



# Annexes

## **Annex I – List of the professionals trained as Peers Trainers during the Transnational TPT in Portugal**

## Annex I

Organisation	Functions within the organisation	Quality Assurance and/or Peer Review background
<b>LETU – Lithuanian Education Trade Union</b>	International secretary Project manager and Administrative Officer	Peer (trained in previous projects) Peer (trained in previous projects)
<b>EPLFPA de Rethel – EPL08</b>	School Headmaster Headmaster of the Adult Education Centre School Deputy headmaster	Peer (trained in previous projects) In charge of the Quality Assurance system In charge of the Quality Assurance system
<b>CIOFS-FP</b>	Responsible of the Quality Assurance system at national level	ISO 9001 and ISO 29990 Quality Management Systems. Peer (trained in previous projects) <sup>1</sup>
<b>Associazione FORMA.Azione</b>	Manager and Responsible of the Quality Assurance and Accreditation systems Project manager	ISO 9001 Quality Assurance System, Regional Accreditation system; Peer (trained in previous projects) <sup>2</sup> Peer (trained in previous projects)
<b>CIOFS-FP Lazio</b>	Project manager	ISO 9001 and ISO 29990 Quality Management Systems
<b>CIOFS-FP Lombardia</b>	Project Manager, Responsible of the QMS and Accreditation systems at Regional level	ISO 9001 and ISO 29990 Quality Management Systems
<b>CINEL</b>	Promotion and Partnerships Coordinator	no experience in quality assurance

<sup>1</sup> Included in the National Register of Peers.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

Annex I

<b>MUT – Malta Union of Teachers</b>	Adult Education Teacher	no experience in quality assurance
<b>Lithuanian Qualification and Vocational Education and Training Development Centre</b>	Methodologist	Peer (trained in previous projects)
<b>CECOA</b>	<p>Training Coordinator – Qualification and Certification Unit</p> <p>Training Technician – Qualification and Certification Unit</p>	<p>Internal ISO auditor. member of team responsible by the systematic process of quality processes and procedures revision with own organisation QMS</p> <p>Trained as trainer for peers.</p>
<b>CUB – Corvinus University of Budapest</b>	Researcher of the Observatory	Trained as Peer Trainer.

**ANNEX II – List of professionals trained as  
Peers in FR, IT, LT, MT and PT**

## Annex II

Name	Surname	Organisation	Function within the organisation
<b>MALTA</b>			
Antonio	Olivari	Malta Union of Teachers	Communication Officer
Philip	Balzan	General Workers Union	International / Education Officer
Antoniette	Saliba	Malta Union of Midwives and Nurses	Senior Midwife Chairperson Education Committee MUMN
Joseph	Chircop	Directorate for LLL & Early School Leavers	Programme Accreditation & Assessment Administrator
Therese	Saliba	Malta Union of Midwives and Nurses	Practice Nurse
Mandy	Mifsud	Directorate for LLL & Early School Leavers	Education Officer
Stefania	Cuschieri	Directorate for LLL & Early School Leavers	Teacher / Tutor
Goeffrey	Axiak	Malta Union of Midwives and Nurses	Nurse / Council Member
Kendrick	Bondin	General Workers Union	GWU Sector Secretary for Youths and responsible for Quality Assurance and Marketing
<b>ITALY</b>			
Daniela	Avalos Umanzor	Frontiera Lavoro soc. coop. sociale	Responsible for provision of training services
Francesco	Battaglioli	T.E.S. e F. Terni Edilizia Sicurezza e Formazione	Director
Erminia	Battista	USL Umbria1	Coordinator of the Network for Health Promotion USLUmbria1
Paolo	Bocchini	Engineering & Consulting	Responsible for quality and accreditation
Sabina	Brinkhoff	PSYCOPRAXIS	Quality accreditation – need analysis expert
Federica	Capezzali	Centro Italiano di Studi Superiori per la Formazione e l'Aggiornamento in Giornalismo Radiotelevisivo	Responsible for directing and project design
Roberto	Cappanera	Impresa Service S.a.s	Responsible for the directing and coordination process
Francesca	Caproni	GAL Trasimeno Orvietano	Responsible for the directing process

## Annex II

Name	Surname	Organisation	Function within the organisation
Massimo	Ceccarelli	Enaip	Responsible for the directing and quality process
Catiuscia	Cesarini	New Consulting Corsi & Co SaS	Responsible for quality
Paola	Chiodi	Partners Coop soc. coop.	Responsible for directing, quality, accreditation and administration
Danilo	Cioccolanti	Lavorare in Sicurezza Group Srls	Responsible for quality and accreditation
Gabriele	Costantini	LISA - Lavoro Informaizone Sicurezza Ambiente srl	Responsible for the directing process
Riccardo	Cruccolini	TS4 S.r.l.	Responsible for the directing process
Barbara	Di Pietro	Superfice8	Project Manager
Sonia	Ercolani	Villa Umbra	Responsible for Project designing and Provision of Training
Stefano	Falcone	Confartigianato Perugia	Training expert
Davide	Ficola	SEU	Training activities coordinator
Mauro	Francia	C.P.I.A. Perugia	Docente vicario
Monica	Giommini	Agenzia Mercurio Srl	Responsible for the economic and administrative process and provision of training services
Simona	Gobbini	Pigo Centro Servizi e Formazione	Responsible for directing, accreditation, project designing and provision of service
Chiara	Massetti	Babele soc. coop. Soc.	Responsible for quality and accreditation
Alfredo	Monacelli	CRATIA	Director
Rosalia	Monaco	ITAS G. Bruno	Head teacher
Loredana	Nuvoloni	YES Your Educational Solutions srl	Responsible for the project design and provision of service
Lamberto	Pernici	Agenzia Formativa IIS "Patrizi-Bladelli-Cavallotti" - Città di Castello	Responsible for analysis and definition of needs

