

# Application Form for Peers

The following form is aimed at allowing interested peers in applying for participating in Peer Reviews at both National and Transnational level. By collecting all the information provided the Coordinating Body is able to set up a repository of potential peers interested in carrying out Peer Reviews. Peers are, therefore, asked to provide updated information in order to:

- Be selected for carrying out peer reviews, according to their level of competences and further specificities;
- Be included in the digital repository storage in [www.peerreviewplatform.eu](http://www.peerreviewplatform.eu) as source of knowledge of professionals' experts in Peer Review and Quality Assurance in VET.

## Personal details

**Title** First Name Last Name

**Sex:** Female Male Non Binary Other Do not want to say

**Date of birth:**

**Nationality:**

**Country:**

**Email**

**Phone:**

## Institutional and professional background

**Job title/position:**

**Name of the organisation at/for which you work:**

**Department:**

**Type of organisation (tick the most appropriate):**

- VET provider
- School (general education)
- Adult education/learning provider
- Validation of non-formal and informal learning provider
- Guidance services provider
- Higher education/research institution (university, polytechnic, research institute)
- Educational authority (national/regional authority, inspectorate, accreditation body etc.)
- EQAVET NRP
- Professional/sectoral association
- Enterprise
- Non-profit organisation
- Consulting firm
- Freelancer consultant

Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

**Certified training in quality assurance/management: (yes/no)**

Training course	When	Certification (yes/no) and what kind	Notes
ISO internal auditor			
ISO external auditor			
European Peer Review Methodology			
Specific Assessment/Evaluation School procedures			
Other			

**Teaching/training experience:**  Yes  No

**Years of teaching/training experience:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Currently working as a teacher/trainer:**  Yes  No

**Main disciplines/subjects** (indicate which in the box below)

1
2
3
4
other

---

**Experience with quality assurance and quality development procedures**

**Have you personally conducted any review assessment work so far, including the European Peer Review Methodology?**

Yes       No

(Review work can be e.g. review of institutions, evaluation of training programmes, evaluation of training resources/materials, assessment of teachers/trainers, audits etc.)

What	Where	Role/tasks	When
1			
2			
3			
4			

**Do you have any expertise in**

(please indicate level of expertise: 1 (excellent), 2 (good), 3 (fair), 4 (basic), do not tick the box if you do not have any expertise)

conducting interviews

observing classes/training sessions

analysing quantitative data

analysing qualitative data

giving oral feedback

writing review reports

review work in a foreign language (indicate language:      )

moderating/coordinating groups

conflict management

time management

research and scientific evaluations in the area of education/VET

(self)-assessment of competencies

**Green transition/Digital transition/Diversity Equality & Inclusion expertise** (e.g. [Greencomp](#) and/or [DigComp](#) Competence Frameworks adoption; assessment and/or training on those topics; Diversity Management at organisational level; Gender Equality practices, etc.)

**Do you have any expertise in the above mentioned topics?**  Yes  No

If yes, please describe your expertise (mandatory):

--

**Transnational experience**  Yes  No

Country, area	Description of experience
1	
2	
3	
4	

### Language Skills

Indicate your level of proficiency according to the [Common European Reference Framework for Languages](#)

Language	Listening	Reading	Speaking	Writing	Are you able to conduct a Peer Review in this language? (yes/no)
Mother tongue:					

### Other relevant professional expertise

**What other professional expertise do you have that is relevant for the Peer Review work (e.g. Intercultural dialogue, validation of formal and non-formal learning, guidance, mediation, teachers/trainers' training, use of digital means for pedagogical purposes, development of digital pedagogical resources, development of sustainable pedagogical resources, etc)?**

Indicate the areas in which you have acquired expertise and rank the level of this expertise on a scale from 1 (excellent) to 4 (basic). Do not tick the box if you do not have any expertise.

If yes, please describe your expertise (optional):

--

---

### Potential conflict of interests

Please, indicate whether there is an institution you prefer not being a member of a Peer Review team, due to potential conflict of interests (e.g. personal relationship with institution management and/or other staff directly involved in the Peer Review, having a family member attending courses on that institution, etc.). If that's the case, please insert the name of institution, name of the contact person within this institution, reasons for not being a peer in this institution).

I would like to be a Peer Coordinator  Yes  No

I would like to be a Transnational Peer  Yes  No

If you would like to be a Transnational Peer, please indicate the country/countries:

Date:

Place:

I confirm the veracity of the data provided.

I accept that my data is stored in [www.peerreviewplatform.eu](http://www.peerreviewplatform.eu) and accessible by platform users.

