

Peer Review Report

ISTITUTO SUPERIORE “GIORGI-FERMI”

2017

Peers:

Antonietta Petetti – Peer coordinator

Leena Koski – Transnational Peer

Clara Della Pietà – Peer

Eleonora Pesce – Peer

Author: Antonietta Petetti

Released by: 22 Febbraio 2017

Contents

1. Data Sheet	3
2. Description of the VET provider	6
2.1 Summary: Description of VET provision	6
2.2 Summary: Mission Statement	7
2.3 Summary: Quality Assurance and Development: policies and measures	7
3. Peer Review procedure	8
3.1 Purpose/targets of the Peer Review	8
3.2 Peer Team	8
3.3 Methods for collecting data and sources	8
4. Assessment of Quality Areas.....	6
4.1 Quality Area 1: Learning and teaching	9
4.2 Quality Area 2: Quality management and evaluation.....	12
5. Annex.....	14
5.1 Agenda of Peer Visit	
5.2 Interview Guidelines for Peer Visit / Observation Grids	

1. Data Sheet

1) Contact information

Contact persons	Name	Contact (tel, e-mail)
Headmaster	SUSANNA PICCHI	Tel: 0422304272 E-mail: dirigente@giorgifermi.it TVIS02300L@istruzione.it
Peer Review Facilitator	CARMELA BERNARDI	Tel: 0422402522 E-mail: carmelabernardi@libero.it
Other persons responsible	MARIA TRANQUILLIN SALVATORE MAZZEO	Tel: 0422402522 E-mail: collaboratore.giorgi@giorgifermi.it; mazzeosalva@tiscali.it

2) Starting point (e.g. prior evaluations, national quality requirements applicable etc.) and decision to conduct the Peer Review (taken when and by whom?)

I.S. GIORGI-FERMI:

- has had the Certificate UNI EN ISO since 2005,
- has been accredited for continuous and higher education by Veneto Region since 2004,
- took part in the National Peer Review project in the school year 2012-13

The decision to take part in the Transnational Peer Review project was taken by the Headmaster and agreed upon by the staff. The person responsible for the Institute Self-assessment informed the teachers about the aims of the project in the Teachers' Council session on 20 Oct, 2016. The Headmaster, upon agreement with INAPP (ex ISFOL), appointed three teachers, including the facilitator, who are going to take part in the project with the precondition of their entering the National Peer Registry. The team examined the materials available, studied the Peer Review in Initial VET Manual and identified the two areas to be peer reviewed in the Institute among the 14 European Quality Areas. These two areas are those which were assessed in the previous edition of the project in order to make possible also a comparison between the results of the last evaluation and the current one, with the aim of identifying improvement areas and good practices.

The Institute considers the Peer Review a useful instrument to promote the quality of educational offer and to promote continuous innovation and evaluation.

The participation in this PR visit was prompted by EQAVET NRP Italy.

3) Aims and purpose of the Peer Review

Through the experience of this Peer Review visit, I.S. GIORGI-FERMI expects a critical comparison of the different organizational and management issues, with a focus on the quality areas Learning and Teaching and Management and Evaluation of QMS.

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

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

Tasks and responsibilities of the Headmaster, the Director of General and Administrative Services, the teachers, the employees, the Teachers' Council, the Departments, the Class Councils, the Teachers' Evaluation Committee, the School Council, its Committee, the Scientific Technical Committee (CTS) are defined and ruled by the current regulations.

On the basis of the principles of school autonomy, the institute has defined the functions, the relevant competences and the tasks, as per organizational and functional charts attached to the Self Report.

In particular, HEADMASTER:

- represents and manages the institute
- promotes, improves and coordinates human and professional resources in the institute to achieve the quality and efficiency goals
- ensures an organic management of the institute to achieve the quality of the educational processes, designing instruments to implement the POF (Educational Offer Plan) and managing financial and instrumental resources.
- disseminates the Institute Regulations and ensures they are known and enforced.
- establishes and maintain relationships with public and private local bodies
- coordinates and plans the activities of the work groups together with her staff and the persons responsible for the different areas (Funzioni Strumentali).
- is responsible for the Quality Management System.
- is responsible for human resource management and training, teaching/learning, "non conformance processing", "document management system".
- examines the companies for the students' work experiences (ASL).
- assigns the teachers' merit bonus.

The Headmaster is supported by a MANAGEMENT STAFF consisting of:

- two School Headmaster Assistants
- three Contact Person (one for each of the 3 branches of the Institute),
- six Coordinators for specific areas (Evening courses, Work experiences, Guidance, School Self Assessment, Web site and IT communication, PTOF - Three years Educational offer Plan).

