ETF Working together Learning for life

European Training Foundation

THE ETF FORUM FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

PEER VISIT GUIDANCE AND TRAINING MANUAL

WORKING PAPER 2018

Quality Assurance Forum

THE ETF FORUM FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

FOREWORD

This Peer Visit Guidance and Training Manual is a Working Paper of the European Training Foundation (ETF). It was developed as a response to the needs of the ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training.

The ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training (VET) is a transnational collaborative network of national-level institutions with a VET quality assurance mandate in sixteen partner countries in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean and South-Eastern Europe regions and Turkey. The ETF Forum is a collective effort. Members collaborate to improve quality assurance in VET by pooling knowledge and know-how, monitoring and reporting on national developments in quality assurance, engaging in joint projects and disseminating good examples of policy and practice.

The purpose of the Manual is to maximise the potential of multinational Peer Visits as an effective means to peer assess the strengths, and improvement needs, of VET quality assurance measures.

ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training - Working Paper, Peer Visit Guidance and Training Manual will undergo a pilot phase in 2019 and its contents will be reviewed and revised as necessary.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The 2018 Peer Visit Guidance and Training Manual Working Paper is a product of the ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training. It was produced under the supervision of Elizabeth Watters, ETF Senior Specialist in VET Policies and Systems.

Franz Gramlinger, Director and Michaela Jonach, Senior Expert of ARQA-VET – The Austrian Reference Point for Quality Assurance in VET (Österreichische Referenzstelle für Qualität in der Berufsbildung) drafted the Peer Visit Guidance and Training Manual, under contract with the ETF.

CITATION

« ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training - Working Paper, Peer Visit Guidance and Training Manual (2018). »

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context

The European Training Foundation (ETF) established a Forum for Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training (VET) in November 2017. This Forum is a transnational collaboration initiative between national institutions with VET quality assurance mandates in selected ETF partner countries. It is operative on a pilot basis in 2017-2019, within a longer-term perspective. The purpose of the ETF Forum is to support its member countries to modernise and improve quality assurance in VET by providing the context and means for peer learning through transnational co-operation. To harness the potential of this partnership, clear membership guidelines and criteria have been developed. Membership is conditional on being agreeable and responsive to the principles, objectives and activities of the Forum and making a commitment to its development and sustainability.

The ETF Forum has the following strategic objectives:

a) to collaborate on matters related to the advancement of quality assurance in VET;
b) to identify and share quality assurance expertise, methods and instruments;
c) to promote networking with relevant stakeholders at all levels as a means to improve the relevance, quality and visibility of quality assurance in VET;
d) to support national efforts for quality assurance in VET advancement[1].

Peer Visits can support the ETF Forum's strategic objectives:

- They support host Forum member institutions in reflecting on their own VET quality assurance approaches by writing a national context report together with national stakeholders and reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of selected VET quality assurance measures at national level.
- They enable the sharing of VET quality assurance expertise between Forum member countries, as peers read the national context report, visit the host Forum member institution, and give feedback on the selected quality assurance measures during the Peer Visit.
- Intense discussions and information exchange between representatives of host Forum member institutions and the peers on diverse quality assurance approaches and quality assurance measures are integral parts of the procedure. In this respect, Peer Visits promote collaboration and networking between Forum member countries.

This manual provides guidance and training for the four phases of a Peer Visit (Planning, Peer Visit, Peer Feedback and Follow-up). The core idea behind the Peer Visit concept is to provide ETF Forum member countries with critical and supportive feedback for the improvement of their national quality assurance in VET approaches and measures.

Peer Visit concept

A Peer Visit is a form of external feedback from peers, with the aim of supporting an ETF Forum member in its quality assurance development efforts. An external group of peer experts is invited to give feedback to quality assurance measures selected by the host Forum member institution.

Peer Visits offer an exchange of information and discussion, but also give opportunities to strengthen Forum members' competences in reflecting on and developing their own quality assurance

---

[1] ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in VET Strategy and Work Plan 2017.

approaches and offering constructive support to other countries. In this respect, Peer Visits are one means to support the core objectives of the ETF Forum of Quality Assurance in VET, which are to:

- promote quality assurance at system level in ETF Forum member countries;
- enhance transparency and comparability of quality assurance in VET at system level;
- strengthen trust building and inter-cultural communication;
- foster networking and cooperation between ETF Forum member institutions.

Peer Visits take place in a member country of the ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in VET represented by its Forum member institution. National Contact Persons representing ETF Forum member institutions are the direct target group of ETF Forum Peer Visits and they take on the role of either the host, on behalf of their institution (the host Forum member institution), or a peer.

The member institution / National Contact Person that takes the role of host gets opportunities to:

- analytically self-assess the selected quality assurance measure by writing a national context report, together with national stakeholders;
- reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of selected quality assurance measure by getting feedback from Forum peers and engaging in a mutual learning process with the peers;
- become acquainted with an external perspective (through the feedback from peers), and gain experience in taking feedback;
- receive advice and discover good practices to further develop the quality assurance measure.

National Contact Persons taking part in Peer Visits, acting as peers, will get opportunities to:

- learn about the national quality assurance approach and selected quality assurance measure presented by the host Forum member institution;
- receive advice and discover good practices to further develop quality assurance approaches and measures in their own countries;
- practise giving critical, but supportive and constructive feedback;
- engage in mutual learning with peers and representatives from the host Forum member institution.

A Peer Visit consists of four phases:

- Phase 1 – Preparation of the Peer Visit
- Phase 2 – Peer Visit (peers visit the host Forum member institution)
- Phase 3 – Peer feedback (peers give feedback to the host Forum member institution)
- Phase 4 – Follow-up (consideration of improvements based on the feedback from the peers)

Peer Visits offer opportunities for mutual learning for all partners involved. A Peer Visit is a development-orientated procedure, which puts emphasis on demonstrating and analysing the strengths and weaknesses of existing quality assurance approaches and measures.

In contrast to Study Visits, Peer Visits put a strong emphasis on the provision of professional feedback given by a group of peers within a structured procedure. The intention of a Peer Visit is that the outcomes of peer feedback and peer counselling are helpful for the host Forum member institution and can potentially inform plans for the improvement of the selected quality assurance measure.

Aims and principles of ETF Forum Peer Visits

There are some important aims and principles to be taken into account when it comes to the implementation of Peer Visits:

- The organisation of and participation in a Peer Visit is voluntary.
- The elements, aims and principles of the Peer Visit procedure are transparent to all persons involved.
- The focus of the Peer Visit is on the ETF Forum member institutions involved and their interests and needs according to their quality assurance approaches at VET system level.
- The host Forum member institutions should have the intention to present both the strengths and the weaknesses of the selected quality assurance measure. Peer Visits should not be misused in the sense of glorifying or marketing organisations, persons, concepts or approaches.
- The host Forum member institution takes the decision on the usage of the peer feedback, however, it is expected to reflect on and work with the results of the peer feedback.
- Peers are expected to reflect on the results of the Peer Visit and think about opportunities to work with the results in their own national contexts.
- Peer Visits should be as dynamic and motivating as possible for both the host Forum member institution and the peers; they are not intended to be controlling, technical or bureaucratic procedures.
- Peers give their feedback as objectively and impartially as possible, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses of the quality assurance measures observed.
- Peer Visit participants need to take account of cultural differences influencing the process and the feedback.

Purpose of this manual

The manual provides a framework for a Peer Visit procedure for ETF Forum member institutions. The manual guides the users through the different phases of a Peer Visit (preparation phase, Peer Visit, peer feedback, follow-up) referring to the roles and tasks of host Forum member institutions peers and observers. The manual:

a) Provides a clearly structured procedure for transnational Peer Visits, referring to all phases of Deming's quality cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act)[2] in order to ensure, that Peer Visits support the continuous improvement of VET quality assurance.

b) Provides guidance for host Forum member institutions on the development of a national context report, which includes information on the national approach to quality assurance in VET and a description of the selected quality assurance measures.

c) Provides guidance for peers on how to prepare for a Peer Visit and provide critical but supportive and valuable peer feedback.

d) Provides the basis for training initiatives for the ETF Forum members to get acquainted with the Peer Visit procedure and the roles and responsibilities of the Forum member institutions as hosts, peers or observers.

e) Supports the members of the ETF Forum to, in turn, organise training seminars on Peer Visits in their national contexts.

Peer Visits are intended to support the core objectives of the ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in VET. This means that they are expected to support the modernisation and improvement of quality assurance in VET by providing the context and means for peer learning through transnational cooperation.

[2] See: Deming, W. Edwards (2000): Out of the crisis. London. (and earlier publications of this author)

Manual contents

The ETF Forum Peer Visit Guidance and Training Manual starts with an overview of the aims and purposes of Peer Visits (see: Executive Summary), followed by a structured description of each of the Peer Visit phases (see: Phases 1 to 4).

A checklist concerning the roles and tasks of the host Forum member institution and peers is provided. Annex I contains materials (guidelines, forms, checklists) which support the implementation of the procedure. Annex II includes a training plan for peers and host Forum member institutions as well as a list of training materials.

PEER VISIT PROCEDURE: SUMMARY

Peer Visits - 4 phases

Phase 1 – Preparation of the Peer Visit (time frame: normally 3 to 5 months)

In the preparatory phase, the Peer Visit is planned and organised by the host Forum member institution with relevant stakeholders. The host Forum member institution prepares the national context report, which is the core document that provides the basic information on all matters related to the Peer Visit. Peers must be informed and prepared for their role and their tasks. In phase 1 a timetable (agenda) for the Peer Visit (phase 2) is drawn up.

Phase 2 – Peer Visit (time frame: normally 2 to 3 days)

In this phase, the Peer Visit takes place. The host Forum member institution presents its VET system-level quality assurance approach with emphasis on the selected quality assurance measure for the Peer Visit. A clearly structured agenda has to be followed. Relevant stakeholders can be invited to make presentations and on-site visits of relevant organisations can take place. Peers visit the host Forum member institution and relevant institutions, listen to presentations and other forms of inputs observe and gain a deeper understanding of the quality assurance measure selected by the host Forum member institution for Peer Feedback.

