SAFE-D

STRENGTHENING WORKPLACE SAFETY THROUGH APPLIED ERGONOMICS IN THE DIGITAL AGE

SAFE-D Curriculum and Intervention Guidebook

BAEHF

DSGI

CAPPINNO

CAPPADOCIA INNOVATION

Co-funded by the European Union

Safe D: Strengthening Workplace Safety Through Applied Ergonomics in The Digital Age 2023-2-HU01-KA210-ADU-000171333

SAFE-D Curriculum and Intervention Guidebook

Mustafa Hilmi ÇOLAKOĞLU, Tihomir Dovramadjiev, Gyula Szabó

Result of the
SAFE-D: Strengthening Workplace Safety through Applied Ergonomics in the Digital Age, project number: 2023-2-HU01-KA210-ADU-000171333
Action 1

Prepared in 2025; revised and finalised in May 2026.

Activity Time Interval: 01/03/2024–31/07/2025

Consortium:

Cappadocia Innovation Institute Technology Ltd. Co., Türkiye	Cappinno.com
Bulgarian Association of Ergonomics, Bulgaria	baehfofficial.wixsite.com/baehf
DSGI Ergonómiai Mérnökiroda kft, Hungary	dsgi.hu

How to cite this document:

Tihomir Dovramadjiev, Mustafa Hilmi ÇOLAKOĞLU, Gyula Szabó:
SAFE-D Curriculum and Intervention Guidebook.
Budapest, SAFE-D consortium, 2025

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Tempus Public Foundation. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

Safe D: Strengthening Workplace Safety Through Applied Ergonomics In The Digital Age 2023-2-HU01-KA210-ADU-000171333

Contents

1 Introduction

The SAFE-D project, *Strengthening Workplace Safety through Applied Ergonomics in the Digital Age*, was implemented as an Erasmus+ partnership project by organisations from Hungary, Bulgaria and Türkiye. The project addressed a practical challenge that is common in many small and medium-sized enterprises: ergonomic risks are present in everyday work, but they are often managed informally, without systematic analysis, structured learning or continuous workplace improvement.

The project was based on the idea that ergonomics can contribute not only to accident prevention and legal compliance, but also to healthier work, better work organisation, employee participation and sustainable organisational performance. In small enterprises, access to ergonomic expertise, training opportunities and structured improvement methods is often limited. Therefore, SAFE-D focused on developing a practical training and support approach that helps organisations recognise ergonomic problems, understand their causes and implement feasible improvements in real workplace settings.

Training has a central role in the SAFE-D approach. It is not understood as a one-way transfer of theoretical knowledge, but as a guided learning and intervention process. Participants are encouraged to observe work situations, identify risks, discuss problems with employees, define realistic goals, plan improvements, test solutions and reflect on the results. In this sense, the training process supports both competence development and practical workplace change.

The project results are presented in four complementary documents: the **Need Analysis Report**, the **Curriculum and Intervention Guidebook**, the **Tool Box** and the **Trainers Manual**. Together, these materials provide a training-based framework for applying ergonomics in small and medium-sized enterprises.

Purpose and Use of the Curriculum and Intervention Guidebook

This Guidebook explains the learning and intervention logic of the SAFE-D approach. It translates the findings of the needs analysis into a structured ergonomic training and improvement model that can be used in adult education, mentoring and workplace-based intervention.

The Guidebook is intended to help trainers, facilitators and workplace stakeholders understand why the SAFE-D approach is organised around a phased intervention process rather than traditional content delivery. It describes the competence logic, the 6+1 phase model and the relationship between ergonomic analysis, planning, implementation and reflection.

2 From Need Analysis to Curriculum Logic

Activity	Deliverable	Function
A1	Needs Analysis	Empirical foundation
A1	Curriculum and Intervention Guidebook	Conceptual model
A2	Accredited Training Program	Formal training structure
A2	Trainers Manual	Methodological implementation
A2	Student Workbook	Operational implementation
A2	Training Log	Documentation and validation
A3	Dissemination and Reporting	Sustainability

2.1 Why a Tailored Ergonomics Curriculum Was Necessary

Activity 1 of the SAFE-D project aimed to identify the real training needs of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in the field of applied ergonomics and workplace safety.