I acknowledge that the processing of my data follows the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

## Gender Equality data - Checklist for policy indicators

Gender disaggregated data about both the composition of VET+ institutions staff (from the top management to the operational staff) and their strategic areas of work are a relevant source of information on how VET+ providers are effectively able to adopt gender sensitive data analysis as guiding principle of their provision. This implies the possibility to re-design their process of training needs analysis, training course design and implementation etc. according to the results of gender-disaggregated analysis.

Regarding the VET+ institution staff figures, gender-disaggregated data on teachers/trainers, management board and operational staff are found in the self-assessment report.

As strategic areas the Peer Review methodology refers to those related to the access and the completion of the training course as well as the employment achievement after having completed the training.

Therefore, also these data should be provided in the self-assessment report with reference to the following aspects:

- enrolment figures;
- drop-out rates;
- graduate/achievement rates;
- post-education employment rates.

In addition to those data, within the present checklist further facts and figures are suggested to be provided so as to give account on how the VET+ Institutions are prepared and able to adopt gender mainstreaming as guiding principle within their overall managerial approach.

Therefore, below some possible areas of work on gender equality are suggested, but further ones can be designed and developed by each institution according to its strategic plans.

### Curriculum and pedagogical materials

Does the curriculum include a range of teaching methods which best promote the active participation of both males and females in learning?

yes       no

How do the individual teachers/trainers use them?

---

---

---

Is there any advice provided on subject choices to ensure that neither gender stereotypes limit their training and employment opportunities by their study patterns?

yes       no

Are the teaching materials, exercises, project works and examinations gender-sensitive as regards to language, images and examples used?

yes       no

Gender Mainstreaming - Checklist for policy indicators

---

Does the institution have a formalised and implemented strategic plan that can foster and support the development of an inclusive work environment and includes corporate values consistent with an inclusive culture?

yes       no

Does the institution implement internal communication and awareness-raising activities that promote the use of behaviour and language to ensure an inclusive and gender diverse work environment?

yes       no

In the governance definition does the institution foresee a presidium (committee, unit or function, organisational role, etc.) aimed at managing and monitoring issues related to inclusion, gender equality and integration?

yes       no

Does the institution define human resources management and development processes for inclusion, gender equality and integration, such as selection, terms and conditions, neutral on-boarding, performance appraisals?

yes       no

Does the institution provide dedicated services for post-maternity/paternity return (e.g.: back-to-work procedures/activities, coaching, temporary and reversible on-demand part-time, smart working, ad hoc welfare plan, company crèche)?

yes       no

If you answered two or more times no, can you briefly elaborate why?

## Peer Review Initial Information Sheet

### 1) Contact information

Name of the Provider

Address

Telephone; e-mail

Contact persons	Name	Contact (e-mail)
Provider Representative		
Peer Review Facilitator		
Other persons responsible		

### 2) Starting point (e.g. prior evaluations, national quality requirements applicable etc.)

---

### 3) Aims and purpose of the Peer Review

---

- 4) External organisation**
- Single Peer Review (Peers come from different providers)
- Reciprocal Peer Review (Peer Review with one partner institution)
- Peer Review in a Network (more than 2 providers have a common Peer Team)
- 

### 5) Internal organisation (Describe who will be responsible for which tasks.)

---

### 6) Overview of the procedure and time schedule

Activity	Time frame and due dates
Self-evaluation	
Self-Report (due 1 month before Visit at the latest)	
Preparation of Peer Visit	
Peer Visit	Give 2 possible dates (reserve a whole week) Date 1: Date 2:
Peer Review Report	
Action Plan and Improvements	

**7) Scope of the Peer Review**

- whole institution
- parts of the institution (indicate which, e.g. certain departments, specific VET+ provision/other related services provision, etc.):  
Please specify:
- 

**8) Quality Areas to be reviewed**

8.1) Special evaluation questions for the Peers (if applicable)

8.2) Requests concerning the Peers – required expertise, from which institution(s) etc.

---

**9) Further comments and requests to the Co-ordinating Body** (if applicable)

---

**10) List of possible Peers with name and contact information** (only if the reviewed provider wants to involve specific peers)

## Interview Guidelines

Once you have the Self Report and the Agenda for the Visit, its time to prepare the moment of the visit.

One of the most common methods for collecting data during the visit is interviews with relevant stakeholders.

