

SICI NEWSLETTER

The Standing International Conference of Inspectorates

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Editorial 2

The supervision of education in the Netherlands 3

The President of SICI 13

General assembly of SICI in Ruesselsheim 14

The Secretary-General 19

The New School Inspection Arrangements in England: the story so far 20

Inspectorates Meeting in Spain: A Commitment to the autonomy of schools 22

How good is our Inspectorate? A workshop report 24

Change in the Secretariat 26

SICI Calendar 2006 27



EDITORIAL

The current situation of inspection in Germany was the focus of the last issue of the SICI Newsletter. Newsletter No 32 now places emphasis on the supervision of education in the Netherlands. The authors of the article inform the



of the Organisation. The Newsletter presents the inaugural speech of Wulf-Michael Kuntze, Director General in the Hesse Ministry of Education, as well as some photographic impressions of the 2 days.

SICI members about the various developments and projects in their country. They also want to further the exchange of experiences and intensify mutual discussions.

Tim Key presents in his article the radical new approach to school inspection in England with a concentration on the big questions of effectiveness of the school's „central nervous system“ and a dialogue between the inspectors and the school's senior management team as central part.

Ángel Onega reports about a meeting in Madrid which was attended by 170 inspectors from Spain's autonomous regions as well as from SICI partners in Germany, France, Portugal and England and from delegates from Argentina, Chile, El Salvador and Venezuela.

The very successful workshop on „How Good is our Inspectorate“, held by the Flemish Inspectorate in Leuven (November 2005) is reported by Yvan Verbauwhede. This workshop is to be continued in a follow up in November 2006 in Hesse.

The general assembly held in Ruesselsheim (Germany) in October 2006 was a good opportunity to link the regular work with a celebration of the 10th anniversary

Decisions were made during the meeting in topics as there are:

- SICI secretariat
- consequences for the organisation from the SICI strategy paper
- new SICI website
- SICI workshops
- Blue Book

Several members were asked to take over the duties of the secretariat for the next 3 years. At last Flanders offered to host the secretariat and to provide the new Secretary General.

A special highlight of the General Assembly was the critical speech of Prof. Roger Standaert about „Tendencies in European Education Policy“. His speech as well as the minutes of the General Assembly will be available on the SICI website.

In this issue of the newsletter you'll also find short CVs of the SICI President Ferry de Rijcke and the Secretary General Paul Schattemann in order to introduce them to all SICI members.

Heinz Kipp
Editor

Contact:

Staatliches Schulamt für den Landkreis Gießen und den Vogelsbergkreis
Bahnhofstraße 82–86
D-35390 Gießen
Germany

Tel: +49 (0641) 9695 - 100

Fax: +49 (0641) 9695 - 333

E-mail: h.kipp@gi.ssa.hessen.de

THE SUPERVISION OF EDUCATION IN THE NETHERLANDS

Introduction

The supervision of education in the Netherlands is changing in many respects. Developments in views on the growing autonomy of schools, on the accountability of schools to their social environment and on the changing role of the central government affect both the content and the organisation of the inspection. Supervision is becoming increasingly diverse, with regard to content, form and frequency. Key concepts in this context are:

- Autonomy
- Diversity
- Proportional supervision
- Co-operation
- Governance

The object of this special issue is not only to inform the SICI members about the various developments and projects but also to further the exchange of experiences and intensify mutual discussions.

In July 2005, the Dutch Minister of Education, Culture and Science (OCW) published a policy memorandum entitled "Governance". Governance is based on the principle that institutions are able to guarantee and promote the quality of their education autonomously, in consultation with their environment. It is a trend that is aimed at increasing schools' autonomy *vis-à-vis* the Ministry. To counterbalance this increased autonomy, the position of the immediate stakeholders, for instance the parents, must be reinforced. In this process, consideration will also be given to the role and the responsibilities of the Inspectorate of Education, for instance in the co-operative project "Integrated Supervision".

In a number of schools, the Inspectorate tried out a different method of supervision over the past year. In this method, the school's own goals and ambitions constituted the point of departure. How can supervision by the Inspectorate be geared to the diversity in education and the objectives of the schools? In what manner can supervision further the quality (assurance) of schools? How can supervision encourage schools to enter into dialogue with their environment on their choices and performances? The contribution on the topic of "Diversity and Ac-

countability" deals with the outcomes of these pilot projects.

A few years ago, initiatives were launched with the aim of increasing coherence in the approach to major social issues in the "youth" domain. The object of these initiatives is to improve the chains of services and the supervision thereof. *Integraal Toezicht Jeugdzaken* [Integrated Supervision of Youth Affairs; ITJ] is a joint venture involving five inspectorates working in the youth domain: the Health Care Inspectorate, the Inspectorate of Education, the Inspectorate for Youth Care, the Inspectorate for Public Order and Safety and the Inspection Service for Work and Income.

Our regular supervision focuses on services for young people, such as youth health care, schools, youth care, police forces, and centres for work and income. With ITJ, it is the social issues involving young people at the local and regional levels that are the point of departure for supervision, rather than the institutions; these issues may range from child abuse to juvenile delinquency and youth unemployment.

Over the past few years, the Netherlands also saw the rise of a renewed and broad-based interest in the social and societal outcomes of education. The call for common values, concern about intolerance and declining social solidarity and pleas for a civilization offensive have led to a new interest in the question of what education can contribute to the cohesion of our society. After all, now that common institutions are disappearing and dominant social patterns and reference frameworks are falling away, the school is one of the few remaining locations offering systematic and professional opportunities for learning to coexist and for the transfer of the common culture.

The Inspectorate has started to develop a vision and a framework to be used to visualise the social and societal outcomes of schools.

The Dutch Inspectorate of Education plays an active role in higher education. Here too, changes are taking place with regard to supervision.

Such changes are not exclusively confined to the Netherlands. In many other



Gonnie van Amelsfoort

(Co-Author)

(European) countries, despite the major differences from one country to the next, similar trends can be observed.

An example of such a trend is the project pertaining to "proportional supervision in an international perspective". Over the past year, the Dutch Inspectorate conducted a comparative study into the development of proportional supervision, in connection with schools' self-evaluation in eight different countries. This self-evaluation is playing an ever larger role, both in improving the quality of education and in the accountability to third parties.

Education and educational supervision are increasingly moving into an international setting.

In addition to exchanging experiences and professionalizing the Inspectorates of the different countries, the Dutch Inspectorate hopes that this survey can contribute to the purpose of SICI, i.e., promoting the international debate on the quality of education. The specifications are obviously snapshots in time, but supervision in the Netherlands continues to develop.

For further information on the topics outlined here please contact the Dutch Inspectorate of Education or the authors of the contributions. Details are provided at the end of the survey.

This survey is set up as follows. The first part presents a picture of the trends in supervision. Subsequently, a number of projects are outlined. The last page contains the names and addresses of the contact persons.

Trends in supervision

Integrated Supervision

In 2004, in close connection with the implementation of the concept of 'Educational governance' (cf. the former paragraph), three agencies of the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW), viz. the Inspectorate of Education, the Audit Service and the Central Funding of Institutions Agency, launched a co-operative project: Integrated Supervision. Through intensive co-operation between the participants, this project seeks to attain integral methods of supervision and enforcement at the education institutions, in line with the supervision and enforcement policies pursued by the Ministry of OCW. Another objective is a reduction in the financial burdens involved in supervision.

Through integrated supervision more co-

herence will be reached as well as a balanced system of high-quality supervision. The aim is to avoid double activities (single audit and single information) in order to reduce the burden that supervision entails for schools. Sub aims are a single counter for schools at the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, burdening schools with supervision only once a year and the decrease of rules and regulations.

