



REQUEST OF CORRECTIVE AND/OR PREVENTIVE ACTIONS (RAC)

NENE HATUN

Approaches (Questions 1-5)

- The food for thought suggested by the criteria have not been adequately developed, providing examples in context of their application. The analysis is limited to one or a few sentences, clearly insufficient for the assessment of the significance of an approach (lever for improvement);
- There is no evidence of a review of the effectiveness of approaches adopted;
- Generic is the reference about the anchorage of policies and strategies to the needs of stakeholders and how the school involves all the stakeholders in the changes of strategies and plans;
- No evidence of a review of the objectives and the subsequent revision of strategies, plans, or of the same objectives and / or related targets;
- No evidence of implementation of many requirements suggested by criteria (food for thought);
- There aren't at all examples of the activities conducted in partnership;
- No reference to the arrangements made for the improvement of processes;
- Generic reference to the management and improvement of relations with the service users and with other stakeholders;
- No evidence of managing the process of continuous improvement (setting priorities, making plans, use of methodologies, and so on).

Results (Questions 6-12)

- There is nothing in the causal link between results and approaches (if the results are sporadic and occasional, or a result of the actions taken and planned by approaches);
- No evidence of indicators and their targets and, consequently, of the results;
- No evidence of comparisons with objectives, targets, benchmarks, and an appropriate comment on the award criteria / selection of indicators, the adequacy of the targets and the relevance of the chosen benchmark;
- Many indicators suggested by the model were not taken into account;
- No evidence of target indicators of external perception and internal performance, and of comparisons, in the space and the time, with the industry average, with other industry

organizations and not ("best in class") and with the performance of the school in previous years;

- There is no evidence of the size of the service users statistical sample who received the customer satisfaction questionnaire referred;
- No evidence of data, commented and segmented (stratified);
- No evidence of indirect measures of customer satisfaction suggested by related criteria (for example enrollment, claims, overall image of the school and outside, and so on);
- Low is also the coverage rate with respect to the measures suggested by the criteria;
- There is no evidence to comment on the choice / appropriateness of indicators and relevance of the targets;
- No evidence of data and comments that provides witness to the views of the community in relation to the school;
- There aren't performance data (internal) although some sporadic indicator is mentioned;
- No evidence of results (economic - financial) performance and internal policy suggested by criterion 9 (question 12) and expected following the reading of the application as regards the criteria (questions) 2,4,5.

The table of the strengths and areas for improvement by criteria (questions) is incomplete.

There is some confusion in identifying the cause-effect relationships, with the description, always too schematic and not exhaustive, of some approaches (levers, causes), in response to 6-12 questions, relating to the results (effects). For example, the answer to question 12 (key performance results) was not relevant to the 2 one (policies and strategies). The answers to the questions of the results (6-12) should be supported by data, graphs, charts, data processing, in order to provide evidence of the performance achieved vs. the actions undertaken, which should have been described in response to the questions 1-5 (factors).

It is recommended to complete the report by filling in the appropriate table of the strengths and areas for improvement, and to include, in the next round, in the description of approaches, the actions undertaken to address the critical issues listed in the appropriate column of strengths and areas for improvement

HENRI COANDA LICEUL

Approaches (Questions 1-5)

- The food for thought suggested by the criteria have not been adequately developed, providing examples in context of their application. The analysis is limited to one or a few sentences, clearly insufficient for the assessment of the significance of an approach (lever for improvement).
- Criterion 1 (question 1) was completely misrepresented;
- There is no evidence of a review of the effectiveness of approaches;

- Generic is the reference to the anchorage of policies and strategies to the needs of stakeholders and how the company involve all stakeholders in the changes of strategies and plans;
- No evidence of a review of the objectives and the subsequent revision of strategies, plans, or of the same objectives and / or related targets;
- No evidence of implementation of many requirements suggested by criteria (food for thought);
- There aren't at all examples of the activities conducted in partnership;
- No reference to the arrangements made for the improvement of processes;
- Generic reference to the management and improvement of relations with service users and with other stakeholders;
- No evidence of managing the process of continuous improvement (setting priorities, making plans, use of methodologies, and so on).