6) Overview of the procedure and time schedule

Activity	Timeframe and (due) dates
Self-evaluation	Preliminary meeting Sept 19, 2016 Individual work to Oct 20
Self-Report (due 1 month before visit at the latest)	Nov / Dec 2016
Preparation of Peer Visit	Dec 2016
Peer Visit	Jan 18-19-20, 2017
Peer Review Report	End of Feb, 2017
Action Plan and Improvements	By Jan 2018

7) Scope of the Peer Review

- whole institution
- parts of the institution (indicate which)
- the quality area *Learning and Teaching*,
 - the quality area *Management and Evaluation of QMS*

8) Quality Areas

- **Learning and Teaching**
- **Management and Evaluation of QMS**

9) List of Peers with names and contact information

	Name	Institution	E-mail
Peer Coordinator	Antonietta Petetti	Regione Umbria - Perugia	apetetti@regione.umbria.it
Transnational Peer	Leena Koski	Finnish National Agency of Education - Helsinki, Finland	Leena.Koski@oph.fi
Peer	Clara Della Pietà	Istituto "Vittorio Veneto" Città della Vittoria – Vittorio V.to (TV)	claraeggp@gmail.com
Peer	Eleonora Pesce	CFP San Marco – Mestre (Ve)	e.pesce@issm.it

10) Signatures of the Peers

2. Description of the VET provider

2.1. Summary: Description of VET provision

I.S. GIORGI-FERMI was established as a School Centre for Technical and Vocational Education on 1st September 2013, with the merger of two important and historical high schools in Treviso: the Vocational Institute Giorgi and the Technical Institute Fermi. Three complexes host the school in Treviso:

“FERMI”, via San Pelaio, 37

“GIORGI”, via Terraglio, 53

“GHIRADA”, via Medaglie d’Oro, 2/B

32 classes attend the morning courses of IP (Vocational Education) and leFP (Vocational Training Courses) organized as follows:

- 22 classes are located in GIORGI complex in Via Terraglio:

from 1st to 5th class of Technical Maintenance and Assistance option

1st, 2nd and 3rd leFP classes with the options: Mechanical operator and Auto repair technician

- 10 classes are located in GHIRADA complex:

from 1st to 5th class of Dental Technician option

1st, 2nd and 3rd leFP classes with the options: Electronic operator and Thermal System Installer

In the school year 2016/2017 around 1,500 students are attending the institute (1,287 attending the morning classes, 228 attending the evening classes) with a total of 69 groups of students (classes). 93% of them are male, 7% are female.

The socio-economic and cultural status of the families of the students attending the VET institute is low, while that of the students attending the Technical Institute is medium, with some high peaks. In addition to the Italian students, there are 35 different nationalities; in the Technical Institute the rate of foreign students is 5.4%, while in the VET institute it is 23.36% (both in the morning and in the evening classes). The high percentage of foreign students in the VET center is explained by the educational path which supplies students with the professional skills which can guarantee an early access to work. While the immigration rate in Veneto is 10.4%, the VET Institute hosts a percentage of 23.36% with predictable difficulties in achieving the competence goals especially in the first two years. 2% of students (gathering in the second year of the VET Institute) have both parents unemployed.

The area is characterized by the presence of small and medium enterprises, mainly operating in the mechanical sector; there are also some national and international companies. Handicraft firms are also well established, especially in the field of installation and maintenance of systems or equipments. The Associations of the entrepreneurs have agreed to take part in the Technical Scientific Committee (CTS) and to promote partnership between the VET centre and their companies. A lot of privately-owned companies and some public ones have also signed agreements with the school to organize work experience activities (which 87% of parents and 80% of students consider useful). The institute also draws on the synergies of a net of several other institutes (14 nets). Inside the learning centre, IPSIA Giorgi boasts a long teaching experience in the industrial e artisan field. In fact, the institute was born in 1927 as Regia Scuola Industriale (Royal Industrial School) and following the evolution of the Italian school system it has undergone many changes to achieve the current structure.

2.2. Summary: Mission Statement

IPSIA Giorgi mission is achieving the students' success for the harmonious development of their personality with the aim of creating future citizens and professionals in an ever-enlarging community, thanks to the achievement of knowledge, competences, maturity, sense of responsibility.

The Institute goal is not only educating professional workers but also educating and training culturally autonomous, self-responsible and active citizens. Students must be able to respond positively to novelties and to face new opinions and models, be able to accept and foster diversity, acknowledge different cultural backgrounds and activate assessment and self-assessment processes.

Internships and work experiences are the necessary complement to a strategy which aims at students accessing the world of work right after the end of school.

Through continuous cooperation with the institutions and the local companies, the school wants to maintain itself receptive and open to innovations and synergies.

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

The Institute's Quality System has been structured in processes, whose systematic control is to be guaranteed.

The Quality Manual, the procedures, the instructions and the internal rules together with specific documents or data gathering and processing database are the instruments used to guarantee the control and the management of the school Quality System.

