



	Protocol/Minutes SICI-Workshop Day One 03-09-2013	Datum: 13-09-2013
		Protocol: AD
		Moderation: HOMEIER
Time:	10:00 am – 05:00 pm	
Venue:	Hotel Arcadia PlayOff, Brunswick, Germany	
Attendents:	See ► List of participants	

1 10:00 - 10:20 am	Official opening (Wulf Homeier, President of NLQ, Hildesheim) Personal greeting from the Secretary of State (Wulf Homeier, per pro. Ministry of Education) The development of the new inspection system – short introduction by Wulf Homeier ► the former government planned to reduce school inspection ► government change gave way to the implementation of the newly developed system (being piloted since the beginning of this year) the workshop's schedule
2 10:20 - 11.30 am	Quality in Public Administration – general aspects of process-quality-development/management (Thomas Votsmeier, DGQ=German Society of Quality) ► QM_Introduction_Votsmeier(DGQ) _SICI-workshop 2013-09-03.pdf ► in Europe ca. 20 similar societies qualifying in TQM ► his topic today: ► promotion of TQM in public administration ► results of a study conducted by DGQ+FORUM comparing public administration with (private) service organisations (2010) ► Questions: What is quality? How to evaluate process quality? How to translate TQM into the language of public administration? Comments, questions (Q) and answers (A) ► key difference for education: product not easily defined, no clear output ► management>leadership/capacity building/focus on school's quality improvement (rather than management) ► inspectors have to see, whether a school's expectations are high enough for the pupils ► In Europe some schools have developed their own model on the basis of EFQM (e. g. Scotland). ► inspectors as auditors follow rather 'act-plan-do-check' instead of 'plan-do-check-act' ► inspection system and school systems two different systems to be evaluated and improved ► this workshop's target is mainly looking at the system of inspections ► Q: Any experiences about how many resources you need for evaluating an inspectorate? ► A: depending on complexity, qualifications of the auditors: one year preparation (e. g. the Netherlands: three years for all the procedures (audits etc.), but then implementing was too heavy a workload for all the inspectors, besides: ISO 9001 focuses on the description of processes, subprocesses and every single process step as well as the outcome, not so much the success of the processes > an adaption of the system necessary

	<p>A Votsmeier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Processes have to be 'a part of your work', there's no use describing them from outside. If you describe them for yourself, then you are experienced enough to not have to describe them in every single detail. ▶ Feeling responsible for your own organisation / identifying with it is very important. ▶ Thinking in processes rather than departments, having a general guideline and a common goal for your institution. ▶ Most important are the targets that teachers have, they need <u>common</u> structural targets, contents targets, which lead to <u>common</u> criteria. ▶ Q: 'Customers' cannot choose, they have only one competitor: the educational system, that's why TQM does not really fit with schools. <p>A Votsmeier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ TQM is a generic model, the criteria can be named: legal requirements, requirements of teachers, students, parents, all different expectations of clients. ▶ You can define a fitting and detailed targets of all groups and then ask them whether their expectations are fulfilled, then you work with this feedback and improve, continually going through the circle of TQM. ▶ TQM-system is useful for huge vocational schools, but not for small schools. <p>A: Each repetition of a process should be similar, that's what we should provide, the same is relevant for the quality of teaching. Therefore: Don't we need a system that gives us a the confirmation/assurance of keeping the same quality or improving quality?</p>
12:10 - 01:10 pm	Lunch
3 01:10 - 02:00 pm	<p>Common Assessment Framework (CAF) – Implementing a Quality Management in the NLQ (Conny Heuer, Quality Manager, NLQ)</p> <p>▶ CAF_Heuer(NLQ)_SICI-workshop 2013-09.pdf</p> <p>Q: What do you see as self-assessment and research? The picture you draw is quite inward-looking. Do you analyze data of inspectors (as a means of outward-looking data)?</p> <p>A: With this model CAF we gather details of the NLQ as an institute asking ourselves: Do we have results? Do we have data? What is the tendency?</p> <p>The challenge we face with the NLQ ist that we don't only have inspection – that's only one department out of four (1: administration and IT; 2: evaluation and school inspection; 3: teacher training, Curricula; 4: headmaster training, Europe). In department 2 we analyze data from each inspection.</p> <p>Q: Shouldn't there be an external input from schools on your self-evaluation?</p> <p>A: First we have to develop and then we have to consolidate our processes. And that's the point when schools will come in.</p> <p>Q: How does it relate to school?</p> <p>A: It's not all directly related to schools. Schools would have to throw out a lot of data. It's not the number of items, that's important, but the seven main criteria (that schools could use). These criteria are first of all answered by the self-assessment team (SAT), recruited from each department. They answer the questions/evaluation finding proof (looking for evidence), finding documents, interviewing 'experts' of the different fields in the NLQ.</p> <p>Q: You mentioned 220 items. How are you going to act with this mass of items to prioritize?</p> <p>A: We will have to decide which items are our biggest concern. We will in the end come up with four or six items, which will give us a lot to do for the next time.</p> <p>Q: You have a self-assessment of 220 items – Why didn't you start off with some prioritized items? We don't want to influence it from the beginning. It's the self-assessment-team's (SAT) decision.</p> <p>Q: Do you have surveys of the employees?</p> <p>A: No, not yet.</p> <p>Q: What is the target of CAF for you? You showed us a few possible results. How can you know what will come out of this survey?</p> <p>A: This possible result merely shows a personal opinion, it served as an example.</p>