## Annex II

Name	Surname	Organisation	Function within the organisation
Leonardo	Pierini	Lingua Più Associazione Culturale	Responsible for provision of training services
Adele	Pirro	Accademia s.n.c.	Process responsible
Stefano	Poeta	ARTES SRL	Res
Anna Maria	Russo	ANWA s.a.s. - Istituto Italiano Design	Responsible for the directing process
Paola	Sensi	Nuova Dimensione	Responsible for quality and accreditation
Lorenzo	Taddei	FIORE VERDE Soc. coop. Soc.	Responsible for project design area and fundraising; certified trainer for National Civil Service
Alessandra	Tirolì	CPIA Perugia	Trainer
Valentina	Tomba	The Language Center srl	Responsible for quality
Walter	Trivellizzi	Cipa-at	Responsible for the directing process
Rosella	Ventimiglia	Ecobyte Technology srl	Responsible for provision of training service
Elena	Rapisarda	Università degli studi Roma Tre	University student who is writing her doctoral thesis on PR methodology
Fiorella Maria Bernadette	Capuzzo	Consiglio Regionale della Lombardia	Executive
Margherita	Dal Lago	CIOFS-FP Veneto - Padova	Director of VTC
Adriana	Galano	Cantiere Lavoro	Trainer
Giovanna	Barillari	CIOFS-FP Lazio - Togliatti	Director of VTC
Valerio	Marcone	Università Ca' Foscari	PhD student
Giulia	Zitelli Conti	Associazione Raccontarsi Raccontando	Secretary
Giuditta	Alessandrini	Università degli studi Roma Tre	Full Professor
<b>FRANCE</b>			
Honorine	Gerard	CFPPA Rethel	Training Assistant

## Annex II

Name	Surname	Organisation	Function within the organisation
Sabrina	Mouissi	CFPPA Rethel	Trainer
Houda	Soltani	CFPPA Rethel	Deputy headmaster
Laurent	Bejot	CFPPA Rethel	Headmaster
Florence	Adam	Forma-ON	Trainer
Frédéric	Gallichet	Forma-ON	Training Assistant
Benjamin	Noizet	Forma-ON	Trainer
Fatma	Valente	Forma-ON	Director
Sébastien	Vial	CFPPA Rethel	Headmaster
<b>LITHUANIA</b>			
Jurgelevicius	Audrius	LETU	Manager
Granskienė	Sigita	Kauno suaugusiųjų mokymo centras	Teacher
Malskis	Edmas	Kauno suaugusiųjų mokymo centras	Teacher
Račaitienė	Vilma	Kauno suaugusiųjų mokymo centras	Teacher
Vėteris	Vitalijus	Kauno suaugusiųjų mokymo centras	Teacher
Kalantienė	Jovita	Vilniaus suaugusiųjų mokymo centras	Teacher
Ziminskaja	Oksana	Vilniaus suaugusiųjų mokymo centras	Teacher
Vilimienė	Sandra	Panevėžio SMC	Teacher, deputy director
Jėčius	Alvydas	Panevėžio SMC	Teacher
Stankevičienė	Asta	Vilniaus suaugusiųjų mokymo centras	Teacher, head of subdivision
Kubilinskienė	Birutė	Vilniaus suaugusiųjų mokymo centras	Teacher, head of departament
Aleksandravičiūtė	Zita	Panevėžio SMC	Teacher



## Annex II

Name	Surname	Organisation	Function within the organisation
<b>PORTUGAL</b>			
Lígia	Veloso	CECOA - Centro de Formação Profissional para o Comércio e Afins	Training Technician – Qualification and Certification Unit
Maria José	Jantarada	CECOA - Centro de Formação Profissional para o Comércio e Afins	Training Technician Innovation and Business Unit; Quality Manager
Sara	Pereira	KERI KERIGMA - Inovação e Desenvolvimento Social de Barcelos GMA	Technician in the Training Department and in the Centre for Recognition, Validation and Certification of Skills and Competences
Joana	Carvalho	KERIGMA - Inovação e Desenvolvimento Social de Barcelos	Technician in the International Cooperation Department
Renata	Silva	KERIGMA - Inovação e Desenvolvimento Social de Barcelos	Technician in the International Cooperation Department
Maria José	Rodrigues	CINEL - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria Electrónica, Energia, Telecomunicações e Tecnologias da Informação	Training Technician/ Coordinator of the Centre for Recognition, Validation and Certification of Skills and Competences
Fátima	Gomes	CINEL - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria Electrónica, Energia, Telecomunicações e Tecnologias da Informação	Quality Technician
José	Domingues	CINEL - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria Electrónica, Energia, Telecomunicações e Tecnologias da Informação	Training Technician
Ana Paula	Viana	CINEL - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria Electrónica, Energia, Telecomunicações e Tecnologias da Informação	Counsellor
Eduardo	Reis	CENFIC - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria da Construção Civil e Obras Públicas do Sul	Responsible for the Unit Certification and Quality
Helena	Rosado	CENFIC - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria da Construção Civil e Obras Públicas do Sul	Responsible for the Activity Promotion and Monitoring Unit, integrated in the Human Resource Department

## Annex II

Name	Surname	Organisation	Function within the organisation
Francisco	Sanches	CENFIC - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria da Construção Civil e Obras Públicas do Sul	Training teams coordinator
Ana	Borges	CENFIC - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria da Construção Civil e Obras Públicas do Sul	Cooperated in training planning, in the development project applications and in physical and financial reporting
Joana	Morgado	KERIGMA - Inovação e Desenvolvimento Social de Barcelos	Technician Guidance, Recognition, Validation and Certification of Skills and Competences