Internal audit programs, the reviews of the quality system and the improvement actions help achieve continuous improvement (PDCA) as required by UNI EN ISO 9001:2008.

The Self assessment Report (RAV) is published on the website.

The Quality Report is presented in the Teachers' Council last session of the school year. On that occasion the priorities in the Self assessment Report (RAV) and the improvement proposals are agreed upon.

3. Peer Review procedure

3.1. Purpose/targets of the Peer Review

The decision to take part in the Transnational Peer Review project was taken by the Headmaster and agreed upon by the staff. The Quality Areas identified to be reviewed (Quality Area 2. Learning and Teaching and Quality Area 14. Quality management) are those which were assessed in a previous Peer Review, with the aim of identifying improvement areas and good practices. Giorgi-Fermi Institute considers the Peer Review a useful instrument to promote the quality of the educational offer and to promote continuous innovation and evaluation. The Institute has also a strong motivation to look at an European dimension, so participation in a Transnational Peer Review is viewed as a good opportunity in this sense.

3.2. Peer Team

List the participants in the Peer Team with their professional and institutional background

	Name	Institution	E-mail
Peer Coordinator	Antonietta Petetti	Regione Umbria - Perugia	apetetti@regione.umbria.it
Transnational Peer	Leena Koski	Finnish National Agency of Education - Helsinki, Finland	Leena.Koski@oph.fi
Peer	Clara Della Pietà	Istituto "Vittorio Veneto" Città della Vittoria – Vittorio V.to (TV)	claraegg@gmail.com
Peer	Eleonora Pesce	CFP San Marco – Mestre (Ve)	e.pesce@issm.it

3.3. Methods for collecting data and sources

Interviews with members of the staff (teachers, tutors, administrative personnel), parents and students, representatives of the companies involved in the students' internships and in other format of cooperation. Visit to the laboratories and observation of a class to get a general idea of how the activities are performed and of the tools and equipments. Analysis of documents.

Attached - Agenda for the Peer Visit in Annex.

4. Assessment of Quality Areas

4.1. Quality Area 1: ***Learning and teaching***

Criterion 1: Teaching contents

Strengths:

- Improvement in the quality planning is based on the results from the previous peer review: clear and systematic for all the subjects on the basis of well defined units of competences
- UDA (Interdisciplinary Units) are well designed and clear planned.
- I.S. GIORGI-FERMI has high capacity to make alliances and maintain consolidated relationships with the companies providing the work-based learning component of the education and training programmes
- There are successful experience in terms of cooperation between School and Companies in developing teaching contents and adapting them to emerging needs of labour market.

Areas for improvement:

- It is not clear how all the feedback results are used to improve the work experience at an organizational level.
- The school is focused on technical competences and abilities and takes special needs into account but does not pay same attention to the personal interests, motivation and expectations.

Criterion 2: Lesson planning

Strengths:

- Lesson plans are transparent and can be shared in the school through the online Register
- Lesson planning is well organised and plans are ready in advance. There are in the school different templates in use and a complete documentation. Those are on the website too, for everyone involved in the work experiences.

Areas for improvement:

- There is still potential to improve the planning of individual learning pathways. Except the planning of work experience, there is long tradition to look at lesson planning at group level.

Criterion 3: Creating the learning and teaching processes**Strengths:**

- A lot of different teacher's methods are used in the school.
- Particular attention is given to those methods which promote students' involvement and active participation.
- The work-based learning periods offer to students concrete opportunities to put into practice what they have learned during the lessons

Areas for improvement:

- The school needs to promote the use of e-learning and more practical oriented teaching methods.
- The school could further improve the monitoring of teaching, especially the use by teachers of different methods and their impact in terms of soft skill development and learning results. At the moment, there are in the school good practices in using different methods but there are also differences among teachers in using methods which fit best to learners needs.

Criterion 4: Promotion of key qualifications**Strengths:**

- UDA (Interdisciplinary Units) are specifically introduced to improve the soft skills, according to the goal of the school not only to train professional workers but also to educate culturally autonomous, self-responsible and active citizens

Areas for improvement:

- The school needs to promote the students' independence and self-assessment more, especially through the development of the relationship between teachers and learners
- It is not clear how the level of competences is evaluated after the UDA

Criterion 5: Guidance and counselling of students**Strengths:**

- Much support from the school is given at the beginning of the studies and to the students who come from other schools.
- Support to students and special need students is given in order to select which kind of work experience is more suitable for them.

Areas for improvement:

- Counselling service is focused on problem solving and it is not seen as an opportunity for all the people of the school
- There is not a system to monitor how personal interests, motivation and expectations are taken in account in developing students skills and competences and, on that way, supported
- Teachers and other staff roles involved in teaching and learning process could be trained in guidance and counselling

Criterion 6: Information to the students**Strengths:**

- Lots of information available on the website

Areas for improvement:

- The School could improve the monitoring how information is acquired and how it is used

Overall assessment of the quality area 1

The school demonstrates a strong investment in innovation and to improve quality of the educational provision. An investment that is also reflected in the high level of motivation and engagement of all the staff and the cooperative relations established with other stakeholders, in particular the relationship with companies.

