

Q-KULT: QUALITY CULTURE IN VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS 2nd Workshop for members of EQAVET National Reference Points 4 & 5 February 2016

OeAD-Haus, Ebendorferstraße 7, A-1010 Vienna

Participants: Sabine Kurz, Dana Stroie, Gerhard Gehrler, Jörg Markowitsch, Leena Koski, Katalin Molnar-Stadler, Karl Skaar, Arancha Oviedo, Phil Witney, Ida Konggaard, Darko Mali, Heinrich Mahler, Marlies Kranebitter, Jouko Luomi, Michaela Jonach, Franz Gramlinger and Sigrid Hartl.

AGENDA

04.02.2016 13:00 - 18:00

13:00 - 13:45 Introduction, expectations, tour de table: (name, institution, new developments in respect to quality culture)

13:45 - 14:00 ARQA-VET: the project management of the Q-KULT project

14:00 - 15:00 Jörg Markowitsch (3s research laboratory):
Main results of the Q-KULT- project: Concepts, experiences, instruments

15:00 - 15:30 Coffee break

15:30 - 17:00 Working groups: Recommendations at system level (WP 8)

1. How relevant are these findings for your own quality management system in your country?
2. Should school cultural aspects be taken into account at QM-system-level? And if so, how?
3. Do you see a benefit to offer school quality culture diagnosis instruments (like OCAI) to VET providers in your country? If yes, why? If no, why not?
4. Would it be useful to work with (anonymous) data from school quality culture surveys at systems level?
5. Should the work on instruments be continued? And if so how?

17:00 - 17:30 Report of working groups

17:30 - 18:00 Sum up, End of the official programme

19:00 Dinner (on invitation of ARQA-VET)

05.02.2016 09:00 - 13:00

09:00 - 09:45 Helmut Ittner (Die Senatorin für Kinder und Bildung, Bremen):
Final Q-KULT product: OCAI (Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument): Compatibility of school culture and quality management

09:45 - 10:45 Testing of OCAI (Working groups), discussion about results (Plenum)

10:45 - 11:00 Coffee Break

11:00 - 12:00 Plenum discussion: Feedback to Q-KULT results
Does the instrument meet provider needs in your country?
What about the usability and usefulness?
What are the opportunities and risks of the use of Q-KULT instruments at provider level in your country?

12:00 - 13:00 Sum-up, next steps in Q-KULT, final conference in 2016

13:00 Lunch

15:30 - 17:00 Working groups: Recommendations at system level (WP 8)

Q1: How relevant are these findings for your own quality management system in your country?

K.Skaar: The idea of working with quality in schools is important - that must be important. If that can be included in findings than it is important

SK: Summary of findings by Jörg Markowitsch.

SK: External evaluation/inspection we don't find everywhere (in every country). But all systems have some kind of feedback and self evaluation - we find for sure one tool we all use

AO: Is this one tool we can use?

KS: yes one of many

SK: depends on involvement of teachers - you have to build up motivation in organisations to use it. We have a lot of schools who refuse quality management tools but nevertheless have good outcome results.

KS: It doesn't support change if you prescribe the use of a certain tool to schools. Some schools may use the instruments but they put the results in the drawer. If you don't find any reason/usefulness you won't use the tool.

KS: This instrument can work for some schools - (OCAI)

KS: Quality has many dimensions - most cultural aspects are hidden - we don't know why we do things this or that way

AO: With the instrument you make visible what you don't see

SK: We have no instrument which goes deeper - we only scratch on the surface

KS: You ask why are there schools that don't work with quality management systems but achieve good results? It is because they work with quality - and don't know it and don't think about it. That is the culture of something.

SK: But that would not be systematical - in the sense of Quality management.

KS: an Example: Bullying is a problem in schools - and I try to reduce bullying and the politics come up with a lot of good ideas - and they work a lot on the topic - then we ask all the children in schools - every year -about bullying - what do we see - many kids answer they have been bullied - but school leaders thought, everything was perfect - and then we publicise the results -In this case we made the bullying visible - and now we see the numbers dropping. You have to recognise the problem to tackle it - you have to be aware of it.