Within the framework of the Integrated Supervision project, the three agencies draw up a profile of the school/educational institution in question, based on a number of indicators, analyses of schools' financial positions and the quality of the education they provide. These risk profiles will be used for the timely detection of schools that are at risk in order to be able to take preventative action, to prevent schools from performing below par (guarantee function).

Definitions have been formulated for what constitutes a risk to the quality of education and the continuity of schools. On the basis of these definitions, supervision arrangements are designed to provide direction to forms of proportional and selective supervision.

During the first half of 2006, under the Integrated Supervision project, pilot studies will be conducted at adult/vocational education institutions and secondary schools. Wherever possible, these will be based on the outcomes of internal supervision as exercised within the framework of the governance approach (accountability documents) as described above.

Integrated Supervision of Youth Affairs (ITJ): a co-operative programme

In the ITJ programme, the co-operating Inspectorates [the five Inspectorates involved in this programme are mentioned in the introduction] examine how youth services co-operate to solve problems and even better: prevent them. Thus, the supervisors intend to contribute to reducing the number of young people now falling between two stools or going off the rails. Eventually, this will produce results for society at individual and collective levels. This form of supervision focuses on the child; its foundation is the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The method

Each year, the Inspectorates draw up a "youth supervision programme". The topics for inspection and the locations are

geared to (possible) problem areas involving young people. Various sources are used to select these topics and locations, ranging from local and national youth monitors to scientific research, policy evaluations and topical issues in the media. Frequently, the municipality will be the starting point for an investigation.

Each ITJ inspection begins with a definition of the problem. What is the nature of the problem? How many young people are involved? What measures has the municipality taken? What is their policy? Which services are involved, both in the problem and in its solution? What do we, as supervisors, already know about these services?

The ITJ team carrying out the inspection on site is composed of inspectors and staff, who, each from his or her own discipline, jointly arrive at an integral assessment on the functioning of the chain of services in relation to the problem. Every problem is different, so every ITJ inspection will be set up differently. The inspectors link up with existing consultations and networks, speak with young people and/or their parents and study files. Subsequently, they subject the chain of services to the ITJ benchmark: on the basis of eight quality aspects, the team paints a picture of the quality of the co-operation. They do not, however, just render a judgement; they also indicate what aspects can be improved and how this can be done. The building blocks for these recommendations are provided by the local services and the users (young people and their parents).

Report and follow-up

With the ITJ project, the Inspectorates intend to contribute to improving co-operation in the chain of youth services; they mean to "make chains work". In each study, they ask themselves: whose problem is this and whom should we address? Their findings are laid down, together with an administrative message, in a so-called memorandum of findings. Based on this memorandum, the municipality, in conjunction with the services, draws up a local action plan. Subsequently, the ITJ inspection is completed when the municipality issues its final publication. This publication contains both the ITJ findings and the action plan. Upon completion of the inspection, one ITJ inspector is charged with monitoring the action plan for a period of two years, on behalf of the ITJ inspectorates.

In some cases, problems experienced at the local level require a solution at the

national level. This, too, is part of the Inspectorates' brief. On the basis of the inspections, the ITJ Inspectorates prepare a report at least once every year for the benefit of national policy, in which these problems are presented.

As regards the testing and monitoring of the action plans, ITJ primarily focuses on visible results. Eventually, all parties involved are only interested in one question: what is the effect on young people, parents and society?

Activities in 2006

At the end of 2005, the ITJ project was positively assessed and wound up. In conjunction with the five Ministries, the year 2006 was defined as a transition year. This means that the Inspectorates will still carry out a number of inspections, intended to refine the method and particularly the risk model used for supervision. The first study for 2006 will focus on youth prostitution in the city of Rotterdam. This topic will also constitute the theme for a European conference that will be organised in November 2006. Part of the programme in November will be devoted to Mark Friedman's 'results based accountability' (RBA) approach. In May a preparatory workshop will be organised with a number of European countries that have already implemented the integral concept of policy and/or supervision.

In the autumn of 2006 the Ministries will express their views on this form of supervision in relation to government policy. The question then is not whether the Inspectorates will proceed with integral supervision, but rather how it will be implemented.

Social cohesion in Dutch education

The socialising role of the school

Reinforcement of the socialising role of education is an issue that is widely advocated. In various recent memoranda, the Dutch government has also stressed the importance of reinforcing the attention schools pay to citizenship and social bonding.

Legislation

Since 1 February 2006, the duty of the education system to contribute to integration has been laid down by law. At the initiative of Parliament and the government, the task to promote "active citizenship and social integration" has been incorporated into the sector laws govern-



Marja Blom

(Co-Author)



Ans Brockhoff

(Co-Author)

ing primary education, secondary education and the centres of expertise. The stipulation reads as follows: "Education (a) also assumes that pupils grow up in a multiform society, (b) also focuses on promoting active citizenship and social integration, and (c) also sees to it that pupils are familiar with and are introduced to the different backgrounds and cultures of their peers."

Supervision

The new legal provision formulates a general assignment stipulating that schools must include integration and citizenship in their curricula. The education world and the schools have been asked to give account of the manner in which they have fulfilled this assignment in the school's public documents. In the spring of 2006, the Ministry of Education will be launching an information campaign aimed at the education sector.

Within the scope of its enforcement supervision, the Inspectorate will specifically supervise compliance in areas facing urgent risks. As from the 2006/07 school year, the implementation of this assignment by the education sector will also be incorporated into the periodic institutional supervision.

The Inspectorate is developing a framework for supervising the manner in which the schools implement their statutory task. In the primary education sector, a draft will be tested in actual practice; for other sectors, supervision frameworks are being developed.

Initially, the supervision will focus on various elements. Developing and finalising a view, in addition to selecting concrete targets, is a precondition for creating a cohesion-promoting educational climate. This is also required for the school, to be able to give account of the method of implementation it has chosen. Other requirements include a methodical approach and insight into the results of the education provided.

Furthermore, it is important for the school to be aware of and be responsive to the circumstances of its pupils. This applies if a school is facing incidents and safety issues, but also if pupils display or come into contact with undesirable views, attitudes or behaviours. Sympathy for others, tolerance, the ability to solve problems in a proper way and democratic attitudes demand active attention from the school. As does the opposite: lack of knowledge of what is moving others, intolerance,

incidents and safety issues or extreme views and radicalisation cannot be permitted to pass unchallenged. Schools may be expected to do their utmost to offer pupils and staff a safe environment. That too falls within the scope of supervision.

All the same, further development is called for. To many schools, developing a vision and policy is important to be able to work towards cohesion-oriented education.

Schools must pay attention to these topics in the documents they issue, not only because this encourages them to further develop their vision and approach, but also because of the requirement to give an account of the method of implementation they have chosen.

The availability of support material is another matter requiring attention. On the one hand, it is up to the schools to carefully select materials that fit in with a school's goals and the situation of its pupils. On the other hand, the availability of good teaching materials is also important. There is an array of materials, of sometimes varying quality, of which it is not always clear what is appropriate for a particular situation. Proper accessibility of the available material and increasing awareness of the effectiveness of materials and means are currently important points of focus.

Long-term trends in education and supervision

The first step in the supervision of education aimed at promoting "active citizenship and social integration" has been outlined above. Standards – when does or does not a school meet the requirements? – will be established on a step-by-step basis. Determining exactly what the operational goals are and how they may best be achieved is not an easy matter. The more diversity or vagueness in the ideas on those goals, the more difficult it will be to reach consensus on the exact requirements to be set for schools. In addition, insight into the effectiveness of methods and approaches is still limited, which complicates the formulation of specific requirements. That is why we have opted for a development perspective to determine the long-term trends in supervision, especially with regard to the use of funds. In this development perspective, consensus in the education world and society, scientific know-how and insights into good practices constitute the points of departure for further statements on the quality of cohesion-based education.