The empirical research – including country reports, enterprise visits, survey results and cross-country synthesis – revealed a consistent pattern across Bulgaria, Hungary and Türkiye:

- ergonomic risks are present but often informally managed,
- structured risk assessment is rarely applied systematically,
- knowledge about standards exists in fragments,
- implementation capacity is limited by time, cost and organisational constraints,
- digital tools are underutilised in ergonomics practice,
- attitude and initiative gaps are more critical than purely informational deficits.

The findings confirmed that SMEs do not primarily lack access to information. Regulatory documents, ISO standards and digital resources are publicly available. What is missing is:

- structured application logic,
- methodological guidance adapted to SME reality,
- step-by-step implementation support,
- motivational and organisational activation.

Therefore, the project could not respond with a traditional, theory-heavy training package. A purely knowledge-transfer curriculum would not address the identified implementation gap.

2.2 From Knowledge Gap to Attitude and Implementation Gap

The cross-country synthesis of empirical findings

shows that:

- Workers report discomfort and fatigue, but rarely connect it to system-level ergonomic causes.

- Managers recognise safety importance but struggle with prioritisation and cost–benefit framing.
- Training is often compliance-driven, not development-driven.
- Risk assessment is seen as documentation, not as a design tool.

This indicates a shift in curriculum logic:

Traditional model	SAFE-D model
Knowledge delivery	Intervention-driven learning
Classroom-based	On-site application
Teacher-centred	Guided project process
Content modules	Process phases
Assessment by test	Assessment by implemented improvement

The SAFE-D curriculum therefore moves from **disciplinary content sequencing** to a **structured ergonomic intervention pathway**.

2.3 Curriculum Logic Anchored in the SAFE-D Intervention Model

The curriculum framework is organised around a 6+1 phase ergonomic intervention model, derived from both empirical needs and best-practice standards:

1. Preliminary self-assessment
2. Framework creation and goal setting
3. Analysis of conditions and best practices
4. Conceptual design and task allocation
5. Detailed technical, human and cost planning
6. Implementation, validation and pilot testing
7. Documentation and presentation of results

This structure provides the curriculum and intervention logic that is operationalised through the Student Workbook, the Tool Box, the Training Log and the Trainers Manual.

Each phase corresponds to a competence cluster:

- Analytical competence (risk identification, assessment tools)
- System competence (design thinking, task allocation, human–machine interaction)
- Strategic competence (cost–benefit reasoning, planning, KPI development)
- Reflective competence (evaluation, feedback, sustainability)
- Attitudinal competence (initiative, ownership, safety culture activation)

2.4 Alignment with Erasmus+ Objectives

The curriculum logic directly responds to the priorities defined in the project proposal

:

Enhancing quality and relevance of adult education
→ The model is based on real SME constraints and empirical findings.

Creating innovative curricula
→ The curriculum is process-based rather than content-based.

Digital transformation planning
→ Digital ergonomic tools are integrated as optional supports within each phase.

Labour market relevance
→ Outputs are practical: risk assessment report, intervention plan, KPI system, pilot evaluation.

2.5 Pedagogical Positioning

The SAFE-D curriculum framework is built on five core pedagogical principles:

1. Minimal initial theory input – essential concepts only.
2. Immediate application in real workplace context.
3. Structured mentoring and consultation.
4. Peer-based reflection and shared learning.
5. Tangible outputs at every phase.

Learning therefore becomes:

- activity-based,
- context-sensitive,
- evidence-supported,
- organisationally embedded.

The role of the Guidebook (A1 deliverable) is to define:

- what should be done,
- why it is structured this way,
- which standards and tools support each phase,
- how SMEs can adapt the process.

The role of Activity 2 is to operationalise this logic through workshops, mentoring and documented intervention.

