



Project Number: 527826-LLP-1-2012-1-BE-LEONARDO-LNW

Project funded by the European Commission:



Lifelong
Learning
Programme

D.3.2 VETWORK Benchmarking Report

TABLE OF CONTENT

Introduction	p. 3
Description of the Benchmarking Tool and main functionalities	p. 4
Focus Group and Internal testing	p. 7
Results of the testing	p. 7
Improvements and amendments	p. 8
Online Helpdesk service	p. 9
ANNEX I: Vetwork Benchmarking Indicators	p. 10
ANNEX II: Comments from the Focus Group, Vienna, 28th May 2014	p. 19

CONTROL SHEET

Project title	VETWORK
Programme	Lifelong Learning Programme, Leonardo da Vinci Network
Project n°	527826-LLP-1-2012-1-BE-LEONARDO-LNW
Work-Package n°	4
Deliverable n°	D.3.2
Authors	Francesco Fedele
Contact details	f.fedele@sophiari.eu
Contributors	Martina Zipoli
Contractual Date of Delivery	31/05/2015
Actual Date of Delivery	20/06/2015
Abstract	
Approval Status:	Last Version
Method of Distribution:	Email; dropbox
Confidential Status:	Confidential

Document Log

Version	Date	Comment	Author
0.0	20/05/2015		Francesco Fedele, Martina Zipoli
0.1	21/05/2015	Proof- reading and Feedback	All Partners
0.2	25/05/2015	Final version	Francesco Fedele, Martina Zipoli



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

@ VETWORK Partnership 2012-2015. Reproduction is authorised, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged

INTRODUCTION

The VETWORK network has developed a Benchmarking Tool to measure the effectiveness of integration between training as provided by VET specialized institutions and organizations, and training as provided in the workplace. Building on the results of the good practice comparative analysis carried out by project Partners, the Benchmarking Tool is meant to help companies, employers, VET institutions and other organizations to evaluate and reduce this learning gap, increasing collaboration between best and least performers to develop strategies for improvement. The Benchmarking Tool (hereinafter BM Tool) will specifically measure features such as: methodological and organizational innovation, excellence, quality assurance, assessment and certification of formal and informal learning, mobility, role of the tutor at the workplace, the degree of integration between VET and the world of work.

The BM Tool has been developed by SOPHIA R&I as a results of the work done for WP3. The Tool is based on sets of questions, along with selected criteria and indicators. By replying to the questions, users will get an assessment of their performance as well as an highlight of the weak areas that shall be addressed to enhance integration between VET and the world of work. Before opening the Tool to the public, it has been tested by a group of experts and VET providers (Vienna, May 2014) and by the Partners (December 2014).

This Report presents the Benchmarking Tool, its main functionalities, the testing phase and outcomes, and the amendments done along with the most important feedbacks collected.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BENCHMARKING TOOL AND MAIN FUNCTIONALITIES

The tool helps VET providers to self-assess and to compare the extent and the concrete ways through which they collaborate with the world of work. It allows VET organizations to answer the following questions: Does your vocational training always match the needs of the world of work? Do you consider your training offer as custom-fit or do you think you can still make improvements?

The benchmarking tool contains questions organized in four categories (Input, Processes, Output/Outcomes and Context) and allows a positioning of the VET provider in order to keep in mind the nature, size and context of each organization and to propose comparisons with the most adequate benchmarking partners. By simply replying to the questions posed by the benchmarking tool, especially if the exercise is conducted collectively by a working team including the main management positions, the VET provider is stimulated to reflect on its performance as well as to recognize the weak areas that shall be addressed to enhance VET- Work integration. If the VET provider organization decides to make its answers public, this contributes to the development of a database which allows to identify best performers in each criterion and indicator, and to propose inter-organizational project work and collaborative learning, locally as well as internationally.

INSTRUCTIONS ON THE USE OF THE TOOL

In order to access the tool you need to be a registered user on the system. Apart from your name, your username and email you will be asked for some data on your organization and for permission to make the data resulting from the benchmark available for statistical analysis. Positioning and public results are of fundamental importance: the BM Tool so conceived could be the basis for a future intelligent analysis, creating networks, a database of best performers and inputs.