Education and cohesion: ability, will and opportunities

The contribution schools can make to the promotion of integration and cohesion relates to more than one dimension. Socio-economic integration, social participation and cultural-normative integration are the principal domains in which people's ties to greater social contexts materialise.

For instance, a successful school career is of paramount importance in gaining access to the labour market. A vital link is the way in which primary schools prepare pupils for entering secondary education. Therefore, the educational opportunities a school offers are essential in the contribution schools may make to pupils' integration into society. Another significant contribution consists in equipping pupils with skills that further the cause of participation. Language proficiency is important, as are social competencies and the extent to which pupils are introduced to the diverse manifestations of society. Cultural-normative integration is about transferring general values, standards and views. The role of the schools as regards the integration of pupils within this dimension relates to, among other things, the transfer of values, in particular those general, basic values that underpin the democratic constitutional state. It also extends, however, to the more day-to-day formation of personalities and cultural transfers in a broad sense, such as paying attention to customs, meanings, symbols, codes and the like.

As schools do a better job of equipping pupils for integration in all these dimensions, the social and societal results of education will increase. Thus, assessing the contribution of education to the integration of young people into society requires a comprehensive consideration of the results of schools in the fields stated.

Educational Governance

Internal supervision and horizontal accountability

Schools must achieve greater autonomy *vis-à-vis* the government; to this end, the Ministry seeks to promote governance in education. The policy view on "Governance" is based on two pillars: (independent) internal supervision and horizontal accountability to stakeholders. Internal supervision must be brought about by separating the managerial from the supervisory function of schools. This may be achieved by setting up a supervi-

sory board in addition to a professional school governing body. Small-sized governing bodies may also be divided, as it were, into a governing section and a supervisory section.

The school must enter into an active dialogue with the stakeholders. Which stakeholders are involved depends on the character of the school. Obviously, they include pupils/students and parents; other stakeholders may be feeder schools, subsequent study programmes, regional trade and industry, etcetera.

The annual report

A key element in this accountability must be the annual report. During the implementation of the governance approach, increasing attention must be focused on reports on schools' performances in the educational field, in addition to financial aspects. The annual report will also need to point out in what manner the school has conducted its dialogue with the stakeholders and what results this has produced. The annual report enables the internal supervisor to fulfil his supervisory role.

The main topic of this part of the annual report will be the school's educational performances. There is a difference between educational performances and outcomes. A school must produce a number of core elements. Central legislation will have to formulate educational performances to be used as benchmarks for the assessment and intercomparison of schools. In addition, a school's own stakeholders may formulate educational performances, which will only be relevant in the dialogue between the school and those particular stakeholders.

Role of the Inspectorate

This annual report, i.e., the information line between the governing body and the internal supervision, serves as the primary point of departure for the supervision exercised by the Inspectorate. The Inspectorate primarily uses the accountability data provided by the school itself. In addition, the Inspectorate gathers independent data on the school's performances and miscellaneous signals (such as complaints, newspaper articles, etcetera). These sources of information are subjected to risk analysis. If the school is found to be at risk, the Inspectorate conducts a specific investigation at that school. Restrained supervision is justified for schools that are not facing any risks.



Anne Bert Dijkstra

(Co-Author)



Miep van Hees

(Co-Author)

Any school, however, may be subjected to a random investigation, possibly unannounced.

This change will produce considerable diversity in the Inspectorate's methods of working. Many investigations that are still conducted in a standard format will now be tailored to a specific situation. The (annual) risk analysis can then be regarded as a standardised assessment of the central educational performances. The subsequent investigation, if any, can be set up on the basis of that information. This will also be of consequence for the school report card, as there will no longer be periodic assessment of all the quality aspects, except for a school's educational performances. This means that the comparability of schools will be more limited in scope.

Regular supervision

The Netherlands' Inspectorate of Higher Education

The role of the Inspectorate in higher education

The higher education sector comprises some 140 government-approved institutions, the majority of which consists of institutions for higher professional education. Half of them are government-funded, the other half are privately funded. In higher education the Inspectorate also supervises the quality of education. In comparison with other sectors such as primary education, the role of the Inspectorate in quality control is different for two reasons. Firstly, institutions possess a greater degree of autonomy, whereby legislation offers a general framework, including conditions for quality. Secondly, as a result of the Bologna Declaration, the focus on international dimensions in the higher education system is more pronounced. Thus, the educational and external quality assurance systems have changed.

The Bachelor's and Master's degree system was implemented in 2002, intending, among other things, to allow for greater international mobility of students. In concert with this shift, the contents and level of study programmes must be more easily recognisable. Therefore, an external quality assurance system for higher education was introduced in which programmes are assessed by independent experts. Based on this external assessment, the Accreditation Organisation

of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) grants accreditation, a hallmark indicating that a study programme meets certain basic quality standards and in the case of institutions within the public system, is entitled to funding.

For these reasons, the supervision of the quality of higher education by the Dutch Inspectorate of Higher Education takes place at both the system level and the institutional level. This means in practice:

- supervising the system of higher education, for example by monitoring the implementation of new policies like the introduction of the bachelor's-master's cycle and accreditation;
- supervising the compliance of institutions with the law, for example with regard to legal guarantees for the value of diplomas and grades;
- stimulating the quality of higher education by conducting studies that describe and analyse points for improvement and good practice, for example in the field of internal quality systems, educational governance or accessibility for disabled and foreign students;
- investigating individual institutions or specific types of institutions, mostly in response to questions from the House of Representatives or at the request of the government;
- mediating in and categorising complaints from students and teachers about the quality of education or other topics.

Further developments for the Inspectorate

In a quickly changing and globalising world, there is a need for adaptability, creativity and well-developed thinking and learning skills, for new understanding of how young students learn and for using the potential of new technologies to make information available and enhance learning. It is the challenge of the professionals to prepare students for this changing world. This requires a culture in which institutions have subsequently strengthened their ability to improve and adapt to the demands of society.

In anticipation of this challenge, the legislation of the Dutch Higher Education and Research Act will undergo major changes in the coming years. The steering philosophy underpinning the adapted Act will be the reduction of national regulations and increasing the responsibility of educational institutions for their own policies

and their accountability (educational governance). Accountability is necessary to ensure confidence among students in educational practice, among other stakeholders and the general public at large, that the institution is being properly managed, making good use of its resources and providing services of an adequate standard.

The methodology of the inspection anticipates the forthcoming changes:

- 1) Proportional supervision: where possible, the supervision must link up with the accountability efforts of the institutions itself, e.g., annual reports and institutional research data. Soberness, selectiveness and proportional inspection tailored to the situation are the key words in this approach: intense supervision where necessary, trustworthy and "light touch" supervision where possible;
- 2) Co-operation: the Inspectorate, the Audit Department of the ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW) and the NVAO are harmonising their supervisory activities. The aim is to bring together the available expertise and to collaborate in developing integral risk profiles/portraits of institutions. For the institutions it should reduce the burden of supervision, including the streamlining of information flows.

Investigations by the inspectorate and incidents show that the quality of governance of institutions still requires an active role of the Inspectorate to supervise and stimulate the quality, legality, effectiveness and accessibility of higher education. This task will take place in an intelligent and proportional manner and in the interests of both the Ministry and society.

Projects

Proportional inspection and school improvement from an international perspective

Proportional inspection in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, proportional supervision has played a role in both the Supervision Act and the current practice of inspection since 2002. Proportional supervision is conceptualised in two ways in the Netherlands. The frequency and form of inspections are based on the quality of the school and the risks of quality de-

cline. This means that schools with poor quality or schools that can be expected to suffer from a serious decline in quality, are inspected sooner and more often than the better performing schools. This form of proportional supervision is also called selective supervision. Selectivity of this kind can be found in other countries in Europe.