DM: After you make data public the attitudes and activities in schools changed and also the results - do you think that in Austria such use of data would have the same results - different cultures react differently - we react differently to data - as a society

MK: QIBB was founded to reduce drop-outs in the beginning - and since years no change! I was really surprised

KS: If things are not visible - you cannot do something. And I agree you cannot do the same in two countries - it won't work in the same way - and the institutions are different (inspections etc.) But what can be transferred in all countries? Is to find instruments that make something visible.

KS: The questions (in OCAI) are not focused on quality -quality is one aspect among 6 others. There are so many instruments we are already using - so this instrument will only compete with all other instruments - I will not introduce it at home - because we have other instruments that work -

KS: But taking cultural aspects into account is important.

SK: The important thing is to take care of cultural aspects.

Q2: Should school cultural aspects be taken into account at QM-system-level? And if so, how?

DM: This is just an instrument. I would use it - but not on system level - only at school level

AO: The instruments can be used on a voluntary basis

KS: All instruments we introduce in Norway are voluntary

DM: But it is good to be aware of quality culture when we talk about quality management. Right now we are only talking about instruments and indicators -

KS: I try to go straight to the question - number 2 - if you answer as a country - should school cultural aspects be taken into account at QM system level - yes absolutely.

KS: We send questionnaires to schools all the time - and we asked about quality cycles - if a school is using the cycle, they adapted some ideas - and in VET schools 60% used it, in gymnasium 40% - meaning we have come much further in VET schools compared with other schools - but we want 100% and therefore I think cultural aspects must be taken into account

AO: Culture is a key to QM in schools

Q3: Do you see a benefit to offer school quality culture diagnosis instruments (like OCAI) to VET providers in your country? If yes, why? If no, why not?

KS: It is not useful at all if you don't do anything with it - it is like you go to a doctor and he tells you you are adiposus and then you eat like before

AO: I don't agree. The self reflection sets in! That is a benefit. We are missing the second phase (the change) -

KS: You have to be able to do sth. With it - p.e. the doctor tells me I am too tall. I can't do anything about that.

MK: The diagnosis is an intervention in the school and if you don't do anything the situation can worsen - the teachers have expectations - you have to discuss, you have to find out about the different point of views- you have to find the trigger

DM: you need some skills to change - you cannot just leave them and hope people will change. The system needs to support schools that need to change.

MK: In this phase the schools need support - in the phase of becoming aware of - they need external experts - moderators - in the diagnostic phase.

SK: My experiences are the main problem for schools is to handle data: they have not enough know-how to deal with the data.

SK: I think it is important to make schools aware of the necessity to discuss their culture.

AO: For **Any diagnostic instrument**: It fosters discussion and self reflection at school level but however the diagnostic phase is not enough and the system should support in areas where the schools think they need to change.

Q4: Would it be useful to work with (anonymous) data from school quality culture surveys at systems level?

KS: Yes I would say. Any kind that will make people think about quality is useful.

SK: No! Why? The only thing we can realise is that there are different cultures. It should not be used as a benchmark.

DM: I would say no - it doesn't make any sense

KS: In Norway we send questionnaires to schools every year - we ask about many things - not to benchmark - that they don't like - but they can compare themselves to national level or to other schools - but we at system level never say sth. To the data - you must be there or there - definitely not. We collect information and we give it back.

SK: It doesn't make sense for a whole country- but for individual school yes.

AO: It is not relevant longer to find out what is quality culture - rather than talking about that and try to find a common understanding - let's go and try to improve the quality

Q5: Should the work on instruments be continued? And if so how?

AO: Yes.

KS: Yes - there are 7 dimensions and only one is specific on quality management - so yes - develop only this one further - number 7 - that is unique. As an instrument - work on that. Throw away 1-6 and work on 7 - make it better

All: Agreed

These instruments can be only relevant if they can be adapted to natural cultures/circumstances etc.

Working in Q-Culture is important and countries should have the possibility to reflect on their own instruments/tools

PROTOKOLL

04.02.2016

Participants: Sabine Kurz, Dana Stroie, Gerhard Gehrler, Jörg Markowitsch, Leena Koski, Katalin Molnar-Stadler, Karl Skaar, Arancha Oviedo, Phil Whitney, Ida Konggaard, Darko Mali, Heinrich Mahler, Marlies Kranebitter, JLU, MJ, FG, SH

FG: Purpose of 2nd EQAVET-Workshop is mainly to get feedback for Final Report on project and the tools in particular

MJ: What out of all the results - what does it mean for system level - is it sensefull to integrate these ideas on system level - if you could give us some ideas/hints how to integrate quality culture in QM at system level - we would like to strengthen these aspects in QIBB - how can we integrate quality culture aspects in QIBB?