**ANNEX III – Table of the participating  
countries and organizations**

## Annex III

Code	City	Country	Organisation	Experience with the methodology
MT1	Msida	MT	Lifelong Learning Centre Msida	None
MT2	Mosta	MT	Malta Union of Midwives and Nurses	None
MT3	Valletta	MT	Unilang International School of Languages	None
IT1	Perugia	IT	Soc. Coop. Soc. Babele	None
IT2	Perugia	IT	CPIA Perugia	None
IT3	Rome	IT	CIOFS Formazione Professionale	Previous experience but never hosted a Peer Visit.
LT1	Vilnius	LT	Vilnius adult education centre	None
LT2	Kaunas	LT	Kaunas adult education centre	None
LT3	Panevėžys	LT	Panevezys adult education centre	None
FR1	Sedan	FR	Forma-ON	None
FR2	Rethel	FR	CFPPA Rethel	None
PT1	Lisbon	PT	CECOA – Centro de Formação Profissional para o Comércio e Afins	Applied PR methodology in IVET (2006); continuing VET (2009) and Educational and Vocational Guidance for Adults (2012).
PT2	Barcelona	PT	KERIGMA - Inovação e Desenvolvimento Social de Barcelos	None
PT3	Lisbon	PT	CINEL - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria Electrónica, Energia, Telecomunicações e Tecnologias da Informação	None
PT4	Lisbon	PT	CENFIC - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria da Construção Civil e Obras Públicas do Sul	None

**ANNEX IV – Analysis of the Impact Assessment  
(integral version)**

PREPARED BY:  
**KATALIN MOLNARNE STADLER**

## INTRODUCTION

In the piloting phase of the PRALINE Project the implementation of the European Peer Review procedure as laid down in the “European Peer Review Manual for Adult Learning” was tested in altogether 15 formal and non-formal adult learning providers in five partner countries (France, Italy, Lithuania, Malta and Portugal<sup>3</sup>).

Following the pilot Peer Reviews, the Peers were asked to assess the Peer Reviews they participated in and complete amongst others the **Peer Review Impact Assessment Tool**. However, the Peers were asked to evaluate and give feedback only on Part I of the questionnaire “Preconditions and quality of Peer Review”, which contained the main thematic areas as below:

### 1. Organisational features

- Commitment and attitudes
- Support for change
- Purpose and intended users

### 2. Quality of the Peer Review (phases 1-3)

- Expertise and competences of Peer Team
- Information and involvement of staff
- Relevance and understanding of quality areas
- Peer Visit
- Feedback from Peers

The coordinator organisation of the piloting – FORMA.Azione – has received the filled in questionnaires from peers participating in the following 11 pilot Peer Reviews (response rate 73%):

<b>MT1</b>	Lifelong Learning Centre Msida
<b>MT2</b>	Malta Union of Midwives and Nurses
<b>MT3</b>	Unilang International School of Languages
<b>IT1</b>	Soc. Coop. Soc. Babele
<b>IT2</b>	CPIA Perugia
<b>IT3</b>	CIOFS Formazione Professionale
<b>LT1</b>	Vilnius adult education centre
<b>LT2</b>	Kaunas adult education centre
<b>LT3</b>	Panevezys adult education centre
<b>PT4</b>	CENFIC - Centro de Formação Profissional da Indústria da Construção Civil e Obras Públicas do Sul
<b>FR2</b>	CFPPA Rethel

<sup>3</sup> In case of Portugal there were 4 pilot Peer Reviews implemented.

The questionnaire contained 9 questions related to the *Organisational features* and again 9 questions related to the *Quality of the phases 1-3 of the Peer Review* (altogether 18 questions). The Peers - respondents were required to rate their answers on a 5 grade scale (where 5 meant "Very much" and 1 "Not at all") and also give comments to explain and underpin the scores allocated.

Based on the analysis of the average scores allocated by the Peers to the individual questions / evaluation criteria, **those with the highest scores (equal to and above 4.5) were identified as strengths and those with scores below 4 as areas for improvement.** According to this, it can be stated that the **main strengths of the pilot Peer Reviews** are:

- management (and staff) commitment and attitude to Peer Review and organizational change (1.1, 1.2),
- knowledge and acceptance of the real purpose, i.e. the formative function of Peer Review throughout the institution (1.8 and 2.2),
- in the majority of the institutions reviewed there were no conflicts between staff hindering the implementation of the Peer Review and utilisation of the Peer Review results (1.3),
- the extent staff could voice their experiences and opinions during the interviews (2.8),
- usefulness of the feedback provided by the Peers (2.9).

On the other side, the **main areas for improvement** identified are:

- the lack of a systematic process for change established in the institution at the time of the Peer Review (1.6),
- availability of time and resources (1.7),
- degree of involvement of staff and especially of other stakeholders (2.7).

The scores allocated by the Peers cannot be considered as fully reliable in all cases as sometimes they misunderstood the questions (e.g. in case of 1.6 procedures for change or 2.4 special evaluation questions).

As part of the evaluation, some of the peers (mainly for IT1 and IT3) have engaged in some **constructive self-criticism**. Their statements / remarks strengthen the **important role of the peer training in the process**; they should be considered when reviewing the training programme for peer trainers and peers and to make them **more practice-oriented**. This also coincides with the findings of one of the external evaluators.

The analysis follows the structure of the questionnaire.

