



QUESTIONNAIRES FOR AN EXTERNAL EVALUATOR'S COMPETENCE ASSESSMENT

DESCRIPTION

The questionnaire was developed based on the Regional standard of competences for external evaluators developed within the Enhancements in the quality of education and training in SEE – EQET SEE project.

I Introductory text

The questionnaires for self/peer/management assessment were developed within the Enhancements in the quality of education and training in SEE - [EQET SEE project](#). Their main objective is to draft a tool that may be used by the quality assurance agencies in seven EQET SEE economies: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo*, Moldova, Montenegro, Republic of North Macedonia and Serbia, as a competence self-assessment tool.

The competence assessment questionnaires were developed based on the questionnaire for assessing the external evaluators needs for trainings that was in turn an articulation of the [Regional standard of competences for external evaluators](#). Both Regional standard of competencies for external evaluators and the questionnaire for measuring the external evaluators needs for trainings were developed by the EQET SEE consortium: the [ERI SEE Secretariat](#) as the lead partner, and implementing partners, quality assurance agencies from seven economies. The contacts of institutions and their representatives who were involved in the process of developing these documents are available on the [EQET SEE project website](#).

The type of evaluation that entails three levels of assessment (self-peer-management assessment) is known as a 360-feedback system and was developed by the HR practitioners to evaluate employees' performance. Its main goal is for employees to receive feedback from their peers and management which they can use for further professional development. Organisations utilising this approach often use it to show their commitment towards developing a culture of democratic feedback and investing into professional growth of employees. The method is developed so that it can provide an opportunity for growth and usually consists of providing quantitative and qualitative feedback. The latter is usually used to provide the why-answer to the quantitative grading. As the peer review should be anonyms the answers must be anonymised and prepared so that they provide constructive feedback. The management review often cannot be anonyms (an argument could be made that it also should not be anonyms) but it should also be presented in an encouraging and positive manner. The system should be implemented by the professionals knowledgeable of this type of assessment as the he data presentation and analysis is not straightforward.

In the case that the EQET SEE project partner institutions opt for implementing all three questionnaires, open questions that could provide additional feedback to a person who is being evaluated (as are questions: why you gave that assessment, why do you think so etc. for example) could be added. Also, only questions on which it can be reasonably expected that individuals can provide informed and reliable feedback should be asked. Lastly, a person that is being evaluated should receive feedback in a mindful and organised way in a safe environment that encourages growth and learning.

Institutions can also decide to implement evaluation at one or two levels (for example only self and management level, or to use only self-evaluation), it is not mandatory to implement all three levels. When deciding which levels are applicable and appropriate and in which way, the following questions might be of assistance:

(1) SELF evaluation - are there legal/institutional procedures preventing/allowing this type of evaluation? If they do exist, are those procedures for evaluation well defined, available, and transparent to all parties?

(2) PEER evaluation - are there legal/institutional procedures preventing/allowing this type of evaluation? If they do exist, are those procedures for evaluation well defined, available, and transparent to all parties? Are peers able to evaluate others in a meaningful way¹, do they cooperate in a way that enables real - measurable and comparable insight in other peoples' competences? Will a peer evaluation produce adverse effects and if they

¹ When implementing a performance review, peers are almost always able to provide some feedback (if not for all selected dimensions, than for most) but when it comes to the competence evaluation the question of whether someone has a real insight into competences that is NOT equalised with performance, becomes central: if colleagues do not have sufficient knowledge or are simply not in a position to evaluate someone's competences, or they are not able to differentiate between performance and competence, they should not be asked to do so.

are even remotely possible, are there procedures in place to identify those affects and manage them? Who among peers will complete the questionnaire? If more than one person will complete the peer evaluation, think about adding additional column to present their answers. Suggestion would be not to present arithmetic mean of all peer answers as it is not adequate measuring tool in this case.

(3) MANAGEMENT evaluation - are there legal/institutional procedures preventing/allowing this type of evaluation? If they do exist, are those procedures for evaluation well defined, available, and transparent to all parties? Who in a management chain will complete the questionnaire? If more than one person will complete the management evaluation think about adding additional column to present their answers. Suggestion would be to avoid presenting arithmetic mean of all management answers as it is not adequate measuring tool in this case.