Secondly, and this is how it is formulated in the Dutch Act of 2002, the extent of the actual inspection is based on the quality of School Self Evaluation (SSE). This means that the Inspectorate should not investigate aspects of quality that have already been evaluated properly by the school itself.

From an international comparative point of view, one can state that the Dutch Inspectorate takes an extreme position in valuing SSE.

Comparison of eight countries

In the dynamic ensemble of internal and external evaluation of educational quality, there are significant and interrelated areas of tension, such as the tension between accountability and improvement and the tension between intrinsic motivation to improve quality and pressure to do so from the Inspectorate [Report on the state of affairs concerning school self-evaluation (ESSE) in various European countries, published by the Standing International Conference of Inspectorates (of Education) in 2003]. An imbalance can result in undesirable side effects. Examples are self-evaluations that are written for the Inspectorate and which no longer serve the goal of improving education, or external evaluations, which hinder the internal motivation of schools to improve.

In this study we compared the national evaluation context, the position of SSE and the product steering of the SSE in eight European countries.

In summary, one could cautiously conclude that in the countries where SSE/QA is strongly incorporated into school inspection, the amount of steering on the form and content of the SSE/QA products by the inspectorate is rather great (pre-structured) and the contextual features tend to be both improvement and accountability-oriented (England, Scotland and Northern Ireland). For the fourth country with a strong position of SSE/QA in school inspection (the Netherlands) the context is the same as in the three countries previously mentioned, but the steering is clearly different and less pre-structured.



*Vic vanden Broek
d'Obrenan*

(Co-Author)



Ferry de Rijcke

(Co-Author)

On the other hand, in countries with a moderate or weak position of SSE/QA in school inspection and an improvement-oriented context, the extent of steering varies from open (Hessen, Denmark) to pre-structured (Belgium Flanders, Lower Saxony). In these countries the contextual features tend to be more improvement oriented.

Accountability and improvement

Together with the increased accountability demands, the concept of SSE seems to become reduced to an overview of SSE results, or a measurement instrument. More and more SSE is referred to as a product, made for accountability purposes. Undesirable side-effects are more inclined to arise from accountability-oriented SSE, especially when the stakes are high. Stressing the importance of SSE as a process within a system of quality assurance in official definitions would be desirable in order to safeguard the improvement function of SSE.

Inspectorates utilising SSE

In all countries, the mere fact that inspectorates pay attention to a school's SSE during their inspection, is seen as highly stimulating for the further development of SSE. SSE is included in inspection in all the investigated countries. This "utilisation dimension" starts with countries where SSE is used as a starting point for discussion with the schools (Denmark, Hessen) and countries where the process of SSE is described in the inspection report (Belgium/Flanders) or assessed (England, Lower Saxony, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Scotland). At the moment, only in the Netherlands does actual proportional supervision exist, where schools may receive a less intensive inspection when they have delivered a proper SSE product.

Effects and side-effects

The study so far did not clearly reveal any undesirable side-effects. However, all the analyses made one effect clear: the way in which schools perform and report SSE is highly influenced by the utilisation of inspectorates and the demands that are imposed on form and content. Schools are very sensitive to the support and structure provided and also tend to deliver the kind of SSE that is asked of them. This conclusion underlines the possibilities of external and internal evaluation being mutually beneficial. In an increased accountability-oriented context, there are chances for SSE to both meet

the demands of the external evaluator and to remain an instrument for school improvement.

The key might be the kind of support and steering that is offered to schools, which has been confirmed in recent studies in the Netherlands and Belgium/Flanders.

A first analysis of SSE

From our analyses, the impression emerges that a mixture of a strong position of SSE in the inspection system, an open inspection framework and considerable support for schools with steering on improvement is the most promising combination for effective SSE.

Reflection on the Netherlands

The Netherlands takes a relatively extreme position in the European evaluation spectrum. In a national context with increasing accountability demands, SSE takes a legally strong position within the inspection system, whilst at the same time, steering mechanisms are weak, implicit and in accordance with increased school autonomy.

Recommendations from this study on proportional supervision towards the future developments in the Netherlands would be:

- 1) To stress in the political discussions the importance of the improvement function of SSE and/or governance documents. This would at least mean a designation of reporting areas dealing with quality and quality improvement;
- 2) To further and thoroughly develop adequate and stimulating validation criteria for SSE and/or governance documents in order to stimulate the schools' internal evaluation process and to avoid schools providing information instead of evaluations.
- 3) To promote and enhance training and support facilities for schools in the field of SSE, QA and governance.

Diversity and accountability

Requesting data from schools

In line with developments such as Governance and Proportional Supervision, a project was carried out last year which was tailored more to schools' own goals and ambitions and in which schools were given more of an opportunity to supply supervision data of their own accord.

The participating schools were first asked to provide insight into their own goals,

ambitions and results. Prior to the start of the project, questions were presented such as: 'What are your goals?', 'What are your quality standards?', 'What is your position now and how do you know that?', 'What improvement measures have you taken?', 'How have you involved stakeholders in the formulation of your goals and the evaluation of your quality?' In other words: how have you conducted the dialogue with your stakeholders?

The Inspectorate asked the schools to give account of all quality aspects in a more concrete form. To do so, the schools were allowed to refer to existing documents if these provided an answer to the questions. A new feature of the pilot studies was that the Inspectorate ascertained in a more *precise* manner whether schools could give account of *all* the quality aspects, whether this account was in line with their *own* goals and ambitions and what the quality of that account was. Except for a few good examples, the Inspectorate concluded that schools still have a lot of difficulty in communicating their quality in concrete and verifiable terms. The advantage of these pilot studies was that this manner of requesting data increased schools' awareness of the gaps in their own quality assurance. Some school heads referred to the completion of this guideline as challenging and "confrontational"; they resolved to adopt a more results-oriented method of working.

Schools' own goals and ambitions

Taking their cue from the account given by the school, inspectors conducted a preliminary discussion with the school management team. This discussion explored the responses provided in greater depth. On the basis of this preliminary discussion, it was determined which components of the quality investigation could be dropped, since the school had provided reliable data on those aspects and what the inspector would still need to investigate. During the investigation, explicit attention was paid wherever possible to issues that were under development at the school. The actual investigation took place some two weeks after the preliminary discussion. The added value of the preliminary discussion was experienced as highly positive. Communication is a most significant and underrated aspect of supervision. The preliminary discussion increased both the support within the school and its involvement.

The school's policy response

A vital innovation was to include the policy response of the school and/or the competent authorities in the report. Does the school take steps as a result of the Inspectorate's conclusions or not, and what arguments underlie this decision? It is the opinion of the Inspectorate that hereby one of the main intentions of the Supervision Act has been implemented: to reinforce the position of a school's stakeholders, such as parents. A public and independent inspection report enables them to call the school to account on its quality. Up until now, the reports published by the Inspectorate did not contain a response by the school, in which it would publicly "relate" to the Inspectorate's findings. Without such information, citizens lack a link that is important for entering into dialogue with the school and that could lead to an undesirable noncommittal attitude on the part of the school.

Evaluation of the pilot studies

The evaluation of the pilot studies proved positive, both for the inspectors and for the schools. Within the Inspectorate, discussions took place on the manner in which quality assurance is assessed under the current supervision. Remarkably, the pilot studies showed that participating schools whose quality assurance was rated at least as sufficient in previous judgements by the Inspectorate, were not nearly as advanced as had been assumed. Especially when it comes to requirements for quality monitoring in the policy vision on governance [Cf. the contribution on educational governance]. Another aspect is the use and the necessity of formulating results-oriented goals. It is essential for schools to be results-oriented and evaluate their quality, but this should not tip the scales into wanting everything to be specific, measurable and predictable. Schools are not factories; they operate in a dynamic context within which processes are at least as important as products. Another key topic in the evaluation was the role of self-evaluations and the mingling of functions that arises if the self-evaluation (which is intended for reflection and school development) is used directly to give account to the supervisor.