2.6 Transition to the Curriculum Framework

Based on the above rationale, the next chapter presents the structured SAFE-D Curriculum Framework, detailing:

- phase-by-phase learning logic,
- competence alignment,
- expected outputs,
- integration with toolbox resources,
- validation pathway.

The curriculum is therefore not an abstract syllabus but a guided implementation architecture tailored to small enterprises in the digital age.

3 The SAFE-D Ergonomic Intervention Reference Model

A structured pathway for practical ergonomic change in SMEs

3.1 Rationale of the Model

The SAFE-D Ergonomic Intervention Reference Model was developed as a response to the findings of the needs analysis, which highlighted that the main barrier in SMEs is not the absence of information, but the absence of structured application and implementation logic.

Small enterprises often:

- recognise ergonomic issues informally,
- lack time for systematic analysis,
- treat risk assessment as documentation rather than as a design tool,
- hesitate to initiate change due to cost or uncertainty.

The reference model therefore provides a **clear, manageable and transferable pathway** that enables SMEs to move from awareness to implementation without requiring large-scale structural reforms.

It is not a standard, nor a prescriptive regulation.
It is a **teachable and adaptable intervention framework**.

3.2 Core Structure of the Model

The SAFE-D model consists of six core phases and one preliminary step. The structure reflects a complete ergonomic intervention cycle that can be scaled according to the size and capacity of the enterprise.

3.2.1 Phase 0 – Preliminary Self-Assessment and Relevance

Purpose:
To activate awareness and define personal or organisational relevance.

Key elements:

- Identification of perceived discomfort, inefficiencies, or risks
- Reflection on current practices
- Initial mapping of problem areas

Outcome:

- Baseline understanding of why intervention is necessary

3.2.2 Phase 1 – Framework Creation and Goal Setting

Purpose:
To define the scope, objectives, and boundaries of the intervention.

Key elements:

- Selection of focus area (workstation, task, process)
- Definition of realistic objectives
- Clarification of responsibilities
- Identification of constraints (time, cost, regulation)

Outcome:

- Clearly formulated intervention goal

3.2.3 Phase 2 – Condition Analysis and Exploration of Best Practices

Purpose:
To analyse the current situation systematically and explore alternatives.

Key elements:

- Observation and documentation of tasks
- Use of simple assessment tools
- Consultation of relevant standards and guidelines
- Identification of comparable SME practices

Outcome:

- Structured risk and workload overview
- Shortlist of potential solution directions

3.2.4 Phase 3 – Conceptual Design

Purpose:
To translate analysis into feasible intervention concepts.

Key elements:

- Development of alternative solutions
- Consideration of human–machine–environment interaction
- Preliminary cost–benefit reflection
- Task allocation planning

Outcome:

- Selected intervention concept

3.2.5 Phase 4 – Detailed Planning

Purpose:
To refine the selected concept into an implementable plan.

Key elements:

- Technical feasibility assessment
- Human factors evaluation
- Financial estimation
- Timeline planning

Outcome:

- Structured action plan with responsibilities and milestones

3.2.6 Phase 5 – Implementation and Pilot Testing

Purpose:
To test and validate the intervention under real conditions.

Key elements:

- Limited-scale implementation
- Monitoring of user feedback
- Adjustment if necessary
- Documentation of observed changes

Outcome:

- Validated or refined ergonomic solution

3.2.7 Phase 6 – Evaluation, Documentation and Knowledge Sharing

Purpose:
To consolidate learning and enable transferability.

Key elements:

- Measurement of impact (qualitative or quantitative)
- Reflection on organisational effects
- Documentation of process and outcomes
- Presentation to peers or management

Outcome:

- Final intervention report
- Organisational learning effect

3.3 Key Characteristics of the SAFE-D Model

The model is defined by the following characteristics:

1. **Scalability**
   It can be applied to small adjustments or larger process redesign.
2. **SME-compatibility**
   It does not require specialised departments or extensive documentation systems.
3. **Integration of Standards as Resources**
   Standards and regulations are used as reference tools, not as rigid templates.
4. **Attitude Activation**
   Each phase requires initiative, responsibility and reflection.
5. **Embedded Learning**
   Learning occurs through implementation, not prior to it.