## DETAILED ANALYSIS

### PART I. PRECONDITIONS AND QUALITY OF PEER REVIEW

---

#### 1. Organisational features

##### Commitment and attitudes

##### 1.1 *Was the responsible management fully committed to the Peer Review, particular to possible changes resulting from the Peer Review?*

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.5

Mode score: 5

##### Analysis

In all of the Peer Reviews evaluated, there was a **high level of management and staff commitment** towards the Peer Review and also to its results. In most of the cases (top) management – president, director, head of school, head of quality etc. – participated in the Peer Review (mostly at the oral feedback session but in FR2 they also wrote the self-report – *“The Cfppa management was involved in the Peer Review process. They participated in the identification of quality areas the PR and wrote the self-evaluation report. They took the conclusions of the PR into account in the strategic analysis of the structure”*) and also the institutions made efforts to ensure – where possible – the full participation of the staff. In case of **LT1 the administrative staff was also involved** and provided a good backup to the colleagues involved in the Peer Review process – *“Administration representatives met all colleagues' requirements”*. Peers have commented as follows:

*“Both the director and the Head of School were very eager for the review and took it very seriously. They showed a lot of commitment towards change for the better and this was evident from the fact that they are already working on how to improve the areas that were flagged as needing improvement.”* (MT1)

*“The Head of School was very willing to conduct the review and to learn about the Peer review process and about its outcomes, especially areas for possible improvement.”* (MT3)

*“Staff made arrangements to ensure the full participation (even including the time of more informal lunch) even in a critical period close to the summer holidays. President, Head of Quality / Accreditation and assistant to the director were present at the time of the first feedbacks at the end of the second day of the peer visit, demonstrating the full interest in peer review and their commitment to improve. [...]The managers have proved very willing to participate and prepared compatibly with the holiday period.”* (IT1)



Only in case of IT3 we see a lower score allocated to this evaluation question, but there were no explanations provided by the Peers on the reasons behind it.

One comment on IT1 suggests that they did not understand rightly the aim of the Peer Review (the peers have perceived the need for some roles / functions to strengthen their ability to influence inside the organization and at the same time to better manage / limit the autonomy of other roles / functions). A Peer Review is not for solving conflicts within an organisation, and is not an instrument of mediation or conflict management.

In case of the IT2 institution the peers reported some kind of a reserve or rather caution on behalf of the manager, which can be explained by the fact that they were experiencing something new. These feelings were fully and positively resolved in the course of work, likely due to the friendly and open manner of the Peer Review and Peers – as emerges from the comment *“The CPIA of Perugia demonstrated a real interest in receiving the Peer Visit, and to get information on possible improvements that might have been indicated as result of the evaluation. At the beginning of the Peer Visit we felt some reserve or rather caution by the manager of the organization, which, however, have been fully and positively resolved in the course of work.”*

## **1.2 Was there a positive attitude towards change in the institution at the time of the Peer Review?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.8

Mode score: 5

### **Analysis**

According to the peers responding in all the institutions adult learning providers reviewed there was a positive attitude of the staff towards the Peer Review evaluation and the change, this was one of the main strengths of the PRALINE Peer Review piloting process (see above).

*“The President and the Peer Review contact within the organisation had a really positive attitude towards the Peer Review and were helpful and eager for suggestions and results.” (MT2)*

*“During the peer review evaluation the exchange of best practices was performed collegially and in good faith, which allowed to take advantage of the good examples of the activity.” (LT1)*

*“The group (respondents) has proven to be very flexible, ready to change for the improvement of quality processes. The organization is characterized by a great openness to innovation and willingness to change. Changes were already in place in the organization but the attitude of the managers was to want to explore further the possibilities for improvement. In this sense, the peers were able to be proactive with their experience in similar fields. The added value of peer review is also when addressing issues that start from the same angle.” (IT1)*

*“Our training centre is engaged in the quality approach since the beginning of the 2000s, it has a capacity to question itself. The staff concerned by the PR who were interviewed were in favour of the PR approach. The questioning that this has entailed on their practices has put them in a situation of reflections on their own professional practices and consequently changed their attitude.” (FR2)*

*“Overall the management of the CPIA was well prepared to accept possible changes, though perhaps not too prepared to understand the level of impact that a Peer Visit could accomplish.” (IT2)*

This was mainly due to the fact that the organizations reviewed – as the peers reported – were characterized by a **great openness to innovation and willingness to change**. In some of the organisations (major) changes and transformations were underway, and **the Peer Review helped define the possible actions in order to support the successful implementation of these changes**.

**1.3 *Were there (hidden or open) conflicts between staff hindering the utilisation of the Peer Review results (i.e. conflicting opinions, antagonistic “parties” within the staff with relevance to the Peer Review)?***

***If yes: Were these conflicts tackled in a constructive way during the Peer Review and its follow-up?***

N. of responses: 16

Average score: Not applicable – YES/NO

Mode score: /

**Analysis**

In the majority of the reviewed adult learning institutions there were no hidden conflicts, which could hinder the implementation of the Peer Review and the use of the Peer Review results.

In case of IT1 the peers provided contradictory opinions, which suggest that some of them felt some kind of problems in the organisation at the time of the Peer Review. The score allocated by the peers (very much – 5) deliberately shows that in the PT4 institution there were considerable conflicts in the organisation but there is no information given about the nature of these conflicts and also the way(s) they were dealt with and resolved during the Peer Review.