Below you can find some **guidelines and recommendations for preparing the interview protocol** but also to **analyse the results**:

- Identify the interview: interviewer or group of interviewers, put date and time, etc.
- Decide the organisation of the interview: who conduct the interview and who take notes (remember, its important that each peer of the peer tandem is focused on one of the tasks, for reasons of efficiency).
- Write down every interview question and the quality area/criterion/indicator it is attributed to.
- Note that interview questions are the questions which are actually asked during the interviews, do not use the phrases specifying the indicators; in most cases they will be too general to obtain any useful answers.
- Interview questions must also be aligned to the specific interview groups; the same question might be phrased quite differently when addressed to 1) learners or 2) teaching/training staff.
- For environmental reasons avoid printing out the interview protocol and use laptops computers/notebooks for that purpose.
- For the peer assigned to take notes: do not try to write down all the statements for each interview question, you will probably fail and get stressed; note only key words and statements.
- After the interview, in peer tandem discuss and distil the information collected during the interview. Try to address the following questions:
  - 1) What are the key issues of the interview in relation to the QA/criteria/indicators?
  - 2) What can be considered strengths, what are areas of improvement?
  - 3) How credible and reliable is the information gathered in this interview?
  - 4) What additional meaningful and distinctive information (which does not fit into the criteria/indicators) can be outlined?
  - 5) Is there any further questions, assumptions or inconsistencies? Any of those is worthwhile to communicate to the reviewed provider, in case they wish for it?



## Meta-evaluation of the Peers

Peer Review of	Name of Provider
Place	
Date Peer Visit	

### 1. Peer Team

List the participants of the Peer Team

	Name and surname
Peer Coordinator	
Peer	
Peer	
Peer	

### 2. Peer Visit: brief comments and feedback on the experience, by each Peer if relevant

max. 0.5 page

--

### 3. Reflective Statement

Please give a reflective statement on your experience of the Peer Review process as a whole and of the Peer Visit, if relevant.

The reflective statement could deal with the following issues:

What went well? What did not? What lessons were learned? What unusual and/or unintended outcomes and experiences occurred? How can the Peer Review procedure be improved?

Diverging opinions of different Peers should be stated separately.

max. 1 page

--

## Peer Visit Agenda: Guidelines & Model

**The Peer Visit is key for the success of the Peer Review process.** It is a fundamental moment for peers to collect more data, check the accuracy of previous information obtained (Self Report) and provide initial feedback to the VET+ provider on their findings.

**The Agenda is, therefore, functional to a successful Peer Visit** and needs to be prepared with careful consideration.

The duration of the Peer Visit depends on the size of the VET+ provider, the number and scope of the Quality Areas and the time available.

The duration of the Peer Visit and the size of the peer team (how many peer tandem) directly influence the **number of “time slots” to consider when preparing the Agenda.**

### **The following “time slots” are mandatory:**

- Tour of the premises (if in-site/f2f peer visit);
- Initial meeting between peer team, VET+ provider representatives / top management and facilitator;
- Final meeting between peer team, VET+ provider representatives / top management and facilitator;
- Interviews (or other methods for collecting data) with learners;
- Interviews (or other methods for collecting data) with VET+ staff;
- “Time slots” in-between interviews (or other methods for collecting data) for peer tandems analysis and for peer team internal analysis;
- “Time slots” at the end of each day (if applicable) and, for sure, before the final meeting with the VET+ provider for peer team internal analysis;
- “Time slot” before the final meeting with the VET+ provider for peers to prepare it;
- Breaks (coffee, lunch).

### **The following “time slots” are highly recommended:**

- Interviews (or other methods for collecting data) with external relevant stakeholders such as companies (practical training companies or potential employers), in-company tutors/trainers, former learners, competent bodies, parents, etc;
- “Time slots” for peer team meta-evaluation (critical reflection on the process).

### **For each “time slot” you need to identify:**

- a) Target group (VET+ representatives, learners, VET+ staff, companies, former learners, etc);
- b) Venue, room;
- c) Peer tandem identification (1, 2, 3, etc);

Peer Visit Agenda: Guidelines & Example

- d) Method for collecting data (interview, observation, visit to premisses, visit to practical training areas/labs, visit to other facilities (cantina, outside areas, etc), video or photo evaluation, job-shadowing, etc).

Consider “time slots” between 45 minutes up to 1h15 minutes, depending on the type of method and numbers of target group participants.

**Model for a two-peer tandem and two days visit**

Day 1 – insert date		
Time		
09h00 – 09h45	a) VET+ Provider Representatives; Facilitator b) c) Peer tandem 1 and 2 d) Initial meeting	
09h45 – 10h30	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 d)	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2 d)
10h30 – 11h45	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 d)	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2 d)
Peer tandems analysis 11h45 - 12h30	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 d)	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2 d)
Lunch break 12h30 – 13h15		
Peer team internal analysis 13h15 – 14h30	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 and 2 d)	
14H30 – 15H15	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 d)	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2 d)
Peer tandems analysis 15h15 – 16h00	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2



Peer Visit Agenda: Guidelines & Example

	d)	d)
Peer team internal analysis 16h00 – 17h30	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 and 2 d)	
End of 1 <sup>st</sup> day		