3.4 Competence Development Through the Model

Each phase of the intervention model contributes to competence development:

- Analytical competence (risk identification, observation)
- System competence (understanding interaction between human and system)
- Strategic competence (planning and prioritisation)
- Reflective competence (evaluation and feedback integration)
- Attitudinal competence (initiative, ownership, sustainability)

This competence-oriented design ensures that the model functions not only as a technical tool, but also as a **developmental pathway**.

3.5 Relationship to the SAFE-D Toolbox and Workbook

The Curriculum and Intervention Guidebook provides the conceptual and methodological logic of the SAFE-D model. The Tool Box supports each phase with practical resources, including references to standards, examples of good practices, simple assessment tools and implementation tips. The Student Workbook operationalises the phases by guiding participants step-by-step through documentation and reflection.

Thus, the reference model functions as the structural backbone, while the Tool Box, Student Workbook, Training Log and Trainers Manual support practical implementation, documentation and facilitation.

4 Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of the SAFE-D Model

The SAFE-D Ergonomic Intervention Reference Model is not presented as a new normative framework. Rather, it is a structured educational and implementation-oriented synthesis of established ergonomic, organisational, and adult learning principles, adapted to the operational realities of small and medium-sized enterprises.

4.1 System-Based Ergonomic Foundations

Contemporary ergonomics is grounded in a systems perspective, where human performance, technical systems, and organisational conditions are considered interdependent components of a work system. International ergonomic standards such as ISO 26800 emphasise the importance of a holistic approach, integrating physical, cognitive, and organisational dimensions within a unified framework.

The SAFE-D model reflects this systems logic by:

- structuring interventions across human–task–environment interactions,
- integrating technical feasibility and human factors considerations,
- avoiding isolated or purely technical corrections.

Rather than prescribing fixed technical solutions, the model encourages context-sensitive adaptation, which is consistent with system-oriented ergonomic practice.

4.2 Continuous Improvement and Intervention Cycles

The phase-based structure of the SAFE-D model parallels established improvement cycles such as Plan–Do–Check–Act (PDCA). However, the SAFE-D model adapts this logic to SME constraints by:

- reducing procedural complexity,
- embedding evaluation within learning,
- emphasising feasibility over formal documentation burden.

The intervention pathway therefore functions as a manageable micro-cycle of continuous improvement suitable for small organisational environments.

4.3 Participatory and Practice-Oriented Ergonomics

Research and international guidance consistently highlight the effectiveness of participatory ergonomics approaches, where employees actively contribute to problem identification and solution development.

The SAFE-D framework incorporates participatory principles by:

- starting from worker-experienced problems,
- embedding reflection and feedback phases,
- promoting peer-based learning and knowledge exchange.

This aligns with evidence indicating that ownership and engagement increase the sustainability of ergonomic improvements.

4.4 Adult Learning and Experiential Education

The educational logic of the SAFE-D model is grounded in established adult learning theory.

Key theoretical anchors include:

- Experiential learning theory (learning through structured experience and reflection),
- Andragogical principles emphasising autonomy and problem orientation,
- Project-based learning models that prioritise real-world tasks,
- Reflective practice approaches supporting critical evaluation and adaptation.

The curriculum design reflects these principles by:

- minimising front-loaded theoretical instruction,
- prioritising workplace-based application,
- structuring learning around concrete outputs,
- embedding reflection at each phase of intervention.

Learning therefore occurs through action, guided inquiry, and contextual adaptation rather than passive knowledge transmission.

4.5 Competence-Based Education Framework

The SAFE-D Curriculum Framework is competence-oriented, integrating knowledge, skills, and attitudes within each intervention phase. This aligns with European Qualification Framework principles, which emphasise:

- demonstrable learning outcomes,

- responsibility and autonomy,
- applicability in professional contexts.

By linking each intervention phase to measurable outputs and competence clusters, the SAFE-D model ensures that educational objectives remain aligned with labour-market relevance and adult education quality standards.