Phase 3 – Peer Visit feedback process (timeframe: normally 2 to 3 hours)

In phase 3, peers give feedback to the host Forum member institution during a moderated final feedback session of the Peer Visit. In this final feedback session, the peers deliver their feedback and make suggestions for improvements regarding the quality assurance measure to the host Forum member institution. Depending on the decision of the host Forum member institution, peers can give feedback individually, as single persons, or as a group of peers (Single Peer Feedback versus Joint Peer Feedback of the peer group).

Phase 4 – Follow-up (time frame: depending on national circumstances)

In the last phase of the Peer Visit procedure, the focus is on the analysis and usage of feedback as a basis for improvements at VET system level. The follow-up process consists of two parts: In a first step, the peer feedback is analysed and reflected upon by the host Forum member institution and disseminated to relevant stakeholders. In a second step, relevant aspects of the feedback are introduced into reform processes, as appropriate. To support the latter, a systematic procedure based on the quality cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act) is proposed.

Peer Visits - management

The host Forum member institution is responsible for the following management tasks:

- project management of the Peer Visit;
- co-ordination of information gathering and distribution to all actors involved;
- documentation of the results of the procedure;
- quality assurance of the Peer Visit procedure.

PHASE 1: PREPARATION OF THE PEER VISIT

The Peer Visit procedure starts with a preparatory phase. In this phase, the Peer Visit is planned and organised by the host Forum member institution. A Peer Visit initial information sheet, including the basic information about the Peer Visit (timeline, quality assurance measure(s), roles and responsibilities) is drafted. A national context report on the quality assurance approach and selected quality assurance measure is prepared by the host Forum member institution in co-operation with relevant stakeholders. The national context report is the core document; it provides the basic information on all matters related to the Peer Visit. Peers must be informed in order to prepare for their role and their tasks. The timetable (agenda) for the Peer Visit (phase 2) is prepared in phase 1. The host Forum member institutions should reserve a time frame of normally three to five months to prepare for a Peer Visit.

Roles and responsibilities

Careful preparation is essential for a successful Peer Visit. One of the first things to do is to determine the roles and responsibilities of all actors within the process. Every Forum member institution taking part in a Peer Visit should take a role and feel responsible for the tasks related to this role.

There are two different main roles: the host of the Peer Visit and the visiting peers; additionally, there is the optional role of observer. In the context of the ETF Forum, ideally and in the long term, every Forum member institution should take on both main roles (host, peer), to benefit substantially from this procedure; however it is for them to decide whether to take on a role and/or which role.

Host Forum member institution: An ETF Forum member institution will take the role of host. Host Forum member institutions are those who get feedback from Forum peers on their quality assurance approach and the selected quality assurance measure to be reviewed within the Peer Visit. The host Forum member institution should have a clear and strong motivation for a Peer Visit as it will have to invest personnel and financial resources to carry out a Peer Visit procedure. The host Forum member institution is also responsible for taking action on the results of the peer feedback. It decides how and which peer feedback will be used for further improvements of the selected quality assurance measure.

Peers: Other representatives of ETF Forum member institutions will take on the role of peers. Their role is to give critical but constructive and supportive feedback on the quality assurance measure presented by the host Forum member institution. Peers are persons who are equal to, or are on equal standing with the persons who are given feedback. They work in a similar environment and have a similar expertise, but come from the outside and represent an external perspective.

Peers are not expected to act in a judging or controlling way or manner. They should have a clear motivation to learn about the quality assurance approach of another country and to engage in a reflective and sometimes demanding process, with the aim to give constructive and supportive feedback.

During Peer Visits, peers will learn about quality assurance approaches in other countries and will get many possibilities to learn about new ways of improvement. They are encouraged to think about the transferability of what they have heard and seen in their own national context.

Observers (optional): Additionally, observers can be nominated. The role of observers is to reflect on the whole process, especially phase 2 (Peer Visit) and phase 3 (Peer feedback). Their main task is to observe whether the process was implemented effectively and efficiently. Observers could be very helpful in the starting phase of Peer Visits in order to receive feedback on the procedure itself and possible areas of improvement. Observers should have an interest in the elements and structures of this special form of external feedback.

A funding and/or a content specialist body may support the host institution in the management and co-ordination of the Peer Visit and/or the identification of external experts as relevant and appropriate.

Tasks of the host Forum member institution

Host Forum member institutions seek and receive feedback from peers on their quality assurance approach and selected quality assurance measure. The feedback goes to the host Forum member institution that decides how to make use of it.

The host Forum member institution has the following tasks in phase 1 (preparation of the Peer Visit):

Decision on the quality assurance measure

In order to ensure a beneficial and fruitful Peer Visit, the host Forum member institution has to decide on one or more quality assurance measures that should be the focus of the Peer Visit (see also questions below). Host Forum member institutions should also have a clear interest in and the intention to work with the feedback of a group of peers.

Questions that may be considered when it comes to the selection of the quality assurance measure:

- Is there a quality assurance measure that urgently need to be reviewed, because there have been problems?
- Is there a quality assurance measure in an area undergoing reform that may also require modernisation, for which peer feedback could be helpful?
- Is there a 'good practice' quality assurance measure that might be transferred to other areas or parts of the system?
- Is there a need for a new/renewed quality assurance measure due to new developments (e.g. devolution of authority, increased provider autonomy, labour market change etc.)?

In order to have some orientation and guidance in relation to the selection of a quality assurance measure, reference can be made to ETFs key areas for quality assurance in VET[3].

The selected quality assurance measure has to be described in the national context report and presented during the Peer Visit (phase 2). Special assessment questions (referring to quality assurance measure(s)) can be formulated for the peers. These can enhance the usefulness of the peer feedback that results from the Peer Visit.

Here are some examples for the selection of quality assurance measure(s) and special assessment questions for peers:

[3] Watters, Elizabeth (2015): The ETF Approach to promoting Quality Assurance in VET. ETF Working Paper, p. 19ff.

TABLE 1: QUALITY ASSURANCE MEASURES AND SPECIAL ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS FOR PEERS - SAMPLES

Quality assurance areas	Quality assurance measures	Special assessment questions for peers
Quality assurance of VET provider institutions	• Self-assessment requirements at provider level	• Are there existing requirements for self-assessment appropriate for different types of providers? • Are there requirements for directors /management staff to acquire competences in the field of self-assessment?
Quality assurance of VET provision	• Regulations for work based learning	• Do work based learning regulations fit labour market needs? • Do we need new regulations for new types of work based learning?
Quality assurance and assessment, validation and certification	• National standards for assessment • National monitoring of assessment results	• What observations can you share with us on the consistency of our standards for assessment? • Which, if any, new/revised indicators do we need?
Quality assurance of VET curricula	• Processes and procedures to ensure the quality of developing new and revising existing curricula in VET	• What advice can you give us to improve our procedures to involve labour market representatives in the development and revision of curricula? • What observations can you share with us on how to improve our feedback procedures? • What suggestions can you make to help us to improve our procedures to ensure the timely development/revision of curricula?

The detailed description of the quality assurance measure will be provided in the national context report, which serves as basic information for the peers and helps them to prepare for the Peer Visit.

Initial documentation and information

Before providing a national context report, information regarding basic decisions concerning the Peer Visit procedure has to be documented by the host Forum member institution. The “Peer Visit initial information sheet” [4] serves as documentation and information for the Forum peers. It should include the following information:

- name and contact information of the host Forum member institution;
- date and venue of the Peer Visit, broad time schedule;
- aims and purposes of the Peer Visit;
- expected outcomes;
- basic information about the selected quality assurance measure;

[4] See: Form for Peer Visit initial information sheet, annex 1.

- formulation of special assessment questions for peers (these can be updated in the national context report),
- decision on the type of feedback the peers are expected to give to the host Forum member institution (Single Peer Feedback or Joint Peer Feedback),
- names of ETF Forum National Contact Persons taking the role of peers,
- names of ETF Forum National Contact Persons taking the role of observers (if relevant).
- further comments (if necessary).

A form for the Peer Visit initial information sheet can be found in annex 1 of this manual. The form should serve as an initial source of information and be sent to all partners involved at an early stage, normally three months before the Peer Visit (phase 2) takes place.

Provision of a national context report

The national context report[5] is the core document of the entire Peer Visit procedure. It includes information about the quality assurance measure for which the host Forum member institution wants to receive feedback and it serves as a reference for both the host Forum member institution and the peers. The national context report should be prepared in collaboration with relevant national stakeholders.

The national context report supports the host Forum member institution in:

- being clear about the topic for the Peer Visit;
- making a form of self-assessment by reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of the selected quality assurance measure;
- establishing the selection and engagement of national stakeholders in the Peer Visit;
- thinking about and providing special assessment questions for peers;
- serving as a basis for the organisation of the Peer Visit (Peer Visit agenda).

The national context report supports Forum peers to:

- get a clear picture regarding the topic for the Peer Visit and prepare for it;
- think about the special assessment questions for peers,
- think about similar quality assurance measures and examples of good practice in their own countries,
- think about open questions in relation to the selected quality assurance measure, which could be asked during the Peer Visit (phase 2) to get a better understanding of the host country context.[6]

The ETF Forum country fiches[7] may be used to give an overview of the status quo of the quality assurance approach at VET system level. Other background information (in relation to the quality assurance measure) can be very useful, if available. The host Forum member institution is encouraged to use existing relevant materials.

The national context report consists of different sections:

---

[5] See: Form for national context report, annex 1.

[6] See: Guidelines for peers: Preparation for a Peer Visit, annex 1.