	<p>Votsmeier: The output of CAF-model is the input for the measures you want to take. There are different methods to collect information (e. g. guided interviews). I would always recommend an external expert/external moderator as an expert of his model.</p> <p>Experience in Styria: thousands of papers, exhaustion > recommendation: Keep it as small as possible.</p> <p>There is the danger of concentrating on quality management and forgetting everything around it. The best way is to still do it and keep it as small and simple as possible, even if there might be some weaknesses going with simplification. You have to concentrate and to find the main areas of interest. You need data.</p> <p>Czech Republic: Interesting to see how all inspectorates have the same evolution. Good luck!</p>
<p>4</p> <p>02:45</p> <p>-</p> <p>04:45</p> <p>pm</p>	<p>Further development of the Lower-Saxon school-inspection system (Wulf Homeier, NLQ)</p> <p>► Inspection system_ Homeier_2013-09-25.pdf</p> <p>Different ideas concerning the new inspection system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ► maybe evaluate only one subject (e. g. mathematics) because if only 14 of 35 teachers were involved, the feedback might be more direct. ► after the first request of a school for inspection: Take 25 % of the budget and open it for requests. This would be one more step from control to consulting. <p>Q: Are five core tasks not too little?</p> <p>A: They have to cover every one of the five areas of activities (school leadership, developing school quality, developing teaching and learning, supporting individually, regarding results, developing cooperation).</p> <p>All core tasks are formulated as activities (with verbs). With lessons we look at the status (lesson observation sheet), combining that with the curriculum, trying to find out how to increase students' interaction.</p> <p>The Observation sheet</p> <p>There will be an online-tool which inspectors will work with as well as schools (in future).</p> <p>Q: How about remarks that you're not so much able to compare schools.</p> <p>A: We have always had some data, but they were rarely asked for (in the last few years). In two weeks there will be a report of the seven years of inspection at the Ministry of Culture. We have to wait until then.</p> <p>Q: If schools choose different core tasks, how can you fit your questionnaires to the core tasks?</p> <p>A: We are going to design a questionnaire for every core task and then have a set we put together.</p> <p>Q: Is there flexibility to find out about support for students other than learning (e. g. social skills)</p> <p>A: We have one core task for that as well.</p> <p>Q: Do you have statistical data you can use?</p> <p>A: 60 schools have already been inspected until summer, other statistical data, e.g. VERA (year 8), last examinations' results</p> <p>Q: What do schools get at the end?</p> <p>A: We hand over all we collect, e. g. statistical diagrams created out of the lesson observation sheet, the inspector-QES for the core tasks in question.</p> <p>Q: How do you use your inspection results? How do you give feedback to schools?</p> <p>How do you get into a professional dialogue with schools?</p> <p>A: Qualifications planned in communication skills, in professional dialogue of inspectors.</p> <p>Q: What happens to the students who don't succeed?</p> <p>A: How schools work with their results, is one of the most important questions for us. We will also suggest the Ministry to publish the results (like in Berlin).</p>
<p>05:00</p> <p>pm</p>	<p>Using statistical data to improve quality management processes</p> <p>► Using statistical data_Dr.Theresa Roehrich_03-09-2013.pdf</p> <p>Q: What happens if you have the worst teacher at the worst school? You are responsible for the students' learning. You <u>have</u> to do something.</p> <p>A: There is no failure, self-depending school will have to evaluate, plan measures, improve. There will have to be a close cooperation between inspection, school and the Educational Authority</p>

	<p>of L.S. (school board).</p> <p>Q: What do you mean with dividing difference level? How do you get reference values? A: Benchmarking, getting the average of the same school form. We are producing reference values now, they are growing.</p> <p>Q: Why did you choose dichotomy in the observation sheet? A: In NRW we had a four-scale evaluation with almost 10% double plus, 60% plus, almost 30% minus, but almost no double minus. The difficulty is to find the difference between 'dead' and 'completely dead'. Now inspectors have to decide, they have to define only <u>one</u> borderline, they only have to make <u>one</u> decision.</p> <p>Q: What about excellence? A: We tried to define some norms, but it's extremely difficult to find the correct levels, e. g. 90 % for double plus, almost no school reached that), 'excellence' was taken out for pedagogical reasons, it seemed too subjective to give. Q: That's why it's excellence, it may be given for only one aspect in a school. The problem is: It made schools want not only 'very good' but 'excellence'.</p> <p>Q: Is there no feedback to individual teachers? A: We have only 20 minutes, can't give individual feedback, it would cost too much time and is accepted in Lower Saxony, lesson observation is a measure of quality on a bigger scale; you cannot judge objectively the single lesson, but on the whole you will get objective results. Our answer to school is systemic not individual. Giving feedback would also take away the responsibility from the board, who goes into lessons and gives feedback. inspection system in Scotland: There's no official feedback, but the interaction of inspector and teacher, so inspectors choose something good and something not so good out of the lesson to give a feedback to. This brings on some effect on future lessons. In case of a discussion the point in question will be delayed as suitable for a more general discussion. Flemish inspectorate/Czech inspectorate/Netherlands: You have to say something, show appreciation. Teachers are expecting a feedback, they shouldn't be left alone, but stimulated and get an impulse, that could make them stronger. Scotland: What about inspectors going together with the head of a school (like in Czech or in Scotland years ago)? Then the Head of school could give the feedback and raise a good discussion about lesson quality.</p>
05:30 pm	End of Day One
07:30 pm	Dinner at the Jakob-Kemenate in the city center