

# SICI workshop 'Internal Quality Assurance on Judgements'

**SICI**

The Standing International  
Conference of **Inspectorates**

Better Inspection, Better Learning



Inspectie van het Onderwijs  
Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en  
Wetenschap

Utrecht, 5-6 March 2020

# Statement 1:

“If an inspector thinks a ‘sufficient’ judgement will have more effect on the school’s willingness to improve rather than an ‘insufficient’ judgement, an inspector should be able to break the rules!”

## Statement 2:

“Inspectors should rely more on their expert view rather than be obliged to use limited, prescribed assessment criteria, even if this may lead to differences in judgements. We should accept the fact that we have different inspectors and thus different judgements.”

## Statement 3:

“Straight on judgements/gradings such as ‘good’, ‘sufficient’, ‘insufficient’ have an opposing force on the professional dialogue based on an equal relationship. The inspectorate should not publish any judgements at all. It is better to only report findings, without hard gradings!”

## Statement 4:

“There is no such thing as a *‘professional and encouraging dialogue’* as long as we focus on evidence gathering and schools know they will be judged at the end of the day.”



## Statement 5:

“Publishing negative judgements can have a negative effect on the competitive position of the school. Parents or pupils may choose other schools and even teachers might choose better schools to work for. Publishing negative judgements could therefore worsen the quality of schools, rather than causing improvement.”