[7] ETF Forum country fiches are short descriptions of the status quo of quality assurance in vocational education and training in the member countries of the ETF Forum. These country fiches serve to monitor and report on developments in a comparable way and are kept up-to-date by the ETF Forum member institutions.

- Section A: General information on VET and quality assurance in VET in the host Forum member country.
- Section B: Focus of the Peer Visit (selected quality assurance measure, reasons for its selection, key stakeholders, expected outcomes).
- Section C: Self-assessment of the selected quality assurance measure, including a SWOT analysis and a stakeholder analysis for each measure selected.
- Section D: Special assessment questions for peers according to the selected quality assurance measure.
- Section E: First ideas/considerations for utilising the feedback after the Peer Visit (Follow-up).
- Section F: Annexes

The SWOT analysis for each quality assurance measure is a core part of the national context report[8]. We recommend carrying out a SWOT analysis for each selected quality assurance measure. Table 2 shows, how and with the help of which questions a SWOT analysis can be made.

The national context report should be sent to the peers about four weeks before the Peer Visit (phase 2) takes place.

TABLE 2: QUESTIONS FOR A SWOT ANALYSIS - SAMPLES

Title of selected quality assurance measure:	
Strengths (internal) ■ What are the strengths of this quality assurance measure? ■ What resources (e.g. financial and human resources) are invested this quality assurance measure and how? ■ Is there positive feedback in relation to this quality assurance measure? What? Coming from which stakeholders?	Weaknesses (internal) ■ Which parts of this quality assurance measure need improvement? ■ What knowledge/competences is/are lacking? ■ Are there complaints in relation to this quality assurance measure? Why? Coming from which stakeholders?
Opportunities (external) ■ What changes in the external environment can be exploited (e.g. legal, technological, demographical, financial)? ■ Have there been changes in the VET system/policy, which create new opportunities? ■ Which strengths can be built on, to meet the identified need for changes?	Threats (external) ■ Are there any obstacles that have to be faced? ■ What might cause problems in the future and why?

Preparation of the Peer Visit agenda

Another task to be fulfilled by the host Forum member institution is the preparation of the Peer Visit agenda. The structure of the Peer Visit agenda should clearly refer to the quality assurance measure, which has been chosen by the host Forum member institution. The agenda should cover the following aspects:

- Introduction to the VET system of the hosting country.
- Presentation of the VET quality assurance approach of the hosting country.

[8] See: Example for a SWOT analysis, annex 1.

- Presentation of the national context report contents (e.g. concepts, legal regulations, data, process descriptions, SWOT analysis, stakeholder analysis) according to the quality assurance measure that has been chosen by the host Forum member institution.
- Allocation of time for discussion of the assessment questions for peers formulated by the host institution (see initial information sheet).
- Site visits, when appropriate, of relevant institutions (e.g. VET providers, school inspection bodies, regional and national bodies responsible for quality assurance in VET, national qualification authorities, accreditation bodies) with the possibility for the peers to speak with members of these organisations and/or receive presentations.
- Allocation of time, as relevant, for a short reflection session for single peers or a longer final discussion and reflection session when the host institution opts for the joint feedback of the peer group.
- Allocation of time for the final feedback session from single peers or from the peer group to the hosting country.

Provision of information during the Peer Visit can be made with the help of presentations but also other formats or forms (e.g. discussion groups, roundtables) are possible.

The agenda should also include a question and answer session after each presentation to give peers the chance to collect additional information as evidence for their feedback at the end of the Peer Visit.

Presentations/inputs can be made by different persons (e.g. experts, policy-makers, headmasters, representatives of relevant institutions, representatives of labour market) including the staff of the host Forum member institution. The host Forum member institution is responsible for the invitation and briefing of presenters and the organisation of site visits to different institutions (if appropriate).

Tasks of the Forum peers

It is crucial for successful Peer Visits that peers are very well prepared, before the Peer Visit (phase 2) starts. Peers should have knowledge of the quality assurance approach and the selected quality assurance measure of the host Forum member country. To prepare for the Peer Visit, the peers need to:

- be acquainted with the Peer Visit purpose and procedure;
- read the initial information sheet, the national context report, the Peer Visit Agenda and additional materials (if appropriate) provided by the host Forum member institution;
- think about the special assessment questions for peers included in the national context report and to reflect on them in relation to the status quo and recent developments in their own countries;
- reflect on areas for investigation during the Peer Visit;
- consider questions for questions and answer sessions.

While reading the materials and papers in the preparatory phase, peers can think about open questions they may have concerning the selected quality assurance measure. In phase 2 (Peer Visit) peers have the chance to get answers to their open questions while attending presentations or by asking relevant stakeholders[9].

[9] See: Guidelines for Peers: Preparation for a Peer Visit, annex 1.

Tasks of observers (optional)

Additionally, observers can be nominated. The role of observers is to observe and reflect on he process, especially phase 2 (Peer Visit) and phase 3 (peer feedback). Their main task would be to observe if the Peer Visit procedure was implemented effectively and efficiently. Observers can provide valuable feedback on the procedure itself and areas for improvement[10].

[10] See: Peer Visit guidelines for observers, annex 1.

PHASE 2: PEER VISIT

In the second phase, the Peer Visit takes place. The host Forum member institution presents its system-level quality assurance approach and the selected quality assurance measure. The Peer Visit is normally organised within a timeframe of 2 to 3 days - depending on the choice of quality assurance measure and available resources. A clearly structured agenda (developed in phase 1) has to be followed. Relevant stakeholders can be invited to make presentations. Visits to relevant organisations, bodies or VET providers can take place, if appropriate. Peers visit the host Forum member institution and listen to presentations and other forms of input. The core tasks of peers in this phase is to gain a deeper understanding of the quality assurance measure selected by the host Forum member institution and the related issues, by active listening, asking questions and analysing all information and evidence provided during the Peer Visit (phase 2).

What happens during the Peer Visit?

Representatives of the host Forum member institution and other national stakeholders or experts - following the Peer Visit agenda - present the quality assurance approach and the chosen quality assurance measure.

During the Peer Visit the peers check the accuracy of the information provided in the national context report and conduct their own investigation, by gathering and assessing additional data related to the selected quality assurance measure.

In general, peers should adopt an exploring attitude, which is characterised by curiosity, openness and acceptance as well as a confident demeanour. They should be prepared to deal with inconsistencies in the replies of presenters or interviewees.

Peers are recommended to take notes of key information throughout the Peer Visit to have some written material to refer to during the single or Joint Peer Feedback session (see phase 3 of the Peer Visit procedure)[11]. The data collection of the peers can be done with the help of the methods outlined in the next section.

Peer Assessment: Active and effective listening, observing and questioning

During the Peer Visit, the peers listen to presentations and discussions and take part in site visits to relevant institutions. Giving valuable feedback requires active and effective listening to and observing and questioning those who are presenting the information and issues during the Peer Visit.

Listening is an important communication competence, which includes complex cognitive processes, for instance understanding and interpreting messages, affective processes like being motivated to pay attention, and behavioural processes, as in responding with both verbal and nonverbal feedback. In other words, to be an effective listener, the listener has to take into consideration what he or she is thinking about the communication being received, what he or she is feeling about the communication and also the context of the conversation[12]. A peer who is practising active and effective listening, observing and questioning is:

- Knowledgeable: is thoroughly familiar with the focus of the Peer Visit, specifically with the quality assurance measure described in the national context report.

---

[11] See: Guidelines and notes for Peers: Peer Visit (phase 2), annex 1.
[12] See: Peterson, S. (2012) "The labor of listening." International Journal of Listening, 26:2, 87-90:

- Focused: stays on the topic (selected quality assurance measure), does not ask questions on topics that are not central to the Peer Visit.
- Clear: asks simple, easy and short questions and uses an appropriate language which fits to the person providing the information (e.g. expert, policy maker, headmaster, teacher, student).
- Gentle: lets people finish, gives them time to think; tolerates pauses.
- Sensitive: listens attentively and carefully to what is said and how it is said, is empathetic in dealing with the presenter or interviewee.
- Open: responds to what is important to the presenter or interviewee and is flexible.
- Steering: knows what he or she wants to find out.
- Critical: is prepared to challenge what is said, for example dealing with inconsistencies in presenters or interviewees replies.
- Remembering: relates what is said to what has been previously said.
- Balanced: does not talk too much and does not talk too little.
- Ethically sensitive: is sensitive to the ethical dimension of questioning.
- Interpreting: clarifies and extents meanings of presenters or interviewees` statements, but without imposing meaning on them[13].

Application of questioning techniques

Peers should get familiar with core rules of questioning techniques before the Peer Visit. In general, questions should be simple and easy to understand. If possible, no more than one question should be asked at a time.

Here are some types of questions that peers can use during a Peer Visit:

Open questions: An open question is likely to receive a long answer. They respondent is expected to think and reflect. Use open questions if you want to have more information about a certain topic. Example: What types of feedback procedures have you implemented at VET provider level? Can you describe how you are dealing with early warning monitoring systems in the context of your VET provision?

Closed (clarifying) questions: Closed questions are easy to answer and offer facts. They can be used if something remains unclear or unanswered after a presentation, a conversation or an interview. Example: In your presentation you talked about criteria for school inspection. Did I understand correctly, that school inspection criteria serve as a basis for external evaluation?

Direct questions: Direct questions directly address the presenter or interviewee. Example: What´s your personal opinion on the recently introduced reform of the school quality management regulation?

Indirect questions: Those do not directly address the presenter or interviewee. For example: What support do teachers need to collaborate effectively with industry partners in relation to work-based learning quality assurance measures?