Coherence between teaching content and institutional goals is ensured by a clear competence-based programming.

Teachers regularly review the results in terms of student learning and on this basis they adapt the program to the characteristics of the class. Also personalized educational plans are developed to support the learning needs of students with difficulties.

Interdisciplinary Units (UDA) are specifically introduced to improve the soft skills, according to the goals of the Institute, that is not only to train professional workers but also to educate culturally autonomous, self-responsible and active citizens.

Particular attention is given by teachers to the use of teaching methods that can stimulate student's involvement and active participation. The scheduling of the lessons and practical activities is made in order to stimulate the students' constant comparison and cross-reference between theory and practice.

We recommend that more attention could be paid in learning and teaching process to personal interests, motivation and expectations of the students.

Focusing on guidance and counselling not only in terms of problem solving could be an opportunity for all the people in the School. In fact, supporting all students in becoming more self-aware about their interest, values, motivation and expectations could provide both teachers and students important information, useable to promote, for example:

by students, the definition of a personal learning project on the basis of which orient the subsequent choices and increase the sense of personal responsibility to the learning objectives to be achieved;

by teachers, an adaptation of teaching content more responsive to the specific needs of all students and more space, in the relationship between the teacher and the class, for student's initiatives and proposals.

Considering the differences among teachers about the methods used, the school could promote and support more learning from each others and good practices' exchange.

4.2. Quality Area 2: **Quality management and evaluation**

Criterion 1: Satisfaction of the students and stakeholders

Strengths:

- The school systematically collects different feedback (mostly by using questionnaires) from different stakeholders and the feedback is fully and systematically documented

Areas for improvement:

- It is no clear how feedback is discussed and analysed and how the results are used at all levels and units of the school to improve the VET provision and support services.
- The school could further develop the process how the units or teams use their own results and make based on that their own development plan as part of the development plan of the whole school. On that way the school could promote the involvement of the whole staff in Quality Management and understanding of continuous development on individual/team/unit level.

Criterion 2: Systematic quality management system

Strengths:

- The school is strongly improvement oriented with lots of procedures and instruments for all the activities and different methods to review (internal audits, management review and peer review).
- The information is collected and documented at the level of all the organization units and the results are documented at the same levels.
- Quality goals and different roles and responsibilities of staff are clearly defined.

Areas for improvement:

- The Quality System must be more known because it is the precondition for its use and to benefit from it at all levels.
- The involvement of the whole staff and of key stakeholders in Quality Management could be improved.
- The measures of the improvement are mostly decided by the Quality team and the school management.

Criterion 3 Feedback and further development at an individual level

Strengths:

- The school systematically collects different feedback (mostly by using questionnaires) from different stakeholders and the feedback is fully and systematically documented.
- Some teachers collect feedback from students individually on other way as by using questionnaires to get up-to-date information e.g. for lesson planning.

Areas for improvement:

- The use of feedback could be improved especially if the school wants to promote the staff involvement.
- School doesn't use all the feedback efficiently. Not all the staff know what kind of information is collected and do not receive useful report and information on how to use the results to improve their performance.
- Feedback is mostly collected by using questionnaires but other forms could also be used like feedback/evaluation discussions (and documentation and monitoring their results).

Criterion 4 *Institutional evaluation and institutional development***Strengths:**

- The school conducts evaluations on a regular basis.
- The school uses various measurement tools-questionnaires for getting feedback of students, trainers and staff.
- Huge amount of data is collected (from staff, students, etc).

Areas for improvement:

- The system could be improved by discussion with all the staff of the different units and their involvement especially in the measures of improvement in their own unit.

Overall assessment of the quality area 2

The Institute is strongly improvement oriented.

Quality goals and different roles and responsibilities of the staff are clearly defined. Different feedback (mostly by using questionnaires) from different stakeholders is systematically collected and the feedback is fully and systematically documented.

The information is collected and documented at the level of all the organization units and the results are documented at the same levels. A lot of procedures and instruments are followed for all the activities and different methods to review (internal audits, management review and peer review) are used.

We recommend to strength an overall view of the different quality tools and procedures, focusing on the meaning to be attributed to the many gathered information and the improvement results to be achieved.

The efficient use all the feedback could be improved, especially through the increased involvement of the staff and of the stakeholders in Quality Management. The pre-condition is a better information: at the moment, not all the staff know what kind of information is collected and receive useful report and information on how to use the results to improve their performance.

5. Annexes

- Peer Visit Agenda
- Interview Guidelines for Peer Visit / Observation Grids