Each institution implementing these questionnaires should include in the introduction section of each questionnaire following information in order to transparently present the evaluation process:

1. The detailed method of implementing the survey which includes:
 - a. Legal and institutional framework behind it
 - b. Steps in the process: whether all three questionnaires (self, peer and management -) will be completed; if peer ones will be completed who are the peers doing so (entire company, members of a unit - make sure to keep anonymity of peers completing the questionnaire) etc. who will have access to the completed questionnaires and who will have access to the data derived from the questionnaires, and who will have access to the evaluation report and in which manner the report will be presented to people who are evaluated.
 - c. How and for what purpose the data will be analysed and for how long will it be kept. Will it be a permanent addon to an expert's/employee's HR file?
 - d. Most importantly: whether the data collected can influence their employment status or the level of salary/fee?
 - i. if so, explain the legal background and steps that either party can take in the process,
 - ii. if not explain measures that will be taken by management to ensure that the answers will not have adverse effects on employees/experts.

Each EQET SEE institution is governed by national and institutional legislature, therefor it is not possible to produce generic method nor all-encompassing-one-measure-fits-all questionnaire. Each institution opting to implement evaluation should develop its own method and ensure that procedures developed are legal and legitimate, that they protect employees and ensure adequate level of reliability of answers.

This general template consists of four parts:

1. Self-evaluation questionnaire - to be completed by an employee/expert that is being evaluated,
2. Peer evaluation questionnaire - to be completed by peers working closely with the person who completed the self-evaluation questionnaire,
3. Management evaluation questionnaire- to be completed by hierarchy, people managing person who completed the self-evaluation questionnaire.
4. Reporting form as an example of how quantitative data can be presented based on the total of three questionnaires completed.

From the perspective of design, the questionnaire ahead is rather condense: the forms of questions for self-evaluation and pear/management evaluation are presented side by side, while the scales are omitted to show the intention to present results in 3-party way. The redesign in terms of adding 10-point scales and separating self-peer-management evaluation into three separate questionnaires is advisable.

Lastly, feel free to adjust the questionnaire to your institutional needs. As the questionnaire is solely based on the [Regional standard of competences for external evaluators](#) there may be additional dimensions that would be of value to add, attitude toward work, cooperation with others, specific tasks and duties etc. It is also possible to limit the number of questions that measure competences and change focus to performance evaluation.

It is important for all questions to be relevant for all levels on which you are implementing the survey. Make sure that all questions have either two options “Cannot evaluate” and “Not applicable” OR one “Cannot evaluate/not applicable” if it is not important for you institution to differentiate between the two. This is not a type of questionnaire that benefits from forced answers, quite the opposite.

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status and is in line with UNCSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

Legal and institutional background and quality assurance

According to your best knowledge, at what level is Mr Samwise Gamgee's knowledge on the following:

At what level is your knowledge on the following:

Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

I legal and strategic framework:

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
1.1 Official state and lower-level strategies for the development of general education			
1.2 Official state and lower-level strategies for the development of VET education			
1.3 Legislation regulating the general education			
1.4 Legislation regulating the VET education			
1.5 Legislation regulating the adult education			
1.6 Legislation regulating the work-based learning			
1.7 Legislation regulating quality assurance			
1.8 Legislation regulating the recognition of prior learning			
1.9 Legislation regulating external evaluation			
1.10 Legislation regulating equal treatment for everyone regardless of cultural and social background, gender, sexual orientation in education			
1.11 Legislation/rulebooks regulating code of ethics			
1.12 Legislation regulation data protection			

II background of the external evaluation:

Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
2.1 European quality assurance framework			
2.2 National quality assurance framework			
2.3 The implementation of work-based learning			
2.4 The implementation of practical learning at schools			
2.5 Teaching and learning methods			
2.6 Assessment methods			
2.7 The effects of school factors on the provision of education			

III institutional policies governing the following aspects of the external evaluation:

Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
3.1 The purpose of the external evaluation			
3.2 The value of the external evaluation			
3.3 The impact of the external evaluation			
3.4 Institutional procedures guiding the preparation of external evaluation			

- 3.5 Institutional procedures guiding the implementation of external evaluation
- 3.6 Institutional procedures guiding the reporting on external evaluation
- 3.7 Institutional procedures guiding the appeal process
- 3.8 Guiding the enhancement of the quality of external evaluation

IV the quality assurance of:

Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
4.1 Curriculum			
4.2 Teaching and learning			
4.3 School climate/ethos			
4.4 Management			
4.5 Student support			
4.6 Achievements			