Follow-up questions: Follow-up questions are used to encourage the presenter or interviewee to elaborate his or her answer. Example: Could you say more about that? What do you mean by that?[14]

---

[13] Source: Guidelines for Developing Interview Questions, online: https://sociology.fas.harvard.edu/files/sociology/files/interview_strategies.pdf
[14] Source: Guidelines for Developing Interview Questions, online: https://sociology.fas.harvard.edu/files/sociology/files/interview_strategies.pdf

PHASE 3: PEER FEEDBACK

In phase 3, peers give feedback to the host Forum member institution during a moderated final feedback session. In this final feedback session, the peers deliver their feedback on and ideas for the improvement of the quality assurance measure to the host Forum member institution. Depending on the decision of the host Forum member institution, peers can give feedback individually, as single persons, or as a group of peers (Single Peer Feedback versus Joint Peer Feedback of the peer group). The host Forum member institution documents the Peer Visit including the peers' feedback.

Tasks of host Forum member institutions and peers in the final feedback session

The final feedback session of the peers, which is the last core activity on the Peer Visit agenda, marks the transition of the Peer Visit procedure from phase 2 (Peer Visit) to phase 3 (Peer Feedback). Its main purpose is delivering the peer feedback to the host Forum member institution and arriving at a common understanding of the findings.

All peers should take part in the final feedback session. The host Forum member institution decides who else (besides the peers) takes part in the final feedback session. The audience normally consists of representatives of the host Forum member institution. However, there can be additional country representatives, if the host Forum member institution is willing to invite them. It can be very useful to open the final feedback session to a larger audience, to foster the commitment to change processes. Furthermore, the dissemination of results can be ensured.

Peers have to prepare for the final feedback session during a preparatory meeting. Time for this preparatory meeting has to be calculated in the Peer Visit agenda. The purpose of the preparatory meeting is to analyse and organise the data and information gathered in phase 2. This can be challenging because usually a lot of data and information are collected and the main findings have to be identified.

In some cases, data and information (e.g. data presented by different stakeholders) can be inconsistent or contradictory and peers have to think carefully about their final feedback for the host Forum member institution. The preparation for and delivery of Peer Feedback sessions must be moderated by an expert.

Types of peer feedback

The Peer Visit procedure offers two different forms of peer feedback: Single Peer Feedback or Joint Peer Feedback. In phase 1 (preparation of the Peer Visit) the host Forum member institution decides about the type of feedback it expects to receive.

There are some differences between Single Peer Feedback and Joint Peer Feedback:

a) Single Peer Feedback: With this type of feedback, the host Forum member institution receives feedback from single peers[15]. Single peers are individual persons who give their comments, ideas, proposals related to the selected quality assurance measure to the host Forum member institution. Single peers take part in a preparatory session to reflect on and prepare their feedback individually. The quality of the feedback will depend on the expertise of the single peers. At the

[15] See: Peer Guidelines and form for peer feedback, annex 1.

Peer Feedback meeting, the moderator will have the task of reconciling the results. The host Forum member institution will have to collate and reflect on each of the peer's feedback.

b) Joint Peer Feedback: With this type of feedback, the host Forum member institution receives combined feedback from the entire peer group. The peers take part in an extensive, moderated preparatory meeting for group reflection, considering everything they have read before, as well as what they have seen and heard during the Peer Visit (phase 2) in order to agree on common conclusions as a peer group. In this case, a rapporteur has to be nominated from the peer group to present the Joint Peer Feedback to the host Forum member institution. The host Forum member institution receives consolidated feedback, as different views, ideas, and attitudes, in relation to the selected quality assurance measure, are discussed in depth and with great care in the peer group[16].

Rationale and moderation of the final feedback session

The host Forum member institution has to plan this part of the Peer Visit agenda according to the type of feedback selected. If the host Forum member institution decides to have the feedback of single peers, the agenda should foresee a slot for the peers to reflect individually and prepare their feedback. If the host Forum member institution decides to have Joint Peer Feedback, a longer reflection session for the peers must be integrated into the agenda.

The final Peer Feedback session should be guided by a moderator with expertise in assessment, review and feedback. The moderator opens the feedback session by clarifying its rationale, aims and objectives before inviting the peers to give their feedback.

In the case of Joint Peer Feedback, after the main results have been presented by a representative of the peer group, the moderator opens the floor for the comments and reactions of the host Forum member institution. The aim of this session is to come to a common understanding regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the selected quality assurance measure between peers and the host Forum member institution. If necessary, misunderstandings can be clarified; and supplementary details about certain facts or questions can be provided[17].

In the case of Single Peer Feedback, each peer is invited to give feedback, normally within a timeframe of 5 to 7 minutes. After each peer has presented feedback the moderator summarises the core and common ideas and proposals and opens the floor for the comments and reactions of the host Forum member institution[18].

Characteristics of reflective and constructive peer feedback

In both cases (Single and Joint Peer Feedback) peers have to be aware, that they have to identify strengths and weaknesses (areas for improvement), when it comes to feedback to the host Forum member institution. Strengths and weaknesses should be balanced. Peers can also provide suggestions for improvements, if appropriate. The presentation of feedback through the peers follows a certain structure[19].

Feedback and conclusions from the peers must be based on facts and evidence e.g. from the national context report, observations and information delivered to peers during the Peer Visit (phase 2). It is very important, that peers try their best to give reflective, constructive and motivating feedback to the

---

[16] See: Guidelines for moderators, annex 1.
[17] See: Guidelines for moderators, annex 1.
[18] See: Guidelines for moderators, annex 1.
[19] See: Peer guidelines and form for peer feedback, annex 1.

host Forum member institution. They are critical friends, being aware that critical feedback is valuable because it can be a starting point for improvements. However, feedback must be given carefully and in an acceptable way.

Reflective and constructive feedback:

- promotes reflection as part of a dialogue between the giver and receiver of feedback. Both parties are involved in observing, thinking, reporting and responding;
- is descriptive rather than judgmental. Avoiding judgmental language reduces the need for an individual to respond defensively;
- is specific rather than general;
- is directed toward aspects which the receiver can change;
- considers the needs of both the receiver and giver of feedback;
- is requested rather than imposed. Feedback is most useful when the receiver actively seeks feedback and is able to discuss it in a supportive environment, do not give “additional” feedback to topics, which were not actively brought in by the host Forum member institution;
- involves sharing information rather than giving advice, leaving the individual free to change in accordance with personal goals and needs;
- considers the amount of information the receiver can use, rather than the amount the observer would like to give. Overloading an individual with feedback reduces the likelihood that the information will be used effectively;
- requires a supportive, confidential relationship built on trust, honesty, and genuine concern[20].

The final feedback session marks the end of phase 3 (peer feedback). Coming to a full understanding of the feedback should be the focus of this oral exchange. The moderator will close the session and the host Forum member institution will close the meeting.

[20] Adapted from: Ground rules for Peers, in: European Peer Review Toolbox. Online: http://www.peer-review-education.net/index.php?class=Calimero_Webpage&id=12781

PHASE 4: FOLLOW-UP

In the last phase of the Peer Visit procedure, the focus is on the usage of peer feedback as a basis for improvements at VET system level. The follow-up process consists of two parts: In a first step, the peer feedback is analysed and reflected on by the host Forum member institution and disseminated to relevant stakeholders. In a second step, the outcomes of step 1 are introduced, as appropriate and relevant, into existing or new reform processes.

For putting results into action, a systematic process based on the quality cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act) is proposed. The timeframe for initiating improvements is hard to predict, it depends on the extent of the intended change processes and many other factors not easy to estimate (e.g. resources available, time for the development of new concepts, time for involving stakeholders, time for legal changes if necessary).

As an important additional learning outcome, Forum peers are also encouraged to think about if and how they might adapt/ transfer good practice observed during the Peer Visit in their own countries.

Follow-up part 1: Reflection, analysis and dissemination of peer feedback

Peer Visits are only meaningful and worth the time, efforts and resources invested, if the host Forum member institution reflects on and takes account of peer feedback on the quality assurance measure when they work on their future developments. As a first step, the peer feedback is analysed and reflected on, by the host Forum member institution and disseminated, as appropriate, to relevant stakeholders.

Here are some questions for the host Forum member institutions (but also for peers) to reflect on after the peer feedback:

- What were the most important results of the Peer Visit?
- What do the results mean to us?
- Have there been unexpected results?
- Is there good practice in other ETF Forum member countries, which is worth thinking about when it comes to improvements?
- Are there areas that call for improvement?
- Which stakeholder groups should be informed about the feedback and which have to be informed when it comes to plans for improvement?
- Which feedback/which proposals are not feasible for us and why?
- What could be changed easily and or quickly?
- What financial and other resources have to be considered when it comes to improvements?

Moreover, to prepare the ground for change processes, relevant stakeholders should be informed about the results of the Peer Visit. For systematic information of relevant stakeholders a dissemination plan can be helpful (see table below):

TABLE 3: FORM FOR DISSEMINATION PLAN

Target group (Stakeholder)	When? (Timeline)	How? (Written report, e-mail, face-to-face meeting…)	Why? (Role and task in the improvement process)

Follow-up part 2: Implementation of change processes

The core idea of the Peer Visit procedure is to give the host Forum member institutions feedback on the strengths of their quality assurance measure but also ideas for improvement. Plans for the improvement of a quality assurance measure will be informed by many sources, one of which may be feedback from a Peer Visit.

For putting results into action, a systematic process based on the quality cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act) is proposed. This means that procedures for improvement should be planned carefully and implemented efficiently. After phase 2, the implementation phase (Do) the newly introduced improvements should undergo a feedback and evaluation procedure again. In phase 4 (Act) improvements on the basis of feedback and evaluation should be introduced.

Plan: Planning of the improvement processes

Implementation of improvement processes need to be planned carefully and take into account peer feedback, as appropriate, as a source of evidence. In the Plan-phase, stakeholder involvement should be ensured.

Involvement of stakeholders

A crucial part of the Plan-phase is to identify all relevant stakeholder groups who should be involved in the improvement processes. An update of the stakeholder analysis already done for the national context report can be undertaken[21].