4.6 Positioning of the SAFE-D Model

The SAFE-D Ergonomic Intervention Reference Model should therefore be understood as:

- a pedagogically structured adaptation of system-based ergonomics,
- a practice-oriented implementation cycle compatible with continuous improvement logic,
- a participatory and competence-based adult education framework.

It does not replace standards or regulatory requirements. Instead, it operationalises them within an accessible, SME-compatible learning and intervention structure.

This theoretical positioning strengthens the legitimacy, transferability, and methodological transparency of the SAFE-D curriculum architecture.

5 Curriculum Framework

Competence-based structure aligned with the SAFE-D Intervention Model

5.1 Curriculum Design Principles

The SAFE-D curriculum framework is not organised around traditional subject-based modules. Instead, it follows a **process-based, intervention-oriented structure**, directly aligned with the SAFE-D Ergonomic Intervention Reference Model presented in Chapter 2.

The framework is built on four core principles:

1. **Competence orientation rather than content accumulation**
2. **Embedded learning through real workplace application**
3. **Scalability for different SME contexts**
4. **Transferability across countries and sectors**

This approach ensures that the curriculum reflects the actual constraints and needs identified in the needs analysis and avoids purely theoretical instruction.

5.2 Curriculum Structure by Intervention Phase

The curriculum is structured according to the phases of the intervention model. Each phase corresponds to a competence focus and expected learning outcome.

5.2.1 Phase 0 – Awareness and Relevance Activation

- Competence focus:
  Attitudinal competence
- Learning outcomes:
  Participants:
  - recognise ergonomic relevance in their own work context,
  - identify at least one improvement area,
  - demonstrate willingness to engage in change.
- Bloom level: Understand → Reflect
- EQF alignment:
  Autonomous responsibility within structured guidance (EQF 4–5)

5.2.2 Phase 1 – Goal Setting and Scope Definition

- Competence focus:
  Strategic and organisational competence
  - Learning outcomes:
    Participants:
  - define a realistic ergonomic intervention goal,
  - identify constraints and stakeholders,
  - formulate expected outcomes.
- Bloom level: Apply → Analyse
- EQF alignment:
  Ability to manage tasks with limited supervision (EQF 5)

5.2.3 Phase 2 – Analysis and Risk Identification

- Competence focus:
  Analytical competence
- Learning outcomes:
  Participants:
  - perform structured observation,
  - use simple ergonomic assessment tools,
  - interpret basic risk indicators.
- Bloom level: Analyse
- EQF alignment:
  Apply specialised knowledge to identify solutions (EQF 5–6)

5.2.4 Phase 3 – Conceptual Design

- Competence focus:
  System competence
- Learning outcomes:
  Participants:
  - develop alternative ergonomic improvement concepts,
  - evaluate human–machine–environment interaction,
  - select feasible intervention strategies.
- Bloom level: Evaluate → Create
- EQF alignment:
  Develop creative solutions within defined frameworks (EQF 6)

5.2.5 Phase 4 – Planning and Implementation Preparation

- Competence focus:
  Operational and strategic competence
- Learning outcomes:
  Participants:
  - prepare a structured action plan,
  - consider technical, financial and human factors,
  - allocate responsibilities and timelines.
- Bloom level: Apply → Evaluate
- EQF alignment:
  Manage projects with responsibility for decision-making (EQF 6)

5.2.6 Phase 5 – Implementation and Validation

- Competence focus:
  Applied competence
- Learning outcomes:
  Participants:
  - implement small-scale ergonomic changes,
  - collect feedback and monitor outcomes,
  - adjust interventions based on evidence.
- Bloom level: Apply → Evaluate
- EQF alignment:
  Take responsibility for managing change processes (EQF 6)

5.2.7 Phase 6 – Evaluation and Reflection

- Competence focus:
  Reflective competence
- Learning outcomes:
  Participants:
  - assess the impact of intervention,
  - document lessons learned,
  - communicate outcomes to stakeholders.
- Bloom level: Evaluate → Create
- EQF alignment:
  Demonstrate autonomy and critical reflection (EQF 6)

5.3 Integrated Learning Outcomes Overview

The SAFE-D curriculum supports balanced development across three domains:

5.3.1 Knowledge

Participants understand:

- basic ergonomic principles,
- risk assessment logic,
- regulatory and standard frameworks,
- system-level interactions.