Quality assurance method

V According to your best knowledge, how skilled is Mr Samwise Gamgee's in: How skilled are you in:

Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
5.1 Evaluating the curriculum implementation			
5.2 Applying contemporary pedagogical approaches that support the development of learners			
5.3 Identifying effective teaching and learning processes			
5.4 Applying theories behind contemporary research methods			
5.5 Quantitative sampling			
5.6 Qualitative sampling			
5.7 Indicator development			
5.8 Questionnaire development			
5.9 Interview guide development			
5.10 Interview implementation			
5.11 Quantitative data analysis			
5.12 Qualitative data analysis			

VI According to your best knowledge, at what level is Mr Samwise Gamgee's: At what level is your:

Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
6.1 Understanding of thematic areas and indicators used in external evaluation			
6.2 Ability to connect indicators used in external evaluation with the school reality.			
6.3 Ability to gather relevant data			

- 6.4 Ability to choose the appropriate data collection method
- 6.5 Ability to assess the quality of evidence used for developing reports
- 6.6 Ability to deal with contradictory evidence in order to make fair and objective judgement

VII Looking at the indicators used in external evaluation, please list all of those that are for you/ for Mr Samwise Gamgee:

When listing the indicators feel free to either list the full name of an indicator (if a specific indicator can be identified) or list a topic/a group of indicators that are challenging, for example indicators related to student support.

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
7.1 The most difficult to understand?			
7.2 The most difficult to assess?			
7.3 The most difficult to agree upon within the evaluation team?			

Communication

**VIII According to your best knowledge, how skilled is Mr Samwise Gamgee's in:
How skilled are you in:**

Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
8.1 Knowledge on different communication techniques			
8.2 Oral communication skills			
8.3 Ability to adjust your communication to a person you are talking to			
8.4 Ability to adjust your communication to changing circumstances			
8.5 Ability to negotiate			
8.6 Ability to apply principles of assertive and flexible communication			
8.7 Ability to use non-verbal communication to your advantage			
8.8 Ability to resolve conflict situations			
8.9 Teamwork and team communication			
8.10 Leadership and decision making			

**IX What is the quality of Mr Samwise Gamgee's:
What is the quality of your:**

Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

	Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager's evaluation
9.1 Written communication skills?			
9.2 Written evaluation reports?			
9.3 Recommendations in evaluation reports?			
9.4 Feedback that has a positive impact on school development?			

X On the scale on 1 to 10, how effective is Mr Samwise Gamgee’s communication with:
 On the scale on 1 to 10, how effective is your communication with:
 Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

		Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager’s evaluation
10.1	School management?			
10.2	Teachers?			
10.3	Learners?			
10.4	Parents/guardians?			
10.5	Employers?			

Social context

XI According to your best knowledge, at what level is Mr Samwise Gamgee’s knowledge on the following:
 At what level is your knowledge on the following:
 Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0.

		Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager’s evaluation
11.1	Integration of social equity principles in school context and teaching			
11.2	Poverty reduction measures available to education institutions/providers (measures that aim at supporting students in the risk of poverty such are free books, meals, financial support for travel, guidance etc.)			
11.3	Integration of environmental sustainability principles in school context and teaching			
11.4	Integration of gender equity principles in school context and teaching			
11.5	Inclusive education			
11.6	School practices regarding the cases of peer violence, cyber bullying, and begging			
11.7	Drop-out prevention measures available to schools			
11.8	Students/pupils participation in the education process			

XII According to your best knowledge, to what extent is the following challenging for Mr Samwise Gamgee:
 To what extent is the following challenging for you:
 Please make an assessment on the scale from 1 to 10, one being very low, and 10 being very high. If you are not able to assess, please write 0. Please note that the term **disadvantaged background** in this questionnaire refers to all of those who have unequal access to resources due to their culture, handicap, religion, gender, sexual orientation, economic or social status, etc.

		Self-evaluation	Peer-evaluation	Manager’s evaluation
12.1	How to identify and address negative institutional practices towards students with disadvantaged background			
12.2	How to identify and address discrimination practices			
12.3	How to communicate with students with disadvantaged background			
12.4	How to communicate with parents/guardians of students with disadvantaged background			
12.5	How to communicate to teachers regarding the identified discriminatory practices towards students with disadvantaged background			
12.6	How to communicate to school directors regarding the identified discriminatory practices towards students with disadvantaged background			

13 Do you have any additional comments?