Day 2 – insert date		
Time		
09h00 – 09h45	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 and 2 d)	
09h45 – 10h30	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 d)	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2 d)
10h30 – 11h45	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 d)	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2 d)
Peer tandems analysis 11h45 - 12h30	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 d)	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2 d)
Lunch break 12h30 – 13h15		
Peer team internal analysis 13h15 – 14h30	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 and 2 d)	
14h30 – 15h15	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 d)	a) b) c) Peer tandem 2 d)
Peer team internal analysis 15h15 – 16h45	a) b) c) Peer tandem 1 and 2	



### Peer Visit Agenda: Guidelines & Example

	d)
Final meeting 16h45 – 17h45	a) VET+ Provider Representatives; Facilitator b) c) Peer tandem 1 and 2 d) Feedback session
End of 2 <sup>nd</sup> day	

## Improvement Plan

Name of the Provider

Date(s) of the Peer Review Visit

Date of the Peer Review Report

Date of the Improvement Plan Definition

### Working Group

List of the members of the Working Group that drafted the Improvement Plan

Name	Role

### Improvement actions and related activities

On the basis of the self-assessment carried out and the conclusions of the Peer Review conducted, describe the improvement action(s) that you intend to implement and the related activities.

It is suggested to identify the actions exclusively within the Quality Areas that have been reviewed.

➔ Tip If more than one improvement action is identified, please create a table per action using the template below.

Title of the action	
<b>Activity 1</b>	
Implementation timeframe	
Responsible for the activity	
Beneficiaries of the activity	E.g., learners, teachers/trainers, other staff, stakeholders, etc
Internal/external target groups involved in implementation	E.g., learners, teachers/trainers, other staff, stakeholders, etc
Expected results (measurable ones)	



Improvement Plan

<b>Activity 2</b>	
<b>Implementation timeframe</b>	
<b>Responsible for the activity</b>	
<b>Beneficiaries of the activity</b>	E.g., learners, teachers/trainers, other staff, stakeholders, etc
<b>Internal/external target groups involved in implementation</b>	E.g., learners, teachers/trainers, other staff, stakeholders, etc
<b>Expected results (measurable ones)</b>	
<b>Activity 3</b>	
<b>Implementation timeframe</b>	
<b>Responsible for the activity</b>	
<b>Beneficiaries of the activity</b>	E.g., learners, teachers/trainers, other staff, stakeholders, etc
<b>Internal/external target groups involved in implementation</b>	E.g., learners, teachers/trainers, other staff, stakeholders, etc
<b>Expected results (measurable ones)</b>	

## **Pact on Peers' Collaboration**

### **1. Subjects of the Pact**

The present pact is aimed at defining the mutual duties and obligations among the peers and between the peers and the institution that asked for the Peer Review, so as to make the whole Peer Review process effective and smooth.

The following Peers

- 1) Name and surname<sup>1</sup>
- 2) Name and surname
- 3) Name and Surname
- 4) Name and surname

And the Institution that asked for the Peer Review  
(name) \_\_\_\_\_ and for this purpose  
represented by its Legal Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Have agreed upon the following:

#### **A) Aspects of the Peer Review implementation process**

- 1) Quality areas to be reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) Date of the Peer Visit: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) Peer Review Report due by: \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Adoption of the Digital Platform for the Peer Review implementation process

#### **B) Duties and obligations**

During the preparation phase:

- to read and analyse the Initial Information Sheet and the Self-Report (and ask for additional information, if necessary),
- to attend a pre-review Peer Team meeting,
- to prepare interview questions or other instruments of data collection.

During the Peer Visit:

- to perform the Peer Visit,
- to carry out an evaluation of the above quality areas during the Visit, by the means of interviews, data collection, observation and other relevant assessment practices,
- to take notes during the evaluation,
- to give oral feedback at the end of the Visit.

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> The Pact is ad personam, thus any substitution of the Peers with another person requires prior written agreement among the signees.

After the Peer Visit:

- to write a Peer Review Report (Peer Coordinator) or to contribute to the Peer Review Report (other Peer Team elements).

### **C) Peer Confidentiality**

Peers treat the entrusted data and feedback confidentially. Each Peer must adhere to strict rules of confidentiality. No information on the Peer Review and its results may be passed on to third parties without the prior explicit consent of the reviewed institution.

GDPR regulations must be applied and strictly followed, especially when viewing and analysing data and information about learners, teachers/trainers, managers and other relevant stakeholders as well as financial and administrative information of the Institution that asked for the Peer Review.

### **D) General Rules for the Peer Visit to be followed by the Peers**

Peers should keep in mind that the work they are asked to carry out during the visit is on the evaluation assignments given by the Institution that asked for the Peer Review. Therefore, Peers commit themselves to:

- keep to the agreed time schedule,
- work as a team supporting each other in their tasks and feedback,
- be prepared for unforeseen occurrences,
- seek to listen and to report the statements objectively.