5.3.2 Skills

Participants are able to:

- identify and analyse ergonomic risks,
- design and implement feasible solutions,
- document and evaluate interventions.

5.3.3 Attitudes

Participants:

- demonstrate initiative,
- assume responsibility for workplace improvement,
- value preventive and systemic thinking.

The integration of these domains reflects the adult education priority of combining knowledge, competence and responsibility.

5.4 Learning Forms and Methods

The curriculum is implemented through:

- minimal structured theoretical input,
- guided workplace projects,
- mentoring and consultation,
- peer discussion and presentation,
- structured reflection exercises.

Assessment is based primarily on:

- documented intervention process,
- feasibility of action plan,
- reflective presentation,
- demonstrated application in context.

This aligns with adult education quality enhancement priorities defined in the project proposal.

5.5 Relationship to the SAFE-D Outputs

The Curriculum Framework is operationalised through:

- the Curriculum and Intervention Guidebook, which provides the conceptual framework;
- the Tool Box, which provides practical resources;
- the Student Workbook, which supports intervention documentation;
- the Training Log, which supports process validation;
- the Trainers Manual, which supports facilitation.

Together, these components ensure coherence between conceptual design and practical implementation.

5.6 European Added Value and Transferability

The curriculum framework:

- is modular and adaptable,
- is independent of national legal specifics,

- integrates digital resource use,
- is compatible with EU-OSH and international ergonomic principles.

Its process-based nature allows adaptation across sectors and countries without structural modification.

6 Educational Rationale and Adult Learning Alignment

The SAFE-D Curriculum Framework is grounded in a clear educational rationale that reflects both adult learning principles and the specific constraints of small and medium-sized enterprises.

The needs analysis demonstrated that the primary barrier in SMEs is not a lack of theoretical knowledge, but limited initiative, fragmented application practices, and the absence of structured implementation logic. Consequently, the curriculum design prioritises competence development and responsible action over content accumulation.

6.1 Problem-Centred Learning

Adult learners are typically motivated by immediate relevance. The SAFE-D framework therefore organises learning around real workplace problems rather than abstract thematic units. Each intervention phase is directly linked to a concrete challenge identified by the participant within their own organisational context.

This ensures that learning:

- is immediately applicable,
- responds to authentic constraints,
- generates tangible value during the learning process itself.

6.2 Experiential and Project-Based Structure

The curriculum is structured as a guided project rather than a sequence of lectures. Participants progress through a defined intervention pathway, producing intermediate outputs at each phase.

This approach:

- embeds reflection within action,
- enables iterative adjustment,
- allows knowledge to be accessed when needed,
- promotes deeper understanding through application.

Learning outcomes are therefore demonstrated through documented intervention steps rather than standardised testing.

6.3 Guided Autonomy and Mentoring

While the SAFE-D framework encourages self-directed action, it does not assume full independence from the outset. Structured mentoring and consultation support participants throughout the intervention cycle.

This balance between autonomy and guidance:

- reduces uncertainty,
- increases implementation confidence,
- supports decision-making in complex situations,
- strengthens accountability.

The Trainer's Manual developed in Activity 2 operationalises this facilitation dimension without altering the conceptual integrity of the A1 framework.

6.4 Peer Learning and Reflective Dialogue

Peer-based exchange is integrated into the curriculum structure through presentation, feedback, and shared reflection. This creates:

- social validation of ergonomic improvements,
- comparison of alternative solutions,
- diffusion of good practices across participants.

Reflective dialogue enhances both competence and attitude development, reinforcing long-term behavioural change.