[21] More information and additional tools for stakeholder analysis can be found here: https://www.eqavet.eu/Aligning-with-EQAVET/Aligning-a-QA-approach/Modules/Module-3

TABLE 4: FORM FOR A STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Name of stakeholder	Interests related to the improvement process	Expectations	Role and tasks in the improvement process

Definition of objectives and action plan for improvements

Development plans, including target definitions for improvements, following the rules of SMART objectives setting[22], measures to reach objectives and indicators to measure if the objectives have been attained can be drawn up. If the achievement of objectives cannot be reviewed by indicators alone, plans for evaluation should be foreseen in the development plan. Evaluation is also useful, if the success of certain measures (to reach objectives) is planned to be reviewed.

TABLE 4: EXAMPLE FOR A DEVELOPMENT PLAN

SMART23 definition of objective	Enhancement of VET School Principals' quality management competences by 2023.
Measures/activities (to achieve the objective):	▪ Reviewed skills profile for VET School Principals ▪ National training programme for VET School Principals ▪ Quality handbook for VET School Principals ▪ Guidance and counselling programme with focus on quality management for VET schools ▪ Information and dissemination plan for different target groups (VET School Principals, counsellors, school inspectors)
Indicators (to measure the achievement of the objective):	▪ reviewed skills profile for VET School Principals is implemented ▪ national training programme for VET School Principals is developed and implemented ▪ number of VET School Principals who took part in the new quality management training programme ▪ number of schools who attended the guidance and counselling programme with focus on quality management
Evaluation (to review the success of measures/activities):	▪ VET School Principals' survey on satisfaction with the new national training programme

The expected outcomes of the planned improvement measures should be communicated to all relevant stakeholders. The preparation of a communication strategy could be very helpful. On the basis of the development plan, action or project plan can be developed and implemented. An action plan:

- provides a framework for planning and carrying out the work needed to achieve the objectives (i.e. as set out in a development plan) within a given period;
- justifies why funds are needed and how they will be used;

[22] SMART goals are Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time based; see: Bogue, R. L.: Use SMART goals to launch management by objectives plan. Online: https://www.techrepublic.com/article/use-smart-goals-to-launch-management-by-objectives-plan/
[23] SMART: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time based.

- contributes to transparency as it can be shared with all stakeholders who have the need or right to know what is being done and why (legislators, funders, implementers, target populations, committees, etc.).

Here is an example of an action plan. At a minimum, an action plan should include the goal/objective, to which the activities pertain, what activities are planned, who is responsible for which activity/measure, a timeframe that clarifies by when the activity has to be finished and which resources are needed. For bigger projects, a more elaborated project management tool would be needed.

TABLE 5: EXAMPLE OF AN ACTION PLAN[24]

Objective: Enhancement of VET School Principals' quality management competences by 2023 (see development plan)			
Activity/measure	Responsible institutions or persons	Timeframe	Resources
Adapted skills profile (including quality management competences) for VET School Principals	Ministry of Education, VET Department (Lead)	End of 2020	Staff resources, financial resources for scientific support
National training programme for VET School Principals (concept and implementation)	National institute for training of school management staff	Concept: End of 2021 Implementation: school year 2021/22	Staff resources (conceptual work), financial resources for the implementation of the programme
Quality handbook for VET School Principals	Ministry of Education, VET Department	End of 2020	Staff resources, financial resources for scientific support

Do: Implementation of change processes

In the Do-phase of the quality cycle, measures based on the development plan need to be implemented professionally and efficiently with the help of project and process management instruments.

It is likely, that action plans have to be adapted during implementation because certain circumstances might have changed in the meantime or the developed action plan did not take into account all relevant influence factors. Also, timelines might have to be changed. In these cases, action plans have to be monitored and revised/adapted during implementation. In some cases even objectives in development plans might have to be changed due to changes e.g. in the regulatory and political framework or other changes in other fields.

Check: Monitoring and evaluation of improvement processes which have been implemented

In the Check-phase, stakeholders and/or institutions who are responsible for the development and implementation of improvement plans, have the task to review whether the intended goals have been reached and the new measures have been implemented successfully and are working efficiently. Indicators and evaluation tools, which should have been already foreseen in the Plan-phase, play a crucial role in the Check- phase. In some cases, a well-developed set of indicators can be used for monitoring the successful or not-successful implementation of improvement processes. Working with indicators usually means that valuable data and statistics have to be collected and analysed. It might happen that necessary data or indicators are not available or that they are out of date. The implementation of well-working monitoring systems is a constant and crucial task at system level.

In many cases, monitoring by indicators might not be enough, because additional information is needed to assess whether improvement processes have been successful. Evaluation at system level

[24] For more information on action plans see: https://www.eqavet.eu/Aligning-with-EQAVET/Aligning-a-QA-approach/Modules/Module-4

can be complex and costly and has to be planned carefully but will contribute to transparency if results are shared with relevant stakeholders. It also gives the opportunity to foster evidence-informed policy at system level. To ensure validity and impartiality of results, evaluation should be carried out by independent institutions that have the necessary competences (e.g. national research institutions).

Act: Improvements based on evaluation and feedback

To close the quality cycle, data and information emerging from monitoring and evaluation processes have to be analysed carefully. Analyses can be supported by core questions, which could be more or less the same questions which have been used for the analysis of Peer Visit feedback, including:

- What were the most important results of the monitoring and evaluation?
- What do the results mean to us?
- Have there been unexpected results?
- Are there areas that call for further improvement?
- Which stakeholder groups have to be informed about the results and which have to be involved when it comes to further plans for improvement?

Analysing results in the Act-phase consequently lead to the preparation of the next Plan-phase, which means the quality cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act) is closed and starts anew, fostering improvements constantly and systematically.

CHECKLIST: PEER VISIT PROCEDURE: OVERVIEW

The following table provides an overview of responsibilities and tasks of the host Forum member institution and the peers in the different phases of the Peer Visit:

TABLE 6: TASKS OF HOST FORUM MEMBER INSTITUTIONS AND PEERS IN THE PEER VISIT PROCEDURE

Peer Visit phases	Tasks for host Forum member institutions	Tasks for peers
Phase 1: Preparation of the Peer Visit	■ read the Peer Visit Guidance and Training Manual ■ select the quality assurance measure for improvement ■ involve national stakeholders in the planning process ■ provide the Peer Visit initial information sheet ■ prepare the national context report with the special assessment questions for peers ■ decide about the type of feedback (Single or Joint Peer Feedback) ■ prepare the agenda ■ plan, including quality assurance, and organise the Peer Visit	■ read the Peer Visit Guidance and Training Manual ■ read the Peer Visit initial information sheet ■ read the national context report and all related materials provided ■ consider the special assessment questions for peers related to the quality assurance measure chosen by the host Forum member ■ think about national good practice in relation to the selected quality assurance measure and the questions for peers.
Phase 2: Peer Visit	■ present the host institution ■ present the national VET system and the quality assurance in VET approach ■ present the selected quality assurance measure ■ invite relevant institutions/their representatives to present ■ implement the site visit, as relevant	■ take part in Peer Visit, listen to presentations, take part in on-site visits of relevant institutions/bodies ■ employ active listening and questioning techniques ■ be actively involved in questions and answers sessions ■ take notes and prepare for the feedback meeting in phase 3 (peer feedback)
Phase 3: Peer feedback	■ take part in the final feedback session ■ listen to the feedback of the peers ■ take the chance to comment on the feedback of the peers, clarify open questions or add additional information as necessary ■ document the Peer Visit, including the feedback of the Peers, in cooperation with the Co-ordinator	■ take part in a peer reflection session to prepare for the feedback meeting ■ give feedback as single persons or work on common results as a peer group (Single Peer Feedback, Joint Peer Feedback) ■ present peer feedback to the host Forum member institution in the final feedback meeting
Phase 4: Follow-up	■ Reflection, analysis and dissemination of feedback ■ Implementation of improvement process, when relevant (Plan, Do, Check, Act)	■ Reflect on the results of the Peer Visit (peer feedback) in relation to own national context ■ Decide, if applicable, how to work with the results of the Peer Visit in own national contexts

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bogue, Robert L. (2005): Use SMART goals to launch management by objectives plan. Online: https://www.techrepublic.com/article/use-smart-goals-to-launch-management-by-objectives-plan/ (04.05.2018).

Deming, W. Edwards (2000): Out of the crisis. London.

Gutknecht-Gmeiner, Maria et al. (2007): European Peer Review Manual for initial VET. Vienna.

Guidelines for Developing Interview Questions. Online: https://sociology.fas.harvard.edu/files/sociology/files/interview_strategies.pdf (30.05.2018).

Gutknecht-Gmeiner, Maria et al. (2009): European Peer Review Reader. Developments and experiences. Vienna.

Koski, Leena et al. (2011): Peer Review Impact Guidelines. Helsinki.

Peterson, Stacey A. (2012): The labor of listening. In: International Journal of Listening, 26:2, 87-90.

Speer, Sandra (2010): Peer Evaluation and Its Blurred Boundaries: Results from a Meta-evaluation in Initial Vocational Education and Training. In: Evaluation, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 413-430.

Watters, Elizabeth (2015): The ETF Approach to promoting Quality Assurance in VET. ETF Working Paper.