So what does this project yield as regards the development of supervision?

One issue that was not solved in the pilot studies is the tension between comparability through the schematised quality



Jos Verkroost

(Co-Author)

profile in the report and diversity: “are schools keeping their promises?”. In the future, this solution may be found by limiting the comparable information to a smaller nucleus of elements that, additionally, are only assessed dichotomously. This would indicate whether a school’s quality is sufficient in a number of essential characteristics. Accessory characteristics, albeit also important, may differ from one school to another and do not need to be schematised. This puts the comparison of schools’ integral quality under review again, but that may be an inevitable consequence of the freedom schools have to organise their teaching, under a number of conditions, as they see fit.

General information:

Information on the “International dimension of the supervision programme” of the Dutch Inspectorate of Education and the activities and projects it involves may be obtained from:

- Mrs **Vic van den Broek d’Obrenan**; Programme Manager and Co-ordinator; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: v.vandenbroek@owinsp.nl
- Mr **Dr Jan Lelyveld**; Policy Advisor and Programme Secretary; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: j.lelyveld@owinsp.nl
- Mrs **Esther Visser-de Jonge**; Assistant Programme Secretary; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: e.visser@owinsp.nl
- Proportional Supervision: Mrs **Gonnie van Amelsvoort**; Inspectorate Office Zwolle;
e-mail: g.vanamelsvoort@owinsp.nl
- Social cohesion in Dutch education: Mr **Dr Anne Bert Dijkstra**; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: a.dijkstra@owinsp.nl
- Integral Supervision of Youth Affairs: Mrs **Miep van Hees**; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: m.vanhees@owinsp.nl
- Developments in the inspection of higher education: Mr **Ferry de Rijcke**; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: f.derijcke@owinsp.nl

Address and telephone number of the Utrecht office:

P.O. Box 2730
3500 GS Utrecht
The Netherlands
Telephone: +31-30-6690600

Address and telephone number of the Zwolle office:

P.O. Box 10048
8000 GA Zwolle
The Netherlands
Telephone: +31-38-4257820

For further information on the specific issues please contact:

- Diversity and Accountability: Mrs **Marja Blom**; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: m.blom@owinsp.nl
- Educational governance: Mr **Jos Verkroost**; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: j.verkroost@owinsp.nl
- Integrated Supervision: Mrs **Ans Brockhoff**; Inspectorate Office Utrecht, The Netherlands;
e-mail: a.brockhoff@owinsp.nl

THE PRESIDENT OF SICI



Ferry de Rijcke

I was born 9 April 1951.

I studied Social Sciences and Philosophy in Amsterdam.

I have worked in a variety of jobs and contexts, mostly related to education policy.

Between 1996 and 2000 I was, within the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, responsible for the development and implementation of ICT-policies in Dutch education.

Since 2000 I work for the Dutch education inspectorate, leading the research, analysis and evaluation of ICT-developments in schools.

Since 2004 I am also co-ordinating inspector for higher education.

2000-2003 I was chairman of European Schoolnet EUN (www.eun.org).

When first introduced to SICI, I soon realised this network has great potentials, but was a bit fallen into routines. With the new Executive Committee we are I think well on our way once again realise these potentials. Our first concern has been a new strategy and strengthening the infrastructure of SICI. Next steps will be to put these to use for our common goals and interests.

It is good to experience the enthusiasm of SICI members and the enormous expertise and knowledge of inspectors from the member countries.

Oh, and I do have a few hobbies apart from work: tennis, hiking, reading and travelling.

Wednesday, March 29, 2006

Contact:
f.derijcke@owinsp.nl

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

*Working on
current topics*



IN RUESSELSHEIM



*Celebrating SICI's
10th anniversary*



**Inaugural Speech on the general assembly of SICI by Wulf-Michael Kuntze
7. October 2005**



Ladies and gentlemen, representatives of education authorities from various countries have come to Ruesselsheim in order to discuss the current developments in education systems throughout Europe. I'm glad you have this year's general assembly in Hesse and would like to welcome all of you. Improving quality of schools and teaching have been the keywords of international discussions concerning education, and there's a broad consensus that this can only be achieved by granting schools greater authority and autonomy. As this development is in full swing, the education authorities face new challenges. – In the following I'd like to explain the new role of education authorities and our way of modernising the education system in Hesse.

Which Is the Role of Education Authorities Today?

Education authorities in Hesse as well as in other Federal States and abroad are undergoing a development from the classical supervisory and controlling organ to a modern consultancy and evaluation agency.

Their new major tasks are giving advice to schools on their way to greater

autonomy and evaluating schools and teaching. Therefore the Hessian education authorities – especially the 15 regional inspectorates – more and more define themselves as agencies for quality development in teaching and education.

The education authorities have been essential switchpoints of our recent intensive educational reforms because these profound reforms of school and teaching require professional attendance by a modern supervision.

In January we founded the Institute for Quality Development (IQ) – the Hessian equivalent of the national Institute for Quality Development in Education. The Hessian IQ in Wiesbaden monitors the education processes, for example the achieving of educational standards, and is about to implement the state-wide school inspection.

There Are Two Sides to Quality

Standards and Evaluation – In my opinion the IQ deals with the two vital aspects of quality development that are crucial for the changing tasks of supervision. Let me try to illustrate that using the following image:

Quality has two inseparable sides – like the two sides of a coin.

On the one hand – or side: The state is responsible for the educational system. The government provides the statutory framework, the educational goals in form of curricula and standards and means of evaluating the attainment.

Evaluation – in many countries long established – has become a major keyword on the German educational system. Here we are in the process of a fundamental change of perspective – towards the emphasis of result and output. This means, we define the schools' targets and have a closer look on the results. Until recently this wasn't sufficiently done in Germany. Comprehensive evaluation of school and teaching as well as empirical studies concerning the educational system were scarce.

But it's a fact: Only by regular assessment of the quality of education, by detecting their strengths and weaknesses we will be able to improve our schools. It's our aim to promote the strengths and to reduce the weaknesses.

We make use of several instruments of evaluation: international studies like TIMSS, IGLU or PISA, statewide final exams, and comparative written tests on certain levels.

The other side of the coin is:

The assessment of quality and the implementation of the various means of improvement in the schools cannot be managed centrally. Each school shall and has to find its individual way in its individual situation. Therefore the schools will – step by step – be granted more authority and autonomy.

Schools with greater autonomy

There's a kind of dialectic relationship of governmental supervision and the greater autonomy of schools. On the one hand there's the statutory framework providing a set of standards as well as the monitoring of the schools' results. On the other hand we will grant schools more freedom to choose their own *modus operandi*.

The focus of the current discussion concerning perspectives in school development is – not only in Hesse – on giving the schools greater authority and autonomy.

Juergen Oelkers says: Autonomy is basically the school's responsibility for the quality of the education it provides for its pupils. The school has to implement targets and standards according to its pupils' needs. Therefore a wide range of possibilities must be granted. Supervision cannot know the local conditions in depth – it's the individual school that has to use

its resources appropriately to solve the problems "on the spot". (excerpt from: Stuttgarter Zeitung, 12/03/05)

In your own strategy document, "Inspecting the Future" (October 2004) you say: "In all countries and regions there appears to be a trend towards giving greater authority and autonomy to the schools themselves and to let them decide on their own *modus operandi*. Schools and their clients will demand evaluations that take into account the individual characteristics and ambitions of schools." (p.4)

In Hesse greater autonomy means a transfer of responsibilities concerning budget, the selection of personnel, the schedule, or the organisation of lessons and classes. They will be able to install regional networks of education, including museums, businesses, clubs etc. for afternoon lessons or internships.