H.Mahler: tested t-Procedure and U-Procedure at our school - can bring our experiences in -

D.Mali: introduce quality culture in QM System especially in company-based training - in schools you have good structures and teachers - with companies it is more important to build on "safe culture" than rely on instruments

I.Koongaard: we are using this tool - did already and will do - am interested in comments

Ph. Whitney: in Wales we have a lot of regulations at country level - through "Colleges Wales" we have a network - I will introduce it to them and I think many will want to use the tool in their institutions

A Oviedo: Secretariate EQAVET-recommendation - one of aims is introduce quality assurance culture - this project is of interest to talk about concrete tangible things that help us to talk about it

K. Skaar: have developed many tools for VET schools and the industry - What is quality in VET in reality? Where do we see it in real life? Am interested what has come of the last Workshop - tools and outcomes

K. Molnar-Stadler: Are there tools and results of this projects that we can use for our work with VET providers

L.Koski: Like to know more about your tools and how they worked? Last year all VET providers in Finland made self evaluation and one topic was quality culture - results have been finished - in EN in one month will be available. Find out how we can promote quality culture in QM

D. Stroie: Interested to adapt and use it in our country - for next years the topic will be great for our schools - and cooperation schools with companies - maybe it can be used for that

S. Kurz: Term "quality culture" was difficult

JLU: What we need is recommendations for implementation of products - we are very interested in your contributions. We are going to have an intensive work sessions group.

INPUT J. Markowitsch

We are happy we found an instrument to diagnose culture - but the other thing would be to change culture - that was not part in the project

One instrument OCAI with guideline - Helmut will present tomorrow

No clear definition of quality culture - that we struggled with and did not accomplish

The idea was to develop a new instrument - we encountered a lot of instruments - that were of very high quality - finally decided to go into a deep analysis of existing instruments, and adapt it to our purposes

We had to decide for one instrument, what is feasible within the project - bit of a disappointment.

Quality culture one (minor) part of a bigger problem -that is school development - schools ill want to use instrument for a certain purpose connected to school development

School culture differs from school climate? - instruments look pretty much the same

Relation Organisational culture - school culture

Which culture are we talking about? Individual school culture (*one* organisation in the focus) and instruments should be applicable to different departments of one school

And we wanted to survey teachers and not students

And how deep can it dig into the layers of culture? (beliefs, convictions....?) The deeper we get, the better.

School culture -school quality culture? Integration? Differentiation? Fragmentation? We did not make this decision either - also caused trouble for the project

Probably we were close to integration perspective

Instruments

Originally we wanted to choose an instrument that has: Focus on teachers, organisation, explore deeper layers, close to pedagogical process, rather descriptive, theory-based and tested

H. Mahler on t-/U-procedure testing: half a day with t-procedure - 3 groups - with moderation external - heterogenous group -we came to some shared convictions - what should we do with them?

So we wanted to go from 4 basic sentences - wanted to work on 4 basic statements -

So we did the U - moderated internally - our SQPM did moderation - we came up with a lot of consistent - were only small - "if they don't find you you don't get extra work" - what the school management took out of it - find out what is workload in different groups - find other people - have a look on who is already very involved and who is not? Find advantages for those who contribute much - they get more influence on their schedule - that is a great reward in schools - because we have no budget to spill out

At the end of the U we had one task list for our quality management - I was happy with the result - we had a lot of discussion about the instrument and the procedure - had critical voices "a very small group made a status of our school culture - that can not be representative. They would have preferred a questionnaire. But I think the result would not have been much (return rate). I think with the heterogenous group we got a good picture. What we got out of it - we have a great commitment to quality in our school - I was happy about it - but some said that was not representative - my perspective was to get something out of the procedure - that brings us forward - not only status quo. I was ambivalent -because I thought we were not that high achievers at quality level - but that was what the result brought at the same time I was flattered...