### **E) Reimbursement [if applicable]**

Each peer receives the amount of \_\_\_\_\_ for reimbursement of travel and accommodation expenses (put 0 € if not applicable).

The reimbursement is paid by \_\_\_\_\_ (identify the Institution that will be paying, e.g. the Coordinating body/ the reviewed institution/other) no later than 30 days after the submission of the Peer Review Report.

In case of full digital Peer Review no reimbursement is foreseen.

Done at

The Peers

The Reviewed Institution

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



PEER REVIEW FOR  
GREEN AND DIGITAL  
VET

# ***Peer Review Report***

***Name of the Provider:***

***Year:***

***Names of Peers:***

***Author(s):***

***Version: (N<sup>o</sup>./final):***

## Contents

Please insert a list of contents.

1.	Data Sheet .....	3
2.	Description of the Provider .....	5
2.1	Summary: Description of the provision .....	5
2.2	Summary: Mission Statement .....	5
2.3	Summary: Quality Assurance and Development: policies and measures .....	5
3.	Peer Review procedure .....	6
3.1	Purpose/targets of the Peer Review .....	6
3.2	Peer Team .....	6
3.3	Methods for collecting data and sources .....	6
4.	Assessment of Quality Areas .....	7
4.1	Quality Area 1: indicate which .....	8
4.2	Quality Area 2: (indicate which) .....	8
4.3	Quality Area 3 etc .....	9
4.4	Overall Assessment .....	9
5.	Annex .....	9
5.1	Agenda of Peer Visit .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5.2	Interview Guidelines for Peer Visit / Observation Grids .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5.3	.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5.4	.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5.5	.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5.6	etc.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## 1. Data Sheet

### 1) Contact information

Name of the provider

Address

Telephone, e-mail

Contact persons	Name	Contact (e-mail)
Provider Representative		
Peer Review Facilitator		
Other persons responsible		

2) **Starting point** (e.g. prior evaluations, national quality requirements applicable etc.)

---

### 3) Aims and purpose of the Peer Review

---

- 4) **External organisation**
- Single Peer Review
- Reciprocal Peer Review
- Peer Review in a Network
- 

5) **Internal organisation** (Describe who was responsible for which tasks.)

---

### 6) Overview of the procedure and time schedule

Activity	Timeframe and (due) dates
Self-evaluation	
Self-Report	
Preparation of Peer Visit	
Peer Visit	
Peer Review Report	
Action Plan and Improvements	

---

---

**7) Scope of the  
Peer Review**

whole institution

parts of the institution (indicate which, e.g. certain departments, specific VET+ provision/other related services provision, etc.):

Please specify:

---

**8) Quality Areas**

8.1) List of special evaluation questions for the Peers (if applicable)

---

## 2. Description of the Provider

This section includes a summary of the corresponding section in the Self-Report which should ideally not exceed one page.

### 2.1 Summary: Description of the provision

Max. 0.5 pages

### 2.2 Summary: Mission Statement

Max. 0.5 pages

### 2.3 Summary: Quality Assurance and Development: policies and measures

Max. 0.5 pages

### 3. Peer Review procedure

#### 3.1 Purpose/objectives of the Peer Review

max. 10-15 lines

#### 3.2 Peer Team

List the elements of the Peer Team.

	Name	Institution	E-mail
Peer Coordinator			
Peer			
Peer			
Peer			
Special Functions			
Evaluation Expert			
Transnational Peer			

#### 3.3 Methods for collecting data and sources

max. 0.5 – 1 pages

## 4. Assessment of Quality Areas

Please describe the results of the Peer Review in continuous text (only illustrative use of tables).

Each quality area and criterion must be assessed separately (max. 1 page per criterion).

For each quality area, the description should address the criteria (and the individual indicators, if possible) specifying the quality areas. This is the main part of the Report.

The evaluation questions formulated by the VET+ provider should be dealt with in the corresponding quality area.

Recommendations for the assessment procedure:

1. Keep to the main findings, be short and concise.
2. All relevant information gleaned during the Visit should be sorted according to its relevance 1) to the quality area and 2) the criteria. Findings should then be analysed and categorised as examples of strengths or areas for improvement. It may not always be easy to attribute findings to one of the two categories, and individual Peers may also have different views. Differences should be recognised and discussed thoroughly.
3. For each criterion, the strengths and areas of improvement should be summarised.
4. Then the whole Quality Area should be assessed on the basis of the assessment of the strengths and areas of improvement on the level of the criteria. Sources of evidence should also be recorded briefly.
5. Findings that do not fit into any of the quality areas chosen for the review can be mentioned pending agreement of the reviewed provider.
6. Recommendations can also be provided, if asked for by the reviewed institution.
7. After each Quality Area has been assessed in this way, it should be relatively easy to provide an overall assessment of the quality areas reviewed, to give oral feedback to the reviewed provider, and to fill in the Peer Review Report.