Once the User is logged in, he/she can select from the menu on the right the specific part of the benchmark to complete. Each benchmark session can be filled many times, especially if the User needs more time to evaluate specific aspects of the organization. Each benchmark session requires about 10/15 minutes to be completed. Users can skip a question, go back to previous questions or use the question list to jump to a specific point. It is also possible to stop the benchmark before having completed it, and it will be evaluated on the basis of the questions answered. However, some fields are mandatory to allow the analysis.

The benchmark is subdivided in four sections analysing the INPUT, the PROCESS, the OUTPUT/OUTCOMES and the CONTEXT criteria with regard to the VET organization. Once the User completes a benchmarking section, a score will be calculated based on answers. The tool gives a score between 0 and 5 for each question. Higher scores are for organizations that are more advanced in the VET training process. The score is given both as an absolute value and as a % of the maximum potential score. The minimum score is also provided, as well as the time used to complete the benchmark.

When Users finish the assessment, along with statistical results, get also a general feedback, to provide organizations with suggestions and recommendations for improvement. Right now, it is

only a short sentence saying how is the organization positioned in respect of full results. Later, when more data are collected and comparison of results wider, the system will be able to give a more detailed feedback and put organizations in connection with each other. Results can be printed, exported as PDF, sent to an email address or even be posted on Facebook, Twitter or LinkedIn. Last but not least, Users can take the benchmark all over again, and evaluate progresses and changes along time.

Vetwork Input Benchmarking

★ **Benchmark Results**

Your score: 0.00 out of 40.00 (0.00%)

Score by categories:

Category 1: Input indicators (I): 0 out of 5 (0%)

Minimum score: 0.00 (0.00%)

Elapsed time: 31:23

🔄 **Benchmark Feedback**

you are at the beginning of a long journey for quality improvement

[PDF Report](#) [E-mail](#) [Take this benchmark again](#)

[f](#) [t](#) [in](#)

BENCHMARKING SECTIONS

The benchmark is subdivided in four sections analysing the INPUT, the PROCESS, the OUTPUT/OUTCOMES and the CONTEXT criteria with regard to the VET organization. An overview of the analysis criteria is presented below (while a more detailed overview is in Annex I).

The first section, INPUTS, is composed by 9 questions: 8 multiple choice questions investigating the existing relations between the organization and the local employers, the influence of stakeholders, the degree of recognition by local industries and so on - plus a comment box.

The second section, PROCESS, requires a more detailed assessment exercise. It is composed by 28 multiple choice questions plus the comment box. This section intends to evaluate several aspects of the processes involving VET organizations in the development of curricula; in the analysis of employers needs and the implementation of training matching these needs; in the definition of competences and training delivery; in the attempts towards innovation. The BM Tool wants also to investigate the impact produced by the training provided, to define whether the institution is able to fill the gap between workplace needs and learning.

INPUTS	PROCESS		OUTCOMES	CONTEXT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing VET-WORK relations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint learning needs identification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graduates employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy for collaboration in place
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T/T with previous work experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint curricula development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graduates employment surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students % internship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management commitment to VET-WORK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint competences/ Learning Objects definition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trainers exchange Joint Learners Support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VET trainers being updated in companies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff commitment to VET-WORK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint delivery of training programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint innovation initiatives 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student interest in VET-WORK

The third section, OUTCOMES, is composed by 15 questions plus the comment box. The analysis focuses on the outcomes of VET training, in terms of employment rate of graduates, percentage of internships offered, degree of improvement of the training provided, innovation of training contents and use of technological resources. Despite the analysis is based here only on percentages, without taking into account (in this specific case) reasons and processes, the questions asked are able to evaluate the degree of innovation and impact of the training provided giving organizations an excellent overview of the level of integration between VET training and job related needs.

The last section, CRITERIAS, is composed by a total of 13 questions, 12 multiple choice questions and the comment box. It investigates sensitive issues such as institutional strategy for collaboration, managers and staff commitment for an effective integration between VET and work, students attitudes and the degree of support they get for career development.

FOCUS GROUP AND INTERNAL TESTING

The Benchmarking Tool has been tested in two different contexts. The first presentation of the Tool in its first version was held the 28th of May 2014 in Vienna, Austria. The participants at the event were 12 persons, experts in the field, stakeholders and VET providers. The composition of the group was quite diverse, from several institutions and associations: BFI OO, EVTA, Chambers of Commerce of Granada and Paris, Tavistock Institute, IPEW, FiaTest, AMKE, KENWERK and GfP.