J. Markowitsch - S. Kurz: Testing in German Schools - meanwhile we tested more - 4 U-Procedure, 6 OCAI

J. Markowitsch: Diskussion of instruments in 2 Austrian Schools

U-Procedure depends a lot on the moderator

H. Mahler: That is true for the t-Part - the U-Part is not so hard any more! If you have the external moderator for the t, you can do the U more easily

MJ: We had the costs in mind -t-/U-procedure would be very expensive - must be feasible

J. Markowitsch: OCAI was most attractive to most schools

Ph. Whitney: If it is so difficult to find definition of quality culture - how many thought they have quality culture in their institution?

MJ: The term itself is accepted - there is sth. implicit in the term - that leads us to decision that it is useful to work with it. No school said, there is no quality culture!

SK: 10 years ago we implemented the same QM system in all schools - and in some it worked well and in others not - so we thought why is that? We hoped to get an answer through the project. What sort of organisational culture influences the quality culture? We found that organisational culture matters - because it defines the way the teachers act in their lessons and what methods they choose - in Germany we have many schools that do their normal processes - and then additionally - they do quality management - the full integration we could not find. But we found "differentiation" and cases where the implementation of QM changed the school culture - but in most cases we found the "fragmentation"

JM: Even though teachers understand the notion of quality culture - but if you introduce the instruments - they are surprised -

SK: Why testing the different instruments? For me there was a big surprise - the OCAI is an instrument that triggers the teacher - with the OCAI they realize it is interesting to find out what kind of culture they have - the difficulty is to come from the type to the discussion and what to do then - we are at "diagnosis" but not on "intervention" - of course schools ask us: now, what to do?

H. Mahler: That is the advantage of the t-Procedure - if you do the U.

SK: But even with the SCEQ you have to think what you do with it in connection to the quality management

SK: With the results of OCAI - would it be useful to work with overall data? What can we learn according to the QM system - what did we wrong with the QM-System - would could we do better? This is the core question now?

K. Skaar: OCAI more normative than other methods?

JM/MJ: No...

K. Skaar: All three are normative - you have an idea that schools need to have a quality system. And you use the instrument to ask if they have a QM system. As I hear it it is not only a diagnostic instrument but an instrument to make a change. Also a great instrument to make changes. If you say "school A", "school B" - you start processes with this instrument

JM: in a way all instruments are normative - but SCEQ would be the most normative.... In my point of view - you don't say it is "easier" to implement QM in an innovative type.... Only a different

K. Skaar: It is normative in a way that you expect

MJ: Of course we have a QM Framework that we want the schools to follow.... Q

FG: There is no ranking of the types.... Not A is better than B

MJ: Every type has advantages and risks - it was very important for us that the OCAI types are positive types - all four of them -

D. Mali: QM-Instruments in schools - can we change the instruments depending on quality culture? Is that thinkable? To offer special instruments? If you focus on performance - is it better to use these instruments

MJ: We gave first hints in our guidelines for OCAI

SK: What we try to find out: which common beliefs the school have and what qm fits? It is always organisational culture -

SK: We found that schools don't work with external evaluation results - our question: what reports do they need?

L. Koski: some schools used lot of evaluation other schools use other innovative tools - what are the impacts on quality culture

JM: I think that is obvious that this is not a one way direction.

K. Skaar: After you have tried the instruments - have sth. Happened in the schools?

JM: Didn't have a framework for comparing and follow-up We were lucky for every school that was willing to test the instruments

SK: A school needs a motivation to think about analysing their culture - some similar problems were identified: if school leader changes - if school gets new headmaster and he wants to find out about the school - or renew the mission statement -

I Koongard: it gives awareness to the school - you start a discussion with the teachers - where you want to achieve sth. Like less dropouts ... If we are a school with good relations - maybe we have low dropouts - if we are very competitive we have more dropouts

Why is there more resistance against certain topics - why do we never discuss some topics? Because no one sets up a meeting on this

MJ: You need a very well established headmaster or a new one - he has to handle it.