**Support for change**

**1.4 *Was the Peer Review (including the quality areas chosen) in line with the overall quality strategy of the institution?***

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.3

Mode score: 5

## Analysis

In most of the cases the peers reported that the Peer Review (including the quality areas chosen) was in line with the overall quality strategy of the institution, however in support to this, **clear links between the quality strategy and the quality areas chosen have been identified in few cases only**. The answers also suggest that the selection of the quality areas was made in a top-down approach, thus serving in the first place the information needs of the management of the institutions and only indirectly those of the staff and/or other stakeholders. According to the peers' evaluation, the least performing institution in this respect was IT3 but there were no comments given to justify the scores. Below are reported some relevant comments:

*“As the director himself explained when he was handed the peer review, the review showed that they tackled the appropriate areas where they needed to make sure what could be done to improve the offer and how to reach better all those who need to be reached.” (MT1)*

*“The institution chose carefully the areas to be evaluated and went for those that they felt they really needed an external opinion to improve them. The institution has a number of quality assurance measures which they felt that a peer review would be complimentary to.” (MT2)*

*“Learning and teaching, along with quality and evaluation, are at the core of Unilang’s operations and therefore they seem to have been chosen with care. Also, the strategy of the institution seems to be in line with the actual operations and day-to-day conduct as seen in the peer review.” (MT3)*

*“For the core Quality Area 1 “Educational Offer”, the assessment has been based on 1 training course already realised. The Area is considered crucial as the organization intends to develop the training offer, as functional to its mission and key services.” (IT1)*

*“The Quality Areas under assessment were: 1 – Educational Offer, 2 – Information, Guidance and Enrolment. The selected areas were consistent with the objectives set for the Peer Review by the CPIA, as on the one hand we have tried to investigate the training contents, seeking innovative solutions that adapt them to the ongoing changes of CPIA user targets, and trying to standardize, while acknowledging the single peculiarities, the training offer of the different branches of the school; on the other, a very strategic activities of guidance and information carried out by the organization, for which interesting observations have been made by the Peers.” (IT2)*

*“The choice of quality areas corresponds to questions that the management poses. These include questioning a part of the activity that still deserves to become more professional and whose practices had to be revisited in order to carry out an inventory and imagine ways of progress.” (FR2)*

**1.5 Was there a pressure to improve in one (or more) quality areas?  
If yes, which kind and where did it come from?**

N. of responses: 16  
Average score: 2.5  
Mode score: 2

**Analysis**

According to the evaluations provided by the peers, only in one of the institutions reviewed – IT1 – was there a pressure to improve before the Peer Review but we don't know which kind of pressure was this and where did it come from. The mismatching scores of the peers in case of IT2 also suggest that there might have been some kind of a pressure to improve, too.

Though not expressed explicitly, it can be suspected that in some cases (e.g. Maltese providers) the need for improvement in the quality areas chosen was based on the earlier (quality assurance) activities of the institutions.

*“They were interested in improving in both quality areas we assessed them, there seemed to be no quality area in particular where they had pressure to improve. Instead it was clearly a genuine internal interest in change and improvement that was showed by the organisation. They had already been going strong in all areas reviewed, so there wasn't pressure to improve but interest to improve as they took the learners and prospective learners' interest at heart.” (MT1)*

*“The attitude was ‘let's wait for the report and see how we can improve’. Therefore if there was any pressure, it was by the Head of the institution herself in order to make sure they benefit from the process.” (MT3)*

*“No pressure has been made to improve an area rather than the other.” (IT2)*

**1.6 Was there a systematic process for change established in the institution at the time of the Peer Review?**

N. of responses: 16  
Average score: 3.7  
Mode score: 5

**Analysis**

From the answers – comments – given by peers it becomes clear that there is a lot of change going on in the reviewed institutions, however, they don't seem to be managed or implemented systematically (i.e. in a thoroughly planned, monitored and controlled way).

*“The organisation had already internal ways how to assess their performance. Indeed, the comments by both director and head of school showed that they had already been aware or at least suspected certain conclusions that came out from the peer review and they were already*

*working on some of them. For example they used to try to improve outreach every year and they also were introducing interactive whiteboards and other technology to improve the way teaching was delivered amongst other.” (MT1)*

*“The institution has a system in place which looks into the quality of the offer, courses and promotion and thus make sure that they are always abreast of what needs to be done and they thus continuously change to improve on their results.” (MT2)*

*“Unilang is going through a process of restructuring and therefore a process for change was initiated anyway. This also means that it would be easier for them to discuss and implement changes in their processes.” (MT3)*

*“In the period before the Peer Visit the CPIA of Perugia had undergone an organizational and functional restructuring as a result of a regional DGR with effect from 01.01.2014. This change has caused a merge of different branches that were once called CTPs. Currently, therefore, the CPIA is still in a definition phase and it is testing the procedures to be implemented, even though already delivering the training activities.” (IT2)*

*“The organization is undergoing major restructuring and the PR was also organised within this process.” (IT3)*

This might be the reason that we don't get information on the kind of the systematic processes for change established and the way they work. This is a common area for improvement in all the institutions reviewed. Especially FR2 (where there is not at all such a systematic process of change established) but it seems also IT1 and IT3 need to improve in this.

### **1.7 Were there enough time and resources to tackle the results of the Peer Review?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 3.6

Mode score: 4

#### **Analysis**

The answers of the peers to this question are diverse and do not always match with the scores allocated. It can be stated that in all institutions the Peer Reviews were carried out on top of the usual activities – for example, in case of IT2 this was a very intense period (beginning of the school year) – but these did not hinder the preparations for and the implementation of nor divert attention and resources from the Peer Review, it was implemented with success. In case of MT1 and MT2 the Peer Review was complementary and fit well within the ongoing (improvement) activities – *“There were no other major projects going on which the Peer Review disrupted. On the contrary the Peer Review came at a time where certain changes and improvements in both quality areas were already on the books. Thus the PR was complimentary and also a stimulus to keep on the right track while proving new insights”.*

FR2 reported also about synergistic effects: *“Our training centre has a very important activity, internal and external audit work is undertaken in other training schemes such as the Second Chance School system school or all training with a beneficial European funds.*

*The Peer Review allowed however the management of the training centre, from a question targeted, to extrapolate the reflection and analysis in all the activities of the training centre with contexts and so to try to bring some ideas of evolution. There was therefore no distraction of attention but rather a sustained and focused attention allowing synergy effects.”*