After the presentation of the VETWORK Project, the methodological aspects and the good practice analysis, Raniero Chelli (SOPHIA R&I) presented the specific features and functionalities of the Benchmarking Tool. A focus group session was opened: the participants had time to try the Tool and share comments during an open feedback session. The session lasted about 1 hour and feedbacks were collected for future implementations.

As foreseen in the application, the Focus Group had the scope to highlight the critical issues of the Benchmarking Tool for revision and improvements. Several comments were collected, on technical aspects and on the content of the analysis. A detailed overview is presented in Annex II, while here only a brief report will be made. Most of the attendees asked Partners to place an indicator of progress while filling the questionnaire, to give users the right perception of what is left to answer in the time they have. They also pointed out the importance of having the possibility to stop and continue filling in answers in a later time. Saving options should have been made clearer, and instructions more visible. Underline the possibility and the usefulness of making results public, and the importance of answers reflecting the institutional position more than personal attitudes. About the content of the Tool, users suggested to add some more text at the beginning of each sections, explaining more in detail what it is about. Also, it would be useful to have a description of the tool in the Homepage, to guide users through the benchmarking exercise. Lastly, participants made a point about results: it is important to explain how results will be analysed and evaluated, how they are displayed and how positioning is made.

On the other hand, comments have been collected also among the Partners of the Consortium in December 2015. A phase of internal testing was opened, and the main results are reported here. First of all, Partners suggested to add to the Tool Instructions a note saying to new users to check the Spam while registering, to make sure the whole process works. Moreover, registration should be shorter: lots of questions were mandatory fields, making the registering process time-consuming. The risk is that many users would not feel motivated to continue. Also, transition from one section to the others should be made smoother, maybe with some explanatory texts.

All in all, several things were pointed out for revision. SOPHIA R&I, who was in charge for the development of the Tool, took the responsibility of revising and improving the Benchmarking Tool, making it look as it is today. Amendments and improvements are described in details in the following paragraph.

IMPROVEMENTS AND AMENDMENTS

All bugs pointed out during the test phase have been addressed and, where possible, the suggested enhancements have been incorporated into the existing version of the benchmarking tool (see a detailed list below).

While this updated version has been delivered and is now operational the collection of improvement suggestions and bugs report will continue thru the dedicated email address support@vetwork.it. When possible or necessary further updated versions of the benchmarking tool will be made available to the project partners and the general public. Thanks to the fact that the system is accessible online those updated version will be immediately available to all users, while always preserving the previous benchmarking results.

List of amendments and improvements:

- Revised tool description page and instructions
- Added table to describe the indicators addresses in each section of the benchmark
- Simplified registration process, added position of individual in organization
- Detailed information on the Organization taking the benchmark was made optional and can now be filled in after the completion of the benchmark
- Questions are numbered with total number of questions for that section shown right beside it (progress indicator), allowing users to know how fare they are into the test
- Buttons to allow skipping a question, moving forward or backwards and finishing a section before fully completing the answers
- “All Statistics” provides an overall results of all benchmarks taken so far
- A free text comment has been added at the end of each section
- The benchmark has been made usable also from smartphones/tablets
- Wrong term “quiz” removed from the benchmark and corrected some questions or possible answers where a mistake was present
- A “Review” button was introduced when results of each section are shown, to allow the user to see his/her answer and the distribution of answers given by others, in order to self evaluate the Organization
- Possibility of printing results, or producing a PDF or sending them via e-mail
- Various minor corrections of bugs

ONLINE HELPDESK SERVICE

The email support@vetwork.it can be used for any support need. An answer will be provided by our support staff and where necessary a synchronous session will be organized to assist the user via Skype or similar means.