Useful links:

http://www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/home

https://www.eqavet.eu/

http://www.peer-review-education.net/index.php?language=EN

http://www.peer-review-in-qibb.at (in German only)

For more information please contact:

Mounir Baati, ETF Senior Specialist in VET Quality Assurance and Manager of the ETF Forum for Quality Assurance in VET

mba@etf.europa.eu

ANNEX I: MATERIALS

M1: Peer Visit initial information sheet (phase 1)

M2: National context report (phase 1)

M3: Example of a SWOT analysis (phase 1)

M4: Guidelines for peers: Preparation for a Peer Visit (phase 1)

M5: Guidelines and notes for peers: Peer Visit (phase 2)

M6: Peer Visit guidelines for observers (phase 1, 2 and 3)

M7: Peer guidelines and form for peer feedback (phase 3)

M8: Guidelines for moderators of Joint Peer Feedback reflection sessions and final feedback sessions (Joint Peer Feedback and Single Peer Feedback) (phase 3)

M1: Peer Visit initial information sheet (phase 1)

1. Contact information

Name of the host Forum member institution

Contact person (name and e-mail address)

Venue of the Peer Visit

Co-ordinator (name and e-mail address), if applicable

2. Focus of the Peer Visit: quality assurance measure[25]

Title of the selected quality assurance measure[26]

Special assessment questions for the peers in outline[27]

Requests concerning the peers (e.g. required expertise, in which fields etc.):

3. Aim and purpose of the Peer Visit

4. Host Forum member institution's desired/expected outcomes

---

[25] The selected quality assurance measure will be described in the national context report, please give a short overview about your quality assurance measure here (basic information).

[26] If you select more than one quality assurance measure for your Peer Visit procedure, please duplicate section 2 of this sheet.

[27] Outline special assessment questions for peers, if possible. They will help peers to get a better insight into your aims for the Peer Visit. Special questions for peers can be updated in the national context report.

5. National stakeholders and/or institutions to be involved[28]

National stakeholders, titles	Institutions	E-mail, website

6. Overview of the procedure and time schedule

Activity	Time frame and dates
National context report	(Normally, 1 month before Peer Visit)
Peer Visit age	(Normally, 1 month before Peer Visit)
Peer Visit	
Follow-up	Indicative dates to give feedback to peers on plans to make use of the Peer Visit results

7. Names of peers

Name of the peer	Institution	E-mail

8. Observers (optional)

Name of the observer	Institution	E-mail

9. Type of feedback

Peers are expected to provide (delete as appropriate)

- Single Peer Feedback
- Joint Peer Feedback

Name of the moderator of the final feedback session

10. Further comments (if necessary)

[28] National stakeholders can be interviewees as well as presenters. They should have the opportunity to take part in the feedback meeting at the end of the Peer Visit and be given the chance to ask questions or comment on the findings. Depending on the focus of the Peer Visit (see point 2), it might be conducive to involve national stakeholders and/or institutions at an early stage. Think about whose collaboration might be needed when it comes to follow-up measures. Early involvement raises the chances for successful follow-up because commitment to change processes is fostered. Furthermore, the dissemination of results can be ensured.

M2: National context report (phase 1)

National context report for the ETF Forum Peer Visit procedure

Name of the host Forum member institution:

Author(s):

Date/Version:

Guiding information:

This is a template for a national context report that can be used for an ETF Forum Peer Visit. The national context report is the core document of the entire Peer Visit procedure. It serves as a crucial reference for the host Forum member institution and the peers. It includes information on the quality assurance measure, for which the host Forum member institution wants to receive feedback.

The template has the following structure:

Section A provides general information on VET and the quality assurance approach of the country hosting the Peer Visit (host Forum member institution). Existing materials, e.g. ETF Forum Country Fiches can be used to provide basic information for peers.

Section B includes outline information on the selected quality assurance measure, reasons for its selection and the host institution's desired/expected outcomes.

Section C provides a detailed description of the selected quality assurance measure, including a SWOT analysis, plans for improvements and information about the stakeholders involved. Examples should be given to illustrate the implementation of the quality assurance measure. Details of relevant stakeholders, their interests and perspectives (a stakeholder analysis) should be integrated. Possible improvement measures could be included. Already implemented improvement measures should be analysed: which ones have been successful and which not and why.

Section D focusses on special assessment questions for peers. The host Forum member institution should formulate these questions, in relation to the selected quality assurance measure, to inform the peers about what to observe and assess during the Peer Visit (phase 2). Recommendation: 3 to 5 core assessment questions for each quality assurance measure.

Section E includes the host Forum member institution plans to provide feedback to the peers on the usage of the feedback after the Peer Visit. The host Forum member institution is asked to describe how it plans to work with the results of the peer feedback. This may include initial ideas for improvements according to the quality cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act).

Section F is an annex section. It should contain documents that will help peers to get a complete and adequate impression of the quality assurance measure to be assessed. It may also contain information related to site visits (if applicable). References to these documents will allow the host Forum member institution to keep the national context report short.

The host Forum member institution should assess each quality assurance measure selected separately. If more than one quality assurance measure is selected, they should each be numbered and sections B to F should be filled in for each accordingly.

(A) VET and quality assurance in VET in …………….. (insert name of the country)

(Please integrate your ETF country fiche or insert a hyperlink to your country fiche here):

(B) Focus of the Peer Visit – the quality assurance in VET measure

Quality assurance measure: [29]

Title of the quality assurance measure:

Why did you select this quality assurance in VET measure for a Peer Visit?

What are your expectations (desired/expected outcomes of the Peer Visit)?

[29] If you select more than one quality assurance measure for your Peer Visit procedure please duplicate section B to F for the description of each additional quality assurance measure.

(C) Self-assessment of the quality assurance in VET measure

Title of the quality assurance in VET measure:

Detailed description of the quality assurance In VET measure:[30]

SWOT analysis of the quality assurance in VET measure:

Selected quality assurance measure:	
Strengths (internal)	Weaknesses (internal)
Opportunities (external)	Threats (external)

Improvement measures.

Specify whether the improvement measure is (a) under discussion, (b) planned or (c) already implemented

Stakeholder analysis: Which stakeholder institutions are concerned with the selected quality assurance measure? What are their roles/responsibilities, interests and perspectives?

Name/description of stakeholder institution	Stakeholder's role/responsibilities in relation to this quality assurance measure	Stakeholder's perspectives in relation to improvement measures

[30] Context/background, concepts, legal regulations, description, support data e.g. statistics. Please provide understandable and clear information for peers here. You can also provide additional information (e.g. links, materials) in this section and/or use the annex chapter.

(D) Special assessment questions for Forum peers[31]

Question 1:

Question 2:

Question 3:

(E) Initial plans to provide feedback to the peers on the usage of the feedback and/or for improvement (Follow-up)[32]

[31] Formulate special assessment questions for peers in relation to your quality assurance measure to inform them about what you want them to observe and assess during the Peer Visit (phase 2). Focus on 3 to 5 core assessment questions for each quality assurance measure.

[32] The host Forum member institution may describe how it plans to work with the results of the peer feedback. This may include initial ideas for improvements according to the quality cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act).

(F) Annex

If appropriate: Annex documents that will help peers to get a complete and adequate impression of the quality assurance measure to be assessed. References to these documents will allow you to keep your national context report short. Only annex documents or links in **English language versions**. You are also recommended to annex your Peer Visit initial information sheet in this section.

Provide a **list of documents**:

—

—

—

Links:

www.

www.

www.

M3: Example of a SWOT analysis

Quality measure: Self-evaluation procedure as part of the quality management system for VET provider institutions

Context: In (a fictional country) a quality management system for VET provider institutions was introduced 10 years ago. Self-evaluation, implemented by VET provider institutions, is a crucial part of their quality management system and the national quality assurance approach. VET provider institutions are expected to plan, implement and evaluate their quality assurance measures and improve them on the basis of evaluation results.

After 10 years, an evaluation of the national quality management system was commissioned by the Ministry of Education (of the fictional country). The main outcome of the evaluation was that the VET provider institutions self-evaluation procedure needed to be improved and self-evaluation competences of VET school principals, quality managers and teachers needed to be enhanced.

Selected quality assurance measure: Self-evaluation procedure as part of the VET provider institutions' quality management system	
Strengths (internal) ■ Strong focus on self-evaluation within the national quality management system ■ Well-functioning evaluation platform for VET provider institutions ■ Governance via evaluation topics: 2 to 3 national evaluation topics selected per year must be evaluated by provider institutions, for which ready-made national questionnaires are provided. ■ Set of questionnaires with reference to the national quality framework is available. ■ Questionnaires are scientifically developed and tested ■ Provider institutions have the possibility to add additional questions to mandatory questionnaires ■ New: Open evaluation tool for providers – they can develop questionnaires for their own purpose.	Weaknesses (internal) ■ Strong focus on phase 3 of the quality cycle (check) – provider institutions often start to evaluate without having set objectives (they don`t follow the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle. ■ Provider institutions have problems to analyse results and use them to inform improvement measures. ■ A mandatory set of ready-made scientifically developed and tested questionnaires does not encourage provider institutions to develop well-founded competences in self-evaluation. ■ Profound and standardised trainings for school principals, quality managers and teachers are lacking.
Opportunities (external) ■ Recent reforms related to VET school autonomy could foster the interest in improvements regarding the national self-evaluation system. ■ Young teachers could be interested in a modern evaluation platform this could increase their interest in self-evaluation. ■ Online-trainings could be a chance to offer standardised trainings of high quality.	Threats (external) ■ The evaluation platform for VET providers was developed more than 10 years ago. The system needs to be redesigned and modernised otherwise it could lose attractiveness. ■ A new evaluation system could be of high cost. ■ A variety of teacher training-institutes exist at national level, not all of them is interested in standardised trainings.

M4: Guidelines for peers: Preparation for a Peer Visit (phase 1)

1. Roles and tasks of peers in phase 1: Preparation of a Peer Visit

The ETF Forum Peer Visit procedure starts with a preparatory phase (phase 1). It is crucial for successful Peer Visits that peers are well prepared before the Peer Visit (phase 2) starts. Peers should have an overview of the VET system of the ETF Forum member country that hosts and the quality assurance in VET approach as well as the selected quality assurance measure.

To prepare for the Peer Visit, the peers need:

- to be acquainted with the Peer Visit procedure as set out in this Forum training manual,
- to read the initial information sheet, the national context report, the country fiche, the Peer Visit agenda and any essential additional materials provided by the host Forum member institution,
- to identify areas for investigation and evaluation for the Peer Visit,
- to consider questions for questions and answer sessions and criteria for observations,
- to reflect on the special assessment questions that the host set for the peers (as set out in the national context report),
- to think about similar quality assurance measures and examples of good practice in their own countries.