However, the scores reveal that especially IT2 but also IT3 as well as the Maltese and the Lithuanian institutions **faced difficulties in allocating enough time and resources to the Peer Review**, as stated by the following comments:

*“Since this is a Union representing nurses, midwives and other health care professionals the limited number of staff they have has to be divided between the main aim of the Union and the courses they offer. They also are a small organisation when it comes to adult learning and thus even human and financial resources are limited. Thus while their commitment, as explained before is high they have to do a lot of work with limited resources. Indeed, the commitment shown was by far greater than their resources.” (MT2)*

*“The Peer Visit was held in September, the month in which the CPIA is more engaged in guidance and enrolment of students. Therefore, it was a very intense period of activity. At the same time the Director was involved in many activities and projects of the CPIA. Nevertheless, the Peer Visit has been realized with the support of all the human resources involved, both at management level, at teacher and administrative/auxiliary staff level. Even the duration of the Visit was adequate to the objectives proposed by the Peer Review.” (IT2)*

One of the IT1 peers made a remarkable comment, namely that **the Peer Review requires investment also on behalf of the peers** (e.g. the time spent on the preparatory meeting of the peers prior to the Peer Visit).

## **Purpose and intended users**

### **1.8 Was a conscious decision taken for Peer Review as a formative, i.e. improvement-oriented evaluation by the responsible managers?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.5

Mode score: 5

## **Analysis**

The formative, i.e. improvement-oriented function of the Peer Review was emphasised in the peers' evaluations and reflected in the scores allocated.

*“It was clear that the Head of school, and also the Director, looked at the Peer Review as a formative tool. Indeed they didn’t feel that they were examined but they felt that the peers were there to help them improve and they showed eagerness to improve. To be exact, at one point the head of school did show a bit of apprehension on the review however when the methodology was explained and the peers made it clear that the organisation had a say itself on the final report as per methodology and saw the review being a positive, improvement-oriented document and not a top-down document as usually happens with audits, and as soon as she understood the difference between the normal audits and the this review, she started focusing more on the formative part of it.” (MT1)*

*“All the staff interviewed, starting from the new president, recognised the importance of the Peer Review visit and its method, to improve the quality of the services/products of the cooperative as well as the internal quality.” (IT1)*

*“The decision to carry out a Peer Review was formative, as we had expected and received some constructive suggestions from our colleagues.” (LT1)*

Despite the score given (5), in the case of FR2, it is reported that *“the Peer Review was thought less as a formative evaluation than as a tool to support management decisions in terms of better reading of the Organization, representations of its members, the reality of its practices”*. (The score given (5) contradicts this statement.)

Most probably, especially the management of the “newcomer” institutions - adult learning providers reviewed had little information about Peer Review at the time of submitting their application. They fully understood the role and especially the potential impact of the Peer Review during the visit, rather than when the decision to host it was made, as in the case of IT2: *“I believe that they fully understood the role and potential impact of the Peer Review during the visit, rather than when decision to host it was mad.”*

### **1.9 Were the “intended users” of the Peer Review, i.e. the people responsible for follow-up of the Peer Review, clearly defined before the Peer Review?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.4

Mode score: 5

#### **Analysis**

As reported by the peers, the “intended users” of the Peer Review were clearly defined in the majority of the cases (according to nine of the 11 respondents):

*“Thanks to the work of Peers and the commitment of the CPIA, the roles of the different human resources were clear.” (IT2)*

*“Yes, the people responsible for follow-up were identified before the PR.” (FR2)*

In one Peer Review – IT1 – it seems that it was only partly clear who was responsible for working with the results of the Peer Review, in one case – LT1 – this was not clear at all. It can also be suspected that the term “intended users” was not clear to (all of) the peers and they did not have a common understanding on it. On the other hand, most of the institutions adult learning providers conducted Peer Review for the first time so most probably **they paid more attention to the preparatory and the implementation phases than to the follow-up activities.**

## 2. Quality of the Peer Review (phases 1-3)

### Expertise and competences of Peer Team

#### **2.1 To what extent did the expertise and competences of the Peer Team fulfil the requirements? (i.e. necessary expertise and institutional backgrounds)**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.4

Mode score: 4

#### **Analysis**

In most cases, the expertise and the competencies of the Peer Team were evaluated as good (4), in one case – IT2 – as very good (5). However, and it is important to note, this was an evaluation made by the peers – and not by the institutions reviewed – on themselves, on their own competencies.

*“The team of peers was experienced and conducted training activities similarly to those conducted by our training centre. Moreover, the fact of having benefited from a PR beforehand has improved the ability of questioning, analysis of the peer review team allowing a quality of PR. The question was properly understood by peers.” (FR2)*

*“There was a healthy balance between people who had already done reviews, or at least audits in the past and those who were completely new but had other competencies (like research skills and soft skills needed to interact with people). Thus yes the expertise did fill the requirements however obviously since not everyone was experienced in similar situations there was still room for improvement.” (MT1)*

The Peer Team composition followed the rules laid down in the Peer Review Manual. There was a good balance reported between peers who have already done Peer Review(s) (or similar type of activities) and those who experienced it for the first time. The Peer Teams – on team level – comprised all the necessary expertise and competencies.



*“The peer review team was quite balanced. There were 4 peers taking part. Two of them never had any experience in peer review while two had already taken part in the first peer review at the Lifelong Learning Centre. The area of expertise of each reviewer was a good mix and thus brought with them to the table experience in auditing, soft skills and so on.” (MT2)*

In their evaluations, **the peers expressed some kind of a self-criticism as well**. An IT2 peer noted that in order to valorise their competencies at maximum all peers should be acquainted with the method and tools. Moreover, a deeper meeting among the peers before the peer visit would have improved the scheduling of questions and its contents, as reported for IT1 *“Yes. In order to valorise their competences at maximum all peers should be acquainted with the method and tools. Moreover, a deeper meeting among the peer before the peer visit would have improved the scheduling of questions and its contents”*. They could also identify some areas where they needed improvement. Beside the professional and evaluation competencies also the **importance of the soft skills was stressed** as the peers need to interact a lot with people in the Peer Review process (e.g. during classroom observations, interviews, oral feedback etc.).