ANNEX I - VETWORK BENCHMARKING INDICATORS

General Indicators	Specific Indicators (observable/measurable)	Levels	Score
I.1. Existing VET-WORK relations	I.1.1. Presence of industry stakeholders and professional unions in the board of VET organisations	• None	0
		• Implemented, but not effective	1-4
		• Implemented and effective	5
	I.1.2. Level of influence of industry/companies in VET organisations	• None	0
		• Limited to some fields	1-4
		• Very substantial and effective	5
	I.1.3. Extent of recognition by the local employers	• None	0
		• Partially	1-4
		• Fully recognised	5
I.2. Teachers/Trainers with previous work experience	I.2.1. Number of specific trainings/conferences, workshops for each T/T of VET organization in last year	• None	0
		• 1 to 4 in average	1-4
		• More than 4 in average	5
	I.2.2. Existence of criteria on trainer recruitment related to his/her work experience, such as: number of years in the field, expertise in the field	• None	0
		• Only for some groups of teachers/trainers	1-4
		• Yes, practically for all teachers/trainers	5
	I.2.3. Percentage of T/T with practical experience in the specific field, not only in education area	• Less than 20%	0
		• 20% to 50%	1-4
		• More than 50%	5
I.3. Technical Equipment and use of company resources	I.3.1. Up-to-date technical equipment used in VET org.	• No	0
		• Only partially	1-4
		• Yes	5
	I.3.2. Access to technical equipment from local industry granted to VET org.	• No	0
		• Only during internships	1-4

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both during internships and planned practical sessions during the study program	5
--	--	---	---

Category 2: Process indicators (P)

General Indicators	Specific Indicators (observable/ measurable)	Levels	Score
P1 Joint learning needs identification	P.1.1. Frequency of processes to identify learning needs	• Never or very seldom	0
		• Every two-three years	1-4
		• At least every year	5
	P.1.2. Joint instruments / methods/ tools applied by VET to identify learning needs	• None	0
		• Learning needs are identified through collaborative processes involving employers	1-4
		• Learning needs are identified through collaborative processes involving employers and workers	5
P2 Joint curricula development	P.2.1. Joint development of innovative teaching-learning methods	• Never	0
		• Sometimes	1-4
		• Always	5
	P.2.2. Percentage of training curricula developed together with the employers representatives	• Less than 20%	0
		• 20% - 50%	1-4
		• More than 50%	5
	P.2.3. Joint updating of subject content, course improvement etc.	• Never	0
		• Sometimes	1-4
		• Always, for each course	5
P3 Joint competences/ Learning Outcomes definition	P.3.1. Adoption of common qualification system to define competences/curricula	• Not yet	0
		• Started	1-4
		• Fully implemented	5
	P.3.2. Identification of key/general learning outcomes	• Not yet	
		• Started	
		• Fully implemented	
	P.3.3. Detailed identification of learning outcomes in a shared approach	• Not yet	
		• Started	
		• Fully implemented	

P4 Joint delivery of training programs	P.4.1. Percentage of practice session realized in real work environment over total practice sessions (*Depending on different types of competences, there may be situations where practice session in real work environment is regulated by law or not really necessary to acquire practical skills. If this is the case please add a note)	• Less than 20%	0
		• 20% - 50%	1-4
		• More than 50%	5
	P.4.2. Collaboration of teachers and company staff in delivery of training	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
	P.4.3. Use of workplace to develop transversal competences	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
P5 Joint learners support	P.5.1. Involvement of employers in an active approach to combat dropping out	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
	P.5.2. Collaboration in active labour policies to train unemployed people to acquire new competences, e.g. ICT	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
	P.5.3. Joint support protocols involving staff from VET and employer	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
P6 Joint assessment of learning outcomes	P.6.1. Presence of employer representatives in the evaluation sessions	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
	P.6.2. Joint design of assessment criteria and tools	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
	P.6.3. The use of industry workplace for running the assessment	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
P7 Graduates	P.7.1. Existence of a	• Not in place	0

employment surveys	mechanism for monitoring and tracking employment or progress after a training	• Occasional surveys	1-4
		• Systematically implemented	5
	P.7.2. Collaboration between VET and employers in evaluating the learning impact of training	• Not conducted	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
P8 Trainers exchange	P.8.1. Percentage of VET teachers/trainers who are active in enterprise training	• Less than 20%	0
		• 20% to 50%	1-4
		• More than 50%	5
	P.8.2. Company specialists active in classroom training in VET organisation	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• Systematically	5
	P.8.3. Mechanisms to support the mobility of trainers and practitioners	• Not in place	0
		• In preparation	1-4
		• Fully implemented	5
P9 Joint innovation initiatives	P.9.1. Availability of customized training in response to demand	• Not available	0
		• Available in certain parts of the programme	1-4
		• Fully available	5
	P.9.2. Joint projects to innovate learning outcomes or learning methods	• Not in place	0
		• Occasionally done	1-4
		• Fully implemented	5
P10 Quality Assurance	P.10.1. Joint development of quality management system (audit internal/ external, self-evaluation)	• Not in place	0
		• In preparation	1-4
		• Fully implemented	5
	P.10.2. Joint action plans addressing weaknesses, emphasize strengths and disseminate good practice	• Not in place	0
		• In preparation	1-4
		• Fully implemented	5
	P.10.3. Monitor and review progress in responding to the outcomes of the self-assessment of quality assurance	• Not in place	0
		• In preparation	1-4
		• Fully implemented	5