Results (Questions 6-12)

- There is nothing in the causal link between results and approaches (if the results are sporadic and occasional, or a result of the actions taken and planned approaches);
- No evidence of indicators and their targets and, consequently, of the results;
- No evidence of comparisons with objectives, targets, benchmarks, and an appropriate comment on the award criteria / selection of indicators, the adequacy of the targets and the relevance of the chosen benchmark;
- Many indicators suggested by the model were not taken into account;
- No evidence of target indicators of external perception and internal performance, and of comparisons, in the space and the time, with the industry average, with the other sector organizations and not ("best in class") and with the performance of the school in previous years;
- There is no evidence of the size of the statistical sample of users who received the customer satisfaction questionnaire referred;
- No evidence of data, commented and segmented (stratified);
- No evidence of indirect measures of customer satisfaction suggested by criterion (enrollment, claims, overall image of the school and outside, and so on);
- Low is also the coverage rate with respect to the measures suggested by the related criteria;
- There is no evidence to comment on the choice / appropriateness of indicators and relevance of the target;

- No evidence of data and comments that provide witness to the views of the community in relation to the company;
- There are not performance data (internal) although some sporadic indicator is mentioned;
- No evidence of results (economic - financial) performance and internal policy pointed by the criterion 9 (question 12) and expected following the reading of the application as regards the criteria (questions) 2,4,5.
- The criterion 8.1 (question 10) has been completely misunderstood.

The table of the strengths and areas for improvement per criterion (question) is complete, but does not show an immediate relevance between what is reported in the respective boxes and the requirements of criterion (question).

There's some confusion in identifying the relationships of cause - effect, with the description, always too schematic and not exhaustive, of some approaches (levers, causes), in response to the questions 6-12, relating to the results (effects). For example, the answer to question 12 (key performance results) was not relevant to the 2 one (policies and strategies). The answers to the questions of the results (6-12) should be supported by data, graphs, charts, data processing, in order to provide evidence of the performance achieved vs. the actions undertaken, which should have been described in response to the questions 1-5 (factors).

It is recommended to review the table of the strengths and areas for improvement, and to include, in the next round, in the description of approaches, including the actions undertaken to address the critical issues listed in the appropriate column of strengths and areas for improvement.

FRONTIERA LAVORO

Approaches (Questions 1-5)

- The food for thought suggested by the criteria have not been adequately developed, providing examples in context of their application. The analysis is limited to one or a few sentences, clearly insufficient for the assessment of the significance of an approach (lever for improvement);
- There is no evidence of a review of the effectiveness of approaches adopted;
- Generic is the reference about the anchorage of policies and strategies to the needs of stakeholders and how the school involves all the stakeholders in the changes of strategies and plans;
- No evidence of a review of the objectives and the subsequent revision of strategies, plans, or of the same objectives and / or related targets;
- No evidence of implementation of many requirements suggested by criteria (food for thought);
- There aren't at all examples of the activities conducted in partnership;
- No reference to the arrangements made for the improvement of processes;

- Generic reference to the management and improvement of relations with the service users and with other stakeholders;
- No evidence of managing the process of continuous improvement (setting priorities, making plans, use of methodologies, and so on).

