit = 10 Learning Hours (for SVOCF internal recording).

ECTS alignment note: If a partner uses ECTS, equivalence can be set in a mapping document (commonly 1 ECTS ≈ 25–30 learning hours).

Important: Credits are granted only when the evidence threshold is met. Learning time without qualifying evidence does not receive equivalent credits.

2.3 Evidence Chain

An evidence chain is a traceable, reviewable set of multi-source evidence demonstrating that learning outcomes occurred and meet the standard. Evidence chains are hard requirements for both credit awarding and level decisions.

3. Credit Award Policy

3.1 Learning Unit Types

Unit Type	Typical Form	Suggested Learning Hours Range	Minimum Evidence Chain Requirement
Micro Task	Practice, check-in, one-off activity	1–5 hours (0.1–0.5 Credit)	Process record + brief reflection / observation record
Module	Course unit, themed	6–15 hours (0.6–1.5 Credit)	Artifact/assessment + process records +

	training	Credits)	feedback
Project	Authentic-context project, team task	16–40 hours (1.6–4.0 Credits)	Project dossier (goal/roles/outputs) + review/retrospective
Practicum	Internship, service learning, clinical observation (if applicable)	≥40 hours (≥4.0 Credits)	Placement/practice proof + process records + assessment feedback

3.2 Evidence Quality Tiers (E1–E3)

To prevent “time-only credit earning,” evidence quality is defined in three tiers, and credit awarding is bound to evidence quality:

Tier	Definition	Typical Context	Impact on Credits
E1 Basic Evidence	Proves participation and completion, but weak on quality/impact explanation.	Entry tasks, Level 1	Eligible for basic credits; not sufficient for higher-level decisions.
E2 Auditable Evidence	Includes process, feedback, and verifiable outputs; explains “how it was done.”	Modules, general projects, Level 2	Eligible for standard credits; supports Level 2 decisions.
E3 Impact & Review Evidence	Includes impact proof, risk/ethics notes, and review/improvement; explains “why and how it iterated.”	Complex projects, leadership tasks, Level 3	Eligible for advanced credits; supports Level 3 decisions.

3.3 Credit Calculation Rules (Minimum Rule Set)

- **R1 | Learning-hour recording:** Learners must submit learning-hour records (time logs, learning diaries, or system records).
- **R2 | Evidence threshold:** Credits can be awarded only after meeting the minimum evidence chain requirement for that unit type (see 3.1).
- **R3 | Quality binding:** If evidence only reaches E1, the awarded credits must not exceed 70% of the suggested unit credits.
- **R4 | Duplicate learning and reuse:** The same evidence must not be counted for two mutually exclusive units; if cross-unit reuse is allowed, the scope must be declared and is subject to sampling checks.

- **R5 | Authenticity declaration:** For key outputs and assessed materials, learners must sign an authenticity declaration; major fabrication triggers revocation and an exclusion period.

4. Progression Policy

Progression is not determined by accumulated credits alone. It is decided by a joint threshold of “minimum credits + key-domain achievement + evidence quality gates.”

4.1 General Progression Conditions (Default Rules)

Target Level	Minimum Credits (Suggested)	Domain Coverage	Evidence Quality Gate	Suggested Form	Assessment
Level 1	≥6 Credits (≈60 hours)	Covers ≥3 domains (or system-specified core domains)	At least E1 (with some E2)	Portfolio/assessment + mentor observation	+
Level 2	≥18 Credits (≈180 hours)	Covers ≥5 domains; all core domains meet threshold	Mainly (≥60%)	E2 Project dossier + peer/mentor feedback + review	+
Level 3	≥36 Credits (≈360 hours)	Covers all core domains; includes leadership/impact tasks	At least 2 projects at E3; E2/E3 ≥80%	Comprehensive review: impact + risk/ethics statement + viva (optional)	+

4.2 System-Specific Notes (Alignment Hints)

SVOS (Part 1): May prioritize core domains such as tools/media literacy, collaboration, and systems thinking, with emphasis on transferable skill evidence.

CP- SSASH (Part 2): Must observe professional boundaries and referral rules; Level 3 typically requires stronger practicum and supervisory evidence.

Youth (Part 3): Emphasizes developmental appropriateness and safeguarding; public-impact evidence should adopt more cautious de-identification strategies.

5. Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL / RPEL)

SVOCF supports recognition of prior learning from formal courses, work experience, social practice, and informal learning. RPL is evidence-based: credits are not granted for “experience itself,” but for auditable evidence proving equivalent learning outcomes.

5.1 Basic RPL Rules

- **RPL- 1:** Applicants submit an RPL declaration form and an evidence chain (artifacts, proof, reflection, third- party feedback, etc.).
- **RPL- 2:** Assessors make equivalence decisions per standards and label mapped domains and levels.
- **RPL- 3:** RPL may grant credits, but must not bypass critical gates (e.g., core projects, ethics/safety training).
- **RPL- 4:** For higher-risk professional subsystems, supervisory evidence or completion of key modules may be required.

6. Remediation, Review, and Appeal

6.1 Remediation Mechanisms

Insufficient evidence: Allow supplementation within a defined window (supplementation does not change recorded learning hours, but may improve evidence tier).

Domain gaps: Provide a “gap-closing pathway” (task packs, practicum, mentor coaching).

Not competent yet but improvable: Prefer resubmission/re-demonstration rather than one-time denial.

6.2 Review and Appeal

Review: Learners may request a re-check of scoring and level decisions (second assessor or committee review).

Appeal: If procedural unfairness, bias, or violations are involved, learners may appeal through governance workflows; investigations may be initiated where necessary.

Record: All reviews/appeals must be logged and included in annual QA reviews.

7. Authenticity, Anti-Fraud, and Revocation Rules

Academic integrity: Plagiarism, proxy completion, forged proof, and timeline tampering are serious violations.

Sampling verification: Programs may apply random sampling checks, viva verification, and third-party validation.

Revocation: Confirmed fabrication may revoke credits/levels and trigger an exclusion period; partner institutions may be notified where legally permitted.

Educational handling: For minors, education and correction are preferred, but severe harm still requires strict handling.

Appendix A. Forms and Template List

- A1 | Learning Unit Record Sheet (hours, tasks, evidence links, signatures)
- A2 | Evidence Chain Submission Checklist (by E1/E2/E3)
- A3 | Progression Application Form (level, credit summary, core-domain achievement, project list)
- A4 | RPL Declaration Form (mapping prior learning to domains and evidence)
- A5 | Review/Appeal Form (reason, evidence, expected outcome)