Peer Review Report

---

#### 4.1 Quality Area 1: indicate which

Criterion 1: (indicate which)

Strengths and areas of improvement by criterion  
(if possible with reference to the indicators, and indicating the sources)

Criterion 2: (indicate which)

Strengths and areas of improvement by criterion  
(if possible with reference to the indicators, and indicating the sources)

Criterion 3 etc

Overall assessment of the quality area 1

(Overall assessment of the QA on the basis of the key evidence found on the levels of criteria and indicators. sources of evidence should also be recorded briefly)

#### 4.2 Quality Area 2: (indicate which)

Criterion 1: (indicate which)

Strengths and areas of improvement by criterion  
(if possible with reference to the indicators, and indicating the sources)

Criterion 2: (indicate which)

Strengths and Areas of Improvement by criterion  
(if possible with reference to the indicators, and indicating the sources)

Criterion 3 etc.

## Peer Review Report

### Overall assessment of the quality area 2

(Overall assessment of the QA on the basis of the key evidence found on the levels of criteria and indicators. Sources of evidence should also be recorded briefly)

### 4.3 Quality Area 3 etc

➔ **Reminder:** Do you really want to review more than two Quality Areas? ;)

### 4.4 Overall Assessment<sup>1</sup>

Overall Assessment of the quality areas reviewed

Max. 1.5 -2 pages

Strengths

Areas of improvement

Overall assessment

## Annex

Annex relevant documents, i.e. the Agenda of the Peer Visit, Agenda of Peer Visit

➔ **Tip:** Delete all explanations and tips after the completion of the Report – this will make the report leaner and easier to read.

---

<sup>1</sup> If only one quality area is to be reviewed, no need to complete this point.

# ***Self-Report for the European Peer Review***

***Name of the Provider:***

***Author(s):***

***Date:***

***Version: (N<sup>o</sup>./final)***

## Contents

Please insert a list of contents.

1.	Data Sheet .....	3
2.	Description of the Provider .....	5
2.1	Description of the provision .....	5
2.2	Mission statement .....	5
2.3	Statistical information on the provision .....	6
2.4	Information on context and on learners .....	7
2.5	Organisational Chart .....	7
2.6	Chart of Education & Training System (for transnational Peer Reviews) .....	7
3.	Quality assurance/ quality management .....	8
3.1	Quality assurance and development policy .....	8
3.2	Quality assurance activities and improvement measures (including QM system and an overview of data generated and used) .....	8
3.3	Overall assessment of quality of VET+ and other related services provision .....	8
4.	Self-evaluation/self-assessment (optional) .....	9
4.1	Description of self-evaluation .....	9
4.2	Main results of the self-evaluation .....	9
4.3	Optional: Reflective statement .....	9
5.	Assessment of Quality Areas .....	10
5.1	Quality Area 1 (indicate which) .....	10
5.2	Quality Area 2 (indicate which) .....	10
5.3	Quality Area 3 etc. ....	11
6.	Annexes .....	12
6.1	.....	12
6.2	.....	12
6.3	.....	12
6.4	.....	12
6.5	.....	12
6.6	etc.....	12

## 1. Data Sheet

### 1) Contact information

Name of the Provider

Address

Telephone, e-mail

Contact persons	Name	Contact (e-mail)
Provider Representative		
Peer Review Facilitator		
Other persons responsible		

**2) Starting point** (e.g. prior evaluations, national quality requirements applicable etc.)

---

### 3) Aims and purpose of the Peer Review

---

#### 4) External organisation

- Single Peer Review (Peers come from different providers)
- Reciprocal Peer Review (Peer Review with one partner institution)
- Peer Review in a Network (more than 2 providers have a common Peer Team)
- 

**5) Internal organisation for the conduct of the Peer Review** (Describe who is responsible for which tasks)

---

### 6) Overview of the procedure and time schedule:

Activity	Timeframe and (due) dates
----------	---------------------------

---

Self-Evaluation

Self-Report  
(due 1 month before Visit at the latest)

Preparation of Peer Visit

Peer Visit

Peer Review Report

Action Plan and Improvements

**7) Scope of the  
Peer Review**

- whole institution
- parts of the institution (indicate which, e.g. certain departments, specific VET+ provision/other related services provision, etc.):  
Please specify:

**8) Quality Areas to be reviewed**

8.1) List of special evaluation questions for the Peers (if applicable)

**9) List of Peers**

	Name	Institution	E-mail
Peer Coordinator			
Peer			
Peer			
Peer			
Special Functions			
Evaluation Expert			
Transnational Peer (if applicable)			

## 2. Description of the Provider

This section should give the Peers an overview of the kind of VET+ provision/other services offered. All important features should be mentioned.