Results (Questions 6-12)

- There is nothing in the causal link between results and approaches (if the results are sporadic and occasional, or a result of the actions taken and planned by approaches);
- No evidence of indicators and their targets and, consequently, of the results;
- No evidence of comparisons with objectives, targets, benchmarks, and an appropriate comment on the award criteria / selection of indicators, the adequacy of the targets and the relevance of the chosen benchmark;
- Many indicators suggested by the model were not taken into account;
- No evidence of target indicators of external perception and internal performance, and of comparisons, in the space and the time, with the industry average, with other industry organizations and not ("best in class") and with the performance of the school in previous years;
- There is no evidence of the size of the service users statistical sample who received the customer satisfaction questionnaire referred;
- No evidence of data, commented and segmented (stratified);
- No evidence of indirect measures of customer satisfaction suggested by related criteria (for example enrollment, claims, overall image of the school and outside, and so on);
- Low is also the coverage rate with respect to the measures suggested by the criteria;
- There is no evidence to comment on the choice / appropriateness of indicators and relevance of the targets;
- No evidence of data and comments that provides witness to the views of the community in relation to the school;
- There aren't performance data (internal) although some sporadic indicator is mentioned;
- No evidence of results (economic - financial) performance and internal policy suggested by criterion 9 (question 12) and expected following the reading of the application as regards the criteria (questions 2,4,5.
- The question number 10 was completely misrepresented.

The table of the strengths and areas of improvement by criterion (question) is completed, but the contents of their cells are often disconnected from the description provided in the report at the relevant criteria.

There is some confusion in identifying the cause-effect relationships, with the description, always too schematic and not exhaustive, of some approaches (levers, causes), in response to 6-12 questions, relating to the results (effects). For example, the answer to question 12 (key performance results) was not relevant to the 2 one (policies and strategies). The answers to the questions of the results (6-12) should be supported by data, graphs, charts, data processing, in order to provide evidence of the performance achieved vs. the actions undertaken, which should have been described in response to the questions 1-5 (factors).

It's recommended to redesign the report ensuring the consistency of what is specified in the table of the strengths and areas for improvement with those described in relation to the corresponding questions, and to include, in the next round, in the description of approaches, the actions undertaken to address the critical issues listed in the appropriate column of strengths and areas for improvement.

CASAGRANDE/CESI

Approaches (Questions 1-5)

- The food for thought suggested by the criteria have not been adequately developed, providing examples in context of their application. The analysis is limited to the slavish repetition of the bullets enucleated from the monitoring report prepared by the Quality Expert;
- There is no evidence of a review of the effectiveness of approaches adopted;
- Generic is the reference about the anchorage of policies and strategies to the needs of stakeholders and how the school involves all the stakeholders in the changes of strategies and plans;
- No evidence of a review of the objectives and the subsequent revision of strategies, plans, or of the same objectives and / or related targets;
- No evidence of implementation of many requirements suggested by criteria (food for thought);
- There aren't at all examples of the activities conducted in partnership;
- No reference to the arrangements made for the improvement of processes;
- Generic reference to the management and improvement of relations with the service users and with other stakeholders;
- No evidence of managing the process of continuous improvement (setting priorities, making plans, use of methodologies, and so on).

Results (Questions 6-12)

- There is nothing in the causal link between results and approaches (if the results are sporadic and occasional, or a result of the actions taken and planned by approaches);
- No evidence of indicators and their targets and, consequently, of the results;
- Indicators, whose results are presented, have a level of coverage rather modest;
- Only sporadically they have been made comparisons with objectives, targets, benchmarks, and an appropriate comment on the award criteria / selection of indicators, the adequacy of the targets and the relevance of the chosen benchmark;
- Many indicators suggested by the model were not taken into account;
- No evidence of target indicators of external perception and internal performance, and of comparisons, in the space and the time, with the industry average, with other industry organizations and not ("best in class") and with the performance of the school in previous years;
- There is no evidence of the size of the service users statistical sample who received the customer satisfaction questionnaire referred;
- No evidence of data, commented and segmented (stratified);
- No evidence of indirect measures of customer satisfaction suggested by related criteria (for example enrollment, claims, overall image of the school and outside, and so on);
- Low is also the coverage rate with respect to the measures suggested by the criteria;
- There is no evidence to comment on the choice / appropriateness of indicators and relevance of the targets;
- No evidence of data and comments that provides witness to the views of the community in relation to the school;
- There aren't performance data (internal) although some sporadic indicator is mentioned;
- No evidence of results (economic - financial) performance and internal policy suggested by criterion 9 (question 12) and expected following the reading of the application as regards the criteria (questions) 2,4,5. There is no answer to the question 12, which was arbitrarily merged with that at n. 7 (perception of customer satisfaction).