2. National context report: Analytical table for peers

The following table can be used to analyse a national context report and consider questions:

Section of the national context report	Comments	Open questions
A. VET/Quality assurance in VET in (Country)		
B. Focus of the Peer Visit – the quality assurance in VET measure		
C. Self-assessment of quality assurance measure: ■ Detailed description of the quality assurance measure ■ SWOT analysis ■ Improvement measures ■ Stakeholder analysis		
D. Special questions for peers		
E. First ideas to inform peers of plans for the usage of feedback for improvements (follow-up)		
F. Annex		

3. Set of peer questions:

After having read and analysed the national context report and having prepared open questions try to compile a set of questions to source additional evidence to support your feedback on the questions set for you by the host[33]. Take into account that you should use the set of questions in a flexible way. New or additional questions could come to you during phase 2 (Peer Visit).

Core peer questions: Quality assurance measure

Title of the quality assurance measure:

Questions (to be asked by the peer during the Peer Visit, phase 2):

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

[33] For the application of questioning techniques see also: Peer Visit Guidance and Training manual, 2018,

M5: Guidelines and notes for peers: Peer Visit (phase 2)

1. Roles and tasks of peers in phase 2: Peer Visit

During the Peer Visit representatives of the host Forum member institution and other national stakeholders / experts – following the Peer Visit agenda – present the quality assurance in VET approach and the chosen quality assurance measure as well as other aspects of the national context report.

The peers conduct a brief data collection and condensed assessment that focuses on the chosen quality assurance measure. The assessment is based on the national context report (and other relevant documentation) previously provided. During the Peer Visit the peers check the accuracy of the findings of the national context report and conduct their own investigation, by asking questions and gathering additional data and information.

In general, peers should adopt an exploring attitude, which is characterised by curiosity, openness and acceptance as well as a confident demeanour. They should be prepared to deal with inconsistencies in the replies of presenters or interviewees.

Peers take notes during the Peer Visit to have some written material as evidence to refer to during the (Single or Joint) Peer Feedback session (phase 3).

The following table can be used to support note-taking notes a Peer Visit (phase 2).

2. Table for notes

Topic according to the Peer Visit agenda	Notes	Evidence/source e.g. from interviews, presentations, questions and answer sessions

Open questions[34]

[34] For details, see Peer Visit manual, phase 3 (Peer feedback):

M6: Peer Visit guidelines for observers

Role of observers:

It is possible to nominate observers (optional) for a Peer Visit procedure. The role of observers is to observe and reflect the process, especially in Phase 2 (Peer Visit) and Phase 3 (peer feedback). With the help of the feedback of observers, the Peer Visit procedure can be quality assured and improved.

Tasks of observers:

If nominated, observers have to prepare for the Peer Visit in the same way as the peers (see Manual, p. 16). They have to be acquainted with the Peer Visit process and procedure as set out in the Forum manual and have to read preparatory documents (initial information sheet, national context report, Peer Visit agenda). Observers will observe the whole process and give their feedback at the end of the final feedback session (if possible). Additionally they will provide their feedback in written form and forward it to the Co-ordinator. The following table can be used to structure the feedback of observers.

Peer Visit procedure:

(Insert: venue, date, etc.)

Phase 1: Preparation of the Peer Visit	What evidence was there to demonstrate that the preparation phase was effectively and efficiently executed?	Were there problems related to the execution of the preparatory phase? If yes, which?	Suggestions for improvements for the Peer Visit procedure
Phase 2: Peer Visit	What worked well in this phase and why?	Were there problems in this phase? If yes, which and why?	Suggestions for improvements for the Peer Visit procedure
Phase 3: Peer feedback	What worked well in this phase and why?	Were there problems in this phase? If yes, which and why?	Suggestions for improvements for the Peer Visit procedure

M7: Peer guidelines and form for peer feedback (phase 3)

1. Aims and objectives of peer feedback

In phase 3 (Peer feedback), peers give feedback to the host Forum member institution during a moderated final feedback session.

Single Peer Feedback - the host Forum member institution gets feedback from single peers on the selected quality assurance in VET measure. Single Peer Feedback is delivered in a final moderated feedback session. Each peer has a timeslot of **5 to 7 minutes** to present the main findings/feedback. After every single peer has presented his or her feedback, the moderator summarises and opens the floor for the reactions of the host Forum member institution and national stakeholders, as applicable.

Joint Peer Feedback - the host Forum member institution gets consolidated feedback from the entire peer group. Before the Joint Peer Feedback session, peers take part in a **reflection session** with the aim of arriving at common conclusions as a peer group. The presentation of the Joint Peer Feedback to the host Forum member institution is made by one or two members of the peer group. The reflection session and the Joint Peer Feedback session is supported by a moderator.

2. Characteristics of reflective and constructive feedback

When preparing your peer feedback, please take into account the following recommendations:

- Give feedback on every quality assurance measure selected by the host Forum member institution.
- Focus on strengths and weaknesses of the selected quality assurance measure and always start with the strengths.
- Be aware, that your feedback should be based on evidence (sources: national context report, information and observations during the Peer Visit).
- Speak briefly and clearly. Use descriptive rather than judgemental language.
- Own the statement: Use “I” statements (e.g. “From my point of view …”) rather than “you” statements (e.g. “You had better …”).
- Stay on track: Don´t comment on topics you may have observed but which have nothing to do with the quality assurance measure selected by the host Forum member institution.
- Focus on the special situation and circumstances of the country you are visiting. Avoid being influenced too much by your own national circumstances, when you give your feedback.
- Peers can provide ideas/suggestions for improvements for selected quality assurance measures, if appropriate.
- In the case of Joint Peer Feedback: peers should try to agree on common feedback, If the peer group can’t agree common conclusions regarding certain points, make clear the different points of view and the reasons.

3. Structure of peer feedback

(1) Title of quality assurance measure: [35]

Strengths	Evidence

Weaknesses/Areas for improvement	Evidence

Ideas for improvements (if appropriate)	Evidence

ONLY in the context of Joint Peer Feedback:

In the event that the peers do not come to common conclusions on certain points: Provide reasons for the different points of view

[35] If the host Forum member institution selects more than one quality assurance measure the template has to be duplicated.

M8: Guidelines for moderators of (A) the Joint Peer Feedback reflection session and (B) the final Joint Peer Feedback meeting (C) the final Single Peer Feedback meeting (phase 3)

(A) Guidelines for moderators of the Joint Peer Feedback reflection session

1. Aims and objectives of the Joint Peer Feedback reflection session

Joint Peer Feedback means that the host Forum member institution gets consolidated feedback from the entire peer group. Before the Joint Peer Feedback meeting, peers take part in a **reflection session** with the aim of agreeing a common and evidence based feedback as a peer group.

2. Duration of the reflection session: 2 to 3 hours (depending on the number of selected quality assurance measures and the number of peers).

3. Participants**:** Peers who took part in the Peer Visit.

4. Moderation of a Joint Peer Feedback reflection session

4.1 The moderator welcomes the peers, shortly introduces him-/herself and opens the Joint Peer Feedback reflection session

4.2 He/she points out the objectives of the reflection session (to arrive at common conclusions).

4.3 He/she informs the peers about the procedure for the reflection session.

4.4 The moderator opens the discussion and asks the peers for their point of view regarding the selected quality assurance measure's strengths and weaknesses/areas for improvements. In this process, the moderator takes into account:

- Peers have to provide Joint Peer Feedback for each quality assurance measure selected for the Peer Visit by the host Forum member institution.
- That it is important to discuss strengths and weaknesses of quality assurance measures selected by the host Forum member institution and to start the discussion with strengths.
- That peers can have different points of view and there may be a need to moderate the discussion with an emphasis on negotiation and gaining a consensus.
- Peers should try to come to common feedback, which is evidence based. A crucial task of moderators will be to ask for evidence in relation to identified strengths or weaknesses.
- If peers do not come to joint conclusions on certain points as a peer group, it is important to agree with them, which points and make clear why.
- Encourage the peers to own their statements: Use "We" statements (e.g. From our point of view..) rather than "you" statements (e.g. You should…).
- Keep the peers 'on track': They should not comment on topics observed but which have nothing to do with the selected quality assurance in VET measure.
- Facilitate the peers to focus on the special situation and circumstances of the country they are visiting rather than their own national circumstances, when giving feedback.
- Peers can offer ideas/suggestions for the improvement of the selected quality assurance measures, if invited to do so by the host.

4.5. After the discussion on each selected quality assurance measure and the formulation and documentation of the Joint Peer Feedback e.g. in Powerpoint or on a flip-chart, the moderator closes the reflection session. The results of the Joint Peer Feedback are not presented by the moderator, but by one or two members of the peer team.

5. Example: Timeline and tasks for the Joint Peer Feedback reflection session

Timeline 15:00-17:30	Task	Comments
15:00-15:15	Welcome, introduction, aims and objectives of the session, procedure	PPP flipcharts can be used to illustrate aims and objectives and the procedure of the final feedback session
15:15-16:15	Discussion of feedback on the selected quality assurance measure	
16:15 – 16.45	Moderated discussion to arrive at common conclusions/common feedback	
16:45-17:15	Documentation of the Joint Peer Feedback for quality assurance measure (strengths, weaknesses, ideas for improvements)	Flipcharts or PPP can be used to document Joint Peer Feedback
17:15-17:30	Preparation for the Joint Peer Feedback meeting and closure	Selection of one or two members of the peer team to give the joint feedback

(B) Guidelines for moderators of Joint Peer Feedback meeting

1. Aims and objectives of Joint Peer Feedback meeting

In phase 3 (Peer feedback) peers give feedback to the host Forum member institution during a moderated feedback meeting. The host Forum member institution receives consolidated feedback from the entire peer group. This Joint Peer Feedback has been prepared in a Joint Peer Feedback reflection session and is presented to the host Forum member institution by one or two representatives of the peer group.