### **Information and involvement of staff**

#### **2.2 To what extent was the formative function of Peer Review, i.e. Peer Review as a procedure for stimulating improvement and not as a control instrument, known and accepted throughout the institution?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.6

Mode score: 5

#### **Analysis**

The high scores allocated to this evaluation question prove that the formative function of Peer Review, i.e. as a procedure for stimulating improvement and not as a control instrument, was known and accepted throughout the institutions reviewed, as also shown by the following comments:

*“All the staff members were there at the “restitution” time at the end of the second day as they recognised it very important for the better understanding of their processes of quality from an “external point of view”.” (IT1)*

*“The structure already knows of many controls and audits. The PR is more lightweight, agile, and especially more reflexive which goes very well with the culture of our training centre. It is so well accepted by our structure as it questions more globally all the staff in the diversity of their functions.” (FR2)*

The formative function (i.e. contributing to the continuous improvement of the institution) as a main aim of the Peer Review external evaluation was quite obvious both for the management and the teaching staff, the management communicated it many times and clearly to their staff and

other stakeholders. The interviews have confirmed that **the staff accepted the formative function of the Peer Review** – they all wanted to learn and improve in everything they do.

*“On one side, some members of the staff had already clear this feature and function of the Peer Review – which partly was behind the decision to participate. On the other, this feature has been better understood by other colleagues in the course of the meetings. In general, however, the basic attitude shown by the involved people, even when critical reflections arose in the discussion, was open and willing to contribute proactively to the improvement.” (IT2)*

*“As explained above (see 1.8) some members of the staff at first were a bit apprehensive, however eventually when they saw how this was working and everything explained to them, they became at ease with the process and the acceptance of the peer review was visible.” (MT1)*

### **2.3 To what extent was staff involved in preparatory activities concerning the self-evaluation/ self-assessment (if applicable) and the self-report?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 3.9

Mode score: 5

#### **Analysis**

Based on the allocated scores and also the comments given by the peers, it can be stated that the involvement of staff in the preparation of the Peer Review, namely in the elaboration of the self-report varied. Usually, the self-assessment exercise was a group effort of many persons within the organisation coordinated by a responsible person (director, quality manager, Peer Review facilitator/contact), as in the case of MT1 *“The Self-evaluation/Self-report phase was a concerted effort between more than one person. A number of people including the head of school and Director gave their input to create the self-report”*, MT3 *“The Self-evaluation/Self-report phase was a group effort of many persons within the organisation including staff”* or IT1 *“The contact person with the Babele was really proactive (despite her new position in the cooperative) and she made sure to collect the cooperative staff inputs during the self-report, but also for and after the peer evaluation report”*. Where the staff was small, almost everybody was involved in the preparation (MT2). **The staff involvement** in the preparation of the self-assessment and the self-report **was reported to be the highest in case of the three Maltese Peer Reviews** and lower in case of IT3 and the Lithuanian Peer Reviews. In case of FR2 the staff was not involved in the preparation of the self-assessment and the self-report at all, only the management.

#### **Relevance and understanding of quality areas**

### **2.4 Were the quality areas and special evaluation questions chosen relevant to the intended users?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 3.9

Mode score: 5

### Analysis

While in most of the cases the quality areas chosen touched upon relevant issues in the reviewed institutions, (and according to 1.5 they were in line with the quality strategy of the institutions), it is difficult to judge about their particular relevance to the needs and interests of the staff and other stakeholders, especially for those intended to follow-up on the results as the answers do not provide specific information on this aspect.

In case of IT 1 and IT 3 the peers felt that only one of the two quality areas chosen was really relevant to the institutions. Furthermore, in IT1 the peers suggested to choose another, completely different quality area as the institution.

The comment of the FR2 peers and the score allocated by them to this question suggest that they did not understand this question and/or the role of the specific evaluation questions in the Peer Review evaluation.

### **2.5 Did the Peers have a clear understanding of the quality areas and specific evaluation questions (if applicable)**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.5

Mode score: 5

### Analysis

Though the scores allocated to this aspect are high, reflecting that some kind of a common understanding of the quality areas was achieved among the peers in the Peer Teams, also **through mutual support and consulting the Manual and Tools provided by the methodology:**

*“There were differences in the level of knowledge of the methodology and it was needed to refocus the attention of the Peer Team in some cases.” (IT3)*

*“The Peers were very competent persons. The European Peer Review Manual and training was of a great support.” (LT1)*

The literal assessment points out an important deficiency in the work of the peers such as to agree before the Peer Visit on the structure and content of the interviews. This is the task of the preparatory meeting of Peers for team-building and to prepare the Peers Visit. If such a meeting did not take place in case of IT1, this is **derogation from the European Peer Review procedure for Adult Learning** – *“The Peer Team agreed that to better focus the analysis is essential to reach a preliminary agreement within the group, not only with respect to the dimensions to be investigated and with what instruments, but also on specific questions to ask. For this, it would be useful that before the visit, the Peers agree on the structure of the interviews, which obviously could be subject to adjustment during the visit and the interviews themselves. In the specific case of the visit to Babele, on the one hand, more preparation as a group would have facilitated the structuring of the*

*interviews and its implementation. However, it would have also limited the flexibility of the analysis and the participation of all, which were instead valuable components in the evaluation process, enhancing the complementarities of skills and the production of individual ideas, then reviewed in group”.*

## **Peer Visit**

### **2.6 How appropriate was the agenda of the Peer Visit for evaluating the Quality areas/specific evaluation questions?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.3

Mode score: 5

#### **Analysis**

According to the peers’ evaluations, in general the quality areas (and the specific evaluation questions, if any) were tackled in an appropriate manner, all relevant questions were covered, and there was enough time allocated in the Peer Visit Agenda.