WORKING GROUP (see above)

PLENARY

Working Group 1

Q1: Dana Stroe: different systems in our 4 countries - for Nordic and from Austria/Romania on other side: findings of project useful because it can be used at provider and system level. In FIN Quality Culture is already an area to be checked. It is relevant because you can analysis can find out what doesn't work - mirror in their face and find ways of improving situation -

Q2: Leena said you can "feel" quality culture in schools - it also is stated in researches - but you can't express on specific terms. It is important to prove this - it is beneficial -

Q3: It's beneficial - for example - some schools are very self sufficient and don't want to improve in any way - with this diagnosis you can show VET providers differences. Ida from Denmark told about school networks with common benchmarks - schools can support each other - for these networks they could use the tool and share experiences. At single VET provider and on networks of

Q4: I would not necessarily say it is a no - but somehow it is - if we could manage to have this data survey - in some countries - it is very difficult to aggregate this data - other contexts... it will be almost possible to make recommendations - very specific situations. Instruments should not be implemented everywhere - but it can be useful for providers who

Q5: definitely yes. Minimum approach: how instruments are used and share experience - also with other - not-germanspeaking countries. Transfer-Strategy should be developed

Working Group 2

Q1: It can be used on a voluntary basis only. The system can offer it and VET providers decide if they use it but it shouldn't be part of QM system (scale 2-9)

Q2: Q culture is a key element. But very difficult to have a common understanding on quality culture. Group talked about improvement culture - that should be part of the QM framework.

Q3: Any diagnostic instrument foster discussion. However the diagnostic phase is not enough but system should support schools who want to change

Q4: No benchmarking. But data is useful for the individual schools - it should be collected and analysed for individual/organisational use.

Q5: Yes but adapted for member states. Working on quality culture is important - and that is value in itself -

KS: If working on OCAI - you should work on number 7 - VET education: cooperation between school and industry - that must be included and that is still missing. That is important for all member states - so add number 8 and drop 1-6

AO EU-perspective: on European Level you have to take into account if it is a centralised or decentralised system - top down and bottom up approach

Working Group 3

Phil Whitney: We talked a lot - different systems - we didn't see it relevant at system level - more provider level

Q1: even though not normative - if you have a target - which is performance-driven - you can get there in another way - it's a useful tool - it affects the way you approach the quality cycle

MJ: We go out with instruments - we talk about instruments all the time -

Q2: We all agree that anything that gets people talking about qm is useful. Quality is not just about instruments. Instrument can foster innovation

We wouldn't put it on system level -

We agreed this is not the end - its no good just to have the diagnosis - we need the next step - there must be a benefit somewhere

PROTOKOLL

05.02.2016

Presentation Helmut Ittner on OCAI

OCAI doesn't measure specific culture of one school. There are only general "types" - you cannot measure culture with it.

You can have a look at certain manifestations regarding the cultural life and then decide upon the type.

OCAI offers only a look at parts of the culture.

The QM can be changed, not the culture.

If QM system is fixed by regulation of government - no use of OCAI recommended - there must be a certain flexibility of the framework -

MJ: OCAI is about adaption of QM not adaption of culture - that is the difference to the t-procedure for example - but all systems offer some flexibility - there is no fixed plan how to implement QM at school.

Use of OCAI: Version 2: Discussion in groups (on statements) is important to find out the shared assumptions - not the individual ones

Options:

1 result for the entire school

Separated results for departments

Only the "is"-status

Only the "should be"-status

"is"-status + "should be"-status

Number of compartments : technically all is possible - you have to choose for the graph which ones to schools

Testing of the OCAI

How should an ideal school be?

category 1, 2, 5 and 7

Ph. Whitney: If a school comes up with a focus on

H. Ittner: Results of Testing

L. Koski: You should make clear what you mean by performance

HI: overall performance is meant - not only the question how are students results

D. Stoie: the language is not the problem - some issues are quite vague, that caused the discussion. interpretation is source of misunderstanding - interpreted differently the same text

L. Koski: definition is missing. It should be defined.

K. Molnar-Stadler: a group in a school will also discuss - they first have to come to a common understanding of these terms and items -

K. Molnar-Stadler: social requirements we did not understand -

MJ: the discussion is more important than the result.

All agree

HI: The statements are only an approach

KMS: Yes. But that should be somewhere explained.

All agree

HI: Our experience with the instrument, 3 main types

KS: is very dependent on school context - if you benchmark, you use that

HI: But it is not benchmarking because each type has benefits and threats - this chart only shows that the instrument has diagnostic value - types are identifiable

D. Stroie: If you use the instrument two times in one school: "IS" and "SHOULD BE" - than it would not only be a diagnosis...