2. Duration of the meeting: 1 – 1.5 hours). At least 30 minutes should be foreseen for the comments and reactions of the host Forum member institution/national stakeholders as applicable.

3. Participants: Representatives of the host Forum member institution and all peers take part in the final feedback session. It is up to the host Forum member institution to invite national stakeholders (e.g. persons who made presentations during the Peer Visit or hosted a site visit etc.).

4. Moderation of a Joint Peer Feedback meeting

4.1 The moderator opens the meeting by summarising the objectives of the Joint Peer Feedback and handing over to the presenters of the Joint Peer Feedback results.

4.2 These representatives of the peer group refer to the selected quality assurance measure's strengths and weaknesses/areas of improvement and they provide suggestions for improvements (if appropriate).

4.3 Representatives of the host Forum member institution carefully listen to the feedback of the peers and prepare their reactions and comments for the next part of the meeting.

4.4 The moderator invites the host Forum member institution to comment on the Joint Peer Feedback and ask questions/seek clarification if needed. The moderator carefully guides the participants through this part of the meeting. Interaction between peers and representatives of host Forum member institution enhances the understanding and validation of feedback.

4.5 Finally, the moderator closes the Joint Peer Feedback meeting and hands over to the host.

5. Example: Timeline template for Joint Peer Feedback meeting

Timeline 16:00-17:30	Task	Comments
16:00-16:20	Welcome, introduction, aims, objectives and organisation of the Joint Peer Feedback meeting	PPP flipcharts can be used
16:20 – 16:40	Presentation of the Joint Peer Feedback on the quality assurance measure (strengths, weaknesses, ideas for improvements – if appropriate)	Flipcharts or PPP can be used to present results
16:40-17:20	Reaction, comments and questions of the host Forum member institution	
17:20-17:30	Wrap up and closing of the meeting	

(C) Guidelines for moderators of Single Peer Feedback meeting

1. Aims and objectives of Single Peer Feedback:

In phase 3 (Peer feedback) peers give feedback to the host Forum member institution during a moderated final feedback meeting. **Single Peer Feedback** means that the host Forum member institution gets feedback from single peers. Single peers are individual persons giving their comments, ideas or proposals according to the selected quality assurance measure to the host Forum member institution. Peers had time to prepare their Single Peer Feedback directly before the final feedback meeting.

2. Duration of the session:

Depends on the number of single peers (5-7 minutes per person). The moderator will need time to seek clarification as necessary. At least 30 minutes should be foreseen for comments and reactions of the host Forum member institution. It is recommended to integrate a short break, after half of the peers have presented their results.

3. Participants:

Representatives of the host Forum member institution and all peers take part in the final feedback meeting. The host Forum member institution may invite national stakeholders (e.g. persons who made presentations or hosted a site visit during the Peer Visit).

4. Moderation of a Single Peer Feedback meeting

4.1 The moderator welcomes the audience and presents the aims, objectives and organisation of the Single Peer Feedback meeting (see Peer Visit manual and above).

4.2 The moderator moderates the feedback session. Each peer is given 5 to 7 minutes to present his/her main findings according to a certain structure (see Guidelines and Form for peer feedback). The moderator has to be very strict with time. Each peer refers to the strengths and weaknesses/areas of improvements of the selected quality assurance measure and provides suggestions for improvements (if appropriate). The moderator seeks clarification as necessary.

4.3 Representatives of the host Forum member institution and national stakeholders carefully listen to the feedback of the peers and take notes (if appropriate) for their reactions and comments to the Single Peer Feedback in the next part of the meeting.

4.4 After each peer presents, the moderator invites the host Forum member institution to comment and react on the feedback of single peers and to ask questions (if appropriate). The moderator carefully guides the audience through this part if the meeting. Interaction between peers and representatives of host Forum member institutions and national stakeholders can be very fruitful for the understanding and validation of feedback.

5. Finally, the moderator wraps up and closes the Single Peer Feedback meeting.

Example: Timeline-template for Single Peer Feedback meeting

Based on number of single peers: 10

Timeline 16:00-18:00	Task	Comments
16:00-16:15	Welcome, aims, objectives and organisation of the meeting	PPP flipcharts can be used
16:15-17:20	Presentation of Single Peer Feedback	5 to 7 minutes per peer
17:20-17:50	Reaction and comments of the host Forum member institution	including 10 minutes time reserve
17:50-18:00	Wrap up and closing of the session	

ANNEX II: PEER VISIT TRAINING CONCEPT AND LIST OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Training for Forum peers and host member institutions

It is recommended that peers and host member institutions take part in a Peer Visit training workshop. National Contact Persons representing ETF Forum member institutions are the target group.

Core competences/goals of the training workshop:

Participants of the training workshop should gain the following knowledge and competences:

- He/she is familiar with the Peer Visit procedure.
- He/she is familiar with the role and tasks of peers and host member institutions and knows how to prepare for a Peer Visit.
- He/she gains experience in applying question techniques in an evaluation/feedback context and in giving critical but supportive feedback in the field of quality assurance in VET.

In preparation, participants are expected to read the Forum Peer Visit Manual and an example of a national context report before the Peer Visit training workshop takes place.

Proposal for an introductory training workshop plan

The following table provides a proposal for a one-day introductory training workshop for Peer Visits.

Timeline	Contents	Methods	Materials
09:00-09:15	Welcome and objectives		
09:15-09:30	Introduction to the agenda	Presentation	
09:30-10:30	Overview: Peer Visits as feedback tools at system level ■ What is a Peer Visit? ■ Advantages and benefits of Peer Visits ■ 4 phases ■ Roles and tasks of peers ■ Role and tasks of host member institutions	Presentation (25 min) Group work – 3 groups (15-20 min) Discuss: ■ Opportunities of Peer Visits for host member institution ■ Challenges of Peer Visits for host member institutions Report to plenum (15 min)	PPP 1 Flipcharts for presentation of group results Work sheet 1 for group work
10:30-10:45	Coffee break		
10:45-12:15	Roles and tasks of host member institutions: National context report ■ How to write a national context report for a Peer Visit	Presentation (20 min) Individuals work on the following questions (15 min): ■ Which quality assurance measure would you choose for a Peer Visit? ■ Why would you choose this quality assurance measure? ■ Who should be involved in the writing of the national context report? ■ Which information would you need to describe your quality assurance measure in a national context report?	PPP 2 Case study Work sheet 2 with questions for single work PPP 3

		■ How long would it take to write a national context report? Group work (35 min): 2 groups with one trainer per group Presentation of individual results Discussion: What challenges do you see in writing a national context report? Trainers present group results to plenum (10 minutes) Input: Next steps after the writing of a national context report (Peer Visit agenda, planning of the Peer Visit)	
12:15-13:15	Lunch		
13:15-14:15	Roles and tasks of peers (1): Peer Assessment Peers as assessors: tasks, attitudes Questioning techniques, types of questions Active listening	Presentation (25 minutes) Group work 1: Distinguish between appropriate and non-appropriate questions (15- 20 min) Discussion of group results (5-10 min)	PPP 4 Worksheet 3 for group work with appropriate and non-appropriate questions in the context of Peer Visits
14:15-14:45	Roles and tasks of peers (2): Peer feedback What is a critical but supportive feedback? Rules for feedback providers	Presentation (30 min)	PPP 5
14:45-15:15	Coffee break		
15:15-16:00	Roles and tasks of peers (2): Peer feedback	Role play - simulated feedback by two experts according to the Example case study 5-7 mins feedback per person Group work: 2 groups (20 min) Reflect on the feedback you heard – which part of the feedback was reflective and constructive, which not? Presentation of group results (10 min)	Guidelines for group work 1
16:00-16:45	Types of feedback within the Peer Visit procedure Single Peer Feedback Joint peer feedback	Presentation (20 min) Group work: Discuss opportunities and risks in relation to Single and Joint Peer Feedback	PPP 5 Guidelines for Group work 2
16:45-17:00	Feedback to the workshop	(Feedback target)	Flipchart
17:00-17:30	Closing of the workshop		

List and description of training and support materials

Material	Title	Content
PPP 1	Overview: Peer Visits as feedback tools at system level	■ What is a Peer Visit? ■ Advantages and benefits of Peer Visits ■ 4 phases ■ Roles and tasks of peers ■ Role and tasks of host member institutions
Work Sheet 1	Opportunities and risks of Peer Visits for host member institutions	
PPP 2	Roles and tasks of host member institutions: National context report	■ Structure of a national context report ■ Focus of the Peer Visit ■ Description of quality assurance measures ■ SWOT analysis ■ Stakeholder analysis ■ Special assessment questions for peers
Case Study	Example of a national context report	Fictional national context report

Work sheet 2	Work sheet for individual work on questions in relation to the writing of a national context report	■ Which quality measure would you choose for a Peer Visit and who ■ Who should be involved in the writing of a national context report? ■ What information would you need?
PPP 3	Next steps after the writing of a national context report	■ Planning of the Peer Visit, inc. agenda
PPP 4	Roles and tasks of peers: Peer assessment (1)	■ Peers as assessors: tasks, attitudes ■ Questioning techniques, types of questions ■ Active listening
Work sheet 3	Appropriate and non-appropriate questioning in the context of Peer Visits	■ Worksheet for group work with appropriate and non-appropriate questions in the context of Peer Visits
PPP 5	Roles and tasks of peers (2): Peer feedback	■ What is a critical but supportive feedback at VET system level? ■ Rules for feedback providers
Guidelines for group work 1	Guidelines for a role play- simulated feedback	■ Identify: Constructive and supportive feedback at system level
PPP 6	Types of feedback within the Peer Visit procedure	■ Final feedback session ■ Single Peer Feedback ■ Joint Peer Feedback
Guidelines for group work 2	Opportunities and risks in relation to Single and Joint Peer Feedback	