PISA has shown that schools need more autonomy to face the demands properly. In Hesse we have made some experiences in that area. Our current projects "Autonomy Plus" and "Improving Schools Together" are the pilot operations. Using the results and conclusions of these models, we plan to transfer the idea to all schools.

The school inspectorate as consultancy and evaluation agency

The schools need support on their way to greater autonomy. It's the education authorities' task to provide that support. Their main emphasis will be:



- support and advice in questions of school programmes and their implementation
- support and advice for the internal evaluation
- accompanying the external evaluation (school inspection).

School inspection is an innovation in Hesse. Beginning this month the first 50 schools will be inspected by specifically trained inspectors. As in many other countries the inspectors are to detect the schools' strengths and weaknesses to help them improve. The reports will be given to the schools and their regional inspectorate. They will agree on a tailored action-plan to achieve improvement. In the future teams of full-time inspectors, associate assessors and lay members shall evaluate all Hessian schools regularly in a cycle of about three to five years.

International Exchange within SICI

School inspections have long traditions in other European countries. We can and we want to benefit from those experiences. Last week a small delegation visited Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Scotland and the local authorities of North Lanarkshire. [>Isobel McGregor!] This trip again confirmed the notion that it is indeed crucial to share knowledge and experience.

Education is the universal resource for the future. Therefore international cooperation in that sector is vital. It creates important impulses for the development

of the educational systems. We appreciate the opportunity – in SICI – to share experiences and to put our reforms forward for international discussion.

Many Hessian education officers have attended international workshops and Hesse has been cooperated in various SICI-Projects. The know-how acquired on international levels – for example concerning school inspection – is of great value for the implementation of the Hessian school inspection.

Considering the long traditions of inspections in Scotland, England, the Netherlands, Belgium or Spain, we will have a wide range of opportunities for comparisons on an international level. Of course we also hope that our experiences will be interesting and helpful for others.

In 1995 SICI was founded for that reason and is of great significance for education in Europe. SICI is a driving force for cooperation and the exchange of experiences and innovations throughout Europe.

This year you have come to Hesse. I wish you an enjoyable stay in Ruesselsheim and inspiring discussions for the benefit of education.



Contact:

Wulf-Michael Kuntze
Director General

E-Mail: michael.kuntze@web.de

HESSEN



Hessisches Kultusministerium

Luisenplatz 10,

D - 65185 Wiesbaden

Tel.: +49 (0611) 368 0

Fax: +49 (0611) 368 2096

www.hessisches-kultusministerium.de

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL



Paul Schatteman

I was born 10th of November 1944.

I became a Master in Chemistry in 1967 at the University of Ghent.

From 1968 to 1973 I was a teacher of Chemistry and Physics in Congo and Rwanda.

As of 1973 I have been working for several companies in the field of Clinical Diagnostics. I started as sales specialist, became product -and marketing manager with Baxter and moved to Beckman Instruments in Geneva in 1982 where I was responsible for marketing planning and strategies as Marketing Director Europe, Africa and Middle East.

After 2 years I became General Manager of Clinical Diagnostics in Holland. As of 1985 I became Managing Director of a Belgian Radiopharmaceutical company IRE-Medgenix.

As of 1990 I have been a consultant and interim manager for a number of companies, mainly in the fields of Diagnostics and Laboratory Services: Innogenetics, Dräger, Kodak, Inlupa,

As of 2001 I have been working for the Flemish Ministry, the first 2 years at the department of Employment as Director of Edufora, a platform for policy co-ordination in adult education.

Since 2003 Edufora was transferred to the Department of Education and Training where I became director of a new regional structure for further co-ordination in adult education.

As of January of this year I am halftime acting as the new Secretary-General of SICI and half time I am responsible for developing an instrument for the early detection of skill needs for future new occupations for the Department of Vocational Training through co-operation with Cedefop and EVT.

My hobbies are travelling, swimming, biking, walking and reading;
I have 3 children aged 34, 32 and 30 and 3 grand children aged 10, 8 and 5 and a lovely wife.

Contact:

paul.schatteman@ond.vlaanderen.be

THE NEW SCHOOL INSPECTION ARRANGEMENTS IN ENGLAND: THE STORY SO FAR

A report from

Tim Key



Last term (Autumn 2005), Ofsted inspected just over 2,000 schools, not far short of the number we inspected in the whole of the previous school year. September 2005 marked the introduction of a radical new approach to school inspection in England. For colleagues familiar with previous inspection arrangements, the new approach is really very different.

So what are the differences? Firstly, all state maintained schools must now be inspected at least once every three years, instead of once every six. This increased frequency will ensure that all parents are able to read a more up-to-date inspection report at any time.

Secondly, schools usually have no more than two days notice of the Inspector's arrival: weeks of anxious pre-inspection preparation and tidying everywhere up are a thing of the past. We want teachers and pupils to concentrate on teaching and learning, not on preparing for inspections. Parents are very keen that we see schools "as they are".

Thirdly, these are short, sharp inspections by small teams. No longer a dozen inspectors camped in a school for a week. No more than two days are spent on site, and the inspection teams comprise of no more than five inspectors in the larger

schools, and only one in the smallest.

Fourthly, inspectors do not look at everything that the school does; they concentrate on the "central nervous system", getting directly at the big questions about its effectiveness.

Fifthly, inspectors start with the school's own self evaluation, as recorded in its self evaluation form, and including the most up-to-date contextual value added data. Inspectors then ask the questions, form some hypotheses, and collect the evidence that enables them to test the school's own views of itself. In other words, the approach to inspection is that a dialogue between the inspectors and the school's senior management team plays a central part.

More emphasis is given to gathering the views of the pupils; they are our most important customers, and inspectors want to be able to see the school through their eyes. Inspectors also gather the view of parents, and talk with governors.

Finally, judgements are now made on a four point scale, not the old seven point scale:

Grade 1 is outstanding
Grade 2 is good
Grade 3 is satisfactory and
Grade 4 is inadequate.

Inspection reports are also reduced in size, being no more than 4-6 pages long, and in most cases the report is published just three weeks after the end of inspection. The report is accompanied by a letter from the inspectors to the pupils, a new feature to the process, which emphasises that it is the pupils who are the point of the exercise.

HOW ARE THE INSPECTIONS GOING?

Initial feedback so far has been overwhelmingly positive. Certainly the cost, stress and bureaucracy associated with inspection has been reduced. Schools like the lighter touch, but are asking questions about the processes, and seeking confirmation that the judgements are rigorous and defensible. The reaction to the very short notice of inspection is also almost entirely positive.

But perhaps we just can't win. Although few teachers claim to enjoy the inspection, many now feel disappointed if their own teaching is not observed, which inevitably will be the case.



WHAT ARE THE INSPECTIONS TELLING US ABOUT SCHOOLS?

We made no secret of the fact that we wanted our new inspection system to "raise the bar". The performance of schools, and the public's expectations of them, have both risen, and we want the inspection to reflect that. In the broadest terms, we are finding that about 10 per cent of the schools inspected are being judged as outstanding, 50 per cent of the schools are judged good, and 30 per cent satisfactory. This leaves about 10 per cent of our schools being judged inadequate, and of these between 3 and 4 per cent are being made subject to "special measures". The rest of the inadequate schools are given a "notice to improve".

WHAT NEXT?

Inspection in England has not stood still. We are already planning the next step, and are intending to move towards an even more proportionate inspection system. This will involve differentiating the inspection model so that we can concentrate our limited and expensive resources where they are most needed, and where inspection can have the most impact in

driving improvement. Therefore, we intend to identify those schools that are performing really well, on the basis of test and examination data (contextual value added indicators), and the outcomes of their previous

inspections, and inspect them with an even lighter touch. These inspections could involve one inspector analysing the school's self evaluation report and performance data, spending one day in the school, and writing a report. We will then have greater resources available to make more frequent return visits to weaker schools.