6.5 Competence Integration Across Domains

The SAFE-D framework integrates three learning domains:

- Knowledge (understanding ergonomic principles and standards),
- Skills (applying structured analysis and intervention planning),
- Attitudes (initiative, responsibility, and preventive thinking).

By embedding these domains within a coherent intervention pathway, the curriculum ensures alignment with European competence-based education principles and adult education quality standards.

6.6 Educational Contribution of Activity 1

Within the overall project structure, Activity 1 does not merely define thematic content. It establishes a pedagogically grounded intervention architecture that:

- translates empirical findings into a structured learning model,
- integrates competence-based outcomes,
- supports scalable and transferable application across different SME contexts.

This alignment between needs analysis, intervention logic, and educational methodology ensures that the SAFE-D Guidebook functions as a coherent and evidence-informed curriculum foundation for subsequent implementation activities.

7 SAFE-D Curriculum Map

From Needs to Competence-Based Ergonomic Intervention

7.1 Logical Flow Overview

Need Analysis
→ Identified Implementation and Attitude Gap
→ SAFE-D Ergonomic Intervention Reference Model
→ Competence-Based Curriculum Framework
→ Workbook Implementation and Mentoring (Activity 2)
→ Documented Workplace Ergonomic Intervention

7.2 Curriculum Mapping Table

Intervention Phase	Identified Need (A1)	Competence Focus	Learning Outcomes	Learning Form	Tangible Output
Phase 0 Awareness	Low initiative, reactive safety culture	Attitudinal competence	Recognises ergonomic relevance in own context	Self-reflection task	Baseline problem statement
Phase 1 Goal Setting	Lack of structured planning	Strategic competence	Defines realistic ergonomic objective	Guided planning	Defined intervention scope
Phase 2 Analysis	Informal risk identification	Analytical competence	Applies simple assessment tools	On-site observation	Risk overview
Phase 3 Concept Design	Uncertainty in solution development	System competence	Develops feasible ergonomic concept	Workshop discussion	Intervention concept
Phase 4 Planning	Cost and feasibility hesitation	Operational competence	Prepares structured action plan	Mentored planning	Action plan

Intervention Phase	Identified Need (A1)	Competence Focus	Learning Outcomes	Learning Form	Tangible Output
Phase 5 Implementation	Fear of change, lack of validation	Applied competence	Tests and adjusts intervention	Pilot implementation	Tested solution
Phase 6 Evaluation	No systematic reflection	Reflective competence	Evaluates impact and documents learning	Presentation & feedback	Final report

7.3 Competence Dimension Overview

Domain	Description	EQF Alignment
Knowledge	Understands ergonomic principles, standards, risk logic	EQF 5–6
Skills	Performs structured assessment and intervention planning	EQF 5–6
Attitude	Initiates and sustains workplace improvement	EQF 5–6

7.4 Pedagogical Model Snapshot

Traditional Training	SAFE-D Model
Content modules	Intervention phases
Classroom-based	Workplace-based
Teacher-led	Guided self-directed
Test-based assessment	Project-based validation
Knowledge focus	Competence + attitude focus

7.5 Alignment with Erasmus+ KA210 Priorities

The curriculum map demonstrates:

- ✓ Relevance to real SME needs
- ✓ Innovation in adult learning methodology
- ✓ Integration of digital resources
- ✓ Transferability across EU contexts
- ✓ Practical labour-market orientation

8 References

- ISO 26800:2011. *Ergonomics — General approach, principles and concepts*. International Organization for Standardization.
- ISO 6385:2016. *Ergonomics principles in the design of work systems*. International Organization for Standardization.
- European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA). *Risk assessment and management — Practical guidance for SMEs*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the Crisis*. MIT Press.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Prentice Hall.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy*. Cambridge Books.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Books.
- European Parliament and Council. (2008). *Recommendation on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (EQF)*.

9 Summary Statement

The SAFE-D Curriculum Map demonstrates a coherent transition from empirical needs analysis to a competence-based ergonomic intervention framework. The curriculum is not content-driven but process-driven, ensuring that learning outcomes are directly linked to documented workplace improvement.