*“While on the whole the agenda was quite appropriate as it tackled all aspects of the reviewed areas through specific criteria, since it was the first time there was a problem with timing. However, since this was a learning exercise for most of the peers too, on the whole the agenda was quite good with some minor changes to be kept in mind for future agendas.” (MT1)*

*“The agenda was ok, even though on the longer side as the organisation was very small and many interviews could have taken place together and/or immediately after and not spaced out to adhere to the agenda. However, as a pilot, it worked well as a learning experience for all concerned and helped to make sure all aspects of the Peer Review as organised beforehand would be conducted.” (MT3)*

*“The areas of quality were properly taken into account; enough time for each of them was dedicated. All relevant stakeholders were involved.” (LT1)*

Only the peers from PT4 reported that *there was a problem with time management: more time was needed, some meetings slipped in time and the feedback session took longer than expected.*

### **2.7 To what extent were staff and other stakeholders involved in the Peer Visit?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4

Mode score: 5

## **Analysis**

The extent (rough percentage) of the involvement of the staff and other stakeholders in the Peer Visit was estimated mostly high in the comments below but the scores given by the peers did not match with these statements. According to the scores, in the Maltese and the Lithuanian Peer Reviews there seemed to be some problems with the involvement of the relevant staff or the other stakeholders, and in case of FR2 staff was not at all involved in the Peer Review.

*“The management was all involved in the visit itself except for the director. However it is the Head of school that runs the institution and the Director is more involved in policy. Indeed he was involved in both the pre-visit and the post-visit parts of the Peer Review. The Head of school and other management officials were all involved and also the teaching staff was not only aware of what was their role but also were very helpful as were the learners themselves. As a rough percentage I would say that more than 75% of the people at the institution were involved.” (MT1)*

*“Managers were involved fully while this was a Union in its own right but one of the peer reviewers was the Malta Union of Teachers which has expertise on all levels of learning in Malta. A representative number of the staff was also interviewed or took part during different phases.”*

(MT2)

*“Attended by 100% of representatives of the administration, 24% of the teaching staff and the chairman of the LETU.” (LT1)*

*“All relevant team members were involved, including heads at various hierarchical levels, including the Director.” (PT4)*

## **2.8 To what extent could staff voice their experiences and opinions during the interviews?**

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.7

Mode score: 5

## **Analysis**

The peers reported and the high average score justifies that in all cases but one, the staff was provided the opportunity to voice their experiences and opinions during the interviews in full and without any restriction:

*“The staff were given ample space to voice their opinion and made at ease. Only a couple of them seemed tense till the end, most of them as soon as they saw that they could speak freely without repercussions to anyone started being very open with the interviewers.” (MT1)*

*“The staff had the complete possibility of expressing oneself fully and without any restriction. The interviews are confidential and this was explained to them and thus could say what they wanted freely.” (MT2)*

*“The interview allowed the staff to express their voices, however the committee of quality is willing to put in place a system to collect all the staff feedbacks to improve the overall quality of its services” (IT1)*

In case of FR2 we don't get a clear answer, the lower score can perhaps be explained by the fact that the Peer Team consisted mostly of the (top) management of the training centre (meaning that the staff was interviewed by their leaders – headmasters, deputy headmaster etc.).

## **Feedback from Peers**

### ***2.9 How useful was the feedback provided by the Peers?***

N. of responses: 16

Average score: 4.6

Mode score: 5

### **Analysis**

The high scores (5 and 4) reflect that in all cases the oral feedback given by the Peers at the end of the Peer Visit was valid, clear, credible, relevant (for further actions to improve the provision and services in Adult Learning), and acceptable both to the management and staff of the institutions adult learning providers.

*“Indeed the feedback by the President of the MUMN showed great appreciation at the report and its positive attitude towards constructive criticism aimed at helping them to take action and improve their service in Adult Learning.” (MT2)*

*“It was stated by representatives of the organization who were at the oral feedback session (Director, 3 Service Directors and a Division Chief) that the feedback given was useful and clear, and some of it of immediate application. No objection to the report was made and was accepted as faithful to the one transmitted in the feedback session.” (PT4)*

In case of MT1 and MT3 the peers reported that at least some of the findings of the peers were already known to the AL providers. This can be explained by the fact that the areas investigated by the Peers have already undergone internal evaluation (e.g. self-evaluation, audit) and the institutions have knowledge about their performance (strengths and areas for improvement) in these areas. The Peer Review can reinforce these institutional findings from an external point of view:

*“The feedback was to the point, it tackled the questions and queries the management had. It tackled the areas in detail and gave also ideas on how to improve. The organisation deemed the report (both oral and written) as very acceptable, and also said that they had already knew about certain conclusions and that they report was now confirming what they were already thinking of tackling and that thanks to the detailed report they now could work more towards improvement.”*

(MT1)

*“The feedback was good – especially during discussions and interviews conducted during the Peer Review. The organisation deemed the report following the review as acceptable, and also said that they were aware there would be such conclusions and had already started implementing to that effect.” (MT3)*

The Peer Review Report which followed in writing the oral feedback was also considered as valid, credible, clear, relevant and acceptable. **The institutions appreciated these reports and were thankful to the peers for their contribution** – expert evaluation/feedback.

*“It should be noted that the writing of the report remains in a benevolent way of thinking avoiding a judgment.” (FR2)*