There is some confusion in identifying the cause-effect relationships, with the description, always too schematic and not exhaustive, of some approaches (levers, causes), in response to 6-12 questions, relating to the results (effects). For example, the answer to question 12 (key performance results) was not relevant to the 2 one (policies and strategies). The answers to the questions of the results (6-12) should be supported by data, graphs, charts, data processing, in order to provide evidence of the performance

achieved vs. the actions undertaken, which should have been described in response to the questions 1-5 (factors).

It is recommended to include, in the next round, in the description of approaches, the actions undertaken to address the critical issues listed in the appropriate column of strengths and areas for improvement.

PANTANELLI MONNET

Approaches (Questions 1-5)

- The food for thought suggested by the criteria have not been adequately developed, providing examples in context of their application. The analysis is limited to one or a few sentences, clearly insufficient for the assessment of the significance of an approach (lever for improvement);
- There is no evidence of a review of the effectiveness of approaches adopted;
- Generic is the reference about the anchorage of policies and strategies to the needs of stakeholders and how the school involves all the stakeholders in the changes of strategies and plans;
- No evidence of a review of the objectives and the subsequent revision of strategies, plans, or of the same objectives and / or related targets;
- No evidence of implementation of many requirements suggested by criteria (food for thought);
- There aren't at all examples of the activities conducted in partnership;
- No reference to the arrangements made for the improvement of processes;
- Generic reference to the management and improvement of relations with the service users and with other stakeholders;
- No evidence of managing the process of continuous improvement (setting priorities, making plans, use of methodologies, and so on).

Results (Questions 6-12)

- There is nothing in the causal link between results and approaches (if the results are sporadic and occasional, or a result of the actions taken and planned by approaches);
- No evidence of indicators and their targets and, consequently, of the results;
- No evidence of comparisons with objectives, targets, benchmarks, and an appropriate comment on the award criteria / selection of indicators, the adequacy of the targets and the relevance of the chosen benchmark;
- Many indicators suggested by the model were not taken into account;

- No evidence of target indicators of external perception and internal performance, and of comparisons, in the space and the time, with the industry average, with other industry organizations and not ("best in class") and with the performance of the school in previous years;
- There is no evidence of the size of the service users statistical sample who received the customer satisfaction questionnaire referred;
- No evidence of data, commented and segmented (stratified);
- No evidence of indirect measures of customer satisfaction suggested by related criteria (for example enrollment, claims, overall image of the school and outside, and so on);
- Low is also the coverage rate with respect to the measures suggested by the criteria;
- There is no evidence to comment on the choice / appropriateness of indicators and relevance of the targets;
- No evidence of data and comments that provides witness to the views of the community in relation to the school;
- There aren't performance data (internal) although some sporadic indicator is mentioned;
- No evidence of results (economic - financial) performance and internal policy suggested by criterion 9 (question 12) and expected following the reading of the application as regards the criteria (questions) 2,4,5.

The table of the strengths and areas for improvement by criteria (questions) is not filled.

There is some confusion in identifying the cause-effect relationships, with the description, always too schematic and not exhaustive, of some approaches (levers, causes), in response to 6-12 questions, relating to the results (effects). For example, the answer to question 12 (key performance results) was not relevant to the 2 one (policies and strategies). The answers to the questions of the results (6-12) should be supported by data, graphs, charts, data processing, in order to provide evidence of the performance achieved vs. the actions undertaken, which should have been described in response to the questions 1-5 (factors).

It is recommended to complete the report by filling in the appropriate table of the strengths and areas for improvement, and to include, in the next round, in the description of approaches, the actions undertaken to address the critical issues listed in the appropriate column of strengths and areas for improvement.