The section should include:

- 2.1 A brief general description of the VET+ provision offered and sufficient information on those parts of your institution that are to be reviewed (supporting documents like programmes, curricula, leaflets with provision presentation, etc. can be annexed)
- 2.1 Information on the cooperation with external stakeholders and the local/regional community (e.g. with enterprises for practical training, in curriculum or standards development, in outreach activities, etc) (if applicable)
- 2.1 A short description of the environment (local/regional social and economic situation, local/regional competition, local/regional challenges)
- 2.2. Information on the institution mission, vision, values, strategy, quality assurance and development efforts undertaken so far
- 2.3 Statistical information on your VET+ provision/other related services provision
- 2.4. Information on your socio-economic and cultural context and on your learner's population

For a transnational Peer Review, a chart of the Education and Training system should be attached, marking and explaining the position of your provision within the system.

➔ **Tip:** Make sure that the Peers have sufficient information on those parts of your institution, specific VET+ provision/other services provision that are to be reviewed.

### 2.1 Description of the provision

Max. 1 – 2 pages

### 2.2 Mission statement

Max. 0.5 – 1 pages



2.3 Statistical information on the provision

Overall data	F	M	Non-binary	Total
<b>Number of teaching/training staff</b>				
<b>Number of management position persons</b>				
<b>Number of other staff</b>				
<b>Learners/participants enrolment overall</b>				
Current year				
Previous year				
Year before previous year				
<b>General success/graduation rate*</b> (in %; reporting year: )				

\* General success/graduation rate: percentage of successful completion/graduation measured against enrolment at the beginning of a training programme or process (for instance if it is a validation of non-formal and informal learning process, a vocational guidance process, etc)

Fill out the following table for each of the specific studies/programmes/branches/departments/types of VET+ provision or related services which will be reviewed. Add further tables, if necessary.

Data by type of VET+ provision/other related services provision	F	M	Non-binary	Total
<b>Number of teaching/training staff</b>				
<b>Number of other staff</b>				
<b>Learners/participants enrolment overall</b>				
Current year				
Previous year				
Year before previous year				
<b>General success/graduation rate*</b> (in %; reporting year: )				

Data by type of VET+ provision/other related services provision	F	M	Non-binary	Total
<b>Number of teaching/training staff</b>				
<b>Number of other staff</b>				
<b>Learners/participants enrolment overall</b>				
Current year				
Previous year				
Year before previous year				
<b>General success/graduation rate*</b> (in %; reporting year: )				

Data by type of VET+ provision/other related services provision	F	M	Non-binary	Total
Number of teaching/training staff				
Number of other staff				
<b>Learners/participants enrolment overall</b>				
Current year				
Previous year				
Year before previous year				
<b>General success/graduation rate*</b> (in %; reporting year: )				

## 2.4 Information on context and on learners

Please provide qualitative information and quantitative data (if possible/available) on your context and on the context of your learners:

- Socio-economic characteristics of the region and of the labour market
- Socio-economic characteristics of the learners: level of qualification, ages, socio/cultural capital, socio-economic background, including information on learners with migrant background and learners with special needs (physical, psychological, learning disabilities etc.) if applicable.
- Information on parents (if applicable to the kind of provision to be reviewed): educational attainment; income; social/cultural capital of parents.

Max. 1 – 2 pages

## 2.5 Organisational Chart

## 2.6 Chart of Education & Training System (for transnational Peer Reviews)

### 3. Quality assurance/ quality management

In this section, please give an overview of the quality assurance policies in your institution, the structures and responsibilities and the kind of activities and improvement measures that are currently undertaken. If you have a quality management system in place, please explain shortly how it works.

Also give an overview of the most important kind of data you collect (including how it is collected: e.g. "satisfaction of learners with provision, biannual online survey").

Finally, provide a short overall assessment of the quality of your VET+ provision.

➔ **Tip:** Make sure that the data you will use in your assessment of the Quality Areas is described.

3.1 Quality assurance and development policy

3.2 Quality assurance activities and improvement measures (including QM system and an overview of data generated and used)

3.3 Overall assessment of quality of VET+ and other related services provision

Max. 2 -3 pages

## 4. Self-evaluation/self-assessment (optional)

If you have conducted a special self-evaluation/self-assessment to prepare the Peer Review, please describe the process and its outcomes briefly.

The description of the self-evaluation/self-assessment process as a whole should provide a summary of the aims of the self-evaluation, the people responsible and involved, the procedure and methods used and the timeframe.