Category 3: Outcomes indicators (O)

General Indicators	Specific Indicators (observable/measurable)	Levels	Score
O1 Graduates employment	O.1.1. Percentage of positive final examinations over the total of examinations	• Under 50%	0
		• 50% to 80%	1-4
		• Over 80%	5
	O.1.2. Percentage of trainees who find a job within 6 months after the end of training course / total no. of trainees unemployed	• Under 50%	0
		• 50% to 80%	1-4
		• Over 80%	5
	O.1.3. Percentage of trainees who remain employed after 6 months of work	• Under 50%	0
		• 50% to 80%	1-4
		• Over 80%	5
O2 Students % internship	O.2.1. Percentage of internship students / Total Number of students	• Under 50%	0
		• 50% to 80%	1-4
		• Over 80%	5
	O.2.2. Percentage of students attending a fully integrated internship over internship students	• Under 20%	0
		• 20% to 50%	1-4
		• Over 50%	5
	O.2.3. Percentage of interns who become employees in the same company	• Under 20%	0
		• 20% to 50%	1-4
		• Over 50%	5
O3 VET trainers being updated in companies	O.3.1. Percentage of trainers that have been trained in enterprises	• Less than 20%	0
		• 20% to 50%	1-4
		• Over 50%	5
	O.3.2. Percentage of trainers that have been substantially updated through courses in enterprises/work organisations	• Less than 10%	0
		• 10% to 50%	1-4
		• Over 50%	5
	O.3.3. Percentage of trainers that have been assessed in enterprises through work-based assessment	• Less than 10%	0
		• 10% to 50%	1-4

		• Over 50%	5
O4 On-line collaboration networks/ Mixed community of practice	O.4.1. Existence of VET-industry communities finding new ways of improving the training system	• None/Not aware	0
		• Some sporadic examples	1-4
		• Active and well organised activities	5
	O.4.2. Influence of mixed on-line communities on VET practice	• None	0
		• Marginal	1-4
		• Very relevant	5
	O.4.3. Percentage of teachers who are members of industry related professional communities	• Less than 10%	0
		• 10% to 30%	1-4
		• Over 30%	5
O5 Resource effectiveness	O.5.1. Involvement of industry in the selection of courses to be implemented	• Never	0
		• In some cases	1-4
		• Systematically planned	5
	O.5.2. Integrated use of technological resources for learning and exams	• Never	0
		• In some cases	1-4
		• Systematically planned	5
	O.5.3. Available examples (in the last five years) of suppression of courses previously delivered	• None	0
		• 1 to 5	1-4
		• Over 5	5

Category 4: Institutional Context indicators (C)

General Indicators	Specific Indicators (observable/measurable)	Levels	Score
C1 Strategy for collaboration in place	C.1.1. Strategy document available (clear, with resources, for 3 or more years)	• Strategy defined by management bodies	0
		• Strategy defined by management and consultations	1-4
		• Fully participatory strategy development	5
	C.1.2. VET Strategy development that involve key partners and stakeholders	• Not available	0
		• In preparation or incomplete	1-4
		• Available and implemented	5
	C.1.3. Evaluation of strategy implementation	• None	0
		• Every 2 years or more	1-4
		• Yearly	5
C2 Management commitment to VET-WORK	C.2.1. Manager(s) are evaluated according to the maintenance of the VET-WORK relationship	• No	0
		• As a marginal aspect of their performance	1-4
		• Yes, as a key aspect of their performance	5
	C.2.2. Personal commitment of VET manager(s) towards strengthening VET-Work relationship	• None	0
		• Moderate	1-4
		• High	5
	C.2.3. Support received by industry to VET management	• None	0
		• Moderate	1-4
		• High	5
C3 Teaching commitment to VET-WORK relationship	C.3.1. Teachers understand the necessity of using specialists from industry to provide good training	• Not really	0
		• Yes, but only some	1-4
		• Yes, it is an accepted principle	5
	C.3.2. Teachers and trainers have a	• Rarely	0