More information, including examples inspection reports with letters to pupils, are available on the Ofsted website: www.ofsted.gov.uk

Contact:

Tim Key

Manager of Research, Analysis and International Division

E-mail: Tim.Key@ofsted.gov.uk

INSPECTORATES MEETING IN SPAIN: A COMMITMENT TO THE AUTONOMY OF SCHOOLS

In collaboration with the Ibero-American State Organization for Education, Science and Culture, the Central Inspectorate of the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science held a three-day international meeting for Inspectors of Education in Madrid on December 14th, 15th, 16th 2005. The theme of the meeting was: "Inspectorates of education and school autonomy".

Ms M.^a Jesús San Segundo (Spanish Minister of Education) opened the conference. Ms. Alicia N. Zamora, Chief Inspector at the Spanish Central Inspectorate organized the meeting. Mr Demetrio Fernández (Central Inspector) was the coordinator of the event.

The forum was attended by 170 inspectors from Spain's autonomous regions as well as from Germany, France, Portugal, United Kingdom, Argentina, Chile, El Salvador and Venezuela.

The purpose of the meeting was to focus on the role of the inspectorates concerning school autonomy with special reference to education, management and resource control.

The immediate aims were as follows:

- to examine the social and pedagogical features of the 21st century with a view to improving the quality of the education system

- to analyse the autonomy of schools with regard to education, management and resource control
- to analyse the meaning of autonomy in relation to the work of the inspectorates, assuming that such inspectorates support autonomy
- to find the best strategies for inspection and determine the most effective way of assessing schools
- to promote cooperation among the inspectorates and to contribute to the professional development of inspectors from Spain's autonomous regions
- to expand knowledge of the Ibero-American and European inspection systems and to promote relationships among the various inspectorates

Five lectures, one round table discussion and four presentations were planned. The subjects included the university teacher's point of view about school autonomy, pedagogic activities in schools, the role of Spain's autonomous regions in education, and the purpose of the inspectorates.

Achieving greater autonomy in schools is a trend in European and Ibero-American countries and is considered an indicator of quality. In Spain, however, decentralisation of education caused by the transfer of power to the autonomous regions has not been accompanied by a process of autonomy in the various educational institutions.

Administrative measures should be taken to limit unnecessary regulation of the educational system and to establish policies that give greater autonomy to schools. At the same time, having more autonomy means for the schools that they will have to accept more responsibility for their actions and use of resources.

Educational policies should create a context that encourages teachers and school institutions to make and carry out their own decisions in the best possible way.

The continuous changes in society as well as the new and unpredictable demands

Ms M.^a Jesús San Segundo, Spanish Minister of Education, opens the conference together with other Spanish Education Authorities



that these changes create require fast, complex and effective answers - this is not possible in a highly centralised and rigid system.

School is regarded as a functional unit which acts as the centre of a network promoting education and knowledge. Schools have a privileged position that allows them both to identify education needs and to deploy human resources and available materials more efficiently. Decision-making capacity in education should move from the state to the individual schools, thus providing them with more autonomy.

For the schools themselves, more autonomy, which implies taking on more responsibility and making more independent decisions, contains risks that have to be minimised.

In order to achieve this, certain aims have to be fulfilled:

- to strengthen inspection and to promote school management, resulting in better qualifications and more professional behaviour
- to introduce some mechanisms (such as assessment by parents) and incentive systems to reward good practices on the part of teachers and school administration staff

From an international perspective, Mr. Heinz Kipp (Inspector of Education from Germany), Mr. Edouard Clément (Inspector of Education from France), and Mr. Alan Dobson (HMI from the United Kingdom) gave presentations about the role of inspection in their countries with special reference to the autonomy of schools.

Ibero-American experts from Argentina, Chile, El Salvador and Venezuela stated that they considered inspection to be essential in implementing reforms and guaranteeing the right of every individual to education. The representatives from these countries gave priority to strengthening their inspectorates with the support of the Ibero-American State Organization and the Spanish Ministry of Education



and Science.

The inspectorates of Andalusia, Cantabria, Castile-La Mancha, Catalonia, Basque Country and Melilla described various experiments which are being conducted in the autonomous regions in Spain to promote the autonomy of schools and to organize inspection in a better way.

The general conclusions of the meeting point towards the need to put greater effort into developing school autonomy and opening up the schools to society. There is also a necessity to work towards well-planned and responsible cooperation among the different stakeholders and, finally, to promote the efficient use of schools as a public service.

In this context, the inspectorates must focus on helping schools to manage their newly gained autonomy in an optimal manner. In addition, a high degree of supervision and evaluation will be needed for assessment and follow-up procedures.

The inspectorates meeting in Spain was useful for studying and debating the role that inspection plays with regard to the autonomy of schools. It also served as a valuable forum for the professional development and training of the participants. Finally, it provided an opportunity to debate about the level of communication which is desirable between inspectorates and schools.

*Ms. Alicia N.
Zamora,
(Chief Inspector),*

*Mr. Heinz Kipp
(Editor of the
SICI-Newsletter)*

and

*Mr. J. Ángel Ónega
(Central Inspector,
SICI delegate from
Spain)*

Contact:

Mr. José Ángel Ónega Onega

Spanish Central Inspector of Education and SICI delegate for Spain

Address: Paseo del Prado, 28 (7ª planta), E-28014 Madrid

Tel No: +34 91 5065724, Fax No: +34 91 5065707

E-mail: angel.onega@mec.es

HOW GOOD IS OUR INSPECTORATE?

Report on the workshop in Leuven:

Introduction

November 2005, an international company of inspectors and co-workers of the inspectorates listened and discussed several themes concerning a number of matters related to the policy on quality and evaluation in the inspectorates, the concept of quality in education and the role of inspections.

Peter Michielsens, senior chief inspector of the Flemish inspectorate, opened the workshop and mentioned the four concrete objectives for the workshop:

- to gain a clear insight into the way in which the quality of the inspection instruments, the procedures and the reports can be guaranteed;
- to exchange knowledge about specific methods that are used to promote systematic quality assurance (internal and external) of products and processes in relation to inspecting and the organisation of inspectorates;
- to share experiences in relation to initiatives focused on common behaviours and on permanent professional training of inspectors;
- to investigate the impact that internal quality assurance of an inspectorate has on the quality of education in general and on whether this can stimulate schools to use internal quality assurance more often or more effectively.

The chairman, Bart Maes, DVO and one of the authors of the 'Bleu-book', who is more familiar with the differences between the various inspectorates than anyone else, gave a short historical introduction of the inspection. He also underlined the differences as well as the similarities in the broad scope of inspectorates. He concluded: this workshop will not only focus on 'how good are we', but also on 'how to get better' and ... how can SICI help us with improvements?

Information sessions took turn with group discussions. Statements, related to the contents of the presentations were discussed in small groups.

A chronological overview of the presentations:

Topic 1: Quality insurance within the organisation.

Flanders

Dirk Lambrechts held an expose on the quality policy plan of the Flemish Inspectorate. He talked about the history of the quality model: an external audit and a project of consulting schools after a school audit. He also dealt with the critical success factor (like-minded people), the key elements and the restatement of the vision the Flemish inspectorate had on quality policy. The quality management model (a dynamic instrument, locally adapted) was presented with the general and operational goals. The speaker concluded with what is to come: goal management and an overall policy plan and emphasised that quality management should be looked upon as a marathon, not a sprint ...