Then main results of the self-evaluation should also be reported.

**Optional:** make a reflective statement on the following issues: What went well? What did not? What lessons were learned? What were surprising and/or unintended outcomes and experiences? How can the self-evaluation procedure be improved?

➔ **Tip:** Do not repeat the general quality policies and measures reported in chapter 3 but refer to them when necessary (e.g. when data from surveys, which are regularly conducted within the QM system, is used).

### 4.1 Description of self-evaluation

### 4.2 Main results of the self-evaluation

Max. 2 pages

### 4.3 Optional: Reflective statement

Max. 1 page

## 5. Assessment of Quality Areas

This is the "heart" of the Self-Report. In this section all the information the Peers need to prepare and conduct the Peer Review should be provided.

- Assess each quality area separately (max. 1 – 1,5 pages per quality area. Please focus on the assessment of the quality area and not on the quality of the VET+ provision or other related services in general. This information has already given in 3.3.).
- At least 2 criteria should be reviewed for each quality area.
- For each criterion, the strengths and areas of improvement should be summarised. Substantiate your assessments and briefly indicate the sources of evidence you base your assessment on.
- Improvement measures (planned and implemented) should be pointed out.
- Evaluation questions for the Peers should be formulated (recommended).

### 5.1 Quality Area 1 (indicate which)

Strengths and areas of improvement by criterion (including the sources of evidence)

<p><i>Criterion 1:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Criterion 2 etc:</i></p> <p>...</p>
---

Improvement measures (planned and implemented)

--

Evaluation questions for the Peers (recommended)

--

### 5.2 Quality Area 2 (indicate which)

Strengths and areas of improvement by criterion (including the sources of evidence)

<p><i>Criterion 1:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Criterion 2 etc.:</i></p> <p>...</p>
--



Self-Report for the European Peer Review

---

Improvement measures (planned and implemented)

Evaluation questions for the Peers (recommended)

5.3 Quality Area 3 etc.

➔ Reminder: **Do you really want to review more than two Quality Areas? ;)**



## 6. Annexes

Annex documents which will help the Peers to obtain a complete and adequate impression of 1) the provision offered and 2) the quality areas to be reviewed. References to these documents will allow you to keep your Self-Report short and concise.

➔ Please make sure, however, that the Self-Report on its own remains a sufficient and adequate source for the Peer Review.

Provide a list of documents:

6.1

6.2

6.3

6.4

6.5

6.6 etc.

➔ **Tip:** Delete all explanations and tips after the completion of the Self-Report – this will make the report leaner and easier to read.

## TIPS FOR PEERS ON HOW TO CARRY OUT AN EFFECTIVE PEER REVIEW

### Communication and Interview

Please find below a list of relevant tips on how to behave during an interview and, in general, while communicating within the Peers Team and with the persons involved in the Peer Review.

- Try to be curious, open and accepting demeanour, striving for understanding, no rash or sweeping interpretations or judgements.
- Use appropriate terminology.
- Use eye contact, assume an open and friendly posture, listen actively and show interest.

### During the Interview

- Ask short questions so that the interviewee can speak as much as possible.
- Speak briefly and clearly, use silence and pauses, do not interrupt the interviewee's line of thought.
- Be sure that you understood correctly by asking again (E.g. Did I understand that correctly?)
- Ask for facts and examples especially when answers are too general.
- Follow the main thread, lead back to the main topic.
- Finish the interview in time.
- Allow critical questions concerning the interviews or the Peer Review.
- Note down remarks and critical comments.

### Reflective and Constructive Feedback

When it is time for Peers to give to the VET+ Institution management and representatives the preliminary feedback at the end of the visit it is important to clearly adopt a constructive feedback approach, as detailed below.

- promotes reflection as part of a dialogue between the giver and the receiver of feedback. Both parties are involved in observing, thinking, reporting and responding.
- focuses on processes rather than on the individual. Refers to what an individual does rather than to what we think s/he is.
- is descriptive rather than judgmental. Avoiding judgmental language reduces the need for an individual to respond defensively.
- is specific rather than general.
- promotes reflection about strategies and the students' or observer's responses to a specific strategy.
- is directed toward behaviours and/or actions which the receiver has to possibility to change.
- considers the needs of both the receiver and giver of feedback.
- is solicited rather than imposed. Feedback is most useful when the receiver actively seeks feedback and is able to discuss it in a supportive environment.
- involves sharing information rather than giving advice, leaving the individual free to change in accordance with personal goals and needs.
- considers the amount of information the receiver can use rather than the amount the observer would like to give. Overloading an individual with feedback reduces the likelihood that the information will be used effectively.
- requires a supportive, confidential relationship built on trust, honesty, and genuine concern.