	proactive attitude towards the world of work	• Frequently	1-4
		• Very frequently, it is a common practice	5
	C.3.3. Actions aimed to increase and motivate staff commitment to VET-WORK (e.g. contests, competitions, projects, ...)	• Never implemented	0
		• Seldom implemented	1-4
		• Regularly implemented	5
C4 Learners interest in VET-WORK relationship	C.4.1. Students show positive attitudes towards industry involvement in the definition of curricula and training activities	• Not really	0
		• A significant minority does	1-4
		• A majority does	5
	C.4.2. VET organisation encourage students to participate in volunteering activities where they learn to build up knowledge in a practical field	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• On a regular basis	5
	C.4.3. VET organisation cooperate with students associations and enterprises to help learners in their career choice	• Never	0
		• Occasionally	1-4
		• On a regular basis	5

ANNEX II - COMMENTS FROM THE FOCUS GROUP, VIENNA

COMMENTS OF TECHNICAL ASPECTS:

1. Insert an INDICATOR OF PROGRESS while filling the questionnaire. If not possible, insert an indication such as 'question 1/10' so that users are aware of how many questions are left to complete the current section, or the questionnaire itself.
2. Make it possible to STOP and RESUME the process of compiling of the survey + add a WARNING about the saving options: inserted data will be saved only when the entire section is completed. Also add an indication about which sections have been completed and which not yet (such as a report of data collected so far).
3. Insert indication about how many persons have already filled the quiz.
4. Add a FREE COMMENTS box at the end of every section of the questionnaire to make possible specifications and descriptions of peculiar cases.
5. Adapt the format of the survey to make it visible and usable on Smartphone
6. Add PRINT button/option in the page with the summary of the RESULTS.
7. Specify that ONLY ONE ANSWER for each question is admitted, and that it is mandatory to answer all questions to complete one section.
8. Add indication of the time needed to complete the survey.
9. Insert the button PREVIOUS in addition to the button NEXT.
10. Delete the section BM.TOOL, keep only the 4 main sections. Use the graphic options of the section Process as the graphic profile for the entire quiz.
11. Move the LOG OUT button because it is too close to the button NEXT. Might be confusing when moving from one question to the next one.
12. Check saving settings and options (for example, add auto-saving every tot minutes).

COMMENTS ON USER ID, POSITIONING OF THE INSTITUTION, ADMINISTRATION OF RESULTS:

1. Add the description of USERS - POSITIONING OF THE VET PROVIDERS - Suggestion: assign users a USER ID and PSW. It is important to consider the possibility that more than one person from the same institution might be filling the quiz. In such cases, it is even more important to specify whether the data provided reflect a personal vision or an official position of the VET Provider, and how those data will be analysed in relation to the whole data system. Ex. what happens (during data analysis) if one institution has filled the questionnaire with many different versions?
2. Verify and establish data insert options. Is it possible to fill in the questionnaire more then once? If yes, how the different versions are related to each other? Is the system able to save different versions for the same User, or is the oldest version replaced by the newest? Is it possible to modify a questionnaire which has been already completed?
3. Create an ADMINISTRATOR USER with access and control over the data gathered. The Admin-User will be able to eliminate the data of the tests, save the valid results and analyse them for the implementation of the BM.Tool.
4. All results must be later published on the VETWORK website.

COMMENTS ON THE TEXTS IN THE TOOL:

1. At the beginning of every SECTION, add a TEXT with a description of what the section is about. At the end of every section, point out which is the next section to be filled with information (a brief note).
2. Add a description of the questionnaire in the HOME PAGE, describing and explaining how to fill the survey, which use will be done with the information collected, how results will be analysed and evaluated. Also insert a note about the importance of participation on behalf of the VET PROVIDED and other stakeholders (why should they do it?), highlighting the two complementary aspects of the creation and subsequent implementation of the Benchmarking Tool.
3. In the introductory text of the HOME PAGE, add information about data analysis and users privacy.
4. In the introductory text of the HOME PAGE, add explanation of SHOW RESULTS and HIDE RESULTS buttons. Explain that results are visible in their totality, but also according to different categories. Users can also see how others responded to the questions and their positioning compared to the data collected up to that moment
5. Explain the RESPONSE OPTIONS in details for each question, specifying the value of each answer option. Also add indications about the categories of every possible answer
6. Remove or explain ACRONYMS