Portugal

The presentation of Maria Julia Neves and Helder Lopo Guerreiro gave an overview of the Portuguese self-evaluation programme. It was based on the same model as the previous speaker, an adapted CAF-model (Common Assessment Framework). The model was adapted to the culture, organisation and language. The focus during the implementation (3rd trimester of 2005) was on resources, strategy & planning and process & change management. First results were shown at the end of the exposition.

Wales

Quite different from the previous speakers and their models was Mike Maguire with his exposition on contracted-out inspections. To ensure that the inspections are of high quality and consistent across all schools, ESTYN has a rigorous process of quality monitoring. The 3 main strands are quality monitoring of inspections, of reports and post inspection questionnaires for schools. The outcomes of the quality monitoring process were shown as well as what Estyn has planned to do with these results. The speaker concluded with the plans for further refinements to the system.



A report from

Yvan Verbaumbede

Topic 2: The external evaluation into focus.

Netherlands

Vic Van den Broek d'Obrenan explained why the Dutch inspectorate of Education choose for a mixture of two models. The INK-model was chosen because of the process orientated way of measuring quality and the ISO model because of the focus on the output and accountability. Furthermore, the Dutch inspectorate values an external accreditation. They hope to be accredited to ISO standard 17020 in 2006.

Northern Ireland

Improving ETI (The Education and Training Inspectorate Northern Ireland) was explained by Wilma Weise. After giving a brief historical background, the main areas of their quality management were elaborated: promoting consistency, openness and transparency and external evaluation. She ended with referring to the self-evaluation by ETI, which is based on various models and methods (Investors in people, EFQM...).

Topic 3: Impact of inspections and changing roles of inspectorates: data analyses and evaluation documents

England

The second day started with the exposition of Robin Stoker and Andrew Reid on the impact of inspection in England. The exposition gave an answer to the following questions: 'how does our inspectorate make an impact?', 'how can we measure impact' and 'how can we maximise impact?'. Keywords for the first question are frameworks and criteria, anticipation of inspection by the institution, dialogue, reporting, making sure that the institution responds and public, political perception. The question on measuring the impact is more complex. A few challenges for the inspectorate became clear: move the average schools forward, improve the outcomes ... On maximising the impact, there were two 'answers': improving the system of inspection and making sure that the inspections are of high quality. The exposition concluded by summing up the key components of quality assurance.

Germany

In the exposition of Peter Döbrich from Germany, a scientific approach was offered. EBIS is an instrument to support the State's School Authorities (SSA) in their change process into regional quality

agencies. The criteria for the process quality as well as some first empirical results (from Hesse) were shown during the presentation. The implementation of EBIS should take place in 2007-2008.

Ireland

Gary O Donnchadha and Eamonn Murtagh from Ireland gave us a presentation on the evaluation instruments and procedures in a thematic evaluation, namely literacy and numeracy. This project took place during 2004 in a sample of 12 primary schools in disadvantaged urban areas. After an introduction, they elaborated the development of inspection instruments, implementing effective inspection procedures and data analysis and reporting. They ended with quality assurance in inspection.

Flanders

René Vanotterdijk talked about the risk-analysis of schools. He started off with a story on how an experienced inspector thinks and operates during a school audit (emphasis on the tacit knowledge of an inspector). This leads to a theoretical concept that can lead to general conclusions and usage. Using a certain method, it becomes an operational model. Dealing with the present state of the development, the concept ends in a win-win-win situation for all participants.

Topic 4: Everything is changing ... adapting or ...

Czech Republic

In the Czech Republic the legal changes (new educational act) have great consequences for the Czech School Inspectorate (CSI) and in particular for the inspectors' education. In her presentation Hana Kozakova illustrated the new methods used for training their inspectors (workshops, in-service-training, initial training, e-learning, self-development).

Slovak Republic

Dana Weichselgärtner gave us an elaborated presentation on the inspection process, the methods, forms, tools and the inspection report in the Slovak Republic.

Austria

Wolfgang Gröpel ended this session talking about the changing role of the

*Peter Michielsens,
senior chief inspector
of the
Flemish inspectorate*



chief inspectorate in Austria. After explaining the differences between the inspectors of different provinces, he summed up the crucial functions of the Austrian school inspectors and what their new job aspects and special duties are. Concluding that school inspection is becoming educational management.

Closure

Jef Verhoeven (educational sociologist at the Catholic University of Louvain) followed the workshop as a critical friend and was asked to formulate some findings and possible recommendations at the end of the three days. Positive was the sincere concern of everybody to do a good job and to think about how we're doing it in a serious, self-reflective organisation. Less positive was the lack of time to thoroughly reflect and discuss. Case studies and examples of good practice can help to concretize the mass of information and schemes offered.

Heinz Kipp – as a member of the executive committee- gave some perspectives on the follow-up of this workshop in November 2006.

The closing speech came from Frank Vandenbroucke, the minister of Education of the Flemish Community. He explained his views on a high-quality inspectorate: valid and reliable sources of information, an autonomous and transparent place for the inspectorate and school autonomy.

The Flemish inspectorates will thank all the participants for their contributions. And soon a detailed report of the workshop will be sent to all the participants and members of SICI..

Yvan Verbauwheide

With thanks to Els and Bieke for the organisation, the preparation, the support and the reports. Thanks to them the workshop passed away without any problem.

Contact:

E-mail: yvan.verbauwheide@skynet.be

CHANGE IN THE SICI-

Since January 2002 the SICI Secretariat has been held by the Education and Training Inspectorate (ETI) in Northern Ireland. The running of the day to day work was managed by the Secretary General James Cuthbert and the Secre-

tariat with Jenny McIlwain, Margaret Ming and Jacqui Patterson.

On behalf of all SICI members the Executive Committee wants to thank the hosting organisation and it's employees

[left to right:]

*Margaret Ming,
James Cuthbert,
Jenny McIlwain,
Jacqui Patterson*

[right page:]

James Cuthbert



SICI CALENDAR 2006

Date		Activity	Location
February	23-24	EC Meeting	The Hague
March	23 27-28	Cidree meeting Yearbook 6 Workshop: „An Eye On Innovation“	Soest The Hague
April		Start Bluebook Project Take Over Website SICI	
May	17-19 29-30 30-31	Hosting History Network Website (Project) Other Workshop of interest for SICI: „Self-Evaluation“ Workshop: „Quality of Leadership and Learning: Empowering Learners and Teachers“ EC Meeting	Praha Graz
September		Start Peer-2-Peer Project ?	
October	4-7	EC and GA Meeting	Stockholm
November	1-3 ?	Workshop: „How good is our Inspectorate?“ Workshop: „The Use of Data“ Workshop: „Conference of Joint Inspection“	Frankfurt London Netherlands

SECRETARIAT

for the excellent work done through the last three years.

Thank you,
Margaret, James, Jenny and Jaqui



FURTHER INFORMATION

- **Standards of a good school** published by the German work group „Blick über den Zaun“ (among others: Helene Lang Schule Wiesbaden, Schule Schloss Salem, Laborschule Bielefeld)

www.blickueberdenzaun.de

A Look Across the Fence: With this paper, the Alliance of Educational Reform Movement Schools would like to offer a contribution to the public discussion about standards and school quality.



An organisation of 22 members drawn from across Europe, working together to improve their understanding of education and inspection.

The current members are:

Austria, Bavaria, Belgium-Flanders, Belgium-Walloon, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eire, England, France, Hessen, Luxembourg, Macedonia (Associate member), Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Northrhine-Westphalia, Portugal, Saxony, Scotland, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Wales (Associate member).

New address: SICI Secretariat

Ministry of the
Flemish Community
Department of
Education and Training
Hendrik Consciencebouw –
7C17
Koning Albert II-laan 15
B-1210 Brussels
Belgium

E-mail:
sici@vlaanderen.be



802176 (R01083) 9-93

Also in the web:
www.sici.org.uk