MJ: But we talk about schools that have a diagnosis and want to change - this has to come from inside the school -

K. Skaar: This is a good tool to bring up a discussion

This should be made clear in the guideline.

HI: Please look at the guideline and tell us where we could/should adapt it

HI/SK: Table developed - types connected to QM instruments

H. Mahler: Will you provide us with a guideline for schools -

MJ: Partly included in the guideline

K. Skaar: Question - performance of schools - why not use this as a kind of tool when schools have low performance. In EQA-VET System we use quality cycle - and always you want to improve - this could be regular work to try to improve your standard in your school

MJ: Maybe if there is a school in a crisis and they tried a lot - you can offer them - but it must be voluntary

L. Koski: You can not only go with the online tool in a school - you need expertise and moderation to support it.

MJ: One argument against t-Procedure was the high effort - very expensive. So we looked for sth. Simpler. But it is an interesting question - maybe it 's enough to train people -

SK: We train external evaluation teams - we give them results from OCAI- for the moment it seems as if it is a good way to get another perspective

FG: Sum-up

AO: What is clear for me: I see it almost as a peer review exercise on a voluntary basis. And it is important you have trained people to support schools to use this.

LK: it is a more internal exercise, not external -

AO: in their case (Bremen) they integrated the diagnosis in external evaluation.

SK: yes I went to the school because they complained about the way we acted before so I offered OCAI then the whole colleagues agreed to test - on voluntary basis.

HI: in Bremen we do a metaevaluation - only of the qm system.

SK: We need somemore testings and then we decide if it should be a fix offer

AO: sometimes it is better that people who go and evaluate the school - for them is a good information

MJ: I would be very careful with that - But then you would need standards

AO: No, only an additional information on the school for peers!

DS: We are trying to further develop our standards to added value to students. It is very difficult to measure this added value - this instrument could provide external evaluators with information...

KMS: innovative tool - other tools in QMS we don't yet have such tools - on the other hand it is very different - this is the one you cannot only give to schools - they need guidelines and support. Competence in the organisation to deal with this - this diagnosis can help understand certain reactions or activities within the school - not only for external evaluations but for all stakeholders (parents etc.)

MJ: The only thing you have in a formal way is the graph - how to communicate this to external stakeholders - I would be very careful - what does that mean? It could help you to look on your mission statement etc.

KMS: OK it is a start but what of it? It is even difficult to interpret for those who are inside the school

MJ: It's really for internal development

DS: Or add to the diagram a text that explains the process - a description

AO: It's a first perspective, first insight into the school -

LK: WE should give schools the chance to do it themselves first - and then think of external stakeholders - start with the schools - need time to exercise this instrument

KS: a good management tool - brings up a huge discussion - also this discussion shows many results - and it is a management tool - you presenting it as a kind of quality culture tool - and my suggestion: dimension number 7 is the unique thing here - 1-6 is good for management in general - while number 7 is unique - that is what we should go on with further. No. 7 is also good for looking at quality system in school.

PW: The type you are has an affect on the students - maybe the students point of view is as important as the management view

JM: It would be helpful to give a little bit **more practical guidelines** maybe a page on a more practical level addressing **Dos and Don't's** - f.e. group building -current situation/target situation - how and what first? Do we recommend one or other way to do it? Another way would be - if schools use them - give us a very short report on how you used it - for this purpose - that was the way we organised it - small stories about how it worked... And then the Follow-up project - any will have to deal with change - starting point: links between school culture and quality management system - there we need evidence! Now it is only assumptions. At the moment I can't think of how to prove these linkages that we assume there are

SK: FHNW/Landwehr: combination with training of school quality managers - they tried to use it with peer reviews

HM: For schools you should find a headline, why schools should use OCAI. Get a headline - what is the purpose of it! The main aspect of OCAI is the discussion - and that will be lost in space - is not documented. We have 250 teachers so 100 different outcomes of OCAI - the numbers that come out are not the most important part. You need Dos and Dons - they should be defined - And I would not reduce the instrument to dimension 7 - cause culture comprises more - you don't get the picture if you don't do the others - it's the one you want but you need the others too.

AO: the relation to the industry - VET - is missing

LK: It's an instrument for quality concept - not quality management

END OF THE WORKSHOP.